Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget supplementary questions 2004–2005; December 2004
Answers to questions on notice from Defence Housing Authority

Question 1

Culturally responsive services

Senator Ludwig asked:

For the each of the i) 1999–00, ii) 2000–01, iii) 2001–02, iv) 2002–03, v) 2003–04 financial years, did the Department include in its annual report a report on outcomes achieved for clients from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds?

Answer:
No. DHA's prime role is provision of housing for members of the Australian Defence Force and requests for provision of special services for members with particular linguistic and cultural needs rarely if ever arises.

If not, for the each of the i) 1999–00, ii) 2000–01, iii) 2001–02, iv) 2002–03, v) 2003–04 financial years, did the Department otherwise publish a report on outcomes achieved for clients from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds? (If yes, please supply report)

Answer: *No*.

For the each of the i) 1999–00, ii) 2000–01, iii) 2001–02, iv) 2002–03, v) 2003–04 financial years, did the department budget for costs associated with developing culturally responsive and accessible services?

Answer: *No*.

For the 2003–2004 financial year, how much did the department budget for this purpose?

Answer: *None*.

For the each of the i) 1999–00, ii) 2000–01, iii) 2001–02, iv) 2002–03, v) 2003–04 financial years, how many Departmental programs or services were delivered via an intermediary service provider, such as another level of government or a non-government organisation?

Answer:
DHA's home maintenance services were provided in each year by local contractors.

Of these, in each financial year how many did the funding conditions in contracts specify relevant access and equity accountabilities (for example, collection and reporting of information on client characteristics)?

Answer: *None.*

For each of these, is the provision a standard clause? If so, can the Department please supply the clause?

Answer: *Not applicable.*

If there is no standard provision, is a copy of the provision available for each of these? Are the provisions subsequently audited? If yes, what were the results? (Please supply).

Answer: *Not applicable.*

Question 2

Community information publications

Senator Ludwig asked:

Can the Department provide a current list of each community information publication it publishes in English as at a) the current date (2, December 2004) or if this is unavailable b) 30 June, 2004 (and take from then to 2 December 2004 On Notice) or if this is unavailable c) 1 January 2004 (and take from then to 2 December 2004 on notice) or if this is unavailable d) the last date for which they were available (specify date and take from then to 2 December 2004 On Notice)?

Answer: *The DHA does not produce community information publications.*

For the above list, what publications are translated into languages other than English and for each, what languages are they translated into?

Answer: *Not applicable.*

For the above list, how many copies were printed?

Answer: *Not applicable.*

For the above list, what was the total cost of each document in translation, publication, printing and distribution?

Answer: *Nil.*

Question 3

Non–English speaking employees

Senator Ludwig asked:

What efforts has the Department made to identify employees from a non–English Speaking background and what languages they are fluent in?

Answer:
Ongoing staff are requested to complete the "Promoting Equity in the APS Employment" form. The information sought from staff is provided voluntarily. The information received, part of which is identifying those staff from a non English speaking

background, is provided to the Australian Public Service Employment Database (APSED) as part of the Australian Government's collection of statistics. DHA does not utilise the information collected in identifying staff who may be fluent in languages other than English.

What proportion of the Department's personnel have a non–English speaking background?

Answer:
DHA does not utilise data collected which may identify staff from non English speaking backgrounds.

For each language other than English that the Department has identified employees with fluency, can the Department provide how employees were fluent? For each language other than English, how many were identified as being fluent?

Answer: *See 13 and 14 above.*

Of these employees, what efforts has the department made to identify the language proficiency of these employees? For each language other than English, how many were identified as having proficiency?

Answer: *See 13 and 14 above.*

Of these employees, how many has the Department identified as possessing accredited language skills to either translator or interpreter standard? For each language other than English, how many were identified as having accreditation at the a) translator and b) interpreter level?

Answer: *See 13 and 14 above.*

Of these employees, how many has the Department funded in whole or in part accreditation of language skills to either a) translator and b) interpreter level?

Answer: *Nil.*

How much did the department spend engaging language a) translator and b) interpreter level in each of the financial years i) 2001–02, ii) 2002–03, iii) 2003–04?

