Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee

Additional estimates 2003–2004, 19–20 February, 2 March 2004

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade**

Question 1

Outcome 1, output 1.1.1
Topic: Human rights in China
Hansard page no. 18

Senator Stott Despoja asked:

(1) Could the department provide specific information about the issues raised at the last Australia–hina Human Rights Dialogue, including but not restricted to practitioners of Falun Gong, and the Chinese Government's response to those issues raised by Australia.

(2) Is the department aware of allegations made by Tibetan monk Nyima Dragpa Khako, who was imprisoned in China in 2002 and is thought to have since died in prison. Has the department raised or done anything on this matter?

Answer:

(1) Australia raised at the last round of the Australia-China Human Rights Dialogue a wide range of concerns including, but not restricted to, Falun Gong—including the welfare of detained relatives of Australian citizens; the rights of migrant workers; the household registration system; public health concerns including the spread of HIV/Aids and a lack of transparency about such issues; civil and political rights such as freedom of expression, information, assembly and association; use of the internet; workers rights and restrictions on unions; use of torture and the death penalty; detention of political prisoners; the Strike Hard campaign; re–education through labour; detention in psychiatric hospitals; aspects of concern associated with China's family planning policy; female suicide; human trafficking; rights of ethnic minorities including in Xinjiang and Tibet; religious freedom; the case of Gendun Choekyi Nyima; and a number of other individual cases of concern.

In Tibet we raised specific issues relating to Tibet with local authorities. The Chinese side's response on many issues was formulaic but on certain issues was more encouraging: it outlined progress in legal reform, including in the areas of re-education through labour, use of torture, civil rights and defendant's rights; responded at length on progress in women and children's rights; and provided information on all of the individual cases of concern we raised.

(2) The case of Nyima Dragpa, a Tibetan monk from Nyitso monastery, had not previously been brought to the Department's attention. The Department has not yet raised his case individually with the Chinese, although we have made representations about alleged use of torture and detention of political prisoners, including in Tibet.

Question 2

Outcome 1, output 1.1.2
Topic: Burma
Hansard page no. 23

Senator Stott Despoja asked:
On what date did the current Australian Ambassador to Burma present his credentials?

Answer:
The current Australian Ambassador to Burma, Mr Paul Grigson, presented his credentials on 8 August 2003. As is common diplomatic practice, the receiving state selects the date for presentation of credentials. The head of mission–designate is not normally at liberty to decline the choice of date for this purpose. Mr Grigson arrived in Rangoon on 4 July 2003.

Question 3

Outcome 1, output 1.1.2
Topic: West Papua
Hansard page no. 25

Senator Stott Despoja asked:
(1) Does the government now acknowledge that in 1969 Australian officials boarded a plane at Port Moresby and forcibly removed the two West Papuan officials who were travelling to New York to meet with United Nations officials?

(2) If so, how and why was that justified?

(3) Does the government have a position in relation to the Act of Free Choice and whether or not it is inconsistent with a number of conventions but specifically with article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?

Answer:
(1) & (2) The events of 1969 are on the public record and the archives are open to members of the public. It is not appropriate for the present Government to account for what might or might not have happened under a previous Government in 1969.

(3) Australia recognises Indonesian sovereignty over Papua which resulted from the 1969 United Nations-sponsored Act of Free Choice. This position is not under review.

Question 4

Outcome 1, output 1.1.4
Topic: Papua New Guinea deployment
Written question

Senator Faulkner asked:
(1) What is the current status of Australia's deployment of personnel to Papua New Guinea?

(2) At the time of the Government's announcement of the deployment, the Government advised that enabling legislation to allow for the Australian deployment to be afforded

legal protection in PNG must first be passed by the PNG Parliament. This hasn't happened as yet, and the PNG Parliament has been adjourned for several months.

(a) What are the implications for the deployment?

(b) Is enabling legislation necessary for all elements of the deployment or only for the AFP contingent of the deployment?

(c) Does it mean that the deployment is being put in doubt?

(d) Will the eight personnel that are to be deployed this week be afforded legal cover and protection?

(e) Where are those eight personnel to be posted?

(f) Are there any DFAT personnel as part of this initial deployment? If so, what position(s) will they be assuming?

(3) Can DFAT provide a breakdown of the estimated cost of this deployment—including staffing costs, allowances paid (including differences by agency), and technical assistance provided to PNG authorities etc.

(4) Is DFAT aware of any sensitivity over the deployment expressed by the PNG Government, Members of Parliament or other community or business leaders?

(5) What is the intended purpose of the police deployment?

(a) Will the police deployment be armed?

(b) Will the operations of the deployment be subject to PNG law?

(6) Will the deployment be time limited?

(7) What criteria have been established for the deployments' success?

(a) What specifically has it been set out to achieve?
(b) What exit strategy does it have in place?
(c) What mechanisms are in place to evaluate the deployments' effectiveness?
(d) Will the deployments evaluation be conducted by an independent third party?

(8) Is the PNG Government able to unilaterally call an end to the operation?

Answer

(1) Implementation of the Enhanced Cooperation Program (ECP) has been complicated because the PNG Parliament has been adjourned, for reasons unrelated to the ECP, until 29 June 2004. Full implementation of the ECP, particularly the policing and judicial elements of the Program, is unlikely to proceed until the PNG Parliament has passed a treaty-level agreement and necessary enabling legislation.

Eight Australian officials have, however, already been deployed under the ECP in advisory capacities, using, as a temporary arrangement, the existing Australia-PNG Development Cooperation Treaty.

The Australian Government has indicated to the PNG Government that, where the powers and legal protections we seek through the treaty and enabling legislation are not immediately necessary, we are prepared to consider further ECP deployments prior to the proposed treaty and enabling legislation being passed by the PNG Parliament. Such deployments are, however, unlikely until agreement has been reached on the text of the proposed treaty, enabling legislation and a separate Memorandum of Understanding

covering the proposed deployment of 19 Australian police and a liaison officer to Bougainville.

(2)

(a) Refer to question 1.

(b) The legal protections that the Australian Government is seeking through the legal arrangements (including the enabling legislation in PNG) will apply equally to all ECP personnel. Separate arrangements may need to be considered for several of the senior judicial positions. Some non–policing positions may be filled in an advisory capacity as a temporary measure.

(c) Not at this stage.

(d) The eight personnel referred to in question 2(d) arrived in Port Moresby on 16 February and have commenced duties in the PNG bureaucracy. They have been deployed in advisory positions, as a temporary measure, under the existing Australia-PNG Development Cooperation Treaty (DCT). The legal protections and powers that we are seeking through the proposed ECP legal arrangements are more comprehensive than those provided in the DCT. The DCT does, however, provide immunity from civil suit. Once the proposed ECP legal arrangements are in place, they will apply to the eight personnel currently deployed.

(e) The eight officials have taken up positions in the PNG departments of the Treasury, Finance, Personnel Management, Customs and Foreign Affairs and Immigration.

(f) No.

(3) Policing

The following table provides details of the estimated costs for the policing elements of the ECP. Due to delays in the implementation of the ECP, the actual costs for 2003–04 are likely to be significantly less than indicated in the table.

	2003–04	2004–05	2005–06	2006–07	2007–08
AFP Salaries & Accommodation	3,087,933	75,534,374	83,673,028	87,019,950	90,500,748
AFP Logistics, Operational Costs	27,207,212	102,066,930	92,993,055	85,374,007	86,955,429
RPNGC Technical Assistance	16,052,755	10,038,845	20,913,100	6,082,850	2,615,975
Total (Including Capital)	46,347,900	187,640,149	197,579,183	178,476,807	180,072,152

Non–Policing

The following table provides a breakdown of the estimated costs of the deployment of 64 (non-policing) officials and judicial experts under the Enhanced Cooperation Program (ECP). It should be noted that:

- Standard allowances within the salary package for ECP personnel are based on those provided to AusAID officials posted to the Australian High Commission in Port Moresby. Individual officials are deployed to PNG under AWAs with their respective agencies. Conditions of service and salary levels may vary between individuals and between agencies.

- Logistics and Operational Costs include, as appropriate, mobilisation costs, communications, travel and vehicles, security arrangements, and office equipment and refurbishment.
- Technical Assistance includes, as appropriate, training for Government of PNG counterparts, professional and technical support for deployed officials, and support for reform initiatives through existing AusAID programs.
- The estimated costs for 2003/04 financial year are likely to be lower than as originally anticipated. This is due principally to delays in reaching agreement with the Government of PNG on the legal arrangements for the ECP and the adjournment of the PNG Parliament until 29 June 2004. At this stage, total expenditure for this financial year could be reduced to as low as $5 million. Estimated expenditure for 2004/05 is also likely to be lower than anticipated as a result of the deferred deployment.

	2003–04	2004–05	2005–06	2006–07	2007–08
Salaries and Accommodation	6,056,684	25,603,712	25,406,036	25,406,036	25,406,036
Logistics, Operational Costs	5,822,249	16,757,047	14,141,347	14,141,347	14,141,347
Technical Assistance	9,340,000	19,600,000	19,580,000	19,580,000	19,580,000
Total (estimated)	21,218,933	61,960,759	59,127,383	59,127,383	59,127,383

(4) A small number of PNG parliamentarians and, most recently the Governor of the Morobe Province, have expressed concerns about the nature of the assistance to be provided through the ECP. Prime Minister Somare has made some public comments concerning the immunities issue. Overall, however, the ECP has received very strong support from the PNG Government, the majority of members of PNG Parliament and other leaders.

(5) The police deployment is intended to improve the law and order situation in PNG, including by strengthening the capacity and capability of the Royal PNG Constabulary to undertake successful, accountable and sustainable law enforcement operations.

(a) Some of the 230 police to be deployed to PNG will be armed or have access to arms. The 19 police that we intend to deploy to Bougainville will not be armed.

(b) The legal arrangements for the ECP are still being negotiated with the Government of PNG. At the very least, ECP personnel, including police, will be required to observe and respect PNG laws.

(6) The Australian Government has approved ECP funding to 30 June 2008.

(7) Detailed criteria for the deployment's success are yet to be agreed. The broad objectives of the ECP are set out at 7(a) below.

(a) (i) **Policing**

During the first phase of the ECP, the aim will be to stabilise law and order and address serious crime in Port Moresby and on the island of Bougainville. Commencing in 2005, the ECP will aim to stabilise law and order and address serious crime in the towns of Lae and Mount Hagen and also along the Highlands Highway.

A parallel package of direct assistance to the Royal PNG Constabulary in the areas of infrastructure, training, equipment and recruitment support will also be provided to ensure operational compatibility between the RPNGC and the Australian police.

As the law and order situation stabilises, direct capacity building, involving intensive training and skills and professional standards development for RPNGC personnel, will become an increasingly important component of the ECP in each targeted geographic location.

(ii) **Non–policing**
The ECP aims to:

- assist the PNG Government to regain control of government expenditure, achieve fiscal discipline, improve budget formulation, improve economic policy development and enhance the quality of economic policy advice and raise the performance of the public sector more generally, including by eliminating weaknesses in the management of the public service payroll.
- significantly improve the functioning of the PNG justice system, including: improved legal policy formulation and law reform; an effective Solicitor-General's Office; enhanced prosecution capacity; increased capacity of the judiciary and national and supreme courts; and improved management of correctional institutions.
- improve the effectiveness of PNG border controls, improve the management of and control over the movement of people and goods, decrease illegal immigration and trade, increase revenue collection and maintain PNG's access to international business and trade links through enhanced governance, management and operational functioning of the PNG immigration, customs and aviation and maritime transport security processes.
- develop and support PNG's capacity to comply with its international obligations to sustain aviation and maritime security standards and provisions of both the International Maritime Organisation and the International Civil Aviation Organisation.

(b) ECP personnel will ensure through mentoring, on-the-job skills transfer and training that local expertise, capacities and decision–making capabilities are progressively improved. The withdrawal of in-line ECP personnel will be incorporated into national PNG planning processes and coordinated through existing PNG national coordinating mechanisms to ensure adequate provision is made by the Government of PNG for PNG agencies to take over the responsibilities assumed by ECP personnel. Improved management of PNG's budget processes and finances—a key objective of the economic management component of the ECP—will help ensure PNG agencies are resourced adequately once ECP personnel depart.

(c) Joint Australia-PNG mechanisms, involving the Australian High Commission in Port Moresby and relevant PNG agencies, will be put in place to monitor and evaluate the ECP. The precise nature of these mechanisms is still being discussed with the PNG Government. Evaluation and reporting mechanisms between ECP personnel, the Australian High Commission in Port Moresby and relevant government agencies in Canberra will also be established. The Australian Government will review on a regular basis the achievements of the ECP.

(d) This has not been considered at this stage.

(8) Yes.

Question 5

Outcome 1, output 1.1.4
Topic: Mr Downer's visit to Israel
Hansard page nos. 29—30

Senator Faulkner asked:

(1) Can the department confirm whether Mr Downer made the following statements during his visit to Israel on 26-27 January 2004:

> *We encourage Israelis to come to Australia, to visit or immigrate. If Israelis want to immigrate to Australia, they are very welcome. We welcome Israelis, especially young ones, who want to take that step.*

(2) Can the department confirm the following statement by Israeli Parliamentarian Ehud Yatom, reported by the Australian Jewish News on 6 February, in response to Mr Downer's comments:

> *The idea is just outrageous. The Zionist youth must remain in Israel.*

(3) Can the department confirm the following statement by Israeli Parliamentarian Yuri Shtern, reported by the Australian Jewish News on 6 February:

> *Attracting another country's citizens is unacceptable between democratic countries.*

(4) (a) How many migration agents operate in Israel?
(b) How many of those deal with Australian immigration applications?
(c) How many immigration queries does the Australian Embassy in Israel receive every month?
(d) What happened to the pattern of immigration queries to the Embassy following Mr Downer's comments?
(e) How many inquiries were received by migration agents following Mr Downer's comments?

