

Supplementary Budget Estimates 2021-22 – Department of Defence QON Index

Department	Q No.	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Proof Hansard Page
Department of Defence	1	Penny Wong	Cancelling Naval Contract	<p>Senator WONG: when were they first made aware of the decision to cancel the Naval contract and acquire nuclear powered submarines?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: I will check. The Chief Defence Scientist was briefed. I'll see if I can immediately find out for you the date when that took place.</p> <p>Senator WONG: And Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group—when were they first made aware?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: I'll try and get that date for you as well.</p>	Hansard	9
Department of Defence	2	Penny Wong	Decision to cancel Naval Contract	<p>Senator WONG: Come on! This is the largest acquisition in the nation's history. Anyway, let's move on. The decision to cancel the Naval Group contract and proceed down this path is the NSIC decision that you've described—</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: National Security Committee.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Sorry, NSC decision—which is in this period between June and September?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Johnston: We're checking those dates.</p>	Hansard	13
Department of Defence	3	Penny Wong	Termination of Attack Class program revised timeline	<p>Mr Byrne: Following the government's announcement around the termination of the Attack class program and decision to pursue a nuclear submarine—</p> <p>Senator WONG: Yes, I read that. I want to know pre the Attack class—pre the announcement on 16 September. I assume you had revised a baseline at some point in that nine months leading up to that announcement for calendar year 2020-21; correct?</p> <p>Mr Byrne: Correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Can I have a copy of that, please?</p> <p>Mr Byrne: Yes, we can take that on notice and table it.</p>	Hansard	24
Department of Defence	4	Penny Wong	Workforce demand	<p>Senator WONG: Now that you've cancelled the Attack class project, can you tell me: do you currently have a revised estimate of direct jobs?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Direct jobs in what sense, Senator?</p> <p>Senator WONG: Sorry; do you currently have revised numbers for workforce demand for the current and subsequent financial years, for South Australia and also across the country?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Well, we certainly have demand projections for South Australia and Western Australia.</p> <p>Senator WONG: You do now, post Attack class being cancelled?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: There are some demand projections.</p> <p>Senator WONG: What are the demand projections?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: We'll look at getting those to you, Senator. We can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I'd like to see before and after. Let's be really clear. I want to see what your assessment was according to Minister Reynolds's statement in estimates a couple of years ago, and then I'd like to see what your best estimates are now. But what we do know is there are 1,100 affected employees and jobs at risk at this stage, minimum.</p>	Hansard	25
Department of Defence	5	Penny Wong	Terms of Discretion	<p>Senator WONG: At this point in time is it open to anyone else?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: The portal is open. If they don't come from that eligibility pool we will look at their individual circumstances on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Senator WONG: This is a weird way to run a process. I assume you have an eligibility framework, correct? You have some definition of eligibility?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: We do.</p> <p>Senator WONG: What's the definition?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: The definition of eligibility is all Naval Group employees and all Lockheed Martin employees engaged directly in</p>	Hansard	27

				<p>the Attack class submarine program.</p> <p>Senator WONG: So the eligibility is only LMA and Naval Group. Then you're telling me you have a discretion to consider anybody else?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When did you decide to have the discretion?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: When we put in framework in place.</p> <p>Senator WONG: What are the terms of the discretion? Can you read them to me? This is a power to determine eligibility to a program. It's not just, again, a wing and a prayer. You must be clear about what the discretion is and who it resides in.</p> <p>Mr Dalton: The case by case status that we'll look at is for other employees who are directly and full-time employed on the Attack class program, who have been affected by the decision.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Where is that written?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: In the heads of agreement that we have with ASC.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Can I have that, please?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: We'll take it on notice.</p>		
Department of Defence	6	Penny Wong	Shipbuilding implementation plan	<p>Senator WONG: Minister, can you tell me why you've delayed releasing the implementation plan for continuous shipbuilding?</p> <p>Senator Payne: I'm not aware, but I'll take it on notice.</p>	Hansard	35
Department of Defence	7	Penny Wong	Pacific support vessel	<p>Senator WONG: Okay. Now, in 2018 Mr Morrison announced a new Pacific relief vessel—is that what it's called—would be acquired?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: I think in 2018 we might have been talking about the large-hulled vessel for the South Pacific.</p> <p>Senator WONG: He said:</p> <p>Our Government will put in place arrangements to ensure Australia has a dedicated vessel to deliver support to our partners in the Pacific, including for humanitarian assistance and response.</p> <p>It's also mentioned in the Force structure plan, yes?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: What do you want me to call it?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: In the Force structure plan, it was referred to as the Pacific support vessel.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Support vessel. Okay. Where is that capability? What's happened to the Pacific support vessel?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: I think what we're looking at is how we adapt to the changing strategic circumstances in the Pacific. That's put an emphasis on delivering that capability into the Pacific more quickly, so the government has made a decision to purchase that vessel from the commercial marketplace to have it in the south-west Pacific next year.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Senator Kitching asked you a question in April about this, and you said, 'At this stage a submission is yet to be presented for government consideration.' What you're now telling me is the government is not going to build it in Australia and will purchase it offshore?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When was that decision made?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: I'll take it on notice. I'll get back to you.</p>	Hansard	36
Department of Defence	8	David Fawcett	Rizzo review	<p>Senator FAWCETT: Yes. Chief of Navy, thank you for that. Perhaps one way to get a snapshot of where collectively, within Navy and broader Defence, we're up to is to revisit the Rizzo review. I think the last time I saw a mention of that in the annual report was 2013-14. It would be useful to go back over the recommendations and give an update as to where we're at and whether we've not only achieved but also sustained the outcomes that were envisaged.</p>	Hansard	44
Department of Defence	9	David Fawcett	Absorbed measure	<p>And for the CFO: you'll be aware that I have long pursued absorbed measures within Defence, and on page 74 of the annual report, table 4.4, there is one mention of an absorbed measure. Again, I think the parliament should get transparency to understand what things have been deferred in order to fund that absorbed measure, albeit that this one, at \$15.7 million, was quite a small measure. But, in principle, if you could take on notice to provide some information, that would be useful.</p>	Hansard	44

Department of Defence	10	David Fawcett	Back-to-back postings	Senator FAWCETT: I'd be interested to know then why some individuals have been given very short notice back-to-back postings to fill holes at sea. Perhaps you can come back with that at some point.	Hansard	44
Department of Defence	11	Penny Wong	Special purpose aircraft	<p>Senator WONG: So, it's a refitted KC30; is that what you want me to call it?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: You said it does air-to-air refuelling?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: Its primary role is air-to-air refuelling.</p> <p>Senator WONG: But it's being used as a passenger aircraft.</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: It can be used as a special purpose aircraft and for strategic airlift, including passengers.</p> <p>Senator WONG: How often has this aircraft been used for prime ministerial travel?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: I will have to dig that out of my brief.</p> <p>Senator Payne: While Air Marshal Hupfeld looks for that, this is a procurement that the government agreed under the previous Prime Minister. I think the opposition leader at the time was advised by then Secretary Richardson, and it has progressed since then.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Can I have an answer to my question?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: There have only been a couple of occasions on which the Prime Minister has used it. Of the in the order of 200 flights this aircraft has performed, only five have been used for special purpose functions.</p> <p>Senator WONG: It's only being used for special purpose functions five times, but it has flown about 200.</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When did it enter service?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: We purchased the aircraft second-hand in November 2015.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When did it start to get used for special purpose?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: I would have to take that on notice. It is somewhere in my brief.</p>	Hansard	45
Department of Defence	12	Penny Wong	Special purpose aircraft - Ministerial travel	<p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: We purchased the aircraft second-hand in November 2015.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When did it start to get used for special purpose?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: I would have to take that on notice. It is somewhere in my brief.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Which Prime Minister?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: I will have to take that one on notice, too. I can't recall.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I thought you might remember which Prime Minister started using it, because it's only been used five times.</p> <p>Senator Payne: I don't think it was fitted out before 2018, but Air Marshal Hupfeld will check.</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: It took a couple of years to get the fitments done.</p>	Hansard	46
Department of Defence	13	Penny Wong	GTC - Glasgow Task	<p>Senator WONG: I agree. But the request to use this aircraft for this tasking was put to you first by the PMO?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: For the GTC—for the Glasgow task, specifically?</p> <p>Senator WONG: Yes.</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: The request for the task is put forward first—</p> <p>Senator WONG: No, no—can you not answer in the general? If I'm wrong, you tell me I'm wrong. I'm not asking generally. I'm saying: on this occasion, the Prime Minister's office requested the use of this aircraft.</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: On the way you're asking the question, I am answering the best way I can. The Prime Minister's office will request the task and we then determine—</p> <p>Senator WONG: And I'm putting to you on this occasion—</p> <p>CHAIR: Can I try and assist? We're going around in circles. The question is specifically: in requesting the task, was a specific aircraft also put in that request?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: Not that I'm aware of—until we explained what the best outcome for the task would have been.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Did you talk to them?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: No, I didn't.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Who did?</p>	Hansard	47

				<p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: I have a wing commander—</p> <p>Senator WONG: Does the wing commander want to come forward, so he or she can tell me who first raised it?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: The wing commander was not listed as a witness and is not here today.</p> <p>Senator Payne: Senator Wong, if you ask your question I'm sure Air Marshal Hupfeld will take it on notice and return to you with a response.</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: I can take it on notice, but that is not the way we do the task.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I'm asking you: is it the case that the use of this aircraft was specifically requested by a member of the Prime Minister's staff?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: The best way I can think to answer that is: the Prime Minister's office, in this case, would prefer the GTC, but I provide the advice on what is the best system.</p> <p>Senator WONG: So they indicated a preference; is that the better way to deal with it? Who indicated that preference?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: That comes through the Prime Minister's office, and the staff that they—</p> <p>Senator WONG: The problem with these answers—and I know you're assisting—is that I keep asking you in the specific and you keep responding in the general. I'm asking you a specific interactional question, and you're responding to me with a general systemic answer.</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: I will have to take the question on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: But you can say to me that the preference was indicated by the Prime Minister's office. Why do you understand that that preference was indicated?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: They understand how the aircraft work, and, as we work with them—</p> <p>Senator WONG: What do you understand the reason for their preference to be?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: The capabilities that are represented by the GTC aircraft, for long-range transport, are most suited to the task for which the Prime Minister's office has requested the aircraft, for this particular event.</p>		
Department of Defence	14	Penny Wong	Air-to-air refuelling	<p>Senator WONG: Was there ever a request for air-to-air refuelling, or did the PMO raise the possibility of air-to-air refuelling?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: Do you mean to air-to-air refuel the aircraft in the GTC itself?</p> <p>Senator WONG: Yes.</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>Senator WONG: No air-to-air refuelling option was ever raised in the discussion between your people and the PMO?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: It may have been discussed. I'd have to take that on notice. It's always an option we can consider, but it's not necessarily the most efficient way to deliver the capability.</p>	Hansard	48
Department of Defence	15	Penny Wong	Workforce figures	<p>Senator WONG: As of March 2021 you had 25,000 outsourced service providers, 6,810 contractors and 314 consultants. By contrast you had just under 16½ thousand APS employees in 2020-21. You had many more people employed externally than you had employed as an APS officer. Those numbers have increased over time. For example, 5,000 in March 2020 to 5,600 in September 2020 to 6,800 in March 2021. The cost has increased. You've got \$1.4 billion in 2018-19, \$1.5 billion in 2019-20 and \$1.3 billion for the nine months to March 2021. This is a lot of expenditure. My first question is about the increase. If you look at your external workforce between March 2020 and March 2021 your numbers increased from 5,361 contractors to 6,810 contractors. I think that's just over a 25 per cent or 27 per cent increase in contract numbers. Can you tell me why?</p> <p>Mr Groves: There were a variety of reasons. One is the workload is increasing and we are relying on the contractor workforce. The 20 March census, I think, was our very first census. Our processes were evolving and improving over the period that we did the subsequent two censuses on 20 September and in March 2021. I don't have the exact numbers of how much were improvements around people reporting better.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Can you get that? Because it looks like a pretty big increase. If you're defence on that, to be frank with you, is it's not just that we kept outsourcing staff and paying other people more, we actually didn't report correctly the last time, I wouldn't mind understanding—</p> <p>Mr Groves: There was a mixture of that, yes.</p>	Hansard	50

				<p>Senator WONG: what is attributable to the underreporting and what is attributable to the growth in the actual number. The costs are GST exclusive—the numbers that I read out which are in your report?</p> <p>Mr Groves: I don't believe so. Could you quote another one of those costs for me?</p> <p>Senator WONG: So \$1.14 billion in 2018-19, \$1.5 billion in 2019-20.</p> <p>Mr Groves: They're exclusive.</p>		
Department of Defence	16	Penny Wong	Average APS employee cost	<p>Senator WONG: Does the contractor headcount fluctuate a great deal within each year?</p> <p>Mr Groves: I only have information based on when we do the census.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I know, but if your argument about the average cost calculation that ASPI has done—and they are very close to government—is that you don't necessarily agree with their per capita figure because the numbers fluctuate in a year, I'm giving you the opportunity to tell us how the numbers fluctuate?</p> <p>Mr Groves: They're seasonal. Our numbers for contractors, depending on the nature of work, would shut down over December and January—</p> <p>Senator WONG: Alright. Then, why don't you do the equivalent—why don't you give me your average cost per APS employee in 2020-21 and 2021-22. Can you give me that?</p> <p>Mr Groves: I don't have that with me.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Can you take it on notice?</p> <p>Mr Groves: We can take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Why don't you give me what Defence says. If you don't agree with ASPI, you tell us what the average cost per contractor is between 2020-21 and 2021-22.</p> <p>Mr Groves: We'll have a look at that.</p>	Hansard	50
Department of Defence	17	Penny Wong	Drivers of the differential on the basis of the ASPI numbers	<p>Mr Groves: Our value-for-money decision needs to be on what we would have to pay the firm to get those skill sets in, and it's not something we ask our contracting firms what their profit margins are.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I'd like to understand the drivers of the differential on the basis of the ASPI numbers, the differential between the average costs. I'd like your explanation of that.</p> <p>Mr Groves: Yes. We will provide that on notice.</p>	Hansard	52
Department of Defence	19	Penny Wong	Difference between information resources	<p>Mr Groves: If I may, in response to your question around pre-COVID, I've got information, if you want to get a guide, for March 2020.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Okay. I was trying to get a baseline that made sense, that's all.</p> <p>Mr Groves: From our March 2020 census, on site, of that 28,632 that we recorded, 19,031 were on site on defence premises. Offsite was 5,889, overseas was 669 and multiple sites—that is, they might be doing a mixture of onsite and offsite—was 3,044. That was back in our March 2020 census.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Alright. I have asked for that on notice. I also want an explanation of the difference between Mr Moriarty's evidence in October 2020 that said there was \$2 billion for civilian employees and then in relation to the budget estimates around question on notice 402 the number was \$1.614 billion for 2021. Can you just on notice explain the difference between those two information sources? I am sure there's a scope question.</p> <p>Mr Groves: I might have an answer, just to confirm those numbers. Certainly for 2020-21 our APS employee expenses were \$1.975 billion. I'm not too sure where the \$1.6 billion—</p> <p>Senator WONG: Question on notice 402.</p> <p>Mr Groves: I would have to have a look at the question on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I think they're the same dataset, but they might not be. In which case what it looks like, where I see it—and you may have a different explanation—is your APS costs are going down and your contractor costs are substantially increasing at a faster rate.</p> <p>Mr Groves: Across the two financial years our employee expenses were pretty much the same, identical.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I have got \$1.614 billion in 2020-21 in question on notice 402.</p>	Hansard	53

				Mr Groves: The financial statements we have in the annual report have \$1.975 billion for 2020-21 and \$1.979 billion for 2019-20, but I will have to check what that QON was covering. Senator WONG: Yes, why don't you check that.		
Department of Defence	20	Penny Wong	Visa ineligibility	Senator WONG: Outstanding. Question on notice 67 I referenced the legislative instrument that people had to apply within six months of ceasing employment. Mr Jeffrey: That's correct, Senator. Senator WONG: You gave me a very lengthy answer. That is correct. Can you tell me how many of the 516 ineligible were refused as a consequence of that criteria not being met—that is, an application within six months of ceasing employment? Mr Jeffrey: I can't tell you that answer specifically, Senator. I will take it on notice. I don't know if our data will explain that detail.	Hansard	54
Department of Defence	21	Kimberley Kitching	Agreed criteria	Senator KITCHING: Did you or Mr Dalton advise the secretary or CDF that you thought that Naval Group had met all of the agreed criteria? Mr Sammut: I did advise Defence leadership that we had received an affordable and acceptable offer for the next phase of work. Senator KITCHING: Was that done verbally or in writing? Mr Sammut: Verbally and in writing. Senator KITCHING: Could I have a copy? Mr Sammut: I will take that on notice.	Hansard	57
Department of Defence	22	Jacqui Lambie	Support to personnel	Senator LAMBIE: Here's a better idea: why don't you make a phone call to your mate and ask him whether that happened? I've also heard allegations that a major is being harassed and could be censured for making a formal complaint against the SUR matter. This same officer has had the worst annual report of the 40 years he gave the Army. What is going on? He's had outstanding reports for 39 years. He goes out there and he's brave and shows courage, and now he's got an annual report that's killed off his career but there are no reprisals going on? That is something you, not investigators, need to investigate. Do you know anything about that? Lt Gen. Burr: All matters at the Sydney University Regiment are being investigated. Senator LAMBIE: I believe the minister has been in contact with the mother of a cadet who had to be removed from the regiment by Army headquarters as a result of bullying and harassment from one of her superiors. Could you please tell me what support that young lady is getting, as well as others who have been forced to leave the regiment because of what's been going on. Lt Gen. Burr: Senator, I'll— Senator LAMBIE: I'll let the minister answer that. The minister may need to take that on notice. Lt Gen. Burr: We'll take that on notice, thank you. Senator Payne: Thank you, Senator Lambie. I will do that.	Hansard	65
Department of Defence	23	Jacqui Lambie	Support Officers	Senator LAMBIE: Is there any way that you could show me or tell me exactly how these cadets have been provided with a support officer as per the Chief of Army's directive on support officers? How many of these cadets have had a support officer? Lt Gen. Burr: I'd have to take that question on notice; I don't have that to hand. I'd like to think that everyone who needs support is being provided support. If that's not the case and you have further information, I'd certainly welcome having a better understanding of that, please.	Hansard	66
Department of Defence	24	Jacqui Lambie	Latchford Barracks	Senator LAMBIE: How many fact finds at Latchford Barracks have been conducted over the last two years? Lt Gen. Burr: I don't know the number of fact-finds. I can take that on notice. Senator LAMBIE: Thank you. Can I also have why that fact-find was conducted. What was the accusation? That's all the information I need to know. Are you aware of any trainees who have had to be removed from the vehicle training wing? If so, what's being done to support them and their families? Lt Gen. Burr: I don't know that level of detail. I would need to take that on notice and respect privacy accordingly.	Hansard	67

