

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q1: Aggregation of Absorbed Costs

Senator Fawcett asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 14.

Could you indicate the aggregation of absorbed costs this year—things like the Moorebank proposal; operations that are under that \$10 million threshold; programs that have been announced as policies by government but it is then indicated that Defence would absorb that cost out of the portfolio?

Response:

As outlined in the 2012-13 Defence Portfolio Budget Statements, Defence has absorbed costs associated with a number of measures to an aggregate of \$126m. These include:

- Operation Resolute;
- Operation Kruger;
- the Intermodal Terminal at Moorebank in Western Sydney - Defence Relocation;
- Bushmaster Vehicles - acquisition of long-lead supplies;
- CH-47D Chinook fleet - acquisition of two additional helicopters; and
- C-17A Globemaster Aircraft - sixth acquisition.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q2: Defence Budget

Senator Fawcett asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 13.

In the past 6 years, have there been cost pressures discussed (formally or informal) by COSC members that for any reason have not subsequently formed part of formal submissions to Government? If so, what was the rough order of magnitude of these additional cost pressures?

Response:

Given the broad nature of the question and the diverse range of discussions that occur in the Chiefs of Service Committee (COSC), Defence is unable to provide a useful response.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates – 17 October 2012

Q3: HMAS *Collins*

Senator Johnston asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 16.

Provide details on the repair / refurbishment issues with HMAS *Collins*. When it went in for deep cycle maintenance, when this work will commence. And what are the arrangements for payment by the Department of Defence to the contractors?

Response:

HMAS *Collins* was transferred to ASC's Osborne facility on 3 August 2012. Its second Full Cycle Docking will officially start on 1 February 2013.

It is intended that the following preparatory work will be undertaken prior to 1 February 2013:

- (a) system decommissioning and preservation;
- (b) removal of the propeller;
- (c) removal of equipment from bilges;
- (d) removal of the casing and undercasing pipework and cabling;
- (e) removal of the main battery;
- (f) removal of the Emergency Propulsion Unit; and
- (g) hull inspections.

This work will be conducted under the In Service Support Contract.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q4: Health Services

Senator Johnston asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 17.

Can they get a copy of the Access Economics report from 2009 regarding Health Services?

Response:

Please find attached a redacted copy of the Access Economics report of 26 October 2009 for your information.

Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q5 - DLA Piper

Senator Johnston asked on Wednesday, 17 October 2012, Hansard page 28.

How many matters were returned to DLA Piper?

Response:

Defence returned 20 matters to DLA Piper for reconsideration as falling within the scope of the Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q6 - DLA Piper

Senator Johnston asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 27:

Of the eight cases referred to the IGADF which have been completed, what is the result of these?

Response:

The table below outlines the results of those eight inquiries referred to the IGADF, which have been completed.

RANK	GENDER	SERVICE	ALLEGATIONS	INQUIRY STATUS	INQUIRY OUTCOME
Sergeant	Female	Army	Unacceptable behaviour	Completed	Unsubstantiated
Lieutenant	Female	Army	Unacceptable behaviour and sexual harassment	Completed	Unsubstantiated
Ms	Female	Australian Public Servant	Unacceptable behaviour	Completed	Unsubstantiated
Mr	Male	Former Army	Avoidance of process	No inquiry	Resolved
Ms	Female	Former Air Force	Health care and breach of privacy	Completed	Unsubstantiated
Ms	Female	Former Air Force	Handling of an alleged sexual assault	Completed	Some systemic issues identified
Mr	Male	Former Navy	Illegal detention	Completed	Unsubstantiated
Ms	Female	Australian Public Servant	Unacceptable behaviour, harassment and victimisation	Withdrawn	Undetermined

An additional case was referred to the IGADF and this is still ongoing. Details below:

Major	Male	Army	Abuse of power	Ongoing	To be determined
-------	------	------	----------------	---------	------------------

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q7 - DLA Piper

Senator Johnston asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard pages 28-29.

Can you confirm that those that were out of scope were advised of this progressively?

Response:

The 'out of scope' assessments were generally advised to Defence by the DLA Piper Review in batches. DLA Piper has advised that it notified people progressively of those decisions (in most instances, once DLA Piper received advice that Defence confirmed the Review's assessment). A small number of individuals were notified immediately during an initial enquiry.

DLA Piper has advised that it determined that a number of individuals did not require notification of the decision that their communication was out of scope of the Review. DLA Piper has advised that the majority of those communications did not require notification because they contained no allegations and were in the nature of a general comment or suggestion relating to the 'Skype incident' or Defence and/or the Minister's response. DLA Piper has also advised that the remaining communications did not require notification because they were in the nature of offers of assistance (including one job application), anonymous communications/communications that contained no contact details, requests for information, subsequent withdrawals, referred to the Review in error and one matter captured in media reporting and one communication returned to the Minister's office for action.

DLA Piper has advised that two individuals were not notified that their communications were outside the scope of the Review. DLA Piper has since contacted both individuals.

DLA Piper advised that the Minister's instructions had been sought for those matters referred to the Review by the Minister's office and later confirmed to be out of scope.

On 26 November 2012, the Minister stated that the Defence Abuse Review Taskforce would re-examine allegations made by individuals which were assessed as out of scope of the Review's Terms of Reference. That would include those individuals whose allegations were referred to the Review by the Minister's office who had not previously been notified that their allegation had been assessed as out of scope.

Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q8: DLA Piper

Senator Johnston asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard pages 31-32.

What is the breakdown of costs for DLA Piper since May 2012?

Response:

Between 28 May 2012 and 30 January 2013, Defence paid DLA Piper invoices totalling \$798,402.53 (incl GST) for work for Defence and the Minister including:

- (a) receiving, responding to and recording contact with complainants;
- (b) providing information to the Minister and the Department as appropriate;
- (c) updating information on the DLA Piper website, answering service and automated email responses to reflect developments;
- (e) work undertaken by the Review leads subcontracted to DLA Piper including advice to the Minister, briefing of the Commonwealth Ombudsman, settling redactions of documents for public release and updating public information;
- (f) communication with the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the Commonwealth Ombudsman in response to requests for information; and
- (g) travel, courier, word processing costs, other sub-contractor charges and administration.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q9: DLA Piper

Senator Johnston asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 29:

What are the ranks of the three officers working with Brigadier Holmes?

Response:

The Organisational Response Unit includes a Liaison Officer from each Service:

- (a) Royal Australian Navy – Lieutenant Commander
- (b) Australian Army – Lieutenant Colonel
- (c) Royal Australian Air Force – Wing Commander

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q10 – Staff Reductions

Senator Humphries asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 31:

How far are we in terms of achieving the 1000 staff reductions, from where you started to where you are going and what point you have reached? When will we reach that target?

Response:

The reduction in civilian numbers of 1,000 announced in the 2012-13 Portfolio Budget Statements is to be achieved over financial years 2012-13 and 2013-14.

Since the start of 2012-13 and as at 24 October 2012, Defence's actual full time equivalent has reduced by 346. Defence remains some 854 over its budget workforce on a year-to-date average basis, and efforts continue to reduce this.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q11: Future of Centurion Tank at Singleton Army Base

Senator Williams provided in writing.

A Centurion tank at Singleton Army Base was used as the main entrance guard, but has been replaced by a Leopard tank. As the Centurion tank served Australian forces well in the Vietnam War and could be a potential restoration project for Vietnam Veterans, it would be disappointing to see it lost or cast aside. What does Defence plan to do with this Centurion tank?

Response:

The Centurion tank, previously on static display at the main gate of the training area has been relocated within Singleton military area to allow greater access to undertake necessary construction/maintenance works at the base. The tank was relocated approximately 30 meters from its original site.

There are no plans to dispose of the Centurion tank. Its final placement at the Singleton military area has not been finalised.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q12: Collins Class Submarine

Senator Fawcett asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 49.

- (a) Question on the AN/BYG-1: is high-density contact management at the top of the 2003 industry brief by the US.
- (b) Is the AN/BYG-1 still largely a manual process rather than an automatic process for multiple target tracking?

Response:

- (a) High-density contact management is a sub-bullet under Command Decision Aids on slide 61 of the 71-slide 2003 industry brief. The focus of the industry brief by the United States was to introduce the advanced processing build process, and outline how industry could become involved including mechanics, challenges, and the competitive nature of the process.
- (b) As indicated in the response to Question on Notice No.156 taken from the Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing on 17 October 2012, a range of target motion analysis functions are used in Collins class submarines. Good submarine practice avoids dependence on any one single tool to maintain an accurate tactical picture, particularly when reliant on passive sensors such as sonar for the detection and tracking of contacts.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q13: Collins Class Submarine (Submarine Tactical Requirements Group)

Senator Fawcett asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 50.

- (a) Has the Australian Navy provided any requests for changes to the APB through the Submarine Tactical Requirements Group?
- (b) Do you know if the officer who sits on the Submarine Tactical Requirements Group has ever been personally briefed by Australian industry as to the capabilities that Australian industry can offer and that the US industry and underwater combat centre have not managed to deliver at this point in time?

Response:

- (a) Australian requests for improvements in the ongoing development of AN/BYG-1 continue to evolve as the system is progressively installed across the submarine fleet. To date, our interaction with the Submarine Tactical Requirements Group (STRG) has involved briefs regarding the methodology used to develop an Australian weapon control display modification within AN/BYG-1, which met with favourable response. Australia has also presented the requirement to maintain power consumption of AN/BYG-1 within margins as processing capacity expands. This has been adopted as a joint United States and Australian goal.
- (b) The current Australian officer who serves as the Royal Australian Navy's Advisory Member on the STRG has not been personally briefed in the manner suggested by the question; however, he did accompany the US Joint Project Office Program Manager during a presentation by Lockheed Martin Australia and Acacia Research in Adelaide.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q14: SEA 1439 Phase 4A

Senator Fawcett asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 51.

- (a) From their perspective which, irrespective of that, is the key issue preventing them preventing some of the systems that have been trialled and proven to work here into that program because there is no protection of their IP. I would be happy for you to take on notice a plan, if you like, to see how we move forward in that area to make it actually possible for industry to compete
- (b) SEA 1439 Phase 4A: Have they (Industry participants?) ever proposed an Australian submarine capability for them? If so, what happened to it? Context of APB program?

Response:

- (a) A plan to increase Australian industry competitiveness in the AN/BYG-1 development program is expected to be completed by early 2013. This plan addresses a range of issues that are of interest to Australian industry, including intellectual property management. The plan is being developed in consideration of the outcomes of recent Priority Industry Capability (PIC) health checks.
- (b) Australian industry has previously proposed capability initiatives for SEA1439 Ph4A. The proposals did not align with the priorities of the AN/BYG-1 program, and therefore did not progress to development within the APB program.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates – 17 October 2012

Q15: Submarines (SEA 1439 Phase 4A and SEA 1000)

Senator Fawcett asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 51.

Have there been any recommendations from any level of management with either a SEA 1439 Phase 4A or SEA 1000 that Australia should withdraw from the APB program?

Response:

Defence can find no record of any management consideration of withdrawal from the Armaments Cooperative Project under which the APB development program operates.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q16: Dredging in Cairns

Senator Macdonald asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 53

Is Navy involved with working with the QLD government regarding dredging at Cairns?

Response:

Navy has regular liaison with Ports North, a Government owned corporation based in Cairns. They run a regular schedule of dredging to maintain the navigation channel, Trinity Inlet and the swing basin. This includes annual dredging of the inner basin at HMAS *Cairns* over a 10 week period.

Dredging operations for HMAS *Cairns* are done on a rotational basis; outer basin of the wharf one year and inner basin of the wharf the next year (2012 involves dredging of the inner basin). The dredging works are performed by Ports North and run for approximately 10 weeks.

Defence's nominal annual dredging budget for HMAS *Cairns* is \$658,000. This year, after heavier than normal sediment flow (due to the after effects of cyclone Yasi), an extra \$80,000 was required as a material effect claim to ensure the correct depth of the inner basin.

Defence is aware that the Cairns Shipping Development project will deliver improved cruise ship infrastructure, and involves 5 million cubic meters of capital dredging, relocated navigational aids, wharf fender upgrades and land based infrastructure services upgrades in 2015. While Navy was not consulted directly, any widening and deepening of the channel and relocation of the swing basin would be beneficial to Navy in Cairns in the long term.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q17: LHDs and turning around in the Cairns Inlet

Senator Ian Macdonald asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 51.

What would you need to do to turn the LHDs around easily in the Cairns Inlet? Is it feasible or not?

Response:

The RAN Master Attendant has advised that it is possible for an LHD to enter, berth and turn around given Cairns Port's current dimensions of the entrance channel and swing basin, however this would only be planned and conducted in very benign conditions and at high tide. The proposed enhancement of the shipping channel and development of the swing basins will increase the range of environmental conditions in which an LHD could safely enter, berth and turn in Cairns Port.

Senate Sanding Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q18: Collins Class Sustainment Budget

Senator Johnston asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 52.

What is the annual and total cost of the Collins class sustainment budget? Provide clarification on variation in figures given previously in May 2011?

Response:

The current Collins Class sustainment budget for FY2012/13 is \$499.2 million.

Navy is required to prioritise its sustainment budget across all its platforms on a needs basis. This reprioritisation and reallocation of funds is the reason for the variations in budgets. The increase in the Collins sustainment budget since May 2011 has mainly been to fund the purchase of critical spares and to enhance the submarine sustainment services provided by industry.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q19: Collins Class Submarine Costs

Senator Johnston asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 56.

In relation to Collins Class submarines, please provide forward estimates out to 2015/16 for the following:

- (a) Sustainment Costs;
- (b) Operating Costs;
- (c) Approved Major Capital Investment program and minor projects;
- (d) Anticipated depreciation costs; and
- (e) Total cost of (a) to (c). ie. sustainment, operating and major capital/minor project costs.

Response:

(a)-(c), (e) The following table outlines Collins Class submarine sustainment costs, operating costs, Approved Major Capital Investment Program, Minor projects and anticipated depreciation costs.

DESCRIPTION	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m
Sustainment Costs	499.2	551.8	552.6	511.3
Operating Costs	187.4	184.4	187.7	202.9
Approved Major Capital Investment Program	44.8	37.3	30.3	23.5
Minor Projects	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL COLLINS PROGRAM	731.4	773.5	770.6	737.7

(d)

Anticipated depreciation costs	140.0	140.0	140.0	140.0
--------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q20: Future Submarine Capability

Senator Ludlum asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 57.

Provide a brief on where the \$214 million study and analysis of future submarine capability is up to ie. including details on the six different groups?

Response:

The six main groups of work that are underway or shortly to begin are listed below and the current planned spend spread is provided in the table below:

- (1) Work to compare and contrast the range of submarine combat systems available on the international commercial market (underway).
- (2) An extensive array of technical studies being undertaken on the project's behalf by the Defence Science and Technology Organisation (underway).
- (3) Comparative analysis of the three existing submarine designs available off-the-shelf, modified only to meet Australia's regulatory requirements (underway).
- (4) Work to determine whether any of the existing off-the-shelf design could be modified to incorporate Australia's specific requirements, including in relation to combat systems and weapons (underway).
- (5) Analysis of an existing design, including the Collins class, that has been evolved to more closely meet the requirements outlined in the 2009 Defence White Paper (to begin shortly).
- (6) Investigation of the cost, capability, risk and schedule profile of an entirely new, developmental submarine design (in the early stages of being set up).

Activity	Spend (\$m) 2012 - 13	Spend (\$m) 2013 - 14	Spend (\$m) 2014 - 15	Total
Design studies with European companies DCNS, HDW & Navantia	6.2	0.0	0.0	6.2
Design studies with Swedish company Kockums for new build Collins	3.0	3.1	6.6	12.7
Analysis of Options	8.0	10.0	12.1	30.0
Mission System studies	3.0	3.2	1.2	7.4
Support system studies	1.2	1.2	0.6	3.0
DSTO-MOTS evaluation studies	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2
DSTO-System Integration & capability modelling	1.2	1.2	1.3	3.7
DSTO-Combat System studies	2.0	3.0	3.0	7.9
DSTO-Signatures	0.8	1.8	2.0	4.7
DSTO-Power & Energy studies	3.4	3.0	3.3	9.6
DSTO-Cell aging & performance tests	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.8
DSTO-Battery design studies	3.4	1.3	0.0	4.7
DSTO-Procure battery test sets	0.0	11.0	0.0	11.0
DSTO-Advanced material propeller	1.1	1.4	0.7	3.3
DSTO - Hydrodynamics	1.6	1.2	1.2	4.1
DSTO - Propellers and Pumpjets	1.2	1.4	1.5	4.1
DSTO-Platform	0.9	1.0	0.7	2.6
DSTO-Secure facilities	0.2	1.7	1.3	3.1
DSTO-S&T planning support	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.4
Project office costs	1.5	1.7	1.9	5.0
US Program Management Support (Foreign Military Sales)	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.0
Specialised Computer systems & software	0.5	2.1	2.2	4.8
Submarine Propulsion Energy Support & Integration Facility Development	2.1	3.2	3.4	8.6
Submarine Performance Modelling	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Engineer Development programs	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.6
Miscellaneous studies	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.5
Engineer signature analysis studies	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.7
Hydrodynamic design studies	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.4
Acquisition of broader Collins Class intellectual property rights		0.0	30.9	30.9
Total Ph 1A Activities (Ex Contingency)	46.1	55.4	45.7	178.1
Contingency				35.9
Total				214.0

Note: Contingency is worked out on risk of individual entries. This ranges from 10% - 50%.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q21: Towed Guns

Senator Johnson asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 65.

Provide a detailed breakdown of the costs (hardware and ancillary) associated with the recent announcement of 19 towed guns @ \$70m. Include what systems are required to bring these guns up to date with the 35 M777A2 announced in the budget. Why is there a cost difference between the 19 guns announced and the 35 announced earlier?

Response:

The cost breakdown outlined in the Minister for Defence’s 16 October 2012 announcement on the acquisition of an additional 19 M777A2 Lightweight Towed Howitzers (LTH) is set out below:

Scope Element	Cost (\$m)	Contingency (\$m)	Total (\$m)
Mission System	55.7	5.6	61.3
Development	0.0	0.0	0.0
Procurement	55.7	5.6	61.3
Howitzer Lightweight Towed 155mm M777A2	54.3	5.4	59.8
Global Positioning System	0.1	0.0	0.1
Radio Transmitters and Accessories	0.3	0.0	0.3
Level 3/4 Toolkit	0.6	0.1	0.7
Muzzle Velocity Sensor (MVS) Assembly	0.3	0.0	0.3
Other Minor value items such as tools adaptors sensors carrycases	0.1	0.0	0.1
Support System	1.9	0.4	2.3
Initial Spares	1.9	0.4	2.3
Packaging	0.0	0.0	0.0
Support and Test Equipment	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contractor Services and Other	4.4	0.4	4.8
General and Administrative - FMS Administrative Charge	2.2	0.2	2.4
Other (specify) - Transportation	2.2	0.2	2.4
Personnel and Other	0.5	0.1	0.6
Personnel	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Project Costs	0.5	0.1	0.6
TOTAL ACQUISITION COST	62.5	6.5	69.0

The total amount shown in the table was rounded up to \$70m.

As the additional 19 LTH will be produced to the same build standard as those already delivered, there is no additional work required to update any of the gun systems. Defence is planning (in 2013) to present to Government a proposal to deliver the remaining support elements, such as additional facilities and ordnance certification requirements, necessary to realise the overall Land 17 indirect fire capability, based on the requirements of a single fleet of LTH.

The apparent cost difference between the additional 19 LTH and the previously delivered 35 LTH is due to the acquisition of a battle management system and artillery fuzes, which were funded within the same approval as the 35 LTH. The actual unit cost per gun has remained broadly consistent between procurements and further acquisition of battle management systems and fuzes is not required with the announced purchase of an additional 19 LTH.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q22: SEA 1000

Senator Johnston asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 69.

- (a) Is there a plan to spend the remaining \$113 million from the \$214 million budgeted for SEA 1000? (\$101.5m spent so far). What is the breakdown for these activities?
- (b) Of the specified budget allocation of \$101 million for the SEA 1000 project, how much has been expended to date and on what?

Response:

Note that the amounts of money referred to in the question reflect planned, not actual expenditure.

- (a)
Yes, there is a plan to spend the full \$214 million approved by Government for the SEA 1000 project.

This funding will be expended on a broad range of activities in support of the Future Submarine Project, including:

- Design studies with European companies DCNS, HDW, Navantia and Kockums;
- Studies into mission and support systems;
- Studies, modelling and tests into a range of aspects of the program, including combat systems, power and energy systems, hydrodynamics, batteries and propellers;
- Submarine Propulsion Energy Support & Integration Facility (SPESIFy) Development;
- Acquisition of broad Collins class intellectual property rights;
- Options analysis; and
- Project office costs, specialised computer systems and software, secure facilities and Legal Support.

Contingency has also been allocated for each individual activity.

The total planned expenditure in 2012-13 is \$46.1 million.

(b)

Actual expenditure to date totals \$24.3 million of the planned expenditure in 2012-13 of \$46.1 million.

The majority of this expenditure has been expended on work conducted by DSTO in support of the activities outlined at response (a) above. Other expenditure has been on legal support, Scheduling Support and SPESIFy Implementation Planning.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q23: Maintenance of Defence Sites

Senator Fawcett asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 72.

What are the outstanding requirements for remediation on Defence sites, including underground infrastructure and the like, particularly the ones that have an OH&S implication or an operational implication?

Response:

The safety and protection of Defence personnel is paramount. At all times Defence seeks to proactively manage health and safety risks across the Defence estate.

Defence has two major financial programs in place to fund its large, complex and aging estate: namely, the Major Capital Facilities (MCF) and the Estate Maintenance (EM) Program

The total Estate Maintenance budget for 2012-13 to 2014-15 totals \$1.42 billion and includes a contracted/recurring component, reactive maintenance, and a provision for risk managed works.

Each asset on the Defence estate is categorised according to its contribution to capability. Examples of the highest contribution are critical command, control, intelligence and communications assets, airfields, and fuel farms.

Each year Defence conducts an assessment of the condition of each asset on the estate. This is known as the infrastructure appraisal (IA) process. It evaluates the condition of assets and determines what work needs to be done to maintain them in an appropriate condition. IA data is consolidated into projects which are assessed against a seven dimension risk model covering capability, safety, legislative compliance, environment and heritage, financial efficiency, personnel and reputation aspects. From the IA, a program of risk managed works is developed for each base.

Risk managed works are prioritised using a risk based approach that funds those works that apply to the highest contribution assets and highest risk requirements.

The total requirement identified through the IA process for risk managed works only for 2012-13 to 2014-15 is in the order of \$1.3 billion. This amount does not include the contracted/recurring or reactive maintenance components.

Work Health and Safety requirements, that can not be mitigated, receive the highest priority funding.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q24: Recreational Leave Travel

Senator Kroger asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 76.

What are the projected budgeted savings with the measure?

Response:

The workforce savings for Recreational Leave Travel (RLT) are listed below:

Table 5: Expenditure Reduction Measures on page 17 of the 2012-13 Portfolio Budget Statements included the following measure:

	2012-13 \$m	2013-14 \$m	2014-15 \$m	2015-16 \$m	Total FE \$m
Workforce Policy Change	14	11	11	11	47

Within the above figures, expenditure reductions as a result of proposed changes to RLT were as follows:

	2012-13 \$m	2013-14 \$m	2014-15 \$m	2015-16 \$m	Total FE \$m
RLT	10.5	10.6	10.7	10.8	42.7

Removal of the age limit on 17 September 2012 reduces the RLT savings by the following amounts:

	2012-13 \$m	2013-14 \$m	2014-15 \$m	2015-16 \$m	Total FE \$m
RLT	- 8.0	- 8.1	- 8.2	- 8.3	- 32.7

The foregone savings of \$32.7m, as a result of removing the age restrictions will be offset within the Defence budget.

The remaining savings of \$10m from this initiative across the 2012-13 Budget and Forward Estimates are outlined in the following table:

	2012-13 \$m	2013-14 \$m	2014-15 \$m	2015-16 \$m	Total FE \$m
RLT	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	10.0

These savings are as a result of aligning Navy entitlements with Army and Air Force whereby all members will be eligible for one return RLT trip per annum to their nominated family within Australia.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q25: Recruitment of RN Navy Personnel to RAN

Senator Kroger asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 78.

How many applicants for the UK navy program (recruitment of RN personnel to RAN) are women?

Response:

The Royal Australian Navy is currently processing 145 applications from currently serving or ex-serving Royal Navy/Royal Marine personnel, and of those 3 are from women.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q26: PRT Funding

Senator Rhiannon asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 82.

As per response to QoN 41 from May 2012 Estimates, can Defence provide updated information that provides a detailed breakdown on spending for FY 2011-12 including what the money was spend on, and an estimate for FY 2012-13?

Response:

Subsequent to the Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing on 17 October 2012, Defence identified that the following costs which are not Official Development Assistance (ODA) eligible under the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Statistical Reporting Directives were incorrectly included in ODA Eligible Expenditure for Afghanistan.

1. Force Protection costs in 2010-11 and 2011-12;
2. Other activities such as engineering elements and trade training activities across some or all years;
3. Direct project costs for some military checkpoints in 2006-07 and 2007-08 shown in the table.

A revised response to QoN 41 has been provided to the Committee.

Direct Construction Project Costs:

The original Defence submission to the Senate Inquiry into Australia's overseas development programs in Afghanistan detailed a total of 43 individual projects believed to be ODA-eligible in accordance with OECD guidelines. The list of projects has subsequently been separately reviewed for OECD guideline compliance.

As a result of this review, two Checkpoint construction projects totalling AUD\$127,187 (Serials 20 and 26 of Enclosure 2) have been deleted from the list as they were not in accordance with OECD guidelines.

The inclusion of six additional individual projects undertaken in financial year 2011-12 or scheduled for work in financial year 2012-13 now brings the number of Defence construction projects, assessed as OECD compliant, up to a total of 47.

Defence Employee and Defence Employee Support Costs:

A comprehensive review of Defence employee and employee support costs identified that a substantial portion of the reported costs were not ODA eligible under the OECD DAC Statistical Reporting Directives. The reported figures incorrectly included activities being undertaken by the Provincial Reconstruction Taskforce such as engineering elements and trade training activities across some or all years that were not ODA eligible and Force Protection costs in 2010-11 and 2011-12.

An investigation into how the error in employee and employee support costs arose indicates that it can be tracked back to the source data contained in the annual costings for Defence Operations.

To date, the number of staff involved in the Provincial Reconstruction Taskforce, including the number of staff assigned to Force Protection in 2010-11 and 2011-12 and other activities such as engineering elements and trade training activities across some or all years, was entered into the costing sheet as an aggregate number. This aggregate number was then used in calculating the reportable ODA costs.

Defence has now implemented a process that will separately identify the staffing for the Reconstruction Taskforce element that is undertaking ODA eligible activities in the Operations Costing Template.

Tables in Defence's submission to the Senate Inquiry into Australia's overseas development programs in Afghanistan

Defence's submission to the Senate Inquiry into Australia's overseas development programs in Afghanistan has been updated to include revised tables and resubmitted.

The Table below is a summary by financial year of expenditure on Defence ODA-eligible construction activities undertaken up to and including FY 2011-12 and estimates for FY 2012-13.

The Table at Enclosure 1 shows a breakdown of the same information for each individual Defence ODA-eligible construction activity.

Summary of ODA Eligible Construction Activities Undertaken by Defence for Period FY 2006-07 to 2011-12 and Scheduled for FY 2012-13

Year	Direct Project Costings⁽¹⁾	Defence Employee Costs⁽²⁾	Defence Employee Support Costs⁽³⁾	Totals
2006-07	\$1,771,777	\$2,678,996	\$1,445,175	\$5,895,948
2007-08	\$5,143,625	\$7,109,470	\$4,901,203	\$17,154,298
2008-09	\$10,737,407	\$4,685,788	\$2,589,838	\$18,013,033
2009-10	\$3,909,776	\$3,641,652	\$2,407,154	\$9,958,582
2010-11	\$5,460,623	\$784,458	\$455,439	\$6,700,520
2011-12	\$7,052,892	\$720,060	\$473,315	\$8,246,267
2012 -13**	\$8,995,013	\$721,000	\$474,000	\$10,190,013
Total	\$43,071,113	\$20,341,424	\$12,746,123	\$76,158,660

(1) Net costs directly attributed to the construction or delivery of development projects.

(2) Net additional costs of ADF personnel, consisting of the payment of international campaign allowance, additional accrued leave entitlements, separation and field allowance. This excludes personnel responsible for providing force protection.

(3) Net ADF Personnel support and associated costs, consisting of logistics support such as rations, water, base support, electricity generation, maintenance and vehicle running costs.

** Estimated costs

ODA Eligible Individual Projects Undertaken by Defence for Period 2006-2013

Ser	Projects/Expenditure Item	Purpose Category	FY 06/07 AUD	FY 07/08 AUD	FY 08/09 AUD	FY 09/10 AUD	FY 10/11 AUD	FY11/12 AUD	FY12/13 AUD (EST)	Category Totals By Purpose AUD	Totals
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)
1	Sedfidkar Flood Mitigation	Civil Works	11,730	158,037						169,767	
2	Tarin Kot Waste Management	Civil Works		95,166			205,303			300,469	
3	Tarin Kot Waste Management Facility	Civil Works				1,163,204		7510		1,170,714	
4	Tarin Kot Wells - various location	Civil Works	18,103	63,621	309,990	48,363	23,473	4,272		467,822	2,108,772
5	Baluchi Community Project	Community		781	364,342					365,123	
6	Chora Food Storage Cellars	Community				72,389	6,291			78,680	
7	Rosie Khan Mosque	Community				61,589	184,616	9,058		255,263	
8	Sorgh Morghab Mosque	Community				232,736	804,987			1,037,723	
9	Sorkh Morghab Community Projects	Community			589,925	74,097				664,022	
9a	Radio Television Authority Rebuild	Community							1,252,397	1,252,397	3,653,208
10	Afghan Health and Development Services Training Facility	Education	4,890	848,269	886,509	40,812				1,780,480	
11	Malalai Girl's School	Education					1,501,939	72,563		1,574,502	
12	Naway Waleh School	Education		136,724						136,724	
13	Talani School	Education	92,051	81,335	2,341					175,727	
14	Tarin Kot Boys High School	Education			1,289,479	130,335	29,401			1,449,215	
15	Tarin Kot Boys Primary School	Education			1,298,467	828,397	44,446			2,171,310	
16	Tarin Kot Boys School	Education	88,077	677,965						766,042	
17	Tarin Kot Girls School Expansion	Education				223,461				223,461	
18	Trade Training Centre	Education	111,092	95,475						206,567	
19	Womens Training Project	Education	3,682	3,254						6,936	8,490,964
20	Project removed as this was an ANA check point									0	
21	Governor's Compound	Governance		111,502						111,502	
22	Governor's Shura Building (including Governors Compound Rectification)	Governance						1,546,508	393,172	1,939,680	
23	Ministry of Energy & Water Compound	Governance			15,621	233,183	355,222	22,882		626,908	
24	Ministry of Rural Reconstruction and Development Compound Refurbishment	Governance		5,598	125,786	2,295				133,679	
25	National Directorate of Security Compound	Governance	340,349	449,174	20,316					809,839	
25a	TK Prison Water Tower	Governance						21,443		21,443	
26	Project removed as this was an ANA check point									0	3,643,051
27	Chora Clinical Health Centre Expansion	Health				168,509	892,361	46,558	2,877	1,110,305	
28	Dorofshan Basic Health Care Centre	Health			354,024	110,221				464,245	
29	Mirabad Basic Health Centre	Health				21,237				21,237	
30	Sorkh Morghab Basic Health Centre	Health			1,356,732					1,356,732	
31	Tarin Kot Hospital	Health	629,231	963,508	548,065	12,882				2,153,686	
31a	Tarin Kot Hospital Doctors Accomodation	Health						162,236.00	19,179	181,415	
32	Yaklenga Health Centre	Health	164,566	360,865						525,431	
32a	Tarin Kot Solid Waste Containment Project	Health						694,285		694,285	6,507,336
33	Alexander Hill Bridge	Transport					274,036	152		274,188	
34	Baluchi Crossing	Transport		368,638	399,420					768,058	
35	Chutu II Bridge	Transport					186,202			186,202	
35a	Chutu Bridge repairs	Transport					136,347			136,347	
36	Eastern Causeway	Transport	308,006	723,713	20,155					1,051,874	
37	Irish Crossing Refurbishment	Transport				26,166				26,166	
38	Kowtwal Crossing	Transport			3,152,356	374,384				3,526,740	
39	Sajawal Crossing	Transport					136,213	1,829,207	423,859	2,389,279	
40	Sorkh Lez Crossing	Transport								0	
41	Talani Crossing	Transport			2,675	85,516				88,191	
42	Tarin Kot Roads	Transport						3,275,219	767,165	4,042,384	
43	Zabul Bridges	Transport			1,204					1,204	
43a	Route Whale East	Transport							5,442,079	5,442,079	17,932,712
44	Quick Impact Projects ¹						679,786	55,284		735,070	735,070
	SubTotal		1,771,777	5,143,625	10,737,407	3,909,776	5,460,623	7,052,892	8,995,013	43,071,113	43,071,113
	Aggregated Employee Costs - Net additional costs of ADF personnel		2,678,996	\$7,109,470	4,685,788	3,641,652	784,458	720,060	\$721,000	20,341,424	
	Aggregated Support Costs - Net ADF personnel support and associated costs		1,445,175	4,901,203	2,589,838	2,407,154	455,439	473,315	474,000	12,746,123	
	SubTotal		4,124,171	12,010,673	7,275,626	6,048,806	1,239,897	1,193,375	1,195,000	33,087,547	
	Total		5,895,948	17,154,298	18,013,033	9,958,582	6,700,520	8,246,267	10,190,013	76,158,660	

Note:1. No further breakdown of actual projects can be provided. QIPs provide a short to medium term development effect at the local level. The aim of a QIP is to provide funding for materials, labour and/or local national specialist advisors that benefit a wider group of people normally a village or community group. The stated goal is to provide entry into local communities, thereby facilitating closer engagement with key leaders and the community as a whole.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q27: ODA Eligible

Senator Rhiannon asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 81.

- (a) As per response to QoN 41 from May 2012 Estimates, are the projects that are done by the ADF that are labelled as ODA eligible expenditure in line with review and evaluation across aid program guidelines?
- (b) Referring to page 12 of the OECD guidelines on statistical reference says that expenses should not be covered in these types of projects – can you please confirm whether or not salary is an expense?

Response:

- (a) Yes. The updated list at Enclosure 1 consists of projects that are all deemed to be OECD compliant and in accordance aid program guidelines.

The original Defence submission detailed a total of 43 individual projects believed to be ODA-eligible in accordance with Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) guidelines. The list of projects has subsequently been reviewed for OECD guideline compliance.

As a result of this review, two Checkpoint construction projects totalling AUD\$127,187 (Serials 20 and 26 of Enclosure 2) have been deleted from the list as they were not in accordance with OECD guidelines. The inclusion of six additional individual projects undertaken in FY2011-12 or scheduled for work in FY2012-13 now brings the number of Defence construction projects, assessed as OECD compliant, up to a total of 47.

- (b) Paragraph 42 (page 12) of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) directives is a general exclusion of military equipment or services from ODA reporting, however, the DAC directives do allow for some military costs to be reported as ODA. Specifically paragraph 42 states "*additional costs incurred for the use of military personnel to deliver humanitarian aid or perform development services are included in ODA (but not their regular salaries and expenses)*".

In accordance with the DAC directives the net additional cost paid to Defence members whilst undertaking humanitarian aid projects is ODA eligible as the costs are only paid while the member is deployed (i.e. they are outside the regular salaries and expenses). This includes personnel costs such as the payment of international campaign allowances, additional accrued leave entitlements and separation and field allowances. Similarly the net additional costs of supporting these members in theatre whilst they undertake the aid project are also ODA eligible under the directive.

ODA Eligible Individual Projects Undertaken by Defence for Period 2006-2013

Ser	Projects/Expenditure Item (a)	Purpose Category (b)	FY 06/07 AUD (c)	FY 07/08 AUD (d)	FY 08/09 AUD (e)	FY 09/10 AUD (f)	FY 10/11 AUD (g)	FY 11/12 AUD (h)	FY 12/13 AUD (EST) (i)	Category Totals By Purpose AUD (k)	Totals (l)
1	Sedfidkar Flood Mitigation	Civil Works	11,730	158,037						169,767	
2	Tarin Kot Waste Management	Civil Works		95,166			205,303			300,469	
3	Tarin Kot Waste Management Facility	Civil Works				1,163,204		7510		1,170,714	
4	Tarin Kot Wells - various location	Civil Works	18,103	63,621	309,990	48,363	23,473	4,272		467,822	2,108,772
5	Baluchi Community Project	Community		781	364,342					365,123	
6	Chora Food Storage Cellars	Community				72,389	6,291			78,680	
7	Rosie Khan Mosque	Community				61,589	184,616	9,058		255,263	
8	Sorgh Morghab Mosque	Community				232,736	804,987			1,037,723	
9	Sorkh Morghab Community Projects	Community			589,925	74,097				664,022	
9a	Radio Television Authority Rebuild	Community						1,252,397		1,252,397	3,653,208
10	Afghan Health and Development Services Training Facility	Education	4,890	848,269	886,509	40,812				1,780,480	
11	Malalai Girl's School	Education					1,501,939	72,563		1,574,502	
12	Naway Waleh School	Education		136,724						136,724	
13	Talani School	Education	92,051	81,335	2,341					175,727	
14	Tarin Kot Boys High School	Education			1,289,479	130,335	29,401			1,449,215	
15	Tarin Kot Boys Primary School	Education			1,298,467	828,397	44,446			2,171,310	
16	Tarin Kot Boys School	Education	88,077	677,965						766,042	
17	Tarin Kot Girls School Expansion	Education				223,461				223,461	
18	Trade Training Centre	Education	111,092	95,475						206,567	
19	Womens Training Project	Education	3,682	3,254						6,936	8,490,964
20	Project removed as this was an ANA check point									0	
21	Governor's Compound	Governance		111,502						111,502	
22	Governor's Shura Building (including Governors Compound Rectification)	Governance						1,546,508	393,172	1,939,680	
23	Ministry of Energy & Water Compound	Governance			15,621	233,183	355,222	22,882		626,908	
24	Ministry of Rural Reconstruction and Development Compound Refurbishment	Governance		5,598	125,786	2,295				133,679	
25	National Directorate of Security Compound	Governance	340,349	449,174	20,316					809,839	
25a	TK Prison Water Tower	Governance						21,443		21,443	
26	Project removed as this was an ANA check point									0	3,643,051
27	Chora Clinical Health Centre Expansion	Health				168,509	892,361	46,558	2,877	1,110,305	
28	Dorofshan Basic Health Care Centre	Health			354,024	110,221				464,245	
29	Mirabad Basic Health Centre	Health				21,237				21,237	
30	Sorkh Morghab Basic Health Centre	Health			1,356,732					1,356,732	
31	Tarin Kot Hospital	Health	629,231	963,508	548,065	12,882				2,153,686	
31a	Tarin Kot Hospital Doctors Accommodation	Health						162,236.00	19,179	181,415	
32	Yaklenga Health Centre	Health	164,566	360,865						525,431	
32a	Tarin Kot Solid Waste Containment Project	Health						694,285		694,285	6,507,336
33	Alexander Hill Bridge	Transport					274,036	152		274,188	
34	Baluchi Crossing	Transport		368,638	399,420					768,058	
35	Chutu II Bridge	Transport					186,202			186,202	
35a	Chutu Bridge repairs	Transport					136,347			136,347	
36	Eastern Causeway	Transport	308,006	723,713	20,155					1,051,874	
37	Irish Crossing Refurbishment	Transport				26,166				26,166	
38	Kowtval Crossing	Transport			3,152,356	374,384				3,526,740	
39	Sajawal Crossing	Transport					136,213	1,829,207	423,859	2,389,279	
40	Sorkh Lez Crossing	Transport								0	
41	Talani Crossing	Transport			2,675	85,516				88,191	
42	Tarin Kot Roads	Transport						3,275,219	767,165	4,042,384	
43	Zabul Bridges	Transport			1,204					1,204	
43a	Route Whale East	Transport						5,442,079		5,442,079	17,932,712
44	Quick Impact Projects ¹						679,786	55,284		735,070	735,070
	SubTotal		1,771,777	5,143,625	10,737,407	3,909,776	5,460,623	7,052,892	8,995,013	43,071,113	43,071,113
	Aggregated Employee Costs - Net additional costs of ADF personnel		2,678,996	\$7,109,470	4,685,788	3,641,652	784,458	720,060	\$721,000	20,341,424	
	Aggregated Support Costs - Net ADF personnel support and associated costs		1,445,175	4,901,203	2,589,838	2,407,154	455,439	473,315	474,000	12,746,123	
	SubTotal		4,124,171	12,010,673	7,275,626	6,048,806	1,239,897	1,193,375	1,195,000	33,087,547	
	Total		5,895,948	17,154,298	18,013,033	9,958,582	6,700,520	8,246,267	10,190,013	76,158,660	

Note 1: No further breakdown of actual projects can be provided. QIPs provide a short to medium term development effect at the local level. The aim of a QIP is to provide funding for materials, labour and/or local national specialist advisors that benefit a wider group of people normally a village or community group. The stated goal is to provide entry into local communities, thereby facilitating closer engagement with key leaders and the community as a whole.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q28: ISAF Evaluations

Senator Rhiannon asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 83.

Does ISAF conduct any evaluations on ADF projects, and, if so, which projects have been evaluated and what were the outcomes?

Response:

The wider development impact of any of these projects has not been formally evaluated by International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). As previously advised, the overall security situation, the relatively small scale of the individual projects undertaken by the military Reconstruction and Task Force and Australian Defence Force (ADF) managed works team and the time imperatives to consistently deliver immediate and visible benefits to local communities, militate against the conduct of formal cost/benefit evaluations.

However, all construction projects undertaken by Defence continue to be assessed, through the Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) leadership, prior to the commencement of construction and are then routinely evaluated at a functional level by the ADF through the formal defect liability process, for fitness for purpose and construction standards, after completion. The PRT and the ADF are part of ISAF.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q29 - Fraud

Senator Fawcett asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 84:

How does Defence fraud statistics compare to defence organisations in comparable countries - Canada, US and the UK over the last 12 or 24 months?

Response:

Defence cannot answer this question as it does not have access to comparative data for these countries. However, to provide some context to how Defence deals with fraud, the following information is provided.

In compliance with the *Commonwealth Fraud Control Guidelines 2011*, Defence has a well established and robust fraud control framework to prevent, detect, investigate and report on fraud. Defence has delivered a biannual fraud control plan, in compliance with Commonwealth guidelines, since 1989. The current *Defence Fraud Control Plan No. 9* was approved by the Secretary of Defence and the Chief of the Defence Force on 20 November 2011.

Defence is successful at controlling and minimising fraud through its strong fraud control framework and rigorous audit regime. Defence implemented all of the agreed recommendations arising from the Australian National Audit Office Report 2000-2001. Fraud control planning processes are ongoing and Defence has adopted an approach of continuous improvement and refinement with each iteration of its corporate fraud control plan and in fraud control operations.

The Defence fraud control framework is supported by a dedicated Defence Whistleblower Scheme accessible to Defence personnel and members of the public to report matters of concern, including allegations of fraudulent conduct impacting on the Department.

Defence has in place a rigorous audit regime as well as an effective capability to investigate fraudulent conduct affecting the organisation, collectively ensuring that the incidence of fraud is reduced to a minimum.

Fraud investigations are managed jointly between the Inspector General of Defence and the Provost Marshall of the Australian Defence Force. With respect to investigations carried out by the Inspector General of Defence, all investigations are conducted by professionally qualified and experienced investigators in accordance with the *Australian Government Investigative Standards* and all investigative processes are regularly reviewed by the Australian Federal Police for quality assurance.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q30: Cost of electricity and refrigerants

Senator Macdonald asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 85.

- (a) What is the actual quantity and price of electricity at Lavarack, Enoggera and HMAS Cairns?
- (b) Do you have any assessment of the cost of air conditioning in Townsville, Cairns and Darwin?
- (c) What is the cost of refrigerants used not just in household air conditioners that keep soldiers comfortable at night but in the major refrigeration aspects you have for keeping food cold and whatever you use refrigeration for, including ICT equipment? (Include totals cost, the quantities of refrigerant gases used and what sort of increase this is over the last financial year, has it been budgeted for?).
- (d) What changes have you had from contractors who were looking after air conditioning?

Response:

- (a) The consumption and cost of electricity at Lavarack Barracks, Enoggera and HMAS Cairns for 2011-12 is provided in the table below:

Base	Total Consumption kWh	Total Cost (excluding GST)
Lavarack Barracks	26,657,484	\$ 3,492,775.19
Enoggera	29,292,679	\$ 2,785,585.54
HMAS Cairns	5,338,504	\$ 824,266.00

- (b) The granularity of information provided by Defence's energy suppliers is not sufficient to identify the cost of air conditioning.

- (c) The maintenance of air conditioning, including those associated with accommodation, office and kitchen operations, is provided through Comprehensive Maintenance Services Base Services contracts. The cost of servicing air-conditioning, including usage of refrigerants, is not identified as a single cost line item but rather grouped as a very small percentage into the Fixed Plant and Equipment service or reactive maintenance service components of the CMS contract. The cost and quantity of refrigerant used in the Defence Estate is not detailed.
- (d) As per the response to part (c) the requested information is not currently collated and is not available in the detail required.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q31: Reserve Training

Senator MacDonald asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 87.

Can Defence provide statistics on number of Reserve Force training days and instructor training entitlements for last two financial years and current financial year?

Response:

Funding for Reserve service days is allocated based on Defence's capability requirements, which are developed from Government's strategic guidance. Funding to each of the three Services is designed to provide Australian Defence Force (ADF) members, including Reservists, with the training and qualifications required for them to do their job and therefore contribute directly to capability. There is not a separate allocation for instructor training.

Defence is conscious of the necessity to fund the Reserves in such a manner that allows individual Reservists to meet specific capability requirements. The allocation of Reserve service days to individual Reservists is determined by each of the Services to meet the capability requirements of the Service. The opportunity for a Reservist to render service is not an entitlement. That is, just because a Reservist may be available for Reserve service does not mean Defence is obligated to take up that offer.

Navy

In financial year (FY) 2010/2011, the average number of days worked per year for 1623 paid Navy Reservists was 51.8 days. Navy consumed 84,081 Reserve Training Days in FY 2010/11.

In FY 2011/2012, the average number of days worked per year for 1400 paid Navy Reservists was 66.5 days. Navy consumed 93,169 Reserve Training Days in FY 2011/12.

In FY 2012/2013, the budgeted amount for Navy Reserve Training Days is 110,047. There are currently 1050 Navy Reservists shown to be undertaking employment this FY which at this stage equates to an average of 104.8 days per Reservist.

Army

In FY 2010/2011, the average number of days worked per year for 16,935 paid Army Reservists was 45. Army consumed 758,907 Army Reserve Training Days.

In FY 2011/2012, the average number of days worked per year for 16,493 paid Army Reservists was 46. Army consumed 760,165 Army Reserve Training Days.

In FY 2012/2013, 598,336 Army Reserve Training Days have been budgeted for, which at this stage is an indicative average of 37.4 days of parading per Reservist.

Air Force

In FY 2010/2011, the average number of days worked per year for 2,953 paid Air Force Reservists was 52. Air Force consumed 152,406 Air Force Reserve Training Days.

In FY 2011/2012, the average number of days worked per year for 2,966 (up from 2,819) paid Air Force Reservists was 57. Air Force consumed 170,680 (up from 161,403) Air Force Reserve Training Days.

In FY 2012/2013, 165,000 Air Force Reserve Training Days have been budgeted for, which is an indicative average of 57 days per Reservist.

Operational Reservists maintain proficiency at Permanent Air Force standards and readiness levels to ensure that they are able to make an effective contribution for the Air Force to meet its operational capability requirements. Reservists serve a specified number of efficiency days per financial year depending on their Reserve Category and Readiness Band. In some instances a Reservist may work additional days where a capability requirement exists.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q32: Cadets

Senator MacDonald asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard Page 87.

Statistics on number of Cadet and instructor training days last two financial years and current financial year

Response:

As cadets are not remunerated, and parading patterns vary widely between units, there is no ready measure of the number of cadet training days.

With regards to instructor training days, it is understood that this question relates to days allocated for Adult Cadet Staff (ACS), who consist of Officers of Cadets and Instructors of Cadets. There are currently no program-wide statistics gathered on the total number of staff training days.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing -17 October 2012

Q33: Border Protection Command Operations

Senator Brandis provided in writing.

- (a) What is the extent of Defence's support to Border Protection Command operations?
- (b) Have they increased, decreased or maintained the same level over the past three years?
- (c) Has there been any evaluation done of the effect on Defence preparedness for their "Defence of Australia" primary role, for providing this level of support to Border Protection Command?
- (d) Has there been any evaluation of alternative options than continuing to divert Defence capability to the Border Protection role?

Response:

- (a) Operation RESOLUTE is the Australian Defence Force (ADF) contribution to the Whole-of-Government approach to protecting Australia's offshore maritime interests. Defence assets and rates of effort assigned to Operation RESOLUTE are based on intelligence determined threat levels. The ADF has a number of assets assigned to Operation RESOLUTE for Australian border protection duties. These assets include AP-3C Maritime Patrol aircraft, Armidale Class Patrol Boats, one Major Fleet Unit assigned from time to time for long-haul tasks, an embarked Transit Security Element, Army Regional Surveillance Force Unit patrols, and the provision of linguists and medical personnel. The current level of Defence support at the beginning of November 2012 is:
 - i. **Personnel.** Approximately 550 ADF personnel support Border Protection Command (excluding current ADF support to the Department of Immigration and Citizenship in Nauru and Manus Island, PNG). This includes the Joint Task Force Headquarters in Darwin, staff positions in the Australian Border Protection and Customs Service, Navy personnel on HMA Ships, RAAF flight crews and maintainers, Army personnel conducting land patrols, ship borne medics and linguists, and the Transit Security Elements.

- ii. **Navy Assets.** Six Armidale Class Patrol Boats (with a potential requirement to surge to nine) and one Major Fleet Unit are currently force assigned for Border Protection Command operations.
 - iii. **Army Units.** Regional Force Surveillance Unit, comprising the three northern Australia Reserve regiments of NORFORCE, the Pilbara Regiment and 51 Far North Queensland Regiment have conducted 153 land patrols so far in 2012 (as of 2 November 2012).
 - iv. **Air Force.** Three AP-3C Orion aircraft provide aerial surveillance with a financial year 2012/13 allocation of 2250 hours. Ground maintenance teams and aircrew regularly deploy to Darwin, and an Air Component Coordination Element in Darwin supports planning.
- (b) The allocation of assets to Operation RESOLUTE remains directly related to a threat based response matrix. The ADF contribution over the past three years has increased as follows:
- i. The provision of a navy Major Fleet Unit has been required from time to time for Irregular Maritime Arrival long haul duties and to offset patrol boat usage. Armidale Class Patrol Boat demand has remained constant although the current usage has been reduced from 3500 to 3100 days per year for a period of six months to achieve Armidale Class Patrol Boat maintenance remediation.
 - ii. The number of personnel assigned to the Transit Security Element is scheduled to increase from 37 to 45 members and is now fully manned by Navy personnel.
 - iii. The number of AP-3C Orion assets has not increased, but hours allocated has increased from an allocation in financial year 2010/11 of 1850 hours revised to 2300 in May 2011 with actual hours flown 2190.5; financial year 2011/12 allocation of 1850 hours revised to 2287 in December 2011 with actual hours flown 2277.6; the financial year 2012/13 allocation is 2250 hours.
 - iv. Regional Force Surveillance Unit patrol days completed in 2012 is 153 (as of 2 November 2012), which is an increase of 46 on the 2010 figure of 107; this amounts to a 30% increase of patrol days.
 - v. The establishment of temporary offshore processing facilities in support of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship in Nauru and Manus Island, PNG, has increased the ADF's contribution to border protection through Operation RESOLUTE in 2012. An additional headquarters element of 36 members was established in Darwin to execute this phase of Operation RESOLUTE.

- From 24 August 2012, a peak of 172 and 145 ADF personnel were deployed to the Republic of Nauru and Manus Island (PNG) respectively.
 - 107 sorties have been flown by RAAF C-130J Hercules, C-17A Globemaster III and B300 King Air 350 aircraft totalling 1064.5 hours. This effort resulted in a payload of 1339 tonnes being air freighted into Manus Island and Nauru (as of 2 Nov 2012).
 - A Navy Major Fleet Unit (HMAS *Tobruk*) is scheduled to provide sealift in January/February 2013 to redeploy much of the ADF's heavy equipment currently deployed to Manus Island.
- (c) Defence continually evaluates the preparedness of its forces for assigned roles and tasks. The evaluations include consideration of the impact on preparedness of the level of commitment to current operations, including support to Border Protection Command under Operation RESOLUTE.
- (d) In March 2005, the Australian Government established Border Protection Command to coordinate national awareness and response efforts to protect Australia's interests in the Australian Maritime Domain. Border Protection Command was designed as a multi-agency taskforce utilising assets assigned from the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service and Defence. The continuing role of Defence in supporting border protection operations is outlined in the 2009 Defence White Paper, and while there have been discussions on specific operational issues, to date there have been no reviews of the larger multi-agency taskforce arrangement.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q34: Matrix or threshold for qualifications.

Senator Fawcett asked on Wednesday 17 October 2012, Hansard page 89.

Could you describe how you would apply that same approach of defining a qualification and experience matrix with thresholds to people within DMO and Defence who are placed in positions of authority within projects? What is the scope to apply a similar process with those thresholds, scaled appropriately for complexity of project, to your own organisation?

Response:

The Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO) has a methodology for categorising Defence projects within one of four Acquisition Categories (ACAT) levels based on their complexity. These ACAT levels form the basis for defining the requirements for project managers placed in positions of authority within these projects. This DMO process is known as the Project Management Professionalisation Framework.

Project Managers within these projects need to demonstrate and satisfy performance attributes defined by the position and consisting of:

- (a) Knowledge and competency (aligned to Project Management Body of Knowledge as set by the Project Management Institute);
- (b) Experience level (number of years in projects or as a project manager);
- (c) Education (Tertiary and Vocational level);
- (d) Professional status (Project Management certification with a professional body); and
- (e) Behavioural characteristics.

The assessment criteria requirements are aligned to the ACAT level of the project. Project Managers are assessed against these criteria by an internal DMO board made up of qualified, certified, and experienced project management professionals.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q35: Anglesea Barracks in Hobart

Senator Bushby provided in writing.

- (a) Can the Department please confirm that Anglesea Barracks is one of 20 Army Major Capital Facilities projects that have been delayed up to three years, as outlined in the Chief of Army's Budget Message sent apparently by LTGEN David Morrison on 9 May 2012.
- (b) If this is correct, how long have works at Anglesea Barracks been delayed?
- (c) Please outline the details of the original redevelopment plans including cost, works and estimated time of completion.
- (d) What makes Anglesea Barracks a 'low priority project'?
- (e) Has any consideration been given to the possible ramifications of delaying these works?

Response:

- (a) As outlined in the Chief of Army's Budget Message sent by LTGEN David Morrison on 9 May 2012, there have been some non-urgent Major Capital Facility project delays. Anglesea Barracks was one of the identified non-urgent projects.
- (b) As it was identified as a non-urgent project, Anglesea Barracks has been delayed by three years.
- (c) Defence has forecast the need to complete a base redevelopment at Anglesea Barracks by 2020. This decision is based on the age and known condition of infrastructure at the site. Although the detailed scope of works for any base redevelopment will not be determined until three years prior to funding becoming available, it is expected that the project will address shortcomings caused by the age of in-ground infrastructure at the base and remediate any significant long term workplace health and safety risks. In addition, if resources permit we will renovate and renew the heritage buildings in accordance with the Heritage Management Plan for the site. Detailed planning for the redevelopment will commence around FY 2016/2017. The Major Capital Facilities Program currently has an allocation of \$10 million during FY 2019/2020 to undertake this project.
- (d -e) Anglesea Barracks was one of several projects to be delayed in the Major Capital Facilities Program. As there were no urgent issues known to require rectification it was decided that delaying this project would not impact on Defence capability.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q36: DMO Workforce Figures

Senator Humphries asked on 17 October 2012 Hansard page 64.

Can you give me the workforce figures for DMO as they stand today?

Response:

The Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO) currently operates under a total labour cost model which allows DMO to recruit civilians (Australian Public Servants) to fill its vacant military (Australian Defence Force (ADF)) positions (where these cannot otherwise be filled with ADF personnel) as long as it remains within its total allocation. As at the pay period ending 8 November 2012, the DMO actual paid workforce was 12 under the 2012-13 estimates given in the Portfolio Budget Statements (see Table 1). DMO anticipates meeting its workforce target in this financial year through a combination of natural attrition and voluntary redundancies.

Table 1: DMO Workforce 2012-13

	DMO PBS Estimate	DMO actual Paid Workforce as at 8 Nov 12
Navy	368	307
Army	485	383
Air Force	940	712
Sub Total Permanent Force A	1,793	1,402
DMO - APS B	5,544	5,936
DMO Contractor C	48	35
Total Workforce Strength (A+B+C)	7,385	7,373

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q37: Fort Direction in Southern Tasmania

Senator Bushby provided in writing.

- (a) Can the Department advise of any works conducted at Fort Direction in the past four years? Please detail any relevant contract details including timings.
- (b) Do works include upgrading ammunition storage facilities?
- (c) If yes, how much did those works cost?
- (d) What are these storage facilities used to house?

Response:

- (a-b) Over the past four years Defence has delivered a number of works packages on the Fort Direction site, with details of these packages below. In addition the following contracts have been let in relation to Fort Direction.

1. Project C8909 – Fort Direction Explosive Ordnance Upgrade. This project has delivered three new explosive ordnance (EO) stores, a new workshop and some basic infrastructure upgrades to support the works, most notably improvements to roads. The project has also relocated the site’s “burn oven”.

The following contractors were engaged for Project C8909 – Fort Direction Explosive Ordnance Upgrade.

- Aurecon – Project Manager/Contract Administrator. This company was engaged as follows:
 - Development Phase – 13 November 2007.
 - Delivery Phase – 12 March 2009.
 - GHD – Design Service Consultant. This company was engaged as follows:
 - Development Phase – 28 April 2008.
 - Delivery Phase – 12 February 2009.
 - Kane – Head Contractor. This company was engaged for the delivery of the works on 30 April 2009.
2. Relocation of barrier fencing. These works were carried out by the Regional Comprehensive Maintenance Services (CMS) Contractor commencing in November 2011. These works also enhanced the security of the EO stores.
 3. Installation of a 600mm high timber retaining wall to EO storage houses. These works were carried out by the Regional CMS contractor commencing in November 2011.

4. Infrastructure works outside the EO storage area (electrical, sewerage and water).
 5. Comprehensive preventative maintenance and refurbishment works, including inground infrastructure, repairing and/or replacing roofs, guttering and downpipes, painting and resealing windows and doors, at the Fort Direction Camp site buildings to allow for their continued use as Australian Defence Force (ADF) training facilities, and on the former heritage married quarters to preserve them as heritage structures.
 6. Internal refurbishments of buildings required for ADF training and infrastructure and environmental works were also completed to the camp site and surrounds to upgrade utilities and fire prevention services.
 7. Infrastructure and environmental works were also completed to the camp site and surrounds to upgrade utilities and fire prevention services.
 8. Removal of the Fort Direction boat ramp and return of foreshore to its natural state.
 9. The maintenance works and upgrades outside the EO storage area were all carried out by the comprehensive maintenance service provider over the period 1 November 2011 to 30 June 2012. The total cost of refurbishment of Fort Direction Camp site, former married quarters and general infrastructure works was approx. \$2.6million.
- (c) The cost of works conducted at Fort Direction over the past four years in order to upgrade the EO storage facilities as follows:
- Project C8909 – Fort Direction Explosive Ordnance Upgrade:
 - Planning Phase - \$.0788M (excluding GST)
 - Delivery Phase - \$5.938M (excluding GST), of which \$5.226M (excluding GST) has been expended on contracted construction activities.
 - Fence Relocations - \$7,095.00 (including GST) and a retaining wall Installation - \$43,117.00 (including GST).
- (d) The Fort Direction EO Storage Facility houses small arms ammunition and other natures of EO. The Net Explosive Quantity (NEQ) that the facilities can house ranges from 1,750 kg in the smallest EO facility, up to 4,000 kg in the largest facility.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q38: Decommissioning of Ships

Senator Bushby provided in writing.

In relation to an answer received to a Question on Notice from the May 2012-13 Estimates, Q50, the Department stated that the full cost for an artificial reef constructed from a de-commissioned ship was estimated to be around AUD \$10 million based on previous projects. Can the Department please provide detail to the following:

- (a) A breakdown of your estimate of \$10 million as the costs involved with creating an artificial reef from a de-commissioned ship.
- (b) Your comment on how the costs differ between the types of ships that can be used for this purpose.

Response:

- (a) Defence has gifted decommissioned vessels to various State governments in the past for use as dive wrecks or artificial reefs, as State development projects. On a few occasions, funds were also provided by Defence to defray a portion of the total cost of establishing and managing the project. Queries related to total project costs (direct and indirect) should be referred to the relevant State governments for response.

The true costs of preparation of a vessel are only available once tender bids have been received for any proposed activity. Costs may be estimated by evaluating costs from previous projects, appropriately indexed by the Consumer Price Index and taking into account the differences between classes of vessels. These considerations include vessel length, weight, materiel, age and structural integrity after demilitarisation.

A prerequisite for disposal of a vessel as a dive wreck includes the attainment of a sea dumping permit which includes a comprehensive engineering and environmental assessment of both the vessel and the proposed dive location, the direct costs of which are estimated at AUD\$500,000.

In addition, the vessel must then be prepared for scuttling which includes:

- (i) berthage, security, insurances and management fees;
- (ii) application fees for permits;
- (iii) environmental assessment and inspection fees;
- (iv) removal of all floating material that may become a pollution hazard on scuttling;
- (v) removal of all hazardous materials that may pollute the environment including lead and chromium paints, polychlorinated biphenyls, asbestos and radioactive isotopes;
- (vi) cleaning of fuel and oil tanks;
- (vii) removal of greases, oils and oily wastes from hydraulic lines and machinery;
- (viii) removal of internal non-structural bulkheads that may collapse and entrap a diver;
- (ix) enlargement of all compartment openings to make them large enough to facilitate diver rescue;
- (x) duplication of entry/egress points for all compartments;
- (xi) removal of non-fixed machinery and furnishings;
- (xii) removal of all overhead wiring and piping that might entangle a diver as it corrodes and collapses;
- (xiii) removal of upper superstructure to ensure surface vessel navigation safety;
- (xiv) preparation and installation of scuttling charges;
- (xv) towage and scuttling site preparation works, scuttling site security; and
- (xvi) post scuttling inspections.

