



# Submission No 16

## **Inquiry into Australian Defence Force Regional Air Superiority**

**Organisation: Australian Flight Test Services**

**Author : Mr Peter Goon**



**The Firm**

**Sent:** Saturday, 21 January 2006 11:05 AM  
**To:** Bruce Scott MP (E-mail)  
**Cc:** JSCFADT\_Defence Sub Committee  
**Subject:** LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL: THE ABSENCE OF INTEGRITY AND COMMON SENSE

***THE ABSENCE OF INTEGRITY AND COMMON SENSE  
A SUBMISSION TO JSCFADT INQUIRY INTO AUSTRALIAN AIR SUPERIORITY***

**Our Reference: 606/05/11 Pt 2 (13)**

To: the Hon Bruce C Scott, Chair, Defence Sub-Committee  
Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Dear Mr Scott,

This submission to your venerable committee is separate to others in which we are contributors. It is in two parts, being a Letter of Transmittal, providing the basis of and the outcomes sought and the pithy submission itself, hopefully made more cogent by the hyperlinks to some of the parliamentary and Defence records upon which our conclusions on this matter are based.

It provides a snapshot of the position and views we have reached, after some six years endeavours in trying to encourage the acceptance and application of a Test and Evaluation (T&E) discipline based feedback loop mechanism on Defence processes. In Defence, this mechanism is notable by its absence, particularly in the areas of capability systems development and the resulting acquisitions.

This journey started with the *collaborative approach*<sup>1</sup> most people in Defence and Industry (including ourselves) believe to be the best way our community can do its job properly and prosper. It then went through a period where we believed the resistance to this approach was the result of systemic problems within Defence that we endeavoured to help address, again cooperatively and collaboratively. The journey has now brought us to the tenor of this submission which some may say is “playing the man, not the ball”. Whereas we say that organisations are made up of people and systems and the systems are run by the people who are responsible and accountable for the success or otherwise of the organisation. However, in Defence, these people *structure and drive the systems*<sup>2</sup> to avoid and negate accountability. Thus, focusing “on the ball” (systemic problems) in the hope of improving the system will always fail whilst ever the concept of accountability (inherent in the T&E feedback loop) is an anathema to the culture of the people driving the systems.

This view is crystallised through the prism of contempt with which these people treat the oversight governance function of the Parliament; the directing governance function of the Minister and Government; and, the way they *abuse their executive governance powers and influence*<sup>3</sup> when dealing with those who put forward countervailing views to theirs.

We commend this submission to you and your Committee Members; are prepared to answer any questions you may have; and have attached a .pdf version, with contact details removed for privacy reasons, for public viewing. As always, we remain prepared to debate these views with Defence.

In the hope this helps fix what is so broken in Defence, and quickly, for all our sakes.

Yours sincerely,

-----  
“AFTS – *Putting Excellence to the Test*”  
-----

**Attachments:**



Submission\_De  
nce Matter\_NACC

Peter Goon, CEO

## THE NEW AIR COMBAT CAPABILITY (NACC)

Australians are proud of their fighting men and women's reputation as some of the best in the world – and believe they deserve the very best equipment and support we can provide them. They would be horrified to think that our own Defence bureaucracy would recommend [inappropriate solutions to the Government](#)<sup>4</sup> for Australia's air combat capability. Unfortunately, this is the case. The present plans of the Defence bureaucracy are far more expensive; far more risky and far less capable than the solutions provided to its leaders back in 2001, in response to their requests of Industry to develop '*innovative, cost effective solutions to Australia's defence capability needs*'.

Such solutions would see the present fighter capability replaced first, in keeping with the Government's Defence 2000 White Paper. Such solutions [have been shown by detailed analyses](#)<sup>5</sup> to be the best. An air combat capability force structure centred on the F-22 Raptor, complemented in the long-range strike/reconnaissance/close air support/electronic attack roles by the F-111, evolved by a Defence/Industry alliance into the superior F-111S, as detailed in the Industry Proposals. Such a force structure would enable Australia to continue to provide the pre-eminent contributions to security and peace in our region that we have made for over three decades.

When Industry proponents have sought the opportunity to discuss their solutions with the Defence hierarchy they have been ignored [with prejudice to the reputations and well being of the Industry](#)<sup>6</sup> proponents and their supporters. People in Defence, DSTO and Industry have been told they risk being ostracised or even sacked if they talk to or support the proponents or their solutions.

