Question no.: 42

Program: 2.1
Division/Agency: (OTS) Office of Transport Security
Topic: Air Cargo Supply Chain
Proof Hansard Page/s: 20 (23/05/12)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: Sure. So what has been the total expenditure on the program to date?
Mr Retter: I would have to take that on notice. The expenditure would be related directly to the staff that I have working on this issue and any travel that they have done domestically or internationally. It would vary from year to year.
Mr Wilson: In terms of expenditure on the program itself, as in the administered funding, there has been no expenditure to date.

Answer:

No administered funds were expensed.

Question no.: 43

Program: 2.1
Division/Agency: (OTS) Office of Transport Security
Topic: Expenditure for Regional Airports security upgrade
Proof Hansard Page/s: 20 (23/05/12)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: One area where funding is provided is security upgrades at regional airports. I would like to move to that if I can. Obviously they are due to come into effect on 1 July this year. Can you tell me how many airports have been required to upgrade their security?
Mr Retter: It is 21.
Senator FAWCETT: Can you provide me with a list of them? I am happy for you to take that on notice.
Mr Retter: I can provide you with that information now if you wish.
Senator FAWCETT: On notice is fine.

Answer:

Since its inception in 1 July 2010, the following 21 regional airports have received funding under the Regional and Domestic Aviation Security New Entrant Regional Airport Program.

AIRPORT	STATE
ALBANY	WA
BARCALDINE	QLD
BLACKALL	QLD
BUNDABERG	QLD
BUSSELTON	WA
CLONCURRY	QLD
DEVONPORT	TAS
EMERALD	QLD
ESPERANCE	WA
GERALDTON	WA
GLADSTONE	QLD
HORN ISLAND	QLD
LONGREACH	QLD
MORANBAH	QLD
OLYMPIC DAM	SA
PORT LINCOLN	SA
RAVENSTHORPE	WA
ROMA	QLD
TAMWORTH	NSW

WAGGA WAGGA	NSW
WEIPA	QLD

Question no.: 44

Program: 2.1
Division/Agency: (OTS) Office of Transport Security
Topic: Regional Airports security upgrade
Proof Hansard Page/s: 21 (23/05/12)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: Does that funding cover the cost of a through-life support contract that may be wrapped in to the procurement?
Mr Retter: I will have to take that on notice.
Senator FAWCETT: Take that on notice. Can you also give us an indicative cost as to how much that through-life support component is expected to be over the life of the equipment?
Mr Retter: Certainly.

Answer:

The Regional and Domestic Aviation Security New Entrant Regional Airport Program covers the purchase cost of each piece of aviation security screening equipment. Other related charges, such as delivery, installation, training and ongoing maintenance are not eligible for funding.

Indicative costs are not readily available given the variation of equipment supplied to industry participants, differing commercial strategies of the new entrant airports, and individual contracts established with the suppliers.

Question no.: 45

Program: 2.1
Division/Agency: (OTS) Office of Transport Security
Topic: Fee increases due to security upgrades at Regional Airports
Proof Hansard Page/s: 21-22 (23/05/12)

Senator FAWCETT and Senator COLBECK asked:

Senator FAWCETT: Are you aware of any airports that are proposing to raise fees to the travelling public or operators to cover the cost of these upgrades?
Mr Retter: Yes.
Senator FAWCETT: How many airports and by how much?
Mr Retter: It varies from airport to airport depending upon the number of passengers, the categorisation of the airport and the costs associated with the operation of those facilities. For example, a regional airport that has one flight a week that has a screening point operating for two hours a day will have a different cost profile to an airport that has multiple flights occurring every day. Therefore, it will have increased operating costs. It could vary from $10 up to a figure depending upon what the airport profile is.
Senator COLBECK: Do you have any numbers on any of those?
Mr Wilson: We do not have them here. I can take it on notice to provide them.
Senator COLBECK: I would appreciate it if you can provide us on notice with the details of the individual cost increases based on—
Mr Retter: The cost decisions are very much the airport's decisions. We will have figures on passenger numbers, but that is it.
Mr Wilson: We will attempt to obtain information from the individual airports.
Senator COLBECK: I appreciate that. So you should be able to get hold of costs to operate over a cycle and number of passengers. That will potentially allow a calculation to be made based on those numbers. Is that right?
Mr Wilson: Yes.

