

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 51

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 23 May 2005:

Please provide information about the number of Mutual Assistance requests and the countries they were received from and made to over the last three years.

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

The following information is accurate for the period 1 July 2002 to 16 June 2005 inclusive.

Requests made by Australia

<i>Country</i>	
Albania	1
Algeria	1
Argentina	3
Austria	3
Bahamas	2
Bahrain	1
Jersey (Channel Islands)	6
Kosovo	1
Lebanon	9
Macau	2
Macedonia	1
Malaysia	3
Maldives	1
Monaco	1
Morocca	1
Netherlands	52
Netherlands Antilles	1
New Zealand	21
Norway	1
Pakistan	2
Panama	4
Peru	1
Philippines	1

Country

Poland	1
Portugal	1
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1
Samoa	1
Singapore	10
Solomon Islands	1
South Africa	4
South Korea	4
Spain	5
St Kitts and Nevis	1
Sweden	3
Switzerland	13
Taiwan	1
Thailand	16
Turkey	4
United Arab Emirates	3
United Kingdom	43
United States	69
Uruguay	1
Vanuatu	4
Vietnam	1
Yugoslavia	1

Requests made to Australia***Country***

Argentina	3
Austria	14
Belarus	3
Belgium	14
Brazil	1
Bulgaria	2
Cambodia	1
Chile	1
Colombia	1

<i>Country</i>	
Croatia	3
Czech Republic	6
Denmark	6
Egypt	2
Estonia	4
Fiji	2
Finland	1
France	9
Germany	26
Greece	6
Hong Kong	4
Hungary	115
ICTY	13
India	5
Indonesia	5
Israel	1
Italy	15
Japan	1
Latvia	1
Liechtenstein	2
Lithuania	4
Mexico	1
Monaco	2
Netherlands	44
New Zealand	14
Norway	1
Panama	2
Philippines	1
Poland	12
Portugal	4
Russian Federation	5
Scotland	2
Serbia & Montenegro	3
Singapore	1

Country

Slovak Republic	1
Slovenia	5
South Africa	1
Spain	15
Sri Lanka	1
Sweden	2
Switzerland	25
Thailand	2
Turkey	42
Ukraine	6
United Kingdom	54
United States	36
Zambia	1

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 52

Senator Collins asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005

With regard to the charges Mr Abu Quassey was convicted of in Cairo in December 2003:

- a) Has the Government made inquiries as to what those charges were?
- b) What were those charges?
- c) What is the maximum sentence that can be imposed under Egyptian law for each of those charges?
- d) What is the maximum sentence that can be imposed under Egyptian law for the crime of manslaughter?

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

- a) Yes.
- b) Abu Quassey was charged with two offences:
 - (i) aiding and abetting attempts to enter a foreign country (namely Australia) without effective travel documents, and
 - (ii) causing death by negligence of more than 3 persons.
- c) For the offence of aiding and abetting attempts to enter a foreign country without effective travel documents the maximum penalty is 7 years imprisonment.

For the offence of causing death by negligence of more than 3 persons the maximum penalty is 5 years imprisonment.
- d) See answer to (c) for crime of causing death by negligence of more than 3 persons. The Government is not aware of sentences attaching to any other manslaughter offences under Egyptian law.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Question No. 53

Senator Collins asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

- a) Has the Government made inquiries as to whether or not Mr Quassey has been charged in Egypt over other voyages he allegedly organised – in particular, the Donnybrook, Gelantipy and Yambuk voyages?
- b) On 12 December 2002, Minister Ellison informed the Parliament that the Government was working to "apprehend Abu Quassey in relation to his alleged involvement in people smuggling activities and bring him to Australia to face the charges".
- i) Can the Attorney-General's Department outline what actions the Government is currently taking with regard to this goal?
 - ii) More specifically, can the Attorney-General's Department outline what actions the Government is taking to ensure Mr Quassey faces charges over the Donnybrook, Gelantipy and Yambuk trips?

