

Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE — Budget Estimates Hearing, 29/30 MAY 2018
Department of Defence

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
1	Microsoft Cloud	<p>Written – Senator Reynolds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the Senate Estimates in February, the DTA said agencies would generally use the public cloud for unclassified data where the service you want to use has little in the way of security or privacy needs and that more secure data such as personal information should be hosted in private clouds. Is this consistent with your view? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Peter Alexander, DTA, Senate Additional Estimates, when explaining their Secure Cloud Strategy said on 27th February 2018: <i>“So, if you're looking at a particular service—an information service, a website—that holds unclassified data and that <u>has very little security or privacy risk, you would put that in the public cloud.</u> That's based on the agency's assessment of risk, looking at the principles and the Information Security Manual. If it's a service that has personal data about individuals or commercial data about businesses, the agency might make an assessment that the security levels are higher, and they would host that in a private cloud”</i> 2. Can you please confirm that according to the ASD website and its consumer guides the Microsoft protected cloud certified by ASD is in fact a public cloud?
2	Project Air 7000	<p>Written - Senator Reynolds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is Project AIR 7003 on schedule? I'm interested to know what milestones are coming up for this project. 2. When is Government being asked to evaluate or approve this project?
3	Air7000 RFI or RFT	<p>Written - Senator Reynolds</p> <p>What research has Defence undertaken on AIR 7003, has either a request for information or request for tender been issued to industry?</p>
4	Air 7000 Acquisition Strategy	<p>Written - Senator Reynolds</p> <p>Has Defence made any decisions on project AIR 7003 in terms of a favoured system and supplier, or any recommendations to Government in regard to acquisition strategy?</p>
5	Air 7000 Competitive Process	<p>Written - Senator Reynolds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I understand that there are two credible competitors for AIR 7003 – is that correct? 2. I also understand that in Germany, France and Canada, competitive processes have been used to determine the best provider between General Atomics and IAI for a MALE UAV – is that also correct? 3. Can we expect then that a similar competitive process will be run in Australia, to ensure we get the most capable platform at the best value for taxpayer money and with the highest local industry component?
6	RAAF Outsourcing	<p>Written - Senator Reynolds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are you able to provide details on aviation platforms which are outsourced for operation by the commercial sector? 2. What roles do these platforms undertake? 3. How does the Air Force assess which platforms and roles to outsource and which should be operated internally?

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
7	Fighter Support to ADF	<p>Written - Senator Reynolds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I understand in November 2017, to service a two year trial for Red Air and fighter support to the Australian Defence Force, Air Affairs Australia teamed with Discovery Air Defence Services to deploy three Dornier Alphajet aircraft and crew, which are currently operating mostly out of RAAF Williamtown. Is this correct? 2. Can you outline what services this consortia provide to the Air Force? 3. In addition to support, does the consortia provide flight crew? 4. What is the operational rationale for outsourcing these roles? 5. Why was a decision reached to outsource this role? 6. What is the cost benefit of outsourcing versus keeping these roles in house? 7. Does this have an impact on the skills base available internally to the Air Force? 8. What impact does this have on accruing flight hours for RAAF pilots? 9. In your view, what impact does this have on the RAAF in terms of recruiting, retention, and overall ADF morale and capability?
8	WA Army Presence and Composition	<p>Written – Senator Dean Smith</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Please advise on the composition of regular and reservist Australian Army presence in Western Australia over the last 10 years: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Composition of 13th Brigade and command structure. b) Why is 13th Brigade’s Commanding Officer based in SA and not WA? 2) Please provide detail on factors that have impacted on the composition of regular and reservist Australian Army presence in Western Australia over the last 10 years: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Are there recruitment factors? b) Are there retention factors? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) 13th Brigade was the largest or one of the largest reserve units in the past – what factors lead to the decline in numbers? 3) Please provide Army recruitment numbers for each year since 2008: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Applications for Regular Army by State/Sex/Age on Application <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) General Entry / Officer Entry b) Applications for Army Reserve by State/Sex/Age on Application <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) General Entry / Officer Entry c) Successful candidates (Regular Army) by State/Sex/Age on Application <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) General Entry / Officer Entry

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		d) Successful candidates (Reserve Army) by State/Sex/Age on Application i) General Entry / Officer Entry
9	Submissions to the Centre for Defence Industry Capability (CDIC)	Written – Senator Reynolds Can the Department confirm: a. The number of submission that have been received by CDIC. b. How many have had contracted awarded and for what purpose? c. How many have been accepted by for configuration baseline. d. what is the criteria for technologies that already commercially available?
10	ADF – Validation of Domestic Technology Products before Export	Written – Senator Reynolds Does the Australian Defence Force have a role in validating products domestically to ensure greater success when exporting technologies - to demonstrate domestic confidence in a domestic product?
11	Australian Defence Industry – International Competitiveness	Written – Senator Reynolds In the view of defence, how can Australian industry compete on upcoming projects when our costs are in many cases higher for the prime's regular supply chain in Europe and the volume's for the Australian projects is a fraction of the prime's regular supplier's volumes?
12	Prime Contractors – Compliance	Written – Senator Reynolds How does the Department of Defence in Australia intend to ensure the compliance of Prime contractors in maximising Australian involvement?
13	Prime Contractors – Australian Industry Involvement	Written – Senator Reynolds 1) Is the Department aware of any cases of Prime's: a. not supplying supply chain sources for highly specialized components in their vessel, thereby limiting the involvement of Australian companies? b. asking for quotes on low volumes required for Australian builds and comparing them against, either internal direct costs or subcontractors manufacturing much higher volumes overseas? c. specifying standards from overseas that make the cost of supply of goods higher in Australia by way of low volume special importation costs ie not allowing equivalent material specs? d. adopting a "no concessions in relation to acceptance of goods with minor non compliance" approach to local manufacturing when they regularly concess items in their own factories? 2) What strategies does the Department have in place to mitigate these risks or any other risks they have identified?
14	Naval Shipbuilding College	Written – Senator Reynolds 1. Can the Department outline what consultation has been undertaken with institutions in Western Australia? 2. Has there been any engagement with South Metro Tafe? 3. What has been the nature of this engagement?

