

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 52

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation & Airports

Topic: Increased traffic at Perth, Karratha and Port Hedland airports

Proof Hansard Page/s: 29-30 (23/05/12)

Senator EGGLESTON asked:

Senator EGGLESTON: Thank you very much. I would like to ask you some questions about Perth airport. There has obviously been a really dramatic increase in the amount of traffic through Perth airport. Are you able to quantify that?

Mr Mrdak: Senator, I do not have the figures with me. But there certainly has been a significant growth in the last year or so.

Mr Doherty: Senator, I cannot answer the exact amount, but we can certainly take that on notice to provide that.

Senator EGGLESTON: I would be very interested in knowing the specific figures. It seems likely to continue to grow with the amount of fly-in fly-out workforce traffic through the airport. There have also been dramatic increases in traffic in both Karratha and Port Hedland, I think. Can you take that on notice?

Mr Mrdak: There has been significant growth at both Karratha and Port Hedland in the last two years, which has resulted in the introduction of ATS services and the like. So we can give you that information. We can give you the data.

Answer:

The most recent figures (2011 calendar year) for regular passenger transport movements at Perth, Karratha and Port Hedland are:

Perth:

- Over 11 million annual passenger movements (8.4% growth on 2010 figures).
- Over 89,000 annual aircraft movements (5.5% growth on 2010 figures).

Karratha:

- Over 740,000 annual passenger movements (17.7% growth on 2010 figures).
- Over 8,000 annual aircraft movements (11.6% growth on 2010 figures).

Port Hedland:

- Over 400,000 annual passenger movements (15.8% growth on 2010 figures).
- Over 5,000 annual aircraft movements (16.6% growth on 2010 figures).

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 53

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation & Airports

Topic: Direct flights to Port Hedland and Karratha from east coast airports

Proof Hansard Page/s: 30 (23/05/12)

Senator EGGLESTON asked:

Senator EGGLESTON: One of the answers or solutions seems to have been direct flights from Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane into Port Hedland and Karratha. What impact are those direct flights having? How often are those direct flights occurring in terms of lightening the load overall on Perth airport?

CHAIR: This is a very important issue, but I may have to start winding it up because there are other senators.

Senator EGGLESTON: I will not ask any more questions.

CHAIR: Thanks, Senator Eggleston. If I can have the shortest direct answer, that would be great.

Mr Mrdak: We will get you the traffic numbers in relation to that. It has been one of the ways in which companies have managed the growth. But it is more about sourcing labour from the east coast states for fly-in fly-out to places like Karratha and Port Hedland. But obviously what that has led to is Airservices Australia upgrading its facilities and airspace management in both those locations.

Answer:

Qantas operates direct services from Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne to Karratha and from Brisbane and Melbourne to Port Hedland. As there is only one operator on these routes, movement numbers cannot be released for commercial reasons.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 54

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation & Airports

Topic: Sydney Airport Environmental Impact Assessment

Proof Hansard Page/s: 30-31 (23/05/12)

Senator RHIANNON asked:

Senator RHIANNON: In the early 1990s, an airport crash risk assessment was undertaken for the environmental impact statement on Sydney airport's third runway. Since then the population at risk, if there is a crash, has been increasing due to urban consolidation. Could you share with the committee the last time an assessment of the current and future crash risk as a result of the airport's siting was undertaken?

Mr Mrdak: I am not aware of any such detailed analysis since that time. I will take that on notice.

Senator RHIANNON: Nobody else is aware. So it appears that there may not have been an assessment since the early 1990s?

Mr Mrdak: Not in the same context as that environmental impact assessment I am aware of. But the aviation agencies obviously maintain a constant oversight of regulatory and operational risks arising from the traffic growth. Obviously, safety measures are taken as necessary by Airservices Australia and CASA to ensure safe operations at the airport.

Senator RHIANNON: I was after the assessments—the assessment within the context of the EIS or a risk assessment in any other capacity. Could you take that on notice?

Mr Mrdak: Certainly.