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

- (a) The Government understands Mr Abu Quassey was charged with two offences (the following is a translation of the Egyptian indictment):

Firstly: He participated with other unidentified persons, by means of aiding and abetting, in introducing foreigners into the territory of the state of Australia without having effective travel documents and through points of entry unassigned for that. He agreed with those unknown persons to introduce the foreigners into the territory of the state of Australia, using a sea vessel which sailed to Christmas Island and aided them by supplying the necessary money and vessel needed for the purpose. As a result of this agreement and support the crime took place.

Secondly: Caused by mistake the death (Manslaughter) of more than three persons as a result of his negligence, lack of cautiousness, and by not securing the requirements of safety and security while sailing to Christmas Island, Australia.

These charges relate to Mr Quassey's involvement in the SIEV X and for people smuggling into Australia.

- (b) (i) The Attorney-General's Department has advised that Abu Quassey was charged and sentenced for his involvement in people smuggling into Australia on four occasions including involvement with the vessels SIEV X, Yambuk, Donnybrook and Gelantipy.
- (ii) The Attorney-General's Department has advised that Australia sought the extradition of Abu Quassey from Egypt in 2003. Egypt, like many countries, does not extradite its own nationals. The Australian Government will consider any options that may arise for extraditing Mr Quassey in the future, should he leave Egypt.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Question No. 54

Senator Collins asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

With regard to the Indonesian search-and-rescue agency (BASARNAS):

- a) Has the Government made inquiries with BASARNAS as to whether or not they hold the so-called "Jakarta Harbourmaster's Report" referred to on the SBS *Dateline* program on 22 May 2002?
- b) Has the Government made inquiries with BASARNAS as to what documentation they hold on the SIEV-X incident generally?

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

The AFP in Jakarta has made repeated requests to the Indonesian National Police (INP) to provide any information in respect to the "Jakarta Harbourmaster Report" but to date have not received a response. The Australian Navy personnel attached to the Jakarta Post spoke to the Harbour Master at Sunda Kelapa shortly after the sinking of the SIEV-X and obtained a brief report. This report did not provide any information in relation to positional information or the name of the vessel which rescued the survivors or the names/origin of survivors. The same Navy personnel attended Sunda Kelapa on a further occasion and obtained no additional information.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 1.7

Question No. 55

Senator Carr asked the following question at the hearing on 23 May 2005:

Family Violence Prevention measures

- a) Please provide details of all programs within the Attorney-General's portfolio which are aimed at preventing or addressing the impact of family violence for Indigenous people and communities.
- b) Please provide details of estimated funding at the program level for each year 2004-05 to 2008-09.
- c) How is the Attorney-General's Department coordinating its expenditure and program design with FACS?

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

(a) The Attorney-General's Department administers the Family Violence Prevention Legal Services (FVPLS) program and two other programs which partially relate to family violence.

The FVPLS program funds 13 FVPLS units in predominantly regional and remote areas of Australia. The program has been expanded by a further 13 units in identified high need areas during 2004-05.

The Commonwealth Community Legal Services program funds a range of organisations to provide legal services to disadvantaged and marginalised people and communities. It is recognised that Indigenous people, particularly Indigenous women constitute some of the most disadvantaged and marginalised people. Consequently, while not specifically funded for the purpose of preventing or addressing the impact of family violence for Indigenous people and communities, Community Legal Centres do provide a range of assistance in this area.

As part of the National Women's Justice Strategy, funding was provided to a number of women's programs to address those legal issues that commonly concern women, of which family violence is one. These programs are accessible to Indigenous women and include:

- Women's Legal Services
- Rural Women's Outreach Program
- Satellite Women's Project
- Indigenous Women's Project

It is not possible to estimate the amount of funding that is specifically expended in providing assistance to Indigenous women on family violence matters under the National Women's Justice Strategy.

The Attorney-General's Department also administers the National Community Crime Prevention Program, the centrepiece of which is a national community grants programme. Grants are awarded under the following streams:

- Community Safety Stream – grants of up to \$150,000,
- Indigenous Community Safety Stream – grants of up to \$150,000,
- Community Partnership Stream – grants of up to \$500,000 to support innovative and collaborative projects in high-need areas, and
- Grants are available to projects addressing a broad range of community concerns (priority areas include domestic and family violence).

