

The Senate

Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Legislation Committee

Additional estimates 2012–13

March 2013

Commonwealth of Australia
ISBN 978-1-74229-772-9

This document was produced by the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Legislation Committee and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Parliament
House, Canberra.

Membership of the Committee

Members

Senator Patricia Crossin, **Chair**, ALP, NT

Senator Gary Humphries, **Deputy Chair**, LP, ACT

Senator Sue Boyce, LP, QLD

Senator Mark Furner, ALP, QLD

Senator Louise Pratt, ALP, WA

Senator Penny Wright, AG, SA

Senators in attendance

Senator Patricia Crossin (Chair)

Senator Mitch Fifield

Senator Gary Humphries (Deputy Chair)

Senator Sarah Hanson-Young

Senator Sue Boyce

Senator the Hon Bill Heffernan

Senator Mark Furner

Senator John Madigan

Senator Louise Pratt

Senator Gavin Marshall

Senator Penny Wright

Senator Lee Rhiannon

Senator the Hon Eric Abetz

Senator the Hon Michael Ronaldson

Senator the Hon George Brandis

Senator Rachel Siewert

Senator David Bushby

Senator Anne Urquhart

Senator Michaelia Cash

Senator Larissa Waters

Senator the Hon John Faulkner

Senator Nick Xenophon

Secretariat

Ms Julie Dennett

Committee Secretary

Ms Leonie Lam

Research Officer

Suite S1.61

Telephone: (02) 6277 3560

Parliament House

Fax: (02) 6277 5794

CANBERRA ACT 2600

Email: legcon.sen@aph.gov.au

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	vii
Reference of documents	vii
Estimates hearings	vii
Ministers	viii
Questions on notice	viii
Note on references	viii
CHAPTER 1	1
IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP PORTFOLIO	1
Migration Review Tribunal – Refugee Review Tribunal (MRT–RRT)	1
Department of Immigration and Citizenship	2
CHAPTER 2	7
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO	7
Australian Crime Commission	7
Family Court of Australia and the Federal Magistrates Court of Australia	8
Office of the Australian Information Commissioner	8
Attorney-General's Department.....	9
APPENDIX 1	13
DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES FOR WHICH THE COMMITTEE HAS OVERSIGHT	13
Attorney-General's Portfolio	13
Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio	14
APPENDIX 2	15
INDEX OF PROOF HANSARDS	15
APPENDIX 3	17
TABLED DOCUMENTS	17

PREFACE

On 7 February 2013, the Senate referred to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee (committee) for examination the estimates of proposed additional expenditure for the financial year 2012-13. The committee is responsible for the examination of the Attorney-General's Portfolio and the Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio. The portfolio additional estimates statements for 2012-13 were tabled on 7 February 2012.¹

Reference of documents

The Senate referred to the committee, for examination and report, the following documents:

- particulars of proposed additional expenditure in respect of the year ending on 30 June 2013 [Appropriation Bill (No. 3) 2012-2013];
- particulars of certain proposed additional expenditure in respect of the year ending on 30 June 2013 [Appropriation Bill (No. 4) 2012-2013];
- final budget outcome 2011-12; and
- issues from the advances under the annual Appropriation Acts for 2011-12.

The committee was required to report on its consideration of the additional estimates on or before 19 March 2013.

Estimates hearings

The committee met in public session on 11 and 12 February 2013.

Over the course of the two days of hearings, totalling over 21 hours, the committee took evidence from the following departments and agencies:

- Attorney-General's Department
- Australian Crime Commission
- Australian Customs and Border Protection Service
- Australian Human Rights Commission
- CrimTrac Agency
- Department of Immigration and Citizenship
- Family Court of Australia
- Federal Magistrates Court of Australia
- Migration Review Tribunal and Refugee Review Tribunal

1 *Journals of the Senate*, No. 132 - 7 February 2013, pp 3606-3607.

