

## Questions on Notice Additional Budget Estimates 2009-2010

Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government Portfolio  
Tuesday 9 February 2010

QON No.	Date Asked	Hansard page reference/ Written	Senator	Question
<b>CORP 01</b>	9/2/10	6	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Well, Mr Mrdak, I was very angry with your department, but I see my anger was misplaced. Your department has obviously done its job. Can you tell me how many of the answers submitted by the department to the minister came back with alterations required?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—I do not have that information.</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—We will have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—I do not have that information, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—You would not have the notice in exact terms, but were there a lot, a few?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—I think—</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—We will take that on notice so that we can give that an accurate answer, Senator Macdonald.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—No, I am not after an accurate answer, thanks, Minister. Just an approximation will do. Is it a lot?</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—We would prefer to give accurate answers, Senator Macdonald, so we will take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—You are here to answer questions, not indicate your preferences.</p> <p><b>CHAIR</b>—The minister has said he will take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—We said we will take it on notice.</p>
<b>CORP 02</b>	9/2/10	9-10	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Can you give me details of the public notice advertising?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—Senator, the government has laid out very extensive guidelines in the definition of the term ‘advertising’ and has put in place guidelines since 2008 which set out a very defined definition and a process for approval of government advertising. I am happy to take on notice the amount of public notices that the department has published, but they are not advertising. They are notices in relation to regulatory changes, or where there are discussion papers and the like, seeking public comment. But I would not in any way characterise them as advertising in accordance with the definitions of the government’s guidelines.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Thank you, Mr Mrdak, but can I have details on that for</p>

				2007-08 and 2008-09, please? Can I update the question on marketing for 2008-09 on just what was spent on public notice advertising as well? <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —Yes, Senator.
<b>CORP 03</b>	9/2/10	10	Senator MACDONALD	<b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —Mr Mrdak, how many pot plants in the minister's office? <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —I am not aware there are any, Senator, but I am happy to take that on notice. <b>Senator Conroy</b> —We will do a headcount for you. <b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —Could you take on notice how many pot plants are in the minister's office, what is the cost— <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —I do not believe there are any, Senator, that are publicly funded, but I will check that. <b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —Well, that would be unusual. <b>Senator Conroy</b> —By the department. <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —By the department. Sorry. I do not believe there any the department has— <b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —Okay. That would be unusual, and very frugal if that is the case, but could you take on notice are there any pot plants paid for by the department and, if so, can you give us the financial details of those?
<b>CORP 04</b>	9/2/10	10-11	Senator MACDONALD	<b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —Thank you. Can you tell me what the department and the minister's office spend— <b>Senator Conroy</b> —We know there is a pot plant in your office. <b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —on hospitality for the year to date, and can you detail the date, location, purpose and cost of those events? And for each minister and parliamentary secretary's office, could you detail the total hospitality spend for the year to date and, again, giving me the detail—date, location, purpose and the cost—of those events? <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —Certainly, Senator. I think there have been answers provided on notice to those questions. <b>Senator Conroy</b> —Absolutely. They get tabled every six months. Publicly. <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —I will check the detail, Senator, of that.
<b>CORP 05</b>	9/2/10	11	Senator MACDONALD	<b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —Okay. Thank you. I would appreciate that. You mentioned before about your rearrangement of staffing. Can you tell me what is the permanent staff recruited since the last estimates and the level of those staff? <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —I will get that information for you, Senator. It is a relatively small number. The department has been going through a restructure and a reduction in resourcing, as with all Commonwealth agencies, and there would be very few permanent appointments been made. But I will take that on notice.
<b>CORP 06</b>	9/2/10	12	Senator MACDONALD	<b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —Thank you for that. Do you have details of the cost of ministers' travel and expenses of community cabinet meetings, so far as your department is concerned? Do they involve many departmental officials travelling with the minister? <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —No. Generally, either myself or one of my deputies will accompany the

				<p>minister at community cabinet, but since my time in the portfolio I think we have had one additional officer attend a community cabinet meeting. But apart from that, no, generally just myself or a senior executive will attend with the minister.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Could you, on notice, give me details of the costs of travel and otherwise of yourself and whoever else from the department goes? If you have ministerial costs that are paid for by the department, could we have a look at those, too, please?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—Certainly. We do not meet any of the ministerial costs. They are met through the normal provisions of ministerial officers by the Department of Finance and Deregulation.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Thank you for that. Could you let me know what it costs the department.</p>
<b>AAA 01</b>	9/2/10	12	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—That is very good. Perhaps, on notice, you could give me the full list of that and the cost of the review to date—people being paid. I understand that public servant people on it will not be being paid, but what are the costs of that?</p>
<b>IA 01</b>	9/2/10	16	Senator WILLIAMS	<p><b>Senator WILLIAMS</b> —Yes. The department’s annual report states that focus group sessions were conducted across the major cities and a research roundtable was held in June 2009. Did the unit staff attend these events?</p> <p><b>Mr Deegan</b>—Yes, they did, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator WILLIAMS</b> —What were the costs associated with these events? Example, travel, accommodation, catering, venue hire et cetera. Have you got any idea of that?</p> <p><b>Mr Deegan</b>—I will take that on notice, Senator.</p>
<b>IA 02</b>	9/2/10	17	Senator WILLIAMS	<p><b>Senator WILLIAMS</b> —Thank you. And what cities were visited?</p> <p><b>Mr Deegan</b>—Again, I will take that on notice. It certainly would have been all the major capital cities. There will be others. I will check that for you.</p> <p><b>Senator WILLIAMS</b> —Any regional cities?</p> <p><b>Mr Deegan</b>—I will check that for you, Senator.</p>
<b>CORP 07</b>	9/2/10	17	Senator WILLIAMS	<p><b>Senator WILLIAMS</b> —Senator Conroy is not interjecting or pinning my ears back, so we will move on. According to the May 2009 estimates the unit has an annual budget of \$1 million. We have been into that. What is the breakdown of this? How much were wages, administration, et cetera? Do you know that?</p> <p><b>Mr Deegan</b>—I will get that for you. There are four staff engaged and I will get the breakdown for you.</p>
<b>CORP 08</b>	9/2/10	19	Senator NASH	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Has the department occupied premises in Sydney before?</p> <p><b>Mr Banham</b>—We have offices at Rosebery.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—And what is the cost per square metre out there?</p> <p><b>Mr Banham</b>—I do not have that information. I can get that to you, Senator.</p>

<b>CORP 09</b>	9/2/10	21	Senator ABETZ	<p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—What is the uplift factor in the seven-year contract lease per annum? Is it CPI or a centenary house type lease, nine per cent per annum irrespective of CPI?</p> <p><b>Mr Banham</b>—My understanding is it is four per cent. I will get back and correct myself—</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—Irrespective of market movements?</p> <p><b>Mr Banham</b>—There would be a rent review midway through the lease, which would adjust things if the market has moved.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—Please let us know what the annual increase is and when the rent review is to take place.</p>
<b>CORP 10</b>	9/2/10	26	Senator NASH	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—The 2008-09 PBS said that the department would provide staff from 2008-09 to assist you. Is it 17 staff including you?</p> <p><b>Mr Deegan</b>—It is 16 staff, plus one secondee who is paid for the capital city lord mayors.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—And what is the overall cost of those 16 staff?</p> <p><b>Mr Deegan</b>—I will get that for you.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Could you take that on notice for me?</p> <p><b>Mr Deegan</b>—Yes.</p>
<b>IA 03</b>	9/2/10	<b>30</b>	<b>Senator NASH</b>	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—So what is the cost of actually doing the overview? I am assuming that, if people are shifting around and business is being done, there has to be some sort of price tag attached to that. So do you have a general idea annually or of how long the actual process is going to run for from the beginning to the time it is finalised?</p> <p><b>Mr Deegan</b>—All up, we have been going for a solid six or seven months on it. It will be another five months or so. It is within our budget.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Just for the committee, just so we have a bit of a ball park figure, do you have any idea of—</p> <p><b>Mr Deegan</b>—I will come back to you on that. I just do not have that off the top of my head. I do not want to mislead you.</p>
<b>NB-II 01</b>	9/2/10	38	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Can you give some estimate as to how much you think you will reduce that equivalent \$20 billion figure by?</p> <p><b>Ms O’Connell</b>—We have not done the predictive modelling in terms of what that might reduce by. We can certainly take it on notice to have a look at what modelling might have been done in terms of that reduction. I think it is fair to say that when all of these projects were assessed, they were assessed with criteria that did look at issues like reduction of congestion, as in each individual project, but we have not got an aggregate in terms of reduction of congestion.</p>
<b>NB-II 02</b>	9/2/10	39-40	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—What data was used in allocating the priority areas, and can you table for us, or could you take on notice and provide to us, copies of that relevant data? Is that to Ms McNally?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—Yes, Senator.</p>

				<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Thank you. Can you provide that or do you have it with you?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—I will provide it. Some of it is still the subject of detailed planning, so we can provide what we have available. being provided to?</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Yes. I am looking for the data in terms of what prioritised the areas that needed work doing, and the order in which they were done and therefore the expenditure and what extent, if at all, the minister or staff of the minister took in determining those sections of the M1 to be funded in this particular tranche that you have spoken about. If you could provide me with that information, I would be appreciative. Also, was your department the federal department involved in identifying which were priority orders? The basis on which I am particularly interested to know that is from the perspective of accidents or, tragically, deaths that might have occurred.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—We will seek that information. We do not have that detail with us.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Sure, but could you make that available to me. Finally, on this particular one, since I gave an introduction to my comments just by way of background about the involvement of the Queensland government, when was it that the federal government was informed by the Queensland government that the 18½ kilometres of the promised Tugun to Nerang section would not be upgraded? Can you give us any advice on that?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—I will have to take all of that on notice.</p>
<b>NB-II 03</b>	9/2/10	41	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Could you advise me, perhaps on notice, what, if any, submissions are made to the Queensland government in relation to that particular issue, and with what priority they are concerned about deaths there. If you would not mind providing a sort of general report on that particular issue, I will not ask too many other questions. Just another couple of quick ones. There is a desperately needed piece of urban infrastructure in Innisfail, North Queensland—the Jubilee Bridge crossing the South Johnstone River. Funding was applied for and was knocked back, I understand, just recently. Can anyone confirm that?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—I have not got that information with me. I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—I thought one of your assistants behind you looked as if she might have known something about it.</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—No, they have not got it with them.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—There was an application for funding. It really joins Innisfail. Innisfail is dissected by two major rivers, the north and South Johnstone. This bridge goes over one. It is quite an old bridge. It is the Jubilee. I am not sure which Jubilee it was, but it has been there for a long time. It is about to be condemned and cannot take heavy traffic. They applied for nation building and, as I understand it, they were knocked back. Could I get the reasons for that and any other information you could give me about</p>

				it. <b>Ms McNally</b> —Yes, I will see what we can do.
<b>NB-II 04</b>	9/2/10	41	Senator MACDONALD	<b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —We know the history, Minister. Just quickly, in Mackay, there was a project where the government announced \$14.4 million for a road project in January last year. In December of last year, there was a much celebrated opening of that project, but the funding was said to be \$12.3 million and we just wonder if you could, perhaps on notice, give me a brief explanation of the difference? <b>Ms McNally</b> —We are happy to do that, Senator.
<b>NB-II 05</b>	9/2/10	43	Senator MACDONALD	<b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —Can you give me details of how many houses would have to be resumed, how many businesses would have to be closed down and how many schools would have to relocate or have major alteration to their entrances? Could you try and get that information for me? <b>Ms McNally</b> —The study is still being undertaking. <b>Senator Conroy</b> —Studies and planning have indicated that progressively upgrading the existing Bruce Highway is the way to go. We have \$150 million invested in it. We are getting on with the job. After 12 years of inaction, you seem now to be arguing for more studies and more delays. <b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —Minister, because at times I like you, I would just suggest to you that I would not get too fixed on a particular route at this time, bearing in mind Leichhardt is a very marginal seat. If I can get the answer to my question about how many people's homes will be resumed, how many people's businesses will be destroyed and how many thousands of people at the schools will be adversely impacted by the proposed route, then you might be as interested as I will be in the answers to that. So if we can get that— <b>Ms McNally</b> —The detailed study is not due till the middle of this year and information relating to those resumptions will not be available until after that. So I guess the answer is we could take that on notice eventually. <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —We will get you what information we can at this stage. But, as Ms McNally is indicating, the full details of those options and implications will not be available till the study is completed later this year. We will get you what information we can from Queensland at this stage.
<b>NB-II 06</b>	9/2/10	44	Senator NASH	<b>Senator NASH</b> —I want to talk about the Princes Highway east from Traralgon to Sale in Victoria. I refer to a commitment that was made in a media release of 27 November 2007 by the minister Martin Ferguson for \$140 million to start duplicating the Princes Highway east from Traralgon to Sale. Can you provide an update on that update? <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —My understanding is that the construction contract for the Traralgon East section was awarded on 14 January this year to Fulton Hogan Pty Ltd. Construction of that section commenced on 1 February.

