

**PARLIAMENTARY JOINT COMMITTEE FOR AUSTRALIAN
COMMISSION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT INTEGRITY
QUESTION ON NOTICE**

DATE ASKED: 1 August 2017

Question

Senator McKenzie asked the Australian Federal Police:

Noting that the AFP supports ACLEI

The AFP states (see *Submission 5*, pp 8–9) that a joint taskforce was established with ACLEI in 2014, which focuses exclusively on corruption enabled border crime. The submission notes that ACLEI provides some financial assistance to the AFP, but that this does not cover the costs of the AFP's investigative capability dedicated to the taskforce. The submission also notes that the expansion of ACLEI's remit will require redirection of further AFP resources.

1. Has the AFP received any increase in funding to cover the redirection of resources to support ACLEI since its initial submission was written in 2015?
2. If not, can the AFP continue to provide the current level of investigative support to ACLEI in the long term, or will resources have to be directed elsewhere?

Answer

The answers to the honourable senator's questions are as follows:

1. The AFP has not received any funding above the financial assistance provided by ACLEI as noted in the submission.
2. The AFP does not operate a standing reserve capacity and will continue to review referrals from ACLEI on a case-by-case basis. Each request is balanced against the AFP's responsibilities for national security, and organised crime investigations, and finite resources are directed according to the highest operational priorities. The continual assessment and redirection of resources ensures the AFP is best placed to protect Australians and Australia's interests.

**PARLIAMENTARY JOINT COMMITTEE FOR AUSTRALIAN
COMMISSION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT INTEGRITY
QUESTION ON NOTICE**

DATE ASKED: 1 August 2017

Question

Senator Bilyk asked the Australian Federal Police:

1. Can the AFP confirm OTS's advice that personnel levels at airports are a matter for the AFP?
2. Was the decision to withdraw AFP personnel from Hobart Airport made on the basis of the OTS's decision to remove Hobart Airport's designation?
3. If yes, why were AFP personnel withdrawn in 2014 when Hobart Airport's designation was removed on 29 July 2015?
4. If no (in answer to question 2) on what advice was it based?
5. Prior to the withdrawal of AFP personnel from Hobart Airport in 2014, was the only duty of those personnel to provide a counter-terrorism first response in accordance with Hobart Airport's designation?
6. If not, what other duties did AFP personnel at Hobart Airport have prior to their withdrawal?
7. If the AFP had duties at Hobart Airport other than providing a CTFR, what security advice, if any, was relied on for the withdrawal of AFP personnel from the performance of those duties?

Answer

The answers to the honourable senator's questions are as follows:

1. The AFP is responsible for the resourcing of their personnel at the nine designated airports.
2. No.
3. N/A
4. On 7 May 2014, a decision was announced as part of the 2014–15 Budget to withdraw AFP resources from Hobart Airport. This decision followed after careful consideration of the threat and risk environment at the airport. Prior to this decision being made, the AFP undertook a comprehensive internal review of all its operations across Australia, including Hobart Airport. The review included analysis of the AFP's data and intelligence holdings to examine the AFP's security footprint and targeted issues related to the effective and efficient deployment of AFP personnel in a tight fiscal environment.

During the course of the review, it was identified that the incidence and detection of Commonwealth offences at Hobart Airport since 2009 was of a substantially lower level than all of the other designated airports where AFP had a presence. The majority of offences detected by the AFP at Hobart Airport were state offences.

An AFP intelligence scan of the operating environment at Hobart Airport identified it at a very low risk from a terrorism perspective and statistical data showed there was a low level of criminal activity.

Subsequently a Steering Committee represented by Assistant Commissioners from AFP and TASPOL, Hobart Airport and OTS, was formed to overview and monitor a staged withdrawal

process between May and December 2014 as per the direction of Government. A Working Committee was established to plan and implement the withdrawal process at a local level represented by AFP, TasPol and Hobart International Airport Pty Ltd. This ensured all relevant TasPol Departments and Hobart Aviation industry participants developed sufficient capability to transition policing authority to TasPol. All representative agencies were comfortable with this process and handover occurred on 21 October 2014.

Regulation 1.03 of the *Aviation Transport Security Regulations 2005 (ATSR)* defines Australian designated airports. Regulations 3.29 and 3.30 of the ATSR stipulate each designated airport must have a CTFR capability. Either the AFP or State/Territory Police can provide CTFR capability to a designated airport.

In the second half of 2014, OTS undertook a comparative security risk analysis that considered aviation security risks at a number of airports, including all designated airports. This concluded that Hobart Airport's aviation security risk profile was more comparable to a larger regional airport (like Newcastle) than to Sydney or Melbourne.

Based on advice from OTS, in late 2014, the Hon Warren Truss MP (then Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development) agreed to progress regulatory changes to remove Hobart Airport from the list of designated airports. Regulatory changes came into force from 29 July 2015. This removed the requirement for Hobart Airport to have a CTFR agreement in place.

5. No.
6. The AFP also provided community policing capability at Hobart Airport.
7. As articulated above in Q4, the AFP reviewed all operations at Hobart airport including the community policing functions.