Answer: *Nil.*

How many times did the department engage an a) translator and b) interpreter in each of the following years i) 2001–02, ii) 2002–03, iii) 2003–04?

Answer: *Nil.*

For each language in which a) a translator and b) an interpreter was engaged, how many engagements occurred in each of the following years i) 2001–02, ii) 2002–03, iii) 2003–04?

Answer: *Nil.*

What was the total cost of these engagements by language for a) translators and b) interpreters in each of the following years i) 2001–02, ii) 2002–03, iii) 2003–04?

Answer: *Nil*

Question 4

Ethnic press

Senator Ludwig asked:

For each of the financial years i) 1995–96, ii) 1996–97, iii) 1997–98, iv) 1998–99, v) 1999–00, vi) 2000–01, vii) 2001–02, viii) 2002–03, ix) 2003–04 how much was spent in advertising or advertorial in the ethnic press?

Answer:

i. 1995–96 = none
ii. 1996–97 = none
iii. 1997–98 = none
iv. 1998–99 = none
v. 1999–00 = none
vi. 2000–01 = none
vii. 2001–02 = $15,379.75 (inc GST)
viii. 2002–03 = $1,760 (inc GST)
ix. 2003–04 = none

For each of the above years, could the Department please specify each title, in which advertising was bought, the language of that title and the total annual spend on advertising and advertorial in each title.

Answer:

2001–02

Title	Language	Total annual spend
Highlight Property Weekly Magazine	Chinese and English	$6,720.00
Australia China Connections	English	$1,320.00
Australian Immigration Handbook	Chinese and English	$6,679.75
Australian Immigration Handbook Website	English	$660.00
	TOTAL (inc GST)	**$15,379.75**

2002–03

Title	Language	Total annual spend
The Indian Post	English	$1,760.00
	TOTAL (inc GST)	**$1,760.00**

For each of the financial years i) 1995–96, ii) 1996–97, iii) 1997–98, iv) 1998–99, v) 1999–00, vi) 2000–01, vii) 2001–02, viii) 2002–03, ix) 2003–04 how much was spent in advertising and or advertorials on ethnic radio? For each financial year, could the Department please specify which station, broadcast language and how much was spent on each language at each station?

Answer: *Nil.*

Question 5

Break–ins in DHA property

Senator Ludwig asked:

How many break-ins were there on Departmental property in 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04? For each incident:

a) What was the location and the cost of damage associated with each break in?
b) What was the cost of damage conducted during each break in?
c) What was the subject of theft in each break in?
d) What was the cost of any theft associated with each break in?
e) Was anyone charged with the break in (specify if they were employed by the Department)?
f) Was anyone convicted of the break in (specify if they were employed by the Department)?

Answer:

2001–02
(a) Canberra HMC and NSSC offices
$2,500 in repairs to windows, boom gate.
(b) Nil
(c) Cash
(d) $400
(e) No
(f) No

2001–02
(a) Canberra Head Office no material damage
(b) Nil
(c) Computer equipment
(d) $40,000
(e) No
(f) No

2002–03	*(a)*	*Perth Office no material damage*
	(b)	*Nil*
	(c)	*Cash*
	(d)	*$300*
	(e)	*No*
	(f)	*No*
2002-03	*(a)*	*Perth Office, no material damage*
	(b)	*Nil*
	(c)	*Cash*
	(d)	*$300*
	(e)	*No*
	(f)	*No*
2002–03	*(a)*	*Perth Office, no material damage*
	(b)	*Nil*
	(c)	*Laptop computer*
	(d)	*$3,000*
	(e)	*No*
	(f)	*No*
2002–03	*(a)*	*Townsville office, no material damage*
	(b)	*Nil*
	(c)	*Cash*
	(d)	*$200*
	(e)	*No*
	(f)	*No*

Question 6

Incidents of theft

Senator Ludwig asked:

How many thefts of departmental property occurred in 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04? For each incident:

a) What was stolen in each instance?
b) What was the value of the stolen item/s?
c) Where was it stolen from?
d) Was anyone charged with the theft (specify if they were employed by the Department)?
e) Was anyone convicted of the theft (specify if they were employed by the Department)?
f) Were any of the items recovered?

