

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

QoN	Senator	Broad topic	Hansard Page	Hansard Reference
1	Wong	Cladding Audit Commencement	6-7	<p>Senator WONG: Was the minister at the time involved in that decision?                      Mr Grzeskowiak: I don't think so. It was something we did departmentally.                      Senator WONG: Was the minister advised?                      Mr Grzeskowiak: I am pretty sure that would have been the case, but I would have to take it on notice.                      Senator WONG: I would love the date of both. Do you have the date of the commencement of the audit?                      Mr Grzeskowiak: I don't have the exact date, but we can probably get that for you as we go.</p>
2	Wong	Cladding Audit Reports	7-8	<p>Senator WONG: What paperwork can you provide us with about this audit?                      Mr Grzeskowiak: Today, nothing. But on notice I can provide more details.                      Senator WONG: I would like documents associated with your arrangements with them and the audit reports. Were there audit reports? Is that the phrase I should use?                      Mr Grzeskowiak: There were reports of the audit which would have reported on the status of all the buildings that were looked at with regard to their correct or otherwise use of flammable cladding.                      Senator WONG: How many buildings were the subject of the audit or within the remit?                      Mr Grzeskowiak: The whole Defence Estate.                      Senator WONG: How many buildings were within the remit?                      Mr Grzeskowiak: I can only give you an approximate number, but we have around 25,000 to 30,000 built structures on the Defence Estate. I can provide on notice further information.                      Senator WONG: When were the audits finalised? How did you get the report? In what form was the report?                      Mr Grzeskowiak: The audits were finalised last year, but the exact date I would need to come back to you on. Looking at my information here, June 2017 was when we commenced our process.</p>
3	Wong	Cladding – Status of 203 Buildings	8	<p>Senator WONG: And in respect of those 208, you then commission fire engineers, I think you described them as?                      Mr Birrer: Correct.                      Senator WONG: They looked at the 208, and five were found to be definitively noncompliant?                      Mr Birrer: Yes.                      Senator WONG: What happened to the other 203? Are they cleared or are they still potentially noncompliant? What is their status?                      Mr Birrer: I'll take that on notice, but I believe they're cleared.                      Senator WONG: We don't know?                      Mr Birrer: There are five that are noncompliant.                      Senator WONG: That wasn't my question. I'm asking about the 200-plus that were in the risk category. You said five were definite. Are the 203 safe? Are they compliant or aren't they?                      Mr Birrer: They are, safe, yes.                      Senator WONG: But you just told me you don't know whether they're compliant?                      Mr Birrer: Of the 208 examined by the fire engineers, five were found noncompliant. The other 203 would be compliant.                      Senator WONG: 'Would' be? Surely someone knows about this? It is a binary proposition, isn't it?                      Mr Birrer: That is right, and there are five that are non-compliant.                      Senator WONG: Do we have a clean bill of health on the 203 or not?                      Mr Grzeskowiak: Yes, we do. The fire engineers' report would have declared which buildings were compliant—</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

				<p>Senator WONG: Do we have a copy of the fire engineers' report?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: Not with us here.                  Senator WONG: This ran on national news last night. Did no-one think that this might be asked? Can we have a copy of the fire engineers' report provided or at least someone at the table who can give evidence about it?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: We can seek to take that on notice.</p>
4	Wong	Cladding – Advice to Staff	9-10	<p>Senator WONG: So, of the five you say people within them have been advised of the elevated risk of fire?                  Mr Birrer: Correct.                  Senator WONG: When were they advised in respect of each of the five?                  Mr Birrer: There was an internal departmental message issued to staff on 27 February 2018.                  Senator WONG: Sorry; I thought the time line you gave me earlier was you commenced in June 2017 the initial audit. I was told it finished last year. Do we infer from that that it actually finished in 2018 or were they advised earlier, prior to the audit being finalised, because the buildings had been assessed as noncompliant while the audit was still in place? Can you see the time line issue?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: I do. We advised people in those billings once we had confirmation from that fire survey that those buildings had noncompliant use of that cladding.                  Senator WONG: Say again?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: People in those buildings were advised once we had confirmation that those buildings had noncompliant cladding. So if that advice was done—                  Senator WONG: While the audit was still underway?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: Yes. To clarify that in detail, I'll take that on notice.                  Senator WONG: Sure. But the time line is that people in those buildings were advised before the audit was finalised?</p>
5	Wong	Cladding Timeline	11	<p>Senator WONG: What action has been taken to address these issues for the five buildings on the defence estate?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: As I mentioned earlier, we have a program of work in place to replace a range of these flammable claddings that have been used in a noncompliant way with the Building Code. That's going on at five locations, and we're targeting completion of that work around the end of this year.                  Senator WONG: When did that commence?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: For the exact start date, I would need to take that on notice.                  .....                  Senator WONG: I appreciate that. Does rectification require replacement of the cladding?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: In most cases, it will.                  Senator WONG: When doesn't it? If the cladding is flammable, when do you just leave it there?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: My understanding is that replacement is the preferred approach for the buildings. I have got some information about the five buildings and what we're doing at each building, if that would be helpful.                  Senator WONG: Sure. Are there any buildings at which we're not intending to replace the cladding?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: I don't believe so. There may be a possibility that, in some areas, some form of insulation process could be an option, but I think the first response would be replacement.                  Senator WONG: You think the first response? In respect of the five buildings, do you have at least time lines for when it was identified and when rectification commenced? Are you able to give me that information, in your brief?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: In detailed time lines about when work starts and will commence for each building, no. I'll take that on notice.</p>
6	Wong	Cladding – Leased Buildings	12	<p>Senator WONG: How many leased are noncompliant?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: At this stage I'm not aware of any leased buildings that are noncompliant with building codes. As part of this process we did go to all of the owners of the various buildings that we lease and asked them to conduct necessary inspections.</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

				<p>Senator WONG: How many of those have been returned?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: I'd have to take that on notice.                  Senator WONG: When did you ask them that?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: It would have been in the same sort of timescale as we kicked off our own investigations.                  Senator WONG: How many thousands of buildings do you lease?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: We don't lease thousands of buildings. I'd have to take that number on notice.                  Senator WONG: How many have a clean bill of health?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: I'm not aware of any of them that has this cladding used in a noncompliant way.                  Senator WONG: No. That doesn't exactly help unless you can tell us that that's been reported. The fact that you're not aware of it doesn't mean that they don't have flammable cladding; correct? I'm just wanting to understand, for leased buildings in which Australian defence personnel work, how many have a clean bill of health—that is, have been investigated, inspected and shown not to be at risk because of flammable cladding?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: To be absolutely confident of my answer—we have had returns of the owners of every building that is leased—I'd just need to take that on notice.</p>
7	Wong	Cladding – Advice to Minister Andrews	13-14	<p>Senator WONG: But is it your evidence that rectification work has started on all of them?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: I don't know whether rectification has commenced on every building at this stage.                  Senator WONG: I have just been handed a note that Minister Andrews—is this Karen Andrews? I can't recall what her portfolio is. The minister asserted that rectification had started on all these buildings. Was that the advice that Defence provided to the office of Minister Andrews?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: I don't know the answer to that question.                  Senator WONG: Do you know if anyone in Defence provided that advice to her department?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: We'll take that on notice. I know that we have provided advice to the government agencies looking across the whole-of-government about the progression of our process.                  Senator WONG: It just seems odd that the deputy secretary who has responsibility for this doesn't know whether or not rectification has commenced, but a minister goes on national radio asserting and assuring the Australian people that it has.                  Mr Grzeskowiak: I'll take that on notice and, hopefully, come back through the day.                  Senator WONG: Thank you very much. I have finished on that point. If you can come back—and now I have forgotten momentarily what you were getting; the dates of the audit?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: We'll seek to confirm the finalisation of the dates of the larger audit and the finalisation of the dates of the specific fire engineer's audit, and the dates that the work has commenced or is planned to commence at the five sites in question.                  Senator WONG: I'm sorry?                  Mr Grzeskowiak: We'll seek to give you dates of commencement of work, and commencement and completion for all of the defence estate audit and the specific fire audit on the 208 buildings.</p>
8	Wong	Jobs at Osborne	16-17 & 39	<p>Senator WONG: What is the current number of Australians employed at Osborne, first for direct construction? What is the current 5,200 tracking figure and the current 15,000 tracking figure?                  Mr Fankhauser: So when you say Osborne you mean across all of the programs?                  Senator WONG: Yes.                  Mr Fankhauser: We can take on notice to get you an updated figure.                  ....</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
Department of Defence

