

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 01

**Topic:** Delays in Investigation of Bag Theft

**Hansard Page:** p. 62 (Monday, 23/5/05)

**Output:** Office of Transport Security

**Senator O'Brien asked:**

Earlier this year, I asked Mr Anderson a question on notice about the theft of checked baggage at Launceston airport belonging to a Ms Sarah Murfett. It was question on notice No. 367. The Minister advised me that the Office of Transport Security initiated and undertook an investigation. Ms Murfett's bag went missing on 12 November 2004. The Office of Transport Security did not investigate the matter until 3 February 2005, almost three months later. When did the Office of Transport Security become aware that Ms Murfett's bag had been stolen?

**Answer:**

The previous answer to question on notice No. 367 was incorrect due to a typographical error, and has been corrected (see **attached**). The Office of Transport Security became aware of the alleged theft from media reports on 3 March 2005.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 02

**Topic:** Baggage Tampering Investigation

**Hansard Page:** pp. 62-63 (Monday, 23/5/05)

**Output:** Office of Transport Security

**Senator O'Brien asked:**

Mr Anderson also says:

“... it has been determined that it is a police matter as the incident involved an alleged theft of passenger baggage and that there is no evidence to suggest that aviation security was compromised. It is considered that this theft does not constitute an act of unlawful interference with aviation at Launceston Airport.”

Clearly that means that the office knows more about the matter than Ms Murfett, who simply checked her bag in for her flight never to see it again. So what happened?

**Answer:**

The Tasmania Police advise that no-one was charged over this alleged theft.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 03

**Topic:** Checked-Baggage Screening

**Hansard Page:** p. 67 (Monday, 23/5/05)

**Output:** Office of Transport Security

**Senator O'Brien asked:**

“When you say ‘checked bag screening’ I presume that means the screening is done after the bag is checked in?” “Does this 100 per cent guarantee include international flights from Christmas Island? Could you give us a percentage of domestic checked-baggage that is currently subject to screening?”

**Answer:**

Christmas Island screens 100 percent of all checked-in baggage on its once a week international flight. This is in accordance with the Australian Government’s mandated requirement that all originating international baggage be subjected to Checked-Bag Screening effective 31 December 2004.

The Australian Government’s current requirement is for major domestic terminals to have a capability to screen domestic checked-baggage. Consequently, the percentage of bags that are subject to the screening process will vary during the operational period of the airport in line with the number of bags being injected into the baggage handling system. All the airports that have a domestic capability are required to be able to screen 100 percent of the bags on a flight if required.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 04

**Topic:** OTS Budget Allocation To Maritime Security

**Hansard Page:** p. 69 (Monday, 23/5/05)

**Output:** Office of Transport Security

**Senator Bishop asked:**

Of the \$8 million increase, how much is allocated to maritime security?

**Answer:**

The Portfolio Budget Statements (PBS) indicate an increase in funding of approximately \$7.8m from the 2004-05 financial year to the 2005-06 financial year for output 1.2.1 (Transport Security). The figure of \$51.1m for the 2005-06 financial year is only an indicative budget allocation due to the timing of the Department's restructure and the business planning process not being finalised at the time of preparing the 2005-06 PBS (as outlined on page 27 of the 2005-06 PBS for the Transport and Regional Services Portfolio).

Of the change between years for the OTS direct expenses, there is an increase of \$3m for maritime security as a result of the new measure in 2005-06.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 05

**Topic:** Staff Distribution

**Hansard Page:** p. 69 (Monday, 23/05/05)

**Output:** Office of Transport Security

**Senator Bishop asked:**

Can you do the break-up on policy or intelligence, compliance and enforcement as well? Can you do the same analysis for the start of the 2004-05 financial year as well?

**Answer:**

At 31 May 2005, the Office of Transport Security had 244 staff. Of these, 68 were involved in policy and legislation, 25 in intelligence and 108 in compliance and enforcement (201 in total).

At 1 July 2004, the Office of Transport Security had 123 staff. Of these, 55 were involved in policy and legislation, 11 in intelligence and 53 in compliance and enforcement (119 in total).

Other staff were involved in activities such as programme implementation, administration or governance (including finance, human resources and secretariat/coordination activities).

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 06

**Topic:** AFP and ASIO checks for ASICs

**Hansard Page:** p. 85 (Monday, 23/5/05)

**Output:** Office of Transport Security

**Senator Bishop asked:**

- (1) In total, how many ASICs were adversely affected by the AFP-ASIO checks?
- (2) Can you give me an indicative number for those noted as PMV's?

**Answer:**

- (1) Of the 65,000 ASICs re-issued, 75 (or 0.1%) of these were adversely affected by the AFP-ASIO checks from 1 July 2004 to 19 June 2005.
- (2) There were no adverse or qualified Politically-Motivated Violence (PMV) checks recorded.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 07

**Topic:** Joint Committee of Public Accounts (JCPAA) and Audit Report into Aviation Security

**Hansard Page:** p. 88 (Monday, 23/5/05)

**Output:** Office of Transport Security

**Senator Bishop asked:**

[With regards to the Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit Report 400: *Review of Aviation Security in Australia*] Can you take on notice, in a more formal sense, when the Government will respond to the recommendations?