Answer:

2002–03	*(a)*	*Canberra Head Office—credit card*
	(b)	*$2,500*
	(c)	*N/A*
	(d)	*No (employee resigned)*
	(e)	*No*
	(f)	*No*

Question 7

Incidents of fraud

Senator Ludwig asked:

How many incidents of fraud were detected against the department in 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04? For each incident:

a) What was the subject of the fraud in each instance?
b) What was the value of the fraud?
c) Which administrative unit was the subject of the fraud?
d) Was anyone charged with the fraud (specify if they were employed by the Department)?
e) Was anyone convicted of the fraud (specify if they were employed by the Department)?
f) Were any of the defrauded items or was any of the defrauded money recovered?

Answer: *No recorded incidents of fraud in period*.

Question 8

Loss of Departmental property

Senator Ludwig asked:

How many incidents of loss (excluding theft, accident, breakage and vandalism) of departmental property were reported to the department in 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04? For each incident:

a) What was the loss in each instance?
b) What was the value of the loss?
c) Which administrative unit lost the property?
d) Were any of the lost item/s recovered?
e) Was anyone disciplined over the loss?

Answer:

No statistics are readily available and DHA is not prepared to devote the considerable time and resources required to provide the details requested.

Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
Budget supplementary questions 2004–2005; December 2004
Answers to questions on notice from Defence Housing Authority

Question 9

Incidents involving Departmental vehicles

Senator Ludwig asked:

How many vehicular accidents in which departmental vehicles (including vehicles leased by the department) were involved were reported to the department in 2000–01, 2001–02, 2002–03, 2003–04? For each incident:

a) What was the value of the damage?

Answer:
Accidents involving DHA vehicles over the specified period totalled 282 incidents. Total cost of damage to the involved DHA vehicles was $387,812.03.

b) Which administrative unit was the vehicle attached to?

Answer:
DHA has offices located around the nation (major cities and remote locations) and organisationally the majority of vehicles are within the Operations Group. The nature of its business is to provide relocation and housing solutions (and related activities) to its customers. A high proportion of DHA staff in the various regions spend most of their day driving between properties to inspect for maintenance/repairs and assist tenants.

Year	No of vehicles	Value of damage	Region
2000–2001	8	$6,164.89	ACT
	7	$5,511.67	NT
	24	$9,152.22	NSW
	3	$1,268.61	WA
	8	$7,250.08	QLD
	2	$4,136.88	SA
	10	$10,147.82	VIC*
Total	**62**	**$43,632.17**	
2001–2002	16	$16,467.88	ACT
	22	$32,983.95	NSW
	7	$30,434.50	NT
	6 4	$1,835.07 $2,377.24	QLD SA
	13	12,149.08	VIC*
	5	$2,227.90	WA
Total	**73**	**$98,475.62**	
2002–2003	11	$8,776.83	ACT

Year	No of vehicles	Value of damage	Region
	23	$33,930.75	NSW
	13	$8,956.12	NT
	8	$10,679.88	QLD
	4	$1,337.51	SA
	5	$28,557.06	VIC*
	1	$398.55	WA
Total	**65**	**$92,636.70**	
2003–2004	14	$21,877.10	ACT
	33	$97.552.14	NSW
	10	$9,680.75	NT
	19	$15,645.13	QLD
	2	$1,761.25	SA
	2	$5,193.53	VIC*
	2	1,357.60	WA
Total	**82**	**$153,067.54**	
TOTAL VEHICLE DAMAGE COSTS	**282**	**$387,812.03**	

Note: * = Includes Tasmania

c) Was anyone charged over the accident (specify charges)?

Answer: *This information is not available.*

Question 10

Ministerial staff

Senator Ludwig asked:

How many Ministerial staff does the department provide?

Answer: *None.*

To what Minister or Parliamentary Secretary are they assigned?

Answer: *Not applicable.*

What is the total cost of the staff?

Answer: *Not applicable.*

Can the Department provide data on how many staff are in each salary band?

Answer: *Not applicable.*