				<p>Senator WONG: You then have this parametrically driven indirect jobs figure. Your evidence to me, I understood, was that you would be updating that every six months, obviously with new data being integrated into that figure. I'm asking what you have to date for the indirect jobs as per the minister's press release.</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: I'll have to get that information for you. I don't have it at hand at the moment.</p>
9	Wong	Naval Shipbuilding Apprentices	19	<p>Mr Fankhauser: With the current network of endorsed education and training providers, we have more than 3,000 students currently undertaking an endorsed program of study nationwide.</p> <p>Senator WONG: How many apprentices?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: I can give you each of the programs of study. Of that, there's a number of students undertaking certificate III-level courses. I'd have to check, though, how many are actual apprentices versus students undertaking those courses.</p> <p>Senator WONG: You do not know how many apprentices there are?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: I will take it on notice and give you that breakdown.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Do they have a target for the number of apprentices?</p>
10	Ayers	Naval Shipbuilding Workforce Composition (Osborne)	21	<p>Senator AYRES: Would it be possible to tell me how many of the directs at Osborne are trades and not trades, this year and last year?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: In terms of people that have left?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: No, what is the total workforce at Osborne, direct, who are trades, as a proportion of the rest of the cohort?</p> <p>Senator WONG: I think that's of the 2,100?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: We'll take that on notice to get you the answer. I will just clarify, though, that the distinction between trades and what other people might call white collar is becoming increasingly blurred. There's a cohort that often get referred to as grey collar as well. We'll get you as accurate a breakdown as we can, but I'll just draw the point that past distinctions—</p>
11	Steele-John	Mitigating Climate Change	24	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: I have a significant line of questioning around this and other areas. If Mr Tesch could provide that to me on notice, I am more than happy to take it on notice and read it. It will save everybody a bit of time. From my understanding, the current Defence infrastructure and strategic planning that went into the white paper treats climate change as a no-no. In other words, it is designed and implemented on the assumption of a stable climate with predictable variability. However, it was made clear by the report that a significant number of ADF assets—that is, naval facilities et cetera—are highly exposed to rising sea levels. Can you provide me with information on the activities that Defence is undertaking to mitigate climate risks in relation to the Defence estate? To clarify, this is in relation to the 2018 Senate report.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: Over years we've had a look at a range of issues that might be something we need to deal with as part of things driven by climate change. For example, we've done studies into what sea level rise might do for us. When we've done those studies, we use published information from CSIRO about what the predictions are for sea level rise into the future. We use that information and factor that into our thinking and planning for basing decisions on long-term infrastructure decisions that we might make.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Could you provide me on notice some additional information around those steps?</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We can have a look on notice. Under an FOI, there were some reports released that we'd done. We can certainly—</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: I'm particularly interested in HMAS Sterling in WA and any work that has been done around the potential climate impacts on that facility.</p> <p>Mr Grzeskowiak: We can take that on notice for specifics. I say in the broad that we do look at the predictions from the government science organisations. We factor that into any infrastructure work that we are doing, looking forward into the long term.</p>
12	Steele-John	Climate Change Policy Staff	25	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: I want to clarify. So a senior executive officer is now doing that role?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: An executive level officer.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Executive level. Can you provide me with their name?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: I could. I am ashamed to say, and he will be very ashamed listening to me, that I can't give it to you straight off the top of my head.</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

				<p>It is an executive level 1 officer in my division.                  Senator STEELE-JOHN: Can you provide that to me on notice?                  Ms Perkins: Yes.                  Senator STEELE-JOHN: Just to be clear, a colonel was appointed to the role in mid-2016. When did that position shift to being an executive level officer, as Ms Perkins just described?                  Gen. Campbell: I believe it was either late 2018 or early 2019—the end of a posting cycle.                  Senator STEELE-JOHN: Can you provide on notice who that individual was?                  Gen. Campbell: Yes, I can.</p>
13	Wong	Sinapse Contract Decision	31	<p>Senator WONG: Was there a decision to go to a limited tender?                  Mr Pearson: There was.                  Senator WONG: Who made that decision?                  Mr Pearson: That was made not by me individually. That was made under a consultation with the Commonwealth procurement rules and Defence procurement policy folk.                  Senator WONG: They're not people; they're documents. I am asking which person or people made the decision to go to a limited tender. Then I will give you the opportunity to tell me how the CPRs were complied with. Who made the decision to go to a limited tender?                  Mr Pearson: The individual name I will have to come back to you with.</p>
14	Wong	Sinapse Contract Assurance Report	33	<p>Senator WONG: Did anybody who was part of the independent assurance review also have a commercial interest in Sinapse?                  Mr Pearson: No.                  Senator WONG: The CPRs do require a report which goes to the value of the type of goods and services, statements that justify the use of a limited tender and a record demonstrating how the procurement via limited tender represents value for money. Was such a report prepared?                  Mr Pearson: Yes.                  Senator WONG: Who prepared it?                  Mr Pearson: It was undertaken by the CASG group that the associate secretary referred to along with my staff.                  Senator WONG: Can I have a copy of it, please?                  Ms Skinner: We'll take that on notice to see what we can provide in relation to that document. I saw the document myself as part of—                  Senator WONG: Was that document prepared prior to the decision that you made or after?                  Mr Pearson: Yes.                  Senator WONG: It was?                  Mr Pearson: Yes.</p>
15	Steele-John	Lethal Autonomous Weapons Statement	45-46	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: We can endeavour to make it 10 minutes. In March 2019, it was my understanding that the Australian government was invited to give a statement at the group of governmental experts meeting in Geneva on lethal autonomous weapon systems. Can you provide to me on notice the position that Australia gave at that meeting? Indeed, can you outline it extraordinarily succinctly?                  Senator Reynolds: I think this is a question for Mr Tesch.                  Mr Tesch: I want to clarify. Are you asking if we can provide you the text of the statement?                  Senator STEELE-JOHN: The text of the statement would be excellent. But if you could summarise the position that we gave briefly, that would be really useful too.                  Mr Tesch: This was at the 2018 GGE meeting?                  Senator STEELE-JOHN: Yes. In March 2019, there was a GGE meeting in Geneva on the subject of lethal autonomous weapons systems.                  Mr Tesch: I would like, if I may, to invite Celia Perkins to add to this. In terms of the text of the statement, obviously we'll take that on notice. I don't have that with me.                  Senator STEELE-JOHN: Absolutely. Can I clarify: are you aware whether we gave a view as to the need for</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

				<p>any kind of international legal framework specifically related to autonomous weaponry?                  Ms Perkins: I echo Mr Tesch's remarks. We welcome the discussion around international legal frameworks on autonomous weapons and how technological advances in weapons systems can comply with international humanitarian law, particularly around precision and supporting commanders to fulfil obligations under international humanitarian law on the battlefield. Australia, of course, is a signatory to the additional protocol 1 of the Geneva Convention. We fully support and undertake a review of any proposed new weapons such that they would be pursuant to article 36.                  Senator STEELE-JOHN:                  I understand. If you don't know, that's fine, but in the position we gave, did we present a view as to whether there was a need for an additional international legal framework around the use of autonomous weaponry?                  Mr Tesch: We'll take that on notice.</p>
16	Steele-John	Meeting Attendees ethical use of autonomous lethal weapons systems	46-47	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Thank you. It doesn't make much sense to me, but we'll leave it there. On 2 August, there was convened in Canberra a meeting of legal experts, scientists and military personnel to consider the question of a policy framework for the ethical use of autonomous lethal weapons systems. Could you provide me on notice a full list of the attendees of that meeting?                  Ms Perkins: We would need to take that on notice.                  Senator STEELE-JOHN: Can you confirm that the work that came out of that meeting is not yet complete?                  Ms Perkins: Absolutely. I can confirm that.                  Senator STEELE-JOHN: When is it expected?                  Ms Perkins: I wouldn't have any timeframes around that.                  Senator STEELE-JOHN: It has been reported that it is the end of next year. Is that incorrect?                  Ms Perkins: I would have to take that on notice.</p>
17	Patrick	Submarine Design Contract Milestones	49	<p>Senator PATRICK: It was scheduled for March. I will be upfront. I am quite frustrated in respect of the project refusing to provide me, under FOI, the master schedule at contract because that provides a baseline against which we can track the project. That matter, as you know, is before the Information Commissioner. But I wonder—this is a separate process—whether or not, to be helpful, you could simply supply the initial integrated master schedule and redact anything you think is classified such that it's clear and in the public domain what your milestones were at contract signature. The Icebreaker project has done that for the environment and communications committee. It has been very helpful just walking through the project from the contract baseline.                  Rear Adm. Sammut: I am happy to look into the ability for us to release to you the contracted milestones on entry to the submarine design contract.                  Senator PATRICK: I'm just talking about things like these very features—system requirements reviews, PDRs and CDRs.                  Rear Adm. Sammut: I'm quite sure that will be possible, given that we've endeavoured to provide you with that information in the past from your questions on notice.</p>
18	Fawcett	Qualifications for those assessing risk	51	<p>Senator FAWCETT: That's great. I applaud the rollout of that framework. It doesn't go to the heart of my question, though, which is around the competence of the people you place, appoint or give delegation to within that framework. I take your example of test and evaluation. I am aware that some people in one of those frameworks have a two-day introductory course. That might help them to spell it. It doesn't make them competent to exercise it. My question comes back to, particularly through the capability development and acquisition part of the life cycle, whether you have identified the key decision points where risk identification and assessment is required. Have you then actually defined it in a similar way to how the former Director-General of technical airworthiness would define his delegated authority for an engineering officer? Have you defined the qualifications and experience that each of those positions, which won't be many, require in order that the Defence committee, and hence government, can have a level of assurance that the information coming through is based on a qualified assessment of risk?                  Vice Adm. Johnston: There are two tracks of work addressing that question. One is identifying the positions and the skillset required. That is</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

