Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/001	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 Civil Law Unit	Collins	Appointment of Sex Discrimination Commissioner	**Senator Brandis:** That is because a decision on the identity of the Sex Discrimination Commissioner was made by cabinet yesterday. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** When was the decision made to establish an advisory panel? **Senator Brandis:** That was made late last year. It might help, rather than beat around the bush, if I gave you the background. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** It would help not to beat around the bush. It might have helped if you had done that in the first instance. **Senator Brandis:** Please do not be impertinent. In September last year, I was about to take a name to cabinet. In the middle of September last year, as you know, there was a change of leadership of the Liberal Party, and a new government was sworn in on 21 September. It seemed to me at the time that it was appropriate to raise with the new Prime Minister the name that I had been about to take to cabinet in September. Mr Turnbull and I had a conversation, the outcome of which was that we decided that an arms-length process of selection should be adopted, and it was. That arms-length process of selection has resulted in the appointment that was decided upon by cabinet yesterday. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** The discussion with the Prime Minister occurred after the discussion we had had at the last estimates but ahead of your statement to the Senate on 11 November? **Senator Brandis:** I am not sure. I will have to check that. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** That was on 11 November that an announcement would be made very soon. **Senator Brandis:** I would have to check that. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Could you advise the committee when the decision to establish the advisory panel was made? **Senator Brandis:** I will take that on notice. I cannot tell you. It was late last year, as a result of my conversation with Mr Turnbull. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** You do not know what date that conversation took place? **Senator Brandis:** No, I do not. I will check. I may or may not have a note of it. It was obviously after Mr Turnbull had become the Prime Minister, so it was after 21 September and it was obviously before the advisory panel was constituted. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** It was reported in *The Sydney Morning Herald* that an advisory panel would be appointed on 11 December. It may be subsequent to 11 November, when you reported to the Senate on this matter. **Senator Brandis:** If that is the case, then the conversation occurred some time between 21 September and 11 December. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** You have taken that on notice, so you will advise.	9 February 2016 L&C: 5 & 6
AE16/002	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	Canavan	Universal Periodic Review Submission's recommendations on same-sex marriage	**Senator CANAVAN:** I have some questions following up on last estimates. I asked you about your UPR submission, and in particular about the recommendation that Australia should adopt same-sex marriage laws. I referred to a number of cases that seem to indicate that under our international human rights law obligations we would have no such obligation to change the Marriage Act. In particular—and I will murder these pronunciations—there is Schalk and Kopf v Austria in 2010 and Hamalainen v Finland in 2014. When I put those cases to you, you mentioned that there is other case law, presumably arguing a different position. You said: … they are decisions of the European Court of Human Rights and the United Nations Human Rights Committee. and: I would really like to write to you with each of those cases; I am just wondering if you have been able to review that case law. Do you have those cases for me today? **Prof. Triggs:** My understanding is that we have provided you with a paper setting out all of these cases. **Senator CANAVAN:** My office has no record of that correspondence. **Prof. Triggs:** Can I then ask for us to be able to resend this material. **Senator CANAVAN:** Sure. **Prof. Triggs:** We have given you a complete analysis of all of the cases that are relevant to this question. I think it probably does not include the United States Supreme Court decision on marriage equality and the 14th amendment. **Senator CANAVAN:** Do you have some of those cases for me now? **Prof. Triggs:** We have this now, but I can also add a briefing on the American decision.	9 February 2016 L&C: 9
AE16/003	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	Collins	Australian Human Rights Commissioner's travel approval	**Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** It may have been an oversight on the previous occasion. I will give you an opportunity to respond here. When I asked you about commissioners' travel, you outlined a range of that travel, but then Mr Wilson outlined some further travel that he himself had undertaken. Was there a reason you were not incorporating that travel within your own response? **Prof. Triggs:** I would really need to know the specifics of that particular matter before I could answer. If I may, I would like to take that on notice. There are occasions—and I am not saying it was in relation to Mr Wilson's travel—when a commissioner will come to me afterwards to get, in a way, ex post facto approval. It happens rarely, but it does on occasion happen. Also, of course, there is a wider opportunity for travel if the travel is not being funded through commission funds. Sometimes a commissioner is funded for international travel from another organisation. If that seems	9 February 2016 L&C: 9 & 15

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				to me to be appropriate to their job, their portfolio, then I would approve their travel. If there were expenses from the commission, I would approve that **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** If you would not mind looking back over the *Hansard* at the discussion we had on the last occasion on that. As I said to you, the thought in my mind at the time was, 'Why was Professor Triggs not covering this travel, as indeed she was the rest of the commissioners' travel?' It may be it involved ex post facto. I think the trip itself involved some external sponsorship as well. But I was curious as to why it was not within your broader response. Indeed, to give Mr Wilson credit, he then proffered that there was this further travel that you had not indeed covered. **Prof. Triggs:** I will look at that example and get back to you as a matter of taking it on notice, to be precise as to the date on which that travel and additional funds were approved by me. … **Mr Wilson:** No, because I took the time to recover in San Francisco. **Senator BILYK:** At a wedding. **Mr Wilson:** And I paid all costs incurred associated with attendance at the wedding. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Well, 'all costs' is the issue that perhaps, given your earlier evidence, I will pursue further with Professor Triggs, because the impression—and correct me if I am wrong—that you gave was that it was a hands-off arrangement with the Human Rights Commission and that you would meet any invoice that related to your personal business. Is that correct? **Mr Wilson:** Correct—and I have done so. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Well, I think that is a matter of further questions. Professor Triggs, how would the invoice have been calculated in these circumstances? **Mr Wilson:** I would have to take that on notice. The financial section of the commission will look at the various stages of a trip like that and work out, according to the rules, what days you can have off to recover, and all of those positions—what is personal, what is related to the portfolio responsibility or the invitation—and they will calculate what expenses are due. And within a reasonably fast period they will produce an invoice to have a recovery of any funds that should be returned to the commission. That is pretty much how the process works. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** And looking at these dates—26 September—the answer to my earlier question may simply be that the travel was so proximate to that last round of estimates that it was not necessarily in your head at that point. **Prof. Triggs:** I think that is entirely possible, and I would like to have a look at the exact record to see how it happened and when the invoices were created. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Yes. Indeed, my question then is: did the last estimates trigger that invoice or was it just in the normal train of events? **Prof. Triggs:** I will make inquiries as to how and by what normal process that was triggered or whether it was triggered by some request. I can inquire about that and report back to you on notice as soon as I can. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Okay. Could you also on notice report back to me the understanding that was reached with Mr Wilson before he travelled? **Prof. Triggs:** I will. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** And then the process that occurred in terms of developing the invoice. Both of us and indeed the minister have travelled overseas often enough to know it is not a nine-to-five travel type schema.	