Department of Defence	25	Jacqui Lambie	Hazing	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Do you think that not standing people down, as you are, because they're of higher rank is actually leading by example and showing how things should be done in the armed forces, seriously? That tells me that that behaviour is okay and 'we'll still pay you and you keep your job while we're investigating you'.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: If it's appropriate for people to be stood down, based on the information that is available, then that action does occur. I don't know the specifics of this incident and I wouldn't prejudge anyone in this regard, but the ability to stand people down is taken where it's appropriate to do so.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: How many people have been stood down for hazing or received charges for hazing since your directive?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: I'll take that on notice, please.</p>	Hansard	67
Department of Defence	26	Jordon Steele-John	Contractors - NPSTF	<p>Vice Adm. Mead: We have a budget which has been provided by government. Over the next 18 months it is \$300 million, but we have no intention of spending that. It is just to provide studies and to do some other support activities.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Can you provide information about how many contractors are in the task force currently, which companies these contractors come from and how much these contractors will cost?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Mead: I can take that on notice. At the moment, though, we have very few contractors working for us. The task force comprises uniformed people and public servants. We have people from other government departments and experts from ANSTO and ARPANSA, but I will take the question on contractors on notice.</p>	Hansard	68
Department of Defence	27	Jordon Steele-John	Taskforce members	<p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Are you able to provide the committee with a full list of task force members?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Mead: That was a question asked of us a week-and-a-half ago. We can certainly provide the list of all the positions in the task force. My preference is not to provide all the names, but I can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STEELE-JOHN: Alright. I also understand you may have to look at that for security reasons. Depending on your decision on that one, it'd be great to get even the institutional members and agency members, if possible, so that we can have a clear line of sight of the members of the task force. Would that be something you could do?</p> <p>Vice Adm. Mead: Absolutely. We can do that.</p>	Hansard	68
Department of Defence	28	Rex Patrick	Scope of investigations	<p>Senator PATRICK: ... So there's no ongoing investigation in relation to, say, the IGADF or complaints that are on foot, whistleblower allegations or administrative investigations going on in 7RAR?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: I'm not aware of the precise finite detail of what is being investigated and what is not. I know that there are ongoing conversations and, indeed, some friction between some of the local ex-service organisations dealing with the unit on some of these matters. I will need to confirm exactly what is in scope and what is still outstanding in relation to investigations</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Noting your statements about the importance of looking after service men and women, particularly obviously in your case in the Army, and the fact that Senator Lambie raised it last time around, I would have thought that you would have at least made inquiries into exactly what's happening there, what allegations have been made and what investigations were on foot. I would have thought you would have done that.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: Based on what I know, they have been investigated and they were not substantiated. I thought you were indicating that there might be new information. The information that was presented that we talked about at the last estimates, assuming that was the totality of it—</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: They cover the sorts of allegations that I mentioned—racial slurs, denial of justice and those sorts of activities?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: I think that's the scope of it, yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Can you please come back on notice?</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: I'll come back to you.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I'd like to understand it just because I've heard there are other things going on.</p> <p>Lt Gen. Burr: Yes.</p>	Hansard	75
Department of Defence	29	Peter Whish-Wilson	UAPs	<p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: None from any aircrew or aviation organisation that I'm aware of. The only experience that I have in this was over 40 years ago when some reports were made and we launched Mirage aircraft. The phenomena turned out to be errors on the radar screens in our normal civil air-traffic control system, but no physical objects were detected.</p>	Hansard	78

				<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Does the characterisation of the DOD, in relation to their report, of both intent and advanced technology concern you? Basically, they're saying they can't explain what these things are, but they would like to better understand them.</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: I can't answer for another sovereign nation. That is a matter for the US and the Pentagon and the Department of Defense in the US.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Would it be possible for you to see if, across the other services, there has been any kind of reporting system in relation to this in Australia?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: Certainly, I can take that on notice. But I feel confident that, as the airspace control authority within Australia, if there had been any detections or items such as this, I would have been aware of them. But I can take that on notice to double-check.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay. Typically, would something like Jindalee be able to pick-up fast-moving objects, or is it more designed to look at ships and—</p>		
Department of Defence	30	Rex Patrick	Batch 1 contract	<p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. I'm only interested in batch 1, because batch 1 obviously feeds into 2 and then 3.</p> <p>Ms Lutz: There's one for batch 1.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: One contract?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes, for production equipment.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: How many are you foreseeing for batch 1 at this point in time? You're in contract negotiations—</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes. I'll have to give that number to you. I will take that on notice. There's a lot of equipment.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. To the extent it doesn't destroy any commercial position—I can't imagine that giving the name of a company would destroy a commercial position—can you—</p> <p>Ms Lutz: It will in terms of the SMEs that we are using.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. I'm only interested in batch 1, because batch 1 obviously feeds into 2 and then 3.</p> <p>Ms Lutz: There's one for batch 1.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: One contract?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes, for production equipment.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: How many are you foreseeing for batch 1 at this point in time? You're in contract negotiations—</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes. I'll have to give that number to you. I will take that on notice. There's a lot of equipment.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. To the extent it doesn't destroy any commercial position—I can't imagine that giving the name of a company would destroy a commercial position—can you—</p> <p>Ms Lutz: It will in terms of the SMEs that we are using.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sorry? In what way? I'm just trying to understand it.</p> <p>Ms Lutz: There might be multiple SMEs that can be used to increase the AIC, and we want to ensure that we keep that commercial position.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. Who's the contract with for the gearbox?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: David Brown.</p>	Hansard	80
Department of Defence	31	Rex Patrick	AIC	<p>Senator PATRICK: Finally, in terms of your project AIC team, I'll ask you to provide this on notice: can you provide the billet statements or the job statements for each member of your AIC team?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes, Senator. We've provided you with the numbers.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I understand that. Now I'd like to look at what you've tasked these people to do.</p> <p>Ms Lutz: I can provide a statement for the overall team of what it's tasked to do.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: No. For each of those positions, I want you to provide the job statement.</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Of the APS positions?</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Whoever is in the AIC team. If you've got contractors in there, could you also provide what their contracted role is?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes.</p>	Hansard	80

				<p>Senator PATRICK: I think you said there were 6.5 FTEs?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: For those 6.5, what's the job statement? And perhaps on notice, can you provide an assessment of what that team has done thus far?</p> <p>Ms Lutz: Yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.</p>		
Department of Defence	32	Concetta Fierravanti-Wells	Port of Newcastle	<p>Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS: In relation to the Port of Newcastle, thank you for the answer that was provided today by Ms Perkins. Interestingly, though, I note that it was dated 24 June, and we seem to have got it only today, which is a bit surprising. But, in any case, the response from Ms Perkins corrects evidence that was given at budget estimates on 2 June, and it corrects the evidence to the effect that a detailed review of Defence records indicates that Treasury did consult Defence in February 2018 on the proposal of a Chinese company acquiring 50 per cent of the shares in the Port of Newcastle. Defence undertook an internal review and consulted internal stakeholders who identified no concerns regarding the transaction. I find that really hard to understand, given the challenges that are now emerging in relation to the port of Newcastle barely a couple of years later. We have some major problems. How do we reconcile those two things? The port of Newcastle is such an important port. I think about 40 per cent of the coal exports in Australia go from the port of Newcastle. Where are we at with that, Mr Tesch? This is a real concern. Surely we must be looking at this again.</p> <p>Mr Tesch: The assessment that was done in 2018, as notified by Ms Perkins in the letter tabled today, obviously pertained to circumstances at the time. Circumstances do change and evolve. I am not aware of anybody having brought to our attention any particular concerns. I'm conscious of the views of members of this committee and, indeed, of the parliament that have been reported. This is something where, obviously, we will react to issues that might be raised, but, at this point, I'm not aware of anything that has led us to consider a need to revisit that.</p> <p>Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS: So, when Senator Abetz and I and other senators wrote to the Prime Minister on this issue, do I understand, from your answer, that the views of Defence have not been resought in relation to the port of Newcastle since March 2018?</p> <p>Mr Tesch: That's my understanding, Senator, but I will make sure that I'm correctly advising you about that.</p> <p>Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS: Would you please take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Tesch: Absolutely.</p> <p>Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS: We're very concerned about that issue. Those are the questions I had.</p>	Hansard	80
Department of Defence	33	Eric Abetz	COVID-19	<p>CHAIR: I understand where you are coming from. If you were so unfortunate as to have contracted COVID and gotten over it, that is a better immunisation, is it, than getting the double jab?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sharkey: The immunity that is conferred either through infection with the virus or through vaccination wanes. We don't know exactly the time line for that, but immunity that you might acquire through infection or through vaccine will wane over time. So, even those who have been so unfortunate as to have contracted COVID-19 may, at a point in time, need immunisation in order to maintain immunity over the longer term.</p> <p>CHAIR: I understand that. But, if you've just had COVID within a relatively recent period of time, what's the efficacy of the double jab in comparison to having recovered from COVID?</p> <p>Rear Adm. Sharkey: I would have to take that on notice to get the exact data.</p> <p>CHAIR: There is one case of a highly qualified individual who, unfortunately, had COVID, courtesy of a deployment to the United Kingdom where he caught it and got over it, but he is reluctant to have the double jab. Based on studies from Israel et cetera, I am told that the immunisation that one gets from having caught the 'bug', if I can call it that, is—</p> <p>Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS: Twenty-seven times greater, according to statements by the Israelis.</p> <p>CHAIR: Thank you, Senator Fierravanti-Wells. I don't want to delay us any more on that. But, if we could have some flexibility and understanding of individual people's cases in these matters, I think it would be helpful because I'm not sure that we actually are oversupplied with highly qualified personnel in defence. I will leave it at that. Who can assist me with MRH-90?</p>	Hansard	82

Department of Defence	34	David Van	Victoria Barracks	<p>Senator VAN: Just for background for everyone else following this from home, it was built as a Repatriation Commission outpatient clinic after the First World War. It was commissioned in 1936 and served the veteran community in Melbourne for years, until, I think, the 1970s or 1980s. When did Defence last use it?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: My understanding is that it has been vacant for around 20 years.</p> <p>Senator VAN: And you said it was put on your for-disposal list in 2015?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: It was potentially on that list earlier. It was approved as surplus to requirements and to move for disposal in May 2015.</p> <p>Senator VAN: And what year was it last used as a Defence property?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: I will just see if Mr Fankhauser has an answer to that, or we'll take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: My understanding is that it was last occupied in 1995 by what is now the Land Engineering Agency with the Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group.</p> <p>Senator VAN: Thank you. I had forgotten that date and who was there. Since 1995, what repairs or maintenance have been done on it?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: Effectively, the externals of the site have been maintained and secured. The building itself, as you point out, is now in excess of 80 years old. There has only been limited work on the site, noting that there is the intention to dispose of it as it's surplus to Commonwealth requirements. Since that time, we have been pursuing a number of options for the off-market sale of the property, both with the Victorian government and, more recently, with the City of Melbourne.</p> <p>Senator VAN: Can you take this question on notice: since it was last used, can you outline what maintenance or what amount of money has been spent on it each year? I assume you are both aware that it's in terrible disrepair. It's at risk of being lost to Melbourne because of the disrepair it has been allowed to fall into. Is that a fair summation of what's happened?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: We will attempt to get those figures for you. I will point out that the external security and maintenance of the property falls within our existing service arrangements for the broader Victoria Barracks precinct.</p> <p>Senator VAN: Would it be safe to say that some of the issues with trying to sell it to another level of government, which has been outlined as the only path available to it, other than a public sale, is because of the state of disrepair and the costs of bringing it back to a safe and usable state?</p> <p>Mr Fankhauser: That's right; it would require significant investment to remediate the known damage and contaminants that are on the site, which are consistent with any property of its vintage.</p> <p>Senator VAN: That has put at risk that sale?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: I'd just extend Mr Fankhauser's point slightly. The valuation of the property takes into account the current state of the facility.</p> <p>Senator VAN: But if it's going to be used for a public purpose, you're asking another level of government to take on a liability that they didn't cause. Your group has let this building go. What is the heritage overlay on it?</p> <p>Ms Perkins: We might have to take that on notice. We recognise the heritage value of that, in the broader heritage value of that precinct.</p>	Hansard	84
Department of Defence	35	Jacqui Lambie	Jordan Penpraze	<p>Questions for Defence / the CDF about the death of Jordan Penpraze and the serious injury of 18 other members of the ADF at Holsworthy on 08 October 2012.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why was the commission of inquiry that commenced on the 5 April 2013 terminated? 2. Why haven't the findings of the 2018 IGADF report into the matter been released to the public? 3. Did the ADF tell Comcare that no investigation was required due to the Commission of Inquiry, the NSW criminal prosecution, or any investigation that was being undertaken by the NSW Coroner? 4. Since there has been no Commission of Inquiry and no Coronal inquest to investigate the circumstances of the fatality, will the ADF agree to the full release of the IGADF report (with usual reductions to protect the privacy of individuals) to 	Written	

				<p>people involved in the accident?</p> <p>5. How much has the ADF and Commonwealth spent to date for the driver's legal fees, in total?</p> <p>6. With respect to the Commonwealth Act of Grace / Ex gratia payment paid to the Penpraze family, what amount:</p> <p>a. Was proposed by the Penpraze family to be a reasonable reflection of the loss incurred in connection with the death of their son?</p> <p>b. What was the amount paid to the Penpraze family?</p> <p>c. How did the commonwealth calculate the amount that was to be paid? Was that calculation explained to the family?</p>		
Department of Defence	36	Jacqui Lambie	Tim Weir	<p>1. Why weren't members of 2RAR (attached to MTF3 and deployed to Afghanistan in 2011) issued with a side arm?</p> <p>2. Were whistles the only means of protection issued to members of MTF3?</p> <p>3. Did the ADF take measures to improve individual security measures after the murder of LCPL Andrew Gordon Jones on the 30 May 2011? If so, what were they?</p> <p>4. Are you aware that Mr Tim Weir made representations to the ADF, Ministers, DVA and Defence Ombudsman about his sexual assault on base whilst in Afghanistan in 2011?</p> <p>5. Has anyone from the Departments or Ministers Office followed the matter up or investigated it?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	37	Jacqui Lambie	Workforce survey / unacceptable behaviour	<p>Questions regarding the Annual Workforce Climate Report 2019 and the Workforce Behaviours Survey:</p> <p>1) Did the Workforce Climate Report contain the Workplace Behaviours Survey, or are they separate documents?</p> <p>2) Please provide a copy of the report and the survey.</p> <p>3) Who conducted the survey? Did the same organisation also deliver the Workforce Climate Report?</p> <p>4) Were all Defence personnel invited to take part in the survey? How were invitations sent out?</p> <p>5) The interim National Commissioner reports that 32% of members surveyed in the Workplace Behaviours Survey had experienced unacceptable behaviour in the previous 12 months.</p> <p>Please provide a breakdown of the share of people who had experienced unacceptable behaviour, by the type of unacceptable behaviour that they experienced (e.g. x% of people who experienced unacceptable behaviour reported that they had experienced bullying).</p> <p>6) The interim National Commissioner report states only 40% of people who made a formal complaint about unacceptable behaviour felt their issue was taken seriously. Is the ADF senior leadership (the CDF, Chief of Army, Chief of Navy and Chief of Air Force) aware of this finding?</p> <p>7) Just 23% of people who made a complaint said their complaint was dealt with in a reasonable period of time. Is the ADF senior leadership aware of this finding?</p> <p>8) Of people who made a complaint, 15% said the outcome arising from their complaint 'seemed fair'. Is the ADF senior leadership aware of this finding?</p> <p>9) Assuming the answer to questions 6) to 8) is 'yes', when did the ADF senior leadership first become aware of the survey's findings?</p>	Written	

				<p>10) Assuming the answer to questions 6) to 8) is 'yes', does the ADF senior leadership agree that poor management of formal complaints is an issue for personnel who have made complaints about unacceptable behaviour?</p> <p>i) If so, does the ADF senior leadership agree that urgent action should be taken to address this issue?</p> <p>ii) If so, what has the ADF senior leadership done to address this issue since learning about the outcomes of the survey?</p> <p>11) The Defence Annual Report 2020-21 states that:</p> <p>The 2020 YourSay Workplace Experience Survey indicates that the majority of Defence personnel perceive that incidents of unacceptable behaviour are being managed well and Defence has a culture that supports individuals who report fraud, corruption or unethical behaviour.</p> <p>Does the statement that 'the majority of Defence personnel' include Defence personnel who have not raised a complaint about unacceptable behaviour?</p> <p>12) The implication of the statement in Question 11) appears to be that most Defence personnel believe complaints about unacceptable behaviour are handled well. This would be at odds with the perspective of personnel who have actually made a formal complaint regarding unacceptable behaviour. Does Defence agree that this should have been made clear in the annual report?</p> <p>i) Is Defence concerned that the statement in the Annual Report could be considered misleading?</p>		
Department of Defence	38	Jordon Steele-John	Nuclear submarines and compliance with international and domestic law	<p>The Prime Minister has stated that the submarine plan will be consistent with the NPT and Australia's commitment to wider non-proliferation issues.</p> <p>? Given this has Defence or any other party examined the compliance status of the UK and USA in relation to their extant NPT obligations?</p> <p>? What was the finding of this assessment - or, if not, why not?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	40	Jordon Steele-John	Nuclear submarines and compliance with international and domestic law	<p>The Prime Minister has stated that the submarine plan will not be a pre-cursor to a domestic nuclear power industry. Others maintain that nuclear powered submarines would require at least some degree of nuclear training and infrastructure to be based in Australia.</p> <p>? What is defence's view about the level of nuclear support infrastructure that would be required in Australia to facilitate the planned submarines?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	41	Jordon Steele-John	Nuclear submarines and compliance with international and domestic law	<p>What current international treaties may be impacted by the proposed Aukus submarine acquisition - could you detail these and the nature of their interplay with the proposed action?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	42	Jordon Steele-John	Nuclear submarines and compliance with international and domestic law	<p>What current domestic legislation may be impacted by the proposed Aukus submarine acquisition - could you detail these and the nature of their interplay with the proposed action?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	43	Jordon Steele-John	Nuclear submarines and compliance with	<p>What is Defence's view in relation to widespread concerns raised over the NPT and wider proliferation concerns raised in relation to the planned use of Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) as a submarine fuel source?</p>	Written	

			international and domestic law			
Department of Defence	44	Jordon Steele-John	Nuclear submarines and compliance with international and domestic law	Speaking after the PM announced the Aukus plan Vice Admiral Michael Noonan - the head of Navy - declared that this was "the single most consequential capability decision - and it will shape the direction of our navy forevermore - and will no doubt change the shape of our nation". Portentous words - and a sentiment that highlights the need for elevated transparency - how do you intend to ensure that the wider Australian community has effective input into the shape of our nation?	Written	
Department of Defence	45	Jordon Steele-John	Nuclear submarines and compliance with international and domestic law	Was ARWA - the Australian Radioactive Waste Agency - either alerted or consulted around the AUKUS submarine plan? Is ARWA going to be involved in the submarine task force that is examining this issue over the next 18 months? If so, who is engaged - if not then who is providing radioactive waste management advice to government on this issue?	Written	
Department of Defence	46	Jordon Steele-John	Nuclear submarines and compliance with international and domestic law	Is the planned federal National Radioactive Waste Management (NRWM) facility currently planned for Kimba in regional South Australia being considered as a place for future submarine waste? What consideration has been given to this issue to date?	Written	
Department of Defence	47	Jordon Steele-John	Nuclear submarines and compliance with international and domestic law	The National Radioactive Waste Management Act excludes international and high level radioactive waste being handled at any future NRWM facility - is it Defence's view that this would preclude any future submarine waste being handled at a future NRWM facility?	Written	
Department of Defence	48	Jordon Steele-John	Cancellation of contract with the Naval Group	What work was done to assess the implications of terminating the Attack Class contract as well as the Framework Agreement between the Aus and French govts? ? What understanding of these implications did the Australian government have when it decided to cease this program? ? Can you table any reports, communications and correspondence between Defence, DFAT and the Ministers that pertains to the legal implications of terminating the contract with the Naval Group as well as the Framework Agreement.	Written	
Department of Defence	49	Jordon Steele-John	Cancellation of contract with the Naval Group	Was any work done to project the costs associated with ending the Attack class contract with the Naval Group? ? What is the current estimate of the full 'transition costs' required to exit any existing contracts with the Naval group, Lockheed Martin and any other parties following last month's issuing of termination of contract notifications? ? What is the amount of pre-Aukus contracts that will be required to be paid out and what break fees are expected? ? What did this work entail? ? Who did this work? ? What was the advice that emerged from this work? ? Can you table any reports, communications and correspondence between Defence, DFAT and the Ministers that pertains to the financial implications of terminating the contract with the Naval Group as well as the Framework Agreement.	Written	
Department of Defence	50	Jordon Steele-John	IGADF Afghanistan Inquiry Report	The IGADF Afghanistan Inquiry Report recommended training for soldiers on the causes of war crimes and on the legal duty to refuse to obey an obviously unlawful order. These recommendations was not addressed in the Department of Defence's July Reform Plan. How will Defence and the ADF address these recommendations?	Written	
Department of Defence	51	Jordon Steele-John	West Papua	The Guardian recently reported the Australian government had photographic evidence that the Indonesian military fired live rounds indiscriminately into a group of unarmed West Papuan demonstrators on the island of Biak on 6 July 1998, but Australia did not share that evidence with the world. According to the Guardian, film was distributed to Defence, but appears to have been destroyed in 2014 without ever being made public. ? Did Defence destroy photographic evidence of alleged abuses? ? Evidence of alleged serious human rights abuses should be collected and preserved, so why wasn't this sent to the UN Human Rights Office if the Australian government was not going to act on it?	Written	