				<p>ongoing work. I might invite the Chief of Joint Capabilities to talk through in part the second track of work, which is associated with ensuring we have the education mechanisms available. Having identified the skill sets and individual needs, it is that the education mechanism is there to provide them with the competencies required.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: Sure. I am happy to go to Air Marshal McDonald, but we're very limited on time. You said work is underway. It has been underway for some time. Do you have a deadline that you are working towards to complete the identification of those positions such that the gap between the existing incumbents and the people with the skilled competencies we would like to see in there can be identified and rectified?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: I would need to check whether it's in some of the body of work. I can't recall specifically.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: Can you take that on notice?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: Yes.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: I think that's important. If you don't set a target, you wouldn't achieve it. Air Marshal McDonald, a brief overview would be great.</p>
19	Fawcett	Industry Plans	52	<p>Mr Moriarty: It's certainly the case that some of those formal plans are still in train. But I am much more confident than I was, say, even 12 months ago that the capability managers are very conscious of what industry has to offer and gaps as well as the opportunities. In terms of the 10 areas that were developed as part of that plan, I would say even more broadly that when the CDF and I sit at the defence committee and these plans come up to us for review or come to us for approval and when we're briefing the minister on them, there is a lot of richness in the discussion about what the Australian defence industry can provide for each of these key capabilities. I agree that it is important to get to those written plans as quickly as possible. I believe that the department is much better placed than it was, say, 12 months ago to have a very rich understanding of what industry can bring and, again, of where we need to partner with them to see if we can close any gaps in the Australian context.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: You are right; we are aware what industry can bring. But the whole concept behind the assessment framework and understanding sovereign industry capability is fundamental to our service chiefs' ability to raise, train and sustain their force. We need to be able to say to industry what it is we want, not just understand what they can deliver. Without these implementation plans, it strikes me that we haven't fully defined the sovereign capability we require industry to develop. I would be interested—I am happy to take this on notice—if we have a timeframe and, if you like, a recovery plan to get us back on track so that the decisions we are taking are informed by what we want as opposed to just what industry can provide.</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: Certainly I will take that on notice. I can also say that beyond those 10, we do have capability managers now talking to industry about what they might seek to build in the coming years. So we are clearly responsible for developing those 10 plans. When we are talking about what industry can offer, it is what we want industry to grow. I am confident that many of those conversations are taking place.</p>
20	Wong	Lasers Pointed at Helicopter Pilots	57	<p>Senator WONG: Thank you. I wonder if you are able to provide the committee with any details in relation to the assertions made by Mr Euan Graham. I can't recall where he is now, but was writing for the Strategist. He published an article in which there were some assertions about lasers being pointed at helicopter pilots. I can't recall if this was discussed previously. I don't think so. I think these events occurred after the last estimates. Am I right? Anyway.</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: Sure. I'm aware of the story.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I don't want to go into anything that's not appropriate here. Is there anything you can tell the committee about those events?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: My understanding—and I will check with the Chief of Navy—is I don't think that we have any further clarity from the last time that we provided some information to identify precisely the origin of the laser.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I have just seen the article. It's May 2019. Obviously I don't think we've had an estimates since.</p> <p>Mr Jeffrey: I think it did come up at the last estimates, though I can't be sure when it was raised. Certainly—</p> <p>Senator WONG: This is what it has asserted—that helicopter pilots had lasers pointed at them from passing fishing vessels. What can you tell us about what we know about those events?</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

				<p>Vice Adm. Noonan: My recollection is that this subject has been discussed before. There has been no further investigation or facts regarding this matter come forward. The issue was largely speculation. There has been no definitive proof that there were laser pointers pointed at navy pilots.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Other than these events, have there been other similar incidents in the past 12 months?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: Not that has been reported through Navy chain.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Not that you know about?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Noonan: Not that I've become aware of, or not that any Navy people have raised through the chain of command to me.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Perhaps on notice someone could confirm that with me. We've previously had a discussion in this committee. There were also public reports from the ABC and others that HMAS Anzac, Toowoomba and Success had interaction with the PLA navy whilst transiting through the South China Sea to Vietnam for a goodwill visit. I use the word 'interaction' because I think there was an argument before about challenge. I don't want to get into the argument. I want to know whether or not there has been a similar interaction, to use the most neutral term I can, since that time. If so, how many?</p>
21	Ayers	Team Defence Australia	58	<p>Senator AYRES: I have a few questions about Team Defence Australia. On Defence's website, it says that Team Defence Australia is the premier national platform for export capable Australian Defence and dual use companies to showcase their goods, services, technology and solutions at international trade events. Is that accurate? Its mission is to support the attendance of export capable Australian Defence and dual use companies at international trade events.</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: Yes.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: On notice, could I have an itemised list of all the international trade events that Team Defence Australia has participated in to date? There's a schedule of planned events on the website. Can I have the names of all Australian officials as well as the names of all the companies and their representatives that have received assistance, support and/or facilitation from Team Defence Australia to attend those international trade events.</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: Are you after a particular timeframe?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Let's say the last two years.</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: I'll have to take that on notice.</p>
22	Ayers	CDIC Communication with Minister	61	<p>Senator AYRES: If it assists, I have one final question that you might be able to come back to us with this afternoon, and that is what communication Defence and/or Team Defence Australia or the Centre for Defence Industry Capability have with the defence minister and their office and/or the defence industry minister and their office with respect to Mr Kauter and/or Strategic Political Counsel?</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: Again, we'll have to take that on notice until we actually get the information.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: What I would like to see is an itemised list of the correspondence.</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: We'll definitely have to take that on notice. We are endeavouring to get the information for the first part of your question to see who went and how the process of selection went. But that one is a detailed question we'll have to take on notice.</p>
23	Ayers	Team Defence Australia – application process	62	<p>Senator AYRES: I have one final question on this before you come back to us. I would like to know if Mr Kauter applied through the process that you've described or whether he was suggested to you.</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: We've taken that on notice.</p>
24	Van	Defence Industry – commercial financing	62	<p>Senator VAN: I refer to the defence industrial capability plan. One of the 10 priorities in Australia's cyber defence capability is munitions and small arms research, design, development and manufacture. Obviously we need to encourage the development of this capacity and capability. My question is around commercial finance for small and medium enterprises in this space. To be very clear, I'm not talking about defence funding; I am talking about private sector funding. In Defence's engagement with industry manufacturers, have there been any concerns raised by manufacturers to Defence about difficulties in obtaining commercial finance for the purpose of manufacturing munitions and small arms?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: I will have to take that on notice. That is about a level of detail in the context of the discussions that have occurred.</p> <p>Senator VAN: Sure. Of course. Please do.</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

25	Abetz	Tiger Risk Assessments	67-68	<p>CHAIR: To minimise flights over water.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: That is a sensible measure. When we can't because we operate from the amphibious platforms, we make sure that all these other procedures are in place. It is straightforward. I might add that the US Army and the US Marine Corps, which use similar aircraft, do not have floatation systems on them.</p> <p>CHAIR: But do they fly them over water?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: Yes, they do.</p> <p>CHAIR: They don't have the limitations that we do.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: They would have similar training and procedural costs.</p> <p>CHAIR: No, limitations, not training. Limitations about flights over water.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: I wouldn't overuse the word 'limitation'. They are sensible precautions before flight over water.</p> <p>CHAIR: Are they less than they are in Australia?</p> <p>Brig. King: I think for us we've made our own assessment.</p> <p>CHAIR: No. That's not the question. Is it the same as in the US or not?</p> <p>Brig. King: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>CHAIR: All right—if you could, please. It's all well and good to train somebody for a controlled landing, but what happens if there's a massive mechanical failure and that platform crashes?</p>
26	Abetz	One Atmosphere – Floation Systems	69	<p>CHAIR: Did the board of inquiry find that Defence should attempt to identify a suitable floatation device for the Black Hawk fleet despite approaching the planned withdrawal from service state? Let's take it in two lots. Did the board of inquiry find that Defence should attempt to identify a suitable floatation system?</p> <p>Brig. King: I do not have it in front of me.</p> <p>CHAIR: This is the whole beginning. I am astounded. If you don't know, you don't know. It doesn't fill me with confidence that you have got your head right around this issue. The next question is: the board of inquiry made this suggestion despite the helicopter approaching its planned withdrawal from service state. Can you take that on notice as well, please.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: We will take that on notice.</p>
27	Abetz	One Atmosphere – Statement of Requirement	73	<p>CHAIR: You've withdrawn the statement of requirement three months earlier and yet you lead them on this proposal. Does Defence actually know what one arm is doing in relation to the other? Why weren't they told that the statement of requirement had been withdrawn? Why would you bother leading them down this path when you'd already made the determination? That is the truth of the matter, isn't it—that even before all this, a determination was made and yet you led them further down the path without telling them. Now it is an exercise of trying to cover up what was done. I just find it inexplicable. I asked for the specific dates because I was told that there was this disconnect of three months. Can you provide an explanation on notice as to why you went on with it despite this change and why that wasn't communicated, I would have thought, to the people who allowed the matter to progress, let alone the company. Labor have been sufficiently generous with time thus far, so I will leave it at that.</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: On that matter, you used the words 'cover up' there. I ask that you withdraw and replace them because they are pretty strong words.</p> <p>CHAIR: I will withdraw those words, of course.</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: Thank you.</p> <p>CHAIR: It seems pretty inept and incompetent—I will use those words advisedly—for Defence, using taxpayers' money to withdraw a statement of requirement, which basically means, 'We don't need it any more' to then continue to proceed with something at taxpayers' expense three months later. One assumes somebody somewhere along the way must have found out that the statement of requirement has been withdrawn, but we've still gone down the path afterwards. I would have thought it somewhat embarrassing. Anyway, we will look forward to the explanation on notice. Minister, you have two issues you want to raise?</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
**Department of Defence**