**Answer:**

The Department of Transport and Regional Services responded to the recommendations of the Report by way of an Executive Minute, which was received by the JCPAA Secretariat on 21 January 2005. The document was posted onto the Parliament House web site in March 2005.

Representatives of the Office of Transport Security appeared before the Committee on 5 June 2005, after it re-opened its Inquiry. This included giving a full account of the status of implementing the recommendations.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 08

**Topic:** Hand-Wand Deployment Kits

**Hansard Page:** p. 90 (Monday, 23/5/05)

**Output:** Office of Transport Security

**Senator O'Brien asked:**

Can you give me an indicative figure, top and bottom, per unit price?

**Answer:**

As the Department is still undergoing contract negotiations with tenderers, it is unable to give any indicative price regarding hand-wand metal detectors, as this may compromise contract negotiations.



**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 09

**Topic:** Screening of Airport Staff

**Hansard Page:** p. 8 (Monday, 23/5/05)

**Output:** Corporate Services

**Senator Bishop asked:**

**Mr Tongue**—you had a lengthy discussion earlier with Senator O'Brien on security at airports, mainly to do with cocaine and Indonesia. I do not really want to go over that ground, so I will try and sieve my questions. What is the current rate of screening of airside staff at each of the capital city airports? Could you take on notice where we are at with the current rate of screening for each capital city airport?

**Answer:**

The question is taken to relate to the physical screening of all employees who work in the airside area of the airport. No regulatory requirement exists for the screening of staff entering the airside area other than that they possess and display a valid Aviation Security Identity Card (ASIC). The current rate of screening of airside staff at capital city airports, imposed voluntarily by the airports, is as shown below:

- **Brisbane:** Brisbane Airport has reduced access around the airport perimeter, and is conducting inspections at its two primary access points to airside. In both the Domestic and International areas, security guards have been posted at entry points to airside and ASIC inspections are taking place.
- **Sydney:** Sydney Airport has increased its number of security guards at vehicle gates 4 and 27 to two guards at each gate, and has posted two guards at each of the two turnstiles in Terminal 1 and the one turnstile in Terminal 2. ASIC inspections are taking place.
- **Canberra:** Screening of staff entering the airside area is under consideration.
- **Melbourne:** Melbourne Airport is conducting ASIC checks and random baggage checks within the airport.
- **Hobart:** Hobart Airport currently has no measures to screen staff entering airside.
- **Adelaide:** Screening of staff entering the airside area is under consideration, and ASIC inspections are taking place.
- **Perth:** Perth Airport currently has no measures to screen staff entering airside, and is currently reviewing all access points to airside. Screening of staff entering the airside area is under consideration, and ASIC inspections are taking place.
- **Darwin:** Screening of staff entering the airside area is under consideration, and ASIC inspections are taking place.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 10

**Topic:** Qantas Correspondence: Aircraft Surveillance

**Hansard Page:** p. 93 (Monday, 23/5/05)

**Output:** Office of Transport Security

**Senator Bishop asked:**

There was a report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 12 May which stated that Qantas had written to the Federal Government asking for assistance in seeking to change State-based legislation to allow the installation of security cameras, as most States have workplace surveillance legislation that prevents airlines from carrying out covert surveillance inside aircraft. When did the Government receive this correspondence from Qantas?

**Answer:**

A facsimiled copy was received on 18 April 2005. The original was received on 21 April 2005.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Transport and Regional Services**

Department of Transport and Regional Services

Consideration of Senate Budget Estimates May 2005

**Question No.:** OTS 11

**Topic:** Dispute at Learmonth Airport

**Hansard Page:** p. 113 (Monday, 23/5/05)

**Output:** Office of Transport Security

**Senator O'Brien asked:**

I recently travelled to Christmas Island on the scheduled National Jet Service. En-route to Christmas Island, the plane landed at Learmonth Airport to re-fuel and passengers were told that, contrary to usual practice, we were not able to disembark while re-fuelling took place, due to a dispute between DOTARS and the Local Council. Can you tell me about the nature of that dispute between DOTARS and the Shire of Exmouth, when it began and when will it be resolved?

**Answer:**

There is no dispute between DOTARS and the Shire of Exmouth. The prevention of passengers disembarking at Learmonth (WA) Airport during a re-fuelling stop in early April 2005 was consistent with security in place under the Aviation Transport Security Regulations 2005 which came into effect on 10 March 2005.

Screened passengers are prevented from disembarking at a non-screening airport to maintain the security and integrity of the flight.

As of 12 April 2005, a further Transport Security Program for Learmonth Airport has been approved and screening equipment and sterile zones have been established at the airport.