

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

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Supplementary Budget Estimates October/November 2005

**Transport and Regional Services**

**Question no:** OTS 01

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** General Manager positions

**Hansard page:** 44 (31/10/05)

**Senator O'Brien asked:**

Can you tell me how long those three general manager positions have been held on an acting basis to date?

**Answer:**

The General Manager (Critical Infrastructure and Surface Transport Security) position has been filled on an acting basis since 16 December 2004.

The General Manager (Aviation Security) position has been filled on a long-term acting basis since 24 March 2005.

The General Manager (Maritime Security) position has been filled on a long-term acting basis since 18 July 2005.

**Question no:** OTS 02

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** Price of passenger and luggage scanning equipment

**Hansard page:** 48 (31/10/05)

**Senator O'Brien asked:**

**Senator O'BRIEN**—Has the cost of aircraft security equipment—scanners, X-ray machinery et cetera—fallen with increased usage

**Ms Dickman**—Has it increased?

**Senator O'BRIEN**—Has the cost fallen?

**Ms Dickman**—Based on world demand, because of the volumes, we are finding the cost on certain items is coming down. But the world demand for other items which tend to be more customised and more difficult to get off the shelf has seen the price increase slightly.

**Senator O'BRIEN**—Where does passenger and luggage scanning equipment fit?

**Ms Dickman**—I am not an expert on passenger and luggage scanning, so I cannot give you a specific answer.

**Senator O'BRIEN**—Can anybody else?

**Ms Dickman**—The Australian Customs Service might be able to give you some advice in respect of the costs of some of the screening equipment.

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

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Supplementary Budget Estimates October/November 2005

**Transport and Regional Services**

**Senator O'BRIEN**—I mean the equipment that screens passenger bags at domestic airports. That is not a Customs matter. Does someone in the Office of Transport Security know anything about that?

**Mr Kilner**—Not with regard to the price. We will take that on notice and come back to you. Are you talking about the checked baggage system?

**Senator O'BRIEN**—It could be the checked baggage or it could be the personal carry-on luggage. There are two sorts.

**Mr Kilner**—We will come back to you on that.

**Answer:**

Security screening at airports is the responsibility of individual screening authorities, that is airport or terminal operators or airlines which are approved by the Department to conduct passenger and baggage screening. Screening authorities are responsible for providing their own equipment in accordance with mandated requirements. The Department of Transport and Regional Services is not responsible for the purchase of this equipment and so has asked for input to this question from some of the major screening authorities.

From discussion with the screening authorities, it has been established that there is not a clear trend with regard to screening equipment costs. Much of the equipment used at Australian airports is leased and as such, trends cannot be easily analysed. In general terms, it appears that costs may have increased slightly. However, as with other developing high-technology equipment, newly-acquired equipment can have greater capabilities than the equipment being replaced so a direct comparison of costs is less meaningful.

The capital cost of equipment is only one aspect of the overall screening cost. Newer, more advanced, screening equipment with a higher capital cost may have an overall cost benefit because of, for example, a higher throughput of passengers or items of baggage, potentially leading to lower costs for staffing and other infrastructure.

**Question no:** OTS 03

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** Maritime workers affected through issuing of MSICs

**Hansard page:** 56 (31/10/05)

**Senator O'Brien:**

On 26 August 2005, the Australian newspaper reported comments made by Minister Truss and a senior Government official as saying that 20% of the maritime work force would be affected through the issuing of Maritime Security Identification Cards (MSICs). Did the Department provide Minister Truss with those figures?

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

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Supplementary Budget Estimates October/November 2005

**Transport and Regional Services**

**Answer:**

The Department is not aware of the source of the figures referred to in the media article.

**Question no: OTS 04**

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** MSIC issuing bodies

**Hansard page:** 56 (31/10/05)

**Senator Heffernan asked:**

Would it be possible for you to provide the Committee with details of the successful issuing bodies?