Answer:

There has been no EIS in relation to Sydney Airport operations since the third runway development in the early 1990s.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 55

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation & Airports

Topic: Upgauging at Sydney Airport

Proof Hansard Page/s: 31 (23/05/12)

Senator RHIANNON asked:

Senator RHIANNON: Could you take on notice to provide more information about the upgauging? How much upgauging can Sydney airport handle?

Mr Mrdak: Certainly. The joint study looked at this very closely. There has been a significant increase in the numbers of people per aircraft. That will continue. We have some projections of that in the study.

Answer:

The Joint Study on Aviation Capacity in the Sydney Region found that Sydney Airport has limited ability to cater for upgauging because of issues including:

- the physical constraints on the size of the airport;
- its runway length and configuration;
- constraints on taxiway, gate and aprons; and
- the need and capability of other airports to develop capacity to also handle the larger aircraft.

Further information can be found in Chapter 3 of the Joint Study report at:

http://www.infrastructure.gov.au/aviation/sydney_av_cap/index.aspx

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 56

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation & Airports

Topic: Public Safety Zones

Proof Hansard Page/s: 33 (23/05/12)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: There is a specific report. I would like you to look into it. That report made recommendations about the requirement for forced landing areas for aircraft. There were 240-odd incidents leading up to 31 December 2010 in the decade before that. They include degradations in the forced landings and 75 energy failures. I would like you to revisit the discussion on public safety areas that has been pushed off to a later date. I would like your response to that on notice as to whether it is adequate.

Mr Mrdak: Certainly, Senator. I will do that.

Answer:

The intention is that guidance on public safety zones will be developed by the National Airports Safeguarding Advisory Group (NASAG), with the guidance material then submitted to the Standing Council on Transport and Infrastructure for consideration by ministers.

The ATSB report 'Managing partial power loss after takeoff in single-engine aircraft' will be put before NASAG for consideration in that process.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 57

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation & Airports

Topic: Investment in aviation infrastructure

Proof Hansard Page/s: 33 (23/05/12)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: Mr Doherty, thank you. I ask you to take this on notice, given that we are rapidly running out of time. How will the department implement your stated vision from the white paper and your response to me that airports are predominantly about aviation? How will you actually achieve that vision statement for your department's view of airports if you do not monitor the investment and the upkeep? I ask you to also extend that to ALOP aerodromes, particularly given that the transfer deed specifically prohibited local government from doing things like building dams or things that might attract bird life? Right at the moment there are a number of councils who are doing things like interrupting drainage, creating bird habitats and building dams right next to runways. I would like your detailed explanation about how you will maintain oversight of aviation infrastructure that is clearly degrading at both the leased airports and within the ALOP space.

Mr Mrdak: Certainly, Senator. I think Mr Doherty was talking about specific development commitments, but we will come back to you with a statement in relation to how we oversight them. As I said, ALOP, as we have discussed, is largely a matter for local government. The guidelines under NASAG try to deal with some of those issues you have raised. So we will come back to you with a detailed answer.

Answer:

The 21 leased Federal airports are subject to the planning and development framework established in the *Airports Act 1996*. In relation to the leased federal airports, regulatory control is achieved through the master planning process, development approvals and reviews of compliance with lease conditions. Building and development activity is subject to building and environmental approval processes.

The Sale Agreements for 10 of these airports included capital expenditure obligations for aeronautical infrastructure of \$700 million over the first 10 years of the leases. These obligations were met and exceeded.

The same level of controls are not available at other airports, such as ex-ALOP airports, which fall outside the planning and development framework established in the *Airports Act 1996*.

The Australian Government is working through NASAG to improve the arrangements for the protection of all airports from developments which have the potential to impact on airport operations, such as wildlife hazards, wind turbines' lighting hazards and incompatible infrastructure developments.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

On 18 May 2012, the Standing Committee on Transport and Infrastructure (SCOTI) agreed to a suite of national guidelines including 'Managing the Risk of Wildlife Strikes in the Vicinity of Airports' as part of the National Airports Safeguarding Framework.