Answer:

Passenger ticket prices are set by airlines. Airport landing charges are negotiated between airports and airlines and may vary considerably. The extent to which these costs are passed to passengers remains a commercial cost recovery decision of the airline operator and in certain circumstances, the airline service provider.

Different approaches are used by airports to determine landing charges. This may include passenger capacity of the aircraft, actual passenger numbers on the aircraft or maximum take off weight of the operating aircraft. Discussions with the Australian Airports Association confirm that there is no set method for airports to calculate landing charges. This information is considered to be highly confidential and is not customarily made available to outside parties.

Question no.: 46

Program: 2.1
Division/Agency: (OTS) Office of Transport Security
Topic: Passenger Screening
Proof Hansard Page/s: 22 (23/05/12)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: But as part of your regulatory impact statement do you look at operations that are on the margins—we are talking regional centres here—where often the choice between somebody flying or choosing road transport is a determinant as to whether that service continues? And $50 a ticket is a fair increase in terms of somebody making that decision. So I am surprised that you have not actually got some detailed feedback about the flow-on impact to the potential viability of some services.
Mr Wilson: I have not been advised of any services that will close or are at risk of closure through this individual measure.
Senator FAWCETT: I can give you one. Alliance flies to Coober Pedy, which is not one of your listed airports, on a charter basis. They do it with groups of seniors who go out for tourism. Coober Pedy is heavily reliant on tourism. The Fokker aircraft just fall over the 20,000 limit. The advice that Alliance sought from the department last year was that, because the passengers who got on the plane were screened and were the same passengers coming home, there was no requirement for remote screening. Everyone was happy with that. They were then advised that that would change—that that was no longer the case and they would have to screen. They wrote to the department in December last year and did not receive a reply until April this year, which indicated that they will need to screen at Coober Pedy, even though it is the same group of people. The current situation is that that service is now at risk.
Mr Wilson: I will have to take that on notice to be able to provide you with a detailed response to that specific issue. With regard to the implementation of this policy, one thing the government has done is introduce an airport classification scheme to ensure that the airports can adjust the screening arrangements to best suit the risk profile of the individual airports. Mr Retter might be able to provide some more detail with regard to that.

Answer:

The Government announced in February 2010 the extension of passenger and checked baggage screening for all aircraft operating RPT and Open Charter services from 1 July 2012 giving industry over two years to prepare for the regulatory changes.

In March 2012, the Strengthening Aviation Security Initiative Regional and Domestic Aviation Security New Entrant Regional Airport Program guidelines were amended to provide up to $110,000 funding to assist airlines operating Open Charter services to purchase portable aviation security screening equipment to deploy at unscreened airports.

In April 2012, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport wrote to a number of industry participants advising options to comply with the relevant regulations including the option for

screening equipment to be carried on the aircraft. Currently the Department continues to work with impacted airports to resolve this issue and ensure compliance with the regulations.

Question no.: 47

Program: 2.1
Division/Agency: (OTS) Office of Transport Security
Topic: Portable Screening Equipment
Proof Hansard Page/s: 24 (23/05/12)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: What kind of volume and weight considerations might an airline have to consider with the portable systems? Obviously, the more volume and weight, the fewer passengers and the less revenue.
Mr Retter: That is true, Senator. It is an option. I have not got, and will have to take on notice, the actual weights of the pieces of equipment we are talking about. We are talking about things like hand wands, portable ETD machines and potentially a portable walk-through metal detector. The weight is not excessive, but, yes, there is some weight and obviously there is a trade-off there.

Answer:

The volume and weight of portable security screening equipment varies depending on the type of equipment, brand and model selected by the aircraft operator.

For example: a hand-held metal detector, including the hard transport case and charger, can weigh up to 3kgs and is approximately equivalent in volume to a hard shell laptop case. One explosive trace detection unit, also including hard transport case, sample wand and swabs, can weigh up to 50kgs and is approximately equivalent in volume to a large piece of checked baggage. A portable walk-through metal detector, including portable power supply and test piece, can weigh up to 70kgs and is also equivalent in volume to a large piece of checked baggage.