AE16/004	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	Collins	Human rights ambassadors	**Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Okay. Professor Triggs, former Senator Stott Despoja is an ambassador for women and girls. What are the other positions that relate to Australia's human rights effort? **Prof. Triggs:** We obviously are and have long been engaged in the United Nations human rights monitoring processes, and they are conducted basically through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade with advice and support from the Attorney-General's Department. That engages a surprisingly large number of people, in fact, who go to these meetings and working groups. There is a major working group on the rights of indigenous peoples, for example, and rights in relation to women, children, disabilities and obviously race. On notice I can give you the names of all of those committees and those people who are currently appointed to them. Our ambassadors throughout the world play a role in relation to human rights— **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** No, I am asking more specifically about specific positions other than an ambassador, such as Senator Stott Despoja, which is why I used her as an example.	9 February 2016 L&C: 12
AE16/005	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	Collins	Australian Human Rights Commissioner's travel expenses	**Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Very good. Perhaps I can go to the information you provided after our questions on the previous occasion related to your travel between 26 September and 12 October. I have been having trouble adding up figures in terms of the fares that were reimbursed and understanding why Brigham Young University paid that figure of $1,749. What does that relate to? **Mr Wilson:** I would have to confirm with my office, but it is most likely going to be the cost of the return airfare share to Utah from Sydney. …	9 February 2016 L&C: 13, 21 & 23

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				Senator JACINTA COLLINS: Let me ask you then this, as an alternative assessment of that criteria—which is why I asked Professor Triggs earlier what process the commission itself undergoes in calculating these matters. Had you continued straight through to New York, where your first business was, the airfare would have been marginally more—I think it is only a couple of hundred dollars extra for the internal leg to Los Angeles—but, because of the way you organised your business and your personal business, it incurred roughly $1,400. **Mr Wilson:** I would have to go back and verify that number because I do not have data on what comparable flights were. I know we looked at it at the time. I made a commitment that any additional costs would be incurred by me, and the price difference was no different fundamentally to either an extra night's accommodation or the cost, obviously, if we had have done a business class airfare the whole way. These things are not calculated by me. These things are calculated by bureaucrats within the commission to make sure— … **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Just concluding on that last matter—and you may need to take these on notice—the travel costs you gave us included fees for variations. I would like to know what they are. **Mr Wilson:** Sure. I do not know what they are either. I will take that on notice.	
AE16/006	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	MacDonald	Travel details for all commissioners in the AHRC	**CHAIR:** I am reluctant to do this, but Professor Triggs, I ask if you can give me on notice details for the last 12 months of all international travel taken by you and other commissioners, identifying what parts of that international travel were not taken up with official functions and also what the arrangements were for any travel that was not official functions to be reimbursed—more or less the same questions that Senator Collins has been asking of Mr Wilson but from all commissioners. I must say I am reluctant to do this, because I understand how these things work and that you can grab a headline by asking questions— **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Is there a question? This is commentary. I do not think it is appropriate that as chair you conduct commentary on my questions. Please behave as the chair. **CHAIR:** I am not commenting on your questions; I am just saying— **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Yes, you were. **CHAIR:** I am saying I am reluctant to have to ask the commission for these— **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Just ask your question. **CHAIR:** I am indicating I am reluctant to do it. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Then don't. Either way, do it. **CHAIR:** We will put the questions on notice that I indicated with some regret.	9 February 2016 L&C: 16
AE16/007	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	Collins	Gifts received by the Australian Human Rights Commission	**Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** As you have indicated, in some parts the accommodation related to accommodation by a third party. Professor, it made me wonder, in terms of declarations of interest, what applies in relation to yourself and commissioners at the Human Rights Commission in relation to any benefits you receive as commissioners? **Prof. Triggs:** We all have to declare any possible either conflict of interest or a gift or opportunity; that has to be properly recorded and reported. We are very careful to make sure that that is met, especially as so many of us do a lot of public speaking. We do get a lot of gifts, so we have to check that very carefully. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Where are those reports made? **Prof. Triggs:** They are within the commission. I think we report to the Attorney-General's Department, but again I can take that on notice and show you how frequently we report on what might be seen as advantages of one kind or another. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Perhaps you could provide me with such reports for the last two years on notice. **Prof. Triggs:** Certainly. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Unless that is burdensome. **Prof. Triggs:** No, not at all. We will be very pleased to do it. It is kept up as a matter of course. We keep full records of anything that might be—I forget the exact amount, but it is $50 or something in that area.	9 February 2016 L&C: 23
AE16/008	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	Canavan	Universal Periodic Review on human rights	**Senator CANAVAN:** Thank you for that, Minister. That is certainly my view as well on that distinction. Ms Triggs, you said one aspect of the UPR is—and it has been so long since the answer that I am paraphrasing—to advocate for progress on this area. On your website, though, where you have got a whole page devoted to the Universal Periodic Review on human rights, where does it say that? I have not read every word, but my reading of the relevant sections of that page indicates, as I said earlier, that the UPR is about assessing our compliance with obligations that we have signed up to, not going beyond and progressing human rights in a political philosophy sense as Mr Brandis said. As I ask that question, can I say I have no issue with the fact that you do have a statutory right to advocate on generic human rights issues. My question specifically goes to your submission, to what is an international review of our record and one in which you do not seem to indicate has the scope to do what you have recommended in this area. **Prof. Triggs:** I will certainly be happy to take your question on notice. **Senator CANAVAN:** Thank you.	9 February 2016 L&C: 33