This guideline is intended to assist State, Territory and Local Governments to ensure that the risk to aviation safety from land uses near airports that attract wildlife such as birds is managed or eliminated.

In relation to the ex-ALOP airports, the Deeds of Transfer between the Commonwealth and local and airport owners require that the facilities continue to operate as aerodromes.

In relation to aviation safety, the standards for the operation of the different categories of aerodromes are determined by the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA). These standards are established under Part 139 of the Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 1998 and the Manual of Standards for Part 139. The provisions include requirements to maintain the facilities in safe working condition.

While the responsibility for maintenance and other aerodrome works rests with the owners and operators, the Australian Government has worked with a number of local aerodrome owners to provide funding assistance for key projects.

Since 2008, the Australian Government has provided \$75.8 million in funding to regional airport projects for infrastructure and upgrade activities under various programs targeting assistance to regional Australia. The Australian Government has also allocated \$51 million for aerodrome upgrade works in remote and very remote locations over the period 2008 to 2014.

This funding is in addition to the financial assistance provided to the States and Territories through GST revenue distribution and to local councils through Financial Assistance Grants. As both are in the form of untied grants, these funds may be used for the maintenance or development of regional aerodromes as appropriate.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 58

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation and Airports

Topic: Airservices CEO and Board Communications

Proof Hansard Page/s: 34 (23/05/12)

Senator XENOPHON asked:

Senator XENOPHON: Were there any communications between the minister and Mr Russell prior to his resignation in respect of his resignation?

Mr Mrdak: Not that I am aware of.

Senator XENOPHON: Could you take that on notice?

Mr Mrdak: I will. But this is a matter for the board. The board engages the CEO. It is a matter for the board.

Answer:

No.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 59

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation and Airports

Topic: Engagement with Coroners

Proof Hansard Page/s: 61 (23/05/12)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: Mr Mrdak, as secretary of the relevant department, how would you propose to engage with the coroners to make sure that we, as a nation, close this loophole to make our air environment safer?

Mr Mrdak: I think Mr Dolan has indicated the relationship with coroners is on a much better footing than it has been ever before. I think the work of the ATSB has led that. I think it then becomes a matter of addressing the relationship between the safety regulators and security regulators, as necessary, with the coroners. It is probably one I would take on notice and give a bit of thought to, if you do not mind.

Senator FAWCETT: You do not accept that your department and you, as secretary, have a duty of care and an oversight to make sure that two agencies who work for you do actually complement their activities for the outcome that benefits the aviation community?

Mr Mrdak: We certainly do ensure that agencies are working together. That is certainly occurring. You have asked me the more detailed question about coroners and relationships with the agencies. I will have a bit of a think about that, if that is okay.

Answer:

In terms of coordination between agencies there are in place a number of mechanisms that ensure effective cross agency handling of issues in relation to safety matters having regard to the specific legislative roles of each agency. These include the establishment of formal Memorandum of Understanding between the Australian Transport Safety Bureau (ATSB) and the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) and between the ATSB and Airservices Australia (Airservices).

In relation to interaction with coroners this takes place in a number of ways. The ATSB supports the coronial process by explaining the findings from its own investigation through the provision of briefings to the coroner and giving evidence at inquests.

The ATSB also brings any aviation safety related issues identified in the ATSB investigation or from the coroner's findings to the attention of the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA), Airservices Australia and industry by publicising them on the ATSB's website. Where appropriate, comments are specifically sought from both CASA and Airservices, and that information is also included on the ATSB's website.