Answer:

(1) No, this quotation is incorrect. In response to a journalist's question about the possibility of Israelis visiting Australia, Mr Downer said "We encourage Israelis to come to Australia, not just to visit, some migrate. And when people migrate to Australia, they're obviously made very welcome in Australia. But certainly in terms of tourists and visitors, we warmly welcome Israelis coming to Australia, particularly young Israelis—not only young Israelis. One of the things that we'll be looking at with the Israeli Government is whether over time it might be possible to negotiate a working holiday arrangement".

(2) This is an accurate quote from the article reprinted in the *Australian Jewish News*. DFAT cannot confirm the accuracy of the original quotation.

(3) This is an accurate quote from the article reprinted in the *Australian Jewish News*. DFAT cannot confirm the accuracy of the original quotation.

(4) (a) There are two types of agents—ones registered in Australia by the Migration Agents Registration Authority (MARA) and unregistered ones—requirements to be registered in Australia by the MARA. Agents list their main business address on the MARA register but may work in many countries, so this address is not a reliable indicator of where an agent works, if they are registered.

The overseas post has advised that there is no listing for migration agents in the Israeli Yellow Pages of telephone directories.

(b) The overseas post is aware of three local unregistered agents and some 10 Australian registered ones who represent Israeli clients. They are unaware of any Australian registered agents who operate from inside Israel. To the best of their knowledge, all of the Australian registered agents are located in Australia.

(c) The average number of inquiries during this financial year (to the end of January 2004) was 1162 inquiries per month.

(d) There was an increase in the number of inquiries during the few days which followed Mr Downer's visit. For example, during January 2004 the total number of inquiries (1313) was higher than the average (1162) during this financial year. However, the number of inquiries gradually returned to the average number during February.

(e) This information is not available, as agents do not and are not required to report to the overseas post on the number of inquiries they receive from clients.

Question 6

Outcome 1, output 1.1.5
Topic: AUSFTA—Government procurement
Hansard page no. 17–19

Senator Conroy asked:
At what level of government—federal, state, local (county) and city—does the great bulk of government procurement occur in the United States?

What is the value of programs Australia is forgoing through exceptions to the broad exemption from industry offset type arrangements?

Which state government programs for small and medium enterprises would have to be discontinued under the terms of the AUSFTA?

Answer:
Detailed data comparing US federal, state, local (county) and city procurement are not available to DFAT.

The government procurement chapter contains a provision banning offset arrangements. Offsets are defined broadly to cover any requirement built into procurement for such matters as local content, technology transfer or export performance. This ban is subject to a number of exceptions under the agreement such as preferences for small and medium enterprises. The

ban on offsets will require modification to the Australian Government Endorsed Supplier Arrangement assessment procedure and to general Australian Government procurement policies such as the Model Industry Development Criteria which may apply to contracts of $5million or more. DFAT is not in a position to place a value on these programs.

Australia has an exception under the chapter for preferences to benefit small and medium enterprises. This exception will obviate the need to discontinue procurement programs that benefit small and medium enterprises.

Question 7

Outcome 1, output 1.1.5
Topic: AUSFTA—Services chapter
Hansard page no. 23

Senator Conroy asked:

(1) For what services does Australia agree to give market access commitments in the AUSFTA that are GATS plus?

(2) For what services has Australia given a national treatment commitment by commercial presence under the AUSFTA beyond our commitments under GATS?

(3) Australia's secondary and higher education services commitments under GATS are limited to private education services. Has this limitation been reproduced in the AUSFTA? If not, does the AUSFTA mean that US–owned campuses in Australia are entitled to be treated as favourably as TAFEs and public universities in respect of services offered by the public institutions, either on a commercial basis or in competition with private providers?

Answer:

(1) The Australia—United States Free Trade Agreement (AUSFTA) has a market access commitment modelled on that in the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). This essentially prohibits the use of a range of quantitative and other restrictions on the supply of a service. Comparisons of Australia's market access commitments in the GATS and in AUSFTA are not straightforward as there are a range of differences in the structure of the two agreements. In particular, the GATS follows a "positive list" approach, whereby the market access commitment only applies to sectors specified in a country's schedule of commitments. In addition, even where a sector is included in the schedule, it is possible for a country to include certain limitations on the application of the market access commitment to that sector. The AUSFTA, by contrast, follows a more liberal "negative list" approach, where all sectors are subject to the key obligations like market access except for those measures or sectors listed in Annexes to the Chapters on Cross-Border Trade in Services (CBTS) and Investment.

The positive list approach followed in the GATS uses a services sectoral classification list to organise the schedule. Headings in the services sectoral classification list where Australia has not made market access commitments under the GATS include: data base services; research and development services on natural sciences; interdisciplinary research and development services; technical testing and analysis services; services incidental to manufacturing; maintenance and repair of equipment; printing and publishing; postal services; courier services; on-line information and/or data processing; audiovisual services; primary and adult education; hospital services; social services; entertainment services; libraries, archives, museums and other cultural

services; internal waterways transport; rail transport services; and some road transport services.

Under the negative list approach used in the AUSFTA, Australia has accepted market access commitments in all sectors subject to the limitations set out in the Annexes to the CBTS and Investment Chapters. In particular, Australia has not accepted any market access commitments in AUSFTA for measures applied by State and Territory Governments beyond those which Australia has made in the GATS. We have also limited the application of the market access commitment in relation to a range of sectors such as audiovisual services, social services, distribution services, primary education and maritime transport. In addition, the market access commitment has no impact on Australia's right to continue to provide public services, including through monopoly provision of such services, in areas such as postal services, hospital services and social services.

(2) AUSFTA has a national treatment obligation in the CBTS and Investment chapters which is similar to that in the GATS. Like the national treatment obligation of the GATS, it requires that the Parties treat the service suppliers or investors of the other Party no less favourably than their own suppliers or investors. However, as is the case in relation to the market access obligation, a comparison of national treatment commitments is not straightforward because of important structural differences between the AUSFTA, which follows a "negative list" approach, and GATS, which follows a "positive list" approach. Under the positive list approach of the GATS, the key obligations only apply to sectors specified in a country's schedule of commitments. Those commitments are also made with regard to the modes by which a service may be supplied, for example, through commercial presence. The negative list approach under AUSFTA, whereby all sectors are subject to the key obligations, does not identify commitments by mode of supply.

In addition, such a comparison is further complicated by important differences between the scope of the CBTS and Investment chapters of the FTA and the scope of the GATS. For example, under the FTA, the obligations of the CBTS Chapter and the national treatment obligation of the Investment Chapter do not apply to subsidies and grants. The supply of a service through commercial presence is primarily addressed in AUSFTA though the Investment Chapter.

As noted above, the positive list approach followed in the GATS largely uses a services sectoral classification list to organise the schedule. Those headings in the services sectoral classification list used in the GATS where Australia has not made market access commitments, as identified in the answer to Question 1 above, are also service sectors where Australia has not made national treatment commitments. In addition to those service sectors, there are also some service sectors where Australia has made commitments under the GATS but has excluded from its national treatment commitments supply of that service by commercial presence—for example in relation to certain education services.

Under the negative list approach used in the AUSFTA Australia has accepted national treatment commitments in all sectors, subject to the limitations set out in the Annexes to the CBTS and Investment Chapters. In particular, Australia has excluded all existing measures at the State and Territory level that do not conform with the national treatment obligation. We have also limited the application of the national treatment commitment in relation to a range of sectoral areas such as fishing-related services, distribution services, broadcasting and audiovisual services, health services, transport

services, social services, and primary education. In addition, we have maintained our right to screen foreign investment that is significant, including in sensitive sectors and in other sectors above $800 million. Existing limits on foreign investment in a number of areas are also maintained.

(3) The provisions on trade in services in the AUSFTA, like the provisions of the GATS, include certain obligations on the Parties with regard to the treatment of services and service suppliers of the other Party. Nothing in the AUSFTA restricts in any way the ability of governments at any level to provide public services and the chapter on Investment explicitly states that nothing in the chapter can be interpreted as imposing an obligation to privatise public services or other assets.

Like the GATS, the key obligations of the AUSFTA are to afford non-discriminatory treatment to the services and service suppliers of the other Party ("national treatment") and not to impose certain kinds of quantitative limitations on service suppliers ("market access"). Other provisions include the obligation to ensure transparency of regulatory processes and the obligation to permit transfers and payments associated with trade in services.

Under AUSFTA's negative list approach, Australia has accepted commitments on education services except for primary education, while the US has accepted commitments on all education services. Both countries, however, have reservations preserving their right to take any measures in relation to public education. While the structure is different to that in GATS, with its positive list approach, it has a similar outcome in excluding public education from key obligations.

With regard to possible campuses of US educational institutions established in Australia, the national treatment obligation would not require Australia to extend the same treatment to those campuses as is afforded to Australian public institutions. The national treatment obligation requires the Parties to afford service suppliers of the other Party treatment no less favourable than that it accords, in like circumstances, to its own service suppliers. The national treatment obligation does not apply in cases where domestic and foreign services suppliers are not in like circumstances as in the case where a domestic supplier of a service is operating on a non-commercial basis. In addition, the commitment does not apply to subsidies or grants and there are safeguards to protect public services like public education.

The intent of the exclusion on subsidies and grants with regard to education services is further elaborated in a side letter to the AUSFTA, which forms an integral part of the Agreement, that specifies among other things that nothing in the AUSFTA will interfere with government funding, such as land grants, preferential tax treatment, and other public benefits, provided to education and training institutions.

Question 8

Outcome 1, output 1.1.6
Topic: Market share in Japan and Republic of Korea
Hansard page no. 11

Senator Conroy asked:
What are the market share figures for Australian iron ore and coal in Japan and the Republic of Korea?

Answer:
The following table outlines changes in Australia's market share since 2001, before the recent appreciation of the Australian dollar.

Australia's share of imports (per cent) [1]

	2001	2002	2003
Japan			
Iron ore	49.5	51.8	54.4
Coal	58.9	58.2	57.4
Republic of Korea			
Iron ore	54.7	53.9	55.1
Coal	39.8	42.7	39.9

[1] Proportion of total value of imports, in local currency

Since 2001 Australia has increased its market share in iron ore imports by Japan but had a slight decrease in its market share for coal. Over the same period, Australia has increased its market share in iron ore imports by the ROK, and maintained its market share for coal.

Question 9

Outcome 1, output 1.1.7
Topic: Human cloning
Written question

Senator Harradine asked:

(1) Why is the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade the 'coordinating agency' on the UN human cloning treaty? Isn't this a matter which is the Attorney General's responsibility, given it deals with an international convention?

(2) How does the DFAT 'coordinating agency' role reconcile with evidence that DFAT gave at the last estimates hearing, which was that 'line responsibility' resides with the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet and the Department of Health and Ageing?

(3) During the November estimates hearings, the DFAT representative commented that Australia supported the Belgium proposal, despite what I think is an inconsistency with Australian law, because "the legislation applies to Australia. These are deliberations by the international community, which provide for a variety of states to pursue two aspects of this issue …" and so on. Were you saying that while the Belgium proposal might not be consistent with Australian law, it was compatible with Australian law?

(4) Doesn't Australia have an interest in making sure that human cloning, which we consider exploitation in Australia—does not occur in other countries. So why would we support the Belgium proposal which allows that exploitation?

(5) The department stated that DFAT was the coordinating agency for developing Australia's position on the international convention on cloning. Amongst the various agencies providing input—DFAT, Prime Minister and Cabinet, Attorney General's, Industry, Health and Ageing and NHMRC—none seem to be willing to be identified as providing the final advice on the position Australia should take. Did DFAT prepare the brief, assembling the input of all the agencies consulted, which outlined the Government's options on this issue and which made a recommendation as to what the position should be?

(6) Can the department provide a point by point analysis explaining why it considers that the Belgium proposal better reflects Australian law than the Costa Rican proposal. Did the department prepared a detailed analysis of both proposals?

Answer:

(1) DFAT needed to provide timely advice to the Permanent Mission of Australia to the UN in New York concerning how to respond on behalf of Australia to developments regarding the proposed International Convention Against the Reproductive Cloning of Human Beings during the 58th session of the UN General Assembly held in 2003. Accordingly, DFAT coordinated a process to determine Australia's position on the proposed Convention. AG's was one other agency involved in that process. Under the Administrative Arrangements Order, DFAT has responsibility for treaties, while AG's has responsibility for international law.

(2) As explained in response to question one, in order to provide timely advice to the Permanent Mission of Australia to the UN in New York, DFAT coordinated a process to determine Australia's position on the proposed Convention. However, DFAT does not have portfolio responsibility for Australia's policy on human cloning issues. The process which DFAT coordinated included those agencies which do have portfolio responsibility for that policy.

