

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 117

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Mandatory Pilotage

Proof Hansard Page: 14-15 (28 May 2015)

Senator Gallacher, Alex asked:

...

Senator GALLACHER: We are a trading nation and we ship huge amounts of produce all over the world 24 hours a day 365 days a year. Are all of those boats under Australian pilots? Is that what you are telling me?

Mr Dolan: There are two types of pilotage. There is port pilotage, where to be able to get a vessel safely out of a harbour you need a pilot input, and there are a range of ports where that is a requirement. There is also coastal pilotage, which is essentially the Great Barrier Reef and the Torres Strait, where there is, again, compulsory pilotage of all commercial vessels going through there.

Senator GALLACHER: Was the Chinese ship that ran aground under an Australian pilot?

Mr Dolan: No, it was outside the mandatory pilotage area. It was south of the mandatory pilotage area.

Senator GALLACHER: So there is a limitation on where we actually provide the pilot?

Mr Dolan: There is a defined area.

Senator GALLACHER: And that just doesn't happen to be outside of the Barrier Reef? It happens to be what?

Mr Dolan: It is largely coincident with the Barrier Reef. As I recall, but I may have to take this on notice, it was extended somewhat after the event.

Mr Mrdak: I think when the Maritime Safety Authority appear shortly, they will be able to give you a better definition. There was an extension of the required pilotage area recently. I think that AMSA is best placed to give us information on that.

Senator GALLACHER: I accept that, but these are the priorities of ATSB—

Mr Mrdak: Yes, I understand.

Senator GALLACHER: that we have had listed.

Mr Mrdak: Yes, I just think that it is a matter of fact that we cannot give you a definitive answer without AMSA.

...

Answer:

The *Shen Neng 1* was well outside the mandatory pilotage area and the area monitored by the Great Barrier Reef and Torres Strait Vessel Traffic Service (REEFVTS) when the ship ran aground on Douglas Shoal in April 2010.

Since that time, the area in which there is mandatory ship reporting to REEFVTS has been extended south from Mackay to the southern boundary of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. Associated protective measures in the form of new two-way routes have also been extended southwards to the southern boundary of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. These extensions now include the location where the *Shen Neng 1* ran aground.

The existing regions requiring mandatory pilotage have not changed. These regions are Torres Strait, the Great North East Channel, Whitsunday Islands, Inner Great Barrier Reef north from Cairns and Hydrographers Passage.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 118

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Dedicated Airborne Search and Rescue Services

Proof Hansard Page: 50 (28 May 2015)

Senator Conroy, Stephen asked:

...

Senator CONROY: What was the previous contract worth? Five years, 10 years or 12 years?

Mr Lloyd: It was a seven-year contract. I would have to take it on notice. We can come back with the contract.

Senator CONROY: What were you paying per year on the previous contract?

Mr Lloyd: I will take that on notice.

...

Answer:

The current contract for dedicated airborne search and rescue services is still in place with AeroRescue Pty Ltd. The service began in 2005 and will complete in 2017, with each base having operated for 10 years.

The value of annual payments has not been made public by the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA). As *AeroRescue* exists solely to provide a service to AMSA, if annual payment information was disclosed it would be possible to analyse payments and reveal information about the current service provider's commercial strategy and thereby disadvantage *AeroRescue*. It would therefore be appropriate to treat the information as "commercial in confidence" and not disclose it publicly.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 119

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Search and Rescue Aircraft Arrival Times

Proof Hansard Page: 52 (28 May 2015)

Senator Conroy, Stephen asked:

...

Senator CONROY: There is still arrival time for the original planes. It was just that it was based in five places. If you worked it out on an average, which is generally how you would do a comparison, there might be a small amount of difference between arrival time and if you wanted the same capability from the same arrival time originally. It may not be right. I am just trying to understand how you calculate it into your costs.

Mr Prosser: I think that was part of our tender assessment. We were getting the best value for money proposition and looking at the services that were provided and how they would respond with timeliness et cetera. But we could probably provide more information on notice on that, if required.