**Answer:**

To this date, 2 December 2005, six Maritime Security Identification Card (MSIC) Issuing Body Plans have been approved by the Department of Transport and Regional Services (DOTARS). There are seven MSIC Issuing Body Plans under consideration.

It is the intention of DOTARS to publish the details of approved MSIC Issuing Bodies on DOTARS' website with the approval of the Issuing Body. To date, approved MSIC Issuing Bodies have not consented to their details being made public on the website.

**Question No.: OTS 05**

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** MSIC issuing bodies' criteria

**Hansard page:** 58 (31/10/05)

**Senator Heffernan asked:**

Can we have the list of what you refer to when considering applications from organisations to authorise an MSIC?

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

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Supplementary Budget Estimates October/November 2005

**Transport and Regional Services**

**Answer:**

An “issuing body” may be a Maritime Industry Participant, a body representing participants, a body representing employees of participants or a Commonwealth authority.

The Secretary may authorise the applicant as an issuing body if he or she is satisfied that the applicant’s MSIC plan is adequate to give effect to the proposed plan’s purposes; and authorising the applicant as an issuing body would not be likely to be a threat to the security of maritime transport or an offshore facility.

A **MSIC plan** sets out procedures to be followed for:

- (a) the issue and production of MSICs;
- (b) the design, distribution and storage of sample MSICs for training purposes, if the issuing body proposes to issue such MSICs;
- (c) the safekeeping, secure transport and disposal of MSICs and associated equipment;
- (d) the recovery and secure destruction of issued MSICs that are no longer required;
- (e) the security of records in relation to applicants for MSICs;
- (f) lost, destroyed or stolen MSICs; and
- (g) ensuring that MSICs are returned to issuing bodies when they are no longer required.

**Question no:** OTS 06

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** Permits for the Port of Fremantle

**Hansard pages:** 39–40 (31/10/05)

**Senator O’Brien asked:**

In the document that has been supplied, the port of pickup is not specified. Is it possible to get details of permits for the Port of Fremantle for that period?

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

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Supplementary Budget Estimates October/November 2005

**Transport and Regional Services**

**Answer:**

In response to the previously-asked coastal trade QON No. 1103 (see **OTS 06 Attachment 1 with attachments A and B**), details of all permits issued to foreign flagged ships undertaking coastal trade for the period 2000-2005 Single and Continuing Voyage were provided.

In response to this current question, additional information on permits issued for foreign flagged ships that have either loaded or discharged at Fremantle is included at: **Attachment 2 – Single Voyage Permits (Fremantle) 2000–2005**; and **Attachment 3 – Continuing Voyage Permits (Fremantle) 2000–2005**.

**[OTS 06 attachments – not included. Available from the committee secretariat on request]**

**Question no:** OTS 07

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** Aero Tropics security devices

**Hansard page:** Written question (Senator McLucas' Q 14.1 )

**Senator McLucas asked:**

Has DOTARS received information from the Cairns Port Authority that Aero Tropics is not using aircraft security devices, as required under the new Aviation Transport Security Act 2004?

**Answer:**

No.

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

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Supplementary Budget Estimates October/November 2005

**Transport and Regional Services**

**Question no:** OTS 08

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** North Queensland compliance with Aviation Transport Security Act 2004

**Hansard page:** Written question (Senator McLucas' Q 14.2, 14.3, 14.4)

**Senator McLucas asked:**

Can DOTARS give details of any physical inspection carried out to ensure that general aviation operators in Far North Queensland were compliant with the Aviation Transport Security Act when it came into force on 10 March 2005?

If inspections were carried out, when did this occur, who carried them out, who was inspected and what were the results?

Are Senators to assume from the answer to Question on Notice 1072 (3) of 9 August 2005 that no physical inspections have been carried out?