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>4. Has there been any engagement with Western Australian Universities, if so, which ones? 5. What has been the nature of this engagement? 6. Has there been any engagement with Western Australian industry? 7. What has been the nature of this engagement? 8. Has there been any discussion of a new facility being constructed in Western Australia for the purposes of the Shipbuilding college? 9. What is the primary skills focus of the college? 10. What is the role of the college in terms of workforce planning? 11. What role will Western Australian institutions play in the college? 12. What is the scale of this role? 13. What role will institutions in other states play? 14. If a decision has not been made yet, when is one expected? 15. What skills have been identified as fundamental for delivery by the college? 16. How many of these will be delivered in WA? 17. Has there been any engagement with industry in WA? 18. What has been the nature of this engagement?</p>
15	Questions on Notice	<p>Spoken, page 10 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Could you provide the committee with a breakdown of when responses were provided to Minister Pyne's office in the same way that you've done for your office? Senator Payne: I'm not sure if I have that detail. I certainly don't have it with me, but I will check that and come back to you on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Perhaps, Mr Secretary, you can provide the committee with that information, if the minister is not able to provide it. Mr Moriarty: I will take that on notice.</p>
16	Defence Export Advocate Refer to QON17 answer	<p>Spoken, page 10 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Who does Mr Johnston report to? Senator Payne: The Minister for Defence Industry and the secretary. Senator KIM CARR: Is there a position description that I could have? Is that available? Mr Dewar: We can advise you of what the roles of the position are, certainly. Senator KIM CARR: Would you mind? Mr Dewar: The export advocates role is to assist with Australian defence exports on a global scale. Senator KIM CARR: Is there a job description somewhere that is written down? Mr Dewar: I'm sure that we can take on notice if there's one written down, but I can give you some more information about—</p>
17	Defence Export Advocate	<p>Spoken, pages 10-11 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: In the parlance of the day, are there KPIs for this job? Mr Dewar: The government has set out a strong focus on defence exports and the advocate's role is to support those efforts across government. Senator KIM CARR: Where will I find this description? Is it published anywhere? Dr Kearnan: The advocate is working for defence industry policy, so there will be a contract that details the position description, but it's not published as a public document. Senator KIM CARR: Why not?</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Dr Kearnan: There hasn't been a requirement for it to be published at this stage.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: On behalf the committee, could I ask for it to be published to this committee?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: With the job description, we can do that.</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: We're happy to.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: And the KPIs?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: Yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: This committee has received KPIs before.</p> <p>Mr Dewar: Sure. We'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I'm told that this position is permanent; is that correct?</p>
18	<p>Defence Export Advocate – Remuneration</p> <p>Answered on the day, refer to page 51</p>	<p>Spoken, pages 11-12 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The minister has decided to appoint Mr Johnston to the position for one year under a standard Commonwealth contract covering conflict of interest and the normal security arrangements. Is that, in essence, what you're telling me?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: And we will detail his role. With his role he has a number of responsibilities in undertaking this position. As Mr Dewar noted, the advocate will provide international advocacy to help the Australian defence industry secure export sales and contracts, support the development and delivery of strategic export campaigns and provide input on options for engagement with domestic stakeholders. He's chair of the Defence Export Forum, which is part of the Defence State and Territory Government Industry Advisory and Engagement Forum, and he sits as a member of the Centre for Defence Industry Capability Advisory Board.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Is there any remuneration for this post?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: Yes, there is.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How much is that?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: That's a part of the contract which is commercial-in-confidence.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Commercial-in-confidence?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I want to be clear about this. Why is it commercial-in-confidence?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: Our standard contract with experts of this nature, eminent persons of this nature, is commercial-in-confidence.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: You've provided me with information for the advisory board and other expert advisory roles. Why is this one different?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: We can take on notice what we can provide, but the contract itself is commercial-in-confidence.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: With respect to the remuneration, which is stated in the advice to the Senate where contracts are listed, under 'Centre for Defence Industry Capability Advisory Board, Defence Export Advocate, Mr David Johnston', it says, 'term: permanent', which is not quite what you've told us.</p> <p>Mr Dewar: No.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: That's what the document states, though.</p> <p>Mr Dewar: We'll confirm that, Senator.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: And it says 'remuneration: nil'. That's not right either.</p> <p>Mr Dewar: I don't know the date of the advice that you're providing, but given the appointment of Mr Johnston to that role, if that was remuneration that had been paid to that date under that contract, that could well be correct. I don't have the letter in front of me.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: All the other posts that are listed on this schedule are at the per-day rate. Does this post have a per-day rate?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: There are rates of payment under the contract and other conditions, and we can take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Senator KIM CARR: Why then does the advice provided to the Senate state that, for remuneration, there's a figure of 'nil', whereas the others have a per-day rate listed?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: I'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: listing all the other appointments, The Chair, Lieutenant General Gillespie, was appointed for three years. With respect to the Australian Strategic Policy Institute, he gets paid \$854 per day. He is a member of various policy institutes, the Defence Housing Authority, the defence reserves council, the relief trust, the Australian Navy, the canteens board—various other posts are listed here. Why is it that Mr Johnston's name appears and the remuneration is listed as 'nil' when it's clearly not the case?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: I'll need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How long will it take you to find out what he is paid?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: That's part of the contract and we don't normally disclose that for these sorts of figures' contracts.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I'm sorry; you do supply that information for a range of other appointments. You say you don't normally supply it but I'm not certain that's correct. You have provided that information to this committee, to other inquiries before this parliament, about a range of people. Why is it that Mr Johnston's remuneration is not covered?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: As the contracts are implemented and invoices are paid, those figures are published on AusTender. So we can take that on notice and come back to you.</p>
19	<p>Contract for the Defence Export Advocate</p> <p>Refer to QON17 answer</p>	<p>Spoken, page 13 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: One of the issues is that individuals may still be in the marketplace, so putting out their daily rate when they might be negotiating different rates for different market opportunities.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I'm pleased to hear that Mr Johnston is in the marketplace, but he hasn't been appointed. The contract has been signed. This is not exactly the competitive tender situation.</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: We will take it on notice. We will try during the course of the morning to have a look at the contract, see what might be appropriate—</p>
20	<p>Naval Shipbuilding Advisory Board</p> <p>Answered on the day refer to pp 15-16</p>	<p>Spoken, page 15 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Just flowing on from that, in regard to the official who didn't appear before the committee back in 2017 over the \$75[,000]-one-month contract, it's my understanding that that official—once again, whom Defence appeared to have resist appearing before this committee—is also the person who is being investigated for misappropriation of funds in France. You recall that on 15 December we had that conversation. I am not going to name the person, but can you confirm that is the case?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: I will have to take that on notice.</p>
21	<p>Compliance with the Defence Trade Controls Act</p>	<p>Spoken, page 17 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Specifically, the Australian Research Council has said that there had been no incidents of noncompliance with the act that have been reported to the Australian Research Council. I'd ask you: do you have any evidence of noncompliance with the act in regard to Australian universities or research agencies?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: Over what time period?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The act's only been in for a short period of time, and it's been subject to amendment. Perhaps you could go through since the act's introduction. Have there been incidents of noncompliance with the act since its introduction?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: We'll need to take on notice whether there have been specific incidents. But I can tell you that, through the operations of the department to deal with the Defence Trade Controls Act, we very actively engage with the Australian research community and provide assessments about whether</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>activities are controlled, and then obviously the permit process as well.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: 2016. Now, the Australian Research Council, which administers the public money for our universities, reports that they've never had an incidence of a breach of the act. Are you able to confirm that?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: We'll take that on notice. I just don't have the figures in front of me. I don't want to answer that without having gone back and checked.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I'm surprised you can't confirm that—</p>
22	Defence Export Controls Working Group	<p>Spoken, page 20 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Is the Defence Export Controls Working Group still in operation?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Within?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The department?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: The department, yes.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is. When did it last meet?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: I'll have to take that on notice.</p>
23	Offshore Patrol Vessel	<p>Spoken, page 26 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: On the question of a sustainment plan—the sustainment costs of the vessels?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: It is in the cabinet submission.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Was it the case that the estimate for the sustainment was seven billion?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I'm told it might have actually blown out to 11 billion; is that true?</p>
24	Mitigation Strategies for the Future Frigate Program	<p>Spoken, page 29 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Is it the case that you made recommendations to the government in January 2017—</p> <p>Mr Gillis: That was one set. That was one in respect of prototyping. There was other advice to government with respect to prototyping, there was other advice to government in respect of the shipyard, and there has been other advice to government in respect to other mitigations. They were only the three principal mitigation strategies. There have been a number of other things that we have undertaken.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: And when was that advice accepted, to go ahead with these mitigation strategies?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I would have to take that on notice because that would be specifically related to cabinet meetings that we provided that advice. All levels of government—</p>
25	Austal-Lurssen Negotiations	<p>Spoken, page 35 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So were there any conversations with Lurssen about including Austal prior to making a decision?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: Yes, there were.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What was the nature of those conversations?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I had a conversation with Peter Lurssen and asked him whether he would be open to exploring options, and that is all that I asked him to do.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Barrett: Post the decision.</p> <p>Mr Gillis: Post the decision.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Post the decision; I see. And did you seek any advice about that matter?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: Yes, I did, from our probity and legal advisers.</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Senator KIM CARR: When did you seek that advice? Mr Gillis: I would have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Was there any conversation with any minister about these matters? Mr Gillis: Yes, there was. Senator KIM CARR: Which minister? Mr Gillis: With Minister Pyne and Minister Payne. Senator KIM CARR: When did that occur? Mr Gillis: It was in a relatively short period of time, but I would have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: But it is unusual, surely, that a tender for a contract that is rejected is then invited to participate with the successful tenderer?</p>
26	Austal-Lurssen Negotiations	<p>Spoken, page 37 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What was the nature of the meetings that were held? Were the meetings between the two companies? Mr Gillis: I was not a party to any of those meetings. They were matters commercial, and Mr Grill undertook those independently of me. Senator KIM CARR: Were there any meetings with the minister? Mr Gillis: I am not aware of them. You would have to ask the minister. Senator KIM CARR: Minister, was there any meeting with Minister Pyne? Yes or no? The minister here is representing the minister. Senator Payne: I will take it on notice. ... Senator KIM CARR: And you understand there were meetings in which the two parties were present at the same time? Mr Gillis: Yes, I believe so. But I was not a party to any of those meetings. Senator KIM CARR: You believe so? Did it occur or not? Mr Gillis: I am aware that there were meetings, but I do not know—I will have to take it on notice specifically. ... Senator KIM CARR: So you have taken on notice whether or not the minister was involved in these conversations. Did the minister or the Prime Minister's office provide any directions to either party before the announcement was made that the mediation had broken down? Mr Gillis: Senator, you are asking me for something I cannot provide you. Senator KIM CARR: Minister, can you provide that on notice? Senator Payne: I will take that question on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Did the minister or the Prime Minister's office provide any directions to the department about the mediation before the announcement was made?</p>
27	Provider for the Naval Shipbuilding College	<p>Spoken, page 39 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Just to refresh my memory: you said in March you've issued a contract; is that right? Mr Chesworth: The contract was entered into in March. Senator KIM CARR: Who with? Mr Chesworth: Huntington Ingalls Industries— Senator KIM CARR: Huntington. Mr Chesworth: and Kellogg Brown & Root, a joint venture. Senator KIM CARR: A joint venture. What is their experience in education? Mr Chesworth: Both parties, through the tender process, demonstrated a very strong background in this area. If you wanted a further exposition of that,</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>I'd be happy to provide that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, do that. When are they going to start to enrol people? Mr Chesworth: It is going to be August this year. Senator KIM CARR: August. How many? Mr Chesworth: Again, could I take that on notice? Mr Fankhauser may have more details. Senator KIM CARR: Your colleague here will provide additional information? What's the profile? Mr Fankhauser: We'll take that question on notice and get back to you.</p>
28	<p>Remuneration for Eminent Advocates</p> <p>Refer to QON 17 and 18 answers</p> <p>Answered 30 May, pp 7-8</p>	<p>Spoken, pages 51-52 – Senator Carr CHAIR: Would it be possible to provide the committee, not necessarily with Mr Johnston's specific remuneration, but you mentioned there was a band for eminent advocates? Are you able to provide the committee with that range Mr Dewar: There's not a formal band for that figure but— CHAIR: You did mention there was a range. Mr Dewar: A rough band, yes. Senator PATRICK: Will the contract be published on AusTender? CHAIR: Sorry—are you able to provide that bandwidth? Mr Dewar: The bandwidth is not a formal document or formal documentation— CHAIR: You did say, 'Whether it's a formal/informal bandwidth.' Those were the words you used. I understand the commercial-in-confidence, but can you provide the committee with an idea for eminent consultants like that? Mr Dewar: Yes. The highest figure in that sort of band is \$4½ thousand, normally. That's an indicative band. Senator KIM CARR: It's \$4½ thousand for what? Per day? Mr Dewar: Correct. Senator KIM CARR: What's the lowest in that band? Mr Dewar: For eminent persons, it normally starts at around \$2½ thousand per day. Senator KIM CARR: Minister, are you claiming executive privilege on this matter in why this is not being made available to the Senate? Senator Payne: This has not been raised with me previously, but perhaps I could take your questions as questions on notice and determine what we are able to provide you. No claim is being made at this point. Senator KIM CARR: I'd be very surprised if you did, frankly, knowing you. I'd be very surprised if you did. I just find this an extraordinary proposition that you would claim this is commercial-in-confidence. Senator Payne: I do want to take advice, and I'll respond on notice. Senator KIM CARR: I appreciate that. I'd ask the department to reconsider their view as well, given that you provide so much other information about the per-day rates for individuals. I'm going to come to some of those in a few minutes, but it's a remarkable proposition, claiming commercial-in-confidence for a former defence minister, where a contract has been signed. How many days work has the minister undertaken for you? Sorry—the former minister. Mr Dewar: To date? I'd have to take that on notice for how many days he'd done so far. ... Senator KIM CARR: This is an appointment made without advertisement, an appointment where there was no job description and an appointment you're claiming preeminent expertise for, and you can't tell me how many days work? Senator Payne: I'm sure we can find that information. I'll ask the department to find that and bring it back to</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>the committee for you. Mr Dewar: I'm also happy to provide more information on the position description if that would helpful? Senator KIM CARR: If you wouldn't mind, thank you.</p>
29	<p>Duty Statement</p> <p>Refer to QON 17 answer</p>	<p>Spoken, page 52 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: When did you prepare that statement? Mr Dewar: This was prepared earlier. It had been prepared some weeks ago. I didn't have it with me this morning. Senator KIM CARR: And that's been provided to Mr Johnson, has it? Mr Dewar: Yes. And we can provide a copy of that to the committee. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you very much. When was it provided to Mr Johnson? Dr Kearnan: It was provided before the contract was signed. Tuesday, 29 May 2018 Senator KIM CARR: By letter? Dr Kearnan: It would have probably been part of the contract negotiations to define the role and responsibilities.</p>
30	<p>Naval Group – Tax Transparency Code</p>	<p>Spoken, page 58 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Is Naval Group a signatory to the Tax Transparency Code that the government has put in place? Rear Adm. Sammut: I can't answer specifically to that. I know of course they are a member of the OECD; they are obliged to act by those requirements and so forth. We do have a taxation treaty with France. I'd have to take on notice as to whether they are actually a member of that code. Senator Payne: We'll come back to you on that, Senator.</p>
31	<p>Collins Class – Life of Type Extension Report</p>	<p>Spoken, page 60 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: In terms of life of type, obviously Collins will have to work out, I think, until at least 2032. In previous estimates there has been no costing information available in terms of life-of-type extension. I presume this is part of that work. When are we likely to get this cost estimate on what it will take to extend Collins to the new submarine launch point or commissioning point?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Admiral Sammut could probably better answer this question because he has been around for the period, but I recall Minister Stephen Smith released a media statement that said, in response to a life of type extension report: 'There is not one thing that would cause us concern in extending the life of Collins.' remember then Cameron Stewart of The Australian must have got a copy of the report, and said, 'It is true: there was not one; there were many.' I seem to recall there were concerns about whether this was achievable. Could you help me out, Admiral?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: I certainly can. The report did not identify any one single issue in terms of managing Collins that would prevent a life-of-type extension. I won't speak to what interpretation Cameron Stewart might have chosen to apply to that. Senator PATRICK: Sure.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Did that study come up with a cost? Rear Adm. Sammut: I don't recall a cost attached with that study. It was an engineering study. As we commenced, down the track, the work to look at those things in more detail we weren't going to be on an errand that would suggest it's not worth trying to cost that, because there could be something fundamental to the ability of the submarines to run on. As I said, that wasn't the case, and we're proceeding with the next phase of detailed studies now, which did leverage from that report. That report identified many of the focus areas for us. We've used those focus areas now to do a much more in-depth study, and they're the life-of-type extension</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>activities that Mr Johnson was talking of.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Admiral, I note what you said, but can you go back and check whether that study did have a number? I don't want the study but I'm just wondering whether there's anything informative in there at all.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: I'll take that on notice.</p>
32	Milestone Payments to Naval Group	<p>Spoken, page 60 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you very much. I asked some questions on milestones and you provided me with some answers, but they're obviously very key milestones. So that I don't have to ask a lot of questions that you'd be uncomfortable with, I'm trying to get a set of milestone payments. I'm sure your first payment is not 2020, which is the first key milestone you provided. Without me using FOI to get the integrated master schedule, I just want some points whereby senators can look and say, 'Admiral, have we met that milestone or are we running late?' or 'Why are we running late?'</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Just so we're clear, yes, there are particular payments attached to milestones, but we do need to keep Naval Group running and design process is a long one. There is work to be done. We do need to make sure that Naval Group running—</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sure.</p>
33	Defence engagement with Australian Industry	<p>Spoken, pages 61-62 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: In a nice sort of way. I am just wondering, in terms of signalling industry, where things are going. For example, I can see that this document—there's a fairly significant redacted part—talks about lithium batteries. That excites me because we have lots of lithium here in Australia. I've been talking to a number of different portfolios—rather than just picking up lithium and shipping it overseas and having all the value-add occur there, having the five stages of processing. We're now moving to stage 2 in Kwinana, through to electrochemical processes, through to building cell components, through to building batteries. That's an exciting opportunity for Australia, and the submarine project could have a part to play in that. I'm just wondering how we identify those things, publish them and make them available for people to latch onto and perhaps provide input.</p> <p>Senator Payne: Senator, I can't put my finger on the exact page that I want, but I do know that, in terms of the work that is already being done on engaging with industry across Australia, whether it's Defence or Naval Group or LMA, for example, literally hundreds of individual companies have been attending those meetings and engaging in a very proactive sense. You meet them. Frankly, I meet them as well, wherever I go. I also meet the ones who tell them they have a challenge in getting into the conversations—</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: It's probably page 42.</p> <p>Senator Payne: To facilitate that. No, I was looking for something in my own notes, Senator. In that regard, it is an extremely focused activity for Defence and for the ministers involved as well. But I would like to take the opportunity to put all of that together for you in one document, if I can't find the piece I want in a timely way, and give that to you on notice as well.</p>
34	Defence Travel Policy	<p>Spoken, page 64 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I see. In the response to question on notice 116, you say all the travel is done in accordance with the departmental policy. Have you got a copy of the current departmental travel policy that's applicable to board travel?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: We would have a copy of the departmental policy.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Well, that's what you say: 'in accordance with the departmental policy. That's the answer you've given me. Can I get a copy of that?'</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: The departmental policy? Yes.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is mentioned here in the answer to question on notice 116. You can take it on notice; I don't need it right away.</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		Mr Fankhauser: Yes.
35	Cost of the Naval Shipbuilding Advisory Board	<p>Spoken, page 65 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: You indicated that as of March the cost of the board was \$2.4 million. Is there an update on that figure?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: That was the figure calculated in response to the question taken on notice at the last hearing. It's the total rate for all 10 members, for their consultancy services.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Okay, that's their consultancy services. Does that include travel?</p> <p>Ms Edwards: No, it doesn't.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What are the travel costs on top of that?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: I will have to take that on notice and get back to you.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. I would like an up-to-date figure, so as of today, of the cost of the consultancy services and the cost of travel please. Are there administrative expenses as well?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: 116 actually says the figure for consultancy service is now \$2,799,422 as of 31 October 2017, so it must be higher than that.</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: That figure was in response to the October hearings. That was the—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So what is the figure now? Have you got that figure in front of you?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: I don't have it in front of me. I'll take it on notice.</p>
36	<p>Naval Shipbuilding Advisory Board – Mr Harris</p> <p>Committee agreed tasking not required</p>	<p>Spoken, page 66 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Mr Harris is receiving \$669,275. What is that for?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: Again, I believe that is the Submarine Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you perhaps help me out? I will confess my ignorance here. What expertise does Mr Harris bring to the role in the Submarine Advisory Committee?</p> <p>Rear Adm Sammut: We had a discussion at the last estimates about the Submarine Advisory Committee. I explained that these are members of a team that has been assembled to look specifically at the conduct of the Future Submarines Program—indeed, the management of the entire submarine capability—because of their particular expertise with submarines.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So Mr Harris has direct experience with submarines?</p> <p>Rear Adm Sammut: Yes, he does have that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: He is also associated with a private equity firm, J.F. Lehman & Company, is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Johnson: We would have to look into that. I do note that the numbers you are quoting are contract values. It doesn't mean that has been paid yet. It's the contract value that you are quoting.</p>
37	SEA1000 Workforce and Contracts	<p>Spoken, page 70 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So how many labour-hire workers are there in the SEA1000 program at the moment?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: That depends on the part of the program. We don't comment on the contract numbers per se, but we contract for services. So we could provide you the value of the contracts.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Would you mind? I would like a breakdown on ADF members, Defence staff and other staff and contractors who are working on the SEA1000 program at the moment. I'm told there are 100 contractors on the project. Is that true?</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Ms Skinner: I think that is consistent with testimony that Admiral Sammut has provided to you in the past. But certainly we can take that on notice to give you some updated figures.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So you don't have labour-hire workers?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I would have to take that on notice. Admiral Sammut might be able to answer. It depends on what the work is. A contractor will do work but assist us to provide extra support.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Is there anyone who can tell me whether or not there are labour-hire people working on this project?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: In terms of service providers on submarines, I would have to take that on notice. I would just make the point that we operate in the department on three definitions—contractor, consultant or service provider. We don't tend to use the term 'labour hire'. But I think by that you mean service providers. I believe most of Admiral Sammut's people would be contractors and consultants.</p>
38	Contractor Delegations with regard to contract	<p>Spoken, page 71 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. I accept you've said 'very limited circumstances'. Can I have in an answer on notice, please, the number of contracts that you've been able to identify that have been signed by contractors on Defence's behalf and the value of those contracts?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: We'll take that on notice.</p>
39	Saudi Arabia	<p>Spoken, page 73 – Senator Whish-Wilson</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Have any Defence officials travelled to Saudi Arabia this year and, if so, can you detail the role and the purpose of their visit?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: We have a resident Defence attache.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Anyone else?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: I need to take on notice what, if any, visits there have been.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: And the role or the purpose of their visit?</p> <p>Mr Dewar: Understood, yes.</p>
40	Exports to Saudi Arabia	<p>Spoken, page 75 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER:</p> <p>So there's no argument that there was a \$2 billion increase to Saudi Arabia and a number of shipments to Saudi Arabia. Were they reported to the Arms Trade Treaty in the annual report for 2016?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: We'll take that on notice.</p>
41	Government capability funding	<p>Spoken, pages 78-79 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Thank you, Secretary. I want to tidy up one other area. The government will provide additional funding to the Department of Defence and better align existing defence funding with capability project requirements, including the government's national naval shipbuilding programs, and there is an additional \$500 million in the reprofiling. What does reprofiling mean? What were the reasons for the \$500 million of reprofiling?</p> <p>Mr Groves: That adjustment was really just as it described, a reprofiling across the forward estimates. If you look in the budget papers, you'll see that it actually nets off across the whole period.</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Senator GALLACHER: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Groves: It's really just an alignment across a number of our programs and projects.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Are you able to provide a breakdown of what the additional \$500 million for 2017-18 has been allocated to? Where has it been allocated?</p> <p>Mr Groves: We may have to take that on notice at that level of detail, because it'll be across a range of things. I'll check with Ms Diamond.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So it's a multitude of smaller payments or is it—</p> <p>Ms Diamond: Predominantly that will be spent on the capital program.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: What does that mean?</p> <p>Mr Groves: I think we'll have to take that on notice to get that level of detail across where that is.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So, on notice, please give me a breakdown of what the additional \$500 million for 2017-18 has been allocated to.</p> <p>Mr Groves: Yes. We can give you a response to that.</p>
42	Defence access to Domestic Ports	<p>Spoken, page 83 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I have one question before we move on. Recently we discussed at the Public Works Committee a couple of wharves you're building, one in Fremantle, or Perth, and one in Darwin. Mention has been made of access to our domestic ports and that Defence has a signed agreement of access without payment to, say, the port of Darwin for 170 days or 190 days. Is it possible on notice to get that availability for access to ports, given your footprint across natural disasters and/or operational requirements? Is it possible to get information on notice on where those agreements exist and what they look like?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Griggs: Yes, we can do that. Of course, a lot of this has come about through the privatisation of ports around the country, which has led us to negotiate particular deeds so that we can have guaranteed access on occasions.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I know you're spending a considerable sum in Darwin building a new operational wharf because that meets your requirements, but you still have access to the public user facility.</p> <p>Vice Adm. Barrett: Under the Defence Act, there are some abilities for us to use commercial ports free of certain charges, but, in certain other areas—as you've indicated, in Fremantle but also in Darwin—there is a specific deed around those ports to gain access for certain periods of time. We have those details and we can provide them on notice.</p>
43	JP2047	<p>Spoken, pages 85-86 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I think, Senator, that you might be referring to a Defence project that enhances computer network defence. Would that be right?</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I would ask our CIO or vice chief to comment on the cost associated with that. I don't have those.</p> <p>Mr Pearson: I will come back to you on notice with that because there is a range of sustainment-end capital provisions across a number of projects within that portfolio. There's an umbrella of programs, so I will break that down for you.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Is this the work that's been done across all the bases to have secure networks?</p> <p>Mr Pearson: That's it.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: The land terrestrial—</p> <p>Mr Pearson: That's it—JP 2047. There are three capability releases in that program. The first one is the networks. The other ones are the tactical interfaces from the bases into the deployed environment as well as a range of other collaboration tools, so there are three parts to a broader program of work.</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Senator GALLACHER: And that all fits in together? Mr Pearson: It does. Senator GALLACHER: It would be excellent if on notice we could have a look at that. ... Senator GALLACHER: Okay, so we've covered the capabilities. That's the network terrestrial capability, and there's a large project going on there. This complements that—brings it together? Mr Pearson: It does. Senator GALLACHER: And you will on notice tell us how that works?</p>
44	Cybersecurity	<p>Spoken, page 88 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Is it incorrect to say that the cybersecurity portfolio is split between three agencies but managed by Home Affairs for policy direction? It's still definitely three agencies. You've got cyberbullying with the Australian Communications and Media Authority, Stay Smart Online and then cybersecurity operations based in ASD and ACSC with Home Affairs. Ms Skinner: It might be best if we take on notice exactly which elements of those other agencies were machinery-of-government changed to the future Australian Cyber Security Centre or whether that is a question for Home Affairs. Senator GALLACHER: Yes, I accept that.</p>
45	Titles for Mr MacGibbon	<p>Spoken, page 89 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Did we just hear, though, that he may well report to the Prime Minister, the Minister for Home Affairs and the Minister of Defence? Senator Payne: Which 'he' are you referring to? Senator GALLACHER: Mr MacGibbon. That would depend on the checking of his title. Senator Payne: As head of the ACSC, Mr MacGibbon has roles which pertain to Home Affairs and roles which pertain to Defence and the Australian Signals Directorate. If there is an additional title of which we are unaware, then we will clarify that reporting line for you on notice, Senator. Ms Skinner: According to the Home Affairs website, Mr MacGibbon is Deputy Secretary National Cyber Security Adviser and appears to report to Mr Pezullo. Senator GALLACHER: So he's not actually reporting to the Prime Minister, the home affairs minister and Defence; he's going through each department? Senator Payne: Yes, Senator. Senator KITCHING: Chair, could I just clarify: I think Mr MacGibbon was on the witness list for Prime Minister and Cabinet estimates, which was also last week. That's correct, isn't it—he was on the witness list? Senator Payne: I'm not sure you can expect the Defence— Senator KITCHING: No, that's fair enough. CHAIR: Senator Kitching, the department have agreed to take that on notice and we're seeking advice as well on multiple appearances. Senator KITCHING: Yes. I'm pretty sure I saw him. Senator GALLACHER: I'm confused. He works for Home Affairs, though—is that right—at the moment? Mr Moriarty: As you'd be aware, Senator, he's also been in the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. He's also been the cybersecurity adviser, in the policy advice function. Senator KITCHING: Thank you. That's all I was asking. Senator GALLACHER: Is he going to relinquish that role in this new structure? No?</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
46	Cybersecurity engagement	<p>Spoken, pages 90-91 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator PAYNE: Senator, we'll respond to you in relation to Mr MacGibbon's titles on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Putting Mr MacGibbon and his position aside, a number of agencies are involved in cybersecurity. Is there a regular structure of meetings? Is that visible at all?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Certainly the senior officials meet regularly and communicate regularly. I had a meeting with Mr Burgess and Mr MacGibbon on Friday, I think. Yes, most definitely.</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: There are internal meetings within Defence. We also coordinate with other operational agencies, but there is also a very important cybersecurity board which is chaired by the secretary of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Could I just clarify something? I'm looking now at the ACSC <i>Threat report 2017</i> and in that document it says: The ACSC is the focal point for the cyber security efforts of the Australian Signals Directorate ..., Computer Emergency Response Team ... Australia, the Defence Intelligence Organisation ..., the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission ..., the Australian Federal Police ..., and the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation ...</p> <p>But that's from last year. Does that mean that the Cyber Security Centre is currently, or last year, in the ASD? This document would seem to indicate that it's already transitioned?</p> <p>Senator Payne: The changes were made, Senator, as a result of a number of things. The development and standing up of the Department of Home Affairs and the <i>Independent intelligence review</i> of 2017 have resulted in ACSC being incorporated within the ASD organisational structure, as I indicated is represented on page 163 of the PBS.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Given that there is a number of agencies and you do meet, can you provide a list of the agencies that meet on a regular basis?</p> <p>Senator Payne: Yes, we can provide you with some information around the structures and those engagements. We'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Is it possible that that notification would include broad responsibilities for who is doing what?</p> <p>Senator Payne: An outline of responsibilities? Yes, of course.</p>
47	Microsoft Azure Cloud Accreditation	<p>Spoken, page 96 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Is it a common event that there are a number of companies or suppliers going through this accreditation process at the same time and that, in relation to Microsoft, they got their tick and there are other people in the process?</p> <p>Mr MacGibbon: There are many companies in the process, yes.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So how many suppliers or businesses would be going through this process?</p> <p>Mr MacGibbon: I would have to take that on notice, I think. I couldn't give you an accurate figure. I'll have to take it on notice. I'm sorry.</p>
48	Microsoft Accreditation	<p>Spoken, pages 96-97 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Well, do you get or have you had feedback from other suppliers and businesses about the Microsoft accreditation decision specifically?</p> <p>Mr MacGibbon: I've heard different types of feedback about the accreditation, or the certification. Again, some companies would be surprised, and other companies wouldn't be. It depends really on how and what type of information companies are able to supply to us to achieve that standard. I should add that it's not the only way in which companies can provide protected-level services to Commonwealth agencies. Individual agencies and departments can go about their own risk assessment process. The ACSC certification is designed to help reduce risk to the Commonwealth, but agencies still, even with that certification, need to do their own risk assessment, depending upon what their own exposure is as an agency. The other thing I'd add is that even using a protected cloud doesn't mean that an agency doesn't have to do anything else.</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Senator GALLACHER: Are you able to characterise the nature of the feedback in relation to the Microsoft accreditation decision? Was it positive? Negative? A bit of both?</p> <p>Mr MacGibbon: It depends on who it is from.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Well, I don't know who it's from, but I mean, what was the nature of the feedback? Was it overwhelmingly positive, or negative?</p> <p>Mr MacGibbon: It'll be hard for me to say. There'd be some suppliers, I'm sure, that don't like the thought of another supplier in a marketplace, and there'd be some who think it's a really good idea. I'm sure a lot of government departments think it's fantastic.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: What does feedback look like? Does it come in a letter form, an email, a submission, or—</p> <p>Mr MacGibbon: I think it depends on who's giving the feedback. I've had verbal conversations. I'm not sure whether I've received any written feedback, which I'd always happily receive. And as an organisation—for example, I've met with two of the companies that are currently also certified, and the team will meet with those companies on a regular basis if they want to, and if they don't want to, that's fine.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Are we able to ask you to provide, on notice, the nature of the feedback—whether it was in writing or verbal?</p> <p>Mr MacGibbon: I can tell you that I don't believe I've received, although I can check, any written feedback from any company in relation to it. If I have, I can certainly let you know. So yes, I'm happy to do that.</p>
49	Cybersecurity Manual	<p>Spoken, pages 98-100 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Is there a difference between the circulated cybersecurity manual and the Information Security Manual? Are there points of difference in there?</p> <p>Mr Burgess: If there is a circulated cyber security manual—which I am not aware of—I'm not aware of it being referred to as the cybersecurity manual. I know that we annually engage in a review of the Information Security Manual. If there is one currently in circulation, that would be a draft for consultation, but I will take that question on notice to confirm for you whether it is proposed to be changed to the cybersecurity manual. Currently it is the Information Security Manual.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I'm going to get to the question. You've answered the question: you're not aware of it, and that's quite normal business; that's fine. Our questions are very simple and succinct: what is the cybersecurity manual, and what is its purpose? You've referred to an ISM, and I think Mr Burgess said, 'I don't know about a cybersecurity manual' and the explanation is that people at another level in your organisation are doing that. I don't think that's contested. So we want to know: what is the current status of the cybersecurity manual; what are the key differences between the cybersecurity manual and the information security manual; has the cybersecurity manual been consulted on with industry and, if so, which industry players would get a Guernsey there—who would comment on it; and how and when did these consultations occur? At the end of all of that, you get to sign off on it, don't you?</p> <p>Mr Burgess: Senator, I'll take those questions on notice. I can confirm for you, though, that the actual information security manual, or if it was suggested to be called the cybersecurity manual, would actually have to be approved by Mr MacGibbon and me as the director of the Australian Signals Directorate.</p>
50	Global Supply Chain	<p>Spoken, page 106 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: The Global Supply Chain Program has been going for a number of years now. It's designed to get the primes and Australian-based primes to work with small and medium enterprises to get the products that small and medium enterprises can provide into the global supply chain for defence export markets.</p> <p>CHAIR: So how many SMEs or companies in total have actually subscribed and are engaging in the program?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: There are about five or six companies. I'll have to take that on notice to get specific details for you.</p> <p>CHAIR: If you could take that on notice. How many Australian companies are subscribing domestically and</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>what are the supply chains globally that they are engaged in? Also, what's the value of that business?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: The business that has been brought through the Global Supply Chain Program has just recently surpassed the \$1 billion mark, so it has produced quite a lot of good investment into business for small and medium enterprises. I would have to take on notice exactly the number of small and medium enterprises that have benefitted.</p> <p>CHAIR: Well, \$1 billion—that's quite significant, particularly when you're talking about SMEs. Would you mind taking on notice to give us a breakdown by year, by company and by value, and also where those exports have gone—into what global supply chains?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: Yes, I can do that.</p> <p>CHAIR: Thank you very much. That's all I've got for 2.1.</p>
51	Advisory Bodies, Reference Committees	<p>Spoken, pages 107-108 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I suppose the question goes to how the Commonwealth is already funding bodies to advise the government on workforce development and skills in naval shipbuilding in these areas. Is that incorrect, or does no-one know? The Manufacturing and Engineering Industry Reference Committee, the Electrotechnology Industry Reference Committee, the Naval Shipbuilding Industry Reference Committee and the Naval Shipbuilding College.</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Again, those three reference committees are not familiar, but we will make a few quick inquiries about that to be of assistance.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: No problem.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I appreciate that answer. What I'm really interested in is, on notice, whether the Commonwealth is funding the three reference committees that I have listed.</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: We will take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: And, really, the main thrust of this line of questions is: is there a risk that the proliferation of advisory bodies will create inefficiencies? You've created the Naval Shipbuilding IRC. Who created that?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: That'll be the subject of one of our responses on notice. We've really got to get to the bottom of, perhaps, the terminology that's being brought forward. If I can provide some clarity</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So the naval shipbuilding college is the initiative that you're most familiar with?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Yes.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So what's being asked here is: is there a proliferation of industry bodies, a duplication of information and expenditure by the Commonwealth, in the gathering of resources? That's the central theme of this.</p> <p>Mr Johnson: Yes, sir, I understand the thrust of your question, and we will have to take it on notice because you've caught us unaware.</p>
52	Proliferation of Advisory Bodies	<p>Spoken, page 109 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Mr Moriarty, you would be aware of the Australian Industry Skills Committee chaired by Professor John Pollaers?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: I have heard of it.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: We understand that the various IRCs are overseen by the Australian Industry Skills Committee. A letter has been sent to the chair, Mr John Pollaers, by the assistant secretary of the ACT, Mr Scott Connolly, in which unions representing shipbuilding</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Workers expressed their concerns about Possible inefficiencies caused by having too many advisory bodies. You are unable to comment on that because you are not aware of that letter or because haven't seen it?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: I am not aware of that letter, but I think there are advisory bodies. There are governance arrangements, as we mentioned to the committee earlier in the day. The size, the complexity and the consequence of these programs do require very significant governance arrangements. It is part of our risk mitigation strategy, but we also need to assure our ministers and we need to assure the government that we are progressing this national shipbuilding endeavour appropriately, effectively and with proper regard to cost. I believe there is a strong case for these oversight committees, governance arrangements, advisory boards because of the scale and complexity of the national shipbuilding endeavour which the government has embarked upon.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Very good. I suppose you have answered the thrust of it, but perhaps half a page on notice to say, 'Look, we know these reference groups exist. We are working towards efficiency and not duplicating work that has already been done' would satisfy us of that brief. I was startled by the fact that people hadn't heard of these—mind you, I hadn't heard of a lot of them either, but that is not my core job. I was surprised they weren't familiar to officials at the table.</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: We will provide on notice an explanation of them and how they link into the work we are doing.</p>
53	Update on the First Principles Review	<p>Spoken, page 109 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>CHAIR: There being no further questions on 2.1, we have concluded program 2.1. We will move on to program 2.2 'First Principles Review', which includes security vetting, common law abuse claims, director of military prosecutions, annual report, and review of Defence annual report. Are there any questions?</p> <p>Senator MOORE: I will put one on notice to get an update on the first principles review, but I won't take time this evening.</p>
54	SLG – Number of Airport Club Memberships	<p>Spoken, page 113 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you. That is very encouraging. The Department of Finance have a number of codes that allow you to work out why someone didn't take the lowest available fare. For example, code 4 is a health issue; code 6 requires flexibility to change a booking, although I would note that, generally, when you get a Virgin flight, there is normally, particularly at business hours, there is a comparable Qantas flexible flight as well. It would be appreciated if you could take a look at it and just see if you could come to some understanding, because that may help you remedy the situation.</p> <p>The second point—and I have asked this of every department over the last week or so; and this is not a criticism of any individuals and, indeed, that includes me—is: how many people in the department have accepted a membership of either the Chairman's Lounge or Virgin's The Club. I want to restrict that to people who have been offered that because of their position in Defence. If someone has a wife or a husband who owns a billion- dollar company, that is their own business. There is no criticism for accepting. I would just like to know how many people in the defence department have membership of those clubs. In a circumstance where a member has only one membership—and I am presuming there wouldn't be many within the department—of either the Chairman's Lounge or The Club, can you please provide the details of their Qantas or Virgin split.</p> <p>Mr Groves: We can certainly look at that, Senator. I obviously don't have the details on that specific question with me, so we will have to take that on notice.</p>
55	Broadspectrum	<p>Spoken, page 114 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Major Gen. Mulhall: My understanding is that, on 6 December, the employees within Broadspectrum voted to accept the enterprise agreement. It was</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>subsequently referred to the Fair Work Commission. It wasn't accepted by the Fair Work Commission, following a submission from the AMWU. I'm advised that the reason for that is that the notice of employee representational rights was not provided to two employees at Kapooka and, on that basis, the Fair Work Commission dismissed the BRS application for the enterprise agreement.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So, basically, the company had not advised all employees of their right to representation?</p> <p>Major Gen. Mulhall: That is what I understand is the case.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So did Broadspectrum give the Fair Work Commission an excerpt from the LMM contract with Joint Logistics Command?</p> <p>Major Gen. Mulhall: I'm happy to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Had they done so, would that have been a breach of commercial confidentiality—do you have to take it on notice?</p> <p>Major Gen. Mulhall: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So protected action was taken by the workforce in October?</p> <p>Major Gen. Mulhall: Yes, there was an instance of protected industrial action at the Bandiana site.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Is this the fifth version of the agreement that we're talking about here?</p> <p>Major Gen. Mulhall: Again, I'd need to take that on notice to be absolutely certain. I believe that to be the case, but I'll confirm that with you. But I understand it has been a long negotiation between Broadspectrum and its employees.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: What does 'abated' mean? Have the Commonwealth payments to Broadspectrum been abated as a result of industrial action?</p> <p>Major Gen. Mulhall: Not to my knowledge.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Not to your knowledge?</p> <p>Major Gen. Mulhall: But I'll confirm that.</p>
56	SEA 1000 CEP	<p>Spoken, pages 114-115 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Admiral Sammut, I was just reviewing some of the evidence you provided before, where you said that it was always the intention that the winner of the CEP would do the build. I've just gone and looked through the covering letter and conditions of contract of the CEP. You'd be aware that that's been supplied to me under FOI. It's very apparent that one of the objectives was to select an international partner for Sea 1000 and that the potential international partner was asked in the CEP for a whole range of things, including capability, cost, program schedule, commercial matters and the ability to assess the build options available to Australia and the ability of each participant to partner with Australia to deliver and sustain a future submarine that meets Australia's sovereign capability requirements. Can you point to me anywhere where you have explicitly stated, leading into the CEP that the international partner would be the builder— even if you do that on notice? Is there some document, some statement by Defence, perhaps made publicly, where that was explicitly stated?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I absolutely agree with the choices that you've made in terms of experienced submarine designers and builders, and I agree with the importance of having someone who was both a designer and a builder. I think that's incredibly important. But that's a slightly different requirement than actually explicitly stating that the successful entity would do the build, and that's what I'm looking for—if there's anything that you can provide that made it clear to everyone that that was going to be the case, that the designer builder would do the build.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Again, we will look over our documentation and get back to you.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Or even a public statement—I don't mind.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Sure.</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		Senator PATRICK: That would be appreciated. Thank you very much.
57	Non-Listed Financial Advisors	Spoken, page 117 – Senator Ketter Senator KETTER: The latest articles suggest, Lieutenant General, that you've directed Army units to 'cease visits by non-listed financial advisers, in line with existing Defence policy'. Can you tell me what the existing Defence policy that you're referring to there is and when it came into effect? Lt Gen. Campbell: I cannot quote the title of the policy. In fact, I'll take it on notice to advise you of the policy and its date of establishment. Vice Adm. Griggs: I think it was about 2006 when we set up the ADF Financial Services Consumer Centre, but we'll take it on notice.
58	Mr Ochremienko – Visits to Army Bases	Spoken, page 118 – Senator Ketter Senator KETTER: Minister, do you have any details of Mr Ochremienko's attendance on Australian Army bases in the years following ASIC's investigation? Senator Payne: Not specifically, Senator. The date of the investigation? Senator KETTER: No. Details of Mr Ochremienko's attendance. Senator Payne: I'm asking you for the date of the ASIC investigation, I'm sorry. Senator KETTER: Back in 2010. Senator Payne: So since then? Senator KETTER: Yes. Senator Payne: I don't have details but, if we take that on notice, as the Chief of Army has indicated, we'll provide that to you—if there are any.
59	School of Infantry – Percentage of Males Completing IET	Spoken, page 118 – Senator Anning Senator ANNING: In relation to my question 89 which I placed on notice at last Senate estimates, Defence has stated that, of 154 women who have been recruited to be an infantry soldier, just 24 have passed their basic training. Of those, 25 per cent have already been medically downgraded. Further, every single female who enlisted via the Army preconditioning program failed to complete basic infantry training. My question is: what percentage of men who are recruited as infantry soldiers complete the basic initial employment training at the School of Infantry? Lt Gen. Campbell: I'll take an exact answer on notice, but your question was the percentage that complete or fail to complete? Senator ANNING: What percentage of men who are recruited as infantry soldiers complete their basic initial employment training at the School of Infantry? Lt Gen. Campbell: I'll take that on notice, Senator. I'll be using the point of enlistment as 100 per cent and the point of graduation from the School of Infantry at Singleton as the point at which you want to know what percentage graduates.
60	Female Infantry Officers – MEC 1 Status	Spoken, page 119 – Senator Anning Senator ANNING: In relation to 1st Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment, once again in relation to my question 89 at the last Senate estimates, how many females have been posted to 1 RAR as infantry soldiers? Lt Gen. Campbell: At the moment, I am advised that we have eight infantry soldiers, women, and two infantry officers, women, serving at 1 RAR. Senator ANNING: How many of those females remain MEC 1? Lt Gen. Campbell: I'll take that on notice. I thought I had it. I thought you asked it on notice, actually.
61	Number of Women in Combat Roles	Spoken, page 121 – Senator Reynolds Vice Adm. Griggs: Chair, it would be remiss of me if I didn't make a point. A lot of this discussion, obviously, is focused on the Army, but it's worth noting that the Navy has had women in combat roles for nearly three decades, with no appreciable drop in combat power or capability. CHAIR: Thank you. That pre-empted a question I was going to ask. Could you provide on notice details across the three services of women in combat roles.