				<p>? Has any policy been put in place to prevent this happening again?</p> <p>? Given the allegations in the Guardian report, it seems to suggest that the government ignored evidence of a mass atrocity in order to maintain friendly relations with the Indonesian government. will there be an independent investigation of the Australian government's approach to the Biak massacre, and the handling of evidence?</p>		
Department of Defence	52	Jacqui Lambie	Townsville Incident	<p>1. What are the allegations linked to the initiation ceremony in Townsville which led to the Chief of Army's directive and what disciplinary action resulted?</p> <p>2. How many people have been stood down in Townsville since the anti-initiation directive?</p> <p>3. How many fact-finds have been conducted in Townsville linked to allegations of initiation or hazing since the directive was issued and what were the accusations? What disciplinary action followed?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	53	Jacqui Lambie	Issues in 1RAR involving allegations of forced violence on soldiers	<p>1. Is Army aware of concerns from junior soldiers about hazing and other violence in 1RAR earlier this year?</p> <p>2. Is Army aware of a series of incidents at a 1RAR boozier and super boozier that resulted in multiple junior soldiers being injured, including being knocked out, breaking or dislocating their arms?</p> <p>3. Have there been any investigations, including by the IDGAF, military police, or as fact finds linked to complaints about junior soldiers being forced to fight and subsequently injured at boozier events, in 1RAR or otherwise?</p> <p>4. Has anyone been charged or faced disciplinary action over these incidents?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	54	Jacqui Lambie	Greenvale	Please provide the full list of subcontractors (including the scope of their work and the location of the company's head office) for the Australia-Singapore Military Training Initiative facility at Greenvale.	Written	
Department of Defence	55	Jacqui Lambie	Emails	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Could I please find out whether emails that contain reprisal action have been sent to you? If they've been filtered away, that's fine, but I need to know that those emails have been sent to your office.</p> <p>LTGEN BURR: Sorry, Senator, I'm not sure if i was following you. I will confirm whether those emails have been sent to my office, yes.</p>	Hansard	67
Department of Defence	56	Jordon Steele-John	Afghanistan Inquiry Reform Plan	Is the government on track to implementing the recommendations in Work Packages 1, 2 and 3 of the Afghanistan Inquiry Reform Plan by the end of 2021, as planned? If not, what recommendations will not be implemented and why?	Written	
Department of Defence	57	Janet Rice	Myanmar	<p>In relation to Myanmar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How many meetings and phone calls has the defence attache had with the Tatmadaw since the 1 February coup? o Has Australia's defence cooperation program (DCP) with Myanmar been cancelled, or is it just suspended? o Are there any previously approved components of the DCP continuing? 	Written	
Department of Defence	58	Janet Rice	Cambodia	<p>In relation to Cambodia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How many scholarships has Australia offered to Cambodian students to study at the Australian Defence Force Academy? o What has been the selection process for these students ? o How many students have graduated so far from the Academy? How much was spent on these students? 	Written	
Department of Defence	59	Janet Rice	Military Relationship with Indonesia	In relation to Australia's military relationship with Indonesia, what joint training is the Australian Government providing to Indonesian military forces?	Written	
Department of Defence	60	Janet Rice	Defence Exports to Indonesia	<p>In relation to defence exports to Indonesia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Following reports of the supply of 15 Bushmaster vehicles to the Indonesian government by the Australian government - what is the intended use of the Bushmaster vehicles? ? What steps is the Australian Government taking to ensure they will not be used in attacks on peaceful protests? ? Is the Government aware of reports of violence against West Papuans, including the deployment of Bushmaster vehicles against civilian protests? o Are these events sufficient to prompt a review or suspension of existing permits or suspend any further permits being granted where the final importing country is Indonesia? o How has the Minister considered publicly available information and available evidence from reputable NGOs and civil society groups of serious human rights violations in the decision to grant or revoke a permit? o What questions and inquiries are being made by the Minister, and to whom, prior to the granting of a permit? 	Written	

				o If it is discovered that an exporter has mischaracterized the use of a particular technology or is using it in a way that was not permitted, what ramifications would this person face in Australia? Have penalties ever been imposed on a person granted a licence?		
Department of Defence	61	Janet Rice	Defence Exports to Myanmar	In relation to defence exports to Myanmar: o What investigations have been undertaken to confirm whether Barrett Communications has been supplying radio equipment to the Myanmar military which are being used against its civilian population in Myanmar? o What sales of radio equipment from Barrett Communications have been sent to Myanmar since 2017 after the Myanmar military launched its brutal campaign against the Rohingya community?	Written	
Department of Defence	62	Janet Rice	Defence Exports to Tigray	In relation to defence exports to Tigray, has the Australian government approved any exports for arms since the beginning of the conflict in Tigray?	Written	
Department of Defence	63	Matthew Canavan	Black Hawk Helicopters	How many black hawk helicopters does the Australian military have?	Written	
Department of Defence	64	Matthew Canavan	Assault Rifles	How many assault rifles does the Australian military have?	Written	
Department of Defence	65	Matthew Canavan	Machine Guns	How many machine guns does the Australian military have?	Written	
Department of Defence	66	Matthew Canavan	Tactical Vehicles	How many tactical vehicles does the Australian military have?	Written	
Department of Defence	67	Jacqui Lambie	Sydney University Regiment	1. I understand there was an initial fact find into the allegations of unacceptable behaviour at the SUR completed in May by a LTCOL from Headquarters 8th Brigade that recommended an investigation of the allegations be completed external to the 2nd Division. Was this recommendation followed? If not, why not? 2. Could Army engage with the IGADF to provide an update on the current IGADF investigation, including details of: a. what the IGADF did after the matter was referred to them by Army Headquarters, and b. what the IGADF did after determining the terms of reference, and commencing the inquiry in September?	Written	
Department of Defence	68	Kimberley Kitching	Pacific support vessel	Further to the evidence at the Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing on 27 October 2021 that the Government has decided to purchase rather than to build in Australia a vessel for Pacific support operations: 1. On what date was this decision made 2. Who made the decision.	Written	
Department of Defence	69	Kimberley Kitching	Navy Helicopters	Are the Navy's MH-60R Seahawk Romeo helicopters equipped with any emergency floatation systems such as pop out floats? If yes, what are the details of those systems. If no, why not.	Written	
Department of Defence	70	Kimberley Kitching	Navy Helicopters	Are the Navy's MRH-90 helicopters equipped with emergency floatation systems such as pop out floats? If yes, what are the details of those systems. If no, why not.	Written	
Department of Defence	71	Kimberley Kitching	MH-60R helicopters	The US Defense Cooperation Agency issued a statement on 8 October 2021 saying that a Foreign Military Sale of 12 new MH-60R Seahawks to Australia has been approved. 1. Has the Australian Government made a decision to acquire new MH-60Rs? 2. If yes: a. How many helicopters are being acquired? b. What is the approved budget? c. When will the aircraft be delivered? d. The US Defense Cooperation Agency says that in addition to improving Australia's anti-surface and anti-submarine warfare capabilities, the new helicopters will be able to perform secondary missions including vertical replenishment, search and rescue and communications relay. Is it anticipated that these aircraft will have a wider role than the Navy's existing Seahawks? e. Why are an additional 12 Seahawks required? f. Will the Government order an additional Seahawk to replace the aircraft that ditched in the Philippine Sea? 3. If no:	Written	

				<p>a. The US Defense Cooperation Agency statement indicates that a potential foreign military sale has been discussed. What is the status of this potential acquisition?</p> <p>b. When does Defence plan to seek a decision from Government?</p> <p>c. Why is Defence exploring the acquisition of another 12 Seahawks?</p> <p>d. What roles would they perform?</p> <p>e. Why are 12 new combat helicopters required in addition to the Navy's existing 24 MH-60R Seahawks?</p> <p>4. Has the Minister or Department made any public statements about this acquisition, including comments provided to media organisations by the offices of Defence portfolio Ministers or by Defence Media? If yes, provide the Committee with a copy of those statements or comments.</p>		
Department of Defence	72	Kimberley Kitching	Navy Helicopters	<p>A news report by the ABC on 9 October 2021 said that a decision by Defence to acquire 12 new MH-60R Seahawk helicopters means the Navy will withdraw its existing MRH-90 helicopters from service.</p> <p>1. Has a decision been made to withdraw the Navy's MRH-90 helicopters from service?</p> <p>2. If yes, what are the details of that decision.</p> <p>3. If no:</p> <p>a. What is the nominal or currently planned withdrawal or retirement date for the Navy's MRH-90s.</p> <p>b. Has Navy commenced any consideration of an early withdrawal of the MRH-90s?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	73	Kimberley Kitching	Submarine Escape and Rescue	<p>In relation to the Submarine Escape and Rescue System project (SEA 1354, Phase 1) and the evidence at 2020-21 Additional Estimates on 24 March 2021 that a review or report was done on the project by Professor Don Winter:</p> <p>1. When was the review by Professor Winter commissioned?</p> <p>2. Why was it commissioned?</p> <p>3. Why was a third party needed to review the differences between Defence and Phoenix International?</p> <p>4. When did Professor Winter complete his report?</p> <p>5. What were his findings and recommendations?</p> <p>6. Provide the Committee with a copy of Professor Winter's report with any necessary redactions for reasons of national security or the Commonwealth's commercial interests?</p> <p>7. Mr Sammut gave evidence at 2020-21 Additional Estimates on 24 March 2021 that Professor Winter's findings were supported by Mr Ron Finlay. What was Mr Finlay's role in the process?</p> <p>8. Prior to Professor Winter's review, had any other reviews or investigations been carried out by Defence on the issues with this project? If yes, what are the details of those reviews?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	74	Kimberley Kitching	Submarine Escape and Rescue	<p>In relation to the Submarine Escape and Rescue System project (SEA 1354, Phase 1):</p> <p>1. When was the decision made to terminate the contract with Phoenix International?</p> <p>2. Who made the decision – was it a decision of Cabinet, the Minister or Defence?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	75	Kimberley Kitching	Submarine Escape and Rescue	<p>In relation to the Submarine Escape and Rescue System project (SEA 1354, Phase 1):</p> <p>1. Since the completion of Professor Winter's report have there been any other reviews of this project</p> <p>2. Is there a review involving the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. If yes, what are the details of that review, when will it be completed and, if completed, what are its main findings and recommendations.</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	76	Kimberley Kitching	Submarine Escape and Rescue	<p>In relation to the Submarine Escape and Rescue System project (SEA 1354, Phase 1) and Defence's announcement of the termination of the contract with Phoenix International in January 2021:</p> <p>1. Have the settlement negotiations with Phoenix International been concluded.</p> <p>2. If yes:</p> <p>a. What are the details of the settlement?</p> <p>b. Will the Commonwealth make any payment to Phoenix as part of the settlement. If yes, how much will be paid.</p>	Written	

Department of Defence	77	Kimberley Kitching	Capability acquisition performance reporting	<p>The Defence Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group's February 2021 Project and Sustainment Report said that under the Defence Transformation Strategy Defence would review governance, analysis, assurance and reporting arrangements for Defence's major projects and the review was due to be completed in mid-2021.</p> <p>1. Has that review been completed?</p> <p>2. If yes:</p> <p>a. What changes will be made to the previous Quarterly Performance Report system for reporting on Projects of Concern and Projects of Interest as a result of this review?</p> <p>b. Will there continue to be a regular report providing senior decision makers with updates on the status of Projects of Concern and Projects of Interest?</p> <p>c. What are the details of the new reporting arrangements?</p> <p>3. If no, when will the review be completed.</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	78	Kimberley Kitching	APS employee costs	<p>The notes to the financial statements in the Department of Defence's 2020-21 Annual Report provided a total figure for APS employee benefits in 2020-21 of \$1,975.1 million (note 1.1A at page 191). Defence's response to 2021-22 Budget estimates question on notice 402 (portfolio question number 172) said total APS salary and non-salary costs were \$1,613.9 million in 2020-21. What are the reasons for the difference between these two figures, including any differences in accounting treatment?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	79	Kimberley Kitching	APS employee costs	<p>What were Defence's total expenses for APS employees in 2020-21 in cash terms – that is in terms of the impact on the Commonwealth Budget's Underlying Cash Balance?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	80	Kimberley Kitching	APS employee costs by category	<p>What were Defence's expenses for APS employees in 2020-21 in terms of the impact on the Commonwealth Budget's Underlying Cash Balance broken down by the following categories of employee expenses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wages and salaries • Superannuation • Leave and other benefits • Fringe benefits tax • Separation, redundancy and other termination-related payments • Other allowances • Health expenses • Other employee expenses. 	Written	
Department of Defence	81	Kimberley Kitching	Non-APS staff	<p>Does Defence employ non-APS civilian staff. If yes, how many non-APS civilian staff were employed by Defence in 2020-21.</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	82	Kimberley Kitching	Consultants	<p>What was Defence's total expenditure on consultants (as defined for the Defence workforce census) in each of 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	83	Kimberley Kitching	Outsourced service providers	<p>What was Defence's total expenditure on outsourced service providers (as defined for the Defence workforce census) in each of 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	84	Kimberley Kitching	UAS Drones	<p>With reference to AusTender Contract Notice 3768831 regarding the purchase of UAS drones from DJI Industries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What will these drones be used for? 2. How many drones were purchased and what models? 3. Were the drones purchased civilian models or the "Government Edition" drones? 4. Is the Department aware of concerns the US Government has with the use of DJI products by its agencies? 5. Is the Department aware of any position taken by the Federal Government on the use of DJI products by Australian agencies? 6. What steps have been taken by Army or Defence to ensure that information recorded on these drones remains secure? 7. Where any other drone manufacturers considered before this purchase was made? If so, what other brands were considered Why was the decision taken to purchase DJI drones? 	Written	

Department of Defence	85	Kimberley Kitching	AUKUS and nuclear-powered submarines – costs associated with cancellation of Attack Class	<p>1. In response to Question no.63 to Senator Chisholm (Senate Economic Committee Naval Shipbuilding Inquiry), the answer states: Department of Defence had two major Attack class submarine contracts in place with primes: the Submarine Design Contract with Naval Group; and the Design, Build and Integration Contract with Lockheed Martin Australia. The contracts contain provisions for settling all relevant costs of terminating the agreements and the closure of program activities and arrangements in place with Naval Group and Lockheed Martin Australia at the time of the Government’s announcement. This includes the relevant costs incurred by Naval Group and Lockheed Martin Australia in terminating subcontracts relating to the Attack class submarine program.</p> <p>a. Please specify the figure (or best equivalent estimate) of the “relevant costs incurred by Naval Group and Lockheed Martin Australia in terminating subcontracts” for Naval Group and Lockheed Martin Australia. Please itemise the estimate attributable to each prime.</p> <p>b. Please provide the total figures (or best equivalent estimate) of the total costs incurred by Naval Group and Lockheed Martin Australia since the beginning of the Future Submarine project.</p> <p>c. Please table the “provisions for settling all relevant costs of terminating the agreements”</p> <p>2. In response to Question no.62 to Senator Chisholm (Senate Economic Committee Naval Shipbuilding Inquiry), the Departments answer did not address some questions relating to a statement made by Minister Price. Minister Price published an op-ed on Defence Connect entitled “Helping industry reap the benefits of the AUKUS deal”. In it, Minister Price states that “I have instructed the Secretary and Deputy Secretaries of Defence to ensure that this process ensures a resolution is reached as quickly as possible for those businesses.”</p> <p>a. How was Defence instructed to undertake these processes (by Minister Price)?</p> <p>b. Please table the instruction from Minister Price.</p> <p>c. Are there specific provisions for the equitable termination process and/or payment for costs incurred by SMEs on the Attack Class project?</p> <p>3. Please table the relevant provisions in the Naval Group and Lockheed Martin Australia contracts that relate to contract termination processes that relate to SMEs on the Attack Class project</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	86	Kimberley Kitching	AUKUS and nuclear-powered submarines – cost estimates of nuclear-powered, design	<p>Vice Admiral Mead told the Senate Economics Committee hearing that in regard to the nuclear-powered submarines, advice had been ‘provided by the department to government over many months’, and then that ‘our projected forecast is that the cost will be significant and it will be more than Attack’.</p> <p>1. Please provide the projected forecast referred to by Vice Admiral Mead. (To be clear, this request does not ask for specifications on options, not associated advice on recommendations – it refers to a quantified projection that has been referred to in general in public)</p> <p>2. Please detail the magnitude of the cost increase relative to Attack class.</p> <p>3. In the recent Senate Estimates hearings, Vice Admiral Mead noted Defence was looking at mature designs which are in-production. How many designs are being considered?</p> <p>4. In Estimates, Senator Wong raised the response to Question 106 to Senator Chisholm (Senate Economic Committee Naval Shipbuilding Inquiry), which noted the “precise details of construction, including what components will come from each partner, will be determined during the 18 month period of work.” Vice Admiral Mead confirmed that Defence is not ruling out a hybrid design (“Correct. So all options are on the table, but the plan is that that design is mature at the start of our build”). Please confirm if this includes consideration of:</p> <p>a. the Astute Class with US technology</p> <p>b. either/both the designs of the UK Astute ‘successor’ (BAE Systems and Rolls-Royce have won two £85m contracts to begin design work on the successor to the UK Royal Navy’s Astute-class attack submarines).</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	87	Kimberley Kitching	AUKUS – MOUs	<p>1. Will the detail or intent of either of the two AUKUS-related MOUs be reflected in a treaty (or treaty-like) arrangement?</p> <p>2. Will at least one treaty (or treaty-like) arrangement be considered by JSCOT before 2022-23?</p> <p>3. Is it the Minister’s intention to present an AUKUS related matter to JSCOT before the end of calendar year 2021?</p>	Written	