(3) The *Prohibition of Human Cloning Act* 2002 bans all forms of human cloning within Australia. The Belgian draft resolution required States to ban human reproductive cloning, and allowed States to ban all other forms of human cloning. It was therefore both consistent and compatible with the Act.

(4) Australia supported the immediate development of a convention to ban human reproductive cloning, and development of a convention to address other forms of human cloning consistent with the *Prohibition of Human Cloning Act* 2002.

(5) DFAT prepared briefing for the Minister for Foreign Affairs concerning the proposed Convention.

(6) Agencies involved in determining Australia's position on the proposed Convention at the 58th session of the UN General Assembly carefully analysed both the Belgian and Costa Rican draft resolutions. Australia's statement to the Sixth Committee of the UN General Assembly on 21 October 2003 explained Australia's position at that time on the Belgian draft resolution. The text of that statement is below:

> 'Mr Chairman,
>
> Australia continues to support the elaboration of a Convention Against the Reproductive Cloning of Human Beings, and welcomes this further opportunity to discuss the appropriate scope of such a convention.
>
> The guiding principle for Australia in this discussion is to work towards a convention which is consistent with our domestic legislative approach, as contained in the *Prohibition of Human Cloning Act* 2002. The Act bans within Australia the creation of a human embryo clone; that is, it bans both human reproductive cloning and other forms of human cloning. However, the Act is subject to an independent review to begin in December 2004, which will include further consideration of human cloning for non-reproductive purposes.

Consistent with the Act, Australia supports the urgent development of a convention to institute an international ban on human reproductive cloning. My delegation is concerned that attempts to develop a convention to ban all forms of human cloning at once may in fact delay a ban on human reproductive cloning. Australia will therefore support proposals for a convention which would ban human reproductive cloning as soon as possible, but which leave some flexibility concerning other forms of human cloning.

The Belgian draft resolution would allow an early international ban on human reproductive cloning. It would also allow States to support proposals for a ban or moratorium on, or strict regulation of, other forms of human cloning, while leaving some flexibility as to the exact manner in which that is done. In Australia's case, this flexibility would allow us to take account of any recommendations which may arise from the review of our Act.

Australia would prefer an international consensus on this issue. In our view, there is little to be gained from a vote on the question of a mandate to commence negotiations on an international instrument to address human cloning. However, should this eventuate, Australia has a preference at this stage for the Belgian proposal. But we urge all States to continue to work together to find a mutually acceptable solution.

Thank you.'

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Question 10

Outcome 1, output 1.1.7
Topic: Timor Sea Treaty
Hansard page no. 28

Senator Stott Despoja asked:
Has Australia granted any new exploration licences since entering into the Timor Sea Treaty with East Timor?

Answer:
Since the entry into force of the Timor Sea Treaty on 2 April 2003, the Australian Government has granted 23 exploration permits in respect of offshore areas. Of these, two lie in the Timor Sea: exploration permit NT/P65, granted on 22 April 2003 in respect of 2002 Acreage Release Area NT02–1; and exploration permit NT/P68, granted on 23 February 2004 in respect of 2003 Acreage Release Area NT03–3.
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Question 11

Outcome 1, output 1.1.7
Topic: International Criminal Court
Hansard page no. 36

Senator Stott Despoja asked:
What legal advice has the department sought with regard to article 98(2) agreements under the ICC? When was that advice sought?

Answer:
Consistent with past practice, the department is not able to give specific details of requests for legal advice that the department may have made, nor of legal advice the department may have given to Government.

Question 12

Outcome 1, output1.1.7
Topic: Freezing of assets of terrorists
Hansard page no. 43–47

Senator Faulkner asked:

(1) Is the department aware that the chairman of the UN Counterterrorism Committee published a report on 2 December 2003, which stated in paragraph 29 on page 13:

> *... 11 of the reporting states, which had indicated the presence of al-Qaeda-related cells in their countries, provided no information that any assets had been frozen.*

(2) Has Australia, as one of the reporting states which had indicated the presence of al-Qaeda–related cells in their country, provided information to the UN that assets have been frozen?

(3) When was the most recent report to the UN concerning the freezing of terrorist assets in Australia linked to the Taliban, al–Qaeda or bin Laden?

Answer:

(1) This reference was contained in a report of the Monitoring Group of the UN Security Council Resolution 1267 Committee issued on 2 December 2003.

(2) In its report of 15 April 2003 to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to Resolution 1267 (which deals with Al–Qaida and the Taliban), Australia stated that it had not frozen any assets of individuals and entities. This was in response to a specific request from the Committee relating to assets frozen pursuant to Resolutions 1267, 1333, 1390 and 1455. In its most recent report of 26 December 2003 to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to Resolution 1373 (which deals with terrorism in general), Australia stated that there have been two cases where assets have been frozen, for a total of $2196.99. Both of these cases involve entities not related to Al-Qaida or the Taliban. In one of these cases, assets were subsequently unfrozen after it was established that the entity concerned had no terrorist connections.

(3) Australia's Fourth Report to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to Resolution 1373, which deals generally with the freezing of terrorist assets, was lodged with the UN on 26 December 2003. Australia's most recent report to the UN specifically concerning the freezing of terrorist assets linked to the Taliban, al–Qaeda or Bin Laden was its report of 15 April 2003 to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to Resolution 1267.

Question 13

Outcome 1, output 1.1.8
Topic: Terrorism
Written question

Senator Faulkner asked:

(1) In relation to the model counter-terrorism legislation developed by the Nasonini Implementation Expert Working Group of the Pacific Islands Forum.

(2) Did Australia participate in drafting the model counter–terrorism provisions?

(3) If so, who represented Australia on the Working Group?

(4) Where and when did the Working Group meet?

(5) Did Australia attend every meeting?

(6) What kind of assistance did we provide?

(7) Were the model counter-terrorism provisions (a) considered and (b) approved by the Australian Government at a ministerial level? If so, (a) when, and (b) by which Minister?

(8) If not, were the model counter-terrorism provisions approved at any level of the Australian Government? If so, (a) when, and (b) by whom?

(9) Did Australia support the adoption of the counter-terrorism provisions by the Pacific Island Forum?

(10) Is Australia helping to promote the adoption of the counter-terrorism provisions by countries in the region? How?

(11) Have any countries requested in–country drafting assistance? If so, (a) when and (b) to which countries has Australia provided in-country drafting assistance?

(12) Does the Government expect to be asked to provide such assistance in future?

Answer:

(1) N/A

(2) Yes

(3) Australia was represented on the Pacific Island Forum's Expert Working Group by two officers from the Attorney General's Department.

(4) The Expert Working Group met at the headquarters of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat in Suva, Fiji in February 2003 and May 2003.

(5) Yes

(6) Policy and legislative drafting assistance.

(7) No

(8) No. This is not Australian legislation. It is a matter for each Pacific Island country to decide which elements of the model legislation should be enacted into their domestic laws.

(9) Yes

(10) Yes. At the request of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, the Australian Government has agreed to provide in-country drafting assistance to the South Pacific Melanesian jurisdictions. Requests for such assistance are to be directed to the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat in the first instance. We have encouraged Pacific Island Forum member countries to seek legislative drafting assistance through the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat.

(11) Yes. A request for drafting assistance was made by Nauru to the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat on 10 March 2004, by Kiribati on 11 March and by the Cook Islands on 12 March. The requests by Nauru and Kiribati were passed to the Australian Government on 11 and 12 March 2004 respectively. New Zealand has agreed to provide in–country drafting assistance to the Polynesian jurisdictions which includes the Cook Islands.

(12) Yes.

Question 14

Outcome 1, output 1.1.8
Topic: ONA documents
Hansard page no. 5

Senator Ray asked:
(1) When was the last occasion that the ONA document issued about 17 December 2002 was issued to anyone in DFAT?
(2) When was the last recorded incoming to DFAT of this document?
(3) When was the last time Mr Downer's office asked for a copy of this document?

Answer:
(1) On or about 17 December 2002.
(2) 17 December 2002.
(3) Mr Downer's office has not asked DFAT for a copy of this document.

Question 15

Outcome 1, output 1.2.1
Topic: Investigation into unauthorised disclosure of a document
Hansard page no. 5

Senator Faulkner asked:
What have been the costs of the investigation into the leak of a Record of Conversation between Mr Downer and the New Zealand High Commissioner that have been borne by DFAT?

Answer:
External legal advice cost five hundred dollars. No additional costs for staff were incurred.

Question 16

Outcome 1, output 1.2
Topic: Inquiry into allegations of misconduct
Hansard page no. 8

Senator Faulkner asked:
Could the department provide a sample copy of the instruction issued by Dr Kennedy to APS employees who could assist in an investigation he was conducting into allegations of misconduct?

Answer:
The text of each of the directions is as follows.

Public Service Act 1999

Direction to APS employee

I have been advised that you are a person who has been identified by the determining officer, Peter Kennedy, as a potential witness in an investigation into alleged breaches of the APS Code of Conduct by Trent Smith. Thus, Peter Kennedy may wish to conduct one or more interviews with you concerning the matters he is investigating.

On that basis I formally direct you, (name of APS employee), that you are not to discuss the matter of Mr Smith's conduct during the period from the beginning of September 2002 to the end of February 2003, so far as that conduct may relate to the preparation of possible Senate Estimates questions to be asked by the Opposition, with anyone other than the determining officer (Peter Kennedy) or your legal advisers, without my prior written approval.

This direction is not intended to prevent you from disclosing information as required or authorised by or under a law or to operate in such a way as to constitute a breach of the privileges or immunities, or a contempt, of a House of the Parliament or the members of a Committee.

Signed: Doug Chester, Deputy Secretary

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Question 17

Outcome 2, output 2.1.1
Topic: Travel advisory review
Written question

Senator Faulkner asked:
A report on p.1 of the 18 February *Australian* newspaper said that:

> *"Apart from the physical security and border protection aspects of the review, there will also be an examination of how our intelligence feeds into security alerts, visa control and travel advisories for the Department of Foreign Affairs."*
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

(1) What will the review encompass? What areas will be reviewed?

(2) What is the timeframe for the review?

(3) When is the reporting date?

(4) What are the terms of reference for the review?

(5) Will the conclusions of the review be made public?

(6) Had the Department considered a similar review into how intelligence feeds into security alerts and travel advisories prior to this announcement?

(7) What were the outcomes of the review following the Bali 2002 bombings on the links between intelligence and travel advisories?

   (a) What recommendations were made?

   (b) Were they implemented?

(8) How is this review to be different from that conducted following the Bali Bombings?

Answer:
(1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6) and (8) There is no such review under way.

(7) The department reviewed its links with ASIO following the Bali bombings, noting that no change in consultative procedures would have had any effect on the tragic outcome or on the travel advice, given the absence of threat information specific to Bali. The travel advice made clear that threats applied across Indonesia "including in areas frequented by tourists". The already strong links between DFAT and ASIO were formalised further through:

   (i) thrice fortnightly meetings between ASIO and DFAT on travel advice matters,

   (ii) an agreement that when an ASIO assessment of threat in a particular country is 'High' the DFAT travel advice for that country will be set at the level of "exercise a high degree of caution" or "exercise extreme caution" or above,

   (iii) an agreement that DFAT will formally consult ASIO about changes to wording of the safety and security section of travel advice for countries where ASIO assesses the threat as 'High',

   (iv) placement of seconded DFAT officers in the National Threat Assessment Centre (NTAC) located in ASIO.

   These arrangements have been fully implemented.

Question 18

Outcome 2, output 2.1.2
Topic: The Passport Act
Written question

Senator Faulkner asked:

(1) Can DFAT advise what changes to the Passport Act will be made?

   (a) Why does DFAT believe that a new Act is necessary?

   (b) Have amendments to the existing Act been considered?

   (c) Why does DFAT believe these proposed changes are necessary?

   (d) Will these proposed changes affect the passports application process?

   (e) Were other options considered?

(f) Will DFAT be consulting stakeholders in the drafting of the new Act? Who?

(2) When did funding for biometric passports begin? What was the total funding provided over the course of the project for biometric technologies for passports?

(a) Was the project tendered?

(b) Has the reliability of the biometric technology been thoroughly assessed?

(3) What is the anticipated phase-in of the new technology and what are the implications for holders of existing passports?

On 17 February the Foreign Minister said: "What we want to do is legislate to provide that both parents of a child or of a minor should have to agree to a passport being issued. If, for one reason or another, there is disagreement, that's a matter that can be settled by a court; and on the basis of a court ruling, then a passport would be issued, or not, as the case may be."

(4) Has DFAT considered the impact this would have on single parents? What was DFAT's assessment of the impact this is likely to have?

(5) Has DFAT consulted with the Family Court or other family mediation services about the potential impact of these changes?

(a) If so, whom and will DFAT provide details of the responses received.

(b) If not, why not?

(6) Will DFAT undertake to locate the other parent or will this be the responsibility of the applying parent? What vetting procedures will DFAT undertake to ensure the accuracy of the application for a minor's passport received?

(a) Will the cost of this process be borne by the Department?

(b) How will this process differ from existing procedures?

(7) Will this mean that should arbitration be necessary that the cost of going to arbitration will be borne by the Department or by the parents of the children in question? (or solely by the parent seeking the passport?)

(8) Can DFAT describe what process will take place to issue a passport to a minor in the event that one parent who has sole custody of a minor and does either not know who the other parent is, or that parent for one reason or another is not contactable?