- Office of the Australian Information Commissioner

Copies of the *Hansard* transcripts are available from the committee's internet page at: www.aph.gov.au/senate_legalcon.

An index of the *Hansard* for each portfolio appears at Appendix 2.

Ministers

On 11 February 2013, the committee heard evidence from Senator the Hon Kate Lundy, Minister for Sport, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, and Minister Assisting for Industry and Innovation, representing the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship.

On 12 February 2013, the committee heard evidence from Senator the Hon Joseph Ludwig, Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and Minister Assisting on Queensland Floods Recovery, representing the Attorney-General and the Minister for Justice and Minister for Home Affairs.

Officers from both departments and associated agencies also appeared. The committee thanks the Ministers and officers for their assistance.

Questions on notice

Further written explanations, and answers to questions on notice, will be tabled as soon as possible after they are received. That information is also available on the committee's webpage.

The committee has resolved that the due date for submitting responses to questions on notice from the additional estimates round is 2 April 2013.

Note on references

References to the committee *Hansard* are to the proof *Hansard*. Page numbers may vary between the proof and the official *Hansard* transcript.

CHAPTER 1

IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP PORTFOLIO

1.1 This chapter summarises some of the matters raised during the committee's consideration of the additional estimates for the Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio for the 2012-13 financial year.

Migration Review Tribunal – Refugee Review Tribunal (MRT–RRT)

1.2 The Principal Member of the MRT-RRT, Ms Kay Ransome, highlighted developments within the organisation since its last appearance before the committee at Supplementary Budget Estimates in October 2012. Ms Ransome informed the committee of workload statistics and strategies to deal with an increased workload, including the adoption of a specialisation model in case allocations, which was assessed by an interim review to be a success and has resulted in increased productivity.¹

1.3 The Principal Member advised that the MRT-RRT are on track to determine significantly more cases than the tribunals were able to in 2011-12, with an increase of 57 per cent more cases decided than in the same period in the previous financial year. In line with this upward trajectory, in 2011-12 the MRT-RRT reported an overall increase in applications of 30 per cent; this trend has continued with a 43 per cent increase in lodgements in the first six months of this financial year.²

1.4 In relation to the portfolio additional estimates statement, the committee sought an explanation of how an additional \$4.663 million in allocated funding is to be spent. The committee was informed that the extra funding is to cover approximately 2,500 additional cases that the MRT-RRT has finalised this year, above the base funding for 8,300 cases.³

1.5 The committee was also advised that some of the recommendations in the Lavarch review are yet to be implemented, including: conferral of a discretionary power to dismiss a matter if a person does not attend a hearing; and legislating for tribunals to give reasons for a decision orally rather than in writing, unless otherwise requested by an applicant.⁴

1 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 3-4.

2 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, p. 4.

3 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 6-7.

4 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, p. 9.

Department of Immigration and Citizenship

1.6 The Secretary of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), Mr Martin Bowles PSM, gave an overview of developments in the portfolio since Supplementary Budget Estimates in October 2012. Mr Bowles covered statistical information on the various migration programs, a new online system for selecting independent skilled migrants, progress on the implementation of the recommendations of the Expert Panel on Asylum Seekers, updates on the regional facilities in Nauru and Papua New Guinea, and the numbers and profiles of asylum seekers currently residing at regional processing centres.⁵

Irregular maritime arrivals and budget implications

1.7 The committee sought an explanation on why the budgeted item for Irregular Maritime Arrivals (IMAs) has been lower than the additional estimates for the 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 financial years. Specifically, the committee sought an explanation as to how the irregular maritime arrival caseload could be resolved into the future with a reduced budget for the 2014-15 and 2015-16 financial years.⁶

1.8 The Secretary of DIAC explained that, due to the fluctuating nature of arrivals, the May 2012 Budget allocation has had to be revised in subsequent estimates to accommodate the changed circumstances. Further, since the number of arrivals is one component of the estimates process and not all arrivals are treated in the same way, the budgeted figure cannot remain static:

The budget that we had in the PBS for 2012-13 was \$1.3 billion and the additional estimates statement for [outcome] 4.3 was \$2.124 billion—an increase of \$1.1 billion-odd. That, obviously, in the context of [outcome] 4.3, is to deal with the increase in the numbers. The budget was set...in May last year. Then we saw a spike that happened around the May time frame and there was a need at the additional estimates, and in fact in the supplementary estimates some of this came through to increase the budget for 2012-13. Hence that is what you are seeing as a change. This is a normal process. It is not unusual. If the activity in this space changes we do go back a number of times during the year, and one of them is now, and then obviously the budget. If you move that forward, yes, it does reduce from 2012-13 to 2013-14. But you will also notice it is an increase from the PBS to the additional estimates, recognising that the figure in the PBS was still in need of some improvement, if you like, based on the activity.

...

And then there is a reduction on the premise that, once we implement the recommendations of the expert panel, these numbers will reduce in the out

5 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 12-13.

6 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, p. 21.

years. So that is the premise for the budget. We would revise that again in the context of the budget if that were required.⁷

1.9 The Secretary also explained that the budget calculations are influenced by a number of other factors:

...It is not as simple as to say that everyone who turns up you treat the same way. It is based on arrivals, obviously, but it is also their length of stay, if you like, within the detention network. That is obviously across multiple streams—held detention, community detention and the bridging visa system—and there are varying cost differentials if you are in there. Obviously we will want to take into account a range of other factors like family size, security, health requirements and, of course, the location of facilities. Some locations are obviously more expensive than others if they are in difficult-to-get-to places. That policy position has changed quite a bit over the last 12 to 18 months, because we were in a situation where the majority of people were in held detention. We have already seen a shift in the numbers of people in the detention system since late last year, [with] record numbers in November. We are down to approximately 5½ thousand people in the detention network as we sit today. So it is not quite as simple as just saying 'because the numbers go up'. I appreciate though that, when the numbers do escalate, we need to respond. We responded between the PBS and the additional estimates and obviously in the context of if there were no further improvement, we would need to think about that in the context of the budget.⁸

Enterprise Migration Agreements

1.10 In response to the committee's questions about the Enterprise Migration Agreements (EMAs), DIAC officials informed the committee that it has received four applications to date, including the Roy Hill application which has been agreed to in-principle. There are two sections within DIAC looking after labour agreements, one dealing with resource labour agreements and the other with non-resources labour agreements. The committee was also advised that there are 11 full-time staff working in the resource labour agreement section, 5.3 of whom work on the enterprise migration agreement applications.⁹

Security assessment processes for IMAs and bridging visas

1.11 DIAC representatives updated the committee on the number of adverse security assessments made by ASIO. Of the 32,795 IMAs which have arrived since 2007, 63 have received an adverse assessment since 2009, with 55 of those in detention in Australia and the remaining eight having been relocated to a third

7 Mr Martin Bowles, Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, p. 22.

8 Mr Martin Bowles, DIAC, *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, p. 22.

9 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 36-39.

country.¹⁰ DIAC clarified the figures in relation to the number of adverse security assessments which have been made:

Senator CASH:...the *ASIO Report to Parliament 2011-12* states that ASIO continues to identify individuals of security concern, that since 2009, ASIO has issued 63 adverse security assessments in relation to IMAs. Why is there the difference between the 55 that you are referring to and the 63 that ASIO have said that they have issued?

...

Mr Bowles: [ASIO's] assessment says 63 clients, comprising 51 IMA clients and 12 *Oceanic Viking* clients. Of the 12 *Oceanic Viking* clients, eight have been resettled in a third country.

Senator CASH: Have any people with a negative security assessment from ASIO been released into the community?

Mr Bowles: No.

Senator CASH: In Australia?

Mr Bowles: No.

Senator CASH: Have they been given protection visas?