Department of Defence	88	Kimberley Kitching	Naval Shipbuilding Workforce	<p>a) In response to question 66 to Senator Chisholm, which asked “Has Defence considered what shipbuilding projects can be brought forward to fill the shipbuilding workload” the response stated “The implications for the Naval Shipbuilding Enterprise are currently being refined by the Department of Defence. The Department of Defence notes that even with the cancellation of the Attack class submarine program, the shipbuilding workforce will continue to grow over the rest of the decade to 2030, both in South Australia and nationally”.</p> <p>a. Please confirm no shipbuilding project has been approved to be ‘brought forward’ yet.</p> <p>b. The response stated “The implications for the Naval Shipbuilding Enterprise are currently being refined by the Department of Defence”.</p> <p>i. Who is conducting this evaluation?</p> <p>ii. How many shipbuilding projects are being considered for an earlier start/completion date?</p> <p>iii. Please detail what “refined” encompasses? i.e. what are the key considerations for refinement, such as workforce stability, and capability? Please table relevant terms of reference or instructions given to whomever is conducting this refinement exercise.</p> <p>b) The ‘Shipbuilding in South Australia’ factsheet provided in response to Question 66 notes 5000 jobs in South Australia by 2030. Please provide 2030 estimates that were current for each financial year since 2014-15 to present.</p> <p>a. Who made the estimate of the 5000 jobs?</p> <p>b. Pages 23-24 of 27 October FADT Estimates include a discussion about the baseline job estimates in naval shipbuilding. Please provide the baseline estimates for each revision since 2014-15</p> <p>c. Mr Byrne confirmed the baseline for job estimates was being revised post-[AUKUS]-announcement. When is that revision going to be completed?</p> <p>d. The factsheet and Senator Birmingham’s comments to the Adelaide Advertiser (4 November 2021, “Mr Birmingham committed to employing 5000 South Australians in the shipbuilding industry by 2030”) note the 5000 jobs. Was the the 5000 jobs estimate developed post-AUKUS? Will it be revised with the new baseline?</p> <p>e. I refer to an extract from Senate Estimates on 27 October 2021: Mr Dalton: The Sovereign Shipbuilding Talent Pool places affected employees that elect to go down that path in a no worse off position. Does this jobs guarantee extend to apprentices, trainees and ancillary staff? How many apprentices and trainees are impacted by the decision to cancel the Naval contract?</p> <p>c) In November 2017, former Defence Industry Minister Pyne promised that shipbuilding projects would create 8,000 direct jobs (3,500 in shipbuilding and 4,550 in directly related industries) in South Australia, with another 20,000 to 25,000 jobs created indirectly (Attachment 11). Senator Wong put a number of questions on notice with regard to these claims by Mr Pyne. In response to Senate chamber QoNs 4141, 4142, 4144, 4145 and 4148 Defence responded: The Prime Minister’s 16 September 2021 announcement of the AUKUS trilateral partnership resulted in a series of changes for the Naval Shipbuilding Enterprise. The implications for future workforce demand are currently being assessed by the Department of Defence. (Attachments 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30) Who is conducting that assessment and when will the assessment noted in the QoN answers be completed? Will it be completed in or before May 2022?</p> <p>d) In response to QoN 4143, which asked for details about the indirect jobs claim made by Mr Pyne, Defence responded: The estimates provided by the then Minister for Defence Industry were sourced from a report supplied by an external service provider. The multipliers used by that service provider to determine the number of indirect jobs were not made available to the Department of Defence. The Department of Defence does not provide estimates of the number of indirect jobs when forecasting future workforce demand in South Australia. Which external service provider gave the estimates used? Can Defence please table the report for the committee?</p>	Written	
-----------------------	----	-----------------------	------------------------------------	---	---------	--

				<p>Why weren't the job multipliers made available to Defence? Was the report made for the Minister and/or Department? What was the reason for the multipliers to not be made available to Defence?</p>		
Department of Defence	89	Kimberley Kitching	Workforce and shipbuilding policy	<p>1. Regarding the SSTP program, what are the likely allocations / staffing levels assumed in the \$30 costing for each stream? ASC identified 5 streams – LOTE-FCD work, seconding to other primes and their projects, overseas work relating to nuclear capabilities, learning skills on design and development, and the nuclear taskforce itself – how many workers are assumed to be deployed into each stream?</p> <p>2. Regarding the workers contracted to work on ANI infrastructure – yesterday we heard that 550-600 workers have an uncertain future now that all activity will be ceased after the Phase 1 Combat Systems is complete. Are they eligible for the SSTP? Will Defence provide any assistance to these workers?</p> <p>3. On page 4 of the 2017 Naval Ship Building Plan (Attachment 12), Defence states: 4. "From 2022, workforce demand in South Australia will increase rapidly to meet the start of the future frigate and future submarine projects. Demand for construction workers will reach a peak of around 5,200 in 2026". 5. Can you confirm when the current peak of construction workers is expected, and what the peak number is estimated to be? Is this also up for assessment?</p> <p>6. If the timing of the peak, and/or the estimated peak construction workforce has changed since the 2017 Naval Shipbuilding Plan, what are the reasons for the change in estimates?</p> <p>7. When was the estimated peak working and timing last re-evaluated? Who did the revised estimate?</p> <p>8. Will the 2016 Integrated Investment Program and 2017 Naval Shipbuilding Plan be updated?</p> <p>9. On 23 April 2018, Defence released the Defence Industrial Capability Plan (ref: p.37), which outlined the Government's policy of the "Continuous shipbuilding program (including rolling submarine acquisition)". Is the Defence Industrial Capability Plan – specifically continuous shipbuilding - still Government policy? How can it be given there are no contracted new submarines?</p> <p>10. The Defence Teaming Centre recently held a member-only forum. Forty per cent of the organisations present started investing into the Future Submarine Program from 2016 following the announcement of Naval Group as the Prime Contractor, with a broad range of out-of-pocket expenses. Has the Government or Defence considered/ provided advice on the establishment of the Australian Sub-Supplier Ready Program related to the AUKUS announcement?</p> <p>11. The Naval Shipbuilding Plan was released in 2017, and Defence's website states "the Government will update the Naval Shipbuilding Plan during 2021" When is that update coming out?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	90	Peter Whish-Wilson	UAP's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Department of Defence had the opportunity to formally review the report completed by the US Office of the Director of National Intelligence titled 'Preliminary Assessment: Unidentified Aerial Phenomena' published in June 2021? • What guidance, if any, has the Department sought on the publication of the US report and the implications for Australian aerospace? • Is the 'Unusual Aerial Sightings Policy' still in effect, and if so when was it last reviewed? If it is not in effect or has been superseded, please give details of the current policy. • In 2011, the Department of Defence reported that, in response to a FOI request from the Sydney Morning Herald, it had 'discovered one file, which had not been destroyed but could not be located'. If it could not be located, how would the Department know that the file had not been destroyed? Were all the files referenced hardcopy only (i.e. not digital)? 	Written	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A response from the Department dated 8 June 2011 states that members of the public making reports of “unusual aerial sightings” are directed to their local police authority. What is the protocol for members of the defence forces when reporting such sightings during military operations and/or normal duty? 		
Department of Defence	91	Kimberley Kitching	AUKUS Timeline	<p>In Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Supplementary Estimates on 27 October 2021, the Secretary of the Department of Defence gave evidence that the Chief Defence Scientist was made aware of the decision to cancel the Naval contract and acquire nuclear powered submarines in March 2021 as follows: “Mr Moriarty: While we're waiting: just to let you know, the Chief Defence Scientist was made aware of the plan on 10 March 2021.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When was Mr Moriarty made aware of the plan? 2. Why was the Chief Defence Scientist told about this plan in March 2021? 3. Why was Chief Defence Scientist made aware several months before the Secretary of the Defence Department, Mr Moriarty? 	Written	
Department of Defence	92	Kimberley Kitching	AUKUS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In responding the AUKUS announcement, Labor Leader Anthony Albanese suggested a bipartisan process be formed (and wrote to the Prime Minister reiterating this suggestion), noting that these submarines will be a multi-decade undertaking and our proximity to an election. Has Defence provided the Government on establishing a non-political, bipartisan process? Has the Government requested any such advice? 2. Will the Government negotiate and mandate a minimum percentage Australian Industry Content for the nuclear-powered submarines? That is, will we avoid the problems we had with the Future Submarines where we signed a SPA initially with no minimum AIC or expenditure? 3. Will this form part of the contract and will there be legal avenues available if AIC is not met? Will there be periodic reviews to ensure AIC is on track? 4. Noting that The Australian newspaper reported in an article titled ‘Scott Morrison’s national security argument for net zero’: “After securing the AUKUS military pact with the US and UK, Mr Morrison said Australia needed to rely on western alliances “now more than ever” and a net-zero commitment was important for the nation’s standing in the international community”, was climate change part of the AUKUS agreement / either MOU? 5. When was the Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources consulted by Defence about the AUKUS agreement? I note the joint leaders statement makes reference to AI and quantum computing. 6. The Government’s announcement on 16 September 2021 mentioned Australia would acquire a minimum of eight nuclear-powered submarines (Attachment 16). Where is the minimum of eight noted in the official AUKUS agreement material signed by the three countries? 7. The announcement on 16 September 2021, mentioned the “intention” to build these submarines in Adelaide (Attachment 16). Where is this intention noted in the official AUKUS agreement material signed by the three countries? How has this been communicated to the other AUKUS members? 8. Will the Government rule out building any of the submarines overseas? 9. Is there any paid work that Australian businesses will be involved in within the next 18 months on the new nuclear submarine program review process? How will Australian industry be engaged in any contracted work on the new nuclear submarine program in the next 18 months? 	Written	

				<p>10. We know from last estimates Defence was considering “prudent contingencies” to the Future Submarine program. Is Defence still considering these contingencies? Does that include other capabilities other than nuclear-powered submarines? Are Defence considering underwater drones or other unmanned capabilities?</p> <p>11. The Australian reported on 5 October that British Defence Secretary Ben Wallace said it was “inevitable” that Australia would turn to Five Eyes intelligence partners to deliver a nuclear-powered submarine and he was confident the boat would be British-made. In a separate report, The Australian said Australia is far more likely to buy a version of Britain’s Astute submarine than the US Virginia class under the AUKUS defence partnership according to Bryan Clark, a senior fellow at Washington’s Hudson Institute who “said his discussions with US Navy and defence industry figures suggested the Virginia class design would not be made available to Australia”. Does Defence concur with these comments?</p> <p>12. Is there a competitive tension between AUKUS partners for the likely submarine candidate? The US have Virginia Class, UK has Astute Class. How do their own – and quite natural – interests in their own submarine programs get managed in the AUKUS framework?</p> <p>13. Will a competitive evaluation program be run under the AUKUS framework? Will it just be UK and US firms? Will ASC be allowed to tender?</p> <p>14. Can Defence confirm Defence Industry Minister Melissa Price was not involved with the AUKUS announcement until it was taken to Cabinet in September? When was Minister Price first involved?</p> <p>15. The Australian on 3 October 2021 reported that: “Defence Industry Minister Melissa Price has backed the nation’s local shipbuilders to deliver the new AUKUS fleet of nuclear-powered submarines”. What engagement has Defence Industry Minister Price and Defence had with local shipbuilders about their capacity to deliver nuclear-powered submarines? Can Defence provide the dates and stakeholders of those engagements?</p>		
Department of Defence	93	Kimberley Kitching	Defence Innovation Review	<p>1. On 13 September 2021, three days before the AUKUS announcement, Minister Price announced that Naval Group Australia board director David Peever had been appointed to conduct a review into the Australian Defence Force’s innovation programs. When was Mr Peever appointed to this role? What was the process of appointing him?</p> <p>2. Was Mr Peever privy to the AUKUS decision?</p> <p>3. How did Defence and/or the Minister manage any potential or perceived a conflict of interest with Mr Peever being appointed to this role ahead of the AUKUS announcement?</p> <p>4. The media release by Minister Price conspicuously did not mention his role at the time of appointment, only his role at Rio Tinto which he retired from in 2014. Why was his role at Naval Group not mentioned in the release?</p> <p>5. Is the independent review into Defence innovation the government’s response to recommendation 2.21 of the First Principles Review of Defence, which was also led by Mr Peever? [If YES] Why has it taken six years to respond to the recommendation? If not, what is the impetus for the review?</p> <p>6. Who is being consulted for the review? Are submissions being sought from interested organisations?</p> <p>7. Recommendation 2.16 of the First Principles Review stated that the “Defence Science and Technology Organisation (now Defence Science & Technology Group – DSTG) be required to clearly articulate its value proposition. This would include examples and actual amounts of value created.” Is the Defence Science and Technology Group (DSTG) included in the current review? Is outsourcing of DSTG work being considered? Is any other outsourcing of APS work in the areas subject to the review under consideration?</p> <p>How far has the current review progressed? When will it report to government?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	94	Kimberley Kitching	Future Frigates	<p>1. According to a report in The Australian on 31 July 2021 Defence Minister Dutton confirmed the Future Frigates project was delayed by 18 months, noting the delay is: “directly related to the UK’s Type 26 frigates design maturity which flows</p>	Written	

				<p>through to our program. It is frustrating to see an up to 18-month delay to the start of construction of ship one but, importantly, this delay will be recovered over the term of the project". Has the 18 month delay in the Frigates program been factored into revised direct job estimates? What impact has the delay had on direct jobs associated with the Frigates and the estimated construction peak?</p> <p>2. Is the delay still 18 months or has there been further slippage?</p> <p>3. At last Estimates you told us the out turned costs for the Hunter Class was \$44.1 billion. Please provide the latest figure.</p> <p>4. Is the Systems Definition Review still due for completion next month? (Ms Lutz said it was due this November at the last hearings)</p> <p>5. How many missile launch cells will the Hunter Class carry?</p> <p>6. How does this compare with similar vessels in other countries? (Note: The US comparison, the Arleigh Burke Class is lighter than Hunter and carries 96 missile launch cells)</p> <p>7. In the article in The Australian noted above Marcus Hellyer from ASPI says: "So one concern I have is that even though it's not going to arrive for another decade, by the time it does arrive it may be outgunned by the kinds of ships that will be in our region." Does Defence share this concern?</p> <p>8. In that same article Craig Lockhart from BAE says the missile carrying capability of the Hunter "could potentially" be increased if the Navy wants more firepower. If you do decide you want more firepower to align with the US warship, that is 96 launch cells, is there sufficient weight margin to allow this? If so what effect would it have on the margin? Has there been any change to the 3.3% weight margin since last Estimates? If yes, please provide the updated margin.</p>		
Department of Defence	95	Kimberley Kitching	Port of Darwin	<p>1. Mr Tesch, in response to a question by Senator Fierravanti-Wells, said "Defence has completed its assessment [of the Port of Darwin], and we are now working with other agencies about facilitating consideration by government of that information... It's to be scheduled for government consideration, and I can't speculate at this point about when that will be able to occur and when government might make any further statements about that". When was the assessment completed?</p> <p>2. Has the assessment been handed to the Minister yet?</p> <p>3. Please confirm the departments and agencies that are participating/participated in the 'facilitating consideration by government' noted by Mr Tesch?</p> <p>4. Is Defence leading this process?</p> <p>5. According to Mr Tillett at the AFR: "Morrison government ministers are split over whether to tear up a Chinese company's ownership of the Port of Darwin... Sources say a Defence Department review of the 99-year lease between the port's operator Landbridge and the Northern Territory is likely to find it should be axed". Has Defence provided review findings or briefings to NSC?</p> <p>6. Has this been discussed at NSC? (This is not asking for information about the deliberations or advice to Cabinet)</p> <p>7. Will the Government provide its response to the review before an election is called?</p> <p>8. On what date will the Government respond to the review?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	96	Kimberley Kitching	Fuel Security, Storage, and Alternative Fuels	<p>Defence – fuel security, storage, and alternative fuels</p> <p>1. What is the total greenhouse gas emissions profile of Defence? Please provide aggregate figures and a breakdown down by source of emissions.</p> <p>2. In relation to fuels, what is the breakdown of emissions by fuel type, and emissions intensity? When was the last assessment of Defence emissions conducted?</p> <p>3. The Regulation Impact Statement (RIS) attached to the Explanatory Memorandum of the Fuel Security Bill 2021 notes: "there is a need to reduce our vulnerability to supply disruptions and insure against forecasts suggesting a medium to high probability that all Australian refineries will close within the next 10 years" Does Defence share the view that remaining refineries in Australia will close in the next 10 years?</p>	Written	

				<p>4. Were Defence consulted about the fuel security package in the budget? Who were Defence consulted by? For example, did the Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources, and/or consultants engaged on their behalf consult with Defence?</p> <p>5. Did Defence provide views on any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• subsidies,• equity investments into commercial operations by Government or statutory bodies,• or other bespoke financial arrangements or loans? <p>[If YES] Which?</p> <p>(NOTE: this not a request for any advice to government, but rather topics Defence was consulted on)</p> <p>6. On the final page of the RIS to the Fuel Security Bill there is a reference to an unpublished McKinsey report titled "Domestic Refinery Review Synthesis". Was Defence consulted on the review? What type of information was provided? Please detail a list of documents, files, meetings, attendees, and other relevant material related to that McKinsey review.</p> <p>7. There are only two remaining large commercial refineries in Australia. What are the fuels manufactured in those remaining refineries that Defence uses?</p> <p>8. Can Defence provide an outline of each type of fuel and the volumes procured domestically and imported? (A breakdown of fuel type based on the previous guidance given to the JSCDFAT Defence subcommittee about fuel storage, such as aviation fuel, diesel etc. would be appropriate)</p> <p>9. What are the countries of origin for main supply sources of imported fuels Defence uses, and what trade routes do they follow?</p> <p>10. The Defence Fuel Transformation Program was announced in 2018 with a value of \$1.16b, due to be completed by 2045-46 (Attachment 80). Please outline the funding allocation over the forward estimates and the use of that funding? Can you confirm that no directions from Government or Defence, nor funding, is associated with alternative fuels in the Defence Fuel Transformation Program?</p> <p>11. Can you confirm that no directions and funding are associated with climate change and the associated impacts on fuel security and demand for alternate fuels in the Defence Fuel Transformation Program?</p> <p>12. In the JSCFADT hearings of 10 August 2021, Rear Admiral Murray said: With respect to the alternative fuel types, Australia has the industry capability to produce those, but it's about the commercial quantity and the commercial viability of those for defence. Defence consumes about one per cent of the total fuel that Australia consumes. To clarify, is it Defence's view that the remaining refineries in Australia have the capability to develop to the alternate fuel that would be in consideration for Defence? What types of fuels are those, and what do they replace?</p> <p>13. Has Defence engaged with Viva or Ampol or others? [If YES] Please specify. [If NO] Can Defence explain why, given these companies have the largest fuel interests in Australia, there has been no collaboration?</p> <p>14. What are the current price disparities between imported alternate fuels and domestically produces fuels?</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>15. On page 18 of the Interim Liquid Fuel Security report, it states: Defence supports the development of alternative fuels (both bio and synthetic). For Defence to utilise alternative fuels, they must be costed competitively and be able to be used as a drop-in replacement requiring no change in engine technology. Has Defence done any assessment of what alternate fuels can be 'dropped in'?</p> <p>16. What evidence can you provide that Defence has analysed which engines may be able to use alternate fuels as 'drop ins'?</p> <p>17. Has the Government sought advice from Defence on which fuels may be able to drop in? [If YES] Can you provide evidence/documentation of the advice sought from Defence?</p> <p>18. In the 10 August 2021 JSCFADT hearings, Commodore Robb said in regard to the use of alternate fuels "We've always taken an approach that we would be a fast follower to somebody in industry". Who leads the industry engagement and analysis in Defence to enable you to be a fast follower?</p> <p>19. What engagement has Defence had with US on their transition to alternative fuels?</p> <p>20. In the 10 August 2021 JSCFADT hearings Commodore Robb also stated: ...our allies have changed some of their military fuel standards, particularly their aviation fuel standards, to take up to 50 per cent biofuels, and we are looking at how we would achieve that here as well. Which allies is he referring to specifically?</p> <p>21. Please provide more detail on "looking at how we'd achieve percentages of biofuels". How is Defence doing this? Is there a formal program? Which part(s) of the Department and ADF are involved? How many staff? Who issued the directive to look at?</p> <p>22. What tests are the ADF undertaking on alternative fuels? Can you list partner countries, research institutions, commercial firms?</p> <p>23. Is Defence, including but not limited to the Defence Science and Technology Group, looking into alternative fuels and/or the infrastructure for production and/or storage of such alternative as biofuels, hydrogen or e-methanol? Please provide details.</p> <p>24. A Defence media release of 20 July 2012 Australian Navy explores alternative fuel use with United States states the "Royal Australian Navy has signed an agreement with the US Navy to explore the increased use of environmentally friendly fuels". Is that agreement still in effect? If not, when was the agreement stopped and why? What was the last activity undertaken under the agreement?</p>		
Department of Defence	97	Kimberley Kitcing	Battlefield Management System	<p>1. Regarding the Battlefield Management System supplied by Elbit that was suspended earlier this year. I understand there was an independent review of the matter. Was that joint funded by Defence and Elbit?</p> <p>2. How much did the report cost and who conducted it?</p> <p>3. Is it complete? When was it given to Government / Defence?</p> <p>4. What was the title of the report?</p> <p>5. Can you please table the report – or at least an unclassified version or synthesis?</p> <p>6. The ABC reported that the review: "singles out Defence's Capability and Sustainment Group (CASG) for mishandling the overall LAND 200 project, which aims to digitise army's command and control systems to better coordinate soldiers in the field." Is this an accurate reflection of the report?</p>	Written	