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
62	Meetings as Defence Export Advocate	<p>Spoken, page 8 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: How many meetings has Mr Johnston had with ministers and officials in his role as Defence Export Advocate; is that none?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: He has met with Minister Pyne and he's had a number of calls just in terms of preparation for the new role; the exact number I'd have to take on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Thank you very much for that.</p>
63	Intellectual Property – CMATS & DDATMCS	<p>Spoken, pages 12-13 – Senator Kitching</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Could I just ask about intellectual property. Who is going to own the intellectual property at the end?</p> <p>Mr Zlabur: I'm going to take that on notice. But I believe if we talk in terms of foreground intellectual property and background, we would either own or fully license the use of the foreground as well as the background. We would license the background. The company would own the background.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Because this is the first time this has been done where a civilian and a military air traffic control system—</p> <p>Mr Gillis: Are you talking about CMATS or are you talking about the mobile air traffic management system?</p> <p>Senator Payne: It's two projects.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Yes, but on both of those, tell me: who owns the intellectual property on CMATS and then on the deployable? Is it both the same? Is it the same answer?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: It is probably easier if we take that on notice because it is a very specific question, and I want to make sure I give you an accurate answer in respect of the legal position in respect to that. But I know that we do have licences. With CMATS the prime contractor, the organisation is Airservices. So I want to make sure that I am not answering on behalf of Airservices.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: No, that's fine.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: That has been traversed, the length of the intellectual property argument. Perhaps in addition to who owns it, is there any prospective income arising out of that ownership?</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Yes, that's where I am going.</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I will have to take that on notice and I will get you a specific answer, because I have to draw back onto the contract.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Thank you.</p>
64	F-18 – Sale to Canada	<p>Spoken, pages 15-16 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Air Marshal Davies: The Canadian government submitted an expression of interest in September of last year for us to consider. In February this year they extended that to include some spares and software testing articles. We are going through a normal process through CASG disposals to be able to provide the Canadian government with aircraft to meet their request as we begin to divest our classic F-18s as we transition to F-35.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: We propose a price to them and they may or may not accept that—is that how it works?</p> <p>Air Marshal Davies: I am not part of the CASG disposal system, but that is effectively the case. We've said that as our aircraft become available we would go through a negotiation process through CASG to then make aircraft and spares available.</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Roberts: We provided a letter of cost proposal in December last year for 18 aircraft and spares to Canada. So we put a proposal through our disposals area to them and agree on a sale price and scope with them.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: When is it likely for them to pick up that offer?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Roberts: They accepted our offer in December last year, but they have also put in a further request for some seven aircraft for system testing, training and spares.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So how much do we get per aircraft?</p> <p>Air Vice-Marshal Roberts: I'd have to take that on notice in terms of the actual price per aircraft. It is a general offer. It's not done per aircraft. But I can</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		take that on notice and get back you to on the actual cost that we agreed with Canada.
65	Estimated Cost of Sustainment of the Future Submarines	<p>Spoken, page 18 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Yesterday Admiral Sammut mentioned a figure of \$50 billion for sustainment for the future submarine project. Just on my own experience—and I have read some stuff on these ratios of acquisition to sustainment costs—that seems to be very optimistic in that you've got a \$50 billion acquisition. It's a very, very complicated project. Future submarines are very, very complex. Noting what we did with Coles, we underestimated at the start. Do you have any knowledge of how that estimate of \$50 billion came about?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: You'd have to ask Admiral Sammut. Regarding sustainment, we were discussing yesterday that the effect of outturning over a 20- or 30-year period is significant. The effect of outturning on a project on a vessel, the last of which may be in operation in 50-plus years time, is even more significant. That's one of the reasons why you've got to be careful of constant dollars or outturn dollars; it's the life of that. So for something that's occurring in, for example, 50 years time, the \$1 value might be worth \$2 to \$3, but in real terms it's the same dollar. Because the GDP of the country has increased and the cost of living has increased, it is a duration issue.</p> <p>That's one of the biggest drivers to that multiplier effect.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sure. As long as you quote outturn dollars, which is what you do in your investment plan, which is why I was referencing that yesterday, I think everyone is safe. Can I ask you, on notice—noting it's a very significant amount—to provide the background to that estimate? I'm presuming there's some report—</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: And some detailed calculations; so not an answer but whatever report that Admiral Sammut has that grounds that number.</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I imagine it wouldn't be classified. It would simply be observing past—</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I'd have to take that on notice. One of the things I don't do is get into the detail of every project at that level. I rely on my senior officers to provide those types of answers.</p>
66	<p>Fundamental Inputs into Capability Training for ADF Members</p> <p>Answered on the day, refer to 30 May, pp 20-21</p>	<p>Spoken, Hansard page 20 – Senator Fawcett</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: Could I perhaps ask you then to take on notice: the first time in any training course, whether it's at ADFA or junior staff officer training, ADF members are introduced to the concept of fundamental inputs to capability? Could you come back and confirm to the committee that industry is now included in the syllabus, at whatever level it is first introduced?</p>
67	Criteria for Projects of Concern	<p>Spoken, page 21 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Now that you've opened this discussion, can I just ask, Mr Gillis, in regard to the four projects of concern, can we have the specific criteria for them being elevated to projects of concern? For example you said 'overpromised, underdelivered' and in another case it was a 'cost overrun and underdelivery'.</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I can give you those specific criteria that were established.</p> <p>Senator Payne: Take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Gillis: We will take that on notice.</p>
68	Smart Buyer Program	<p>Spoken, page 21 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>CHAIR: I've got one final question in this program, and that's on the Smart Buyer program. I'm happy for you to take this on notice. But if you could give us maybe a quick snapshot now of how its implementation is going</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		and on notice I'd like some information on how, going forward, you're going to assess the success of the Smart Buyer program in terms of metrics, because while it certainly makes sense—and I think it's a very sensible approach—what does success look like and how do we know that it's actually making a difference in terms of better capability and better efficiencies?
69	<p>Smart Buyer Program – Metrics</p> <p>Refer to QON 68 answer</p>	<p>Spoken, pages 21-22 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>CHAIR: Mr Gillis, as I said, I and, I know, the committee are very supportive of this project because it clearly is a very good way of changing the way that we do expend public money on these projects from, as you said, now not from top-down but bottom-up. But, in terms of a committee that has oversight of the expenditure of Defence funds on these projects, how do we know what success looks like for the Smart Buyer program? That's why I come back to metrics. I know even from what you have said it can be a little challenging, because, if you're implementing measures up-front to save money, how do we know and how can we demonstrate that the project is actually realising savings and better capability?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: Because, by doing a Smart Buyer assessment, an acquisition strategy, from its outset, which is the low-cost, smarter way of doing it, it's really hard then to just assume what would have been the dumb way of doing it. So it is a hard metric to undertake. But one of the things that we—</p> <p>CHAIR: Hard but not impossible?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: No, not impossible, but it might have to be at the level of an order of magnitude rather than trying to get down to a specific definitive number metric.</p> <p>CHAIR: Mr Gillis, would you mind taking that on notice? And, again, not in any way to be critical, but in terms of where you are going—</p> <p>Mr Gillis: I agree with you entirely.</p> <p>CHAIR: If you could take that on notice. It is something we might explore with you—perhaps not in the estimates forum—but if you can provide us some more information on that we might seek further briefings on that particular aspect.</p> <p>Mr Gillis: As this is my last estimates, it will have to be my successor.</p>
70	<p>FPR – Properties Recommended for Disposal</p>	<p>Spoken, pages 22-23 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Thank you, Chair. Mr Grzeskowiak, I have a number of questions, but I wanted to start with the 2012 Defence listing of 17 properties for disposal. According to paragraph 5.7 of the Australian National Audit report No. 34—Defence's implementation of the first principles review—this list has expanded to 32 properties. The Audit report notes that independent preliminary assessments have been made or are in the process of being made regarding disposal of these 32 properties. Is this implementation plan available publicly?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We've consistently said here that the 2012 report would not be released publicly. It contained information that was relevant at that time. It's a fairly aged report now. It contains information that, if it was released, could affect market conditions in certain areas and give intent of what was then Defence thinking. It's fair to say that things have moved on since 2012. As part of the First Principles Review into Defence, as you've referenced, we've been looking at and continue to look at the future Defence estate profile. That work is ongoing. You'd be aware that there have been some announcements over the past few years about property disposals that the government have agreed to—for example, Leeuwin Barracks in Western Australia, Bulimba Barracks in Brisbane, Pontville in Tasmania and others. We keep under review the estate profile. We try and plan for the future and look to adjustments that we need to make over time. That's just an ongoing work in progress.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: If we just examine that answer: the 2012 list was not made publicly available because of some commercial-in-confidence considerations or impact on property valuations? Is that what you are saying?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Yes, those sorts of things. Defence wouldn't normally give indications of what it was thinking ahead of any government agreement for property disposals. In regard to the First Principles Review, there was a recommendation that the 17 properties that were listed in that report, which the First Principles Review implementation team did have access to, should be disposed of. But the government, in considering the</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>First Principles Review, noted that recommendation and agreed that disposals would be considered on a case-by-case basis. That is what has been happening since that time.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: It's now 2018. How many of the 17 properties have been disposed of?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'd have to take that on notice and have a close look. We've had decisions, for example on Leeuwin Barracks, that are publicly known. That's not yet disposed of, but it's going through the process at the moment. Bulimba Barracks I mentioned and Pontville in Tasmania.</p>
71	ANAO Report No. 34 and Estate Strategy	<p>Spoken, pages 23-24 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So you don't take on notice the wrong question. I'm very clearly asking: in the ANAO audit report No. 34—Defence's Implementation of the First Principles Review—this list has expanded to 32 properties.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'll take that on notice, Senator.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: You are aware of that—32 properties referred to by that Audit report?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'm aware of the property disposal actions that we have ongoing, and I'll make sure we reference back to that Audit report for the response on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: The Audit report notes: 'Independent preliminary assessments have been made or are in the process of being made regarding disposal options on these 32 properties.'</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: There's an ongoing range of disposals, most of them minor in nature.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I just asked a very specific question in relation to those that are referred to in the Audit report. The next question is: can you provide a list of those 32 properties?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Can Defence table the implementation plan that supports its Defence Estate Strategy 2016-2026?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'll take that on notice.</p>
72	Singaporean Troops Training at Shoalwater Bay	<p>Spoken, page 25-26 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: How many Singaporean troops have trained in the calendar year or the financial year, whatever's the best measure?</p> <p>Senator Payne: We might take those exact numbers on notice. There have been a number of training activities occur, as have been occurring for almost 20 years now, if I am not mistaken, in the Shoalwater Bay area. But is it the exact figures for this calendar year you are interested in?</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Yes. Senator Payne: For this calendar year—we'll take that on notice.</p>
73	PFAS Remediation	<p>Spoken, pages 28-29 – Senator Rice</p> <p>Senator RICE: When do you think you will have an estimate of the full extent of the contamination and what the likely costs will be to give to potential purchasers of the site?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I won't have one. I'll provide all the information that we know about the site, details of the remediations we have done, all the reports we've had done by specialists on the remaining contamination, and industry will form its view and factor that into the price it might offer to purchase the site.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Will all that information be available to the public as well?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Certainly available to those companies that might bid for the site. I'm not sure we would necessarily make it available to the public, but certainly available to all those companies that are involved in the tendering process.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Why wouldn't you make the information available to the public?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'm not sure what the value would be. I can take it on notice to ask whether we would do that. We wouldn't normally do that. We would</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>normally make it fully available to companies that might be seeking to acquire the site. The important point here is that when remediation is undertaken at a place like Maribyrnong, in this case the Victorian government's Environment Protection Authority are fully involved in that process, in terms of oversight. At the conclusion of remediation we will get a certificate from the Victorian EPA that acknowledges that remediation has been done to their required standards. I'm talking now about the remediation Defence is doing. As and when a private entity acquires that site for redevelopment, they will have to go through a similar process. The remediation they do will have to meet Victorian EPA standards. It will be oversighted by the Victorian EPA, which will issue a certificate that remediation has been done correctly, if that is the view of the Victorian EPA. If your concern is that the remediation might not be effectively conducted, then I can assure you that the relevant Victorian state government agencies are well connected into what we are doing. They will be well connected into what a private developer would do, and they will insist on appropriate standards being reached.</p> <p>Senator RICE: People are very concerned about the contamination of the site, particularly given that it's going to be used for housing development. Would you have any reason why that information, given it's going to be made available, obviously through the EPA, to all potential purchasers, should not be made available to the public?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'll take that on notice.</p>
74	Maribyrnong Expressions of Interest	<p>Spoken, pages 30-31 – Senator Rice</p> <p>Senator RICE: Thank you, Minister. I'll take it up with the Treasurer. Moving on to the sale of the site, you said in answer to Senator Gallacher that you are looking at going out to market in August for expressions of interest, then a formal request for tender next year. At this stage, prior to the August expressions of interest, have there been any other informal discussions with potential purchasers?</p> <p>Grzeskowiak: We conducted a market sounding process in the first quarter of this year. That process concluded in April this year. We had 23 different companies come and talk to us about that. It was a very useful exchange of information in terms of possible developments, the issues around remediation and the like. That process has concluded. We will be going to market for expressions of interest later in the year. I have suggested it might be August, but it could be July or September. Following that process next year we will be in a position to formally seek requests for proposal for purchase of the site.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Were the 23 companies that responded to your market sounding all accepting of the risk they were taking on with decontamination?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I wasn't involved in the conversations in detail, but my understanding is that the suggestion that industry should manage the decontamination of the site is not seen as a show stopper in this case.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Was there an expression of interest through that process from the enrichment holdings group that had made an unsolicited expression of interest in 2017?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I don't know if they were at those meetings. I'd have to take that on notice. We did have an unsolicited proposal around a year ago. I can't recall the name of the consortium.</p> <p>Senator RICE: I think that was the enrichment holdings group.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We advised that consortium that we were following a process and they were more than welcome to engage in the process.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So you can't tell me whether they indeed did engage with the process?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: No. I would have to take it on notice. I don't have a list of the companies that were there.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator RICE: In terms of those 23 companies that put in bids, what countries were those potential buyers from?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Just to clarify, the 23 companies have not put in bids.</p> <p>Senator RICE: No.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: They attended an information session with the Department of Defence. I don't have the list of which companies they were, so I'd need to take that on notice.</p>
75	Watsonia Barracks Land – Potential Sale of Land	Spoken, page 32 – Senator Rice