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/009	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	O'Sullivan	Trauma levels of refugees	**Senator O'SULLIVAN:** I accept all of that, but the burden of my question that I am trying to point out is that you would be able to separate a refugee visitor who was not traumatised at the time that they arrived into the custody of Australian officials. You would be able to go down the list and go, 'No, this individual's trauma started post arrival as opposed to pre-arrival. **Prof. Triggs:** I can certainly disaggregate those figures. There may be some who arrived who were never traumatised, were never anxious or were never injured in any way by the conditions that you have so graphically described. That may be the case, but I suspect it is a tiny number. But I will be very happy to find out if that baseline material from the medical officers employed by the government can demonstrate that. **Senator O'SULLIVAN:** Then we are in fierce agreement that almost all of these people pre-arrival, pre-engagement with any officials within this country were traumatised. **Prof. Triggs:** I would like to get the exact figures from the medical services, but my understanding is that a relatively high number of those arriving had some level of trauma but since arriving that level of trauma has significantly increased.	9 February 2016 L&C: 39 & 40
AE16/010	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	McKim	Australia's international human rights obligations and permanent residency access	**Senator McKIM:** I am happy to argue this on a point of order if it will make it easier. I am quoting from a cabinet document that was obtained and made public last week by at least one media outlet. The department of immigration yesterday confirmed that this document had veracity—that is, that it did exist. So I will rephrase again the question, which, I believe, would put it within your comfort zone around whether or not it is hypothetical. Will removing direct access to permanent residence for humanitarian visa holders contravene any of Australia's international human rights obligations? **CHAIR:** First of all, the evidence yesterday—I am not sure if you were here—was that it was not a cabinet document, that it had not gone to cabinet but that it was a draft by someone in the department. I think that is an accurate reporting of it. So it is not a cabinet document. It was a draft of, I gather, a middle-order official. It is a bit difficult to ask witnesses what might happen if this, that and the other will happen because we do not know full proposal. **Senator McKIM:** In fact I have removed that element of it. In none of my substantive questions have I referenced a cabinet document. I have simply said: will doing this contravene Australia's international human rights obligations? The Human Rights Commission has an advocacy role here around— **CHAIR:** Perhaps if the question were: what are the human rights obligations in relation to whatever the substance is— **Senator HANSON-YOUNG:** The current law is that they get permanent residency. If we take that away, does that contravene any international human rights? **Senator McKIM:** And there have been hypothetical questions asked this morning already without a ruling from you. **CHAIR:** That shows that I am not as good chairman as I thought I was. Anyhow, I think it is inappropriate but it is almost lunchtime. Prof. Triggs, if you can give some sort of an answer. **Prof. Triggs:** Thank you for the question. I, if I may, would like to take it on notice because you raise an important legal question and I would like to really examine what the implications of this purported proposal are. I think it is something that we would need to look at in a little bit more detail. But perhaps I can make a general statement—that is, Australia is a sovereign body and has the right to decide those who would have permanent residence and that is a very important underpinning principle of international law. With that in mind, we would be very pleased to get back to you with a view of what we think the law is.	9 February 2016 L&C: 42 & 43
AE16/011	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	MacDonald	Geneva meeting of the Universal Periodic Review process	**Prof. Triggs:** I think the general question of the transferring of those seeking our protection under the refugee convention to Nauru and to Manus is a matter that is objectively of great concern to members of the Human Rights Council and to the international community generally. I was at the Geneva meeting of the UPR process and I counted well over 60 countries that raised their concerns and asked Australia courteously to review the policies, particularly with regard to children. So this is not a small issue; it is a matter of concern to the overwhelming majority of those states that chose to speak about Australia's human rights record generally. **CHAIR:** Could you, on notice, list the 60 countries. **Prof. Triggs:** Yes, I will provide you with that list.	9 February 2016 L&C: 43
AE16/012	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	McKim	*Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Act 2014*	**Senator McKIM:** All right. I want to move on and ask whether the commission is aware of the Tasmanian anti-protest laws under which former senator Bob Brown was arrested a few weeks ago. It did generate some media coverage. The law is the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Act 2014. Effectively, it criminalises some forms of protest in Tasmania and provides for the courts to impose terms of up to five years imprisonment for some protest actions. Does the commission have a view about those laws and their consistency or otherwise with Australia's international human rights obligations? **Prof. Triggs:** We have not received any complaints in relation to that matter and therefore we have not looked specifically at those laws. But there are many other examples where we do consider the balance between the rights to freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, political demonstration and political activity and the needs of a workforce or other national priorities—or, in that case, a state priority. I would be very happy to refer you to the work that we have already done in this area. As I said, it arises in many	9 February 2016 L&C: 43 & 44

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				contexts. But if it would help you, we are very happy to look at that piece of legislation to see, in our view—and that is all it would be—whether the balance is probably achieved. Or, to put it in more legalese: whether the measure in the legislation is a necessary and proportionate response to achieve a legitimate outcome— **Senator McKIM:** Yes. **Prof. Triggs:** That is the mantra, if you like, in law—both in international law and in Australian law, as articulated by the High Court. How we fall on that question is, of course, our view that it will only be resolved for the purposes of Australian law by the Federal Court or the High Court. **Senator McKIM:** Thank you, Professor. I do appreciate those caveats. **Prof. Triggs:** But we would be very happy to get back to you if that would help you. **Senator McKIM:** Would you be happy just to take that as a question on notice, or should I write to you— **Prof. Triggs:** Very pleased to take it—very happy to do that.	