Senator CONROY: That would be great. Thank you...

Answer:

In August 2013, the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) released a request for tender (RFT) to replace the current dedicated airborne search and rescue service. The RFT specified a maximum standing charge and key minimum requirements of the service, including the number and distribution of aircraft bases. AMSA also provided historical data on search locations from 2010 to 2012. Each tenderer was invited to propose aircraft types and numbers, the bases where they would be located and to calculate the resultant average time to reach all of the historical incidents.

AMSA took into account many factors that made up the price, the capability offered, and the risk inherent in each bid to decide which proposal offered the best value for money to the Commonwealth. The contract was signed within the specified maximum standing charge. The future capability will use faster and longer range aircraft to provide a similar level of service, using fewer aircraft.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 120

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Search and Rescue Capability Provider, Cobham SAR Services Pty Ltd

Proof Hansard Page: 52 (28 May 2015)

Senator Conroy, Stephen asked:

...

Senator CONROY: ... You said you retrofitted the windows. Do you buy the planes? Who is the winning tenderer?

Mr Lloyd: Cobham.

Senator CONROY: Where are they based?

Mr Lloyd: Out of Adelaide. Just for reference, they are the current surveillance contractor for Border Protection Command, or customs.

Senator CONROY: They are not an Australian company? They are an overseas company?

Mr Prosser: I believe that they are a UK company, but I am not quite sure. We could take that on notice.

...

Answer:

In October 2014 Cobham SAR Services Pty Ltd was awarded a 12-year contract to provide the Australian Maritime Safety Authority with a dedicated airborne search and rescue service.

Cobham SAR Services Pty Ltd is an Australian company that is a wholly owned subsidiary of National Jet Systems Pty Ltd, itself a wholly owned subsidiary of Cobham's Australian parent, Jet Systems Pty Ltd. Jet Systems Pty Ltd is owned by Cobham plc, a company based in the United Kingdom.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 121

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: New Search and Rescue Aircraft – engine and air frame hours

Proof Hansard Page: 53 (28 May 2015)

Senator Conroy, Stephen asked:

...

Senator CONROY: So they are being fitted out?

Mr Lloyd: Correct.

Senator CONROY: And who is fitting them out?

Mr Lloyd: It is a combination. Actual structural changes will be done in Canada, and then the aircraft will come to Adelaide, where they have their mission management and sensors fitted.

Senator CONROY: The sensors?

Mr Lloyd: Yes. Approximate new. They have been refurbished and repainted. They are approximately seven years old. That was part of the contract—to ensure that the reliability and the age of the plane was not an issue.

Senator CONROY: So they are not new planes; they are used planes that have been refurbished?

Mr Lloyd: Yes.

CHAIR: How many hours have they been used?

Mr Lloyd: I could take it on notice. They are seven years old from when they were produced.

CHAIR: Hours is the thing. It does not matter how old they are. Engine and air frame hours would be helpful, thanks.

...

Answer:

Cobham SAR Services Pty Ltd will acquire, operate and maintain the aircraft to provide the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) with a dedicated airborne search and rescue service for the life of the contract. AMSA considered the aircraft to be acquired, the age of the aircraft, and the capacity for ongoing industry support to the Challenger aircraft type over the term of the contract. The engine and air frame hours are not detailed in the contract.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 122

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Australian Crewed Vessels

Proof Hansard Page: 54-56 (28 May 2015)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

...

Mr Prosser: Just ships?

Senator RICE: Yes. That is what I have been told—that you detain an average of one international tanker every month.

Mr Prosser: Last year we had 270 port state controlled detentions.

Senator RICE: That is one every couple of days. Many more than one a month.

Mr Prosser: But that is all ships.

Senator RICE: That is all ships. So tankers, being one a month, is probably—

Mr Prosser: I will take that on notice as far as what the world tanker composition of that is.

Senator RICE: **Am I right that Australian crewed tankers have never been detained once in 36 years of service?**

Mr Prosser: I would have to take that on notice. I cannot give you that answer at this time.

