

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 01

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Application for an export certificate of airworthiness

Hansard Page: 45 (28/05/08)

Senator Johnston asked:

Senator JOHNSTON—That is a form 725, is it not?

Mr Carmody—I do not know. Somebody can probably provide me some advice on that and I will find out for you.

Answer:

Yes.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 02

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Correction of erroneous advice to Kimberly Seaplanes

Hansard Page: 46 (28/05/08)

Senator Heffernan asked:

Senator HEFFERNAN—What time did he discover his mistake as opposed to what time he made the phone call?

Mr Carmody—I presume he discovered the mistake that day. But I know the call was made that day. I can check.

Senator HEFFERNAN—Would it not be pertinent to this argument to find out when he actually discovered the mistake and what was the delay between the mistake and the phone call?

Mr Carmody—It would.

Senator HEFFERNAN—Can we find that out?

Mr Carmody—Yes. We could. It would be pertinent.

Answer:

The Airworthiness Inspector discovered the mistake in the late afternoon of 21 January 2008. On 22 January 2008 at approximately 1130 the Airworthiness Inspector called Kimberley Seaplanes and left a message that the earlier advice was incorrect.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 03

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Issue of special flight permits

Hansard Page: 47 (28/05/08)

Senator Johnston asked:

Senator JOHNSTON—He says special flight permits for Singapore are issued by the civil aviation authority of Singapore for Australian registered aircraft. Are you sure of that?

Mr Carmody—I can check that fact. I will.

Answer:

Special Flight Permits (SFPs) are only valid in the airspace of the country in which they are issued. They are only provided by the country of issue for aircraft registered in that country. While SFPs do not have extra territoriality, they may be considered by third countries where those countries are considering applications for overflights.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 04

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Events surrounding the detention of an Australian pilot in Singapore

Hansard Page: 47, 50 (28/05/08)

Senator Johnston asked:

Dr Aleck—I am reasonably familiar with the case. I was aware of it when it initially arose.

Senator JOHNSTON—We will pause there. How did you become aware of it?

Dr Aleck—Initially, quite frankly, before I had heard about any of the events arising in Australia, I got a telephone call from my colleague at the Civil Aviation Authority in Singapore asking specifically for advice about what our regulations provided. It was not connected with any case.

Senator JOHNSTON—What date was that?

Dr Aleck—I do not have a date. I can get that to you.

Senator JOHNSTON—Did you make a note of the phone call?

Dr Aleck—I most certainly did.

Senator JOHNSTON—Can you take on notice what date you received an inquiry from your colleague in Singapore as to our regulations?

.....

Senator JOHNSTON—Dr Aleck, you had a discussion with someone from Singapore Aviation?

Dr Aleck—The Civil Aviation Authority.

Senator JOHNSTON—Was it a woman?

Dr Aleck—Yes, the head of their legal services.

Senator JOHNSTON—Have you met her over the years at various conferences and what have you?

Dr Aleck—Yes, but we also from time to time on various matters exchange information.

Senator JOHNSTON—As you would. Do you recall when that discussion was?

Dr Aleck—I could not say, but I will take that on notice.

Senator JOHNSTON—If you could take it on notice I would be obliged.

Dr Aleck—Yes. I will get back to you on that.

Answer:

Dr Aleck's first contact with Ms Siew Huay Tan, of the Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore, in relation to this matter was when she rang Dr Aleck on 25 January 2008.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 05

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Events surrounding the detention of an Australian pilot in Singapore

Hansard Page: 51-52 (28/05/08)

Senator Johnston asked:

Dr Aleck—It would be inappropriate for me to say, yes, I am aware of that. What I would like to do, with your indulgence, is take this on notice and provide with as full a chronology of events and facts and circumstances as we are able to provide, which I think will address most of your questions. Also, in the meantime, we will confer with the Singaporean authorities and get some of the details that we do not have.

Answer:

A chronology of events is **attached**.

[CASA 05 attachment]

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 06

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Detention of an Australian pilot in Singapore – involvement of DFAT

Hansard Page: 52, 54 (28/05/08)

Senator Johnston asked:

Senator JOHNSTON—Mr Carmody, do we have any relationship with DFAT over the problems this man was facing?