28	Kitching	Briefings for Ministers – Capability & Sustainment issues	78	<p>Senator KITCHING: Mr Hawke would have received briefings or advice from the department that relate to issues that don't just pertain to step-up. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: From time to time.</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: Yes. On that, yes, he has. I have made sure that all three ministers have a sound understanding of Defence organisation and the ADF as well. Even for certain issues that are not particularly in their area, all ministers in the portfolio must have a good understanding of the organisation—</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: And you want to coordinate it.</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: And the context. Absolutely.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Would he have received briefs about capability acquisition, sustainment issues and industry issues? When you did ensure that the junior ministers had an understanding of the department and the ADF, did you do that in a formal briefing process?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: We did some introductory briefings for all of the ministers in the portfolio. I need to check the date of those briefings for you.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: It couldn't have been that long ago, because you put it up on the website on the 23rd. It was decided, I think, on the 20th. You put it up on the website on the 23rd. So it must have been within the last month that you've held the induction.</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: Senator Kitching, it was certainly before then. Whether ministers get a briefing or not didn't depend on what was on the website on any given day.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: I will go back to my question. Have you got someone who can answer that now? Did he receive any briefings on capability acquisition, sustainment issues and industry issues?</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: I will come back. I have just been reminded of some pertinent information by my staff. The website information was delayed because Minister Price was traveling at the time and, given it was cabinet- in-confidence, we needed her to check the details. I had actually corresponded with them before that date.</p>
29	Kitching	Ministerial Responsibilities and Travel	78-79	<p>Senator KITCHING: What is the date of that correspondence?</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: That's what I'm checking on. While it wasn't made public until then, the conversations and the arrangements had been put in place before then. So in terms of—</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Before the 20th?</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: Yes.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: So was Minister Price traveling for a long time or was it just for a few days?</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: That I don't have. By the nature of your questions, you are making it sound like the ministers haven't known what they had to do and certainly had nothing to do for three or four months, which is anything but the case. I am making that point so it is very clear that all ministers hit the ground, in fact, the day they were sworn in.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: So 29 May?</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: Yes.</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: Your previous evidence was that you informed the department. You had this consultation process. You also consulted with the Prime Minister. You then wrote to each of the ministers, is that correct, on the 20th?</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: We will go back with the initial dates. The dates I have given you are correct. I think the inference I was getting from your questioning is that really nothing happened for the first four months across the portfolio, which is vastly untrue.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator KITCHING: So you are going to get that date when Minister Price was traveling?</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: We'll come back with that on notice, yes.</p>
30	Kitching	Special Purpose Aircraft Guidelines	80	<p>Senator KITCHING: So you received the charter letter on 4 July, Independence Day. With regard to special purpose aircraft, can the department confirm that the guidelines for the use of the SPAs, as published in February 2013, are still accurate?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: They are the guidelines that were published in February 2013 and they are the ones that we still use to provide the advice</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

				<p>up to the minister.                  Senator KITCHING: I think I put in a QON to you, which would be QON 611.                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: There is a number there. We've got one that is QON 69 that asked that question.                  Senator KITCHING: I asked on 12 September 2019, and it is QON 611. Essentially, the guidelines on the website are not particularly easy to find. They are on the Trove archive website. Is that correct?                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: I'd have to take that on notice.</p>
31	Kitching	Special Purpose Aircraft Copy of Guidelines	81	<p>Senator KITCHING: Yes. Are you able to table a current copy of the guidelines for the committee?                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: I don't have that today, but I can get that on notice.</p>
32	Kitching	Special Purpose Aircraft Draft Schedule	81	<p>Senator KITCHING: Fair enough. I put in another QON to you, which is 613. That is the schedule for the special purpose aircraft of July to 31 December 2018. It was provided to the PMO on 24 January 2019 and verified on 17 March 2019.                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: That's correct.                  Senator KITCHING: Did the department provide the draft schedule to former defence minister Pyne's office?                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: I don't believe so, but I'll take that on notice as well. The dates that we've provided there are for when they were verified. The current minister was sworn in on 29 May. Her office was provided the brief on 11 June in accordance with that question on notice that we provided to you.                  Senator KITCHING: Can you check for me who received the draft schedule, if not former minister Pyne?                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: I'll take that on notice. This was all caught up in and around the time of the election, so I will take that element on notice to confirm.                  Senator KITCHING: Is that subject to caretaker provisions? We wouldn't have been in caretaker on 17 March because the election was called just after the last lot of Defence estimates, which was early April. So who received the draft schedule? I guess that's what I want to know. What happened to the schedule between 17 March and 11 June, which is I think when Minister Reynolds received the schedule. That's correct? I think you said that. What happened? Where did it go between then?                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: My understanding is in the administration, verified on the 17 and 29 March through the official secretary of the Governor-General. I will have to take on notice what occurred and the reasons for that between those dates and when it then provided the brief to the minister on 11 June.                  Senator KITCHING: This is from the QON. This is the response in the QON: after reviewing, the Minister verified and signed the schedule on 21 August 2019— being the final version and the printing date. Why did that take two months?                  Senator Reynolds: I will have to check for you. That was a while ago, so I will have to check and take that on notice.</p>
33	Kitching	Special Purpose Aircraft Schedule Tabling	81-82	<p>Senator Reynolds: I'll have to defer to Air Marshal Hupfeld. I just don't have that information because that was before I was sworn in.                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: Are you referring to the same schedule of special purpose flights?                  Senator KITCHING: I would like that and the one before. Obviously there's a guideline, section 25, which says that there are dates. There is a schedule of when you have to verify and put this up. I want to see if it is unusual that it took so long this time.                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: Another question on notice that was provided to you was 612, which refers to the schedule of 1 July to 31 December 2018. Is that the one you are referring to?                  Senator KITCHING: What date was that?                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: It is 1 July to 31 December 2018.                  Senator KITCHING: Yes.                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: That was tabled on 28 August.                  Senator KITCHING: Yes. What was the one before that?                  Air Marshal Hupfeld: I don't have the data on that. I'll have to take it on notice for you.</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

34	Steele-John	Invitation criteria – Australian Military Sales Catalogue	82-83	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: It was the launch of the 2019 Australian Military Sales Catalogue.</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: The Australian Military Sales Catalogue includes a large number of defence industry export opportunities that we promote for companies to help support them export overseas. A range of diplomatic missions were invited to the launch of the Australian Military Sales Catalogue. Over 70 embassies and high commissions were invited. I can confirm that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was one of them.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: What were the criteria? I know they attended. What was the criteria for attendees?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: We looked at a broad range of embassies and high commissions that we thought might be of interest.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: But 70 ain't the number of countries in the world. So there must have been some excluded. Again, I ask: what were the criteria for inviting people?</p> <p>Dr Kearnan: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Are humanitarian concerns are factored into the extension of such invitations?</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Does the government regard this invitation as one that meets its ethical parameters?</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: As I said, Senator Steele-John, we've taken this on notice to get you the precise information.</p>
35	Wong	Project Concur Decision	84-85	<p>Senator WONG: This poorly managed project. You identify the origin or the cause, at least initially, of the problems to date as the original procurement decision. Would that be correct?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I think they certainly date from perhaps a poorer understanding of the business requirement.</p> <p>Senator WONG: We'll come to the business case. I want to understand why the business case was made when it was and why it wasn't done earlier. Let's start with procurement. Did this go to open tender?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: That is a very good question. I can't answer the procurement piece. I don't have that detail with me.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Who made the decision?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I believe the previous chief financial officer.</p> <p>Mr Groves: I'm not sure either. It was before my time. I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: You are getting a reaction because PM&amp;C kept saying to me, 'I wasn't there.' There is not year zero for when everyone starts employment. It is a government, so there should be records. There should be a capacity to obtain information. I know you have a lot of projects, but this was the subject of a pretty negative audit office report. I am surprised that no-one is able to answer those sorts of questions, such as how the decision was made. Can we take that on notice?</p>
36	Wong	Project Concur Business Case	86	<p>Senator WONG: There is a draft business case prepared, which is referenced in the ANAO report. The CIO group in October 2016 developed a draft business case, which identified the target implementation date of 30 June 2017. Can you confirm for me whether that business case was prepared and/or finalised prior to the procurement decision being made?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I'm not going to use the word 'would'. I don't know.</p> <p>Senator WONG: No-one knows whether the business case was finalised before we agreed to spend money on this?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I would need to take—</p> <p>Senator WONG: If you don't, just say. Take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Can I ask for a copy of the business case on notice?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: Sorry?</p> <p>Senator WONG: I'm asking for a copy of the business case on notice.</p> <p>Ms Skinner: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Was there more than one business case prepared? There was one, presumably, around October 2016. Is there a subsequent one? As the problems become clearer, is the business case revised at any point?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: There may be elements of not so much the business case but the implementation that may have been revised. But we'd need to take on notice the full history of that project in that sense of implementation, which we do have but not with us.</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

37	Wong	Project Concur Ministerial Advice	86	<p>Senator WONG: The ANAO report says that the Minister for Defence in December 2016 approved the funding of \$11.9 million. I think your evidence is—I don't have the dates of the ministerial changes in front of me—it would have been former Minister Payne. Can you tell me on notice whether former Minister Payne was advised of this project at any time prior to 20 December 2016?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: We'll take that on notice.</p>
38	Lambie	Veterans Motorcycle Club Charity Ride	Written	<p>There are rumours that the Department of Defence asked Operation Raptor to run breath tests, registration checks and licence checks at the Veterans Motorcycle Club charity ride in Queanbeyan on Saturday the 19<sup>th</sup> of October. Can you confirm or deny these allegations?</p>
39	Lambie	Welfare boards	Written	<p>1) How many welfare boards had there been in the last 2 years and can the answer include the ranking of each official on the board?</p> <p>2) How many discharged ex-servicing members have had a successful outcome after fronting up to the welfare boards and having their case reviewed?</p> <p>3) What are the ranks of the diggers that sit in front of the welfare boards?</p>
40	Lambie	Mr Ray Williams	Written	<p>In relation to Mr Ray Williams, of Hobart, in his quest to have his service in Beirut as a UN Military Observer during November 1983 to April 1984, during a significant State of Disturbance, which in turn was a War Zone, being stubbornly denied by Defence Nature of Service Branch (NOSB).</p> <p>This matter has been ongoing for 21 years. It took over 10 years to produce the Review Report into the Reclassification of the UN Truce Supervision Organisation (UNTSO) from 1956 to 2006.</p> <p>Questions are:</p> <p>1. What were the Terms of Reference provided to the Investigating Officer of the Defence Nature of Service Branch, for the matter of the Review into Classification of Service to the UN Truce Supervision Organisation (UNTSO) during the period 1956-2006?</p> <p>2. If there were no Terms of Reference, what guidance, witnesses and evidence did the Defence Nature of Service Branch rely upon when conducting this Review?</p> <p>3. Why was this matter not delegated to an independent and impartial decision-maker?</p> <p>4. Did the Author of the Review and Director of the Defence Nature of Service Branch, conduct their own internal review, after being directed by the Minister (Darren Chester) on 20 February 2019? What was their guidance or written directive to conduct this Review?</p> <p>5. If the Author and Director conducted their own internal review, why was this not delegated to an impartial decision-maker?</p>
41	Kitching	Executive Management	Written	<p>In relation to executive management for the Department and its agencies, can the following be provided for FY 2018-19 and 2019-20 to date:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The total number of executive management positions</li> <li>b. The aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions.</li> <li>c. The change in the number of executive manager positions.</li> <li>d. The change in aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions.</li> </ol>
42	Kitching	Ministerial functions	Written	<p>In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio since 1 July 2018, can the following be provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. List of functions.</li> <li>b. List of all attendees.</li> <li>c. Function venue.</li> <li>d. Itemised list of costs (GST <u>inclusive</u>).</li> <li>e. Details of any food served.</li> <li>f. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage.</li> <li>g. Any available photographs of the function.</li> <li>h. Details of any entertainment provided.</li> </ol>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