AE16/013	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Office of the Australian Information Commissioner**	Rhiannon	Cost of applying for an FOI review with the AAT	**Senator RHIANNON:** With this new system, is the new way of doing it a greater cost to an applicant than would be charged were the function in question to be under the OAIC? **Mr Pilgrim:** As I said, out of the 249 applications we received for Information Commissioner review, we finalised some 236. Of those, there is no application fee to lodge a request or an application for an IC review with our office. Of those 236 that we finalised, 10 per cent were closed by our office, as we formed a decision that they would be best dealt with by going to the AAT—and, yes, there is a lodgement fee with the AAT. **Senator RHIANNON:** Can you expand on the lodgement fee? **Mr Pilgrim:** I might need to have this corrected, but I believe it is $861 at the moment.	9 February 2016 L&C: 47
AE16/014	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Office of the Australian Information Commissioner**	Rhiannon	DIBC's staff consultation to release documents under FOI	**Senator RHIANNON:** Commissioner, I was interested in the case with the Department of Immigration and Border Control. This was the issue where they said that they would need to consult with 600 employees before releasing documents. Could you provide some brief about that decision and if this is a trend that is coming with departments to argue that they need to consult with large numbers of employees before information can be released? **Mr Pilgrim:** Without going through the decision, which was published entirely, I think it is an issue that I would prefer to take on notice because I would like to remind myself of some of the other trends we may be seeing in that area. We do believe that we encourage all agencies to publish org charts as part of their publication scheme to try to reduce the number of issues or inquiries people may have about staffing levels and particular positions within agencies. As to the broader question you are asking, I would like to take that on notice.	9 February 2016 L&C: 49
AE16/015	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Office of the Australian Information Commissioner**	Rhiannon	FOI resourcing trends – cost of obtaining/releasing the requested documents	**Senator RHIANNON:** I noticed in some of the findings that it was suggested or reported that some of the departments were overestimating the amount of time it would take for the information to be found and to be released. Is that also a trend? **Mr Pilgrim:** Again, I want to be careful of my words and not say it is a particular trend. It is an issue we are seeing, and one of the things we hope to do through the decisions we make is to use them also as an educative process so that they can understand the views of our office in terms of some of the time frames we think should be taken in terms of being able to identify and locate documents. **Senator RHIANNON:** Are you just accepting that the departments will make a fair judgement on the time that will be required? Is it just a matter of trust or are there guidelines with regard to this matter? Because it seems as though that becomes quite influential in deciding where some of these cases go. **Mr Pilgrim:** We certainly do monitor the IC reviews that are coming through to us to understand what some of the challenges may be for agencies. We try to use some of the decisions we make as the educative tool. Ms Toohey might want to make some observations in terms of sampling. **Ms Toohey:** One of the things that we certainly encourage agencies to do is this idea of sampling so they can justify a decision if they are have made a decision— **Senator RHIANNON:** You used the word 'sampling'; could you define that. **Ms Toohey:** If a matter comes to us and it has been a practical refusal, we generally ask the agency to produce a small sample of the documents so that we can then test their calculation versus our own. The commissioner has made a number of decisions looking at those sorts of processes and has certainly provided guidance in those decisions to the agencies about that approach. **Senator RHIANNON:** Is there a trend that there is often considerable disparity between your estimations and other departments' estimations? **Mr Pilgrim:** I think what I was saying is that I do not want to try to use the word 'trend' because it can be taken in a way to say that there is a major issue. It is certainly something we are looking at and it is something that I think we can provide more guidance to agencies on, and, as I said, our primary way of doing that is using the IC review process as part of that educative process to let agencies have an understanding about what we think in certain circumstances. Looking at each case individually would be a reasonable period of time. **Senator RHIANNON:** So you said you are looking at it. In time will you be able to share with us what these trends are?	9 February 2016 L&C: 49

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				Mr Pilgrim: I can certainly take that back and see whether it is something we can produce any useful information on. I cannot guarantee what we may be able to produce, but I certainly will take it on board.	