Mr Carmody—I am not aware. I would have to take that on notice.

Senator JOHNSTON—Chair, what is the date that Mr Carmody has to come back to me by?

CHAIR—18 June. I will check that just to make sure. I am sorry, 18 July.

Senator JOHNSTON—That is a little disappointing, but I look forward to 18 July. If you could look at that and just tell me what interaction you might have had and when with respect to these events I would be very much obliged.

.....

Senator JOHNSTON—Mr Thomas says that on 22 January he sought the assistance of the Australian embassy with respect to his situation and they declined to interfere with a Singaporean authority administered matter. Was CASA ever aware of any of that?

Mr Carmody—As I have indicated, I am not formally aware of discussions we would have had, if we did have any, with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and I will take that on notice. That would cover that point off.

Answer:

CASA had no communications with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade in regard to Mr Thomas' arrest.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 07

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Provision of erroneous advice to Kimberly Seaplanes

Hansard Page: 52 (28/05/08)

Senator Johnston asked:

Mr Carmody—I believe he was the team leader of airworthiness.

Senator JOHNSTON—So, he was the boss?

Mr Carmody—I think so, and we could confirm that.

Senator JOHNSTON—And he made the mistake?

Mr Carmody—Yes, if that is in fact true, and I can confirm whether he was the team leader. I think he was the team leader, but he may not have been. I will look back through my brief and I can find out for you. But, yes, he made the mistake. If I may say, just while we are covering this, during the advice that was provided we offered and told Kimberley Seaplanes that they should apply for an export certificate of airworthiness.

Answer:

Mr Stallard was acting in the position of Airworthiness Team Leader at the time of providing the original advice.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 08

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Allegations of misleading the Senate – legal advice

Hansard Page: 54-55 (28/05/08)

Senator O'Brien asked:

Senator O'BRIEN—Did you receive written advice from that person?

Mr Carmody—I did. In addition to that written advice and subsequent to that response I sought external legal advice from one of the lawyers on our external panel, subsequent to my response, to confirm the original advice that I had been provided with internally. That advice also confirmed that I did not in any way mislead the Senate. As I have said, the allegation being raised by a professional colleague is to say the least disappointing.

Senator O'BRIEN—Are you prepared to share those advices external and internal with the committee?

Mr Carmody—As far as I am aware, I cannot provide legal advice. I am not allowed to table legal advice.

Senator O'BRIEN—I do not know that you are not allowed to, but the government does not table legal advice.

Mr Carmody—The government normally does not table it.

Senator O'BRIEN—You have sought advice in relation to the question of whether you misled the senate. That is what you have just told us.

Mr Carmody—That is correct, and I could seek advice on that matter. Personally the advice, as far as I am concerned, is unambiguous, but it really depends on whether the advice falls in under that direction.

Senator O'BRIEN—It is not advice to government, is it?

Mr Carmody—It is not necessarily my interpretation to make. That is why I would like to take the question on notice.

Senator O'BRIEN—It was advice that you sought for your purposes?

Mr Carmody—It was advice that was sought but it was sought for the organisation. It was sought on the advice of the organisation's legal panel so it is government legal advice.

Senator O'BRIEN—It was sought for CASA, was it?

Mr Carmody—Yes, it was. It was sought through our legal panel. When I am providing my testimony I am representing the organisation so I suppose that is correct.

Senator O'BRIEN—Yes. I suppose in part you are. You are also representing yourself. In terms of the suggestion that you misled the Senate it would be you who would be called to answer for that rather than the organisation, would it not?

Mr Carmody—Correct. But as I have indicated, I am not aware of whether or not I am able to provide this advice. I can check that matter. As far as I am concerned the allegations are closed.

Answer:

Consistent with Government policy, CASA is unable to table legal advice.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 09

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Connection between Aero-Tropics and Transair

Hansard Page: 63 (28/05/08)

Senator O'Brien asked:

Dr Aleck—As to the reference to the newspaper article indicating that the operator was going to be conducting operations into Bamaga and did not hold an operator's certificate to do so, again I will take that on notice but my recollection is that particular flight was actually conducted by Aerotropics. It was conducted by an AOC holder who had RPT.

Senator O'BRIEN—They are connected, are they not?