43	Kitching	Departmental functions	Written	In relation to expenditure on any functions or official receptions etc hosted by the Department or agencies within the portfolio since 1 July 2018, can the following be provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. List of functions.</li> <li>b. List of all attendees.</li> <li>c. Function venue.</li> <li>d. Itemised list of costs (GST <u>inclusive</u>).</li> <li>e. Details of any food served.</li> <li>f. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage.</li> <li>g. Any available photographs of the function.</li> <li>h. Details of any entertainment provided.</li> </ol>
44	Kitching	Executive office upgrades Facilities upgrades	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have any furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries been upgraded since 1 July 2018. If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided (GST <u>inclusive</u>).</li> <li>2. Were there any upgrades to facility premises at any of the Departments or agencies since 1 July 2018. This includes but is not limited to: staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment.</li> <li>3. If so, can a detailed description of the relevant facilities upgrades be provided together with an itemised list of costs (GST <u>inclusive</u>).</li> <li>4. If so, can any photographs of the upgraded facilities be provided.</li> </ol>
45	Kitching	Staff travel	Written	What is the total cost of staff travel for departmental/agency employees for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 to date.
46	Kitching	Legal costs	Written	What are the total legal costs for the Department/agency for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 to date.
47	Kitching	Secretarial travel	Written	Can an itemised list of the costs of all domestic and international travel undertaken by the Secretary of the Department since 1 July 2018 be provided including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Flights for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the airline and class of travel.</li> <li>b. Ground transport for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials.</li> <li>c. Accommodation for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed.</li> <li>d. Meals and other incidentals for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided.</li> <li>e. Any available photographs documenting the Secretary's travel should also be provided.</li> </ol>
48	Kitching	FOI	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please list the number of Freedom of Information Act requests ('FOI requests') received by the Department for the following years:                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 2013-14;</li> <li>b. 2014-15;</li> <li>c. 2015-16;</li> <li>d. 2016-17;</li> <li>e. 2018-19; and</li> <li>f. 2019-20 to date.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. For each year above, please provide:                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The number of FOI requests the Department granted in full;</li> <li>b. The number of FOI requests the Department granted in part;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

				<p>c. The number of FOI requests the Department refused in full; and</p> <p>d. The number of FOI requests the Department refused for practical reasons under the Freedom of Information Act.</p> <p>3. For each year above, please also provide:</p> <p>a. The number of times the Department failed to make any decision on a FOI request within the 30 day statutory period; and</p> <p>b. The number of times a request to the Department resulted in a practical refusal (i.e. no decision was made on the request).</p> <p>4. For each year above, please also provide:</p> <p>a. The number of times the Department's FOI decisions have been appealed to the OAIC; and</p> <p>The number of times has the OAIC overturned – in whole or in part – the Department's decision to refuse access to material.</p>
49	Kitching	FOI	Written	<p>5. Please provide the staffing (both ASL and headcount) of staff at the Department who work exclusively on FOI requests, broken down by APS level (e.g. three EL1s, four APS6s, one SES) for each of the following years:</p> <p>a. 2013-14;</p> <p>b. 2014-15;</p> <p>c. 2015-16;</p> <p>d. 2016-17;</p> <p>e. 2018-19; and</p> <p>f. 2019-20 to date.</p> <p>6. For each of the years above, please also list the number of officers who are designated decision makers under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 within the Department.</p> <p>7. In the past 12 months, has the Department seconded additional resources to processing Freedom of Information requests? If so, please detail those resources by APS level.</p> <p>8. Please provide the number of officers who are currently designated decision makers under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 within the Minister's office.</p> <p>9. Please provide the number of FOI requests currently under consideration by the Department. Please also provide the number of these requests that are currently overdue in response.</p> <p>10. Does the department consult or inform the Minister when it receives Freedom of Information requests? If so:</p> <p>a. How many times has this occurred in the past twelve months; and</p> <p>b. Please outline the process by which the Department consults the Minister.</p> <p>11. Has the Department consulted or informed another Department or agency about any FOI request in the past twelve months. If so, please provide the legal basis on which that consultation occurred (e.g. third party consultation, transfer of request).</p>
50	Kitching	Briefings	Written	<p>Has the Department/agency or the Minister's office provided briefings to independents/minor parties in the Senate or House of Representatives. If so, can the following be provided:</p> <p>a. The subject matter of the briefing.</p> <p>b. The location and date of the briefing.</p> <p>c. Who proposed the briefing.</p> <p>d. Attendees of the briefing by level/position</p>
51	Kitching	Acting Minister arrangements	Written	<p>Can the Department provide all leave periods of the portfolio Minister from 24 August 2018 to date.</p> <p>Can the Department further provide acting Minister arrangements for each leave period.</p>
52	Kitching	Departmental staff allowances	Written	<p>Can a list of Departmental/agency allowances and reimbursements available to employees be provided.</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

53	Kitching	Market research	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the Department/agency undertake any polling or market research in relation to government policies or proposed policies.</li> <li>2. If so, can the Department provide an itemised list of:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Subject matter</li> <li>b. Company</li> <li>c. Costs</li> <li>d. Contract date period</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Can the Department/agency advise what, if any, research was shared with the Minister or their office and the date and format in which this occurred.</li> </ol>
54	Kitching	Advertising and information campaigns		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns for FY 2018-19 and for the current financial year to date.</li> <li>2. What advertising and information campaigns did the Department/agency run in each relevant period. For each campaign, please provide:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. When approval was first sought.</li> <li>b. The date of approval, including whether the advertising went through the Independent Campaign Committee process.</li> <li>c. the timeline for each campaign, including any variation to the original proposed timeline.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in each period be provided.</li> </ol>
55	Kitching	Promotional merchandise	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on promotional merchandise for FY 2018-19.</li> <li>2. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all promotional merchandise contracts in that period please be provided.</li> <li>3. Can photographs or samples of relevant promotional merchandise please be provided.</li> </ol>
56	Kitching	Ministerial overseas travel	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can an itemised list of the costs met by the department or agency for all international travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio since 1 July 2018 please be provided including:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Flights for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, together with the airline and class of travel.</li> <li>b. Ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials.</li> <li>c. Accommodation for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed.</li> <li>d. Meals and other incidentals for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided.</li> <li>e. Any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
57	Kitching	Social media influencers	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on social media influencers for FY 2018-19 and 2019-20 to date.</li> <li>2. What advertising or information campaigns did the Department/agency use social media influencers to promote.</li> <li>3. Can a copy of all relevant social media influencer posts please be provided.</li> <li>4. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts please be provided.</li> </ol>
58	Kitching	Commissioned Reports and Reviews	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Since 24 August 2018, how many Reports or Reviews have been commissioned. Please provide details of each report including:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Date commissioned.</li> <li>b. Date report handed to Government.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
**Department of Defence**

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Date of public release.</li> <li>d. Terms of Reference.</li> <li>e. Committee members and/or Reviewers.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost.</li> <li>3. The background and credentials of the Review personnel.</li> <li>4. The remuneration arrangements applicable to the Review personnel, including fees, disbursements and travel</li> <li>5. The cost of any travel attached to the conduct of the Review.</li> <li>6. How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level.</li> <li>7. What is the current status of each report. When is the Government intending to respond to each report if it has not already done so.</li> </ol>
59	Kitching	Board Appointments	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide an update of portfolio boards, including board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members.</li> <li>2. What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio</li> <li>3. Please detail any board appointments made from 1 July 2018 to date.</li> <li>4. What has been the total value of all Board Director fees and disbursements paid.</li> <li>5. What is the value of all domestic travel by Board Directors.</li> <li>6. What is the value of all international travel by Board Directors.</li> </ol>
60	Kitching	Appointments – briefs prepared	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many times has the Department prepared a brief for statutory authorities, executive agencies, advisory boards, government business enterprises or any other Commonwealth body which includes a reference to a former Liberal or National member of parliament at a state, territory or federal level.</li> <li>2. For each brief prepared, can the Department advise: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The former member.</li> <li>b. The board or entity.</li> <li>c. Whether the request originated from the Minister’s office.</li> <li>d. Whether the appointment was made.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
61	Kitching	Stationery	Written	How much has been spent on ministerial stationery requirements in FY 2019-19 and FY 2019-20 to date.
62	Kitching	Media monitoring	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the each Minister's office for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 to date. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Which agency or agencies provided these services.</li> <li>b. Can an itemised list of Austender Contract notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided</li> <li>c. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2019-20.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 to date. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Which agency or agencies provided these services.</li> <li>b. Can an itemised list of Austender Contract Notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided</li> <li>c. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2019-20.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
63	Kitching	Communications staff	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following:</li> <li>2. By Department or agency: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How many ongoing staff, the classification, the type of work they undertake and their location.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
**Department of Defence**