Senator RICE: I have been told. Presumably, it is public information, as you say, that is on your website?

Mr Prosser: We also do not have any.

Ms O'Connell: There are no Australian tankers.

Senator RICE: Well, there have been. Australian-crewed tankers is what I am asking about.

Mr Prosser: And you going back how many years, did you say?

Senator RICE: Even 36 years.

Mr Prosser: We can provide that information on notice, I think.

Senator Cash: At the end of the day, though, the same high standards apply to Australian vessels as they do, obviously, to foreign vessels.

Senator RICE: But the comparison between detaining an internationally crewed tanker once a month and Australian crewed vessels is—

Senator Cash: The same standards apply, and AMSA will take action if the wrong thing is done. I do not want there to be any dispute about that.

Senator RICE: No. I am just highlighting the difference between the Australian crewed tankers, which I am told have not ever been detained once in 36 years of service, compared to the international ones.

Ms O'Connell: I just want to get this clarified. There are no Australian crewed tankers.

Senator RICE: As of now. But there has been in the past.

Ms O'Connell: That would be some time ago, but, yes.

CHAIR: I seek a clarification. The request on notice is to go back 36 years. Is that feasible?

Senator Cash: I would have to ask Mr Prosser.

CHAIR: Can you lighten up your request?

Senator RICE: I trust the information that I have been given...

...

Senator RICE: But this is the point of my question. It is the difference and the increased risk as we have gotten rid of Australian jobs with Australian high standards. It is the contrast between having to detain one international tanker every month compared with never having had to detain a tanker crewed by Australian sailors.

Ms O'Connell: I am not sure that that is correct. We will check that. I know that we have looked in the past at Australian crewed vessels and detention rates versus foreign crewed vessels and detention rates. We will have to get the data back for you. Mr Prosser has the data. It does not separate out tankers, but it talks about vessels.

...

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Senator RICE: I am particularly interested in terms of not just overall ships but with tankers, particularly because of the risk of accidents with the increasing number of foreign flagged vessels that are going to be going through the Great Barrier Reef and the increase in risk of accidents occurring in those waters.

Senator STERLE: I am more worried about Australian jobs and security.

Senator RICE: Exactly. Thank you.

Answer:

1. In 2014 a total of 3,742 port State control inspections were carried out by the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA). Of these inspections, 269 ships were detained. This equates to an overall detention rate of 7.2 percent.

In relation specifically to 'tankers':

- 244 oil tankers were inspected resulting in 10 detentions. This represents an average detention rate of 4.1 percent for oil tankers.
 - 194 chemical and Noxious Liquid Substances (NLS) tankers were inspected (169 chemical tankers and 25 NLS tankers). This resulted in three detentions which is an average detention rate of 1.5 percent for chemical and NLS tankers.
2. AMSA's port State control ship inspection database, *Shipsys*, includes data from 1990. *Shipsys* records indicate that 26 Australian tankers have been subject to 223 flag State control inspections since 1990 and two Australian tankers were detained:
 - *MV Palmerston* detained on 3/7/1998; and
 - *MV Tasman* detained 5/7/2001.
 3. Information prior to 1990 is not maintained in an automated data management system and is therefore not readily accessible. In order for AMSA to provide data for those years prior to 1990 would therefore be an unreasonable diversion of resources.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
 Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 123

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Port State Control Inspections

Proof Hansard Page: 56 (28 May 2015)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

...

Mr Prosser: In general, we normally look at port state control for foreign flagged and then flag for state control for our own vessels. There is not a discernible difference between the flag. The flag is not the determinant. It is the operator that makes the difference. Look at issues such as, for example, deficiencies per inspection. Last year, from a port state control perspective, there were 2.5 deficiencies per inspection for overseas ships and there were 3.8 deficiencies for our flag state arrangements. But it is hard with statistics because the numbers of Australian vessels are very low. But there is no discernible trend that we can take at this point in time.

Senator STERLE: Can we get those figures tabled—how many actual inspections there were?

