

wholePortfolio	DeptAgency	HearingDate	QoN	Senator	Broad topic	Hansard Reference	WrittenHansard	
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	1.	Alex Gallacher	PFAS Compensation	<p>Senator GALLACHER: There was, in earlier estimates, talk about settlements, people making approaches and you doing it confidentially. Has any of that been achieved?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: There was one settlement achieved recently from one of the non-litigated claims. That's been canvassed in the media. It related to one of the claims from Oakey. The settlement was made to a Dr Donaldson.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Is there any public disclosure of the amounts of settlement?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: No. All of these settlements are confidential and so—</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: How does that go in a budgetary sense? I understand that between people there's confidentiality, but how do you account for the money? You can't be confidential from the public—from the taxpayer. How do you account for it?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: The settlements are managed by the whole of government through the Attorney-General's Department, but, as is normal business for these sorts of settlements, they are confidential settlements between the parties.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: Chair, as I just said, Senator Patrick was taking a leap that was not even under suggestion. There is no claim for public interest immunity. However, what the officials will do is take that on notice for a short period of time and actually clarify. The heart of Senator Gallacher's question is whether AGD is funding that or does that come from Defence, and we will get back to you shortly.</p>	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	2.	Penny Wong	Defence Budget	<p>Senator WONG: I know, but it's hard to manage if you don't measure, isn't it, because then one is abstracted. You're dealing with abstract concepts. Can I go to PBS page 18, please? I want to understand what comprises the bring-forward—table 2. Mr Groves, we don't have a lot of time; it's the Friday before an election, probably. Can you just try and answer what you can, thank you. I would just like to know what the bring-forward is for.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator WONG: Thank you. I know the Defence budget is reasonably large, but it is a reasonably large bring-forward and a lot of additional money to spend, in—where are we?—a few months.</p> <p>Mr Groves: If I may, Senator, it is not inconsistent with what's been done in other budgets, and it's largely on</p>	Hansard	

						those items where we have the opportunities to put additional funds into foreign military sales arrangements.¶ Senator WONG: When were you asked to do this? Were you asked to do this?¶ Mr Groves: We were asked as part of the budget context. I would have to take on notice the exact date, but it was certainly not finalised until sometime in March.		
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	3.	Penny Wong	Foreign Military sales	¶ Senator WONG: I think you described them as foreign military sales, all of them, across the three—¶ Mr Groves: Predominantly. There's another term which I can't remember off the top of my head. I think they're 'coordination arrangements' in place.¶ Senator WONG: Sorry, I was trying to use your terminology.¶ Mr Groves: The majority are; correct.¶ Senator WONG: This is an odd question, but do we pay in US dollars or Australian dollars?¶ Mr Groves: I would have to take that on notice. Obviously it is reflected in our accounts in Australian dollars.	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	4.	Alex Gallacher	Defence Passes	¶ Senator GALLACHER: Is it possible to get the number of security passes issued to contractors and the number of passes issued to APS employees? I presume you do have security passes for contractors and employees. ¶ Mr Moriarty: Yes. ¶ Senator GALLACHER: Take it on notice, but we'd like to see that. If you could get it today, that would be excellent. ¶ Mr Moriarty: We'll do the best we can.	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	5.	Rex Patrick	HMAS Adelaide	¶ Senator PATRICK: Sure. On 28 November 2018, who was the captain of HMAS Adelaide?¶ Vice Adm. Noonan: The commanding officer of HMAS Adelaide was and still is Captain Jonathan Earley.¶ Senator PATRICK: There was clearly an incident that took place on that day in Townsville. You're aware of the incident?¶ Vice Adm. Noonan: I have a broad overview of the incident, yes.¶ Senator PATRICK: Who was in charge of the vessel at the time of the incident? Was it under the command of the captain, or was it a duty watch situation?¶ Vice Adm. Noonan: From my recollection of the events of that day, the ship was actually alongside; it was secured alongside during what was a pretty difficult weather situation. The exact whereabouts of the captain at that time I am not sure of, but the ship would have been under the control of the officer of the day.¶ Senator PATRICK: When did it break free from its mooring?	Hansard	

						<p>Obviously, the ship drifted across. I accept what you say about weather; it would have a fairly large wind grab on that vessel. How long did it take to drift across to Glorious Sunrise, which is the merchant vessel that it hit?¶Vice Adm. Noonan: I don't have the exact details of the incident available to me. My recollection is that it was a matter of minutes that it was unsecured before it was able to be resecured.¶Senator PATRICK: What damage was done to Glorious Sunrise?¶Vice Adm. Noonan: I don't have those details available.¶Senator PATRICK: I presume it's been repaired now. I went past the other day and I saw an LHD. It looked okay.¶Vice Adm. Noonan: That's HMAS Adelaide. She's been in dock in a programmed maintenance period for the last eight weeks. She will soon be back at sea.¶Senator PATRICK: So it has been repaired?¶Vice Adm. Noonan: I'd expect it has been.¶Senator PATRICK: Is there any idea of the cost that's been associated with that repair?¶Vice Adm. Noonan: I don't have that detail available.¶Senator PATRICK: Could you take that on notice, please?¶Vice Adm. Noonan: I will.</p>		
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	6.	Rex Patrick	<p>HMAS Adelaide Incident Reporting</p>	<p>Senator PATRICK: Noting that you would have been aware of the weather conditions, are you aware of whether or not the captain had any additional instructions in place in relation to that predicted weather?¶Vice Adm. Noonan: I would have to come back to you with full details. My understanding was that the weather conditions on that morning did change beyond those that were predicted, and it did pick up rather quickly.¶Senator PATRICK: When was the incident reported to the COMAUSFLT?¶Vice Adm. Noonan: I'd have to take that on notice. I would expect that it would have been as soon as possible on the day of the event.¶Senator PATRICK: Was the minister informed of that?¶Vice Adm. Noonan: I'd have to check on that one.¶.....¶Senator PATRICK: I understand that. But my point is that, when these things happen, they can go wrong. In this instance, we've been quite lucky, and I'm glad that nothing happened. I'm wondering whether some report exists within Navy—I presume you follow these things up—that could be provided to the committee.¶Vice Adm. Noonan: There would be. We would, as a matter of course, raise what we call an 'incident grounding report' on</p>	Hansard	

