

The Senate

Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Legislation Committee

Additional estimates 2011–12

March 2012

Commonwealth of Australia
ISBN 978-1-74229-587-9

This document was prepared by the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Legislation Committee and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Parliament
House, Canberra.

Membership of the Committee

Members

Senator Patricia Crossin, **Chair**, ALP, NT

Senator Gary Humphries, **Deputy Chair**, LP, ACT

Senator Sue Boyce, LP, QLD

Senator Mark Furner, ALP, QLD

Senator Louise Pratt, ALP, WA

Senator Penny Wright, AG, SA

Senators in attendance

Senator Patricia Crossin (Chair)

Senator Mitch Fifield

Senator Gary Humphries (Deputy Chair)

Senator Sarah Hanson-Young

Senator Sue Boyce

Senator Scott Ludlam

Senator Mark Furner

Senator John Madigan

Senator Louise Pratt

Senator the Hon Bill Heffernan

Senator Penny Wright

Senator Helen Kroger

Senator the Hon Eric Abetz

Senator Bridget McKenzie

Senator Simon Birmingham

Senator Lee Rhiannon

Senator the Hon George Brandis

Senator Rachel Siewert

Senator David Bushby

Senator Nick Xenophon

Senator Michaelia Cash

Secretariat

Ms Julie Dennett

Committee Secretary

Ms Margaret Cahill

Research Officer

Ms Hannah Dibley

Administrative Officer

Ms Elise Williamson

Administrative Officer

Suite S1.61

Telephone: (02) 6277 3560

Parliament House

Fax: (02) 6277 5794

CANBERRA ACT 2600

Email: legcon.sen@aph.gov.au

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Membership of the Committee	iii
PREFACE	vii
Reference of documents	vii
Estimates hearings	vii
Minister and parliamentary secretary	viii
Questions on notice	viii
CHAPTER 1	1
IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP PORTFOLIO	1
Migration Review Tribunal – Refugee Review Tribunal (MRT–RRT)	1
Department of Immigration and Citizenship	2
CHAPTER 2	9
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO	9
Australian Human Rights Commission	9
Australian Federal Police (AFP)	10
Attorney-General's Department	12
Efficiency dividend increase	12
APPENDIX 1	15
DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES FOR WHICH THE COMMITTEE HAS OVERSIGHT	15
Attorney-General's Portfolio	15
Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio	16
APPENDIX 2	17
INDEX OF PROOF HANSARDS	17
APPENDIX 3	19
TABLED DOCUMENTS	19

PREFACE

On 9 February 2012, the Senate referred to the committee for examination the estimates of proposed additional expenditure for the financial year 2011-12. The committee is responsible for the examination of the Attorney-General's Portfolio and the Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio. The portfolio additional estimates statements for 2011-12 were tabled on 9 February 2012.

Reference of documents

The Senate referred to the committee, for examination and report, the following documents:

- Particulars of proposed additional expenditure in respect of the year ending on 30 June 2012 [Appropriation Bill (No. 3) 2011-2012];
- Particulars of certain proposed additional expenditure in respect of the year ending on 30 June 2012 [Appropriation Bill (No. 4) 2011-2012];
- Final budget outcome 2010-11; and
- Issues from the advances under the annual Appropriation Acts for 2010-11.

The committee was required to report on its consideration of the additional estimates on or before 20 March 2012.

Estimates hearings

The committee met in public session on 13 and 14 February 2012.

Over the course of the two days of hearings, totalling over 21 hours, the committee took evidence from the following departments and agencies:

- Attorney-General's Department
- Australian Crime Commission
- Australian Customs and Border Protection Service
- Australian Federal Police
- Australian Government Solicitor
- Australian Human Rights Commission
- Australian Security Intelligence Organisation
- Department of Immigration and Citizenship
- Family Court of Australia
- Federal Magistrates Court of Australia
- Migration Review Tribunal and Refugee Review Tribunal
- Office of the Australian Information Commissioner

- Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions

Copies of the transcripts of *Hansard* are available from the committee's internet page at: www.aph.gov.au/senate_legalcon.

An index of the *Hansard* for each portfolio appears at Appendix 2.