Mr Prosser: I think they were tabled on notice last time at the last Senate estimates. We provided the 2013 port state control report. The 2014 report is almost ready for publication on our website as well.

...

Answer:

The Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) conducts an extensive Port State Control (PSC) programme. The programme is undertaken in line with the International Maritime Organization conventions on ship safety and pollution prevention and the provisions noted within the Australian *Navigation Act 2012* and subordinate marine orders.

In 2014, AMSA carried out 80 Flag State Control inspections on Australian flagged ships and 3,742 PSC inspections on foreign flagged ships. The breakdown of Australian and foreign flagged detention and deficiency rates are as follows:

Year	2012		2013		2014	
	Foreign	Australian	Foreign	Australian	Foreign	Australian
Inspections	3,179	76	3,342	66	3,742	80
No. of Detentions	210	3	233	5	269	3
Detention rate	6.6%	3.9%	7.0%	7.6%	7.2%	3.8%
Deficiencies per inspection	2.4	2.7	2.4	3.9	2.9	4.0

Details of AMSA's PSC programmes are summarised in PSC annual reports publicly available for the years 1998 to 2014 at: <http://www.amsa.gov.au/forms-and-publications/International/publications/Ship-Safety/PSC-Annual-Reports/index.asp>. The 2014 PSC Annual Report will be published shortly.

In addition, AMSA publishes an online monthly report that provides full details of all detentions for the relevant month. These monthly reports are retained online back until 2010. This information includes the 2014 monthly detention details and can be accessed at: <http://www.amsa.gov.au/vessels/ship-safety/port-state-control/ship-detention/index.asp>.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 124

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Livestock Vessels

Proof Hansard Page: 57 (28 May 2015)

Senator Rhiannon, Lee asked:

...

Senator RHIANNON: How often are these inspections required to be performed?

Mr Prosser: Are you talking particularly with livestock vessels?

Senator RHIANNON: Yes, please.

Mr Prosser: I will take that on notice, and we will provide detail for that.

Senator RHIANNON: I am interested in how many inspections are required to be performed. Can you explain how we work it out? Is it per year, per week or per how many times this vessel comes to port? Could you explain your methodology there? I am interested in how many inspections have been performed since the beginning of 2014.

Mr Prosser: I think it is best to answer your question on notice.

Senator RHIANNON: On which ships and who performed it?

Mr Prosser: Okay.

Senator RHIANNON: I want to stick with Western Australia. How many inspectors do you have based in Western Australia?

Mr Prosser: We have a number of survey officers in Western Australia.

Senator RHIANNON: And is a survey officer your name for an inspector, is it?

Mr Prosser: That is correct. So in Fremantle and Karratha. I would have to give you on notice the actual number of surveyors in each of the offices in WA.

Senator RHIANNON: If you could and where they are based. I am trying to get a sense of how often these ships are inspected. We do get a number of complaints. I am interested in understanding the process.

Mr Prosser: We take a very proactive approach to where we appoint our port surveyors. We look at what the shipping trends are and what the projected growth is going to be to make sure that we can place our surveyors in the most valuable position to do their job.

Senator RHIANNON: Thank you for explaining that. If you are making that determination so that they are most effective in their job, could you provide the committee with an up-to-date list of the reported concerns and complaints that they have recorded as a result of their inspections?

Mr Prosser: When you say complaints, could you provide a bit more detail on that?

Senator RHIANNON: Issues that they find—that there are not enough water vessels, that the cages are too small or that the cow might get its head caught in the fence as it walks up the ramp. I am not sure. I am just trying to get a sense of whether they identify problems and whether they just randomly report, or whether you have categories by which they make this report.

Mr Prosser: I think the best way to answer that would be, on our question on notice, to provide some information about what deficiencies we have found.

Senator RHIANNON: Thank you for that. When a person goes in to inspect, are they ticking boxes? Are there certain categories that they look for? Or are they just making a general report that you can then file away?