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location.</li> <li>c. How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location.</li> <li>d. How many are graphic designers.</li> <li>e. How many are media managers.</li> <li>f. How many organise events.</li> </ul> <p>3. Do any departments/agencies have independent media studios.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If yes, why.</li> <li>b. When was it established.</li> <li>c. What is the set up cost.</li> <li>d. What is the ongoing cost.</li> <li>e. How many staff work there and what are their classifications.</li> </ul>
64	Kitching	Departmental staff in Minister's office	Written	<p>1. Can the Department provide an update on the total number of departmental staff seconded to ministerial offices, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Duration of secondment.</li> <li>b. APS level.</li> </ul> <p>2. Can the Department provide an update on the total number of DLOs/CLOs for ministerial offices including APS level.</p>
65	Kitching	CDDA Payments	Written	<p>1. How many claims have been received under the Compensation for Detriment caused by Defective Administration scheme (CDDA) by the Department for FY 2018-19?</p> <p>2. How many claims were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Accepted.</li> <li>b. Rejected.</li> <li>c. Under consideration.</li> </ul> <p>3. Of the accepted claims, can the Department provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Details of the claim, subject to relevant privacy considerations</li> <li>b. The date payment was made</li> <li>c. The decision maker.</li> </ul>
66	Kitching	Congestion busting	Written	<p>1. Can the Department/agency advise how it is "congestion busting" in relation to bureaucratic bottlenecks and regulatory bottlenecks.</p> <p>2. Have any additional resources been allocated within the Department to achieve "congestion busting" within the department.</p>
67	Kitching	Recruitment	Written	<p>1. What amount has been expended by the department/agency on external recruitment or executive search services in FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 to date.</p> <p>2. Which services were utilised. Can an itemised list be provided</p>
68	Kitching	Staffing	Written	<p>1. How many full-time equivalent staff are engaged at 21 October 2019. How does this differ from the figures presented in Budget Paper 4 in the 2019-20 Budget.</p> <p>2. How many of these positions are (a) on-going and (b) non-ongoing.</p> <p>3. How many redundancies have occurred in FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 to date. How many were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. voluntary</li> <li>b. involuntary.</li> </ul> <p>4. How many of those redundancies occurred as a result of departmental restructuring. What is the total cost of those redundancies.</p> <p>5. What was the total value in dollar terms of all termination payments paid to exiting staff.</p> <p>6. How much overtime or equivalent has been paid to staff in FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 to date.</p> <p>7. How many section 37 notices under the Public Service Act 1999 have been offered in FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 to date.</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

69	Kitching	Comcare	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For FY 2018-19 and FY2019-20 to date, can the Department advise whether it has been the subject of any investigations involving Comcare. If yes, please provide details of the circumstances and the status.</li> <li>2. Can the Department advise the number of sanctions it has received from Comcare in the FY2019-20 to date.</li> </ol>
70	Kitching	Fair Work Commission	Written	For FY 2018-19 and FY2019-20 to date, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Commission within the Department or agency.
71	Kitching	Fair Work Ombudsman	Written	For FY 2018-19 and FY2019-20 to date, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Ombudsman within the Department or agency.
72	Kitching	Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner	Written	For FY 2018-19 and FY2019-20 to date, how many references have been made to the Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner within the Department or agency.
73	Kitching	Public Interest Disclosures	Written	For FY 2018-19 and FY2019-20 to date, how many public interest disclosures have been received.
74	Gallagher	External Consultants	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In relation to the use of all external consultants in the Department or agencies within the portfolio, can the following be provided.                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. For each of the last six financial years from 2013-14 to 2018-19, the total amount spent on external consultants, including:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. contracts tagged as a “consultancy”.</li> <li>ii. contracts not defined as a “consultancy”, but tagged as “business intelligence consulting services”, “information technology consultation services”, “management advisory services”, “management support services”, “organisational structure consultation”, “risk management consultation services” or “strategic planning consultation services”</li> </ol> </li> <li>b. The total amount of full time equivalent hours (FTE’s) provided by external consultants in 2018-19.</li> <li>c. The total amount of variances granted to external consultant contracts (including those specified in 1(a)(i) above) in 2018-19.</li> <li>d. A breakdown by consultant, specifications and project completion for 2018-19.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
75	Gallagher	External IT Consultants	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In relation to expenditure on information technology in the Department or agencies within the portfolio, can the following be provided.                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. For each of the last six financial years from 2013-14 to 2018-19, the total amount spent on information technology consultation services</li> <li>b. The total amount of full time equivalent hours (FTE’s) provided by information technology consultation services in 2018-19.</li> <li>c. The total amount contracted to information technology consultation services in 2018-19.</li> <li>d. The total amount of variances granted to information technology consultation services contracts in 2018-19.</li> <li>e. A breakdown by consultant, specifications and project completion for 2018-19.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
76	Gallagher	External Contractors	Written	<p>In relation to the use of all external contractors in the Department or agencies within the portfolio, can the following be provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The total amount spent on all contracts for Management and Business Professionals and Administrative Services for each of the last six financial years from 2013-14 to 2018-19.</li> <li>2. The total amount spent on all contracts tagged as “Temporary Personnel Services” for each of the last six financial years from 2013-14 to 2018-19.</li> <li>3. The total number of external contractors employed in 2018-19.</li> <li>4. The aggregate total remuneration payable for all external contractors employed in 2018-19.</li> <li>5. The total number of FTE hours provided by external contractors in 2018-19.</li> </ol>
77	Gallagher	External IT Contractors	Written	<p>In relation to the use of external information technology contractors in the Department or agencies within the portfolio, can the following be provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The total amount spent on external contractors for each of the last six financial years from 2013-14 to 2018-19.</li> <li>2. The total number of external contractors employed in 2018-19.</li> </ol>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
Department of Defence