Minister and parliamentary secretary

On 13 February 2012, the committee heard evidence from Senator the Hon Kate Lundy, the then Parliamentary Secretary for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, representing the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship.

On 14 February 2012, the committee heard evidence from Senator the Hon Joseph Ludwig, Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and Minister Assisting on Queensland Floods Recovery, representing the Attorney-General and the Minister for Home Affairs.

Officers from both departments and associated agencies also appeared. The committee thanks the Minister, Parliamentary Secretary and officers for their assistance.

Questions on notice

Further written explanations, and answers to questions on notice, will be tabled as soon as possible after they are received. That information is also available on the committee's internet page at the above address.

The committee has resolved that the due date for submitting responses to questions on notice from the additional estimates round is 30 March 2012.

CHAPTER 1

IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP PORTFOLIO

1.1 This chapter summarises some of the matters raised during the committee's consideration of the additional estimates for the Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio for the 2011-12 financial year.

Migration Review Tribunal – Refugee Review Tribunal (MRT–RRT)

1.2 The Principal Member of the MRT-RRT, Mr Denis O'Brien, advised that lodgements for both tribunals continue to rise, and updated the committee on workload statistics since his last appearance before the committee. He advised that, as at 31 December, there has been an increase of 43 per cent in active cases for the MRT compared to the same period for 2010-11, with the highest rate of lodgements in the areas of student visa refusals and cancellations. MRT lodgements have increased by 21 per cent, and decisions have increased by 28 per cent, compared to the same period in 2010-11. For the RRT, Mr O'Brien advised that there was a 68 per cent increase in active cases as at 31 December compared to the same period in 2010-11, a six per cent increase in lodgements, and nine per cent fewer decisions during this period.¹

1.3 The committee was also advised that the recent amendment to the *Migration Act 1958*, which inserts complementary protection into the Act, would result in the RRT having jurisdiction in relation to irregular maritime arrivals (IMAs) with members now dealing with complementary protection claims. As a result of this change, Mr O'Brien indicated that he anticipated a further increase in the RRT's case load.²

1.4 Mr O'Brien informed the committee that, even though 23 new members were nominally appointed to the tribunals from 1 July 2011, he did not consider the number of members sufficient to carry out the current workload. Accordingly, the committee heard that the Minister had agreed to another recruitment round for new members, which Mr O'Brien anticipated would result in the engagement of approximately 20 full-time-equivalent members.³

1.5 The committee was advised that the tribunals were facing significant financial challenges in the current financial year attributed, in particular, to the net increase in active membership and increases in member remuneration.⁴

1 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 6.

2 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 6.

3 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 8.

4 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 7.

1.6 Senators asked about the current review of the tribunals conducted by Professor Michael Lavarch. The committee was advised that this review would consider strategies for reducing the tribunals' backlog and management of the transition of the IMA caseload to the RRT's jurisdiction.⁵ The committee looks forward to the outcome of the review with interest.

Department of Immigration and Citizenship

Office of the Migration Agents Registration Authority (MARA) (Sub-program 1.1.3)

1.7 The Office of the MARA provided an update of operations since it last appeared before the committee in relation to statistics on registered agents, application refusals, complaints, and reforms to continuing professional development.⁶

1.8 The committee also heard details of the reforms to the standard ethical framework which was developed for use by migration agents. Officers from MARA advised that it was hoped that the framework would provide better guidance to identify and manage ethical dilemmas and conflicts of interest, and would be supported by a free and confidential counselling service.⁷

1.9 As part of MARA's communications strategy, a translated booklet has been developed to enhance communication with ethnic communities. The committee was advised that the booklet has been made available in 24 languages online and has been well received.⁸

Enterprise migration agreements and regional migration agreements

1.10 The committee revisited the enterprise migration agreement (EMA) scheme which was introduced in May 2011. While only one submission has been received, there is currently discussion around a number of projects, and the department estimates that between 17 and 37 projects are likely to be eligible for an EMA.⁹ Mr Kruno Kukoc elaborated on the reasons why only one submission has been received to date:

...This is a completely new and innovative approach through bringing temporary, skilled migrants into the country and that is the reason a lot of stakeholders expressed initial interest in the process; however, they were seeking more information from the department about the process. As part of the process related to any investment project, once they apply they need to get information documentation to make the application successful. That is in the interests of all project owners who may apply for enterprise migration

5 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 10.