National Community Crime Prevention Program (NCCPP) grants are nationally advertised application-based, and competitive. Decisions regarding the award of grants are made by the Minister for Justice and Customs. Multi-year grants are subject to the Australian Government's requirements for the administration of discretionary grants. The number and mix of grants awarded under each stream and in each priority area in funding round will vary.

As at 8 June 2005, the following grants have been awarded under the NCCPP to projects specifically targeting Indigenous family violence:

- Kabbarli Home and Community Care – Walparra Kaduwna – \$133,217 (QLD)
- Brisbane Indigenous Media Association – Keepin' Safe – \$120,000 (QLD)
- Bibelmen Mia Aboriginal Corporation – Crime Prevention through Culture – \$137,000 (WA)
- Protective Behaviours WA Inc - \$150,000 (WA). Arabunna Nulla Kari- Gunyangara Men's Group - \$150,000 (NT), and
- Killara Refuge/Inarr Nura Aboriginal Women and Children - \$138,135 (NSW).

It is not possible to estimate the amount of funding which will be awarded under the NCCPP to family violence projects in future rounds.

(b) The following table provides details of estimated funding at the program level for the financial years 2004-05 to 2008-09 for the Family Violence Prevention Legal Services program.

2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
\$7,865,818	\$10,863,000	\$10,895,000	\$10,117,000	\$11,262,000

(c) Officers of the Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Family and Community Services meet monthly and comment on each other's program activities to ensure that all projects are complementary to existing programs and that consistency is maintained in the delivery of all services.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.2

Question No. 56

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 23 May 2005:

Please provide a full list of applicants for the second round of the Computer Network Vulnerability Assessment Program.

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

Four applications were received for the second round of the Computer Network Vulnerability Assessment Program. The applications were as follows:

1. The Australian Red Cross Blood Service
2. A joint application from the Tasmanian Energy Sector comprising the following three organisations:
 - Transend Networks Pty. Ltd.
 - Hydro Electric Corporation
 - Aurora Energy Pty. Ltd.
3. Australian Pharmaceutical Industries Limited
4. Country Energy (based in New South Wales)

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 57

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

Please break down budget expenditure of Output 2.4 into sub programs. (eg: diplomatic guarding, dignitary protection or high office holders?)

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

A breakdown of budget expenditure for Output 2.4 in 2004-05 by sub-program is as follows:

Counter-Terrorism - \$2.80m

Policy and Services - \$4.08m

Security Programs - \$26.79m (including Guarding of \$23.46m)

Information Coordination - \$4.44m

Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games Security - \$.30m

APEC 2007 Security - \$.41m

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 58

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

Please provide details of how much is expended on a per month basis on private contractors to provide security services.

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

It is anticipated that \$79,942 will be expended in the 2004-05 financial year on private sector guarding. The average per month expenditure is \$6,662.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 59

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

What is the cost of providing security for visiting dignitaries in 2003-04 and 2004-05?

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

Management and coordination of visits is part of the core business of the Attorney-General's Department and is budget funded.

Excluding salaries, the costs of providing security to visiting dignitaries was \$20,560 in 2003-04 and \$67,560 to date in 2004-05.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Question No. 60

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

Are you able to provide a breakdown of what expenditure was made in relation to providing security for Crown Prince Frederick and Crown Princess Mary of Denmark's visit, as far as the Commonwealth is concerned?

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

Other Australian government agencies absorbed their own costs.

The expenditure incurred by the Attorney-General's Department in relation to providing security for Crown Prince Frederick and Crown Princess Mary of Denmark's visit (excluding salary) was \$3,172.

Management and coordination of visits is part of the core business of the Attorney-General's Department and is budget funded.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 61

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 23 May 2005:

What was the cost of compensation, directly attributed to Attorney-General's, from the counter terrorism exercise in Victoria?

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

There has been no cost of compensation, directly attributed to the Attorney-General's Department, from the counter terrorism exercise in Victoria.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 62

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 23 May 2005:

Australian Vetting Service –

- a) What has been allocated?
- b) how much has been spent?
- c) what is the estimate for 2004-05?