				<p>7. Did the report recommend removing CASG or Army from the running of BMS?</p> <p>8. What were the recommendations of the review? Do any require a decision of Government to be implemented?</p> <p>9. Has Defence begun to implement changes recommended by the review?</p>		
Department of Defence	98	Kimberley Kitching	Major Service Provider Review	<p>1. In March 2021, Defence announced a review of the Major Service Provider program (“CASG launches review of MSP panel”, Defence Connect, 1 March 2021):</p> <p>2. What gave rise to the review?</p> <p>3. Were there any particular incidents or issues that the review was designed or intended to look into?</p> <p>4. If yes, what is the nature of those concerns?</p> <p>5. Has that review completed?</p> <p>6. If no to (5), when will it be completed?</p> <p>7. If yes to (5), what were the key findings?</p> <p>8. If yes to (5), what are the recommendations to address these findings?</p> <p>9. What is being done to implement them?</p> <p>10. Were there any actual, perceived or potential conflicts found?</p> <p>11. If yes, what is now being done to manage those?</p> <p>12. Do these give rise to an unfair advantage for any tenders that should mean unsuccessful tenderers should have a new opportunity to re tender?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	99	Kimberley Kitching	LAND 2097 Phase 4	<p>1. It is our understanding that the test pilot for LAND 2097 Phase 4 program has resigned due to irregularity in the ADF’s own testing program. Is this true? If not, why did the pilot resign?</p> <p>2. If yes, will the same test pilot be asked to return to the program to complete the testing, given his depth of experience in the program?</p> <p>3. Is the LAND 2097 Phase 4 program being conducted in a fair and equitable process in accordance with the ADF’s own procurement and testing policy?</p> <p>4. If no, what parts of the policy have not been followed?</p> <p>5. Defence has tested the Bell 429 helicopter in the US. Is CASG going to test the helicopter of the other tenderer, the Airbus H145M aircraft that are in Mackay QLD, as was previously arranged by Airbus through PHI Aviation or by any other means?</p> <p>6. Is Defence aware that there is a retirement index number (RIN) on the Bell 429 helicopter’s skids/landing gear which is critical and expensive to maintain and purchase?</p> <p>7. We understand there is no RIN system on the H145M. Is Defence aware that with the Bell 429 helicopter, there is a substantial cost associated with replacing the complete skid/landing gear from the OEM, if the Bell 429 is selected?</p> <p>8. Is Defence aware that the number of run-on landings in the Bell 429 in training and on operations has a marked effect in expediting the retirement index number (RIN) of cycles for the Bell 429 helicopter?</p> <p>9. Is the Department aware that the Bell 429 has a marked reduction in performance and capability with the doors off configuration as opposed to the H145M and that reduction in capability may reduce the ADF’s capability to conduct Strategic Recovery Operations?</p> <p>10. Has Defence effectively “dumbed down” or in any way modified the requirements for LAND 2097 Phase 4 program to accommodate the Bell 429 given the reduction of performance and capability compared to the H145M?</p> <p>11. Given the US Defence Dept is upgrading the UH-72A Lakota’s to UH-72B (based on the H145) and the ADF prioritises interoperability with the US, why wouldn’t the Department test the H145M in the same time frame and on the “same level playing field” given it was offered to the ADF for evaluation?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	100	Kimberley Kitching	SME Support Cell	<p>The Department of Defence has announced that there will be an Impacted SME Support Cell for businesses affected by the Government’s cancellation of the Attack class submarine program.</p> <p>1. Can the Department advise the Committee what this Impacted SME Support Cell actually is?</p> <p>2. Will it compensate businesses that are affected by the cancellation of the Attack class program?</p>	Written	

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Who heads the Impacted SME Support Cell? 4. How many staff does Impacted SME Support Cell have? 5. What is the Impacted SME Support Cell's mandate? 6. How long will the Impacted SME Support Cell last given it is to be set up in the Centre for Defence Industry Capability (CDIC), which the Government has said it is abolishing by the year? 7. Can Defence give any guarantee that SMEs affected by the cancellation of the Attack Class submarine program will get work on any other defence programs before work commences on the new nuclear submarine program? 8. If so, which defence programs will this work be on? 9. Can the Department give any guarantee that SMEs affected by the cancellation of the Attack class program will receive work in the nuclear submarine program? 10. The Government announced an 18-month "exploratory program" to begin this nuclear submarine program. Noting that all work on the Attack class program has ceased, and work on the nuclear submarine program obviously cannot begin until after this 18 month "exploratory program" has concluded, will there be any other submarine work for any of these companies to undertake during this 18-month period that is not already being undertaken by Australian SMEs? 		
Department of Defence	101	Kimberley Kitching	Centre for Defence Industry Capability	<p>Minister Price has announced that the Centre for Defence Industry Capability (CDIC) will be abolished and replaced with a new entity ("CDIC to be replaced", Australian Defence Magazine, 28 September 2021).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What will the CDIC be replaced by and when? 2. Who will lead the new organisation? 3. How many staff will the new organisation have? 4. Where within the Defence organisational structure will the new organisation be located? 5. What will be the mandate of this new organisation? 6. Can Departmental officials provide an organisational structure/chart for the Department of Defence that shows where CASG and whatever will replace the CDIC sits in the organisation structure? 7. How many staff are currently employed at CDIC? 8. How many job losses resulted from the CDIC abolition? 	Written	
Department of Defence	102	Kimberley Kitching	AIC Plans	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Under the Australian Industry Plans included in major procurement contracts, Defence primes are required to make regular AIC Plan reports. How frequently are these reports required to be submitted to Defence? 2. What part of Defence are these reports submitted to? 3. Is there a central part of Defence that reviews all these reports or are they only reviewed on a project-by-project basis? 4. Does CDIC have access to these reports or the information about Australian defence industry businesses contained in these reports? 5. If yes to (4), does CDIC review this information? 6. If no to (4), why not? 7. Are there any penalties for non-compliance or repeated non-compliance with such AIC Plans? 8. Is any effort made or process required to compare reports across projects to ensure that where one Prime contractor may identify a lack of local Australian capability that there is not in fact another contractor using such or similar local Australian capability? 9. Are there any consequences on a prime where it is found that they have not properly sought to identify or utilised an available local Australian capability provider or supplier? 10. Can the Department provide the last AIC Plan report for each of the Future Frigate, the OPV and Land 400 projects? 11. Can the Department provide a copy of the last two copies of the ACE Achievement Report (ACEAR) from Naval as required by clause 12.2.1.8 or 13.2.1.7 of the Strategic Partnering Agreement? 	Written	
Department of Defence	103	Kimberley Kitching	Dry Docking	<p>In its Force Structure Plan 2020, the Government committed to introducing "an additional docking facility to complement the Captain Cook graving dock in Sydney to support the anticipated build and sustainment of new and larger vessels" (Force</p>	Written	

				<p>Structure Plan, pp 118-20).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When will the Captain Cook Graving Dock require maintenance and be out of service? 2. How long would the maintenance on the Captain Cook Graving Dock take? 3. In September 2021 the Prime Minister said the Government has committed to building a new Dry Dock (Prime Minister, Transcript, Press Conference, Canberra, 16 September 2021). How long will this take? 4. What is the lead time to start building? 5. How long would it take to build? 6. Are there any locations currently under active consideration? 7. If yes, where? 8. Are there any locations in WA under consideration? If so, where? 9. Are there any locations not in WA under consideration? If so, where? 10. The Captain Cook graving dock has been called the RAN's "most important strategic asset". As such, would the Department agree that the cost of an additional graving dock is essentially a Federal Government responsibility? 11. Why hasn't the location of the new graving dock yet been announced? 12. Is this project only considering a graving dry dock such as the Captain Cook graving dry dock, or are forms of a ship lift, or other forms of a dry dock being contemplated, and if so, what and why? 13. To what extent and how do regulatory restrictions regarding use and operation of nuclear power plants on land in Australia factor into decision-making regarding location and type of dock? 14. To what extent are increases in sea levels being taken into account for this project? 		
Department of Defence	104	Kimberley Kitching	Hornet and F35 Programs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is RUAG Australia's role in the Hornet aircraft program and the F35 aircraft program? 2. Has there been any work done to check if there are any Australian SMEs that can perform this work? 3. What is the basis for RUAG Australia receiving a Sovereign Industrial Capability Priority Grant ("RUAG Australia awarded SICP Grant", https://business.gov.au/cdic/news-for-defence-industry/ruag-australia-awarded-sicp-grant#:~:text=RUAG%20Australia%20has%20been%20awarded,grant%20along%20with%2010%20others%20) when it is 100% beneficially owned by the Swiss Government? 	Written	
Department of Defence	105	Kimberley Kitching	HMAS Stirling Upgrade	<p>On 28 October 2021, Minister Dutton provided an "exclusive" story to The West Australian which stated "HMAS Stirling naval base will get a \$1 billion Federally-funded upgrade to support a nuclear submarine being stationed in Australian waters" ("HMAS Stirling naval base to get \$1 billion Federally-funded upgrade", The West Australian, 28 October 2021).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What specific initiatives will this funding pay for and over what time period will each project be undertaken? 2. Has any of this funding for specific upgrade activities been previously announced? 3. Was any of this \$1 billion allocated in the 2021-22 Federal Budget? 4. If yes to (3), how much? 5. If yes to (3), which page of which Budget paper detail these specific spending commitments? 6. How does Defence propose to design and build these facilities at HMAS Stirling for these new nuclear submarines when the design and crewing requirements for such vessels are not yet determined? 	Written	
Department of Defence	106	Kimberley Kitching	Shipbuilding Projects	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When will each of the following naval construction projects occurring in Western Australia conclude: Guardian Class; Offshore Patrol Vessel (OPV) and evolved Cape Class Patrol vessels? 2. In his press conference on 16 September 2021, the Prime Minister said there were more ship construction work projects coming to Western Australia "over the coming decade" and listed "an ice-rated replacement for the Navy's Ocean Protector, a new large Salvage and Repair Vessel, and up to four support ships for the enhanced Undersea Surveillance System." Have contracts been awarded for any of the above projects, and, if so, to whom? 3. When is construction anticipated to commence on each of the above projects? 4. In response to concerns raised by defence industry advocates from other States, the Minister for Defence Industry, Melissa Price, told an industry briefing that even if these projects are awarded to WA, the construction work may occur in other States. Can the Government guarantee that each of these projects will occur in Western Australia? 	Written	

				<p>5. What guarantee is there for the naval shipbuilding workforce and businesses in Western Australia that they don't face a cliff and will lose work once the existing projects come to an end?</p> <p>6. Given an apprenticeship takes between three to six years, and existing programs will start ending within that time frame, doesn't the impending naval shipbuilding employment cliff in WA act as ballast to employing more apprentices and building a trained sovereign shipbuilding workforce</p>		
Department of Defence	107	David Van	Defence Disposal - 310 St Kilda Rd	<p>- The 2001 Senate report 6.18 into Defence property disposals recommends to Defence how they should approach disposals in the case of 310 St Kilda Rd o why has this been ignored?</p> <p>o Can Defence provide the Senate its detailed assessment of the property that concluded it should be disposed of?</p> <p>o Can Defence provide details of its correspondence to the Department of Finance to list the property on the Commonwealths internal register, I believe called "Clearing House", offering it to other departments prior to it being declared surplus to Commonwealth needs?</p> <p>- Given the significant historical and heritage value of this site, if it cannot be given to another level of government, how will Defence protect this valuable site?</p> <p>- In the Heritage Management Plan Volume Two Published in April 2021 on Page 64 it lists 310 St Kilda Rd as heritage nominated building, how are you planning on protecting it given in previous estimates you have said that you would?</p> <p>- This 2011 report from your own department gave strong recommendation to fixing the damage, why was this ignored?</p> <p>- The report states "The Repatriation Building is in solid structural condition, lack of maintenance and recent storm damage to roof tiles has meant that the internal spaces are degrading rapidly". Why has Defence not done anything in the last 10 years to protect the buildings paid for by the taxpayers?</p> <p>- How much money has Defence saved by not maintaining the site?</p> <p>- In Estimates the officials said there had been maintenance of the external parts of the building. Please provide detailed accounts on what has been spent on the building and on what?</p> <p>- Page 65 states that appropriate use of the facility would include "a Public Museum", why has defence not worked with ANVAM to deliver an activity which Defence listed in 2011 as an appropriate use of the site?</p> <p>- Does the Department believe the site should remain in public hands or sold to the private sector?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	108	Timothy Ayres	LAND 8120	<p>The successful tenderer for Project LAND 8120 in 2021 was Ventia ("\$158 million vehicle upgrade contract creating jobs", Minister Price, Media Release, 23 August 2021). Ventia included Qinetiq as a partner in their tender according to LinkedIn posts by Qinetiq and Ventia. Contract Notice CN3487470 published by Defence on AusTender on 27 February 2018 indicates that Defence entered a contract with Qinetiq Pty Ltd for 'Procurement Delivery Model Assessment & Approach to Market Preparation' for the LAND 8120 project in 2018.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was Defence aware that the company engaged in 2018 to undertake delivery of the "Procurement Delivery Model Assessment & Approach to Market Preparation" for LAND 8120 was Qinetiq, who then subsequently partnered with Ventia to tender for the LAND 8120 Phase 1 project itself? 2. Isn't this a case of answering the exam question they wrote? 3. Isn't this a conflict of interest? 4. Were any steps taken to mitigate or control for such a conflict of interest? 5. Were other tenderers aware of Qinetiq's involvement in advising on the LAND 8120 project in 2018? 6. Wasn't Ventia given an unfair advantage by partnering with Qinetiq in this tender? 7. Why did Defence let this occur? 	Written	
Department of Defence	109	Timothy Ayres	LAND 8140	<p>An Australian Defence Magazine article "Request for Tender issued for LAND 8140" published on 31 March 2020 states "The [LAND8140] project is also working with industry through the Defence Innovation Hub to develop new technology solutions, such as more efficient and effective power generation and distribution systems".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hadn't Qinetiq already undertaken the bulk of this work through its prior contract in 2018? 2. So why is the Australian Government supporting them through the Defence Innovation Hub? 3. What do they need to innovate if they've already spent three years assessing what needs to be done for the Microgrid 	Written	

				<p>project?</p> <p>4. If Qinetiq have spent 3 years assessing a microgrid project, why is the Department of Defence supporting them through the Defence Innovation Hub?</p> <p>5. Why is the Defence Innovation Hub providing grants to a non-Australian, London Stock Exchange listed company, that has already been working on these areas for many years? Where's the innovation? Where's the support for Aussie industry?</p>		
Department of Defence	110	Timothy Ayres	LAND 8141	<p>LAND 8140 is \$500 million Deployable Force Infrastructure Project, announced by then Defence Minister Reynolds on 13 February 2020 with the first \$150 million to "fund work to modernise deployable sanitation, catering, water management and treatment, shelters, and power generation" ("Investment into deployed infrastructure to support the ADF, Joint Media Release, Minister Reynolds and Minister Price, 13 February 2018). Contract Notice CN3535664 published by Defence on AusTender on 24 August 2018 shows that Defence entered a contract with Qinetiq Pty Ltd in 2018 for a Rapid Assessment task in this LAND 8140 project. Part of this project was to deliver a set of performance standards against which micro grid solutions would be assessed. Then in 2021 the successful tender for Microgrid Systems for the LAND 8140 work under was Qinetiq ("5.4 million investment in Vic company to help power our ADF", Minister Price and Senator Paterson, Joint Media Release, 7 October 2021).</p> <p>1. Was Defence aware of this?</p> <p>2. Isn't this a conflict of interest?</p> <p>3. Were any steps taken to mitigate or control for such a conflict of interest?</p> <p>4. Were other tenderers aware of Qinetiq's involvement in advising on this project in 2020 or 2021 when they tendered?</p> <p>5. Wasn't Qinetiq given an unfair advantage by completing the Rapid Assessment task and then tendering for the subsequent Microgrid system?</p> <p>6. Why did Defence let this occur?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	111	Kimberley Kitching	Workforce and Recruitment	<p>Can Defence provide advice on the Defence workforce and recruitment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the latest 2020-21 Defence annual report, an updated workforce plan will be released in late 2021. Will this still be released this year in light of the new AUKUS arrangement and if so, when? • Recent media reports have indicated Navy alone may need 20,000 personnel, up from its current 15,000 to be able to crew new submarines and frigates when they eventually come online. Is this correct? • Can Defence advise how many personnel will be in the new plan? A recent media report suggested Defence was planning for a budget increase beyond the 2 per cent of GDP threshold for up to 10,000 new recruits, including trying to attract skilled former personnel back to the ADF to meet future workforce needs. Was this report accurate? 	Written	
Department of Defence	112	Kimberley Kitching	Defence Force Retirement and Death Benefits	<p>Can Defence provide advice on the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee Inquiry into the Defence Force Retirement and Death Benefits (DFRDB) military superannuation scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Government or Defence likely to consider the recommendation to provide more support to help DFRDB members access the Commonwealth's Compensation for Detriment caused by Defective Administration (CDDA) scheme to make a claim and appeal any adverse decisions? • Is the department aware of any CDDA scheme applications since the inquiry? If so, what was the outcome of those claims? • The Committee also considered that, for DFRDB pensioners who were unsuccessful in their claims and any appeals, some form of reparation payment would be appropriate to recognise "the Government's moral obligation to address the confusion and distress suffered by DFRDB members as a result of defective administration". Is this something the Government and Defence would consider? • The inquiry also recommended the Government look at ways to improve members' understanding of DFRDB and other military superannuation schemes through additional information for DFRDB members, like a dedicated website, and information for current ADF personnel on other schemes they may belong to, such as ADF Super. Would the Government and Defence consider this proposal? 	Written	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some submissions to the Senate inquiry and Ombudsman’s investigation raised a number of other concerns, including indexation arrangements, spouse payments and the use of life expectancy factor tables. Will the Government or Defence be considering any of these issues, and any other changes to the DFRDB scheme or legislation going forward? 		
Department of Defence	113	Rex Patrick	Hunter Class Frigate AIC and Australian Procurement	<p>In response to QON 271 it was advised that “BAE Systems Maritime Australia employs 49 people managing the Australian supply chain for the Hunter class frigate”. However it is understood that for the Hunter Class Frigate BAE Systems Maritime Australia has people in an Australian Industry Capability Team and separately people handling Australian Procurement for the program.</p> <p>In relation to the Hunter Class frigate program please provide clarification on the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How many people does BAE Systems have managing the Australian supply chain and AIC? What is the number of people BAE Systems has in the organisation handling the Australian procurement activities? Can defence provide clarification on what supply chain decisions are being made out of the UK and what supply chain decisions are being made in Australia? Which entity is the Design Authority for the Hunter Class Frigate? 	Written	
Department of Defence	114	Rex Patrick	Arafura Class OPV AIC and Australian Procurement	<p>In relation to the Arafura Class Offshore Patrol Vessel program could defence please provide advice on the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will there be any change to the OPV configuration baseline to increase the level of Australian Industry Capability (AIC) in the program? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If so, in what areas? Which entity is the Design Authority for the Arafura Class OPV? The number of people Luerksen Australia has managing the Australian supply chain and AIC? The number of people Luerksen Australia has handling Australian procurement activities? 	Written	
Department of Defence	115	Louise Pratt	Small-and-medium-sized enterprises	<p>On 16 September 2021, the Morrison Government announced that a contract with French firm Naval Group to manufacture diesel-powered submarines in Australia would be scrapped in favour of a plan to procure nuclear-powered submarines from the United States of America. Small-and-medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) along the defence industry supply chain have spent years building capability with the belief that Naval Group diesel-powered submarines would be manufactured in Australia.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Did the government consult with SMEs along the defence industry supply chain before scrapping the contract with Naval Group ensuring local content? Does the government have a plan to compensate SMEs for their investment in increased capability that is now going to waste? Does the government have a plan to actively involve SMEs that increased their capacity with the belief they would be involved in the manufacture of submarines in Australia in other manufacturing growth areas, such as renewable energy technology? 	Written	
Department of Defence	116	Louise Pratt	Attack Class Submarine Program Announcement	<p>On 16 November 2020, then Minister for Defence, Melissa Price, announced that “Australian companies will compete for work that had been assessed by Naval Group as being worth up to \$900 million”. The announcement included notice that companies had “formally lodged their interest to become part of the Attack Class Submarine Program as tier-one suppliers of equipment, ranging from the submarine’s main shaft line to the weapons handling system”.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How many companies lodged expressions of interest for the hundreds of millions of dollars’ worth of work packages for the program? How many Australian companies applied to Naval Group to manufacture items of submarine equipment for the Morrison Government’s Attack Class Submarine Program? 	Written	