6 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 26.

7 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 27.

8 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 27.

9 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 32.

agreements. That is the reason that by the end of last year we had one submission. But, as I said, we expect many more to come along in the coming months.

Senator CASH:...When you said that project owners sought information about the process, were you able to then put together something that you have been able to hand out to project owners?

Mr Kukoc: Yes. We issued very comprehensive guidelines on how to make a submission under the enterprise migration agreement. That was on 2 September 2011. Those guidelines were informed by a very comprehensive early consultation process in mid 2011, so we knew what information and guidelines project owners might need before we finally put together the guidelines, got them approved by the minister and released them on 2 September 2011. I think the guidelines and a template are on our website and provide very comprehensive information on how to make an application for an enterprise migration agreement.¹⁰

1.11 Senators indicated that they would follow-up on this initiative at the budget estimates hearings.

1.12 The committee also sought an update on the regional migration agreement (RMA) scheme. The department advised that consultations throughout regional Australia have been conducted, particularly focussing on the Northern Territory and Queensland, and that draft guidelines have been prepared. Senators asked about the definition of 'region' under this scheme:

Mr Kukoc: The definition is that the population is less than 150,000, employment growth is very strong, the unemployment rate is very low and the participation rate is very high...

Senator CASH: Are there specific figures, though, in relation to 'very low unemployment rate'? What is a 'very low unemployment rate'?

Mr Kukoc: Much lower than the national unemployment rate.

Senator CASH: Are there any guidelines surrounding what you have just said?

Mr Metcalfe: You are trying to ask if there is a particular percentage?

Senator CASH: Exactly. I can understand 'a population less than 150,000'; that is obvious. But a 'very low unemployment rate'—is that objective, subjective or at the discretion of the person reviewing the RMA?

Mr Kukoc: It is ultimately at the discretion of the minister, but the overall proposal will need to prove that the labour market shortages in that region are arising out of the very strong employment growth and economic growth and out of the fact that this region currently has very low unemployment and high participation. So there are a number of factors that will be taken into account at the time of the decision. There is no prescribed threshold. It

is more a very solid labour market analysis put forward that actually proves the case for the regional migration agreement.¹¹

1.13 When asked about the timeframe for the scheme, the department advised that it expected the first RMAs to be finalised this year.¹²

Budget

Revised forward estimates

1.14 Senators questioned the department about the revisions to forward estimates through the Mid Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook (MYEFO) process and the additional estimates, particularly with respect to Program 4.3 – Offshore Asylum Seeker Management. There was robust discussion between some members of the committee, and the Parliamentary Secretary and the Secretary of the department, about the reasons for the substantial increase in funding for the department in the forward estimates. The Chief Financial Officer, Mr Stephen Sheehan, provided the following explanation of the adjustments that were part of the MYEFO process:

...The increase in IMA funding is \$1.296 billion. Then there were a number of adjustments that were made as part of the operating costs for New Guinea—the offshore processing centre that were reduced; the Regional Protection Framework—the net amount for Malaysia; and in addition the return of funding for the humanitarian program, where we had budgeted for an additional 1,000 entrants. So the amount required for the department, after taking into consideration those adjustments, was \$564 million, but in addition there was an amount for the regional cooperation measure of about \$5,228,000, which, in terms of the reconciliation for the DIAC MYEFO adjustment, was \$570.033 million.

...In addition, the announcements as part of MYEFO included an increase in the arrival estimate for 450 per month. There was also a change in the model for the number of clients that we would have in general society as well, which is roughly six per cent for the 2011-12 financial year. In addition, in terms of funding now available for the humanitarian program, the reversal of capital works that was held in the contingency reserve was announced as part of the budget process and the whole-of-government fiscal impact was \$232 million, and including the regional cooperation measure it was \$230,300,000 net...¹³

1.15 Mr Sheehan sought to provide further clarification:

...The difference between additional estimates and the MYEFO numbers in the estimate for the department for program 4.3, including depreciation, is \$179,762,000. That is related to an increase in the arrival estimates because

11 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 36.

12 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 37.