Dr Aleck—As I recall. I will take that that on notice.

Answer:

At the time of the accident at Lockhart River, Aero-Tropics did not hold an AOC authorising RPT operations in Metro aircraft between Bamaga and Cairns, via Lockhart River. Although Aero-Tropics advertised that route in its flight schedule on the Internet, it was clearly stated that, that particular flight was operated by Transair, for Aero-Tropics. Transair did hold an AOC authorising that operation. To that extent, it could be said that Transair and Aero-Tropics were 'connected', although these would have been legally separate and distinct operations under different and discrete AOCs.

[Note: In testimony on this point, Dr Aleck inadvertently transposed references to Transair and Aero-Tropics, mistakenly stating that Aero-Tropics conducted operations for Transair. It was, in fact, the other way around (as noted above). Dr Aleck has prepared a letter to the Committee Chair correcting this error].

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
 Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 10

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority
Topic: References to CASA in coronial findings
Hansard Page: 64 (28/05/08)

Senator O'Brien asked:

Senator O'BRIEN—Can you, on notice, give us the details of over the last five years how many times there have been specific references to the findings that reflect on CASA's performance from coroners?

Dr Aleck—As a matter of fact I can do that. We have them. We can do it on notice. We can go back 10 years, in fact, if you like.

Answer:

Set out in the table below are references reflecting on CASA's regulatory performance, as these have appeared in the reported findings of coronial proceedings: in which CASA has been involved, or of which the Legal Services Group (and its predecessor) had otherwise become aware.

It is conceivable that coronial proceedings involving the death of persons resulting from aircraft accidents might be conducted with no involvement of CASA whatsoever, and without CASA necessarily having been advised that those proceedings were in train or concluded. With those considerations in mind, the information presented in the table below may not be exhaustive.

Accident & Inquest Details	Comments or Findings Reflecting Adversely on CASA's Regulatory Performance
<p>Accident at Bankstown (NSW) on 5 April 2006</p> <p>Aircraft: .VH-ZNZ Findings delivered: 6 December 2007 Coroner's Court, Sydney</p>	<p>NO ADVERSE FINDINGS OR COMMENTS REFLECTING ON CASA'S REGULATORY PERFORMANCE</p>
<p>Accident near Whetstone (Qld) on 13 September 2005</p> <p>Aircraft: TC-18, unregistered Findings delivered: 14 September 2006 Warwick Magistrates Court (Qld)</p>	<p>NO ADVERSE FINDINGS OR COMMENTS REFLECTING ON CASA'S REGULATORY PERFORMANCE</p>
<p>Accident at Lockhart River (Qld) on 7 May 2005</p>	<p>Recommendation 1 – Crew resource management training CASA should expedite the introduction of mandatory</p>

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2008

Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

<p>Aircraft: VH-TFU</p> <p>Findings delivered: 17 August 2007</p> <p>Brisbane Coroner's Court</p>	<p>crew resource management training.</p> <p>Recommendation 2 – Limit on multiple or conflicting roles</p> <p>CASA should consider creating firm guidelines that require consideration of workload, lines of authority, potential conflicts of interest and any other factors that impact upon the ability of “key personnel” to discharge their responsibilities within an aviation organisation when its officers are approving appointments to those positions.</p> <p>Recommendation 3 - Regulation of training and checking</p> <p>CASA should reconsider the introduction of measures to ensure the efficiency of training and checking organisations for air transport operations. This should include the way in which particular training needs of an air operator's flight crew are to be identified (including recurrent training and CRM training) and how those needs are to be met by approved or certified training and checking organisations.</p> <p>Recommendation 4 – Ministerial assessment of interagency relations</p> <p>The Federal Minister for Transport should consider engaging an external consultant to assess whether high level intervention is warranted, concerning the relationship between ATSB and CASA.</p>
<p>Accident near Thargomindah (Qld) on 13 October 2004.</p> <p>Aircraft: Gyrocopter 20040055111</p> <p>Findings delivered: 8 December 2006</p> <p>Charleville Magistrates Court (Qld)</p>	<p>Coroner criticised CASA in relation to the level of funding provided to Australian Sport Rotorcraft Association (ASRA), if ASRA were to administer commercial use of gyroplanes which it does not currently do, or is required to do. The Coroner recommended that [commercial aerial mustering operations be permitted in gyroplanes.</p> <p>Coroner recommended that CASA fund an investigation into gyroplane hub bar/rotor blade manufacture and in-service inspection and maintenance procedures.</p> <p>Coroner recommended that CASA facilitate regular industry forums or work groups with a view to discussing aerial mustering operations.</p> <p>Coroner recommended that CASA fund the production of an industry code of practice for aerial mustering..</p> <p>Coroner recommended that CASA provide funding to ASRA in the amount of \$250,000 per annum..</p>
<p>Accident near Kununurra (WA) on 8 November 2003</p>	<p>The Coroner recommended CASA should take steps to ensure that pilots working for commercial operators</p>