Mr Bowles: No, they are what we call '1A met'. They are recognised as a refugee, but they have never progressed past that to be granted a protection visa and they are held in detention.¹¹

Other matters of interest

1.12 A wide range of other matters were also canvassed. These included:

- the costs of international charter flights to regional processing centres;¹²
- the delivery cost and participation rate in relation to the Adult Migrant English Program;¹³
- staffing numbers, including for airline liaison officers;¹⁴
- the cost of the Ethics Bytes modules produced by the Office of the Migration Agents Registration Authority;¹⁵
- the take-up rate and use of the online system SkillSelect by potential migrants and employers;¹⁶

10 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 60-63 and 66-67.

11 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, p. 61.

12 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 106-107.

13 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 116-118.

14 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 52-53 and 57.

15 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 11-12.

16 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 12 and 42-43.

- the treatment of detention centre residents and media access to Nauru and Manus Island in Papua New Guinea;¹⁷
- the level of intelligence and data exchange between the Sri Lankan and Australian governments;¹⁸ and
- an update on the Community Placement Network.¹⁹

1.13 The committee was also informed that Australia Day 2013 saw a record number of more than 17,000 people become citizens in ceremonies held around the country. It is anticipated that by the end of the current program year, around 150,000 people will become Australian citizens, 40,000 more than last year.²⁰

Answers to questions on notice

1.14 The committee again notes DIAC's lack of timeliness in providing answers to questions on notice for the Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio. Almost three hundred responses to questions on notice from the Supplementary Budget Estimates 2012-13 round remain outstanding.

1.15 The Secretary acknowledged that DIAC will commit to improving its performance in this area, and explained the lack of timeliness in the context of an increased burden of work:

I accept that we need to improve our performance in this area. I just want to give some context, though, about what we are dealing with. We have actually seen a 500 per cent increase in questions on notice in the last couple of years.

...

I accept and I acknowledge that there is a growing interest in our business, and all I can try to commit is that we will try and improve on this; but we do have to make sure that we get the right answer. We deal with 34 million border crossings and 4.5 million visa issues and all sorts of different things, and some of these questions go to quite specific issues.²¹

1.16 The committee notes that none of the answers to questions on notice for Supplementary Budget Estimates 2012-13 were provided by the due date set by the committee, and only just over half of the answers (54 per cent) have been answered as at the date of tabling of this report. The committee expects to see an improvement in the timeliness of answers provided by DIAC in future estimates rounds.

17 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 80-83.

18 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, p. 112.

19 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, pp 72-75 and 90.

20 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, p. 13.

21 *Estimates Hansard*, 11 February 2013, p. 35.

CHAPTER 2

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO

2.1 This chapter summarises some of the matters raised during the committee's consideration of the additional estimates for the Attorney-General's Portfolio for the 2012-13 financial year.

Australian Crime Commission

2.2 The Australian Crime Commission's (ACC) recent report on organised crime and drugs in sport, as well as the ACC's involvement in the press conference given by the Hon Jason Clare, Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for Justice, and the Hon Kate Lundy, Minister for Sport, on 7 February 2013, was the subject of extensive questioning by the committee. The Chief Executive Officer of the ACC, Mr John Lawler AM APM, advised that attendance at the press conference was in accordance with due process and past practices of the commission. Mr Lawler informed the committee that the investigation, called Project Aperio, started with work related to the issue of 'serious and organised crime penetration of professional sport' in 2011.¹

2.3 Mr Lawler explained that, although the ACC's report does not contain specifics of particular instances of widespread misuse of drugs by professional athletes in Australia, those details are contained in the classified report, which has been widely circulated to the relevant authorities.² Mr Lawler informed the committee that those authorities include the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority (ASADA), which is the lead agency in relation to breaches of World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) activities.³

2.4 Mr Lawler also updated the committee on the implications for staffing of the funding reduction of the ACC.⁴

2.5 With respect to whether there were some crime-fighting activities which the ACC is not able to engage in due to its reduced staffing levels, Mr Lawler advised:

[I]n relation to the organised crime threats and the issues of crime more broadly in the community there is in actual fact more crime and more criminality than all the resources combined in the country can deal with. Agencies have to constantly prioritise where those resources are best deployed, and that is an exercise of judgement and indeed that is part of my responsibility, along with the board of the [ACC], which has a statutory function to set the priorities and indeed set the strategic direction for the commission and its work in targeting the very highest threat to criminal activities that we face.