In relation to CASA, Airservices or the Department, all organisations participate in the coronial process when requested. Where coroner's findings are directed at any of these organisations,

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

the coroners' recommendations are fully considered and where agreed, actions are implemented to enhance aviation safety.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 60

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation and Airports

Topic: Sydney aviation capacity joint study report recommendations

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator FAWCETT asked:

1. Will the Department adopt recommendation 8 contained within the report by the Joint Study on Aviation Capacity in the Sydney Region?
2. If so, will the Department undertake this review and what is the time frame for this to take place?
3. Are there any operational or technical reasons why Recommendation 7 contained within the report by the Joint Study on Aviation Capacity in the Sydney Region could be rejected in favour of moving regional services outside of the slot management system at Sydney Airport?
4. Will the Department adopt Recommendation 6 contained within the report by the Joint Study on Aviation Capacity in the Sydney Region?
5. If so, how will the Department undertake this review and what is the timeframe for this to take place?

Answer:

- 1.-5. It is the role of the Government, not the Department, to decide whether or not to adopt recommendations contained in the Joint Study.

In responding to the Joint Study, the Government made it clear that it is committed to noise sharing through LTOP and also reaffirmed its commitment to safeguarding existing regional slots of Sydney Airport. The Government is also committed to the current movement cap limit and curfew arrangements.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 61

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation and Airports

Topic: Adelaide (City) Development Plan

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator FAWCETT asked:

1. The SA State Government has proposed building heights of 30 storeys or more in the Adelaide CBD. How does the Department intend to deal with conflicting interests of aviation flight paths and government development proposals?
2. Will PANS-OPS requirements have to be changed or will the Department disallow inappropriate city developments?
3. What consultation will occur with airlines and other AOC holders?

Answer:

1. Prescribed airspace for Adelaide Airport is protected in accordance with the applicable provisions of the *Airports Act 1996* and the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996. The prescribed airspace recognizes both PANS-OPS and OLS surfaces. The Adelaide (City) Development Plan, consolidated on 31 May 2012, requires that developments that would intrude into prescribed airspace be referred to the Department through Adelaide Airport.
2. There is no plan to change PANS-OPS requirements for Adelaide Airport.
3. The Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996 require the airport operator company to give written notice and invite submissions about any application seeking approval of an activity that would intrude into prescribed airspace from CASA, Airservices Australia and the building authority concerned. Adelaide Airport will consult airlines and other AOC holders if necessary as part of this process.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 62

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation and Airports

Topic: Domestic Carbon Price for Aviation

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

1. If the carbon tax applies to domestic aviation operators- does this mean that any Qantas international flight will have a carbon tax- and other carriers outside Australia won't have to pay Australia's carbon tax – as they are not domestic aviation operators?
2. Can you give examples of where carbon tax would apply to domestic aviation operators?

Answer:

1–2. Only fuel consumed on domestic flights will be subject to an effective carbon price through an increase in the existing fuel excise on domestic aviation fuel. Fuel for international flights will not incur a carbon liability. Qantas and other Australian carriers will operate international services on the same basis as foreign carriers.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 63

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation and Airports

Topic: **Airservices Australia Enroute Charges Payment Scheme**

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

1. Can you confirm that there was no money to extend the En Route Subsidy Scheme in the 2012-13 Budget?
2. From 1 July 2012 the En Route Subsidy Scheme will cease for non-aero-medical operators?
3. I refer to Question in Writing number 90 from the last estimates hearings, which was: In relation to the proposed replacement scheme announced in the Aviation White Paper, can you please provide a list of regional airports and routes that would have been eligible under that scheme?

And the answer was: The current guidelines for aeromedical services will continue to apply.

Really what was being asked was the Aviation White Paper's announcement that quotes "the Government will use the Australian Standard Geographical Classification... to identify those routes that will qualify for the subsidy."

I realise that the Government never introduced this scheme but what I'm asking is what are those routes that would have qualified using the Australian Standard Geographical Classification?

I'm not interested in the scheme that will operate from 1 July 2012. I'm interested in the scheme announced in the White Paper that was never introduced by the government.

Surely you should have this information given the programme was announced in the White Paper. So can you provide me with a list of the routes that would have been eligible under the scheme announced (but not implemented) in the Aviation White Paper?