				<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—I think the section of road is over 50 kilometres. Is the \$140 million figure correct?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—As I understand it, there is a lot of single lane along those 50 kilometres. How much of that 50 kilometres is that \$140 million expected to address?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—We will have to take that on notice. It is 44 kilometres in total.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Is there any commitment for future funding to deal with the last six kilometres, or is there a reason that is not being dealt with?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—I would have to take that on notice.</p>
<b>NB-II 07</b>	9/2/10	50-51	Senator ABETZ	<p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—Which was at the hands of the bureaucracy, one would imagine, at all times and deliberately not provided. I now turn to NBII 06. I asked in relation to the MOUs that were signed with the states and territories. I was told by Ms McNally: The list was finalised when the MOUs were provided to the states and territories.</p> <p>I then asked: And what date was that?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>: I would have to take on notice.</p> <p>Quite reasonable. I am then told: The Nation Building projects can be found on the Nation Building Program website.</p> <p>Just press the button for the same answer. I actually want to know the date. I am not interested in the projects. I was asking about the date the various MOUs were provided to the states and territories. Can we be told that, please? What was the date?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—I will find that for you, Senator.</p>
<b>NB-II 08</b>	9/2/10	54	Senator ABETZ	<p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—Right. Now, who has been invited to this official launch?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—I do not have that information with me, Senator. I would have to take that aspect of the question on notice.</p>
<b>NB-II 09</b>	9/2/10	56	Senator MILNE	<p><b>Senator MILNE</b>—Under the nation building project, what money has been set aside for the Northern Economic Triangle development? Is the Commonwealth investing in that in any which way under this Nation Building-Infrastructure Investment program?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—I will have to take that on notice, Senator.</p>
<b>NB-II 10</b>	9/2/10	56	Senator MILNE	<p><b>Senator MILNE</b>—Can you tell me what volumes of coal we are expecting to be exporting from the Chinalco, the Hancock mining and Waratah Coal developments?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—I would have to take that on notice as well, Senator.</p>
<b>NB-II 11</b>	9/2/10	57	Senator MILNE	<p><b>Senator MILNE</b>—Sure. On this multicargo port facility that is being proposed for North Queensland, can you just include that in terms of whether the Commonwealth has got any money in these port facility expansions for those coal developments. Thanks, Chair.</p>
<b>NB-II 12</b>	9/2/10	57	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I will draw the attention of the committee for a few minutes to a couple of projects in Western Australia. The first one relates to the funding agreement between</p>

				<p>the former government and the City of Wanneroo, which was signed in 2007. I understand it was a \$7 million grant to assist with the extension of the Ocean Reef Road from Hartman Drive to Gnangara Road north of the city. Are you aware of this project?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—No, I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I would ask you to take a number of questions on notice. First, there was an understanding that the project would be finished by June 2010 under that agreement, but it will not be. When will it be completed? Are the department and the minister aware of the delay? What is the involvement of the department and/or the minister in authorising that delay and the occasioning of it? What, if any, funding variations have been authorised in the project and by whom? So we cannot throw any more light on that one at the moment?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—No.</p>
<b>NB-II 13</b>	9/2/10	58	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—At this stage would you be aware of the convening of this particular task force?</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—I would have to check. There have been a number of meetings between us and the Western Australian government. I have not personally attended those, so I will check exactly which particular groups are getting together and what our knowledge is of those.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Thank you. If you do that, I would also like to know whether or not to this point the Commonwealth has actually allocated any funding to the task force itself and, if so, how much. Obviously we are all keen to know what will be allocated in the forward estimates for that particular project.</p> <p><b>Ms McNally</b>—I can answer now that \$3 million has been provided to Western Australia to develop the Perth airport transport master plan. A steering group oversees that. I am not sure if that is the same as a task force; sometimes they have a number of committees. So I will double-check that aspect.</p>
<b>NB-II 14</b>	9/2/10	62	Senator BUSHBY	<p><b>Senator BUSHBY</b>—When I went and had a look at Hansard I found that the minister was basically referring to proposals of other parties, not the government. The question was about the Prime Minister ruling out the provision of funding directly, not whether other parties were putting forward proposals or what the government thought of those proposals. The answer did not go to the merits of the case; it was more about the format and the way that the proposals had been put forward by the other parties. I am interested in knowing on what basis the Prime Minister ruled out providing funding.</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—I am not sure the officer could possibly answer that. You have asked about the Prime Minister's motivations. We are happy to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator BUSHBY</b>—I would have thought that the motivations of the government in making decisions are actually quite relevant for the people of Australia to know. It is not something that is a matter of opinion.</p>

				<b>Senator Conroy</b> —I said that Mr Mrdak would not be able to answer that question. We are happy to take that on notice for you.
<b>ISTP 01</b>	9/2/10	63	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I refer to the question of heavy vehicle driver fatigue and the reforms that were agreed to by transport ministers, I think, in 2007 and rolled out in 2008. Can you tell me which states and/or territories have agreed to adopt those reforms?</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—My understanding is that the Australian Transport Council has approved those reforms and that at this time laws relating to driver fatigue based on the model law developed by the National Transport Commission have been passed in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Right. So we are about halfway there?</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I simply reiterate that they have been passed in those three states.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Where are they in the other states and in the Northern Territory? Do you have any advice for the committee about the status of the process of enacting?</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—No, I do not. I will take that on notice.</p>
<b>ISTP 02</b>	9/2/10	64	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Also, drivers can make a defence against a breach of these provisions if they cannot find a reasonable or suitable place of rest on the highway and they find a rest stop after 45 minutes. Is that correct? In other words, if they are driving for 5¼ hours, the required time comes along and there is no suitable place to pull off, a driver can effectively keep going for up to three-quarters of an hour. Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I regret to say that I am not sufficiently familiar with the detail of the model legislation. I will take the question on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—When you do respond, would you advise me whether in Victoria and New South Wales the above premise is not a defence in the event that a driver has failed to pull up? Can you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—We will examine how each of those states have implemented their fatigue laws.</p>
<b>ISTP 03</b>	9/2/10	64	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Thank you. Can you give us an indication of what the differences are between logbook requirements in the different jurisdictions?</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—That is a matter for the parliaments in each of those jurisdictions.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I am sure that the legislation is a matter for the parliaments, but can you tell us what the differences are, if any?</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—That is a complex question across eight states and territories. I am sure you will understand if the officers would like to take it on notice to ensure we give you an accurate answer.</p>
<b>ISTP 04</b>	9/2/10	68	Senator ABETZ	<b>Senator ABETZ</b> —So it was not my questioning but somebody a little bit earlier on. Until one of the stakeholders in early October drew your attention to it, did the department have any record or any analysis as to how long these claims were taking to be processed by Centrelink?

				<p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I think my staff had some idea that the time had become longer than we might have preferred. I would have to examine the record to see what form of data and analysis they had undertaken at that point.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—If you could take that on notice, and please do not tell me that the information is available on a website. I would appreciate a written answer.</p>
<b>ISTP 05</b>	9/2/10	69	Senator ABETZ	<p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—Is that report available? Can that be made publicly available?</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I believe that may have been part of our internal considerations, so I would need to consult with the minister about that.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—It would be helpful if you could take that on notice.</p>
<b>ISTP 06</b>	9/2/10	69	Senator ABETZ	<p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—That is what I thought. I think we are on the same wavelength there. You might need to check, but I have been advised that freight-forwarding companies such as LINFOX were involved in consultations. In fact, LINFOX does not have any involvement in sea transport to or from Tasmania. Why were they consulted as part of the ministerial direction consultations?</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I will take some advice on that and take the question on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—I accept that that occurred—</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—In advance of my being in the role.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—prior to your taking over the issue. However, I understand that Searoad Shipping was not consulted despite the fact that it is involved in sea transport to and from Tasmania. Another company, Southern Shipping, which is now in administration also was not consulted. I would like you to provide to us on notice the reason or rationale for some being consulted and others not—especially if the advice I have is right that, for example, Linfox is not involved in sea transport to and from Tasmania.</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I will seek to discover those considerations and see what we can provide.</p>
<b>ISTP 07</b>	9/2/10	71	Senator ABETZ	<p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—Right, I think I understand all those distinctions. In your discussions with Centrelink are you encouraging them or asking them to get with it, if I can use that term, and do things electronically? As I understand it, whilst you can lodge electronically, you still need to forward the original plus a photocopy?</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I am not familiar with the requirement for a photocopy. We certainly ask for original documentation.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—It is fair enough that you do not know this detail. Can you take on notice whether the current system requires applicants to forward the original plus a photocopy? Centrelink then returns the original to the claim agent, who then has to return it to the original business.</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I will inquire.</p>
<b>ISTP 08</b>	9/2/10	71	Senator ABETZ	<p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—Thank you. It seems highly bureaucratic and highly unnecessary. I would have thought that these days there would be the capacity for electronic lodgement,</p>

				<p>if it is good enough for the Australian Taxation Office with tax returns. By all means do your spot audit, and I encourage you to do so, to ensure that people are not having a lend of the scheme. However, it really is incurring a lot of red tape. I am sure my friends in Australia Post are absolutely delighted with this system, but it really does create a lot of extra paperwork. The Tasmanian paper industry would also be happy as well, I am sure, Senator Colbeck. From a business efficiency point of view it seems unnecessary for this sort of paperwork to be undertaken for these claims. Please take on notice whether what I have outlined is a relatively correct reflection of the process and then, if it is, what the department might consider to be a more streamlined approach to the lodgement and assessment of claims.</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I will arrange to have that description confirmed or otherwise. I am also aware that, rather than using Australia Post, Centrelink is perfectly happy to accept lodgement of, as I said, the original of the invoice as supporting documentation at any Centrelink office in Tasmania. They then use their internal arrangements for transporting it to the Hobart processing office.</p>
<b>ISTP 09</b>	9/2/10	72	Senator COLBECK	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I am after some information about statistics for the King Island and Flinders Island claims and I would like to get some sense of the commodity groups. Is that information available yet? I do not necessarily need to know who is making the claims. I am just interested to get a sense of the general types of goods being moved.</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—Please forgive me, Senator, but I have not brought that information with me.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I am happy for you to take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—You are interested in the categories of goods that are being supported under the Furneaux Group—</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—The King and Flinders.</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—The supplementary arrangements?</p>
<b>ISTP 10</b>	9/2/10	72	Senator COLBECK	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—Yes. With regard to the current stats on the scheme are concerned, the current information on the website is only to 2007. Can you look at that?</p> <p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I will certainly undertake to examine whether it is possible to update the website.</p>
<b>ISTP 11</b>	9/2/10	73	Senator COLBECK	<p><b>Senator COLBECK</b>—I recall that at the time the government announced its position on the review of the scheme a decision was made that the current rates would continue to apply because of concern about potential distortions or changes in returns available to different portions of the market based on the process that occurred. I understand that the government has made a decision on that process. I am starting to have some concerns about the fact that rates have not moved for a period of time. Cost pressures are obviously being felt within the system. The question I am getting is: when is there going to be some action with respect to rates?</p> <p>That is fundamentally my question.</p>