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

- a) In the 2004-05 financial year the funding allocated to the Australian Security Vetting Service was \$1,839,578.
- b) The expenditure as at 31 May 2005 is \$1,705,329.
- c) It is estimated the Australian Security Vetting Service will expend \$195,360 in June 2005. There are three pay periods in June which accounts for the variance in monthly expenditure.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 63

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 23 May 2005:

What amount is actually paid to a contractor to carry out vetting service?

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

Contractors are paid a set rate per case – the level of clearance determines the rate paid.

There are other agencies and private companies which conduct personnel security vetting. The rates that the Australian Security Vetting Service pays are commercial-in-confidence for this reason.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 64

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 23 May 2005:

Have all the recommendations of the Review of the protective security for holders on high office conducted in 2003-04 been implemented?

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

All key recommendations of the Review have been or are in the process of being implemented.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 65

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 23 May 2005:

National Security Hotline – how many hoax calls have been received?

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

The National Security Hotline is not in a position to answer this question. All calls received at the National Security Hotline and processed as an "Information Call" are forwarded to the respective State/Territory police authorities, ASIO and the Australian Federal Police. It remains the responsibility of these authorities and agencies to undertake analysis and investigation, further determining the relevance of the information to terrorist activities.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 66

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

National Security Hotline – Of the 24,000 cases taken for the provision of information, can this be broken down into telephone calls, e-mails and letters?

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

The National Security Hotline has received 24,220 communications (as of 14 June 2005) that have been classified as "information calls". The table below breaks down the communications by year and method received:

Year	Phone calls	E-mails	Letters
2002	619	47	11
2003	11,912	1,223	604
2004	6,418	1,132	310
2005	1,600	232	112

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 67

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

National Security Hotline – can you provide a breakdown from the commencement of the Hotline in 2002 of information as telephone calls, e-mails and letters?

The answer to the Honourable Senator's question is as follows:

The National Security Hotline has received 49,109 calls, e-mails and letters as of 14 June 2005, expressed by year below:

2002 – 752

2003 – 25561

2004 – 16237

2005 - 6086

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Question No. 68

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

- a) Please provide a comparison of National Security Hotline costs for 2003, 2004 and 2005.
- b) How has the public awareness campaign or the funding been taken into consideration?

The answer to the Honourable Senator's question is as follows:

a) Expenditure on the National Security Hotline for 2002-03 was approximately \$4.6m. This figure does not include a Public Affairs component, but does include establishment and running costs.

Expenditure on the National Security Hotline for 2003-04 was approximately \$3.5m. This does not include Public Affairs expenditure.

Expenditure on the National Security Hotline for 2004-05 was approximately \$3.7m. This does not include Public Affairs expenditure.

b) The national security public information campaign was run by the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet in 2002-03 and expenditure on it was \$18.5 million.

In 2003-04, the Attorney-General's Department Public Affairs Unit spent \$707,000 on the campaign. \$493,000 was rolled over to continue the campaign in 2004-05.

In 2004-05, the Attorney-General's Department Public Affairs Unit spent \$1,076,000 on the campaign, as well as \$6.1 million provided at Additional Estimates. \$617,000 was rolled over to continue the campaign in 2005-06.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 69

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 23 May 2005:

National Security Hotline – How many calls in each of its years of operation have been referred to agencies? Please break down by referral to jurisdiction.

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

The National Security Hotline has received by year and forwarded to ASIO and State/Territory Police the total calls expressed in the table below, as at 14 June 2005:

Year	ASIO/AFP	ACT	NSW	VIC	SA	WA	QLD	TAS	NT
2002	677	10	237	148	43	56	74	4	3
2003	13,739	354	4,495	2,560	728	1,288	1,739	181	61
2004	7,860	218	2,556	1,540	457	624	1,023	106	53
2005	1,944	49	632	362	98	125	244	26	14

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 70

Senator Kirk asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

What are the costs of providing security for visiting dignitaries, for both AGs and AFP, for the years

- a) 2003-04
- b) 2004-05 and
- c) 2005-06

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

The joint Attorney-General's Department and Australian Federal Police cost of providing security for visiting dignitaries for the stated years was:

- a) 2003-04 - Attorney-General's Department \$20,560 (excluding salary) and Australian Federal Police \$541,749 (British Royals \$344,781; Danish Royals \$50,736; Heads of State including US and China Presidents \$146,232 – including salary).
- b) 2004-05 - Attorney-General's Department \$67,560 (excluding salary) and Australian Federal Police \$75,709 (including salary; figures are incomplete due to acquittal process delays).
- c) 2005-06 – as this is the next financial year in which no expenditure has yet been incurred, it is inappropriate to forecast costs for visiting dignitaries, as in the main visits are only advised a few months in advance.