In the meantime, the Defence hierarchy have forged ahead with plans that will see little, if any, return on investment on the billions of tax payer dollars they have now spent and are intending to spend on the F/A-18s. At the same time, these same people are stymieing the significant returns on offer from the smart investments made in the F-111s during the 1990s. They continue to ignore or squander [risk mitigation and savings opportunities](#)<sup>7</sup> in a manner akin to that of people who don't know what they don't know, dealing with things they either don't or choose not to understand, albeit in an operationally frenetic and politically charged environment.

Meantime, this same group of bureaucrats omnisciently promote their entrenched and group think vested views through dissembled double speak, [misrepresentations and distortions of the facts](#)<sup>8</sup>, and what effectively amounts to [flowery hyperbole](#)<sup>9</sup>, with no rigorous analyses being presented to support their claims. The [Hansard records of their responses to various parliamentary hearings](#)<sup>10</sup> and inquiries are thickly peppered with examples of this behaviour.

Our Prime Minister, the Hon John Howard, is on record as proclaiming his belief that –

[“Each generation of Australians is obliged to leave our country in better shape than they found it”](#)<sup>11</sup>.

The current leaders of the Defence bureaucracy, in both the civil and military branches, are doing the exact opposite when it comes to Australia's air combat capabilities, seemingly blinkered by the plans of their immediate predecessors. Their actions and behaviour are putting us all at risk and, if allowed to proceed unchecked, will leave future generations of Australians a terrible legacy.

We implore members of this venerable committee to provide this check and to engender in the Parliament, the Government and, hopefully, within the Defence bureaucracy, the political will to do the right thing and fix what is so clearly busted in Defence. By all accounts, the fixes to such problems are simple and relatively painless, once the [root causes](#)<sup>12</sup> are acknowledged and accepted.

---

---

EndNotes:

1. Defence Teaming Centre Inc. Code of Ethics and Conduct  
(<http://www.dtc.org.au/documents/DTCODEETHICSAMENDED.pdf>).  
Additional reading, see Defence Service Charter (copy attached as Enclosure 1)
2. Defence Unsolicited Proposals Gateway compared with the Industry Policy Consultative Forum (IPCF) Issue Papers on Unsolicited Proposals and Innovations from Industry developed in March/April 2001 and the resulting Ministerial Statement of 26 June 2001  
(<http://www.defence.gov.au/dmo/id/ic/dupg.cfm>).
3. Report by Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade into the Effectiveness of the Australian Military Justice System  
([http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/FADT\\_CTTE/miljustice/report/index.htm](http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/FADT_CTTE/miljustice/report/index.htm))
4. Submission No 4 – Air Force Submission to Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Consideration of Defence Input to Review of Defence Annual Report for FY2002/03 entitled ‘Air Combat Capability’.  
([http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/jfadt/defenceannualreport\\_2002\\_2003/dar\\_subs.htm](http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/jfadt/defenceannualreport_2002_2003/dar_subs.htm))
5. Air Power Australia Web Site and On-Line Journal  
([www.ausairpower.net](http://www.ausairpower.net))
6. Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee Inquiry into Defence Materiel, Hearing held on Friday, 07 February 2003  
(<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard/senate/commttee/s6125.pdf>)
7. Submission No 6 - Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Consideration of Defence Input to Review of Defence Annual Report for FY2002/03.  
([http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/jfadt/defenceannualreport\\_2002\\_2003/dar\\_subs.htm](http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/jfadt/defenceannualreport_2002_2003/dar_subs.htm))
8. Submissions No 2 and No 5 - Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Consideration of Defence Input to Review of Defence Annual Report for FY2002/03.  
([http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/jfadt/defenceannualreport\\_2002\\_2003/dar\\_subs.htm](http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/jfadt/defenceannualreport_2002_2003/dar_subs.htm))
9. Strategic Insight 9 – “Is the JSF good enough?” dated 18 August 2004, published under disclaimer on behalf of then Chief of the Air Force by the Australian Strategic Policy Institute.  
<http://www.aspi.org.au/publications.cfm?pubID=56>
10. Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing on Wednesday, 02 November 2005 – Pages 84 to 88 et al.  
<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard/senate/commttee/S8869.pdf>
11. Address by the Prime Minister, the Hon John Howard MP, entitled “Getting the Big Things Right: Goals and Responsibilities in a Fourth Term” on 08 July 2004.  
(<http://www.pm.gov.au/news/speeches/speech978.html>)
12. Air Power Australia Analysis,  
Volume II – APA-2005-01 entitled “The Root Cause of What Ails Defence, Today!”  
(<http://www.ausairpower.net/apa-analyses.html>)