1 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 74.

2 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 81.

3 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 81.

4 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 73.

So, the commission is no different to any other agency. Yes, there are crimes that the commission cannot tackle that it could tackle if there were more resources available. But I can assure this committee and the Australian public that with the resources we have, and with the support of the board, we have those resources focused on the highest threats and we are making significant inroads into the organised crime threat in this country.⁵

Family Court of Australia and the Federal Magistrates Court of Australia

2.6 Representatives from the Family Court of Australia (FCA) and the Federal Magistrates Court of Australia (FMC) were questioned extensively on the impending merger of the executive and administrative functions of those courts.⁶

2.7 The committee also asked questions about why the funding allocation to the FCA and the FMC differed from the budget figure. A representative of the courts informed the committee:

That allocation in many ways is simply formula based. Essentially, if you are looking at the two courts' budgets, the Family Court's budget is significantly larger than the Magistrates Court budget. Part of the reason is that the Family Court, by and large, pays for the large bulk of the properties that are occupied by both the FMC and the Family Court. It employs the bulk of the registry staff that provide the registry services and also a large portion of the registrars and consultants. So a significant component of the budget is actually a shared budget, so those resources are providing services across both courts. So, on the face of it, yes, it looks like the Family Court is getting a huge amount of funding compared with the [FMC].⁷

2.8 Mr Richard Foster PSM, Chief Executive Officer of the FCA and Acting Chief Executive Officer of the FMC, also explained the funding allocation in the context of the merger of the two courts:

...I think it is important to understand that the Family Court provides nearly \$30 million worth of services to the FMC free of charge. So one of the sound outcomes, I think, about the restructure of the administration of the courts is that the agency has one budget, and that is split up more easily between the two courts. So, assuming this legislation goes through, we will be able to say exactly what each court costs to run, although the money will be in the agency.⁸

Office of the Australian Information Commissioner

2.9 The committee questioned the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (OAIC) as to why it has taken a long period of time to initiate

5 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 74.

6 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, pp 60-65.

7 Mr Grahame Harriott, Family Court of Australia and Federal Magistrates Court of Australia, *Estimates Hansard*, p. 67.

8 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 68.

Australia's membership of the Open Government Partnership, following an invitation from the US State Department to join in August 2011 and the then Attorney-General's express support in May 2012.⁹ Professor McMillan, the Australian Information Commissioner, advised the committee that it was a case of 'competing priorities' and workload:

[T]he short answer is that there have been competing priorities, certainly in my office, and I expect there would be a similar consideration in, say, the Attorney-General's Department or in other departments. If I can just explain my part. I received a letter from the Attorney-General's Department in mid-August 2012 asking me to advise on what steps my office could take to assist the Australian government to join the Open Government Partnership. It took me five months to reply with the letter that you referred to that was recently released under the FOI Act and placed on our and another website. The only explanation, I think, is that there were quite a number of other competing priorities in the office at the time.¹⁰

2.10 The committee heard that, to date, although the previous Attorney-General has provided express support, Australia has not joined the Open Government Partnership, as no official decision has been made by the government. In response to a question about whether the OAIC anticipates 'receiving additional staff and resources to help drive whatever level of involvement the government decides to bring forward for the [Open Government Partnership]',¹¹ Professor McMillan informed the committee that 'without some supplementary funding or assistance', the OAIC could not 'see any way forward for [it] to take on extra work'.¹²

2.11 Upon questioning as to whether there has been a response to the US Secretary of State's invitation to join the Open Government Partnership, a representative from the Attorney-General's Department (AGD), which is the lead agency in relation to this issue, informed the committee that it has not responded.¹³

2.12 An AGD representative also advised that it would be briefing the new Attorney-General about the Open Government Partnership.¹⁴

Attorney-General's Department

2.13 A number of issues were raised with AGD, including: the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture; the Native Title Respondent Funding Scheme; and the issue of justice reinvestment.