13 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, pp 73-74.

of the increases that we have had in November and December, and also an increase in our overall occupancy rate.¹⁴

Efficiency dividend increase

1.16 Members of the committee also questioned officers about the 2.5 per cent increase in the efficiency dividend for 2012-13.¹⁵ The committee was advised that the dollar amount impact for the department, including the capital efficiency dividend of approximately \$19 million and the departmental efficiency dividend of approximately \$28 million, is \$47 million a year across the forward estimates.¹⁶ It was further clarified that the capital amount is quarantined from the recurrent amount.¹⁷

1.17 The Secretary provided a detailed account to the committee of the impact on the department and how it intends to manage the additional impost:

Mr Metcalfe: ...Effectively, we are funded for what we spend and if the efficiency dividend does not apply to that, it does not require us to seek efficiencies in contracts, cut services or reduce the number of meals or anything like that—far from it.

The department is also funded on an activity based formula. Essentially, depending on the number of visa applications we receive and are decided and so on, we are funded for those on a widget basis. So it is not just a question of us cutting services and making cutting decisions because in fact we will be cutting our own budget.

...

Mr Metcalfe: This saving will largely need to come from areas which are not funded in that way. Clearly in relation to capital, we are a large consumer of information technology and we are looking very carefully at our technology spend. In relation to the administered costs we will be going through all of our expenses. We have a large property expense, we have a large staff cost expense, and travel and other areas. So there is not a definitive answer on, 'We will be cutting this,' but effectively will be looking across all of those to ensure that, as we have in recent years, we continue to live within our budget.

Senator HUMPHRIES: Are you examining the possibility of staff reductions?

14 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 74.

15 On 29 November 2011, the Minister for Finance and Deregulation announced an additional one-off 2.5 per cent efficiency dividend, on top of the existing efficiency dividend of 1.5 per cent: see Minister for Finance and Deregulation, 'Driving Efficiency Savings Within Government', Media Release, PW 253/11, 29 November 2011, http://www.financeminister.gov.au/media/2011/mr_pw25311.html (accessed 6 March 2012). The Migration Review Tribunal and the Refugee Review Tribunal are exempt from the additional efficiency dividend.

16 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 25.

17 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 26.

Mr Metcalfe: We are. We are certainly not looking at the issue of involuntary redundancies. Like all big organisations there is a significant turnover—we have almost 8,000 staff. And, of course, because of the ongoing nature of activity levels such as irregular maritime arrivals servicing there is always the potential to move staff from an area that is losing funding to an area that has high activity levels. So there is the ability to transfer resources as well. I should properly say that of course we will be looking at staffing budgets and that could impact on some areas...

Senator HUMPHRIES: You would surely say, with 8,000 staff and those administered expenses separately quarantined, that it is almost inevitable that you are going to look at some reduction in staffing?

Mr Metcalfe: Yes, and that is exactly what we are doing. Exactly where and how we achieve that—most likely through not filling vacancies and therefore slowing down on recruitment...¹⁸

Community detention program

1.18 Officers of the department were questioned in detail about the community detention program. The committee was advised that the occupation rate at the time of the additional estimates hearing was 1,576, and the approximate cost of the program for the 2011-12 financial year is \$150 million.¹⁹

1.19 Senators followed up a response provided to a question on notice from the Supplementary Budget Estimates 2011-12 hearings concerning the average cost per client, which the department advised that an amount could not be provided until the program stabilises. At the additional estimates hearing, the committee was informed that this continues to be the case and this cost cannot be meaningfully derived at present:

Mr Metcalfe: I think we will find there is an average cost but in due course there will be a lower average cost because those setup costs of acquiring the property, the bond, the household formation and the furniture cost will be rolled over across multiple clients. So while there is a setup cost, the ongoing costs are going to average out to a lower number.

Mr Sheehan: There is another complicating factor. It depends on the different client mix—whether we have small families, large families, or singles. There is a range of other complicating factors that we need to work our way through as well.²⁰

1.20 The committee learnt that the Red Cross administers the rental program and housing package for community detention, which currently comprises approximately 550 rental properties across all states and territories, excluding the Northern

18 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 25.

19 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 79.

20 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 86.

Territory.²¹ The committee was assisted with its examination of this topic by the tabling of two documents: Location of Community Detention Properties and the Household Goods Formation Package List.