The direct costs to perform the project tasks detailed above for an *Adelaide* Class Guided Missile Frigate is estimated to be between AUD\$5-7 million.

The cost increases proportionally to the size, weight and complexity of the vessel. Additional project costs include project management, administration, governance, legal, planning, monitoring and stakeholder engagement required among the numerous state and federal agencies, legislative bodies and community organisations.

The above costing does not take into account the value of the vessel that could be recovered if the vessel were disposed of by other means.

This estimate does not include indirect costs relating to project management, administration, governance, legal, planning and monitoring or stakeholder engagement required among the numerous state and federal agencies, legislative bodies and community organisations.

Additional costs such as the design and ongoing management and monitoring of the project once the vessel settles on the seafloor also requires long term resourcing. Some States have required legislative amendments to establish marine conservation parks to manage and control access to the project, and have also established commercial and state development tourism and recreation boards to monitor and assess the economical impact to the community. Ecological monitoring of the environmental impact of a dive wreck may extend to fifty years.

This estimate of costs does not allow for any additional costs incurred as a result of an appeal to the granting of a sea dumping permit on environmental grounds, as was experienced in the ex-HMAS *Adelaide* project.

(b) Preparation costs for sea dumping can vary significantly between vessel types.

The amount of material to be removed increases in proportion to the size of the vessel, as there will be increased scope to remove toxic and hazardous materials, floating material and other diver hazards including overhead plumbing and wiring. The size of the vessel impacts on storage and towage costs as well.

The complexity of a ships structure and technology complicates the removal of materials, and will include a larger range of materials to be removed, which increases labour costs.

Some classes of vessel may have large amounts of a specific hazardous material (e.g. asbestos), and the specialist removal requirements may significantly affect the preparation costs.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates - 17 October 2012

Q39: Gifting of de-commissioned ships by the Commonwealth

Senator Bushby provided in writing.

The HMAS *Adelaide* was 'gifted' to the state of New South Wales, along with a Commonwealth grant of AUD5.8 million. Similarly, the HMAS *Canberra* was gifted to the state of Victoria. Can the Department please provide answers to the following:

- (a) How does a state/entity become eligible for the donation of a decommissioned ship?
- (b) Under what conditions were the ships gifted to New South Wales and Victoria?
- (c) Under what conditions did the Commonwealth provide funding for the HMAS *Adelaide*?

Response:

(a)-(c) States or other entities may write to the Australian Government seeking the gifting of a decommissioned ship, or may apply for such a gift in response to a Defence disposal project.

In the past, States have asked the Australian Government for the gift of a de-commissioned ship for use as a dive wreck or artificial reef.

The use of a de-commissioned vessel for use as a dive wreck or artificial reef is considered a state tourism, sport and recreation project. Such a project carries significant financial, environmental and legislative risks. Defence does not have the discretionary resources required to fund such complex and resource-intensive projects and requires that such a project be managed at the state government level.

Eligibility for use of a de-commissioned vessel is conditional upon the relevant state government agreeing to:

- (i) provide an assurance that all costs associated with this State development project will be provided by the State with no contribution from, or cost to, Defence or any other Commonwealth agency;
- (ii) assume responsibility for all legal, economic, environmental, or any other matters that are associated with the project;
- (iii) take possession of the vessel from its location by the appointed date, or earlier, and bear all responsibility for the preparation and transport of the vessel(s) to its intended location; and
- (iv) recognise and protect the reputational image of the vessel's former service with the Royal Australian Navy.

It is recommended that any entity proposing use of a de-commissioned vessel, develop a business case addressing the conditions above for consideration by the State Government. Defence will assess proposals on a case-by-case basis, along with other disposal options available.

Ex-HMA Ships *Adelaide* and *Canberra* were transferred to the governments of New South Wales and Victoria respectively, by way of a Deed of Gift. The Deed of Gift contains various standard conditions relating to the gifting, including funding, and the purposes for which the gift could be used.

Ex-HMAS *Adelaide* was transferred to the New South Wales Government under conditions under which Defence would reimburse the State an amount not exceeding \$3 million. This represented a portion of the State's costs of the project. Notwithstanding this agreement, additional Commonwealth funding was sought by New South Wales to assist with funding the State's cost of the project. This brought the total Commonwealth contribution to \$5.8 million.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q40: Submarines - APB Program

Senator Fawcett provided in writing.

- (a) Is it correct that under the Submarine Statement of Principles signed by the USN Chief of Naval Operations and the RAN Chief of Navy on the development of submarine capability, that Australia's contribution to the annual APB program is 15%?
- (b) Are there any restrictions on how this contribution from Australia is spent?
- (c) Defence has acknowledged that the IP rights for US defence industry are owned by the US government and that IP rights of the Australian defence industry are owned by the individual defence companies. Defence has acknowledged the obvious difficulty which exists for Australian defence companies with respect to sharing IP when competing in the APB process. Is there anything to prevent a percentage of Australia's contribution to the APB program being paid to Australian defence industry to conduct R&D for the APB, to enable government owned IP, thus providing a level playing field for all companies contributing to the APB?

Response:

- (a) Australia's contribution to the AN/BYG-1 Advanced Processor Build program is 15%. This rate is defined in a subordinate document to the Submarine Statement of Principles; the AN/BYG-1 Tactical Subsystem Memorandum of Understanding.
- (b) The priorities of the joint Australia - United States AN/BYG-1 program office determine how all monies in the program will be allocated. Accordingly, the Australian contribution is spent directly in relation to the needs of the joint program.
- (c) A plan to increase Australian industry competitiveness in the AN/BYG-1 development program is expected to be completed by early 2013. The plan will be informed by the outcome of recent Priority Industry Capability (PIC) health checks.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing - 17 October 2012

Q41: Submarines - Combat Systems

Senator Fawcett provided in writing.

- (a) In response to a question on the effectiveness of the Submarine Combat System in the Collins Class compared to the Oberon Class, Vice Adm Griggs stated "*However, it is a generational advancement over the Oberon combat system and is entirely capable of being successfully operated in high-contact-density environments*". The USN Test and Evaluation report on AN/BYG-1 in APB-07 states "*APB-07 is not effective in supporting operator situational awareness and contact management in areas of high contact density.*" And further "*APB-07 is not effective in short-range Anti-Submarine Warfare scenarios*". How is this statement reconciled with the statement from Vice Adm Griggs?
- (b) Vice Adm Griggs stated that "*..... the (Collins CS) is entirely capable of being successfully operated in high-contact-density environments*". Is it correct to assume from this statement that the AN/BYG-1 is actually and successfully being used in these environments?

Response:

- (a) As explained in the response to Q156 from the Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing on 17 October 2012, the US Navy Director Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) report is based on limited testing of AN/BYG 1 Advanced Processor Build (APB) releases, often constrained by the significant difficulties in meaningfully simulating operational conditions during test and evaluation. Such deficiencies are mitigated by the regimen of testing at several stages throughout the AN/BYG-1 development process.

The combined results of this testing and that conducted by DOT&E are used to determine when each AN/BYG-1 APB is ready to be fielded in operational submarines. Importantly, both the United States Navy and Royal Australian Navy have significant real-world data that show each new generation of AN/BYG-1 has substantially improved the ability of submarine crews to maintain situational awareness on operations in high contact densities and other scenarios. This does not diminish the value of DOT&E tests in supporting the 'build-test-build' approach adopted in the development of AN/BYG-1, which continues to rapidly deliver new and improved capabilities.

Notably though, both the United States Navy Submarine Force and the Royal Australian Navy Submarine Force recognise that post-mission analysis is far more representative of actual system performance than any individual test event, and underpins the statement made by the Chief of Navy during the Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing on 17 October 2012.

- (b) Yes.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q42: Target Motion Analysis function in Collins Class Submarines

Senator Fawcett provided in writing.

- (a) Is an automated Target Motion Analysis function being used in the Collins class submarines today or is a manual system being used and if so why?
- (b) What priority has been given to an improved CS with respect to TMA in STRG letters over the past 10 years?
- (c) What priority has been given to an improved CS with respect to TMA in the APB over the past 10 years?

Response:

- (a -c) The response to this question is classified. A private briefing can be provided if required.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q43: Howitzer Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System

Senator Fawcett provided in writing.

- (a) Can you confirm that all our towed Howitzers (old and newly acquired/to be acquired) are equipped with the same Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data Systems (AFATDS)?
- (b) Is this AFATDS based on the US AFATDS?
- (c) Has our AFATDS been adapted to suit the needs of the Australian army?
- (d) Does our AFATDS have complete interoperability with the US AFATDS, and if not, does this limitation result from changes made to the system by Australia?
- (e) When was interoperability of our AFATDS with the current US version tested and when will the next testing take place?

Response:

- (a) Yes. All M777A2 Lightweight Towed Howitzers acquired by the Commonwealth, including those recently approved for purchase by the Government, are designed for use with the same version of AFATDS. All of Army's other towed howitzers are being withdrawn from service.
- (b) It is the same software as fielded by the US but modified to comply with US export control requirements.
- (c) No.
- (d) The level to which the Australian version of AFATDS is interoperable with the US version will be confirmed through verification and validation activities planned for 2013.
- (e) Australian/US AFATDS interoperability has not been tested. The level to which the Australian version of AFATDS is interoperable with the US version will be confirmed through verification and validation activities planned for 2013.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q44: Aircraft Cargo Loaders

Senator Fawcett provided in writing.

- (a) What program are transportable aircraft cargo loaders purchased under?
- (b) Has a contract for the supply of these loaders been completed, if so who has been successful?
- (c) Who has supplied the loaders in the past?

Response:

- (a) Aircraft Cargo Loaders are being purchased by the Defence Materiel Organisation and are jointly funded by Air Force sustainment product CAF24 (Ground Support Equipment) and Project AIR8000 Ph3 (C-17A).
- (b) The contract for the supply of Aircraft Cargo Loaders has not yet been awarded. The preferred tenderer has been identified and negotiations will commence soon.
- (c) Broens Industries Pty Ltd has supplied Aircraft Cargo Loaders to the Australian Defence Force in the past.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q45: Base Infrastructure Works for the Base Security Improvement Program

Senator Fawcett provided in writing.

Please provide an update on the Base Infrastructure Works for the Base Security Improvement Program.

Response:

The Base Infrastructure Works, as part of the Department of Defence's Base Security Improvement Program will deliver security related infrastructure improvements at 16 Defence sites in the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria. These works are in response to Defence's 2009 review of physical security, and will fulfil one of the two remaining recommendations. To date, 31 of a total 33 recommendations have been closed.

The Project was reviewed by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works (PWC) mid-2012 with Parliamentary approval granted in September 2012.

On receipt of this approval, Defence was preparing to release two Request for Tender packages associated with the delivery phase of the Base Infrastructure Works Project in October 2012. These packages were to be sent to a short list of construction firms and electronic security system contractors. The delivery phase was to commence in early 2013 and be complete before July 2015.

The release of the Request for Tender packages was delayed, and the short listed companies advised accordingly.

The delay in the release of the two Request for Tender packages will result in construction commencing in mid 2013, however it is expected that construction completion will still be achieved before July 2015.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q46: Quarterly Sign-Off Reports

Senator Fawcett provided in writing.

Ministers Smith and Clare announced in May 2011 that Quarterly Accountability Reports were to be issued for “designated key projects.” These reports are now referred to as Quarterly Sign-Offs and to my knowledge only one (for HMAS Choules) has been presented. Are any further QS to be presented, when, and for which projects?

Response:

Quarterly Sign-off Reports have been prepared to cover Armidale Class Patrol Boats, High-Grade Cryptographic Equipment, Naval Helicopter Capabilities and Collins Class Submarines. These reports are planned to be provided to the Defence Capability Investment Committee later this year for finalisation prior to transmission to Government.

Quarterly Sign-off Reports covering Army Helicopter Capabilities, and Amphibious and Afloat Support Capabilities will be prepared for committee consideration in early 2013.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q47: Mr Murray Inwood

Senator Ronaldson provided in writing.

- (a) With regards to the answer to Question on Notice 28 from Budget Estimates in May, can the Department confirm what the extent of their 'limited information' is in relation to Mr Inwood's service in Korea during the Korean War? Further, can the Department provide the eligibility criteria for medals awarded to personnel who served in Korea during the Korean War?
- (b) On 30 August 2012 the Department wrote to Major General David McLachlan AO (Ret'd), State President of the RSL in Victoria indicating that Defence has 'not been able to verify the circumstances under which Mr Inwood was awarded the Korea Medal', but in response to Question on Notice 28 Defence says that 'no recent verification' of Mr Inwood's service records has occurred. If Defence cannot verify the circumstances of the awarding of a service medal, how can Defence be satisfied that the medal was correctly awarded in the first place?
- (c) In that same letter of 30 August, the Department notes that Mr Inwood's medal was awarded 'in good faith based on appropriate evidence at the time', and goes on to say: "Given that Senator Feeney, the Parliamentary Secretary for Defence, has responded on behalf of the Government indicating that it is not intended to pursue the matter, I am not in a position to reconsider it further". Given Defence is not now able to verify that Mr Inwood served the required period of time in Korea to qualify for a Korea Medal, and that service records are inconclusive, on what basis has Senator Feeney been informed that no further action should be taken on this matter?
- (d) On 22 March this year Senator Feeney wrote to the Federal Member for Gippsland advising him that 'Mr Inwood was legally awarded the Korea Medal... and is entitled to wear them'. He also writes that Defence 'has examined Mr Inwood's service records and is satisfied that the medals were correctly awarded to him'. However, the 30 August 2012 letter from Defence to Major General McLachlan casts doubt on the Parliamentary Secretary's claims that the medals were correctly awarded. Further, the Parliamentary Secretary's letter goes on to say: 'The Korean War ended nearly 60 years ago. I do not think it is possible or appropriate for me to entertain suggestions that an 81 year old veteran should be stripped of medals arising from that conflict, medals which he was legally awarded on the basis of the evidence then available'. Senator Feeney says it is 'not possible... to substantiate' claims about Mr Inwood's service to the contrary. Given Defence now claims that Senator Feeney's statement is the definitive response to the matter, but will not verify that a recent review of Mr Inwood's service records will confirm his alleged entitlements to medals, how can Korean War veterans be satisfied that Defence has adequately reviewed this matter?

- (e) In the Courier Mail on 28 September, a story headed 'Twins charged over war claims' appeared, noting that 'Twin brothers who allegedly masqueraded as war veterans were yesterday charged by Queensland police'. What are the offences for impersonating a war veteran? What are the penalties for wearing medals which the bearer is not entitled to? Has Defence ever taken action against Mr Inwood in these matters?
- (f) Senator Feeney has previously advised that 'Without official documentation to prove otherwise, Defence will not cancel a previously issued award'. Given Defence cannot prove that Mr Inwood is indeed eligible for the award he has been given, why will Defence not take steps to fully satisfy itself that Mr Inwood is indeed eligible for this award and to make available to interested parties the documents which support Mr Inwood's award being correct?
- (g) If Defence is unable to verify Mr Inwood's entitlement to a Korea Medal, what steps will they take to strip Mr Inwood of this medal in accordance with usual practice?

Response:

- (a) As advised in response to Question on Notice 28 taken from the Senate Budget Estimates hearing on 28/29 May 2012, the limited information available now to Defence is: a copy of a general index card which shows that the Korea Medal and the United Nations Service Medal – Korea were issued to Mr Inwood during the 1950s, and a statement made by Captain M.A. Bennett (Mr Inwood's Officer Commanding at the time) dated 12 June 1956 which states that Mr Inwood undertook courier trips to Korea.

The following eligibility criteria applies to those medals awarded to personnel who served in Korea during the Korean War:

Korea Medal – awarded for service between 1 July 1950 and 27 July 1953:

- Army – service of one day or more on the posted strength of a unit or formation in Korea.
- Navy – service of 28 days in ships engaged in operations off the Korean coast or one day on duty ashore.
- Air Force – one operational sortie over Korea or Korean waters.

Official visits and inspections totalling 30 days or more also qualifies.

United Nations Service Medal – Korea – awarded to personnel who were posted for any period between 27 June 1950 and 27 July 1954 with the United Nations forces in Korea. The medal may also be awarded to personnel who served in adjacent areas including Japan and Okinawa while operating under United Nations command or sent to support United Nations operations in Korea. Official visitors require 30 days to qualify.

Australian Active Service Medal 1945-75 with Clasp 'KOREA' – awarded to personnel who were awarded the Korea Medal for service between 1 July 1950 and 27 July 1953.

- (b) Defence has maintained the position that the medals were issued to Mr Inwood based on information that was available at the time, and to the awarding authorities, during the 1950s. Because Defence cannot verify the service now, it does not mean that records did not exist at the time.

- (c) As per the previous response, the lack of records available to Defence now does not mean that the authorities at the time did not have access to sufficient information that would have resulted in the medals being issued. It is not possible to know what may have happened to these records over 50 years after the event.
- (d) Defence maintains that the authorities of the time issued the medals to Mr Inwood, based on evidence that was available to them. Defence therefore trusts that appropriate evidence was available to enable the authorities to be satisfied that Mr Inwood had rendered appropriate service.
- (e) The cases cited are quite different. The persons in Queensland were charged with wearing medals to which they had no entitlement and which had not been properly issued. Mr Inwood was properly issued with medals which he is therefore entitled to wear.

The offences contained in the *Defence Act 1903*, include falsely representing to be a returned soldier, sailor or airman and for the improper use of service decorations.

The Australian Federal Police have primary responsibility for conducting investigations into alleged Commonwealth offences. The Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions has responsibility for prosecuting such offences.

The criminal offence provisions under the *Defence Act 1903* may attract a penalty of up to 30 penalty units, 6 months imprisonment, or both. Sections 80A and 80B of the *Defence Act 1903* refer.

There is no case for any action to be taken against Mr Inwood.

- (f) Defence is satisfied that the medals were issued on the basis of evidence that existed to the authorities at the time. Some information does exist now and these were provided in response to Question on Notice No. 28 taken from the Senate Budget Estimates on 28/29 May 2012. Given these factors, Defence will not consider initiating an investigation into Mr Inwood's case.
- (g) Defence will not withdraw Mr Inwood's medals. There is no case for doing so unless it can be proven that he did not render the service that resulted in him being issued with the medals. For this to occur, a formal investigation would have to be initiated by the Australian Federal Police and Defence would respond to the outcomes of any such investigation at that time.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q48: Staffing

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) How many ongoing staff recruited this financial year to date? What classification are these staff?
- (b) How many non-ongoing positions exist or have been created this financial year to date? What classification are these staff?
- (c) This financial year to date, how many employees have been employed on contract and what is the average length of their employment period?
- (d) How many ongoing staff left the department/agency in the year 2011-12? What classification were these staff?
- (e) How many non-ongoing staff left department/agency in the year 2011-12? What classification were these staff?
- (f) How many contract staff left department/agency in the year 2011-12? What classification were these staff?
- (g) How many ongoing staff were recruited in the year 2011-12? What classification were these staff?
- (h) How many non-ongoing staff were recruited in the year 2011-12? What classification were these staff?
- (i) How many contract staff left were recruited in the year 2011-12? What classification were these staff? What is the average length of their employment period?
- (j) Are there any plans for staff reduction? If so, please advise details including if there is a reduction target, how this will be achieved, and if any services/programs will be cut.
- (k) If there are plans for staff reductions, please give the reason why these are happening.

Response:

(a) The numbers of ongoing staff recruited this financial year as at 26 October 2012, and their classifications are;

APS Level 1	27
APS Level 2	13
APS Level 3	49
APS Level 4	102
APS Level 5	82
APS Level 6	99
Executive Level 1	53
Executive Level 2	28
Senior Executive (Band 1)	3
Senior Executive (Band 2)	1
Senior Executive (Band 3)	1
Agency Head	1
Total	459

(b) The current number of non-ongoing positions and their classifications as at 26 October 2012 are;

APS Level 1	9
APS Level 2	59
APS Level 3	39
APS Level 4	21
APS Level 5	38
APS Level 6	21
Executive Level 1	30
Executive Level 2	17
Senior Executive (Band 1)	1

Senior Executive (Band 2)	3
Senior Executive (Band 3)	4
Total	242

Of these current positions, the following have been created this financial year as at 26 October 2012;

APS Level 5	5
Executive Level 1	4
Executive Level 2	1
Total	10

Note: Non-ongoing refers to temporary APS positions and staff.

(c) Previous responses have classified “employees employed on contract” as meaning non-ongoing staff and not contractors. Using this definition, 38 staff have been hired as non-ongoing. The average length of their employment period is 309 days.

(d) The numbers of ongoing staff who left the department this financial year as at 26 October 2012, and their classifications are;

APS Level 1	46
APS Level 2	129
APS Level 3	153
APS Level 4	152
APS Level 5	288
APS Level 6	411
Executive Level 1	303
Executive Level 2	145
Senior Executive (Band 1)	8
Senior Executive (Band 2)	1
Senior Executive (Band 3)	2
Agency Head	1

Total	1639
-------	------

(e) The numbers of non-ongoing staff who left the department this financial year as at 26 October 2012, and their classifications are;

APS Level 1	55
APS Level 2	115
APS Level 3	78
APS Level 4	53
APS Level 5	49
APS Level 6	66
Executive Level 1	21
Executive Level 2	11
Senior Executive (Band 1)	2
Senior Executive (Band 2)	1
Senior Executive (Band 3)	2
Agency Head	0
Total	453

(f) Contract staff are defined as non-ongoing. As such, the answer to this question is as response to (e) above.

(g) The numbers of ongoing staff who were recruited in Financial Year 2011-12, and their classifications are;

APS Level 1	209
APS Level 2	119
APS Level 3	287
APS Level 4	388
APS Level 5	491
APS Level 6	604

Executive Level 1	292
Executive Level 2	81
Senior Executive (Band 1)	5
Senior Executive (Band 2)	2
Senior Executive (Band 3)	1
Agency Head	1
Total	2480

(h) The numbers of non-ongoing staff who were recruited in Financial Year 2011-12, and their classifications are;

APS Level 1	89
APS Level 2	124
APS Level 3	94
APS Level 4	51
APS Level 5	65
APS Level 6	55
Executive Level 1	34
Executive Level 2	18
Senior Executive (Band 1)	0
Senior Executive (Band 2)	0
Senior Executive (Band 3)	1
Agency Head	0
Total	531

- (i) Contract staff are defined as non-ongoing. As such, the answer to this question is as the response to (h) above.
- (j) There are plans for staff reductions for the Defence APS workforce. The reduction target is 1,000 full time equivalent (FTE) over the next two financial years. For financial year 2012 - 13 a reduction of 666 is required and 334 is required for financial year 2013 - 14. Defence will meet the required employee reductions

through a combination of natural attrition, close management of recruitment and a targeted offering of voluntary retrenchments (VR).

Australian Defence Force (ADF) Personnel are not subject to the staff reductions.

The focus of the VR program is on areas of Shared Services reform, employees/positions in operational areas have not been included. Defence must retain a highly capable workforce with the capacity to deliver capability. Employees with critical skills and/or knowledge will not be offered a VR.

- (k) Defence's commitment to the Federal Budget 2012-13 included a reduction in its Australian Public Service (APS) workforce of 1,000 full time equivalent (FTE). This reduction is in addition to the ongoing impact of 1,000 FTE-Average reduction in growth from Budget 2011-12.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q49: Making the Public Service more efficient

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) Please detail how the department/agency will achieve savings over the forward estimates through pursuing further efficiencies in the way the public service operates (see media release by the Minister for Finance and Deregulation and the Special Minister of State of 25 September 2012 http://www.financeminister.gov.au/media/2012/mr_1982012.html). In addition, please provide the following detail:
- (b) How will reductions in air travel spending be achieved? What is the estimated savings for each year over the forward estimates?
- (c) What restrictions will be implemented for business flights? What are the estimated savings for each year over the forward estimates?
- (d) How will the use of external consultants and contractors be reduced? How will this impact on the Department/agency? What are the estimated savings for each year over the forward estimates?
- (e) How will the department/agency manage moving recruitment advertising online? Will all future recruitment advertisement be online only? If not, explain why. What are the estimated savings for each year over the forward estimates?
- (f) How will printing costs be reduced? Explain if and how the department/agency will reduce its printing costs by five per cent, or if it will not, why not? How will it be determined what documents will no longer be printed? What are the estimated savings for each year over the forward estimates?

Response:

- (a) The Department of Defence is excluded from the initiative 'Making the Public Service more efficient'. However, the Department is engaged in a reform agenda which includes the Strategic Reform Program and the increased use of Shared Services. Some of the savings and efficiencies achieved through the reform agenda are outlined in the following responses.
- (b-c) Defence has a 10 year strategic reform savings target of \$624 million to be delivered over the period to 2018/19. The category includes all spends related to Domestic and International travel. The mature savings target is \$59.8 million in 2013/14.

Further travel savings as part of Budget 2012/13 have been identified which has added an additional 20% reduction across this category for this financial year. The additional savings from the 2012/13 Budget is \$43.5 million.

'Travel' is subject to reform through the ongoing Strategic Reform Program (SRP). There are a series of travel initiatives currently being implemented as part of the Strategic Reform Program to reduce Defence's travel costs and tighten the use of business class fares.

Savings initiatives include:

- Increasing the use of the Online Booking Tool, introduced by Defence in September 2010. The booking fee is halved when air travel is booked online.
- Increasing the use of lower cost 'Restricted' airfares instead of 'Fully Flexible' airfares.
- Reducing project related travel within the Defence Materiel Organisation as part of demand management. This is achieved by less people travelling for a project related need and/or using video teleconference facilities.
- Implementing process changes to support Defence travellers and their approving authorities to select 'best fare of the day' for international business travel, in line with Department of Finance and Deregulation Policy.
- Promoting the use of video teleconference facilities as an alternative mechanism.

Defence continues to review all travel related documentation as an obligation under Whole of Australian Government travel arrangements and to promote a cultural change within Defence to maximise savings through compliance to policies such as Lowest Practical Fare.

In addition to the Strategic Reform Program focus on travel, in August 2012 the Secretary and CDF released a Joint Directive on overseas travel. The purpose of the Directive is to place tighter controls on overseas travel for conferences etc prescribing that additional approvals are required when two or more people are travelling, and for the approval authority to be at the Group Head or Service Chief level.

- (d) Further Professional Service Providers savings of 20% were identified in the 2012-13 Budget. The additional savings from the 2012-13 Budget is \$63.5 million.

Within the SRP, "Professional Services" is identified as a savings category and includes spend on contractors and consultants. For this category, Defence has a 10 year reform savings target of \$418 million to be delivered over the period 2010/11 to 2018/19. The mature savings target is \$50.5 million a year in 2014/15.

Defence has a two pronged strategy in this category. Firstly Defence is consolidating provider panels to increase efficiency and lower costs. Secondly, Defence is critically reviewing our use of consultants and looking internally at our in-house skill set initially, prior to seeking external assistance.

As part of this strategy, the Category Manager will lead and manage supply arrangements and will influence demand and policy levers. Under this holistic approach, supply panels will be rationalised and this, in turn, will reduce inefficiencies in panel management and introduce pricing consistency through opportunities to leverage corporate buying power.

- (e) Both Defence and the Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO) adhere to the guidelines for Non-Campaign Recruitment Advertising as determined and provided by the Department of Finance and Deregulation for Australian Public Service (APS) recruitment.

These Guidelines came into place on 1 July 2012 and have been communicated throughout the organisation.

Defence and DMO will continue to adhere to the Non-Campaign Recruitment Advertising policy as determined and provided by the Department of Finance and Deregulation for APS recruitment. Policy dictates that Defence must advertise all recruitment online except in certain exceptional circumstances i.e. regional area advertising.

In addition to the implementation of the new guidelines for Non-Campaign Recruitment Advertising in July 2012, Defence is operating under a reduced recruitment climate due to the May 2012 Budget. Within this climate, Defence has seen a dramatic reduction in APS recruitment advertising costs. On 17 August 2012, Adcorp Australia Limited (Adcorp), the Master Media Agency for Placement of Non-Campaign Advertising for the Commonwealth of Australia, increased their commission based fee for Non-Campaign Recruitment Advertising. It is therefore difficult to estimate the savings that will be gained from the implementation of these new guidelines.

It is expected that a greater level of departmental management of APS recruitment will continue to yield reductions in costs and improve recruitment decision making and practices into the longer term.

- (f) The electronic delivery of publications has significantly reduced the cost that is associated with the production and delivery of hardcopy publications.

Defence Groups/Services and/or the Sponsor of publications decide what is not to be printed. For example decisions have been taken to cease the hardcopy printing and distribution of Service Annuals and these are now produced electronically and 80% of Defence official forms are now online, noting that not all personnel within Defence have ready access to the Defence Restricted Network.

The Defence Publishing Service (DPS), on receipt of a request for the production and delivery of hardcopy publications, asks the Defence customer to provide a distribution list prior to production to reduce wastage. DPS also uses economical in-house print on demand production methods and/or Whole of Australian Government printing and production panel arrangements.

Printing costs have been reduced in other business areas. For example this includes the pay and leave processing of ADF, APS and Defence Reservists where the implementation of fax server technology has introduced a paper-less office. These savings have been achieved in all Defence Personnel Administration Centres (PAC). Within PAC Melbourne, over 75,000 electronic transactions have been received this financial year for processing. These transactions would have primarily been received in hard copy. Future initiatives such as the implementation of home internet access will provide Defence Personnel with greater online access to HR Self Service capability. The saving for Defence will be the reduction in volume of pay slips being printed and distributed for Defence Reservists. This project is scheduled for financial year 2013 -14.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q50: Recruitment Costs

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) How much was spent on recruitment advertising in 2011-12? How much of this was spent online and how much of this was spent on print advertising?
- (b) Please list where recruitment advertising was listed online and in print media.
- (c) How much has been spent on recruitment advertising this financial year to date? How much of this was spent online and how much of this was spent on print advertising?
- (d) Please list where recruitment advertising was listed online and in print media.

Response:

- (a) Defence Force Recruiting's (DFR) total marketing budget for financial year 2011-12 was \$38,923,347.59 which includes ongoing development of the Defencejobs website, market research and other non-advertising related marketing activities.

DFR utilises the Australian Government media/advertising contracts with Universal McCann and Adcorp for the placement of all ADF recruiting advertising. A total of \$2,545,488.93 was paid to these suppliers in financial year 2011-12 for online advertising and a total of \$2,303,251.07 was paid to these suppliers in financial year 2011-12 for print advertising.

- (b) DFR utilises a large number of on-line channels including websites, job boards and search engines and print media including metropolitan and regional newspapers, consumer magazines and publications.
- (c) DFR's total marketing budget for this financial year to date is \$6,951,351.37 (period 1 July 2012 to 31 October 2012) which includes ongoing development of the Defencejobs website, market research and other non-advertising related marketing activities.

DFR utilises the Australian Government media/advertising contracts with Universal McCann and Adcorp for the placement of all ADF recruiting advertising. A total of \$1,339,976.98 was paid to these suppliers to date in 2012-13 for online advertising and a total of \$551,233.66 was paid to these suppliers to date in 2012-13 for print advertising.

- (d) DFR utilises a large number of on-line channels including websites, job boards and search engines and print media including metropolitan and regional newspapers, consumer magazines and publications.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q51: Printing Costs

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) How much was spent on printing 2011-12? Of this amount, how much was for printing documents?
- (b) How many documents (include the amount of copies) were printed in 2011-12? How many of these printed documents were also published online?
- (c) Of the documents that were printed in 2011-12, where were they delivered and what was the cost?
- (d) How much has been spent on printing this financial year to date? Of this amount, how much was for printing documents?
- (e) How many documents (include the amount of copies) have been printed this financial year to date?
- (f) How many of these printed documents were also published online?

Response:

(a-f)

Defence does print hard copies of reports/statements/papers produced within the Department. Examples include statutory documents such as the Portfolio Budget Statements, the Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements and the Annual Report, which are intended for Parliamentary purposes and external transparency. Other examples include internal documents such as audit reports, financial statements, and discussion papers.

Numbers of copies printed for each document differ greatly depending on the nature of the document and its intended audience.

Given the breadth of the question and the diversity of documents printed within Defence, it is not possible to provide a more specific response without an unreasonable diversion of resources.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q52: Graduate Recruitment and Training

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) How much has been spent on 2013 Graduate Recruitment? Please itemise and detail costs?
- (b) Has any travel been incurred for 2013 Graduate Recruitment? Please itemise and detail costs?
- (c) How much is estimated to be spent on 2013 Graduate Training? Provide details of what training is to be provided, why and the estimated cost for each.

Response:

(a-b) Total expenditure for activities relating to 2013 graduate recruitment, including travel, for the Graduate Development Program, Defence Materiel Organisation, Intelligence & Security, and Navy Civilian Engineer Development Program programs was approximately **\$1,155,000** and this includes:

(i) Marketing and Advertising (primarily non-print)	\$ 305,026
(ii) Testing, Assessment and Security Screening	\$ 396,170
(iii) Travel:	
(1) University engagement / careers fairs	\$ 138,622
(2) Assessment of interstate candidates	\$ 315,054

This expenditure commenced in October 2011 and concluded in September 2012.

(c) An estimated expenditure on 2013 Graduate Training activities is expected to be approximately **\$ 1,085,000** which includes:

(i) Defence training courses	\$261,049
(ii) Participation in APSC Programs	\$ 55,000
(iii) Travel and relocation for regional rotation placements	\$645,129
(iv) Defence organisational familiarisation	\$122,699

These activities are required to adequately develop and train graduates for entry at the appropriate level to meet specialist or generalist workforce requirements determined prior to selection.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q53: Government Advertising

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) What was the total cost of all advertising for the financial year to date?
- (i) Is the advertising campaign or non-campaign advertising? Provide details of each advertising, including the program the advertising was for, the total spend and the business that provided the advertising services.
 - (ii) Has the Department of Finance and Deregulation provided any advice about the advertising? Provide details of each advertising item.
 - (iii) Has the Peer Review Group (PRG) and/or Independent Communications Committee (ICC) provided any advice about the advertising? Provide details of each advertising item.
 - (iv) Did the Advertising comply with the Guidelines on Information and Advertising Campaigns by Australian Government Departments and Agencies? Provide the details for each advertising item.
 - (v) Provide details for any other communications program, including details of the program, the total spend and the business that provided the communication services.
 - (vi) What advertising – Campaign and Non-Campaign – and other communications programs is the Department/Agency undertaking, or are planning to undertake?
- (b) What was the total cost of all advertising for 2011-12?
- i. Is the advertising campaign or non-campaign advertising? Provide details of each advertising, including the program the advertising was for, the total spend and the business that provided the advertising services.
 - ii. Has the Department of Finance and Deregulation provided any advice about the advertising? Provide details of each advertising item.
 - iii. Has the Peer Review Group (PRG) and/or Independent Communications Committee (ICC) provided any advice about the advertising? Provide details of each advertising item.
 - iv. Did the Advertising comply with the Guidelines on Information and Advertising Campaigns by Australian Government Departments and Agencies? Provide the details for each advertising item.

- v. Provide details for any other communications program, including details of the program, the total spend and the business that provided the communication services that was undertaken in 2011-12.

Response:

(a)

- (i) As at 26 October 2012 Non-Campaign Australian Public Service (APS) recruitment advertising costs for financial year are \$467,652.76 for the Department of Defence (Defence) and \$3,798.86 for Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO). This total of **\$471,451.62** has been reducing over the last three to four years due to internal reforms and Whole-of-Government changes to advertising.

TOTAL DEFENCE	\$467,652.76
VCDF	\$143,287.45
OFFICE OF SECRETARY AND CDF	\$5,762.87
CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER	\$727.80
DEFENCE PEOPLE GROUP	\$60,250.69
DEFENCE SUPPORT GROUP	\$70,472.44
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER GROUP	\$607.56
DSTO	\$298.49
INTELLIGENCE & SECURITY	\$105,506.30
AIR FORCE	\$56,837.12
ARMY	\$8,780.17
NAVY	\$15,121.87
TOTAL DMO	\$3,798.86

- (ii) For APS recruitment, Defence and the DMO adhere to the guidelines for Non Campaign Recruitment Advertising as determined and provided by the Department of Finance and Deregulation.
- (iii) No.
- (iv) For APS recruitment, Defence and the DMO advertising adheres to the guidelines for Non Campaign Recruitment Advertising as determined and provided by the Department of Finance and Deregulation.

(v) N/A

(vi)

Campaign:

N/A

Non-Campaign:

Group/ Service	Communications Program – 1 July 2012 – 26 Oct 2012	Business supplier	Total Spend (\$)
Defence Science and Technology Organisation	Sponsorship of the Australian Science and Engineering Clunies Ross Awards	Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering	\$10,000
	Science meets Parliament	Science And Technology Australia silver sponsorship	\$5,000
Royal Australian Air Force	Sponsorship advertising of Safe Skies Australia Conferences	Safe Skies Australia	TBA
Royal Australian Air Force	Flying Activity Awareness Notifications	Safe Skies Australia	TBA
Defence Honours and Awards	Public Hearings advertising	Defence Honours and Awards Appeals Tribunal	TBA
Infrastructure Division	Unexploded Ordnance cautionary advertising handbooks	Countrywide Austral Pty Ltd	\$43,907
Infrastructure Division	Point Cook Remediation Project advertisement for ongoing community engagement	Adcorp	\$16,035
Infrastructure Division	New Australian Noise Exposure Forecast for RAAF Base Amberley and Point Cook	Internal	\$6000
Joint Logistics Command	Planning to undertake non campaign advertising relating to recruitment, field firing range notices, and contract re-tender activities.	TBA	TBA
Cadet, Reserve and Employer Support Division	Planning a non campaign advertisement to promote more than 800 supportive Employers of Reservists on 10 November for Remembrance Day.	TBA	\$35,000 estimates
Defence Signals Directorate	Sponsorship fee for the ICT conference Australia	Linux	\$6000

Defence Signals Directorate	Seeking 2013 Silver Sponsorship	University of Sydney	\$10,000
Defence Materiel Organisation	Air 9000 Phase 8 Project Office	ADCORP	\$415.30
Defence Materiel Organisation	Air 9000 Phase 8 Project Office	ADCORP	\$415.30
Defence Materiel Organisation	Air 9000 Phase 8 Project Office	ADCORP	\$198.08
Defence Materiel Organisation	Air 9000 Phase 8 Project Office	ADCORP	\$461.31
Defence Materiel Organisation	Air 9000 Phase 8 Project Office	ADCORP	\$196.25
Defence Materiel Organisation	Guided Weapons Commercial West Project	ADCORP	\$198.08
Defence Materiel Organisation	Guided Weapons Commercial West Project	ADCORP	\$102.00
Defence Materiel Organisation	Guided Weapons Commercial West Project	ADCORP	\$1087.84
Defence Materiel Organisation	Naval Aviation Special Project Office	ADCORP	\$207.04
Defence Materiel Organisation	Naval Aviation Special Project Office	ADCORP	\$247.93
Defence Materiel Organisation	Specialist Ships Executive	ADCORP	\$45.00
Defence Materiel Organisation	New Air Combat Capability Project	ADCORP	\$3750.53
Defence Materiel Organisation	New Air Combat Capability Project	ADCORP	\$78.54

Defence Materiel Organisation	Workforce Planning and Management	Department of Defence	\$501.00
Defence Materiel Organisation	Workforce Planning and Management	Department of Defence	\$501.00
Defence Materiel Organisation	Workforce Planning and Management	Department of Defence	\$501.00
Defence Materiel Organisation	Workforce Planning and Management	Department of Defence	\$501.00
Defence Materiel Organisation	Workforce Planning and Management	Department of Defence	\$501.00
Defence Materiel Organisation	Workforce Planning and Management	Department of Defence	\$501.00
Defence Materiel Organisation	Entry Level Programs	Australian Defence College	\$1500.00
Defence Materiel Organisation	Entry Level Programs	Careerhub	\$163.64
Defence Materiel Organisation	Entry Level Programs	Canberra Careers Market	\$609.09

(b)

(vii-xi) Total advertising and market expenditure for financial year 2011-12 for each Group/Service within Defence is provided in the Defence Annual Report 2011-12 on page 319.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q54: Hospitality and Entertainment Costs

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) What is the Department/Agency's hospitality spend for this financial year to date? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events.
- i. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total hospitality spend for this financial year to date. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event.
 - ii. What is the Department/Agency's entertainment spend for this financial year to date? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events.
 - iii. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total entertainment spend for this financial year to date. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event.
 - iv. What hospitality spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events.
 - v. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what hospitality spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event.
 - vi. What entertainment spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events.
 - vii. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what entertainment spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event.
 - viii. Is the Department/Agency planning on reducing any of its spending on these items? If so, how will reductions be achieved and what are the estimated savings over each year of the forward estimates?
- (b) What is the Department/Agency's hospitality spend for 2011-12? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events.
- ix. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total hospitality spend for 2011-12. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event.
 - x. What is the Department/Agency's entertainment spend for 2011-12? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events.
 - xi. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total entertainment spend for 2011-12. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event.

Response:

- (a) For the period 1 July 2012 to 31 October 2012 the Defence portfolio's total expenditure on hospitality (excluding the Minister's Office and minor portfolio bodies) is \$261,241 as shown in **Table 1**. Details of date, location, purpose and (GST exclusive) cost of each event are provided at **Table 2**.
- (i) **Table 3** provides details of hospitality expenditure for the period 1 July 2012 to 31 October 2012, for the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. Details provided include date, location, purpose and (GST exclusive) costs of each event for the period 1 July 2012 to 31 October 2012.
- (ii & iii) The Defence systems show that the Defence Portfolio and Ministers/Parliamentary Secretary's offices have not undertaken any entertainment activities.
- (iv) Planned expenditure on hospitality for the Defence portfolio for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013 is shown at **Table 4**. Details of the date, location and purpose of the planned Hospitality expenditure are not available until events are approved.
- (v) The Department has not been advised of any anticipated hospitality expenditure for each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office.
- (vi & vii) The Department and each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary is not planning any entertainment events.
- (viii) The Defence Instructions (General) PERS 25-7 Gifts, Hospitality and Sponsorship requires all officials to comply with a comprehensive approval and reporting process for hospitality. With this control framework hospitality expenditure is expected to decrease.
- (b) For the financial year 2011-12 the Defence portfolio's total expenditure on hospitality (excluding the Minister's Office and minor Portfolio bodies), is \$1,280,435 as shown in **Table 5**. Details of date, location, purpose and (GST exclusive) cost of each event are provided at **Table 6**.
- (ix) **Table 7** provides details of hospitality spend for the financial year 2011-12 for the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. Details provided include date, location, purpose and (GST exclusive) costs of each event for the financial year 2011-12.
- (x & xi) The Defence systems show that the Defence and Ministers/Parliamentary Secretary's offices did not undertake any entertainment activities.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q55: Board Appointments

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) List all of the boards within this portfolio, including: board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members.
 - i. What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio?
 - ii. Please detail any board appointments for this financial year to date.
- (b) List all of the boards within this portfolio, including: board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members for 2011-12.
 - iii. What was the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio for 2011-12?

Response:

- (a)
 - i&ii. In accordance with Senate Orders 13 and 14, the Department of Defence is required to table all appointments, current vacancies and grants made by the Government no later than seven days before the commencement of Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates hearings. Given the significant time and resources required to provide this information, I refer the Senator to the report tabled in the Senate on 11 October 2012.
- (b) The table below provides the requested information on boards within the Department of Defence which has been collated under the Office for Women (FaHCSIA) guidelines (the Guidelines) for the 2011-2012 Gender Balance on Government Boards Report. 'Terms of Appointment' within the Guidelines are as follows:

The appointments included in the gender balance target are appointments where the Government has some level of control, influence or sign-off for the selection and/or approval of the appointment. These are appointments that are made or approved by an Australian Government Minister, the Attorney-General, Governor-General in Council or by Cabinet.

Board Title	Person	Board Position	Terms of Appointment	Gender	Tenure (start to end dates)	
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	Peter Jennings	CEO/Executive Director/Managing Director	Ministerial	Male	30/04/2012	29/04/2017
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	Stephen Loosley	Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	5/07/2001	31/12/2014
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	Allan Hawke	Member	Ministerial	Male	5/07/2001	31/12/2013
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	Alison Jones	Member	Ministerial	Female	22/04/2009	31/12/2012
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	Robert Ray	Member	Ministerial	Male	10/03/2010	31/12/2013
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	Ryan Stokes	Member	Ministerial	Male	10/10/2011	10/10/2014
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	John Blackburn	Member	Ministerial	Male	10/03/2010	31/12/2013
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	Russell Trood	Member	Ministerial	Male	9/09/2009	31/12/2012
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	Samina Yasmeen	Member	Ministerial	Female	22/04/2009	31/12/2012
Defence Housing Australia	Derek Volker AO	Chairperson	Cabinet	Male	24/07/2008	12/10/2014

Defence Housing Australia	Michael Del Gigante	CEO/Executive Director/Managing Director	Cabinet	Male	4/08/2005	3/02/2013
Defence Housing Australia	Gary Beck AO	Director/Non-Executive Director	Cabinet	Male	23/11/2006	22/11/2013
Defence Housing Australia	Archibald Bevis	Director/Non-Executive Director	Cabinet	Male	13/10/2011	12/10/2014
Defence Housing Australia	Esther (Carol) Holley	Director/Non-Executive Director	Cabinet	Female	23/11/2009	22/11/2012
Defence Housing Australia	John (Sandy) Macdonald	Director/Non-Executive Director	Cabinet	Male	24/07/2008	12/10/2013
Defence Housing Australia	Gary Potts	Director/Non-Executive Director	Cabinet	Male	23/11/2009	22/11/2012
Defence Housing Australia	Peter Sharp	Director/Non-Executive Director	Cabinet	Male	23/11/2009	22/11/2012
Defence Housing Australia	Margaret Walker	Director/Non-Executive Director	Cabinet	Female	15/07/2009	14/07/2012
Australian Military Forces Relief Trust Fund	BRIG Gavan Reynolds	Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	27/06/2011	1/01/2099
Australian Military Forces Relief	LTCOL Maree	Member	Ministerial	Female	10/11/2008	1/01/2099

Trust Fund	Zanatta					
Australian Military Forces Relief Trust Fund	WO2 Alex Barnes	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/12/2008	1/01/2099
Australian Military Forces Relief Trust Fund	Mr Glen Tye	Member	Ministerial	Male	28/08/2005	1/01/2099
Australian Military Forces Relief Trust Fund	Mr Tim Heenan	Member	Ministerial	Male	2/06/2011	1/01/2099
RAN Relief Trust Fund	CDRE Paul Kinghorne	Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	3/04/2009	1/01/2099
RAN Relief Trust Fund	CMDR Lisa Batchler	Member	Ministerial	Female	25/03/2011	1/01/2099
RAN Relief Trust Fund	CMDR Jayne Craig	Member	Ministerial	Female	30/10/2010	1/01/2099
RAN Relief Trust Fund	CMDR Jennifer Wittwer	Member	Ministerial	Female	27/01/2012	1/01/2099
RAN Relief Trust Fund	LCDR Tristan Skousgaard	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/12/2011	1/01/2099
RAN Relief Trust Fund	WO David Devlin	Member	Ministerial	Male	25/02/2011	1/01/2099
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Trust Fund	Murray Earl	Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	10/03/2008	1/01/2099

Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Trust Fund	Robert Rodgers	Deputy Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	30/09/2010	1/01/2099
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Trust Fund	Royce Thompson	Member	Ministerial	Male	24/05/2000	1/01/2099
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Trust Fund	Kenneth Birrer	Member	Ministerial	Male	10/01/2002	1/01/2099
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Trust Fund	Donald Malcolmson	Member	Ministerial	Male	30/09/2010	1/01/2099
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Trust Fund	Janet O'Dea	Member	Ministerial	Female	30/09/2010	1/01/2099
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Trust Fund	Mark Pentreath	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/12/2011	1/01/2099
Army & Air Force Canteen Service	Ted Moore	Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	1/10/2007	30/09/2013
Army & Air Force Canteen Service	Catherine Sinclair	Director/Non-Executive Director	Ministerial	Female	1/10/2009	30/09/2012
Army & Air Force Canteen Service	Andrew Tregaskis	Director/Non-Executive Director	Ministerial	Male	1/10/2011	30/09/2014
RAAF Veterans' Residences Trust	David E Tindal	Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	12/02/07	1/01/2099
RAAF Veterans' Residences Trust	Peter L Finkelstein	Director/Non-Executive	Governor-General	Male	5/09/95	1/01/2099

		Director	in Council			
RAAF Veterans' Residences Trust	Terrence Saunder	Director/Non-Executive Director	Ministerial	Male	10/03/11	1/01/2099
RAAF Veterans' Residences Trust	Michelle Oakden	Director/Non-Executive Director	Ministerial	Female	10/03/11	1/01/2099
Defence Families of Australia	Julie Blackburn	Chairperson	Ministerial	Female	18/01/2010	18/01/2014
Defence Families of Australia	Christina Saladino	Member	Ministerial	Female	15/10/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Families of Australia	Anne Carruthers	Member	Ministerial	Female	20/02/2012	1/01/2099
Defence Families of Australia	Jacqui Bennett	Member	Ministerial	Female	19/07/2010	1/01/2099
Defence Families of Australia	Caetlin Watch	Member	Ministerial	Female	1/02/2012	1/01/2099
Defence Families of Australia	Amita Tandukar	Member	Ministerial	Female	21/06/2010	1/01/2099
Defence Industry Innovation Board	David Mortimer, AO	Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	3/03/2011	3/03/2013
Defence Industry Innovation Board	Harry Dunstall	Deputy Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	3/03/2011	3/03/2013
Defence Industry Innovation Board	VADM Peter Jones	Member	Ministerial	Male	28/02/2012	28/02/2014
Defence Industry Innovation Board	Paul Bastion	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/06/2012	1/06/2014
Defence Industry Innovation Board	Judith Zielke	Member	Ministerial	Female	3/03/2011	3/03/2013

Defence Industry Innovation Board	Graham Priestnall	Member	Ministerial	Male	3/03/2011	3/03/2013
Defence Industry Innovation Board	Dr Alexander Zelinsky	Member	Ministerial	Male	28/02/2012	28/02/2014
Defence Industry Innovation Board	Mr John O'Callaghan	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/06/2012	1/06/2014
Defence Industry Innovation Board	Mr Michael Borowick	Member	Ministerial	Male	3/03/2011	3/03/2013
Defence Industry Innovation Board	Mr Michael Ward	Member	Ministerial	Male	3/03/2011	3/03/2013
Defence Industry Innovation Board	Mr Rob Forbes	Member	Ministerial	Male	3/03/2011	3/03/2013
DSTO Advisory Board	Mary O'Kane	Member	Ministerial	Female	1/05/2011	1/05/2014
DSTO Advisory Board	Edwina Cornish	Member	Ministerial	Female	25/05/2012	25/06/2015
DSTO Advisory Board	Sandra Harding	Member	Ministerial	Female	25/05/2012	25/06/2015
DSTO Advisory Board	Neil Edwards	Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	14/04/2011	14/05/2014
DSTO Advisory Board	Peter Binks	Member	Ministerial	Male	14/04/2011	14/05/2014
DSTO Advisory Board	Paul Greenfield	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/11/2008	1/11/2013
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Jack Smorgon	Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	1/01/2012	31/12/2014

Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Marcus Blackmore	Deputy Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	1/10/2009	30/09/2012
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Tony Behm	Member	Ministerial	Male	15/10/2010	14/10/2013
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	MAJGEN Paul Brereton	Member		Male	1/01/2011	31/12/2013
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Stephen Carey	Member	Ministerial	Male	29/11/2011	31/07/2012
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Duncan Warren	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/07/2009	30/06/2012
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Philip Moss	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/05/2011	30/04/2014
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Margaret Goody	Member	Ministerial	Female	1/07/2010	30/06/2013
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Mark Todd	Member	Ministerial	Male	31/03/2012	30/03/2015
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Christopher Young	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/06/2011	31/05/2014
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Leigh Purnell	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/09/2011	31/08/2014

Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Pamela Schulz	Member	Ministerial	Female	1/03/2012	28/02/2015
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Randolph Alwis	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	James Barry	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Leonie Christopherson	Member	Ministerial	Female	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Judith van Unen	Member	Ministerial	Female	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Adrian Beresford-Wylie	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Ken Doolan	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Neil James	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Bruce Fadelli	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Helen Bull	Member	Ministerial	Female	1/01/2011	1/01/2099

Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Colin Townes	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Innes Willox	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Defence Reserves Support Council (DRSC)	Michael Borrowick	Member	Ministerial	Male	1/01/2011	1/01/2099
Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Jeffrey Rosenfeld	Chairperson	Ministerial	Male	2/04/2012	2/04/2015
Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Kaye Hogan	Member	Ministerial	female	31/05/2008	31/05/2013
Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Lindsay Roe	Member	Ministerial	Male	31/05/2010	31/05/2015
Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Stephan Rudzki	Member	Ministerial	Male	31/05/2010	2/04/2015
Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Catie Inches-Ogden	Member	Ministerial	female	2/04/2012	2/04/2015
Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Lorraine Walker	Member	Ministerial	female	2/04/2012	2/04/2015
Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Ken McAnally	Member	Ministerial	Male	17/03/2008	17/03/2013

Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Tony Cotton	Member	Ministerial	Male	30/06/2009	30/06/2014
Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Keith Horsley	Member	Ministerial	Male	30/06/2009	30/06/2014
Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Victoria Ross	Member	Ministerial	female	12/09/2002	18/07/2014
Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee	Tracy Smart	Member	Ministerial	female	30/06/2009	30/06/2014

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q56: Freedom of Information

Senator Eggleston provided in writing

- (a) Has the department/agency received any updated advice on how to respond to FOI requests?
- (b) What is the total cost to the department/agency to process FOI requests for 2011-12?
- (c) How many FOI requests did the department/agency receive in 2011-12?
- (d) How many requests were denied and how many were granted?
- (e) Did the department fail to meet the processing times outlined in the FOI Act for any requests? If so, how many? Do any of these requests remain outstanding?
- (f) What is the total cost to the department to process FOI requests for this financial year to date?
- (g) How many FOI requests has the Department received for this financial year to date?
- (h) How many requests have been denied and how many have been granted? Has the department failed to meet the processing times outlined in the FOI Act for any requests? If so, how many and why? Do any of these requests remain outstanding? If so, how many and why?

Response:

- (a) Defence has sought external legal advice, where necessary, for a small number of more complex requests. Both Defence and Defence Housing Australia (DHA) make use of publicly available and regularly updated guidance from the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (OAIC).
- (b) Details for both Defence and DHA are publicly available at page 56 of the 2011-12 Freedom of Information Agency Statistics which can be found at the publications page of the OAIC website (www.oaic.gov.au).
- (c) Details for Defence are publicly available in the OAIC Annual Report 2011-12 at page 119 and details for DHA are publicly available in the 2011-12 Freedom of Information Agency Statistics at page 3.

- (d) Details for Defence are publicly available in the OAIC Annual Report 2011-12 at page 121 and details for DHA are publicly available in the 2011-12 Freedom of Information Agency Statistics at page 9.
- (e) Defence and DHA have met all processing times outlined in the FOI Act.
- (f) This figure will be available in the OAIC Annual Report 2012-13. Financial expenditure and staff hours are provided to the OAIC quarterly and the office uses an internal formula which generates the figures for the annual report.
- (g) As at 31 October 2012, Defence had received 166 section 15 requests and five section 48 requests. DHA had received three section 15 requests.
- (h) The following table provides a breakdown of finalised requests to 31 October 2012:

Defence

Granted in Full	Partial Disclosure	Denied ^[1]	Refused ^[2]	Total
23	74	6	10	113

Notes:

^[1]Where a document is identified and exempted in full, access to the document can be **denied**, with reference to the relevant exemption provisions of the FOI Act. During the period in question, three denials related to documents where section 47E 'certain operations of agencies' provisions applied, one section 37 where 'enforcement of law and protection of public safety' provisions applied, one section 47F 'personal privacy' and one denial related to documents where section 33 'national security' provisions applied.

^[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 the resources of an agency. For the period in question, all 10 refusals related to documents that did not exist or could not be found.

Defence now publishes statistics contained in parts (g) and (h) quarterly on its website at www.defence.gov.au/foi.

DHA has finalised one request and granted partial access under section 47 (trade secrets or commercially valuable information) and section 45 (material obtained in confidence). Defence and DHA have met all processing times outlined in the FOI Act.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q57 – Community Cabinet Meetings

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) How many Community Cabinet meetings has the Minister attended this financial year to date? List date and location.
- i. How many Departmental Officers travelled with the Minister for the Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date? What was the total cost of this travel? List travel type, accommodate and any other expenses. Which Community Cabinet meetings did the Departmental Officers attend? List date and location.
 - ii. What was the total cost to the Department and the Ministers office for the Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date?
- (b) How many Community Cabinet meetings did the Minister attend in 2011-12? List date and location.
- iii. How many Departmental Officers travelled with the Minister for the Community Cabinet meetings for 2011-12? What was the total cost of this travel? List travel type, accommodate and any other expenses. Which Community Cabinet meetings did the Departmental Officers attend? List date and location.
 - iv. What was the total cost to the Department and the Ministers office for the Community Cabinet meetings for 2011-12?

Response:

- (a) A Defence Minister or Parliamentary Secretary has attended two Community Cabinet meetings this financial year to date. The dates and locations are as follows:
- 10 July 2012 in Oxley, Queensland; and
 - 5 September 2012 in Brand, Western Australia;
- i. Two Departmental officers travelled with a Defence Minister or Parliamentary Secretary attending two Community Cabinet meetings this financial year to date. The total cost of this travel was \$5,522.93. These Departmental officers either flew or drove to/from Community Cabinet locations and travelled by taxi or hire car to/from venue. Departmental officers were accommodated in hotels, provided travel and incidental expenses within their entitlements. The Community Cabinet meetings which Departmental officers attended were held on:
 - 10 July 2012 in Oxley, Queensland; and
 - 5 September 2012 in Brand, Western Australia.

- ii. Total cost to the Department was \$5,522.93. Defence does not have information about travel costs by ministers, parliamentary secretaries and MOP(S) Act staff as these arrangements are administered by the Department of Finance and Deregulation.

- (b) A Defence Minister or Parliamentary Secretary attended three Community Cabinet meetings in the 2011-12 financial year. The dates and locations are as follows:
 - 1 September 2011 in Yeronga, Queensland;
 - 9 November 2011 in Werribee, Victoria; and
 - 4 April 2012 in Parramatta, New South Wales.

- iii. Four Departmental officers travelled with a Defence Minister or Parliamentary Secretary attending three Community Cabinet meetings for 2011-12. The total cost of this travel was \$2970.26. These Departmental officers either flew or drove to/from Community Cabinet locations and travelled by taxi or hire car to/from venue. Departmental officers were accommodated in hotels, provided travel and incidental expenses within their entitlements. The Community Cabinet meetings which Departmental officers attended were held on:
 - 1 September 2011 in Yeronga, Queensland;
 - 9 November 2011 in Werribee, Victoria; and
 - 4 April 2012 in Parramatta, New South Wales.

- iv. Total cost to the Department was \$2970.26. Defence does not have information about travel costs by ministers, parliamentary secretaries and MOP(S) Act staff as these arrangements are administered by the Department of Finance and Deregulation.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q58: Reviews

Senator Eggleston asked in writing.

- (a) For this financial year to date:
 - (i) How many Reviews are being undertaken?
 - (ii) What reviews have concluded, and for those that are still ongoing, when will those reviews be concluded?
 - (iii) Which of these reviews has been provided to Government?
 - (iv) When will the Government be responding to the respective reviews that have been completed?
 - (v) Has the Government responded to all reviews within the timeframe? If not, why not?
 - (vi) What is the estimated cost of each of these Reviews?
 - (vii) What reviews are planned?
 - (viii) When will each of these reviews be concluded?

- (b) For 2011-12:
 - (ix) How many Reviews were undertaken?
 - (x) For those reviews that have concluded and for those that are still ongoing when will those reviews be concluded?
 - (xi) Which of these reviews has been provided to Government?
 - (xii) Did the Government respond to all reviews within the timeframe? If not, why not?
 - (xiii) What was the estimated cost of each of these Reviews?
 - (xiv) For any ongoing reviews, when will each of these reviews be concluded?

Response:

- (a) (i-viii) A list of the 20 reviews being undertaken by the Department of Defence for this financial year to date is provided in the table below.