				<p><b>Ms Riggs</b>—I need to correct my earlier advice. The two-yearly examination of the rate of assistance is for the passenger assistance scheme, not the freight scheme. On notice I will draw your attention to any advice that is available about the operation of the scheme and the current rate setting.</p>
AMSA 01	9/2/10	73	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I want to go first to the aftermath of the <i>Pacific Adventurer</i> oil spill off the Queensland coast about this time last year. I refer to an announcement in August 2009 that the Australian government has initiated proceedings at the International Maritime Organisation to increase the limit for shipowners' liability for clean-up costs. What is the current status of those proceedings?</p> <p><b>Mr Peachey</b>—We have raised this with the IMO. We have raised concern that the extent of the limitation is, in fact, too limited. We have been successful in putting that on the IMO's work program to reassess the extent of that limitation.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—What was your proposed increase in the liability?</p> <p><b>Mr Peachey</b>—There is a formula under the convention. The convention sets the maximum amount to which it can be increased. That is part of the discussions that will happen through the IMO process.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—In drawing it to attention, have you made a submission about what you think that increase in the limit should be?</p> <p><b>Mr Peachey</b>—I do not recall the precise wording of the submission. Our main aim, through our close working relationship with the IMO, was to get it addressed and considered and to bring the other member states along with that debate.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—What was the catalyst for you doing that? Did you feel that the liability was set at too low a figure?</p> <p><b>Mr Peachey</b>—That was the catalyst, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—What was that figure, or what is it currently if there has not been a change?</p> <p><b>Mr Peachey</b>—I will have to take that question on notice.</p>
AMSA 02	9/2/10	73	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—What consultation was undertaken and with whom was it undertaken in determining our proposal to the IMO?</p> <p><b>Mr Peachey</b>—Just as a general comment, we consult relatively widely on IMO matters. We canvass views of industry and our departmental colleagues about approaches. Obviously things that go to IMO represent a government view. It is incumbent on us to make sure that we reflect that properly at the IMO.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Would that include onshore Australian shipowners and offshore shipowners?</p> <p><b>Mr Peachey</b>—I would be hazarding a guess as I was not directly involved in that. However, I am assuming that that was the case.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Again, I would be most appreciative if you took on notice just who was</p>

				consulted. Can you give us some indication from the IMO as to when this process will be finalised?
<b>AMSA 03</b>	9/2/10	78	Senator COLBECK	<b>Senator COLBECK</b> —I know that you cannot do this now but would you take this question on notice and give us a schedule of your proposed consultation once you have put that together? <b>Mr Peachey</b> —Yes, Senator. We will have to take that question on notice, and we will be happy to do that.
<b>AMSA 04</b>	9/2/10	78	Senator COLBECK	<b>Senator COLBECK</b> —How many tenders did you receive? <b>Mr Kinley</b> —I would not like to stray into commercial-in-confidence issues, Senator. <b>Senator COLBECK</b> —I do not necessarily need to know from whom. If you do not want to do it now and you want to give it to me on notice that is cool. <b>Mr Kinley</b> —I will have to take that question on notice because I am not exactly sure.
<b>AMSA 05</b>	9/2/10	78	Senator COLBECK	<b>Senator COLBECK</b> —I do not want anything commercial in confidence. However, I am interested to know about particular milestones that we can continue to follow through this process. <b>Mr Kinley</b> —I will have to take that question on notice and come back to you. Our intention is to get the system running towards the end of this year.
<b>LGRD 01</b>	9/2/10	80	Senator NASH	<b>Senator NASH</b> —Rather than trawling through them now could you provide the committee with a list of completed projects with their location and details? <b>Mr Wood</b> —Certainly.
<b>LGRD 02</b>	9/2/10	80	Senator NASH	<b>Senator NASH</b> —I understand the vagaries of weather and that sometimes it gets in the middle of these things. Could you provide the committee with a list of those projects that have had a variation as a result of not hitting a milestone thus far? <b>Mr Wood</b> —Yes, Senator.
<b>LGRD 03</b>	9/2/10	81	Senator NASH	<b>Senator NASH</b> —We were just discussing Regional Development Australia offices, and how funding is divvied up and where that funding goes. <b>Ms Foster</b> —In the budget \$14.7 million was allocated but an additional amount of almost \$300,000 was rolled over to make the total for this year just over \$15 million across the committees. We do not have with us the details of the allocation by committee, but Mr James can take you through the process that we used to arrive at those allocations. <b>Senator NASH</b> —Could you also take my question on notice and provide us with the allocations for each committee? <b>Ms Foster</b> —Certainly.
<b>LGRD 04</b>	9/2/10	84-85	Senator NASH	<b>Senator NASH</b> —Are the proposals that are being drawn up always in concert with local government? <b>Mr James</b> —Only local governments are eligible to apply as the formal applicant to the Regional and Local Community Infrastructure Program, or RLCIP. <b>Senator NASH</b> —Fantastic; that was the missing link. You are saying that local

				<p>government authorities will be able to assist. <b>Ms Foster</b>—That gives an RDA the capacity to focus more strategically on trying to bring together various elements of the community and to work with them on the priorities for that community, for example, by developing a business plan in consultation with the community.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—How do you measure this? Of all the ideas or proposals that have been brought to you or to the state government, how many are up and running?</p> <p><b>Mr James</b>—We would have to take that question on notice and provide you with the detail. Ms Foster mentioned a number of examples of things that are already up and running or that are underway. We do not have that information at our fingertips.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Could you take that question on notice?</p>
<b>LGRD 05</b>	9/2/10	86	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I am quoting from ABC News of 17 December 2009, which states: The Labor Party has named its candidate for the Western Australian seat of Forrest in the next federal election. Margaret River small business owner Jackie Jarvis was endorsed by the party's state executive on Monday. I think that was about 12 December or 13 December—about the same day. I note that the conflict of interest clause states: ... the RDA must remain politically neutral at all times and must be especially vigilant when elections are called. Would the department consider that to be possibly a conflict of interest, or could it be seen as a conflict of interest, Minister?</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—Let me be clear about this. The Nationals leader in Western Australia and the state minister ticked off the RDA WA appointments. It was ticked off by the Western Australian Nationals leader and state minister. I am happy to take the rest of your question on notice to see whether there is anything further we would like to add.</p>
<b>LGRD 06</b>	9/2/10	86-87	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I am not so much interested in what the state minister thought of the whole process.</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—We know what you think of the Western Australian Nationals, but you are a coalition partner, so try to keep your differences—</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I have no view at all. I refer again to the conflicts policy, which states: Conflicts carry a significant risk to the standing and reputation of the organisation—and, no doubt, in the eyes of the wider community.</p> <p>It continues: No decisions we take are worth exposing RDA south-west to any accusation that members may be acting in self-interest, either pecuniary or otherwise. With this in mind it is better to err on the side of caution.</p> <p>Armed with that knowledge, what action should be taken to satisfy the clause in the conflict policy relating to politics?</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—As I said, we will take on notice the issues that you have raised. If there is anything further that we would like to add we will get back to you, Senator Back. You have raised an issue and we are happy to seek some advice and to give you an answer.</p>
<b>LGRD 07</b>	9/2/10	87	Senator BACK	<p><b>Senator BACK</b>—I would be delighted if you would. Will the department also take on notice another question? I am now reading in the same policy the personal information:</p>

				<p>Individuals declare their interests in the nomination form. Where circumstances change members should inform the administration officer so that information on the register can be amended.</p> <p>Would you take on notice whether or not the information officer was so advised? I notice that it refers also to ongoing conflicts:</p> <p>The Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government— which is this department— should be advised of ongoing conflicts.</p> <p>Would you take on notice whether or not the department has been advised. I also ask you to take on notice the next reference, which is:</p> <p>Where an ongoing conflict exists it may be necessary for the member concerned to resign.</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—To add some further information, I mentioned earlier a gentleman called Steve Perryman.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—Is he also part of the process in Western Australia, Minister?</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—No, he is a South Australian, I think from Mount Gambier. When he was appointed he was already the candidate for the Liberals in the South Australian state election.</p> <p><b>Senator BACK</b>—And?</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—I think he is a member. I am just making the point, as I wanted to ensure that—</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—There is a slight difference, though.</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—Yes and no. I am happy to take the question on notice and to seek some further information. I wanted to ensure that Senator Back knew all the facts.</p>
<b>LGRD 08</b>	9/2/10	88	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Thanks, Minister. That was not what I asked, but thanks for the gratuitous comment. I am interested in what the states are contributing. Are they contributing about the same amount as the federal government?</p> <p><b>Ms Foster</b>—Senator, I think it varies from state to state. We can take that question on notice.</p>
<b>LGRD 09</b>	9/2/10	89	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Could you perhaps help me and other parliamentarians by referring me to the item in the partnership agreement that indicates that they are able to meet with parliamentarians, state or federal.</p> <p><b>Mr James</b>—We could take on notice the guidelines and provide them.</p>
<b>ONA 01</b>	9/2/10	90	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—I well appreciate Senator Heffernan's expertise and enthusiasm, as he was the original chairman of this. In fact, it is really his baby, and I will be relatively brief before handing over to Senator Heffernan for half an hour or so later on. Who authorised its release to the <i>Australian</i>?</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—Look, I am not sure anyone at the table is in a position to give you any information on that, Senator Macdonald. Those pesky journalists in the gallery often have many ways of obtaining documents, but I am happy to take that on notice and see if there is any information that Minister Albanese, Parliamentary Secretary McKew or Parliamentary Secretary Gray have for you.</p>

<b>ONA 02</b>	9/2/10	93	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Mr Chairman, I might ask just one more question and then Senator Heffernan can have a go and perhaps I will come back later. Can I ask the minister: is it accurate, as Dr Cresswell is reported as saying, that the Australian government has a no-dams policy? It is a policy issue.</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—I have never heard that. Mr Mrdak has never heard that.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—You would be the first to say to me, ‘It’s a policy issue; you can’t ask Mr Mrdak’, and nor should I.</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—No, but he may be aware of a government policy on that. I am not aware of one but I am happy to come back to the committee if that is an incorrect answer.</p>
<b>ONA 03</b>	9/2/10	107	Senator HEFFERNAN	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Can you table the details of all those meetings, observations and briefings and who attended, when, where and how?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—We can certainly provide that.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Face-to-face, phones, written, whatever—the whole lot.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—We can certainly provide detail of which consultations, where, and who attended.</p>
<b>ONA 04</b>	9/2/10	107	Senator HEFFERNAN	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Can you tell us who attended that meeting?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—We will get that detail for you.</p>
<b>ONA 05</b>	9/2/10	112	Senator HEFFERNAN	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Is that a competitive tender?</p> <p><b>Ms Foster</b>—I do not have with me the details of the tendering process.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Could you get the details?</p> <p><b>Ms Foster</b>—Certainly, Senator.</p>
<b>ONA 06</b>	9/2/10	112-113	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Apart from the East Kimberley, could you take that question on notice, as we have run out of time? Could you give me the other areas where Mr Gray administers the money as in the East Kimberley package? I think you mentioned one other but you gave them as examples. Perhaps there are others around.</p>
<b>ONA 07</b>	9/2/10	113	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Could you take my question on notice and tell me—I assume it is not a hugely long list—what the projects are and how much money is allocated to them? This is money that comes through your department that is oversights by Mr Gray.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—We can do that.</p>
<b>ONA 08</b>	9/2/10	113	Senator HEFFERNAN	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—I am happy for you to supply me with the paper trail that arrived as a result of that decision.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—Let us come back to you, Senator, with details of how that was determined.</p>
<b>ONA 09</b>	9/2/10	113	Senator HEFFERNAN	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Was that a competitive tender? Who estimated the cost of the refurbishment? Did three locals apply, or a company in Perth or a Melbourne company, as they did with some of the Aboriginal housing? You will come back to the committee with that information?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—Yes, we will come back to the committee.</p>