1.21 Senators also sought clarification of other costs associated with the community detention program, including health, pharmaceuticals, dental, transportation and education costs.²²

Answers to questions on notice

1.22 The committee notes that all answers to questions on notice from the Supplementary Budget Estimates 2011-12 hearings for the Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio were provided after the due date of 2 December 2011. This is the fifth successive estimates round where that has occurred. The first batch of answers was provided to the committee on 20 January 2012, and a significant number of answers were provided on the weekend before the additional estimates hearings, and also during the hearing on 13 February. Such late provision of answers clearly does not allow members of the committee reasonable time to consider those answers prior to the hearings.

1.23 On 9 February 2012, pursuant to Senate standing order 74(5), Senator Cash asked the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship (Senator the Hon Joseph Ludwig) for an explanation of answers not provided to questions placed on notice during the Supplementary Budget Estimates 2011-12 hearings.²³

1.24 Senator Ludwig provided an explanation:

...the number of questions asked of the department at Senate estimates hearings has increased significantly over recent years, but the department has put significant effort into ensuring that all questions on notice have been answered prior to the next committee hearing.

At the supplementary hearing in October last year, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship received 423 questions on notice, including those taken on notice during the hearing and additional questions provided subsequently in writing. The department remains fully committed to providing responses to the questions on notice as soon as possible. All endeavours will continue to be made in this regard. However, many of the questions do seek detailed information on a number of complex and sensitive issues. Providing responses to all of these questions is also extremely resource-intensive and places a significant burden on the department.

21 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 80.

22 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, pp 87-88 and 101.

23 *Journals of the Senate No. 75*, 9 February 2012, p. 2088.

The department has already provided the committee with responses to most of the 423 questions, which does demonstrate the commitment of the department to answering all questions on notice as quickly as possible.²⁴

1.25 The Senate noted the Minister's explanation.²⁵

Other matters of interest

1.26 Other areas of interest to Senators during examination of the department included the department's new media access policy, the new visa pricing regime, prospective marriage visas subclass 300, minors charged with people smuggling who are currently held in detention facilities, status of discussions with Papua New Guinea on the establishment of a processing centre, the inspection and infrastructure report on re-opening offshore processing centres on Nauru, the provision of services to people with a disability in detention centres, and the closing of the Pontville Immigration Detention Centre in Tasmania.

1.27 The Secretary of the department, Mr Andrew Metcalfe AO, advised the committee that he would be taking extended leave over the coming year and that Mr Martin Bowles PSM will act as Secretary in his absence.²⁶ The committee and the Parliamentary Secretary also acknowledged Mr Metcalfe's recent appointment as an Officer of the Order of Australia in the 2012 Australia Day Honours List, in recognition of his distinguished service to public sector leadership through, among other things, his contributions to public policy development in the areas of immigration, citizenship and cultural diversity.²⁷

24 *Senate Hansard*, 9 February 2012, p. 53.

25 *Journals of the Senate No. 75*, 9 February 2012, p. 2088.

26 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, p. 5.

27 *Committee Hansard*, 13 February 2012, pp 3 and 119

CHAPTER 2

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO

2.1 This chapter summarises some of the matters raised during the committee's consideration of the additional estimates for the Attorney-General's Portfolio for the 2011-12 financial year.

Australian Human Rights Commission

2.2 The committee asked about the commission's work on the issue of wheelchair capacity on airlines following the recent Federal Court of Australia case of *King v Jetstar Airways Pty Ltd*.

2.3 The Disability Discrimination Commissioner, Mr Graeme Innes AM, advised that he is continuing to work with airlines about the current policy of only carrying two people per flight who use wheelchairs. He further advised that an appeal to the King case has been filed and the commission is still assessing whether it will seek to intervene in the matter.¹

2.4 The Commissioner was asked whether the best resolution to this issue would be through legislative changes rather than through the courts:

Senator SIEWERT: To resolve this issue, would it not be better to make sure the legislation was fairly clear rather than people having to take court action over such a matter?

Mr Innes: The process for alleging discrimination is common across all of the legislation with which we deal on the basis of gender, age, race and disability. There is always an option for legislators to do other things to change that process. I suppose in the broader term that is a matter before the government in its consideration of consolidation of discrimination legislation. But at present the way the disability area is dealt with is no different to the way that areas which are the responsibility of my colleagues are dealt with.