(9) Can DFAT describe the process that will take place to issue a passport to a minor in the event that one parent has sole custody of a minor and is not in contact with the other parent (eg for personal safety reasons)?

(a) Will this matter still be referred to arbitration?

(b) If it is, who will bear the cost of arbitration?

Answer:

(1) The Australian Passports Bill and the Australian Passports Fees Bill would repeal and replace the *Passports Act 1938*. In summary, new provisions in the Australian Passports Bill relate to:

- Identity integrity: to increase penalties for existing offences, to provide for the use of technology (such as facial biometric identifiers), to regulate data exchanges and to address the problem of lost and stolen passports;

- Entitlement: to expressly state the entitlement to a passport and to expand and clarify the powers to refuse or cancel a passport to complement national security and law enforcement measures (such as for suspected people-smugglers, terrorists, child abductors and child sex tourists);
- Child passports: to ensure disputes over children's passports, and situations where the rights of a parent are unclear, are resolved by the family law courts.

The Australian Passports Fees Bill would establish a simpler structure for changing the fees and validity periods of the different categories of passports and other travel documents.

The basic elements of the other provisions of the *Passports Act 1938* would be retained, modernised and refined.

A new Australian Passports Act is needed to maintain Australians' access to a travel document of the highest integrity which establishes the bearer's nationality and identity. Over the past decade without amending the Act, the Department has implemented a large number of changes to achieve this objective. A replacement Act is the best option to implement the next phase of the Government's policy and operational objectives.

The provisions of the *Passports Act 1938* also make it unnecessarily difficult to operate the passports system in a manner consistent with family law and privacy and to ensure it does not run counter to national security, border protection, Australian law enforcement measures and international law enforcement co-operation. The changes cut across many different parts of the current Act and its Regulations. The provisions of the 65 year-old Act need to be modernised.

It is intended that the passport application process, from the perspective of the applicant, will not be substantively changed. The relatively small numbers of applicants who may be dealt with differently include children who do not have the consent of both parents or a court order, applicants who have lost two passports in three years and applicants who may be subject to refusal on national security or law enforcement grounds.

The Government has begun a public consultation and awareness program. A Passports Legislation Consultation Group has been established. Members are drawn from privacy, human rights and consumer groups and from travel, financial and biometrics industries with ex officio participation by the Federal Privacy Commissioner and representatives from other key Australian Government and State and Territory Government agencies. Background information was sent to key stakeholders who also circulated it to their contacts. The Department has established a website for the Australian Passports Act Revision and through it provides information on specific issues to interested members of the public and has sought submissions on the proposals. The Department conducts regular Customer Satisfaction Surveys in accordance with the Passports Client Service Charter. The responses to these surveys have contributed to policy development for the new legislation.

(2) Funding for research and development of a biometric for passport purposes began in 2002–03. The total funding to date for research and development of a biometric for passport purposes has been $6.5 million.

On 3 July 2002, a tender for project assistance with biometric research and development was issued by DFAT. Unisys Australia was selected and a contract was signed on 12 August 2002.

As a result of photo-match testing conducted under the biometrics R & D program, DFAT has concluded that facial recognition technology is a viable proposition. The test results have been verified by independent testing conducted by the US Government. The International Civil Aviation Organisation, which sets international standards for travel documents, has adopted facial recognition as the primary biometric identifier for all passports and other travel documents.

(3) The Government is still considering the possibility of introducing biometric technology to Australian passports. If it is decided to proceed with implementation, it is proposed that the technology will only be available in new passports. Under this arrangement existing passport holders will be provided with a biometric when they apply for a replacement passport. Existing passports will remain valid.

(4) Yes. The factual and legal circumstances of single parents vary widely. Over the past decade, the Department has implemented a number of operational changes to reduce any adverse impacts on its service to parents seeking passports for children, while operating in a manner consistent with family law. The revision of the legislation will improve the legal situation in a number of ways.

If a parent objects to the child obtaining a passport, this dispute will need to be resolved in the family law courts in the same manner as other issues between the parents. Accordingly, the single parent will not be subjected to two parallel legal processes.

Unless there has been legal acknowledgement of the parentage of other parent (for example, father's name on a birth certificate, by a court or under child support laws), that parent's consent will not be required. Currently, considerable effort is made to ensure that fathers are afforded the opportunity to exercise their rights, in relation to children for whom they had not acknowledged paternity on any legal document.

A principal objective of the child passports provisions is to protect the child from abduction. The new legislation will establish a framework for more efficient data exchange with the courts and relevant agencies to reduce the risk to a single parent of their child's passport being obtained by false statements.

The existing provisions for the issue of passports will not change for situations where the physical or mental welfare of the child would be adversely affected or there is a family crisis. The Department will retain discretions to issue passports when a child is overseas. The Government is committed to working closely with the courts to ensure that the existing timeframe and cost for the issue of a child passport is maintained.

(5) The Department has established an issue specific Passport Act Revision Family Law Consultation Group comprising representatives from the Family Court of Australia, the Federal Magistrates Court and Attorney–General's Department. The Family Law Council has also considered the proposals. The results of these consultations will be reflected in the legislation.

(6) It will remain (as it is now) the responsibility of the person lodging the application to obtain all required consents. In certain circumstances, the Department will continue to seek to locate the absent parent, through information available to the Department, for

the purposes of validating certain information and/or seeking consent to the issue of the passport or other travel document. DFAT's established vetting procedures, designed to protect the child from parental abduction and to safeguard the rights of parents, will remain in place. The application fee for a child passport does not and will not depend on whether or not the consent of both parents has been obtained.

(7) The cost of arbitration will be a matter for the courts and the parties to any dispute.

(8) Where one parent claims not to know the identity of the other parent, the unknown parent is generally not named on the child's birth certificate. It is intended that, where no acknowledgement of parentage has been made (e.g. in a birth certificate, by marriage or by court order), that parent's consent will not be required.

The Government's policy intention is to maintain the existing law and procedure that if a parent, who has a caring responsibility for a child, is known but cannot be contacted within a reasonable period, a passport will be normally issued with the consent of the lodging parent only. In these circumstances, DFAT's standard process is to seek to contact the non–lodging parent in writing, allowing a reasonable period for reply. DFAT advises the non–lodging parent that if no response is received within the reasonable time specified, a passport (or other travel document) will be issued to the child.

(9) The Department is consulting with its Family Law Consultation Group to identify the most effective approach to take if a lodging parent does not wish to contact the other parent for personal safety reasons. The other circumstances where the non–lodging parent is not in contact with the other parent are addressed in Question 8.

Question 19

Outcome 4, output 4.1
Topic: Overseas property
Hansard page no. 59

Senator Faulkner asked:
(1) Could the department provide a disaggregation of the costs associated with the refurbishment of the chanceries in New Delhi, Paris and Wellington, and the ambassador's residence in Washington.

(2) What are the time frames for the four projects?

(3) What are the details of other chancery projects and time frames for completion?

Answer:
(1)
New Delhi chancery project
The construction of a new chancery and new residential accommodation on the existing compound site in New Delhi was approved by Parliament following consideration by the Public Works Committee and tabling in September 2003. The new chancery will replace the present aging and overcrowded building, which no longer meets Australia's representational requirements in New Delhi.

Total cost of the project will be $24.61 million. Costs will cover:

- Demolition of existing chancery
- Construction of temporary chancery
- Construction of new chancery on the site of the existing building
- Construction of a temporary recreational facility to replace the existing one, which will be absorbed into the temporary chancery space.
- Construction of two new town houses on compound for High Commission staff
- Conversion of the former Deputy Head of Mission residence into three residential units.

Paris apartments refurbishment

The Paris chancery compound is 25 years old and consists of two linked buildings providing office accommodation and 31 apartments (including two official residences, those of the Ambassador to France and the Ambassador to the OECD). The remaining 29 apartments—ranging in size from 120 square metres to 240 square metres in configurations of two to four bedrooms—are generally run down and the services are in need of upgrade. The refurbishment program does not include the two head of mission apartment residences. The project was approved by Parliament in September 2003 following referral to the Public Works Committee.

The proposed works include upgrading telephone and data connections; fire detection and alarm systems; electrical switchboards; lighting; and refurbishing kitchen, laundry and bathroom areas. Carpet will be replaced, repairs made to walls and built-in units and apartments will be repainted. Security will be improved by the provision of updated locking devices.

Total cost of the project is $9.5 million. Costs include:

- professional fees (project architects, management, electrical, mechanical, and hydraulic engineers, and quantity surveyors) plus VAT;
- construction costs plus VAT;
- contingency and escalation allowances.
- move out and move in of occupants in each apartment, and
- costs related to restricted working hours and associated difficulties of working in an occupied complex.

Wellington chancery

The Chancery building is 24 years old, the usual age for a building of this nature to require mid-life refurbishment. A significant upgrade of building services is required to ensure the building meets the functional requirements of the High Commission. A budget of $6.5 million has been approved for the building upgrade, which will now require consideration by the Parliamentary Public Works Committee and approval by Parliament.

The works will comprise a full refurbishment of the chancery building and services including:

- Refurbishment of base building elements, toilets and ceiling systems
- Heating and cooling upgrade
- Fire service replacement and upgrade including sprinkler and hydraulic systems and lifts.
- Repairs to building fabric
- New carpets

- Double glazing
- Extension to terrace
- Electrical upgrade including emergency power, emergency lighting and distribution boards.

Washington Head of Mission residence
The residence is an historic building of 1,117 square metres and is a significant representational asset. Under the Australian Government Property Principles the Overseas Property Office has an obligation to maintain its condition and value.

The existing state of the services is degraded and disjointed, preventing efficient management of the property and, in some areas, posing health and safety issues. All electrical installations require replacement as generally the insulated wiring is no longer of a standard required by existing codes and presents a fire hazard.

The refurbishment, make good and upgrade works at a total cost of $5.9 million comprise:

- General works
- Site works
- External envelope (facades, roofing and drainage)
- Heating, ventilation and air conditioning replacement
- Plumbing and gas service replacement
- Electrical replacement and refurbishment
- Telecommunications wiring replacement and extension
- Building-wide redecoration (painting, plastering and timberwork)
- Interior works refurbishment—including kitchen upgrade and additional public rest rooms in basement.

(2)
New Delhi: initial work commenced in the first quarter of 2004 with completion of works expected by the first quarter of 2007.

Paris apartments: Work commenced in January 2004 and completion is expected in late 2005.

Wellington: subject to Public Works Committee consideration, work will commence in March 2005 with completion in January 2006.

Washington: the works will be intrusive and will require vacant possession of the residence for nine months. Works will commence at the time of the succession of the next ambassador.

(3) Other chancery capital works currently in train in the owned overseas estate are:

Colombo: new chancery ($11.19 million)
Commencement: first quarter 2004; completion: second quarter 2005

Beijing chancery—façade rectification and other associated works ($4.9 million)
Commencement: February 2004; completion: first quarter 2005

Geneva chancery: defects and rectification work on façade, roof and related building fabric ($2.4 million)
Commencement final quarter 2004; completion: first quarter 2005

Bali: new offices for consulate–general ($7.1 million)
Land purchase being finalised; following completion of approvals processes, estimated time from commencement to completion of construction: two years (2006).

Question 20

Outcome all, output all
Topic: Salary and allowances
Written question

Senator Faulkner asked:

(1) Can DFAT advise what allowances it provides for staff posted overseas on short-term missions, secondments and long-term postings?

(2) Are these allowances and rates of pay common across all federal government agencies?

(a) Can DFAT provide comparative examples?

(3) Do DFAT personnel receive the same rate of pay (allowances) than their counterparts from other government departments in:

(a) Iraq?
(b) Solomon Islands?
(c) PNG?

(4) If not, can DFAT advise why not?

(a) How long has this been the case?

Answer:

(1) Allowance packages are constructed according to the needs of the particular assignment. They are designed to ensure staff are not disadvantaged in accepting an assignment and that reasonable compensation is provided where they face hardship conditions. Staff overseas on short-term missions of six months or less receive travelling allowance and any hardship allowance which may be applicable to the locality of assignment. Staff on a long–term posting greater than six months receive an adjustment to salary, where appropriate, to compensate for a higher cost of living; an allowance to compensate for the wide range of impacts that overseas service has on their lives; and a hardship allowance should it be applicable to the post. Staff on secondment receive allowances as determined by DFAT or the agency to which they are attached. Allowances determined by DFAT under these circumstances maintain the principles applying to short-term missions and long-term postings.

(2) No. Salaries are negotiated by Certified Agreements and are not common across agencies. Overseas allowances are set by individual agencies. While the overall overseas allowances framework, inherited from the former Department of Employment and Workplace relations, continues to apply across agencies, the value of allowances is not common. DFAT is not able to provide comparative examples of allowances.

(3) As indicated at (2) above, DFAT staff receive different rates of pay and allowances in these locations.

(4) The Workplace Relations Act and the Australian Public Service Act gives heads of agencies the authority to set rates of pay and allowances for their staff. The department has been setting its own rates accordingly since 1998.

Question 21

All outcomes, all outputs
Topic: Performance assessment mechanisms
Written question.

Senator Carr asked:

(1) For each agency within the DFAT portfolio, please provide full details of each of the performance assessment mechanisms linked to the pay outcomes or other financial reward of individual employees, including:

(a) What are the current process/es of performance assessment within the portfolio agency? If more than one, please provide details of each, and the employee category it applies to.