						something of this nature. This is done almost immediately upon the incident occurring. I'd be prepared to make that available to the committee.		
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	7.	Rex Patrick	Mine Hunter Coastal Disposal	<p>Senator PATRICK: The chair is putting some pressure on me in relation to time. We had six MHCs, but it appears that you've sold two of them. ¶Vice Adm. Noonan: That is correct: two have been sold. ¶..... ¶Senator PATRICK: How much were they sold for each? ¶Vice Adm. Noonan: The exact details of that I don't have available, but it is on the public record. They were sold publicly. ¶Senator PATRICK: What was it in the order of? \$100,000? \$1 million? I mean, they were vessels that cost several hundred million dollars. ¶Vice Adm. Noonan: I'd have to take that on notice and get back to you with the exact details of the disposal figures.</p>	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	8.	Penny Wong	Design and mobilisation	<p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Not specified. I can say the design services contract was conducted in Australia with the Australian subsidiary of KBR. That work was done in Australia. There has been some work done in Australia under the design and mobilisation contract. ¶Senator WONG: What's the 'some work'? ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: I believe we've given an indication of that in answer to a question on notice from Senator Patrick.</p>	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	9.	Penny Wong	Collins sustainment	<p>Rear Adm. Sammut: That means there is a guarantee in terms of the obligations that ANI have under access arrangements with Naval Group. The access arrangements are built around the fact that the shipyard is owned by ANI on behalf of the Commonwealth. It is not owned by Naval Group or its subsidiary. As it does own the shipyard and it will have an access agreement with Naval Group to use that shipyard to be able to operate it and deliver our submarines, there are obligations on ANI to ensure that it operates in accordance with that access agreement in a way that does not impede Naval Group's ability to deliver on the strategic partnering agreement in program contracts to the Commonwealth. ¶Senator WONG: Okay. So, if ANI don't do that, taxpayers are up for what costs flow as a consequence to Naval Group and Naval Group SA? ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: That's correct. ¶Senator WONG: Do you have a sense of the upper limit of that? Is there an upper limit to that indemnity? ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: There is an</p>	Hansard	

						upper limit to that indemnity, as negotiated between ANI and Naval Group. ¶ Senator WONG: What's the upper limit? ¶ Rear Adm. Sammut: I don't know what the upper limit is. I don't have that figure with me. I'd have to provide that.		
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	10.	Kimberley Kitching	ANZAC Class Sustainment	<p>Senator KITCHING: Okay. I might start on the ANAO audit into the sustainment of the Anzac class frigates. I particularly want to go to pages 9 and 10 of that report. There are some concerning findings in this report. For example, on pages 9 and 10, it says: ¶<i>The performance reporting indicates that there was underperformance for most of the Key Performance Indicators for the sustainment of the ANZAC class frigates during 2017-18.</i> ¶It then goes on to say: ¶<i>The current sustainment plan and available budget do not accurately reflect the operational use of the frigates, which is higher than planned.</i> ¶<i>The misalignment between operational use and sustainment funding ... has caused Defence to defer maintenance activities and transfer items of equipment between frigates.</i> ¶<i>Defence has identified the effects of the current misalignment between sustainment planning, funding and actual operational use. The ANZAC class has experienced degradation of the ships' hulls and sub-systems, with successive reviews and performance information highlighting the link between lack of conformance to operating intent/requirement, reduced platform life and reduced sustainment efficiency.</i> ¶The report obviously covers the decade, but I'd like to focus on the last few years. Since 21 September 2015, how many times has Defence provided information about Anzac class sustainment to the defence minister or their office? ¶Rear Adm. Malcolm: I'll have to take on notice exactly what we have provided, but I can tell you that we report monthly on sustainment outcomes for the class. ¶..... ¶Senator KITCHING: Can I just put some questions and then perhaps they could be incorporated in the response that I'm optimistically hoping for after lunch. I'll give you that date again: 21 September 2015. How many times has Defence provided information about the Anzac class sustainment to the defence minister—their office? What form has that advice taken? What feedback or instruction has Defence received? Since 19 July 2016, how many times has Defence provided information about Anzac class</p>	Hansard	

						sustainment to the defence industry minister or their office? What form has that advice taken? What feedback or instruction has Defence received?		
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	11.	Eric Abetz	Mission Fit flotation system	<p>CHAIR: But you had a look-see in November 2018, nine months after you had withdrawn the statement of requirement to fit the Tiger. Did you pass on to the people that had been spending all this time developing this proposal that you were coming to do a look-see in circumstances where you had withdrawn the statement of requirement?</p> <p>¶Mr Fairweather: I'm unaware of what was communicated.</p> <p>¶CHAIR: Can you please take that on notice and see. ¶Mr Fairweather: Yes, I'll take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	

	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	12.	Eric Abetz	Tiger Helicopter – Innovation Hub Proposal	<p>Mr Fairweather: The technology is a sound technology. The TRL levels are lower than we expected. The problem is not the technology; the problem is the integration onto a very complex platform and everything that's involved. That is where the problem is. We are looking at other options as to how we can help develop the technology further without the difficulty of trying to integrate it into what is already a very complex system to maintain. ¶CHAIR: Can we go through this step by step. There is an innovation hub within Defence. That's correct? ¶Mr Fairweather: Yes. ¶CHAIR: Is there an innovation hub program ready to go to address the matters to which you've just referred? ¶Mr Fairweather: There is a proposal that is with the innovation hub for the one atmosphere. That is still being assessed, and a response will be going back. I can ask the innovation hub people— ¶CHAIR: But in circumstances where you've withdrawn the statement of requirement—anyway, I think we've been through that. Can you also confirm that this project was the most mature to hit the innovation hub when it first hit the innovation hub? I don't know if others have come along or not, but, at the time, this project was the most mature. ¶Mr Fairweather: I'd have to take that on notice because I'm unaware of other projects that have come to the hub.</p>	Hansard
--	-----------------------	------------	-----	------------	--	---	---------

	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	13.	Kimberley Kitching	ANZAC class sustainment	<p>Senator KITCHING: In relation to the cumulative shortfall, have you advised government of that? Did that come up in the monthly meetings that you have? ¶Rear Adm. Malcolm: So we report the progress on Anzac sustainment. As well as in our monthly performance reporting, we also do a quarterly performance reporting that goes to government. We have highlighted that we're doing these studies and that we will be presenting those to government. We have highlighted the performance and where we currently are at. I think that we have, if you like, foreshadowed that there will be a need for further budget injection in terms of life-of-type extension, yes. ¶Senator KITCHING: When did you first advise that? ¶Rear Adm. Malcolm: I would have to take that on notice. ¶Senator KITCHING: I don't want to be too obvious about this, but, since September 2013, did you come to the minister or other cabinet ministers to ask for a funding increase to deal with the fact that the maintenance budget was below what you needed to prevent what was described in the ANAO report in paragraph 17? ¶Rear Adm. Malcolm: I'd have to take that on notice, as I'm still consolidating the input that might have been provided to the minister</p>	Hansard
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	14.	Rex Patrick	Growler	<p>Air Marshal Davies: The Growler that was in the accident at Nellis Air Force Base has been removed from the register. In the report that I received last year that it was confirmed as an engine issue, therefore not involving the rest of the aircraft or the fleet. That engine performance issue has now been managed to the point where we are safely operating the Growler fleet and indeed, the Super Hornet fleet that have the same engine. There has been no further progress that I've been made aware of in terms of an insurance option, and we have not yet begun any formal process with regard to a replacement for the 12th Growler. ¶Senator PATRICK: Last time we talked you indicated that an insurance option was being considered. Has it just not been further advanced, or is there no option? ¶Air Marshal Davies: It has not been further advanced that I'm aware of. ¶Senator PATRICK: Maybe take it on notice and provide an update. I'm really after whether or not we get that aircraft back. Obviously it wasn't the fault of the pilot and it wasn't the fault of the aircraft manufacturer, but there would be a chain of responsibility.</p>	Hansard