Senator SIEWERT: You have just touched on the reform or the consolidation process. It could be dealt with through that process, could it not?

Mr Innes: It could.²

1 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 8.

2 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 8.

Australian Federal Police (AFP)

2.5 The AFP was questioned extensively on a range of issues. One area of interest was the outsourcing of 'open-source monitoring' with the company National Open Source Intelligence Centre (NOSIC). The committee heard that NOSIC has been contracted by the AFP since 2002. The contract is valued at just under \$100,000 a year. NOSIC is required to scan publicly available information, collate the material and provide a daily report to the AFP on matters relating to general law enforcement. Commissioner Tony Negus APM noted that the AFP considers the outsourcing of this service as a cost-effective approach and that, if the AFP were to undertake this role in-house, it would cost approximately four times that of the contracted service.³

2.6 When asked if NOSIC is tasked with monitoring a specific area, Commissioner Negus responded:

...We do not specifically task them with looking at a type of criminal offence per se. These are things that may be of interest to general law enforcement—really keeping tabs on what is happening in that protest community. As I said, our protection liaison officers are out there speaking to these communities. They are making very overt contact with them on a weekly basis to try to understand what is happening and to work with them to achieve those outcomes. Again, we want to keep the public safe and make sure that nothing untoward happens along the way. It is very much a professional relationship. They provide details of things that they may feel are of interest to law enforcement. My understanding is that they are not tasked with specific elements of what is available. It is a longstanding contract—about ten years.

Senator WRIGHT: It would then be quite feasible to think that they would be obtaining open-source information about citizens who may not have committed any criminal offence at all.

Mr Negus: They would collect what is available on the internet and in newspapers—those sorts of things—and provide it to us. This is in a macro sense. If there were any semblance of a criminal investigation that needed to be undertaken, we of course would launch that separately. We would do our own intelligence work and collection on that process. But, as I said, a criminal offence would have to be identified or it would have to relate to the protection of high office holders, foreign dignitaries or something like that.⁴

2.7 Continuing examination of the AFP, the committee requested details of the AFP's role in the Australia Day protest at the Lobby Restaurant in Canberra. Commissioner Negus and officers of the AFP provided a detailed timeline of the

3 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 54.

4 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 54.

AFP's involvement and response. Commissioner Negus further advised that a post-operational report was being prepared.⁵

2.8 The AFP was also questioned about the attack on the Syrian Embassy in Canberra on 4 February 2012. Senators sought details of the sequence of events in the lead-up to the incident, and the AFP's response. Commissioner Negus advised the committee that knowledge of attacks on three Syrian embassies overseas was not known to the AFP at the time of its response to the incident. He also confirmed that an assessment by the National Threat Assessment Centre was not conducted prior to the attack.⁶

2.9 Commissioner Negus assured the committee that resourcing levels for this area of intelligence gathering is satisfactory, and further advised:

I am confident...that we can respond appropriately. We had responded appropriately based on the available information. We are now examining if there are ways to better communicate what is happening overseas and make sure our officers are afforded the availability of that information immediately rather than relying on the course of events that took place the other night, where a couple of hours made a big difference in regard to what happened. In fact, the AFP first became aware of the incidents overseas at 10 pm that night. So 20 minutes after the attack took place, the AFP were formally notified of the issues surrounding the Syrian embassy.

Senator HUMPHRIES: As you pointed out, it should not be the AFP's job to gather intelligence about what is happening overseas. It should be somebody else's job to directly get that information.

Mr Negus: You are right. The AFP plays a role in that, of course. The agencies, overwhelmingly, provide that intelligence in sufficient time for the AFP to take appropriate responses. This was an unfortunate incident in which a couple of hours of notification of what was happening overseas would have changed the conditions on the ground. My officers made those decisions based on what was happening.⁷

2.10 The committee also took evidence from the AFP on a range of other matters including the investigation into the alleged leaks relating to the Australia Network tender, the process for charging people suspected of people smuggling, the status of matters relating to Wikileaks, the AFP's role in the development of a cybersecurity strategy, and interception authorisations under the *Telecommunications (Interception and Access) Act 1979*.