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2008

Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

<p>Aircraft: VH-YKL Findings delivered: 18 August 2006 Perth Coroners Court</p>	<p>complete reliable flight note details which provide sufficient information to ensure maximum take off weights are not exceeded.</p> <p>For aircraft where there is a small safety margin in respect of weight and balance issues, commercial operators should ensure that issues relating to weight of passengers are addressed prior to accepting bookings.</p> <p>CASA should require commercial operators to retain all manufacturer safety notices in their operations manual and in the event a safety notice is not complied with, that the manual should state the notice is not to be complied with and why.</p> <p>CASA should consider whether there ought to be additional requirements for pilots carrying passengers for reward in remote and potentially hazardous environments in addition to the requirement that they hold a commercial pilot licence (with a view to better ensuring that those pilots are well trained and experienced).</p>
<p>Accident near Mackay (Qld) on 17 October 2003 Aircraft: VH-HTD Findings delivered: 14 October 2005 Rockhampton Magistrates Court</p>	<p align="center">NO ADVERSE FINDINGS OR COMMENTS REFLECTING ON CASA'S REGULATORY PERFORMANCE</p> <p>The Coroner recommended that:—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CASA consider regulating helicopter pilot training to include night VFR; ▪ CASA and the industry move towards a national system of accreditation and uniform standards for provision of Emergency Medical Services (EMS) in Australia ▪ CASA investigate reclassification of EMS helicopter operations into charter category, or create a separate EMS category of aviation in order to provide the benefits of increased level of regulation and CASA oversight, than that presently available under the aerial work category; ▪ CASA ensure that appropriate information be provided to pilots on an ongoing basis regarding the issue of special disorientation. <p>The Coroner supported draft regulations Parts 61 and 133 becoming final.</p>
<p>Accident at Jandakot (WA) on 11 August 2003 Aircraft: VH-ANV Inquest concluded: 27 July 2005</p>	<p>The Coroner found CASA's response to the accident was inadequate, in that it did not quickly ensure other aircraft with the same approved part were not grounded.</p> <p>CASA did not conduct audits at intervals it had set for itself. The Coroner recommended CASA perform regular</p>

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2008

Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

<p>Findings delivered: 19 December 2005</p> <p>Brisbane Coroners Court</p>	<p>audits of no more than 24 months duration between audits</p> <p>The Coroner recommended CAR 30 design organizations and CAR 35 authorised persons ensure engineering orders contain sufficient information, and include a metallurgical report where there is a material change. If such persons do not do so, CASA should consider not permitting those organizations to exercise those functions</p> <p>The Coroner recommended CASA increase the operations classification and safety standards for organizations transporting their own employees</p> <p>The Coroner recommended those issuing engineering orders ensure those operating the aircraft receive a copy</p> <p>The Coroner criticized CASA for not attempting to assess the quality of aerodrome emergency plans, and not ensuring aerodrome operators conduct an emergency exercise at least every 2 years. The Coroner recommended CASA review the quality of aerodrome emergency plans</p> <p>The Coroner recommended the Minister issue a charter letter providing direction to CASA to the effect that greater priority be allocated to safety issues relating to general aviation.</p>
<p>Accident at Brisbane on 19 March 2003</p> <p>Aircraft Bell 206 VH-MTZ</p> <p>Findings delivered 15 October 2004</p> <p>Brisbane Coroners Court</p>	<p>NO ADVERSE FINDINGS OR COMMENTS REFLECTING ON CASA'S REGULATORY PERFORMANCE</p>

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 11

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Enforcement of Civil Aviation Order 48

Hansard Page: 68 (28/05/08)

Senator Sterle asked:

CHAIR—And it would be CASA's role to enforce that exemption; is that correct?