	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	15.	Rex Patrick	Autonomous Sea-Drones	<p>Senator PATRICK: Sure. I want to go very quickly back to Admiral Sammut. There was an article in the <i>Advertiser</i> by Tory Shepherd that talked about Lockheed Martin working with Flinders University on some research. In your contract with Lockheed Martin, if they then subcontract to a university for research, where does the IP ownership lie? ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: Any IP developed under our contracts with our funding becomes foreground IP, and ownership of that resides with the Commonwealth. ¶Senator PATRICK: So, even though you might not have a contract with Flinders University directly, you have a flow-through requirement in your contracts that that research—I don't know whether, for that particular bit of research, Lockheed Martin, if they want to reinvest in IP themselves—¶Rear Adm. Sammut: If the funding is coming through the Commonwealth as part of the contract—and we do allow, under the contract, the ability to fund research and development in Australia, and elsewhere if it's going to be particularly important to capability—there is a requirement, provisions are there, that, if it's Commonwealth funded, that ownership comes back. ¶Senator PATRICK: In this case, it was a range of autonomous sea drones. Are you familiar with that? ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: I'll have to check if that's one of the kick-start programs that Lockheed Martin recently announced with a range of Australian SMEs and universities. ¶Senator PATRICK: Could you take that on notice and provide an answer. Thank you.</p>	Hansard
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	16.	Claire Moore	Milne Bay	<p>Senator MOORE: I apologise if I called you wrongly, but I've got a question about the Milne Bay museum in Toowoomba. The Milne Bay museum in Toowoomba is a longstanding issue. They have been removed from Defence property in that space. That finally happened at the beginning of the year. It took a while. But there continues to be an ongoing dispute about one shed on that space after this community organisation has spent a lot of money to move everything else. They've raised it with me. I've tried to raise it with the minister's office on two occasions and no-one has got back to me. So I really want to know: what is the current situation; who is talking to whom about this ongoing process? I know that's going to be difficult. I thought it could well have been you, but I want to get it on record this afternoon</p>	Hansard

						<p>because I'm disappointed in the way this process has operated. I was very pleased with the support I got when Minister Payne was involved and there were a number of discussions about it; the end decision didn't change. But now, after a process that's gone on for well over a year, there continues to be correspondence about one shed, and I don't understand. ¶Mr Birrer: Defence has had a long history of working with the Milne Bay museum. ¶Senator MOORE: And vice versa, Mr Birrer. ¶Mr Birrer: They have. It goes beyond the issue of one shed. There was a licence for them to operate on the Defence estate. ¶Senator MOORE: They've already left. That whole argument is over. Now the only correspondence is about the shed. ¶Mr Birrer: And which shed is that? ¶Senator MOORE: The one remaining shed on the plot. You're not going to know the detail. ¶Mr Birrer: No. We'll take that on notice.</p>		
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	17.	Eric Abetz	One Atmosphere	<p>CHAIR: Senator Fawcett might be Mr Fixit. I want to quickly revisit the matter that I've been asking questions about before and ask Mr Fairweather to come to the table and get confirmation on a few issues. Can we confirm that One Atmosphere's proposal has never been under the rapid deployment program? You were talking to me a fair bit about the RPD and this particular project, and I am now advised that it was never in fact under that program. ¶Mr Fairweather: I may have been in error, so I'll confirm that for you. ¶CHAIR: If you could confirm that, please. ¶Mr Fairweather: I'm happy to. ¶CHAIR: I'm advised and—so could you confirm—that the project was in fact under the Defence Innovation Realisation Fund and that has since been made defunct or whatever or rolled over into the Defence Innovation Hub? Is that correct? ¶Mr Fairweather: I think that is, but I will come back to confirm that. ¶CHAIR: If you can confirm that, and then the proposal was submitted and accepted by the Defence Innovation Hub? ¶.....¶CHAIR: Can you confirm that the innovation hub was, and in fact remains, ready to proceed? ¶.....¶Senator Fawcett: Chair, to be fair to the official, he has indicated that he would need to check on the status of the level of readiness of the project. So I think we will take that part on notice.</p>	Hansard	

	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	18.	Kimberley Kitching	Operation Resolute	<p>Senator KITCHING: I want to go back to table 3 on the operations summary and Operation Resolute. I notice that there is no Defence funding for Operation Resolute in 2020-21. Why is that? Mr Groves: Unless we have specifics, we tend to get no-loss funding on an annual basis. That gets updated at budget and also through the additional estimates processes. So we will have opportunities, both at the next update and also leading into the 2020-21 budget, to seek additional funding. Senator KITCHING: For both MYEFO and the budget? Mr Groves: Yes. Senator KITCHING: Note 3 says that the value of Operation Resolute includes funding for expanded activities under Operation Sovereign Borders. I'm wondering what the expanded activities are valued at. Mr Groves: I'm not sure. I'd have to take that on notice. Senator KITCHING: Thank you. Mr Groves: The additional funding that we do receive is more for the additional operational tempo associated with Resolute using additional vessels in certain ways which would mean that we need to get additional maintenance activities. Senator KITCHING: If you could take that on notice— Mr Groves: Yes.</p>	Hansard
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	19.	Alex Gallacher	Consultancies and contracts	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Can I first go to the annual report. Mr Moriarty, would you be comfortable in answering some questions on that? You should know the answers to these questions anyway, I would have thought, Secretary. Appendix A, consultancies and contracts: the figures for the three years in there are very clear. For 2015-16, it's \$90.7 million; 2016-17, \$244.7 million; and 2017-18, \$108 million. The question I have is: why the variance in 2016-17 of in excess of \$100 million worth of consultancy and contracts? Mr Moriarty: Senator, which page? Senator GALLACHER: Appendix A of your annual report, consultancies and contracts, and you spent over \$100 million more in 2016-17 than in 2015-16 and 2017-18, and the question is: why? Is there a broad answer? Mrs Skinner: Senator, I think I would need to just clarify the reason. Off the top of my head, that period— Senator GALLACHER: Sorry. It's more than \$100 million and you have no idea. Is that your evidence? Mrs Skinner: No, that is not my evidence, Senator. Senator GALLACHER: Well, then, let's get the evidence. Mrs Skinner: We'll give you an accurate</p>	Hansard