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Senator RICE: Moving away from Maribyrnong, I just wondered whether there was any update on the potential sale of land regarding the land acquisition related to the North East Link, so the Watsonia Barracks land?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'm aware that discussions are ongoing. I don't have an update in terms of finalisation of that discussion at the moment. Defence seeks to work cooperatively with local governments in terms of enabling the sort of infrastructure that that link would provide. I don't have an update.</p> <p>Senator RICE: You aren't able to tell me the timing of negotiations or discussions?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: No.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Could you take on notice whether there is any further detail that you would be able to share with us about those negotiations, particularly the timing of any potential acquisition of the land?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'll take that on notice.</p>
76	Sites of Heritage Value at Leeuwin Barracks	<p>Spoken, pages 32-33 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>CHAIR: Obviously, there's been quite a lot of discussion locally and within the military community in Western Australia about the heritage value of some of the buildings on Leeuwin. Are able to give us an update—I am happy for you to do it on notice—from a Defence perspective, on what are the heritage and historical values and locations and sites at Leeuwin Barracks that you would seek to preserve?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We always undertake heritage assessments of any site we dispose of. The recruit memorial is probably the most important piece of Leeuwin. I can absolutely assure you that through any disposal process the preservation of that memorial site would be put in as a constraint on any future development.</p> <p>CHAIR: Is that the only site of heritage value?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: No. I think there are other sites on the base there that have heritage value. I can take it on notice and provide you with all the detail.</p> <p>CHAIR: If you wouldn't mind. In terms of the defence community there, one of the major issues they still have is to be reassured that the heritage value and the commemorative properties of some of the locations there are retained. That might help ease their concerns a little bit.</p>
77	RAAF Base Curtin	<p>Spoken, page 33 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>CHAIR: ... I would like to turn further north, to the north-west of WA, and pursue a couple of issues that we've had previous discussions on. I've been working on a number of development projects, particularly infrastructure projects, in the north-west. There are some opportunities to develop new infrastructure in the north-west with the NAIF. Obviously, the facilities at Curtin and Learmonth, the air bases there, could provide some significant commercial opportunities in the north-west.</p> <p>I just want to go through a couple of questions. Again, if you want to take these on notice and provide more detailed answers? The first one is in relation to RAAF Curtin. If you could provide some information on the size of the property and also on the zones at Curtin air base? I know that there was a commercial airfield there on the base. It was an Ansett facility.</p> <p>...</p> <p>CHAIR: ... I am interested in just where some of the opportunities or limitations might lie in commercial access to the air base for flights. You've probably seen some of the media in WA. In particular, the Ukrainian Space Agency have put in a reasonably serious approach and are doing a feasibility study on having a closed equatorial large payload launch facility in the north-west. Obviously, there's a range of other issues that would need to be overcome for that to develop further. Could you have a look at that and provide some more advice on what issues, in relation to the Defence estate, we might have to consider and whether it would be possible to access either Curtin facilities or Learmonth facilities? That would be appreciated. Have you seen some of the reporting of this?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I haven't seen it in detail. I can take an action to give you some information about Curtin—what's there and what we use it for. It would be previous of me probably to comment on any issues about the Ukrainians' launch.</p>
78	RAAF bases Curtin and	Spoken, page 33 – Senator Reynolds