(b) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), please list the range of outcome results an employee can achieve from each of the performance assessment processes identified in (a).

(c) For each of the performance assessment process/es identified in (a), what pay or other financial change is linked to each outcome or result for the employee from the performance assessment (ie the pay increase or one-off bonus or classification or level change).

(d) For each of the performance assessments identified in (a), what is the classification level of employees subject to this performance assessment (eg SES, EL2, EL1 or APS or equivalent).

(e) What is the principal industrial or other instrument governing each of the performance assessment mechanism/s (eg the certified agreement or AWA).

(f) Do the performance assessments operate over a common cycle? Please provide the commencement and end dates of the most recent full cycle of each of the performance process/es.

(2) For each performance assessment mechanism described in (1) above, advise the number of male and the number of female employees at each possible outcome, by classification level for the most recent full cycle (if the performance mechanism does not operate over a common cycle—aggregate outcomes using the 2002-03 financial year).

Answer:

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

(1) (a) The Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade Performance Management System (PMS) applies to all ongoing (permanent) employees, including Senior Executive Service (SES) employees. Ongoing employees must have worked three calendar months of the performance cycle to be eligible to receive performance pay. Non–ongoing (temporary) employees engaged for more than 12 months have access to the PMS in their second year of continuous employment in the department, if they have

worked for at least three calendar months of the second year. Locally Engaged Staff at Australian missions overseas are not included under the PMS, but are covered under post-specific performance management systems.

The PMS is based on regular and constructive feedback between supervisors and employees. All eligible employees are required to establish a performance agreement with their supervisor. Performance agreements provide the basis for assessment of individual performance in relation to the position held. Performance agreements reflect the relevant work level standards for the employee's APS classification, the major objectives and responsibilities of the position and include well–defined performance indicators. Mid–term and end–of–cycle performance reviews are a formal and essential part of the PMS.

(b) Performance appraisal is made on the basis of the following five–point rating scale:

- **Outstanding**: The employee has performed at an outstanding level to achieve exceptional results within the top 10 per cent of staff in the same broadband.
- **Superior**: The employee has performed at a superior level to achieve results within the next 20 per cent of staff in the same broadband.
- **Fully Effective**: The employee has met to a high standard the performance indicators in the performance agreement and has performed consistently at a fully effective level.
- **Effective**: The employee has met the performance indicators in the performance agreement and has performed at an effective level.
- **Unsatisfactory**: The employee has not met the performance indicators in the performance agreement and has failed to perform at a satisfactory level.

(c) Performance rewards are as follows:

- Employees rated **Outstanding** receive a pay point movement and a 6 per cent bonus, or a bonus of 12 per cent if at the top of a broadband.
- Employees rated **Superior** receive a pay point movement, or a 6 per cent bonus if at the top of a broadband.
- Employees rated **Fully Effective** receive a bonus of 3 per cent if at the top of a broadband, or a pay point movement where they have received this rating for two performance cycles.
- Employees rated **Effective** or **Unsatisfactory** receive no performance rewards.
- **Non–SES employees** may elect to receive a bonus in lieu of a pay point movement.
- **SES employees** who receive ratings of Outstanding, Superior or Fully Effective are only eligible to receive bonus payments.

(d) The PMS applies to the Senior Executive Service and to all APS levels, ranging from APS Level 1 to Executive Level 2.

(e) For non-SES employees, the principal industrial instrument governing the PMS is the department's Certified Agreement 2003–06. Individual Australian Workplace Agreements (AWA) are the principal industrial instruments governing the PMS for SES employees and non–SES heads of mission/post.

(f) The PMS is conducted over a common cycle corresponding with the financial year. The most recent full performance cycle commenced on 1 July 2002 and ended on 30 June 2003.

(2) Performance ratings by gender and broadband for the 2002-03 performance cycle are given in the table below.

	Unsatisfactory	Effective	Fully Effective	Superior	Outstanding	Total
BB1						
Female		12	75	33	16	136
Male		6	37	7	3	53
BB2						
Female	2	14	150	52	29	247
Male		11	89	24	11	135
BB3						
Female		11	178	63	31	283
Male	2	22	294	93	43	454
BB4						
Female		5	46	16	5	72
Male		12	101	33	18	164
SES [1]						
Female		3	32	5	4	44
Male		14	80	33	14	141
Total						
Female	2	45	481	169	85	782
Male	2	65	601	190	89	947
Grand Total [2]	4	110	1082	359	174	1729

[1] Includes BB4 staff acting in head of mission/post SES positions overseas.
[2] Does not include staff not covered by the PMS eg, staff on leave for more than 9 months of the performance cycle, Graduate Trainees in their first year of employment with DFAT, staff on secondment to other agencies and staff covered by the Members of Parliament (Staff) Act

AusAID

1 (a) Two types of performance assessment systems in AusAID are linked to pay outcomes or other financial reward of individual employees:

Non–SES Performance payment assessment (PPA). This system applies to all AusAID employees except SES employees. Its purpose is for the supervisor and employee to assess current performance and recommend pay point advancement, remain at current pay point, or regress one pay point.

SES SES Performance Planning and Review system. This system applies to all SES staff and provides a framework for regular work planning and performance appraisal. It measures performance against agreed key tasks/planned outcomes for the SES employee.

(b)
Non–SES Effective, Adequate or Unsatisfactory

SES Highly Effective, Fully Effective, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory. For the 2003/04 cycle the range will change to: Outstanding, Superior, Fully Effective, or Unsatisfactory.

(c)
Non–SES Effective—pay point advancement (equivalent to a 2% pay increase).
Adequate—remain at current pay point.
Unsatisfactory—regress one pay point.

SES For the most recent full cycle (i.e 2002/03)
Highly Effective—performance bonus equal to 5% of annual salary plus 2% salary increase
Fully Effective—2% salary increase
Satisfactory—no performance payment or salary increase
Unsatisfactory—no performance payment or salary increase

(d)
Non–SES All levels of AusAID employees below SES.

SES All SES employees.

(e)
Non–SES AusAID Certified Agreement 2003—2006

SES Individual AWAs.

(f)
Non–SES The PPA system operates over the preceding 12 calendar months (usually from the date of commencement of the employee).

SES The SES system has an annual cycle of 1 March to 28 February.

(2) Performance ratings by gender and broadband for the 2002–03 performance cycle are given in the table below.

Non–SES

AusAID Performance assessment (PPA) outcomes for the Financial Year 2002-03

	Effective		**Adequate**		**Unsatisfactory**	
	Females	**Males**	**Females**	**Males**	**Females**	**Males**
APS1	2	1				
APS2	3	2		2		
APS3	19	8				
APS4	12	5		1		
APS5	16	14	4			1
APS6	91	52		3		
EL1	53	87		5		
EL2	17	27		2		

SES

AusAID SES Performance Planning and Review system for the period 1 March 2002 to 28 February 2003

	Highly Effective		**Fully Effective**		**Effective**		**Unsatisfactory**	
	Females	**Males**	**Females**	**Males**	**Females**	**Males**	**Females**	**Males**
SES	3	8	0	3	0	0	0	0

Austrade

(1)

(a) All Austrade employees participate in a performance management program, designed to ensure alignment of individual efforts with overall organisational objectives. Employees in consultation with their managers develop individual performance agreements consistent with business unit operating plans. Performance agreements detail key responsibility areas for the employee and include a mix of agreed defined quantitative and qualitative performance outcomes against each area.

Employee performance is assessed on the basis of demonstrated achievement against these outcomes. An overall performance assessment rating is given to each employee.

(b) Up to June 2003 the performance assessments rating descriptors for A-based and Overseas Engaged staff were identical and delivered similar bonus outcomes. As part of the negotiation of the most recent Certified Agreement the performance ratings for A-based staff and the bonus payment arrangements were varied. The current performance assessment rating descriptors are:

Australian Based Employees—Austrade Performance Levels 1–8

4 Exceeds job requirements (Exceptional)
3 Meets job requirements and exceeds in some areas
2 Meets job requirements
1 Partly meets job requirements—further development required
Fails to meet job requirements.

Overseas Engaged Employees—Austrade Overseas Performance Levels 1–5

5 Exceptional
4 Superior
3 Fully Proficient
2 Satisfactory
1 Unsatisfactory.

(c) Australian Based Staff

Austrade Performance Level 1–5—broadly equivalent to APS 1 to E.L 2

Commencing with the 2003–2004 assessment period staff at these levels are eligible for payment of a one off annual performance bonus of a maximum of 5% of gross annual base salary. It is anticipated that up to 10% of staff will achieve such a payment in any given assessment year.

Achievement of one of the top two performance ratings ('Meets job requirements and exceeds in some areas' or 'Exceeds job requirements (Exceptional) qualifies staff for single pay point advancement within the relevant pay scale.

Austrade Performance Level 6–8—broadly equivalent to SES B1–3

Commencing with the 2003–2004 assessment period staff at these levels are eligible for one-off performance bonuses of up to 20% of gross annual base salary.

Overseas Engaged Staff (Austrade Overseas Performance Levels 1–5—broadly equivalent to APS 1—EL 2)

Staff at these levels are eligible for payment of a one off annual performance bonus of between 2% and 12% of gross annual base salary (2% Fully Proficient; 7% Superior; 12% Exceptional). Up to a maximum of 30% of staff may achieve payments of either 7% or 12% in any one assessment year.

Staff who achieve two consecutive 'Superior' (or higher) ratings in consecutive years or in two out of three years are eligible for a salary adjustment to the second Tier within their salary range. Adjustment to the third (top) Tier requires achievement of three consecutive 'Superior' (or higher) ratings in consecutive years or in three out of four years.

(d) See responses to (a) to (c) above.

(e) The principle industrial instruments governing the abovementioned performance assessment mechanisms are:

Australian Based Staff (Austrade Performance Levels 1–5)—Australian Trade Commission Certified Agreement 2003-2006

Australian Based Staff (Austrade Performance Levels 6–8—broadly equivalent to SES Bands 1–3)—Individual fixed term common law contracts.

Locally Engaged Staff (Austrade Overseas Performance Levels 1–5)—terms and conditions of employment determined by Austrade under S60(2) Australian Trade Commission Act 1986.

(f) Yes. The program operates on an annual basis, covering the period from 1 July to 30 June. Formal assessments of annual performance are finalised once verified organisational performance data is available by end August each year.

(2) Performance ratings by gender and broadband for the 2002–03 performance cycle are given in table 1 below.

(3)

ClassAct	Gender	5 Rating Exceptional	4 Rating Superior	3 Rating Fully Proficient	2 Rating Satisfactory	1 Rating Unsatisfactory	Count
AOPL1	FEMALE	0	1	3	0	0	4
AOPL1	MALE	0	1	13	4	1	19
AOPL2	FEMALE	2	7	42	7	0	58
AOPL2	MALE	0	4	3	1	1	9
AOPL3	FEMALE	5	28	68	11	1	113
AOPL3	MALE	4	11	24	8	2	49
AOPL4	FEMALE	3	23	47	11	4	88
AOPL4	MALE	2	29	31	13	3	78
AOPL5	FEMALE	0	4	7	1	0	12
AOPL5	MALE	0	9	13	3	3	28
APL1	FEMALE	0	9	32	8	0	49
APL1	MALE	0	2	11	0	0	13
APL2	FEMALE	0	18	45	6	0	69
APL2	MALE	1	19	26	4	1	51
APL3	FEMALE	1	9	30	1	0	41
APL3	MALE	0	20	27	5	0	52
APL4	FEMALE	0	8	21	1	1	31
APL4	MALE	1	21	37	5	0	64
APL5	FEMALE	0	6	4	0	0	10
APL5	MALE	0	7	10	1	0	18
APL6	FEMALE	1	6	3	0	0	10
APL6	MALE	2	20	30	4	0	56
APL7	FEMALE	0	0	2	0	0	2
APL7	MALE	0	3	6	1	1	11
APL8	FEMALE	0	0	2	0	0	2
APL8	MALE	0	1	4	0	0	5
Total		22	266	541	95	18	942
Overall	FEMALE	12	119	306	46	6	489
Overall	MALE	10	147	235	49	12	453

Note:

- Includes all staff actually rated in the 2002-03 Performance Assesment cycle.
- Total numbers will vary from 30 June 2003 reported staffing levels.

Source:

- 2003 Performance Based Pay Calculator
- Aurion HRMIS

Date:

Monday 1 March 2004

Annual report 2002-03 staffing numbers — 962

EFIC

(1)

(a) Under the Corporation's performance assessment system, employees have agreed performance objectives. The Board and the Managing Director agree the MD's objectives; below the MD, objectives are agreed between individual employees and managers.

Individuals have performance reviews at which their performance against the agreed objectives is assessed and, at least annually, a ranking on a 1–6 scale is determined. The Corporation has one performance assessment system.

(b) Key to Rating Scale

1 Key objectives not met
2 Most objectives were met
3 Objectives were met
4 Objectives were exceeded on a number of occasions
5 Achievements exceeded most agreed objectives
6 Achievements were exceptional and demonstrated an extraordinary contribution to the Corporation.

(c) Employees graded 4, 5, or 6 are eligible for a one-off performance incentive payment of up to 12% of base salary (being remuneration excluding superannuation).