					figure, but to frame that period of time— ¶ Senator GALLACHER: Sorry. Is your annual general report not accurate? ¶ Mrs Skinner: No. 'Why the difference' I'd like to make sure we can quantify all of the reasons that number might be different and there could be a couple of them. That of period time was the time in which we were implementing the First Principles Review and there was rather a significant support to us from a range of contractors and consultants in delivering those very early outcomes of the First Principles Review implementation, and there was one contract in particular that will account for some of the difference between 2015-16 and 2016-17. But I'd like to take that on notice to clarify that that is the purpose and the reason why that figure is so different.		
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	20.	Alex Gallacher	Fraud	¶ Senator GALLACHER: Sixty. Page 59 was the investigations paragraph, and 60 is the detail. In 2017-18, you lost \$605,351 through fraud. Is that correct? ¶ Dr Clarke: That's correct. ¶ Senator GALLACHER: I note in 2013-14 that figure is \$1.4 million, and we know historically you sold some buses with a fuel card in it and someone ran amok with that. What happened in the 2017-18 year? ¶ Dr Clarke: There are a range of fraud matters. Typically, they range from allowance related frauds to matters relating to credit card usage and the like. ¶ Senator GALLACHER: You're not able to be specific about which areas are attracting the most problematic control? Is this \$605,000 92 per cent travel allowance? I don't know. That's what I'm asking. I don't want a generic answer. ¶ Dr Clarke: I would have to take that on notice in terms of the precise breakdown as to the offence type. ¶ Senator GALLACHER: It is your annual report. ¶ Dr Clarke: I can give you information as to the areas which related to where the investigation occurred, but, if you wish to have a more detailed breakdown as to the particular type of offence, I would have to take that on notice. ¶.....¶ Senator GALLACHER: How many people went to jail as a result of fraud in the Defence area?¶ Dr Clarke: In 2017-18, there were four individuals found guilty of an offence and sentenced in a criminal court. ¶ Senator GALLACHER: And they had a custodial sentence? ¶ Dr Clarke: I don't have the information on the outcome in terms of the nature of the punishment. ¶ Senator	Hansard

						GALLACHER: And the value of their indiscretions? ¶Dr Clarke: Those particular four? I'd have to take that on notice. I will also get that back to you today.		
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	21.	Concerra Fierravanti-Wells	ADF Diversity	<p>Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS: What's the percentage of people in our Defence Force from a different background? ¶Major Gen. Fox: Twenty-four per cent. ¶Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS: What about language skills? ¶Major Gen. Fox: We have a number of people with different languages in Defence both that we train internally for particular capability requirements but who also join our military from their backgrounds with language capabilities. We work with the people who have those particular language capabilities to have them recognised so that we can draw on them as required. I do not have the specific information, but we certainly track that information through our Defence census around capabilities. I can provide you that on notice, if you'd like. ¶Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS: Thank you.</p>	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	22.	Rex Patrick	Future Submarines - AIC	<p>Senator PATRICK: I understand all that. I'm just focusing on what you've done. Can you please on notice provide to the committee, in respect of Australian industry content only—so I'm not interested in technical specs or anything that's classified—any questions that you asked through Naval Group, MTU directly or Penske in relation to local content. ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: I'll take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	23.	Rex Patrick	Main Motor Contract	<p>Senator PATRICK: I'm asking you for the name of the company. If you think that there is some commercial sensitivity in naming that, I'm happy that you advance a public interest immunity, but you would need to state the harm in naming that company. The company clearly knows and you clearly know, and I presume all the other potential suppliers are aware that they're not a supplier. ¶CHAIR: Is there an issue with mentioning the name? Because if there is you might like to take that on notice to give a full, detailed consideration. ¶Senator Fawcett: The only other comment I'd make is it's normally the prerogative of the government to actually make the announcement, hence a number of announcements I've been making about infrastructure programs. Defence has agreed it and contracts have been signed, but it's the government's prerogative to actually— ¶CHAIR: You weren't trying to get the announcement today, were you?</p>	Hansard	

						¶ Senator PATRICK: I don't think withholding an announcement is a public interest immunity claim that you can make, Minister. There are some, such as prejudice to national security and prejudice to an investigation—those such things— ¶ Senator Fawcett: We'll take that on notice and get advice.		
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	24.	Rex Patrick	Future Submarines	¶ Senator PATRICK: Could you, on notice, Rear Admiral, just to save some time, just a very top level—the 105 work packages that you've put on the ICN. Could you provide a heading and the list of the 105 so I've got some idea of what you're asking for? ¶ Rear Adm. Sammut: If we could take that on notice, Senator, yes.¶. ¶ Senator PATRICK: I agree. Going back to the combat system, for those 10 work packages that you said had gone out for the combat system, can you also just provide a list of those to the committee? ¶ Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes.	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	25.	Alex Gallacher	Defence Boards	¶ Mrs Skinner: I've got the Defence industry people. It's probably worth pointing out there's a range of different boards. There's a range of different appointment methods. Some are appointed by the CDF. Some are appointed by other parts of the organisation. Some are appointed by the ministers. ¶ Senator GALLACHER: I understand that. I honestly don't need to be lectured on that. I realise there are a number of Defence related boards. On notice you're going to give us a list.¶..... ¶ Senator GALLACHER: Okay. So, as a starting line: your board appointments, their term of appointment and who they are—that's all publicly available. You've consolidated it into a spreadsheet or a list presumably? ¶ Mrs Skinner: I think if you were to look at the ASPI website you would see all the board appointments there. If you look at some of the banks—Australian Military Forces Relief Trust—you will see those board appointments there. Those institutes or organisations will have available in their public domain all of their board appointments. ¶ Senator GALLACHER: And you have a list and you manage that list. ¶ Mrs Skinner: Yes, we try to keep a list of all of that. ¶ Senator GALLACHER: So we would be happy if, on notice, you give us the list that you keep. ¶ Mrs Skinner: Certainly.	Hansard	

	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	26.	Alex Gallacher	Board Appointments	<p>Senator GALLACHER: How many appointments are in front of the minister as we speak? Do you know from your monitoring of your activities? ¶Mrs Skinner: To the best of my knowledge, I think there are only two vacancies that are sitting with Defence boards at the moment, a vacancy for a member of the Defence Honours and Awards Appeals Tribunal and a vacancy for the chair of the Defence Reserves Support Council. I know that there are two vacancies; I'm unaware of whether there are proposals for those appointments before the minister and I'll have to take that on notice.¶.....¶Senator GALLACHER: This is about due process in board appointments and whether you consider these types of publicly reported statements. ¶Senator Fawcett: Senator Gallacher, can I just say: if you're interested in the process, I'll ask the department to take on notice to provide details of the process that the boards go through for each individual case. As I've said, they're different. Some have charters, some have terms of reference. We can provide that to you.</p>	Hansard
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	27.	Alex Gallacher	MTU contract	<p>ACTING CHAIR: There was a media release on 6 April that Naval Group had signed a contract with MTU— ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: No, that's a subcontract now, which is, as I mentioned before, for the supply of equipment into the platform. Naval Group is writing the subcontracts with the suppliers of those equipments. So the media release on 6 April referred to the selection of the first of those suppliers—they're the suppliers of the diesel engines—and that subcontract was announced on 6 April. ¶ACTING CHAIR: So, was it signed then or was it signed— ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: It was signed in the course of that week, the week prior to the announcement. ¶.....¶ACTING CHAIR: What's the value of that contract? ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: I will have to take on notice the actual value of the design contract and get back to you. ¶ACTING CHAIR: Can you give us an estimate? Is it \$1 million or— ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: I will need to get back to you.</p>	Hansard
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	28.	Alex Gallacher	Cherbourg Project	<p>Senator GALLACHER: Can we, perhaps on notice, get the spend on the project to date and how you treat it, or where we would look in forward estimates to ascertain what you're budgeting for going forward? ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: You're talking about the total</p>	Hansard

