

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Question No. 155

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 17 February 2006:

Further to the reply to Question 239 of 31 October 2005:

- a) Why is it not feasible to keep tabs on the \$47 million worth of funding mentioned in the answer to this question?
- b) If the AFP doesn't know what it is spending it on how do you account for it?
- c) In (d) of your answer to question number 239 it is indicated that the stated outcome of the program was to employ an additional 116 AFP officers throughout Australia to respond to various crimes.
 - i) How many of those officers are still deployed for that purpose under this program?
 - ii) How many of them have overlaid duties such as the rapid deployment team membership?
- d) Regarding the additional funding programs with similar or expanded outcomes to this measure, please indicate what the additional funding programs are?
- e) Of the \$22.6 million remaining for the Jakarta Centre for law enforcement is that merely support of the program or ongoing support or are there additional assets to be purchased or staff to be purchased?
- f) The funding provided for the people smuggling strike team as at question 241, indicate whether or not this is totally exclusive of the funding provided to double the strike team capacity of AFP under question on notice number 239?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) This program was to expand existing AFP investigative strike team capacity. This capacity is distributed throughout Australia within the various regional offices. The AFP's Financial Information Systems are configured to monitor expenditure against the AFP's organisational structure and functional activities, but not to monitor expenditure against the different funding sources for the total investigative capacity. As such, once the measure was fully implemented, it was not economically feasible to keep financial data relating to the specific additional funding.
- b) This funding provided has been fully spent over the years 2001-02 to 2004-05. 2005-06 funding is forecast to be fully spent.
- c)
 - i) With the exception of any staff who might be on leave for various purposes, all officers employed under this program are still deployed for that purpose.
 - ii) Nil; however the utilisation of the flexible team model enables staff to be deployed to priority matters; i.e. the Bali bombings, tsunami response, Operation Pendennis.

- d) Following the Double Strike team measure, the AFP has received additional funding under the following new measures which has allowed further expansion of it's investigative strike team capacity:
- Combating trafficking in persons for purposes of sexual servitude and slavery (2003-04);
 - Investing in Australia's security – rapid deployment capability (2004-05);
 - Fighting Terrorism at its Source (2004-05); and
 - National Child Protection Initiative (2004-05).
- e) The remaining funding for the Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement is to fund the ongoing staffing, operational and training activity of the Centre. There are no significant asset purchases planned for the remaining funding, although some assets will be purchased – for example, photocopier, computers, LCD monitors, docking stations, electronic white boards, and some minor refurbishment to the conference centre.
- f) The funding provided to the AFP for the people smuggling strike team is totally exclusive of the funding provided under the Double Strike Team measure.