

Karen Creet Assistant Secretary Ministerial and Executive Support R1-5-A019 Department of Defence CANBERRA ACT 2600

Tel: 02 6265 4414 Fax: 02 6265 2923

ASMES/OUT/2011/74

Mr Robert Little Inquiry Secretary Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade Parliament House CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Mr Little

I write concerning corrections to the Hansard record for the Defence Annual Report 2009-10 hearing on 25 March 2011.

Please find enclosed five letters correcting or clarifying the factual evidence provided by individual officers as outlined below:

- Mr Mark Cunliffe, Head Defence Legal concerning military justice.
- Mr Harry Dunstall, General Manager Commercial, Defence Materiel Organisation concerning procurement and contracting.
- Major General Grant Cavenagh, Head Land Systems, Defence Materiel Organisation concerning the procurement of Australian Light Armoured Vehicles.
- Rear Admiral Peter Marshall, Head Maritime Systems, Defence Materiel Organisation concerning the date of the 2010 LPA Seaworthiness Board and
- Read Admiral M Campbell, Head Helicopter Systems, Defence Materiel Organisation concerning Army helicopter training.

If you would like to discuss this further, please do not hesitate to contact Ms Manda McFarlane, Acting Director. Ministerial and Parliamentary Reporting on 6265 6277.

Yours sincerely

Karen Creet Assistant Secretary Ministerial and Executive Support June 2011



Department of Defence Defence Support Group Head Defence Legal CP2-4-044 PO Box 7911 CANBERRA BC ACT 2610 Tel: (02) 6266 4143 Fax: (02) 6266 3093

HDL/OUT/2011/97446

29 April 2011

Mr Robert Little Inquiry Secretary Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Parliament House CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Mr Little

1 write to correct evidence that I gave at the Defence Annual Report 2009-10 hearing held on 25 March 2011 concerning military justice.

In answer to two questions from Mr Robert (page 41 of *Proof Committee Hansard* 25 March 2011), I wrongly referred to 'the joint standing committee' in relation to changes to the military justice system over recent years. The relevant committee was of course the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee, which reported in June 2005 concerning 'The effectiveness of Australia's military justice system'.

The following possible corrections would ensure the accuracy of the references:

Paragraph 5:

*If I can put it in these terms. I do not think it is a simple question of fact at that point, because it is an argument of a policy nature ultimately about the value of alternative systems. Progressively the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee of 2005 advocated a chapter 3 court. You will know that the course that was ultimately adopted at that point was not to move to a chapter 3 court but to move to a court outside chapter 3.'

Paragraph 7:

'I would not certainly suggest that for one moment. Indeed, notwithstanding the High Court in the Lane v. Morrison decision found the military court system to be constitutionally invalid, there was no criticism either of the quality of justice under that system. I suppose I could say whichever system we have had the indications are that the matters have been dealt with. However, I should comment that

Defending Australia and its National Interests

the Senate Committee did consider that it was not an ideal system, and that was why they recommended to government a chapter 3 outcome. My recollection is that was a unanimous view of that committee.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely

Mule

Mark Cunliffe PSM Head Defence Legal



Department of Defence Defence Materiel Organisation

> General Manager Commercial R2-5-Exec Russell Offices ACT 2600

GMCOM/OUT/2010/45

Mr Robert Little Inquiry Secretary Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Parliament House CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Mr Little

I write to correct evidence that was given at the Joint Standing Committee On Foreign Affairs, Defence And Trade - Defence Subcommittee hearing held on 25 March 2011. I would like to request the following minor corrections to the Hansard:

1. On page FADT82, under the first entry by Mr Dunstall it should read as follows:

We also have a significant professionalisation activity underway for the procurement and contracting workforce. We created procurement and contracting as a separate job family a couple of years ago and we have been working hard to create a procurement and contracting profession in Australia. We have done that both in the vocational and the tertiary areas. This year, for example, in partnership with the Australian Procurement and Construction Council and the Australian Technology Network of Universities, we have universities in every jurisdiction in Australia now offering a masters in strategic procurement. We have also created an executive masters of strategic procurement that aligns with the complex project management masters program. There are 19 core units that are common amount to both streams and then five separate units in that the procurement stream. Graduates of that executive masters will also receive an <u>MCIPS MSIP</u> from the Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply Australasia, which is a <u>Mmaster of CIPSSIPs</u>, which is really the international gold standard qualification for procurement.