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
	Learmonth – Potential Commercial Utilisation	<p>Chair: ... Curtin and Learmonth and also the broader issue of what opportunities there are for people—we are looking at new port facilities and new industries, and obviously they are very significant airfields—is there any possibility of looking at some additional commercial utilisation that wouldn't compromise the Defence usage of those two facilities? Are you happy to take those on notice? Again, I'm not trying to pin you down for any particular proposal, but just to give us a bit more of an idea about left and right of arc for consideration.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We will have a look at that on notice and see what we can provide.</p>
79	Mowanjum Aboriginal Corporation – Pastoral Land near RAAF Base Curtin	<p>Spoken, page 33 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>Chair: Thank you. In terms of Curtin air base, there has been a representation, which you may or may not have seen. The Mowanjum Aboriginal Corporation have approached you about leasing 11,000 hectares on the northern side of the Curtin air base. I have also made some representations, but haven't heard back on that.</p> <p>Perhaps you could take that on notice? It's for pastoral considerations.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We'll take that on notice.</p>
80	Mining Tenement Access to Yampi Sound	<p>Spoken, page 33 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>Chair: The final one is on the Yampi Sound Training Area; again, something that we've had a discussion on in the past. But I am wondering if you could provide me with some more information on the mining tenement access to Yampi Sound. When I've raised these issues with you and the department previously, it appears that there's a quite inconsistent application of commercial use and contracts for training areas, which the department is looking at. For example, people who want to access the land at Woomera have quite different contractual arrangements than those at Yampi Sound. Again, I am happy for you to take it on notice. But in terms of junior explorers in Western Australia accessing Yampi Sound, the worst possible outcome for them would be to continue to be granted exploration licences—these are small family companies generally, this is the family livelihood—and have access to training areas under quite restrictive conditions. But then when they find something they can't actually develop it.</p>
81	Mineral Exploration & Exploitation at Defence Training Areas – Consistency of Approach	<p>Spoken, pages 33-34 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>Chair: ... In terms of policy, could you provide some advice about the measures you're taking to get consistent approaches across all training areas—and not on Defence land? Whether for Yampi Sound—</p> <p>Senator Payne: I would just make the point that the training areas are not consistent. They are not all the same.</p> <p>CHAIR: I understand that.</p> <p>Senator Payne: It doesn't necessarily lend itself to—</p> <p>CHAIR: No, it doesn't. For example, in some training areas there are red zones and they are subject to different requirements. And there are others, like at Yampi Sound, where there are issues with unexploded ordnance.</p> <p>Senator Payne: Perhaps I misunderstood you. I thought you said a consistent approach across all training areas.</p> <p>CHAIR: Yes, a consistent approach. But it doesn't mean that there is one size fits all. So if you're looking at minerals explorations in areas that are not red zones, could there be consistent contractual arrangements?</p> <p>Senator Payne: I've seen some of the material that has passed back and forth on this. I understand your premise. But I do think, and obviously will stand to be corrected by the experts, because of the location and the range of our training zones and the great differences between them inherently, sometimes that is difficult to do. So I was just interested in what you were saying and wanted to flag that. But we will come back to you on notice with greater detail.</p>
82	Access for Minor Explorers	<p>Spoken, page 34 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>CHAIR: But my point is that I think there is more work to be done so that if you do give access to land it is very clear. Again, with miners there is no point</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>having people being able to explore if they can't actually develop the ore deposits.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: If I could just say, there was a company—it may be the company you're referring to, I'm just not sure—that was conducting exploration on the Yampi Sound Training Area. They recently concluded their exploration and have terminated their deed. They are no longer there. I am not aware of any application from that company to commence mining.</p> <p>CHAIR: You are talking about one of the larger explorers. I'm happy to take that on notice and perhaps talk about it separately, offline. But there are a number of minor explorers that do actually have tenements on there and have access and are still having contractual discussions. I don't want to hold up estimates with this. If you could perhaps take that on notice I would be—</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I can tell you we reached agreement on 7 May with a company called Cominco around some of the clauses that they had a problem with in our agreement. And having agreed them, they've now raised a new range of questions about other clauses. So we're in negotiations with them. The training area's primary purpose is being available for defence training, which is important. We do accommodate commercial activities on our properties as that makes sense, and mining is one of them. We have five licences at the moment on various training areas—that's not counting Woomera—for various explorations that are ongoing. So the process we have in place works. Different companies have different views about some of the clauses and there's a negotiation.</p> <p>CHAIR: I understand that, and I am very grateful; I raised that company's considerations because, again, there were different contractual requirements to those in Woomera. The department has been incredibly helpful in actually getting some more consistency in those contractual arrangements between the two sites, where appropriate. But the threshold question is: if Defence is going to allow junior explorers, or any explorers, to explore in those Defence sites there is no point allowing them to do it in the first place if they are not going to be able to mine the ore. Anyway, if you could take that on notice I would be grateful.</p>
83	Method of Disposal for Point Nepean	<p>Spoken, pages 35-36</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: I understand that there was property in Point Nepean that was dealt with where a trustee was appointed so that the property could be utilised. I think it might have been property sold at the Point Nepean.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I am not aware of what that was.</p> <p>Senator Payne: That was some time ago?</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Yes, it was.</p> <p>Senator Payne: Some considerable time ago.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: I am wondering if that is a precedent that could be used where a trustee could be appointed to that site, to 310 St Kilda Road, and then it could be utilised by the veterans organisation.</p> <p>Senator Payne: We can have a look, on notice, as to what disposal method was adopted in relation to Point Nepean and whether it has any relevance to St Kilda Road.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We will take it on notice. But in this current negotiation the ball is firmly with the Victorian government.</p>
84	Henderson Shipyard - \$100 Million Investment	<p>Spoken, page 36 – Senator Kitching</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: ... Could I just ask some questions about the Henderson shipyard. There was an announcement on 20 February 2017 about the \$100 million investment into the Henderson shipyard. Firstly, I am wondering was this money for improvement of the wharves, the hard stands, cranes, and module-manufacturing facilities? Is that what the money was for?</p> <p>Mr Gillis: The appropriate officials from my area have actually left; so can I take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Absolutely. Can I ask whether that money was for the improvement of wharves et</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>cetera? And was this Department of Defence money? Mr Gillis: I will have to take it on notice. As I said, the officials—</p>
85	Henderson Shipyard	<p>Spoken, page 36 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So if Defence spent \$100 million on wharves and facilities they're not part of Defence Estate? How does that work? Vice Adm. Griggs: Those projects are part of the innovation investment program. When something comes into the innovation investment program it then goes through Mr Grzeskowiak's process, within Defence Estate and Infrastructure Group. The Henderson piece is not yet at that stage. Senator GALLACHER: We're very happy to put this on notice. We want to make sure we send it to the right people. Who owns Henderson? Mr Grzeskowiak: Not Defence. Vice Adm. Griggs: Not Defence. Senator Payne: The government.</p>
86	Master Plans for Henderson Precinct and Naval Facility in WA	<p>Spoken, page 37 – Senator Kitching</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: When will the master-planning process be finished? Mr Gillis: We will be working on that with the Western Australian government this year. We've planned three more meetings with them over the next six to nine months. Senator KITCHING: So not calendar year, but financial year? Mr Gillis: Again, I would have to take that on notice. I have some of my officers working on that specific task, but we were looking at that in the 2.8 program, so we sent them home.</p>
87	Sustainable Water Program	<p>Spoken, pages 37-38 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: I want to start the brief on Defence-based contamination, but when I get to a specific area of Katherine I want to throw to Senator McCarthy. By way of preamble, \$55.2 million is to be provided over five years to establish drinking water programs in communities surrounding the Army Aviation Centre Oakey, RAAF Base Williamtown, RAAF Base Tindal and RAAF Base Perth: are we reading that correctly, Mr Grzeskowiak? Mr Grzeskowiak: That's correct. That was announced by the government on 7 May this year. We refer to it as the Sustainable Water Program. Those four sites you mentioned will enable us over the next few years to continue the work we're doing to break the primary exposure pathway, which is drinking water that might be impacted by PFAS through range of measures. Some of those measures have already commenced, as you would be aware. So it is going back in time, starting with provision of cask water to people who relied on contaminated bore water as their only source of water, and connecting people to mains water. At Williamtown and Oakey that is in progress. The provision of water tanks, which is the main mechanism for breaking the exposure pathway in Katherine up in the Northern Territory, is well advanced. Defence has committed to paying for those people we connect to mains water— ... Senator GALLACHER: You've answered the question—there's no rigid allocation. What will the funding cover? Mr Grzeskowiak: Connection to town water, insulation of rainwater tanks, paying people's water connection fees and their water usage fees for a number of years, and other measures that would enable people to live in accordance with the advice that might be provided by a relevant state agency, usually the Environment Protection Agency, in terms of whether they can use water for watering vegetables they might grow in their garden, or whatever. Senator GALLACHER: What are the costs per site to date for the provision of bottled water or the provision of alternative drinking water sources, including water treatment plants and connection to town water? Is that something you need to take on notice?</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		Mr Grzeskowiak: To give a comprehensive response, I'd need to take that on notice.
88	Katherine Remediation - Costs	<p>Spoken, pages 38-39 – Senator McCarthy</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: How much will all the plants cost?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: To buy and install the plant that we put on the bore for the town water cost around \$4 million. That plant is capable of treating around a million litres of water a day. I would have to take on notice the cost of the plants we're installing on the base. I expect that they would be slightly more expensive because they were higher capacity plants.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: I'm a bit confused now. What are the costs of the tanks at Tindal?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'll take that on notice. I was talking about the processing capacity of the plant at Tindal.</p>
89	Soil Removal - Tindal	<p>Spoken page 39, Senator McCarthy</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Do you have an estimated time for that soil removal on Tindal?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Not at this stage. I'll come back to you with that. The problem we've got across the whole estate is that techniques for extracting PFAS from soil are much less developed than techniques for extracting PFAS from water. We're doing a range of research activities, which include working with industry, to try and find better ways of extracting PFAS from soil. In fact, we'll be running some trials at one of the defence sites, starting probably later this year, on a relatively new technique for extracting PFAS from soil. The problem with soil is that soil has many different compositions. Whether it's sandy or clay soil or different types, the PFAS attaches itself to it in different ways and therefore you might need different techniques for removing it.</p>
90	Katherine – Cost of Water Bottles	<p>Spoken, page 41 – Senator McCarthy</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Just going back to the water bottles being supplied: can you tell us how much is being spent on water bottles being supplied to those properties?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'll take that on notice for Katherine. We should be able to get those figures.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: And also how often the water is being supplied to those properties? Is it on a daily basis or a weekly basis?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: That varies. We try and work individually with properties. Obviously, now we've got 50 of those properties connected to rainwater tanks, we would fill those rainwater tanks initially, so bottled water supplies would cease because the rainwater tanks are in place. The amount of bottled water that's being delivered would be significantly reduced now compared to where we were a year or so ago. The negotiation with individual households about the amount of water they need and how often it is delivered would vary, I think, from household to household.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: If we could get that information for the committee?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I'll see what I can get for you.</p>
91	PFAS Taskforce Meetings	<p>Spoken, page 42 – Senator Rhiannon</p> <p>Senator Payne: Mr Grzeskowiak might also want to indicate that the responsibility has now transferred to the Department of the Environment and Energy.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: The announcement on 7 May from the government contained within it a statement to the effect that the task force will continue its operation, in terms of coordinating whole-of-government activity, but the leadership has moved into the department of the environment. Defence works closely with the task force, and has done since its inception, including seconding people into the task force process for various periods of time. We continue to work closely with the task force, now led by the department of the environment, on Defence matters in relation to the broader government issue of PFAS.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: Since the task force was set up, how many meetings have representatives of the department attended, and how many meetings have</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>been held? Mr Grzeskowiak: Defence would have attended all of the meetings of the task force. I'll have to take on notice the actual number.</p>
92	<p>PFAS Public Consultation Activity</p> <p>Senator Patrick listed as additional asker</p>	<p>Spoken, page 43 – Senator Rhiannon</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: Could you take it on notice and provide the committee with a list of public town hall meetings that have been held, where there can be a Q&A at the end, and of those one-on-one meetings— Mr Grzeskowiak: We can certainly take that on notice. Senator RHIANNON: for the different areas where you interact? Senator Payne: There are a number of other variations on that. I think the response should put together all of the public consultation activity.</p>
93	<p>PFAS – Summary of Consultations at Edinburgh</p> <p>Refer to QON92 answer</p>	<p>Spoken, page 47 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I note that you are doing consultation. In fact, my office got an invitation, so thank you for that. Can I have a summary, as was prescribed by Senator Rhiannon for the New South Wales sites? Can I get one of those that describes the consultation that's taken place for Edinburgh, please? Mr Grzeskowiak: A list of the consultations that we've undertaken? Senator PATRICK: Yes, in a similar form. The minister made mention of the fact that there were different types of consultation. Senator Payne: Yes, that's right. Mr Grzeskowiak: We can provide that on notice.</p>
94	<p>Alternatives to PFAS in use Internationally</p>	<p>Spoken, page 49 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Products are being used by defence forces in countries where PFAS is banned; is that your understanding of your international contacts? Mr Grzeskowiak said they was in touch with international partners about this subject. Mr Grzeskowiak: There are rather other countries that use ansulite for firefighting. Senator GALLACHER: Are you in touch with any other countries where the defence forces have banned PFAS? Mr Grzeskowiak: I'm not aware that anyone has banned PFAS. There maybe some defence that use fluorine-free foams, but I would have to take that on notice to give you a reliable answer.</p>
95	<p>Average Posting Cycle</p>	<p>Spoken, page 51 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: What is your average posting cycle? Is it 18 months and 2,000 people or 18 months and 1,000 people? Ms Skinner: I don't have the detail on how many people move at the end of each year. I can get that for you.</p>
96	<p>Trial of PostingConnect</p>	<p>Spoken, page 51 – Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I chair the integrated service delivery committee within Defence. I'm waiting for advice from the lead area there to come forward with how we take those learnings and make it into a program. We are working on that right at the moment. It is a key focus. Senator GALLACHER: Is it a funding issue or a 'get it right the first time' issue? Ms Skinner: It is a combination of 'let's get it right' and then 'let's understand how much it will cost'. Then we can have a look at how we prioritise the resources to what is a very worthy endeavour.</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Senator GALLACHER: Do we know how much the trial costs? Ms Skinner: I don't have that. I can take that on notice. Senator GALLACHER: If you could take on notice what the trial cost. To clarify, has the trial been and gone?</p>
97	SeMPRO – Experience of Staff	<p>Spoken, page 54 – Senator Moore</p> <p>Rear Adm. Wolski: That is correct, yes. They do a lot of travel around Australia because, as Admiral Griggs said, we are taking the training which is going on to bases—including the healthy relationships and sexual ethics courses, general awareness courses and the command-and-management team awareness training as well. Also, we are building a library of scenario based sexual ethics training packages so that commanders on the ground can take their workforce through those online modules. Senator MOORE: Is it a case study model? Rear Adm. Wolski: Yes, exactly like with case studies. Senator MOORE: On notice, can we get the experience level staff profile of those people? Rear Adm. Wolski: Yes.</p>
98	Sanctions for Sexual Offences – Issues raised in Cadets	<p>Spoken, pages 55-56 – Senator Moore</p> <p>Senator MOORE: The FOI request—and various media covered various different parts of that particular situation. There were a number of quite explicit examples of the types of behaviour that was alleged to have happened in the six months to March. Are those the kinds of things that you're looking at doing in that case model—working with people in the service, both as supervisors and potential victims? They're quite direct about spiking drinks and filming, and there is this constant thing about filming other members; it just seems to be a recurring issue. They're the kinds of things that could be the basis of the model for how you survive those situations and what you do. That's what I would expect. I'm just putting that on record. Rear Adm. Wolski: Yes, that's correct. Vice Adm. Griggs: We're analysing the trends. ... Senator MOORE: It is way too high. Can you give me some indication, on notice, about the kinds of things that happen with that range? You've given me what happens with the most serious, which is absolutely when somebody has been sexually assaulted, but around the issues of— Unidentified speaker: Sexual harassment? Senator MOORE: Vice-Admiral, you gave me the list of things, from sexual harassment through to indecent behaviour. Can you just give us some idea about the kinds of responses for military—can it be demotion, counselling? What kinds of things? Vice Adm. Griggs: We can do that. ... Senator MOORE: A bit of a spread. The particular program now that's looking at issues in cadets—can I get some indication of the issues that have been raised? I'll put that on notice as well. Vice Adm. Griggs: We can do that.</p>
99	Reservists - Project Suakin	<p>Spoken, page 61 – Senator Reynolds</p> <p>Rear Adm. Wolski: A lot do then return and do some continuous full-time service as you would know, and at the moment we've got about 730 reservists who are doing full-time service. They will again be able to access the transition process as they move back out of continuous full-time service and into more reserve work. CHAIR: That is particularly pleasing because that's obviously been another gap in the past. We're about to stop for the tea break, but could I ask you</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		perhaps on notice that you provide a bit more background information about the transition package and the measures that you've talked about. But also in terms of the survey results, if you could also take on notice and give us a report back how you're measuring success. With the numbers of people on the programs going through and some of the survey results, I think the committee would find that very instructive to have a look, so we can longitudinally look at it with you as well—what's the snapshot in time now and then when we come back and talk to you, we can have updates to see how it's progressing across the different indicators. Rear Adm. Wolski: Of course.
100	Dependent Child of ADF Members	Spoken, page 62 – Senator Moore Senator MOORE: That's the end of that section. This is completely non-related; it's a data question. You may well have to take this on notice. What is the total number of dependent children across the Defence Force? Rear Adm. Wolski: I can take that on notice. In the childcare program I do have one point which was asked last time, and that was around the individual case management service for child care, which is run by the Defence Community Organisation. It has now assisted 512 families in placing their children in new child care and has helped 601 children.
101	Healthcare Australia at Lavarack Barracks	Spoken, pages 62-63 – Senator Moore Senator MOORE: I now have a series of questions about the restructuring of Healthcare Australia at Lavarack Barracks. My understanding is that Healthcare Australia is currently undertaking changes to nursing and health practitioner rosters in all of the health units on site at Lavarack—is that true? My understanding is that that is happening. ... Senator MOORE: It's about roster changes to healthcare practitioners employed through Healthcare Australia at Lavarack Barracks. Cdre Sharkey: I'd have to take that question on notice to get the details. Senator MOORE: ... There was a question on notice on vacant positions in the Defence Community Organisation. We've asked before, but can we get on record again the support provided by the Defence Community Organisation during relocation? We've had these discussions. It's similar for relocations we've just gone through with the transition process. Rear Adm. Wolski: We'll take that all on notice. ... Senator MOORE: On notice, can we get where your vacancies are and how long they've been vacant for? You've said that you can tap into this professional support unit when there's— Rear Adm. Wolski: That's right. We'll take that on notice. Senator MOORE: One of the vacancies in Tindal was moved to Darwin. How many social workers remain at Tindal? Rear Adm. Wolski: I believe it's one. I will confirm that on notice. ... Senator MOORE: How many positions are in Darwin? Rear Adm. Wolski: There are a couple. I'll take that on notice. Senator MOORE: While there's a vacant position at Tindal, you're saying that you'll be able to fill it by support out of Darwin? Rear Adm. Wolski: That's correct, Senator. Senator MOORE: What is an FLO? Rear Adm. Wolski: Family Liaison Officer.