				<p>3. The aggregate total remuneration payable for all external contractors employed in 2018-19.</p> <p>4. The total number of FTE hours provided by external contractors in 2018-19.</p>
78	Gallagher	Grants	Written	<p>Please provide, for all administered and discretionary grant programs administered by each department and agency within the portfolio:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Name of the administered or discretionary grant program.</li> <li>2. The recipient of the grant.</li> <li>3. The ABN or ACN of the grant recipient.</li> <li>4. The charitable status of the grant recipient.</li> <li>5. Who authorised the grant payment.</li> <li>6. For each year of the budget and forward estimates: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What is the total funding budgeted for the program;</li> <li>b. How much funding has been contracted and allocated;</li> <li>c. How much funding has been contracted but not allocated;</li> <li>d. How much funding has been committed but not contracted;</li> <li>e. How much funding is uncommitted, uncontracted and unallocated.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
79	Gallagher	Cost of APS staff	Written	<p>The total cost of all staff employed under the Public Service Act for each of the last six financial years from 2013/14 to 2018/19.</p>
80	Van	310 St Kilda Road	Written	<p>I have some concerns about the allocation of the Defence site at 310 St Kilda Road, Southbank. In particular, concerns have been brought to me by the Australian National Veterans' Arts Museum (ANVAM) about the potential disposal of the site.</p> <p>It is my understanding that 310 St Kilda Road, which is part of the Victoria Barracks complex, is currently unoccupied and in a state of disrepair. ANVAM has sought to use it to return the former <i>Repatriation Commission Outpatient Clinic, as it was originally known</i>, to the veteran community as a cultural institution for the wellbeing of veterans through facilitated arts engagement.</p> <p>However, ANVAM has encountered six years of continuing difficulties in receiving support from the Department on the potential use of the site, as the Department is claiming the site must be sold under the Commonwealth Property Disposal Policy.</p> <p>As such, within this context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can Defence please provide an update about the status of the site at 310 St Kilda Road, Southbank, Melbourne?</li> <li>2. What is Defence doing to rectify the issues of the site?</li> <li>3. What is Defence considering doing with the site? What process are they undertaking to consider these options?</li> <li>4. What is the timeframe on this process?</li> <li>5. Is six years a reasonable timeframe to let this issue continue to go unresolved?</li> <li>6. What does Defence envisage this process will produce?</li> <li>7. Will Defence consider supporting ANVAM's use of the site as part of this process?</li> <li>8. If not, will Defence facilitate an alternative venue for ANVAM to do their important work for the benefit of our valued veterans?</li> </ol>
81	Jordon Steele-John	Arms Sales – Export licenses	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In Australia it is the Assistant Secretary for Defence Export Controls who is charged with making a decision about whether or not to approve a permit. It has been well established through previous estimates questions that five criteria are used to assess whether a permit is granted or rejected - international obligations, human rights, regional security, national security and foreign. What weighting is assigned to each of these criteria when assessing the risk of approving a permit, or indeed if we look at the past in assessing the risk of future violations?</li> <li>2. Does Defence carry out post-delivery checks or controls or have the capacity to do so?</li> <li>3. What is our response to End-User-Certificate (EUC) violations?</li> <li>4. How do we monitor EUCs?</li> </ol>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Is Defence highly dependent on voluntary cooperation with Australian export companies and their weapon recipients?</li> <li>6. Do we place reservations to the right to conduct post-export end-use monitoring in EUCs?</li> <li>7. Has the Defence ever recommended that a military permit not be granted, and subsequently been overruled by the Minister?</li> <li>8. Has Defence ever recommended against granting an export license?</li> </ol>
82	Jordon Steele-John	The Defence Export Advocate	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Could you provide the level of seniority, job description, and remuneration details of the Australian Defence Export Advocate?</li> <li>2. Could you also provide information about the organisation supports and structures which support the work of the Australian Defence Export Advocate?</li> </ol>
83	Jordon Steele-John	Davos in the Desert	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did Australia send any defence personnel/officers/departmental staff/ministerial staff to "Davos in the Desert" held in Saudi Arabia in October 2019?                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If so, what level of government representation was there?</li> <li>b. Has the humanitarian disaster occurring in Yemen at all factored in to how we rationalise our continued Defence and Arms Sales relationship with Saudi Arabia, and indeed also with the United Arab Emirates?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
84	Jordon Steele-John	Updated Figures of Arms Sales	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many permits have been granted for the export of military equipment from Australia to Saudi Arabia from 1 July 2019 to present?                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What good have been approved under these licenses?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. How many permits have been granted for the export of military equipment from Australia to the United Arab Emirates from 1 July 2019 to present?                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What good have been approved under these licenses?</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. How many permits have been granted for the export of military equipment from Australia to Turkey in the last three years?                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What good have been approved under these licenses?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
85	Di Natalie	Myanmar	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the current extent of the Australian Government's defence cooperation and engagement with Myanmar?</li> <li>2. How much was spent on defence cooperation and engagement with Myanmar in FY 2018-19?</li> <li>3. How much have we spent on defence cooperation and engagement with Myanmar thus far this financial year?</li> <li>4. Do we have projections for how much we intend to spend next financial year? If so, what are they?</li> <li>5. What sort of training took place last financial year, and thus far this financial year as part of our defence cooperation with Myanmar? When and where did that training occur?</li> </ol>
86	Di Natalie	West Papua	Written	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please provide details of all training and education the Australian Government has provided through the ADF (Australian Defence Force) to Detachment 88 (Detasemen Khusus 88 or D88), Brimob or Kopassus since January 2014. Please include:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a list of the training courses administered;</li> <li>b. how many personnel attended each training course (Indonesian and Australian); and</li> <li>c. where these training courses were held?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. What is Australia doing to counsel trainees against human rights abuses during training?</li> <li>3. Please provide details of the steps taking place to ensure that human rights violators do not receive training in Australia.</li> <li>4. Please provide a list of all joint training exercises between the ADF and TNI (the Indonesian National Military) since January 2014, including:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Where the joint training courses took place;</li> <li>b. What divisions of the TNI participated;</li> <li>c. How many Indonesian and Australian personnel participated; and</li> <li>d. The nature of these training exercises.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Please provide a list of all members of the TNI who trained, exercised or were educated in Australia since January 2014, including:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The years they received this training/education;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Where the training/education/exercises took place; and</li> <li>c. In which training/education/exercises they participated?</li> </ul> <p>6. Please provide details of how much funding the Australian Government provides to IKAHAN (Official Defence Alumni Association Australia-Indonesia), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Which portfolio the funding comes from;</li> <li>b. who the Indonesian members of IKAHAN are;</li> <li>c. the eligibility criteria for membership; and</li> <li>d. if anyone has ever been excluded for their involvement in human rights violations.</li> </ul> <p>7. In response to previous questions on notice, the Minister for Justice has stated “the AFP has provided equipment to Detachment 88 to increase their counter terrorism capacity. This has included computer equipment, vehicles and office furniture.” Has the Defence Department provided equipment to the TNI, including Kopassus?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If so, please provide an itemised list of what computer equipment was given, and what types of vehicles and office furniture, since January 2014.</li> <li>b. Were any of these supplies used in West Papua?</li> </ul> <p>8. Can the Department of Defence guarantee its assistance to the Indonesian military is not used in in West Papua?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If so, what monitoring and evaluation framework is in place to ensure this is the case?</li> </ul> <p>9. Please provide details of any monitoring and evaluation of the ADF’s work with the TNI, including an evaluation of the effectiveness and human rights risks of this assistance.</p> <p>10. If the ADF does not undertake any monitoring or evaluation, please provide a statement of why no monitoring and evaluation framework is in place.</p> <p>11. Further, please provide details of what, if any, conditions are placed on Australia’s material support to the TNI.</p> <p>12. In relation to the Defence Cooperation Agreement with Indonesia, please provide details of the specific provisions this agreement contains to ensure transparency, including documentation that specifies the provisions which ensure Australian resources do not directly or indirectly support human rights abuses in Indonesia.</p> <p>13. In answer to Question on Notice 174 from Supplementary Estimates in 2012, the Department asserted that “Defence limits engagement with individuals where we have information to support allegations of human rights concern”. Please provide details of what process is in place to limit this engagement, including how often this occurred in the last 10 years.</p>
87	Kitching	Cyber Reserve Force	Written	<p>On 10 October 2017, Julia Talevski of ARN reported that then Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Cyber Security, Dan Tehan, told ABC radio that federal government plans to establish a ‘Cyber Reserve force’, consisting of people from the industry with cyber/IT skills, who can be called on in times of national emergency to support Australian Defence deployed cyber security personnel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) When was this Cyber Reserve Force established?</li> <li>(b) How many people have been enlisted in the Cyber Reserve Force?</li> <li>(c) How many people was the government targeting for enlistment in the Cyber Reserve Force?</li> <li>(d) How many ‘reservists’ have been deployed to support Defence?</li> <li>(e) In what cyber security incidents have ‘reservists’ been deployed to support Defence?</li> <li>(f) What have these ‘reservists’ done to support Defence?</li> <li>(g) How much funding has been allocated to the Cyber Reserve Force program?</li> <li>(h) As a part of the renewal of the 2020 Cyber Strategy will there be a review into the way responsibility for cybersecurity and developing offensive cyber capabilities is split across ASD, Home Affairs, Defence and the Attorney General’s?</li> </ul>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

88	Kitching	Outcome 1 of Action 11	Written	<p>Action 11 of 2016 Australia’s Cyber Security Strategy is “Strengthen Defence’s cyber security capacity and capability, through initiatives in the 2016 Defence White Paper”.</p> <p>Outcome 1 of Action 11 is “Defence strengthens its cyber capabilities to protect itself and other critical Australian Government systems from malicious cyber intrusion and disruption”.</p> <p>(a) How does the Government measure progress towards this outcome?                  (b) In Year 1 of the Strategy, what was the progress made toward this outcome?                  (c) In Year 2 of the Strategy, what was the progress made toward this outcome?                  In Year 3 of the Strategy, what was the progress made toward this outcome?</p>
89	Kitching	Outcome 2 of Action 11	Written	<p>Action 11 of 2016 Australia’s Cyber Security Strategy is “Strengthen Defence’s cyber security capacity and capability, through initiatives in the 2016 Defence White Paper”.</p> <p>Outcome 2 of Action 11 is “Defence enhances the resilience of networks, including networks used by deployed forces, and the capability of the Australian Cyber Security Centre and its cyber workforce, including new military and APS positions and training programs”.</p> <p>(a) How does the Government measure progress towards this outcome?                  (b) In Year 1 of the Strategy, what was the progress made toward this outcome?                  (c) In Year 2 of the Strategy, what was the progress made toward this outcome?                  (d) In Year 3 of the Strategy, what was the progress made toward this outcome?</p>
90	Kitching	Cyber security funding	Written	<p>The 2016 Defence White paper stated that Department of Defence will be allocated an additional \$300-400 million over ten years for cyber security.</p> <p>(a) What was the additional cyber security expenditure in Defence in 2016-17?                  (b) What was the additional cyber security expenditure in Defence in 2017-18?                  (c) What was the additional cyber security expenditure in Defence in 2018-19?                  (d) What was the additional budget allocation for cyber security in Defence in 2019-20?</p>
91	Gallagher	Overall compliance and reporting	Written	<p>The Australian Government set a target date for government entities to achieve compliance with the Australian Signals Directorate’s Top Four mitigation strategies as detailed in the Protected Security Policy Framework (PSPF), INFOSEC 10 core requirements<sup>1</sup> by 30 June 2014<sup>2</sup>. Non-corporate Commonwealth entities are required to apply the Mandatory 4 whereas it is only considered best practice for corporate Commonwealth entities and wholly-owned Commonwealth companies. ASD had stated that implementing the top 4 mitigation strategies will be able to prevent over 85% of unauthorised intrusions.</p> <p><i>Overall compliance and reporting</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the Department compliant with the core requirements in the Protected Security Policy Framework, <i>INFOSEC 10: Safeguarding information from cyber threats</i> policy?</li> <li>2. Under the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013, all non-corporate Commonwealth entities are required to report annually to the Attorney-General on the implementation of the Protected Security Policy Framework (PSPF). Has the Department provided an annual report to the Attorney general in 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 on compliance with the INFOSEC 10 core requirements?</li> </ol>

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.protectivesecurity.gov.au/information/safeguarding-information-from-cyber-threats/Documents/pspf-infosec-10-safeguarding-information-cyber-threats.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> ANAO, Audit Report No. 42 (2016–17), p. 7.