Mr Prosser: All of our surveyors undergo a continuous training regime, where we make sure they are surveying to a common standard. They are constantly upgraded on that to make sure that their surveys are effective. It is not just a tick the box scenario. They will be looking at the vessel from a number of different aspects.

Senator RHIANNON: And you will be able to supply what those aspects are?

Mr Prosser: I think we should be able to, yes, Senator.

Senator RHIANNON: Thank you.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Answer:

The Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) is responsible for ensuring the safe handling/storage of certain higher risk cargoes – including livestock. The regulations for the carriage of livestock are made under the *Navigation Act 2012* and are contained in Marine Order 43 (Cargo and cargo handling – livestock) 2006.

Marine Order 43 sets out construction and material requirements for provision of livestock services and for safe stowage and operation of vessels engaged in carrying livestock.

Under Marine Order 43 a livestock vessel cannot load livestock in Australia until a preload inspection has been carried out by an AMSA inspector. Vessels on short voyages of less than 10 days are only required to be inspected every 60 days, although an inspection may be conducted at shorter intervals.

The purpose of the preload inspection is to confirm that livestock equipment complies with Marine Order 43 and accords with the Record of Equipment referenced in the Australian Certificate for the Carriage of Livestock. This record details the material arrangements on the vessel which include:

- Power generation;
- Vessel stability;
- Ventilation;
- Lighting;
- Pens, pen rails and gates;
- Ramps and passageways;
- Water supply systems;
- Food supply systems; and
- Drainage.

The details of livestock vessel preload inspections carried out by AMSA between 1 January 2014 and 17 June 2015 at Western Australian ports is provided at [Attachment A](#).

AMSA employs the following number of surveyors based in Western Australian offices:

Office	Number of Surveyors
Fremantle	8
Karratha	4
Port Hedland	3
Geraldton	1

Details of deficiencies found on livestock vessels between 1 January 2014 and 17 June 2015 at Western Australian ports is provided at [Attachment B](#).

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Attachment A

Livestock vessel preload inspections carried out by AMSA between 1 January 2014 and 17 June 2015 at Western Australian ports:

Ship Name	Ship Type	Inspections	Deficiencies
AL MESSILAH	livestock carrier	10	17
AL SHUWAIKH	livestock carrier	8	3
ANGUS EXPRESS	livestock carrier	2	9
AWASSI EXPRESS	livestock carrier	4	12
BADER III	livestock carrier	5	32
BARKLY PEARL	livestock carrier	5	9
BISON EXPRESS	livestock carrier	2	4
BRAHMAN EXPRESS	livestock carrier	2	12
DAREEN	livestock carrier	1	0
DEVON EXPRESS	livestock carrier	4	3
DIAMANTINA	livestock carrier	3	10
FINOLA	livestock carrier	2	4
GALLOWAY EXPRESS	livestock carrier	2	0
GANADO EXPRESS	livestock carrier	1	2
GELBRAY EXPRESS	livestock carrier	3	2
GHENA	livestock carrier	3	4
GL LAN XIU	livestock carrier	2	2
LINCOLN EXPRESS	livestock carrier	11	15
MAYSORA	livestock carrier	1	2
NADA	livestock carrier	2	13
NINE EAGLE	livestock carrier	1	2
OCEAN DROVER	livestock carrier	4	22
OCEAN OUTBACK	livestock carrier	1	3
SAHIWAL EXPRESS	livestock carrier	3	4
SHORTHORN EXPRESS	livestock carrier	2	1
Total		84	187

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
 Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Attachment B

Number of inspections/deficiencies by Western Australian ports:

Port	Inspections	Deficiencies
Broome	10	17
Fremantle	65	164
Geraldton	6	6
Wyndham	3	0
Total	84	187

Number of deficiencies by type:

Deficiency Type	Number
Ventilation systems/fans	17
Fodder systems	13
Power generation	25
Water systems	7
Sewage/drainage systems	3
Lighting systems (except emergency)	3
Emergency lighting/signage/switchboard	3
Fire detection/fighting	10
Pens	25
Corrosion	18
Watertight door/access/seals/instructions general	16
Other minor deficiencies	47
Total	187

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 125

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Search and Rescue Sub Programme 1.1.2

Proof Hansard Page: 58 (28 May 2015)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: Mr Prosser, I take you to page 99 of the portfolio budget statement.