2. On page FADT83, under Mr Dupstall's second entry it should read as follows:

MCSIPS, so <u>M</u>master of <u>CSIPS</u>. The Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply is a UK based body established by Royal Charter. They have established an Australasian arm called CIPSA, and they have accredited that program to receive <u>MSIPsMCIPS</u>. We have also worked in the vocational space and done a lot of work with the Department of Finance and <u>Deregulation and</u> Government Skills Australia to ensure that the vocational courses also meet the required competencies for government procurement standards. So, we have done a lot of work in that space as well.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely

Harry Dunstall

General Manager Commercial R2-5-C045 Ph: 02 6265 7357 Fax: 02 6266 7641 Email: harry.dunstall@defence.gov.au

5 May 2011



Department of Defence Defence Materiel Organisation Land Systems Division Office of Head Land Systems Victoria Barracks (A-G-23), 256-310 SI Kilda Road, SOUTHBANK VIC 3006 (+61 3) 9282 6696

HLS/OUT 2011/177

Mr Robert Little Inquiry Secretary Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Parliament House CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Mr Little,

I write to clarify evidence that I gave at the Defence Annual Report 2009-10 hearing held on 25 March 2011 concerning procurement of Australian Light Armoured Vehicles (ASLAV) under LAND 112 Phase 3.

In answering a question from Mr Brodtmann at page 97 of Proof Committee Hansard 25 March 2011, I stated that "The ASLAV phase 3 project has delivered all of the vehicles. It has delivered the initial training capability, which is a whole lot of simulators that Army wanted. They actually found that simulator capability so useful that they put through a capability chain through Capability Development Group and increased the project's budget and requirement to in fact go out and buy more of the simulators. The area that we are continuing to focus on is the surveillance variant."

I wish to provide further clarity in my response. "Most of the scope of Phase 3 has been delivered including the Phase 3 vehicles, remote weapon stations and crew procedural trainers (simulators). The work on the surveillance variant is still ongoing. Additional simulators are being procured under an Army minor capital equipment project."

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely,

G.D. CAVENAGH, AM Major General Head Land Systems

13 May 2011





Department of Defence Defence Materiel Organisation

OHMS/OUT/2011/210.

4 May 2011

Mr Robert Little Inquiry Secretary Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Parliament House CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Mr Little

1 write to correct evidence that I gave at the Defence Annual Report 2009-10 hearing held on 25 March 2011 concerning the date of the 2010 LPA Seaworthiness Board.

In answer to a question from Mr Robert (page 72 of *Proof Hansard* 25 March 2011), I stated that the LPA Seaworthiness Board was held on 27 September 2010. This information was incorrect because the LPA Seaworthiness Board was conducted on 22 September 2010.

I apologise for any misunderstanding that may have arisen.

Yours sincerely

P.J. Marshall AM Rear Admiral, RAN Head of Maritime Systems

Maritime Systems Division Russeli Offices CANBERRA ACT 2600



Department of Defence Defence Materiel Organisation Helicopter Systems Division

R2-5-C014 Russell Drive) Canberra ACT 2600

Tel: (02) 6265 1018 Mobile 0408 840 136 Fax. (02) 6265 7799

HSD/OUT/2011/52

Mr Robert Little Inquiry Secretary Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Parliament House CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Mr Little,

I write to clarify evidence that I gave at the Defence Annual Report 2009-10 hearing held on 25 March 2011 concerning Army helicopter training.

In answer to a question from the Chair, Senator Forshaw, (page 68 of *Proof Hansard*), I became a little confused as to which Army aircrew training contract was being pursued by the members of the Committee. In my response I queried whether the questions were about the Army aircrew training contract conducted by Boeing Defence Australia (Boeing) in Oakey, before proceeding to answer several questions. On reviewing the *Proof Hansard*, it is clear that the Chair's questions were about Army Tiger aircrew training which is conducted by another contractor - Australian Aerospace. I believe it is prudent to provide further details on Army aircrew training contracts at Oakey to minimise any potential for confusion.

One contract is for the training of pilots and aircrew on various Army helicopters, and is known as the Army Aviation Training and Training Support (AATTS) contract. This contract is currently awarded to Boeing Defence Australia. The evidence I provided was primarily in relation to this contract and should be interpreted in this context. To be clear, the Boeing contract delivers effective training outcomes to Army.

The second aircrew training contract conducted at Oakey trains Army Tiger pilots and aircrew. This contract is currently awarded to Australian Aerospace. While I was not referring to this contract in the page 68 testimony, I should point out that the Australian Aerospace training contract also delivers effective training outcomes to Army.

I hope the above explanation clarifies my testimony, and I apologise for any misunderstandings that I may have created.

Yours sincerely,

M.G. CAMPBELL CSC, Rear Admiral RAN Head Helicopter Systems Division

4 May 2011