DEFENCE REVIEWS FOR 1 JULY TO 26 OCTOBER 2012

Name of Review	Concluded / Date of Conclusion	Has the review been provided to Government?	Status of Government Response	Cost of review
Force Structure Review. Analyse the current and required force structure against strategic outlook. Develop force structure options cognisant of risk.	Expect conclusion 1 st Qtr 2013	No.	N/A	Cost has been absorbed within Defence.
Five Year Audit of the Australian Defence Force Investigative Service	05 Sep 12	No. This is an internal Defence review.	N/A	Approximately \$38,600.00 GST exclusive
Review into ADF Health Services following Transition of Garrison Health to Joint Health Command	Yes.	No. This is an internal Defence review.	N/A	Approx \$1900.00 – travel only. The value of the Defence staffing and administrative resources used in this review has not been estimated.
Review into the Strategic direction of the Army Malarial Institute.	Dec 12	No. This is an internal Defence review.	N/A	Approximately \$5000 – travel only. The value of the Defence staffing and administrative resources used in this review has not been estimated.
Provision of View Point Modelling (VPM) Program Simulator Tool. VPM has been undertaken in two distinct stages: Stage A - an initial QuickScan view of the sources of complexity and interrelationship of major influences within the program, and Stage B - full VPM simulator is developed.	Estimated conclusion date 30 June 13.	No. This is an internal Defence review.	N/A	The total cost of ICCPM engagement is \$347,930.
The Moon-Weber Review - The Review of delivery of Legal Services by ADF Legal Officers to the ADF and Defence. This was conducted by Mr John Weber – Chief Executive Partner, Minter Ellison	Yes.	No. This is an internal Defence review.	N/A	The quantifiable costs of the Moon-Weber review are estimated as being \$129,912.89. This review was conducted using a combination of

together with Brigadier Michael Moon				departmental and external resources. It is possible to quantify some aspects of the departmental expenditure. Departmental travel expenditure related to this review was \$13,487.34. The value of the Defence staffing and administrative resources used in this review have not been estimated. The cost of Minter Ellison's services in relation to this review was \$116,425.55.
Rethinking Systems of Inquiry, Investigation, Review and Audit in Defence (The Re-thinking Inquiries review)	February 2013.	No. This is an internal Defence review.	N/A	The Re-thinking Inquiries review has been conducted by internal Defence staff (ADF and APS personnel), without external support or resources. It is not possible at this stage to provide a reliable estimate of costs.
Review of the Weapons of Mass Destruction (Prevention of Proliferation) Act 1995 conducted by Mr Bill Blick AM PSM.	Defence received Mr Blick's report on 31 July 2012.	Yes.	The Blick Review is currently under consideration.	\$73,738.50 for consultancy services and \$3,185.87 for associated travel costs for Mr Blick (Total: \$76,924.37).
Review of the Notifiable System in Defence. This review was directed by the CDF and conducted by Inspector General ADF to identify whether the current system of reporting notifiable incidents in Defence remains effective or could be improved.	November 2012	No. This is an internal Defence review.	N/A	The review has been conducted internally and has not been separately costed.
Review of the Military	Completed October	No. This is an	N/A	Required no

<p>Justice Arrangements applying in the Defence Material Organisation. This review was directed by the CDF and conducted by Inspector General ADF to examine military justice arrangements for ADF personnel employed in the integrated environment of the Defence Material Organisation.</p>	2012	internal Defence review		additional funding.
<p>Review of Operations and Maintenance of Ships of Commercial Design</p>	24 Oct 2012	No. This is an internal Defence review.	N/A	\$8800 in reserve wages, \$6300 in travel (approx as final reconciliation not yet complete).
<p>Independent Review of the Potential for Enhanced Cruise Ship Access to Garden Island Sydney</p>	February 2012	Yes.	On 15 July 2012, the Prime Minister announced that Garden Island would provide access for three cruise ship visits during the 2012/13 cruise season and another three visits during the 2013/14 cruise season, addressing the short term requirements of the cruise industry. The longer term recommendations of the Review remain under active consideration and Government will announce its response in due course.	\$192,140
<p>P3M3 Assessment As part of the ICT Reform Agency Capability Initiative, the Government directed that agencies complete regular P3M3 assessments of their portfolio, program and project management capability, to compare their actual capability to their target capability, and report the results to the Secretaries' ICT Governance Board</p>	30 Sept 2012	Yes.	N/A	\$69,960.00 (inc GST).

commencing in September 2012.				
Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force by Ms Elizabeth Broderick, Sex Discrimination Commissioner, on behalf of the Australian Human Rights Commission	<p><u>Phase 1</u> (Review into the Treatment of Women at the Australian Defence Force Academy (ADFA)) tabled in Parliament on 3 November 2011.</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u> (Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force) tabled in Parliament on 22 August 2012.</p> <p><u>Phase 3</u> (Review of implementation of Phase 1) expected mid 2012.</p> <p><u>Phase 4</u> (Review of implementation of Phase 2) expected late 2012.</p>	Yes.	On 26 November 2012, the Minister for Defence announced that Defence has accepted all 21 Recommendations from the Phase 2 report of the Broderick Review, six in-principle and 15 in full.	Phases 1 and 2 – \$2.975m Phases 3 – \$2m budgeted
Technical Regulatory Frameworks Workforce (TRFW) review. Commitment in Defence Enterprise Collective Agreement 2012-2014. Review includes a work value assessment and development of strategic solutions in attracting, developing and retaining Defence APS engineering and technical skills.	Research and analysis to be completed by 30 Nov 12. Expecting to be finalised early 2013.	No. This is an internal Defence review	N/A	\$0.630m
The Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence	Phase 1 of the Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence has concluded. Volume 1 (General Findings and Recommendations) and the first part of Volume 2 (Individual Allegations) of the Phase 1 Report was provided to the Minister for Defence on 11 October 2011. A supplement to Volume 1 and the full Volume 2 of the Report was delivered to the Minister on 17 April 2012. This	Yes.	<p>On 26 November 2012, the Minister for Defence announced the Government's response to the Report of the DLA Piper Review into allegations of sexual and other abuse in Defence, received in April this year.</p> <p>The response included the conduct of a public apology, the establishment of an independent taskforce to review all allegations, a capped compensation scheme and ongoing</p>	As at 10 October 2012, Defence has paid DLA Piper \$10.490m

	concluded Phase 1 of the Review.		counseling support. The Government's response to the Review is guided by the Recommendations in the Review and will ensure that people who have alleged past abuse in Defence receive a response which is tailored to their individual circumstances and the nature of their experiences.	
DSD Review into Security	30 June 2012	No. This is an internal Defence review.	N/A	\$30,634
DSA Organisational Analysis Review	2 October 2012	No. This is an internal Defence Review	N/A	\$463 909.00
Security Governance Framework Review An assessment of the present security governance arrangements in Defence with respect to the Protective Security Policy Framework and Shared Services requirements.	December 2012	No. This is an internal Defence review.	N/A	\$78,750 (GST incl.)
Review into the Analytic Independence of DIO	February 2013	No.	N/A	Nil.

(b)

(ix –xvi) This question was answered under Question on Notice No. 69 taken from the Senate Budget Estimates hearing on 28/29 May 2012 and remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE - COMMITTEES

Senate Budget Estimates – 28/29 May 2012

Q69: Reviews

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

Reviews

For this financial year to date:

- (a) How many Reviews are being undertaken?
- (b) What reviews have concluded, and for those that are still ongoing, when will those reviews be concluded
- (c) Which of these reviews has been provided to Government?
- (d) When will the Government be responding to the respective reviews that have been completed?
- (e) What is the estimated cost of each of these Reviews?
- (f) What reviews are planned?
- (g) When will each of these reviews be concluded?

Response:

The following table provides an update on reviews that had been conducted or were concluded as at 30 June 2012 by Defence.

This response supplements Senate Questions on Notice No. 1500 which details reviews that were being conducted or had recently concluded as at 31 January 2012.

DEFENCE REVIEWS AS AT 30 JUNE 2012

Name of Review	Concluded	Has the review been provided to Government?	Cost of review
Defence Budget Review	Yes	No. This is an internal Defence Review	\$358,671.60
<p>Organisation Analysis Review - This review was undertaken to conduct an analysis of the work processes within the Australian Government Security Vetting Agency to enable appropriate structures and staffing levels to be put in place to support the future demand for vetting services.</p>	<p>Estimated completion August 2012</p> <p>Final draft has been submitted, currently waiting sign-off.</p>	No. This is an internal Defence Review.	\$463,909.00
<p>Defence Counterintelligence (CI) Concept of Operations/Review - This review was directed by VCDF/DEPSEC I&S in September 2011, at the request of CJOPS and DSA. The review will be conducted in two phases:</p> <p>Phase 1 - an urgent review of the deployable CI capability to support operations offshore.</p> <p>Phase 2 - a longer term Defence wide review of the domestic and non-operational offshore CI capability across Defence</p>	<p>Estimated completion of both phases in December 2013.</p> <p>FIC requirements to be submitted in December 2012.</p> <p>Anticipated completion of Phase 1 by end of June 2013, and Phase 2 by mid 2014.</p>	No. This is an internal Defence Review.	Unknown - currently restricted to travel costs of Working Group members to attend review meetings, and staffing costs are being drawn from Defence internally.
<p>The Moon-Weber Review - The Review of delivery of Legal Services by ADF Legal Officers to the ADF and Defence. This was conducted by Mr John Weber – Chief Executive Partner, Minter Ellison together with Brigadier</p>	Yes.	No. The review was provided to the Chief of the Defence Force on 22 June 2012.	<p>The quantifiable costs of the Moon-Weber review are estimated as being \$129,912.89.</p> <p>This review was conducted using a combination of departmental and</p>

Michael Moon			external resources. It is possible to quantify some aspects of the departmental expenditure. Departmental travel expenditure related to this review was \$13,487.34. The value of the Defence staffing and administrative resources used in this review has not been estimated. The cost of Minter Ellison's services in relation to this review was \$116,425.55.
Australian Defence Force College Strategic Infrastructure Planning Study	No. Estimated completion 31 October 2012.	No. This is an internal Defence Review.	\$190,000
Australian Defence Force Posture Review	Yes.	The final report was provided to the Minister for Defence on 30 March 2012.	\$288,731
Collins Class Sustainment Study, also known as the Coles Study	Phase 1 report completed 4 Nov 2011. Phase 2 Report completed 12 Jun 2012. Phase 3 final report to be completed by	Phase 1 report has been released to Government. Phase 2 report has been released to Government and is under consideration.	Total contracted price for all Phases to date is \$9.7985m (GST incl).

	<p>end 2012.</p> <p>Phase 4 (Optional) may be exercised mid 2014 when the ISSC with ASC is due to enter the mature phase.</p>		
<p>Defence Home Ownership Assistance Scheme Implementation (DHOAS) Review</p>	<p>Ernst & Young have completed an external review of the implementation of the scheme. A working group is currently looking at the outcomes and recommendations of the Ernst & Young review. It is intended to present a report to Government by the end of 2012; however, as the Ernst & Young review has recommended some changes to the scheme, the report may be delayed if the recommendations suggest improvements to the scheme.</p>	No.	<p>Anticipated final cost is \$166,000 (ex. GST).</p>
<p>Senior Management Review on DSTO's Networks (both Restricted and Secret) and ICT Arrangements</p>	<p>The review commenced on 28 May 2012 and the report was provided to Chief Defence Scientist on 20 June 2012.</p>	<p>This is an internal Defence review, however, a copy of the Executive Summary was provided to the Minister for information.</p>	<p>The cost of the review is estimated at \$10,500. This was the travel cost for the Review Team to hold meetings with DSTO stakeholders at the three major sites in Adelaide, Canberra and Melbourne.</p>

<p>The Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence</p>	<p>Phase 1 of the Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence has concluded. Volume 1 (General Findings and Recommendations) and the first part of Volume 2 (Individual Allegations) of the Phase 1 Report was provided to the Minister for Defence on 11 October 2011.</p> <p>A supplement to Volume 1 and the full Volume 2 of the Report was delivered to the Minister on 17 April 2012. This concluded Phase 1 of the Review.</p>	<p>Phase 1 of the Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence has been provided to the Government.</p> <p>The Government is currently considering its response to the Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence. The large number, the seriousness and the age of some of the allegations, as well as the cross-Government issues, will mean that quick resolution may not be possible. The solution will need to deal with systemic issues in Defence, deal fairly with the people who say they are victims of abuse, and also deal fairly with people against whom it might be alleged they have committed some offence or conducted some wrongdoing.</p>	<p>As at 30 June 2012, the Review of Allegations of Sexual and Other Abuse in Defence had cost \$10,199,455.60.</p>
<p>Rethinking Systems of Inquiry, Investigation, Review and Audit in Defence. (The Re-thinking Inquiries review)</p>	<p>February 2013.</p>	<p>No. This is an internal Defence review.</p>	<p>The Re-thinking Inquiries review has been conducted by internal Defence staff (ADF and APS personnel), without external support or resources. It is not possible at this stage to provide a reliable estimate of costs.</p>

DSD Security Review	The review was concluded in June 2012.	No.	\$30,634
AGSVA Organisational Structure and Business Process Review	29 Aug 2011.	No.	\$101,876
Inspector-General of Intelligence and Security – Inquiry into allegations of inappropriate vetting practices in the Defence Security Authority and related matters.	December 2011.	Yes.	\$40,000
Review of Weapons of Mass Destruction (Prevention of Proliferation) Act 1995	Mr Blick Bill, AM, PSM, is expected to report to Defence in mid-2012.	Defence received Mr Blick's report on 31 July 2012.	\$73,738.50 for consultancy services and \$3,185.87 for associated travel costs for Mr Blick (Total: \$76,924.37).
Review of the Management of Incidents and Complaints, including Civil and Military Jurisdiction	The review commenced on 12 April 2011 and a report was submitted to the Minister for Defence on 2 November 2011 as part of the reviews into defence culture.	The report was submitted to the Minister for Defence on 2 November 2011 as part of the reviews into defence culture.	\$0.019
Inspector General ADF CDF directed Review of the Notifiable Incidents System (IGADF)	Paper to be presented at the November 2012 COSC meeting.	No, this is an internal Defence Review.	This review has been conducted internally and has not been separately costed.
Review into ADF Health Services following Transition of Garrison Health to Joint Health Command	Yes.	No. This is an internal Defence Review.	Approx \$1900.00 – travel only. The value of the Defence staffing and administrative

			resources used in this review has not been estimated.
--	--	--	---

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q59: Consultancies

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) How many consultancies have been undertaken this financial year to date? Identify the name of the consultant, the subject matter of the consultancy, the duration and cost of the arrangement, and the method of procurement (ie. open tender, direct source, etc). Also include total value for all consultancies.
- (b) 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? In each case please identify the subject matter, duration, cost and method of procurement as above, and the name of the consultant if known.
- (c) How many consultancies were undertaken in 2011-12? Identify the name of the consultant, the subject matter of the consultancy, the duration and cost of the arrangement, and the method of procurement (ie. open tender, direct source, etc). Also include total value for all consultancies.

Response:

- i. From 1 July 2012 to 31 October 2012 Defence entered into 180 new consultancy contracts with a total contract value of \$18,684,704 (139 contracts were above \$10,000 with a total value of \$18,499,682). For consultancy contracts let between 1 July 2012 and 31 October 2012 greater than \$10,000 the details of consultant's name, the subject matter, the duration and cost of the arrangement and the method of procurement are provided in Table 1.
- ii. Defence systems do not plan for individual consulting contracts as many contracts are a response to current operational and business requirements. The Defence Annual Procurement Plan (APP) published on AusTender provides details of known forward consulting contracts with a value greater than \$1 million. Lower value contracts and contracts for which details are not known at the time of publishing the APP will not be shown on AusTender. The consultant's name, subject matter, duration, costs, method of procurement is not known when financial plans are collated. These details are published on AusTender when the contract is let.
- iii. As detailed in the Defence Annual Report during 2011-12 Defence entered into 533 consultancy contracts with a total contract value of \$47,328,722 (339 contracts were above \$10,000 with a total value of \$46,448,860). For consultancy contracts let during 2011-12 greater than \$10,000 the details of consultant's name, the subject matter, the duration and cost of the arrangement and the method of procurement are provided in Table 2.

Table 1

Consultancy reported YTD FY 2012/13
1 July 12 to 31 October 12 (value \$10,000 and Above)

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 31/10/12
	Air Force						
1	HEALTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL P/L	8-Aug-12	30-Sep-12	Flexible Safety Training	Open tender	A	15,400
2	HEALTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL P/L	28-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	Flexible Safety Training Supplier. Is Able To Sup Suitable Training To The Raaf Base Locations	Open tender	A	19,221
3	HEALTH SERVICES INTERNATIONAL P/L	12-Oct-12	30-Jun-13	Flexible Safety Training Supplier. Is Able To Supp	Open tender	A	16,280
4	TRANSFIELD SERVICES	19-Oct-12	1-Feb-13	Bird And Wildlife Management Plan	Prequalified tender	B	88,000
	Air Force Total						138,901
	CFOG						
1	DUN & BRADSTREET AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	14-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	Specialist Services To Provide Mercantile Data	Open tender	B	16,435
2	SYNERGY GLOBAL	16-Aug-12	30-Jun-15	Coaching Mentoring Services For Finance Domain Services	Open tender	B	895,000
	CFOG Total						911,435
	CIOG						
1	HEWLETT-PACKARD AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	6-Sep-12	31-Oct-12	Desktop Cloud Environment	Open tender	A	11,000
2	OAKTON SERVICES PTY LTD	3-Aug-12	30-Sep-12	Conduct Act Capability Assessment	Open tender	B	69,960
	CIOG Total						80,960
	DSTO						
1	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	2-Aug-12	31-Dec-12	DSTO Strategic Plan Development	Open tender	B	412,500
	DSTO Total						412,500
	Defence Support Group						
1	AEC ENVIRONMENTAL PTY LTD	16-Jul-12	30-Jun-13	Asbestos Remediation Works	Prequalified tender	B	57,732
2	AECOM	13-Sep-12	30-Sep-12	Maintenance And Repair Services	Open tender	B	22,000
3	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	4-Jul-12	31-Aug-12	DL111/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,203
4	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	16-Jul-12	31-Dec-12	DL0114/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	70,588
5	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	19-Jul-12	30-Jun-13	DL0028E03/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	1,710,619
6	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	26-Jul-12	30-Dec-12	ID1100E03/2007 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,452
7	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	7-Aug-12	30-Sep-12	DPE2008/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,167
8	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	23-Aug-12	30-Jun-13	DL0128/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	91,727

Table 1

Consultancy reported YTD FY 2012/13
1 July 12 to 31 October 12 (value \$10,000 and Above)

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 31/10/12
9	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	11-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	ID1055/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	43,171
10	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	14-Sep-12	30-Jun-14	ID1053/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	105,884
11	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	2-Oct-12	30-Apr-13	ID1060/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	38,450
12	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	8-Aug-12	30-Jun-13	ID1045/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	51,641
13	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	2-Oct-12	30-Dec-12	ID1063/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	24,206
14	ASPECT ORGANISATIONAL	13-Sep-12	30-Sep-12	Organisational Psychology Services	Open tender	B	12,320
15	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ACTUARY	16-Oct-12	30-Jun-13	Actuarial Services	Prequalified tender	B	91,000
16	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	4-Jul-12	31-Aug-12	DL0109/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	17,644
17	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	21-Aug-12	31-Dec-12	DL0133/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	16,148
18	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	23-Aug-12	31-Oct-12	DL0134/2012 - Tied Work	Limited tender	B	10,230
19	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	10-Sep-12	31-Dec-12	DL0136/2012 - Tied Work	Open tender	B	30,762
20	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	11-Sep-12	31-Oct-12	DL0141/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,265
21	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	4-Oct-12	30-Nov-12	DL0153/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	22,160
22	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	11-Oct-12	31-Oct-12	DL0161/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,785
23	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	13-Sep-12	30-Mar-13	ID1036/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	39,606
24	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	5-Sep-12	30-Sep-12	DL0135/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,428
25	BLUE VISIONS MANAGEMENT PTY LTD	11-Oct-12	1-Dec-16	Blue Vision Engaged To Review The Managing Contractor's Delivery Phase Program	Limited tender	C	22,044
26	CHAMBERS OF DOUGLAS J CAMPBELL SC	11-Sep-12	31-Oct-12	DL0139/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	25,000
27	CLAYTON UTZ	12-Sep-12	31-Oct-12	DL0107E04/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	37,620
28	CLAYTON UTZ	18-Jul-12	31-Dec-12	ID1044/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	22,968
29	CLAYTON UTZ	16-Jul-12	30-Jun-13	ID1039/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	22,880
30	CLAYTON UTZ	21-Aug-12	31-Oct-12	DL0130/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	36,568
31	CLAYTON UTZ	11-Sep-12	31-Mar-13	ID1051/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	86,280
32	CLAYTON UTZ	5-Oct-12	31-Dec-12	DL0068E08/2007 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	28,915
33	CLAYTON UTZ	5-Oct-12	31-Oct-12	DL0158/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	14,960
34	CLAYTON UTZ	5-Oct-12	31-Dec-12	ID1064/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,736
35	CORPORATE SCORECARD PTY LTD	9-Aug-12	30-Jun-13	Support For Future Acquisition Strategy For Delivery Of Base Services	Open tender	B	140,000
36	CORPORATE SCORECARD PTY LTD	8-Aug-12	31-Dec-12	Payment For Financial Investigation Services By Corporate Scorecard For Land17 Phase 1A	Limited tender	B	16,500
37	CSIRO - DAVIES LABORATORY	7-Aug-12	31-May-13	Sustainability Monitoring	Limited tender	B	287,100
38	DELOITTE	21-Aug-12	30-Nov-12	Management Support Services	Prequalified tender	B	644,490
39	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	3-Sep-12	30-Sep-12	DL0124/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	32,010

Table 1

Consultancy reported YTD FY 2012/13
1 July 12 to 31 October 12 (value \$10,000 and Above)

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 31/10/12
40	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	8-Aug-12	30-Sep-12	DL0125/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,789
41	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	23-Aug-12	30-Jan-13	ID1047/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	14,369
42	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	10-Sep-12	31-Oct-12	DL0137/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,657
43	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	5-Oct-12	30-Jun-13	ID1050/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	106,896
44	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	4-Oct-12	31-Dec-12	ID1062/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	35,552
45	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	16-Jul-12	30-Jun-13	ID1031/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	13,193
46	ENVIRONMENT AUDITORS	10-Aug-12	30-Jun-13	Auditor For Remediation Of Trichloroethylene Plume	Limited tender	B	54,164
47	GHD PTY LTD	17-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	Contaminated Site Investigation	Limited tender	B	88,000
48	GHD PTY LTD	28-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	Preparation Of Design & Tender Documents	Limited tender	B	13,581
49	GRANT THORNTON	31-Jul-12	4-Aug-12	Forensic Accounting And Auditing	Open tender	C	87,912
50	GROSVENOR MANAGEMENT CONSULTING	14-Aug-12	30-Sep-12	Provision Of Management Advisory Services	Limited tender	C	26,414
51	HYDER CONSULTING	17-Jul-12	16-Jul-13	Review Of Fire Safety Rectification Works	Limited tender	B	10,934
52	INTERNATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION P/L	3-Oct-12	30-Oct-12	Assessment Services Of Base Services Retendering	Limited tender	B	25,000
53	Key Energy and Resources	4-Aug-12	3-Aug-16	Energy Consultancy Services	Open tender	B	797,584
54	KPMG	13-Jul-12	31-Aug-12	Development Of A Petroleum Oils & Lubricants Management Statement Of Work	Open tender	B	117,700
55	KPMG AUSTRALIA	8-Aug-12	30-Jun-13	Support To Update And Maintain Software/Systems	Open tender	B	136,953
56	MADDOCKS	21-Aug-12	30-Sep-12	DPE2009/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,327
57	MILSEARCH PTY LTD	17-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	Contaminated Site Investigation	Limited tender	B	88,000
58	MINTER ELLISON	19-Jul-12	31-Aug-12	DL0119/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,325
59	MINTER ELLISON	25-Jul-12	30-Dec-12	ID1038/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	74,610
60	MINTER ELLISON	14-Sep-12	31-Oct-12	ID1052/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	14,665
61	MINTER ELLISON	14-Sep-12	31-Jan-13	DL0144/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	45,949
62	NORTON ROSE	25-Jul-12	30-Dec-12	ID1046/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,724
63	NORTON ROSE	13-Sep-12	30-Sep-12	ID1061/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	34,920
64	NORTON ROSE	4-Oct-12	31-Jan-13	Jlg4001E04/2010 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	13,271
65	NORTON ROSE	5-Oct-12	30-Nov-12	ID1067/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	65,450
66	PALADIN RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES	8-Aug-12	31-Dec-12	Provision Of Specialist Risk Management Services	Open tender	B	84,200
67	PROVIDENCE CONSULTING GROUP PL	2-Jul-12	30-Jun-13	Security And Searches Implementation Fy 12/13.	Open tender	B	399,047
68	PROVIDENCE CONSULTING GROUP PL	4-Jul-12	21-Dec-12	Professional Services.	Open tender	B	170,500
69	PROVIDENCE CONSULTING GROUP PL	9-Jul-12	21-Dec-12	Professional Services.	Open tender	B	176,000
70	PROVIDENCE CONSULTING GROUP PL	4-Jul-12	21-Dec-12	Professional Services.	Open tender	B	184,250
71	PROVIDENCE CONSULTING GROUP PL	4-Jul-12	21-Dec-12	Professional Services.	Open tender	B	176,000

Table 1

Consultancy reported YTD FY 2012/13
1 July 12 to 31 October 12 (value \$10,000 and Above)

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 31/10/12
72	PROVIDENCE CONSULTING GROUP PL	4-Jul-12	21-Dec-12	Professional Services.	Open tender	B	154,000
73	QINETIQ TECHNICAL CONSULTING	4-Jul-12	21-Dec-12	Professional Services	Open tender	B	173,500
74	QINETIQ TECHNICAL CONSULTING	24-Jul-12	14-Sep-12	Project Management Audit Services	Limited tender	B	60,800
75	RISK DECISIONS PTY LTD	19-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	Provision Of Specialist Risk Management Services	Prequalified tender	B	18,150
76	SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ DEFENCE P/L	24-Aug-12	30-Jun-13	National Program Support Service	Open tender	B	148,969
77	SME GATEWAY LTD	19-Sep-12	30-Jun-14	Management Consultancy Services	Open tender	B	368,000
78	SPARKE HELMORE	16-Jul-12	30-Jun-13	ID1029E02/2009 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	53,893
79	SPARKE HELMORE	17-Jul-12	30-Jun-13	ID1042/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	53,065
80	SPARKE HELMORE	21-Aug-12	31-Oct-12	DL0131/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	39,475
81	SPARKE HELMORE	21-Aug-12	30-Jun-13	ID1021E01/2008 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	52,140
82	SPARKE HELMORE	24-Sep-12	28-Feb-13	DL0149/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	77,700
83	SPARKE HELMORE	26-Sep-12	31-Oct-12	DL0148/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,035
84	SPARKE HELMORE	4-Oct-12	30-Jun-13	ID1065/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	39,190
85	SPARKE HELMORE	2-Aug-12	30-Oct-12	Probity Services For Corrosion Control Facility Head Contractor Tender	Prequalified tender	A	18,805
86	SPARKE HELMORE	8-Aug-12	31-Dec-14	Australian Defence Force Investigative Services- Probity Services Contract Locations Australia WIDe	Limited tender	B	40,732
87	SPARKE HELMORE	15-Oct-12	30-Jul-15	Probity Advice For The Development Phase Of Land 121-Stage 2 Unit Sustainment Facilities	Open tender	B	80,900
88	SYNERGY GROUP	20-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	Business Analyst Support Services	Limited tender	B	418,000
89	THIESS ENVIIRONMENTAL SERVICES P /	16-Oct-12	31-Dec-12	Site Remediation Work	Open tender	B	980,697
90	TRANSFIELD SERVICES	16-Jul-12	30-Jun-13	Fire Management Plan Development	Prequalified tender	B	10,997
91	TRANSFIELD SERVICES	3-Jul-12	30-Jun-13	Hazardous Area Electrical Rectification Works	Prequalified tender	B	19,910
92	TRANSFIELD SERVICES	6-Aug-12	30-Jun-13	WILDLife Safety Officer Services	Prequalified tender	B	77,000
93	WORLEY PARSONS SERVICES PTY LTD	10-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	Redesign Of Drainage Works At Herberfield Original Prepared By The Vendor	Limited tender	B	13,816
94	YARRIMBAH CONSULTING	2-Oct-12	4-Oct-12	Provision Of Investigation Services	Limited tender	B	21,000
	Defence Support Group Total						9,996,966
	INT-SEC						
1	APIS LEARNING & DEVELOPMENT PTY	4-Sep-12	20-Nov-12	Training Services	Limited tender	B	37,782
2	CSC AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	14-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	Software Developer Services	Open tender	B	56,153
3	ICON RECRUITMENT PTY LTD	9-Jul-12	31-Dec-12	Procurement Of Information Technology Service	Open tender	C	152,826
4	MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY - SYDNEY	18-Jul-12	15-Sep-12	Research Services	Limited tender	B	18,247

Table 1

Consultancy reported YTD FY 2012/13
1 July 12 to 31 October 12 (value \$10,000 and Above)

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 31/10/12
5	NOETIC SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	12-Sep-12	1-Dec-12	Management Advisory Services	Open tender	B	78,750
6	PS MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS	19-Sep-12	30-Apr-13	Technical Training	Limited tender	A	79,937
7	SPARKE HELMORE	28-Sep-12	30-Nov-12	DIO155/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,300
8	UNISYS AUSTRALIA LTD	18-Sep-12	30-Jun-13	Provision Of Services Or Process Improvement Initiative	Open tender	B	1,125,788
9	UXC LIMITED	10-Sep-12	30-Sep-13	Business Intelligence System	Open tender	A	2,258,146
	INT-SEC Total						3,817,930
	PSPG						
1	MAJOR TRAINING SERVICES PTY LTD	18-Sep-12	15-Nov-12	Development Of Defence Assessor Guidelines	Prequalified tender	B	19,800
2	MERCER	18-Oct-12	31-Dec-12	Australian Military Senior Leaders' Remuneration R	Prequalified tender	C	69,300
3	NOETIC SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	11-Sep-12	30-Nov-12	Delivery Of Framework And Policy Education	Prequalified tender	B	38,280
4	NOUS GROUP	20-Sep-12	5-Oct-12	Development Of A New Implementation Strategy	Limited tender	B	98,000
5	SMS MANAGEMENT & TECHNOLOGY	27-Sep-12	30-Jun-14	Audit And Assurance Manager	Limited tender	A	447,550
	PSPG Total						672,930
139	Total						18,499,682

A -	Skills currently unavailable within agency
B -	Need for specialised or professional skills
C -	Need for independent research or assessment

		Value
Total Contracts =	180	18,684,704
Above \$10k =	139	18,499,682
Below \$10k =	41	185,022

Table 1

Consultancy reported YTD FY 2011/12 July 11 to Apr 12 (of value \$10,000 and Above)							
Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/04/12
	Officer of the Secretary and CDF						
1	DAVID LEVINE	13-Jul-11	30-Dec-11	President For CDF Commission Of Inquiries	Direct	B	109,900
2	DR ALLAN HAWKE	16-Aug-11	30-Mar-12	Australian Defence Force Posture Review	Direct	B	99,000
3	F & W BLICK SUPERANNUATION FUND	16-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	Review Of Policy Act	Direct	B	53,955
4	JBTGLOBAL CORPORATE ADVISORY	29-Jul-11	30-Jun-12	Training - Non-Military	Direct	B	17,633
5	JENNIFER R CLARK	20-Dec-11	31-Dec-12	Advisory Board	Direct	C	31,862
6	MR PAUL RIZZO	1-Nov-11	21-Mar-13	Review Implementation Committee	Direct	B	119,929
7	NOETIC SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	5-Sep-11	30-Apr-12	Provision Of Professional Enterprise Risk Management Services	Open	B	233,740
8	NOETIC SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	3-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	Professional Enterprise Risk Management Services	Select	B	118,588
9	PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS LEGAL	7-Dec-11	23-Dec-11	Business Process Improvements-Defence Parliamentary Workflow System Project	Open	B	47,045
10	RICHARD C. SMITH	23-Sep-11	30-Mar-12	Australian Defence Force Posture Review.	Direct	B	99,000
11	ROSS J MONAGHAN	5-Jul-11	30-Jun-13	Research Into Social Media Trends	Direct	C	60,500
11	SECCDF Total						991,151
	VCDF						
1	ABW MANAGEMENT CONSULTING	20-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	Strategic Negotiation Advisor	Direct	B	249,700
2	ACCENTURE AUSTRALIA HOLDINGS	19-Mar-12	14-Feb-13	Development Of A Strategy For The Procurement Of A Learning Management System	Open	C	110,000
3	AUSTHINK CONSULTING PTY LTD	12-Jul-11	30-Jun-12	Administration Services Including Workshop Participation, Preparation And Production	Direct	B	29,769
4	CURTIN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY	4-Jul-11	31-Aug-11	Independent Advisory Panel	Direct	C	37,500
5	GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY	8-Aug-11	24-Nov-11	Evaluation Of Suicide Prevention Program In The Australian Defence Force	Select	C	126,325
6	KPMG AUSTRALIA	16-Aug-11	30-Sep-11	Inventory Accounting Support	Direct	B	75,420
7	MR ANDREW JOHN KIRKHAM	6-Jul-11	27-Jul-11	Inquiry Fees For Services	Direct	B	495,000
8	MR N. CLELLAND	6-Jul-11	27-Jul-11	Inquiry Fees For Services	Direct	B	119,988
9	NOETIC SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	31-Oct-11	5-Dec-11	Accommodation Review	Direct	C	22,000
10	PARITY TECHNOLOGY CONSULTING	9-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	Audio Visual Technology Upgrade Consultants	Direct	B	37,576
11	PROFESSOR MICHAEL R MOORE	3-Aug-11	30-Jun-12	Scientific Advisory Committee.	Direct	C	18,768
12	SAI GLOBAL	9-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	Re-Certification & Surveillance Audits	Direct	C	78,634
12	VCDF Total						1,400,679

Table 1

**Consultancy reported YTD FY 2011/12
July 11 to Apr 12 (of value \$10,000 and Above)**

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/04/12
JOC							
1	CUBIC APPLICATIONS INC.	7-Mar-12	31-Jan-13	Services Of United States Liaison Officer	Direct	A	270,511
2	DYNAMIC BUSINESS SYSTEMS PTY LTD	4-Dec-11	4-Dec-11	Training Of Unit Staff	Open	B	17,377
3	OTEK AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	23-Aug-11	31-Aug-11	Provision Of Environment Services	Direct	B	22,583
4	PS MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS	7-Jul-11	28-Oct-11	Consultancy - Simulation Procurement	Select	A	66,000
5	ROLANDS & ASSOCIATES CORPORATION DB	27-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	JLTS Training	Direct	B	12,400
6	UNMANNED SYSTEMS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	22-Sep-11	31-Oct-11	ADF Joint Combined Training Study	Direct	A	33,000
6	JOC Total						421,870
NAVY							
1	DR ALLAN HAWKE	17-Nov-11	31-Dec-11	Review Of The Future Use Of Royal Australian Navy Base By Visiting Cruise Ships.	Direct	C	132,000
2	NORTON ROSE	8-Nov-11	31-Jan-12	DL0155/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	208,948
2	NAVY Total						340,948
ARMY							
1	BMD CONSULTING PTY LTD	19-Jan-12	30-Nov-12	Civil Works Design Package Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Program 2012	Open	B	550,000
1	ARMY Total						550,000
Air Force							
1	Australian Government Solicitor	1-Jul-11	31-Aug-12	Legal Services	Open	B	14,048
2	Capgemini Australia Pty Ltd	1-Jul-11	31-Jul-12	Strategic Support	Open	C	860,630
3	CIT Solutions Pty Ltd	11-Jul-11	31-Aug-11	Scoping study - Air Force aeroskills	Open	C	40,458
3	Air Force Total						915,136
CFOG							
1	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	18-Jul-11	31-Jul-11	Task 2.4 Foreign Exchange	Open	B	129,888
2	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	19-Jul-11	30-Sep-11	Review And Analysis Of Budget Management Processes Within Defence	Open	B	61,860

Table 1

**Consultancy reported YTD FY 2011/12
July 11 to Apr 12 (of value \$10,000 and Above)**

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/04/12
3	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	19-Jul-11	31-Oct-11	Funds For Additional Support Of Internal Funding Requirements, Budget Lines, Cost Assurance Items	Open	B	85,029
4	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	4-Oct-11	20-Oct-11	Budget Analysis Services	Open	B	132,696
5	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	8-Nov-11	18-Nov-11	Review And Update Of Standardised Financial Management Reports	Open	B	126,892
6	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	8-Nov-11	18-Nov-11	Budget Analysis (Support To Budget Review)	Open	B	161,354
7	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	9-Nov-11	30-Nov-13	Development Of Standardised Financial Management Reports	Open	B	47,530
8	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	5-Dec-11	13-Jan-13	Task 2.12 Budget Analysis (Support To Budget Review)	Open	B	294,293
9	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	27-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Independent Review Of Resource, Output Management And Accounting Network Indemnities Register	Open	B	224,228
10	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	4-Apr-12	5-Apr-12	Task 2.2 Finrep - To Support Defence's Ongoing Review Of Year End Journals	Open	B	21,644
11	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	4-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	Task 2.1 Finrep - To Support Defence's Ongoing Accounting Policy	Open	B	67,020
12	ERNST & YOUNG CONSULTING	28-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Draft Submission To The AASB	Open	B	80,000
13	F1 SOLUTIONS	17-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	Access Database Programming Services	Direct	B	19,800
14	INNOGENCE LIMITED	15-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Specialist Advice And Support Services	Open	B	59,400
15	JOHN SYMONS AND ASSOCIATES PTY LTD	7-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	Management Advisory Services	Direct	B	80,000
16	KPMG AUSTRALIA	8-Feb-12	31-Dec-12	Financial Statements 10-11	Select	A	275,000
17	PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS LEGAL	7-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Benchmarking Assessment Of The Finance Shared Services Implementation Plan	Open	C	85,000
17	CFOG						1,951,633
	CIOG						
1	AQUITAINE CONSULTING PTY LTD	22-Dec-11	29-Feb-12	CIOG 412/11 Review Of Defences' Disaster Recovery Readiness	Direct	C	261,855
2	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	8-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	DI0134/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	75,999
3	MICROSOFT SERVICES PTY LTD	2-Apr-12	28-Mar-13	Software Support And Assistance Services	Direct	B	5,727,934
4	PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS LEGAL	19-Jan-12	30-Apr-13	Project And Technical Support Services	Open	B	32,252
5	THE NOUS GROUP	14-Dec-11	31-May-12	Management Consultancy Services	Open	B	143,000
5	CIOG Total						6,241,040
	Defence Support Group						
1	AECOM	25-Aug-11	29-Feb-12	Analysis, Contract, Report & Presentation Services	Open	B	28,600
2	AECOM	28-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Undertake Asbestos Surveys	Select	B	17,357

Table 1

**Consultancy reported YTD FY 2011/12
July 11 to Apr 12 (of value \$10,000 and Above)**

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/04/12
3	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	8-Mar-12	30-Jun-16	ID1071/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	208,333
4	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	27-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	DL0020/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	15,550
5	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	21-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	DL0118E01/2010 - Legal Services	Open	B	32,097
6	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	7-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	DL0028/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	225,562
7	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	16-Mar-12	30-Jun-14	Probity Advisor	Direct	B	71,567
8	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ACTUARY	26-Aug-11	30-Jun-12	Actuarial Services	Direct	B	91,000
9	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	17-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	Single Leap - Probity Advice & Services For Phase 2 Project	Select	B	36,300
10	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Jul-11	31-Aug-11	DL0104/2011-Legal Services	Open	B	14,511
11	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	15-Jul-11	31-Dec-11	DL0102011- Legal Services	Open	B	23,920
12	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	18-Jul-11	31-Aug-11	DL0113/2011-Legal Services	Open	B	10,820
13	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	28-Jul-11	31-Aug-11	DP0105/2011-Legal Services	Direct	B	14,834
14	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	5-Aug-11	31-Oct-11	DL0122/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	11,184
15	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	5-Aug-11	31-Dec-11	DL0103/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	27,720
16	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	17-Aug-11	30-Nov-11	DL0128/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	25,674
17	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	17-Aug-11	30-Mar-12	DL0127/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	11,017
18	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	25-Aug-11	30-Jun-12	DPE2019/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	13,000
19	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	7-Sep-11	30-Nov-11	DL0137/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	20,087
20	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	7-Sep-11	30-Nov-11	DL0125/2011 - Tied Legal Services	Direct	B	12,606
21	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Sep-11	31-Jan-12	DL0135E01/2010 - Tied Legal Services	Direct	B	104,500
22	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Sep-11	31-Mar-12	DL0132/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	11,637
23	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	ID1091/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	17,820
24	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	DL0133/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	11,637
25	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	27-Sep-11	31-Oct-11	DL0139/2010 - Legal Services	Open	B	22,100
26	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	28-Sep-11	30-Sep-11	DL0146/2011 - Legal Services - Tied	Direct	B	20,092
27	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	28-Sep-11	29-Feb-12	DL0147/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	13,624
28	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	28-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	DL0145/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	12,760
29	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	29-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	ID1095/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	10,428
30	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	5-Oct-11	1-Oct-12	AZ5160 To A8989 Probity Services For 17 Const. SQN Relocation And Water & Sewerage Treatment Pro	Select	B	32,340
31	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	7-Oct-11	31-Mar-12	DL0148/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	29,568
32	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	7-Oct-11	31-Dec-11	DL0140/2011 - Tied Legal Services	Direct	B	37,318
33	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	1-Dec-11	29-Feb-12	DL0179/2011- Tied Legal Services	Direct	B	10,230

Table 1

**Consultancy reported YTD FY 2011/12
July 11 to Apr 12 (of value \$10,000 and Above)**

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/04/12
34	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	6-Dec-11	31-Jan-12	DL0181/2011- Legal Services - Tied Work	Open	B	33,605
35	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	14-Dec-11	30-Apr-12	DL0185/2011 - Tied Work	Direct	B	10,778
36	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	23-Dec-11	29-Feb-12	DL0190/2011- Tied Legal Services	Direct	B	11,017
37	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	23-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	DL0191/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	15,081
38	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	30-Jan-12	28-Feb-12	DL0003/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	11,628
39	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	21-Feb-12	31-May-12	DL0012/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	10,230
40	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	21-Feb-12	31-Mar-12	DL0015/2012 - Tied Work	Direct	B	11,875
41	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	27-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	DPE2000/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	11,413
42	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Mar-12	30-May-12	DL0032/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	15,345
43	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	14-Mar-12	30-Apr-12	DL0029/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	47,514
44	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	15-Mar-12	30-Apr-12	DL0034/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	10,808
45	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	11-Apr-12	30-May-12	DL0046/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	10,450
46	AUSTRALIAN MEDICO-LEGAL GROUP PTY	20-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	Injury Management Services	Open	B	110,000
47	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	14-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	DPE2002/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	23,047
48	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	18-Jul-11	31-Oct-11	DL0119E02/2008 - Legal Services	Open	B	13,850
49	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	19-Jul-11	31-Dec-11	DL0100/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	16,064
50	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	27-Jul-11	31-Oct-11	DPE2011/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	12,785
51	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	2-Aug-11	30-Jun-12	DL0100E01/2009 - Legal Services	Open	B	41,580
52	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	14-Sep-11	30-Dec-11	ID1076/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	393,105
53	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	14-Sep-11	15-Dec-11	ID1076E01/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	12,440
54	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	28-Sep-11	31-Oct-11	DL0111/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	19,035
55	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	9-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	ID1097/2011 Legal Services	Open	B	94,807
56	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	14-Nov-11	30-Apr-12	DL0164/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	49,421
57	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	23-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	DPE2011EO1/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	48,306
58	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	6-Dec-11	31-Jan-12	ID1112/2011 Legal Services	Open	B	15,261
59	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	10-Jan-12	29-Feb-12	Provision Of Probity Services For DSTO Reinvestment In ADF Specific Facilities	Direct	C	25,090
60	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	7-Feb-12	30-Mar-13	ID1000/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	51,651
61	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	9-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1066E01/2009 - Legal Services	Open	B	16,804
62	CHG	20-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	Injury Management Services	Open	C	110,001
63	CLAYTON UTZ	26-Aug-11	30-Sep-11	DL0099/2011-Legal Services	Open	B	76,536
64	CLAYTON UTZ	27-Oct-11	30-May-12	ID1047/2011-Legal Services	Open	B	40,468

Table 1

Consultancy reported YTD FY 2011/12 July 11 to Apr 12 (of value \$10,000 and Above)							
Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/04/12
65	CLAYTON UTZ	14-Jul-11	30-Jun-13	ID1068/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	21,130
66	CLAYTON UTZ	9-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	DL0107/2011-Legal Services	Open	B	31,680
67	CLAYTON UTZ	28-Jul-11	31-Dec-11	ID1072/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	69,025
68	CLAYTON UTZ	6-Oct-11	31-Dec-11	ID10772011- Legal Services	Open	B	70,840
69	CLAYTON UTZ	6-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	ID1080/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	108,376
70	CLAYTON UTZ	8-Sep-11	30-Dec-11	ID1082/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	59,550
71	CLAYTON UTZ	8-Sep-11	30-Sep-11	DL0126/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	19,547
72	CLAYTON UTZ	14-Sep-11	31-Oct-11	DL0089/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	41,338
73	CLAYTON UTZ	17-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	DL0015E02/2010 - Legal Services	Open	B	139,810
74	CLAYTON UTZ	25-Oct-11	31-Jan-12	ID11114E01/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	38,095
75	CLAYTON UTZ	18-Oct-11	30-Jun-12	DL0142/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	279,840
76	CLAYTON UTZ	10-Nov-11	31-Mar-12	DL0165/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	41,540
77	CLAYTON UTZ	18-Nov-11	30-Jun-13	ID1102/2011 Legal Services	Open	B	120,000
78	CLAYTON UTZ	18-Nov-11	30-Jan-15	ID1051/2011 Legal Services	Open	B	265,962
79	CLAYTON UTZ	6-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	ID1108/2011 Legal Services	Open	B	37,840
80	CLAYTON UTZ	6-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	ID1032E03/2009 Legal Services	Open	B	38,250
81	CLAYTON UTZ	2-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	DL0184/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	195,250
82	CLAYTON UTZ	30-Jan-12	29-Feb-12	DL0183/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	13,520
83	CLAYTON UTZ	3-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1001/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	189,470
84	CLAYTON UTZ	7-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1057E03/2010 - Legal Services	Open	B	89,115
85	CLAYTON UTZ	9-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	ID1006/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	15,070
86	CLAYTON UTZ	20-Feb-12	30-Jun-13	DL0013/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	60,451
87	CLAYTON UTZ	21-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1004/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	16,478
88	CLAYTON UTZ	29-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	DL0018/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	35,530
89	CLAYTON UTZ	10-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	DL0017/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	45,006
90	CLAYTON UTZ	16-Mar-12	30-Dec-12	ID1013/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	25,080
91	CLAYTON UTZ	29-Mar-12	31-May-12	DL0038/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	33,292
92	COFFEY ENVIROMENTS AUSTRALIA	28-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Fire Safety Surveys	Open	B	404,023
93	COFFEY ENVIROMENTS AUSTRALIA	3-Apr-12	3-Apr-12	Review Of Risk Assessment Report	Direct	B	27,280
94	COGENT BUSINESS SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	21-Dec-11	12-Mar-12	Management Advisory Services For Independent Chairperson For Negotiations	Open	A	27,500
95	COGENT BUSINESS SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	23-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	Base Support Operations	Open	B	75,880

Table 1

**Consultancy reported YTD FY 2011/12
July 11 to Apr 12 (of value \$10,000 and Above)**

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/04/12
96	COGENT BUSINESS SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	10-Apr-12	31-May-12	Review Of Management Of Canberra Offices Space	Open	B	40,460
97	DELOITTE	21-Oct-11	16-Dec-11	Financial Reform Review	Open	B	233,000
98	DEPT OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION	20-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Actuarial Services	Direct	B	19,500
99	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	20-Sep-11	30-Apr-12	DL01162011- Legal Services	Open	B	40,888
100	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	5-Aug-11	30-Sep-11	DL0123/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	11,330
101	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	27-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1078/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	82,474
102	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	16-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	DPE2020/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	15,005
103	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	18-Oct-11	30-Dec-11	DL0151/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	12,111
104	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	20-Oct-11	31-Mar-12	DL0161/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	73,508
105	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	28-Oct-11	30-Jun-12	DL0162/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	13,640
106	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	17-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	DL0195/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	17,369
107	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	27-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	DL0019/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	20,592
108	ESRI-AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	21-Sep-11	28-Feb-12	Specialist Act Practitioner	Direct	B	22,000
109	I & S K PAUZA	21-Sep-11	31-Jan-12	Competency Profile Workshop And Report	Direct	B	21,120
110	JAMES CANNON	6-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	Public Relation Services	Direct	B	31,116
111	KPMG	12-Sep-11	26-Sep-11	Conduct Desktop Forensic Audits	Open	B	43,000
112	KPMG	12-Sep-11	12-Sep-11	Conduct Spend Analysis & Categorisation For Non Equipment Procurement Professional Services	Open	B	90,910
113	KPMG AUSTRALIA	4-Aug-11	30-Nov-11	Support To Pay And Entitlement Calculators, Data Analysis Activities And Maintenance Of Excel Tools	Direct	B	329,760
114	MALLESONS STEPHEN JAQUES	31-Oct-11	31-Dec-11	DL0087/2010 - Legal Services	Direct	B	93,000
115	MCKINSEY PACIFIC RIM INC	21-Mar-12	15-Apr-12	Strategic Planning Consultation Services	Open	B	1,200,001
116	MEDIBANK HEALTH SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	28-Oct-11	30-Jun-12	Injury Management Services.	Open	C	110,001
117	MINTER ELLISON	12-Jul-11	30-Jun-13	ID1064/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	28,945
118	MINTER ELLISON	2-Aug-11	30-Nov-11	DL0118/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	14,739
119	MINTER ELLISON	17-Aug-11	31-Dec-14	ID1074/11- Legal Services	Open	B	77,484
120	MINTER ELLISON	26-Aug-11	21-Oct-11	ID1086/20011- -Legal Services	Open	B	12,738
121	MINTER ELLISON	7-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	DPE2022/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	15,928
122	MINTER ELLISON	22-Nov-11	30-Mar-12	ID1092/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	60,268
123	MINTER ELLISON	2-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	ID1089/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	55,267
124	MINTER ELLISON	29-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	ID1094/2008 - Legal Services	Open	B	25,850
125	MINTER ELLISON	31-Oct-11	31-Jan-12	DL0153/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	226,603
126	MINTER ELLISON	4-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	DL0159/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	154,484

Table 1

**Consultancy reported YTD FY 2011/12
July 11 to Apr 12 (of value \$10,000 and Above)**

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/04/12
127	MINTER ELLISON	7-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	DL0171/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	32,694
128	MINTER ELLISON	24-Nov-11	30-Apr-12	DL0170/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	88,239
129	MINTER ELLISON	1-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	DL0166/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	56,584
130	MINTER ELLISON	19-Dec-11	31-Mar-12	DL0188/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	36,379
131	MINTER ELLISON	30-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	DL0001/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	171,998
132	MINTER ELLISON	9-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	DL0008/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	11,163
133	MINTER ELLISON	27-Feb-12	31-May-12	ID1008/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	11,921
134	MINTER ELLISON	27-Feb-12	1-May-12	DL0021/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	11,000
135	MINTER ELLISON	29-Mar-12	31-May-12	DL0043/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	72,545
136	MLCOA	1-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Injury Management Services	Open	B	330,000
137	NORTON ROSE	12-Oct-11	31-Dec-11	ID1096/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	12,370
138	NORTON ROSE	18-Oct-11	30-Dec-11	ID1097E04/2010 - Legal Services	Open	B	15,280
139	NORTON ROSE	27-Oct-11	30-Jun-12	ID109892011 - Legal Services	Open	B	11,212
140	NORTON ROSE	8-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	DL0169/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	129,700
141	NORTON ROSE	17-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	ID1113/2011 Legal Services	Open	B	18,790
142	NORTON ROSE	17-Jan-12	31-Mar-12	DL0177/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	48,804
143	NORTON ROSE	28-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	DL0039/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	69,400
144	PAXUS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	10-Feb-12	28-Sep-12	Support For Future Acquisition Strategy For Delivery Of Base Services.	Open	B	228,690
145	PROVIDENCE CONSULTING GROUP PL	15-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Base Security Improvement Program	Select	B	129,800
146	RECOVRE	21-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	Injury Management Services	Open	C	110,001
147	SAP AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	19-Sep-11	31-May-12	Garrison Estate Management System	Direct	B	31,287
148	SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ DEFENCE P/L	20-Feb-12	30-Jun-13	Estate Data Validation And Development Program.	Select	B	550,000
149	SKM	20-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Training Area Sustainability Education	Select	B	33,659
150	SPARKE HELMORE	4-Oct-11	1-Sep-12	Probity Services	Select	B	66,334
151	SPARKE HELMORE	12-Aug-11	31-Dec-11	ID1079/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	17,905
152	SPARKE HELMORE	8-Sep-11	30-Nov-11	ID1090/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	79,745
153	SPARKE HELMORE	8-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	DL0131/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	41,000
154	SPARKE HELMORE	13-Sep-11	28-Feb-13	DL0115/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	181,275
155	SPARKE HELMORE	13-Oct-11	31-Dec-11	DL0157/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	18,210
156	SPARKE HELMORE	18-Oct-11	30-Dec-11	DL0160/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	19,460
157	SPARKE HELMORE	25-Nov-11	28-Feb-12	DL0174/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	79,500
158	SPARKE HELMORE	7-Dec-11	28-Feb-12	DL0182/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	40,125

Table 1

**Consultancy reported YTD FY 2011/12
July 11 to Apr 12 (of value \$10,000 and Above)**

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/04/12
159	SPARKE HELMORE	9-Dec-11	30-Jun-13	ID1109/2011 Legal Services	Open	B	79,090
160	SPARKE HELMORE	22-Dec-11	1-Mar-12	DL0189/2011- Legal Services	Open	B	37,000
161	SPARKE HELMORE	9-Jan-12	1-Nov-13	Planning Phase - Probity Services	Open	B	54,024
162	SPARKE HELMORE	27-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1005/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	32,520
163	SPARKE HELMORE	16-Mar-12	30-Dec-12	Probity Services	Select	B	113,520
164	SPARKE HELMORE	12-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	DL0051/2012 - Legal Services	Open	B	39,850
165	URS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	11-Oct-11	30-Jun-12	Environmental Consultancy Services For N2232 Hams Watson Redevelopment	Select	B	63,382
165	Defence Support Group Total						11,619,094
	INT-SEC						
1	ARCHITED PTY LIMITED	15-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Design Specification	Direct	B	12,953
2	AUSTRALIAN VALUATION OFFICE	25-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	Annual Revaluation Assessment	Direct	B	50,000
3	BECA CONSULTANTS PTY LTD	1-Aug-11	31-Aug-11	Organisational Structure & Business Process Review For The Australian Security Vetting Agency	Open	B	75,000
4	DAY & HODGE ASSOCIATES	1-Aug-11	16-Dec-11	Security Awards Project Plan And Communications Material	Direct	B	27,126
5	ERNST & YOUNG CONSULTING	29-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Assess Organisational Restructure Requirement Of Its Group Branch Operating Models	Open	B	252,177
6	IAN CARNELL PTY LTD	14-Dec-11	1-Feb-12	Independent Review	Direct	C	25,300
7	ICON RECRUITMENT	22-Jul-11	30-Jun-12	Independent Advise To Capability Assurance On It Infrastructure Library Framework	Direct	C	305,653
8	INTEGRAL CONSULTING SERVICES	12-Apr-12	30-Oct-12	Business Requirement Identification	Open	B	205,920
9	LOCKHEED MARTIN AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	16-Dec-11	31-Jan-12	Review Of Corporate Governance Processes	Open	B	142,554
10	MARTIN BRADY	13-Jan-12	10-Apr-12	Review Services	Direct	C	88,000
11	MERCER	10-Feb-12	30-Jul-12	Organisational Structure Review	Direct	B	510,300
12	NEW INTELLIGENCE	14-Mar-12	30-Apr-12	Psycholinguistics Training	Direct	B	16,509
13	REMOTE PTY LTD	22-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	Project Planning Services	Open	B	21,606
14	RUDDS CONSULTING ENGINEERS	15-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Design Specification	Direct	B	17,248
15	STANCERT PTY LTD	2-Dec-11	31-Mar-12	Audit Of Compliance With Protective Security Policy Framework	Open	C	91,000
15	INT-SEC Total						1,841,345
	PSPG						
1	AERIAL CONSULTANCY	22-Mar-12	8-Jun-12	Quality Assurance	Direct	B	27,500

Table 1

**Consultancy reported YTD FY 2011/12
July 11 to Apr 12 (of value \$10,000 and Above)**

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/04/12
2	CENTRAL DESERT TRAINING	9-Feb-12	30-Dec-12	Provision Of Mentor Services To The Defence Indigenous Development Program	Direct	B	550,000
3	CLAYTON UTZ	2-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	ID1052E01/2011 - Legal Services	Open	B	112,284
4	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	20-Jul-11	14-Oct-11	Development Of Operating Model To Conduct Business Process And Workforce Analysis	Open	B	303,050
5	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	14-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	APS Medical Officer Work Classification Review	Select	B	107,282
6	ERNST & YOUNG CONSULTING	1-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	Review Of Defence Assistance Scheme	Select	B	182,600
7	FUTURETRAIN	2-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Development Of A Diversity Awareness Training Package For Defence.	Select	B	52,723
8	I & S K PAUZA	5-Apr-12	8-Jun-12	Education And Training Services	Direct	B	36,300
9	KPMG	13-Mar-12	31-May-12	Delivery Of HR Shared Services Program	Open	B	5,472,300
10	MERCER	6-Feb-12	24-Apr-12	Industrial Relations Benchmarking Of Australian Defence Force Legal Officers	Direct	C	35,857
11	MULGA GIDGEE	16-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Development Of Indigenous Employment Strategy	Direct	B	77,000
12	NORTHCOTT PARTNERS PTY LTD	30-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	Develop And Provide User Documentation And Internal Workflow Processes For Tracking System	Open	B	124,146
13	PEOPLEBANK	27-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Development Of System Enhancements To Learning Management System	Select	B	81,139
14	TALENT2	20-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Supplying The Technology To Develop E-Learning Course.	Select	B	44,550
15	THE NOUS GROUP	29-Feb-12	6-Mar-12	Facilitation Of Divisional Planning Day	Open	B	14,505
16	TRAINING SYSTEMS SERVICES PTY LTD	17-Feb-12	29-Feb-12	Updates Of Campus Courses	Open	C	17,765
17	YOUNG & RUBICAM BRANDS	7-Jul-11	30-Sep-12	Review Of Social Media & Defence	Open	C	233,989
17	PSPG Total						7,472,989
254	Total						33,745,886

A -	Skills currently unavailable within agency
B -	Need for specialised or professional skills
C -	Need for independent research or assessment

		Value
Total Contracts =	394	34,463,516
Above \$10k =	254	33,745,886
Below \$10k =	140	717,630

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
	Officer of the Secretary and CDF						
1	CANBERRA CONSULTING RESOURCES PTY	4-May-12	15-Jun-12	Information Management	Open tender	A	26,928
2	DAVID LEVINE	13-Jul-11	30-Dec-11	President for CDF Commission of Inquiries	Limited tender	B	109,900
3	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	20-Apr-12	11-Jun-12	Strategic Review Program Portfolio And Program Governance Review	Prequalified tender	B	123,561
4	DR ALLAN HAWKE	16-Aug-11	30-Mar-12	Australian Defence Force Posture Review	Limited tender	B	99,000
5	F & W BLICK SUPERANNUATION FUND	16-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	Review of Policy Act	Limited tender	B	53,955
6	IBM AUSTRALIA LTD	3-May-12	30-Jun-12	Information Management Roadmap Resource	Open tender	B	69,960
7	IBM AUSTRALIA LTD	2-May-12	30-Jun-12	Develop a Strawman Defence Information Model.	Open tender	B	99,550
8	JBTGLOBAL CORPORATE ADVISORY	29-Jul-11	30-Jun-12	Training - Non-Military	Limited tender	B	17,633
9	JENNIFER R CLARK	20-Dec-11	31-Dec-12	Advisory board	Limited tender	C	31,862
10	MR ANDREW JOHN KIRKHAM	27-Jun-12	30-Sep-12	Provision of Legal Services for commission of Inquiry	Limited tender	A	110,000
11	MR PAUL RIZZO	1-Nov-11	21-Mar-13	Review Implementation committee	Limited tender	B	119,929
12	MR W J BLICK	18-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	Review of the Weapons of Mass Destruction (Prevent	Limited tender	B	13,200
13	NOETIC SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	3-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	Professional enterprise risk management Services	Prequalified tender	B	118,588
14	NOETIC SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	5-Sep-11	30-Apr-12	Provision of professional enterprise risk management services	Open tender	B	233,740
15	PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS LEGAL	7-Dec-11	23-Dec-11	Business Process Improvements-Defence Parliamentary Workflow System Project	Open tender	B	47,045
16	RICHARD C. SMITH	23-Sep-11	30-Mar-12	Australian Defence Force Posture Review.	Limited tender	B	99,000
17	ROSS J MONAGHAN	5-Jul-11	30-Jun-13	Research into Social Media Trends	Limited tender	C	60,500
18	THINKEVANS	1-Jul-11	31-Jul-11	Database upgrades and Database Processes	Limited tender	B	88,000
19	MR DAVID GEORGE LOADMAN	23-Jan-12	28-Feb-12	President services for Chief of the Defence Force Commission of Inquiries	Limited tender	C	199,957
	SECCDF Total						1,722,307
	VCDF						
1	ABW MANAGEMENT CONSULTING	20-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	Strategic Negotiation Advisor	Limited tender	B	249,700
2	ACCENTURE AUSTRALIA HOLDINGS	19-Mar-12	14-Feb-13	Development of a strategy for the procurement of a learning management system	Open tender	C	110,000
3	AUSTHINK CONSULTING PTY LTD	12-Jul-11	30-Jun-12	Administration Services including Workshop Participation, Preparation and Production	Limited tender	B	29,769
4	CURTIN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY	4-Jul-11	31-Aug-11	Independent Advisory Panel	Limited tender	C	37,500
5	GREY ADVANTAGE CONSULTING PTY LIMIT	30-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Review of Corporate Governance Services	Open tender	A	58,000
6	GREY ADVANTAGE CONSULTING PTY LIM	27-Jun-12	30-Jun-13	Consultant support for the development of a Service Level Framework	Open tender	B	154,250
7	GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY	8-Aug-11	24-Nov-11	Program Evaluation	Prequalified tender	C	126,325
8	JAKEMAN BUSINESS SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	19-Apr-12	30-Jun-14	Review Implementation	Open tender	B	219,395

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
	ARMY						
1	NOUS GROUP	21-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	360 Review of Army Headquarters	Limited Tender	C	80,545
	ARMY Total						80,545
	Air Force						
1	WOODHEAD INTERNATIONAL	22-May-12	28-May-12	Supply Of Architectural Designs	Limited tender	B	51,150
	Air Force Total						51,150
	CFOG						
1	ERNST & YOUNG CONSULTING	28-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Draft Submission To The AASB	Open tender	B	80,000
2	INNOGENCE LIMITED	9-May-12	30-Jun-12	Consultancy Support Services	Open tender	B	69,300
3	JOHN SYMONS AND ASSOCIATES PTY LTD	7-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	Management Advisory Services	Limited tender	B	80,000
4	PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS LEGAL	7-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Benchmarking Assessment Of The Finance Shared Services Implementation Plan	Open tender	C	85,000
5	SAP AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	7-Jun-12	30-Jun-14	Specialist Systems Advisory Services	Limited tender	B	252,000
	CFOG						566,300
	CIOG						
1	AQUITAINE CONSULTING PTY LTD	22-Dec-11	29-Feb-12	CIOG 412/11 Review Of Defence's Disaster Recovery Readiness	Limited tender	C	261,855
2	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	22-Jun-12	31-Aug-12	DL0134/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	97,856
3	QP3 CONSULTING	3-May-12	30-Jun-12	Advisory Services	Limited tender	B	22,000
4	THE NOUS GROUP	14-Dec-11	31-May-12	Management Consultancy Services	Open tender	B	143,000
5	BROADLEAF CAPITAL INTERNATIONAL	19-Jul-11	30-Jun-12	Project Management	Open Tender	B	19,445
6	ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES	1-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Environmental Specialist	Open Tender	B	79,838
	CIOG Total						623,994
	Defence Support Group						
1	AECOM	25-Aug-11	29-Feb-12	Analysis, Contract, Report & Presentation Services	Open tender	B	28,600
2	AECOM	28-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Undertake Asbestos Surveys	Prequalified tender	B	17,357
3	AECOM AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	28-Mar-12	30-Oct-13	Climate Change Adaptation And Mitigation Strategies Study	Open tender	B	143,252
4	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	26-Jun-12	30-Jun-16	ID1071/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	303,373