					<p>program now? ¶Senator GALLACHER: Well, you've got 39 people. ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: You are talking about the people in—</p> <p>¶Senator GALLACHER: Cherbourg. ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: Cherbourg. ¶Senator PATRICK: Admiral, when you answer that could you be so kind as to include the sorts of things that are included in that total cost—as you said, accommodation—just so we know you'll have a number and what's included broadly? ¶Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes.</p>		
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	29.	Alex Gallacher	<p>Cost of Services</p> <p>¶Senator GALLACHER: So how does it stack up against Canberra? I know that Foreign Affairs uses a model that is a percentage of cost versus what you'd spend in Canberra. Are the costs in France cheaper than here? ¶Mrs Greig: In 2016 there was that whole-of-government review of overseas conditions of service, which looked at a range of factors for overseas postings. Defence conforms with the whole-of-government approach. ¶Senator GALLACHER: What's the number compared to Canberra? ¶Mrs Greig: The number for—sorry? ¶Senator GALLACHER: As an index: a foreign affairs posting in Zimbabwe might get 135 times what it costs in Canberra. ¶Mrs Greig: Cherbourg is not a hardship posting. ¶Senator GALLACHER: So what's the number? ¶Mrs Greig: I need to get my colleague to get that. ¶Senator GALLACHER: I'm just trying to get a sense of whether it is dearer to live in Cherbourg than in Canberra; that's all. ¶Mrs Greig: I'd like to take it on notice, because the element there is the cost-of-living index.</p>		Hansard
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	30.	Alex Gallacher	<p>Posting – dependent education costs</p> <p>¶Senator GALLACHER: You're not unique here. Foreign Affairs do this all the time; it's their bread and butter. I'm trying to get to: you've got younger children going to French school—for want of a better word. ¶Dr Greig: Yes. ¶Senator GALLACHER: And then other children, who are at a more critical place in their education, are being sent to boarding school? ¶..... ¶Senator GALLACHER: So the reunion costs are on top of this \$54½ thousand? ¶Mrs Greig: No, that's included. ¶Senator GALLACHER: So what's the cost for schooling minus the reunion? I might have missed it. Did you tell me? ¶Mrs Greig: The calculations I've got with me here are the one figure. I would need to come back to you. We can do that today.</p>		Hansard

	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	31.	Rex Patrick	Posting support	Senator PATRICK: I seem to recall that the person we were talking about on Friday, who was involved in an investigation around fraud, was involved in these set-up arrangements. Was that person involved in looking at these apartments and schools? ¶ Mrs Greig: I'd have to take that on notice.	Hansard
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	32.	Rex Patrick	Naval Group Work Packages	Rear Adm. Sammut: I mentioned a number of figures before, and I don't wish to labour the point but I want to be very clear in what I said before and what it refers to: 1,113 unique Australian companies have registered interest with Naval Group via the Industry Capability Network; 105 separate Naval Group work packages have been listed on the Industry Capability Network; and, against those, 1,455 expressions of interest from Australian companies have been registered against those work packages. In response to that, at this point, 1,018 requests for information have gone to Australian companies issued by Naval Group. ¶ Senator PATRICK: Okay, so 105 work packages look like they're going out to see what could come back. In terms of a time frame, when would you expect responses from industry—and, obviously, there are 105 of these, so—¶ Rear Adm. Sammut: It's going to vary as to when. ¶ Senator PATRICK: Sure; just a range. ¶ Rear Adm. Sammut: I've given you figures to date, and it would depend on the complexity of the work package and so forth and the timing. ¶ Senator PATRICK: What's the earliest you might reasonably see? ¶ Rear Adm. Sammut: I would have to take that on notice just to make sure that I give you an accurate answer.	Hansard
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	33.	Kimberley Kitching	Women in ANA	Senator KITCHING: How many women have gone through officer training and, more broadly, are now in the ANA? I ask that because there are cultural reasons why women can do only certain tasks. I don't know what the percentage is now.¶ Gen. Campbell: While my colleagues are checking on that—and I'm not sure if we have it here at the table— we do have, and we do see, women entering the officer academy. That's a very brave decision for them to take, and a very patriotic decision, because a number of them come with the blessing of their families, but many do not. They make a decision to serve their nation and to do so in an environment which has historically been very male- dominated and within a broader culture that does not	Hansard

						comfortably expect, or necessarily accept, women in military or security service roles. So we've been active in our own support in the training and instructing roles and in encouraging and mentoring the officer cadets at the academy, and there is an effort by the Afghan government and the security force leadership to bring more women into their force. ¶ Mr Hamilton: We would have to check to see whether we can get any quantitative information for you, and we would rely on the Afghans themselves collecting that for it to be in any way accurate. But we'll take that on notice and see if we can get something for you.		
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	34.	Alex Gallacher	Consultancies and Contracts	¶ Senator GALLACHER: That was investigating and delivering, what, a document or a mythology about how you'd be a smart buyer? ¶ Mr Groves: There might be others not at the table who can answer with more detail and better than I can, but it was certainly looking at the construction of our Smart Buyer program, which is now an integral part of the Integrated Investment Program process that currently operates. ¶.....¶ Senator GALLACHER: On notice, we would seek the detail of the expenditure in 2016-17—why it went from \$90.7 to \$244.7 million. and back down to \$108 million.	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	35.	Rex Patrick	Submarine Advisory Committee	¶ Senator PATRICK: Just wondering about the Submarine Advisory Committee. Senator Carr had asked some questions about that some time ago. I think there are four members of that committee? ¶ Rear Adm. Sammut: There are four members to the Submarine Advisory Committee. ¶ Senator PATRICK: Can you please provide—you might have to take this on notice—how much each member has been paid to date from the contract? I remember you said there was a contract that had a ceiling on it. ¶ Rear Adm. Sammut: There's a contract value for each of them. I will need to take that on notice to—	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	36.	Rex Patrick	Army Symbols	¶ Senator PATRICK: I can assure you. I won't name them, but that was a conversation held under privilege. Chief, you—or it might have been the CDF—issued a directive in 2018 banning the use or display of death symbols in the Army. Are you satisfied at this point in time that the Army is complying with that directive? ¶ Lt Gen. Burr: Yes, I am. ¶ Senator PATRICK: So all symbols have been removed from Army units within the facilities? ¶ Lt Gen. Burr: Yes. ¶ Senator PATRICK:	Hansard	