Mr Prosser: Yes.

Senator STERLE: Do you see the yellow highlighted part that I made?

Mr Prosser: No

Senator STERLE: AMSA lists this as a KPI for search and rescue subprogram 1.12 search and rescue:

Maximise percentage of saved lives as a portion of lives at risk (a person is defined as being at risk if the person has a chance of surviving the initial maritime or aviation accident).

Am I right that your targets after this financial year are estimated at the moment at 99 per cent?

Mr Prosser: I think our target would have been 100 per cent this year. Ninety-nine per cent is our actual target.

We will always be trying to save everyone we can. That is the bottom line.

Senator STERLE: For 2014-15, yes. Then your targets are 100 per cent. Right?

Mr Prosser: Yes.

Senator STERLE: Can you tell me what the estimated numerator and denominator for that measure is?

Mr Prosser: I might ask Mr Lloyd if he can help or if we need to take that on notice.

Senator STERLE: Sure.

Mr Lloyd: I believe the question is how we actually calculate the percentage figure.

Senator STERLE: That is it.

Mr Lloyd: Simply there, it is the number of lives that are assessed at risk. Then we look at the number of lives that were lost and differentiate those. For example, if there was no chance that the person survived an air crash, then of course that is not regarded as a life lost. So that assessment is made and then, of course, the figure is divided to get your percentage.

Senator STERLE: I know what 100 per cent means. So, for 2014-15, could you provide the committee with just the numbers and the situation and differentiate between aviation and maritime? You could do that for us?

Mr Lloyd: We can, yes.

Senator STERLE: If you can take that on notice, that is fantastic, thank you. How do you source your data for that KPI?

Mr Lloyd: From our incident response systems.

Senator STERLE: All from that?

Mr Lloyd: Yes.

Senator STERLE: Out of curiosity, does 'person' include asylum seekers?

Mr Lloyd: The figures have included that. We would have to check. There has been a significant change from previous years to now. Yes, they would be involved.

Senator STERLE: It may be helpful for that question to go back a couple of years, if you could.

Mr Prosser: I will add to that. It is of note that from 1 July 2014 to 30 April this year there were 231 persons rescued from distressed situations. We have had roughly one a day.

Senator STERLE: And that is all maritime?

Mr Prosser: We are aviation and maritime, so it could be somebody with a four-wheel drive broken down in the Simpson Desert.

Senator STERLE: Sorry to cut you off, Mr Prosser, but that is why I asked you to differentiate between maritime and aviation. At least you know from June or July 2014 to April this year there has been 231. Mr

Lloyd said he would take that on notice. But if you have them all there and it saves you taking them on notice—

Mr Prosser: That was just a headline I got.

Senator STERLE: Take it on notice. I understand that there is a bit of work in it. You have to go back a couple of years so we can see the asylum seeker numbers. Thank you, gentlemen, and thank you, Chair.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
 Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Answer:

The Key Performance Indicator (KPI) for sub programme 1.1.2 is the percentage of saved lives as a proportion of lives at risk. A person is defined as being at risk if the person has a chance of surviving the initial maritime or aviation accident. AMSA applies additional criteria relating to coordination arrangements and to the Australian search and rescue region to avoid double-counting incidents with other authorities involved or reaching misleading conclusions about Australian search and rescue system performance.

The KPI calculation is:

- $KPI = \text{Lives saved} / \text{Lives at risk} \%$.

The KPI results for the financial years 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 to the end of May 2015 are detailed in Table 1 below. The reportable KPI includes maritime, aviation and land incidents. Table 2 details the subset of maritime incidents that contribute to the reportable KPI calculation. Table 3 details aviation incidents. Lives lost have been added to Table 2 to provide the number of lives related to suspected illegal entry vessels as requested.