9 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 83.

10 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 83.

11 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, pp 84-85.

12 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 85.

13 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 85.

14 Ms Elizabeth Kelly, Attorney-General's Department (AGD), *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 87.

Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture

2.14 AGD officials provided an update on the progress of the department's work with states and territories to develop model legislation in relation to the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture, (OPCAT). The committee was informed that a draft of the model legislation has been developed under the auspices of New South Wales as they are taking the lead in its drafting.

2.15 In response to questions as to the detail of the draft model legislation, a representative from AGD advised:

I do not have the detail with me but, essentially, the arrangements are necessary to both establish the national preventative mechanism, and the legislation would also govern visits by the international body. The legislation could also be supported by MOUs or agreements between ministers to facilitate those visits as well. It sets up the regime under which the OPCAT would be introduced in every jurisdiction.¹⁵

2.16 In relation to the delay in implementing the OPCAT treaty Australia signed in 2009, the representative explained:

It is the complexity of implementing a treaty of this nature in a federal context. I should say that [I] do not think the delay can necessarily be perceived as a problem in [the] sense that there has been a lot of work amongst jurisdictions to get the system right in a way that every jurisdiction is satisfied with, and that takes time as well.¹⁶

2.17 The AGD representative explained that the Commonwealth's intention is to 'continue to work with the states and territories to achieve agreement about how [OPCAT] should be implemented'.¹⁷

Native Title Respondent Funding Scheme

2.18 The AGD was questioned on changes to the Native Title Respondent Funding Scheme. Officers confirmed those changes had reduced funding to respondents in native title claims but clarified that the pool of funding is not disaggregated from the larger funding pool for financial assistance schemes:

Mr Fredericks: The financial assistance for the Native Title Respondent Funding Scheme is in an appropriation which picks up funding for all legal financial assistance programs. I can tell you the reduction in the level of funding across all of those financial assistance schemes.

Senator BRANDIS: No, I want to know the reduction in that part of that funding which is attributable to the Native Title Respondent Funding Scheme.

...

15 Mr Greg Manning, AGD, *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 99.

16 Mr Greg Manning, AGD, *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 99.

17 Mr Greg Manning, AGD, *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 100.

Mr Fredericks: ...I can give you a three-year figure. In the financial year 2010-11, expenditure on the Native Title Respondent Funding Scheme was \$2.815 million. In the financial year 2011-12, it was \$2.749 million. For the financial year 2012-13, the year to date figure is \$1.299 million. That is actual expenditure, because, as I say, there is not an individual appropriation for that scheme on its own.¹⁸

Justice reinvestment

2.19 In response to questions concerning the area of justice reinvestment, AGD representatives informed the committee that the National Justice Chief Executive Officers Working Group on Justice Reinvestment or Causes of Crime (NJCEOs) is active and has produced a report related to the topic areas of justice reinvestment and causes of crime. The Secretary indicated that the report could be made available to the committee, subject to approval from all states and territories.¹⁹

2.20 Another area of focus by the NJCEOs is improving data collection:

One of the other things that the group is focused on is efforts around improved data collection to better inform justice reinvestment approaches. Often the difficulty we have is that the data is not collected in a way that gives you the ability to make informed judgements, so the NJCEOs have requested the National Corrective Services Statistics Unit board consider specific improvements to the currently available national data prisoner set to give us a better idea of effectively why people are in prison. On 19 April [2012] the board agreed to include this request in its upcoming review of the National Corrective Services quarterly data set. That review is currently being undertaken by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in consultation with all agencies with an interest in improving data. A key issue that the department raised during those consultations was the fact that the quarterly national corrections data collection does not currently identify offence type, which is one of the barriers to accurately identifying the key drivers of incarceration generally and Indigenous incarceration specifically. The ABS is expected to conclude that review by the middle of this year.²⁰

Other matters of interest

2.21 Other matters canvassed with the AGD by the committee included:

- the growing availability of guns in the community and the effectiveness of the work of the Commonwealth Firearms Advisory Council;²¹
- payments for people affected by natural disasters and the criteria used to assist people;²²

18 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, pp 93-94.