<b>ONA 10</b>	9/2/10	113-114	Senator HEFFERNAN	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—There is a question. According to the Queensland government and the Australian Wilderness Society, the wild rivers legislation is a procedural step towards World Heritage listing for a lot of the Cape York peninsula to take it completely out of production. Does the department have a role to play in the World Heritage process?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—To be honest, I am not familiar with the World Heritage listing process, Senator. I would have to take some advice on that and come back to you.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Will you come back to us?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—I am not aware whether or not our department has been involved in that process in the past. Let me come back to you.</p>
<b>ONA 11</b>	9/2/10	114	Senator HEFFERNAN	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Thank you for that. My question to the minister is: is the government in favour of a World Heritage listing for the regions taken up by wild rivers legislation which, to the great distress of Indigenous people in that region, is removing economic opportunities from them?</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—That is an excellent question, Senator Heffernan. I am sure you understand that I want to make sure that I reflect the minister's view on this. I will take that question on notice and provide you with any information.</p>
<b>ONA 12</b>	9/2/10	115	Senator EGGLESTON	<p><b>Senator EGGLESTON</b>—I do. My question goes to whether or not the Office of Northern Australia is prepared in some way to give consideration to the economic desirability of upgrading the Tanami Road.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak</b>—Certainly, Senator. As I have indicated, the government provides considerable funding for local government for road expenditure. I am not familiar with any recent proposals for upgrading the Tanami Road, but perhaps I could check with our relevant infrastructure area to see whether any proposals have been provided to us and I can then come back to you. Like you, I am very aware of the increasing traffic on Tanami Road—both tourist and business traffic traversing that area. There is no doubt that that road has had an increase in traffic.</p>
<b>OTS 01</b>	9/2/10	116	Senator NASH	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—How many of the OTS staff would be involved in undertaking these compliance activities?</p> <p><b>Mr Retter</b>—We have approximately 120 officers in total spread between the five outposted offices. I will check the exact number, but approximately one-third of those officers undertake maritime compliance activities on a daily basis.</p>
<b>OTS 02</b>	9/2/10	117	Senator NASH	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—It would be worthwhile if you could the committee with details of where those instances have occurred. I take your point that obviously no further action was necessary, but it would be quite useful for the committee to understand the level of that noncompliance. With those where there have been, as you say, no significant levels of noncompliance, what is the process then for follow-up to ensure that compliance is met?</p> <p><b>Mr Retter</b>—Where we do find issues that need to be rectified, those issues are formally advised to the industry participant. We then work with each of those industry participants</p>

				to rectify the issue. The inspectors on the ground and the regional directors from the Office of Transport Security report back to the general manager of the branch who deals with those issues to confirm that rectification has occurred. Indeed, when we go back and reassess, as we do on a periodic basis, we check to see that those things that needed rectification have been addressed. If they have not been addressed, then obviously that is a matter of concern. You asked for some advice about what vulnerabilities or issues were found going around the ports. We can give you a rough break-up, but I would be concerned about providing details of which specific ports. That perhaps would not be in the transport security interest, if you understand where I am going.
<b>OTS 03</b>	9/2/10	117	Senator NASH	<b>Senator NASH</b> —I understand, Mr Retter. I think the committee would be quite happy just to get a sense of the types of issues that you are referring to. Are you now confident that all of those issues that have been identified over the last three years have been resolved and have been through that follow-up process that you are talking about? <b>Mr Retter</b> —The follow-up process is continuous. We review the follow-up program on a regular basis in terms of what issues have been uncovered as a result of inspections and audits and, as I said, we go back to look at those issues on a regular basis. I am unaware of any unresolved issues at the moment but, if I can, I will check with my staff and come back to you very shortly in terms of the answer to that.
<b>OTS 04</b>	9/2/10	117-118	Senator XENOPHON	<b>Senator XENOPHON</b> —Mr Retter, I would like to ask you some questions in terms of the GHD report into Australia’s maritime security industry card scheme. Is it correct that that was provided to Office of Transport Security in July last year? ..... ..... <b>Senator XENOPHON</b> —If I could put that on notice and have that sent to my office. <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —We will do that through the committee.
<b>OTS 05</b>	9/2/10	119	Senator XENOPHON	<b>Senator XENOPHON</b> —Perhaps on notice if you could provide some further details of the date upon which the AFP and Customs were provided with details. <b>Mr Retter</b> —As I said, they were provided with the report on 18 September. I can advise whether we received a response from them. <b>Senator XENOPHON</b> —But on notice can you provide who it was sent to and the covering letter? Would that be a difficulty? <b>Mr Retter</b> —I am sure we can check and take it on notice.
<b>OTS 06</b>	9/2/10	119	Senator XENOPHON	<b>Senator XENOPHON</b> —But you were not shown a copy of the report that was prepared by Mr Kessing in 2003, by Customs. You only became aware of it in 2005. <b>Mr Wilson</b> —I would have to take that on notice. In 2003, I do not believe any of the officers sitting at the table were involved in the Office of Transport Security.
<b>OTS 07</b>	9/2/10	121	Senator ABETZ	<b>Senator ABETZ</b> —Unfortunately, I think that has escaped us for this round of estimates. Minister, when was it determined that this course of action, as announced today, would be

				undertaken? <b>Senator Conroy</b> —I would have to take that on notice.
<b>OTS 08</b>	9/2/10	121	Senator ABETZ	<b>Senator ABETZ</b> —Thank you for that terminology. When did they last meet? <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —I would have to take that on notice. I would have to take advice as to whether the government normally discloses the dates of cabinet meetings
<b>OTS 09</b>	9/2/10	121	Senator ABETZ	<b>Senator ABETZ</b> —I do, indeed. Noting the lack of pro-disclosure culture here, I would have thought that your department, being intimately involved in this, may have had some understanding of the processes. So if we can then take on notice when that committee last met— <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —I will certainly take that on notice and seek advice from the National Security Adviser in relation to— <b>Senator ABETZ</b> —That would have been the final sign-off then of the decision that was announced today. <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —I will take advice in relation to the decision-making process from the National Security Adviser.
<b>OTS 10</b>	9/2/10	122	Senator ABETZ	<b>Senator ABETZ</b> —When were you advised of the committee’s decision and that you might have to get things in place for this announcement? <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —Again, I will take that on notice. Certainly, as I have mentioned, the government has been considering these issues for the last few weeks— <b>Senator ABETZ</b> —We know that. <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —in relation to this report. I will take on notice the government practice—which I am not familiar with, in terms of the National Security Committee—in relation to what information is provided on their meetings and when their conclusion of those is normally advised. I will take that on notice and come back to you as soon as I can.
<b>OTS 11</b>	9/2/10	122	Senator ABETZ	<b>Senator ABETZ</b> —Are you able to tell us when he went to those various meetings? <b>Senator Conroy</b> —No, we are not. No-one is in the habit of releasing dates of cabinet meetings, particularly meetings of the National Security Committee of Cabinet. <b>Senator ABETZ</b> —Even after they occurred? I would ask you to take that on notice— <b>Mr Mrdak</b> —We will take it on notice.
<b>OTS 12</b>	9/2/10	123	Senator ABETZ	<b>Senator ABETZ</b> —If you are now limiting it to the committee, we can have a look at that as well. In relation to the minister’s responsibility for the aviation security regulatory regime, has any consideration been given to a system of biometric identification of staff and workers in, at and around airports? I would have thought that that potentially is a very important security measure. <b>Senator Conroy</b> —I do not know if you got a chance to watch the press conference in the lunchbreak earlier today. I was in my office and did get to see some of it. There were some questions that were asked about that, so perhaps we can get you the transcript of the—

				<p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—And the answers were?</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—As I said, I was not following it all completely. I was actually eating my lunch and having a discussion with my staff.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—Do you mean to say you were not standing there in awe of your Prime Minister, Senator Conroy? You shock me!</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—Always.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—But possibly the departmental officials might actually know—</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—We can get you the transcript of the—</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—Yes, but these people—</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—We can give it to you first-hand.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—might actually know.</p> <p><b>Senator Conroy</b>—No, we can give you the information first-hand.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—If you can take that on notice.</p>
<b>OTS 13</b>	9/2/10	123	Senator ABETZ	<p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—Thank you. Have you received any specific submissions against biometric identification of airport workers?</p> <p><b>Mr Retter</b>—I would have to take that on notice.</p>
<b>OTS 14</b>	9/2/10	126	Senator ABETZ	<p><b>Senator ABETZ</b>—And what are the price ranges?</p> <p><b>Mr Retter</b>—I will take that on notice.</p>
<b>OTS 15</b>	9/2/10	129-130	Senator HEFFERNAN	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—At some stage, in some convenient manner, could you report back to the parliament on what precautions have been taken? You may have to do that in camera to this committee.</p> <p><b>CHAIR</b>—On that, Senator Heffernan, I would urge that we roll on, because we have gone way over time. <b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Okay.</p> <p><b>CHAIR</b>—Thank you. Senator Macdonald.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Mr Chairman, I had these questions down for Aviation and Airports.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—I did not actually get an answer there, by the way.</p> <p><b>CHAIR</b>—I am sorry. That is fair enough!</p> <p><b>Mr Wilson</b>—Can we take that question on notice?</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN</b>—Right.</p>
<b>AAA 02</b>	9/2/10	132	Senator MACDONALD	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Have there been complaints about the noise, apart from the member for Griffith? Is it something that you get a lot of complaints about?</p> <p><b>Mr Doherty</b>—My understanding is that noise has been an issue in Brisbane over a long period of time.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b>—Not according to the Premier of Queensland, Anna Bligh, who has condemned the suggestion that there should be any curfew. Does the minister, Senator Conroy, have any view on whether he agrees with Premier Anna Bligh or agrees with the member for Griffith on these things?</p>

				<b>Senator Conroy</b> —I will happily take that on notice and see if the minister has anything he would like to contribute on that.
<b>AA 01</b>	9/2/10	134	Senator BACK	<b>Senator BACK</b> —Thank you very much. I have a question that refers to a couple of different dates: the first, just the other day, 2 February, in which residents in the Perth hills area of Stoneville noted planes flying overhead at two- to three-minute intervals between 7 am and 7 pm, with some being so loud that it was not possible for the person describing this to hear their television; and one example of a day of flight activity that is now typical in the area, residents describing it as psychological torture. Other residents in the same area have described that on some nights they do not get woken at all; on an average night they are woken half a dozen times. Does Airservices Australia have some type of gauge of what is or is not acceptable aircraft activity over inhabited areas? <b>Mr Russell</b> —The noise decibel readings that we would regard as being acceptable are in the order of 60 decibels. I am not sure of the specifics of the incident that you refer to, but I am more than happy to take that issue on notice and we will provide an answer to you.
<b>CASA 01</b>	9/2/10	136	Senator MACDONALD	<b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —How frequently are permissions granted to foreign air carriers under the relevant section, which I assume is section 25. Is that right? <b>Mr McCormick</b> —Do you mean ones that do not have foreign aircraft operator certificates? <b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —Yes. <b>Mr McCormick</b> —The actual number I do not have in front of me. I do not expect it to be large. I can get that number for you, though, if you wish. <b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —If you could do that and tell me how many were granted in 2009 and in the last five years, if you are able to do that without too much rummaging.
<b>CASA 02</b>	9/2/10	141	Senator MACDONALD	<b>Senator IAN MACDONALD</b> —I have not been through it closely enough to even contemplate that. Perhaps I could put on notice to you, Minister, so that the department could just have a bit of a think about that: what is the situation where our safety authority says no but courts, acting on other very appropriate bases, decide yes? Could you perhaps give it some thought, Mr Mrdak. <b>Senator Conroy</b> —That is a very valid question and we will certainly give it serious consideration when we take that on notice, Senator Macdonald.
<b>ATSB 01</b>	9/2/10	144	Senator NASH	<b>Senator NASH</b> —What actually was the engineering problem? <b>Mr Dolan</b> —It was a minor engineering problem. I would have to take it on notice for the details. It is one that was looked at comparatively quickly because it was minor. The aircraft originally, as I recall, was diverted to Brisbane for fuel related reasons because of headwinds and various things. It had no adequately safe guarantee of reaching Sydney and so landed in Brisbane. It was on the ground in Brisbane that the minor mechanical problem was found.