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		Senator MOORE: Vacant Family Liaison Officer positions—do you want to take that on notice as well? Rear Adm. Wolski: I'll take that on notice. We have very few vacancies there.
102	Vacant Family Liaison Officer Positions	Spoken, page 63 – Senator Moore Senator MOORE: According to the returned question on notice following the last session, two Family Liaison Officer positions were recently inactivated. Can the department provide an explanation as to why these positions were inactivated, where they were, how support is being offered to those sites and how much the saving is to the department by having these positions not filled? Rear Adm. Wolski: I'll take that on notice.
103	Women in Defence	Spoken, pages 63-64 – Senator Moore Senator MOORE: We've got some questions, and we had some discussion yesterday, seeking an update in relation to women's participation in the ADF. We had some, and I think you may well have answered the question about—I'm not sure of the title, but the head of Defence did put some information about how many women are in combat roles and, across Defence, whether that was an increase or decrease. I think we had the discussion on that yesterday afternoon, but, if not, it can go on notice. Can the department advise how many women sit on boards in Defence and whether that's gone up or down in the last 12 months? Ms Greig: We can give you the full information. The short answer is that it's gone up in the last 12 months. Senator MOORE: On notice we'll get how many and which boards? Ms Greig: Yes. Senator MOORE: That would be wonderful. This question is very general, and I think I'll put it on notice as well: what's being done to encourage more women to join or stay in the ADF? What programs do you have? We will put that on notice rather than— Senator Payne: There is a range of responses for that.
104	Procurement Delegations in DSTO	Spoken, page 68 – Senator Gallacher Senator GALLACHER: I accept all of that. What I am asking for the committee to be apprised of is the efficacy of the systems in place at DSTO. For whatever reason, you have had a problem in the public domain. Where do you point us to say, 'We've investigated. Here is the result of the investigation. These are the standards that are now in place'? Senator Payne: Do you mean in addition to what we discussed yesterday? Senator GALLACHER: Yes. Senator Payne: I think what we discussed yesterday is actually the answer. That would be my understanding from Ms Skinner. Ms Skinner: We have taken some initial actions, as we discussed yesterday, to ensure that only Australian public servants can act on procurement delegations within that research science area— Senator GALLACHER: And that is a written delegation now? Ms Skinner: I believe that is the case. Subsequently, we are doing an inquiry. Part of that will also tell us whether additional governance would be required in the process. Senator GALLACHER: Can the committee have in writing a snapshot of the actions you are taking, including any written delegations to correct any anomalies that might have occurred and been publicised? Ms Skinner: We can take that on notice and see what we can provide as far as the initial actions are concerned.
105	Investigation of Senior Scientist	Spoken, pages 68-69 – Senator Patrick

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Senator PATRICK: In April 2018, Fairfax Media reported that a Defence Department senior scientist had been involved as a director with a private company that had entered into a business partnership with a subsidiary of the China Aerospace Science and Industry Corporation. Are you familiar with that article?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: Yes, I am familiar with that. That is a matter of security, so that is a matter that is in my area.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Did the departmental officer properly declare his involvement in the company and the connections with the Chinese state owned enterprise prior to the report of the media?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: That is a matter that is also under review and investigation, so I can't comment on that.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I might just ask some other questions. If you are uncomfortable let me know. Have any other agencies been involved in this investigation?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I would have to take that on notice and discuss that with the head of security.</p>
106	Defence Community Organisation	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many Defence Social Workers are currently employed by the Defence Community Organisation? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Where are these workers located? b. Are there any vacancies? If yes, how long have these roles been vacant for? 2. How many Military Support Officers are currently employed by the Defence Community Organisation? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Where are these workers located? b. Are there any vacancies? If yes, how long have these roles been vacant for? 3. How many Education Liaison Officers are currently employed by the Defence Community Organisation? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Where are these workers located? b. Are there any vacancies? If yes, how long have these roles been vacant for? 4. How many Family Liaison Officers are currently employed by the Defence Community Organisation? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Where are these workers located? b. Are there any vacancies? If yes, how long have these roles been vacant for? 5. How many Community Development Officers are currently employed by the Defence Community Organisation? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Where are these workers located? b. Are there any vacancies? If yes, how long have these roles been vacant for?
107	Model Litigant Rules	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <p>The Attorney-General has issued special model litigant rules for child abuse victims, will the ADF seek similar special model litigant rules for victims of abuse in the ADF?</p> <p>If not why not?</p>
108	Settlements with Victims of Abuse	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If victims of abuse in the ADF have made settlements with defence are they allowed to make claims for medical treatment from DVA for the injuries they received through their abuse in the ADF? If not, why not? 2. Are there circumstances where Defence settlements have prevented victims from claiming assistance from DVA for injuries they received through their abuse? If yes, will defence review these cases, whether writs were issued or not, and enable victims to claim assistance from DVA? If not, why

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>not?</p> <p>3. Does Defence seek DVA's input on the drafting of agreements and in mediation settlements to ensure the correct information is provided to the victim from a DVA perspective? If not, why not?</p>
109	Model Litigant Instructions – Median Settlement where Writs not Issued	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <p>1. Can Defence explain why the median settlement, where writs were not issued in relation to child abuse, post 28th of July 2017 reduced to \$145,000 down from \$192,500? Was this related to an issue regarding Defence not following the model litigant instructions?</p> <p>2. Will defence review these cases with a view to topping up these payments to the pre-28 July levels? If not, why not?</p> <p>3. Why are the payments where no writ is issued considerably less than when a writ is issued?</p>
110	Numbers of Dependent Children	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <p>1. What is the total number of dependent children across the Defence Force?</p> <p>a. How many broken down according to parents/guardian at COL (E) rank and below; and parents/guardian at BRIG (E) rank and above?</p>
111	APS Staff Numbers	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <p>1. The 2017/18 Defence Budget estimated that Defence APS staff would increase to 17,970 however; the 2018/19 Defence Budget states that staffing numbers only reached 17,500, can the department advise why this number wasn't reached?</p> <p>2. Have positions been refilled when they have become vacant?</p> <p>a. If not, why not?</p> <p>3. What impact did this have for staffing and projects?</p> <p>4. What impact does this have on our capability?</p> <p>5. Is this reduction a part of finding efficiencies?</p> <p>6. How many contractors were employed during this same period?</p> <p>a. Is this an increase or decrease on previous years?</p> <p>7. Were these positions covered by contractors?</p>
112	Equipment and Kit for ADF Members	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <p>1. With regards to equipment and kits, can the department detail the process for individuals who require additional alterations to the standards? For instance, those who are taller or shorter?</p> <p>2. How much ability is there to customise kits?</p> <p>3. What are the most common issues raised with regards to the kits and equipment in each of the forces?</p> <p>4. How many complaints did the department receive in the last 12 months in relation to uniforms?</p> <p>a. Last 24 months?</p> <p>5. How many complaints did the department receive in the last 12 months in relation to personal field equipment?</p> <p>a. Last 24 months?</p> <p>6. How many complaints did the department receive in the last 12 months in relation to combat equipment?</p> <p>a. Last 24 months?</p> <p>7. How many complaints did the department receive in the last 12 months in relation to protective equipment?</p> <p>a. Last 24 months?</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>8. How many complaints did the department receive in the last 12 months in relation to sustainment stores?</p> <p>a. Last 24 months?</p> <p>9. How many complaints did the department receive in the last 12 months in relation to boots?</p> <p>a. Last 24 months?</p> <p>10. What are the most common injuries incurred from the kits across each of the forces?</p> <p>11. How much on average does it cost to fit out each member of the ADF in each of the forces?</p>
113	Future Submarines – Strategic Partnership Agreement	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <p>1. Admiral Sammut told the committee in February there had been two negotiation sessions in France and two in Australia. How many have there been now in total?</p> <p>a. How many in Australia and how many in France?</p> <p>2. What is the cost of the SPA negotiations to date?</p> <p>3. What do you estimate these negotiations will have cost by the time they are complete, assuming you meet the deadline provided at the most recent hearings?</p> <p>a. And what if they extend as far as the end of September?</p> <p>4. Can you provide the committee with a list of the negotiating team, both Defence staff and contractors as requested in QoN17 at the February hearings?</p>
114	Future Submarines – Local Industry Involvement	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <p>1. Who is establishing which local companies have capacity to take part in the supply chain for the first Future Submarine?</p> <p>a. What are the activities involved?</p> <p>b. When do you expect that work to be complete? The first round, at least?</p> <p>c. How well do you believe that work is going? Is there more or less industry capacity than you expected?</p> <p>2. Does Defence ultimately sign off on the supply chain?</p> <p>a. What levers do you have in place to make sure the Australian portion of the supply chain grows over time?</p>
115	Future Submarines - Statement by OMDIND on Australian Content	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <p>Minister Pyne promised that less than 10 per cent of the work would be done overseas. Does the Department stand by that commitment?</p>
116	Future Submarines - First Three Submarines	<p>Senator Gallacher</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		What will the proportion of Australian content be on the first three submarines?
117	Collins Class –Sustainment and Regional Superiority	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When will the first Collins become effectively unusable, or out of date? 2. You have stated that you expect that the last Collins’ class to finish their service in the 2030s. Do you expect that the Collins, by that stage 50 years old, will still be regionally superior in the 2030s? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. How many platforms built in 1970s are currently the superior ones? ii. There will need to be a significant upgrade program to keep Collins regionally superior. How much do you expect that will cost? iii. You’re planning now for the Future Submarine to come online decades away. When do you expect to start planning for this upgrade program?
118	Defence Exports – Increase in 2016	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On average, authorised exports range from \$1-2 billion annually. Can you explain the spike to \$4.2 billion reported in 2016? 2. What is the monetary value of actual defence exports from Australia?
119	Defence Exports to Saudi Arabia	<p>Senator Gallacher</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the value of Defence exports to Saudi Arabia since April 2016? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What type of goods were they? b. With which permit were the goods authorised? c. In which part of the controlled goods list do they appear? 2. Defence has told the Senate that during 2016, four transfers were authorised for Saudi Arabia, but they do not appear in the Arms Trade Treaty annual report. Can you explain why? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Arms Trade Treaty annual report only covers conventional weapons. Were the authorised transfers of unconventional weapons?
120	Myanmar – Defence Cooperation	<p>Senator Wish-Wilson</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the current extent of the Australian Government’s defence cooperation and engagement with Myanmar? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. How many joint exercises or trainings have taken place? b. Where did they occur? c. What personnel were involved? 2. Given allegations of crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing and other serious human rights abuses against the Rohingya perpetrated by the Myanmar security forces, as well as recent reports that abuses by the same units continue in Kachin and Shan states, will the Australian government follow the response of the UK Government and the European Union and suspend future defence engagement and cooperation with Burma?