19 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, pp 101-102.

20 Mr Kym Duggan, AGD, *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, p. 101.

21 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, pp 109-114.

22 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, pp 114-119.

- a court case before the Victorian Court of Appeal in relation to the release of sources by two journalists in the prosecution of a number of former employees from Securrency and Note Printing Australia;²³ and
- reviews of ASIO adverse security assessments by the Independent Reviewer of Adverse Security Assessments.²⁴

Senator Trish Crossin
Chair

23 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, pp 97-99.

24 *Estimates Hansard*, 12 February 2013, pp 103-104.

APPENDIX 1

DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES FOR WHICH THE COMMITTEE HAS OVERSIGHT

Attorney-General's Portfolio

- Attorney General's Department;
- Administrative Appeals Tribunal;
- Australian Federal Police;
- Australian Customs and Border Protection Service;
- Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity;
- Australian Crime Commission;
- Australian Government Solicitor;
- Australian Human Rights Commission;
- Australian Institute of Criminology;
- Australian Law Reform Commission;
- Australian Security Intelligence Organisation;
- Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre;
- Classification Board and Classification Review Board;
- CrimTrac Agency;
- Family Court of Australia;
- Family Law Council;
- Federal Court of Australia;
- Federal Magistrates Court of Australia;
- High Court of Australia;
- Insolvency and Trustee Service Australia;
- National Native Title Tribunal;
- Office of the Australian Information Commissioner;
- Office of the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions; and
- Office of Parliamentary Counsel.

Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio

- Department of Immigration and Citizenship (including the Office of the Migration Agents Registration Authority); and
- Migration Review Tribunal and Refugee Review Tribunal.

APPENDIX 2

INDEX OF PROOF HANSARDS

Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio, 11 February 2013	Pages
Migration Review Tribunal – Refugee Review Tribunal	3
Department of Immigration and Citizenship	
Office of Migration Agents Registration Authority (sub-program 1.1.3)	10
Cross portfolio/corporate/general	12
Outcome 1	35
Outcome 2	43
Outcome 3	52
Outcome 4	60
Outcome 5	116
Outcome 6	120
Attorney-General's Portfolio, 12 February 2013	Pages
Australian Customs and Border Protection Service	7
Australian Human Rights Commission	42
Family Court of Australia and Federal Magistrates Court of Australia	60
Australian Crime Commission	72
Office of Australian Information Commissioner	83
CrimTrac Agency	89
Attorney-General's Department	93

APPENDIX 3

TABLED DOCUMENTS

Immigration and Citizenship Portfolio, Monday, 11 February 2013

No.	Tabled by:	Topic
1	Mr Stephen Wood, CEO, Office of the MARA	Opening statement
2	Ms Kay Ransome, Principal Member, MRT-RRT	Opening statement
3	Mr Martin Bowles PSM, Secretary, DIAC	Opening statement
4	Senator Cash	Comparison of Asylum Budget 2012/13
5	Senator Cash	IMAS since November 2007

Attorney-General's Portfolio, Tuesday, 12 February 2013

No.	Tabled by:	Topic
1	Mr Michael Pezzullo, Acting CEO, Australian Customs and Border Protection Service	Opening statement
2	Mr Richard Foster PSM, CEO, Family Court of Australia	Courts and Tribunals Legislation (Administration) Amendment Bill 2012 – Family Court and Federal Circuit Court
3	Senator Brandis	Operation Mescos – Kevin Rudd YouTube investigation