<b>ATSB 02</b>	9/2/10	144	Senator NASH	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Was it something that was likely to be an issue—I mean, obviously if it has been diverted for fuel reasons and then the problem is found. Is that unusual? Wasn't it something that had any kind of airborne trigger mechanism or—</p> <p><b>Mr Dolan</b>—I think I will have to get greater details of this to you on notice, if you do not mind.</p>
<b>ATSB 03</b>	9/2/10	145	Senator NASH	<p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Out of all of those thousands of reports, how many are, on a yearly average, investigated?</p> <p><b>Mr Dolan</b>—Eighty.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—Sorry; it is just a very small figure with the amount that come through.</p> <p><b>Mr Dolan</b>—We have—we would be happy to provide it if it were of benefit to the committee—a policy framework for assessing which are the most serious and therefore which would most benefit from a close look to see whether there are safety lessons to be learned and passed on more broadly to the industry. But it goes to the potential seriousness of the incident that was reported. There is another thing which I suppose shows how we keep these sorts of matters under review. We are conscious that, whatever the number is, it is always going to have some level of discomfort that we may miss something. What we have added as an additional string to our bow is a new level of investigation, which is to take an occurrence that would not merit sending out a team to look at all the details and go to the thoroughgoing one but to actually work with the reporting organisation to find more details and do a very short one-page report that means that over time we are getting visibility of more of them. So, in terms of where you perhaps feel a little uneasy, that is our response to that.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—No, I am getting more and more comforted by the minute. Sorry; it is very late. It is a very good contribution. Thank you. You did offer, I think, just then to provide the criteria that you use around that to the committee.</p> <p><b>Mr Dolan</b>—Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator NASH</b>—That would be quite useful.</p>

**Written Questions on Notice Additional Estimates 2009-2010**

Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government Portfolio  
Tuesday 9 February 2010

<b>QON No.</b>	<b>Date Asked</b>	<b>Hansard Reference/Written</b>	<b>Senator</b>	<b>Question</b>
<b>AMSA 06</b>	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p><b>AMSA</b> How is the 12 month trial going for “Coastal Pilotage Services in the Torres Strait and Great Barrier Reef”?</p> <p>When can a decision be made by AMSA regarding the single provider concept and a safety management system?</p>
<b>CORP 11</b>	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p><b>Corporate Services</b> <b>ASL</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What is the total expenditure on staffing for the Department and for all portfolio agencies? What is the SES and non-SES breakdown?</li> <li>▪ What are the current staffing levels for SES and non-SES officers? What is the breakdown by location?</li> <li>▪ What have been the changes in ASL since November 2007? Why have these changes occurred? What have been the Budgetary implications?</li> <li>▪ In the case of reductions in staff numbers, how have these reductions been absorbed by the Department? What functions have been sacrificed and why?</li> <li>▪ Has there been a target for staff reductions to achieve savings? What is that target and what strategy is being implemented to achieve this?</li> <li>▪ Have any voluntary or involuntary redundancies been offered to staff? If so, how have staff been identified for such offers? Are there such plans for the future?</li> </ul>
<b>CORP 12</b>	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p><b>Corporate Services</b> <b>Election Commitments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What is the status of each election commitment within the portfolio?</li> <li>▪ Which election commitments are experiencing slippages? Why? Where relevant, what are the revised implementation dates? What are the implications of this slippage?</li> </ul>
<b>CORP 13</b>	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p><b>Corporate Services</b> <b>Consultancies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How much has the Department spent on consultancy services since November 2007? How can the department justify this expenditure?</li> <li>▪ Could the Department provide a complete list of current consultancy services. For each consultancy, please indicate the rationale for the project and its intended use. For each</li> </ul>

				consultancy, please indicate why the Department or its agencies could not have undertaken the work themselves.
<b>CORP 14</b>	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<b>Corporate Services</b> <b>Advertising and Marketing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How much has the Department spent on advertising and marketing since November 2007? Ask for justification of expenditure.</li> <li>▪ Could the Department provide a complete list of current contracts. Please indicate the rationale for each service provided and its intended use.</li> </ul>
<b>CORP 15</b>	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<b>Corporate Services</b> <b>Discretionary Grants</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Could the Department provide a list of all discretionary grants, including ad hoc and one-off grants since November 2007? Please provide details of the recipients, the intended use of the grants and what locations have benefited from the grants.</li> </ul>
<b>CORP 16</b>	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<b>Corporate Services</b> <b>Commissioned Reports</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How many Reports have been commissioned by the Government in the infrastructure portfolio since November 2007?</li> <li>▪ Please provide details of each report including date commissioned, date report handed to Government, date of public release, Terms of Reference and Committee members.</li> <li>▪ How much did each report cost? How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level?</li> <li>▪ What is the current status of each report? When is the Government intending to respond to these reports?</li> </ul>
<b>OTS 16</b>	N/A	Written	Xenophon	<b>Office of Transport Security</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When was the GHD report sent to the Australian Federal Police and Australian Customs?</li> </ul>
<b>OTS 17</b>	N/A	Written	Xenophon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who was the GHD report sent to at the Australian Federal Police and Australian Customs?</li> </ul>
<b>OTS 18</b>	N/A	Written	Xenophon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What information was provided along with the GHD report to the Australian Federal Police and Australian Customs?</li> </ul>
<b>OTS 19</b>	N/A	Written	Xenophon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the flow of information procedures between agencies and the Office of Transport Security?</li> </ul>
<b>OTS 20</b>	N/A	Written	Xenophon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the Office of Transport Security receive a report co-authored by Allan Kessing from Australian Customs in 2003?</li> </ul>
<b>CORP 17</b>	N/A	Written	Barnett	<p>In relation to staffing:  How many permanent staff recruited since the supplementary budget estimates?</p> <p>What level are these staff?</p>

				<p>How many temporary positions exist or have been created since budget estimates?</p> <p>Since supplementary budget estimates, how many employees have been employed on contract and what is the average length of their employment period?</p>
<b>CORP 18</b>	N/A	Written	Barnett	<p>In relation to budget cuts/the efficiency dividend: Have staffing numbers been reduced as a result of the efficiency dividend and/or other budget cuts?</p> <p>If so, where and at what level?</p> <p>Are there any plans for staff reduction? If so, please advise details ie. reduction target, how this will be achieved, services/programs to be cut etc.</p> <p>What changes are underway or planned for graduate recruitment, cadetships or similar programs? If reductions are envisaged please explain including reasons, target numbers etc.</p>
<b>CORP 19</b>	N/A	Written	Barnett	<p>In relation to Government advertising: What communications programs has the Department/Agency undertaken, or are planning to undertake? For each program, what is the total spend?</p>
<b>CORP 20</b>	N/A	Written	Barnett	<p>In relation to hospitality expenditure: What is the Department's hospitality spend FYTD? Please detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events. For each Minister/Par Sec's office, please detail total hospitality spend FYTD. Please detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event.</p>
<b>CORP 21</b>	N/A	Written	Barnett	<p>In relation to board appointments: What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio?</p>
<b>CORP 22</b>	N/A	Written	Barnett	<p>In relation to freedom of information requests: Has the Department/agency received any advice on how to respond to FOI requests?</p> <p>How many FOI requests has the Department received?</p> <p>How many have been granted or denied?</p> <p>How many conclusive certificates have been issued in relation to FOI requests?</p>
<b>CORP 23</b>	N/A	Written	Barnett	<p>In relation to Community Cabinets: What was the cost of Ministers travel and expenses for the Community Cabinet meetings held since Budget Estimates?</p>

				<p>How many Ministerial Staff and Departmental officers travelled with the Minister for the Cabinet meeting?</p> <p>What was the total cost of this travel?</p> <p>What was the total cost to the Department and the Ministers office?</p>
<b>CORP 24</b>	N/A	Written	Barnett	<p>In relation to Departmental reviews: How many Reviews are currently being undertaken in the portfolio/agency or affecting the portfolio agency?</p> <p>When will each of these reviews be concluded?</p> <p>Which Reviews have been completed since Budget Estimates?</p> <p>When will the Government be responding to the respective reviews that have been completed?</p> <p>What is the total number of Reviews <i>both completed and ongoing</i> in the portfolio/agency or affecting the portfolio agency since November 2007?</p> <p>What is the estimated cost of these Reviews?</p> <p>What further reviews are planned for 2009 - 10 FY?</p>
<b>CORP 25</b>	N/A	Written	Barnett	<p>In relation to consultancies: How many consultancies have been undertaken or are underway since November 2007? Please 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). Please also include total value for all consultancies.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>AMSA 07</b>	N/A	Written	Barnett	<p>It is understood that the asylum seekers contacted the Australian Maritime Safety Authority by phone on October 16 at 11.45pm, saying they were in trouble off the Sumatran coast:</p> <p>a. Was there any indication that those making the calls were following proper AMSA protocol?</p> <p>b. Were the asylum seekers questioned on where they received the contact details for</p>

				AMSA? c. Is this the first time those seeking asylum have contacted AMSA directly?
<b>ISTP 12</b>	N/A	Written	Payne	1. With regard to Government's 'A truly national transport system', why did the Governments not agree to a host national regulator at the recent COAG meeting when 3 states, NSW, VIC, QLD had offered to host it? Why has COAG delayed making a decision on this matter until "the first half of 2010"?
<b>ISTP 13</b>	N/A	Written	Payne	2. Please explain why the National Partnership Agreement that would define the national rail safety regulators powers and roles will not be considered until 2010 and 2011?
<b>NB-II 15</b>	N/A	Written	Adams	Can you provide an update on the status of any discussions with the WA State Government about the future of the WA grain rail freight network?
<b>NB-II 16</b>	N/A	Written	Adams	Has the Commonwealth received any revised funding request to contribute to the upgrade of the WA grain freight network?  If so – how much assistance is being sought from the Commonwealth?
<b>NB-II 17</b>	N/A	Written	Adams	How long will assessment by the Commonwealth of this project take and when will a recommendation regarding funding be made?
<b>NB-II 18</b>	N/A	Written	Back	What is the status of negotiations with the WA Government to fund the Perth Airport Intermodal Links?  Has any commitment been undertaken to fully or partially fund this project?  Are you aware of a Taskforce has been convened to work on this project?  Who is on this Taskforce and what contact does the Department have with them?  Are any commonwealth funds being used to fund the work of the Taskforce? If so, how much funding has been allocated by State / commonwealth?
<b>AA 02</b>	N/A	Written	Back	Going forward, what specific model of community consultation does Airservices Australia propose to undertake? (a) In what circumstances will consultation occur? (b) Who will be consulted? (c) Will this information be of a technical or practical nature? (d) Will there be direct community consultation? (e) If there is community consultation: - in what manner will this be conducted; - what will be the model of advertising this consultation; - how will you determine which localities should be included in the consultation;