(d) All EFIC employees are eligible for an annual performance incentive payment. With the exception of the Managing Director, whose performance incentive is governed by the Principal Executive Office arrangements, all EFIC employees are assessed under the same system.

(e) The principal instrument is the Export Finance and Insurance Corporation Certified Agreement 2003.

(f) Yes. 1 July 2002 to 30 June 2003.

(2) EFIC does not have classification levels along the lines of those set out in question 1(d). Being a small organisation, skill and competence levels are considered person–by–person. Under the performance review system an incentive payment of any amount up to 12% of base salary is possible. Set out below are the performance incentive outcomes for 2003 by gender and by percentage of remuneration bands:

Level of bonus as % of salary	Total	No of females	No of males
nil	45	27	18
1–3%	21	14	7
3–6%	33	15	18
6–9%	30	13	17
9+%	16	5	11
TOTAL	145	74	71

ACIAR

(1)(a) Where the Director has determined that ACIAR has achieved a specified percentage of the items in that financial year's Operational Plan:

i. a bonus payment of $650 will be payable in the July immediately following that financial year, to all ACIAR employees whose individual performance has been assessed as Competent, Superior or Outstanding (see (1)(b)) and who have been employed in ACIAR for at least 9 months;

ii. a bonus payment equal to half the amount in (i) will be paid to those employees whose individual performance has been assessed as Competent, Superior or Outstanding and who have been employed in ACIAR between 6 and 9 months; and

iii. a pro-rata bonus payment will be paid to part–time employees who meet the criteria of either (i) or (ii).

The performance of individual employees is critical to the successful achievement of organisational goals and the PDAS provides a mechanism whereby the performance of each individual employee can be enhanced to enable achievement of both ACIAR's and individual contributions to those.

(b) Each employee will be assigned a rating of Outstanding, Superior, Competent, Requires Development or Unsatisfactory by his/her supervisor. The rating of Competent indicates that performance meets work-level standards for the relevant classification.

(c) Employees assigned a rating of Outstanding, Superior or Competent will be eligible for salary progression of one salary point if all other eligibility requirements have been met.

Salary Movement Based on Performance Achievements

Advancement between the salary progression points within each classification (see Appendix A for classification structure) will be on the basis of performance review using the ACIAR PDAS.

Salary progression to higher salary points within a classification level is available to eligible employees who, after commencing in or being promoted to a position in ACIAR, have performed duties at that classification level for a period of at least 9 months (as at 30 June each year) and who meet performance appraisal requirements for such salary progression (see 4.3.5).

Payment of salary increases, based on performance assessments, will be made in July of each year. Salary progression is not available to employees who are still on probation.

Employees who have been receiving Temporary Performance Loading (TPL) for 9 months or more, and whose performance is rated as Outstanding, Superior or Competent, are eligible for salary progression to the next pay-point for the remainder of that reassignment of duties.

Additional benefits may be offered through ACIAR's Recognition and Reward scheme (see HR Manual) to employees achieving a rating of Outstanding.

(d)

ACIAR CLASSIFICATION STRUCTURE AND SALARY RATES

ACIAR Broadband	APS Classification	Former ACIAR Local Designations and Salary		New ACIAR Local Designations and Salary		With 3.7% Increase on certification	With further 4.0% increase 7/03	With further 4.3% increase 7/04
Band 3	**EL 2**	***SPRS***	108,296	**Research Program Manager 3/Program Manager 3/ Senior Principal Research Scientist***	108,296	112,303	116,795	121,817
			105,304		105,304	109,200	113,568	118,452
			102,312		102,312	106,098	110,341	115,086
			99,321		99,321	102,996	107,116	111,722
					96,329***	99,893	103,889	108,356
		PRS	93,974	**Research Program Manager 2/Program Manager 2/ Principal Research Scientist**	93,974	97,451	101,349	105,707
			91,460		91,460	94,844	98,638	102,879
			88,943		88,943	92,234	95,923	100,048
			86,430		86,430	89,628	93,213	97,221
			83,917		83,917**			
		EL2 (A)	83,917	**Research Program Manager 1/Program Manager 1/ Senior Research Scientist***	83,917	87,022	90,503	94,394
			82,225		82,225	85,267	88,678	92,491
			80,532		80,532	83,512	86,852	90,587
			78,839		78,839	81,756	85,026	88,682
			77,147		77,147	80,001	83,201	86,779
Band 2	**EL 2**	**EL2 (B)**	78,528	**Unit Manager 2**	78,528	81,434	84,691	88,333
			76,212		75,616*	78,414	81,550	85,057
			73,896		72,706*	75,396	78,412	81,784
			71,581		69,796*	72,378	75,274	78,510
			69,264		66,886*	69,361	72,135	75,237
	EL 1	**EL1**	64,848	**Unit Manager 1**	64,848	67,247	69,937	72,945
			63,251		63,251	65,591	68,215	71,148

ACIAR Broadband	APS Classification	Former ACIAR Local Designations and Salary		New ACIAR Local Designations and Salary		With 3.7% Increase on certification	With further 4.0% increase 7/03	With further 4.3% increase 7/04
			61,653		61,653	63,934	66,492	69,351
			60,056		60,056	62,278	64,769	67,554
Band 1	**APS 6**	**APS 6**	53,813	**APS 6**	53,813	55,804	58,036	60,532
			52,070		52,070	53,997	56,156	58,571
			50,329		50,329	52,191	54,279	56,613
			48,588		48,588	50,386	52,401	54,654
			46,846		46,846	48,579	50,522	52,695
	APS 5	**APS 5**	45,992	**APS 5**	45,992	47,694	49,601	51,734
			45,121		45,121	46,790	48,662	50,755
			44,247		44,247	45,884	47,720	49,771
			43,374		43,374	44,979	46,778	48,789
	APS 4	**APS 4**	42,223	**APS 4**	42,223	43,785	45,537	47,495
			41,111		41,111	42,632	44,337	46,244
			40,000		40,000	41,480	43,139	44,994
			38,887		38,887	40,326	41,939	43,742
	APS 3	**APS 3**	37,659	**APS 3**	37,659	39,052	40,614	42,361
			36,736		36,736	38,095	39,619	41,323
			35,813		35,813	37,138	38,624	40,284
			34,891		34,891	36,182	37,629	39,247
	APS 2	**APS 2**	33,970	**APS 2**	33,970	35,227	36,636	38,211
			32,858		32,858	34,074	35,437	36,960
			31,745		31,745	32,920	34,236	35,709
			30,633		30,633	31,766	33,037	34,458
	APS 1	**APS 1**	29,917	**APS 1**	29,917	31,024	32,265	33,652
			28,966		28,966	30,038	31,239	32,583
			28,018		28,018	29,055	30,217	31,516
			27,069		27,069	28,071	29,193	30,449

*The specific local designation will depend on the work to be done, i.e. management of research programs, management of non–research programs or the conduct of scientific research. In each case, the equivalence (eg RPM3=PM3=SPRS) is formally recognised.

* Paypoint altered; ** Paypoint removed; *** Paypoint added;

--- = hard barrier (see clause 4.8.9); – – – = soft barrier (see clause 4.5)

(e) Certified Agreement and AWAs
(f) Financial Year basis; Joly 2002—June 2003

(2)

Level	Male			Female		
	Outstanding	Superior	Competent	Outstanding	Superior	Competent
APS 2						2
APS 3			1		2	
APS 4			1	1	6	3
APS 5			1	2	3	
APS 6						2
EL 1		1	1		2	
EL 2	1	5	6		2	2
SES 1		2				

No staff were rated as 'requires development'

Australia–Japan Foundation

(1)

(a) The Australia–Japan Foundation employs a full time Australian-based EL2 employee who is assessed under a system that mirrors the DFAT performance appraisal process. The AJF also employs several full and part time locally engaged staff who participate in the Tokyo Embassy's local staff performance management system. All staff operate from within the Australian Embassy Tokyo.

(b) A–based member: Outstanding, Superior, Fully Effective, Effective, Unsatisfactory; Locally Engaged Staff: Superior, Fully Effective, Unsatisfactory.

(c) A–based member: As per DFAT Certified Agreement; Locally Engaged Staff: Superior—one off bonus equivalent to one month's salary, Fully Effective—one off bonus equivalent to half of one month's salary. Locally Engaged Staff are able to achieve additional salary bonuses through an incentive pay point system. Two incentive point levels exist. Each of these increases the employee's salary by approximately 10 percent. Staff achieving three *superior* assessments in three consecutive review cycles would be rewarded with a permanent increase in salary to the incentive salary point immediately above their current pay.

(d) A–based member under DFAT system: EL2; Locally Engaged Staff operate under a six point classification system from Level One to Level Six (the highest classification).

(e) A–based member: AWA; Locally Engaged Staff: DFAT Locally Engaged Staff Conditions of Service incorporating the Australian Embassy Tokyo's LES performance management system, which follows minimum requirements of Japanese Labour Law. This system was introduced on 1 January 2002.

(f) Yes; 1 July 2002 to 30 June 2003.

(2) A–based officer: EL2, 1 female, Superior; Locally Engaged Staff: Level II, 1 female-Fully Effective; Level III, 2 females-1 Fully Effective, 1 Superior; Level IV–1 male Fully Effective, 2 females, both Superior.

Question 22

All outcomes, all outputs
Topic: Corporate management
Written question

Senator Faulkner asked:

(1) Could a list be provided of all administered programmes in DFAT, including:

(a) a description of the programme;

(b) the number of people directly receiving funds/assistance under the programme;

(c) a breakdown on those receiving funds/assistance under the programme by electorate;

(d) the policy objective of the programme;

(e) whether the programme is ongoing;

(f) the funding in each financial year of the forward estimates for the programme (with a breakdown of administered and departmental expenses), including:

(i) how much funding was allocated for the programme;

(ii) how much is committed to the programme; and

(iii) how much is unspent.

(g) whether an evaluation of the programme effectiveness has been conducted:

(i) if so, when that evaluation occurred; and

(ii) if so, the conclusion of that evaluation.

(2) How many Senior Executive Officers (or equivalent) were employed in DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04.

(3) What was the base and top (including performance pay) wages of APS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (or equivalent), Executive Level 1 and 2 (or equivalent), and SES band 1, band 2 and band 3 (or equivalent)in DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04.

(4) What was the average salary for an SES (or equivalent) in DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04.

(5) How many staff had mobile phones issued by the DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date;

(6) What was the total mobile phone bill for DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date.

(7) How many SES (or equivalent) were issued with cars in the DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04;

(8) Could the department please list all 'management retreats/training' conducted by DFAT which were attended by employees during 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date. For such meetings held off-site (from DFAT) could the department please indicate:

(a) where (location and hotel) and when they were held;

(b) how much was spent in total;

(c) how much was spent on accommodation;

(d) how much was spent on food;

(e) how much was spent alcohol/drinks; and

(f) how much was spent on transport.

(9) How many overseas trips were taken by employees in DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date.

(10) What were the destinations of each of these overseas trips.

(11) What was the total cost of overseas trips by DFAT staff in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003-04 to date. Could the department provide a breakdown on the cost of accommodation allowances, food allowances and airflights.

(12) What was the total cost of domestic trips by DFAT staff in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date. Could the department provide a breakdown on the cost of accommodation allowances, food allowances and airflights.

(13) How many overseas trips of Ministerial Staff were paid for by DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date.

(14) What was the total cost of overseas trips of Ministerial Staff paid for by DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date.

(15) How much was spent on advertising by DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date.

(16) Did DFAT produce publications that provided electorate breakdowns on spending on government programmes in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date.

(17) How much was spent on advertising which provided electorate breakdowns of spending by the government on programmes within DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date.

(18) How much was spent on consultancies by DFAT in 1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date.

(19) Did DFAT conduct any surveys of attitudes towards programmes run by their department in1996–97, 1997–98, 1998–99, 1999–00, 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04 to date.

(20) On what programmes administered by DFAT were surveys conducted.

(21) What were the findings of these surveys.

Answer:

(1)(i) Payments to International Organisations

(a) Australian contributions to international organisations and peacekeeping operations.

(b) 23 international organisations and 13 peacekeeping operations as at 22 March 2004.

(c) Not applicable.

(d) Australia's national interests protected and advanced through contributions to international security, national economic and trade performance and global cooperation.

(e) Yes.

(f) (i) 2004–05: 169.849 million
2005–06: 150.040 million
2006–07: 135.726 million
2007–08: 135.726 million

(ii) All funds are committed.

(iii) The total allocation will be spent in each year.

(g) The Australian Government works within international organisations to improve their management and to ensure their continuing effectiveness in carrying out the mandate given to them by their member states. DFAT also continually assesses the value of Australian membership of specific international organisations against national interest criteria. For example Australia withdrew from membership of UNIDO in 1996 when Ministers decided that membership no longer served our interests. Contributions are based on Australia's legal obligations under international treaties and membership of international organisations.

(ii) Payments to ABC Asia Pacific (ABCAP) TV

(a) Funding of the ABC Asia Pacific satellite television service.

(b) ABC Asia Pacific TV service.

(c) Not applicable.

(d) Projecting images and perceptions of Australia to the Asia Pacific region in an independent and impartial manner.

(e) The current ABCAP TV contract expires on 30 June 2006.

(f) 2004–05: 18.359 million
2005–06: 18.800 million
All funds are committed. We expect to fully expend the total allocation in accordance with the contract.