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
5	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	20-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	DL0094E01/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	24,728
6	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	27-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	DL0020/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	15,550
7	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	21-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	DL0118E01/2010 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	32,097
8	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	30-May-12	30-Jun-13	DL0028/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	417,637
9	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	16-Mar-12	30-Jun-14	Probity Advisor	Limited tender	B	71,567
10	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	17-May-12	30-Oct-12	DL0060/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	54,660
11	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	17-May-12	31-Mar-13	ID1026/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	81,340
12	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	21-Jun-12	30-Dec-12	ID1100E02/2007	Open tender	B	20,471
13	ASHURST AUSTRALIA	29-Jun-12	30-Jun-13	DL0091/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	102,802
14	ATTORNEY GENERALS DEPARTMENT	11-May-12	31-May-12	DL0065/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	40,040
15	AURECON AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	27-Mar-12	1-Jun-12	Planning Phase And Design Services	Open tender	B	771,834
16	AURECON AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	9-May-12	30-Jun-12	Removal Of Asbestos	Prequalified tender	C	106,113
17	AURECON AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	28-May-12	31-Oct-12	Finalising Public Private Templates And Documents	Prequalified tender	B	249,700
18	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ACTUARY	26-Jun-12	30-Jun-12	Actuarial Services	Limited tender	B	129,500
19	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	17-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	Single Leap - Probity Advice & Services For Phase 2 Project	Prequalified tender	B	2,035,126
20	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Jul-11	31-Aug-11	DL0104/2011-Legal Services	Open tender	B	14,511
21	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	15-Jul-11	31-Dec-11	DL0102011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	23,920
22	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	18-Jul-11	31-Aug-11	DL0113/2011-Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,820
23	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	16-Sep-11	31-Jul-12	DL0105/2011- Tied Work	Limited tender	B	27,478
24	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	5-Aug-11	31-Oct-11	DL0122/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,184
25	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	5-Aug-11	31-Dec-11	DL0103/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	27,720
26	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	17-Aug-11	30-Nov-11	DL0128/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	25,674
27	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	17-Aug-11	30-Mar-12	DL0127/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,017
28	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	25-Aug-11	30-Jun-12	DPE2019/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	13,000
29	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	7-Sep-11	30-Nov-11	DL0137/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	20,087
30	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	7-Sep-11	30-Nov-11	DL0125/2011 - Tied Legal Services	Limited tender	B	12,606
31	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Sep-11	31-Jan-12	DL0135E01/2010 - Tied Legal Services	Limited tender	B	104,500
32	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Sep-11	31-Mar-12	DL0132/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,637
33	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	ID1091/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	17,820
34	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	DL0133/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,637
35	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	27-Sep-11	31-Oct-11	DL0139/2010 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	22,100
36	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	28-Sep-11	30-Sep-11	DL0146/2011 - Legal Services - Tied	Limited tender	B	20,092

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
37	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	28-Sep-11	29-Feb-12	DL0147/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	13,624
38	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	28-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	DL0145/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,760
39	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	3-May-12	30-Jun-12	ID1095/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	21,658
40	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	5-Oct-11	1-Oct-12	AZ5160 To A8989 Probity Services For 17 Const. SQN Relocation And Water & Sewerage Treatment Pro	Prequalified tender	B	32,340
41	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	7-Oct-11	31-Mar-12	DL0148/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	29,568
42	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	7-Oct-11	31-Dec-11	DL0140/2011 - Tied Legal Services	Limited tender	B	37,318
43	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	1-Dec-11	29-Feb-12	DL0179/2011- Tied Legal Services	Limited tender	B	10,230
44	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	6-Dec-11	31-Jan-12	DL0181/2011- Legal Services - Tied Work	Open tender	B	33,605
45	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	14-Dec-11	30-Apr-12	DL0185/2011 - Tied Work	Limited tender	B	10,778
46	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	23-Dec-11	29-Feb-12	DL0190/2011- Tied Legal Services	Limited tender	B	11,017
47	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	23-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	DL0191/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	15,081
48	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	30-Jan-12	28-Feb-12	DL0003/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,628
49	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	23-May-12	31-May-12	DL0012/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	82,715
50	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	21-Feb-12	31-Mar-12	DL0015/2012 - Tied Work	Limited tender	B	11,875
51	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	27-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	DPE2000/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,413
52	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	8-Mar-12	30-May-12	DL0032/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	15,345
53	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	14-Mar-12	30-Apr-12	DL0029/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	47,514
54	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	15-Mar-12	30-Apr-12	DL0034/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,808
55	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	11-Apr-12	30-May-12	DL0046/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,450
56	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	17-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	DL0036/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,911
57	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	20-Apr-12	31-May-12	DL0264E02/2008- Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,230
58	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	26-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	DL0049/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	15,802
59	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	16-May-12	31-Oct-12	Probity Services For Project JO105-Joint Health Command	Open tender	B	49,500
60	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	23-May-12	30-Jun-12	DL0063/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,616
61	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	23-May-12	30-Jun-12	DL0077/2012- Legal Services*Tied Work*	Limited tender	B	14,223
62	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	1-Jun-12	31-Jul-12	DL0084/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	14,460
63	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	1-Jun-12	30-Jun-12	DL0083/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,186
64	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	5-Jun-12	31-Jul-12	DL00902012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	16,368
65	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	21-Jun-12	30-Dec-12	ID1034/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,848
66	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	26-Jun-12	30-Jun-13	DL0100/2012 - Legal Services	Limited tender	B	142,560
67	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	27-Jun-12	30-Jun-12	DL0065/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	40,040
68	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR	28-Jun-12	30-Sep-12	Legal Assistance - Lace	Limited tender	B	19,559

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
69	AUSTRALIAN MEDICO-LEGAL GROUP PTY	20-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	Injury Management Services	Open tender	B	110,000
70	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	14-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	DPE2002/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	23,047
71	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	18-Jul-11	31-Oct-11	DL0119E02/2008 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	13,850
72	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	19-Jul-11	31-Dec-11	DL0100/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	16,064
73	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	27-Jul-11	31-Oct-11	DPE2011/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,785
74	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	2-Aug-11	30-Jun-12	DL0100E01/2009 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	41,580
75	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	14-Sep-11	30-Dec-11	ID1076/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	393,105
76	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	14-Sep-11	15-Dec-11	ID1076E01/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,440
77	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	28-Sep-11	31-Oct-11	DL0111/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	19,035
78	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	9-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	ID1097/2011 Legal Services	Open tender	B	94,807
79	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	14-Nov-11	30-Apr-12	DL0164/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	49,421
80	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	23-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	DPE2011Eo1/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	48,306
81	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	6-Dec-11	31-Jan-12	ID1112/2011 Legal Services	Open tender	B	15,261
82	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	10-Jan-12	29-Feb-12	Provision Of Probity Services For Dots Reinvestment In Add Specific Facilities	Limited tender	C	25,090
83	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	7-Feb-12	30-Mar-13	ID1000/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	51,651
84	BLAKE DAWSON WALDRON	9-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1066E01/2009 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	16,804
85	CHG	20-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	Injury Management Services	Open tender	C	110,001
86	CHG	29-Jun-12	30-Jun-13	MEDICAL ASSESSMENT SERVICES.	Open tender	C	21,360
87	CLAYTON UTZ	26-Aug-11	30-Sep-11	DL0099/2011-Legal Services	Open tender	B	76,536
88	CLAYTON UTZ	27-Oct-11	30-May-12	ID1047/2011-Legal Services	Open tender	B	40,468
89	CLAYTON UTZ	14-Jul-11	30-Jun-13	ID1068/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	21,130
90	CLAYTON UTZ	9-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	DL0107/2011-Legal Services	Open tender	B	31,680
91	CLAYTON UTZ	28-Jul-11	31-Dec-11	ID1072/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	69,025
92	CLAYTON UTZ	6-Oct-11	31-Dec-11	ID10772011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	70,840
93	CLAYTON UTZ	6-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	ID1080/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	108,376
94	CLAYTON UTZ	8-Sep-11	30-Dec-11	ID1082/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	59,550
95	CLAYTON UTZ	8-Sep-11	30-Sep-11	DL0126/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	19,547
96	CLAYTON UTZ	14-Sep-11	31-Oct-11	DL0089/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	41,338
97	CLAYTON UTZ	8-Jun-12	30-Jun-12	DL0015E02/2010 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	154,230
98	CLAYTON UTZ	25-Oct-11	31-Jan-12	ID11114E01/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	38,095
99	CLAYTON UTZ	18-Oct-11	30-Jun-12	DL0142/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	279,840

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
100	CLAYTON UTZ	10-Nov-11	31-Mar-12	DL0165/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	41,540
101	CLAYTON UTZ	18-Nov-11	30-Jun-13	ID1102/2011 Legal Services	Open tender	B	120,000
102	CLAYTON UTZ	18-Nov-11	30-Jan-15	ID1051/2011 Legal Services	Open tender	B	265,962
103	CLAYTON UTZ	6-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	ID1108/2011 Legal Services	Open tender	B	37,840
104	CLAYTON UTZ	6-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	ID1032EO3/2009 Legal Services	Open tender	B	38,250
105	CLAYTON UTZ	2-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	DL0184/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	195,250
106	CLAYTON UTZ	30-Jan-12	29-Feb-12	DL0183/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	13,520
107	CLAYTON UTZ	3-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1001/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	189,470
108	CLAYTON UTZ	7-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1057E03/2010 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	89,115
109	CLAYTON UTZ	9-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	ID1006/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	15,070
110	CLAYTON UTZ	20-Feb-12	30-Jun-13	DL0013/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	60,451
111	CLAYTON UTZ	21-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1004/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	16,478
112	CLAYTON UTZ	29-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	DL0018/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	35,530
113	CLAYTON UTZ	26-Jun-12	31-Jul-12	DL0017/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	71,746
114	CLAYTON UTZ	16-Mar-12	30-Dec-12	ID1013/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	25,080
115	CLAYTON UTZ	22-Jun-12	31-Aug-12	DL0038/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	55,864
116	CLAYTON UTZ	19-Jun-12	30-Dec-12	ID1008E15/2007 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	92,582
117	CLAYTON UTZ	20-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	DL0047/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	288,310
118	CLAYTON UTZ	26-Apr-12	31-May-12	DL0056/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,309
119	CLAYTON UTZ	27-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	ID1024/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	39,490
120	CLAYTON UTZ	19-Jun-12	30-Dec-12	ID1023/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	51,865
121	CLAYTON UTZ	11-May-12	30-Jun-12	DL0067/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	18,150
122	CLAYTON UTZ	16-May-12	30-Jun-12	DL0066/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	20,880
123	CLAYTON UTZ	17-May-12	30-Dec-12	ID1020/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	40,780
124	CLAYTON UTZ	17-May-12	30-Jun-12	DL0178/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	32,900
125	CLAYTON UTZ	17-May-12	30-Jun-12	DL0075/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	70,928
126	CLAYTON UTZ	18-Jun-12	30-Jan-13	ID103102012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	168,789
127	CLAYTON UTZ	18-Jun-12	31-Dec-12	DL0097/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	68,035
128	CLAYTON UTZ	21-Jun-12	31-Dec-12	ID1033/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	66,270
129	CLAYTON UTZ	21-Jun-12	30-Jun-13	ID1029E01/2010 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	179,520
130	CLAYTON UTZ	29-Jun-12	30-Dec-12	ID1040/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	154,270
131	COFFEY ENVIROMENTS AUSTRALIA	28-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Fire Safety Surveys	Open tender	B	404,023

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
132	COFFEY ENVIROMENTS AUSTRALIA	3-Apr-12	3-Apr-12	Review Of Risk Assessment Report	Limited tender	B	27,280
133	COGENT BUSINESS SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	21-Dec-11	12-Mar-12	Management Advisory Services For Independent Chairperson For Negotiations	Open tender	A	27,500
134	COGENT BUSINESS SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	23-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	Base Support Operations	Open tender	B	75,880
135	COGENT BUSINESS SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	2-Apr-12	31-May-12	Operations Of Base Accountabilities.	Open tender	B	40,460
136	COGENT BUSINESS SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	10-Apr-12	31-May-12	Review Of Management Of Canberra Offices Space	Open tender	B	40,460
137	CORPORATE SCORECARD PTY LTD	24-Feb-12	30-Mar-12	Provision Of Credit Rating	Limited tender	B	12,500
138	DELOITTE	21-Oct-11	16-Dec-11	Financial Reform Review	Open tender	B	233,000
139	DEPT OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION	20-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Actuarial Services	Limited tender	B	19,500
140	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	20-Sep-11	30-Apr-12	DL01162011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	40,888
141	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	5-Aug-11	30-Sep-11	DL0123/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,330
142	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	27-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1078/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	82,474
143	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	16-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	DPE2020/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	15,005
144	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	18-Oct-11	30-Dec-11	DL0151/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,111
145	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	20-Oct-11	31-Mar-12	DL0161/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	73,508
146	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	28-Oct-11	30-Jun-12	DL0162/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	13,640
147	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	17-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	DL0195/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	17,369
148	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	27-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	DL0019/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	20,592
149	DLA PIPER AUSTRALIA	20-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	DL0050/2012- Legal Services	Open tender	B	23,434
150	ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	25-Jun-12	31-Jul-12	Consultancy - Defence National Wildlife Hazard Management Plan	Prequalified tender	B	127,193
151	ESRI-AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	21-Sep-11	28-Feb-12	Specialist Act Practitioner	Limited tender	B	22,000
152	FISHER DORE LAWYERS	15-Jun-12	30-Jun-13	LEGAL ASSISTANCE - LACE	Open tender	B	22,159
153	GHD PTY LTD	8-Jun-12	30-Jun-13	Provision Of Specialist Services To Review Defence Infrastructure	Prequalified tender	B	150,048
154	GODDEN MACKAY LOGAN	4-Jun-12	30-Jun-12	Indigenous Heritage Management Plan	Open tender	B	49,400
155	I & S K PAUZA	21-Sep-11	31-Jan-12	Competency Profile Workshop And Report	Limited tender	B	21,120
156	JAMES CANNON	13-Feb-12	31-Dec-12	Professional Services	Limited tender	B	59,991
157	JOHN SYMONS AND ASSOCIATES PTY LTD	15-May-12	14-Nov-12	Eminent Advisor Contract	Limited tender	B	78,000
158	KPMG	12-Sep-11	26-Sep-11	Conduct Desktop Forensic Audits	Open tender	B	43,000
159	KPMG	12-Sep-11	12-Sep-11	Conduct Spend Analysis & Categorisation For Non Equipment Procurement Professional Services	Open tender	B	90,910

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
160	KPMG	1-Jun-12	31-Aug-12	Stores Management Statement Of Work	Limited tender	B	242,000
161	KPMG AUSTRALIA	4-Aug-11	30-Nov-11	Support To Pay And Entitlement Calculators, Data Analysis Activities And Maintenance Of Excel Tools	Limited tender	B	329,760
162	KPMG AUSTRALIA	29-Feb-12	1-Apr-12	Provide Strategic Advice And Business Improvement Initiatives For The Storage & Distribution Rev	Limited tender	B	198,680
163	KPMG CORPORATE FINANCE (AUST)	17-May-12	12-Oct-12	Purchase Order Reflective Of Elements Of Work Pertaining To The Defence Logistics Transformation	Limited tender	B	80,000
164	MALLESONS STEPHEN JAQUES	31-Oct-11	31-Dec-11	DL0087/2010 - Legal Services	Limited tender	B	93,000
165	MCKINSEY PACIFIC RIM INC	21-Mar-12	15-Apr-12	Strategic Planning Consultation Services	Open tender	B	1,200,001
166	MEDIBANK HEALTH SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	28-Oct-11	30-Jun-12	Injury Management Services.	Open tender	C	110,001
167	MEDIBANK HEALTH SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	28-Jun-12	30-Jun-13	MEDICAL ASSESSMENT SERVICES	Open tender	C	45,455
168	MINTER ELLISON	12-Jul-11	30-Jun-13	ID1064/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	28,945
169	MINTER ELLISON	2-Aug-11	30-Nov-11	DL0118/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	14,739
170	MINTER ELLISON	17-Aug-11	31-Dec-14	ID1074/11- Legal Services	Open tender	B	77,484
171	MINTER ELLISON	26-Aug-11	21-Oct-11	ID1086/20011- -Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,738
172	MINTER ELLISON	7-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	DPE2022/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	15,928
173	MINTER ELLISON	22-Nov-11	30-Mar-12	ID1092/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	60,268
174	MINTER ELLISON	2-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	ID1089/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	55,267
175	MINTER ELLISON	24-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	ID1094/2008 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	37,440
176	MINTER ELLISON	31-Oct-11	31-Jan-12	DL0153/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	226,603
177	MINTER ELLISON	19-Jun-12	5-Mar-13	DL0159/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	293,222
178	MINTER ELLISON	7-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	DL0171/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	32,694
179	MINTER ELLISON	24-Nov-11	30-Apr-12	DL0170/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	88,239
180	MINTER ELLISON	1-Dec-11	30-Jun-12	DL0166/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	56,584
181	MINTER ELLISON	19-Dec-11	31-Mar-12	DL0188/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	36,379
182	MINTER ELLISON	30-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	DL0001/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	171,998
183	MINTER ELLISON	9-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	DL0008/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,163
184	MINTER ELLISON	27-Feb-12	31-May-12	ID1008/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,921
185	MINTER ELLISON	27-Feb-12	1-May-12	DL0021/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,000
186	MINTER ELLISON	29-Mar-12	31-May-12	DL0043/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	72,545
187	MINTER ELLISON	17-May-12	30-Nov-12	DL0040/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	41,322
188	MINTER ELLISON	17-May-12	31-May-13	ID1028/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	25,531
189	MINTER ELLISON	1-Jun-12	30-Jun-12	DL0080/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	13,668

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
190	MINTER ELLISON	14-Jun-12	31-Oct-12	DL0094/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	43,083
191	MINTER ELLISON	21-Jun-12	30-Dec-12	ID1035/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,501
192	MINTER ELLISON	29-Jun-12	31-Jul-12	DL0153E01/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,461
193	MLCOA	1-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Injury Management Services	Open tender	B	330,000
194	NORTON ROSE	12-Oct-11	31-Dec-11	ID1096/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,370
195	NORTON ROSE	18-Oct-11	30-Dec-11	ID1097E04/2010 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	15,280
196	NORTON ROSE	27-Oct-11	30-Jun-12	ID109892011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	11,212
197	NORTON ROSE	8-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	DL0169/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	129,700
198	NORTON ROSE	17-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	ID1113/2011 Legal Services	Open tender	B	18,790
199	NORTON ROSE	17-Jan-12	31-Mar-12	DL0177/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	48,804
200	NORTON ROSE	28-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	DL0039/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	69,400
201	NORTON ROSE	27-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	ID1021/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	76,988
202	NORTON ROSE	29-Jun-12	30-Aug-12	DL0177E01/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	12,650
203	PAXUS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	28-Feb-12	28-Sep-12	Support For Future Acquisition Strategy For Delivery Of Base Services.	Open tender	B	242,550
204	POWER INITIATIVES	20-Jun-12	30-Jun-12	Development Of Requirements Analysis Report	Open tender	A	75,570
205	PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS LEGAL	22-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Accommodation Study	Limited tender	B	22,000
206	PROVIDENCE CONSULTING GROUP PL	30-May-12	30-Jun-12	Base Security Improvement Program	Prequalified tender	B	299,200
207	PROVIDENCE CONSULTING GROUP PL	17-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Performance Review	Limited tender	B	33,000
208	PROVIDENCE CONSULTING GROUP PL	30-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Performance Review Of Service Agreement	Limited tender	B	55,000
209	PS MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS	21-Jun-12	23-Jun-12	Terms Of Reference For Works On Training Areas	Limited tender	A	25,300
210	RECOVRE	21-Sep-11	30-Jun-12	Injury Management Services	Open tender	C	110,001
211	RECOVRE	29-Jun-12	30-Jun-13	MEDICAL ASSESSMENT SERVICES	Open tender	C	34,100
212	SAP AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	19-Sep-11	31-May-12	Garrison Estate Management System	Limited tender	B	31,287
213	SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ DEFENCE P/L	20-Feb-12	30-Jun-13	Estate Data Validation And Development Program.	Prequalified tender	B	550,000
214	SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ DEFENCE P/L	13-Jun-12	30-Jun-12	Compliance And Risk Assessments	Prequalified tender	B	24,895
215	SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ DEFENCE P/L	26-Jun-12	30-Jun-13	Due Diligence Facility Review	Prequalified tender	B	682,000
216	SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ PTY LTD	26-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	Assessment Of Power Factor Correction Options	Prequalified tender	C	118,736
217	SKM	20-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Training Area Sustainability Education	Prequalified tender	B	33,659
218	SOIL AND GROUNDWATER PTY LTD	22-May-12	30-Jun-12	Soil Remediation Supervision Works	Prequalified tender	B	14,905
219	SPARKE HELMORE	4-Oct-11	1-Sep-12	Probity Services	Prequalified tender	B	66,334
220	SPARKE HELMORE	12-Aug-11	31-Dec-11	ID1079/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	17,905
221	SPARKE HELMORE	8-Sep-11	30-Nov-11	ID1090/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	79,745

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
222	SPARKE HELMORE	8-Sep-11	31-Dec-11	DL0131/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	41,000
223	SPARKE HELMORE	13-Sep-11	28-Feb-13	DL0115/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	181,275
224	SPARKE HELMORE	13-Oct-11	31-Dec-11	DL0157/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	18,210
225	SPARKE HELMORE	18-Oct-11	30-Dec-11	DL0160/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	19,460
226	SPARKE HELMORE	25-Nov-11	28-Feb-12	DL0174/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	79,500
227	SPARKE HELMORE	7-Dec-11	28-Feb-12	DL0182/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	40,125
228	SPARKE HELMORE	9-Dec-11	30-Jun-13	ID1109/2011 Legal Services	Open tender	B	79,090
229	SPARKE HELMORE	22-Dec-11	1-Mar-12	DL0189/2011- Legal Services	Open tender	B	37,000
230	SPARKE HELMORE	9-Jan-12	1-Nov-13	Planning Phase - Probity Services	Open tender	B	54,024
231	SPARKE HELMORE	27-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	ID1005/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	32,520
232	SPARKE HELMORE	16-Mar-12	30-Dec-12	Probity Services	Prequalified tender	B	113,520
233	SPARKE HELMORE	12-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	DL0051/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	39,850
234	SPARKE HELMORE	26-Apr-12	27-Apr-12	DL0059/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	10,845
235	SPARKE HELMORE	27-Apr-12	30-Jun-12	DL0062/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	46,650
236	SPARKE HELMORE	16-May-12	1-Jul-13	Probity Advisor Services For J0056 Explosive Ordnance Logistics Reform Program Stage One	Limited tender	C	37,356
237	SPARKE HELMORE	1-Jun-12	30-Jun-12	Review Of Procurement Templates	Open tender	C	12,980
238	SPARKE HELMORE	14-Jun-12	30-Dec-12	ID1031/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	64,500
239	SPARKE HELMORE	18-Jun-12	31-Aug-12	DL0089/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	21,975
240	SPARKE HELMORE	21-Jun-12	31-Mar-13	DL0096/2012 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	26,475
241	TRESSCOX	2-May-12	30-Jun-12	Provision Of Management Advisory Services.	Open tender	C	249,999
242	TRESSCOX	7-May-12	30-Apr-13	Probity Adviser Services For Retendering	Open tender	B	244,970
243	URS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	11-Oct-11	30-Jun-12	Environmental Consultancy Services For N2232 Hams Watson Redevelopment	Prequalified tender	B	63,382
244	WILDE AND WOOLLARD	10-Feb-12	30-Jun-13	Cost Elimination Services In Support Of Historical Aircraft Restoration Society Project	Limited tender	B	11,000
	Defence Support Group Total						20,873,556
	INT-SEC						
1	ARCHITED PTY LIMITED	15-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Design Specification	Limited tender	B	12,953
2	AUSTRALIAN VALUATION OFFICE	25-Jan-12	30-Jun-12	Annual Revaluation Assessment	Limited tender	B	50,000
3	BECA CONSULTANTS PTY LTD	1-Aug-11	31-Aug-11	Organisational Structure & Business Process Review For The Australian Security Vetting Agency	Open tender	B	75,000
4	DAY & HODGE ASSOCIATES	1-Aug-11	16-Dec-11	Security Awards Project Plan And Communications Material	Limited tender	B	27,126

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
5	ERNST & YOUNG CONSULTING	29-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	Assess Organisational Restructure Requirement Of Its Group Branch Operating Models	Open tender	B	252,177
6	IAN CARNELL PTY LTD	17-Feb-12	10-May-12	Independent Review	Limited tender	C	44,220
7	ICON RECRUITMENT	22-Jul-11	30-Jun-12	Independent Advise To Capability Assurance On It Infrastructure Library Framework	Limited tender	C	305,653
8	INTEGRAL CONSULTING SERVICES	12-Apr-12	30-Oct-12	Business Requirement Identification	Open tender	B	205,920
9	LOCKHEED MARTIN AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	16-Dec-11	31-Jan-12	Review Of Corporate Governance Processes	Open tender	B	142,554
10	MANUKA PSYCHOLOGY	21-Jul-11	30-Jun-12	Psycho Services	Limited tender	B	12,000
11	MARTIN BRADY	13-Jan-12	10-Apr-12	Review Services	Limited tender	C	88,000
12	MERCER	10-Feb-12	30-Jul-12	Organisational Structure Review	Limited tender	B	510,300
13	NEW INTELLIGENCE	14-Mar-12	30-Apr-12	Psycholinguistics Training	Limited tender	B	16,509
14	PRINCIPALS PTY LIMITED	21-May-12	13-Jun-12	Rationalise The Agency's Branding Approach	Open tender	B	98,238
15	REMOTE PTY LTD	22-Feb-12	30-Apr-12	Project Planning Services	Open tender	B	21,606
16	RUDDS CONSULTING ENGINEERS	15-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Design Specification	Limited tender	B	17,248
17	STANCERT PTY LTD	2-Dec-11	31-Mar-12	Audit Of Compliance With Protective Security Policy Framework	Open tender	C	91,000
	INT-SEC Total						1,970,503
	DPG						
1	AUSTRALIAN VALUATION OFFICE	20-Apr-12	20-Jun-12	Undertake Rental Valuations For The Living-In-Accommodation	Limited tender	B	112,640
2	CONRAD GARGETT ARCHITECTS	22-May-12	29-Jun-12	Architectural Services	Prequalified tender	B	56,760
3	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	14-Mar-12	30-Jun-12	APS Medical Officer Work Classification Review	Prequalified tender	B	107,282
4	DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU	20-Jul-11	14-Oct-11	Development Of Operating Model To Conduct Business Process And Workforce Analysis	Open tender	B	303,050
5	ERNST & YOUNG CONSULTING	1-Nov-11	30-Jun-12	Review Of Defence Assistance Scheme	Prequalified tender	B	182,600
6	GOVERNMENT SKILLS AUSTRALIA	15-May-12	8-Jun-12	Prepare Version Two Of The Defence Training Package For National Endorsement	Limited tender	B	41,800
7	I & S K PAUZA	5-Apr-12	8-Jun-12	Education And Training Services	Limited tender	B	36,300
8	KPMG	17-May-12	31-Dec-12	Hr Shared Services - Delivery Of Tranche 2	Open tender	B	9,647,451
9	KPMG	13-Mar-12	31-May-12	Delivery Of Hr Shared Services Program	Open tender	B	5,472,300
10	MERCER	10-Apr-12	30-Apr-12	Industrial Relations Benchmarking Of Australian Defence Force Chaplains	Limited tender	C	19,058
11	MERCER	6-Feb-12	24-Apr-12	Industrial Relations Benchmarking Of Australian Defence Force Legal Officers	Limited tender	C	35,857
12	MULGA GIDGEE	16-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Development Of Indigenous Employment Strategy	Limited tender	B	77,000
13	NORTON ROSE	5-Mar-12	28-Feb-14	DL0152/2011 - Legal Services	Open tender	B	362,608

**Consultancy reported for FY 2011/12
(value \$10,000 and Above)**

Table 2

Count	Consultant Name	Start Date	End Date	AusTender Description	Procurement Method	Justification	AusTender Contract Value as at 30/06/12
14	TALENT2	20-Feb-12	30-Jun-12	Supplying The Technology To Develop E-Learning Course.	Prequalified tender	B	44,550
15	YOUNG & RUBICAM BRANDS	7-Jul-11	30-Sep-12	Review Of Social Media & Defence	Open tender	C	233,989
	DPG Total						16,733,244

339 Total							46,448,860
------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------

A	Skills currently unavailable within agency
B	Need for specialised or professional skills
C	Need for independent research or assessment

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q60: Media Monitoring

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the Minister's office for this financial year to date?
- i. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - ii. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year 2012-13?
 - iii. What has been spent providing these services this financial year to date?
- (b) What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency for this financial year to date?
- iv. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - v. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year 2012-13?
 - vi. What has been spent providing these services this financial year to date?
- (c) What was the actual total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the Minister's office for 2011-12?
- vii. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - viii. What was the estimated budget to provide these services for the year 2011-12?
- (d) What was the actual total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency for 2011-12?
- ix. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - x. What was the estimated budget to provide these services for the year 2011-12?

Response:

- (a)
- i. Media monitoring services were provided by Sentia Media (formerly known as Media Monitors).
 - ii. There is not a specific amount budgeted for each ministerial office's use of media monitoring.
 - iii. The table below details expenditure for each ministerial office on media monitoring services provided by Sentia Media (formerly known as Media Monitors) other than press clips. The figures are GST exclusive for financial year 2012-13 as at 30 September and represent amounts expensed, not invoiced.

Minister for Defence (Mr Smith)	\$8,958.59
Minister for Defence Materiel (Mr Clare)	0
Minister for Defence Science and Personnel (Mr Snowdon)	0
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Senator Feeney)	\$1,736.39
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Dr Kelly)	\$143.28
TOTAL	\$10,838.26

(b)

- iv. These services were provided by Sentia Media (formerly known as Media Monitors).
- v. The estimated departmental budget for media monitoring in 2012-13 is \$605,100 and \$42,000 for Defence Housing Australia.
- vi. Department of Defence: \$252,652
Defence Housing Australia: \$8,584.

(c) The table below details expenditure for each ministerial office on media monitoring services provided by Sentia Media (formerly known as Media Monitors) other than press clips. The figures are GST exclusive for financial year 2011-12 as at 30 September and represent amounts expended, not invoiced.

Minister for Defence (Mr Smith)	\$47,827.03
Minister for Defence Materiel (Mr Clare)	\$8,492.53
Minister for Defence Science and Personnel (Mr Snowdon)	\$594.16
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Senator Feeney)	\$5,675.72
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Dr Kelly)	\$262.21
Former Minister for Defence Materiel (Senator Kim Carr)	0
TOTAL	\$62,851.65

- vii. These services were provided by Sentia Media (formerly known as Media Monitors).
 - viii. There is not a specific amount budgeted for each ministerial offices' use of media monitoring.
- (d) Department of Defence: \$722,303
Defence Housing Australia: \$49,045
- ix. These services were provided by Sentia Media (formerly known as Media Monitors), with occasional services provided by Stratfor — Global Intelligence and AAP.
 - x. The departmental budget for media monitoring in 2011-12 was \$517,500 and \$47,000 for Defence Housing Australia.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q61: Social Media

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) Has there been any changes to department and agency social media or protocols about staff access and usage of Youtube; online social media, such as Facebook, MySpace and Twitter; and access to online discussions forums and blogs since May 2012 Budget Estimates? If yes, please explain and provide copies of any advice that has been issue.
- (b) Does the department/agency monitor usage of social media? If yes, provide details of the usage (for example details could include average hours per employee, hours when usage peaks). If no, will the department/agency monitor usage in the future?
- (c) Does social media impact on employee productivity? Provide details (details could include increased internet usage in general or increased internet usage in standard business hours).

Response:

- (a) No. There have been no changes to protocols about staff access and usage of social media since the May 2012 Budget Estimates.

On 7 March 2012, the Minister for Defence, former Secretary of the Department of Defence and Chief of the Defence Force released the Reviews into Defence Culture and the Defence response to the Reviews: "Pathway to Change: Evolving Defence Culture". The independent *Review of Social Media and Defence* was released as one of these reviews. The Review examined the impact of the use of social media in Defence, with the aim of developing measures to ensure that the use of new technologies is consistent with ADF and Defence values. The Government agreed the seven recommendations of the Review. Defence has recently updated its social media policy and guidance in line with one of the Review's recommendations.

- (b) Defence does not monitor usage of social media by its employees and does not intend to do so. Usage of Defence's ICT resources is monitored for security, compliance and maintenance purposes and to detect any inappropriate behaviour. Defence personnel must only use Defence ICT Resources in a manner that is appropriate and in accordance with Defence instructions.

With respect to the use of social media, only a small number of employees are allowed to access social media through the Defence Restricted Network. This access is permitted to enable those employees to conduct their duties, and they are discouraged from using this access for personal pursuits.

Defence does monitor international and national commentary on social media that is publically available and relevant to the work of Defence. This monitoring helps Defence, to build a better understanding of the medium as well as to identify, monitor and report on issues of interest in social media.

Defence also provides training to help personnel manage the risks associated with their use of social media. Defence security policy mandates that all personnel undertake annual training with respect to their security responsibilities, and safe use of the web is a component of this training. ADF members who deploy on operations are provided with additional guidance on the responsible use of social media.

- (c) As Defence does not monitor social media use by its employees, Defence is unable to answer this question.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q62: Internet

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

Has the Department experienced any internet problems, such as but not limited to slow internet, or internet blackouts? If yes, what was the reason for this? Did it impact the Minister's office?

Response:

The Department has experienced a small number of service disruptions related to internet access since transition to a new High Availability Internet Gateway Service (HAIGS) provided as a managed service by Verizon since March 2012.

Since commencing transition to the managed service on 29 March 2012, Defence has suffered one incident, of one hour duration, that may meet the definition of an 'internet blackout' and one occurrence of generally 'slow internet' performance. The occurrence of unplanned interruptions during the phase was not unexpected given the complexity of the task to move services to HAIGS. Service transition into HAIGS was completed on 12 June 2012. Other than the issues noted above, the HAIGS service has maintained a 100% availability level for Defence internet services.

The Minister's public website is not hosted by Defence and as such this service was not affected by the transition to HAIGS or by unplanned service interruptions. Where staff in the Minister's office use the Defence Restricted Network to access the internet, those users would have been affected by unplanned interruptions in the same manner as other Defence users.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q63: Staff Amenities

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

What amenities are provided to staff? Provide a list.

Response:

A number of amenities are purpose built facilities that go the operational readiness (levels of fitness) for Australian Defence Force (ADF) personnel. Defence Australian Public Service (APS) employees and the family members of ADF personnel are able to access these facilities subject to ADF operational efficiency not being jeopardised. In all cases, the level of access to facilities on ADF bases and establishments will be determined by the relevant ADF authorising officer.

The amenities provided at ADF establishments and Defence work places may include:

- (a) toilets, showers, change rooms and lockers;
- (b) kitchen or break out areas that include a fridge, iced and boiling water, dishwashing facilities, microwave oven, toaster, sandwich press or other appliances for the purposes of food and beverage preparation;
- (c) sporting fields and equipment including tennis and squash courts, golf courses;
- (d) swimming pools;
- (e) gymnasiums and outdoor fitness tracks and sporting apparatus;
- (f) cinemas;
- (g) chapels and churches;
- (h) canteens, messes and other commercial outlets such as a convenience store, hairdresser, credit union;
- (i) first aid, nursing mothers' and prayer rooms; and
- (j) Defence sponsored child care centres.

In addition all Defence personnel are able to use Defence information and communications technology (ICT) resources to conduct limited personal business during work hours. Such use is required to be appropriate and prudent having regard to Defence's security and ICT requirements.

ADF personnel deployed in areas of operations are also provided with amenities that support their morale and welfare. These include access to recreational equipment, postal, telephone and internet services.

Other than for deployed forces, Defence does not provide newspapers and magazines to personnel as an 'amenity'; rather they may be purchased as a work related expense where justified.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q64: Coffee Machines

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) For financial year to date, has the department/agency purchased coffee machines for staff usage? If yes, provide a list that includes the type of coffee machine, the cost, the amount, and any ongoing costs such as purchase of coffee or coffee pods and when the machine was purchased.
- (b) Why were coffee machines purchased?
- (c) Where did the funding for the coffee machines come from?
- (d) Who is responsible for the maintenance of the coffee machines? How much was spent on maintenance in financial year 2011-12 and how much this financial year to date, include a list of what maintenance has been undertaken Where does the funding for maintenance come from?

Response:

(a -d)

Defence has purchased a total of 15 coffee machines for use by staff.

Defence allows the purchase of coffee-machines where there is a legitimate requirement to host senior officials and visitors from other agencies including as part of international engagement. Six machines are primarily for this purpose.

Nine of the coffee machines purchased are located in the Middle East Area of Operations and are for the general well-being of the deployed personnel.

The table below provides details of coffee machines purchased by Defence for staff use.

Coffee Machines purchased by Defence for staff use for this Financial Year to Date

Type of Coffee Machine	Cost	Number of Coffee Machines Purchased	Ongoing costs (ie. purchase of coffee or coffee pods)	Date of purchase	Reason for the purchase of the coffee machine	Where did the funding for the coffee machine come from?	Who is responsible for the maintenance of the coffee machine	How much was spent on maintenance in 2011-12	How much was spent on maintenance this financial year to date?	What maintenance has been undertaken	Where does the funding for maintenance come from?
Delonghi - Nespresso	\$549	1	Nil	Aug 2011	Official visitors to the Unit and for use by staff	Internal Budget	Joint Logistics Command staff	Nil	Nil	Descaling	Staff funded
Jura Impressa Z5	\$900	1	\$50 decalcification on tablets	2007 or 2008	To host VIP Visits.	Internal Budget	Australian Defence College staff	\$50	Nil	Decalcification	Unit funded
Drip Filter	\$183.02	2	\$111.73	July 2012	For Commandant meetings with visiting foreign dignitaries	Internal Budget	Commandant Staff	Nil	Nil	Nil	Internal Budget
Seaco Magic	Unknown	1	Nil	The actual date of purchase of this machine is not known.	High security meetings and/or briefings for the Defence Senior Leadership Group, including	Internal Budget	Joint Control Centre – Headquarters Joint Operations Command	\$127.00	Nil	Nil	Internal Budget

					SEC/CDF, visiting VIPs including Ministers and Foreign Senior Officers and 2-3 Star level conference and committees.						
Seaco Royale	Unknown	1	Nil	Inherited in 2010 following a building redevelopment and it was left behind when the organisation moved to another area	High security meetings and/or briefings for the Defence Senior Leadership, including SEC/CDF, visiting VIPs including Ministers and Foreign Senior Officers and 2-3 Star level conference and committees	Not known.	Joint Control Centre – Headquarters Joint Operations Command	Nil	Nil	Nil	Internal Budget
Delonghi Coffee Maker	\$1144	1	\$95.00	Apr 2012	General well-being	Operation Slipper operational supplementat ion	Under Warranty	Nil	Nil	Nil	Internal Budget

Seaco Royal Professional	\$1907	1	\$95.00	June 2012	General well-being	Operation Slipper operational supplementat ion	Under Warranty	Nil	Nil	Nil	Internal Budget
Seaco Synita	\$1101	1	\$95.00	June 2012	General well-being	Operation Slipper operational supplementat ion	Under Warranty	Nil	Nil	Nil	Internal Budget
Gemini Coffee Machine	\$1205	1	\$95.00	Aug 2012	General well-being	Operation Slipper operational supplementat ion	Under Warranty	Nil	Nil	Nil	Internal Budget
Seaco Coffee Machine	\$2410	2	\$190.00	Aug 2012	General well-being	Operation Slipper operational supplementat ion	Under Warranty	Nil	Nil	Nil	Internal Budget
Gemini CS100 Pro	\$3602	2	\$190.00	Sept 2012	General well-being	Operation Slipper operational supplementat ion	Under Warranty	Nil	Nil	Nil	Internal Budget
Gemini CS220	\$3973	1	\$95.00	Oct 2012	General well-being	Operation Slipper operational supplementat ion	Under Warranty	Nil	Nil	Nil	Internal Budget

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q65: Contractors

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

(a) For this financial year to date:

- i. Has the department/agency ever employed Hawker Britton in any capacity or is it considering employing Hawker Britton? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- ii. Has the department/agency ever employed Shannon's Way in any capacity or is it considering employing Shannon's Way? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- iii. Has the department/agency ever employed John Utting & UMR Research Group in any capacity or is it considering employing John Utting & UMR Research Group? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- iv. Has the department/agency ever employed McCann-Erickson in any capacity or is it considering employing McCann-Erickson? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- v. Has the department/agency ever employed Cutting Edge in any capacity or is it considering employing Cutting Edge? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- vi. Has the department/agency ever employed Ikon Communications in any capacity or is it considering employing Ikon Communications? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- vii. Has the department/agency ever employed CMAX Communications in any capacity or is it considering employing CMAX Communications? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- viii. Has the department/agency ever employed Boston Consulting Group in any capacity or is it considering employing Boston Consulting Group? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- ix. Has the department/agency ever employed McKinsey & Company in any capacity or is it considering employing McKinsey & Company? If yes, provide details.
- x. What contractors have been employed by the department/agency? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).

(b) For 2011-12:

- xi. Has the department/agency ever employed Hawker Britton in any capacity or is it considering employing Hawker Britton? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- xii. Has the department/agency ever employed Shannon's Way in any capacity or is it considering employing Shannon's Way? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- xiii. Has the department/agency ever employed John Utting & UMR Research Group in any capacity or is it considering employing John Utting & UMR Research Group? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- xiv. Has the department/agency ever employed McCann-Erickson in any capacity or is it considering employing McCann-Erickson? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- xv. Has the department/agency ever employed Cutting Edge in any capacity or is it considering employing Cutting Edge? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- xvi. Has the department/agency ever employed Ikon Communications in any capacity or is it considering employing Ikon Communications? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- xvii. Has the department/agency ever employed CMAX Communications in any capacity or is it considering employing CMAX Communications? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- xviii. Has the department/agency ever employed Boston Consulting Group in any capacity or is it considering employing Boston Consulting Group? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).
- xix. Has the department/agency ever employed McKinsey & Company in any capacity or is it considering employing McKinsey & Company? If yes, provide details.
- xx. What contractors have been employed by the department/agency? If yes, provide details (including the work undertaken and the cost).

Response:

- (a) For the financial year 2012-13 to date:
- (i) Hawker Britton - No.
 - (ii) Shannon's Way - No.
 - (iii) John Utting & UMR Research Group - No.
 - (iv) McCann-Erickson - No.
 - (v) Cutting Edge - No.
 - (vi) Ikon Communications - No.
 - (vii) CMAX Communications - No.
 - (viii) Boston Consulting Group - Yes. Payments totalling \$4,267,038 were made to Boston Consulting Group for this Financial Year to date for services relating to the ICT Reform.
 - (ix) McKinsey & Company - No.
 - (x) From 1 July 2012 to 31 October 2012, Defence entered into contracts with 1516 contractors totalling \$2.6billion. Details of contracts are published on the Austender website <https://www.tenders.gov.au>. Due to the breadth and complexity of the question, information on the work undertaken by each contractor is not readily available and an unreasonable amount of departmental resources would be required to develop a response.
- (b) For financial year 2011-12:
- (xi) Hawker Britton – No.
 - (xii) Shannon's Way - No.
 - (xiii) John Utting & UMR Research Group - No.
 - (xiv) McCann-Erickson - No.
 - (xv) Cutting Edge - No.
 - (xvi) Ikon Communications - No.
 - (xvii) CMAX Communications - No.

- (xviii) Boston Consulting Group - Yes. Payments totalling \$13,928,855 were made to Boston Consulting Group for the financial year 2011-12 for services relating to the review of the Defence Capability Plan as well as project management and contract services for the Chief Information Officer Group.
- (xix) McKinsey & Company - Yes. Payments totalling \$3,641,999 were made to McKinsey & Company for the financial year 2011-12 relating to advice on the implementing of shared services across Defence as well as providing strategic planning consultation services.
- (xx) During 2011-12 Defence entered into contracts with 4053 contractors totalling \$10.5 billion. Details of contracts are published on the Austender website <https://www.tenders.gov.au>. Due to the breadth and complexity of the question, information on the work undertaken by each contractor is not readily available and an unreasonable amount of departmental resources would be required to develop a response.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q66: Grants

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) Could the department/agency provide a list of all grants, including ad hoc and one-off grants for this financial year to date? Please provide details of the recipients, the amount, the intended use of the grants and what locations have benefited from the grants.
- (b) Have all grant agreement details been published on its website within the required timeframe? If not, provide details.
- (c) Could the department/agency provide a list of all grants, including ad hoc and one-off grants for 2011-12? Please provide details of the recipients, the amount, the intended use of the grants and what locations have benefited from the grants.
- (d) Were all grant agreement details published on its website within the required timeframe? If not, provide details.

Response:

- (a-b) Full details of all grants made by Defence are reported on the Department's website in accordance with Commonwealth Grant Guidelines. For Defence grants excluding DMO. www.defence.gov.au/header/publications.htm#D.

Details of Grants awarded by the DMO are as follows:

- Skilling Australia's Defence Industry (SADI) program for financial year 2012-13 are available at:
www.defence.gov.au/dmo/ID/SADI/SADI_CommonwealthGrantsTable_FY1213.pdf
- Defence Industry Innovation Centre (DIIC) for financial year 2012-13 are available at:
http://www.defence.gov.au/dmo/id/industry_skilling/ISPE_GrantsReporting.pdf
- No grants have been issued by the Priority Industry Capability Innovation Program (PICIP) in financial year 2012-13.

Defence (including the DMO) have complied with the Commonwealth Grant Guidelines publishing timeframes.

- (c-d) Details of Grants awarded by Defence (excluding DMO) are reported on the Department's website in accordance with Commonwealth Grant Guidelines. These details can be found at www.defence.gov.au/header/publications.htm#D.

Details of grants made by the Defence Material Organisation for year 2011-12 are available as follows:

- Details of grants awarded under the SADI program for financial year 2011-12 are available at:
http://www.defence.gov.au/dmo/ID/SADI/SADI_CommonwealthGrantsTable_FY1112.pdf
- Details of grants awarded under the DIIC program for financial year 2011-12 are available at:
http://www.defence.gov.au/dmo/id/industry_skilling/ISPE_GrantsReporting.pdf
- Details of grants awarded under the PICIP program for financial year 2011-12 are available at:
http://www.defence.gov.au/dmo/id/picip/PICIP_Round1_GrantRecipients.pdf

Defence (including the DMO) have complied with the Commonwealth Grant Guidelines publishing timeframes with the following timelines:

Two grants awarded through the SADI program in the 2011-12 financial year were not published on the website within the required timeframe; the grant details were published on the website shortly after the required timeframe specified in the Commonwealth Grants Guidelines.

Five grants awarded through the DIIC in the 2011-12 financial year were not published on the website within the required timeframe; the grant details were published on the website shortly after the required timeframe specified in the Commonwealth Grant Guidelines.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q67: Commissioned Reports

Senator Eggleston asked in writing.

- (a) How many Reports were commissioned by the Government in your department/agency in 2011-12? Please provide details of each report including date commissioned, date report handed to Government, date of public release, Terms of Reference and Committee members.
- (i) How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost? How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level?
 - (ii) What is the current status of each report? Did the Government report within the required timeframe? If not, when is the Government intending to respond to these reports?
- (b) How many Reports have been commissioned by the Government in your department/agency this financial year to date? Please provide details of each report including date commissioned, date report handed to Government, date of public release, Terms of Reference and Committee members.
- (iii) How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost? How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level?
 - (iv) What is the current status of each report? When is the Government intending to respond to these reports?

Response:

- (a) The only report commissioned by the Government for Defence is provided below.

Report commissioned by the Government for Defence for financial year 2011-12

Name of Report
Inspector General of Intelligence and Security (IGIS) Personnel security risk management inquiry
Date commissioned
28 November 2011
Date report handed to Government
14 June 2012
Date of public release
N/A
Terms of Reference
N/A
Committee members
Inspector General of Intelligence and Security
How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost?
Nil. Is a function of IGIS.
How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level?
IGIS, 2 EL2s, 1 APS 6
What is the current status of each report?
Finalised (with the Minister for Defence)
Did the Government report within the required timeframe, if not when is the Government intending to respond to these reports?
Report is currently with the Government.

- (b) There have been no reports commissioned by the Government this financial year to date.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q68: Government Payments of Accounts to Contractors/Consultants

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) For this financial year to date, has the department/agency paid its accounts to contractors/consultants etc in accordance with Government policy in terms of time for payment (i.e. within 30 days)?
- i. If not, why not? Provide details, including what has been the timeframe for payment of accounts? Please provide a breakdown, average statistics etc as appropriate to give insight into how this issue is being approached)
 - ii. For accounts not paid within 30 days, is interest being paid on overdue amounts and if so how much has been paid by the portfolio/department agency for the current financial year and the previous financial year?
 - iii. Where interest is being paid, what rate of interest is being paid and how is this rate determined?
- (b) For 2011-12, did the department/agency pay its accounts to contractors/consultants etc in accordance with Government policy in terms of time for payment (i.e. within 30 days)?
- iv. If not, why not? Provide details, including what has been the timeframe for payment of accounts? Please provide a breakdown, average statistics etc as appropriate to give insight into how this issue is being approached)
 - v. For accounts not paid within 30 days, is/was interest being paid on overdue amounts and if so how much has been paid by the portfolio/department agency for the current financial year and the previous financial year?
 - vi. Where interest is being paid, what rate of interest is being paid and how is this rate determined?
 - vii. Have all accounts from 2011-12 been paid? If no, why not?

Response:

- (a) Defence and the Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO) on time payment performance is monitored at an aggregate level. The data used for this response includes all payments made by Defence, with the exclusion of employee payments. In the current financial year to 31 October 2012 Defence has made 555,876 payments to suppliers with 97.8% of these made on time. This exceeds the 90% on time payment performance expectation contained in the Department of Innovation, Industry, Science, Research and Tertiary Education Survey of Australian Government Payments to Small Business.
- i. Defence has exceeded the Government's 90% on time payment performance policy requirements.
 - ii. No interest has been paid on overdue amounts by Defence for either the current or previous financial years.

- iii. Interest is to be paid in accordance with the rate and methodology advised in the Department of Finance and Deregulation Finance Circular No 2012/02.
- (b) During financial year 2011-12 Defence made 2,291,568 payments with 97.8% of these made on time.
- iv. Defence has exceeded the Government's 90% on time payment performance policy requirements.
 - v. No interest was paid on overdue amounts by Defence.
 - vi. If interest was to be paid it would be calculated in accordance with the rate and methodology advised in the Department of Finance and Deregulation Finance Circular No 2008/10.
 - vii. All accounts from 2011-12 have been paid.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q69: Stationery Requirements

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) How much was spent by each department and agency on the government (Ministers/Parliamentary Secretaries) stationery requirements in your portfolio (i.e. paper, envelopes, with compliments slips) this financial year to date?
- (b) What are the department/agency's stationery costs for the financial year to date?
- (c) How much was spent by each department and agency on the government (Ministers/Parliamentary Secretaries) stationery requirements in your portfolio (i.e. paper, envelopes, with compliments slips) in 2011-12?
- (d) What were the department/agency's stationery costs for 2011-12?

Response:

- (a) Defence has spent \$782.38 GST inclusive on stationery on behalf of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries for this financial year (up to 31 October 2012).
- (b) Defence (including the Defence Materiel Organisation) has spent \$278,000 on stationery from 1 July to 31 October 2012.
- (c) Defence spent \$7,447.40 GST inclusive on stationery on behalf of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries for the financial year 2011-12.
- (d) Defence (including the Defence Materiel Organisation) spent \$1,433,605 on stationery during the financial year 2011-12.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q70: Media Subscriptions

Senator Eggleston asked in writing.

- (a) Has there been any change to your pay TV subscription since the 2012-13 Budget Estimates (May 2012)
 - i. If yes, please provide the reason why, the cost and what channels.
 - ii. What is the cost for this financial year to date?

- (b) Has there been any change to your newspaper subscriptions since the 2012-13 Budget Estimates (May 2012)
 - iii. If yes, please provide the reason why, the cost and what newspapers.
 - iv. What is the cost for this financial year to date?

- (c) Has there been any change to your magazine subscriptions since the 2012-13 Budget Estimates (May 2012)
 - v. If yes, please provide the reason why, the cost and what magazines.
 - vi. What is the cost for this financial year to date?

- (d) What was the 2011-12 cost for:
 - vii. TV subscriptions
 - viii. Newspaper subscriptions
 - ix. Magazine subscriptions

- (e) Does the department/agency provide any media subscriptions to its Ministers/Parliamentary Secretaries? If yes, provide details of what is provided and the cost this financial year to date and for 2011-12.

Response:

- (a) Yes.
 - i. Defence has cancelled several pay TV subscriptions to achieve cost savings. An estimated savings amount cannot be provided at this stage.
 - ii. The total cost for this financial year to date (as at 26 October 2012) is \$64,686.42.

- (b) Yes.
 - iii. Defence has cancelled newspaper subscriptions to achieve cost savings. An estimated savings amount cannot be provided at this stage.
 - iv. The total cost for this financial year to date (as at 26 October 2012) is \$42,502.28

(c) Yes.

- v. Defence has cancelled magazine subscriptions to achieve cost savings. An estimated savings amount cannot be provided at this stage.
- vi. The total cost for this financial year to date (as at 26 October 2012) is \$22,512.90

(d)

- vii. The total cost for Defence's TV subscriptions for financial year 2011-12 was \$255,891.51
- viii. The total cost for Defence's newspaper subscriptions for financial year 2011-12 was \$114,676.79
- ix. The total cost for Defence's magazine subscriptions for financial year 2011-12 was \$75,485.48.

(e) Yes. Details of media subscriptions provided to its Ministers/Parliamentary Secretaries are available in the tables below.

Total FY 12/13 (period 1 July to 30 September 2012)	Foxtel subscriptions	Newspaper subscriptions
Office of the		
Minister for Defence (Mr Smith)	\$235.45	\$4,545.53
Minister for Defence Materiel (Mr Clare)	Nil	Nil
Minister for Defence Science and Personnel (Mr Snowdon)	Nil	Nil
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Sen. Feeney)	Nil	Nil
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Dr Kelly)	\$369.67	\$372.36
	\$605.12	\$4,545.53

Total FY 11/12	Foxtel subscriptions	Newspaper subscriptions
Office of the		
Minister for Defence (Mr Smith)	\$1,162.18	\$14,613.07
Minister for Defence Materiel (Mr Clare)	Nil	Nil
Minister for Defence Science and Personnel (Mr Snowdon)	Nil	Nil
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Sen. Feeney)	Nil	Nil
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Dr Kelly)	\$338.16	\$966.18
	\$1,500.34	\$17,825.94

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q71: Travel Costs

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) For the financial year to date, please detail all travel for Departmental officers that accompanied the Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary on their travel. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals).
- (b) For the financial year to date, please detail all travel for Departmental officers. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals).
- (c) Are the Government's Lowest Practical Fare travel policy for Domestic Air Travel (Finance Circular No. 2009/10) and Best Fare of the Day for International Air Travel (Finance Circular No. 2009/11) guidelines being followed? How is the department/agency following the advice? How is this monitored? If the guidelines are not being followed, please explain why.
- (d) Are lounge memberships provided to any employees? If yes, what lounge memberships, to how many employees and their classification, the reason for the provision of lounge membership and the total costs of the lounge memberships.
- (e) When SES employees travel, do any support or administrative staff (such as an Executive Assistant) travel with them? If yes, provide details of why such a staff member is needed and the costs of the support staff travel.
- (f) For 2011-12, please detail all travel for Departmental officers that accompanied the Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary on their travel. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals).
- (g) For 2011-12, please detail all travel for Departmental officers. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals).

Response:

- (a) **Annex 1** provides details of costs (GST exclusive) that have been expensed for the period 1 June to 30 September 2012 by the Department for official overseas travel undertaken in support of the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. This information is correct as at 30 September 2012.

Annex 2 provides details of costs (GST exclusive) that have been expensed for the period 1 June to 30 September 2012 for domestic travel undertaken by the Aides-de-Camp and Departmental Liaison Officers in support of the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. This information is correct as 30 September 2012.

The cost of all other travel undertaken by Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries are paid for by the Department of Finance and Deregulation. These costs are tabled in the Parliament every six months in a report titled 'Parliamentarians' Travel'. These reports also include dates, destination and purpose for the travel and are published to the DoFD website.

- (b) and (g)

For financial year to date, as at 31 October 2012, Defence, including the Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO), has spent approximately \$117 million (exclusive of GST) on travel related expenses. For financial year 2011-2012, Defence, including DMO, spent approximately \$459 million (exclusive of GST) on travel related expenses. These figures represent the entire Department of Defence workforce; APS employees, full time Australian Defence Force (ADF) members and ADF Reservists and encompasses business, training, operational, removal and condition of service leave associated travel. The figure does not represent charter aircraft used for deployments and exercises.

The Defence travel program is very large and complex and it is not possible to provide data broken down at the level requested as it is not captured or maintained at this level. Defence undertakes in excess of 200,000 domestic trips each year and has over 1.5 million individual transactions made through our travel card program. Trips may be made using commercial means (air, car hire, rail etc), service vehicles or in some cases private vehicles and Defence does not have a single data source that identifies each trip undertaken for central reporting.

- (c) Defence complies with Government's use of lowest practical fare for official domestic air travel policy and use of the best fare of the day for official International air travel policy. To assist agencies monitor compliance to these government policies, the Department of Finance and Deregulation (Finance) established Whole-of-Government reason codes that each traveller must select when making a domestic and international airline booking with their travel management company. The reason codes were updated by the Department of Finance and Deregulation for domestic air travel with effect 1 July 2012 and for international travel, with effect 1 October 2012. The revised reason codes are:

- Lowest fare taken
- Unsuitable due to time routing, connection or baggage charges

- Approval / Entitlement to travel at higher fare class (e.g. business class or premium economy)
- Health issues
- Personal responsibilities
- Require flexibility to change booking
- Outside Lowest Practical Fare/International Best Fare of the Day Policy

Defence's travel management company, QBT, provides Defence with a consolidated reason code report as part of its quarterly suite of reports.

- (d) Some Defence employees have airline lounge membership funded by Defence where it provides value for money outcomes to Defence. Approval must be given by an authorised financial delegate who considers a number of factors including: the business benefits of having access to lounges (e.g. ability to work whilst travelling), frequency of travel by the individual, free availability of some lounges, travel destinations and the traveller's personal circumstances. Members of the Senior Executive Service (SES) and Star ranked officers retain an entitlement to lounge membership through their workplace agreement.

It is not possible to provide accurate data on the number of Defence employees who have lounge membership funded by Defence. Payment is by various means (Defence Travel Card, Defence Purchasing Card or on a reimbursement basis) to one or more airlines and these transactions are not itemised separately in Defence's financial management system or enterprise management system. Under the Whole-of-Australian Government travel arrangements, some airlines do offer discounted rates to government employees.

- (e) There may be instances where support staff will travel with SES employees when there is a demonstrated business need and it represents efficient, effective, economical and ethical use of Commonwealth resources.

As Defence does not have a single data source that identifies each trip undertaken and an associated relationship with a SES or Star Ranked Officer, it is not possible to identify and breakdown travel by support staff to SES employees.

- (f) Travel details for Departmental officers that accompanied Minister's and/or Parliamentary Secretaries on their overseas and domestic travel for period 1 July 2011 to 30 May 2012 were provided earlier this year in the response to Question on Notice 79 taken from Senate Budget Estimates hearing on 28/29 May 2012, **Attachment B**. Details of travel undertaken for the period 1-30 June 2012 was provided in response to Parliamentary Senate Question on Notice Nos. 2072, 2073 and 2074, **Attachment C**.

ANNEX 1

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, Duration and Purpose	Departmental Ministerial Costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence Delegation	Defence Personnel Costs (i) Travel (ii) Accommodation (iii) Other
<i>Minister for Defence, Mr Smith</i>	<p>Hawaii, USA from 23 to 25 July 2012</p> <p>The Minister travelled to Honolulu to meet with Admiral Samuel J. Locklear, Commander, United States Pacific Command and the component commanders of the US Navy, Army, Air Force and Marine Corps in the Pacific.</p> <p>The Minister also met with academics from the East-West Center, the Asia-Pacific Centre for Security Studies and the Pacific Forum Center for International and Strategic Studies to discuss regional security trends, and bilateral Australia-United States relations.</p>	<p>(i) Nil</p> <p>(ii) Nil</p> <p>(iii) \$1,625.24¹</p> <p>(iv) Nil</p>	<p>1. Aide de Camp to Minister (business class)</p> <p>2. Assistant Director Americas, International Policy Division (business class)</p>	<p>(i) \$19,906.29</p> <p>(ii) \$2,895.77</p> <p>(iii) \$1,926.22</p>

¹ This cost relates to the rental of IT equipment.

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, Duration and Purpose	Departmental Ministerial Costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence Delegation	Defence Personnel Costs (i) Travel (ii) Accommodation (iii) Other
<i>Minister for Defence, Mr Smith</i>	<p>Vietnam from 29 to 30 August 2012</p> <p>The Minister travelled to Vietnam to meet with his counterpart, the Defence Minister General Phung Quang Thanh to discuss Australia's growing Defence relationship with Vietnam.</p> <p>The Minister visited the National Defense College, the Special Forces Officers School and the Vietnam People's Army commissioning.</p>	<p>(i) \$1,128.05</p> <p>(ii) Nil</p> <p>(iii) Nil</p> <p>(iv) Nil</p>	<p>1. Secretary (first and business class)</p> <p>2. Aide de Camp to Minister (business class)</p>	<p>(i) \$14,667.79</p> <p>(ii) \$772.59</p> <p>(iii) \$347.00</p>

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, Duration and Purpose	Departmental Ministerial Costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence Delegation	Defence Personnel Costs (i) Travel (ii) Accommodation (iii) Other
Minister for Defence, Mr Smith and Minister for Defence Materiel, Mr Clare ²	<p>Indonesia from 3 to 5 September 2012</p> <p>The Minister for Defence, along with the Minister for Defence Materiel travelled to Jakarta for bilateral talks with their counterpart Indonesian Ministers.</p> <p>The Minister for Defence conducted the inaugural Indonesia-Australia Defence Ministers' Meeting with the Indonesian Defence Minister Dr Yusgiantoro.</p> <p>The Minister for Defence and the Minister for Defence Materiel attended the defence industry symposium to discuss opportunities for greater cooperation between Australian and Indonesian defence industries.</p>	<p>(i) Nil</p> <p>(ii) Nil</p> <p>(iii) \$2,436.37</p> <p>(iv) \$755.16</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Secretary (first and business class) 2. Vice Chief of Defence Force (first class) 3. Chief Executive Officer, Defence Materiel Organisation (business class) 4. Aide de Camp to Minister (business class) 5. Aide de Camp to VCDF (business class) 	<p>(i) \$11,299.62</p> <p>(ii) \$3,586.09</p> <p>(iii) \$633.39</p>

² The Minister for Defence Materiel was not accompanied by any Defence personnel on this trip. All costs reported relate to departmental support provided to the Minister for Defence.