The Attorney-General's Department salary costs for dignitary protection are budget funded and are not able to be separated for each visit. Costs provided relate to travel incurred in relation to total visits for each year.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 71

Senator Kirk asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

What was the joint cost, both AGs and AFP, of security for the recent visit of Crown Prince of Denmark and his wife, Princess Mary?

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

The joint Attorney-General's Department and Australian Federal Police cost of security for the recent visit of Crown Prince of Denmark and his wife, Princess Mary was \$53,908.

This cost includes \$3,172 (excluding salary) for the Attorney-General's Department and \$50,736 (including salary) for the Australian Federal Police.

Salary costs for the Attorney-General's Department officers involved in dignitary protection are budget funded and are not able to be separately identified. The costs identified relate to travel incurred during the visit.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 72

Senator Kirk asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

What was the total spent for the various visits to this country by the British royal family between 1999 and 2005?

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

The joint Attorney-General's Department and Australian Federal Police cost of providing security for the various visits to this country by the British royal family between 1999 and 2005 was \$370,081.

This cost includes \$25,300 (excluding salary) for the Attorney-General's Department and \$344,781 (including salary) for the Australian Federal Police.

Salary costs for the Attorney-General's Department officers involved in dignitary protection are budget funded and are not able to be separately identified. The costs identified relate to travel incurred during the visit.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.2

Question No. 73

Senator Lundy asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

Can the department provide a full description of their role in e-security and physical security or ICT in the Commonwealth, critical infrastructure protection and associated resource allocations?

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

The question is taken to refer to the security of information and communications technology (ICT) in terms of preventing unauthorised access to hardware and information or the loss of integrity or availability of such systems.

In an operational sense, the Attorney-General's Department (AGD) is only responsible for the security of its own corporate ICT. AGD actively participates in inter-departmental committees such as the Chief Information Officers' Committee which touch on such matters from time to time.

In terms of policy responsibility for Australian Government ICT the Protective Security Coordination Centre (PSCC), a division of the Attorney-General's Department, provides policy advice on protective security issues, and is responsible for promulgating Australian Government protective security policy. It also offers training in all protective security practices and procedures, and provides an advisory service to all Australian Government agencies on protective security matters.

The PSCC supports the Protective Security Policy Committee (PSPC), a high-level inter-departmental consultative committee. The committee consists of senior executives from those agencies with a strong interest in national and non-national security matters. The Executive Director, PSCC, chairs the PSPC and a secretariat within the PSCC serves the committee. The Department, in consultation with the PSPC and other agencies, produces the Protective Security Manual.

In terms of policy responsibility for ICT security as a part of critical infrastructure protection, the Department has the role of coordinating measures to identify and protect the critical elements of the nation's information infrastructure. There are several major elements of this work including;

- The Information Infrastructure Protection Group, a monthly meeting of relevant Australian Government agencies to coordinate the protection of the National Information Infrastructure
- National Information Technology Alert Service, a free National Information Technology Alert Service to the public provided by the Australian Computer Emergency Response Team (AusCERT) with funding assistance from the Australian Government
- The Computer Network Vulnerability Assessment Program, which helps owners and operators of critical infrastructure in identifying major vulnerabilities within computer systems and interdependencies between connected computer networks, and testing their ability to resist exploitation.

- The Trusted Information Sharing Network for Critical Infrastructure Protection, which comprises a number of advisory groups examining threats and vulnerabilities to critical infrastructure, including to ICT

Announcements of supplemental funding for AGD for critical infrastructure protection were made as part of the FY02/03 and FY04/05 federal budgets.