(g) (i) Annually.
(ii) The latest annual evaluation of ABCAP's performance, conducted in November 2003, concluded that the ABC had satisfactorily met all the key Performance Indicators set out in the contract between DFAT and the ABC.

(2) Numbers of Senior Executive Officers (or equivalent).

	1995–1996	1996–1997	1997-1998	1998--1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004 (at 1 Mar 2004)
Australia	84	67	70	72	77	78	78	79	79
Overseas	86	76	74	74	76	78	84	87	86
Total	170	143	144	146	153	156	162	166	165

Note: The table above does not include employees on LWOP, seconded to other agencies or employed under the MOPS Act. It includes Heads of Mission/Heads of Post as well as Heads of Mission/Heads of Post designate preparing for overseas assignment.

(3) Salary range (including Performance pay). Prior to 1998 salary ranges were centrally set by the then Department of Finance. To extract data for earlier years would require a substantial use of resources.

	1998–1999				1999–2000			
	Salary		Performance Pay		Salary		Performance Pay	
	Base	Top	Base	Top	Base	Top	Base	Top
APS1	25,273	26,829	505	3,488	25,652	27,231	513	3,540
APS2	28,601	31,717	572	4,123	29,030	32,193	581	4,185
APS3	33,424	35,161	668	4,571	33,925	35,688	679	4,639
APS4	37,463	39,423	749	5,125	38,025	40,014	761	5,202
APS5	40,498	42,943	810	5,583	41,105	43,587	822	5,666
APS6	44,828	50,244	897	6,532	45,501	50,998	910	6,630
EL1	54,640	59,006	1,093	7,671	55,460	62,000	1,109	8,060
PA01	40,498	42,943	810	5,583	41,105	45,501	822	5,915
PA02	54,640	54,640	1,093	7,103	55,460	55,460	1,109	7,210
PA03	59,006	65,372	1,180	8,498	59,891	67,461	1,199	8,770
SPA01	71,434	73,826	1,429	9,597	72,506	72,506	1,450	9,425
SPA02	75,085	75,085	1,502	9,761	76,211	76,211	1,524	9,907
EL2	62,996	73,826	1,260	9,597	63,941	74,933	1,279	9,741
MO2	74,259	74,259	1,485	9,654	75,373	75,373	1,507	9,798
MO3	78,769	81,270	1,575	10,565	79,950	82,489	1,599	10,723
MO4	85,908	93,185	1,718	12,114	87,196	94,583	1,743	12,295
SES Band 1	78,456	87,493	1,569	11,374	79,633	88,805	1,593	11,545
SES Band 2	98,539	107,387	1,971	13,960	100,017	108,998	2,000	14,170
SES Band 3	119,932	129,499	2,399	16,835	121,731	131,441	2,435	17,087

	2000–2001				2001–2002			
	Salary		Performance Pay		Salary		Performance Pay	
	Base	Top	Base	Top	Base	Top	Base	Top
APS1	26,806	28,456	536	3,699	27,745	29,452	555	3,829
APS2	30,336	33,642	607	4,373	31,398	34,819	628	4,526
APS3	35,452	37,294	709	4,848	36,692	38,599	734	5,018
APS4	39,736	41,815	795	5,436	41,127	43,278	823	5,626
APS5	42,955	45,548	859	5,921	44,458	47,143	889	6,129
APS6	47,549	53,293	951	6,928	49,213	55,158	984	7,171
EL1	57,956	64,790	1,159	8,423	59,984	67,058	1,200	8,718
PA01	42,955	47,549	859	6,181	44,458	49,213	889	6,398
PA02	49,915	57,956	998	7,534	50,834	59,984	1,017	7,798
PA03	62,586	70,497	1,252	9,165	64,777	72,964	1,296	9,485
SPA01	75,769	75,769	1,515	9,850	78,421	78,421	1,568	10,195
SPA02	79,640	79,640	1,593	10,353	82,428	82,428	1,649	10,716
EL2	66,818	78,305	1,336	10,180	69,157	81,046	1,383	10,536
MO2	78,765	78,765	1,575	10,239	81,522	81,522	1,630	10,598
MO3	83,548	86,201	1,671	11,206	86,472	89,218	1,729	11,598
MO4	91,120	98,839	1,822	12,849	94,309	102,299	1,886	13,299
SES Band 1	83,216	92,801	1,664	12,064	86,129	96,049	1,723	12,486
SES Band 2	104,158	113,903	2,090	14,807	108,176	117,890	2,164	15,326
SES Band 3	127,209	137,356	2,544	17,856	131,661	142,163	2,633	18,482

	2002–2003				2003–2004			
	Salary		Performance Pay		Salary		Performance Pay	
	Base	Top	Base	Top	Base	Top	Base	Top
APS1	28,994	30,777	870	3,693	30,154	32,008	905	3,841
APS2	32,811	36,386	984	4,366	34,223	38,010	1,027	4,561
APS3	38,343	40,336	1,150	4,840	39,977	42,080	1,199	5,050
APS4	42,978	45,226	1,289	5,427	44,797	47,135	1,344	5,656
APS5	46,459	49,264	1,394	5,912	48,417	51,335	1,453	6,160
APS6	51,428	57,640	1,543	6,917	53,485	59,946	1,605	7,194
EL1	62,683	70,076	1,880	8,409	65,190	74,959	1,956	8,995
PA01	46,459	51,428	1,394	5,912	48,417	53,485	1,453	6,418
PA02	53,122	62,683	1,594	7,522	55,767	65,190	1,673	7,823
PA03	67,692	76,247	2,031	9,150	70,400	79,297	2,112	9,516
SPA01	81,950	81,950	2,459	11,034	85,228	85,228	2,557	10,227
SPA02	86,137	86,137	2,584	10,336	89,582	91,721	2,687	11,007
EL2	72,269	84,693	2,168	10,163	79,297	91,721	2,379	11,007
MO2	85,190	85,190	2,555	11,074	88,598	92,238	2,658	11,069
MO3	90,363	93,233	1,812	12,120	93,978	96,962	2,819	11,635
MO4	98,553	106,902	2,956	13,897	102,495	111,178	3,075	13,341
SES Band 1	90,005	100,371	2,700	12,045	105,191	115,972	3,156	13,917
SES Band 2	113,044	123,195	3,391	14,783	129,152	139,708	3,875	16,765
SES Band 3	137,586	148,560	4,128	17,827	153,636	172,964	4,609	20,756

(4) SES (or equivalent) average salary levels. Details before 1998 are not readily available.

1998–1999	1999–2000	2000–2001	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004
98,737	102,421	109,867*	114,055	120,416	132,337**

* level of increase due to cashing out of allowances including spouse travel, home phone, airport lounge membership, membership of professional associations and professional development expenses.
** SES salaries in new AWAs (1 July 2003 -30 June 2006) brought into line with salaries of SES in comparable policy agencies in the APS.

(5) Number of mobile phones. Mobile telephone allocation and usage is managed by individual Divisions, offices and overseas posts. It would require a substantial use of resources to provide the information requested. Individual work areas are required to manage the use of mobile phones in accordance with strict departmental guidelines.

(6) Mobile phone costs. As for the preceding question, it would require the diversion of substantial resources to the information requested.

(7) SES Vehicles. The following information is based on information which has been provided by LeasePlan (and previously DASFLEET), the Executive Vehicle Scheme (EVS) managers. The numbers below relate only to EVS cars in Canberra. It does not include cars provided to SES staff at overseas posts and state offices.

Year	Exec Leases
1997–1998	69
1998–1999	70
1999–2000	77
2000–2001	79
2001–2002	77
2002–2003	64
2003–2004	65

Note: Data for 1996-97 using individual officer status is not available.

(8) Management retreats/training conducted by DFAT

2000–2001

Management Skills (ASO 1—6 levels)
Dates
9—11 August 2000
4—6 October 2000
13—15 November 2000
6—8 December 2000
21—23 February 2001
9—11 April 2001
13—15 June 2001

Strategic People Management Workshop (EL1—EL2 levels)
Dates
19—21 July 2000
30 Aug—1 Sept 2000
21—24 Nov 2000
14—16 Feb 2001
22—25 May 2001
Locally Engaged Leadership &

Management Workshop
Dates
23 Oct—3 Nov 2000
Management Skills Workshop for Graduate Trainees (GTs)
Dates
5—7 July 2000
SES Leadership Program
Dates
5—6 Oct 2000
6—7 March 2001
Heads of Mission/Post Preparatory Program
Dates
2—3 November 2000
13—14 Feb 2001

2001-2002

Management Skills (ASO 1—6 levels)
Dates
8—10 August 2001
10—12 October 2001
12—14 December 2001
6—8 March 2002
29—31 May 2002

Strategic People Management Workshop (EL1—EL2 levels)
Dates
4—6 July 2001
11—14 Sept 2001
7—9 Nov 2001
13—15 Feb 2002
9—12 April 2002
5—7 June 2002
Locally Engaged Staff Leadership & Management Workshop
Dates
9—13 Oct 2001
Management Skills Workshops for Graduate Trainees
Dates
4—5 July 2001
21—22 Jan 2002
29—30 Jan 2002
SES Leadership & Development Program
Dates
9—10 April 2002
Heads of Mission/Post Preparatory Program
Dates
6—7 Dec 2001
4—5 April 2002

2002-2003

Management Skills (APS 1–5 levels)
Dates
10—12 July 2002
4—6 September 2002
6—8 November 2002
26—28 February 2003
1—3 April 2003
Strategic People Management (APS 6—EL1 levels)
Dates
28—30 Aug 2002
8—11 Oct 2002
4—6 Dec 2002
5—7 March 2003
26—28 May 2003
Locally Engaged Staff Leadership & Management Workshop
Dates
29 Oct—2 Nov 2002
BB4 (Exec level 2) Leadership & Management Workshop
Dates
3—4 Oct 2002
27—28 Feb 2003
17—18 June 2003
Management Skills Workshop for Graduate Trainees
Dates
23—24 Jul 2002
25—26 Jul 2002
20—21 Jan 2003
3—4 Feb 2003
SES Leadership Program
Dates
21—22 May 2003
Heads of Mission/Post Preparatory Program
Dates
12 Sept 2002
11—12 Dec 2002
16—17 April 2002

2003–2004 (to 22 March 2004)

Management Skills (APS 1-5 levels)
Dates
6—8 August 2003
1—3 October 2003
27—29 January 2004
BB4 (Executive Level 2) Leadership & Management
Dates
29—30 October 2003

18—19 February 2004
Strategic People Management (ASP Level 6-Exec Level 1)
Dates
25—27 Aug 2003
8—10 Oct 2003
26—28 Nov 2003
2—4 March 2004
Management Skills Workshop for Graduate Trainees (2003 GTs)
Dates
2—3 February 2004
5—6 February 2004
28—29 July 2003
4—5 Aug 2003
Locally Engaged Staff Leadership & Management Workshop
Dates
4—8 Nov 2003
Heads of Mission/Post Preparatory Program
Dates
23—24 Jul 2003
6—7 Nov 2003

Management retreats/training conducted by DFAT and held off-site

2000–2001

Strategic People Management Workshop (EL1—EL2 levels)						
Date	Location	Total cost	Accommodation (incl Food and Drinks)/ Facilitator Costs	Food	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
19—21 July 2000	Hill Station, Canberra	9,638.68	Venue/Food: 2,490.40 Facilitator: 7,148.28	Included	Nil	Nil
30 Aug—1 Sept 2000	Forestry House, Canberra	10,252.68	Venue/Food: 1,377.86 Facilitator: 8,874.82	Included	Nil	Nil
21—24 Nov 2000	Horizons, Jindabyne	16,801.95	Acc'n/F&D: 7,555.00 Facilitator: 7,970.95	Included	Included	1,276.00
14—16 Feb 2001	CCEGGS, Aquatic Centre Canberra	8,286.84	Venue/Food: 1,491.60 Facilitator: 6,795.24	Included	Nil	Nil
22—25 May 2001	Horizons, Jindabyne	15,139.81	Acc'n/Food: 6,297.00 Facilitator: 7,318.81	Included	Nil	1,524
Locally Engaged Staff Leadership & Management Workshop						
Date	Location	Total cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
23 Oct—3 Nov 2000	Coolangatta Estate, Shoalhaven	20,771.50	Acc'n/Food: 10,816.50 Facilitator: 7,315.00	Included	Included	2,640.00
Management Skills Workshop for Graduate Trainees (GTs)						
Date	Location	Total Cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/Drinks	Transport
(2000 GTs) 5—7 Jul 2000	Forestry House, Canberra	9,930.00	Venue: 1,553.75 Facilitator: 7,810.00	566.25	Nil	Nil

SES Leadership Program						
5—6 Oct 2000	Carrington, Bungendore	11,552.35	Venue/F&D: 3,383.75 Facilitator: 8,168.60	Included	Included	Nil
6—7 March 2001	Boat House by the Lake Canberra	10,948.50	Venue: 1,917.00 Facilitator: 8,368.00	518.50	145.00	Nil
Heads of Mission/Post Preparatory Program						
Date	Location	Total Cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/Drinks	Transport
2—3 Nov 2000	The Brassey, Canberra	10,065.50	Venue/Food: 1,595.50 Facilitator: 8,470.00	Included	Nil	Nil
13—14 Feb 2001	The Boat House by the Lake Canberra	9,385.50	Venue/Food: 2,125.50 Facilitator: 7,260.00	Included	Nil	Nil
TOTAL ($)		132,773.31				