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, Duration and Purpose	Departmental Ministerial Costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence Delegation	Defence Personnel Costs (i) Travel (ii) Accommodation (iii) Other
<i>Minister for Defence, Mr Smith</i>	<p>Japan from 24 to 26 September 2012</p> <p>The Minister travelled to Japan to meet with his counterpart, the Defence Minister Satoshi Morimoto and other senior Ministers and Parliamentarians.</p>	<p>(i) \$138.16</p> <p>(ii) Nil</p> <p>(iii) \$15,095.00³</p> <p>(iv) \$1,297.00</p>	<p>1. Aide de Camp to the Minister (business class)</p> <p>2. Director North South Asia, International Policy Division (business class)</p>	<p>(i) \$17,974.83</p> <p>(ii) \$4,994.24</p> <p>(iii) \$2,696.16</p>

³ Reported figures are estimates only based on quotes pre-approval; final invoices are yet to be finalised by the Australian Embassy in Tokyo.

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, Duration and Purpose	Departmental Ministerial Costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence Delegation	Defence Personnel Costs (i) Travel (ii) Accommodation (iii) Other
<i>Minister for Defence Materiel, Mr Clare</i>	<p>USA from 11 to 18 July 2012</p> <p>The Minister travelled to the US to meet with senior US legal, national security and Defense officials at the Australian American Leadership Dialogue (AALD).</p>	<p>(i) Nil</p> <p>(ii) Nil</p> <p>(iii) Nil</p> <p>(iv) Nil</p>	<p>1. The Minister was not accompanied by any Defence personnel.</p>	<p>(i) Nil</p> <p>(ii) Nil</p> <p>(iii) Nil</p>

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, Duration and Purpose	Departmental Ministerial Costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence Delegation	Defence Personnel Costs (i) Travel (ii) Accommodation (iii) Other
<i>Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, Mr Snowdon</i>	<p>East Timor from 24 to 27 August 2012</p> <p>The Minister visited East Timor in his capacity as the Minister for Veterans' Affairs and the Minister for Defence Science and Personnel to participate in the Anniversary of the Bird Force Campaign.</p> <p>The Minister conducted several defence related meetings as part of this visit, including talks with the President, Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Defence.</p>	<p>(i) \$175.43</p> <p>(ii) Nil</p> <p>(iii) Nil</p> <p>(iv) \$279.24</p>	1. Aide de Camp to Minister	<p>(i) \$1,073.99</p> <p>(ii) \$323.03</p> <p>(iii) \$612.50</p> <p>Travel includes pre-positioning prior to departing for East Timor with the Minister</p>

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, Duration and Purpose	Departmental Ministerial Costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence Delegation	Defence Personnel Costs (i) Travel (ii) Accommodation (iii) Other
<i>Parliamentary Secretary for Defence, Senator Feeney</i>	<p>United States and France from 12 to 24 July 2012</p> <p>The Senator travelled to the US to attend the Australian American Leadership Dialogue (AALD). The Senator met with several government representatives in Washington DC and visited the Iron Works Shipyard in Maine.</p> <p>The Senator travelled to Paris and met with Government representatives to discuss the Pacific region. He met with Ms Sonia Legarde, the New Caledonia Representative.</p> <p>The Senator travelled to Fromelles to attend a Headstone Ceremony on behalf of the Minister for Defence Science and Personnel.</p>	<p>(i) Nil</p> <p>(ii) Nil</p> <p>(iii) Nil</p> <p>(iv) Nil</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assistant Secretary Pacific and East Timor (business class) 2. Aide de Camp to Minister for Defence Materiel (business class) 	<p>(i) \$27,132.21</p> <p>(ii) \$5,017.14</p> <p>(iii) \$3,706.24</p>

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, Duration and Purpose	Departmental Ministerial Costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence Delegation	Defence Personnel Costs (i) Travel (ii) Accommodation (iii) Other
<i>Parliamentary Secretary for Defence, Senator Feeney</i>	<p>Solomon Islands from 6 to 9 August 2012</p> <p>Senator Feeney attended the memorial service to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the Battle of Guadalcanal.</p> <p>The Senator met with representatives from the Solomon Islands, New Zealand and the US to discuss the gradual transition of the Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands (RAMSI).</p>	<p>(i) Nil</p> <p>(ii) Nil</p> <p>(iii) Nil</p> <p>(iv) Nil</p>	<p>1. Assistant Secretary Pacific and East Timor (business class)</p> <p>2. Aide de Camp to Minister for Defence Materiel (business class)</p>	<p>(i) \$6,517.34</p> <p>(ii) \$1,496.53</p> <p>(iii) \$1,116.88</p>

ANNEX 2

Minister for Defence

Position	Start	Finish	City	Accommodation	Airfares including taxes	Ground Transportation	Meals & Incidentals	Miscellaneous travel costs	Grand Total
Aide-de-Camp	22/06/2012	22/06/2012	Perth		\$ 1,725.13			\$ 40.87	\$ 1,766.00
	8/07/2012	12/07/2012	Brisbane/Adelaide	\$ 249.14	\$ 641.71	\$ 74.17		\$ 31.85	\$ 996.87
	15/07/2012	16/07/2012	Perth	\$ 141.82	\$ 885.95			\$ 23.60	\$ 1,051.37
	9/08/2012	11/08/2012	Perth	\$ 208.18	\$ 619.43	\$ 58.43	\$ 130.00	\$ 60.75	\$ 1,076.79
	13/09/2012	14/09/2012	Sydney	\$ 213.64	\$ 113.12	\$ 25.09	\$ 100.00	\$ 25.60	\$ 477.45
	16/09/2012	18/09/2012	Perth	\$ 396.77	\$ 483.45	\$ 71.77	\$ 220.00	\$ 28.00	\$ 1,199.99
	4/10/2012	5/10/2012	Amberley	\$ 249.14	\$ 46.85		\$ 130.00	\$ 2.60	\$ 428.59
Aide-de-Camp Total				\$ 1,458.69	\$ 4,515.64	\$ 229.46	\$ 580.00	\$ 213.27	\$ 6,997.06
Departmental Liaison Officer	20/07/2012	20/07/2012	Adelaide		\$ 669.30	\$ 75.81		\$ 27.20	\$ 772.31
	16/08/2012	17/08/2012	Perth	\$ 189.41	\$ 870.52	\$ 93.37		\$ 13.60	\$ 1,166.90
Departmental Liaison Officer Total				\$ 189.41	\$ 1,539.82	\$ 169.18		\$ 40.80	\$ 1,939.21
Grand Total				\$ 1,648.10	\$ 6,055.46	\$ 398.64	\$ 580.00	\$ 254.07	\$ 8,936.27

Minister for Defence Science and Personnel

Position	Start	Finish	City	Accommodation	Airfares including taxes	Ground Transportation	Meals & Incidentals	Miscellaneous travel costs	Grand Total
Aide-de-Camp	6/06/2012	9/06/2012	Perth	\$ 309.09	\$ 1,772.58	\$ 106.62	\$ 300.00	\$ 18.85	\$ 2,507.14
	22/06/2012	24/06/2012	Cairns	\$ 159.49	\$ 1,587.26	Nil	Nil	\$ 13.60	\$ 1,760.35
	23/06/2012	24/06/2012	Sydney	\$ 244.53	Nil	\$ 78.77	\$ 150.00	\$ 18.10	\$ 491.40
	4/09/2012	6/09/2012	Perth	\$ 652.73	\$ 816.96	\$ 53.85	\$ 290.00	\$ 18.68	\$ 1,832.22
	21/09/2012	21/09/2012	Holsworthy	Nil	\$ 264.69	\$ 59.59	Nil	\$ 27.20	\$ 351.48
	24/09/2012	27/09/2012	Sydney and Armidale	\$ 443.10	\$ 679.05	\$ 217.69	\$ 320.00	\$ 21.20	\$ 1,681.04
Aide-de-Camp Total				\$ 1,808.94	\$ 5,120.54	\$ 516.52	\$ 1,060.00	\$ 117.63	\$ 8,623.63
Departmental Liaison Officer	11/07/2012	12/07/2012	Alice Springs	\$ 113.81	\$ 1,190.49	\$ 41.82	\$ 150.00	\$ 28.73	\$ 1,524.85
	4/09/2012	6/09/2012	Perth	\$ 470.91	\$ 828.33	\$ 41.82	\$ 200.00	\$ 29.60	\$ 1,570.66
	20/09/2012	21/09/2012	Sydney	Nil	\$ 359.80	\$ 20.91	Nil	\$ 23.60	\$ 404.31
	12/10/2012	13/10/2012	Brisbane	Nil	\$ 423.99	Nil	Nil	\$ 23.60	\$ 447.59
Departmental Liaison Officer Total				\$ 584.72	\$ 2,802.61	\$ 104.55	\$ 350.00	\$ 105.53	\$ 3,947.41
Grand Total				\$ 2,393.66	\$ 7,923.15	\$ 621.07	\$ 1,410.00	\$ 223.16	\$12,571.04

Minister for Defence Materiel

Position	Start	Finish	City	Airfares including taxes	Ground Transportation	Meals & Incidentals	Miscellaneous travel costs	Grand Total
Departmental Liaison Officer	10/08/2012	12/08/2012	Sydney	Nil	\$ 42.68	Nil	Nil	\$ 42.68
Grand Total				Nil	\$ 42.68	Nil	Nil	\$ 42.68

Parliamentary Secretary for Defence – Senator Feeney

Position	Start	Finish	City	Airfares including taxes	Ground Transportation	Meals & Incidentals	Miscellaneous travel costs	Grand Total
Aide-de-Camp	29/09/2012	29/09/2012	Holsworthy	\$ 713.03	\$ 141.70	Nil	Nil	\$ 854.73
Aide-de-Camp		Total		\$ 713.03	\$ 141.70	Nil	Nil	\$ 854.73
Departmental Liaison Officer	28/09/2012	28/09/2012	Melbourne	\$ 291.00	\$ 117.72	Nil	\$13.60	\$ 422.32
Departmental Liaison Officer		Total		\$ 291.00	\$ 117.72	Nil	\$13.60	\$ 422.32
Grand Total				\$ 1,004.03	\$ 259.42	Nil	\$13.60	\$ 1,277.05

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q72: Legal Costs

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for 2011-12? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
- (b) What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for 2011-12 from the Australian Government Solicitor? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
- (c) What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for 2011-12? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
- (d) What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for 2011-12 from other sources? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
- (e) What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for this financial year to date within the department/agency? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
- (f) What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services this financial year to date from the Australian Government Solicitor? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
- (g) What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services this financial year to date from private firms? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
- (h) What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services this financial year to date from other sources? Please provide a list of each service and costs.

Response:

- (a) The Department of Defence's approximate legal expenditure (GST inclusive) for the financial year (FY) 2011-12 as at 30 June 2012 is \$77,737,885.26. This is broken down as follows:

- Internal Expenditure \$41,467,171.59
- External Expenditure \$36,270,683.67

The figures above do not include the Defence Materiel Organisation's (DMO) legal expenditure. DMO's legal expenditure (GST exclusive) for the FY 2011-2012 as at 30 June 2012 is \$14,299,039.72. This figure is broken down as follows:

- Internal Expenditure \$2,869,851.00
- External Expenditure \$11,429,188.72
 - consisting of:
 - Professional Fees \$11,143,761.47
 - Disbursements \$ 285,427.25

(b) Defence (excluding DMO) spent \$4,866,613.71 on legal services from the Australian Government Solicitor in FY 2011-12 as at 30 June 2012. These services were:

- Advice in relation to litigation \$3,362,598.58
- Advice on other legal matters \$1,075,724.67

Tied legal work accounted for 41% of this expenditure.

In the FY 2011-12, as at 30 June 2012, the DMO purchased \$1,042,813.82 in legal services from the Australian Government Solicitor.

(c) Defence (excluding DMO) spent \$31,404,069.96 on legal services from private firms in FY 2011-12 as at 30 June 2012. Listing every matter that this expenditure relates to is not practical due to the large volume of individual transactions. AusTender provides details of all new matters raised during the year and the value of the commitment, but it does not list the value of the expenditure. In the tables below, the expenditure has been broken down into litigation services and other legal matters, and then further refined by the panel the work was assigned to.

Advice in relation to litigation

\$ 2,966,506.66

Commercial, including contract, acquisitions and PPP	Clayton Utz	\$ 788,368.40
	Norton Rose	\$ 339,739.21
	DLA Piper	\$ 5,308.50
Dispute Resolution	DLA Piper	\$ 736,135.11
	Minter Ellison	\$ 26,844.84
Employment and Industrial Relations	Ashurst (previously known as Blake Dawson)	\$ 104,677.30
	DLA Piper	\$ 16,028.33
	Maddocks	\$ 146,262.78
	Minter Ellison	\$ 86,487.58
	Sparke Helmore	\$ 165,046.12
Finance including Private Finance	Minter Ellison	\$ 774.29
Government and Administrative, including Privacy and FOI	Clayton Utz	\$ 89,523.53

	DLA Piper	\$ 1,041.15
	Minter Ellison	\$ 48,226.97
	Sparke Helmore	\$ 5,828.38
Intellectual Property	Minter Ellison	\$ 10,476.40
Negligence and other common law claims	Clayton Utz	\$ 11,483.77
	DLA Piper	\$ 68,209.52
	Minter Ellison	\$ 31,437.37
	HWL Ebsworth	\$ 372.24
Technology and Communications	Clayton Utz	\$ 96,956.76
Non-Panel	Mallesons Stephen Jaques	\$ 77,200.00
	Attorney Generals	\$ 6,182.24
Non Panel – DFDAT	John Harris SC	\$ 12,353.21
Non Panel – CIVCAS	Kennedys	\$ 11,583.39
	Middletons Lawyers	\$ 59,986.52
	David Mclure	\$ 11,550.00
	K Wolahan	\$ 14,000.00
LACE	Kamy Saeedi Lawyers	\$ -5,577.25

Advice on other legal matters

\$28,437,536.30

Commercial, including contract, acquisitions and PPP	Ashurst (previously known as Blake Dawson)	\$ 2,200,248.33
	Clayton Utz	\$7,377,646.19
	DLA Piper	\$ 258,898.50
	Minter Ellison	\$1,878,929.20
	Norton Rose	\$ 450,963.89
	Sparke Helmore	\$ 665,221.56
Construction Engineering	Allens Arthur Robinson	\$ 12,695.64

and Infrastructure		
	Clayton Utz	\$ 46,032.25
	Minter Ellison	\$ 22,133.32
Corporate Law and Governance	DLA Piper	\$ 40,888.10
Employment and Industrial Relations	Ashurst (previously known as Blake Dawson)	\$ 143,888.60
	Clayton Utz	\$ 157,506.17
	DLA Piper	\$ 40,267.21
	Maddocks	\$ 3,916.44
	Minter Ellison	\$ 48,462.87
	Sparke Helmore	\$ 4,991.89
Environment, Heritage and Indigenous	Clayton Utz	\$ 66,411.29
	Allens Arthur Robinson	\$ -1,368.00
	DLA Piper	\$ 69,744.46
	Minter Ellison	\$ 40,448.04
	Norton Rose	\$ 4,645.67
Finance, including Private Finance	Minter Ellison	\$ 2,340.36
Government and Administrative, including Privacy and FOI	Ashurst (previously known as Blake Dawson)	\$ 20,791.90
	Clayton Utz	\$ 654,554.11
	DLA Piper	\$9,456,419.58
	Minter Ellison	\$ 442,778.16
	Sparke Helmore	\$ 361,040.31
Intellectual Property	Allens Arthur Robinson	\$ 13,984.30
	Clayton Utz	\$ 149.60
	Minter Ellison	\$ 51,916.77
Negligence and other	DLA Piper	\$ 21,348.90

common law claims		
	HWL Ebsworth	\$ 2,173.05
Defence Force Advocate	R Kenzie QC	\$ 223,364.25
Non- Panel	Mallesons Stephen Jaques	\$ 82,003.80
	Attorney Generals Department	\$ 42,835.42
	Insolvency & Trustee Service Australia	\$ 6,098.75
LACE	Paul Smith	\$ 3,500.00
	Tony Hargreaves Lawyers	\$ 34,313.98
	Corrina Jane Porter	\$ 2,654.90
	Guides & Elliott Solicitors and Notary	\$ 11,098.73
	Maddocks	\$ 2,766.28
	Margaret Allars	\$ 3,255.51
	Paul W Kerr Barrister	\$ 1,826.00
Property, Leasing, Land Planning and Disposals	Clayton Utz	\$ 236,112.13
	Minter Ellison	\$ 183,367.76
	Ashurst (previously known as Blake Dawson)	\$ 763,387.90
	DLA Piper	\$ 86,772.64
	Norton Rose	\$ 91,632.60
	Sparke Helmore	\$ 63,820.50
Technology and Communications	Ashurst (previously known as Blake Dawson)	\$ 96,317.27
	Clayton Utz	\$ 1,240,471.42
	Sparke Helmore	\$ 408,958.57
	DLA Piper	\$ 289,438.23

	Minter Ellison	\$ 3,498.00
--	----------------	-------------

In the FY 2011-12 as at 30 June 2012, DMO purchased legal services from the following firms:

• Allens Arthur Robinson	\$ 340,241.24
• Ashurst (formerly known as Blake Dawson)	\$3,471,854.20
• Clayton Utz	\$1,770,603.10
• DLA Piper (previously DLA Phillips Fox)	\$1,684,344.19
• Minter Ellison	\$1,345,631.85
• Norton Rose	\$ 546,363.59
• Sparke Helmore	\$1,190,020.78

- (d) In the FY 2011-12, as at 30 June 2012, Defence has not purchased any legal service from other sources.

In the FY 2011-12, as at 30 June 2012, DMO purchased the following legal services from other sources:

- Thomas Cooper Law (UK) – In-Country Assistance with ‘Largs Bay’ Procurement - \$5,874.95
- Proximity Legal- CSB Secondment Support- \$31,441.00

- (e) The Department of Defence’s approximate legal expenditure (GST inclusive) for this financial year (FY) to date as at 20 November 2012 is \$26,742,444.48. This is broken down as follows:

• Internal Expenditure	\$17,158,034.32
• External Expenditure	\$ 9,584,410.16

The figures above do not include the DMO’s legal expenditure. DMO’s legal expenditure (GST exclusive) for the year to date (FY 2012-2013) is \$5,861,692.62. This figure is broken down as follows:

• Internal Expenditure	\$1,164,946.00
• External Expenditure	\$4,696,746.62
consisting of:	
▪ Professional Fees	\$4,438,770.61
▪ Disbursements	\$ 257,976.01
▪	

- (f) Defence (excluding DMO) has spent \$1,784,067.67 on legal services from the Australian Government Solicitor in FY 2012-13 as at 20 November 2012. These services were:

• Advice in relation to litigation	\$ 398,044.72
• Advice on other legal matters	\$1,386,022.95

Tied legal work accounted for 38% of this expenditure.

In FY 2012-13 the DMO has purchased \$335,915.90 (GST exclusive) year to date in legal services from the Australian Government Solicitor.

- (g) Defence (excluding DMO) spent \$7,800,342.49 on legal services from private firms in FY 2012-13 (year to date). Listing every matter that this expenditure relates to is not practical due to the large volume of individual transactions. AusTender provides details of all new matters raised during the year and the value of the commitment, but it does not list the value of the expenditure. In the tables below, the expenditure has been broken down into litigation services and other legal matters, and then further refined by the panel the work was assigned to.

Advice in relation to litigation

\$943,399.85

Commercial, including contract, acquisitions and PPP	Ashurst	\$22,738.10
	Clayton Utz	\$23,914.00
	Norton Rose	\$20,999.99
Dispute Resolution	DLA Piper	\$517,105.86
Employment and Industrial Relations	Ashurst	\$139,176.75
	Clayton Utz	\$3,234.00
	DLA piper	\$1,529.55
	Minter Ellison	\$6,215.53
Finance, including Private Finance	Minter Ellison	\$1,220.67
Government and Administrative, including Privacy and FOI	Ashurst	\$7,134.95
	Clayton utz	\$70,207.95
	Minter Ellison	\$10,464.18
	Sparke Helmore Layers	\$11,105.86
Negligence and other common law claims	Clayton Utz	\$18,038.00
	DLA Piper	\$36,461.47

	Minter Ellison	\$1,220.67
Non Panel	Attorney Generals	\$40,251.62
Property, Leasing, Land Planning and Disposals	Clayton Utz	\$73,289.90
	Norton Rose	\$5,433.92
	Sparke Helmore Lawyers	\$31,288.39
Technology and Communications	Sparke Helmore Lawyers	\$31,288.39

Advice on other legal matters

\$6,856,942.64

Commercial, including contract, acquisitions and PPP	Ashurst	\$726,948.10
	Clayton Utz	\$2,357,371.19
	DLA Piper	\$4,312.55
	Minter Ellison	\$382,504.13
	Norton Rose	\$161,807.30
	Sparke Helmore Lawyers	\$134,442.94
Construction Engineering and Infrastructure	Minter Ellison	\$14,640.78
Employment and Industrial Relations	Ashurst	\$28,783.83
	Clayton Utz	\$90,433.84
	DLA Piper	\$9,207.00
	Maddocks	\$11,000.00
	Minter Ellison	\$10,033.21
Environment, Heritage and Indigenous	Clayton Utz	\$8,538.28
	DLA Piper	\$73,436.33
	Minter Ellison	\$55,507.28

Finance, Including Private Finance	Minter Ellison	\$16,005.00
Government and Administrative including Privacy and FOI	Ashurst	\$5,879.48
	Clayton Utz	\$146,671.80
	DLA Piper	\$347,403.33
	Minter Ellison	\$87,452.95
	Sparke Helmore Lawyers	\$63,010.11
Intellectual Property	Allens Arthur Robinson	\$1,776.50
	Clayton Utz	\$56,240.80
	Minter Ellison	\$15,670.38
Negligence and other common law claims	Clayton Utz	\$6,688.00
	DLA Piper	\$6,521.35
Non-Panel (Tied Work)	Allocatur Consulting PTY LTD	\$20,895.88
	Allygroup	\$79,473.01
	Attorney Generals Department	\$25868.81
	DFAT	\$1,167.15
	Michael J Heath Barrister at Law	\$2,873.86
Non-Panel	Stephen Lloyd	\$4,700.00
LACE	David McLure	\$2,528.00
	Fisher Dore Lawyers	\$8,937.50
	Paul C F Hornsby	\$537.50
	Tony Hargreaves and Partners	\$4,544.60
	HWL Ebsworth	\$541.20
Defence Force Advocate	R Kenzie QC	\$81,159.00

Property, Leasing, Land Planning and Disposals	Ashurst	\$262,014.10
	Clayton Utz	\$16,915.82
	DLA Piper	\$8,045.95
	Minter Ellison	\$34,279.85
	Norton Rose	\$39,358.37
	Sparke Helmore Lawyers	\$301,939.96
Technology and Communications	Clayton Utz	\$864,623.42
	DLA Piper	\$65,810.00
	Sparke Helmore Lawyers	\$208,442.17

In the FY 2012-13 (year to date), DMO has purchased legal services from the following firms:

• Allens Arthur Robinson	\$ 29,166.25
• Ashurst (formerly known as Blake Dawson)	\$1,444,562.01
• Clayton Utz	\$ 490,588.59
• DLA Piper (previously DLA Phillips Fox)	\$1,078,731.65
• Minter Ellison	\$ 454,495.82
• Norton Rose	\$ 266,766.92
• Sparke Helmore	\$ 408,635.58

(h) In the FY 2012-13 to date, as at 20 November 2012, Defence has not purchased any legal service from other sources.

In the FY 2012-13 (year to date) DMO purchased the following legal services from other sources:

• Proximity	\$116,878.50
• Maddocks	\$ 71,005.40

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE - COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q73: Education Expenses

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) Has there been a change to the department/agency's guidelines on study since the 2012-13 Budget Estimates (May 2012)? If yes, please provide details.
- (b) For this financial year to date, detail all education expenses (i.e. in house courses and tertiary studies) for each portfolio department and agency. Include what type of course, the total cost, cost per participant, the employment classification of each participant, how many participants and the amount of study leave granted to each participant (provide a breakdown for each employment classification). Also include the reason for the study and how it is beneficial for the department/agency.

Responses:

- (a) There has been no change to the Departments guidelines on study since Budget Estimates, May 2012.
- (b) Within a reasonable application of resources, Defence is unable to detail all education expenses, including the type of course, cost and number of participants for workforce development achieved through experiential learning and formal education and training.

Defence's financial management system does not support cost attribution that would be necessary to provide this information, nor do enterprise management systems record every separate course attended by a Defence member and the number of participants.

While the vast majority of education and training provided to Defence members is designed and delivered in-house, most of the fixed and variable costs of doing so are not uniquely captured and are reflected in the operating budget of the Defence element responsible for the delivery of the education and training.

However, Defence does capture the cost of education and training activities appropriated as Supplier Expenses (e.g. training and development that is procured). To 30 September in financial year 2012-13, this amounted to \$60.6 million.

Major cost components of Defence Education and Training activities were:

- Training related travel \$21.5 million;
- Expenditure on the Australian Defence Force Academy contract with the University of New South Wales amounted to over \$14 million;
- Procured military related training, which includes flight and submarine training, amounted to \$20.3 million of expenditure;
- Spend on non-military training came to \$9.8 million, which includes that expended at Universities and Technical and Further Education institutions. This last figure also

includes funds managed by the Groups and Services to provide education and training to meet their specific needs and that expended by authorities responsible for the deployment of Defence-wide business policies and processes;

- Attendance by Defence personnel at conferences and seminars accounted for \$1.1 million in expenditure;
- information and technology training and development \$0.5 million;
- Overseas Training \$0.5 million.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q74: Executive Coaching and Leadership Training

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) In relation to executive coaching and/or other leadership training services purchased by each department/agency, please provide the following information for this financial year to date:
1. Total spending on these services
 2. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification
 3. The number of employees who have utilised these services, their employment classification and how much study leave each employee was granted (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 4. The names of all service providers engaged
- (b) For each service purchased from a provider listed under (a4), please provide:
- i. The name and nature of the service purchased
 - ii. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based
 - iii. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification
 5. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - iv. The total amount spent on the service
 - v. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package)
- (c) Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:
- vi. The location used
 6. The number of employees who took part on each occasion (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 7. The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - vii. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location
- (d) In relation to executive coaching and/or other leadership training services purchased by each department/agency, please provide the following information for 2011-12:
1. Total spending on these services
 2. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification
 3. The number of employees who have utilised these services, their employment classification and how much study leave each employee was granted (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 4. The names of all service providers engaged
- (e) For each service purchased from a provider listed under (d4), please provide:

- i. The name and nature of the service purchased
 - ii. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based
 - iii. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification
 - iv. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - v. The total amount spent on the service
 - vi. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package)
- (f) Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:
- vii. The location used
 - viii. The number of employees who took part on each occasion (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - ix. The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - x. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location

Response:

(a–c) Defence's information management systems do not permit the cost attribution specifically for executive coaching and training expenses categorised as leadership. These systems do not record each separate coaching session or leadership course attended by a Defence member / employee nor the number of participants or other attributes such as hours involved, training venue or any applicable study leave.

Some civilian senior executive and executive level coaching is provided at a corporate level, however the majority of other leadership training is externally purchased, including executive coaching which is managed at group, divisional and branch level. Senior military leadership training is provided through attendance at Australian Defence College programs.

In response to Question on Notice No. 73 taken from the Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing on 17 October 2012, Defence stated that it spent \$9.8 million on non-military training. This amount includes expenditure on Executive Coaching and Leadership training for this financial year to date. It also includes money expended on universities and technical and further education institutions and funds managed by the Groups and Services to provide education and training to meet their specific needs and that expended by authorities responsible for the deployment of Defence-wide business policies and processes.

(d)-(f) This question has been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 82 taken from the Senate Budget Estimates on 28/29 May 2012. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q75: Media Training

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) In relation to media training services purchased by each department/agency, please provide the following information for this financial year to date:
1. Total spending on these services;
 2. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification;
 3. The number of employees who have utilised these services, their employment classification and how much study leave each employee was granted (provide a breakdown for each employment classification); and
 4. The names of all service providers engaged.
- (b) For each service purchased from a provider listed under (a4), please provide:
- i. The name and nature of the service purchased;
 - ii. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based;
 - iii. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification (provide a breakdown for each employment classification);
 - iv. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification);
 - v. The total amount spent on the service; and
 - vi. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package).
- (c) Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:
- vii. The location used;
 - viii. The number of employees who took part on each occasion;
 - ix. The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification); and
 - x. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location.
- (d) In relation to media training services purchased by each department/agency, please provide the following information for 2011-12:
1. Total spending on these services;
 2. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification;
 3. The number of employees who have utilised these services, their employment classification and how much study leave each employee was granted (provide a breakdown for each employment classification), and
 4. The names of all service providers engaged.
- (e) For each service purchased from a provider listed under (d4), please provide:
- xi. The name and nature of the service purchased;
 - xii. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based;

- xiii. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification (provide a breakdown for each employment classification);
 - xiv. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification);
 - xv. The total amount spent on the service; and
 - xvi. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package).
- (f) Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:
- xvi. The location used;
 - xvii. The number of employees who took part on each occasion;
 - xviii. The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification); and
 - xx. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location.

Response:

- (a) The following information is provided in relation to media training services purchased by Defence for this financial year to date:
1. \$83,300 (GST exclusive).
 2. Defence training was available to ADF members and APS employees likely to engage with the media.
 3. As at 12 November 2012, ninety people have completed the training conducted by Media Manoeuvres on behalf of Defence. Information about their employment classification is not readily available. Course attendance was classified as duty and study leave was not required.
 4. Media Manoeuvres.
- (b)
- i. Media Manoeuvres was contracted by Defence to deliver three types of courses: a series of one-day duration media awareness and interview skills courses, a series of one-day duration media awareness and writing skills courses; and a half-day course for senior Defence staff conducted when required.
 - ii. Both one-on-one and group based training was delivered.
 - iii. Ninety people (1 x Navy, 51 x Army, 21 x Air Force and 17 x APS) attended one of the ten courses conducted on behalf of Defence. Information about their employment classification is not readily available.
 - iv. Eighty-five people completed the one-day Defence training courses, which is the equivalent of 637.5 hours. Five people completed the half-day course which is the equivalent of 17.5 hours. Information about their employment classification is not readily available.

- v. For financial year 12/13, Media Manoeuvres has been contracted to provide media awareness and skills training for \$83,300 GST exclusive (as at 12 November 2012).
- vi. The breakdown of costs incurred under contract is commercial-in-confidence.

(c)

vii –x. All contracted media training was conducted at Defence establishments.

(d)

- 1. In 2011-12 media training services were purchased to the value of \$203,168 GST exclusive.
- 2. Training was available to ADF members and APS employees.
- 3. In total, 269 people completed the training. Information about their employment classification is not readily available.
- 4. Media Manoeuvres and Media Gurus.

(e)

- xi. Media Gurus was contracted by the Australian Defence College to deliver the media awareness training for the Australian Command and Staff College course as part of its curriculum.

Media Manoeuvres was contracted by Defence to deliver three types of courses: a series of one-day duration media awareness and interview skills courses; a series of one-day duration media awareness and writing skills courses; and a half-day course for senior Defence staff conducted when required.

- xii. Both one-on-one and group based training was delivered.
- xiii. 171 Australian Command and Staff College course members took part in the media training. Course members are of the rank Major (equivalent). No study leave was granted as the training is part of the course curriculum.

98 people (26 Navy, 24 Army, 9 Air Force and 39 APS) attended one of the twelve courses conducted on behalf of Defence. Course attendance was classified as duty and study leave was not required.

- xiv -xv. \$84,000 GST exclusive in 2011-12 for the training contracted by the Australian Defence College.

\$119,168 GST exclusive in 2011-12 for the training contracted by Defence.

- xvi. The breakdown of costs incurred under contract is commercial-in-confidence.

(f)

xvii – xx. All contracted media training was conducted at Defence establishments.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q76: Paid Parental Leave

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) Please list how many staff in each portfolio department and agency are eligible to receive payments under the Government's Paid Parental Leave scheme?
- (b) For this financial year to date list which department/agency is providing its employees with payments under the Government's Paid Parental Leave scheme? Please list how many staff and their classification are in receipt of these payments.
- (c) For 2011-12 to date which department/agency is providing its employees with payments under the Government's Paid Parental Leave scheme? Please list how many staff and their classification are in receipt of these payments.

Response:

- (a) Defence is unable to provide a list of how many staff are eligible. All Australian Defence Force (ADF) members and Defence Australian Public Service (APS) employees that meet the eligibility criteria in the *Paid Parental Leave Act 2010* are eligible to receive payments under the Australian Government's paid parental leave scheme. The Family Assistance Office (FAO) is responsible for determining the eligibility of each claimant and whether the employer, or the FAO, will administer payments.

Defence provides these payments to ADF members and Defence APS employees who are new claimants where the FAO has requested Defence take on the paymaster role for the claimant. The total cannot be provided by Defence as it only deals with payments for new claimants where the FAO has requested Defence take on the paymaster role for the claimant.

- (b) In financial year 2012/13 to pay day 25 October 2012, Defence has made payments to 104 ADF Permanent Force members, 8 ADF Reserve members and 177 APS employees. The number of Defence APS employees who have received, or are in receipt of, paid parental leave payments by classification as at 25 October 2012 June 2012 are as follows:

Classification	Total Employees
APS 1	0
APS 2	5
APS 3	19
APS 4	19
APS 5	34
APS 6	57
Executive Level 1	38
Executive Level 2	5
Senior Executive Service	0
Total	177

- (c) In financial year 2011/12, Defence made payments to 92 ADF Permanent Force members, 3 ADF Reserve members and 140 APS employees. The number of Defence APS employees who had received, or were in receipt of, paid parental leave payments by classification as at 21 June 2012 (last pay day in financial year 2011/12) are as follows:

Classification	Total Employees
APS 1	0
APS 2	4
APS 3	18
APS 4	13
APS 5	25
APS 6	41
Executive Level 1	33
Executive Level 2	6
Senior Executive Service	0
Total	140

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q77: Training for Portfolio Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) For this financial year to date, how much has been spent on training for Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries in your portfolio? Itemise each training, cost and for which Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary the training was for.
- (b) For this financial year to date, how much has been spent on training for staff of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries in your portfolio? Itemise each training, cost and for which Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary the training was for.
- (c) For this financial year to date, how much has been spent on training for designed to better suit the needs of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries in your portfolio? Itemise each training, cost and for which Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary the training was for, and how many employees attended and their classification.
- (d) For 2011-12, how much has been spent on training for Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries in your portfolio? Itemise each training, cost and for which Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary the training was for.
- (e) For 2011-12, how much has been spent on training for staff of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries in your portfolio? Itemise each training, cost and for which Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary the training was for.
- (f) For 2011-12, how much has been spent on training designed to better suit the needs of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries in your portfolio? Itemise each training, cost and for which Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary the training was for, and how many employees attended and their classification.

Response:

- (a) The Department of Defence has not funded or paid for any training for the Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries during the financial year to date (1 July to 31 October 2012).
- (b) The Department of Defence has not funded or paid for any training for the staff of Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries during the financial year to date (1 July to 31 October 2012).
- (c) The Department offers two training workshops designed to assist Defence personnel to better understand the machinery of government, their role in supporting parliamentary processes and providing quality, accurate and timely advice. The costs and participation rates for each workshop during this financial year to date (1 July to 31 October 2012) is provided in the table below:

Financial year to date (1 July to 31 October 2012)

Course title	Participant level	Approximate cost (Ex GST)¹	Number of participants
Ministerial Awareness and Writing	APS5-EL1 and military equivalents	\$10,020.31	151
Advising Government and Ministers	EL1-EL2 and military equivalents	\$45,534.85	68
Total		\$55,555.16	219

- (d) The Department of Defence has not funded or paid for any training for Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries during the financial year 2011-12.
- (e) The Department of Defence has not funded or paid for any training for the staff of the Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries during the financial year 2011-12.
- (f) The Department offered four training workshops during financial year 2011-12 designed to assist Defence personnel to better understand the machinery of government, their role in supporting parliamentary processes and providing quality, accurate and timely advice. The costs and participation rates for each workshop during financial year 2011-12 is provided in the table below:

Financial year 2011-12

Course title	Participant level	Approximate cost (Ex GST)²	Number of participants
Ministerial Awareness and Writing	APS5-EL1 and military equivalents	\$90,799.24	813
Advising Government and Ministers	EL1-EL2 and military equivalents	\$117,185.18	188
Working with Government	SES and Star Ranked Officers	\$73,513.93	67
Parliamentary Privilege and Accountability	SES and Star Ranked Officers	\$4,545.45	110
Total		\$286,043.80	1178

¹ Includes travel, venue hire, catering, courier charges and contract facilitation charges, where appropriate.

² Includes travel, venue hire, catering, courier charges and contract facilitation charges, where appropriate.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearings - 17 October 2012

Q78: Corporate Cars

Senator Eggleston provided in writing

- (a) Please update if there have been any changes since Budget Estimates 2012-13 (May 2012):
- i. How cars are owned by each department/agency?
 - ii. Where is the car/s located?
 - iii. What is the car/s used for?
 - iv. What is the cost of each car for this financial year to date?
 - v. How far did each car travel this financial year to date?
- (b) For 2011-12:
- i. How cars are owned by each department/agency?
 - ii. Where is the car/s located?
 - iii. What is the car/s used for?
 - iv. What was the cost of each car?
 - v. How far did each car travel?

Response:

- (a)
- i. As at 31 October 2012, Defence owned 2477 passenger vehicles, or cars, including sedans, station wagons and multi-purpose vehicles (excluding four wheel drive vehicles, buses and trucks).
 - ii. These passenger vehicles are located throughout Australia and overseas (Singapore and Malaysia) as follows:
 - Australian Capital Territory - 242
 - New South Wales - 774
 - Northern Territory - 171
 - Queensland - 506
 - South Australia - 137
 - Tasmania - 35
 - Victoria - 420
 - Western Australia - 157
 - Singapore - 3
 - Malaysia 32
 - iii. These passenger vehicles are used to meet Departmental administrative requirements, support training activities and base operations.

- iv. As at 31 October 2012, the cost of owning the 2477 passenger vehicles during financial year 2012-13 was approximately \$3.110 million or \$1256 per vehicle, comprising net acquisition (capital cost less revenue received), operating, maintenance and domestic fuel costs.

Note: Ownership costs are reduced this year, due to revenue for vehicles replaced in May/June 2012 not being received until the current financial year. The lower than normal operating costs will continue for the remainder of this and next financial year, due to a programmed reduction in the size of the fleet under the Strategic Reform Program.

- v. A complete data set of the distance travelled for individual Defence-owned vehicles during financial year 2012-13 is not available and would not be able to be confirmed within the time available to respond to this Question on Notice. At 28 September 2012, average whole-of-life utilisation during financial year 2012-13, across a sample of 119 cars at disposal was 12 840km per annum per vehicle.

(b)

- i. As at 4 July 2012, Defence owned 2522 passenger vehicles, or cars, including sedans, station wagons and multi-purpose vehicles (excluding four wheel drive vehicles, buses and trucks).

- ii. These passenger vehicles are located throughout Australia and overseas (Singapore and Malaysia) as follows:

- Australian Capital Territory -249
- New South Wales - 777
- Northern Territory - 175
- Queensland - 519
- South Australia - 144
- Tasmania - 35
- Victoria - 427
- Western Australia -161
- Singapore - 3
- Malaysia - 32

- iii. These passenger vehicles are used to meet Departmental administrative requirements, support training activities and base operations.

- iv. As at 4 July 2012, the cost of owning the 2522 passenger vehicles during financial year 2011-12 was approximately \$15.722 million or \$6236 per vehicle, comprising net acquisition (capital cost less revenue received), operating, maintenance and domestic fuel costs.

- v. A complete data set of the distance travelled for individual Defence-owned vehicles during financial year 2011-12 is not available and would not be able to be confirmed within the time available to respond to this Question on Notice. During financial year 2011-12, average whole-of-life utilisation across a sample of 440 cars at disposal was 13 516km per annum per vehicle.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q79: Taxi Costs

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) How much did each department/agency spend on taxis this financial year to date? Provide a breakdown of each business group in each department/agency.
- (b) What are the reasons for taxi costs?
- (c) How much did each department/agency spend on taxis in 2011-12? Provide a breakdown of each business group in each department/agency.
- (d) What are the reasons for taxi costs?

Response:

(a) and (c)

The table below represents the Department of Defence, including the Defence Materiel Organisation, approximate spend on taxis domestically and overseas for financial year 2011-2012 and for the current financial year up to 31 October 2012.

Department/Agency	Financial Year 2011-2012	Financial Year 2012-2013 (up to 31 October 2012)
Department of Defence	\$15.9m	\$4.7m

The

Defence travel program is very large and complex. To provide the level of detail as requested would represent an unreasonable diversion of resources as taxi travel data is not captured or maintained at such a level in Defence's financial system.

(b) and (d)

Defence travel policy and procedural framework provides Defence staff and their manager's flexibility to determine the most suitable and cost effective means of transport, hire cars and private vehicles.

Taxis are commonly used when:

- It represents the most efficient and effective means of transport;
- No other reasonable alternate transport is available; and/or
- Shared use represents more cost effective outcomes.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q80: Credit Cards

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) Provide a breakdown for each employment classification that has a corporate credit card.
- (b) Please update if there have been any changes since Budget Estimates 2012-13 (May 2012):
 - (i) What action is taken if the corporate credit card is misused?
 - (ii) How is corporate credit card use monitored?
 - (iii) What happens if misuse of a corporate credit card is discovered?
 - (iv) Have any instances of corporate credit card misuse have been discovered? List staff classification and what the misuse was, and the action taken.
 - (v) What action is taken to prevent corporate credit card misuse?
- (c) For 2011-12 how many instances of corporate credit card misuse were there? List staff classification and what the misuse was, and the action taken.

Response:

- (a) As at 20 November 2012 there were 64,487 Defence Travel Cards (DTC) and 7,047 Defence Purchasing Cards (DPC) issued to Australian Public Servants and Military personnel who are required to either undertake travel or procure items on behalf of the Commonwealth.
- (b)
- (i) It is mandatory in Defence for suspected misuse of a corporate credit card to be reported to a Defence Investigative Authority (DIA) for investigation.

For Australian Defence Force (ADF) personnel, there are three options available for dealing with misuse of corporate credit cards, depending on the circumstances such as, the seriousness and criminality involved in the matter. The three options include: administrative action for low level matters by the chain of command; investigation by the Service Police under the *Defence Force Discipline Act 1982*; or, for more serious cases, referral for prosecution under the civilian criminal law.

Misuse of a corporate credit card involving Australian Public Service (APS) employees that warrants criminal prosecution is investigated under the criminal law. The employee's misconduct is also simultaneously dealt with under misconduct provisions of the *Public Service Act 1999*. Less serious matters that do

not meet the criteria for criminal prosecution are dealt with through misconduct provisions alone.

For ADF personnel, administrative or disciplinary action may include counselling, reprimands, loss of pay, rank, privileges or seniority, a term of Military imprisonment and administrative discharge from the Service. For APS personnel, misconduct administrative action may include counselling, reprimands, fines, reduction in salary or classification or termination of employment.

In all cases, if a debt to the Commonwealth is identified, Defence makes every effort to recover the debt in full.

- (ii) Corporate credit card transactions are monitored by card providers, account holders, supervisors, resource and governance areas, cost centre managers, corporate card support centre staff and the Inspector General of Defence.

Each day's transactional information is available to be viewed by all stakeholders via the card management system the next business day. The Corporate Card Support Centre also reviews a percentage of daily transactions to indentify any unusual trends.

The Inspector General of Defence regularly monitors all corporate credit card activity to identify potentially suspicious transactions. If suspicious transactions are found, an explanation is sought from the relevant manager.

Additionally, the DTC and DPC corporate card providers notify Defence of any unusual spending or merchant activity that they detect.

- (iii) Refer to the answer for part (i).
- (iv) In Financial Year 2011-12, there were 20 DTC and 4 DPC investigations finalised with an assessed loss of just over \$82,000. This equates to less than 0.013% of fraud on a total spend of \$639.7 million comprising 2.06 million individual transactions. See (c) below for specific details.
- (v) In addition to the monitoring mechanisms described in part (i) above, Defence has a number of other mechanisms in place to guard against credit card misuse. Defence places a strong emphasis on fostering and maintaining the highest standards of ethical behaviour, which plays an important role in preventing fraud and helping to detect it once it occurs. Within this context, Defence has a comprehensive fraud control framework that is underpinned by:
- the Defence Values;
 - intelligence driven internal audits, systematic analysis of corporate information and communications technology systems;
 - the Defence Whistleblower Scheme;
 - the investigation and prosecution of reported frauds;
 - the recovery of defrauded moneys (where possible);

- Education programs consisting of either face-to-face ethics and fraud awareness presentations or completion of an on-line eLearning ethics and fraud training module;
- the provision of quarterly fraud statistics to Groups to facilitate the ongoing fraud risk assessment process;
- specialist workshops in fraud risk assessment, the evaluation and treatment of fraud risks, and the development of fraud control plans;
- the provision of a central point of contact by the Inspector General for policy, guidance and advice on ethics and fraud related issues;
- Defence Audit and Risk Committee (DARC) oversight of the development and implementation of the fraud control plan; and
- A comprehensive suite of policies aimed at ensuring that Defence personnel behave in a proper manner, which in turn mitigates the risk of fraudulent conduct.

Other mechanisms in place to guard against credit card misuse include:

- delegate approval and funds availability sign off prior to the commitment of Commonwealth monies;
- credit card limits, cash advance controls and card merchant blockings;
- a two step process (involving both the card-holder and supervisor) for acquittal of expenditure that includes the provision of expenditure documentation to the supervisor.

(c)

Rank/Level	Allegation	Value	Outcome
APS 2	Misuse of DTC	\$ 5,596.25	Charged under FMA Act 1997. Found guilty but no offence recorded. Recognisance to be of good behaviour for a period of three years.
APS 3	Misuse of DTC	\$ 4,080.00	Employment terminated under the Public Service Act 1999.
APS 3	Misuse of DTC	\$ 2,903.19	Employment terminated under the Public Service Act 1999.
APS 4			Charged under FMA Act 1997. 18 months imprisonment released forthwith to be of good behaviour for 24 months. Employment terminated under the Public Service Act 1999.
APS 4	Misuse of DPC	\$ 130.00	Administrative action. Resigned before disciplinary action could be taken.
APS 6	Misuse of DTC	\$ 57.60	Found to have breached the Public Service Act 1999. Received formal reprimand and a fine of \$500.

EL1	Misuse of DTC	\$ 779.02	Administrative action. Resigned before disciplinary action could be taken. Debt repaid in full.
EL1	Misuse of DTC	\$ 1,047.65	Administrative action. Employee counselled. Debt repaid in full.
Private	Misuse of DTC	\$ 3,052.50	Administrative action. Member counselled by unit.
Private	Misuse of DTC	\$ 1,400.00	Administrative action. Member formally counselled.
Private	Misuse of DPC	\$ 3,326.04	Administrative action. Member educated on processes to secure DPC and made financial reparation.
Private	Misuse of DTC	\$ 900.00	Found guilty under the DFDA 1982. Dismissed from ADF and fined \$1500.
Private	Misuse of DTC	\$ 1,560.00	Administrative action. Member counselled.
Private	Alleged theft of DTC	\$ 1,500.00	Found guilty under DFDA 1982. Member reprimanded and counselled.
Able Seaman	Misuse of DTC	\$ 186.40	Charged and convicted under DFDA.
Leading Aircraftman/Woman	Misuse of DTC	\$ 14,488.76	Reduction in rank from SGT to LAC/W and 28 days detention.
Corporal (Army)	Misuse of DTC	\$ 77.70	Administrative action.
Corporal (Army)	Theft of DTC	\$ 28,658.27	Relates to former Corporal. Found guilty under FMA Act 1997. 4 month prison sentence - to be served by way of Intensive Community correctional order. Reparation order for \$18,458.27.
Leading Seaman	Misuse of DTC	\$ 613.75	Found guilty under the DFDA 1982 relating to FMA Act 1997. Member reprimanded.
Sergeant	Misuse of DPC	\$ 260.00	Administrative action. Received counselling and ordered to pay financial reparation.
Sergeant	Misuse of DTC	\$ 2,323.59	DFDA Charges not pursued due to medical discharge on 27 Nov 2011. Debt repaid in full.
Sergeant	Misuse of DTC	\$ 852.00	Administrative action. Member was given 14 days extra guard duty.
Lieutenant Commander	Misuse of DTC	\$ 1,792.62	Administrative action. Member issued with Notice to Show Cause. Member censured.

Squadron Leader	Misuse of DPC	\$ 7,121.25	Relates to former Squadron Leader. Charged under FMA Act 1997. Recognisance to be of Good behaviour for a period of two years.
-----------------	---------------	-------------	--

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q81: Provision of Equipment to Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) For departments/agencies that provide mobile phones to Ministers and/or Parliamentary Secretaries and/or their offices, what type of mobile phone is provided and the costs.
- (b) For departments/agencies that provide electronic equipment to Ministers and/or Parliamentary Secretaries and/or their offices, what are the ongoing costs for this financial year to date? What were the running costs for 2009-10 and 2010-11?
- (c) Is electronic equipment (such as ipad, laptop, wireless card, vasco token, blackberry, mobile phone (list type if relevant), thumb drive) provided to department/agency staff? If yes provide details of what is provided, the purchase cost, the ongoing cost and a breakdown of what staff and staff classification receives it.
- (d) Please update if there have been any changes since Budget Estimates 2011-12 (May 2012).
- (e) Does the department/agency provide their Ministers and/or Parliamentary Secretaries and/or their offices with any electronic equipment? If yes, provide details of what is provided, the cost and to whom it is provided.
- (f) For departments/agencies that provide mobile phones to Ministers and/or Parliamentary Secretaries and/or their offices, what type of mobile phone is provided, the cost and what were the ongoing costs for 2011-12.
- (g) For departments/agencies that provide electronic equipment to Ministers and/or Parliamentary Secretaries and/or their offices, what type of electronic equipment was provided, the cost and what were the ongoing costs for 2011-12.
- (h) Is electronic equipment (such as ipad, laptop, wireless card, vasco token, blackberry, mobile phone (list type if relevant), thumb drive) was provided to department/agency staff for 2011-12, provide details of what was provided, the purchase cost, the ongoing cost and a breakdown of what staff and staff classification receives it.

Response:

- (a) Defence Portfolio Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries and their staff may be provided with a BlackBerry handset and/or a Nokia C5 mobile phone in accordance with the Whole of Government panel arrangements for the procurement for telecommunications carriers, commodities and other associated services. The type of equipment that is provided is based on the individual requirement of the user. Equipment costs are approximately \$178.00

(GST exclusive) per unit for the Nokia C5 and \$655.45 (GST exclusive) per unit for the BlackBerry.

- (b) The ongoing costs (GST exclusive) for the provision of electronic equipment to the offices of the Defence portfolio Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries for the financial year to date (from 1 July to 30 September 2012) are shown in Table A. The running costs for this equipment for financial years 2009-10 and 2010-11 were provided earlier this year in response to Question on Notice 90, Attachment A.

Table A

Office of the	Mobile phones (inc BlackBerry)	Telstra 3G and 4G Data card	iPad 2
Minister for Defence (Mr Smith)	\$11,457.72	\$5,272.30	NIL
Minister for Defence Materiel (Mr Clare)	\$2,163.45	NIL	NIL
Minister for Defence Science and Personnel (Mr Snowdon)	\$2,568.83	NIL	\$99.63
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Sen. Feeney)	\$1,662.16	\$356.32	NIL
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Dr Kelly)	\$1,085.32	\$779.89	NIL
FY 12-13 YTD	\$18,937.48	\$6,408.51	\$99.63

- (c) Departmental staff may be provided with electronic equipment, such as, BlackBerry, Telstra Next G data cards, mobile phones, laptops, Vasco tokens and iPads. A detailed breakdown of purchase costs, ongoing costs and a breakdown of departmental staff and classification that received the electronic equipment are not readily available and to gather this information would require an unreasonable diversion of Defence resources.
- (d) Since the Budget Estimates 2011-12 (May 2012) the cost of procuring laptops has decreased from \$966.50 to \$843.02 per unit.
- (e) Defence Portfolio Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries and their staff may be provided with electronic equipment, such as BlackBerry, Telstra Next G data cards, mobile phones, laptops, Vasco tokens, and iPads. Table B provides details of the mobile electronic equipment costs (GST exclusive) per unit.

Table B

Equipment	Cost per unit
Laptop	\$843.02
BlackBerry Bold 9900	\$655.45
Nokia C5	\$178.00
DREAMS (Vasco) Token	\$22.00
Telstra 3G and 4G Data card	\$200.00
iPad 2	\$961.37
iPhone 4S	\$816.36

(f) The ongoing costs (GST exclusive) for the provision of mobile phones to the offices of the Defence portfolio Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries for 2011-12 are included in Table C.

Table C

Office of the	Mobile phones (inc Blackberry)	Telstra 3G and 4G Data card
Minister for Defence (Mr Smith)	\$58,738.85	\$23,760.88
Minister for Defence Materiel (Mr Clare)	\$24,352.39	\$4,890.56
Minister for Defence Science and Personnel (Mr Snowdon)	\$6,856.35	\$11,712.96
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Sen. Feeney)	\$6,490.51	\$11,930.35
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Dr Kelly)	\$3,120.63	\$356.32
former Minister for Defence Materiel (Sen. Carr)	NIL	\$1,383.60
FY 11-12	\$99,558.73	\$54,034.67

(g) The ongoing costs (GST exclusive) for the provision of mobile phones to the offices of the Defence portfolio Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries for 2011-12 are also included in Table C.

Table D provides details of all mobile electronic equipment that is currently issued to the Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries and their staff as at 30 October 2012.

Table D

Office of the	Staff Classification	Laptop	Datacard	BlackBerry	Mobile Phone	Dreams Token	iPad
Minister for Defence	Minister			1	2	1	1
	DLO	1	1	2		2	
	Ministerial Staff	11	13	14		12	1
	ADC	1	1	1		1	
	Total	13	15	18	2	16	2
Minister for Defence Materiel	Minister						
	DLO	1	1	1		1	
	Ministerial Staff	1	1	2		6	
	Total	2	2	3		7	
Minister for Defence Science and Personnel	Minister	1	1	1		1	
	DLO	1	1	1			
	Ministerial Staff	1	1	2		2	1
	ADC	1	1	1		1	1
	Total	4	4	5		4	2
Parliamentary Secretary for	Parliamentary Secretary	2	1	1		1	
	DLO	1	1	1		1	

Defence (Sen. Feeney)	Ministerial Staff	3	3	4		4	
	Total	6	5	6		6	
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence (Dr Kelly)	Parliamentary Secretary	1	1	1	1	1	
	DLO	1	1	1		1	
	Ministerial Staff	2	2	3		3	1
	Total	4	4	5	1	5	1

- (h) A detailed breakdown of purchase costs, ongoing costs and a breakdown of departmental staff and classification that received the electronic equipment in 2011-12 are not readily available and to gather this information would require an unreasonable of diversion of Defence resources.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q82: Electricity Purchasing Agreement

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) Provide details of any update of the department/agency electricity purchasing agreement if there has been a change since Budget Estimates 2011-12 (May 2012).
- (b) What are the department/agency electricity costs for 2011-12?
- (c) What are the department/agency electricity costs for this financial year to date?

Response:

- (a) This question has been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 91 taken from the Senate Budget Estimates hearing held on 28/29 May 2012. There has been one change to Defence's electricity purchasing agreements since May 2012:
 - Northern Territory – Contracted from 1 September 2012 for two years.
- (b) Defence consumed 880,778,207 kWh of electricity in financial year 2011-12 at a total cost of \$111.7million (or \$122.9million GST inclusive).
- (c) Defence's energy spend is not linear throughout the year due to seasonal factors and the sequencing of invoices, received both monthly and quarterly. At 30 September 2012 the accrued cost, based on invoices received, for electricity in the first quarter of financial year 2012-13 was \$33.378million (excluding GST).

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q83: Briefings for the Australian Greens and Independents

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) Have any briefings been provided to the Australian Greens? If yes, please include:
 - (i) How are briefings requests commissioned?
 - (ii) What briefings have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each briefing.
 - (iii) Have any briefings request been unable to proceed? If yes, provide details of what the briefings were and why it could not proceed.
 - (iv) How long is spent undertaken briefings for the Australian Greens? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.

- (b) Have any briefings been provided to Independents? If yes, please include:
 - (v) How are briefings requests commissioned?
 - (vi) What briefings have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each briefing.
 - (vii) Have any briefings request been unable to proceed? If yes, provide details of what the briefings were and why it could not proceed.
 - (viii) How long is spent undertaken briefings for the Australian Greens? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.

- (c) Were any briefings been provided to the Australian Greens in 2011-12? If yes, please include:
 - (ix) How are briefings requests commissioned?
 - (x) What briefings have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each briefing.
 - (xi) Have any briefings request been unable to proceed? If yes, provide details of what the briefings were and why it could not proceed.
 - (xii) How long is spent undertaken briefings for the Australian Greens? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.

- (d) Were any briefings been provided to Independents in 2011-12? If yes, please include:
 - (xiii) How are briefings requests commissioned?
 - (xiv) What briefings have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each briefing.
 - (xv) Have any briefings request been unable to proceed? If yes, provide details of what the briefings were and why it could not proceed.
 - (xvi) How long is spent undertaken briefings for the Australian Greens? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.

Response:

Defence provides information and undertakes requests from the Australian Greens, Independents and other political parties on matters relating to Defence in the usual course of Parliamentary and Ministerial business, including in the course of responding to Parliamentary Committees and Questions on Notice.

The specific detail sought in the question, such as the detail of each representation and the amount of time taken to prepare a response, is not readily available. To provide the information would be an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q84: Shredders

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) Did the department/agencies purchase any shredders in 2011-12? If yes, provide details of how many shredders were purchased, the cost of each shredder, why each new shredder was needed and the purpose for which the shredder is to be used.
- (b) Has the department/agencies purchased any shredders since Budget Estimates 2011-12 (May 2012)? If yes, provide details of how many shredders were purchased, the cost of each shredder, why each new shredder was needed and the purpose for which the shredder is to be used.

Response:

(a) and (b)

Yes. As part of its standard office fit out Defence purchases shredders that have been endorsed by the Security Construction and Equipment Committee to shred paper material classified up to and including Top Secret. The shredders were purchased to replace machines that had failed and to fit out new offices under major projects.

In 2011/2012 through its central contracts area Defence purchased the numbers of shredders listed below:

Type of Shredder	Quantity	Cost Per Unit
Small (Navy ships)	3	\$2,997.50 (GST inclusive)
Small (Other)	3	\$2,227.50 (GST inclusive)
Medium (Navy ships)	2	\$3,446.58 (GST inclusive)
Medium (Other)	278	\$2,832.50 (GST inclusive)
Large	41	\$6,022.50 (GST inclusive)
Total	327	\$1,056,925.66 (GST inclusive)

From May 2012 to October 2012 through its central contracts area Defence purchased the numbers of shredders listed below:

Type of Shredder	Quantity	Cost Per Unit
Small (Other)	3	\$2,227.50 (GST inclusive)
Medium (Navy ships)	3*	\$3,255.18 (GST inclusive)
Medium (Other)	127	\$2,832.50 (GST inclusive)
Large (Project)	9	\$6,233.70 (GST inclusive)
Large	10	\$6,022.50 (GST inclusive)
Total	152	\$492,503.84 (GST inclusive)

*Note: Quantity purchased post 30 June 2012.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q85: Protective Security Policy Framework

Senator Eggleston asked in writing.

Provide an update for your department/agency, including what is your current compliance level, what are you doing to manage risk, what is being done to comply with the mandatory requirements and details of any department/agency specific policies and procedures.

Response:

As with other Commonwealth agencies, the Department of Defence is currently transitioning to the Protective Security Policy Framework (PSPF) in accordance with implementation timeframes agreed with the Attorney-General's Department. Due to the scale and complexity of transitioning a large agency with diverse business requirements, the Attorney-General's Department agreed to provide Defence an additional twelve months, until 31 July 2013, to manage this process.

The agreed implementation timeframes require agencies to submit their first annual compliance report against the PSPF to their respective portfolio Minister in August 2013. Due to the extended timeframe for implementation of the PSPF within Defence, the Department is required to submit an interim compliance report at this time; the first full compliance report will be submitted in August 2014. In light of these timeframes and noting that Defence has not completed its transition, the Department is yet to measure its level of compliance with the PSPF.

Defence employs a strategy of security-in-depth to protect its people, information, assets and infrastructure from sources of harm and security risks. Security-in-depth is achieved through a protective security regime that combines physical, personnel, information and information technology security measures to mitigate risks identified through a security risk assessment process. In this respect, Defence employs a risk-managed approach to security consistent with Australian Standards *AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009 Risk Management – Principles and Guidelines* and the associated handbook *HB 167:2006 Security risk management*. These require the use of a structured process to determine the nature of the threats, identify vulnerabilities and risks, and plan, implement and monitor risk treatments.

Defence has reviewed its existing security policy, promulgated in the *Defence Security Manual*, against the mandatory requirements of the PSPF and identified where new or amended policy is required. A policy development program is in hand to affect the changes required to ensure the *Defence Security Manual* is fully aligned to the PSPF. These new or revised policies are being supported by accompanying change management programs to ensure that personnel have the necessary knowledge, processes, tools and training to implement the new or revised security policies.