5 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 68.

6 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 76.

7 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 77.

Attorney-General's Department

2.11 The Attorney-General's Department was briefly examined on a range of issues, including justice reinvestment, the government's response to the *Doing time – time for doing* report, Australian Government Disaster Recovery Payments to people in the Gascoyne region of Western Australia following flooding in 2010, and the emergency alert upgrade.

Efficiency dividend increase

2.12 The committee raised the increase of 2.5 per cent in the efficiency dividend in 2012-13 with a number of agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio which appeared at the hearing. The committee notes that all the courts and tribunals within the portfolio are exempt from this 'one-off' increase.⁸

2.13 The President of the Australian Human Rights Commission, the Hon Catherine Branson QC, tabled a letter to the Minister for Finance and Deregulation outlining the impact of the increased efficiency dividend on the commission. Her letter revealed that the dollar amount of the increase is \$1.6 million over four years. This may potentially impact the commission's ability to perform its key statutory functions, and could place at risk the commission's accreditation as a 'status A' national human rights institution.⁹ Ms Branson elaborated at the hearing:

The commission, as you know, is evaluated at the international level under the Paris Principles, which have been adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations as the principles which an independent national human rights institution should meet. We were re-assessed late last year and were very gratified to have our status A confirmed. But one of the observations made by those who undertook the assessment was that the growing impact of efficiency dividends on our budget was regrettable and we would be expected to limit our capacity to undertake policy work of our own choice in the way they would wish a national human rights institution to be able to do. That is a concern.

We have greatly appreciated the additional funding that has come the commission's way in recent years, but it has been funding linked to particular areas of work. It has not been funding that has a significant impact on our ability to decide for ourselves that an issue warrants our

8 These include the Family Court of Australia, the Federal Court of Australia, the Federal Magistrates Court of Australia, the High Court of Australia, the Administrative Appeals Tribunal, and the National Native Title Tribunal: see attachment to the Minister for Finance and Deregulation, 'Driving Efficiency Savings Within Government', Media Release, PW 253/11, 29 November 2011, http://www.financeminister.gov.au/media/2011/mr_pw25311.html (accessed 6 March 2012).

9 *Tabled Document No. 1*, Correspondence from the President of the Australian Human Rights Commission to the Minister for Finance and Deregulation, dated 7 December 2011.

attention. Without the capacity to do that, the commission cannot hold its status A accreditation.¹⁰

2.14 Ms Branson further advised at the hearing that the commission has not yet made any decisions on how it will manage the increased efficiency dividend, but expected that it will result in both staffing losses and the loss of some program work.¹¹

2.15 The committee also heard that the Australian Information Commissioner has written to the Secretary of the Department of Finance and Deregulation regarding the additional efficiency dividend, outlining its main areas of concern and requesting a review of the measure.¹² The committee was advised that the impact on the agency would be approximately \$300,000 a year and that it would result in a reduction in staff numbers.¹³

2.16 The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions advised the committee that the increase in the efficiency dividend will reduce its budget by approximately \$2 million each year over the next three years, and will result in a decrease in staffing numbers (most likely by natural attrition).¹⁴

2.17 The Australian Crime Commission advised the committee that the increased efficiency dividend will equate to approximately \$2.1 million a year over the forward estimates. While the Chief Executive Officer, Mr John Lawler, could not provide a definitive answer in terms of staffing losses at the time of the hearing, he advised the committee that 'in all probability, depending on how the budget falls, there will be staffing reductions.'¹⁵

2.18 The committee also questioned the Australian Federal Police about the impact of the increased efficiency dividend on its budget. The committee heard that it would represent \$24.545 million in the 2012-13 financial year for the AFP budget, and approximately \$22 million each year over the forward estimates.¹⁶ The organisation is currently looking at approaches to minimise the impact. Commissioner Negus conceded that there will be staff reductions as a result of these budgetary impacts; however, he confirmed that the AFP would be aiming to minimise the impact on operational staff.¹⁷

10 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 13.

11 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 13.

12 *Tabled Document No. 2*, Correspondence from the Australian Information Commissioner to the Secretary of the Department of Finance and Deregulation, dated 2 February 2012.