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
121	Dialogue with Myanmar Armed Forces	<p>Senator Whish-Wilson</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the Australian Defence Minister raised concerns about ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity against the Rohingya by the Myanmar security forces directly with the leader of Myanmar's Armed Forces Min Aung Hlaing? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If so, how were these concerns raised and how many times? b. What was the response? 2. Has the Chief of the Australian Defence Force raised concerns with Myanmar's Armed Forces about ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity committed by security forces against the Rohingya? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. At what level were these concerns raised? b. How were these concerns raised and how many times? c. What was the response?
122	Safe Schools Declaration	<p>Senator Whish-Wilson</p> <p>Britain recently became the 74th country to join the Safe Schools Declaration, a global declaration to end the military use of schools that has now been signed by the majority of NATO and EU member states. France and Canada have also recently signed. Will Australia reconsider its previous decision, and sign the Safe Schools Declaration?</p>
123	F/A-18s - Potential Purchase by Canada	<p>Senator Whish-Wilson</p> <p>Will Canada purchase Australia's FA-18s, as reported by Canadian news outlets?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide the details of this arrangement. 2. How much are the Canadians paying for each plane?
124	Expenditure on Armed RPAS	<p>Senator Whish-Wilson</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is Australia's contracted or planned expenditure on unmanned aerial drones which can be armed with weapons? 2. How does the Department of Defence envisage that these drones will contribute to the defence of Australia?
125	Estimates for Acquiring the F-35	<p>Senator Whish-Wilson</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the Defence Department's most recent estimate for the acquisition cost per unit of the F-35? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please include in the total figure any costs required to ensure the aircraft are operational. 2. There have been various reports that serious and extensive modifications are required to the F-35s, like fixes to the landing gear, ejection seats and the aircraft's bulkhead structures. Is Defence aware of these concerns? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Who will pay for these updates? 3. Please provide an updated estimate of the full life-cycle costs for the F-35s.
126	Naval Shipbuilding Advisory	<p>Senator Patrick</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
	Board	<p>1. Please provide the agenda for each meeting of the Naval Shipbuilding Advisory Board.</p> <p>2. Please provide a list of the total invoiced to date for each board member.</p>
127	Strategic Partnering Agreement	<p>Senator Patrick</p> <p>Please provide a list of each Strategic Partnering Agreement negotiating meeting, the location of the meeting and the Commonwealth attendees in circumstances where the Commonwealth attended or were represented?</p>
128	Legal Representative during Strategic Partnering Agreement Negotiations	<p>Senator Patrick</p> <p>Who are the Commonwealth's legal representative in the Strategic Partnering Agreement negotiations?</p>
129	Future Submarines - Expenditure	<p>Senator Patrick</p> <p>1. What is the total expenditure for the Future Submarine Program for FY 16/17 and 17/18 to date?</p> <p>2. Please provide the forward estimates to 2027</p> <p>3. How much has Naval Group (France) invoiced the project since they were announced as the future submarine project strategic partner?</p> <p>4. How much has Naval Group (Australia) invoiced the project since Naval Group (France) was announced as the future submarine project strategic partner?</p> <p>5. Please provide any earned value project management reports for the project for FY17/18.</p> <p>6. Please provide a list of all consultants/contractors in the project who are receiving a day rate of more than \$3,500.</p>
130	Offshore Patrol Vessel – Contract Negotiation Meetings	<p>Please provide a list of each contract negotiating meeting, the location of the meeting and the Commonwealth attendees in circumstances where the Commonwealth attended or was represented.</p>
131	Offshore Patrol Vessel – Legal Representative at Negotiations	<p>Senator Patrick</p> <p>Who are the Commonwealth's legal representative in the contract negotiations?</p>
132	Offshore Patrol Vessel - Expenditure	<p>Senator Patrick</p> <p>1. What is the total expenditure for the OPV Program for 17/18 to date?</p> <p>2. Please provide the forward estimates to 2027</p> <p>3. How much has Luerssen invoiced the project since they were announced as the project prime?</p> <p>4. Please provide any earned value project management reports for the project for FY17/18.</p>
133	AUKMIN Announcement	Senator Gallacher

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the AUKMIN meeting last year there was an announcement of a strategic partnership in anti-submarine warfare. What exactly will be in that strategic partnership? 2. What work has been done on that to date? 3. Can we get a breakdown of the ADF, departmental, and contract staff involved in negotiating that agreement?
134	Defence Policy	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>On 16 April 2013, the former Commanding Officer of the Defence Intelligence Training Centre received a quick assessment report titled 'Quick Assessment (QA) 013/13 for CO DIntTC'.</p> <p>In the conclusion of that document at paragraph 8.a. it was stated:</p> <p>The ADF traditionally avoids overt support of specific political viewpoints. By allowing official participation in the 2013 Mardi Gras by uniformed personnel the ADF could be seen as now being comfortable in supporting politically polarising issues.</p> <p>In the conclusion of that document at paragraph 8.b. it was stated:</p> <p>If a uniformed member were to support a gathering that insulted strongly held beliefs of a religion other than Christianity (to use his example, vilifying Islam with 'Mohammed is Gay' signs vs the 'Jesus is Gay' signs in the Mardi Gras) that member would be severely dealt with. In the case of the Mardi Gras, the opposite occurred.</p> <p>Next to both of those paragraphs the officer who received this report wrote the word 'policy'.</p> <p>The complaint that resulted in this report was subsequently dismissed by the Commandant of the Defence Command Support Training Centre on 21 May 2013 on the basis that the complaint was a 'personal divergence with Defence policy'.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why is it Defence policy to be comfortable supporting politically polarising issues? 2. Why is it Defence policy to allow Defence members to participate in events that vilify Christianity but not Islam? 3. If neither of these positions are Defence policy, what action has Defence taken against the officers involved who clearly believe that both of these positions are Defence policy and who made decisions to dismiss a complaint on that basis? 4. If neither of these positions are Defence policy, on what basis can Defence be satisfied that the complaint that generated this report was adequately investigated? 5. Has a Defence member ever marched in a parade in uniform where other participants in that parade held placards stating that 'Mohammad is Gay'? 6. What action was/would be taken against a Defence member who attended such an event?

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>7. Has a Defence member ever marched in a parade in uniform where other participants in that parade held placards stating that 'Jesus is Gay'?</p> <p>8. What action was/would be taken against a Defence member who attended such an event?</p>
135	Sydney Mardi Gras	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>Defence has previously maintained that the Mardi Gras is a cultural event.</p> <p>1. Would there be any restriction on Defence members storing or displaying images of any participants in this event on Defence IT networks or in Defence workplaces?</p> <p>2. For instance, would Defence members be able to display images of 'Sydney Leather Pride', the group that marched almost directly behind Defence in the 2018 Mardi Gras or images of other parade participants engaged in sexually explicit embraces or females with their breasts exposed?</p> <p>3. Or would images of this group that Defence marched with be considered unacceptable in a Defence workplace due to the fact that members of this group march in various stages of undress?</p> <p>4. If images of the Mardi Gras would not be acceptable to store on Defence IT system or display in Defence workplaces, how does Defence justify marching in the same parade with this behaviour on display?</p> <p>5. The Sydney Leather Pride website states that it was formed by individuals 'who shared a common fetish, that of leather BDSM' [bondage, discipline, sadomasochism]. Members of this group routinely attend the Mardi Gras in various stages of undress, including those who are chained and crawl like animals while dressed in that clothing.</p> <p>6. What particular aspect of this group's 'culture' is Defence happy to associate with when it marches with it at the Mardi Gras?</p>
136	Indigenous	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>In relation to question 98 that I asked at the last Senate Estimates hearing, it was reported in the Cairns Post on 7 March 2017 that the family members of Micqaella O'Shane and a lawyer met with Navy personnel in relation to disciplinary action taken against her for her comments that she would spit on and burn the Australian flag.</p> <p>1. In relation to any meetings held with Micqaella O'Shane's family in the wake of her Facebook post:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> When were those meetings held? Who attended them? What was the purpose of those meetings? What was the outcome of those meetings? What action has Defence taken in relation to those meetings? <p>2. Given Micqaella O'Shane publicly attacked Anzac Day and Remembrance Day, would Defence allow Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander personnel to be excused from duty on those days (and Australia Day) for cultural reasons?</p>
137	Battling with Words	Senator Anning

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>The 2013 Secretary of Defence Fellow produced a document titled 'Battling with Words' in February 2014. It is printed under the logo of the Department of Defence. On Page one of that document it states:</p> <p>'Compared to the wider community, Defence is an Anglo-Australian, male-dominated organisation. Such a demographic profile in no longer desirable...'</p> <p>Page XV of that document it states that the ideal of 'courage' 'excludes' others, such as women, first Australians and new Australians.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the cost to Defence to produce this document in terms of time, grants, resources and publication costs? 2. Who authorised the publication of this document and the expenditure or allocation of Defence resources for its publication? 3. Was the author of this document ever employed in the Australian Defence Force or Department of Defence - and, if so, is the author still employed and in what capacity? 4. Has this document been used to help formulate any Defence policy? 5. If not, what was the purpose of this document and how does Defence justify the resources used to produce it? 6. Does Defence concede that it was inappropriate to waste time and resources on the politically-correct rubbish contained in this document? 7. Why is it undesirable that Anglo-Australians continue to serve in such great numbers in the Australian Defence Force? 8. Is it possible that Anglo-Australians sign up in such great numbers to serve in the Australian Defence Force because they are patriotic Australians? 9. Is it Defence's position that a focus on courage in battle excludes women, first Australians and new Australians? 10. If this is not Defence's position, why has it published a document that states this under the Department of Defence logo?
138	Teaming	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>In March 2017 the Australian Army produced a document titled 'Teaming'. Its aim is to optimise military capability for the coming 'Era of Equality'.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the cost to Defence to produce this document in terms of time, grants, resources and publication costs? 2. Who authorised the publication of this document and the expenditure or allocation of Defence resources for its publication? 3. Is the author of this document still employed in the Australian Army and what is her role? 4. Has this document been used to help formulate any Defence policy?

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>5. If not, what was the purpose of this document and how does Defence justify the resources used to produce it?</p> <p>6. Does Defence concede that it was inappropriate to waste time and resources on the politically-correct rubbish contained in this document?</p> <p>7. What is the coming 'Era of Equality'.</p> <p>On page 53 of this document, it states:</p> <p>'It is not inconceivable, considering the trends described above, that in the 2020 to 2050 period, the Australian Army may face a female organised or female dominated type of adversary. The emergence, or return, of a female warrior type identity may pose an external threat, but also could be something Army harnesses from within its own society.'</p> <p>8. 2020 is only 18 months away. What female organised or female dominated adversary could conceivably threaten Australia in 2020?</p> <p>9. Does the Army believe that there is an emergence of a female warrior identity within Australian society that it could harness?</p> <p>10. If so, please give one practical example of the emergence of this female warrior identity?</p> <p>On page 56 of this document, it states:</p> <p>'Turning to Aboriginal Australia, there are many stories of strong women in Indigenous culture. Given protocols about who may tell these stories, I note that I do not have the authority to know or to convey any of these stories here. However, I can acknowledge that a rich source of knowledge and wisdom on the role of women in societies exists within Indigenous culture. I defer to those Elders who have the authority to share those stories, as is appropriate.'</p> <p>11. Does this mean that the author is acknowledging the existence of female Aboriginal warriors even though she is also acknowledging that she does not know about the existence of these warriors because it is forbidden for her to know about them?</p> <p>12. If this is not what this paragraph means, can the Army please explain what it means and why it published this paragraph?</p> <p>On page 149 of this document it states:</p> <p>A key question when considering this idea is whether or not male leaders will be able to connect to and enable the inner Xena-spirit of Army women to emerge, or whether they will subtly stifle or suppress this.</p> <p>13. Are Army leaders connecting with the inner Xena-spirit of Army women?</p> <p>14. What resources is the Army devoting to ensure that the inner Xena-spirit of women is not subtly suppressed?</p> <p>15. Is it embarrassing for the Army to have to answer questions in Senate estimates about its documents that raise the idea of Xena-spirit?</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>16. This document raises the idea of a female infantry battalion or company. Can the Chief of Army rule out the creation of female only or female heavy units?</p> <p>17. This document raises the idea of reduced standards for women seeking to join Special Forces or the creation of a female only SF unit. Can the Chief of Army rule out any lowering of standards for Special Forces or the creation of a female only SF unit?</p>
139	Administrative Instruction & Corporate Directory	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>In relation to questions 91 and 92 that I asked at the last Senate Estimates hearing in which Defence answered that DEFLIS named an administrative instruction 'in error' and that LGBT allies 'symbol' within the Corporate Directory was not formally authorised or approved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What disciplinary/administrative action has been taken against those personnel responsible? 2. What actions has Defence taken to ensure that such 'mistakes' and 'unauthorised' actions do not happen again? 3. Does Defence concede that certain LGBT activists have gone rogue inside Defence and are pushing their agendas without any proper oversight? 4. What would happen to a Defence member who allowed a Christian 'cross' symbol to be displayed next to names on the Defence Corporate Directory without authorisation?
140	Unit/Sub-Unit Logos	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>In relation to the Chief of Army's decision to ban certain unit and sub-unit logos:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the Chief of Army produce an example of a unit/sub unit logo that was contrary to Army standards and is now banned? 2. Please provide an image of the logos used by each of the SAS squadrons as at 1 January 2018? 3. Are these logos now banned? 4. Are any Army funds being used to replace unit PT shirts? If so, how much is the replacement of these shirts expected to cost? 5. Are any Army funds being used to replace the stock or merchandise of unit clubs/messes etc that are marked with logos that are now banned? If so, how much is this expected to cost? 6. What units/sub-units are affected by this directive? 7. Have any units sought exemptions from this directive? If so, which units and what is the outcome of the request/s? 8. Have any senior officers linked unhappiness with this directive with white, Anglo, male privilege? 9. Are there any investigations into such comments and why did these investigations commence?