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

92	Gallagher	Mandatory 4 implementation	Written	<p>The Australian Government set a target date for government entities to achieve compliance with the Australian Signals Directorate's Top Four mitigation strategies as detailed in the Protected Security Policy Framework (PSPF), INFOSEC 10 core requirements by 30 June 2014. Non-corporate Commonwealth entities are required to apply the Mandatory 4 whereas it is only considered best practice for corporate Commonwealth entities and wholly-owned Commonwealth companies. ASD had stated that implementing the top 4 mitigation strategies will be able to prevent over 85% of unauthorised intrusions.</p> <p>Mandatory 4 implementation</p> <p>3. Has the Department implemented Protected Security Policy Framework INFOSEC 10, requirement 1: application whitelisting?</p> <p>a. According to the Essential Eight Maturity Model what is the maturity of application whitelisting implementation?</p> <p>4. Has the Department implemented Protected Security Policy Framework INFOSEC 10, requirement 2: patching applications?</p> <p>a. According to the Essential Eight Maturity Model, what is the maturity of patching applications implementation?</p> <p>5. Has the Department implemented Protected Security Policy Framework INFOSEC 10, requirement 3: restriction of administrative privileges?</p> <p>a. According to the Essential Eight Maturity Model, what is the maturity of 'restrict administrative privileges' implementation?</p> <p>6. Has the Department implemented Protected Security Policy Framework INFOSEC 10, requirement 4: patching operating systems?</p> <p>a. According to the Essential Eight Maturity Model, what is the maturity of 'Patching operating systems' implementation?</p> <p><a href="https://www.protectivesecurity.gov.au/information/safeguarding-information-from-cyber-threats/Documents/pspf-infosec-10-safeguarding-information-cyber-threats.pdf">https://www.protectivesecurity.gov.au/information/safeguarding-information-from-cyber-threats/Documents/pspf-infosec-10-safeguarding-information-cyber-threats.pdf</a></p> <p>ANAO, Audit Report No. 42 (2016–17), p. 7.</p> <p><a href="https://www.cyber.gov.au/publications/essential-eight-maturity-model">https://www.cyber.gov.au/publications/essential-eight-maturity-model</a></p>
93	Gallagher	Essential 8 implementation	Written	<p>Essential 8 implementation</p> <p>7. Has the Department implemented Protected Security Policy Framework INFOSEC 10, C.4, 27 (a): configuring Microsoft Office macro settings?</p> <p>a. According to the Essential Eight Maturity Model what is the maturity of 'configuring Microsoft Office macro settings' implementation?</p> <p>8. Has the Department implemented Protected Security Policy Framework INFOSEC 10, C.4, 27 (b): user application hardening?</p> <p>a. According to the Essential Eight Maturity Model what is the maturity of 'configuring Microsoft Office macro settings' implementation?</p> <p>9. Has the Department implemented Protected Security Policy Framework INFOSEC 10, C.4, 27 (c): multi-factor authentication?</p> <p>a. According to the Essential Eight Maturity Model what is the maturity of 'multi-factor authentication' implementation?</p> <p>10. Has the Department implemented Protected Security Policy Framework INFOSEC 10, C.4, 27 (d): daily backups?</p> <p>a. According to the Essential Eight Maturity Model what is the maturity of 'daily backups' implementation?</p>
94	Gallagher	Accountability and funding	Written	<p>11. How many times has the Department conducted a self assessment of its compliance with the Protected Security Policy Framework Essential Eight mitigation strategies and cyber resilience since 1 July 2013?</p> <p>12. How many independent assessments of its cyber resilience has the Department conducted since 1 July 2013?</p> <p>13. Has the Minister responsible been briefed on cyber security vulnerabilities in the Department networks since 1 July 2013?</p> <p>14. Has an Australian Signals Directorate cyber security sprint team been deployed to the Department since 1 July 2013?</p> <p>15. How much funding has the Department allocated to cyber security each year during 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019?</p> <p>16. How many times has there been a physical or cyber intrusion attempt made on the Department's networks that were considered serious enough to warrant an operational response in 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019?</p>
95	Kitching	310 St Kilda Road	Written	<p>Can the department provide a status update in relation to the Defence property at 310 St Kilda Road, Melbourne?</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
**Department of Defence**

96	Kitching	DFRDB – Timelines	Written	What are the next steps for this report [DFRDB]? Does the department have a timeline? Will the government release the investigation report and a response?
97	Kitching	DFRDB – Ombudsman Investigation	Written	In its September update, the Ombudsman noted DFRDB members were unhappy with other aspects of the scheme, including indexation arrangements and administration of spouse payments. It said it would acknowledge these areas of concerns in the report. Can the department provide a copy of the investigation’s terms of reference? a. Can the department advise how the Ombudsman will deal with these areas of concern in its investigation? b. Are there avenues to address these other issues more fully in the future? c. How might this be progressed?
98	Kitching	DFRDB – Model Commutation Outcomes	Written	As part of its own motion investigation into the administration of DFRDB commutation arrangements, the Commonwealth Ombudsman has engaged the Australian Government Actuary and KPMG to model commutation outcomes in a number of real life examples, to compare the longer term financial outcomes of decisions to commute or not. Is the department able to provide the results of this modelling?
99	Lambie	Defence Firefighters Chemical Contamination – Inclusion in State Fire Services Study	Written	The RAAF Fire and Rescue Service were informed that their members should and were included in a study conducted on State Fire Services despite the fact that these services never carried out the same training burning the same multiple of chemicals with the same frequency. Why?
100	Lambie	Defence Firefighters contamination – Exposure at Point Cook	Written	A medical survey carried out on 128 Firefighters in 2018 revealed the following conditions which may have been caused by chemical contamination. Cancers                    49 = 38% Respiratory                15 = 11% Neurological               7 = 5% Eyesight                    22 = 17% Hearing                     63 = 49% Medical                      243 = 90% Does the Department acknowledge that firefighters were exposed to an unacceptable level of risk to their health when training at Point Cook?
101	Lambie	Origin of firefighting chemicals at Point Cook	Written	According to the RAAD Fire and Rescue Service, contaminated fuel was delivered by RAAF transport to Point Cook for disposal. Where did it come from?
102	Lambie	Firefighters Chemical Contamination – Reseal/Deseal unaccounted drums investigation	Written	The Reseal/Deseal claims which involved one chemical were resolved with a tax free payout to those involved. During the Reseal/Deseal claims it was revealed that there were approximately 80 two hundred litre drums unaccounted for. Many believe that some of these were sent to the Fire School at Point Cook for burning. Has this been investigated?
103	Kitching	DFRDB Ombudsman	Written	1. This [DFRDB] investigation was discussed at the Ex-Service Organisation Roundtable (ESORT) in April 2019. a. Can the department advise what other consultation with scheme members and veterans has taken place?

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
 Department of Defence

		consultation		<p>b. Has the Ombudsman provided a questionnaire to scheme members?</p> <p>c. If so, can the department advise what this covered?</p> <p>d. Can the department advise who the Ombudsman conducted interviews with?</p>
104	Patrick	Workforce at ASC Submarines	75	<p>Senator PATRICK: So the bit we're missing now is the workforce at ASC submarines, which I know is not your area.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: We were answering the question in relation to the 1,100 average jobs for the Future Submarine program.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: It wasn't a criticism. I was just saying that, between the two bits of information, the workforce for ASC submarines wasn't provided. Maybe that can also be provided on notice.</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sammut: Of course, we are here today. That is of the order at the moment.</p>
105	Wong	Project Concur Advice to Minister	86-87	<p>Senator WONG: No-one knows whether it went to open tender and who made the decision. When was the minister first advised?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: The minister would have been advised—</p> <p>Senator WONG: No. Let's not use 'would' but 'when'.</p> <p>Ms Skinner: Yes, sorry.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Because that means maybe.</p> <p>Ms Skinner: The minister of the day was advised around the time of the authority to expend the money.</p> <p>Senator WONG: The \$11.9 million?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WONG: So who was the minister then?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: I believe Minister Payne was the minister. I would need to get the date, unless my colleagues have it, of when further advice was provided about the difficulties in the project.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When was the minister first asked, or is \$11.9 million above the delegation threshold where the minister had to sign off?</p> <p>Mr Groves: No. Not sign off. They would have been advised that we were going forward.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Does anyone have the date the minister was advised?</p> <p>Mr Groves: Not with me.</p> <p>Senator WONG: The draft business case identified a target implementation of June 2017. The minister approved acquisition with capability to be implemented by January 2017. Is anyone able to tell me why there was a difference between those two start dates?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: We have to get the project manager, who is not here. I don't have those answers. There was a project manager.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Is she or he still working with you?</p> <p>Ms Skinner: They are not currently working on the project. But we will have the information in the department.</p>
106	Wong	Jobs in the shipbuilding sector	22-23	<p>Senator WONG: Can I just ask for this? You have given me figures today of 577. That is a cumulative figure. Do we agree? I want to know how many of them got jobs in the shipbuilding sector.</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: We'll do our best to get those figures, but I'm not sure if they're available.</p> <p>Senator WONG: How many of them have been redeployed into the projects the minister just outlined?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: We'll see what information we can get for you.</p> <p>Senator WONG: And of the 220?</p> <p>Senator Reynolds: We can probably identify how many have voluntarily registered and got assistance through the workforce register. That might be possible. But for those who have retired or moved, we don't have visibility of that.</p>
107	Wong	Skills and trades job profile	37	<p>Senator WONG: Next year. I might have asked this before the break. Can you give me a skills and trades profile of those workers in the 220?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Of the 220?</p> <p>Senator WONG: Of lost jobs.</p> <p>Ms Lutz: I don't have an exact split of the skills.</p> <p>Senator WONG: What do you have?</p>

SSCFADT QUESTIONS ON NOTICE INDEX  
 Supplementary Estimates Hearings 23 October 2019  
**Department of Defence**

				<p>Ms Lutz: The percentages roughly are—the majority would be trade skills.                  Senator WONG: The majority of the 220 would be tradespeople. When you say majority, is that in excess of 150?                  Ms Lutz: I'd have to get back to you on that number.                  Senator WONG: Okay.</p>
108	Wong	Shipbuilding jobs number	41	<p>Senator WONG: I have one last question. Mr Pyne also said in December 2018 that over 6,300 jobs will be created nationwide. That is an increase on Mr Turnbull's announcement. Can someone explain to me how that figure was arrived at? This is in relation to frigates.                  Ms Lutz: I don't know.                  Senator WONG: You don't know. Is it based on Defence advice?                  Senator Reynolds: I can't jump into the mind of my predecessor.                  ...                  Senator WONG: Minister, I'm just asking the government to be accountable for the figure that the former Minister for Defence used.                  Senator Reynolds: I understand that. But the context—                  Senator WONG: No. He didn't put any context in.                  Senator Reynolds: Senator Wong, as you well know, the context of this is critically important.                  Senator WONG: I would like someone in government to be accountable for the figure that the Minister for Defence put out.                  Senator Reynolds: Senator Wong, the officials at the table have taken those on notice and will come back with as much fidelity as they can, given the circumstance.                  Senator WONG: I think the only evidence was she doesn't know, which is an honest answer. I don't press the official because she has given the answer to the best of her ability. I am asking you and the secretary whether someone can please explain to me how it is that the 6,800 figure is arrived at.                  Senator Reynolds: Senator Wong, that has been taken on notice given that it relates to circumstances two years ago. We will come back to you with the best possible information.</p>