				<p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- will the community consultation include a process for community feedback to reported back to Airservices Australia for planning?</li> </ul> <p>What are the different process/models of consultation used around Australia?</p> <p>During the meeting hosted by the Shire of Mundaring, it was said that Airservices Australia frequently attends public meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Are public meetings a standard process for community consultation at any airports in Australia?</li> <li>(b) Are there other forms of direct community consultation used at any airports in Australia?</li> <li>(c) Are there differences in constitution and terms of references between PANMCC (Perth Aircraft Noise Management Consultative Committee) and other similar bodies across Australia?</li> <li>(d) Does Airservices Australia foresee any reason why a consistent community consultation cannot be mandatory across Australia for different levels of airport? For example, is it possible that all major airports, or all airports with a specified traffic capacity have the same community consultation process?</li> <li>(e) If this is not possible please explain why different community consultation processes would be appropriate in different circumstances.</li> </ul> <p>Now you have undertaken a public forum in the Hills, will you organise public forums in other communities, as has been requested by the Member for Swan?</p>
<b>AA 03</b>	N/A	Written	Back	<p>Notwithstanding the complexity of the Perth airspace, in the initial phase of the WARRP, were there any other routes considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) If at any time during WARRP, alternative flight paths were considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- can you provide a diagrammatic example of these paths;</li> <li>- what were the specific reasons that each of the potential paths were not pursued further; and</li> <li>- was the range of potential flight paths made known to any airline prior to a final determination of flight paths being made?</li> </ul> </li> <li>(b) What is the reason (by reference to diagrams if necessary) that the flight paths could not be located more extensively over national and state parks in the Darling Range locality.</li> </ul> <p>What consultation takes place between Airservices Australia and any airline during route reviews?</p>

				<p>(a) It is entirely reasonable there be some level of consultation between airlines, airports and Airservices Australia. In the process of a route review, what is the relative degree of importance given to feedback received from airlines, compared to all other considerations?</p> <p>(b) What is the level of disclosure during consultations with any airlines, what information is shared and what information do they have access to.</p> <p>(c) What was the nature the consultation between Airservices Australia and any airlines during the WARRP.</p> <p>Was the WARRP instigated in response to the CASA audit report from 2002 or 2003?</p> <p>(a) If the relevant CASA Audit Report was number 03-01, please provide a reference point to the relevant safety concerns that led to the WARRP being undertaken, as these concerns are not apparent from the information provided under the FOI request.</p> <p>(b) If the relevant CASA Audit Report was <b>not</b> number 03-01, why was this report provided in response to the FOI request?</p>
AA 04	N/A	Written	Back	<p>I understand that matters relating to aircraft noise to be referred to the Minister for the Environment under section 160 of the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.</p> <p>This states that before a Commonwealth agency authorises <i>'the adoption or implementation of a plan for aviation airspace management involving aircraft operations that have, will have or are likely to have a significant impact on the environment'</i>, the plan must generally be referred to the Environment Minister for advice.</p> <p>Steve Irons, the Member for Swan has written to the Minister and has been advised that no referral was made in the case of the Western Australian Route Review Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why did Airservices Australia not refer this matter?</li> <li>• Under what circumstances would this be triggered?</li> <li>• How significant do changes to flight paths have to be to warrant consultation by Airservices Australia?</li> <li>• Can you explain how this differs from the referral of the Brisbane Parallel Runway proposal in 2005 for consideration under the EPBC Act?</li> </ul> <p><i>Try and get Airservices to go on record saying that the changes were significant.</i></p>
AA 05	N/A	Written	Back	<p>What action is taken by Airservices Australia upon receiving a specific complaint through the Noise Enquiry Unit detailing the height, time, direction, noise and airline or other information that can identify an aircraft flying outside the Airservices Australia guidelines?</p>

				(a) Are there any repercussions for airlines whose aircraft fly in contravention on the WARRP guidelines?
<b>AA 06</b>	N/A	Written	Back	<p>Does Airservices Australia have any control over the frequency of flights?</p> <p>When aircraft are flying in the Perth Control area, they are generally limited to a max speed of 250 knots. At his speed, a 15 nautical mile separation equates to 3.5 minutes.</p> <p>Does the lateral separation minima dictate to the airlines what the maximum frequency of flights is, as residence in the Darling Range locality have frequently reported that planes often fly overhead in intervals of 3.5 minutes?</p>
<b>AA 07</b>	N/A	Written	Back	Under the new flight paths for Perth Airport is there any circumstance in which jet and non-jet aircraft may share the flight track albeit with some vertical separation?
<b>OTS 21</b>			NASH	<p>What compliance activities have been undertaken by OTS at our ports in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Financial year 2007-2008</li> <li>○ Financial year 2008-2009</li> <li>○ So far in financial year 2009-2010</li> </ul> <p>How many OTS staff are involved in undertaking these compliance activities in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Financial year 2007-2008</li> <li>○ Financial year 2008-2009</li> <li>○ So far in financial year 2009-2010</li> </ul>
<b>OTS 22</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>How does OTS determine which ports to inspect and which not to inspect? (ie is it a truly random process or does it rely on tip-offs or each port getting inspected in routine way?)</p> <p>Did any of your inspections at ports in the last three financial years result in the port not meeting required standards?</p> <p>If yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Which ports?</li> <li>○ When?</li> <li>○ Why?</li> </ul> <p>Have follow up inspections been done to ensure that all of these ports have been brought up to the required standards?</p> <p>If not, why not? If yes, give details?</p>
<b>OTS 23</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Aviation Security – Maximum Take Off Weight (MTOW) as primary determinant of aviation security settings

				<p>Aircraft with greater than 30tonnes MTOW effective 01<sup>st</sup> July 2010 – requires passenger and baggage security</p> <p>Aircraft with greater than 20tonnes MTOW effective 01<sup>st</sup> July 2014 – requires passenger and baggage security</p> <p>This specific issue poses significant implications for Regional Airports across Australia. The MTOW threshold change to above 20tonnes effective mid 2014 will capture the Q-400 turbo-prop aircraft as operated by QantasLink. As a result many regional airports (such as but not limited Wagga Wagga NSW and Port Lincoln SA) will be subject to costly security measures for the first time. The cost of such security measures which includes the upfront infrastructure costs, ongoing maintenance and manpower costs is set to exceed the total annual revenue that many of these regional airports generate in total. With smaller regional market sizes (smaller passenger numbers) the cost burden on the cost of tickets to regional destinations could be as high as \$20 per trip and if simply left to the airlines to collect will have a significant adverse impact on passenger growth and service viability. Airlines such as Regional Express have demonstrated that with lowering average ticket prices that they have been able to viably stimulate market sizes and increase flight frequency thus making schedules more convenient to the benefit of Regional Australia. Additional and significant security related costs will put the future viability of many regional routes at risk.</p> <p>How does the Government propose to fund the costly security related measures at regional airports that will be impacted by the new MTOW thresholds and will it provide regional airports (primarily local councils) with the necessary funding and support? The White Paper has done very little to assist regional airports (not referring to remote aerodromes) with funding to support what is essential infrastructure that links Regional Australia to our Capital Cities and the additional security related costs will only further add to the cost pressures experienced by regional airports and local councils.</p> <p>Additionally, what is the rationale for delaying the revised 20tonne MTOW threshold until mid 2014? If the Government has determined that the revised aircraft MTOW threshold of greater than 20 tonne is due to a valid security concern, how is it that such a measure can be delayed until mid 2014?</p>
<b>AAA 03</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>Funding for regional aviation infrastructure</p> <p>Further to point above, the White Paper does not contain any assistance for the smaller regional airports to enable them to sustain such infrastructure into the future. Such schemes as the RASS are perpetuated and work well to assist the very remote parts of Australia but many airports that serve small isolated communities are now deteriorating and local Councils often</p>

				<p>struggle to find the funding to maintain them.</p> <p>Does the Government intend to provide any necessary funding for these smaller regional airports that are essential regional infrastructure that should be viewed as important as roads, highways, bridges or rail lines?</p>
<b>NB-II 19</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>I refer to the Labor Party's promise during the 2007 election campaign. I quote a Labor Party's press release date 19 November 2007 that <i>Labor will provide \$840 million towards a dedicated freight rail track from North Strathfield to Gosford.</i></p> <p>Now I notice, on the department's website that this \$840 million commitment has turned into a \$15 million study:</p> <p><i>The Australian Government is providing \$15 million to undertake planning for the Northern Sydney Rail Freight Corridor. The planning involves developing a concept design, environmental assessment and development approval for infrastructure improvements along the rail corridor between North Strathfield and Broadmeadow (a suburb of Newcastle). The focus of the planning work is to provide additional capacity for freight rail services, segregate passenger and freight services and to reduce peak-period restrictions on freight services. The planning work is being undertaken by the Transport Infrastructure Development Corporation (TIDC), a NSW Government corporation.</i></p> <p>I also notice on this website that this planning study is not to finish until late 2010. Is that right?</p> <p>So let's be clear – a \$840 million election promise to fit one of Australia's most significant rail freight bottlenecks has turned into a \$15 million study to be completed by the end of the Government's first term of office. Is that right?</p>
<b>NB-II 20</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>Is this another example of the Government promising everything and delivering nothing?</p> <p>How is the study going?</p> <p>Who is on it?</p> <p>When will it be finished?</p> <p>What will be the benefits of the Northern Sydney Freight Line?</p> <p>When will it be built?</p> <p>What is the Government's promise on this project?</p>

<b>NB-II 21</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	I refer to the recently released Commonwealth Coordinator General's Progress Report providing an update on the so-called <i>Nation Building Economic Stimulus Plan</i> . Can you please give me an update of the status of the 17 projects approved under the plan? How many have started? When will they finish?
<b>NB-II 22</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Is ARTC aware of any slippages in timeframes or costs for these projects?
<b>ISTP 14</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Unfortunately, over the Christmas period there were a number of fatalities involving trucks. I note that the Rail, Tram and Bus Union are calling for a ban to the long distance road transport of dangerous goods. Hypothetically, if such a ban or a limited ban was to be put in place what kind of additional burden would that put on our rail network?
<b>ISTP 15</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Would our rail networks be any safer in handling dangerous goods?
<b>NB-II 23</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	In October 2008 the federal government's Grains rail task force was established. About 12 months later made recommendations which included: The need for more capacity on lines into the Port of Newcastle, where competition for rail between coal and grain has increased. Port of Newcastle to be better integrated into the east coast rail network in the future. The maintenance of the lines is handed over to the Australian Rail Track Corporation. Is ARTC at present working on improvements to the NSW grain lines?
<b>NB-II 24</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Has Government consulted with ARTC or discussed with ARTC increases in your maintenance responsibilities?
<b>NB-II 25</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	From your perspective what further need to be done to improve grain rail lines? My understanding from the report is that those lines should be maintained as a class 5 line – but class 3 seems the more optimal as it can carry heavier loads at higher speeds.
<b>NB-II 26</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	What is the annual cost difference to maintaining a class 5 and class 3 lines?
<b>NB-II 27</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	My understanding is that the taskforce also called for an independent study of the Cowra to Demondrille and Cowra to Blaney line because of its uses outside of grain transport. Are you aware if that study has been undertaken?
<b>AAA 04</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	In January 2010 the DITRDLG wrote to the Chair of the Sydney Airports Community Forum (SACF) in response to questions that were raised about funding of the now terminated Aviation Community Advocate (ACA) position. The advice from the Department concluded that the residual monies from the Airport Noise Levy could not be used to fund the ACA position. The Department has indicated that it sought legal advice on this matter. Will the Department provide a copy of that legal advice to the Committee? Why is funding of the ACA position from the Sydney Airport Noise Amelioration Program not possible when monitoring and community consultation were specific components of the then Transport Minister Laurie Brereton's media release dated 1 November 1994?