				<p>6. Of the companies that applied to Naval Group to manufacture items of submarine equipment for the Attack Class Submarine Program, how many were Western Australian?</p> <p>7. How many companies registered their interest in broader supply chain opportunities through the Industry Capability Network portal for the Attack class submarines?</p> <p>8. Is the government aware of any investments that interested companies have made to increase capacity to manufacture submarines in Australia?</p> <p>9. Has the government made any commitments to companies who have invested in skilling-up and scaling-up infrastructure for this work?</p>		
Department of Defence	117	Louise Pratt	Existing Shipbuilding Commitments in WA	<p>On 16 September 2021, Prime Minister Morrison committed that the following will be built or maintained in Western Australia:</p> <p>a). The Arafura class offshore patrol vessel worth \$3.9 billion;</p> <p>b). The Guardian class patrol boats worth \$510 million;</p> <p>c). The Evolved Cape class boats worth \$343 million;</p> <p>d). The ANZAC Class sustainment worth \$338 million per annum;</p> <p>e). The undersea surveillance support ships worth \$6-9 billion;</p> <p>f). The future mine warfare and hydrographic vessel worth between \$4.3 and \$6.4 billion;</p> <p>g). The joint support ships worth \$5.1 to \$7.7 billion;</p> <p>h). The replacement LHD landing craft worth between \$400 and \$600 million;</p> <p>i). The Ocean Protector replacement worth between \$400 and \$650 million;</p> <p>j). The Collins class intermediate mid cycle docking arrangement supporting 500 jobs through to the mid-2040s.</p> <p>1. What is the project timeline for each of these commitments?</p> <p>2. Which of these commitments has already commenced construction or maintenance in Western Australia?</p> <p>3. Does the government remain committed to these projects?</p>	Written	
Department of Defence	118	Penny Wong	Prime Minister's Glasgow Trip	<p>Senator WONG: I am just confirming that you've been tasked to fly the Prime Minister from Australia to Glasgow and return.</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>Senator WONG: When were you tasked?</p> <p>Air Marshal Hupfeld: I'd have to take that on notice, just the actual date.</p>	Hansard	45
Department of Defence	119	Penny Wong	Implementation Plan	<p>Senator WONG: Sure. Did the draft assume this vessel would be purchased offshore or built here?</p> <p>Mr Tesch: The implementation plans are designed to give industry an indication of the scope.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Correct.</p> <p>Mr Tesch: I will have to check whether it was expressly referenced in the implementation plan.</p>	Hansard	37
Department of Defence	120	Penny Wong	Surge Capacity	<p>Senator WONG: I think I asked you this. You can't give me a proportion of the 6,000 that is surge capacity; what you can give me is a proportion that were ICT. Is that right?</p> <p>Ms Greig: That's correct. We can also look at the previous census, to give you a sense of the change in that mix.</p> <p>Senator WONG: But that is categories of work, not need. Your argument to me is we need some surge capacity, but you can't tell me what proportion of that is attributable to surge capacity. What you can say to me is which sectors they work in.</p> <p>Ms Greig: And what's changed. We can talk to you, in the response, in terms of the activities performed by the contract workforce, how the activities have changed in relative contribution.</p>	Hansard	53

				<p>Senator WONG: Could you also provide me more specific figures on the tenure of contractors, the number of existing contractors who have been engaged for less than 12 months, for 12 to 24 months, for 24 to 36 months and for more than 36 months?</p> <p>Mr Groves: That may be challenging. I'll try and explain why. I think in some cases we're hiring a firm to provide a skill set. We can certainly look at how long we've had a contract in place, but they might be different individuals who are being provided over the course of that contract.</p> <p>Senator WONG: So your dataset doesn't tell me individuals but it does tell me entity.</p> <p>Mr Groves: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WONG: Okay, why don't you just do it for entity if you can't interrogate it.</p>		
Department of Defence	121	Penny Wong	Attack Class Submarine Program	<p>Senator WONG: But, basically, you're hoping you can keep enough people for six years to actually do some construction work on these submarines? Yes? If you're a tradesperson, wouldn't you just go to a different industry?</p> <p>Mr Dalton: Again, the cohort we're talking about doesn't have a lot of blue-collar workers in it because the Attack class submarine program is not in construction.</p> <p>Mr Byrne: I might suggest that, when we consider the shipbuilding workforce, we consider the workforce across the whole enterprise, and the demand will continue to grow, even with the cancellation of the Attack class—</p> <p>Senator WONG: You're going to come back after lunch with the documents that show me that?</p> <p>Mr Byrne: Correct.</p>	Hansard	32
Department of Defence	122	Penny Wong	Joint Submission	<p>Senator WONG: Was the submission to cabinet for the final announcement a joint submission?</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: I'll check that for you.</p> <p>Senator WONG: I assume Defence was involved in preparing the submission.</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: It was, and it's my understanding it was a joint submission. I'll confirm that for you.</p> <p>Senator WONG: So PM&C and Defence or—</p> <p>Mr Moriarty: I will confirm that for you.</p>	Hansard	27
Department of Defence	123	Timothy Ayres	ADF mobilisation for upcoming bushfire seasons	<p>Have there been arrangements made for potential ADF mobilisation in the upcoming bushfire season?</p> <p>Has there been any change made to the protocols for emergency mobilisation during natural disasters since the 2019/20 bushfire season?</p>	Written	

Australian Signals Directorate – Supplementary Budget Estimates 2021-22 – QON index

Agency	Q No.	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Proof Hansard Page
Australian Signals Directorate	1	Timothy Ayres	Ransomware	Senator AYRES: Did ASD assist in recent offensive cyber operations against the DarkSide Ransomware group? Are you able to comment on that?	Hansard	88
Australian Signals Directorate	2	Kimberley Kitching	Pacific	<p>1. What assistance does ASD offer Pacific countries through the Pacific Cyber Security Operational Network (PaCSON)?</p> <p>2. Does ASD offer any assistance to protect the critical infrastructure of Pacific countries from cyber-attacks?</p> <p>3. Does ASD offer any Security Operations Centre-like monitoring services for PacSON members?</p> <p>4. Does ASD provide incident responders to Pacific countries in the event of a cyber incident?</p> <p>5. In 2018 the Australian government entered a Memorandum of Understanding with Papua New Guinea on cyber security cooperation.</p> <p>a. Did ASD provide assistance to Papua New Guinea when its Department of Finance was the subject of a ransomware attack recently? If so, what assistance was provided?</p> <p>b. Was ASD aware of this attack prior to being notified by Papua New Guinea’s government or through the media?</p> <p>c. Did Papua New Guinea’s government request Australian assistance?</p> <p>d. Was the jointly funded Cyber Security Operations Centre involved in the detection or response to this ransomware attack?</p> <p>e. Was the jointly funded Papua New Guinea Computer Emergency Response Team deployed in response to this ransomware attack?</p> <p>f. Were resources from CERT Australia deployed in response to this ransomware attack?</p> <p>6. What support does ASD provide to the Pacific and South East Asia region through APCERT?</p> <p>7. What resources or staffing have ASD provided to APCERT?</p> <p>8. What in-kind contributions have ASD provided to APCERT?</p>	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	3	Kimberley Kitching	Ransomware	<p>At a 25 October 2021 Senate Estimates hearing of the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee Secretary Pezzullo said in relation to actions against ransomware crews: “Director-General Noble, under the technical assistance powers that are available to her under the ISA legislation—they’re hunting. They are hunting every night, I can assure you.”</p> <p>1. How many successful offensive operations has ASD conducted against ransomware groups?</p> <p>2. Did ASD assist in recent offensive cyberoperations against the REvil ransomware group?</p>	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	4	Kimberley Kitching	Quantum	<p>1. In its FAQ on Quantum Computing and Post-Quantum Cryptography the U.S. National Security Agency (NSA) says:</p> <p>“NSA considers the use of pre-shared symmetric keys in a standards compliant fashion to be a better near-term post-quantum solution than implementation of experimental postquantum asymmetric algorithms that may or may not be proven secure and which will not be compatible with NIST standards.”</p> <p>Does ASD and the ACSC share the NSA’s view?</p>	Written	

				<p>2. CSIRO Futures said in its 'Growing Australia's Quantum Technology Industry' report that if we believe that quantum computing will be commonplace in the next 10-30 years it's important to move away from the cryptography currently in use to protect our data. What risk assessments has ASD undertaken to determine what data needs to be prioritized for protection with quantum safe encryption?</p> <p>3. Has ASD undertaken a stocktake of the extent that government departments and agencies employ modular cryptography that is able to be upgraded to post-quantum encryption algorithms when these standards become available?</p> <p>4. What steps is ASD undertaking to protect currently stored encrypted data holdings from the threat of subsequent decryption when current encryption techniques are able to be cracked by quantum computing?</p> <p>5. What actions is ASD undertaking to prepare government networks for the deployment of larger encryption keys?</p>		
Australian Signals Directorate	5	Kimberley Kitching	Pegasus Spyware	<p>1. Media reported in July on a leaked data set analysed by The Guardian of more than 50,000 mobile phone numbers allegedly targeted by Pegasus malware, sold by Israeli technology firm NSO Group.</p> <p>a. Did ASD analyse this data set?</p> <p>b. Is ASD aware of any Australians targeted by Pegasus malware?</p> <p>c. Is ASD aware of any politicians, diaspora members, journalists, dissidents in Australia targeted by Pegasus malware?</p> <p>d. What steps were undertaken to determine this?</p> <p>e. Does the Australian government operate programs to proactively monitor cyber-enabled interference involving this type of malware against politicians, diaspora members, journalists, or dissidents?</p> <p>f. Did ASD consider developing or distributing a tool to allow Australians to detect indicators of compromise and determine whether they'd been targeted by Pegasus malware, such as this one developed by third party researchers? If not, why not?</p> <p>g. Has ASD considered the need for proactive, technical interventions of the kind developed by third party researchers for the Pegasus malware to assist these individuals to protect themselves from cyber enabled foreign interference?</p> <p>2. What initiatives does the ACSC undertake to assist these groups of Australians, particularly diaspora groups that might be targeted by their former home country, to protect themselves from cyber enabled foreign interference?</p> <p>3. On the ACSC's cyber.gov.au website there is a page at the path .../individuals-and-families/translated-content. It states "Translated content introduction. This section provides details of the ACSC publications that have been translated into different languages." Why is this page blank other than this text?</p> <p>4. An objective of the Act now, stay secure campaign is to "promote cyber.gov.au as the one-stop shop for individuals, businesses and organisations to arm themselves with cyber security information and advice." Where should culturally and linguistically diverse members of the public go to get this information and advice?</p>	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	6	Kimberley Kitching	Cyber Security Posture Report	<p>1. 'The Commonwealth Cyber Security Posture in 2020' Report states: "The ACSC has observed less extensive compromise of networks as a result of the 2020 activity in comparison to the 2019 activity. The positive response by affected Commonwealth entities in taking action has assisted in averting sustained disruption to essential services, and has increased cyber security resilience across Commonwealth entities." What metrics did the ACSC apply to make this judgement?</p> <p>2. 'The Commonwealth Cyber Security Posture in 2020' Report states:</p>	Written	

				<p>“the ACSC responded to 434 cyber security incidents affecting Commonwealth entities – 46% of which were self-reported to the ACSC. The remaining 54% were identified through ACSC investigations, reporting from international partners and third parties, and analysis of a variety of classified and open-source material.”</p> <p>How does this compare to previous years?</p> <p>3. ‘The Commonwealth Cyber Security Posture in 2020’ Report states:</p> <p>“The effects of the cyber skills shortage intensified in 2020, with more entities identifying the lack of cyber skills in their workforce as a barrier to adopting the Essential Eight. As with 2019, insufficient budget and staffing were also reported as notable barriers for adopting the Essential Eight.”</p> <p>What is the ACSC doing to address this?</p> <p>4. ‘The Commonwealth Cyber Security Posture in 2020’ Report states:</p> <p>“Commonwealth entities misunderstand, misinterpret and inconsistently apply the Essential Eight.”</p> <p>What is the ACSC doing to address this?</p>		
Australian Signals Directorate	7	Kimberley Kitching	ACSC advertising campaigns	<p>1. Please provide a breakdown of advertising targeting SMEs to grow their cyber security awareness and capability by:</p> <p>a. Total spend for the 2020-21 financial year</p> <p>b. YTD spend for the 2021-22 financial year</p> <p>c. Impressions and reach and frequency figures</p> <p>d. Web traffic figures for the small business advice pages for cyber.gov.au in the corresponding periods (including percentage change), stripping out bots and international traffic.</p> <p>2. Please provide a breakdown of advertising through the ‘act now, stay secure’ campaign by:</p> <p>a. Total spend for the 2020-21 financial year</p> <p>b. YTD spend for the 2021-22 financial year</p> <p>c. Impressions and reach and frequency figures</p> <p>d. Web traffic figures for cyber.gov.au in the corresponding periods (including percentage change), stripping out bots and international traffic.</p> <p>e. Whether ACSC has undertaken/commissioned any research on the effectiveness of the campaign in raising awareness of ACSC/cyber.gov.au</p> <p>3. What research was commissioned to inform the ‘beat cyber crime in your downtime’ campaign?</p> <p>4. Please provide this research.</p>	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	8	Kimberley Kitching	Cyber Hygiene Improvement Programs (CHIPS)	<p>1. What are the costs of expanding the Cyber Hygiene Improvement Program beyond the dot gov.au domain on an opt-in basis? Could this be offered to non-government democratic institutions (e.g. political parties, research institutions, media, the parliament, and political parties)?</p> <p>2. Does the ACSC provide the results of automated scans undertaken through CHIPS to non-government Australian entities?</p>	Written	

Australian Signals Directorate	9	Kimberley Kitching	Insider Threat Tool	The US Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) recently released an Insider Risk Mitigation Self-Assessment Tool to help organisations determine their risk posture and mitigate against insider threats. 1. Is ASD aware of this tool? 2. Does ASD offer a similar tool? 3. If not, why not?	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	10	Kimberley Kitching	Sextortion	The US Federal Bureau of Investigation has said that Americans lost more than \$8 million from more than 16,000 to sextortion scams in the first half of 2021. 1. How many sextortion reports has ACSC received in 2021? 2. How much money has been lost by Australians to sextortion scams in 2021?	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	11	Kimberley Kitching	PSPF Compliance	‘The Commonwealth Cyber Security Posture in 2020’ Report states: “The Cyber Maturity Measurement Program (CMMP) enables specialist ACSC teams – working with Commonwealth entities – to review ICT systems against the Essential Eight mitigation strategies. Each Commonwealth entity benefits from tailored advice on how to improve their cyber security posture. In some instances, where the Commonwealth entity does not have the capability internally, the ACSC provides additional funding for the entity to employ specialist commercial vendors to help them implement the ACSC’s recommendations. Since the CMMP was established in mid-2020, five assessments have been undertaken” Please provide aggregate findings of Essential Eight compliance for each CMMP assessment	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	12	Kimberley Kitching	ACSC staffing profile	Please provide a staffing profile for the ACSC as at 5 November 2021 by the technical qualifications of SES and EL band (or equivalent) employees. the previous private sector experience of SES and EL band (or equivalent) employees	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	13	Kimberley Kitching	Performance on Hiring Targets in Cyber Security Strategy	The 2020 Cyber Security Strategy said “the Australian Government will also further expand the ACSC’s ability to counter cyber crime actors offshore”. 1. Please provide a breakdown of the number of FTEs and their classification within the ACSC dedicated to cybercrime in the periods 1 January to 31 June 2021, and 1 July to date. 2. How many staff is the ACSC planning to have dedicated to cybercrime in 2021-22? 3. Please provide a breakdown of. the number of FTEs and their classification hired in the periods 1 January to 31 June 2021, and 1 July to date	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	14	Kimberley Kitching	Staffing numbers	1. How many full-time equivalent staff are engaged at each of 31 May 2021, 30 June 2021, and 30 September 2021? 2. How many of these positions are (a) on-going and (b) non-ongoing? 3. How many redundancies have occurred in each of the periods 1 April 2021 - 30 June 2021; 1 July 2021 – 30 September 2021? How many were: (a) voluntary (b) involuntary? 4. How many of those redundancies occurred as a result of departmental restructuring? What is the total cost of those redundancies? 5. What was the total value in dollar terms of all termination payments paid to exiting staff? 6. How much overtime or equivalent has been paid to staff in each of the 1 April 2021 - 30 June 2021; 1 July 2021 – 30 September 2021. 7. How many section 37 notices under the Public Service Act 1999 have been offered in each of the periods 1 April 2021 - 30 June 2021; 1 July 2021 – 30 September 2021.	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	15	Kimberley Kitching	HikVision	The UK Parliament Foreign Affairs Committee recommended that “equipment manufactured by companies such as Hikvision and Dahua should not be permitted to operate within the UK” and that “government prohibits organisations and individuals in the UK from doing business with any companies known to be associated with the Xinjiang atrocities.” 1. Does ASD agree with this recommendation? If not, why not? 2. Has ASD provided advice to government or other departments on whether these companies should be prohibited from servicing the Australian government?	Written	