Table 1 – Portfolio Budget Statement reportable KPI result

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15 (to end May 2015)
Lives saved	8978	4619	256
Lives at risk	9091	4638	260
KPI result	98.7%	99.59%	98.5%

Table 2 – Maritime input to KPI calculation

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15 (to end May 2015)
Lives saved	8928	4589	219
Lives at risk	9031	4605	223
Lives lost	103 (99 SIEV)	16 (13 SIEV)	4

Table 3 – Aviation input to KPI calculation

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15 (to end May 2015)
Lives saved	12	9	19
Lives at risk	22	12	19

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 126

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Livestock Vessels

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Rhiannon, Lee asked:

1. Under the Australian Standards for the export of livestock (ASEL) who is responsible for on board ship inspections of livestock vessels in Western Australian ports?
 - a. How independent are these inspections?
 - b. Are they paid for by the exporter?
 - i. If so does this mean there is a conflict of interest?
2. How often are such inspections supposed to be performed?
3. How many were performed since the beginning of 2014, on which ships and by whom?
4. How many inspectors are there in WA who are authorised to perform on board ship inspections?
5. May I have an up to date list of reported concerns/complaints recorded from such inspections, the details and outcomes?

Answer:

1. On board ship inspections of livestock vessels that relate to the Australian Standards for the export of livestock (ASEL) are the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture.

The Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) is responsible for compliance with regulations made under the *Navigation Act 2012* and contained in Marine Order 43 (Cargo and cargo handling – livestock) 2006.
- 2-5. The answers to parts 2-5 of the question in relation to inspections of livestock vessels carried out by AMSA in accordance with Marine Order 43 are provided in the answer to Question on Notice 124.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 127

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: North East Shipping Management Plan – marine pollution incident

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Waters, Larissa asked:

1. We're very lucky that when the *Shen Neng* ran aground in 2010 the cargo of 68,000 tonnes of coal didn't end up on the sea floor, given what we know about coal's toxicity. What access to funds would AMSA have in the case of a coal spill on the Great Barrier Reef?
2. Are there funds available right away without having a 5 year legal battle with the insurance companies?
3. I understand that one recommendation of the North East Shipping Management Plan ([NESMP](#)) was that –
Actions:
 - *AMSA to maintain a pollution response reserve of \$10 million and line of credit of \$40 million to ensure immediate access to funds in the event of a marine pollution incident.*
 - *GBRMPA and AMSA to investigate means of securing funding for restitution of non-pollution damage to coral reefs following a ship incident*
- a. To clarify – would non-pollution damage to coral reefs ~~would~~ include remediation of the Shen Neng contamination?
- b. Would it include a coal spill?
- c. What's the progress on the above action?
- d. Can you explain what you've done so far?
- e. How many FTE have you got working on the second of those two actions?
4. What would the procedure be in the event of a coal spill?
5. How much research have we got to draw on about the consequences of a big coal spill?
6. What is AMSA's understanding of the risks of a large coal spill on the Reef?

Answer:

1. In 2012-13 the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) established a \$10 million pollution response reserve to meet the immediate costs of responding to pollution of the sea or harm to the marine environment by oil or hazardous and noxious substances, as set out in the National Plan for Maritime Environmental Emergencies (the National Plan). The pollution response reserve was supplemented in 2013-14 by a \$40 million unsecured commercial line of credit which provides immediate access to a total pollution response funding capacity of \$50 million.
2. See answer to question 1.
3.
 - a. Funding for restitution of non-pollution damage, such as the physical impact of a ship's hull on a reef, would not be covered under the National Plan arrangements. Funding for contamination by hazardous and noxious substances, such as tributyltin (TBT) anti-fouling paint scraped from a ship's hull, would be covered where response actions seek to enhance the natural processes of recovery, as defined in the National Plan.
The pollution response reserve is one aspect of an overall capability established to respond effectively to a pollution incident caused by a shipping accident. The National Plan provides a comprehensive strategy for responding promptly and efficiently to maritime incidents and includes a network of emergency towage vessels to prevent ships from running aground, strategically positioned response equipment stockpiles, and a regulatory framework to support a coordinated approach to emergency responses.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Importantly, the Plan outlines the approach not only to response and recovery arrangements but also to prevention and preparedness.