				Has the Department considered any variations to the role of the ACA in order for it to be funded out of monies collected under the Noise Levy Act? If not, why not?
AAA 05	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>The 2008-09 and 2009-10 Budgets included appropriations for Implementation of noise amelioration for Sydney Airport. This has been a continuation of the Sydney Airport Noise Amelioration Program (SANAP) begun in about 1994. Several variations were made to the duration and cost of the program. Several works were accelerated and the overall duration extended to June 2000. The areas benefiting from the program were extended to those affected by aircraft movements under the Long Term Operating Plan for Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport.</p> <p>It is understood that the current budget provides an appropriation of \$575,000 towards the implementation of noise amelioration for Sydney Airport and a further \$575,000 in 2010-11. Is this correct?</p> <p>When were the noise amelioration projects for Sydney Airport finalised?</p> <p>What has been the purpose of the appropriations that have been made since the completion of the project works in about 2007?</p> <p>Is it correct that appropriations are associated with warranties connected with such works (window and air-conditioning insulation)? What is the Commonwealth's exposure to any liability associated with these works and do the manufacturers/installers have an obligation to manage their own warranties?</p> <p>Despite there being appropriations made to this program for the current budget and 2010-11 budget, no expenditures have been made in the current Financial Year. Why has no expenditure been made in current financial year?</p> <p>Why does the Government intend to return the combined budgeted amounts (\$1.15 million) to consolidated revenue? This is stated in the Department's letter of 19 January 2010.</p> <p>For the duration of this program have these funds been held in a "Special Account" as defined under Section 20 of the Financial Management and Accountability Act 1997? If not, why not?</p> <p>Is the Department aware of any legal obligations that prevent the use of monies collected under the Aircraft Noise Levy Collection Act 1995 for other purposes as would be contemplated if returned to consolidated revenue?</p> <p>IS the Department aware of any similar issues with the Aircraft Noise Amelioration Program at Adelaide Airport? Have amelioration projects at Adelaide been completed? Is there any residual funds associated with the Adelaide Airport program?</p>
AAA 06	N/A	Written	NASH	<p><b>Refining the payment scheme for Airservices Enroute charges / Targeting the Enroute Scheme at Uneconomic Routes.</b></p> <p>The Government proposes to use the "Australian Standard Geographical Classification – Remoteness Areas" to determine routes that will qualify for the subsidy. It is stated that "overall the funding of the scheme will remain the same". Does this mean that each airline</p>

				<p>will still receive the same quantum of subsidy but that the subsidy will be allocated to the remote routes in its network?</p> <p>It must be understood that remote routes by definition have very few services and so consume very little of the current en route subsidy and if the overall funding were to remain, this would mean that the remote routes would be allocated a subsidy that goes beyond mere recovery of the airtservices enrout charges.</p> <p>Further the Government in an earlier statement said that operators were given ample advanced warning so that they could adjust for the removal of the rebate in 2012. However it appears that the change will now be in July 2010 which is just a few months away. This appears to be going back on an earlier made promise.</p>
<b>OTS 24</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>I refer to the Aviation White Paper – <i>Flight Path to the Future</i> – released in December last year. Specifically, the White Paper flags a change to the mandatory passenger and baggage screening requirements. The White Paper notes that from 1 July 2010 the trigger for compulsory passenger and baggage screening for Regular Public Transport and open charter aircraft will be applied to aircraft with a Maximum Takeoff Weight of 30,000 kilograms, regardless as to whether the aircraft is jet or turbo propelled.</p> <p>I further understand that the trigger for compulsory passenger and baggage screening for aircraft conducting Regular Public Transport and open charter will be lowered to those aircraft with a Maximum Takeoff Weight of 20,000 kilograms by 1 July 2014.</p> <p>Is this correct? Is that on 1 July 2014 or before 1 July 2014?</p>
<b>OTS 25</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>Now obviously this decision poses significant implications for regional aviation – namely the QantasLink service. Just to confirm, Dash8 300 series have a Maximum Takeoff Weight of 18,640kg according the Qantas website and so the 2014 trigger does not apply to this aircraft.</p> <p>Is that correct?</p>
<b>OTS 26</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>The Dash 8 400 series has a Maximum Takeoff Weight of 28,998kg, so clearly the 1 July 2014 trigger does apply to this aircraft. Is that correct?</p>
<b>OTS 27</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>Now the Dash 8 400 series services a number of regional airports in Australia. I understand that its Maximum Takeoff Weight is 28,998kg. So just to be clear, this means that compulsory passenger and baggage screening will apply to the Dash8 400 series aircraft after 1 July 2014.</p> <p>Is that right?</p>

<b>OTS 28</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>I understand that the QantasLink Dash 8 400 series serve a number of ports in Australia that do not have screening facilities. These are Barcaldine in Queensland, Blackall in Queensland, Blackwater in Queensland, Cloncurry in Queensland, Devonport in Tasmania, Horn Island in Queensland, Longreach in Queensland, Port Lincoln, (from 14 February 2010), in South Australia, Tamworth in New South Wales, Weipa in Queensland and Wagga Wagga in New South Wales.</p> <p>I also note that the Minister in his media release dated 22 December 2009 claims that Blackwater, Barcaldine and Blackall do not operate the Dash 8 series 400 aircraft but that Qantas on its website states that it does. Is the Minister right or wrong?</p>
<b>OTS 29</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>So by my count eleven regional airports need to be upgraded to meet the new security requirements. Is that correct?</p>
<b>OTS 30</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>What is your understanding as to how many regional airports will need to be upgraded?</p>
<b>OTS 31</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>There are also a number of airports that are currently served by the Dash 8 200 and 300 series. They are Armidale in New South Wales, Biloela in Queensland, Charleville in Queensland, Dubbo in New South Wales, Moranbah in Queensland, Moree in New South Wales and Roma in Queensland.</p> <p>So a further seven regional airports in the years to come may have to upgrade their security facilities. Is this correct? Is that number correct?</p>
<b>OTS 32</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>I refer to the <i>Aviation Transport Security Amendment Regulations 2008 (No.1)</i> which requires that an aircraft that is normally not subject to the Checked Baggage Screening requirements are subject to those requirements if such an aircraft departs from the same apron within 30 minutes of the departure or arrival of an aircraft that is subject to screening requirements. So does this mean that aircraft below the weight of 20,000kg that take off within half an hour, from the same apron, as an aircraft that weighs over 20,000kg will be subject to these new baggage and passenger screening requirements as well?</p>
<b>OTS 33</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>How many regional airports will have to be upgraded, to comply with the new security screening requirements post 1 July 2014?</p>
<b>OTS 34</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>I refer to the Government's new so-called <i>Strengthening Aviation Security</i> initiative. This \$200 million package includes \$32 million to bring forward screening at a number of additional regional airports that are currently served by larger passenger turbo-prop aircraft. I also note that the White Paper states, on page 141 that <i>The Government will work closely with industry to ensure an effective transition to these new requirements.</i> Does this \$32 million fund apply to these transition arrangements?</p>
<b>OTS 35</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>What will be the upfront construction cost to upgrade regional airports that do not have the required screening facilities that are being serviced by the Dash 8 400 series?</p>

<b>OTS 36</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	What will be the upfront construction cost to upgrade the listed regional airports that are serviced by the Dash 8 series 200 and 300 aircraft, to be able to operate the Dash 8 400 series?
<b>OTS 37</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	What will be the additional annual security running costs upon the regional airports that do not have the required screening facilities that are being serviced by the Dash 8 400 series?
<b>OTS 38</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Should the regional airports that are currently serviced by the Dash 8 series 200 and 300 be upgraded to operate the Dash 8 400 series, what would be the additional security running costs?
<b>OTS 39</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	I assume, in order to be compliant with the new security requirements, the total capital and additional annual running cost upon affected regional airports will be in the league of \$100 million. Is that your understanding? What do you think is the correct figure? The \$32 million falls rather short doesn't it? Where will the balance come from – ie the \$68 million? What do you think is the shortfall?
<b>OTS 40</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Which regional airports will receive the benefit of this \$32 million to pay for screening measures?
<b>OTS 41</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Will this decision be based on a risk analysis?
<b>OTS 42</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	What analysis have you done on the cost to regional aviation of these new security measures?
<b>OTS 43</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Assuming the customer will pay, what will be the average increase in ticket costs upon regional routes that are affected by the new security screening requirement?
<b>OTS 44</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Will the Government guarantee that no regional air routes will close as a result of the Government refusing to fund the security costs of the new screening requirements?
<b>OTS 45</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	What has changed in the security environment to prompt this change in security arrangements for regional Australia?
<b>OTS 46</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Has there been any report or study that has prompted this tightening of security procedures for regional Australia?
<b>OTS 47</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Given the tightening of screening requirements won't occur until 1 July 2014, is the Government saying the security environment is expected to deteriorate over that period?
<b>OTS 48</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Is there a specific threat now? Why hasn't the Government decided to implement the 1 July 2014 criteria now, if the Government believes there is a security risk?
<b>OTS 49</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Will the Government promise to provide assistance to the long-suffering regional aviation commuter so they are not slugged by additional fare increases?

<b>OTS 50</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	I refer to the Government's new so-called <i>Strengthening Aviation Security</i> initiative. The Government announced today that \$54.2 million will be given <i>to assist industry to install cargo x-ray screening and explosive trace detection technology at selected locations</i> . Can you inform the Committee which industry bodies will be given cargo x-ray screening and explosive trace detection technology?
<b>OTS 51</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	What kind of x-ray machines will be purchased and what is their cargo screening capacity?
<b>OTS 52</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Where will they be located and for what reason have these locations been chosen?
<b>Trf'd to Customs</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	The Government also announced today that they will <i>establish a regulated shipper scheme, which will allow for the identification of high-risk cargo for technical examination</i> . I understand that the Government cut \$17.1 million over four years for risk-based air cargo inspections in the 2009-10 Budget. Are there plans to restore funding for risk-based air cargo inspections?
<b>AAA 07</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<u>CASA Cost Recovery</u> Given that the initial Aviation Green Paper acknowledged that the regional aviation industry was struggling and the Government gave a commitment to reduce the regulatory burden on smaller operators, it is concerning that the White Paper does not address this issue. The system of Cost Recovery in CASA is a burden on the Regional Airline industry and yet the White Paper simply caps future increases at CPI for 5 years and does not address the unfairness and excesses in the current system.  Does the Government propose to review the current system of Cost Recovery in CASA with a view to making it fairer for the regional industry?
<b>AAA 08</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	I note that the Aviation White Paper discusses the resource base of CASA. The Paper states, in Chapter Six, page 103, that:  <i>To provide a more stable and certain fiscal outlook, the Government is reviewing this resourcing base and is developing a long-term funding strategy for CASA.</i>  What is this review?  Who is conducting it? It is just departmental?  When will the review be concluded?  What are its terms of references?