Defence has a comprehensive suite of protective security policies that are promulgated in the *Defence Security Manual*. The *Defence Security Manual* is maintained by the Chief Security Officer as an on-line manual to facilitate the prompt promulgation of revised security policies, either in response to changes in Government policy, new or emerging threats, or in changes in the external security environment.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q86: Office Locations

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

Please provide a list of all office locations for all departments and agencies within the portfolio by:

- (a) Department/Agency;
- (b) Location;
- (c) Leased or Owned;
- (d) Size;
- (e) Number of Staff at each location and classification;
- (f) If rented, the amount and breakdown of rent per square metre;
- (g) If owned, the value of the building;
- (h) Depreciation of buildings that are owned;
- (i) Type of functions and work undertaken.

Response:

(a) – (h) Please see the table below.

Building Location	Owned or Leased	Net Lettable Area	Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)	Annual Rent (ex GST)	Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)
		m2		\$m	\$/m2
8 McMinn Street, Darwin NT 800	Leased	515.60	Total 26: APS - 13; EL - 6; Enlisted - 2; Officer - 5;	220,939.92	428.51
3 Tybell Street, Winnelle NT 820	Leased	720.80	Total 12: APS - 8; EL - 1; Enlisted - 1; Officer - 2;	194,886.24	270.37
84 Coonawarra Road, Winnelle NT 820	Leased	26,900.00	Total 52: APS - 10; Contractor - 19; EL - 1; Enlisted - 19; Officer - 3;	772,000.08	28.70
28 – 32 King Street, Raymond Terrace, NSW 2324	Leased	2,311.00	Total 197: APS - 155; EL - 4; Enlisted - 34; Officer - 4;	1,278,070.44	553.04
270 Pitt Street, Sydney NSW 2000	Leased	24,140.50	Total 920: APS - 388; Contractor - 111; EL - 120; Enlisted - 152; Officer - 149;	13,882,080.72	575.05
311 High Street, Penrith NSW 2750	Leased	3,849.00	Total 180: APS - 120; Contractor - 11; EL - 27; Enlisted - 10; Officer - 12;	1,291,638.48	335.58
13 Garden Street, Eveleigh NSW 2015	Leased	4,910.40	Total 82: APS - 28; Contractor - 1; EL - 51; Officer - 2;	2,820,110.04	574.31
8 Station Street, Wollongong NSW 2500	Leased	3,821.00	Total 161: APS - 107; EL - 15; Enlisted - 18; Officer - 21;	1,531,481.28	400.81
232 Sharp Street, Cooma NSW 2630	Leased	1,425.00	Total 91: APS - 83; Contractor - 2; EL - 2; Enlisted - 4;	173,998.26	122.10
85 Chalgrove Avenue, Rockingham WA 6168	Leased	4,259.72	Total 266: APS - 42; Contractor - 94; EL - 21; Enlisted - 63; Officer - 46;	979,735.68	230.00
661 Bourke Street, Melbourne NSW 3000	Leased	19,026.70	Total 945: APS - 575; Contractor - 66; EL - 133; Enlisted - 56; Officer - 114; SES - 1;	7,743,021.00	406.96
99 Coventry Street, Southbank VIC 3006	Leased	1,135.50	Total 20: APS - 9; EL - 5; Enlisted - 5; Officer - 1;	342,031.56	301.22
324 St Kilda Road (Level 1), Melbourne VIC 3004	Leased	867.50	This is a 12 month temporary lease for tender activities relating to the Defence Logistics Transformation Program. Defence staff and contractors are visiting the site for this	253,562.52	292.29

			project.		
151-171 Roma Street, Brisbane QLD 4000	Leased	1,915.00	Total 90: APS - 50; Contractor - 35; EL - 2; Enlisted - 1; Officer - 2;	692,153.52	361.44
Campbell Park, Northcott Drive, Campbell ACT 2612	Leased	36,449.00	Total 2240: APS - 788; Contractor - 310; Defence Families of Australia - 1; EL - 587; Enlisted - 119; Exchange - 3; Officer - 415; Religious Advise Comm Services - 1; SES - 16;	10,667,045.27	292.66
39 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	1,471.10	Total 2985: APS - 961; Contractor - 269; EL - 742; Enlisted - 353; Officer - 638; SES - 22;	653,425.80	444.17
26 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	8,136.00		3,613,807.32	444.17
20 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	960.00		390,515.38	406.79
18 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	1,781.00		705,569.16	396.16
33 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	5,896.00		2,846,252.28	482.74
35 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	6,501.00		2,852,235.48	438.74
31 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	4,714.00		1,213,069.28	257.33
29 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	6,056.00		1,558,410.72	257.33
25 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	7,540.30		3,056,332.57	405.33
26 Fairbairn Avenue, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	4,681.00		Total 1054: APS - 191; Contractor - 264; EL - 246; Enlisted - 128; Exchange - 2; Officer - 214; SES - 9;	1,780,104.71
24 Fairbairn Avenue, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	4,832.00	1,991,314.96		412.11
28 Fairbairn Avenue, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	4,537.00	1,654,498.18		364.67
10 Richmond Avenue, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	809.60	299,551.92		370.00
1 Molonglo Avenue, Canberra Airport ACT 2609	Leased	12,945.00	5,306,877.54		409.96

8 Thesiger Court, Deakin ACT 2600	Leased	1,560.00	Total 80: APS - 42; Contractor - 15; EL - 11; Enlisted - 3; Officer - 8; SES - 1;	647,469.60	415.04
109 Kent Street, Deakin ACT 2600	Leased	9,036.00	Total 392: APS - 46; Contractor - 303; EL - 30; Enlisted - 10; Officer - 3;	3,015,181.92	333.69
Anzac Park West, Constitution Avenue, Canberra ACT 2600	Leased	17,686.00	Total 882: APS - 224; Contractor - 280; EL - 320; Enlisted - 8; Officer - 37; SES - 13;	5,446,348.32	307.95
219 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2601	Leased	7,371.50	Total 251: APS - 46; Contractor - 29; EL - 15; Enlisted - 64; Officer - 97;	2,456,619.60	333.26
91 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612	Leased	750.20	Total 31: APS - 4; EL - 5; Enlisted - 2; Officer - 19; Statutory Office Holders - 1;	328,849.68	438.35
2 Barrow Place, Queanbeyan NSW 2620	Leased	7,100.00	Total 74: APS - 69; EL - 3; Enlisted - 1; Officer - 1;	771,886.44	108.72
1 Dairy Road, Fyshwick ACT 2609	Leased	1,187.00	Total 54: APS - 11; EL - 2; Enlisted - 19; Officer - 22;	341,208.19	287.45
5/101 Tennant Street, Fyshwick ACT 2609	Leased	1,830.00	Total 45: APS - 15; Contractor - 17; EL - 5; Officer - 8;	536,448.64	293.14
10 Whyalla Street, Fyshwick ACT 2609	Leased	2,747.00	Total 45: APS - 2; Contractor - 32; EL - 1; Enlisted - 3; Officer - 7;	540,320.93	196.69
205 Anketell Street, Greenway ACT 2900	Leased	4,960.50	Total 246: APS - 89; Contractor - 32; EL - 84; Enlisted - 7; Officer - 34;	2,168,371.63	437.13
101/109 Flemington Road, Mitchell ACT 2911	Leased	4,120.00	Total 281: APS - 3; Contractor - 275; EL - 1; Enlisted - 2;	1,270,390.08	308.35
1 Thynne Street, Bruce ACT 2617	Leased	2,751.00	Total 58: APS - 26; Contractor - 8; EL - 17; Enlisted - 3; Officer - 4;	328,938.12	119.57
34 Lowe Street, Queanbeyan NSW 2620	Leased	1,058.00	Total 15: APS - 6; EL - 5; Officer - 3; SES - 1;	214,005.04	202.27
13 London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601	Leased	636.00	Total 17: APS - 3; EL - 1; Enlisted - 1; Officer - 12;	261,309.19	410.86

Building Location	Owned or Leased	Net Lettable Area	Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)	Gross Book Value as at 30/6/2012	Accumulated Depreciation – 30/6/12
		m2		\$m	\$m
R1 Sir Thomas Blamey Square, Russell ACT 2601	Owned	27,226.00	Total 6986: APS - 2203; Contractor - 547; EL - 1805; Enlisted - 836; Exchange - 6; Officer - 1487; Religious Advise Comm Services - 4; SES - 98;	75.020	0.447
R2 Sir Thomas Blamey Square, Russell ACT 2601	Owned	24,785.00		66.097	0.390
R3 Sir Thomas Blamey Square, Russell ACT 2601	Owned	7,175.00		15.456	0.072
R8 Sir Thomas Blamey Square, Russell ACT 2601	Owned	9,438.00		18.883	0.077

Notes:

The above information does not include office functions located on Defence bases, high security sites or premises of less than 500 square metres in area.

Gross book values and accumulated depreciation provided are from the last audited Defence Financial Statements at 30 June 2012.

- (i) The work undertaken by Defence covers a broad range of disciplines and job types, including administration, procurement, logistics, research and development, planning, training, information communications technology and engineering. Work performed will also include Service-specific trades and employment categories and the broad range of unit-specific work undertaken by soldiers, sailors and airmen/airwomen. A mix of these work types will be performed at most Defence sites.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q87: Public Relations, Communications and Media Staff

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following: By Department or agency:

- (a) How many ongoing staff, the classification, the type of work they undertake and their location?
- (b) How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location?
- (c) How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location?

Response:

(a – c)

The majority of staff engaged in public affairs roles within the Department of Defence are located in the Communication and Media Branch and the Strategic Communication Branch.

As at 26 October 2012 the Communication and Media Branch employed 49 permanent civilians, eight permanent military and one part-time military personnel, three non-ongoing civilian personnel and two contractors.

Communication and Media Branch is responsible for day to day media operations, both nationally and regionally; collation and distribution of Defence imagery and video; and producing the Navy, Army and Air Force newspapers and the Defence magazine.

As at 26 October 2012 the Strategic Communication Branch employed 31 permanent military, 28 part-time military and 11 permanent civilian staff.

Strategic Communication Branch undertakes strategic communication planning and provides advice to commanders at the military strategic, operational and formation headquarters levels. It also delivers military public affairs training and preparedness functions; as well as assigned military public affairs personnel, who deploy at short notice for short duration tasks to obtain imagery and video to report on Defence personnel serving in Australia and overseas.

In addition, as at 26 October 2012, outside the Communication and Media and Strategic Communication Branches there were a further 47 ongoing civilians, 2 non-ongoing civilians, three contractors, 16 permanent and one part-time military staff who provided public affairs support as part of their regular duties within the Defence Groups and Services.

Communication and Media Branch	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	58	<p>Executive:</p> <p>1 x permanent SES Band 1</p> <p>1 x permanent EL2</p> <p>2 x permanent part-time EL1</p> <p>1 x permanent APS6</p> <p>1 x permanent APS4</p> <p>Defence Newspapers:</p> <p>1 x permanent EL2</p> <p>5 x permanent EL1</p> <p>4 x permanent APS6</p> <p>1 x permanent APS4/5</p> <p>1 x permanent SGT</p> <p>3 x permanent CPL</p> <p>1 x permanent LS</p> <p>1 x permanent LAC</p> <p>1 x Reserve SGT</p> <p>Media Operations:</p> <p>1 x permanent EL2</p> <p>3 x permanent EL1</p> <p>5 x permanent APS4/5</p> <p>Defence Digital Media:</p> <p>1 x permanent EL2</p> <p>3 x permanent EL1</p> <p>1 x permanent part-time EL1</p> <p>4 x permanent APS6</p> <p>1 x permanent part-time APS6</p> <p>Operations & Services:</p> <p>1 x permanent COL</p> <p>1 x permanent MAJ</p> <p>Regional Manager</p> <p>Public Affairs:</p> <p>1 x permanent EL1</p> <p>1 x permanent APS6</p> <p>1 x permanent EL1</p> <p>1 x permanent EL1</p> <p>1 x permanent APS2</p> <p>1 x permanent EL1</p> <p>1 x permanent APS5</p>	<p>Public affairs support for Defence and Ministers in the areas of media operations (enquiries & responses), Defence newspapers, imagery (stills and video), online content, entertainment media liaison, regional media engagement, corporate identity, archiving and records management.</p> <p>Provide public affairs support to all Defence elements in region.</p>	<p>Canberra</p> <p>Sydney</p> <p>Perth</p> <p>Adelaide</p> <p>Melbourne</p>

		1 x permanent APS2 1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent EL1		Brisbane Townsville Darwin
		Service Advisers: 1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent EL1	Strategic Communication Advisers to Chiefs of Navy and Air Force.	Canberra
(b) Non-ongoing staff	3	1 x temporary EL1	Acting Regional Manager (incumbent on maternity leave)	Melbourne
		1 x temporary APS6 1 x temporary APS4	Defence Newspapers Video archiving	Canberra
(c) Contractors	2	N/A	Web programmers	Canberra

Key: SES: Senior Executive Service, EL: Executive Level, APS: Australian Public Service, COL: Colonel, MAJ: Major, WO2: Warrant Officer Class 2, SGT: Sergeant, CPL: Corporal, LS: Leading Seaman, LCPL: Lance Corporal, LAC: Leading Aircraftsman, AB: Able Seaman.

Strategic Communication Branch	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	1	1 x permanent Brigadier ¹	Executive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic communication planning and advice • Military information activities planning/execution 	Canberra
	4	1 x permanent EL2 1 x permanent EL1 1 x Reserve WGCDR 1 x permanent APS4	Directorate Plans & Policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military information activities planning/execution 	
	3	1 x permanent COL 2 x permanent EL1	Directorate Operations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic communication planning & advice • Military information activities planning/execution 	
	29	1 x permanent LTCOL 1 x permanent MAJ 1 x permanent CAPT 2 x permanent EL1 4 x Reserve LTCOL	Military Public Affairs Support (Preparedness & Training): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military public affairs doctrine, training and preparedness 	
		8 x Reserve MAJ 12 x Reserve CAPT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Augment (when needed) the provision of military public 	

	26	<p>2 x Reserve LT</p> <p>1 x permanent MAJ 3 x permanent CAPT 1 x permanent FLTLT 1 x permanent FLGOFF 2 x permanent LT 2 x permanent WO2² 1 x permanent PO 2 x permanent Army SGT 2 x permanent RAAF SGT 1 x permanent LS 4 x permanent Army CPL 2 x permanent RAAF CPL 1 x permanent AB 1 x permanent LCPL 1 x permanent LAC 1 x permanent APS4</p>	<p>affairs support to ADF operations, training and support tasks</p> <p>1st Joint Public Affairs Unit: • Provision of military public affairs support to ADF operations, training and support tasks.</p>	
	3	<p>1 x Reserve WGCDR 1 x Reserve SGT 1 x permanent APS4³</p>	<p>Administrative & logistic support to StratCom Executive</p>	
	2	<p>2 x permanent ELI</p>	<p>Long-term absences: Maternity leave/temporary transfer to another Group</p>	
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

Key: SES: Senior Executive Service, EL: Executive Level, APS: Australian Public Service, COL: Colonel, MAJ: Major, WGCDR: Wing Commander, CAPT: Captain (Army), FLTLT: Flight Lieutenant, FLGOFF: Flying Officer, WO2: Warrant Officer Class 2, PO: Petty Officer, SGT: Sergeant, CPL: Corporal, LS: Leading Seaman, LCPL: Lance Corporal, LAC: Leading Aircraftman, AB: Able Seaman.

Notes:

1. Media/public relations are only one aspect of this appointment, which also includes responsibility for oversight of select special ADF projects.
2. Includes 1 x WO2 that is posted for duty within Preparedness, Plans and Training Directorate.
3. This member is employed in a supply management role, not media and public relations. This member is also reported under Administrative/Logistic Support as a Reserve SGT.

Navy	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	9	1 x permanent CFTS (Reserve) CMDR 1 x permanent LEUT 1 x permanent LEUT 1 x permanent PO 1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent part-time EL1 3 x permanent APS6	Director Comms and Media Imagery Comms and Media West Image Specialist Manager Navy Web Services Manager Comms and Media Navy Web Managers	Canberra Canberra HMAS Stirling Canberra Canberra HMAS Kuttabul Canberra
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Army	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	5	1 x permanent EL2 1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent APS6 1 x permanent APS5 1 x permanent CAPT	Director Army Communication Branding Media engagement Media engagement Military public affairs	Canberra Canberra Canberra Canberra Bungendore
(b) Non-ongoing staff	2	1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent APS 5	Public affairs support for the VC recipients Graphic design	Canberra Canberra
(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Air Force	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	7	1 x permanent EL1 3 x permanent APS 6 1 x permanent APS 4-5 2 x permanent FLTLT	Public affairs support for Air Force, including answering media enquiries and proactive regional media engagement.	Glenbrook Canberra Richmond Williamstown Glenbrook Williamstown Amberley
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Office of the Secretary and Chief of the Defence Force (OSCDF)	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	1	1 x permanent EL1	Strategic Communications Adviser to the Chief of the Defence Force	Canberra
	1	1 x permanent EL1	Strategic Communications Adviser to the Chief of the Defence Force Commissions of Inquiry	Canberra
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vice Chief of the Defence Force	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	1	1 x permanent EL1	Office of the Vice Chief of the Defence Force: Strategic Communication Adviser	Canberra
	3	1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent APS6	Cadet, Reserve and Employer Support Division: EL1 & APS6 ADF Cadets, Defence Youth, Defence Work Experience and Engagement Program. Support Plan Suakin – Reserve Reform Stream.	Gold Coast Canberra
	2	1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent APS6	Australian Defence College: Communications Advisers to ADFA, ADC	Canberra
	1	1 x permanent EL1	Australian Civil-Military Centre: Corporate communications	Queanbeyan
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	1	N/A	Specialist communication advice to ADFA.	Canberra

Military Headquarters Support (FORCOMD, HQ 1 Div, HQ 1 Bde, HQ 3 Bde, HQ 7 Bde, HQ NORCOM, HQ SOCOMD)	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	8	1 x permanent MAJ 1 x part-time MAJ 1 x permanent CAPT 1 x permanent LEUT	Organic public affairs support to military headquarters.	Sydney Brisbane Sydney Brisbane Darwin Bungendore Townsville Darwin
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Defence People Group	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	3	1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent APS5 1 x part time APS6	Developing strategic communication plans for Defence People Group products and services. Internal Defence communications on people matters. Providing advice and assistance to SME'S on communication planning and products. Events Management (internal and external). Writing and implementing the PA guidance pack. Executive speech writing and presentations. Coordinating and responding to media enquiries in relation to people matters.	Canberra
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
-----------------	---	-----	-----	-----

Intelligence and Security	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	6	2 x permanent EL1 3 x permanent APS6 1 x permanent APS5	Defence and Defence Security Authority Security Communications	Canberra
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Defence Science and Technology Organisation	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	6	1 x permanent EL2 1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent APS 6 1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent APS 6	Director Corporate Communications Web Manager Internal Communications Regional Communications Events Management	Canberra Canberra Melbourne Melbourne Edinburgh Edinburgh
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	1	N/A	Research, write and produce monthly internal staff magazine (part time)	Edinburgh
	1	N/A	Research, write and produce quarterly external defence science magazine (part time)	Edinburgh
Defence Materiel Organisation	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	4	1 x permanent EL2 (50% of role) 1 x permanent EL1 1 x permanent APS6 1 x permanent APS 5 (0.8 FTE)	Media liaison, development of public relations materials	Melbourne Canberra Canberra Canberra
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

Capability Development	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	1	1 x permanent APS 5	Media, Communication, Coordination (also supports Group governance and planning activities)	Canberra
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
HQ Joint Operations Command	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	5	1 x permanent LTCOL 1 x permanent MAJ 1 x permanent SQNLDR 1 x permanent CAPT 1 x permanent LEUT	Support to ADF Operations/Joint & Combined Exercises (Supports ADF's 24-hour Watch/ Control Centre)	HQJOC, Bungendore
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Defence Support	Number of staff	Classification	Type of Work	Location
(a) Ongoing staff	1	1 x permanent part-time EL2	Communication planning (Strategic Issues Management).	Canberra
(b) Non-ongoing staff	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
(c) Contractors	1 (Defence Legal)	N/A	Publicist to support the Defence Honours and Awards Appeals Tribunal inquiry into "unresolved Recognition into Past Acts of Naval and Military Gallantry and Valour (Part-time only for the duration and finalisation of the inquiry).	Canberra

Key: SES: Senior Executive Service, EL: Executive Level, APS: Australian Public Service, COL: Colonel, LTCOL: Lieutenant Colonel, CMDR: Commander, MAJ: Major, SQNLDR: Squadron Leader, LEUT: Lieutenant, CAPT: Captain (Army), FLTLT: Flight Lieutenant, WO2: Warrant Officer Class 2, SGT: Sergeant, CPL: Corporal, LS: Leading Seaman, LCPL: Lance Corporal, LAC: Leading Aircraftsman, AB: Able Seaman.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q88: Grants Pause

Senator Eggleston provided in writing.

- (a) To date, how much of the 2012-13 budget appropriations has your department received?
- (b) For 2012-13 please list each grant program your department administers, and the total funding of each program.
- (c) Please list each grant program that has not been paused as part of the Government wide grants pause.
- (d) Please provide the total cash value of each program that has not been paused?
- (e) Please list each grant program that has currently been "paused" as part of the Government wide grants pause.
- (f) Please provide the total cash value of each program that has been paused, and the total value of all grants paused?
- (g) On what date did your department receive advice from the government to pause certain grants programs?
 - i. How was the instruction received, and from whom was it received?
- (h) Please list the dates the Minister for Finance met with senior department officials to discuss the grants pause and the Minister overseeing your department met with senior department officials.
- (i) From what date was your department told to implement the grants pause?
 - ii. When did it do so?
- (a) Has your department been provided with information regarding when the grants pause would end?
 - iii. If so, what was the date?
 - iv. Was your department advised if it could communicate when the grants pause would end to grant applicants?
- (k) Please provide the advice your department gave to Department of Finance regarding which programs should be included in the grants pause.
- (l) Did your department receive advice/instruction from the Department of Finance regarding how best to communicate the grants pause to grant applicants, the media and other external stakeholders?
- (m) What information has been provided to grant applicants regarding the grants pause?
Please provide scripts if these have been given to call centres, or any other information sheets which have been used internally for discussing the grants pause with applicants.
- (n) Has your department been advised by the Department of Finance of further grants pauses in the future? If so
 - v. When did you receive notification of future grants pauses?

- vi. What is the date of future grants to be paused?
- vii. Which grants programs will be paused?
- viii. What is total value of pauses in future grants programs?
- ix. When will notification of these future grants pauses be made public?
- (o) How many staff are employed to administer grant programs within the department?
- (p) During the Grants Pause what activities are these staff involved with?
- x. Have staff been moved to other divisions during the grants pause?
- (q) During the Grants Pause are decisions on grants being made, but applicants not being alerted?

Response:

- (a) Appropriation information is reported in the Defence 2012-13 Portfolio Budget Statements. Appropriation information will be updated in the Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements.
- (b) Information on grants awarded by Defence (including grant programs) is published on Defence's website at <http://www.defence.gov.au/header/publications.htm#D>. Guidelines and information on rounds of grant programs are also published on Defence's website at:

Skilling Australia's Defence Industry (SADI) Program
<http://www.defence.gov.au/dmo/id/sadi/index.cfm>

Industry Skilling Program Enhancement (ISPE) package
http://www.defence.gov.au/dmo/id/industry_skilling

Information on Defence funding including grants can be found in the 2012-13 Portfolio Budget Statements.

- (c) & (d) On 27 August 2012, the Government decided to pause all grant rounds for 2012-13 which were not advertised, and advertised rounds which were not finalised. Providing the list of grant programs that were not paused could disclose the Expenditure Review Committee of Cabinet's deliberations and therefore is not publicly available.

However, information on grant programs, in general, can be found on Defence's website identified at answer (b).

Information on the outcome of the grants pause is reported in the 2012-13 MYEFO, and in the Finance Minister's media release of 22 October 2012.

- (e) Information on the grant programs that had uncommitted grants funding reduced can be found in the Finance Minister's media release of 22 October 2012.
- (f) Refer answer (c).
- (g) On 28 August 2012 the Department of Finance and Deregulation (Finance) released an Estimate Memorandum informing portfolio departments of the grants pause and sought

information on grant rounds and programs in 2012-13 which were not advertised, and advertised rounds which were not finalised.

- (h) No meeting was held between senior departmental officials (including the Defence Materiel Organisation, the Minister for Finance and the Minister for Defence in relation to the Grants Pause.
- (i) On 28 August 2012 the Department of Finance and Deregulation released an Estimate Memorandum informing agencies of the decision by the Government to pause grant rounds.

The grant pause was implemented as per the decision of the Government.

- (j) The pause on grant programs ended with the release of the 2012-13 MYEFO. The outcome of the Government's decision was reported in the 2012-13 MYEFO and the Finance Minister's media release of 22 October 2012.
- (k) The information Departments/agencies provided to Finance included grant rounds, committed funds, purpose of the grant and recipients of the grants. This information informed the briefing to the Cabinet's Expenditure Review Committee and therefore is not publicly available.
- (l) The Department of Finance and Deregulation provided standard talking points to all Portfolios Departments to use as necessary.
- (m) Applicants of programs which were open at the time the pause was implemented were advised of the pause.
- (n) No.
- (o) Defence does not employ any staff with the sole duty of administering grants programs. There are several staff members across Defence that work on grants as a minor component of their overall role.

Defence Materiel Organisation employs three full time staff to administer the grant programs. There are a further ten staff that are involved on a part time basis.

- (p) The staff involved with grants programs generally work in finance or policy areas. There have been no staff movements as a result of the grants pause.

During the grant pause, Defence Materiel Organisation staff responsible for the administration of the Priority Industry Capability Innovation Program and DMTC continued their work on the DMTC and on managing contracts awarded prior to the grants pause. Staff also ensured the program was prepared for launch when the grant pause was lifted; the Program was opened by the Minister for Defence Materiel less than five business days after the pause was lifted.

Defence Material Organisation staff responsible for administering the Defence Industry Innovation Program and New Air Combat Capability – Industry Support Program continued to work in their primary role undertaking industry liaison.

ISIP staff continued to work on managing contracts and funding agreements that were signed prior to the grant pause. Additional work was undertaken to prepare documentation for a second Skilling Australia's Defence Industry round in the current financial year in the event that the grant pause was lifted and a quick opening of the round was required; the next funding round was opened by the Minister for Defence Materiel less than two weeks after the pause was lifted.

No staff were transferred to other divisions during this time.

- (q) No decisions on grants were made during the grants pause for Defence and the Defence Materiel Organisation.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q89: Medibank Health Agreement - Preferred Providers

Senator Johnston asked in writing.

- (a) Is the agreement that Defence has struck with Medibank based on the Health Maintenance Organisation (HMO) model such as exists in the United States?
- (b) Under this model the health agent intervenes between the doctor and the patient by contracting the doctor who follows the rules of the agent. The patient must see those doctors who have been contracted by the HMO which are commonly referred to as “preferred providers” i.e. preferred by the HMO not necessarily the patient. This effectively removes the patient’s choice of doctor. Is this the case with the new agreement, if it isn’t the case what are the arrangements?

Response:

(a) and (b)

The Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services Contract is not based on a Health Maintenance Organisation (HMO) model. Under the new contract, Defence retains full responsibility for the provision and management of health care services to ADF members.

Defence’s contract is with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS), a subsidiary of the Medibank group. MHS is not a health insurance provider. It has a proven track record for providing effective health care services to the community, to business and to government at a national level for over 35 years.

The contract comprises the following five service streams:

1. On base services, which will be delivered through a national contracted health professional workforce;
2. Off base services, which will be delivered through a national network of specialist and allied health care providers;
3. Pathology services, which will be delivered through a national provider network;
4. Imaging and Radiology services, which will be delivered through a national provider network; and

5. Health Hotline Service, delivered through Medibank Health Solutions world class telehealth hotline service.

Under the off base service package, the contract requires MHS to provide ADF personnel with timely access to off base services in their local community, irrespective of where they are located within Australia.

To meet that requirement and ensure continuity and sustainability of health care capability to ADF members, MHS is engaging a national network of specialists, allied health and hospital service providers. This network is continuing to grow daily and MHS will continue to sign-on providers during the contract period.

Under the new contract, on base Medical Officers will retain clinical independence for medical care provided to ADF members. If referral to specialist or allied health services is required, Medical Officers will refer in the first instance, and as clinically appropriate, to the MHS service provider network.

During transition of the off base services package, arrangements were put in place to enable Medical Officers to refer to service providers outside the MHS service provider network where there is limited availability of MHS service providers in that location.

Under the off base service package, on base Medical Officers will refer, where clinically appropriate, to the MHS service provider network. However, Medical officers will retain the ability to refer outside this network where clinically required.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q90: Medibank Health Agreement – Referring Entitled Personnel

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

In the documentation forwarded to health care providers, Dr Andrew Wilson for MHS clearly states, “On-base medical officers will be actively encouraged to refer Entitled Personnel to network providers.” What does ‘actively encouraged’ mean?

Response:

It is Defence’s policy that on-base medical officers will refer in the first instance, and where clinically appropriate to the Medibank Health Solutions service provider network. On-base medical officers will have the ability to refer to service providers outside of the network where there is clinical justification for doing so. Referrals to service providers outside of the network will require higher level clinical approvals.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q91: Medibank Health Agreement – Provider Agreement clause 2.1

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) In the Provider Agreement at clause 2.1, those signing the agreement are offered “potential access to patients and associated revenue streams”. What does this mean?
- (b) In the Provider Agreement it says, “you will be paid a fee for service as per our fee schedule.” What exactly does this mean?
- (c) What other inducements are being offered in addition to a payment for service?

Response:

(a), (b) and (c)

Defence’s highest priority remains the health and wellbeing of its people. Under the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services Contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS), ADF personnel will continue to receive high quality health care services.

Under the new arrangements Defence retains full responsibility for, and oversight of the health services provided to ADF members; and the policies and procedures supporting ADF healthcare entitlements.

Defence has no visibility or control over the contractual arrangements being offered by Medibank Health Solutions to service providers for the provision of services to Defence. This includes arrangements relating to potential access to patients and associated revenue streams.

Therefore, Defence is unable to comment on specific clauses contained in those service provider agreements. Those arrangements are a contractual matter between the parties involved.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q92: Medibank Health Agreement – Preferred Provider Emergency Medical Treatment

Senator Johnston asked in writing.

- (a) The issues associated with preferred provider models are well known and add extra stress and complexity particularly in emergency situations which can occur at any time during medical treatment. What if the preferred provider is undertaking a procedure and his/her anaesthetist is not a preferred provider?
- (b) What will be the procedure when the specialist's anaesthetist is unable to anaesthetise and a last minute replacement anaesthetist is not a preferred provider?
- (c) Will this give rise to onerous bureaucratic procedures which could delay or add stress to a situation which is already difficult? This situation can be translated to a variety of medical scenarios including a doctor wanting to refer an entitled patient to a clinician who has very specific expertise but is not a preferred provider (or collaborate with same etc).
- (d) If not, what will be the arrangements to ensure a high quality of provision of service?

Response:

(a), (b), (c) and (d)

Under the new Contract with MHS, MHS has established (and continues to add to) an approved service provider network for the provision of off-base services to Defence. This network includes specialist, allied health and hospital service providers, to which on-base medical officers will refer. Off-base service providers will also on-refer to that network as required.

However, in a critical or emergency situation where a specialist provider is undertaking a procedure, it is Defence's expectation that the specialist provider will do whatever is necessary to ensure the best possible clinical outcome for the patient. This may include referring to or utilising the services of providers outside the MHS service provider network where clinically required.

In those circumstances, invoices for individuals outside the MHS service provider network will also be forwarded to MHS for payment.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q93: Medibank Health Agreement – Updated Procedures

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) The Agreement clearly states that the preferred provider must follow operational procedures “as updated” from time to time by MHS. What does this mean and will it be implemented so that all providers are aware of the ‘updated procedures’?
- (b) This raises the issue of what process is available should a participating clinician believe that the procedures being updated are unsuitable or unsatisfactory for any reason. The whole issue of anomalies and disputes is not addressed in the contract. It would appear to be a submissive relationship to the agent and this is of major concern given the complexities of modern medicine and the pressure on agents concerning costs and any contractual obligations the agent may have agreed to without the doctor’s knowledge. What is being put in place to mitigate against this happening?

Response:

- (a) and (b)

Defence’s highest priority remains the health and wellbeing of its people. Under the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services Contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS), ADF personnel will continue to receive high quality health care services.

Under the new arrangements Defence retains full responsibility for, and oversight of the health services provided to ADF members; and the policies and procedures supporting ADF healthcare entitlements.

Defence has no visibility or control over the contractual arrangements, including those relating to the update of Medibank Health Solutions (MHS) procedures, being offered by MHS to service providers for the provision of services to Defence. Therefore, Defence is unable to comment on specific clauses contained in those service provider agreements. Those arrangements are a contractual matter between the parties involved.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q94: Medibank Health Agreement – Dismissing Preferred Provider

Senator Johnston asked in writing.

- (a) It would appear that under the arrangements being offered by MHS, any preferred provider not complying can be dismissed in writing without any due process. If this is the case, please provide a detailed explanation of your reasons?
- (b) If this not the case what are the arrangements under which a preferred provider can be dismissed as it would appear to be a submissive relationship to the agent and this is of major concern given the complexities of modern medicine and the pressure on agents concerning costs and any contractual obligations the agent may have agreed to without the doctor's knowledge?

Response:

(a) and (b)

Defence's highest priority remains the health and wellbeing of its people. Under the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services Contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS), ADF personnel will continue to receive high quality health care services.

Under the new arrangements Defence retains full responsibility for, and oversight of the health services provided to ADF members; and the policies and procedures supporting ADF healthcare entitlements.

Defence has no visibility or control over the contractual arrangements, including those relating to termination or dismissal, being offered by Medibank Health Solutions (MHS) to service providers for the provision of services to Defence. Therefore, Defence is unable to comment on specific contractual arrangements between MHS and service providers. Those arrangements are a contractual matter between the parties involved.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q95: Medibank Health Agreement – Privacy Issues

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) It is clear in the Provider Agreement at 6.4 that MHS assigns unto itself the authority to collect information on behalf of the Department of Defence. How does this sit with any Commonwealth Privacy Legislation and/or potential disputes between the patient and the Department of Defence or MHS?
- (b) It would appear that, in any potential dispute between the patient and MHS, the medical practitioner signing the agreement must side with MHS. Is this the case, if not, what is the case?

Response:

- (a) Defence's highest priority remains the health and wellbeing of its people. Under the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services Contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS), ADF personnel will continue to receive high quality health care services.

Under the new arrangements Defence retains full responsibility for, and oversight of the health services provided to ADF members; and the policies and procedures supporting ADF healthcare entitlements.

It has always been the case in Defence that health information is collected in order to manage an individual's health. Australian Defence Force (ADF) members provide this consent when they join the ADF. Access to members' health records is provided in accordance with the Privacy Act and is permitted for the purposes of clinical management by authorised health care providers.

The ADF Health Services contract with MHS does not change these access requirements. Under the Contract, MHS will receive and transfer limited medical information for the purposes of making referral appointments and paying invoices for the provision of off-base services. MHS will not store Defence personnel medical records. Those records are held by Defence. This is no different to the previous processes which have been in place for many years to transfer information between on-base health facilities and civilian service providers.

The contract contains strict obligations for all systems and processes used in the delivery of the services to comply with Australian Privacy Laws. In the course of

planning and managing the transition of services under the contract, MHS processes and systems for transfer of health information have been reviewed and assessed by the Defence Chief Information Officer Group and the Defence Security Authority. All processes and systems have been deemed to satisfy the requirements of the Defence Security Manual.

- (b) Defence's highest priority remains the health and wellbeing of its people. Under the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services Contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS), ADF personnel will continue to receive high quality health care services.

Under the new arrangements Defence retains full responsibility for, and oversight of the health services provided to ADF members; and the policies and procedures supporting ADF healthcare entitlements.

Defence has no visibility or control over the contractual arrangements being offered by MHS to service providers for the provision of services to Defence. Therefore, Defence is unable to comment on specific contractual clauses contained in service provider agreements. Those arrangements are a contractual matter between the parties involved.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q96: Medibank Health Agreement – GST Issues

Senator Johnston providing in writing.

It is not clear to me of the requirement for GST to be paid on medical treatment and the statement that “entitled personnel will be treated (if you are registered for GST) as a taxable supply. It would appear that this raises the issue of the doctor’s obligation to the patient to provide a direct service being consumed by the sub-contractual relationship to MHS. Is the case, if it isn’t, what is it?

Response:

Defence’s highest priority remains the health and wellbeing of its people. Under the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services Contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS), ADF personnel will continue to receive high quality health care services.

Under the new arrangements Defence retains full responsibility for, and oversight of the health services provided to ADF members; and the policies and procedures supporting ADF healthcare entitlements.

Defence has no visibility or control over the contractual arrangements being offered by Medibank Health Solutions to service providers for the provision of services to Defence. This includes arrangements relating to the requirement for GST to be paid on medical treatment.

Therefore, Defence is unable to comment on specific clauses associated with this issue contained in those service provider agreements. Those arrangements are a contractual matter between the parties involved.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q97: Medibank Health Agreement – Use of Health Insurance

Senator Johnston asked in writing.

There is nothing in the documentation provided to health care providers which would suggest the ability of an “entitled personnel” to use their private health insurance should they consider that what is being offered by MHS to not be within their interests or that a better non MHS alternative could be found. What alternative choice of treatment pathway is being offered to service personnel?

Response:

Defence’s highest priority remains the health and wellbeing of its people. Under the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services contract there will be no reduction in health care entitlements for ADF personnel.

ADF personnel will continue to receive high quality health care services under the new arrangements. Defence’s contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS) contains more comprehensive monitoring and quality assurance measures than are currently in place to ensure our people receive high quality and timely care.

The contract with MHS also requires MHS to ensure access to choice of providers, irrespective of where ADF personnel are located within Australia.

All of the service providers who sign-on to the MHS service provider network for Defence are fully qualified, accredited professionals who are subject to strict credentialing processes put in place by medical accrediting and training bodies. They will also work in accordance with a consistent, national clinical governance framework.

Therefore, there is no requirement for ADF members to take out private health insurance.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q98: Medibank Health Agreement – Specialist Fees

Senator Johnston asked in writing.

- (a) It would appear that the fees offered are considered as a percentage of the Commonwealth Medical Benefits Schedule (CMBS or MBS) and clearly vary from specialty to specialty, and it will be up to each doctor to consider their own obligations as company directors of their own practices as to whether these fees are adequate reimbursement for their costs given their obligations to provide for all financial commitments going forward. My understanding is that senior specialists have previously been paid AMA rates for services provided to serving Defence Force personnel. By way of example, I am told that orthopaedic surgeons are currently being paid the fees quoted in the Fee Schedule at 170.7% of the MBS fee. I would estimate this to be around 60% of the AMA fee for a sample of common procedures, however, much depends on the mix of services and taking consultations into account and on my calculations the reduction in fees that Medibank is proposing is around 50% on what they have been previously reimbursed. How can this be the case if Defence is committed to providing the highest quality surgeons/specialists to our injured ADF personnel?
- (b) What are the fees for service being paid to our best specialists/ surgeons currently under the present arrangements compared to what is being offered by Medibank under the new agreement?

Response:

- (a) Defence's highest priority remains the health and wellbeing of its people. Under the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services Contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS), ADF personnel will continue to receive high quality health care services.

Defence has no control over the contractual arrangements, including fee schedules being offered by Medibank Health Solutions (MHS) to service providers for the provision of services to Defence. Therefore, Defence is unable to comment on the rates being offered. Those arrangements are a contractual matter between the parties involved.

However, MHS has made public that the rates being offered to the service provider network are generally similar to, or higher than, those currently received by providers of government funded treatment for ex-Australian Defence Force (ADF) personnel.

- (b) Previously, Defence had no contractual arrangements in place with off-base service providers including specialists. Those services were accessed locally by on-base health facilities as required, with fees varying depending on the provider and the location.

Under the new arrangements, there will be greater consistency of, and accountability for, the fees being charged to Defence. Defence will also have the data available to understand more accurately the true costs of providing health care services to ADF personnel. The fees applicable under the MHS contract are Commercial-in-Confidence.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q99: Medibank Health Agreement – Quality of Health Care

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Efficacious medical practice is concerned with getting the best possible results for patients so all arrangements should be judged under this criteria. It is most disturbing when surgeons and specialists of the very highest quality and who have been dedicated clinicians in the treatment of Australian Defence Force servicemen and women do not wish to sign contracts because they no longer believe the conditions of the contract allow them to do their best for their patients. It just doesn't make any sense to take such a risk with the treatment of our ADF personnel. Why would Defence be so ready to put in place arrangements that will most certainly preclude these people from signing a new agreement that mitigates against the provision of high quality health care?

Response:

Defence's highest priority remains the health and wellbeing of its people. Under the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services Contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS), ADF personnel will continue to receive high quality health care services.

Under the new arrangements Defence retains full responsibility for, and oversight of the health services provided to ADF members; and the policies and procedures supporting ADF healthcare entitlements.

The contract will provide a national, integrated health care services solution that will assist Defence to realise synergies and optimise service delivery through innovation and technology.

To ensure ADF personnel continue to receive high quality and timely care, Defence's contract with MHS contains comprehensive monitoring and quality assurance measures; as well as nationally consistent clinical governance procedures; and detailed monthly performance management and reporting.

MHS has consulted with specialist groups over the past few months and is continuing to engage specialist medical providers as part of its network for Defence, which is growing daily. Management of the Defence service provider network will be an ongoing function as part of this new arrangement over the life of the contract.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q100: Medibank Health Agreement – Consultations with the Australian Welfare Association

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) What consultations has Defence had with the Australian Defence Welfare Association?
- (b) What consultations has Defence had with the professional associations associated with the specialists and surgeons who currently provide high quality health outcomes to our ADF personnel? Please provide the full details of these consultations?

Response:

- (a) Defence has not undertaken specific consultation with the Australian Defence Welfare Association about the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS) as health care entitlements for ADF members will not change under the new arrangements. ADF personnel will also continue to have access to the same range of health care services available previously.
- (b) Health industry bodies and specialist groups were not engaged individually regarding the ADF Health Services project.

Defence did however engage with industry through the Request for Information (RFI) process prior to developing and releasing its tender. As part of its procurement strategy, Defence released a Request for Information (RFI) on Austender on 14 February 2011. The purpose of the RFI was to inform the potential procurement strategies through:

1. Engagement with industry;
2. Gathering market information on available service delivery models;
3. Gaining an understanding of the sustainability of any such delivery models;
4. Gaining an understanding of indicative costs of any such delivery models;
5. Providing a mechanism for industry consultation.

Twenty seven entities attended the industry briefing sessions and 23 entities formally responded to the RFI.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q101: Medibank Health Agreement – Dental Services

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) How exactly is the new agreement going to effect the provision of the full range of dental services to ADF personnel?
- (b) How are the current providers of dental care included, or been given the opportunity, to participate in the new arrangements that come into place on 2nd November, 2012?

Response:

- (a) The Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS) provides five service streams nationally, including:
 - (1) On base services, which will be delivered through a national contracted health professional workforce;
 - (2) Off base services, which will be delivered through a national network of specialist and allied health care providers;
 - (3) Pathology services, which will be delivered through a national provider network;
 - (4) Imaging and Radiology services, which will be delivered through a national provider network; and
 - (5) Health Hotline Service, delivered through Medibank Health Solutions world class telehealth hotline service.

Under the new contract, ADF members will continue to have access to general dental services on base. MHS has Sub-Contracted Aspen Medical to deliver Contracted Health Professionals including dentists for the provision of those services on base. The on base service package was successfully transitioned on 5 November 2012, with no material gaps in service delivery, including dental services.

ADF members will also continue to have access to the full range of off base specialist dental services that they had previously. What may change under the new contract is the practice and/or location to which they are referred.

- (b) Providers of specialist dental services were given the opportunity to participate in the provision of ongoing services to Defence via the mechanisms outlined below.

Defence consulted with industry collectively through release of a Request for Information (RFI) via Austender in February 2011, including industry briefing sessions. This was

followed by release of the Request for Tender (RFT) for the five service packages identified above.

In July 2012, Joint Health Command wrote to all existing off base health care services providers, including dental specialists, notifying them that the ADF Health Services contract had been awarded to Medibank Health Solutions. This was followed by a second letter to specialist providers in September 2012 notifying of the MHS procurement activity to establish a network of specialist service providers.

MHS then wrote to all existing Defence and MHS providers of specialist (including dental), allied health and hospital services inviting them to be part of the approved MHS provider network for Defence.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q102: Medibank Health Agreement – Fees Schedule

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Why is the proposed fees schedule below Workers Compensation and Motor Accident Fee Schedules in most states for some specialties?

Response:

Defence's highest priority remains the health and wellbeing of its people. Under the new Australian Defence Force (ADF) Health Services Contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS), ADF personnel will continue to receive high quality health care services.

Under the new arrangements Defence retains full responsibility for, and oversight of the health services provided to ADF members; and the policies and procedures supporting ADF healthcare entitlements.

Defence has no control over the contractual arrangements, including fees schedules between Medibank Health Solutions (MHS) and its service providers. Such arrangements are a commercial matter between those parties. However, MHS has made public that the rates being offered to the service provider network for Defence are generally similar to, or higher than, those currently received by providers of government funded treatment of ex-Australian Defence Force personnel.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q103: Medibank Health Agreement – Protection of Personnel Issues

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) What safeguards have been put in place in regards to third party providers and others having access to Defence personnel medical records and other associated Defence medical records?
- (b) On what system will Medibank store Defence personnel's records and who will have access to this information?

Response:

(a) and (b) It has always been the case in Defence that medical information is collected in order to manage an individual's health. Australian Defence Force (ADF) members provide consent for this to occur when they join the ADF. Access to ADF member's health records is provided in accordance with the Privacy Act for the purposes of clinical management by authorised health care providers.

The ADF Health Services contract with Medibank Health Solutions (MHS) does not change these access requirements.

Under the contract, MHS will receive and transfer limited medical information for the purposes of making referral appointments and paying invoices for the provision of Off-Base services. MHS will not store Defence personnel medical records. Those records are held by Defence.

In the course of planning and managing the transition of services under the contract, MHS processes and systems for transfer of such information have been reviewed and assessed by the Chief Information Officer Group and the Defence Security Authority. All processes and systems have been deemed to satisfy the requirements of the Defence Security Manual.

The contract and sub-contracts contain strict obligations for those systems to comply with Australian Privacy Laws. This is no different to the previous processes which have been in place for many years to transfer information between On-Base health facilities and civilian service providers.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q104: HMAS *Choules* - Overheating and Ventilation Issues

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with rectifying the overheating and ventilation issues with the propulsion motors and transformers?
 - (i) Have the Fan Coil Units (FCU) cooling the transformer room and the propulsion motors been replaced with higher rated units?
 - (ii) What measures have been taken to protect the transformers and the propulsion motors from overheating in the event of FCU failure?
 - (iii) Have measures been taken to improve the natural ventilation of the transformers and the propulsion motors?
 - (iv) Do the measures that have been taken in any way negatively affect the operational performance, capabilities or force protection of the vessel?
- (b) Is the vessel now able to undertake sustained, unrestricted, high-speed operation as per the vessel's official operational specifications as stated at the point of purchase?
 - (i) What steps have been taken to prevent the transformers and propulsion motors from sustaining critical damage in the event that they do overheat?
 - (ii) Transformer compartment cooling has now been improved considerably which will prevent transformer overheating. However, due to the mechanical damage on the transformers that are yet to be changed the risk is that these transformers would be susceptible to electrical failure.

Response:

- (a)
 - (i) The transformer room fan coil units are being replaced during the current maintenance availability. This Class wide modification doubles the capacity of the transformer room cooling. The itemised projected costs are Commercial-In-Confidence. The Commercial-In-Confidence classification arises from the contractual arrangements between The Australian Government, the DMO and the sustainment contractor(s).

- (ii) In the event of a fan coil unit failure, the propulsion system would be automatically shut down by the platform control system to prevent overheating and a compartment high temperature alarm would sound above 55 degrees, informing the ship's engineers of a problem. If transformer room cooling could not be re-established, the temperature sensor in the transformer itself would cause the integrated platform management system to shut down the propulsion system to prevent overheating.
 - (iii) No. The compartment is designed to be cooled by the fan control unit, which controls moisture and humidity build up. The propulsion motors cooling have been upgraded by the "Tropicalisation modification" installed by the United Kingdom Ministry of Defence in 2011.
 - (iv) No.
- (b)
- (i) At the moment, HMAS *Choules* cannot undertake sustained unrestricted, high-speed operation due to the mechanical damage to the port propulsion transformers and distribution transformers. Only the starboard propulsion transformers have been changed. Operation is possible with restrictions to protect the damaged port propulsion and distribution transformers. When replacement of all transformers is complete in April 2013, the ship is intended to be able to meet the propulsion operating specification provided with the vessel when it was acquired in 2011. This should be facilitated by the doubling of cooling capacity for the transformer rooms. However, analysis is being conducted regarding the resetting of temperature sensor limits to ensure that the internal temperature limit of the transformer windings is not exceeded. The effect of this modification upon high speed endurance will not be known until it is trialled.
 - (ii) Transformer compartment cooling has now been improved considerably which will prevent transformer overheating. However, due to the mechanical damage on the transformers that are yet to be changed the risk is that these transformers would be susceptible to electrical failure.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q105: HMAS Choules - Overboard Discharges

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Are combustion products still being discharged overboard in engine exhaust cooling water?
- (b) What steps were taken to manage this problem in sensitive ports?
- (c) What steps were taken to minimise the environmental impact of such discharge when it occurred?
- (d) Were discharges reported to the appropriate port authorities as required?
- (e) When was this problem first identified?

Response:

- (a) Yes, this is an occasional occurrence, but only for a short period as the engine warms up from cold (the exhaust cooling system activates when exhaust temperatures reach 150 degrees C). Discharge could be avoided by keeping the diesels running, but this would cause other problems such as excessive fuel consumption and carbon dioxide production, as well as damage to the engines left running at low load over extended periods.
- (b) An oil containment boom is deployed to contain any carbon floating on the surface of the water close to the ship.
- (c) The carbon is scooped up by ship staff in a boat for appropriate disposal.
- (d) Yes. Port Authorities were notified.
- (e) The United Kingdom Ministry of Defence undertook an independent Environmental Impact Assessment in 2007. The report concluded that most of the environmental impacts are likely to be negligible to minor in scale. The most significant aspect identified is the black, sooty discharge taking place on the start-up of the coolers after the exhaust system has not been run for sometime and the engines are put under sudden load. The impacts are likely to be limited in scale and mostly linked to the visibility of the discharge, rather than its chemical properties.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q106: HMAS *Choules* - New Exhaust Design

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Has the proposed new exhaust design solution been fitted?
- (b) Have the recommended redesigned seals been fitted to the generators' charge air coolers?
- (c) Have the air entrainment issues with the generators' water cooling circuits been rectified?

Response:

(a) – (c) All four generators were overhauled as recommended by the United Kingdom Ministry of Defence as well as routine servicing during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the Royal Australian Navy. Updates by the Engine manufacturer Wartsila were undertaken at this time.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q107: HMAS *Choules* - Main Generators

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Are all four main generators now capable of sustained, unrestricted operation?
- (b) When did the main generators last undergo major servicing and when are they next due for major servicing?
- (c) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with rectifying the issues with the exhaust systems and generator cooling systems?

Response:

- (a) Yes
- (b) In the pre-delivery refit in Falmouth in Aug - Sep 2011, the ship's two 8 cylinder engines had a 24,000 hour overhaul. The two V12 engines had a 12,000 hour overhaul. The timing of the next overhauls will depend upon engine hours accumulated, but the next set of main engine overhauls are anticipated in mid - 2014.
- (c) The itemised costs of UK MOD work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS Choules are Commercial-in-Confidence. The itemised projected costs are also Commercial-in-Confidence. The Commercial-In-Confidence classification arises from the contractual arrangements between the United Kingdom, The Australian Government, the DMO and the sustainment contractor(s).

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q108: HMAS *Choules* - Water Hammer Issues

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Has a solution for the water hammer issue with the main fire pumps been determined?
- (b) If so what is the solution and has it been implemented?
- (c) Have any measures been taken to implement alternatives should the main fire suppression system fail?
- (d) What steps have been taken to minimise the increased risk of fire suppression system failure resulting from the water hammer issue?
- (e) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with rectifying the water hammer issue?

Response:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) An additional pressure maintaining pump fitted during the 2011 refit and amended operating procedures appear to have resolved the water hammer problem.
- (c) There is a separate sprinkler system for the accommodation area. This is a fresh water system with a salt water backup supply.
- (d) Apart from measures in (b), enquiries have been made with the ship Classification Society regarding the fitting of a motorised pump discharge to automatically achieve smooth pressurisation of the fire main on pump start-up.
- (e) The itemised costs of United Kingdom Ministry of Defence work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-in-Confidence. The itemised projected costs are also Commercial-in-Confidence.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q109: HMAS *Choules* - Air Compressors

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) What measures have been taken to rectify the limitations on the fitted air compressor systems in the engine rooms?
- (b) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with rectifying the limitations on the air compressors?

Response:

- (a) Limitations with the air compressors were fixed by implementation of an approved United Kingdom Ministry of Defence (UK MOD) alteration during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the Royal Australian Navy.
- (b) The itemised costs of UK MOD work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-in-Confidence. The itemised projected costs are also Commercial-in-Confidence. The Commercial-In-Confidence classification arises from the contractual arrangements between the United Kingdom, The Australian Government, the DMO and the sustainment contractor(s).

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q110: HMAS *Choules* - Oil Priming Pumps

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Have the pre-lubricating oil priming pumps been permanently connected to the emergency supplies?
- (b) Why were the pumps not permanently connected to the emergency supplies?
- (c) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with permanently connecting the pumps to the emergency supplies?

Response:

- (a & b) The priming pumps are now connected to the emergency supply. This was done by implementation of an approved United Kingdom Ministry of Defence (UK MOD) alteration during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the Royal Australian Navy. Defence does not have background data on the original design rationale.
- (c) The itemised costs of UK MOD work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-in-Confidence. The itemised projected costs are also Commercial-in-Confidence. The Commercial-In-Confidence classification arises either from the contractual arrangements between the United Kingdom, The Australian Government, the DMO and the sustainment contractor(s).

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q111: HMAS Choules - Steering Pump Couplings

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Why did the steering pump couplings require upgrading?
- (b) What was the cost of upgrading the steering pump couplings?
- (c) Has the lack of driving fit between the pump shaft and the coupling half been rectified?
- (d) How does/did this issue affect the vessel's performance?

Response:

- (a) (c) & (d) Due to failures of the original steering pump couplings the United Kingdom Ministry of Defence (UK MOD) replaced the couplings with an improved type as recommended by the Original Equipment Manufacturer during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the Royal Australian Navy.
- (b) The itemised costs of UK MOD work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-in-Confidence.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q112: HMAS *Choules* - Driving Fit Issue

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with rectifying the driving fit issue?

Response:

The itemised costs of United Kingdom Ministry of Defence work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-in-Confidence. The itemised projected costs are also Commercial-in-Confidence. The Commercial-In-Confidence classification arises from the contractual arrangements between the United Kingdom, The Australian Government, the DMO and the sustainment contractor(s).

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q113: HMAS Choules - Fresh Water Systems

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Is calcium deposit build-up still an issue for the vessel's fresh water systems?
- (b) What measures have been taken to manage this issue?
- (c) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with rectifying this issue?

Response:

- (a & b) The hot fresh water system was modified to reduce calcium build up in accordance with an approved United Kingdom Ministry of Defence (UK MOD) alteration during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the Royal Australian Navy.
- (c) The itemised costs of UK MOD work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-in-Confidence. The itemised projected costs are also Commercial-in-Confidence.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q114: HMAS *Choules* - Chemical Treatment Issues

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Why had chemical treatment not been undertaken for the boiler water and chilled water circuits?
- (b) How many incidents of component or system failure have there been as a result of the lack of chemical treatment?
- (c) Are there plans to upgrade the chilled water systems? What measures been taken to rectify this issue?
- (d) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with rectifying this issue?

Response:

- (a) A new chemical treatment system was installed in accordance with an approved United Kingdom Ministry of Defence (UK MOD) alteration during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the Royal Australian Navy. Chemical treatment was only required for the sea water systems to reduce marine growth in the pipes to an acceptable level. It was not considered necessary for chilled water and boiler systems.
- (b) No failures in boiler or chilled water systems can be attributed to a lack of water chemical treatment.
- (c) No.
- (d) The itemised costs of UK MOD work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-in-Confidence. The itemised projected costs are also Commercial-in-Confidence. The Commercial-In-Confidence classification arises from the contractual arrangements between the United Kingdom, The Australian Government, the DMO and the sustainment contractor(s).

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q115: HMAS Choules - UPS Batteries

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) When were the UPS batteries last renewed?
- (b) When are the UPS batteries next due for renewal?

Response:

- (a) The United Kingdom Ministry of Defence replaced the UPS batteries in accordance with standard maintenance procedures in 2009.
- (b) 2014; the UPS batteries are changed out every five 5 years.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q116: HMAS *Choules* - Integrated Bridge System

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Is the Integrated Bridge System fully operational?
- (b) Has the original radar been integrated into the system?
- (c) Is the system performing to operational specifications?
- (d) What was the cost of utilising the stand-alone radar system?
- (e) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with bringing the IBS to full operational status?

Response:

The integrated bridge system is operational and compliant with international regulations for safety of navigation. The Commonwealth is not aware of any development work to improve or upgrade the existing class integrated bridge system fit.

- (a) Yes.
- (b) The original radar is integrated into the system, however, radar display performance issues led the Royal Fleet Auxiliary (RFA) to install stand-alone displays. A United Kingdom Ministry of Defence (UK MOD) approved modification to the integrated platform management system upgrade is intended to fix the display issue. This modification has not yet been installed in *Choules*. This modification is presently being installed in RFA Lyme Bay (first of Class) as part of a wider Integrated Platform Management System obsolescence upgrade. This upgrade is intended to be installed during 2013.
- (c) Yes. The stand-alone radar displays meet the standard for navigational safety.
- (d) Nil. The stand-alone displays were installed by the RFA some years before the sale of *Choules* to the Royal Australian Navy.
- (e) The Defence Materiel Organisation is awaiting a quotation from the equipment manufacturer for the upgrade of the integrated platform management system and integrated bridge system. This upgrade has just been installed on the first UK Bay Class ship.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q117: HMAS *Choules* - Windlasses Issues

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Have the issues with the windlasses been rectified?
- (b) Have the restrictions on the operation of the windlasses been lifted? What measures have been taken to restore the system to full capability?
- (c) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with restoring or replacing the windlasses?
- (d) Have the drainage issues with hatch covers and lift wells been rectified?
- (e) What measures were taken to address the drainage issues?
- (f) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with rectifying the issue?

Response:

- (a & b) The United Kingdom Ministry of Defence (UK MOD) overhauled the windlasses on *Choules* in accordance with maintenance procedures and to the satisfaction of Classification Society, Lloyds Register during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the Royal Australian Navy.
- (c) The itemised costs of UK MOD work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-In-Confidence.
- (d) Yes.
- (e) Larger diameter drain pipes have been fitted.
- (f) The itemised costs of UK MOD work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-in-Confidence.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing -17 October 2012

Q118: HMAS *Choules* - Lift Systems

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) What measures have been taken to adapt the lift systems to the Australian operational environment?
- (b) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with these measures?
- (c) Are the lifting systems currently subject to reduced weight limit restrictions?
- (d) When were the cargo crane hydraulic rams last re-chromed?
- (e) When will the cargo crane hydraulic rams require re-chroming?
- (f) Are the lifting systems still suffering from overheating and accelerated degradation?
- (g) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with restoring the lift systems to full operational status?

Response:

(a)(c) and (f)

An approved United Kingdom Ministry of Defence alteration to up-rate the lift is being implemented during the current maintenance period.

(d & e)

Cargo crane hydraulic rams were repaired in accordance with the United Kingdom Ministry of Defence maintenance procedures during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the Royal Australian Navy. Given upper deck exposure, re-chroming may be required in the ships next five year re-certification cycle (2016).

(b & g)

The itemised costs of United Kingdom Ministry of Defence work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-In-Confidence. The itemised projected costs are also Commercial-In-Confidence.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q119: HMAS Choules - Vacuum Toilet Systems

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

What measures have been taken to address the fragility of the vacuum toilet systems?

Response:

The vacuum toilet system as with other systems of the same design in other ships, requires appropriate management in the way it is used.

The vacuum toilet system performs satisfactorily if operated and maintained correctly. For example, use of appropriate cleaning agents and non-flushing of foreign objects.

The United Kingdom experienced some issues mainly when a Military Force was embarked with large numbers of troops unfamiliar with normal ships operation routines.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q120: HMAS Choules - AHU's

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) When were the AHU's (confirm what this stands for) last checked for potential health issues (eg. Legionnaires disease)?
 - (i) Have permanent solutions been found to the design issues found in the AHU's?
 - (ii) What measures have been taken to resolve the issues with the AHU's?
 - (iii) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with resolving the issues with the air handling system?
 - (iv) Are further measures required to adequately adapt the vessel's air handling systems to Australia's operating environment?
 - (v) Have issues regarding the exposure of crew to unacceptable levels of noise from the AHU's been resolved?

- (b) Have issues regarding the exposure of the crew to unacceptable levels of diesel fumes and exhaust fumes, particularly in the mess, the Hospital and the POSA office, been resolved?
 - (i) Are there plans to upgrade the air handling system to improve capacity and reliability?

- (c) What measures have been taken to address the issues caused by water ingress on the flight deck?
 - (i) What measures have been taken to address deficiencies with communications during flight operations between the flight deck and aircraft?
 - (ii) Are aircraft connected to the Ground Power Unit still subject to fluctuating voltages caused by the unit earthing abnormally?
 - (iii) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with rectifying the issues with the flight deck?

- (d) Have filters been fitted to all existing fans?
 - (i) What measures have been taken to ensure that the vents to the engine room will operate nominally in the event of an emergency (ie. they will close)?