Answer:

1. The 2012-13 Budget provides \$1 million per annum in 2012-13 and the outyears for payments to eligible aeromedical air operators under the Payment Scheme for Airservices Australia's Enroute Charges.
2. In the 2008-09 Budget the Government advised that the Airservices Australia Enroute Charges Payment Scheme would cease in the 2012-13 Budget for non-aeromedical operations.
3. No decisions were taken on which routes would have been eligible under an amended Scheme.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 64

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation and Airports

Topic: Business jet aircraft permitted to operate during the curfew at Sydney and Adelaide airports

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator WILLIAMS asked:

1. Would you agree that since 2005 there have been upgrades to particular models of aircraft?
2. Would you agree that commercial jets are getting quieter as technology improves?
3. Why hasn't the list been updated to allow these newer, quieter aircraft to operate?
4. Can you appreciate that this is a disincentive for the industry to upgrade to quieter, more fuel-efficient aircraft and emissions-friendly aircraft?
5. Are you aware that over the last 7 years low noise curfew-exempted jet aircraft movements have averaged less than 1 per day at Sydney Airport and less than 1 per week at Adelaide Airport with many of these being medical emergency landings?

Answer:

- 1&2. Some aircraft types have been redesigned or changes made to equipment such as engines, avionics and other parts since 2005 and some commercial jets are quieter than previous commercial aircraft types.
3. The Government believes the existing curfew arrangements strike the right balance between community amenity and industry requirements.
4. Aircraft operators make aircraft purchasing decisions based on a range of factors including fuel and other operational costs.
5. Airservices Australia has advised they have been unable to source data for the last seven years. The Department notes that medical emergency landings are exempt from curfew restrictions.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 65

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation and Airports

Topic: 'Tag' Flights

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator XENOPHON asked:

In answer to Question 87 on notice from Additional Estimates in February this year, DIT stated:

“An Australian airline can link a domestic flight to an international flight, using a single flight number (a so called “tag” flight) if they choose to do so, provided the applicable bilateral air services arrangements permit such services. In these circumstances, the domestic leg is considered part of the international flight for the purposes of the Air Navigation Act 1920 and the economic rights which it regulates.”

1. Does an Australian airline “choose” to add a domestic ‘tag’ flight or does it have to apply to DIT for approval to create the linkage?
2. Have any Australian carriers sought to add ‘tag’ flights but been denied because the applicable bilateral air services arrangements do not permit such services?
3. Do the bilateral air services arrangements that permit Australian domestic ‘tag’ flights automatically include reciprocal arrangements in the partner country?
4. Given that cabotage by foreign carriers is not generally permitted, are there any practical implications for bilateral air services arrangements that are enlivened by permitting Australian International carriers to carry domestic passengers on the ‘tag’ sectors?

Answer:

1. Australian airlines decide whether to link a domestic flight to an international flight, using a single flight number. An airline wishing to operate a domestic sector linked to an international sector with the same flight number would need to seek approval from the Department of Infrastructure and Transport as part of the regular timetable approval process.
2. Not to the Department’s knowledge.
3. Generally reciprocal rights are available for both parties to a bilateral air services agreement.
4. No. Australian carriers are permitted to carry purely domestic passengers on the domestic flight linked to an international flight using a single flight number.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 66

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation and Airports

Topic: International Flights

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator XENOPHON asked:

In Question 107 on notice from Additional Estimates in February this year, CASA was asked:

“How many sectors conducted solely within Australian airspace may be designated as international “tag” flights? How is such a determination monitored?”

The answer provided was: “10: The Department publishes a summary of routes and frequencies that international airlines are authorised to operate in accordance with the Air Navigation Act 1920. This summary includes approvals given to airlines to operate domestic sectors as part of an international service. The timetable summary is available at:

<http://www.infrastructure.gov.au/aviation/international/timetable.aspx>

A search of the NORTHERN SUMMER 2012: 25 MARCH 2012 / 27 OCTOBER 2012

Timetable Summary did not easily reveal any permissible ‘tag’ flights by foreign airlines nor was there any obvious entry that showed the Jetstar ‘tag’ flights.