2001–2002

Strategic People Management Workshop (EL1—EL2 levels)						
Date	Location	Total cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
4—6 July 2001	CCEGGS, Aquatic Centre Canberra	7,659.35	Venue: 627.27 Facilitator: 6,221.48	Catering: 810.60	Nil	Nil
11—14 Sept 2001	Horizons, Jindabyne	14,070.62	Acc'n/Food: 5,403.18 Facilitator: 7,143.44	Included	Nil	1,524
7—9 Nov 2001	CCEGGS, Aquatic Centre Canberra	8,805.71	Venue: 627.27 Facilitator: 6,861.16	Catering: 1,317.28	Nil	Nil
13—15 Feb 2002	CCEGGS,	8,479.45	Venue: 627.27	Catering:	Nil	Nil

	Aquatic Centre Canberra		Facilitator: 6,708.36	1,143.82		
9—12 April 2002	Horizons, Jindabyne	15,321.49	Venue: 2,400.00 Facilitator: 7,122.48	Catering/Equipt Hire: 4,275.01	Nil	1,524
5—7 June 2002	CCEGGS, Aquatic Centre Canberra	8,467.08	Venue: 627.27 Facilitator: 6,708.36	Catering: 1,131.45	Nil	Nil
Locally Engaged Staff Leadership & Management Workshop						
Date	Location	Total cost	Accommodation Costs	Food costs	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
9—13 Oct 2001	Mollymook Shores	26,746.13	Acc'n/Food: 15,651.95 Facilitator: 8,454.18	Included	Included	2,640.00
Management Skills Workshop for Graduate Trainees						
Date	Location	Total Cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/Drinks	Transport
(2001 GTs) 4—5 Jul 2001	The Brassey, Canberra	6,741.50	Venue/Food: 825.00 Facilitator: 4,459.00	1,457.50	Nil	Nil
21—22 Jan 2002	MTAA House, Canberra	4,594.00	Venue: 440.00 Facilitator: 4,154.00	Nil	Nil	Nil
29—30 Jan 2002	MTAA House, Canberra	4,594.00	Venue: 440.00 Facilitator: 4,154.00	Nil	Nil	Nil
SES Leadership Program						
Date	Location	Total Cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/Drinks	Transport
9—10 Apr 2002	Hotel Kurrajong, Canberra	11,843.50	Venue/F&D: 1,984.50 Facilitator: 9,859.00	Included	Included	Nil
Heads of Mission/Post Preparatory Program						
Date	Location	Total Cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/Drinks	Transport
6—7 Dec 2001	Rydges Cap. Hill, Canberra	7,316.50	Venue/Food: 1,992.50 Facilitator: 5,324.00	Included	Nil	Nil

4—5 April 2002	The Brassey, Canberra	8,327.50	Venue: 1,050.00 Facilitator: 6,762.00	515.50	Nil	Nil
TOTAL ($)		132,966.83				

2002–2003

Strategic People Management Workshop (EL1—EL2 levels)						
Date	Location	Total cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
28—30 Aug 2002	CCEGGS, Aquatic Centre Canberra	8,777.96	Venue: 690.00 Facilitator: 6,716.36	Catering: 1,371.60	Nil	Nil
8—11 Oct 2002	Horizons, Jindabyne	17,883.32	Acc'n/Food: 8,671.00 Facilitator: 7,206.32	Included	482.00	1,524
4—6 Dec 2002	CCEGGS, Aquatic Centre Canberra	8,713.60	Venue/Food: 1,985.40 Facilitator: 6,728.20	Included	Nil	Nil
26—28 May 2003	MTAA House, Canberra	7,057.00	Venue/Food: 660.00 Facilitator: 6,397.00	Included	Nil	Nil
Locally Engaged Staff Leadership & Management Workshop						
Date	Location	Total cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
29 Oct - 2 Nov 2002	Mollymook Shores	24,989.54	Venue/Food: 15,024.75 Facilitator: 7,324.79	Included	Included	2,640
BB4 (Exec Level 2) Leadership & Management Workshop						
Date	Location	Total cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
3—4 Oct 2002	MTAA House, Canberra	15,672.52	Venue: 440.00 Facilitator: 15,232.52	Nil	Nil	Nil
27—28 Feb 2003	MTAA House, Canberra	8,441.00	Venue: 440.00 Facilitator: 8,001.00	Nil	Nil	Nil

Management Skills Workshop for Graduate Trainees						
Date	Location	Total Cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/Drinks	Transport
(2002 GTs) 23—24 Jul 2002	MTAA House, Canberra	4,274.50	Venue: 440.00 Facilitator: 3,834.50	Nil	Nil	Nil
25—26 Jul 2002	MTAA House, Canberra	4,274.50	Venue: 440.00 Facilitator: 3,834.50	Nil	Nil	Nil
20—21 Jan 2003	MTAA House, Canberra	4,480.00	Venue: 440.00 Facilitator: 4,040.00	Nil	Nil	Nil
3—4 Feb 2003	MTAA House, Canberra	4,480.00	Venue: 440.00 Facilitator: 4,040.00	Nil	Nil	Nil
SES Leadership Program						
Date	Location	Total Cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/Drinks	Transport
21—22 May 2003	Hotel Kurrajong, Canberra	9,530.25	Venue/F&D: 1,813.25 Facilitator: 7,717.00	Included	Included	Nil
Heads of Mission/Post Preparatory Program						
Date	Location	Total Cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/Drinks	Transport
12 Sept 2002	Hotel Kurrajong, Canberra	9,129.30	Venue/Food: 1,812.80 Facilitator: 7,316.50	Included	Nil	Nil
11—12 Dec 2002	Hotel Kurrajong, Canberra	7,644.00	Venue/Food: 1,418.00 Facilitator: 6,226.00	Included	Nil	Nil
16—17 Apr 2002	Hotel Kurrajong, Canberra	8,465.00	Venue/Food: 1,455.00 Facilitator: 7,010.00	Included	Nil	Nil
TOTAL ($)		143,811.49				

2003/2004 (to 22 March 2004)

Strategic People Management Workshop (APS Levels 6—Exec level 1)						
Date	Location	Total cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
25—27 Aug 2003	MTAA House, Canberra	7,029.00	Venue/Food: 660.00 Facilitator: 6,369.00	Included	Nil	Nil
8—10 Oct 2003	MTAA House, Canberra	7,029.00	Venue/Food: 660.00 Facilitator: 6,369.00	Included	Nil	Nil
26—28 Nov 2003	MTAA House, Canberra	7,033.00	Venue/Food: 660.00 Facilitator: 6,373.00	Included	Nil	Nil

Locally Engaged Staff Leadership & Management Workshop						
Date	Location	Total cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
4—8 Nov 2003	Mollymook Shores	27,224.90	Acc'n/Food: 15,155.80 Facilitator: 7,978.30	Included	1,190.80	2,900
Management Skills Workshop for Graduate Trainees						
Date	Location	Total Cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
(2003 GTs) 4—5 Aug 2003	MTAA House, Canberra	4,625.50	Venue: 440.00 Facilitator: 4,185.50	Nil	Nil	Nil
Heads of Mission/Post Preparatory Program						
Date	Location	Total Cost	Accommodation	Food	Alcohol/drinks	Transport
23—24 Jul 2003	Hotel Kurrajong, Canberra	8,072.35	Venue/Food: 1,114.35 Facilitator: 6,958.00	Included	Nil	Nil
6—7 Nov 2003	Hotel Kurrajong, Canberra	8,188.80	Venue/Food: 1,204.80 Facilitator: 6,984.00	Included	Nil	Nil
TOTAL ($)		69,202.55				

Note: **(A)** The Department also conducted Regional Management Conferences during the financial years 2000–2004 in Bangkok, Brisbane, Los Angeles, Buenos Aires, London, Hong Kong, New Delhi and Kuala Lumpur. They were attended by senior departmental officers from Canberra as well as senior administrative officers and locally engaged staff from overseas posts. Costs were incurred by individual posts rather than centrally therefore it would involve substantial use of resources at a number of different posts to provide a comprehensive breakdown of costs.
(B) From time to time, the Department conducts regional Head of Mission meetings both in Canberra and overseas which constitute a form of management retreat/training. As for Regional Management Conferences, costs are incurred by individual posts.

(9) The information below relates to trips to and from Australia only and does not include international travel arranged at overseas posts. It would require the use of substantial resources at all posts to provide that information. It does not include travel to post to take up a long–term posting or return to Australia after posting.

1999–00	1,183 overseas trips undertaken
2000–01	1,269 overseas trips undertaken
2001–02	1,386 overseas trips undertaken
2002–03	1,416 overseas trips undertaken
2003–04 to date	1,120 overseas trips undertaken

Note: It is not possible to provide information on earlier years due to machinery of government changes.

(10). Due to the number of trips and diverse nature of the department's work overseas it is not practical to provide the destinations of the trips.

(11) Cost of overseas trips

	Accommodation	Food/allowances	Airflights	Total
1999–00	$1,481,171	1,217,355	5,451,949	8,150,475
2000–01	$1,366,264	1,195,880	6,073,241	8,635,385
2001–02	$1,385,035	1,372,570	6,940,951	9,698,566
2002–03	$1,204,020	1,584,886	7,404,214	10,193,120
2003–04 to date	$ 889,766	1,205,719	6,464,394	8,559,879

Note: It is not possible to provide information on earlier years due to machinery of government changes.

(12) Cost of domestic trips

	Accommodation	Food/allowances	Airflights	Total
1999–00	$265,659	286,701	925,333	1,477,693
2000–01	$268,767	265,261	839,068	1,373,096
2001–02	$327,022	291,736	857,540	1,476,298
2002–03	$237,947	229,985	788,243	1,256,175
2003–04 to date	$163,922	151,880	580,541	896,343

Note: It is not possible to provide information on earlier years due to machinery of government changes.

(13&14) The Department of Finance and Administration is responsible for costs associated with Ministerial staff including travel.

(15) Advertising costs

1999–2000:	$394,226
2000–01:	$338,237
2001–02:	$310,501
2002–03:	$303,659
2003–04:	$3,302,935* (to 29 February 2004)

* increase due to Smartraveller campaign
Note: To extract figures for earlier years would require a substantial use of resources due to a change in the financial management information systems.

(16) No

(17) Nil

(18) Costs of consultancies

1998–99	$3,186,252
1999–00	$1,922,567
2000–01	$4,555,862
2001–02	$8,856,352
2002–03	$3,735,692
2003–04 (to date)	$3,322,322

Note: Information for earlier years is unavailable.

(19) Yes. DFAT conducted the following surveys:

(a) *Hints for Australian Travellers*—the booklet asks readers to provide feedback or suggestions on ways to improve its content. The request for feedback has been included in the booklet since August 2001.

(b) *Consular Newsletter*—a survey to elicit suggestions for improving the content of the newsletter was conducted in October 2002.

(c) *Travel Advice*—a survey was conducted in January 2003 on the awareness and use of the Department's travel advice by travel agents.

(d) *Travel Advice*—developmental research for the *Smartraveller* public information campaign was conducted with the travel industry and travellers in May 2003.

(e) *Smartraveller* campaign aimed at promoting awareness and use of travel advisories. Market research, on the effectiveness of the campaign, was conducted for the period September 2003 to January 2004.

(f) *Passport Card Survey*—Market research on take up rate for the sale of an Australian Passport Card conducted 1999/2000

(g) Passports Customer Satisfaction Surveys Scale of survey—Telephone contact with 1500 people who had their passports issued in the previous month. Surveys conducted in 2000/01 and 2002/03

(20) Consular Services and Passport Services

(21) Survey findings were as follows:

(a) The request for feedback on *Hints* is an ongoing exercise designed to ensure that the booklet continues to carry information that is regarded as useful and relevant to Australian travellers.

(b) No significant findings could be derived from the October 2002 survey on the content of the *Consular Newsletter* due to the small number of subscribers who responded.

(c) The findings from the January 2003 survey on the awareness and use of travel advice by travel agents were:

- 78% indicated strong or significant interest in the information contained in advisories;
- 95% encouraged clients to inform themselves about personal security awareness before travel to any country they believed to carry security risks;
- 69% described their awareness of travel advisories as significantly or moderately greater than twelve months ago;
- 90% described their clients' awareness of travel advisories as significantly or moderately greater;
- 78% described travel advisories as easy to access (none said it was difficult to obtain);
- 80% anticipate accessing travel advisories more frequently in the future;
- 57% said they subscribed to DFAT's travel advisory subscription service.

(d) The purpose of the survey research was to inform the development of the *smartraveller* campaign. Results indicated mixed awareness of the availability and purpose of travel advisories.

(e) The first comprehensive market research results of the *smartraveller* campaign (based on first four months of advertising) indicate an increased awareness and use of travel advice.

(f) 44% of clients would take up the offer of a passport card at a cost of $15.00, and 33% at a cost of $25.00

(g) Passports customers satisfaction survey results

2000/01

91% "good/very good for efficiency and competence"

86.5% "good/very good for courtesy and friendliness"

80% "good/very good for level of knowledge"

89% "good/very good overall level of service received"

2002/03

91% "good/very good for efficiency and competence"

90% "good/very good for courtesy and friendliness"

81% "good/very good for level of knowledge"

90% "good/very good for overall level of service received"