						<p>Have there been any instances of noncompliance since the Chief of Army's order? ¶Lt Gen. Burr: Not that I am aware of. ¶Senator PATRICK: Does that ban extend to all symbols and imagery associated with white nationalists, racists or far-right extremist groups and movements? ¶Lt Gen. Burr: Yes, it does. ¶Senator PATRICK: Is it possible to table that directive on notice? ¶Lt Gen. Burr: Yes. It is available on the internet. We can get that. ¶Senator PATRICK: Even just the URL would be fine.</p>		
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	37.	Alex Gallacher	Credit Cards	<p>¶Mr Groves: There are 31 cards between \$250,000 and \$500,000. ¶ACTING CHAIR: Okay. What are they used for? ¶Mr Groves: They could be used for similar reasons. I would have to get the detail on the justification that was used for those cards. There is a very thorough process. We don't just provide it willy-nilly. It does go through a fairly formal process. For cards over \$500,000, I think that rests with me for approval.¶...¶ACTING CHAIR: Can you confirm, on notice, that there is no untoward spike towards the end of the financial year on spending and no request for increases in credit card limits? ¶Mr Groves: I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	38.	Claire Moore	Maritime Presence	<p>¶Mr Hamilton: That's correct. <i>Choules</i> is another good example. We were deploying ships into the region more regularly as part of the white paper step-up, but the government's announcement of a near continuous maritime presence in the region means that we are now making sure that one of our vessels is there near continuously, and <i>HMAS Choules</i>— ¶Senator MOORE: Prior to November, how nearly continuously were we there? You can take that on notice. ¶Mr Hamilton: We will take that on notice.¶Senator MOORE: I'd really like to get some indication of the standard operation before November 2018 and what 'near continuous' means. Of course, that will be impacted by so many things. ¶Mr Hamilton: That's right. ¶Senator MOORE: But, on notice, can I get that.</p>	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	39.	Claire Moore	Pacific Secondees	<p>¶Mr Hamilton: sorry, the February hearing—we said that we intended to second a senior executive official from Defence. The update is that we have seconded that senior official at SES band 1 to head up the security branch in the office of the Pacific coordinator. It's early days for them, but their role will be to strengthen the links between that</p>	Hansard	

						office and the work that we are doing in my group and in Mr Jeffery's division where we're building our capacity to deliver the step-up as well. That officer will play a key role in making sure that there is very tight alignment in how we implement our components of the step-up and how DFAT oversees overall arrangements. ¶ Senator MOORE: At this stage it's just the one officer? ¶ Mr Hamilton: I will check.		
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	40.	Claire Moore	Sustainable Development Goals	¶ Senator MOORE: Mr Moriarty, I have a follow-up question on the SDG agenda, and Defence's role in the SDG process. ¶ Mr Hamilton: We will endeavour to assist where we can. We might be taking some questions on notice. ¶ Senator MOORE: That is fine. I wanted to follow up on who represents Defence at the deputy secretaries interdepartmental committee. ¶ Mr Hamilton: I'll confirm this. I'd assume it would be a member of the International Policy division, but I will check that. ¶ Senator MOORE: Also, as Defence has backup responsibility in one goal under the SDG—and, I think, actually goes across a couple of others—has the issue of the SDG agenda been brought into the corporate planning process? Are people in Defence made aware of the SDG agenda, and what training and awareness-raising do you do across the department on that? ¶ Mr Hamilton: I'll take that on notice for you. ¶ Senator MOORE: This is the other question. Certainly, from the way that the government website reads, Defence is under the SDG peace and security goal, as you would expect, and that's where the major focus is. This particular committee did an inquiry last year, or the year before, on climate change implications for national security, and there was some really valuable information brought forward about the initiatives Defence were taking, responding with environmentally sound processes in policy and also looking at procurement policies and all those things. I just want to make sure that that is not lost. We were really impressed by that work that the department was doing in this space, yet it doesn't tend to be listed in the SDG agenda as part of what you're doing. ¶ Mr Hamilton: Okay, we'll come back to you.	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	41.	Rex Patrick	Pacific Step-up	¶ Senator PATRICK: So like a <i>Choules</i> -type solution? ¶ Vice Adm. Noonan: Possibly something of that nature—not necessarily as big as <i>Choules</i> . And one of the considerations that I'm currently looking at is	Hansard	

						<p>the manning requirements around such a vessel and how we might be able to come up with the best possible solution.¶.....¶Senator PATRICK: So I presume this vessel is going to be more than a couple of thousand tonnes then?</p> <p>¶Vice Adm. Noonan: I'm looking at options. I don't have a firm view on what the displacement of the vessel would be. I would expect it would be more than a thousand tonnes and probably less than 6,000 tonnes. ¶Senator PATRICK: Minister, I presume this vessel is going to be built in Australia? ¶Senator Fawcett: I believe that statement has been made, but I will get back to you to confirm that. ¶Senator PATRICK: There wouldn't be any doubt, I would hope. ¶Senator Fawcett: We'll get back to you. ¶Senator PATRICK: Thank you.</p>		
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	42.	Rex Patrick	SEA5000 – Invoices Paid	<p>Senator PATRICK: Okay! Can you advise me what the total expenditure for the future frigate program is, to date? ¶Mrs Lutz: Yes. It's \$322.2 million.¶Senator PATRICK: That's invoiced or budgeted? ¶Mrs Lutz: That's expenditure to date invoiced. ¶Senator PATRICK: How much of that money has gone to BAE Systems and how much has gone to other significant payees? ¶Mrs Lutz: \$47.7 million has gone to BAE Systems/ASC Shipbuilding, and the other significant Commonwealth—I don't have a breakdown of individual payments but the other payments have gone to CA Technologies— ¶Senator PATRICK: Sorry—'CA Technologies'—that's the radar people is it? ¶Mrs Lutz: Yes, CFAR radar—and to Deloitte; Fincantieri; Jacobs Australia; Navantia; Odense Maritime Technology, OMT; and Saab Australia. ¶Senator PATRICK: Can you, on notice, provide the numbers associated with those? ¶Mrs Lutz: The breakdown? ¶Senator PATRICK: Thanks.</p>	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	43.	Rex Patrick	SEA5000 – Local Content	<p>Senator PATRICK: You're indicating that money also includes the money that was provided as part of the tender process? ¶Mrs Lutz: Yes. ¶Senator PATRICK: What's the target percentage for local content for this vessel? ¶Mrs Lutz: It's contracted over the duration of the whole contract at 58 per cent. BAE have publicly stated that they believe they can achieve 65 to 70 per cent. ¶Senator PATRICK: I remember the tender had a number in it of 50 per cent. ¶Mrs Lutz: It's 58 per cent for the head contract. For the design and production phase</p>	Hansard	

						it's 54 per cent. ¶ Senator PATRICK: But I think the tender itself only had 50 per cent. Is that right? ¶ Mrs Lutz: I'd have to confirm for you.	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	44.	Rex Patrick	SEA5000 – ASC Contract	¶ Senator PATRICK: Is the contract that you've got a fixed price contract? What's the contracting arrangement with—what is it called—ASC Shipbuilding? ¶ Mrs Lutz: Yes, ASC Shipbuilding. The current phase is a cost reimbursement model and there are incentives in the contract. ASC Shipbuilding are paid their actual costs, but they must meet their milestones until get profit paid. ¶ Senator PATRICK: Would you lay out what the significant milestones are for the next few years with respect to that contract?	Hansard
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	45.	Rex Patrick	Childcare services	¶ Senator PATRICK: That's where I got to with the Chief of Navy, because tonnage has some impact on what weapons they carry. ¶In a question on notice I asked about childcare centres. I noted that in South Australia we have about 7,000 Defence people, Western Australia has 8,000 Defence people and the NT has 5,000 and that they have two childcare programs and South Australia has none. The answer provided, if I construed it correctly, was that there is no need for a facility in South Australia because there are plenty of commercial places in South Australia. My question in relation to that is: how did you establish that? How do you know that there are a lot? Is it because you've not had any complaints from ADF personnel? ¶ Mrs Greig: On the first part of your question—I think there were couple of parts to it—we did a comprehensive study looking at the availability of child care in proximity to our bases and then what the demand was. It was that study that then informed where the need was for Defence operated or Defence run childcare centres. ¶ Senator PATRICK: Has that study been made public? ¶ Mrs Greig: We could provide that report. ¶ Senator PATRICK: That would be fantastic. How long ago was that study done? ¶ Mrs Greig: Not that long ago. I'd say two years ago. But I'd like to come back to you because— ¶ Senator PATRICK: Sure. ¶ Mrs Greig: It's in that ballpark. ¶..... ¶ Senator PATRICK: So have you had any people from South Australia raising a concern? ¶ Major Gen. Fox: I've had no concerns raised to me, but I can check if there have been any.	Hansard