- b. The pollution response reserve is available to respond to pollution from both oil and hazardous and noxious substances as defined in the National Plan. Access to funds from the pollution response reserve may, therefore, include a coal spill if it was likely to create hazards to human health, to harm living resources and marine life, to damage amenities or to interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea.

In addition to the pollution response reserve, admissible claims can be pursued through ship owners and insurers to recover costs associated with damage to the marine environment not covered by the National Plan and international oil spill conventions. The options to be considered would depend on the circumstances.

- c. As outlined in answer to part 1, AMSA established a \$10 million pollution response reserve in 2012-13 and a commercial line of credit in 2013-14.
 - d. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) and AMSA have held a number of meetings to investigate means of securing funding for restitution of non-pollution damage to coral reefs following an incident. Funding options are being investigated, noting that existing insurance arrangements and international conventions are presently focussed on pollution damage.
 - e. AMSA has assigned one full time officer with core responsibility for coordinating the implementation of the 63 actions under the North East Shipping Management Plan. These actions are being carried out by various officers of AMSA, other agencies and industry.
- 4. The response procedures are set out in the National Plan which provides a comprehensive and integrated response arrangement to minimise the impacts of marine pollution from vessels. Consistent with the National Plan, any response to a maritime incident within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park is a coordinated approach between the GBRMPA, AMSA, Maritime Safety Queensland and other stakeholders.
 - 5. There is limited research on the consequences of a large coal spill. However, at the most fundamental level, coal would smother coral and the focus is on preventing any coal spills in the first instance.
 - 6. Risks to the Great Barrier Reef are set out in the Great Barrier Reef Outlook Report 2014 and were also considered in the development of the North East Shipping Management Plan. Some relevant actions have been completed, such as the establishment of two-way shipping routes in the Great Barrier Reef and extension of the Coral Sea Particularly Sensitive Sea Area and associated ship routeing measures. Actions to address risks are ongoing and safety of navigation and measures to prevent incidents, such as those outlined above, remain a focus.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 128

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: National Ship Strike Strategy

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Waters, Larissa asked:

1. Please provide an update on AMSA's work on the NSSS since last estimates.
2. How many FTE are devoted to the NSSS?

Answer:

1. The Department of the Environment (DoE) has carriage of the National Ship Strike Strategy. Since Senate Additional Estimates on 24 February 2015 the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) has met with DoE to discuss preparation of the National Ship Strike Strategy.
2. AMSA has assigned one officer with core responsibility for coordinating the implementation of the 63 actions in the North East Shipping Management Plan. Six actions directly relate to measures to reduce the impacts of ship noise and ship strikes with cetaceans.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 129

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Underwater Noise

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Waters, Larissa asked:

1. Please provide an update on AMSA's work on creating a guideline on underwater noise which includes mitigation measures, since last estimates.
2. How many FTE are devoted to this task in AMSA?

Answer:

1. Since Senate Additional Estimates on 24 February 2015, the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) has had preliminary discussions with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) on the development of underwater noise guidelines for the Great Barrier Reef. AMSA plans to contribute to this work, drawing from the work undertaken in the development of the International Maritime Organization Guidelines for the Reduction of Underwater Noise from Commercial Shipping to Address Adverse Impacts on Marine Life.

GBRMPA is leading the project to develop guidelines on underwater noise by 2020 identified in the *Reef 2050* Long-term Sustainability Plan. Planning is underway by GBRMPA to consider this work in the 2015-16 financial year.

2. AMSA has assigned one officer with core responsibility for coordinating the implementation of the 63 actions under the North East Shipping Management Plan. Six actions directly relate to measures to reduce the impacts of ship noise and ship strikes with cetaceans.