<b>CASA 03</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>I notice that CASA receives \$15 million per year in the form of charges levied for regulatory services to industry. What is the breakdown of those figures? How much is provided by General Aviation?</p> <p>How is the regulatory reform program going?</p> <p>How many regulations relating to licensing, aircraft maintenance and flight operations are there?</p> <p>What is the backlog in the regulatory development program?</p> <p>How many regulations have to be rewritten?</p> <p>How many are there to go?</p>
<b>CASA 04</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>What are the public consultative arrangements conducted by CASA as part of the drafting process?</p> <p>Is it correct that the maintenance regulations are to be completed by the first half of 2010? How many of these regulations are to be written?</p> <p>What does the first half of 2010 mean? March? June 2010?</p>
<b>CASA 05</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>How confident are you that you will finish the licensing and flight operation regulations by the end of 2010?</p> <p>What does by the end of 2010 mean? The last day of December? July?</p>
<b>CASA 06</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p><b>Trial of Unicom System</b></p> <p>I refer to the air-traffic situational awareness trial called Unicom that was conducted by Air Services Australia. This, I understand was an attempt to provide an alternative arrangement for regional airports catering for higher capacity jets now using aerodromes in regional Australia without the expensive infrastructure associated with licensed air traffic controllers and control towers.</p> <p>I understand that CASA received the report written by Airservices Australia about the trial on 31 March 2009. Is that correct?</p>
<b>CASA 07</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>I notice the extraordinary answer we received from a Question on Notice asked in the Supplementary Budget Estimates in October 2009. This committee asked when the Government will provide a response to this trial. Your answer was, and I quote:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>CASA expects to provide a response to Airservices in relation to the trial shortly.</i></p>

				<p>So does it usually take eleven months for CASA to provide a report on a trial that involved the expenditure of the taxpayer's money of \$650,000?</p> <p>What does 'shortly' mean? Before the election? Next year?</p>
<b>IA 04</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>There is a growing body of evidence to support the view that Infrastructure Australia is being systematically sidelined. Privately, IA members are saying that they are being excluded from the decision making process.</p> <p>Why has this situation been allowed to arise? Will the Minister clearly reaffirm his confidence in IA and his support for its continuation in accordance with the terms of its charter?</p>
<b>IA 05</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>There is no transparency in the processes employed by this government in determining which infrastructure projects are to be funded. This situation is totally at odds with the promises this government made when in opposition and in the 2007 election campaign.</p> <p>Why has this situation been allowed to arise? Will the Minister formally undertake to honour (subject only to the reasonable requirements of commercial confidentiality) the government's pledges on transparency as they apply to infrastructure funding decisions?</p>
<b>IA 06</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>I refer to the Coastal Shipping Inquiry conducted by the Infrastructure Committee and Infrastructure Australia's recent National Infrastructure Priorities Report which both discuss the development of a National Ports Strategy. What is the current status of the development of the National Ports Strategy?</p> <p>When will it be finalised and made public?</p> <p>Which agencies will be involved in the creation of the National Ports Strategy?</p> <p>What consultation is being undertaken in the formulation of this plan?</p>
<b>NB-II 28</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>Can the Department explain why two of the 17 infrastructure projects approved for ARTC Rail Investment are yet to commence? How were projects prioritised? Why were the projects yet to commence deemed a lesser priority?</p>
<b>NB-II 29</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>Can the Department explain why five of the 14 infrastructure projects relating to national road projects are yet to commence? How were projects prioritised?</p>

				Why were the projects yet to commence deemed a lesser priority?
<b>NB-II 30</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Can the Department explain why 127 black spot program (out of 607) are yet to commence? How were projects prioritised? Why were the projects yet to commence deemed a lesser priority?
<b>NB-II 31</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Can the Department explain why 137 boom gates for rail crossing projects are yet to commence? How were projects prioritised? Why were the projects yet to commence deemed a lesser priority?
<b>NB-II 32</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Why have NONE of the national road projects been completed? Is the Department aware of any slippages in timeframes or costs for these projects? What accountability measures has the Department put in place to ensure the projects are completed?
<b>NB-II 33</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Why has only 29 per cent of the rail infrastructure projects for ARTC been completed? Is the Department aware of any slippages in timeframes or costs for these projects? What accountability measures has the Department put in place to ensure the projects are completed?
<b>NB-II 34</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Why has only 25 per cent of the 'boom gates for rail crossing' projects been completed? Is the Department aware of any slippages in timeframes or costs for these projects? What accountability measures has the Department put in place to ensure the projects are completed?
<b>NB-II 35</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Pacific Motorway upgrades How was funding of the upgrade project allocated and how were priority areas identified?  What data was used in the allocation of priority areas? Will the Department provide copy of the relevant data?  Was the Minister or his personal staff involved in determining which sections of the M1 were to be funded in this tranche?  Was the Federal Department involved in identifying the sections of the M1 that would be upgraded in this funding tranche?  Was the Minister or the Department lobbied by Labor Members of Parliament to fund certain sections of the Motorway in this tranche?  When was the Federal Government informed by the Queensland Government that 18.5km of the promised 23km Tugun-Nerang section of the M1 would not be upgraded?

				Will the Department table correspondence between the relevant Federal and Queensland Departments regarding the allocation of federal funding for the upgrade of the M1?
<b>NB-II 36</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>A funding agreement between the former Government and the City of Wanneroo was signed in 2007 for a \$7 million grant to help extend Ocean Reef Road from Hartman Drive to Gnangara Road near the intersection with Alexander Drive. The road was due to be completed by June 2010 in accordance with the funding agreement.</p> <p>The road is not completed. When will it be completed?</p> <p>Is the Department and the Minister aware of this delay?</p> <p>What involvement did the Department and the Minister have in authorising the delay?</p> <p>What funding variations have been authorised in this project and by whom?</p>
<b>IA 07</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>Is there any update on when the remaining projects listed in Infrastructure Australia's National Infrastructure Priorities Report (released May 2009) will be funded?</p> <p>In which financial year?</p> <p>What percentage of the total project cost will be funded?</p>
<b>NB-II 37</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p><u>Oakajee Port</u></p> <p>What is the latest update on the Oakajee Port "equity injection" funding provided in the May Budget?</p> <p>What will the 'equity injection' be spent on?</p> <p>What specific conditions (if any) has the Department put on the funds?</p> <p>With construction to start in 2011, has the money been given to the WA State Government or the Geraldton Port Authority? If not, when will it be?</p> <p>Is the Department considering a further allocation of funds after the completion of the feasibility study in 2010?</p>
<b>NB-II 38</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p><u>Darwin Port Expansion</u></p> <p>What is the latest update on the Darwin Port Expansion project?</p> <p>What exactly will this money be spent on?</p> <p>What specific conditions (if any) has the Department put on the funds?</p> <p>I understand that the funding is subject to the outcome of further work currently underway, has</p>

				the when is it anticipated this work will be finished?
<b>NB-II 39</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>We have raised the issue of the Pacific Highway duplication in this place before. I notice in the previous Estimates, dated 20 October 2009, Secretary Mrdak seemed to suffer a bout of unexpected frankness, when he admitted that there was a massive shortfall in funding in order to complete the duplication of the Pacific Highway.</p> <p>To remind the Committee, the Government has committed \$3.1 billion towards the upgrade of the Pacific Highway from 2008-09 to 2013-14 and the New South Wales Government has committed \$500 million towards the upgrade over the same period. So, a total of \$3.6 billion has been allocated to duplicate the Pacific Highway between now and 2014.</p> <p>Now the National Roads and Motorists Association in its January 2009 budget submission to the Australian Government stated that it will cost \$6.7 billion to duplicate the Pacific Highway. Therefore it seems that there is a shortfall in funding of at least \$3 billion to complete the duplication of the Pacific Highway.</p> <p>So, can the Government confirm the correctness of the Secretary's statement – that it would take at least that sort of element, ie \$6.7 billion – to complete the duplication of the Pacific Highway?</p>
<b>NB-II 40</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Given that there is a shortfall of at least \$3 billion to duplicate the Pacific Highway between Sydney and Brisbane, does the Government stand by its commitment in its media release by the Federal Labor Party dated 21 November 2007?
<b>NB-II 41</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	So I ask again, does the Government stand by its election commitment that it will duplicate the Pacific Highway by 2016?
<b>NB-II 42</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>I understand, according to the <i>Report Card of Pacific Highway Upgrade</i>, dated November 2009 by the NRMA, that of the 821 kilometres of the total road length between Hexham, just northwest from Newcastle and the Queensland border, that 410 kilometres has been upgraded. That means 411 kilometres, or another 50% is still to be upgraded or duplicated.</p> <p>Do you accept this?</p>
<b>NB-II 43</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>So given that another 410 kilometres remain to be duplicated, in order to meet the Government's promise, the duplication rate would have to be nearly 70km per year. Is that happening?</p> <p>Are you confident that additional funds will be provided so the Government can meet its promise?</p> <p>Even the extra billions were provided, are you satisfied that there is the road building capacity to complete the task?</p>
<b>NB-II 44</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	Are you satisfied that the competence and skills of the NSW Road Traffic Authority is adequate to meet this deadline even if additional finances are provided?

				Will the Government meets its election promise?
<b>ISTP 16</b>	N/A	Written	NASH	<p>I refer to the report Rebuilding Australia's Coastal Shipping Industry: Inquiry onto Coastal Shipping Policy and Regulation tabled in October 2008 by the Standing Committee on Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government. As you will be aware this report made several recommendations regarding competitiveness of the Australian industry, training of maritime employees and the need review some existing legislation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the recommendations of that report been considered to date?</li> <li>• If yes, which of the recommendations have been considered?</li> <li>• Which of the recommendations are yet to be considered?</li> <li>• What is the timeframe for the Government to consider the report in detail?</li> <li>• What is the status of Recommendation 2 calling on a 2000 review of the <i>Navigation Act 1912</i> be completed and amendments made to Part VI of the Act?</li> <li>• What is the status of Recommendation 10 recommending the establishment of one national maritime training authority?</li> <li>• What discussions have been held with the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations in relation to this investigation?</li> <li>• If no discussions have taken place, when will they take place?</li> </ul>
<b>OTS 53</b>	N/A	Written (transfer from Defence-23 Feb & PM&C 5 March)	KROGER	<p><b>Border security—proposed use of body Scanners</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How much of the \$28.5 million to assist in the introduction of new screening technology announced by the Government will be allocated specifically towards the introduction of full body scanning technology?</li> <li>2. What is the likely cost of each individual body scanning device?</li> <li>3. What is the likely cost of introducing body scanning technology overall?</li> <li>4. Will all passengers be subjected to body scans?</li> <li>5. If not, which passengers will be exempt from being scanned?</li> <li>6. Is the Government considering exempting passengers from being scanned on the basis of cultural reasons, such as religious objection?</li> <li>7. Will passengers on all routes be scanned, or only selected routes?</li> <li>8. If passengers will only be scanned on selected routes, which routes and why has the</li> </ol>

				<p>government chosen those routes in particular?</p> <p>9. The Government has indicated that it plans to introduce ‘appropriate privacy and facilitation measures to mitigate [privacy] concerns’ What are these measures?</p> <p>10. How does body scanning technology work?</p> <p>11. What do full body scans reveal?</p> <p>12. Will children be subjected to full body scans?</p> <p>13. Has the Department investigated the legality of subjecting children to full body scans?</p> <p>14. If so, what has been the outcome of those investigations?</p>
--	--	--	--	--