	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	46.	Rex Patrick	Pressurised Training	<p>Vice Adm. Noonan: I think what I'm alluding to here is not a matter of the cost to the facility; it's actually the risk of the training, and understanding what is the most contemporary, safe nature of training that we can provide to our current and future submariners to reduce the instance of suffering a pressure injury during training, while still providing them with the skills to be able to escape safely from a submarine should that situation ever arise.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So a decision hasn't been made at this point, and you are still garnering information? Is that correct?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Is it possible to provide the committee with information that has led to the doubt about the worthiness of this particular training? This training has been run for as long as I can remember. I got my Dolphins back in the nineties, and we were doing stuff in the UK. Has the UK stopped? Has the US stopped?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: I would have to take that on notice. I'm not 100 per cent familiar with that.</p>	Hansard
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	47.	Peter Georgiou	IGADF Report	<p>(i) I refer to the NSW police raid on former decorated Commando and Veteran Mick Bainbridge's family home on the 23 July 2016 which was caused by possible deliberate malicious or negligent false information from high-ranking Australian Army officers. Can the Minister give a guarantee that no Defence force member made a call to NSW emergency services 000 pretending to be Mr Bainbridge, prior to the police raid? Can the Minister detail the steps his Defence department has taken to investigate serious allegations that Defence force members have acted in a criminal or negligent manner with regard to the raid on Mr Bainbridge's family home? Can the Minister explain why an official copy of the final report by the IGADF (Inspector General of the Australian Defence Force) regarding the wrongful NSW police raid has not been delivered (as promised) after 2 years? In relation to the IGADF report – can the minister detail the date it was started and completed? In relation to the IGADF report –</p>	Written