13 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 28.

14 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, pp 45-46.

15 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 47.

16 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 72.

17 *Committee Hansard*, 14 February 2012, p. 72.

2.19 Finally, the committee heard briefly from the Attorney-General's Department on its approach to finding savings as a result of the increased efficiency dividend. The Secretary advised that the department would be prioritising savings from reductions in areas such as consultants and contractors, virtual meeting facilities, hospitality and entertainment, and media and advertising, so that front line services that are provided to the community are kept intact.¹⁸

Senator Trish Crossin
Chair

APPENDIX 1

DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES FOR WHICH THE COMMITTEE HAS OVERSIGHT

Attorney-General's Portfolio

- Attorney General's Department;
- Administrative Appeals Tribunal;
- Australian Federal Police;
- Australian Customs and Border Protection Service;
- Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity;
- Australian Crime Commission;
- Australian Government Solicitor;
- Australian Human Rights Commission;
- Australian Institute of Criminology and Criminology Research Council;
- Australian Law Reform Commission;
- Australian Security Intelligence Organisation;
- Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre;
- Classification Board;
- Classification Review Board;
- CrimTrac;
- Family Court of Australia;
- Family Law Council;
- Federal Court of Australia;
- Federal Magistrates Court of Australia;
- High Court of Australia;
- Insolvency and Trustee Service Australia;
- National Native Title Tribunal;
- Office of the Australian Information Commissioner;
- Office of the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions; and
- Office of Parliamentary Counsel.

Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio

- Department of Immigration and Citizenship (including the Office of the Migration Agents Registration Authority); and
- Migration Review Tribunal and Refugee Review Tribunal.

APPENDIX 2

INDEX OF PROOF HANSARDS

Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio, 13 February 2012	Pages
Migration Review Tribunal – Refugee Review Tribunal	3-10
Department of Immigration and Citizenship	
Cross portfolio/corporate/general	10-26
Office of Migration Agents Registration Authority (sub-program 1.1.3)	26-29
Outcome 1	29-52
Outcome 2	52-68
Outcome 3	68-72
Outcome 4	72-118
Outcome 5	118-119
Outcome 6 (released without examination)	
Attorney-General's Portfolio, 14 February 2012	Pages
Australian Human Rights Commission	6-19
Family Court of Australia and Federal Magistrates Court of Australia	19-26
Office of Australian Information Commissioner	26-30
Australian Government Solicitor	30-39
Office of the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions	39-46
Australian Crime Commission	46-49
Australian Federal Police	49-90
Australian Customs and Border Protection Service	90-108
Australian Security Intelligence Organisation	108-112
Attorney-General's Department	112-118

APPENDIX 3

TABLED DOCUMENTS

Immigration and Citizenship, Monday, 13 February 2012

No.	Tabled by:	Topic
1	Mr Andrew Metcalfe, Secretary, Department of Immigration and Citizenship	Opening statement
2	Mr Denis O'Brien, Principal Member, Migration Review Tribunal and Refugee Review Tribunal	Opening statement
3	Ms Christine Sykes, CEO, Office of the MARA	Opening statement
4	Ms Kate Pope, First Assistant Secretary, Community Programs and Children Division, Department of Immigration and Citizenship	Location of Community Detention Properties as at 1 November 2011
5	Ms Kate Pope, First Assistant Secretary, Community Programs and Children Division, Department of Immigration and Citizenship	Household Goods Formation Package List
6	Mr Ken Douglas, First Assistant Secretary, Detention Infrastructure and Services Division, Department of Immigration and Citizenship	Infrastructure Report on Nauru

Attorney-General's Portfolio, Tuesday, 14 February 2012

No.	Tabled by:	Topic
1	The Hon Catherine Branson QC, President, Australian Human Rights Commission	Correspondence from the President of the Australian Human Rights Commission to the Minister for Finance and Deregulation, dated 7 December 2011
2	Mr Timothy Pilgrim, Privacy Commissioner, Office of the Australian Information Commissioner	Correspondence from the Australian Information Commissioner to the Secretary of the Department of Finance and Deregulation, dated 2 February 2012
3	Mr Ian Govey, Chief Executive Officer, Australian Government Solicitor	Opening statement