Mr Carmody—Yes, I would expect so.

CHAIR—If we have got a host of people sitting around a table under the guise of a Standards Consultative Committee having some extended issues with a law, it tells me that something is not working. I am asking you, Mr Carmody or Mr Wight, have you been vigilant in enforcing that exemption or that law?

Mr Wight—Through our normal surveillance process that would be something that we would routinely check, the exceeding of limitations of how they have been recorded within organisations.

CHAIR—Do you have to hand your hit record, or score record, or those that are behaving and those that might be working outside it?

Mr Wight—I do not on me, no.

CHAIR—You may want to take that on notice, if you can, and provide that information to the committee.

Answer:

Compliance against CAO Part 48 and any exemptions under CAO Part 48 is assessed on all system audits. Enforcement action has been taken three times in relation to CAO 48 since 1 January 2007. Requests for Corrective Action have been issued 26 times in the same period. CASA also undertakes a range of other administrative action in addition to Requests for Corrective Action. Disaggregating this data is not practicable at this time.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 12

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Enforcement of Civil Aviation Order 48

Hansard Page: 70 (28/05/08)

Senator Sterle asked:

CHAIR—Commissioner Hart has raised his concerns. Would I be right in assuming that you have not implemented his recommendations?

Mr Carmody—I have not got his recommendations in front of me but I would say that we are considering his recommendations in the context of the Standards Consultative Committee deliberations. That is my understanding.

CHAIR—You are saying that the breach has been committed because the FRMS rules are being developed?

Mr Carmody—Without having the full details of the response, I am not saying that a breach has been committed. I would be happy to take the matter on notice and look at what the ICC's response has been. And I will look at the FRMS as well.

Answer:

If a breach has occurred it would necessarily be a breach under the existing requirements, not any proposed rules being developed by the Standards Consultative Committee.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 13

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Breaches of Civil Aviation Order 48

Hansard Page: 70-71 (28/05/08)

Senator Sterle asked:

CHAIR—Mr Carmody, we can sit there and ‘hmm’, but if we are talking about fatigue management obviously there are laws around it for a very good reason and I want to get to the bottom of it. Perhaps this law is not being enforced. I am not talking about my colleagues on the committee here who happen to spend too much time on airplanes now but for the whole general public. We like to think that our pilots are safely rested and ready for duties. But if we have major operators who are getting away with not enforcing the law because they cannot do it themselves and the major enforcement body, CASA, is not policing it, it sends a very worrying message when the pilots are out there saying, ‘Hey, how many more times do we have to scream out: “Enforce the law.”?’ If a new one is negotiated and a new one is enforced, good luck to all. Would that be a fair assumption? It is now 3.30 pm and there is a long way to go. You have taken on notice and you are going to come back to the committee with the records that you have for whatever breaches there have been to this exemption; is that right?

Mr Wight—We can if—

CHAIR—I am actually asking you to take it on notice if you can and come back to us.

Mr Wight—I will take that on notice.

Answer:

Compliance against CAO Part 48 and any exemptions under CAO Part 48 is assessed on all system audits. Compliance with the relevant sections of CAO 48.0 and with the terms of any exemptions from those provisions is governed by Civil Aviation Regulation (CAR) 5.55

Enforcement action has been taken three times in relation to breaches of CAO 48 since 1 January 2007. Requests for Corrective Action have been issued 26 times in the same period.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 14

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Enforcement of Civil Aviation Order 48

Hansard Page: 71 (28/05/08)

Senator Sterle asked:

CHAIR—Why are you permitting airlines to not comply with the law?

Mr Carmody—If I may respond, as I have said before, I am not sure that we are. I would like to review that information.

CHAIR—Okay. You did say that. That is fair and I will wait with bated breath for you to come back with that information.