					<p>can the minister confirm that his department has received a copy from the AGIDF?¶In relation to the IGADF report – can the minister detail the cost of producing that report?¶In relation to the IGADF – can the minister confirm that an independent NSW police report called operation Civet exists which accuses the Australian Defence Force Investigative Service (ADFIS) staff and other sections of the Australian Defence Force (ADF) including the IGADF to deliberately lie, withhold evidence and fabricate information?¶In relation to the IGADF – can the minister give a guarantee that, as indicated by independent NSW police report operation Civet - the Australian Defence Force Investigative Service (ADFIS) staff and other sections of the Australian Defence Force (ADF) including the IGADF still do not continue to deliberately lie, withhold evidence and fabricate information?¶I refer the Defence Minister to the facts that: ¶Mick Bainbridge is a decorated former Commando and Veteran, who along with his family was wrongly targeted on 23 July 2016 with a NSW police raid on his family home.¶The NSW police raid was caused by either deliberately malicious or negligently false information from high-ranking Australian Army officers.¶The NSW police raid caused significant harm to Mr Bainbridge and his family who have never received an official apology from the Australian Army or Government.¶On the 1st Feb 2017 the Coalition government through then Defence Minister Marise Payne promised in writing, a special mediation for Mr Bainbridge.¶On the 15th Feb 2019 - 2 years after Defence Minister Marise Payne’s promise – Senator Hanson wrote to Prime Minister Scott Morrison about his government’s failure to set a date and deliver Mr Bainbridge’s promised mediation.¶Can the Minister please detail in writing an explanation why the mediation date (as promised) still has not</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>been communicated by the Defence Department to Mr Bainbridge's Lawyers?¶I refer the Defence Minister to the facts that: The investigation into Mr Bainbridge's matter by the Inspector General of the ADF (IGADF) has taken over 2.5 years to complete and it was to be delivered to Mr Bainbridge's legal representatives on the 27/03/2019. Can the Minister please detail in writing an explanation: Why the IGADF report has still not been delivered to Mr Bainbridge's legal representatives? ¶Is the sudden unexpected delay in delivering the IGADF report due to the likelihood that the report will provide further evidence that the IGADF (as found in the NSW Police Force's operation Civet) has continued to deliberately lie, withhold evidence and fabricate information in order to cover up official corruption in the ADF?¶I refer the Minister to the fact that Individual Welfare Boards (IWB) are conducted for ill and injured members of the Defence Force. In relation to IWB can the Minister please list and break down yearly for the last 10 years:¶How many times have IWB's been carried out for Australian Special Forces members¶Separately indicate how many times these IWB's have included the attendance of a legal officer?¶Separately indicate how many times Special force members have had support persons present at IWB's?¶I refer the Minister to the laws and protocols the ADF must adhere to when posting a defence force member. Please detail in writing:¶What notification is required to a Defence Force member before they are posted?¶What period of time does a member have to either accept or appeal a posting?¶What Defence policy sets out this posting procedure?¶I refer the Minister to the annual discharge of Special Forces members due to medical reasons. Broken down and itemised for each year for the last 10 years, can the Minister please detail in</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>writing:¶The total number of Special Force members who were medically discharged ¶Of that number the number of Special Force members who were discharged due to war service injuries?¶Of those discharged because of medical conditions caused by war service injuries, the number of Special Force members who were able to retain their normal Special Forces pay and entitlements? ¶Of those discharged because of medical conditions caused by war service injuries, the number of Special force members who were effectively stripped of their normal Special Forces pay and entitlements, by posting prior to discharge?¶I refer the Minister to the Individual Welfare Board (IWB) for Mr Bainbridge convened by the ADF (a day before the NSW police raid on his family home) where he was informed he would be posted, just prior to his discharge, and thus his pay and entitlements would be effectively stripped of normal Special Forces pay and entitlements; can the Minister:¶Give a guarantee that on the 22/07/2016 the extra-ordinary proposal made by the IWB to post Mr Bainbridge (which unchallenged would have resulted in a significant decrease in Mr Bainbridge’s pay and entitlements) was not an illegal act of reprisal caused by Mr Bainbridge’s decision to question/complain about substandard medical care and other negligent actions on the behalf of certain ADF officers?¶List the names of all the ADF officers who were present at the IWB that Mr Bainbridge attended on the 22/07/2016?¶Separately identify and list the name of the official legal officer in attendance? ¶State whether it is normal procedure to have a legal officer present and a member of IWB?¶Indicate the reason why the legal officer was present?¶I refer the Minister to the fact that an electronic medical record system called “Jedi” is the Defence Force’s online medical record keeping system used</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>to manage ADF members' personal medical files. In relation to this, reported separately by date, and itemised yearly for the last 10 years please state:¶The number of times that the Jedi System has been down, malfunctioned or became unserviceable?¶The average amount of time per failure for the Jedi System? ¶Can the minister confirm that the Jedi system is utilised:¶To record emails with Defence Force Members?¶To record all communications with Defence Force Members?¶I refer the Defence Minister to Mr Bainbridge's online (Jedi) Medical history records. Can the Minister:¶Confirm that the Jedi record system was utilised correctly?¶Agree that official medical entries were made retrospectively following the NSW Police raid on his home?¶State how many times ADF medical personnel made entries retrospectively following the NSW Police raid on his home?¶List the names of the individuals who made retrospective entries on Mr Bainbridge's Jedi records following the NSW Police raid on his home?¶List the names of those who authorised the retrospective entries on Mr Bainbridge's Jedi records following the NSW Police raid on his home?¶Confirm that retrospective entries on Mr Bainbridge's Jedi system were also made after his complaints to the Defence Minister regarding the NSW Police raid on his home?¶I refer the Minister to the NSW police raid on former decorated Commando and Veteran Mick Bainbridge's family home on the 23 July which was caused by either deliberately malicious or negligently false information from high-ranking Australian Army officers. Can the Minister please list all the dates and times that Defence contacted the NSW Police in relation to Mr Bainbridge's matter including: ¶Any calls to triple 000?¶The names of those who gave the order to call triple 000?¶Description of reference to the written authority for the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>triple 000 call?¶An indication whether Defence claims that the Jedi recording system was down or malfunctioning at the time of these calls to NSW police?¶I refer the Minister to the NSW police raid on former decorated Commando and Veteran Mick Bainbridge's family home on the 23 July 2016. Can the Minister please provide:¶The date that the Chief of Army became aware of Mr Bainbridge's matter?¶A description of how the Chief of Army became aware of Mr Bainbridge's matter?¶A description of what the Chief of the Army did to address Mr Bainbridge's complaints regarding Defence's negligent, careless or criminal behaviour?¶An explanation of why the (now) Chief of Defence has chosen to defy orders from the PM and Minister and has delayed Mr Bainbridge's mediation with Defence?¶I refer the Minister to the NSW police raid on former decorated Commando and Veteran Mick Bainbridge's family home on the 23 July 2016:¶Can the Minister please list in chronological date order, the number of times that the Prime Minister's advisor (Mr Jimmy Kiploks) has communicated with Mr Bainbridge, Senator Hanson's office and the Department of Defence, in relation to Mr Bainbridge's matter?¶Can the Minister state the number of times that former Defence minister Marise Payne (both in her capacity as the Defence Minister and also in her capacity as a Minister of the Government), has been contacted in relation to this matter?¶Can the Minister explain why he chose not to honour the written promise of the former Defence Minister Marise Payne and deliver a special mediation to Mr Bainbridge in order to deliver swift justice and restitution to him and his family?¶Can the Minister accept responsibility and apologise to Mr Bainbridge and his family for the unnecessary harm and humiliation caused by the NSW police raid on his family home?</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	48.	Rex Patrick	Naval Group	In answer to Senate Notice Paper Question 897, Defence advised that it “continues to review workforce planning by Naval Group and also engages with industry through regular meetings to plan wider workforce needs for the Submarine Enterprise to ensure that the requirements of the Future Submarine Program and Collins sustainment continue to be addressed.”¶1.How many meetings have taken place and on what dates?¶2. Which senior officials attended these meetings?¶	Written	
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	49.	Rex Patrick	Canada’s Surface Combatant Program	Please advise of the number of Australian companies that have secured work on Canada’s Surface Combatant Program (where an export permit was required)?	Written	
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	50.	Rex Patrick	Naval Group - Australian industry capabilities	In answer to Senate Notice Paper Question 992, Defence advised that Naval Group has not reported any gaps in Australian industry capabilities. We note that the diesel appears to not have involved any work from Australian companies. In that context, please explain what is meant by the statement that there are no gaps in industry capability?¶	Written	
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	51.	Rex Patrick	Review into DFRDB	1a) The Minister announced review into Defence Force Retirement and Death Benefits Scheme (DFRDB) commutation issues late last month. At the time he said further details would be released after a round table on April 2nd with veterans groups. Please provide the further details, including but not limited to, the timeframe, the scope, who will run the inquiry, how consultation will work and the date that the report is to be returned to the Minister.¶¶1b) Is it the Government’s intention to make the review report public?	Written	
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	52.	Rex Patrick	Submarine escape training	1. Vice Admiral Noonan advised that there were presently 809 qualified submariners. How many of these submariners have completed wet (pressurised) submarine escape training?¶For each of the years 2013 through 2017, please provide the number of submariners that have suffered pressure injuries?¶Does the Navy still conduct recompression chamber testing of submariners before or during initial training. If not:¶When did this stop?¶Why did this stop?¶To what pressure (i.e. bars) are (or were) submariners tested to in the recompression chamber?¶How many submariner candidates in	Written	

						<p>each of the years 2013 onwards have failed to deal satisfactorily with the recompression chamber pressure test?¶For each of the years 2013 through 2018,how many ADF personnel have completed parachute training?¶For each of the years 2013 through 2018, please provide the number of ADF personnel that have suffered injuries during parachute training?¶For each of the years 2013 through 2018,how many ADF personnel have completed helicopter underwater escape training?¶For each of the years 2013 through 2018, please provide the number of ADF personnel that have suffered injuries during helicopter underwater escape training?</p>		
	Department of Defence	05/04/2019	53.	Rex Patrick	Collins LOTE Study Contract	<p>Senator PATRICK:...Going back to LOTE, how many full-time-equivalent employees are working on LOTE at this point in time?¶Mr Johnson: We have 30 ASC employees and four Commonwealth employees on the study team at this moment. ¶Senator PATRICK: That's by way of contract. Can you provide me with the contract value for ASC? ¶Mr Johnson: Yes. ¶Senator PATRICK: Also, I think you mentioned some dates before, but just what the contract says in terms of the completion date for that scope of work that you've obvious attached to a contract. ¶Mr Johnson: Yes. ¶Senator PATRICK: Thank you very much.</p>	Hansard	
	Department of Defence	10/04/2019	54.	Claire Moore	DCP Breakdown	<p>Senator MOORE: Mr Hamilton, on the \$128 million in 2018-19, is it possible to get that itemised, as to the themes of particular programs you've identified to me, program by program? Is that possible— certainly on notice, without question¶...¶Mr Jeffery: You asked about the increase. Obviously, in the Defence white paper in 2015, international engagement in defence was a core and integrated function. In financial year 2016-17, the total defence cooperation budget was \$98 million. ¶Senator MOORE: That's the total for the Pacific region? ¶Mr Jeffery: No. The bulk of DCP funds is actually in the Pacific and the remaining is typically in South-East Asia. We can provide you with the full breakdown. ¶Senator MOORE: That would be good.</p>	Hansard	