Internationally AGD has addressed ICT security issues through the Telecommunications and Information Technology Working Group of APEC (APECTEL) and the OECD Expert Group of the Working Party on Information Security and Privacy. In APEC, AGD has provided officers and support to projects aimed at increasing the number of Computer Emergency Response Teams (CERTs) in the region, and promoting cooperation between them. AGD provided officers and support to the Expert Group of the Working Party on Information Security and Privacy to the OECD which met during 2001 and 2002. The resulting *OECD Guidelines for the Security of Information Systems and Networks: Towards a Culture of Security* were adopted as a recommendation of the OECD Council at its 1037th Session on 25 July 2002.

AGD has also taken a leadership role in bilateral and multilateral discussions with countries including the USA, Canada, UK, New Zealand, Japan and the Republic of Korea on these issues.

AGD also has policy responsibility for a number of areas such as telecommunications interception, privacy and copyright law that are not specific to ICT but can impact its security.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.4

Question No. 74

Senator Lundy asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

Can the PSCC please provide information on the establishment, reporting, monitoring and enforcement of all its obligations under the JCPAA Inquiry into the Management and Integrity of Electronic Information in the Commonwealth report, including the level of compliance for each individual agency and department for each of the requirements?

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

The PSCC in the Attorney-General's department is the lead agency for responding to Recommendations 1, 5 and 6 of the JCPAA Report No 399. Progress against those recommendations is as follows:

Recommendation 1

The PSCC chaired the review of the Protective Security Manual (PSM). The revised Australian Government PSM, which will be available later this year, details the minimum standards for the protection of Australian Government resources (including information, personnel and assets) that agencies must meet in their operations. The revised PSM addresses the JCPAA Report No 399 recommendations regarding information and communications technology (ICT) physical security issues and refers extensively to the Australian Government Information and Communications Technology Security Manual (ACSI 33) prepared by the Defence Signals Directorate.

The Protective Security Policy Committee, an interdepartmental committee, monitors agency compliance with Government policy through an annual self-assessment survey of all departments and agencies. The annual Australian Government Protective Security Survey requires agencies to report on the compliance of their security plans with the PSM's requirements for the protection and storage (physical protection) of ICT systems. Survey results will soon be considered by Government.

Recommendation 5

The revised PSM mandates that agencies must comply with the reporting requirements of the Information Security Incident Detection, Reporting and Analysis Scheme (ISIDRAS).

Recommendation 6

The revised PSM mandates agencies develop an information security policy and refers to ACSI 33 for further details on ICT security. The PSM reinforces the requirements for security risk management strategies specific to ICT.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN CRIME COMMISSION

Question No. 75

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 24 May 2005:

If available, please provide statistics that demonstrate the workload of ACC Examiners from 2003 onwards

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

Examiner workloads may be broadly categorised into three statutory duties under the ACC Act; s.28 Issue of Summons to attend examinations, s29 Issue of Notices to produce documents and s.24A conducting examinations.

	Issue of summons to attend an examination - s.28 of the ACC Act				
Examiners	Bennett	Boulton	Hannaford	Sage	Total
Jul 03 to Jun 04	3	162	51	78	294
Jul 04 to 19 May 05*	0	272	146	159	577
TOTAL	3	434	197	237	871

Persons summonsed to an examination are required to attend at a nominated date and time. The duration of an examination may vary from one hour to several days and as such may involve a number of sittings. Alternatively, some witnesses choose to provide a signed statement in lieu of an appearance before an Examiner at an examination.

Examinations conducted - s.24A of the ACC Act				
Examiners	Boulton	Hannaford	Sage	Total
Jul 03 to Jun 04	171	47	80	307
Jul 04 to 19 May 05	249	142	156	547
TOTAL	420	189	236	854

Examinations conducted - s.29 of the ACC Act				
Examiners	Boulton	Hannaford	Sage	Total
Jul 03 to Jun 04	117	56	154	327
Jul 04 to 19 May 05	132	146	155	433
TOTAL	249	202	309	760

Mr Bennett's appointment to the ACC ceased on 16 July 2003, Mr Hannaford commenced on 12 January 2004 and Mr Sage commenced on 19 January 2004.