AE16/016	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia/Federal Circuit Court**	Collins	Judiciary numbers	**Mr Foster:** That number of judges—I was talking about currently, Senator; I did not have any historical data. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** No, I understand that. But I am asking, when you were talking about your case numbers, you went back to what year? **Mr Foster:** I went back to 2010 and 2011. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Can you start there on the number of the judiciary? **Mr Foster:** I do not have those numbers with me. I would need to take that on notice. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Is that something that would take long? **Mr Foster:** No, it will not take long. We have got information, I just have not got it here. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Okay. As there are other senators who have questions to ask too, perhaps we could revisit that later this session? If that is possible; if not, then take it on notice. **Mr Foster:** Okay, thank you. I think I can give you the number of Family Court judges, going back. But I have not got the Federal Circuit Court numbers. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Why don't you wait until you do, because I would like to be able to compare apples with apples, to the extent it is possible. **Mr Foster:** Okay. I probably would need to take that on notice then, Senator, if that is okay. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Sure. It is only in the sense that I want to build a picture of the resource constraints, and to have a sense of the trend in that respect. **Mr Foster:** Sure, I understand.	9 February 2016 L&C: 51
AE16/017	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia/Federal Circuit Court**	Heffernan	Radio National interview: *In the child's best interests*	**Senator HEFFERNAN:** It is nearly as bad as farming! I realise the difficulty of the Family Court, and the death threats that come with it et cetera. I also appreciate the fact that judges might well have expertise in an area that involves family disputes, but not the expertise in whether the children are or are not being abused, and the use of the law to outsmart the truth, with parents saying one kid is being abused and vice versa—all of that stuff. I want to go to an issue that has been raised with me about a medico legal report writer, Dr Christopher Rikard-Bell, who told ABC National in June 2015 that he has written over 2,000 reports in his 25 year career. These were to assist the court. He said he is often called by the court to assess allegations of physical and sexual abuse. But he then went on to say that he is not specifically trained in child sexual abuse and/or assessments. As I understand it, evidence rules require specialised knowledge by training, skill or experience. His internet public profiles for clinical work do not reflect specialisation in child sexual abuse assessments. Contrary to accepted research, this particular gentleman believes 90 per cent of Family Court child sexual abuse cases are unfounded. This confirmation bias is reflected in his practice of asking a child, in front of the alleged perpetrator, about any worries or fears concerning that parent. I think that is barmy. This is cruel and contrary to accepted clinical practice. Dr Rikard-Bell nominated Richard Gardner as a role model, and as very relevant. The Family Court publicly decried the parent alienation theory that Gardner invented when he relabelled child sexual abuse symptoms as signs of a mother alienating a father from a child for no good reason. Gardner said: "… the child has to be helped to appreciate that we have in our society an exaggeratedly punitive and moralistic attitude about adult-child sexual encounters. And: Older children may be helped to appreciate that sexual encounters between an adult and a child are not universally considered to be reprehensible acts. The child might be told about other societies in which such behavior was and is considered normal." My God, this reminds me of Justice Garry Neilson. Gardner continues: "The child might be helped to appreciate the wisdom of Shakespeare's Hamlet, who said, "Nothing's either good or bad, but thinking makes it so."" If the Family Court is going to rely on Dr Rikard-Bell's opinion to assess child sexual abuse, and his opinions are not based on specialised knowledge and are clearly out of step with research, how can this be in the child's best interests? **Ms Filippello:** I am not familiar with the article to which you have referred. **Senator HEFFERNAN:** You can take it on notice if you like. This is just the tip of a very big iceberg I am about to climb. **Ms Filippello:** Perhaps if I can address the more general issue that comes out from your question, and that is the role of the expert witness. Dr Rikard-Bell, and any psychiatrist who appears before the court, is appearing provided they meet the criteria as an expert witness. The court, through its rules, tries to minimise the exposure of families to the need to attend on reports and would normally appoint a single expert for the particular family. The rules themselves are very explicit as to the nature of the material that is provided to the expert. The instruction to the expert must be in writing, and the material that the expert has relied upon also needs to be disclosed. The expert's brief is also articulated in that letter. In addition, the expert's qualifications to undertake the work that is required of him or her is also to be disclosed. **Senator HEFFERNAN:** Thank you very much for that, but in the system, if you have people giving advice—and I appreciate the huge workload in the Family Court—if you have people who think that there is some question mark over what is so bad about sex with children, which is what is in some of this, how in God's name do they get into the system? Rikard-Bell made public his lack of specialisation. His disbelief in sexual child abuse cases is dangerously out of step	9 February 2016 L&C: 54 & 55

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				with research, noting the court must be aware of the radio interview. Are you aware of that Radio National interview? **Ms Filippello:** No. I apologise. I do not. But I can certainly read the context of that. **Senator HEFFERNAN:** You cannot cover everything. I appreciate that. But maybe, as a consequence of today, we might familiarise ourselves with some of these circumstances. I appreciate, Mr Attorney, the difficulty of all of this. *In the child's best interests* was the name of the radio interview. The question is: what steps to do something about it will be taken by the Attorney-General or the Chief Justice to give judicial notice or otherwise instruct all Family Court judges to not rely on the unsafe opinion of a person with those views? **Ms Filippello:** It is probably appropriate that we take that particular question in relation to that particular issue on notice. But, in relation to expert witnesses, they are cross-examined in court by both parties, and the opinion that they express may not necessarily be the opinion accepted by the court.	
AE16/018	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia/Federal Circuit Court**	Collins	Standards for family consultants	**Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Thank you, Chair. In fact, on that point I also had another question about the family violence standards. Sorry, were they family assessment standards or family violence standards? **Ms Filippello:** Is that in relation to the family consultants? **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** No, the standards you were just referring Senator McKim to. **Ms Filippello:** Yes, they are for family consultants. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** They are not specifically for family violence? **Ms Filippello:** They include family violence. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** And who developed them? **Ms Filippello:** The Family Court, in consultation with other experts. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Can you take on notice who those experts were. **Ms Filippello:** Yes, certainly. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** It may be available online, but I was interested in that point as well.	9 February 2016 L&C: 62
AE16/019	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Courts, Tribunals & Admin Law Branch	Collins	Judicial appointments	**Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Now, just very briefly, since Senator O'Sullivan raised the judicial appointments issue, it might save me coming back to this if I ask a further question. Attorney, you mentioned federal appointments that cabinet dealt with. How many appointments were there? **Senator Brandis:** Five. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Is it true for the figures ahead of these five appointments that you have appointed as many men who attended Magdalen College—your college at Oxford—as you have appointed women overall? Would that be correct? **Senator Brandis:** I do not know, Senator. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Perhaps you could take it on notice for me. **Senator Brandis:** Okay.	9 February 2016 L&C: 62
AE16/020	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia/Federal Circuit Court**	Madigan	Children involved in Family Court proceedings	**Senator MADIGAN:** How many children were involved in or affected by Family Court judgements in the 2010-15 period? **Mr Foster:** I will have to take that on notice; I have no idea. I am not even sure that we can provide an answer easily. I am just imagining the complexities of trying to extract that data from our database; it might be extremely difficult. That period of time is a long period of time to find the number of children affected. And they are affected in a number of ways—there are interim orders, of which there are about 25,000 a year; there are applications for final orders, of which there are about 20,000; and there are other sorts of orders that impact upon children across the board. It is a very wide question. We deal with about 200,000 individuals in a year, excluding children, so it will be a very large number. I have no idea how we will find that number out, but we will do the best we can. **CHAIR:** Senator Madigan, you obviously have a purpose for asking the question, but is there any way you could perhaps confine or narrow the thing? From what the CEO says, they are going to spend the rest of their days trying to work this out. **Mr Foster:** There are 40,000 divorce orders as well as about 13,000 consent orders, so we are talking about huge numbers of applications. **CHAIR:** Anyhow, it stands that it has been taken on notice, but I cannot imagine— **Mr Foster:** I am not sure that we can actually answer the question, but we will take it on notice.	9 February 2016 L&C: 62 & 63
AE16/021	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia/Federal Circuit Court**	Madigan	Court orders	**Senator MADIGAN:** Does the Family Court have any information, if court orders were adhered to, on the welfare of those children consequent to court decisions? Do you do any follow-up to see what is happening? **Ms Filippello:** In some matters, the court does make an order that the family consultant meet with the children to explain the orders and the reasons that the judge made those orders. But, unless the judge has made an order either requiring the family consultant to continue to maintain their relationship with the family or ensuring that the independent children's lawyer continues for a period of time rather than being discharged on the order, the court has very little further to do with that family unless there has been noncompliance with an order. **Senator MADIGAN:** So there are no figures on whether court orders were adhered to? **Ms Filippello:** We would have details in relation to applications for enforcement if those applications are brought. We	9 February 2016 L&C: 63

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				certainly would have that detail. **Senator MADIGAN:** Would you be able to supply that to the committee on notice? **Mr Foster:** We can do that. **Ms Filippello:** Yes, we can take it no notice.	