Australian Signals Directorate	16	Kimberley Kitching	Threat Intel Sharing	Does the ACSC provide real-time indicator feeds to federal, state, and local government entities?	Written	
Australian Signals Directorate	17	Kimberley Kitching	Cleaner pipes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What advice has ACSC provided to government on options to incentivise ISPs to provide protective DNS filtering? 2. What are ACSC doing to incentive ISPs to provide cleaner pipes style protective DNS filtering services, as Telstra has done? 3. What engagements has ACSC had with industry on expanding the cleaner pipes program? 4. Does ACSC have a view on the number of cyber-attacks that would be prevented if more ISPs offered protective DNS filtering? 5. Does ACSC have a view on the costs of cyber incidents that could be avoided through a wider roll out of protective DNS filtering in Australia? 6. What engagement has ACSC had with industry on technical options other than DNS filtering to provide cleaner pipes to Australian consumers? 	Written	

Supplementary Budget Estimates 2021-22 – Defence Housing Australia QON Index

Agency	Q No.	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Proof Hansard Page
Defence Housing Australia	1	Concetta Fierravanti-Wells	DHA input into location of new Defence sites	<p>ACTING CHAIR: I actually have a couple of questions, Mr Jackson. During our defence estimates, we explored the possibilities of new bases and infrastructure. For example, were the government to make a decision in relation to the location of a new east coast base, would Defence Housing have a role as well? Would you provide input in relation to potential sites and availability of housing and those sorts of things?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Certainly, we would have input into the second part, the availability of housing—and how that can be met. I'm not talking for Defence, but obviously the operational requirements of the base would probably take first priority. But, equally, you need to be able to provide accommodation on bases. There is also the living-in accommodation on bases, which a lot of the non-married officers or members will go into. So we are looking primarily at accommodation for the married with dependants. So on a ratio basis it could vary, but it's only a proportion of the number of people that would need to shift to that location or be recruited to that location.</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: I wonder if you to take on notice the sort of input that you would give, in very general terms, rather than specifics.</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Yes, we can certainly do that.</p>	Hansard	92
Defence Housing Australia	2	Kimberley Kitching	Supply and quality of Defence housing	How does DHA assess the current supply and quality of defence housing around the country?	Written	
Defence Housing Australia	3	Kimberley Kitching	Member satisfaction survey results	At the Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit (JCPAA) inquiry hearing on 14 April 2021 that dealt with the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) performance audit of DHA management completed in April 2020, DHA explained that it has a KPI with Defence on member satisfaction with accommodation quality, cleanliness, readiness and general service, and that this is measured through quarterly surveys that are consolidated into an annual KPI. Can DHA advise of its most recent survey results and KPIs?	Written	
Defence Housing Australia	4	Kimberley Kitching	Board review recommendations	On some of the governance issues discussed in the JCPAA hearing, we understand DHA recently undertook a biannual review of its board with Directors Australia, which included an updated skills matrix or assessment of skills that the board should have. This found that the DHA Board is “performing well, underpinned by a sound governance framework and supported by a high performing secretariat.” We note Directors Australia made a number of recommendations. Has the Board considered those in the interests of continuous improvement?	Written	
Defence Housing Australia	5	Kimberley Kitching	Draft 2021 DHA Board Plan	<p>In line with the requirements of the Government Business Enterprise Guidelines, the draft 2021 DHA Board Plan contained information on Board composition, a forecast of likely vacancies and an assessment of skill and diversity requirements. It also included how the Board is addressing the findings of the Board performance review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the draft plan presented to the Board and endorsed at their September 2021 meeting? • Was it provided to DHA’s Shareholder Ministers for their consideration and has it been approved by Shareholder Ministers? 	Written	
Defence Housing Australia	6	Kimberley Kitching	DHA Board capability matrix	The DHA Board Assessment capability matrix appears to show some gaps in the Board’s capability, including in critical areas like risk management. How is DHA addressing these capability gaps?	Written	
Defence Housing Australia	7	Kimberley Kitching	New business model implementation	<p>We understand DHA’s new business model was agreed in December 2019 and was expected to take 18 months to implement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the business model been implemented? • Is it proving to be efficient and effective? 	Written	

Supplementary Budget Estimates 2021-22 - Australian War Memorial QON index

Agency	Q No.	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Hansard Page
Australian War Memorial	1	Jordon STEELE-JOHN	Australian War Memorial Heritage Management Plan	<p>[Context] The 2011 Heritage Management Plan and the draft Heritage Management Plan dated 2019 both assume that Anzac Hall will be retained as a key part of the Memorial's heritage value. The Heritage Management Plan is well overdue and needs to be hurried along. Apparently, the Australian Heritage Council recommended they complete it before the development progressed, but that was ignored.</p> <p>[Sources]</p> <p>-Estimates Hansard: 2 June 2021, p. 134</p> <p>Mr Anderson: I was asked out of session for an update on the heritage management plan, so I just want to update the committee to advise that we're continuing to work in consultation with the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment on the memorial heritage's management plan. It has been updated to address the changes that we hope will be brought in with the memorial's development project and how these new facilities are going to be managed from a heritage perspective. That will be submitted to the Australian Heritage Council for their consideration and approval in the coming months.</p> <p>- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</p> <p>341X Review of plans at least every 5 years</p> <p>(1) At least once in every 5 year period after a plan for managing a Commonwealth Heritage place is made under section 341S, the Commonwealth agency concerned must cause a review of the plan to be carried out.</p> <p>(2) The review must:</p> <p>(a) assess whether the plan is consistent with the Commonwealth Heritage management principles in force at the time; and</p> <p>(b) assess whether the plan is effective in protecting and conserving the Commonwealth Heritage values of the place; and</p> <p>(c) make recommendations for the improved protection of the Commonwealth Heritage values of the place.</p> <p>(3) [procedure for public comment]</p> <p>(4) [requirement to consider public comments].</p> <p>[Questions]</p> <p>- What is the current status of the War Memorial's Heritage Management Plan?</p> <p>- Has the Memorial received the Australian Heritage Council's approval of the Plan?</p> <p>- When will the Plan be made publicly available?</p> <p>- What will the Plan say about Anzac Hall?</p> <p>= Why has it taken the Memorial ten years to update the Plan when the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act requires five-yearly updates?</p>	Written	
Australian War Memorial	2	Jordon STEELE-JOHN	Australian War Memorial Re-development	<p>[Context] Quote from AusTender page</p> <p>On 13 January 2021 the Memorial issued a Request for Expressions of Interest (REOI) for Construction Contractor(s) for Main Works Packages ('MWP') through AusTender. The REOI closed on 3 March 2021.</p> <p>Since the conclusion of the REOI process, a number of successful Respondents have withdrawn from their nominated Works Package due to other work priorities, resulting in a reduced number of Respondents remaining to be invited to participate in the Request for Tender (RFT) phase for Main Works Packages 1 and 3.</p> <p>The Memorial is exercising its rights under paragraph 18.1.1(a) of the REOI to vary the REOI process to reopen the REOI and increase the number of shortlisted Respondents to be invited to participate in the Request for Tender (RFT) for MWP1 and 3.</p> <p>[Sources]</p> <p>- https://www.tenders.gov.au/Atm/ShowClosed/34cc24e3-2b78-4be2-a3f5-98f37e069d31?PreviewMode=False</p> <p>- https://www.canberratimes.com.au/story/7362250/war-memorial-expansion-hits-roadblock/</p> <p>[Questions]</p> <p>- Is it the case that the Memorial had to start again with the tender process for two elements of the redevelopment process: building the New Southern Entrance and Parade Ground (Main Works Package 1) and building the New Anzac Hall and Glazed Link (Main Works Package 3)?</p> <p>- Did the new tender process close on 1 September?</p> <p>- Has the Memorial awarded contracts for this work yet and are you able to disclose the names of the successful bidders?</p>	Written	

Australian War Memorial	3	Jordon STEELE- JOHN	Chair of the Australian War Memorial Council	<p>[Context] 'Boral Australia is the country's largest construction materials and building products supplier with operations in all states and territories. In Australia, Boral supplies concrete, quarry products, asphalt, cement, roof tiles, timber and masonry to build infrastructure, residential construction and commercial buildings.' https://www.boral.com/</p> <p>[Sources]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - https://www.awm.gov.au/about/our-people/council - https://www.boral.com.au/ - https://www.boral.com/sites/corporate/files/media/field_document/20210730-ASX-Release-Boral-Board-Changes-and-Corporate-Governance-Structure.pdf - https://cement.org.au/australias-cement-industry/ - https://www.ibisworld.com/au/company/boral-limited/8008/ - https://www.sevengroup.com.au/ - https://www.smh.com.au/business/companies/ryan-stokes-named-boral-chair-seven-ups-board-presence-20210730-p58ebf.htm <p>[Questions]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the Chairman of the Council of the Australian War Memorial, Mr Kerry Stokes AC, also the Executive Chairman of Seven Group Holdings (SGH)? - Does SGH hold a 69.6 per cent stake in Boral, Australia's largest supplier of construction materials and building products (asphalt, cement, concrete, quarrying, roofing, timber). - Is it likely that Boral will be a supplier of goods and services to contractors on the \$498m War Memorial redevelopment project? - Does that create a conflict of interest for Mr Stokes? - Will Mr Stokes absent himself from War Memorial discussions (in Council and at a management level) of the redevelopment project? 	Written	
Australian War Memorial	4	Jordon STEELE- JOHN	Australian War Memorial Re-development	<p>[Context]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have been informed that the AWM still haven't settled on builders (they went back out to tender because some pulled out as they received other jobs and couldn't wait). We have been told they still had a single tenderer (from an experienced, large and respected company, not Lend Lease) but decided to go out again anyway - which is their right but an embarrassing hiccup all the same. Could be worth a question for the embarrassment value. - Related to this, there is the concern that multiple builders will also be engaged (for the different portions of the development) instead of the sensible solution of one coordinated builder to do all portions of the development. The AWM already have multiple architects for the different portions - all adding up to a bit of a nightmare for coordinated, smooth, and efficient delivery- let alone site wide consistency in design. <p>[Questions]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which contractors are being used for the redevelopment project? - Are you using multiple contractors for different parts of the project? If so, why? 	Written	
Australian War Memorial	5	Jordon STEELE- JOHN	Sponsorships	<p>Can you please provide a list of the corporations who sponsor or donate to the Australian War Memorial whose primary business is the manufacturing, distribution, and sale of weapons, weapons systems, and related technologies and services?</p> <p>What are the starting and finishing dates for those contracts, and the dollar value of the donations or sponsorships?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If this information cannot be provided because the arrangements are "commercial-in-confidence", please provide detailed explanation for how these disclosures of financial support to such an institution Can be commercially sensitive and not appropriate for public transparency? 	Written	

Supplementary Budget Estimates 2021-22 – Department of Veterans' Affairs QON Index

Department	Q No.	Senator	BroadTopic	QuestionText	Written Hansard	Page
Department of Veterans' Affairs	1	Timothy AYRES	TTTP	<p>Senator AYRES: Perhaps you could take it on notice, but I want to check whether we agree on the categories. For each of these claim types I'm interested in seeing, as at 30 June 2021 and 30 September 2021, the number of claims on hand, the number of unallocated claims on hand, the average time for a claim to be allocated, the median time taken for a claim to be allocated, average processing time for claims, median processing time for claims and the number of claims on hand not processed within 100 days. There's quite some detail in there. Would you be able to provide that sort of detail on notice? I wanted to run through it and give you an opportunity to tell me whether that is the kind of data that you're collecting.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: It is. Indeed, I think we've provided most of that to you before. The only one that Ms Cole might also comment on is the time taken to allocate, which is slightly different to the time taken to process.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: How would you prefer that to be described, Ms Cole?</p> <p>Ms Cole: We may be able to work out average time to allocate or median time to allocate, but it's not something we ordinarily calculate. I'll have to check with my data people before confirming that we can provide that for you.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: With that qualification, I think that information would be useful.</p> <p>p. 110</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Ms Cherne, thank you for your time. I now want to follow up on the claims process, which Senator Ayres has covered a lot. The Canberra Times reported today that the average wait times for compensation claims is 235 days, and thousands of applications for assistance have been unallocated for more than a year. Is that correct?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I think we agreed to take that on notice; we were going to give you a breakdown of Senator Ayres's request against all the claim types. It might be easier if we did that, and we can give you a breakdown of what the wait times are.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: That'll be fine, thank you, Chair. How long is it taking for a claim to be allocated to a delegate across the different claim types?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Once again, we will bring that back on notice so we can give you the full breakdown of the different claim types and also the wait times in responding to Senator Ayres. If that's okay, we'll take that on notice</p>	Hansard	99, 110
Department of Veterans' Affairs	2	Timothy AYRES	Contracts	<p>Senator AYRES: This McKinsey contract costs \$1.32 million. Since the start of the financial year, the department's entered into \$5 million worth of contracts. Are they all similar consulting arrangements?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I can have a look for you. We did have other consultants that have been helping us with our Veteran Centric Reform. Bupa was a significant contract that we entered into. You may be aware that Defence has an agreement with Bupa, and there was a head of agreement that we were signatory to, where we engage Bupa now to assist with our workforce management and our workforce flow for our medical advisers. That was a big contract. They were probably—</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Would you, on notice, be able to provide what each of those contracts is?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Absolutely.</p>	Hansard	102
Department of Veterans' Affairs	3	Timothy AYRES	Services Australia - Secondments	<p>Senator AYRES: How did the department engage with the COVID response? I know that some staff were seconded to agencies like Services Australia to do important work there. Were DVA staff seconded to Services Australia?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Our graduates were. Our graduates were really keen to go over and experience that at Services Australia.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: How many people are in the graduate program.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I don't know the numbers, sorry. There will be somebody who will be able to—</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Is it ten or 100 or—</p> <p>Ms Cosson: No. It's about—</p> <p>Ms Rundle: It's about 10 or 12.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: So they went over. Were any other staff deployed?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: A few others did, but not from the claims area. They were some executive level staff who wanted to go over with the graduates. That was in the last year. We may have a couple over there at the moment who have expressed an interest in working in Services Australia, but not a lot of staff.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: The department is already stretched. That period, particularly August-September—withdrawal from Afghanistan and the fall of Kabul—provided an additional amount of pressure on the department. The COVID response and Services Australia are critical issues for government, but was it really sensible for staff to be reallocated from DVA to do that work?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: That was last year that we allocated the staff, not this year.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I see.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: We might have one or two—I'd need to follow that up with Mr Harrigan—but there are not many this year at all, and certainly not during that period.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Okay, thank you.</p>	Hansard	103
Department of Veterans' Affairs	4	Timothy AYRES	MyService rejection rates	<p>Senator AYRES: Back on claims, how many rejections from claims on MyService answer?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: How many rejections? I'll have to take that one on notice.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Can you take that on notice for all the categories that are relevant?</p>	Hansard	103-104

				<p>Ms Cosson: Yes, absolutely.</p> <p>Ms Cole: Just to clarify, you were asking how many claims which were lodged on MyService subsequently got rejected?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: As in a technical rejection or as in a decision?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Both categories, if you can.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Okay. We'll have a look at that.</p> <p>...</p> <p>senator LAMBIE: On the last question that Senator Ayres asked, can I have the rejections from the claims on the MRCA and the VEA that have been rejected on MyService?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Yes. We'll have to take that one on notice—that's rejected through MyService. But if you're after the overall acceptance rates of claims that are lodged, regardless of whether it's MyService or otherwise, it's a 74 per cent acceptance rate, and 84 per cent of MRCA initial liability claims are accepted.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Is that the [inaudible] MyService?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'll have to have a look at the MyService data. I don't have the MyService data. I'll take that on notice. They are just the overall claims, those percentages I gave you</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	5	Jacqui LAMBIE	McKinsey Contract	<p>Ms Cosson: As I mentioned, we kicked this off before we knew that we were getting the budget for the staffing. We kicked this off in April. It was intended to say, 'Well, are there some fresh ideas out there?' I believe other agencies had used a similar claims diagnostic where they were looking at their backlog. It was really important that we be able to explore what could be done, and McKinsey were the successful tenderer in this process.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Would you be able to show the terms of reference of that tender to the committee?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Do you go to a competitive tender?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Yes, we did. We can certainly show you the request for quote and the work statement.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: If you don't mind me adding, Secretary, there were three quotes sought off the Department of Finance panel, which was an open tender. So it was an open tender.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay. You've issued them with the terms of reference on what they have to work on—the complete terms of reference?</p> <p>Ms Rundle: Do you mean the request for quote that we sent out, or the current work—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: The written framework that they were given to work within. That's what I'm looking for.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: The work order.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: If it might help, normally government contracts will have a scope of work, and that part is not normally confidential.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: We'll certainly share that. We'll share the work order, which outlines exactly the body of work that McKinsey are doing for us.</p>	Hansard	105-106
Department of Veterans' Affairs	6	Jacqui LAMBIE	McKinsey Contract	<p>Senator LAMBIE: You'll be passing that information straight over to the royal commissioner, whatever comes out of that?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Yes. The royal commission has asked to have visibility of any of the recommendations as a result of the work McKinsey will be doing with us, so certainly we will provide that to the royal commission as requested.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Will that report be made public?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: That will really be a matter for the royal commission. Anything we provide to the royal commission, they then consider—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Hang on. The royal commission didn't ask for this, you did. Is the department going to release this for public consumption?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I would need to take advice on that one.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: You do that. What I've asked for from the royal commission you've asked for, the department did, apparently. That's what you told me. I just want to know whether you're going to put that out to the public.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'll take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	106
Department of Veterans' Affairs	7	Jacqui LAMBIE	Veteran Wellbeing Centres	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay. While we're talking about public documents, the Tasmanian university did a report. Do you know where that document is? They were supposed to be finished by late February. They got a slight extension on the thing until April. Could you please tell me where that report now is and why that has not been released to us so we can look at that?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Can I ask what the name of the report was? Was that around—I'm not too sure which report that one was.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: I'll get back to you on that.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: It could be the wellbeing centre, I'm not too sure, but if you could let me know—</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Yes, that would be it. There was a lot of work done. As a matter of fact, she was pulling her hair out. Do you know where that report is?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: That is currently being considered. It shouldn't be too far away, but we'll take that on notice as well and give you advice on that.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Didn't you get that in April—and they're still considering it? We've got veterans taking their lives and you're still considering a wellbeing report. Are you kidding me? Please tell me you're kidding me.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'll have to come back to you, on notice, on that one.</p>	Hansard	106
Department of Veterans' Affairs	8	Jacqui LAMBIE	Veteran Family Advocate	<p>Senator LAMBIE: Aren't you giving them advice on the claims process? I thought you said that you give them advice. Who is giving them advice on claims processing and where to go?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Ms Cherne doesn't help with the actual claims process. But, sitting on the two commissions, she and the other commissioners seek from the</p>	Hansard	109