1. Could you provide a listing of approved tag flights in Australia for foreign airlines and for Australian designated International airlines, including a worked example of how a member of the public could find such information?
2. Are codeshare flights considered to be international flights whenever an international airline is one of the partners?
3. Does each International Air Service Licence specify the approved routes that the operator may fly?
4. Noting the answer to Question 88 on notice from Additional Estimates in February this year, does DIT provide other agencies with regularly updated data on flight designations, given the implications for the exemption of international flight from a range of Australian legislation?
5. Does DIT participate in the Border Protection Task Force set up and led by DPM&C?

CASA considers any flights that proceed more than 12 miles offshore to be an international flight because it leaves Australian territory. On the other hand, the Migration Act 1958 defines the Migration Zone that includes offshore resource and sea installations, many of which are more than 12 miles offshore. DIAC does not consider flights to those offshore resource and sea installations to be international flights. In the answer to Question 87 on notice from Additional Estimates in February this year, DIT stated:

For the purposes of the Air Navigation Act 1920 administered by the Department, a flight (described by its flight number) will be considered an international service if it crosses the

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Australian border. If a flight (described by its flight number) does not cross the Australian border it is a domestic flight.

6. What does DIT consider to be the Australian border?

Answer:

1. This information is contained in the International Airlines Timetable Summary available on the Department's website at <http://www.infrastructure.gov.au/aviation/international/timetable.aspx>
2. When a foreign airline wishes to place its code on a domestic flight operated by an Australian airline, it must first seek timetable approval under the Air Navigation Act 1920. For the purposes of the Act and the economic rights which it regulates in relation to that foreign carrier, the domestic sector operated by the Australian carrier is considered part of the international flight operated by that foreign carrier. The Australian carrier domestic flight remains a domestic flight.
3. No. International Airline Licences authorise services between countries and do not specify particular sectors.
4. Approved international flights are available to government agencies and the public in the form of the International Airlines Timetable Summary published on the Department of Infrastructure and Transport's website twice each year soon after the commencement of the scheduling seasons.
5. No.
6. For the purposes of the *Air Navigation Act 1920* 'Australian territory' is defined as follows:

"Australian territory" means:

- (a) the territory of Australia and of every external Territory;*
- (b) the territorial sea of Australia and of every external Territory; and*
- (c) the air space over any such territory or sea.*

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 67

Program: 2.4

Division/Agency: (AAA) Aviation and Airports

Topic: Airservices CEO and Board Communications

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator XENOPHON asked:

During Estimates, on a number of occasions Mr Mrdak made reference to issues relating to the CEO being “a matter for the Board”.

1. While it is clear that the officers of Airservices are subject to the scrutiny of the Senate, what Parliamentary oversight arrangements apply to the Board?
2. (a) Who is responsible for authorising the travel and expenses for the CEO of Airservices?
(b) To whom do they report?
3. What is DIT’s role in regard to the operations of Airservices Australia?
4. Did DIT conduct a review of Mr Russell’s overseas travel expenses? If not, are you aware of any other agency being directed to conduct such a review?
5. What was the period of time between Mr Russell being provided with a copy of the Review and the tendering of his resignation?

Answer:

1. Airservices Australia (Airservices) has a range of reporting responsibilities to the Parliament, including the tabling of a Corporate Plan and an Annual Report. Other relevant Airservices functions and responsibilities are set out in the *Air Services Act 1995* and the *Commonwealth Authorities and Companies Act 1997*.
2. The Chief Financial Officer was responsible for signing off the CEO’s credit card expenditure.
3. The Department is responsible for providing advice to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport on a range of air traffic governance and policy issues involving Airservices including Airservices’ obligations under the *Air Services Act 1995*, the *Commonwealth Authorities and Companies Act 1997*, the *Airports Act 1996*, and the Minister’s Statement of Expectations.
4. No. The Department notes the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport wrote to the Airservices Board to ask they review these matters.
5. Airservices has confirmed that the details of Mr Russell’s resignation are a matter between himself and the Airservices Board.