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>10. Is it the Chief of Army's position that these logos (or any unhappiness his directive has caused) are a manifestation of while, Anglo, male privilege?</p> <p>11. On 22 May 2015, Ben Fordham (2GB) aired an interview in which it was stated that a sergeant from 5 Brigade had contacted Ben Fordham and informed him that the 5 Brigade Commander was allocating \$16,000 per unit to replace PT shirts and unit logos:</p> <p>a. Is this correct?</p> <p>b. If not, has any figure been allocated and what is it?</p> <p>c. Has any investigation or disciplinary action been taken against any person within 5 Brigade in relation to this interview?</p>
141	Defence Force Recruiting	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>1. How much has Defence spent in 2016/17 financial year on advertising specifically designed to recruit females?</p> <p>2. What percentage is this figure of the overall advertising spend for Defence recruitment?</p>
142	Letters of Offer	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>The Women in the ADF Report 2016/17 states that females recruited into general entry positions are given a letter of offer 108 days faster than males (for the Navy), 78 days faster than males (for the Army) and 109 days faster than males (for the RAAF).</p> <p>1. Why are females receiving a letter of offer 2.5 to 3.5 months quicker than men?</p>
143	Maternity Costs	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>Since 2012:</p> <p>1. How many Defence members have received medical care for child birth?</p> <p>2. How much has Defence spent on medical care for maternity-related health care?</p> <p>3. How many maternity leave days have been taken since 2012 (please break down by paid/unpaid)?</p> <p>4. If Defence cannot provide this break down, since 2012 what has been the mandatory maternity leave requirement for Defence members after birth?</p> <p>5. How long after birth are female Defence members medically downgraded?</p> <p>6. Are Defence members required to deploy or go on exercise if they are breastfeeding?</p> <p>7. How many Defence members have received medical care for termination of pregnancy?</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>8. How much has Defence spent on medical costs in relation to termination of pregnancy?</p> <p>9. Why does Defence provide maternity leave for Defence members who have late-term abortions, as per Chapter 5, Part 6 of the ADF Pay and Conditions manual?</p>
144	Female Soldiers	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>Samantha Cromptvoets describes herself on Twitter as a feminist.</p> <p>1. How much has Defence paid to Samantha Cromptvoets or entities which she controls since 2012?</p> <p>2. What reports has she written for Defence – please list by date and title?</p> <p>In an article jointly authored by Samantha Cromptvoets titled, ‘Determining the Long-Term Health Outcomes of Servicewomen and Female Veterans: An Australian Perspective’ for the book War and Family Life, it is stated: ‘As the ADF moves towards new gender-neutral physical employment standards, the importance of gender-specific and nation-specific analysis will be critical to maintaining a strong national defense.’</p> <p>3. How can Defence accept the risk of gender-neutral physical employment standards if the analysis of those standards needs to be gender-specific?</p> <p>4. In other words, does Defence concede that gender-neutral physical standards may result in increased health risks to females?</p> <p>In an article jointly authored by Samantha Cromptvoets titled, ‘Women and War: Australia’ for the book Women at War, it is stated: ‘...while there has been a move to “fitness for task” assessments, there are significant physiological and biomechanical demands in training and performance, and these impact differently on male and female bodies. Women are at risk of musculoskeletal injury and stress fractures (particularly when subject to military load carriage requirements, such as the 40-40 kg requirements in recent deployments to Afghanistan. Female recruits are also at risk of training-induced menstrual irregularity and subsequent osteoporosis. It is suggested that these and other physical factors, such as poorly fitting body armour, not necessarily shaped for women’s bodies, may contribute to the lasting health impacts of musculoskeletal injury, pelvic floor instability, and possibly in the longer term, incontinence (Orr, Johnston, Coyle & Pope, 2011; Yoram, 2012). There are similar gaps in understanding the physical re-conditioning issues that confront women returning to active service after delivery or breastfeeding’.</p> <p>An article published on the Army ‘The Cove’ website also makes reference to a study conducted by Samantha Cromptvoets titled, ‘Longitudinal evaluation of the integration of women in to combat corps: Preliminary analysis of the first year of female soldiers at the School of Infantry and 1RAR’ in which concerns were raised about poorly fitting body armour.</p> <p>5. Given the adverse health outcomes faced by females who are at risk when carrying operational military loads and the fact that Samantha Cromptvoets’ own work acknowledges that there are gaps in understanding these issues, can the Army guarantee it is not placing the health of women at risk by allowing them serve in the infantry?</p> <p>6. Can the Army guarantee the Australian taxpayer that this program will not result in an increase in costs that they must bear via the Department of</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Veterans Affairs?</p> <p>7. Given it seems to be acknowledged within the Army that body armour fits females poorly, what risk assessment has the Army conducted in terms of placing females in positions where the body armour may not be providing the protection it is supposed to provide and, worse, may actually be the cause of injury to the female soldier?</p> <p>8. Given the gaps in understanding and the current deficiency in equipment for females soldiers, does the Army concede that it is has prematurely rushed to allowing females to serve in the infantry, potentially placing their health and safety at risk?</p> <p>9. Can the Army guarantee that no female will suffer an injury in the infantry because it has failed to adequately assess the risk to female health of allowing them to serve in this role?</p>
145	Recruitment Policy	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>1. Please list the roles in the Navy, Army and Air Force where there are different enlistment periods for males and females for the same job?</p> <p>2. Given the 'Risk Log – Removal of Gender Restrictions on ADF Combat Role Employment Categories' on the Defence website acknowledges in Army 'Risk Number' 4 that there was a likely risk that the plan would be perceived as 'positive discrimination' and that this risk was to be reduced by ensuring that there was equitable recruitment and selection, no targets for women and that it would be reinforced women would compete on merit:</p> <p>a. Does Defence concede that allowing women to have shorter enlistment periods (thereby allowing them to be eligible for the Australian Defence Medal before males who enlist in the same role and on the same day) has increased the risk to engendering a perception that females receive 'positive discrimination' within Defence?</p> <p>b. Does Defence concede that quarantining some jobs for women (as it conceded it does in its answer to my Question 89 at last Estimates) until six weeks prior to enlistment date (if there are no suitable females identified) also increases this risk?</p> <p>3. In relation to the roles covered in Question 89 where Defence concedes that there are roles initially quarantined for women or open to them before men, for each of these roles please outline:</p> <p>a. The number of positions open to females first?</p> <p>b. The percentage of positions in that role set aside for female recruits first?</p>
146	Land Power Forum	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>In an article published on the Army's Land power Forum website in November 2017, the ideas of prostitution, Defence-issued sex toys, masturbation rooms and a relaxation on the ban on fraternisation on operations were raised. The stated purpose of this article was to generate discussion about the Army's future policy in relation to sexual behaviour.</p> <p>1. Can Defence rule out relaxing the ban on fraternisation on operations?</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>2. Can Defence rule out any changes to policy that might see the introduction of Defence-funded prostitutes, sex toys or masturbation rooms?</p> <p>3. Was it appropriate that this article was published on an Army website?</p> <p>4. Who authorised the publication of this article?</p> <p>5. Who ordered the removal of this article from the Landpower Forum website?</p>
147	Physical Employment Standard Assessment	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>On 12 April 2018 an article was published on the The Cove – Australian Army Facebook page titled, ‘These (combat) boots are made for walking...by both men and women’. It generated a number of comments from accounts that indicated they belonged to, or were associated with, instructors at the Recruit Training Battalion and the School of Infantry. These comments suggested that physical standards had been lowered via the removal of the Physical Employment Standard assessment and a capping on load carrying to 25 kgs.</p> <p>1. Has any disciplinary/administrative action been taken against any persons for comments that they left on this Facebook article?</p> <p>2. Has the School of Infantry capped load carrying weights to 25 kg or any other figure since the removal of gender restrictions?</p> <p>3. Prior to the removal of gender restrictions, was the PES a requirement for those conducting their Initial Employment Training at the School of Infantry?</p> <p>4. Is the PES still a requirement for those conducting the Initial Employment Training at the School of Infantry?</p> <p>5. When the PES was introduced, how often were members of an infantry battalion required to undertake that test (ie was it taken every 6 months etc)?</p> <p>6. How often are members of an infantry battalion required to undertake that test now (ie is it now only required as part of pre-deployment training)?</p>
148	MDIND Twitter Account	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>In November 2016 the Defence Industry Minister’s Twitter account was claimed to be hacked after it ‘liked’ a gay pornographic Tweet.</p> <p>1. Has any investigation been conducted into the hacking of this Twitter account by Defence?</p> <p>2. What was the outcome of any investigation?</p> <p>3. If there was no investigation, how can there be any confidence that sensitive Defence information has not been lost or compromised as a result of this claimed hacking?</p>
149	Ration Packs	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>1. Do any Army ration packs have items that are labelled in Arabic? If so, why?</p> <p>2. What is the certification cost Defence has paid for its ‘halal’ rations packs?</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
150	Gender X	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>In September 2017, it was acknowledged that at least one Defence member identified as ‘gender x’. A Defence statement at the time stated that Defence was considering an exemption to the Sex Discrimination Act and was in the process of finalising its policy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many Defence members currently identify as ‘Gender X’? 2. What pronouns are used in relation to personnel who identify as ‘Gender X’? 3. Have any Defence personnel ever faced disciplinary/administrative action for using the wrong pro-nouns? 4. Is Defence seeking an exemption under the Sex Discrimination Act in relation to persons who identify as ‘Gender X’?
151	White Ribbon	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>The Army, Navy and Royal Australian Air Force are all White Ribbon accredited workplaces. White Ribbon, as part of its agenda, has supported attempts to decriminalise abortion (for instance, proposed law changes in Queensland to allow abortion up until the day of birth). Its website states that criminalisation of abortion is ‘reproductive coercion’ and an aspect of ‘men’s violence against women’.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How much has Defence paid to White Ribbon since 2014? 2. Is it appropriate that Defence supports an organisation involved in a contentious internal political debate about abortion? 3. Have Defence members ever been asked to participate in White Ribbon activities? 4. What would happen to a Defence member who refused to participate in a White Ribbon activity? 5. Has Defence provided any guidance to commanders to inform them of the contentious political activities of White Ribbon in relation to abortion so that they do not unfairly or adversely judge Defence members who refuse to support White Ribbon? 6. If so, when and how was this guidance provided? Please provide a copy of any written guidance. 7. Given senior Defence leaders are White Ribbon ambassadors, can each of the Service Chiefs and the Chief of Defence Force please clarify their positions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the Chief of Defence Force support White Ribbon’s view that criminalisation of abortion is ‘reproductive coercion’ and a form of men’s violence against women? b. Does the Chief of Navy support White Ribbon’s view that criminalisation of abortion is ‘reproductive coercion’ and a form of men’s violence against women?

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>c. Does the Chief of Army support White Ribbon’s view that criminalisation of abortion is ‘reproductive coercion’ and a form of men’s violence against women?</p> <p>7. Does the Chief of Air Force support White Ribbon’s view that criminalisation of abortion is ‘reproductive coercion’ and a form of men’s violence against women?</p> <p>8. If it is inappropriate for the Service Chiefs to put their position on this issue on the public record, how can it be appropriate for senior Defence leaders to be ambassadors for White Ribbon?</p>
152	Event at the Australian War Memorial	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>On 23 June 2015 a dinner was held in the Australian War Memorial so the Navy could mark Ramadan.</p> <p>1. How much did this dinner cost?</p>
153	Conference in Egypt	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>On 17 May 2018 it was reported that Captain Mona Shindy had attended a conference with the Member for Cowan in Cairo. It was reported that the Member for Cowan’s travel costs were funded by the Egyptian government.</p> <p>1. Was Captain Shindy’s travel funded by Defence? If so, how much did it cost?</p> <p>2. If not, who funded this travel?</p> <p>3. Was Captain Shindy granted leave for this travel or was she performing official duties on this trip?</p> <p>4. If she was performing official duties, what was the purpose of this trip?</p>
154	Political Activities	<p>Senator Anning</p> <p>Previously DI(G) 21-1 Political activities of Defence personnel prohibited attendance at events of a political nature in uniform. However, in paragraph 5.9 of Chapter 5 of the Military Personnel Manual, the Chief of Defence Force can now permit the wearing of uniform in political activity.</p> <p>1. Why was this policy changed?</p> <p>2. What events political activity/events has the Chief of Defence Force permitted Defence members to wear their uniforms to?</p> <p>3. Have any Defence members ever participated in an event in uniform that was also supported by left leaning political parties such as the Australian Greens?</p> <p>4. Have any Defence members ever participated in an event in uniform that was also supported by right leaning parties such as Australian Conservatives or One Nation?</p>
155	Pre-Deployment Range Shoot	Senator Anning

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Recently elements of 6 RAR have deployed on operations.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During pre-deployment range shoots, were any soldiers unable to pass and then offered a chance to reshoot without wearing body armour and other equipment? 2. If so, please provide a breakdown of numbers by gender? 3. Is it true that after approximately 6 hours of retesting on one range shoot, a number of soldiers still had not passed their pre-deployment range shoot? 4. If so, please provide a breakdown of numbers by gender? 5. Were any females posted to 1 RAR as infantry soldiers deployed as part of the force element based on 6 RAR? If so, how many and why did this occur? 6. Were any qualified infantry soldiers from 6 RAR removed from this deployment in order to allow female infantry from 1 RAR to deploy? If so, how soon before deployment were these soldiers informed that they would no longer be deploying? 7. Did any soldiers deploy without passing all of the usual range shoots in preparation for deployment as an infantry soldier? 8. Was any pressure placed on the OIC of the range practices to ensure that all females passed their pre-deployment range shoots? 9. Given the findings in the Inquest into the deaths of James Thomas Martin, Robert Hugh Frederick Poate and Stjepan Rick Milosevic recommended that training to ensure cultural sensitivity and maintaining rapport is appropriately balanced with the requirements of force protection against insider attacks, would Defence consider it a serious breach of duty for any infantry soldier to be allowed to deploy if they could not pass the normal pre-deployment range shoots expected of all infantry soldiers?
156	Naval Shipbuilding Advisory Board - Meetings	<p>Senator Carr</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since its creation how many times has the Naval Shipbuilding Advisory Board (NSAB) met in person or and in tele-conference? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What was the duration of those meetings and phone hook-ups? b. Where were they held? c. Which members of the NSAB were in attendance? 2. Can the Department please provided a copy of the travel policy which is applicable to the board's travel?
157	Naval Shipbuilding Advisory Board - Costs	<p>Senator Carr</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To date what has been total cost incurred for the operation of the NSAB? 2. Can the department please provide the current figures for each board member's: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consultancy remuneration; b. Travel-related expenditure; and c. Administrative expenses.

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
158	PFOS Levels at Three Sites	Senator Rhiannon What are the maximum PFOS levels of surface and groundwater at Williamstown, Oakey and Tindall?
159	Deployments of Military Elements	Senator Whish-Wilson Can you provide a table of the deployment of all military elements (units, battalions etc), when deployed, returned home and redeployed on each overseas operation since the start of 2001?
160	Operational Tours	Senator Whish-Wilson Does the ADF or Department of Defence have any limitations of the number of tours or days of overseas service that an individual can undertake?
161	Average Time on Overseas Operations	Senator Whish-Wilson Can you provide any records that the ADF or Department of Defence has in relation to broad statistics of the average time spent per individual in overseas operations and in war or war-like conditions?
162	Impact of Deployments	Senator Whish-Wilson Can you provide any reports or studies that relate to the psychological or cultural impact of extended time in deployments?
163	Inquiries - Military Justice	Senator Whish-Wilson Can you list all the inquiries since 2001 that have related to either specific incidences of alleged war crimes or civilian deaths; or the carriage of military justice more broadly within the ADF? Can you please table any such reports in relation to such inquiries?
164	Military Prosecutions	Senator Whish-Wilson Can you provide a list of all military justice prosecutions that have occurred during overseas service over the last 10 years and their outcomes?
165	Defence Force Correctional Establishment	Senator Whish-Wilson Can you provide the statistics of the number of people held in the Defence Force Correctional Establishment for each of the last 10 years; and for what crimes they are held for?
166	Foreign Military Justice Systems	Senator Whish-Wilson Can you provide accounts of any incidences where ADF personnel have been ask to cooperate with other countries military justice systems in relation to alleged war crimes?
167	Export Regions	Spoken, page 74 – Senator Whish-Wilson Senator WHISH-WILSON: You can't provide me with any of the nature of the exports to the UAE either then? It is just the dollar value and by region, not by country? Mr Dewar: Yes. Senator WHISH-WILSON: Where could we find detail on this? Is it the Middle East region classification? Mr Dewar: Yes. Senator GALLACHER: That's not what your website says. There's no Middle East section on your website.

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Dr Kearnan: It has composition by destination continent—for example: North America, South America, Africa, Europe, Asia, Oceania. Senator GALLACHER: No Middle East. Mr Dewar: We will confirm where the UAE fits into that breakdown. Senator MOORE: Can we have what fits into those regions? Mr Dewar: What countries are in the regions? Yes. Senator MOORE: That would be very helpful.</p>
168	Board Membership	<p>Spoken, page 67 – Senator Carr</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Retired Admiral Kirkland, is he a director of Huntington Ingalls Industries? Mr Johnson: Admiral Kirkland Donald is a retired US Navy Admiral who, since his original engagement, has become a member of the board—I think; we will have to confirm—of Huntington Ingalls. Senator KIM CARR: He's a member of the board? Mr Johnson: I believe so, but I would have to take that— Senator KIM CARR: Is that the same company that secured the contract for the naval college? Mr Johnson: We'll have to check exactly how those companies nest together. There's more than one entity within the Huntington Ingalls family. Senator KIM CARR: I see. It could be another company? Mr Johnson: It depends. You're always very precise, which we appreciate. We would like to answer precisely as well.</p>
169	Human Rights Watch	<p>Spoken, page 80 – Senator Whish-Wilson</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: This is the last question for me. Can the department confirm or deny Australia's involvement in a list of coalition air strikes provided by Human Rights Watch, published on 7 June last year, especially whether Australia was involved in an air strike resulting in 10 civilian casualties near a railway station in west Mosul, Iraq, on 3 March 2017? Vice Adm. Griggs: If we haven't reported it— Senator WHISH-WILSON: If you haven't published it already, then— Vice Adm. Griggs: then I suspect we were not involved, but I will check and get back to you. Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you just check that, Admiral, because that was put out by Human Rights Watch, and they did list Australia as being involved in that. Thank you.</p>
170	Nellis Air Force Base, USA	<p>Spoken, page 123 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Finally, is it possible to provide the committee with the report when it's completed or is it classified? Air Marshal Davies: I'm not being evasive here. I have no other purpose. I don't know because I haven't seen the full report yet, but I will endeavour to make available to the committee any parts of that report, with the maximum intent possible. Senator PATRICK: That would be appreciated, obviously when it's concluded. Thank you very much.</p>
171	Wurli-Wurlinjang Aboriginal Health Service Meeting	<p>Spoken, page 40 – Senator McCarthy</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: In relation to the meeting at Wurli-Wurlinjang Aboriginal Health Service that Dr Anthony Hobbs, the Deputy Chief Medical Officer, attended in Katherine, are you able to tell me how that meeting was promoted amongst the community? ... Mr Grzeskowiak: I'm not aware. I just can't recall how that health meeting was promoted. Normally, from a</p>

QoN	Responsible Group & Broad topic	Hansard Reference
		<p>Defence perspective—there's a community group that have been formed up in Katherine to deal with this issue. We'd talk to them and they would spread the word. When we're having engagements we put adverts in the local paper and we try and get on the radio to promote what we're doing.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Do you have a copy of the information that was provided to Aboriginal people about PFAS at that meeting?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Not the Health information that was provided. I'm sure we could obtain that and provide it to you on notice, but we'd have to get that from the Department of Health.</p>
172	PFAS Liability	<p>Spoken, pages 47-48 – Senator Patrick</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Do you have any contingent liability set aside for litigation? I won't ask you the amount, but—</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: I am not an expert in that area. I don't think there's any specifically for litigation. No, I don't think so.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Maybe if you could just take that on notice just to confirm that, that would be good.</p>
173	Military Justice	<p>Senator Whish-Wilson</p> <p>Can you list all the inquiries since 2001 that have related to the carriage of military justice more broadly within the ADF? Can you please table any such reports in relation to such inquiries?</p>