AE16/022	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia/Federal Circuit Court**	McKim	Guidelines and complaints for family consultants	**Senator McKIM:** Thank you for that, Attorney—ultimately. I appreciate that very much. Can I just go back to the other matter I was raising, which was around the report writers, as I think I inaccurately classified them. You have talked about the guidelines. **Ms Filippello:** Yes. **Senator McKIM:** I am shorthanding them there. When were those guidelines brought into effect, if I might ask? **Ms Filippello:** I would have to say that the most recent ones were 2003, from recollection—sorry, 2013. But there has been a version of that document around for some time. **Senator McKIM:** So 2013 is the latest version. **Ms Filippello:** Yes. **Senator McKIM:** So they were already in place, if you like, when Senator Waters raised her concerns at previous estimates. So has the court done anything at all subsequent to Senator Waters raising these matters, which were concerns conveyed to her, whilst these guidelines were actually in place? **Ms Filippello:** Could I just clarify: although the guidelines are in place, they are revisited. If there are particular areas within the guidelines that need to be reconsidered given the more recent practice evidence that is available, then the relevant principle of—family consultants would actually revisit those guidelines and update them. **Senator McKIM:** Can I ask whether there are any training programs associated with the guidelines? **Ms Filippello:** Yes, there is. There is quite extensive training. Perhaps we could provide that to you on notice. **Senator McKIM:** I am happy for you to take that on notice. **Ms Filippello:** Yes. But I can indicate to you that, in addition to the guidelines that are in place, there is regular training conducted through the court by regular seminars—they have monthly internal seminars and they deal with various topics, including, more recently, the forensic examination of violence in a family law context, post-separation arrangements and high-conflict families, men's behaviour change programs—do they work and what should we do? It is certainly that type of training that occurs quite frequently. In 2014-2015, there was a series of three family violence clinical training modules that were delivered to all clinical staff. These modules focused primarily on personal and professional biases that can impact on clinical practice, in particular with an emphasis on balanced, robust and thorough examination, and reporting of family violence. … **Senator McKIM:** Perhaps, then, I could follow up, Mr Foster. Are you able to provide figures around the number of complaints, particularly relating to, what I think are called, family consultants—the report writers. **Mr Foster:** Yes, we can. I can give to you—on notice, I will send it to you—the number of complaints for a particular period of time, the nature of those complaints and what happened to them. **Senator McKIM:** Are they broken down into categories of— **Mr Foster:** Administrative, procedural, privacy, security, transcripts—there is a range of different categories. **Senator McKIM:** Thank you, I appreciate that. So you will provide that are notice? **Mr Foster:** We can provide that on notice for both courts. **Senator McKIM:** Thank you.	9 February 2016 L&C: 64 & 65
AE16/023	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia/Federal Circuit Court**	McKim	Concerns raised in *The Monthly* and *Background Briefing*	**Senator McKIM:** There was some reporting done by *The Monthly* and *Background Briefing*. Perhaps I could ask you to take on notice this question. Are you satisfied that the concerns raised in those reports have been adequately addressed? **Mr Foster:** Was that an article in *The Monthly* in November or October? **Senator McKIM:** Yes, I believe so. **Mr Foster:** I have seen that. What is your specific question? **Senator McKIM:** Are you satisfied that the concerns raised in those reports have been satisfactorily addressed? **Mr Foster:** I think we can always improve, but we can only do as much as we possibly can. We have good protocols in place. We have good recruitment processes. We have good supervision. We are a court that is very easy to complain about. People come to us with a fixed view. **Senator McKIM:** A bit like parliament, perhaps! **Mr Foster:** I'm not sure about parliament; no one would complain about parliament! But we are a court that is very easy to complain about, and people do have a certain amount of baggage to their complaints. But we take every complaint seriously and deal with it in an appropriate way. Sometimes you only get one side of the story as well, obviously. **Senator McKIM:** I accept that. Would you take on notice the question and provide a brief response to the committee around that article in *The Monthly* and ABC's *Background Briefing* and whether or not you believe they have been satisfactorily addressed? **Mr Foster:** We will do that.	9 February 2016 L&C: 65 & 66

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/024	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre**	MacDonald	Operatives in Vanuatu	**CHAIR:** Do we have any permanent operatives in Vanuatu from your agency? **Mr Jevtovic:** Not from my agency, no. This might be something to check, but we may have an AFP presence in Vanuatu. I have not had to put my mind to that for a number of years. We do have Australian embassy representation there. As to any operatives, law enforcement officers, I could not confirm that now.	9 February 2016 L&C: 67
AE16/025	TBA Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Security Intelligence Organisation**	McKim	Assessment of Syrian humanitarian entrants	**Senator McKIM:** Are you currently in the process of assessing any of the Syrian humanitarian entrants? **Mr Lewis:** Yes we are. I cannot give you a precise figure, but the process is underway and we have cases we are examining now. **Senator McKIM:** Could you take on notice the figure in terms of how many of those 12,000 the department has asked you to assess? **Mr Lewis:** I would like to speak with the department of immigration first. **Senator McKIM:** I appreciate that. **Mr Lewis:** But assuming that there is no impediment to that then perhaps I can come back to you with a figure. **Senator McKIM:** I will place the question on notice and you can respond subsequent to your— **Mr Lewis:** It might be that the department of immigration is in a better position because they have control over which ones they are bringing forward to us. There are other considerations which that department can and does take which are beyond ASIO's competence and so the figures may be a little skewed as a result of that, but I understand the point you are making. **Ms