Answer:

CASA is generally obliged to enforce compliance with regulations under its authority, when it is necessary and appropriate to do so. CASA has discretion as to whether or not enforcement action should be taken in each instance. Consistent with its obligations under the Civil Aviation Act, and consistent with CASA's enforcement policy, CASA may decline to initiate enforcement action in relation to a particular instance of non-compliance with a legislation requirement.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 15

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Enforcement of Civil Aviation Order 48

Hansard Page: 71 (28/05/08)

Senator Sterle asked:

CHAIR—Is it correct to say that if CASA were to enforce the CAO 48E definition then the operators would need additional crew to operate some of their currently scheduled sectors and hence incur additional costs? Would that be a fair statement?

Mr Carmody—I would have to couple that with my previous response. I do not know the answer to that.

Answer:

As CASA enforces CAO 48, it is not a fair statement.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 16

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Enforcement of Civil Aviation Order 48

Hansard Page: 71 (28/05/08)

Senator Sterle asked:

CHAIR—Were such commercial considerations a factor in CASA withdrawing its initial acknowledgement in 2005 to AIPA that the CAO 48 duty time definitions were being breached?

Mr Carmody—I do not know the answer to that, either.

CHAIR—Take that on notice, thank you.

Answer:

No. On 11 July 2005, AIPA wrote to CASA seeking determination of the method for determining Flight Deck Duty Time when operating in accordance with the general exemption to CAO 48 Part III.

On 12 August 2005, CASA responded advising AIPA that Flight Deck Duty referred to the total time a flight crew member was on duty on the flight deck.

On 31 August 2005, after reviewing its documentation, CASA again wrote to AIPA to clarify the determination which had an emphasis on the distinction between Flight Deck Duty and Flight Deck Duty Time. In that determination, Flight Deck Duty referred to the period when the aircraft was airborne. Implicit in that clarification was the notion that it applied to a flight crew of 2 pilots and that Flight Deck Duty Time was synonymous with Flight Time. Therefore, the alleged original acknowledgement of breaches had not been withdrawn, but in light of additional information, the determination of 12 August 2005 had been clarified.

In its letter of 31 August 2005, CASA acknowledged that varying interpretations could lead to uncertainty and initiated actions to clarify the situation.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 17

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Appointments made since 24 November 2007

Hansard Page: Written question

Senator Fierravanti-Wells asked:

What appointments have been made to boards, advisory committees, or any other quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisations (quangos) within the following departments and agencies within the responsibility of these departments since 24 November 2008: Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government?

Answer:

Refer to CORP 12.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 18

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: A list of Quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisations (quangos) in the Portfolio

Hansard Page: Written question

Senator Fierravanti-Wells asked:

Please list all quangos within the following departments and agencies within the responsibility of these departments: Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Answer:

Refer to CORP 13.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 19

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Programs, Initiatives and other undertakings to be carried forward

Hansard Page: Written question

Senator Fierravanti-Wells asked:

In relation to the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government and agencies within its responsibility, please answer the following questions in relation to each of the Federal seats of Banks, Lowe, Bennelong, Macquarie, Cunningham, Throsby, Barton, Watson, Charlton and Werriwa:

- a) What programs, initiatives or other undertakings of the Howard Government will be maintained under the Rudd Government?
- b) What programs, initiatives or other undertakings of the Howard Government will be reversed under the Rudd Government?
- c) What new programs, initiatives or other undertakings will be allocated to these seats under the Budget?

Answer:

The Government has made various decisions, including in the Budget context, about the establishment of new programs and initiatives, and changes and terminations to existing programs and initiatives. These are detailed in Portfolio Budget Statements, including for the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government. There are no programs in the Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government portfolio that are implemented or allocated differentially on the basis of Federal electorates.

Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2008
Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

Question: CASA 20

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: ALP Website- Election Promises -Rudd Government

Hansard Page: Written question

Senator Fierravanti-Wells asked:

Please advise whether the list of items under the policy heading on the ALP website <http://www.alp.org.au/> constitutes the total sum election "promises" made by the Rudd Government within the following portfolios: Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government

If not, please provide a comprehensive list which includes all promises referred to on the ALP website as well as those that were made but are not contained on the ALP website?

Answer:

As indicated in previous answers on this issue (answer to Questions on Notice 153 to 188 of 12 February 2008), the election commitments made by Federal Labor are on the public record. Those measures implementing commitments that are funded through Budget appropriations to the Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government portfolio are detailed in Departments' Portfolio Budget Statements.