Response:

- (a)
- (i-v) Air handling units maintenance and modification was undertaken by the United Kingdom Ministry of Defence (UK MOD) in accordance the supplier's (VAPAC) procedures during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the Royal Australian Navy (RAN). The solution adopted to reduce the risk of health issues such as Legionnaires disease was to disconnect the fixed condensate drains and connect a drain hose to send the condensate close to, but not in the drains in order to reduce risk of air contamination. There is also weekly and monthly routine maintenance routine on the air handling units to check for legionella.
- (b) A former Largs Bay officer observed in his supersession report that exhaust fumes can enter the ship when the ship is positioned with a strong wind from directly astern. The RAN has not encountered this problem and is not aware of any approved UK MOD modification or design solution being considered to address this observation. This was not considered by the UK MOD to warrant a design change.
- (i) No, there are no plans to upgrade the air handling system.
- (c) The flight deck boundary lights remain difficult to seal to prevent water ingress. To minimise this problem, ship staff are instructed not to clean the deck around them with high pressure hoses. A new design of light that avoids this leakage problem has been developed in the UK and will replace lights of the older design in due course.
- (i) Defect repaired and certified by the UK MOD Aviation Naval Authority during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the RAN.
 - (ii) No, the defect was repaired and certified by the UK MOD Aviation Naval Authority during the 2011 re-certification period prior to delivery to the RAN.
 - (iii) The itemised costs of UK MOD work undertaken prior to the hand over of HMAS *Choules* are Commercial-In-Confidence. Itemised projected costs are also Commercial-In-Confidence. The Commercial-In-Confidence classification arises from the contractual arrangements between the United Kingdom, The Australian Government, the DMO and the sustainment contractor(s).
- (d)
- (i) Engine Room fans were updated with new units including filters. Checking that the emergency vent closure operates correctly is a routine maintenance task.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q121: HMAS *Choules* - Rapid Protection Spray Systems

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Why have the Rapid Reaction Spray systems failed in the past?
- (b) What measures have been taken to minimise the risk of the systems failing in future? What was the cost of these measures?
- (c) Have all issues with failing handles and hinges now been rectified?
- (d) What are the itemised existing and projected costs associated with rectifying these issues?

Response:

- (a) Rapid reaction spray faults have been identified as operator error while the ship was in Royal Fleet Auxiliary service.
- (b) Operator error has not been noted in Royal Australian Navy (RAN) service. There is no cost associated with this.
- (c) Yes. Rectification occurred prior to handover to the RAN.
- (d) There are no existing or projected costs associated with rectifying these issues in *Choules*.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q122: C-27J - Procurement Guidelines

Senator Johnston provided in writing/

- (a) Were established procurement guidelines followed in the case of the AIR 8000 Phase 2 programme?
- (b) What is the Department's legal exposure in the event that it is determined that proper procurement process was not followed?

Response:

- (a) Yes, Defence conducted the C-27J procurement in accordance with all applicable procurement guidelines, namely, the *Commonwealth Procurement Rules* (CPRs) (referred to as the *Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines* (CPGs) prior to 1 July 2012).

A more detailed explanation of the application of the CPRs (formerly CPGs) to this procurement can be found in the Official Committee Hansard, Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee Estimates for Tuesday 29 May 2012, specifically pages 19 to 41 (inclusive).

- (b) There is no legal basis or ground of which Defence is aware that a third party could rely on to successfully challenge any action or decision taken by Defence in the context of procurement of the C-27J aircraft.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q123: C-27J – Loading Capabilities

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Why and on who's authority was the recommendation that the replacement aircraft be capable of transporting an unloaded and unmodified Mercedes G Wagon made?
- (b) Is the C-27J capable of airlifting the proposed Hawkei vehicle?
- (c) Is the C-27J capable of airlifting the Bushmaster vehicle?
- (d) Is the C-27J capable of airlifting the Jackal/MWMIK vehicle?
- (e) Is the C-27J capable of airlifting the Land Rover Perentie/LRPV?
- (f) Is the C-27J capable of airlifting the Unimog?
- (g) Is the C-27J capable of airlifting the M777 howitzer?

Response:

23 common loads were used to assess the capability of the C-27J in comparison with the C295. Of these 23 loads, all were transportable in the C-27J but only seven were transportable in C295.

- (a) The selection criteria for the C-27J did not include an explicit requirement to carry the Mercedes G Wagon.
- (b) No.
- (c) No.
- (d) Yes (the Australian variant of the Jackal, Nary SOV 4x4).
- (e) Yes.
- (f) No.
- (g) No.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q124: C-27J - Army Consultations

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Was the Army involved in the development of desired requirements for the AIR 8000 Phase 2 programme?
- (b) What submissions were made by the Army and/or Special Operations Command regarding the AIR 8000 Phase 2 programme?

Response:

(a) and (b)

Senior Army officers were key members of the capability committees responsible for developing the submission presented to Government. Army Officers and Special Operations staff have provided advice and guidance throughout the Caribou replacement project. This occurred through the Defence capability development process, and included advice on battlefield operations and procedures, the capabilities sought by Army and Special Operations in the Caribou replacement, and during review and endorsement of project documentation by Defence capability committees.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q125: C-27J - Airfield Access

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) It has been stated by the Minister that the C-27J can access approximately 1900 airfields while the C-130 can access approximately 500 airfields. Which variant of the C-130 was the Minister referring to when he made this statement?
- (b) If it were in operation today, how many airfields could the DCH-4 access?

Response:

- (a) The C-130H and C-130J Hercules aircraft are similar in airfield accessibility. Accessibility is determined by four factors:
 - 1. weather conditions;
 - 2. runway length;
 - 3. surface strength; and
 - 4. the dimensions of ground manoeuvring areas.

While each model of the C-130 Hercules has advantages over the other in some factors, their overall accessibility is essentially similar.

- (b) The DHC-4 Caribou aircraft was capable of operating from short, unprepared landing zones with relatively soft surfaces and small ground manoeuvring areas. In addition to established airfields, the DHC-4 could operate from suitably surveyed paddocks and other open areas.

Therefore, the number of potential accessible landing zones are too numerous to provide a definitive figure. If the DHC-4 Caribou aircraft was operating today, it would be very difficult and costly to sustain and would not provide other features essential to survivability in a modern threat environment.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q126: C-27J - Airfield Requirements

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Does the C-27J have STOL capability?
- (b) What are the minimum airfield requirements for the C-27J?
- (c) What are the minimum airfield requirements for the C-130H?
- (d) What are the minimum airfield requirements for the C-130J?
- (e) Are there any plans to fit the C-27J with systems enabling them to operate on improvised and/or shorter airfields (eg. RATOG, drag 'chutes) that they are not currently capable of accessing?

Response:

- (a) Yes. Aircraft are considered to have a Short Take-Off and Landing (STOL) capability when specified STOL take-off and landing techniques and/or design features allow them to operate from airfields shorter than would otherwise be possible. The C-27J design encompasses STOL features, including the highest power to weight ratio in its class, that are complemented by published STOL techniques.
- (b-d) The airfield requirements for an aircraft vary significantly with aircraft weight and environmental conditions. Key requirements are runway dimensions, surface strength and the size of ground manoeuvring areas. For the same environmental conditions and at maximum aircraft weight, the minimum airfield length required are:
 - C-130H 4,400 feet,
 - C-130J 4,800 feet, and
 - C-27J 3,200 feet.

The length of the runway can be less than these airfield lengths when a suitable over-run exists beyond the end of the runway. In such cases the C-27J has a STOL takeoff roll ranging from 1,100 - 1,900 feet over its weight range.

A C-27J at maximum weight can operate from soft runways that a C-130 can only access when almost empty. C-130H and C-130J Hercules also require a runway width of at least 60 feet. However, the C-27J requires a runway width of at least 45 feet. Nevertheless, runway surface strength is often a more critical factor than runway length.

During flood relief efforts in New South Wales in early 2011 Air Force was requested to access three airfields (Walgett, Collarenebri and Lightning Ridge). While the runway lengths at each location were sufficient for both models of C-130 Hercules aircraft, runway surface strength prohibited C-130 operations into all but one (Walgett) airfield.

Analysis of C-27J aircraft performance data for the same scenario showed that it could have accessed all three locations. The C-27J has a superior combination of STOL performance, soft footprint and ground manoeuvrability compared to the C-130H or C-130J Hercules aircraft.

- (e) No, the C-27J aircraft will provide excellent accessibility without modification.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q127: C-27J – Flight Hours

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) How many estimated flight hours (or approximate percentage reduction) will be saved from projected operations of the CH-47 fleet as a result of the operation of the C-27J?
- (b) What are the estimated financial savings that the C-27J will generate for the CH-47 fleet?
- (c) How many estimated flight hours (or approximate percentage reduction) will be saved from projected operations of the C-130J fleet as a result of the operation of the C-27J?
- (d) What are the estimated financial savings that the C-27J will generate for the C-130J fleet?

Response:

- (a) There will be no direct CH-47 rate-of-effort savings resulting from the introduction into service of the C-27J. The role of the CH-47 is to provide a medium lift helicopter capability to support Land and Special Forces. Introduction of the C-27J will relieve the CH-47 of conducting flights between those airfields the C-130J Hercules cannot access or which do not require the unique landing abilities of a helicopter. The current CH-47 rate-of-effort represents the minimum level of capability to ensure sustained commitment to operations and to meet the minimum operational airworthiness requirements.
- (b) The hourly operating cost for the C-27J will be approximately \$8,700 whilst the CH-47 is \$15,992. Accordingly, savings will be made per flying hour on future missions that can be fulfilled by a C-27J in lieu of a CH-47. Notably the C-27J flies at approximately twice the speed of a CH-47. Thus, the savings will compound both from reduced hours and reduced hourly costs.
- (c) There will be no change to the annual rate of effort of the C-130J aircraft as a result of the introduction of the C-27J aircraft. The introduction of the C-27J aircraft will perform the functions that are no longer performed by the DHC-4 Caribou and the C-130H aircraft. In financial year 2008/2009 the combined annual rate of effort of the DHC-4 Caribou and C-130H Hercules aircraft was 7,300 hours. By the time the C-27J aircraft reaches final operational capability, the annual rate of effort of the C-27J will be 7,500 hours.
- (d) Nil.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates – 17 October 2012

Q128: C-27J – US Approach

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Is the Department aware that the United States is in the process of divesting its armed forces of the C-27J as they have deemed the aircraft: Not to possess the STOL capabilities the US Army, the US Marines, the US Navy or the numerous US Special Forces regiments desired; Not to add any significant capabilities not already provided by the C-130J; Uneconomical to operate compared to the C-130J due to the relatively small number of aircraft produced, the lack of commonality with other aircraft in the US inventory, and the resultant projected costs of maintenance and sustainment; Extraneous to requirements across all four US branches of service?

Response:

Defence is aware that the United States (US) Air Force (USAF) is considering divesting its fleet of 21 C-27J 'Joint Cargo Aircraft' already procured but not for the reasons asserted by Senator Johnston.

The 'Joint Cargo Aircraft' (JCA) program was a joint US Army/USAF program from 2007 to 2009 consolidated from individual service programs. No other US Government defence and security agencies, such as the US Navy or Marine Corps, have been involved in the development, selection or acquisition of the C-27J or the JCA program. The US Director of Operational Test and Evaluation reported that 'The C-27J is operationally effective in conducting its primary mission of delivering time sensitive/mission critical cargo and personnel to forward units in remote locations using unimproved airfields.' The Director further noted that the C-27J was not operationally suitable during multi-service operational Test & Evaluation due to not meeting the reliability and availability thresholds but that these matters have since improved: the C-27J meets its flight performance requirements and the US Air National Guard deployed two of its ten C-27J aircraft to Afghanistan in August 2011. The aircraft have proven operationally effective and suitable during the 11-months operational deployment in Afghanistan.

The 13 C-27J in service, and eight in production, for the US Air National Guard were acquired by the US Army and transferred to the USAF by the Secretary for Defence in 2009. The USAF proposes to divest the fleet of 21 C-27J Spartan aircraft in order to meet US Defence budget funding restrictions. The final decision to divest the fleet of C-27J is still subject to US Congressional agreement. The USAF plans to utilise its approximately 400 C-130 aircraft fleet remaining after fleet reductions, augmented by nearly 500 US Army CH-47 Chinook helicopters, instead of continuing to operate the C-27J aircraft. The US military force structure means that the divestment of the C-27J does not have a significant impact on its tactical air lift capability, which is in stark contrast in the Australian environment, the delivery of the C-27J will vastly improve the ADF's tactical air lift capability.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q129: C-27J - Multirole

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Are there any plans to modify and utilise the C-27J for roles other than cargo and transport (eg. recon, ground fire support, EW, AEW&C, maritime surveillance, etc)?

Response:

Defence currently has no plans to modify or utilise the C-27J for roles other than those already identified to Government.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q130: C-27J - Cost of Capability

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) What is the itemised breakdown of the \$1.4 billion stated as being allocated to the procurement of the C-27J?
- (b) Does the \$1.4 billion stated as being allocated to the procurement of the C-27J include through life support?
- (c) Does the \$1.4 billion stated as being allocated to the procurement of the C-27J include a simulator and pilot training?

Response:

- (a) This question has been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 139 taken from the Senate Budget Estimates hearing on 28/29 May 2012.

(b) and (c)

Government approved Project AIR8000 Ph2 at A\$1.4 billion for the acquisition of C-27J aircraft, support systems, training devices, intellectual property and technical data, initial spares, facilities, supplementary certification, test and evaluation, and an initial period of sustainment services (including initial air and ground crew training services). The project acquisition cost includes the acquisition of a pilot simulator. Through life support (after the initial period) and through life pilot training are not included in the project acquisition cost.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q131: C-27J - Maintenance

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Which companies will be involved in the maintenance and sustainment of the C-27J fleet?

Response:

Defence will initially seek C27J sustainment services via United States (US) Foreign Military Sales during the aircraft's introduction to service to leverage the experience of the US prime contractor, L-3 Communications Integrated Systems, and subcontractor/aircraft original equipment manufacturer, Alenia Aermacchi.

Defence anticipates that a large proportion of the initial sustainment will be undertaken by an Australian commercial partner, yet to be determined. Defence will use this initial sustainment period to garner the information necessary to run a local commercial competition for longer-term C27J maintenance and sustainment support.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates – 17 October 2012

Q132: C-27J – Fleet Basing

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Which unit/s will be operating the C-27J?
- (b) Where will the C-27J fleet be based?

Response:

- (a) The C-27J will be operated by Number 35 Squadron.
- (b) The C-27J fleet will initially be based at Royal Australian Air Force Base Richmond. The long term, but not yet approved, estate consolidation plan would have the C-27J based at Royal Australian Air Force Base Amberley.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q133: C-27J - Tactical Airlift

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Following the decision to procure the C-27J, have any options been explored to augment the Army's current light or medium tactical airlift inventories?
- (b) Has the Minister received any requests or recommendations from the Army or Special Operations Command regarding their tactical airlift capabilities since the decision to procure the C-27J was made, and if so what were they?

Response:

- (a) No options have been considered to augment Army's current light or medium tactical airlift inventories since the C-27J decision.
- (b) Neither Army nor Special Operations Command have provided formal advice to Government via Ministerial Submission regarding Army tactical airlift capability since the C-27J acquisition decision.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q134: C27J - IOC

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

What is the current IOC date for the C-27J?

Response:

As outlined in the joint announcement by the Minister for Defence and Minister for Defence Materiel on 10 May 2012, C-27J Initial Operating Capability is scheduled for the end of 2016.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimate Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q135: CH-47F - IOC

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

What is the current IOC date for the CH-47F?

Response:

The current Initial Operational Capability date for the CH-47F capability (minimum of 2 x CH-47F ready to deploy in support of operations) is scheduled for January 2016.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q136: SPS *Cantabria* - *Cantabria* Agreement

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) What are the itemised existing and projected financial costs associated with the Agreement?
- (b) What period does the Agreement cover?
- (c) Does the Agreement contain provisions to extend the deployment period if desired?
- (d) Does the Agreement state the vessel's maximum and minimum days at sea for the duration of the deployment, and if so what are they?
- (e) What provisions are within the Agreement concerning the command authority of the vessel during the deployment period?
- (f) What provisions are within the Agreement governing the involvement of the SPS *Cantabria* and associated Spanish personnel (military and civilian) in ADF non-training operations?
- (g) Are the SPS *Cantabria* and associated Spanish personnel (military and civilian) authorised to take part in Australian border protection operations?
- (h) What provisions are within the Agreement pertaining to the diplomatic and legal implications resulting from the vessel potentially being involved in operations involving unauthorised maritime arrivals or asylum seekers?

Response:

- (a) The total cost estimate for the SPS *Cantabria* deployment is \$14 million. This cost estimate is comprised of the following main cost elements:
 - (i) Pre-deployment Preparation and Maintenance \$2.7 million
 - (ii) Fuel \$4.6 million
 - (iii) Crew Deployment Allowance (145 Crew not including wages) \$4.0 million
 - (iv) Victualling and Supplies \$0.8 million
 - (v) Shore Based Support Team (4 personnel - accommodation) \$0.15million
 - (vi) Port Services in Australia (Tugs, berthing service, car hire) \$0.25 million
 - (vii) Transit Costs (Suez Canal/Panama Canal and Port Visits) \$0.25 million
 - (viii) Support Costs (Office Support and Travel) \$0.05 million
 - (ix) Core Ships Crew and Compassionate Travel \$0.2 million
 - (x) Contingency \$1.0 million
- (b) The Project Arrangement for the deployment of SPS *Cantabria* covers the period from SPS *Cantabria*'s departure from Ferrol, Spain on 3 January 2013 to the ship's return to Ferrol, Spain on 21 December 2013.

- (c) The Project Arrangement does not provide provisions to extend the deployment.
- (d) Yes, the Project Arrangement does state the vessel's maximum and minimum days at sea for the duration of the deployment. Broadly, *Cantabria*'s deployment is based on a 350 day rotation to/from Ferrol, Spain with the following defining periods:
 - (i) Ferrol to Australia transit – 43 days (approximately) to arrive in Sydney in mid February 2013.
 - (ii) In Australia – 259 days (comprising not more than 160 sea days and not less than 99 port days (including maintenance days)).
 - (iii) Australia to Ferrol transit – 48 days (approximately) to depart Sydney in early November 2013.
- (e) SPS *Cantabria* will be transferred to the operational control of the Royal Australian Navy (RAN) Fleet Commander on the ship's arrival in Australia as per the deployment program (mid-February 2013). SPS *Cantabria*'s operational control will be relinquished to the Armada National Command on departure from Australia as per the deployment program (early-November 2013). The RAN Fleet Commander will delegate operational control to the Director General Maritime Operations for the daily management of SPS *Cantabria*'s program which will be facilitated through the Maritime Operations organisation.
- (f) The program of the deployment of SPS *Cantabria* only envisages training activities, however, exercises, either at national or international level. However, the evolving security environment is complex and there might be unforeseeable developments which will lead the RAN to request the participation of SPS *Cantabria* in specified operations. In accordance with Spanish law, the participation of SPS *Cantabria* in any operation requires the prior approval of the Spanish Government. The Project Arrangement establishes the procedures for requesting Spanish Government approval for the employment of SPS *Cantabria* in designated RAN operations.
- (g) No, SPS *Cantabria* and associated Spanish personnel (military and civilian) have not been authorised to take part in Australian border protection operations.
- (h) Not applicable. See response to part (g).

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q137: SPS *Cantabria* - Personnel Issues

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) How many Armada personnel are to be deployed with the vessel?
- (b) How many civilians are to be deployed with the vessel?
- (c) In the event that civilian personnel are to be deployed with the vessel, will Australia be paying all or part of their salary or other remuneration for the deployment period?
- (d) What restrictions are there on the vessel's operation under the Agreement?
- (e) What provisions are within the Agreement governing the maintenance and sustainment of the vessel?
- (f) What provisions are within the Agreement regarding possible modifications to the vessel as may be required to adapt it to Australian requirements and/or operational environment?
- (g) Does the Agreement contain any provisions pertaining to the possible Australian purchase of the SPS *Cantabria*?
- (h) Does the Agreement contain any provisions relating to the possible Australian purchase of a Spanish BAC/AOR vessel?
- (i) What is the vessel's full crew complement?
- (j) How many Australian personnel are expected to serve on the vessel during the deployment period and how much time are these personnel expected to spend on the vessel?

Response:

- (a) SPS *Cantabria* will deploy to Australia with a crew of approximately 145-150. Four Armada personnel will deploy separately to form a shore based Logistics and Maintenance Support Unit based at Fleet Base East in Sydney.
- (b) No civilians are being deployed with SPS *Cantabria*.
- (c) No civilians are being deployed with SPS *Cantabria*.
- (d) The program of the deployment of SPS *Cantabria* only envisages training activities and exercises, either at national or international level. Notwithstanding, the evolving security environment is complex and there might be unforeseeable developments which will lead the Royal Australian Navy (RAN) to request the participation of SPS *Cantabria* in specified operations. In accordance with Spanish Law, the participation of SPS *Cantabria* in any operation requires the prior approval of the Spanish Government.

The Project Arrangement establishes the procedures for requesting Spanish Government approval for the employment of SPS *Cantabria* in designated RAN operations.

- (e) The following provisions have been made within the Project Arrangement governing the maintenance and sustainment of the SPS *Cantabria*:

- (i) SPS *Cantabria* will undergo a pre-deployment preparation and maintenance period to bring the ship to the required engineering material state for the deployment to Australia. The intent of this maintenance and preparation period is to reduce the requirement for extended maintenance during the deployment.
 - (ii) During the deployment SPS *Cantabria* will undergo one three week mid-deployment Maintenance Period in Sydney.
 - (iii) Logistic support to SPS *Cantabria* will be conducted through the Spanish Armada's logistic system and provisions.
 - (iv) Maintenance support to SPS *Cantabria* will be conducted through Armada contractors in Australia.
 - (v) A Logistic and Maintenance Support Unit RAN Liaison Officer construct will be established for the logistic support of SPS *Cantabria*.
 - (vi) The Armada will provide and fund all necessary logistic support as required for SPS *Cantabria's* routine maintenance.
 - (vii) The RAN will cover freight and customs costs.
 - (viii) The RAN will provide limited organic technical support and advice as well as access to relevant standing contract support where feasible.
 - (ix) The RAN and Armada will share the cost of emergency or non-routine urgent maintenance.
- (f) The only modifications required to adapt SPS *Cantabria* to Australian requirements relate to minor modifications to ensure communications connectivity. Provisions have been within the Project Arrangement for these modifications.
- (g) No.
- (h) No, but one of the deployment's aims as specified in the agreement is to 'undertake a capability assessment assist to in informing the Australian Government's decision on a replacement for HMAS *Success* and *Sirius*.'
- (i) After operational assessment by the Armada the baseline crew of SPS *Cantabria* has been established to 142 to enable the ship to fulfill all of its intended basic roles and functions as detailed in the Armada's Operational Concept Document. In order to meet the requirements of the deployment SPS *Cantabria* full crew will be between 145-150.
- (j) SPS *Cantabria* will be able to accommodate approximately thirty (30) Australian personnel for training and familiarisation at any one time during the deployment. The RAN intends to maximise the use of these training and familiarisation bunks throughout the deployment by rotating RAN personnel on and off the ship. Given the commonality between SPS *Cantabria's* technical systems, the SPS *Canberra* Class Landing Helicopter Docks (LHD) and the *Hobart* Class Air Warfare Destroyers (AWD), the use of the training and familiarisation bunks will be focused on providing technical familiarisation for those sailors training to serve in the LHD and the AWD.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q138: SPS *Cantabria* - Operational Issues

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Will the vessel be taking part in any multinational exercises or other operations during the deployment and if so will the Australian personnel form part of the crew and which flag will the vessel be sailing under during such?
- (b) What is the estimated base monthly cost of operating the vessel?
- (c) Will any modifications need to be made to the vessel to adapt it to Australia's operational environment?
- (d) What measures have been or will be taken to ensure the vessel does not suffer from overheating issues due to the difference between European and Australian environmental conditions? What is the estimated cost of such measures?
- (e) Have any restrictions been placed on the vessel's operation as a result of the operational environment?

Response:

- (a) SPS *Cantabria* will remain Spanish flagged throughout the deployment; however the ship will be under the operational control of the Royal Australian Navy (RAN) Fleet Commander. SPS *Cantabria* will take part in and support multinational exercises during the deployment including participation in Exercise *Triton Century* and providing support to Exercise *Talisman Sabre*. Australian personnel will be embarked in SPS *Cantabria* during these exercises for training and familiarisation purposes, but will not form part of the core crew of the ship. The program of the deployment of SPS *Cantabria* only envisages training activities and exercises, either at national or international level. Notwithstanding, the evolving security environment is complex and there might be unforeseeable developments which will lead the RAN to request the participation of SPS *Cantabria* in specified operations. In accordance with Spanish law, the participation of SPS *Cantabria* in any operation requires the prior approval of the Spanish Government. The Project Arrangement establishes the procedures for requesting Spanish Government approval for the employment of SPS *Cantabria* in designated RAN operations.
- (b) The estimated base monthly cost of operating the SPS *Cantabria* during the deployment is \$0.8 million. This estimate includes fuel, crew deployment allowances (145-150 Crew not including wages), victualling and supplies, shore based support team costs (4 personnel - accommodation), port services in Australia (tugs, berthing service, car hire) and other support costs (office support and travel).
- (c) The only modifications required to adapt SPS *Cantabria* to Australian operational requirements for the deployment relate to minor modifications to ensure communications connectivity.

- (d) No additional measures are being taken to ensure the vessel does not suffer from overheating. SPS *Cantabria* is built to operate in climatic conditions commensurate with those experienced in Australia.
- (e) No.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q139: SPS *Cantabria* - Capabilities

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Is the vessel capable of landing CH-46/CH-47, CH-53E, and V-22 aircraft?
- (b) Are the vessel's medical facilities equipped for CBRN casualties?
- (c) In relation to the fuel replenishment systems, are there any RAN vessels the SPS *Cantabria* will be unable to resupply?
- (d) Is the vessel capable of replenishment-at-sea of *Collins* class submarines?
- (e) Is the vessel capable of replenishing itself?
- (f) Are any modifications required to enable a vessel to be replenished by the SPS *Cantabria*?
- (g) Which companies will be involved in the maintenance, sustainment and evaluation of the vessel during the deployment?

Response:

- (a) SPS *Cantabria*'s flight deck is not rated to land the CH-46/CH-47, CH-53E, and V-22 aircraft, although it is designed to conduct vertical replenishment with CH-47 and CH53E. SPS *Cantabria* is designed to operate with three medium size naval helicopters (i.e. Augusta-Bell AB212) or two heavy size naval helicopters (i.e. SH-60 or NH90) and the hangar is designed to accommodate those helicopters. The ship will not deploy to Australia with an Armada aircraft embarked. Australia has not conducted flight trials for the operation of Australian Defence Force helicopters to SPS *Cantabria*, therefore all air operations will be conducted in accordance with the standing internationally agreed NATO operating limits for *Helicopter Operations From Ship other than Aircraft Carriers*. This will enable all in service RAN helicopters to conduct operations with SPS *Cantabria*.
- (b) SPS *Cantabria*'s medical facilities are not equipped with specialist equipment for CBRN casualties. *Cantabria* is fitted with a CBRN citadel and pre-wet system to enable operations in a CBRN threat environment. Procedurally, CBRN casualties proceed through a cleansing/decontamination station prior entry into the ship's citadel where they are able to be treated within the ship's medical facility like any other casualty.
- (c) All vessels that can replenish fuel from *Success* and *Sirius* can replenish from SPS *Cantabria*.
- (d) No submarine can replenish underway at sea. Replenishment while at anchor is possible but very rarely utilised.
- (e) SPS *Cantabria* can transfer fuel from its cargo tanks to the ships own ready use tanks.

- (f) No modifications are required to enable any RAN ship's to be replenished by the SPS *Cantabria*.
- (g) Maintenance support to SPS *Cantabria* during the deployment will be arranged by the Armada and conducted through Armada contractors in Australia. During the deployment only routine maintenance is planned which will not require external support. In the event of emergency or non-routine urgent maintenance, external support might be required. The details of which companies will be involved in these arrangements will be studied on a case by case basis. Where possible RAN standing contracts, such as the *Standing Offer for Navy Port Agency Services* will be used to provide support to the SPS *Cantabria* deployment. There is no intention for companies to conduct an evaluation of SPS *Cantabria* during the deployment.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q140: SPS *Cantabria* - Evaluation Team

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Is a dedicated vessel evaluation team to be formed for the duration of the deployment and if so what will be its size and composition?

Response:

Defence intends to undertake a capability assessment to assist in informing the Australian Government decision on replacement of HMAS *Success* and *Sirius* under Project SEA 1654 Phase 3. The *Cantabria* Class is one of a number of candidate platforms being considered for SEA 1654 Phase 3. The exact form and composition of any evaluation team is yet to be finalised.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q141: SPS *Cantabria* - Basing

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Where is the vessel to be based during the deployment?

Response:

SPS *Cantabria* will be based in Fleet Base East, Sydney, for the duration of the deployment.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q142: SPS *Cantabria* - Compliance with Australia Regulations

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

What measures will be taken to ensure the vessel complies with Australian environmental regulations?

Response:

SPS *Cantabria* has been designed with different systems to comply with the International Conventions for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships 1973, as modified by the Protocol of 1978 relating thereto MARPOL 73/78 and its annexes in order to prevent and minimise pollution from oil, sewage, garbage and exhaust. In accordance with Annex I, Regulation 19 the ship complies with double-hull requirements for oil tankers. Like all other foreign warships visiting Australia, SPS *Cantabria* will be subject to Australian environmental regulations, for example quarantine requirements. To ensure that the SPS *Cantabria* crew are aware of these Australian requirements and implements measures to comply with Australian environmental regulations the requirements will be clearly articulated in administrative instructions currently being developed by the RAN in support of SPS *Cantabria*'s deployment.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q143: Submarines - SLEP

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

With respect to SLEP (and noting it is concluding in October):

- (a) Please provide a summary the findings of this program.
- (b) Please provide an estimate of the cost necessary to extend the life of Collins, if indeed the SLEP report suggests this is possible.

Response:

- (a) The Service Life Evaluation Program was undertaken by Defence to identify any issues that would prevent Australia's fleet of Collins Class Submarines from achieving their current theoretical platform life and planned withdrawal dates.

The study also considered the possibility of a service life extension for the Collins fleet beyond the current on-paper service life for the fleet of 2024 to 2031.

The study found there is no single technical issue that would fundamentally prevent the Collins Class submarines from achieving their theoretical platform life, their planned withdrawal dates, or a service life extension of one operating cycle for the fleet, which is currently around seven years, excluding full cycle docking periods. As well, under the Coles Review into Submarine Sustainment, improved management of the Collins Class is expected to extend the operating cycle.

Using a similar approach, other Navies have successfully extended the theoretical life of their submarine fleets. For example, the United States Navy has extended the life of the Ohio Class submarine fleet from 30 to 40 years.

The service life evaluation examined 145 platform and mission systems across the Collins Class Submarines to determine long-term supportability.

Four major Australian companies that are currently contracted to support the Collins Class Submarines assisted in the study. The United States Navy was also engaged to provide an independent review of the key evaluation outputs.

A joint media release of 12 December 2012 (Minister for Defence/Minister for Defence Materiel) Collins Class Service Life Evaluation Program refers.

- (b) Further analysis will now be required to refine the remediation options to fully identify the expected costs of a life extension. The initial assessment however suggests that the costs of any extension will be within the currently allocated budgets for sustainment and relevant capital projects already proposed in the Defence Capability Plan.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q144: Submarines - Sustainment costs

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

It is noted that forward estimates for financial year 14/15 sustainment was \$374M in February 2011 (QON 130) and it is now \$640M (stated by Air Vice Marshall Deeble). Please confirm the difference in forward estimates.

Response:

The \$374M identified in the response to QON130 represented the approved Collins sustainment budget as at February 2011.

Since February 2011, funding supplementation has been provided at various times to the Collins sustainment budget allocation for financial year 2014-2015. This periodic supplementation reflects Defence decisions over time to improve submarine availability through targeted injections of funding. The funding injections have been provided for inventory remediation and other activities. In recent times these funding injections have been for activities recommended in the initial Coles Study findings.

The figure of \$640m quoted at the October 2012 Senate Estimates hearing was the original funding amount allocated to Collins Class Submarine sustainment in 2014-15. The current requirement for Collins Class Submarine sustainment in 2014-15 is \$553m. The residual (\$88m) will fund other activities across the Navy Fleet.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q145: Submarines - Total Sea Miles

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

In QON 208 of May 2012 Estimates Defence advised that the total sea miles travelled by each Collins Class submarine on a per annum basis is classified. The Chief of Navy stated at October estimates the total sea miles travelled (23,716 nautical miles) by three Australian submarines in the time between estimates hearings.

- (a) Please provide the total sea miles of each Collins Class submarine since boat launch (i.e. total odometer reading)
- (b) Please provide the total collective sea miles of the Collins Class submarine force over the past 5 years.
- (c) Of the 28 material ready days indicated lost by Chief of Navy at Estimates, please provide a list of the nature of the defects that made the submarines unready.

Response:

(a) and (b) During the Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing on 17 October 2012, the Chief of Navy provided the Committee the total sea miles travelled by three submarines between May and October 2012. The information provided an insight into the achievements of the Collins fleet over a five month period without revealing information that could be used to further assess the capabilities and operations of the fleet. Public disclosure of the information sought in this question could be used for such a purpose and is therefore classified. A private briefing can be provided if required.

(c) The loss of planned materiel ready days indicated by Chief of Navy was caused by minor overruns of maintenance periods and defects on various systems in operating submarines including the motor, weight compensation system, power control and distribution system, external hydraulic system, and auxiliary sea water cooling system.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q146: Submarines – Collins Class Complexity

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Mr King has stated a number of times at Estimates that the Collins Class submarines are more complex than other submarines. How are the Collins more complex than:

- (a) Type 212
- (b) Type 214
- (c) LA Class?

Response:

(a-c) When referring to the relative complexity of the Collins Class, Mr King is comparing Collins with other diesel-electric submarines, such as the Type 212 and Type 214, and not with nuclear powered submarines such as the Los Angeles (LA) class. As identified through benchmarking activities conducted with the Coles Study, the Collins class is one of the largest and most complex diesel-electric submarines in service today.

The demanding operational requirements stipulated by Defence during the 1980s could not be met by existing submarine designs. A new design, which would eventually become the Collins class, included numerous high-performance systems and components, many of which were unique to Collins and most of which had never been previously integrated together. Integration of these various systems into the limited available space in the Collins hull resulted in a densely populated internal layout and required the development of highly complex power distribution, cooling and other supporting infrastructure.

Since the submarines were built, several original equipment manufacturers have left the market or no longer have the capacity to support Collins equipment. So, in addition to the relative technical complexity of the Collins submarine, a point often made by Mr King is the significant challenge that Australia faces in sustaining the Collins class. Australia is the parent nation for the Collins fleet and is responsible not only for the actual maintenance of the submarines, but also for most engineering and other support policies, processes, and procedures. Australia, unlike most parent nations, does not have the benefit of several decades of submarine development and evolution.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates – 17 October 2012

Q147: Submarines - Coles Review

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

When will the committee be provided with a copy of the Coles Review and its benchmarking data?

Response:

The final report of the Coles Review into Submarine Sustainment was released on 12 December 2012. The joint media statement (Minister for Defence/Minister for Defence Materiel) of 12 December 2012 refers.

The Coles Review is available at:

[<www.defence.gov.au/dmo/publications/coles.cfm>](http://www.defence.gov.au/dmo/publications/coles.cfm)

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q148: Submarines - ASC

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

What work orders/approvals have been given by the DMO to Australian Submarine Corporation with respect to work on HMAS *Collins* (please provide dates, rough work scope and value) since she arrived at ASC Osborne.

Response:

HMAS *Collins* was transferred to ASC's Osborne facility on 3 August 2012. Its second full cycle docking will officially start on 1 February 2013.

The following preparatory work is planned to be done prior to 1 February 2013:

- a. system decommissioning and preservation;
- b. removal of the propeller;
- c. removal of equipment from bilges;
- d. removal of the casing and undercasing pipework and cabling;
- e. removal of the main battery;
- f. removal of the Emergency Propulsion Unit; and
- g. hull inspections.

This work will be conducted under the in service support contract. The value of work performed up to the end of September 2012 is \$4.35 million. The Commonwealth is yet to receive invoices for the work performed since 1 October 2012. The contracted work on HMAS *Collins* for financial year 2012-13 totals \$27.8 million.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q149: Submarines - CTD and PIC IP

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) How much money was spent on Australian small to medium enterprises for Capability and Technology Demonstrator (CTD) programs in each of the five years prior to the suspension of that program?
- (b) What analysis has been carried out to establish the effect of the suspension of the CTD programs on Australian small to medium enterprises?
- (c) How much money has been spent of allocated funding to Australian small to medium enterprises through Priority Industry Capability (PIC) funding in each year since PIC program was introduced?
- (d) How much money has been spent of allocated funding to Australian small to medium enterprises through PIC funding for the Acoustics PIC in each year since PIC program was introduced? Please break down the allocation of funding to each company.
- (e) How much money has been spent of allocated funding to Australian small to medium enterprises through Priority Industry Capability (PIC) funding for the Collins Class Combat System PIC in each year since PIC program was introduced? Please break down the allocation of funding to each company.

Response:

- (a) The following information is based upon the Government's approval of the Capability Technology Demonstrator (CTD) Rounds 11-15 (2007-2011) and CTD Extension Program (CTD EP) Rounds 1-3.

All CTD EP funding was allocated by 2009. The initial round of the CTD EP was managed by the Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO) and the subsequent rounds by the Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO). The CTD EP was completed in June 2012.

CTD Round 16 was cancelled. Round 17 is scheduled for submission for approval in December 2012.

The support to Australian small to medium enterprises (SMEs) from both programs is identified by the year of approval, noting that the support is normally spread over 3 years.

Serial	Program	Year of Approval	Total Funding Approved (\$m)	SME Funding Approved (\$m)	Cumulative SME total (\$m)
1	CTD Round 11	2007	26.0	2.1	2.1
2	CTD Round 12	2008	21.5	9.5	11.6
3	CTD Round 13	2009	12.7	10.7 ¹	22.3
4	CTD Round 14	2010	14.4	1.5	23.8
5	CTD Round 15	2011	13.0	11.5 ²	35.3
6	CTD EP Round 1	2007	4.8	0	35.3
7	CTD EP Round 2	2008	18.2	10.3	45.6
8	CTD EP Round 3	2009	19.7	4.8	50.4

¹ AUD4.96 million was for SMEs partnered with a major company.

² AUD10 million was for SMEs partnered with a major company, Australian University or an Australian Government Research Organisation.

- (b) DSTO advises that no analysis has been conducted to establish the impact of the completion of the CTD Extension Program or the cancellation of CTD Round 16.
- (c) The Priority Industry Capability Innovation Program (PIC IP) awarded AUD\$12.1 million to nine applicants in its first funding round in financial year 2011-2012. A total of AUD\$5.5 million in funding was awarded to seven Australian SMEs.
- (d) Two Australian SMEs have been awarded \$1.2 million through the PIC IP to develop new technology related to the acoustic technologies and systems Priority Industry Capability (PIC). These projects are scheduled for completion in 2014.

Company	Funds Awarded (\$m)	Funds paid to date (\$m)	Purpose
Sonartech Atlas Pty Ltd	0.72	0.42	Extend the capability of the Sonix system.
Cirrus Real Time Processing Systems Pty Ltd	0.47	0.27	Development of a sensor association and fusion engine.

- (e) The PIC IP has provided AUD\$3.4 million in funding to three Australian SMEs to develop new technology related to the Collins-class combat system PIC. This includes the two projects listed above under part (d) related to the acoustic technologies and systems PIC, as they also relate to the Collins-class combat system PIC. An additional Australian SME was awarded funding to develop new technology related to the Collins-class combat system PIC. The project is scheduled for completion in 2014.

Company	Funds Awarded (\$m)	Funds paid to date (\$m)	Purpose
C4i Pty Ltd	2.19	1.29	Develop a network-centric command and control interface system.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q150: Submarines

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

At QON 257 Defence indicated it would spend money on the following:

1. Design Studies with DCNS, HDW & Navantia
 2. Design studies with Kockums for new build Collins
 3. Analysis of options studies
 4. Mission system studies
 5. Support system studies
 6. DSTO-MOTS evaluation studies
 7. DSTO-Systems integration & capability modelling
 8. DSTO-Combat system studies
 9. DSTO-Signatures
 10. DSTO-Power & energy studies
 11. DSTO-Cell aging & performance tests
 12. DSTO-Battery design studies
 13. DSTO-Procure battery test sets
 14. DSTO-Advanced material propeller
 15. DSTO-Platform
 16. DSTO-Secure facilities
 17. DSTO-S&T planning support
 18. Project Offices Costs
 19. US Program Management Support (FMS)
 20. Computer systems & software (IPPDE)
 21. Submarine Propulsion, Energy, Support & Integration Facility Development
 22. Engineer development programs
 23. Miscellaneous studies
 24. Engineer signature analysis study
 25. Hydrodynamic design studies.
- (a) Please provide one paragraph stating the purpose of each study, when it will commence, and what the activity will involve and when it will be completed.
- (b) Please provide one paragraph on how each line item will assist the SEA 1000 project.
- (c) Please provide a short statement outlining anticipated Australian involvement in such.
- (d) Please provide details on any outcomes to date for each line item.
- (e) Noting the recommendation made by the Senate in its Procurement procedures for Defence capital projects report recommended that “listen to technical community concerns about risk—the technical community, supplemented by outside expertise from industry and allied

technology partners as necessary, should understand the state of technology and the degree to which a new design extends that technology” and this has been agreed to by the Minister, please indicate if the results of each study be released publically?

Response:

(1) Design studies with DCNS, HDW and Navantia:

- (a) Identify design changes necessary and resultant performance implications for “Australianised” Military off the Shelf (MOTS) designs. Design studies will be let to DCNS (France), HDW (Germany), and Navantia (Spain) to provide trials data on their in-service versions of Scorpene, Type 214 and S80A respectively.
- (b) The results of this activity are required to advise Government on future submarine options.
- (c) No Australian industry involvement in this activity.
- (d) None at this stage.
- (e) No. The data gained from this activity will be commercially sensitive and address submarine performance so will not be publicly releasable.

(2) Design studies with Kockums for new build Collins:

- (a) To develop a design concept that corrects design and performance deficiencies and treats obsolescence issues with the Collins design such that it could be built again using modern technology.
- (b) The results of this activity are required to advise Government on future submarine options.
- (c) Australian industry will be involved in this activity but the extent will not be determined until contract negotiations for this task begin.
- (d) None at this stage because preliminary discussions have been not completed.
- (e) No. The data gained from this activity will be commercially sensitive and address submarine performance so will not be publicly releasable.

(3) Analysis of options studies:

- (a) To examine design characteristic options for a submarine concept that would meet the full 2009 White Paper capability while at the same time developing Australian industry skills and capacity. This is due to begin in early 2013 and conclude in approximately 2015.
- (b) The results of this activity are required to advise Government on future submarine options.
- (c) Yes. Australian industry will be involved heavily in this activity.
- (d) None at this stage.
- (e) No. The data gained from this activity will be commercially sensitive and address submarine performance so will not be publicly releasable.

(4) Mission system studies:

- (a) This activity includes modelling in the United States of the performance of conceptual submarines ranging in capability from that of the existing MOTS submarines through to a modernised Collins design. The activity began in financial year (FY) 2012/2013 and should complete in FY 13/14.
- (b) This modelling will be an independent source of analytical advice to Government on the comparative capabilities and therefore utility for Australia of various future submarine options.

- (c) No Australian industry involvement in this activity.
- (d) None at this stage.
- (e) No. The data gained from this activity will be strategically and operationally sensitive, addressing expected submarine performance. It will therefore be highly classified and not publicly releasable.

(5) Support system studies:

- (a) This is made up of four studies; Support Requirements study, Workforce study, Basing and Infrastructure study and Facilities Requirements Analysis. These are due to begin FY 12/13 and complete FY 14/15.
- (b) This will inform Government on options and requirements for the total future submarine support system.
- (c) Yes. Australian industry and contractors will have the opportunity to be extensively involved in this activity.
- (d) None at this stage.
- (e) This will be at the discretion of Ministers.

(6) DSTO – MOTS evaluation studies:

- (a) Studies are in progress to evaluate the MOTS platform and combat system options for SEA1000. These activities commenced in 2012 and are expected to be complete once formal reports have been submitted to Government for First Pass consideration, which is expected in 2013.
- (b) Formal reports from this activity will inform upcoming Government First Pass decisions.
- (c) Commonwealth subject matter experts have been and will continue to be involved extensively. Australian industry involvement is limited to assistance in data management and document preparation.
- (d) None yet as this activity is still in progress. Commercial data has been received and is being analysed.
- (e) No. The data gained from this activity is commercially sensitive and covered by provisions of releasability in various Deeds of Participation which prohibit public release.

(7) DSTO – System integration and capability modelling:

- (a) This activity focuses on the development of Australian capabilities for assessment tools and methodologies that will facilitate informed procurement decisions by Government. These activities commenced in July 2012 and are anticipated to be completed by September 2014.
- (b) Results from these studies will inform Government decisions over the life of SEA1000 and will form part of an enduring submarine technical capability.
- (c) Australian industry will assist in developing these tools with Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO) staff who will guide the process.
- (d) None yet as this activity is still in progress.
- (e) Studies completed for this activity are likely to be sourced from commercially sensitive information which will limit releasability.

(8) DSTO – Combat System studies:

- (a) Combat system studies are being undertaken to investigate key technologies and methodologies for the development of future combat system requirements. This

activity commenced in November 2012 and is scheduled to be completed by November 2014.

- (b) Results from these studies will inform Government decisions over the life of SEA1000 and will form part of an enduring submarine technology capability.
- (c) DSTO staff and contractors will be required to complete these activities.
- (d) This activity has recently commenced and there are no outcomes to report yet.
- (e) Studies completed for this activity are likely to be sourced from commercially sensitive information which will limit releasability.

(9) DSTO – Signatures:

- (a) This activity is aimed at developing techniques and technologies to both quantify and to reduce platform signatures. This activity commenced in February 2011 and will be completed by September 2015.
- (b) Outcomes from this activity will be used throughout the life of the future submarine to ascertain and mitigate submarine signatures.
- (c) Australian industry will be involved in this activity.
- (d) The activity has recently commenced and there are no outcomes to report.
- (e) Studies completed for this activity are likely to be sourced from commercially sensitive information which will limit releasability.

(10) DSTO – Power & Energy studies:

- (a) The activity is aimed at an improved understanding of all of the elements of power and energy systems, the associated technologies and their requirements for the future submarine. This activity commenced in August 2012 and is expected to be completed by August 2015.
- (b) A detailed understanding of power and energy systems for submarines will be developed and used to mitigate risks associated with each system.
- (c) Australian industry will be involved in this activity.
- (d) This activity has recently commenced and there are no outcomes to report.
- (e) Studies completed for this activity are likely to be sourced from commercially sensitive information which will limit releasability.

(11) DSTO – Cell aging & performance tests:

- (a) This activity will investigate the effects of cell ageing on battery performance. The activity commenced in August 2012 and is expected to be completed by August 2015.
- (b) Outcomes for this activity will include a thorough understanding of the limits of performance and the durability of candidate battery cell technologies for the Future Submarine.
- (c) Australian industry will be involved in this activity.
- (d) This activity has recently commenced and there are no outcomes to report.
- (e) Studies completed for this activity are likely to be sourced from commercially sensitive information which will limit releasability.

(12) DSTO – Battery design studies:

- (a) In this activity DSTO will work closely with submarine battery providers to understand the performance characteristics of their developmental battery technologies and designs compared with existing systems, as well as understand key safety and integration issues, and associated platform and program risks. This activity commenced in August 2012 and is expected to be completed by August 2015.

- (b) An assessment of potential battery design concepts, which will reduce identified risks associated with the selection and active development of batteries for the Future Submarine.
- (c) Australian industry will be involved in this activity.
- (d) This activity has recently commenced and there are no outcomes to report.
- (e) Studies completed for this activity are likely to be sourced from commercially sensitive information which will limit releasability.

(13) DSTO – Procure battery test sets:

- (a) This is the acquisition of battery test sets associated with a range of battery technologies. This activity commenced in August 2012 and is expected to be completed by August 2015.
- (b) This activity supports the development of battery technology expertise in Australia.
- (c) Australian industry will be involved in this activity.
- (d) This activity has recently commenced and there are no outcomes to report.
- (e) Studies completed for this activity are likely to be sourced from commercially sensitive information which will limit releasability.

(14) DSTO – Advanced material propeller:

- (a) This activity focuses on the development of propellers made from new materials. This activity commenced in September 2012 and is expected to be completed by July 2015.
- (b) Improved performance and maintainability of propellers to improve Australia's submarine capability.
- (c) Australian industry will be involved in this activity.
- (d) This activity has recently commenced and no outcomes can yet be reported.
- (e) This activity will involve very sensitive, highly classified technology that will not be publicly releasable.

(15) DSTO – Platform:

- (a) This activity is focused on the performance and the resilience of the overall submarine platform. This activity commenced in August 2012 and this phase is expected to conclude in August 2015.
- (b) Results from this activity will inform the Government decision making process on all options.
- (c) Australian industry will be involved in this activity.
- (d) This activity has recently commenced and no outcomes can yet be reported.
- (e) Studies completed for this activity are likely to be sourced from commercially sensitive information which will limit releasability.

(16) DSTO – Secure facilities:

- (a) Secure facilities are in planning and development at two DSTO sites to support sensitive SEA1000 related activities.
- (b) Provides facilities that allow sensitive, highly classified tasks to support the capability and Government decision making.
- (c) Construction and maintenance of the facilities will be conducted by Australian industry.
- (d) Planning has been completed, and the process of construction has commenced.

- (e) Nothing for this activity has been completed yet, but it is likely to contain sensitive data that will limit prospects for public release.

(17) DSTO – S&T planning support:

- (a) Contracting support is in place for the implementation of a DSTO science and technology (S&T) plan for SEA1000 support.
- (b) The DSTO S&T program supports execution of the SEA 1000 Program including Government decision making.
- (c) Australian contractors will be extensively involved.
- (d) This will be an ongoing activity.
- (e) Release will be governed by the sensitivity and security classification of the information.

(18) Project office costs:

- (a) Business and support costs associated with running the project office.
- (b) The project office will assist in delivery of advice and documentation in support of Government.
- (c) The program office is delivering advice and documentation in support of Government decision-making.
- (d) Advice provided to Government as programmed.
- (e) The Government will release statements when required.

(19) US Program Management Support:

- (a) United States Government and industry support for SEA1000 studies and research under an Foreign Military Sales (FMS) case. This is an ongoing activity.
- (b) A series of disparate activities are and will continue to be conducted under the FMS case.
- (c) No Australian industry involvement directly in this activity although work will flow to Australian industry as a result of information gathered in the various activities.
- (d) This is an ongoing activity.
- (e) Release will be governed by the sensitivity and security classification of the information.

(20) Computer systems & software (IPPDE):

- (a) A requirements study and acquisition of prototype system for an Integrated Product and Process Development Environment (IPPDE) is due to begin FY 2012/2013 and conclude in FY 2014/2015.
- (b) This will enable SEA 1000 to track all data and information pertinent to the program.
- (c) This will be an Australian activity.
- (d) No outcomes to report at this stage.
- (e) This will be at the discretion of Ministers.

(21) Submarine Propulsion, Energy, Support & Integration Facility Development Development:

- (a) Undertake preferred option concept design, infrastructure planning and commence implementation. An Request for Tender (RFT) for the initial level of support is being assessed. The project is due to begin FY 2012/2013 and complete in FY 2014/2015.
- (b) This will de-risk the development, integration and future support of the propulsion system for the future submarine.
- (c) Australian industry will have the opportunity to compete for work packages.

- (d) None at this stage. A submission will be made to Government for further analysis of options.
- (e) This will be at the discretion of Ministers.

(22) Engineer Development programs:

- (a) A skilling and development program to up-skill graduate engineers for the program office.
- (b) This will grow the national submarine technical capacity and capabilities.
- (c) Yes.
- (d) None at this stage, the program is still being progressed through Defence.
- (e) This will be at the discretion of Ministers.

(23) Miscellaneous studies:

- (a) Studies of a variety of types covering technical, commercial, infrastructure, training, workforce and other matters not specified elsewhere.
- (b) These studies will be an integral part of the analyses of the proposed solution options and planning for the fundamental inputs to capability.
- (c) Studies will be contracted to Australian industry where they have the necessary skills and capacity if the work is beyond Defence's resources.
- (d) None at this stage.
- (e) This will be at the discretion of Ministers.

(24) Engineer signature analysis study:

- (a) Engineering signature analysis studies by the engineering section as a follow on from associated DSTO studies.
- (b) Signature analysis is core to the development of the stealth capability and operational capability of the Future Submarine.
- (c) Engineering signature analysis studies are currently being undertaken by DSTO. Australian industry will become involved through subsequent design phases of the program.
- (d) DSTO is undertaking a number of research and analysis tasks in sonar and acoustic technologies.
- (e) Signature analysis work and results are classified and will not be released.

(25) Hydrodynamic design studies:

- (a) Hydrodynamic design studies by the engineering section including hydrodynamic modelling of submarine forms.
- (b) Hydrodynamic modelling of potential hull forms and appendages will expand knowledge of the application of propulsion power across a submarine's speed range and understanding of the acoustics of water flow around a submarine.
- (c) Hydrodynamic modelling is currently being undertaken by DSTO facilitated by Australian and overseas research institutions.
- (d) Hydrodynamic modelling is being undertaken and is not yet complete.
- (e) This work and its results are classified and will not be publicly released.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q151: Submarines – Batteries

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

With respect to DSTO-Battery design studies why are we looking at designing submarine batteries when there are a number of extant high quality submarine battery providers?

Response:

The Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO) battery studies are not for the purpose of designing submarine batteries. The DSTO studies will work closely with extant submarine battery providers to understand the performance characteristics of their developmental battery technologies and designs compared to legacy systems, as well as to understand key safety and integration issues, and associated platform and program risks.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q152: Submarines - Submarine Propulsion, Energy, Support & Integration Facility Development

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) With respect to Submarine Propulsion, Energy, Support & Integration Facility Development please provide the specific details, including costs and the purpose of the Submarine Propulsion, Energy, Support and integration Facility development program?
- (b) Is this the LBTS?
- (c) Where will this be located (Perth (SUBFOR), Adelaide (Submarine Build Central) or Melbourne (DSTO Maritime Platform Division)?

Response:

- (a) The propulsion, energy and drive-train system is a key part of any submarine and such a facility will enable this system to be developed, tested and proved before it is installed into the submarine.

Regardless of the submarine design option that is ultimately chosen, such a facility would significantly reduce the risk of delay and cost blowouts, poor availability and increased operating and sustainment costs, loss of capability and most importantly, the risk of a catastrophic accident caused by the power and energy systems.

There are several approaches that could be taken for such a facility and a range of costs as a consequence. The location would depend on the functions the facility was to fulfill. It could be distributed across several locations. Similarly, the cost would vary depending on the functions such a facility was planned to fulfill.

These matters have all yet to be brought before Government for decision, so more definitive answers to the question cannot yet be provided.

- (b) No, the land based test site is for the Collins Class submarines. The Submarine Propulsion, Energy, Support & Integration Facility (SPESIFy) is however sometimes referred to as a land based test site.

- (c) The joint media release of 12 December 2012 (Minister for Defence/Minister for Defence Materiel) announced that the Future Submarine Land Based Test Site would be primarily based in Adelaide.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q153: Submarines - Combat System Spend

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Noting the explanation given by RADM Moffitt at Estimates hearing about the difference between a combat system (effectively a command and control system) and other mission system equipment (sonar, ESM, navigation etc.), why is the combat system spend almost as large as the mission system?

Response:

This question is understood to have arisen from a table showing the SEA 1000 spend spread projection that was provided in answer to Question on Notice 257 from Senator Johnston (see **Annex A**), following the Senate Budget Estimates hearings on 28/29 May 2012. That table itemises for the period 2012/13 and 2013/14 the project office's planned studies and their estimated costs.

The combat system study mentioned in that table is the funded request for information from international submarine combat system vendors. This is under way with a forecast maximum total cost of \$5.0 million. This will finalise the work that is planned to enable a consideration of combat system future direction in conjunction with first pass, announced previously for late 2013 or early 2014.

The mission system studies mentioned in the table, for which \$6.2 million is forecast, will involve:

- (a) capability modelling studies with the US Navy under a Foreign Military Sales case;
- (b) capability drivers study using US companies SPA and General Dynamics Electric Boat; and
- (c) continuing development of the capability document suite.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE - COMMITTEES

Senate Budget Estimates – 28/29 May 2012

Q257 – SEA 1000 Ph 1 and 2

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) For the SEA 1000 – Ph 1 and 2 Project what was the approval process?
- (b) How much is to be spent on this project in 2012/13 and 2013/14?
- (c) Itemise specifically what will be spent on the SEA 1000 Project in 2012/13 and 2013/14?
- (d) Why has Defence delayed making a First Pass Approval for the SEA 1000 project until late 2013, early 2014

Response:

- 1. It was a Government decision.
- 2. \$46.1m in 2012-13 and \$55.4m in 2013-14
- 3. As per table below.

Activity	Spend (\$m) 2012-13	Spend (\$m) 2013-14	Total
Design Studies with DCNS, HDW & Navantia	6.2	0	6.20
Design studies with Kockums for new build Collins	3.0	3.1	6.1
Analysis of options studies	8.0	10.0	18.0
Mission system studies	3.0	3.2	6.2
Support system studies	1.2	1.2	2.4
DSTO-MOTS evaluation studies	0.2	0.0	0.2
DSTO-Systems integration & capability modelling	1.2	1.2	2.4
DSTO-Combat system studies	2.0	3.0	5.0
DSTO-Signatures	0.8	1.8	2.6
DSTO-Power & energy studies	3.4	3.0	6.4

DSTO-Cell aging & performance tests	1.8	0.0	1.8
DSTO-Battery design studies	3.4	1.3	4.7
DSTO-Procure battery test sets	1.0	11.0	11.0
DSTO-Advanced material propeller	1.1	1.4	2.5
DSTO-Platform	3.8	3.6	7.4
DSTO-Secure facilities	0.2	1.7	1.9
DSTO-S&T planning support	0.5	0.5	1.0
Project Offices Costs	1.3	1.7	
US Program Management Support (FMS)	1.0	1.0	2.0
Computer systems & software (IPPDE)	0.5	2.1	2.6
Submarine Propulsion, Energy, Support & Integration Facility Development	2.1	3.2	5.3
Engineer development programs	0.5	0.5	1.0
Miscellaneous studies	0.2	0.2	0.4
Engineer signature analysis study	0.2	0.2	0.4
Hydrodynamic design studies	0.5	0.5	1.0
SEA 1000 Phase 1A – TOTAL	46.1	55.4	101.5

- (d) The amount of work that needs to be done to inform a First Pass decision by Government cannot be done in any shorter time.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q154: Submarines - Made in Australia

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

It was said at a previous Estimates hearing regarding our technical capability of designing and building a submarine:

Rear Adm. Moffitt: *In part I would accept that. What you are touching on is absolutely right. If we were to decide to design a submarine in Australia using the skills and resources we have in Australia today, the risk would be extreme. No-one is saying that we should do that. In fact, the RAND study quite clearly suggests that if we are going to do this in a timely manner then we are going to need a great deal of assistance from overseas. I do not think there is any doubt about that. We do not have the resources and no-one has suggested that we do this entirely within our existing national resources. It is not something that makes a lot of sense to do in terms of design.*

- (a) If this is the case why are we proposing to look closely at designing and building a submarine in Australia?
- (b) How much are we spending on options that involve major design work in Australia and why?

Response:

- (a) On 3 May 2012, the Prime Minister and Minister for Defence announced that the Government will consider four platform options for the future submarine:
 - (i) An existing submarine design available off-the-shelf, modified only to meet Australia's regulatory requirements;
 - (ii) An existing off-the-shelf design modified to incorporate Australia's specific requirements, including in relation to combat systems and weapons;
 - (iii) An evolved design that enhances the capabilities of existing off-the-shelf designs, including the Collins Class; and
 - (iv) An entirely new developmental submarine.

Defence will research each of these options in order to provide Government with the necessary information on which to base a decision. An integrated project team is being established in Adelaide, incorporating Defence and Industry personnel to carry out concept work on the fourth option. This work has been assessed independently as being within Australia's capacity and capabilities. Doing this work does not suggest that Australia would take total responsibility for designing a submarine. What this is intended to do is examine the cost, risk and schedule implications associated with pursuing a new design option, a task assessed to be within Australia's capacity and capability.

This work is being done in this way to develop Australia's capabilities and knowledge, which will be important for ensuring that the Commonwealth is best prepared to be an

informed customer. The alternatives available for exploring the new design option set would have required work being done by overseas designers, who would be most keen to advance their own interests with no development of Australia's capabilities and capacity being likely as a result.

(b) The program office has budgeted the following to the Option 4 exploratory work:

2012 – 13	2013 – 14	2014 – 15	Total
\$7.956 million	\$9.953 million	\$12.105 million	\$30.014 million

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q155: Submarines - IPT

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Can you explain the following that has been taken directly from the Exposure Draft of the Integrated Project Team (IPT) tender documentation: *All Foreground IP developed during the concept design activities will be owned by the Commonwealth. Participants must not introduce Background IP or Third Party IP for use within the IPT without the Commonwealth's approval in accordance with the RA and the Policies.*
- (b) What motivation would a commercial entity have to send their best engineers to the IPT when it would be at a huge opportunity cost to that commercial entity?

Response:

- (a) The objective with the integrated project team is that all participants bring only their skills and know-how to the activity, not company owned intellectual property. All intellectual property developed by the integrated project team during the activity will be owned by the Commonwealth.
- (b) Companies keen to win a longer term role in the future submarines program are likely to see the integrated project team as an opportunity to build their knowledge and experience while also being suitably recompensed for their contribution.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q156: Submarines

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) At October Estimates hearings Admiral Griggs advised the committee that the Collins Combat System “*is entirely capable of successfully operating in a high contact density environment*”. Noting last year’s US Navy Director Operational Test and Evaluation report on the AN/BYG specifically contradicts this claim, please provide the committee with an explanation on why the Australian submarine system has no difficulties and the US system does.
- (b) Is the Royal Australian Navy happy with the performance of automatic Target Motion Analysis on Collins Class submarines?

Response:

- (a) There is no difference in the assessment of AN/BYG-1 between submarine operators in the United States Navy and Royal Australian Navy. The US Navy Director Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) report is based on limited testing of AN/BYG 1 Advance Processor Build releases, often constrained by the significant difficulties in meaningfully simulating operational conditions during test and evaluation. Such deficiencies are mitigated by the regimen of testing at several stages throughout the AN/BYG-1 development process.