**Answer:**

General aviation operators were not required to fit anti-theft devices until after 10 March 2005 when the Transport Security Act (ATSA) 2004 came into effect. Since 10 March 2005, seventeen inspections of general aviation aircraft for anti-theft devices have been conducted at security-controlled airports in far north Queensland by the Department of Transport and Regional Services (DOTARS) Aviation Security Inspectors (ASI). Compliance rates for general aviation aircraft across Queensland to date are 84%. Of those aircraft that were not compliant with the requirement for anti-theft devices, DOTARS ASI are following up with the registered operator to ensure compliance with the ATSA 2004.

**Question no:** OTS 09

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** Aviation operators audits

**Hansard page:** Written question (Senator McLucas' Q 15)

**Senator McLucas asked:**

- (1) It is stated in the answer to QoN 1072 (2a) that compliance audits have begun of aviation operators. What does this audit consist of and when did it begin?
- (2) The answer also refers to non-compliant general aviation operators. The answer to QoN 1072 (1) stated that all airlines operating a prescribed service complied with the Act on 10 March. Does that include general aviation operators?
- (3) If so, how is it that there are evidently non-compliant general aviation operators, as referred to in QoN 1072 (2a)?

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

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Supplementary Budget Estimates October/November 2005

**Transport and Regional Services**

- (4) Can we have a list of non-complying general aviation operators, detailing how they are non-compliant?
- (5) Can you tell us which Queensland aviation operators have been audited to date?

**Answer:**

- (1) General aviation aircraft are inspected by the Department of Transport and Regional Services (DOTARS) Aviation Security Inspectors (ASI) to ensure they comply with the requirement to take reasonable measures to prevent their aircraft being flown by an unauthorised person. This activity began in Queensland on 27 June 2005.
- (2) General aviation operators did not have to comply with the requirement to take reasonable measures to prevent their aircraft being flown by unauthorised persons until after the Act took effect on 10 March 2005. Operators of prescribed air services were required to have an approved Transport Security Program on 10 March 2005 and all complied with this requirement.
- (3) 1072 (2a) refers to general aviation operators that are not compliant with the requirement to ensure that anti-theft devices are fitted to the aircraft, to prevent the aircraft being flown by an unauthorised person. Not all general aviation aircraft inspected to date have had a visible anti-theft device; these operators are followed up by DOTARS ASI to ensure compliance with the requirements of Aviation Transport Security Act 2004.
- (4) This information is not appropriate for public release as it could assist in planning or execution of a security incident.
- (5) Please see response to (4).

**Question no:** OTS 10

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** Transport Security Programs

**Hansard page:** Written question (Senator McLucas' Q 16.1)

**Senator McLucas asked:**

If it is possible to have a copy of the Transport Security Programs submitted prior to 10 March 2005 for Queensland general aviation operators?

**Answer:**

This information is not appropriate for public release.

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

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Supplementary Budget Estimates October/November 2005

**Transport and Regional Services**

**Question no:** OTS 11

**Division/Agency:** Office of Transport Security

**Topic:** Compliance visits for regional aviation

**Hansard page:** Written question (Senator McLucas' Q 16.2, 16.3)

**Senator McLucas asked:**

The Department states in answer to Question on Notice No. 1072 (5) that there have been 21 compliance visits to Queensland regional airports and airlines. Can the Department explain the purpose of those visits, the nature of any compliance checks, and the results?

Can the Department explain which airports and which general aviation operators have undergone one of these compliance checks?

**Answer:**

The purpose of the compliance visits to new entrant airports and prescribed aircraft operators that became security-regulated on 10 March 2005 is to assess progress with implementation of basic security measures, assess progress with implementing Transport Security Programs and to facilitate an enhanced awareness and understanding of the Aviation Transport Security Act (ATSA) 2004. The compliance visits also provide an opportunity to raise awareness amongst operators of other Government initiatives to improve regional aviation security. Across Queensland, 49 compliance visits have taken place with airports and prescribed aircraft operators. Information about airports and general aviation operators that have had compliance visits is not appropriate for public release.