				<p>department that monthly report on how we are tracking with claims. Ms Cherne doesn't have the role of being a direct advocate in the sense you might be thinking of with a lot of our advocates. Her role is to advocate on behalf of families, in the true sense of the definition of an advocate. If somebody comes to Ms Cherne who is experiencing delays in their claim—she has raised them with me on a few occasions and I've been able to make sure that a widow or a family member is able to be connected. And Ms Cherne has often contacted me in relation to others who are wondering how they can get into the system, and we connect them with a case manager. So that is the role that Ms Cherne has been playing in supporting those who are waiting for their claims.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: So she's not doing what my office is doing—triage. Has she got a list of all the service organisations out there—all the level 4, 3, 2 and 1 advocates? They're the people that actually need to help them—unless they're on their last legs. How many of these people going through claims that you need to fix up are going through Ms Cherne? Or are we not keeping numbers?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'm certainly not keeping numbers, but Ms Cherne and I can take that on notice to see if we have any statistics around that for you.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: That'd be fabulous. Thank you</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	9	Jacqui LAMBIE	Vaccination register	<p>Senator LAMBIE: So you don't have a vaccine register?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: No, we don't.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: You've got this problem going on, and we've got no idea how many have been vaccinated, then?</p> <p>They don't have a place in the Medicare system and you've got no vaccine register for card holders under the DVA. Is that going to be an issue for you?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Ms Rundle just reminded me that there is the Australian vaccination register, but we don't run that vaccination register. I assume the Department of Health would run that register. We've certainly got a register of all our card holders, and, as I mentioned, we can help them link in with the register so they've got their certificate loaded. I can take it on notice to see if we think there's something we can do with matching, but I'd need to take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	111
Department of Veterans' Affairs	10	Rex PATRICK	FOI statistics	<p>Senator PATRICK: I want to ask a couple of questions about FOI processing, and I'd also like to ask some questions about DVA assistance dogs. I might start off with FOI. Do you have a measure of the average processing time of FOI requests? I presume that you might come back with the 30 days. But I'm just wondering, in terms of statistics, how many FOI requests come within the initial 30 days, how many times you ask for extensions and so forth.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Could I take that on notice? Or I'll see whether someone's got the answer here—</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Actually, I'm happy for you to take that on notice—the average time.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Okay. Thank you.</p>	Hansard	112
Department of Veterans' Affairs	11	Rex PATRICK	FOI statistics	<p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. So, can you give me an idea of the magnitude of the change? I note that in the information commissioner's annual report the number of FOIs last year came down substantially. You had a total number of 1,927; the previous year you had 2,400. Where are you projecting that it will end up? And what's your feel about FOIs in relation to the royal commission?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I'll try to get you all the stats. I just don't have it all in front of me. But certainly we have seen an increase in the number of requests for personal records for veterans wanting to put forward a submission to the royal commission. I did try to find the number before I came here tonight, and unfortunately I couldn't get that one. The veterans who are seeking to put a submission forward—putting them to us, they would like to think that we can give them their records unredacted, but unfortunately we do have to follow the FOI Act, and that is taking a little bit of time, and we have seen additional requests for that. So, what we're doing across the different business areas now is having a look at how we can bring the FOI team together with the information law team and also the records team, the administrative information team, to see whether we can streamline some of this. But we still have to comply with the FOI Act for those records.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sure. What's the magnitude of the change? You'd have this monthly number that comes in. Since the royal commission, how has that monthly number changed?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Perhaps I could take that one on notice. I couldn't get that before tonight.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Do you have a feel for it? Obviously you're aware of the problem.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I don't, sorry.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Anyone else?</p> <p>Ms Rundle: I don't have a feel for that, no.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: What flows from that—I mean, you've said you're trying to streamline some of these processes; I just wonder how you might be reacting in terms of perhaps additional personnel. I don't know the seriousness of the issue, so in some sense I don't know what questions to ask you. Can you provide me, perhaps, with statistics for the six months prior to the royal commission and since then, and any details about what it is that you are doing to address any concerns? I'm interested in those delays that are occurring.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you.</p>	Hansard	112
Department of Veterans' Affairs	12	Rex Patrick	Assistance dogs contracts	<p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you. I want to go to assistance dogs. I'll take you to question on notice No. 3958—from the Senate, not from estimates. I asked some questions about assistance dogs, and I'm just going to go to a couple of matters first. One of my questions was, 'Please provide a breakdown of expenditure'—which you did—'including contracts awarded to external entities to government.' And you've written: 'Funding for each of DVA's four contracted providers are commercial in confidence.' That is an absolutely extraordinary answer, because I would have thought that you would have to put that on AusTender as a mandatory requirement for a total value of a contract.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: It's a good question. There were a couple of things. One was that the program was sourced in two parts. We had two providers in the beginning and then we had two more. They each train their dogs differently. Some of them acquire pups and some acquire more mature dogs. So it can take on average about 18 months, but some are quicker.</p>	Hansard	112-113

				<p>Senator PATRICK: To be clear: I'm not after the scope of the contract or the manner in which it's executed. It is absolutely a normal and essential thing for departments to publish total contract values for any entity with which it enters into a contract. There are some exceptions in our security services, for example, but I don't think you qualify.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: I'd like to take this on notice and come back with some better advice, but the one thing I will say is that there are a number of components to the program. Some are fixed costs—that is, for the acquisition of the dog, the training of the dog, feeding and looking after the dog et cetera while that is happening—then, once the dog has been handed over, there are some ongoing costs which are variable, depending on each of the different veterans. As I understand it, they are paid from two different programs. I have a feeling one is administered and one is departmental. But we will need to check and come back to you.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: If you are not in a position to be able to provide that to the Senate, I would seek a very comprehensive answer. You could have even said, 'These are the contracts on AusTender.' It's a transparency failure if DVA is not putting contracts on AusTender.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: We'll try to answer it as best we can for you.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you.</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	13	Rex PATRICK	Assistance dogs statistics	<p>Senator PATRICK: In the answers you provided me you talked about the number of veterans who have been approved for the provision of a DVA assistance dog. In 2019-20 it was 74 and then in 2020-21 it was 132. So there was an increase, but that's not surprising because the program had just started. Then the question was: how many have actually got a dog? The answer for the previous year was five and last year was 29. They were helpful numbers. Then I asked you: what's the waiting list? And you said, 'There is no waiting list.' I might put it to you that, if I stuck up my hand and said, 'I'd like to have a dog, to assist,' and you process me and I don't have a dog yet, I'm on a waiting list. I just found that answer extraordinary, noting you provided me with the data that suggested otherwise.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: Do you mind if I make a comment on that?</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Absolutely; that's the point. We're having a conversation.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: Perhaps we could have answered that better. You've seen the data, and those numbers have increased again. We have total veterans accepted into the program, because we find that they're eligible. Then there are some who are declined at that time, at least. Once the four providers have the ability to take more—so as they finish one they might let us know that they can take another or, if they are expanding, they can take a few more—the people on the waiting list get allocated to that number. We have that number. As at 26 October, we have 307 who have been accepted into the program. We've got 144 of those who are currently in the program, and we've so far completed 47, who have finally passed their second test and are placed with a veteran. Probably, if we were to take a proxy, we're talking about the balance of those who aren't in training and those who are still on the list awaiting allocation.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: You can see why I was concerned with that answer—it didn't seem to make a lot of sense to me.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: Yes.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: How many veterans have we had since Afghanistan? What are the numbers? This seems like a really low number. I'll state up-front that I'm a big fan of the program. I'm just trying to understand the demand versus the response. How many veterans do you have on your books?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: We've got 240,231 veterans on our books.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I just don't believe the numbers there, knowing the success of the program.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: There are a couple of things. Probably, it's the criteria for being allocated a dog when you apply saying you have a clinical diagnosis for PTSD and that your clinician recommends that you will get a benefit from a dog. That's one category. Some veterans have already got a dog, so they're not actually in this program. But yes, it is a fairly low number, when you think that 39,000 veterans served in Afghanistan.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I want to get the full picture. Could you lay out the full number of veterans, then the ones who come to you—and even if they're not eligible, I'd like to get an understanding of that—then those who are eligible? Perhaps you can update this list so we can see what's happening down the chain.</p>	Hansard	113
Department of Veterans' Affairs	14	Eric ABETZ	Assistance dogs - US Study	<p>Senator PATRICK: Those sorts of things. Do you have data on that? Have you commissioned any studies?</p> <p>Ms Rundle: We don't yet. We have two programs that we're running. We've got the La Trobe research trial, which is expected to run until June next year—and we've had some interim reports but there will be a final report of that. That's a very small number, though. There are 20 in that trial and about 17 that are active. We are looking at this to see what else we can marry up, and we know that Royal Society for the Blind, for example, have done some of their own research along with Adelaide uni—</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: That's Dr Van Hooff, I think.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: I think so. We are looking to see what we can leverage off and work with those—</p> <p>CHAIR: Is there anything from overseas? Are there any similar programs and studies that we could possibly—</p> <p>Ms Cosson: The US were conducting a study a couple of years ago. I haven't seen the report for that, but we can track that down.</p>	Hansard	114
Department of Veterans' Affairs	15	Rex PATRICK	La Trobe University study	<p>CHAIR: If you could, it'd be interesting to see what they've learned.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: The other thing we have done is start to do some further surveying of people in the bigger program. We phoned those veterans and asked if they wanted to participate in the survey that we're running, and quite a lot of interesting things have come out of that. They have said there is reduced PTSD symptom severity, improved sleep quality, and decreased levels of social isolation, anger, depression, sadness, anxiety and fatigue. The data also indicated that in some instances there were improvements in veteran interactions with other family members. Some family members have said in the stories they've told us—because we get a lot of emails from them—that they never thought that their partner would be able to step outside the house again, or even go to something and participate socially, but they are. They're doing quite amazing things, which is not surprising of course. The other thing—and some of this is from the other trial—is that treating clinicians report significant benefits to the majority of veteran participants in relation to PTSD, overall mental health and social interactions. That's the interim report from La Trobe University.</p>	Hansard	114

				<p>Senator PATRICK: Can you provide that report to the committee please?</p> <p>Ms Rundle: Can we please take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sure.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: We'd need to talk to the university, but we can take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sure,</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	16	Rex PATRICK	Assistance dogs	<p>Senator PATRICK: I'd be grateful if you could just provide it to the committee. If there are some sensitive numbers in there, redact them. 'Openness' and 'transparency' are my two favourite words. I want to wrap up this. It sounds to me that you at least experienced some really good results from this that I think benefit the veterans and likely benefit DVA from a cost perspective—you might have had to provide other services were it not for the provision of these dogs. If you could come back on notice with any analysis you've got of not just the effect on the participants of the program but how that has translated through to, hopefully, a reduction in cost for DVA, because then I'm going to be thinking about the big numbers you have given me in terms of veterans and how much money we can save along with helping them in a fantastic way. That's where I would like to get to.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: I understand</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I would be most grateful for anything you can provide to me on that.</p>	Hansard	114
Department of Veterans' Affairs	17	Timothy AYRES	Contracts	<p>Senator AYRES: Ms Cosson, I went back to my office to have a cup of tea and made the mistake of getting one of my staff to print off for me the AusTender details of all of the contracts for the Department of Veterans' Affairs that are listed as management advisory services or strategic planning consultants. We had a bit of a discussion earlier about McKinsey's role with the organisation. There are 46 contracts over the course of the year, basically. I haven't got them here in order. Does that sound like a very big number to you—46 consultancies? Some of them, when you look at them, are small and credible, but there are many of them that are just strategic planning consultancies.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: I haven't got the list in front of me.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: I've got it.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Does 46 sound about right to you?</p> <p>Ms Cosson: It does.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: This list is of those over a million, so it won't be everything. AusTender is everything over 100,000, isn't it?</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: The list I've got is everything over a million.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: So it will be longer than that because it will have others.</p> <p>Ms Rundle: That's right.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: Your list is over a million, is it?</p> <p>Ms Rundle: The list I've got is over a million, but I haven't got the under-a-million list here.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Certainly, we do use consultancies, where we don't have the expertise or the capability in our own workforce, so I'm not surprised. I am conscious that the figure that we've spent on consultancies has reduced over the last couple of years, but we certainly do use consultancies.</p> <p>Senator AYRES: I'll arrange for my office to send the AusTender list over tomorrow, but I assume it's the same list that you can produce. I'd like to get an understanding of what the amounts are for each of those contracts. And then, for the ones that you've got on your list of contracts over a million, I'd be interested in seeing what the purpose of those contracts is as well.</p> <p>Ms Cosson: Absolutely. I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>	Hansard	115
Department of Veterans' Affairs	18	Kimberley KITCHING	Staffing	<p>In the Senate Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee inquiry into Australian Public Service (APS) capability hearing on 20 July 2021, DVA advised that the 400 additional staff allocated in the Budget would be temporary positions. Can DVA advise how many of these extra positions have been filled to date and how they are being distributed across DVA?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	19	Kimberley KITCHING	Staffing	<p>In an answer to a Question on Notice (QoN) for the APS capability inquiry, DVA said it forecast the labour hire component of the workforce will reduce to between 950 to 1,000 staff over the course of the 2021-22 financial year. A table included in the response indicated actual labour hire headcount was 1,038 as at 21 July. Can DVA advise what the number is now?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	20	Kimberley KITCHING	Labour Hire	<p>The responses to the last round of Estimates QoNs indicated that DVA had spent \$59,929,000 on labour hire contracts for the period 1 July 2020 to 31 May 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can DVA provide an update on this figure? • Is this expected to increase further? • Has DVA estimated how many permanent staff it could employ using this funding? 	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	21	Kimberley KITCHING	ASL	<p>In the hearing and in an answer to a QoN for the APS capability inquiry, DVA advised it has the option of returning to government to seek further funding dependent on the ongoing claims intake over the next two years. Can DVA estimate how many additional ASL it may request at this stage?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	22	Kimberley KITCHING	Time Taken to Process Claims	<p>Can DVA please advise on claims processing times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the average waiting time for MRCA Initial Liability claims and Permanent Impairment claims? • Responses to the last round of Estimates QoNs showed around 36 per cent of on hand MRCA Initial Liability and 24 per cent of DRCA Initial Liability claims were over 300 days old. Can DVA provide an update on these figures? What measures is DVA taking to address this? 	Written	

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the average time to allocate a file to a delegate? • Can DVA advise the current backlog of unprocessed Initial Liability claims and Permanent Impairment assessments as of 30 September 2021? 		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	23	Kimberley KITCHING	Time Taken to Process Claims	<p>Specifically, in relation to claims processing performance data, as at 30 June 2021 and 30 September 2021, can DVA please provide the following information by claim type:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of claims on hand • Number of unallocated claims on hand • Average time taken for a claim to be allocated • Median time take for a claim to be allocated • Average processing time for claims • Median processing time for claims • Number of claims on hand not processed within 100 days 	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	24	Kimberley KITCHING	Time Taken to Process Claims	<p>Can DVA please provide the latest available information, where possible, on compensation claims as per the following tables?</p> <p>As at 1 Sep 2020 Number of Claims on hand that are currently being considered (and allocated to a delegate for processing) Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment <28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Sep 2021 Number of Claims on hand that are currently being considered (and allocated to a delegate for processing) Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment <28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Sep 2020 Number of Claims on hand that have not yet been considered (and have not yet been allocated to a delegate) Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment <28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Sep 2021 Number of Claims on hand that have not yet been considered (and have not yet been allocated to a delegate) Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment <28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Sep 2020 Number of Claims on hand that are currently being considered (and allocated to a delegate for processing) Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment <28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Sep 2021 Number of Claims on hand that are currently being considered (and allocated to a delegate for processing)</p>	Written	

				<p>Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment</p> <p><28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Sep 2020 Number of Claims on hand that have not yet been considered (and have not yet been allocated to a delegate)</p> <p>Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment</p> <p><28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p> <p>As at 1 Sep 2021 Number of Claims on hand that have not yet been considered (and have not yet been allocated to a delegate)</p> <p>Case Age VEA MRCA Initial Liability MRCA Permanent Impairment DRCA Initial Liability DRCA Permanent Impairment</p> <p><28 days 1-3 months 3-6 months 6-12 months >12 months</p>		
Department of Veterans' Affairs	25	Kimberley KITCHING	McKinsey review	<p>Can DVA provide advice on the McKinsey review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the review Terms of Reference? • How many McKinsey consultants are working on the review? • Will departmental officials be working closely with McKinsey as part of this process? 	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	26	Kimberley KITCHING	Contracts	<p>According to information from AusTender, since the start of the financial year on 1 July until 15 October, DVA entered into \$5,001,682.86 worth of contracts – the sixth highest among APS agencies. Can DVA confirm this or provide an update including the cost of the McKinsey contract?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	27	Kimberley KITCHING	Consultants	<p>Including McKinsey, can DVA advise how many consultants are engaged by DVA and what tasks or functions they are involved in?</p>	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	28	Kimberley KITCHING	TPI Inquiry	<p>Can DVA provide advice on the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee inquiry into the TPI payment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did DVA provide advice to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs for the Government response to the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee inquiry into the TPI payment? • If so, what was DVA's advice? • In its response to the inquiry, the Government said it noted the recommendation and will take it into account when considering future policy options for support to TPI veterans. Can DVA advise if the Government has any future plans to revisit this issue and potentially raise the payment at a later date? Does the Government have any plans for further support for TPI veterans? • Has the Government or DVA considered the TPI Federation's request to extend entitlements to cover a wider range of hearing conditions like tinnitus and a wider range of hearing aids? • Does DVA have any views on other proposals that came out of the inquiry, such as the Disabled Veterans of Australia Network and TPI Victoria proposal to remove means testing from the Service Pension? Has DVA considered the proposal from Mr Rick Ryan to extend the Gold Card to partners of TPI veterans when the partner has reached the age of 65? • The central recommendation of the Tune review was that TPI veterans who pay private rent should have access to rent assistance. Can DVA advise how many TPI and other veterans this will assist? Will it benefit any other cohorts of disabled or other veterans? If so, which ones and how many? • A response to a Questions on Notice from the last Estimates round shows that 68 per cent of disability pension claims were yet to be finalised as of April this year. Does this relate to TPI payment claims? What is DVA doing to improve processing of these claims? 	Written	
Department of Veterans' Affairs	29	Kimberley KITCHING	Alternative Therapies	<p>Can DVA provide advice on alternative therapies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DVA has said there is little evidence that medicinal cannabis is an effective treatment for mental health conditions, including PTSD. However, there appears to be growing scientific and anecdotal evidence it is effective. If it works for some veterans with PTSD, would DVA consider subsidising medicinal cannabis for those individuals on a case-by-case basis? • There has been strong support from mental health experts, doctors and other interested groups, and even former Chief of the Defence Force Retired Admiral 	Written	

			<p>Chris Barrie, who say medically prescribed psychedelic drugs, including Psilocybin, MDMA and ecstasy, have been shown to successfully treat PTSD in veterans. Would Defence and DVA be open to adopting these into clinical practice in future?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Feedback from veterans on the Government’s Psychiatric Assistance Dog Program is that the eligibility criteria are too narrow – for example, if a veteran has other conditions or comorbidities along with PTSD, like anxiety and depression, they are not eligible to get a dog under the program. Also, despite there being many reputable training providers across the country, only four providers have been selected under the program and so demand for dogs far exceeds supply. Will the Government and DVA consider expanding the number of providers and/or the eligibility criteria so more veterans can benefit from the program?• Despite broad acceptance of the benefits of art therapy, the Government and DVA do not provide any dedicated or targeted support for this or veteran art programs. Is this something DVA would consider providing more support for in the future?		
--	--	--	--	--	--