The combined results of this testing and that conducted by DOT&E are used to determine when each AN/BYG-1 APB is ready to be fielded in operational submarines. Importantly, both the United States Navy and Royal Australian Navy have significant real-world data that show each new generation of AN/BYG-1 has substantially improved the ability of submarine crews to maintain situational awareness on operations in high contact densities and other scenarios. This does not diminish the value of DOT&E tests in supporting the ‘build-test-build’ approach adopted in the development of AN/BYG-1, which continues to rapidly deliver new and improved capabilities. Notably though, both the United States Navy Submarine Force and the Royal Australian Navy Submarine Force recognise that post-mission analysis is far more representative of actual system performance than any individual test event, and underpins the statement made by the Chief of Navy during the Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing on 17 October 2012.

- (b) The Royal Australian Navy is happy with the range of target motion analysis tools in Collins class submarines, of which automatic target motion analysis is one. Good submarine practice avoids dependence on any one single tool to maintain an accurate tactical picture, particularly when reliant on passive sensors such as sonar for the detection and tracking of contacts.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q157: Submarines - Trade Agreement with US

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Air Vice-Marshal Deeble stated that the Trade Agreement Acts necessary for Australian companies to participate in the Acquisition Program Baseline program was stalled by concerns from the US State Department. Please provide a chronology of:

- (a) When the renegotiation activity was initiated by Defence.
- (b) When the State Department responded with their concerns (Please provide a copy of the correspondence that articulates their concerns).
- (c) When the agreement expired.
- (d) Actions agreed to address the State Departments concerns.

Response:

The term "Trade Agreement Acts" referred to in the question is taken to mean Technical Assistance Agreements (TAA); and the term "Acquisition Program Baseline" referred to in the question is taken to mean Advanced Processor Build (APB).

- (a) The AN/BYG-1 Joint Project Office in Washington DC, contacted Johns Hopkins University on 7 October 2011 to initiate negotiations for renewal of Technical Assistance Agreement (TAA) 2124-06. Normally, this lead-time would be sufficient for a standard amendment to an existing TAA. On this occasion however, additional processing was deemed necessary by the United States Government because Australia sought to expand the scope of the TAA and include additional Australian industry participants.
- (b) On 14 December 2011, Johns Hopkins University informed Defence via staff-level emails that the revised agreement was still being drafted and could not be finalised until additional approvals had been obtained from within the United States Government. During subsequent meetings, Defence was advised that the main reason for delay in renewing the TAA related to United States Government concerns regarding the release of technical data to Australian dual nationals. All communication from the United States Government relating to reasons for delays in the renewal has been via teleconferences and staff email, there is no formal correspondence that can be provided to the Committee at this stage.

- (c) The Johns Hopkins University Technical Assistance Agreement expired on 31 December 2011.
- (d) Subsequent negotiations with Johns Hopkins University and the United States Navy have resulted in an agreed way ahead. This outcome addresses United States Government concerns regarding dual national access and enables Australian industry involvement in the Advanced Processor Build Program. The new agreement is being circulated for signature amongst industry participants.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q158: Submarines - Perisher Qualified Officers

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

What are the current total number of perisher qualified officers eligible for command (i.e. Commander and below) and how many in each year since the Moffitt review into submarine workforce sustainment?

Response:

As at 26 October 2012 the current total number of Perisher-qualified officers eligible for command (Commander and below) is 14.

The number of Perisher-qualified officers in each year eligible for command since the Moffitt review into submarine workforce sustainment is:

- (a) 2012 - 14 (As at 26 October 2012)
- (b) 2011 - 16
- (c) 2010 - 16
- (d) 2009 - 17

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q159 Submarines - ISSC

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

At QON 209 of May 2012 estimates Defence confirmed that its In Service Support Contract (ISSC) includes a clause which specifically requires the contractor, on request, to disclose the names of subcontractors and to ensure that the sub-contractors acknowledge and agree that the Commonwealth may be required to publicly disclose the sub-contractors' participant in the performance of its ISSC.

- (a) Please provide a list of its sub-contracted consultants over the period of the contract for provision to the committee.
- (b) If such a clause existed in the Through Life Service Agreement, please provide a list of its sub-contracted consultants over the period of the contract for provision to the committee.

Response:

- (a) Subcontractors under the In Service Support Contract (ISSC) are categorised under three different classifications. The classification is dependant upon the nature of the work performed by the subcontractor and the circumstances under which they are engaged. The classification does not distinguish between subcontractors engaged for the purpose of providing consultancy services as distinct from other types of services.

Although the Commonwealth has the right to request a list of subcontractors from the contractor pursuant to rule 7.19 of the Commonwealth Procurement Rules, this right does not extend to compelling the contractor to identify which subcontractors are engaged for the purpose of providing consultancy services.

The three categories of subcontractor are: subcontractors; approved Subcontractors; and mandated subcontractors.

- i. There are presently no mandated subcontractors engaged under the ISSC;
- ii. A list of approved subcontractors under the ISSC is included at Enclosure 1;
- iii. The Commonwealth has requested a list of subcontractors from the contractor in accordance with the terms of the ISSC, which will be forwarded as a supplement to this response when provided. The Commonwealth has requested that ASC identify which subcontractors are 'consultants' under the ISSC.

- (b) The strategic agreement for through life support was terminated by mutual consent in June 2012. Although the agreement contained a provision that required the contractor to provide a list of subcontractors upon request, the provision became inoperative upon termination. The Commonwealth therefore has no right to request a list of subcontractors from the contractor.



Australian Government

Department of Defence
Defence Materiel Organisation

Collins Class Submarine In Service Support Contract

Attachment M: Approved Subcontracts

Commonwealth of Australia
Represented by the Department of Defence
ABN 68 706 814 312

ASC Pty Ltd
ABN 64 008 605 034

Approved Subcontract No	Subcontractor	Title	Date
TLS 30163	Veem Engineering Group Pty Ltd ABN 51 008 944 009	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	7/06/2004
TLS 30177	Process Pumps (Australia) Pty Ltd ABN 72 005 626 764	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	4 March 2004
TLS 30187	Wartsila Australia Pty Ltd ABN 38 003 736 892	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	23 March 2004
TLS-30185	Transfield Services (Australia) Pty Ltd ABN 11 093 114 553	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	14 April-2004
TLS 30190	Amertec Pty Ltd (was APV Australia Pty Limited) ABN 89 895 583 664	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	3 June 2005
TLS 30158	Saab Systems Pty Limited ABN 88 008 643 212	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	29 April 2004
TLS 30244	RPC Technologies Pty Ltd ABN 29 100 903 124	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	15 July 2005
TLS-30150	Delta Hydraulics Pty Ltd ABN 14 009 567 186	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	31 May 2004
TLS 30160	Strachan & Henshaw Australia Pty Ltd ABN 32 050 019 817	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	5 October 2006
TLS-30168	Woronora Engineering Pty Ltd ABN 25 002 797 239 t/a Garlock Pty Limited	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	7 April 2004
TLS-30149	Calzoni S.r.L.	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	11 November 2004
TLS-30152	Intra Pty Lts t/a GTSA Engineering ABN 12 052 506 886	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	6 December 2004
TLS 30169	Furmanite Australia Pty Limited ABN 58 078 420 112	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	29 March 2001
TLS-30153	HI Fraser Pty Ltd ABN 67 003 343 271	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	23 March 2005
TLS 30204	Ryco Haudraulics Pty Ltd ABN 96 085 527 724	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	29 April 2004
TLS 30208	Hill Equipment & Refrigeration Co. Pty Ltd ABN 67 007 819 801	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	4 May 2004
TLS-30148	Wenross Pty Pdy t/a Buchanan Advanced Composites ABN 62 380 952 046	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	20 January 2006

Approved Subcontract No	Subcontractor	Title	Date
TLS 30159	Schneider Electric (Australia) Pty Limited ABN 42 004 969 304	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	23 May 2008
TLS 30174	Measurement Resources ABN 62 003 247 738	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	26 March 2004
TLS 30164	Wormald ABN 80 008 399 004	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	18 January 2005
TLS 30151	Euroatlas GmbH	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	28 June 2004
TLS 30255	Entech Electronic Manufacturing Pty Ltd ABN 69 078 973 547	Umbrella Agreement for Through – Life Support of Collins Class Submarines	23 October 2008
	Electric Boat Australia LLC ARBN 104 385 702	EB Agreement	October 2002 as extended as of 1 July 2008 and 4 September 2009 and on or around ED

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q160: Submarines - Attrition Rates

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Please provide the committee with self-attrition rates from the submarine training program over the past three years, namely:

- (a) Numbers of personnel who entered the submarine training but left voluntarily before they received their submarine qualification.
- (b) Numbers of personnel who left voluntarily within two years of receiving their submarine qualification.
- (c) Total numbers of submariners qualified personnel who have left the submarine force to other navy postings or to civilian life.

Response:

- (a) Financial Year 09/10 – 16
Financial Year 10/11 – 17
Financial Year 11/12 – 17
Financial Year 12/13 – 4 (to 26 October 2012)
- (b) Financial Year 09/10 – nil
Financial Year 10/11 – 3
Financial Year 11/12 – 4
Financial Year 12/13 – nil (to 26 October 2012)
- (c) Financial Year 09/10 – 37
Financial Year 10/11 – 35
Financial Year 11/12 – 57
Financial Year 12/13 – 18 (to 26 October 2012)

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q161: Submarines - Fourth submarine crew

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Please provide an update with respect to the fourth submarine crew.

Response:

Fifty-five of 60 crew members of the fourth submarine crew have joined HMAS *Waller*. Four of the final five crew members will join by 14 December 2012, with the last - a junior officer who is not essential to enable the submarine to proceed to sea - intended to join in 2013.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q162: Submarines - LBTS

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Further to my Question 229 from May Estimates about proceeding with a Propulsion Land Based Test site you suggested that:

- *The facility would be relevant for all options*
- *The facility must be decided on early to support work around propulsion systems component selection and integration*

- (a) How do you select the right Land Based Test Site (LBTS) if you don't know which submarine option we will be pursuing?
- (b) An LBTS can be found on Vice Admiral Deeble's July presentation to industry. Noting Vice Admiral Deeble is responsible for Collins, not future submarines, is this a different LBTS?

Response:

- (a) The proposed land based test facility to be established as a result of the report on Submarine Propulsion Energy Support and Integration Facility (SPESIFy) would support the systems testing relevant to any option chosen for the future submarines, with different purposes in each case for a new or evolved submarine design. The facility needs to be decided upon early to support work on propulsion system component selection, integration and construction, as well as in-service operational support. For an off-the-shelf design a similar facility would be required, but later, to support only pre-installation testing during construction and for in-service operational support. The joint media release of 12 December 2012 (Minister for Defence/Minister for Defence Materiel) Future Submarine Land Bases Test Site to be based in Adelaide refers.
- (b) Yes. The facility mentioned by Air Vice Marshall Deeble is specifically for the Collins Class.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q163: Submarines – Bridging between Type 214 and 216

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

In the report on the Australian Parliamentary Delegation to the UK, Spain, Germany and the United States in April and May this year, the delegation noted they had discussed “*The potential for bridging between Type 214 and Type 216*”. Has the SEA 1000 team considered this, and if so, what were its findings?

Response:

Yes, although the proposal has not been examined extensively.

The Type 214 is being examined in detail as part of the exploration of the Option 1 – Military off the Shelf (MOTS) option set. The Type 216 is a new design that has never been built. It has yet to be studied in detail by the Project Office which is nonetheless in possession of the details of the design. The potential to bridge between the two will be considered.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q164: Submarines - Brisbane Transit Times

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

QON 221 Defence advised that transit time from the proposed future submarine base in Brisbane (Force Posture Review recommendation) to a suitable diving area is 7.5 hours. Isn't this transit duration a serious impediment to the development of a submarine base at Brisbane?

Response:

While transit duration to a suitable diving area is one consideration in the selection of an appropriate submarine base, there are a range of important factors such as local geographic and environmental conditions, the proximity and concentration of infrastructure and population, and access to other military assets for training that weigh heavily in the selection of a suitable base.

Among others, such factors have direct bearing on our capacity to train and operate, access dependable industry support, and sustain our workforce. There are several examples of major submarine operating bases worldwide where the surface transit time is of a similar duration to the Port of Brisbane. In the case of Brisbane, the 7.5 hour surface transit is one consideration, but does not present a serious impediment to potential use of this port as a future submarine base.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q165: Submarines - Darwin Transit Times

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

In QON 220 you advised that the US Company SPA, examining sovereign bases and how they might impact on range and “patrol presence”, had been directed to use Darwin as a base.

- (a) Why have we limited ourselves to Darwin?
- (b) What is the Transit time from the Darwin to a suitable diving area?
- (c) What are the impediments of using Exmouth, Cocos Keeling Island and Port Hedland as possible submarine bases?

Response:

- (a) Darwin was used as an example for the purposes of the study only to contain to a manageable level the options being analysed.
- (b) Approximately one day.
- (c) The shortcomings of these ports all relate to the absence of existing infrastructure and facilities as well as natural constraints such as shelter from extreme weather, shallow water and confined channels.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q166: Submarines - Combat System Selection

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) In the answer to QON 232 Defence states *The combat system will be a significant design driver for the submarine platform in terms of space, weight and power requirements.* The defence committee in its procurement report suggests that it is unwise to select the combat system before you select the submarine. To do so will potentially limit government options with respect to the submarine selection. With regard to the Ministers acceptance of the recommendation of the procurement committee, do you agree with this and if not why not? Please confirm that SEA 1000 will not lock in a combat system before the selection of the submarine?
- (b) In QON 231 you stated: *There are proven submarine combat systems in service today that are available from several international vendors.* If this is the case why is there a need to consider an Australian specific requirement in relation to combat systems and weapons in your option two – *“an existing off-the-shelf design modified to incorporate Australia’s specific requirements, including in relation to combat systems and weapons”*?
- (c) In the report on the Australian Parliamentary Delegation to the UK, Spain, Germany and the United States in April and May this year, the delegation was advised “The combat system [on the S-80] is being supplied by Lockheed Martin after a competitive process. Navantia described the combat system as attempting to achieve Virginia Class performance in a small platform. Is the SEA 1000 team examining this system as part of the combat and mission system studies? If not, why not?”

Response:

- (a) The combat system selection decision will be subject to the normal first and second pass processes, as announced by the Government in its response to the final report of the review of procurement procedures for defence capital projects tabled by the References Committee of the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade.
- (b) Australia is co-owner and co-developer with the United States of the AN/BYG-1 submarine combat data management system and Mk 48 CBASS heavyweight torpedo that equip the Collins Class submarines. Significant investment has been made by the Commonwealth in both and they are meeting Australia’s requirements. It makes sense for Government to know if the submarine designs that are available off-the-shelf could be fitted with those systems because doing so would greatly simplify transition from the Collins Class to a future class of submarines by avoiding the cost, risk and schedule

impact related to changing existing training, support and logistics systems from that combat system and weapon to new ones.

(c) Yes.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q167: RAN Vessels deployed to support Operation Resolute.

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Which Royal Australian Navy (RAN) vessels, by name, have been deployed in support of Operation Resolute in (a) 2008 (b) 2009 (c) 2010 (d) 2011 (e) 2012?
- (b) For each RAN vessel listed in (part a), how many (i) days and (ii) hours in each of (a) 2008 (b) 2009 (c) 2010 (d) 2011 (e) 2012, was that vessel used in support of Operation Resolute?
- (c) For each RAN vessel listed in (part a), what was the total distance that each vessel travelled while supporting Operation Resolute during (a) 2008 (b) 2009 (c) 2010 (d) 2011 (e) 2012?
- (d) For each RAN vessel listed in (part a), how many times was that vessel used to transport irregular maritime arrivals?
- (e) For each RAN vessel listed in (part a), how many (i) days and (ii) hours was that vessel used to transport irregular maritime arrivals?
- (f) For each RAN vessel listed in (part a), what was the total distance that each vessel travelled while transporting irregular maritime arrivals?
- (g) For each RAN vessel listed in (part a), how many times was that vessel used to intercept a vessel that has since been shown to be transporting irregular maritime arrivals?
- (h) For each RAN vessel listed in (part a), how many (i) days and (ii) hours was that vessel used to intercept a vessel that has since been shown to be transporting irregular maritime arrivals?
- (i) For each RAN vessel listed in (part a), what was the total distance that each vessel travelled while intercepting a vessel that has since been shown to be transporting irregular maritime arrivals?

Response:

- (a) Enclosure 1 provides details of RAN ships (by class) that have deployed on Operation RESOLUTE since January 2008 to present.
- (b)
 - (i) Enclosure 1 also provides days that each ship was used in support of Operation RESOLUTE.

- (ii) An exact calculation of hours is not possible without the expenditure of significant resources and effort by all ships to reconstruct signal logs. As assets remain force assigned throughout, and in the majority of cases join and leave Operation RESOLUTE at the commencement of the day, a reasonable approximation of total RESOLUTE hours equates to the number of days multiplied by 24.
- (c) Due to the breadth and complexity of the question, an unreasonable amount of departmental resources would be required to develop a response.
- (d) Enclosure 2 lists the number of interceptions conducted by each ship (September 2010 to present). Data further back will require reconstruction from ships logs and reports, with significant resources and effort required to develop a response.
- (e) (i) & (ii)
Enclosure 2 lists numbers of days each ship has carried Potential Irregular Immigrants (PIIs) (long and short haul) back to September 2010. As indicated in response to (b) (ii) due to the normal force assignment process hours can be estimated approximately by multiplying by 24.
- (f) Enclosure 2 provides distances ships travelled when conducting long and short haul operations (i.e. with PIIs embarked). Readily available data has only been accumulated since September 2010. Due to the breadth and complexity of reconstructing distance data, an unreasonable amount of departmental resources would be required to develop a response.
- (g) Due to the breadth and complexity of the question, an unreasonable amount of departmental resources would be required to develop a response.
- (h) and (i)
Establishing days, hours and distance travelled to conduct interceptions will require detailed reconstruction from archived logs, signals and reports; with commensurate effort and resources from all ships involved.

Enclosures:

1. MS Excel Spreadsheet - RESOLUTE Dates since January 2008
2. MS Excel Spreadsheet – Intercepts and LSH Data

Enclosure 1 - RESOLUTE Days from Jan 08 1.XLS

FFH (Anzac Class Frigates)		
Unit	Year	Days
PERTH	2008	33
TOOWOOMBA	2008	46

FFG (Adelaide Class Frigates)		
Unit	Year	No. of Days
DARWIN	2012	20

AAS			
Unit	Year	Days	Totals
SUCCESS	2008	14	19
	2009	5	
BETANO	2008	7	17
	2011	10	
TARAKAN	2008	18	18
MANOORA	2008	35	48
	2009	13	

MHP			
Unit	Year	No. of Days	Totals
MELVILLE	2008	58	267
	2009	0	
	2010	0	
	2011	105	
	2012	79	
LEEUVIN	2008	0	235
	2009	4	
	2010	0	
	2011	54	
	2012	171	

MHC		
Unit	Year	Days
HAWKESBURY	2008	117
HUON	2008	131

ACPBs			
Unit	Year	Days	Totals

Enclosure 1 - RESOLUTE Days from Jan 08 1.XLS

Unit	Year	Days	Totals
ALBANY	2008	171	
	2009	206	
	2010	183	
	2011	248	
	2012	143	
			951
ARARAT	2008	189	
	2009	186	
	2010	164	
	2011	120	
	2012	155	
			814
ARMIDALE	2008	96	
	2009	235	
	2010	175	
	2011	117	
	2012	96	
			719
BATHURST	2008	245	
	2009	169	
	2010	126	
	2011	205	
	2012	170	
			915
BROOME	2008	211	
	2009	260	
	2010	198	
	2011	139	
	2012	161	
			969
BUNDABERG	2008	176	
	2009	134	
	2010	107	
	2011	168	
	2012	134	
			719
CHILDERS	2008	178	
	2009	186	
	2010	114	
	2011	197	
	2012	136	
			811
GLENELG	2008	177	
	2009	218	
	2010	176	
	2011	132	
	2012	211	
			914
LARRAKIA	2008	152	
	2009	202	
	2010	129	
	2011	193	
	2012	172	
			848

Enclosure 1 - RESOLUTE Days from Jan 08 1.XLS

LAUNCESTON	2008	113	
	2009	138	
	2010	182	
	2011	243	
	2012	140	
			816
MAITLAND	2008	160	
	2009	196	
	2010	240	
	2011	158	
	2012	180	
			934
MARYBOROUGH	2008	151	
	2009	148	
	2010	232	
	2011	152	
	2012	146	
			829
PIRIE	2008	122	
	2009	164	
	2010	168	
	2011	193	
	2012	139	
			786
WOLLONGONG	2008	178	
	2009	166	
	2010	261	
	2011	129	
	2012	166	
			900

HMA SHIPS	INTERCEPTION S	HAUL	TIME (DAYS)	DISTANCE (NM)	Caveats
2012					This data has been supplied with the following caveats. 1. This is ADF information only 2. The information for 2010 is Sep-Dec only. 3. OP RESOLUTE SURGE commenced 07 MAY 2011 4. OP RESOLUTE SURGE ceased 21 NOV 2011
ALBANY	14	0			
ARARAT	14	1		427	
ARMIDALE	1	0			
BATHURST	3	0			
BROOME	6	0			
BUNDABERG	9	0			
CHILDERS	12	0			
GLENELG	12	0			
LARRAKIA	7	0			
LAUNCESTON	5	0			
MAITLAND	11	0			
MARYBOROUGH	9	0			
PIRIE	2	0			
WOLLONGONG	16	0			
LEEUWIN	7	3	10.5	3090	
DARWIN	1	2	3	854	
MELVILLE	4	3	10.5	3090	

Key: Darwin Based ships name
 Cairns Based ships name
 Long Haul ships name

HMA SHIPS	INTERCEPTION S	HAUL	TIME (DAYS)	DISTANCE
2011				
ALBANY	8	0		
ARARAT	8	0		
ARMIDALE	3	0		
BATHURST	5	1	3.5	1030
BROOME	3	0		
BUNDABERG	2	0		
CHILDERS	0	0		
GLENELG	4	0		
LARRAKIA	5	0		
LAUNCESTON	4	1	3.5	1030
MAITLAND	5	1	3.5	1030
MARYBOROUGH	4	1	3.5	1030
PIRIE	8	0		
WOLLONGONG	0	0		
LEEUWIN	0	3		
MELVILLE	0	7		

HMA SHIPS	INTERCEPTION S	HAUL	TIME (DAYS)	DISTANCE
2010				
ALBANY	0	0		
ARARAT	2	0		
ARMIDALE	3	1	3.5	1030
BATHURST	0	0		
BROOME	0	1	3.5	1030
BUNDABERG	3	4	14	4120
CHILDERS	0	0		
GLENELG	4	1	3.5	1030
LARRAKIA	2	2	7	2060
LAUNCESTON	0	0		
MAITLAND	4	2	7	2060
MARYBOROUGH	2	3	10.5	3090
PIRIE	5	5	17.5	5150
WOLLONGONG	2	1	3.5	1030
LEEUWIN	0	0		
MELVILLE	0	0		

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q168: RAAF platforms deployed to support Operation RESOLUTE

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Which Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) platforms, by name, have been deployed in support of Operation Resolute in:
 - a. 2008;
 - b. 2009;
 - c. 2010;
 - d. 2011; and
 - e. 2012?

- (b) For each RAAF platform listed at part (a) how many:
 - a. days; and
 - b. hours in each of:
 - a. 2008;
 - b. 2009;
 - c. 2010;
 - d. 2011; and
 - e. 2012?

- (c) For each RAAF platform listed at part (a) what was the total distance that each platform travelled while supporting Operation Resolute during:
 - a. 2008;
 - b. 2009;
 - c. 2010;
 - d. 2011; and
 - e. 2012?

- (d) For each RAAF platform listed at part (a) how many times was that platform used to transport irregular maritime arrivals?

- (e) For each RAAF platform listed in part (a), how many (i) days; and (ii) hours, was that platform used to transport irregular maritime arrivals?

- (f) For each RAAF platform listed in part (a) what was the total distance that each platform travelled while transporting irregular maritime arrivals?

Response:

- (a) The following Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) platforms that have been deployed in support of Operation RESOLUTE:
- a. 2008: AP-3C Orion (three), C-17A, C-130H and C-130J.
 - b. 2009: AP-3C Orion (three), C-17A, C-130H and C-130J.
 - c. 2010: AP-3C Orion (three).
 - d. 2011: AP-3C Orion (three), C-17A, C-130H, C-130J and King Air 350.
 - e. 2012: AP-3C Orion (three), C-17A, C-130H, C-130J and King Air 350.

(b)

The total number of days that each of the platforms listed in part (a) above have been deployed in support of Operation RESOLUTE:

AP-3C Orion:

- (a) 2008: 261 Mission Days.
- (b) 2009: 441 Mission Days.
- (c) 2010: 306 Mission Days.
- (d) 2011: 371 Mission Days.
- (e) 2012: 298 Mission Days.

C-17A:

- (a) 2008: Eight Mission Days.
- (b) 2009: Five Mission Days.
- (c) 2010: Nil.
- (d) 2011: Two Mission Days.
- (e) 2012: 52 Mission Days.

C-130H:

- (a) 2008: Eight Mission Days.
- (b) 2009: Four Mission Days.
- (c) 2010: Nil.
- (d) 2011: 11 Mission Days.
- (e) 2012: 36 Mission Days.

C-130J:

- (a) 2008. Nine Mission Days.
- (b) 2009. 10 Mission Days.
- (c) 2010. Nil.
- (d) 2011. 19 Mission Days.
- (e) 2012. 123 Mission Days.

King Air 350:

- (a) 2008. Nil.
- (b) 2009. Nil.
- (c) 2010. Nil.

- (d) 2011. Three Mission Days.
- (e) 2012. Six Mission Days.

The total number of hours for each platform as listed in part (a) above:

AP-3C Orion:

- (a) 2008. 1,915.5 hours.
- (b) 2009. 3,269.9 hours.
- (c) 2010. 1,740.7 hours.
- (d) 2011. 2,405.8 hours.
- (e) 2012. 2,100.9 hours.

C-17A:

- (a) 2008. 61.9 hours.
- (b) 2009. 36.4 hours.
- (c) 2010. Nil.
- (d) 2011. 13.7 hours.
- (e) 2012. 418.4 hours.

C-130H:

- (a) 2008. 39.0 hours.
- (b) 2009. 25.8 hours.
- (c) 2010. Nil.
- (d) 2011. 114.3 hours.
- (e) 2012. 229.1 hours.

C-130J:

- (a) 2008. 50.8 hours.
- (b) 2009. 52.4 hours.
- (c) 2010. Nil.
- (d) 2011. 92.6 hours.
- (e) 2012. 607.3 hours.

King Air 350:

- (a) 2008. Nil.
- (b) 2009. Nil.
- (c) 2010. Nil.
- (d) 2011. 6.0 hours.
- (e) 2012. 18.7 hours.

(e)

The total distance travelled by each platform as listed in part (a) above:

AP-3C Orion:

- (a) 2008. 527,000 nautical miles (nm).
- (b) 2009. 899,000 nm.
- (c) 2010. 479,000 nm.
- (d) 2011. 662,000 nm.
- (e) 2012. 578,000 nm.

C-17A:

- (a) 2008. 27,855 nm,
- (b) 2009. 16,380 nm.
- (c) 2010. Nil.
- (d) 2011. 6,165 nm.
- (e) 2012. 188,280 nm.

C-130H:

- (a) 2008. 11,700 nm.
- (b) 2009. 7,740 nm.
- (c) 2010. Nil.
- (d) 2011. 34,290 nm.
- (e) 2012. 68,730 nm.

C-130J:

- (a) 2008. 16,256 nm.
- (b) 2009. 16,768 nm.
- (c) 2010. Nil.
- (d) 2011. 29,632 nm.
- (e) 2012. 194,336 nm.

King Air 350:

- (a) 2008. Nil.
- (b) 2009. Nil.
- (c) 2010. Nil.
- (d) 2011. 5,655nm.
- (e) 2012. 5,423nm.

(d) The number of times the platform as listed in part (a) above was used to transport irregular maritime arrivals.

- (a) AP-3C – Nil.
- (b) C-17A – Nil.
- (c) C-130H – Nil.
- (d) C-130J – Nil.
- (e) King Air 350 – Nil.

(e)

The number of days the platform as listed in part (a) above was used to transport irregular maritime arrivals.

- (a) AP-3C – Nil.
- (b) C-17A – Nil.
- (c) C-130H – Nil.
- (d) C-130J – Nil.
- (e) King Air 350 – Nil.

The number of hours the platform as listed in part (a) above was used to transport irregular maritime arrivals.

- (a) AP-3C – Nil.
- (b) C-17A – Nil.
- (c) C-130H – Nil.
- (d) C-130J – Nil.
- (e) King Air 350 – Nil.

(f)

The total distance travelled by each platform as listed in part (a) above used to transport irregular maritime arrivals:

- (a) AP-3C – Nil.
- (b) C-17A – Nil.
- (c) C-130H – Nil.
- (d) C-130J – Nil.
- (e) King Air 350 – Nil.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q169: Satellite Imaging Projects as part of Operation Resolute

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

Has the government purchased any commercial (non-defence) satellite imaging products as part of Operation Resolute, if so, what is the total value?

Response:

The Defence Imagery and Geospatial Organisation has not purchased any commercial satellite imagery as part of Operation RESOLUTE.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q170: ADF Personnel deployed to Nauru

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) How many (i) RAN, (ii) Army and (iii) RAAF personnel have been deployed to Nauru in total?
- (b) How many (i) RAN, (ii) Army and (iii) RAAF personnel are currently deployed to Nauru?
- (c) How many (i) RAN, and (ii) RAAF personnel have been deployed to support Operation Resolute for (1) 2008 (2) 2009 (3) 2010 (4) 2011 (5) 2012?
- (d) Have any (i) RAN or (ii) RAAF platforms or personnel been taken away from their usual duties to assist in Operation Resolute, if so, which platforms and for how many (1) days and (2) hours?

Response:

- (a) A total of 189 ADF personnel deployed to Nauru in 2012 as follows:
 - (i) Royal Australian Navy (RAN) – 1 person;
 - (ii) Army – 173 persons; and
 - (iii) Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) – 15 persons

The information includes Australian Defence Force (ADF) members deployed as part of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) led joint reconnaissance team, public affairs personnel, air loading personnel and personnel to construct temporary immigration processing facilities. It does not include aircrew flying into Nauru delivering supplies or recovering equipment/personnel during redeployment. At the peak, 166 personnel were deployed to Nauru concurrently.

- (b)
 - (i -iii) There are currently no ADF personnel deployed to Nauru. The last ADF personnel returned to Australia from Nauru on 30 October 2012.
- (c) There have been a total of 8940 deployments of personnel from the RAN and RAAF to Operation RESOLUTE since 2008. It should be noted that the numbers may represent multiple deployments for the same individual.

(i)	RAN – 5148		
	(1)	2008	943
	(2)	2009	788
	(3)	2010	795
	(4)	2011	1119
	(5)	2012	1503

(ii)	RAAF – 3792		
	(1)	2008	495
	(2)	2009	774
	(3)	2010	867
	(4)	2011	850
	(5)	2012	806

(d)

(i& ii) Operation RESOLUTE is the ADF's contribution to the Whole-of-Government approach to protecting Australia's offshore maritime interests and as part of a government directed operation, allocation of assets in support of the operation is considered normal ADF activity.

Operation RESOLUTE commenced on 17 July 2006 to consolidate previous ADF operations Relex II, Cranberry, Celeste and Mistral.

The ADF routinely assigns a number of platforms and personnel to Operation RESOLUTE for Australian border protection duties including three AP-3C Maritime Patrol aircraft, six Armidale Class Patrol boats, one Major Fleet Unit on standby for long-haul tasks, and approximately 550 ADF personnel. These personnel fill a range of duties including staff positions in the Australian Border Protection and Customs Service, Navy personnel on HMA Ships, RAAF flight crews and maintainers, Army personnel conducting land patrols, ship-borne medics and linguists, and the Transit Security Elements.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q171: Irregular Maritime Arrivals

Senator Johnston provided in writing.

- (a) Does (i) Defence or (ii) Customs pay for life jackets and associated equipment for illegal maritime arrivals, if so, what was the cost of this equipment for (1) 2008, (2) 2009, (3) 2010, (4) 2011 and (5) 2012?
- (b) Does (i) Defence or (ii) Customs pay for water and food for illegal maritime arrivals when aboard Defence or Customs vessels, if so, what was the cost of this food and water for (1) 2008, (2) 2009, (3) 2010, (4) 2011 and (5) 2012?
- (c) Does (i) Defence or (ii) Customs pay for medical supplies for illegal maritime arrivals when aboard Defence or Customs vessels, if so, what was the cost of these medical supplies for (1) 2008, (2) 2009, (3) 2010, (4) 2011 and (5) 2012?

Response:

This response to Senator Johnston's question is in respect of Defence costs only.

When supplied from a Defence asset, Defence pays for life jackets and associated equipment, food and water and medical supplies, but does not track the cost of providing support to irregular maritime arrivals in the way Senator Johnston's question is posed.

- (a) Each Armidale Class Patrol Boat assigned to Operation RESOLUTE duty deploys with a number of life jackets designated for irregular maritime arrival use, one humanitarian assistance pack and one potential irregular immigrant medical kit to augment their own vessel's resources. A humanitarian assistance pack includes items such as portable showers, baby food, nappies, blankets, additional water, sunscreen, and a small number of life jackets. Costs for the designated irregular maritime arrival life jacket use are estimated as follows:
 - (1) 2008: \$11,300
 - (2) 2009: \$13,000
 - (3) 2010: \$25,400
 - (4) 2011: \$36,800
 - (5) 2012: \$58,000

Upon return from an Operation RESOLUTE patrol, the humanitarian assistance packs are replenished as necessary. The majority of items within the kits are codified and ordered through the Australian Defence Force inventory, hence usage of these items would not relate to Operation RESOLUTE only. An accurate figure for cost of replenishment of the life jackets in the humanitarian assistance packs for is not available. There are also a number of items in the humanitarian assistance pack which are procured locally; an indication of these costs is that from March 2012 to October 2012, Navy spent approximately \$9,700 replenishing the humanitarian assistance packs for the Armidale Class Patrol Boats.

- (b) When irregular maritime arrivals are embarked in Navy vessels, they are provided food and water from the respective vessel's messes with supplementation from the humanitarian assistance packs. Hence food and water used by irregular maritime arrivals are not costed separately.
- (c) Similarly for medical supplies—any medical supplies used to provide medical assistance to irregular maritime arrivals comes from the medical supplies carried in the vessel augmented by use of the potential irregular immigrant medical kit. As with the Humanitarian Assistance packs, these medical kits are replenished at the end of a patrol from items in the Australian Defence Force inventory, hence the use of medical supplies for irregular maritime arrivals is not separately costed.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing - 17 October 2012

Q172: Carbon tax

Senator McKenzie provided in writing.

In response to my question from last estimates (Ref: Q111) Defence has forecast the 2012-2013 impact of the carbon tax on its cost base to be over \$80m. With Defence's 2011-2012 electricity costs \$121.4m, this represents a two thirds increase on that amount alone.

- (a) Where in Defence's budget will the \$80m come from?
- (b) What ongoing impact will this have?
- (c) Has the Department received any compensation in recognition of the carbon tax's significant impact on its business?

Response:

- (a) The costs associated with the carbon pricing scheme will be absorbed from within Defence's existing budget allocation.
- (b) Treasury modelling indicates an expected overall increase on aggregate consumer prices of 0.7% in financial year 2012-13 as a result of the \$23 carbon price. Noting the wide nature of goods purchased by Defence it would be reasonable to forecast the impact on Defence to be equivalent to that of the broader community (i.e. 0.7% price increase) on Australian purchased items.
- (c) Defence has not received supplementation for the impact of carbon pricing.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing 17 October 2012

Q173: Carbon Price Impact on Electricity Costs

Senator McKenzie provided in writing.

- (a) For the financial year 2011-2012, how many kilowatt hour of electricity did the department consume? What was the total cost?
- (b) What does this cost work out to per employee?
- (c) What increases in electricity costs has the Department experienced since the introduction of the carbon tax?
- (d) How has this changed the Department's spending pattern? What programs or services have been cut to meet the increased costs?
- (e) What measures is the Department taking to reduce its electricity expenditure? When did these commence? What impact have they had?

Response:

- (a) Defence consumed 880,778,207 kWh of electricity in financial year 2011-12.

The total cost of electricity was \$122.9million (GST inclusive).

The response to Question on Notice No. 111 taken from the Senate Budget Estimates hearing of 28/29 May 2012 advised Defence consumed 917,338 MWh (or 917,338,000 kWh) of electricity for financial year 2011-12. The response also advised the cost of electricity was \$121.4 million (GST inclusive) in 2011-12.

Consumption data can vary as some accounts are based on estimates and are revised by retailers in later billing cycles. As a result of a review of invoice data Defence has a revised electricity consumption of 880,778,207 kWh for 2011-12. Additionally, the actual cost for 2011-12 has been updated to \$122.9 million following final reconciliation of accounts.

- (b) Using the Defence Annual Report 2011-12 at 30 June 2012 the Defence workforce was 80,324 (Average Full Time Equivalent) consisting of 57,994 Australian Defence Force (ADF) members (Page 20: Table 2.7 ADF Permanent Force Average Funded Strength) and 22,330 Civilian (Page 22: Table 2.9 Civilian (APS and Contractors) Average Full Time Equivalent).

Based on a workforce of 80,324 and total cost of electricity of \$122.9 million, the cost of electricity per Defence 'employee' was \$1530 in 2011-12 (this figure does not include ADF Reservists).

- (c) Nearly half of the cost of electricity is attributed to network charges, regulated fees and environmental levies. These are set by regulators and governments and under Defence electricity contracts these are considered 'pass through costs' and therefore outside the control of Defence.

All electricity consumers, including Defence, have incurred increases in network charges, regulated fees and environmental levies over the past three years. The most recent increase in network costs from 1 July 2012 which vary from state to state, range from 6% in Tasmania to 25% in South Australia.

The forecast expenditure on electricity in 2012-13 is \$140.830 million (excluding GST). In addition to the costs associated with the introduction of the Carbon Pricing Mechanism estimated at \$20.345 million, Defence expects electricity costs to increase in 2012-13 by a further \$6.251 million. The additional cost increases are the result of an expected 4.4% or \$2.446 million increase in the energy component, an average of 7.1% increase or \$2.392 million in network charges and a 17.7% or \$1.413 million increase from the impact of changes and charges resulting from the state and federal environmental levies.

- (d) Defence has identified the potential for increased utilities cost for some years and has allocated resources to meet the expected requirement. To date Defence has not cut specific programs or reduced services to meet the increased cost of electricity.

Future year budget requirements have been calculated with allowance for expected increases in network and environmental costs.

- (e) As a significant user of electricity, Defence is committed to reducing its consumption, and the resultant cost and carbon emissions, to the extent practicable, particularly in non-operational and support activities. The extent to which Defence can achieve a long-term reduction in its consumption is influenced by operational requirements.

Defence has in place policies and strategies to reduce its consumption and emissions from electricity, gas and fuel use and is continuing to identify and implement new initiatives that aim to further reduce consumption and impacts from carbon emissions. Regional energy action plans identify short, medium and long term actions to reduce energy demand and improve energy efficiency.

Defence is pursuing measures that include:

- installation of electricity sub-meters on high consumption facilities improving its capacity to monitor and report on energy consumption;
- infrastructure projects with energy efficient designs, fittings and equipment;
- the upgrading of building management systems;
- the use of renewable energy sources such as solar hot water systems; and
- in remote locations, solar hybrid power systems are installed.

Since 2010 Defence has embarked on open market tendering and regular meetings with electricity retailers which have resulted in improved market response and reduced electricity contract rates for Defence compared with previous electricity contracts.

Defence has also performed regular network tariff reviews to ensure sites are on the lowest applicable tariff. This is an ongoing process as consumption at sites varies in response to operational tempo.

Defence has numerous small sites with electricity consumption below the “contestable limit” (i.e. the consumption level where a contract is specified by the Regulator) which are charged at a regulated tariff. Defence has bundled these sites and approached retailers to obtain a discount to the regulated tariff.

Defence is currently developing an Energy and Water Strategy which is due for release in April 2013. This Strategy will include opportunities for monitoring and further reducing electricity consumption.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q174: Defence Cooperation agreement with Indonesia

Senator Di Natale provided in writing.

In September this year, the Australian Government signed a Defence Cooperation arrangement with Indonesia. The arrangement implements the cooperation provisions of the Agreement between Australia and the Republic of Indonesia on the Framework for Security Cooperation (Mataram, Lombok, 13 November 2006), the “Lombok Treaty”, and The Joint Standing Committee on Treaties reviewed the Lombok Treaty in Report 84 of June 2007. The first 2 recommendations are explicitly about human rights, and Recommendation 2, titled “Cooperation provisions of the Agreement”, recommends that the Australian Government “increase transparency in defence cooperation agreements to provide assurance that Australian resources do not directly or indirectly support human rights abuses in Indonesia”. The Indonesian army and police have been implicated in serious human rights abuses in Papua, most recently during a riot by soldiers leading to the burning of a village near the remote town of Wamena, and the killing by police of the independence activist Mako Tabuni:

- (a) Does the Department agree that transparency in defence cooperation arrangement of this nature is an important principle? Does the Department agree that it is important that the Australian public can be assured that Australian resources do not directly or indirectly support human rights abuses in Indonesia?
- (b) What specific provisions does the Defence Cooperation arrangement contain to ensure transparency? Is the Defence Cooperation arrangement publicly available?
- (c) Which specific provisions in the Treaty ensure that Australian resources do not directly or indirectly support human rights abuses in Indonesia?
- (d) Does the International Policy Division, which is part of the Office of the Secretary and Chief of the Defence Force (OSCDF) Group in the Department of Defence, retain a list of all members of the Indonesian military who trained, exercised or were educated in Australia? Please table this list and the years when they received this training or education.
- (e) If not, does any other area within the Department of Defence retain this list? Does the Department keep a database of all members of the Indonesian security forces trained in Australia? Does this database include information about credible or substantiated human rights abuses? Will this database be crosschecked against any members of the Indonesian security forces set to be trained in Australia? Will this database be made public in the interests of transparency as recommended by the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties review of the Lombok Treaty?
- (f) Reporting on the Defence Cooperation arrangement referred to “commitments about future exercises”.

- i. What exactly are these commitments?
 - ii. Given the importance of transparency around arrangement of this nature, will information about the scale, purpose and nature of these exercises be made publicly available? In what form?
- (g) Reports indicate that the signing of this Defence Cooperation arrangement comes in the context of Australia gifting Indonesia four C-130 Hercules aircraft. What is the value of these aircraft?
- (h) Foreign Affairs Minister Carr called recently for a thorough and open inquiry into the shooting death of Mako Tabuni. When asked about Papua at a joint press conference following the signing of the arrangement, Minister Smith said it had only been discussed "in passing", going on to say that "I have no concerns about our enhanced defence co-operation, practical co-operation, whether it's through the defence co-operation agreement or our discussions about defence capability". Mr. Smith is then reported as saying he respected Indonesia's policies towards Papua and the recent statement by the President, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono that the allegations of abuse would be investigated. In relation to the recent shooting of Papuan independence leader Mako Tabuni, Foreign Minister Carr saw this evidence as serious enough publicly call for an inquiry, however Mr Purnomo, standing beside Mr Smith, said the killing of Mr Tabuni had been legal and required no investigation:
- (iii) Is the Department aware whether there will there be an investigation of the shooting of Mako Tabuni? If yes, who is conducting this investigation, what are its terms of inquiry, and what is its timeline? Has the Department sought a briefing from any Indonesian security agency as to the progress of the investigation? How often will the Department receive briefings on the progress of the investigation?
 - (iv) In the negotiations leading up to the signing of the arrangement did the Department:
 1. perform any assessment of recent allegations of human rights abuses made against Indonesian security forces? Can we see this assessment?
 2. attempt to negotiate any clauses to ensure transparency? If so, what happened to these clauses?
 3. attempt to negotiate any clauses to ensure that Australian resources do not directly or indirectly support human rights abuses in Indonesia? If so, what happened to these clauses?
 - (v) Does the arrangement contain any provision to cancel or modify the arrangement where human rights abuses are perpetrated by Indonesian security forces?

Response:

- (a) Defence is committed to transparency in its engagement with Indonesia, and to preventing its resources from directly or indirectly supporting human rights abuses. Defence's engagement with Indonesia is subject to scrutiny and accountability, with information on Australia's defence engagement policy priorities, activities and expenditure publicly available in the 2009 Defence White Paper, Ministerial and Parliamentary speeches, the Defence Annual Report and Corporate Plan, the Defence Freedom of Information Disclosure Log, and the Portfolio Budget Statements. The Minister responds to correspondence from members of the public, interest groups and Members of Parliament regarding our defence engagement with Indonesia. Parliamentary Committee hearings are another accountability mechanism.

Defence continually assesses its engagement with Indonesia and limits engagement with individuals where we have information to support allegations of human rights concern. Australia has arrangements in place to identify people suspected of human rights abuses and prevent them from entering the country. This includes a layered approach to border management, effective systems to identify persons of concern and a screening process to assess character issues relevant to human rights violations. Defence, along with a number of other government agencies, provides input to Australia's whole of Government arrangements.

- (b) The Australia-Indonesia Agreement on the Framework for Security Cooperation (the Lombok Treaty) provides a legal framework for areas of cooperation affecting our common security, including provisions to conclude separate arrangements on specific areas of security. The Defence Cooperation Arrangement (DCA) is one example of a non-legally binding arrangement under the Lombok Treaty. Its purpose is to implement the Treaty's defence cooperation provisions. As such, it provides an administrative framework for future defence cooperation activities, and includes provisions for dealing with practical issues such as claims, jurisdiction, protection of classified information and cost-sharing. In contrast to the Lombok Treaty, the DCA is private and confidential between the Australian Department of Defence and the Indonesian Ministry of Defence. In accordance with international convention and longstanding Australian practice, such documents are not releasable to the public without the prior written consent of both participants.
- (c) The Preamble to the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and Australia on the Framework for Security Cooperation (Lombok Treaty) states that both Indonesia and Australia are determined to comply in good faith with their respective obligations under generally recognised principles and rules of international law. These principles and rules include those applicable to the promotion and protection of human rights.

Paragraph 6 of Article 2 further provides that nothing in the Lombok Treaty "shall affect in any way the existing rights and obligations of either Party under international law". Indonesia's existing obligations under international law include its obligations under the international human rights treaties to which it is party, including: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; the Convention on the Rights of the Child; and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

The Lombok Treaty also states that Australia and Indonesia will adhere to their respective laws and regulations in the pursuit of closer security cooperation. Our cooperation with Indonesia takes place in the context of our own commitments to human rights. Australia believes that the protection and promotion of human rights is vital to global efforts to achieve lasting peace and security, and freedom and dignity for all. Australia's commitment to human rights reflects our national values and is an underlying principle of Australia's engagement with the international community.

- (d-e) Defence keeps records of members of Indonesian National Defence Forces (TNI) members who have trained, exercised or were educated in Australia at Defence's expense. It is not appropriate to publicly release the names of TNI members who have trained in Australia without their explicit consent. As outlined in responses to parts (a) and (b) of this question, Defence limits engagement with individuals where we have information to support allegations of human rights concern, and contributes to whole of Government arrangements to prevent people suspected of human rights abuses from entering Australia.
- (f)
- (i-ii) The DCA formalises and strengthens the defence relationship between Australia and Indonesia, and provides a formal framework for future engagement initiatives. The DCA represents a political commitment to conduct a broad range of defence engagement activities, including in fields such as defence policy, counter-terrorism, peacekeeping, defence industry and maritime security. It does not specify what these activities will be. As with all of our defence engagement with Indonesia, Defence will continue to make public the details of its engagement with the TNI through departmental media releases, Service news publications, and corporate reporting. These sources can be accessed at <http://www.defence.gov.au/header/publications.htm>.
- (g) In November 2011, the Australian Government offered to gift up to four surplus C-130H aircraft to Indonesia as a bilateral initiative between our two defence forces. In July 2012, Australia and Indonesia signed a memorandum of understanding setting out arrangements for the gifting. The aircraft will enhance Indonesia's airlift capability for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. Were the Australian Government to retain the aircraft, it could offer them for open market sale at a price to be determined by the open market.
- (h)
- (iii) The Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) handles these issues on behalf of the Australian Government. The following response was provided by DFAT.
- Embassy officials encouraged Indonesia to hold an investigation into the death of Mako Tabuni - with Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) on 22 June 2012, with the Head of the Unit to Accelerate Development in Papua and West Papua on 25 June 2012, and with the Head of the Papuan Provincial Police on 7 August 2012.
- Embassy officials discussed the case further with Indonesian officials on 29 August 2012 and on 15 October 2012.
- Indonesian authorities informed our Embassy on 15 October 2012 that the Indonesian police had launched an investigation into Mako Tabuni's death. This followed an investigation by the National Commission on Human Rights (Komnas HAM) which

recommended the police investigation. We are not aware of the terms of reference for the investigations. The investigation's findings have not been released. The timing of any such announcement is a matter for Indonesian authorities. Embassy officials seek regular updates, and will continue to follow up on this issue.

The Australian Government has consistently urged the Indonesian Government to investigate all alleged human rights abuses in the Papuan provinces.

We welcome President Yudhoyono's repeated public statements, including most recently on 12 June 2012, that abuses by security forces in the Papuan provinces are to be investigated and punished.

(iv) 1-3

The Indonesian security forces include both the Indonesian National Defence Forces (TNI) and the Indonesian National Police (Polri). Defence does not engage with Polri. As outlined in responses to parts (a), (b), (d) and (e) of this question, Defence continually assesses its engagement with Indonesia and limits engagement with individuals with backgrounds of human rights concern. Defence does not release these assessments. As outlined in the response to parts one and two, Defence's engagement with Indonesia, including the application of its resources, is subject to scrutiny and accountability through a number of mechanisms outside the scope of the DCA. Our defence engagement with Indonesia aims to enhance the Indonesian National Defence Forces' (TNI) human rights awareness, respect for the rule of law and accountability through the provision of training, seminars and officer exchanges. Defence also funds specific human rights training for the TNI, which is delivered by Indonesian human rights specialists.

(v) The DCA may be terminated by either Participant giving written notice to the other at least 90 days prior to its intention to terminate, or at any time by mutual written consent.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q175: Australia-Indonesia Defence Relationship

Senator Di Natale provided in writing.

- (a) How much does Australia spend on the Australia-Indonesia defence relationship? How much does Indonesia spend?
- (b) What is the cost of Exercises DAWN KOOKABURRA and KOMODO to Australia? What does Indonesia contribute?
- (c) What is the cost of the biennial counter-hijack and hostage recovery exercises to Australia? How much does Indonesia contribute?
- (d) What is the cost to Australia of training and exchanges in Indonesia, and the more than 150 positions that were offered to Indonesian students in over 50 courses in Australia under the bilateral Defence Cooperation Program? How much does Indonesia contribute?
- (e) What is the cost to Australia of its support to Indonesia's Peace and Security Center at Sentul through English language training?

Response:

- (a) Australia's defence engagement with Indonesia aims to: encourage practical cooperation in areas that support our mutual interests in the region (counter-terrorism, maritime security, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, peacekeeping and intelligence); and develop a stronger, more reciprocal partnership.

Over the past five financial years, Defence has spent approximately AUD \$38,299,000 on defence engagement with Indonesia. This figure includes the estimated net additional cost of Defence personnel based in Indonesia, but excludes salaries as these are paid to personnel regardless of their location. This figure includes expenditure under the Defence Cooperation Program, and by each of the Services and other areas of Defence.

Depending on the engagement activity, Indonesia contributes personnel, assets, training and meeting venues, accommodation and rations. Defence does not keep records of Indonesia's financial contributions to our defence engagement.

Activity	2007-08 \$'000	2008-09 \$'000	2009-10 \$'000	2010-11 \$'000	2011-12 \$'000
Defence expenditure on engagement with Indonesia	7,354	7,030	8,187	7,469	8,259

- (b-c) Exercise DAWN KOOKABURRA and Exercise DAWN KOMODO are Defence's biannual counter-hijack and hostage recovery exercises with the Indonesian National Defence Forces TNI, held in Australia and Indonesia respectively. Over the past five financial years, Defence has spent AUD \$454,000 on these exercises. This amount is included in the total amount in the response to part one. Indonesia covers hosting expenses for Exercise DAWN KOMODO. Defence does not keep records of Indonesia's financial contributions to our defence engagement.

Activity	2007-08 \$'000	2008-09 \$'000	2009-10 \$'000	2010-11 \$'000	2011-12 \$'000
Exercises DAWN KOOKABURRA and DAWN KOMODO	0	16	0	186	251

- (d) Defence sends an Australian Defence Force (ADF) student to each of the four Indonesian Staff Colleges every year, and an ADF student to the Indonesian National Resilience Institute (Lemhannas) every third year. Defence has had an instructor at the Indonesian Air Force Staff College since the 1990s, and an instructor at the Indonesian Army Staff College since 2011. Over the past five financial years, this has cost Defence approximately AUD \$1,892,000. This figure excludes salaries, and is included in the total amount in the response to part one. Indonesia provides the student and instructor positions at their military educational institutions.

Each year, approximately 75% of the Defence Cooperation Program budget is spent on training provided to TNI members in Australia. Over the past five financial years, this has cost Defence approximately AUD \$17,419,000. This amount is included in the total amount in the response to part one. Other than providing the personnel to attend courses, Indonesia does not contribute to this activity.

Activity	2007-08 \$'000	2008-09 \$'000	2009-10 \$'000	2010-11 \$'000	2011-12 \$'000
Training and exchanges in Indonesia	341	367	367	378	439
Training positions for TNI members in Australia	3,419	3,357	4,193	3,180	3,270

- (e) In 2011, Defence funded the installation of an English language laboratory at the Indonesian National Defence Forces' Peacekeeping Centre at Sentul. The laboratory and associated training publications cost approximately AUD \$80,000. This amount is included in the total amount in the response to part one. Defence is in discussions with Indonesia to provide further English language support to the Peacekeeping Centre, leveraging off the language laboratory.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q176: Indonesia-Australia Defence Alumni Association

Senator Di Natale provided in writing.

On 4 September 2012 Defence Minister Stephen Smith said in a speech that he was "pleased to welcome members of the Indonesia-Australia Defence Alumni Association (IKAHAN)... launched less than 18 months ago and already has a constituency of over 800 members, a testament to the close links between our Defence forces."

- (a) What is the purpose of this Association?
- (b) Who is in it now? What are the eligibility criteria?
- (c) Are any of the following members or former members of the Indonesian security forces currently members of the Indonesia-Australia Defence Alumni Association or eligible to become a member (please note ranks may not still be current)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Major General Syafrie Syamsoeddin | • Major General Sutiyoso |
| • Lieutenant Colonel Bambang Heru Sukmadi | • Lieutenant General A.M. Hendropriyono |
| • Major General Syahrir | • Major General George Toisutta |
| • Brigadier General Syarifudin Tippe | • General Ryamizard Riyacudu |
| • Lieutenant General Prabowo Subianto | • Brigadier General Nur Muis. |

- (d) What steps are being taken to ensure that members of the Indonesian security forces with a record of human rights violations are barred joining from this Association?
- (e) What steps are being taken to screen Indonesian personnel with human rights violations in their track record from receiving training? Specifically, what sources are being used to conduct this screening? Is there a database?
- (f) Please provide a list of "frequent reciprocal visits by senior military personnel and high level dialogue" mentioned in Minister Smith's speech published at <http://www.minister.defence.gov.au/2012/09/04/minister-for-defence-australia-and-indonesia-strategic-partners/>.

Response:

- (a) The purpose of the Indonesia-Australia Defence Alumni Association (Ikahan) is to facilitate and strengthen people-to-people links between the Australian and Indonesian Defence Forces. It does so through an annual program of seminars, cultural and sporting events, and internet and hardcopy publications. Details of Ikahan's activities are available at www.ikahan.com.
- (b) There are currently more than 800 registered Ikahan members. Membership is open to current and former members of the Australian and Indonesian Defence Forces and Defence departments that have participated in official defence engagement activities with the other country. Defence engagement activities include defence-sponsored training and education, personnel exchanges, exercises, operations, strategic dialogue, and visiting defence delegations.
- (c) Of the Indonesian security forces, which include both the Indonesian National Defence Forces (TNI) and the Indonesian National Police (Polri), only TNI personnel are eligible for Ikahan membership. Membership is open to current and former members of the Australian and Indonesian Defence Forces and Defence departments that have participated in official defence engagement activities with the other country. It is not appropriate to publicly release the names of Ikahan members without their explicit consent.
- (d) Defence continually assesses its engagement with Indonesia and limits engagement with individuals where we have information to support allegations of human rights concern. As with all of our defence engagement with Indonesia, Defence carefully assesses applications for Ikahan membership. Individuals with backgrounds of human rights concern are not welcome to join Ikahan.
- (e) Australia has arrangements in place to identify individuals with backgrounds of human rights concern and prevent them from entering the country. This includes a layered approach to border management, effective systems to identify persons of concern and a screening process to assess character issues relevant to human rights violations. Defence, along with a number of other government agencies, provides input to Australia's whole of Government arrangements.
- (f) In 2012, Australia has hosted the following senior Indonesian defence officials.

Month	Name and Position	Purpose
October	Lieutenant General Muhammad Munir, Head Army Strategic Reserve Forces	To participate in the Chief of Army's Exercise
July	Dr Purnomo Yusgiantoro, Minister of Defence Admiral Agus Suhartono, Commander in Chief of the Indonesian National Defence Forces Air Marshal Eris Herryanto, Secretary General of the Ministry of Defence	To participate in the Australia-Indonesia Leaders' Meeting
July	Air Chief Marshal Imam Sufaat, Chief of Air Staff	To attend Exercise Pitch Black
May	General Pramono Edhie Wibowo, Chief of Army Staff	Counterpart visit
May	Air Chief Marshal Imam Sufaat, Chief of Air Staff	Counterpart visit
March	Dr Purnomo Yusgiantoro, Minister of Defence	To participate in the inaugural 2+2 Foreign and Defence Ministers' Meeting
February	Lieutenant General (Retd) Syairfuiddin Tippe, President of the Indonesia Defence University	To consult with Australian educational institutions on curriculum development
February	Admiral Soeparno, Chief of Naval Staff	Counterpart visit

In 2012, Indonesia has hosted the following senior Australian defence officials.

Month	Name and Position	Purpose
September	The Hon Stephen Smith, Minister for Defence The Hon Jason Clare, Minister for Defence Materiel Mr Duncan Lewis, Secretary of the Department of Defence Air Marshal Mark Binskin	To participate in the inaugural Australia-Indonesia Defence Ministers' Meeting and talks on maritime search and rescue cooperation
August	General David Hurley, Chief of the Defence Force	Counterpart visit
August	Vice Admiral Ray Griggs	Counterpart visit
March	Mr Duncan Lewis, Secretary of the Department of Defence General David Hurley, Chief of the Defence Force	To address the Jakarta International Defence Dialogue
March	Air Marshal Geoff Brown	Counterpart visit

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q177: Indigenous expenditure

Senator Scullion provided in writing.

Please indicate whether the programs and measures listed below are still operating in 2012-13. If they are still operating, please provide by program/ measure the current allocation and expenditure year to date (please indicate in respect of any of these programs/measures if information has already been provided):

- (a) Indigenous Employment Strategy
- (b) Indigenous Employment & Development

Response:

The two programs are still operating in 2012-2013.

- (a) The Defence Indigenous Employment Strategy (IES) supports continued engagement with Indigenous programs across Government and into Indigenous communities. The Defence IES comprises a number of subordinate programs that are designed to attract and retain Indigenous employees. These include a variety of experiential tours (1-4 days) that target high performing Indigenous high school students, as well as an Indigenous Pre-Recruitment Course (IPRC), which is a full residential six-week course. The IPRC is designed to prepare eligible Indigenous jobseekers for the Defence Force recruiting processes. It is primarily aimed at urban and regional communities, although some participants have come from remote communities.

The IES was allocated \$2.8 million in 2012-13. The estimated expenditure as at 30 September 2012 was \$0.7 million¹.

- (b) The Defence Indigenous Development Program (DIDP) is aligned to the Government's *Closing the Gap* strategy and provides opportunities for Indigenous Australians from remote and regional communities to acquire skills that are transferable back to their community. An increase in the recruitment of Indigenous people from the DIDP into the Australian Defence Force is an additional benefit. Currently, the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations and the Department of Defence are engaged in the ongoing development and implementation of the program.

The DIDP was allocated \$6.2 million in 2012-13. The estimated expenditure as at 30 September 2012 was \$1.7 million².

¹ This includes on costs, net personnel costs, operating costs and direct costs (program delivery). Direct costs for example include; travel, meals, accommodation, clothing and stationery.

² *ibid*

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing – 17 October 2012

Q178: Proposed Australian Peacekeeping Medal

Senator Wright provided in writing.

I understand that an Australian Peacekeeping Service Medal has been proposed - has the department conducted any research/otherwise looked into this possibility? If yes, please provide current status.

Response:

A proposal by the Australian Peacekeeper & Peacemaker Veterans' Association that an Australian Peacekeeping Service Medal be established was considered by the independent Defence Honours and Awards Appeals Tribunal as part of its inquiry into recognition for Australian Defence Force (ADF) personnel who served as peacekeepers from 1947 onwards.

This inquiry began in November 2009 and the Tribunal presented its findings to the Australian Government in November 2010. The Tribunal made three recommendations:

1. No change be made in the present practice of an award of the Australian Service Medal or Australian Active Service Medal being the appropriate form of recognition for participation by ADF personnel in peacekeeping operations.
2. The Australian Government should not establish a new medal for general or specific recognition of peacekeeping service, to be awarded to ADF personnel who have taken part, or in the future take part, in peacekeeping operations.
3. No action be taken by the Australian Government to recognise the award of the 1988 Nobel Peace Prize to United Nations peacekeepers.

The Government accepted these recommendations.

The service of ADF members on peacekeeping operations is recognised through a variety of awards, including the Australian Service Medal or Australian Active Service Medal. Eligible members may also receive foreign awards conferred by international organisations such as the United Nations.

Future ADF involvement in any newly established peacekeeping operations may be considered for recognition through the award of the Australian Operational Service Medal.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – COMMITTEES

Senate Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing -17 October 2012

Q179: Australian Operational Service Medal - Border Protection

Senator Wright provided in writing.

Are Defence Force Personnel involved in training of Regional Force Surveillance Units (RFSU) eligible to receive the Operational Service Medal – Border Protection?

Response:

No. Regional Force Surveillance Units personnel involved in training do not meet the criteria to be eligible for the Operational Service Medal (OSM) – Border Protection. Training forms part of the raise, train, sustain continuum that takes place prior to personnel being certified ready to deploy or ready for force assignment. The delivery of training is not considered to be directly supporting or contributing to an operation therefore would not be considered for award of the OSM – Border Protection.