Question no.: 48

Program: 2.1
Division/Agency: (OTS) Office of Transport Security
Topic: Port incidents in Fremantle and Hobart
Proof Hansard Page/s: 26 (23/05/12)

Senator COLBECK asked:

Senator COLBECK: I am certainly interested in that. I do not know whether you have that information or whether you can take it on notice for me.
Mr Wilson: We can take it on notice. It will have been a response, I believe, by the jurisdictional police. We can inquire as to what charges have or have not been laid and what the situation is with regard to those incidents in Hobart.
Mr Retter: To reinforce that point, jurisdictional police can use state based law—notably, trespass—or they can choose, as the Western Australian police did in the Fremantle port incident that you refer to, to use our legislation to prosecute those individuals. As Mr Wilson said, we can check on the results of those prosecutions.

Answer:

Port of Fremantle

On 4 March 2012, a person entered a Water-side Restricted Zone in Fremantle Inner harbour, boarded the live sheep export vessel, the *Ocean Shearer* and secured herself to the vessel.

On 4 April 2012, at least nine persons engaged in protest activities while the vessel *al-Shuwaikh* was again at berth in the Fremantle Inner Harbour, with three persons securing themselves to the vessel and two other persons securing themselves to a gate. All were taken into Western Australia (WA) Police custody.

One female was charged following the 4 March 2012, incursion onto the Ocean Shearer in Fremantle.

On the 4 April 2012, a separate group were involved in a similar protest action. Six persons were arrested and charged with three offences, then released on bail with conditions to keep away from the Fremantle Port area.

The following day, the 5 April 2012, two of the protesters returned to Fremantle Port, and were arrested and charged with breach of bail conditions.

A total of six people were charged with 29 charges across three dates.

The West Australian authorities are prosecuting these matters.

Port of Hobart

On 10 May 2012, a number of persons were present in the Port of Hobart precinct to protest about the loading of wood veneer on the vessel *MV Matsusaka.* Three persons climbed over a security gate to access the wharf, two of whom then gained access to the vessel, while other persons were prevented from accessing the wharf by security personnel. Tasmania Police officers took into custody the person on the wharf, and two persons who had "locked" themselves to railing and a crane on the vessel were removed and taken into police custody.

Tasmania Police advise that the matter has been completed in court, and advise that two females were charged with trespass of a vessel and trespass of land, and both found guilty of these offences. One was sentenced to 35 hours community service and the other fined $200.

Question no.: 49

Program: 2.1
Division/Agency: (OTS) Office of Transport Security
Topic: Airport Security
Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator FAWCETT asked:

What feedback has been received from airlines regarding their desire or capacity to conduct security screening?

Answer:

The following airlines including Virgin Australia, Qantas, Qantaslink and SkyWest are currently approved as 'screening authorities' and are legally responsible for ensuring that aviation security screening is conducted to the standard required under Aviation Transport Security Regulations.

Question no.: 50

Program: 2.1
Division/Agency: (OTS) Office of Transport Security
Topic: Enhanced Cargo Examination Program
Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator HEFFERNAN asked:

1. Will the Enhanced Cargo Examination Program continue following the cancellation of funding by the Australian Government?

2. How will the Enhanced Cargo Examination Program now receive funding? (follow-up)

Answer:

1. Yes.

2. Industry participants will have to plan for and purchase equipment where appropriate to meet enhanced air cargo examination requirements as they are introduced.

Question no.: 51

Program: 2.1
Division/Agency: (OTS) Office of Transport Security
Topic: AFP Cost Recovery
Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator MACDONALD asked:

The Government has announced in its 2012-13 Budget paper #2 that the Australian Federal police will commence a program of cost-recovery in return for providing policing services at international airports. This measure will apply to ten (10) airport operators and will recover between $38.2m and $40.5m in the 2013-13 through 2015-16 financial years.

1. Has the department sought assurance from the relevant Airport operators that these additional operating costs will not be passed on to passengers moving through these airports?
2. Does the department then concede that the cost per person of moving through an international airport will be increased in line with this increased call on the purse of operators of international airports?
3. Can the department provide the Australian people with any reassurance that if an airport operator seeks in the alternative to use private security providers that these providers will be Australian companies?
4. What security vetting occurs where private enterprise security operators are employed to provided public security services in international airports within the Australian jurisdiction?
5. If the Government starts to dilute the presence of Australian security services at international airports, how can the Government proceed with any certainty that security objectives are in fact being met?
6. The airports in question include Darwin and Cairns. As substantial tourism portals, will the government be providing any subsidy to offset this increase and the potential deleterious impact on tourism traffic through these airports (and the subsequent impact on local economies)?

Answer:

1-6.   This is a matter for the Attorney-General's portfolio.