Hartland:** It is also a process where we are working continuously with the department of immigration as well, so we have deployed staff in working with them. So in terms of numbers and where they are at, as the director-general said, it will depend on whether they have actually been alerted through the system when they come to us. So whether there has actually been any that have come through in that way, we will need to take that on notice. … **Senator McKIM:** Based on your previous answers, I acknowledge that some of my next series of questions you would need to answer on notice, if you were able to answer them. I will place that on the record first. I am interested in how many screenings have been completed. I think I asked that earlier, but if I did not, I ask that. **Mr Lewis:** Are we talking about the 12,000? **Senator McKIM:** I am specifically asking about 12,000. Certainly in my state of Tasmania there is a general expectation in the community that they are about to arrive. They have not. I am trying to explore what some of the delays might be. I am certainly not suggesting that you should not be conducting your work diligently. I encourage you to do so, not that you need my encouragement. I am wondering whether there are any blockages— perhaps blockages is not the right word—any reasons for the delay in this process. How many screenings have been completed, in relation to the 12,000? How many, if any, have been cleared? Okay, that is not your role. **Mr Lewis:** We understand the questions you are asking. We will try to provide answers. Most of this lies with the Department of Immigration. For example, the answer may be affected dramatically by the way in which the immigration department is presenting the cases to us in terms of the degree of concern that that they may or may not have about them. For instance, are they taking people about whom there is absolutely no concern and who appear to be very simple cases first? If that were the case, our figure would be correspondingly low. I am not sure that it is a useful figure for you. It will have a whole lot of conditionality around it. **Senator McKIM:** I appreciate that**.**	9 February 2016 L&C: 73
AE16/026	TBA Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Security Intelligence Organisation**	McKim	Security risks associated with Syrian humanitarian entrants	**Senator McKIM:** I appreciate that. I am happy for you to take this on notice: I am interested in how many, if any, there are of the 12,000 of the Syrian cohort that you have advised do present a risk to national security, as of today, for example? **Mr Lewis:** I understand the question. We will see what we can provide. **Senator McKIM:** I asked about the average time to complete an assessment. You have responded in broad terms around that. Thank you for your response to those questions. I want to turn to another topic now. The Attorney is not there.	9 February 2016 L&C: 74
AE16/027	TBA Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Security Intelligence Organisation**	McKim	Listing of terrorist group, Tehrik-i-Taliban	**Senator McKIM:** What I said, Mr Lewis, was that they claimed responsibility for that shooting. I obviously have no knowledge of whether or not it was them. They are the Tehrik-i-Taliban, known as the TTP. **Mr Lewis:** They are not on the list of prescribed organisations. **Senator McKIM:** I understand that. My advice is that they are listed in both New Zealand and the United States. **Senator Brandis:** We will look into that. **Senator McKIM:** So you will provide a response? **Senator Brandis:** I think we have given you a response, really, but thank you for drawing that to my attention and we will look into it.	9 February 2016 L&C: 74 & 75

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				Senator McKIM: I am sorry to push the point but the response from ASIO was that it is not listed. I know that it is not listed; that is why I am asking the question. I appreciate your commitment to look into it. Could I ask you to communicate with me or the committee in some way, if it is possible to do so without compromising national security— **Mr Lewis:** It is a matter for me and my organisation, in that sense, to make recommendations. I will have a look at it and I will speak with the attorney. I understand the point of your question	
AE16/028	Strategy and Delivery Division Outcome 1 Strategy and Delivery Division	Collins	FOI request regarding Attorney-General's diary	**Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** I would like to commence with questions around Mr Dreyfus's FOI request in relation to the Attorney's diary. Attorney, your colleague the foreign minister released her ministerial diary under FOI without fuss. What makes you different here? What is the issue at stake? **Senator Brandis:** This is a matter that is now before the Federal Court on appeal. I really do not think it is appropriate for me to be commenting on a matter that is currently before the courts. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** If you do not want to indicate what the issue at stake is here, because— **Senator Brandis:** Senator, your premise attributes something to me which is wrong. I did not say I do not want to comment; I said it is not appropriate for me to comment. But, if you want to acquaint yourself with the issues in the case, then you are perfectly free to read the judgement of Justice Jagot, which is under appeal. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** What I was about to continue with was the statement that it is before the Federal Court. I also have questions with respect to costs, which I believe would be appropriate for you address at this stage. **Senator Brandis:** The cost issue is a live issue before the court too. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Some of them may not be, so let's see how far we can get. How much did the Commonwealth spend on the diaries matter before the AAT? **Senator Brandis:** I do not know that those costs have been tabulated. It may be, depending on what costs order is ultimately made, that the costs will be coming from Mr Dreyfus. I will take the question on notice and see if we can provide something to you. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** How many staff from the AGD worked on the matter and for how long? **Senator Brandis:** I will take the question on notice. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** What was the charge to the Commonwealth from the AGS? **Senator Brandis:** We will take the question on notice. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** And what dispersements were required? **Senator Brandis:** We will take the question on notice. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** You have referred me to the matter. Will that provide the reason for your appeal? **Senator Brandis:** There has been a notice of appeal filed, so it will be available for inspection on the court file, which I believe is accessible electronically. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** But will that notice provide your reasons? **Senator Brandis:** The grounds of appeal, yes. **...** **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** What negative consequences would there be for the FOI system if the AAT decision is allowed to stand? **Senator Brandis:** I think that is one of the very issues of which the full court or the federal court will be seeing, so it would not be appropriate for me to comment. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Does the Commonwealth have an estimate on how much is likely to be spent on its appeal to the federal court? **Senator Brandis:** I will take that on notice **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** The Commonwealth would ordinarily brief senior and junior counsel for an appeal before the full court or the federal court, wouldn't it? **Senator Brandis:** I am sorry, say that again. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** I said that the Commonwealth would ordinarily brief senior and junior counsel for an appeal before the full court or the federal court, wouldn't it. **Senator Brandis:** Yes. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** How much would that ordinarily cost? **Senator Brandis:** It all depends on their fees. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** I am asking for a ballpark. You are very experienced in this field, Senator Brandis. **Senator Brandis:** I cannot give you a ballpark. I do not know what fee has been negotiated with that counsel, but I will take that on notice. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** If you do not succeed in the full court, will you go to the High Court? **Senator Brandis:** That is a decision to be made depending on the outcome. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** I will wait for your answers on notice on further costs. I will defer the remainder of my time at this stage, because the remainder of my questions move on to the royal commissions. Senator Gallagher has questions at the cross-portfolio level.	9 February 2016 L&C: 78 & 79

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/029	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Family Law Branch	Gallagher	Self-executing plebiscite	**Senator GALLAGHER:** One of the options that I have had discussions with stakeholders around is the idea of a self-executing plebiscite, which would automatically legalise equal marriage if the plebiscite succeeded. Has advice been provided to you on that proposal? **Senator Brandis:** It is a possibility that has been addressed. Let me take that on notice. I have taken a deal of legal advice from various sources on this. Whether there is specific legal advice on a self-executing plebiscite? I had better take that on notice rather than mislead you. **Senator GALLAGHER:** Thank you. And, further, whether that could be constitutionally valid and how that— **Senator Brandis:** There is a constitutional issue about this—about that model. **Senator GALLAGHER:** It would be excellent if you could take that on notice.	9 February 2016 L&C: 81
AE16/030	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Family Law Branch	Simms	Departmental staff costs associated with the same-sex marriage plebiscite	**Senator SIMMS:** I do not think I will take the full 15 minutes because Senator Gallagher covered some of the territory that I was going to explore. My questions relate more generally to the Attorney General's Department, in particular, dealing with the issue of the plebiscite. You mentioned before, Mr Acting Deputy Secretary, that some work of the department had been devoted to exploring this plebiscite and liaising with other departments and ministerial offices, can you give me a bit of a sense of how much time has been devoted to this project in terms of staff time? **Mr Manning:** Not off the top of my head, sorry, Senator. I would have to take that on notice. **Senator SIMMS:** That would be good if you could. **Senator Brandis:** Senator Simms, I know that this is impressionistic, but I do have a sense that there has been a lot of work by the department on this and a lot of attention devoted to it since the latter part of last year. **Senator SIMMS:** A lot of time. Can I ask what kind of staff would be devoting time to this? Is it senior level staff or— **Mr Moraitis:** I would say it is about four or five staff that have been on this for a while, Senator. Mr Hall can explain what levels they are at. **Mr Hall:** Thank you, Senator. The levels range from Executive Level 2 down to APS 5-6 level. **Senator SIMMS:** I am very new, so you might have to tell me salary ranges. **Mr Manning:** If you like, Senator, if you have APS 5-6 and an EL1 they would be doing the sort of day-to-day work that would be under direction of an EL2 and, of course, people at the table—Ms Williams is responsible for the branch, administers the Marriage Act, Mr Hall is responsible for the division which that is in, and I am responsible for the groups it in. So, we dedicate time to it as required as well. **Senator SIMMS:** Just so I am clear, four or five quite senior staff— **Mr Manning:** Four or five in addition to us. **Senator SIMMS:** What salary level or what increment? You do not have to tell me the actual figure. Could you take me through the classifications again? **Mr Hall:** EL2 down to APS6. We can certainly take it on notice and give you a table that tells you what that equates to for salary purposes. **Senator SIMMS:** Yes, that would be great, and a sense of the staff time as well that has been devoted to the project. Could I also ask, as it was certainly apparent to me, Attorney, in the response that you were giving that this is certainly quite a complex endeavour involving liaising with a range of different arms of the government. It is also the first time that a government has approached a legislative question in this way. We have not had a plebiscite since, I think, the 1950s, if I am correct, or even earlier.	9 February 2016 L&C: 86 & 87
AE16/031	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Family Law Branch	Simms	Legal advice costs associated with the same-sex marriage plebiscite	**Senator SIMMS:** Strange that people getting married could be compared to sending people to war. In terms of the staff time that has been attributed to this, has there also been a commissioning of high-level legal advice to deal with some of the complexities? I imagine your department would be in a position to provide that as well. **Senator Brandis:** Yes. **Senator SIMMS:** Can you give me a sense: is that in addition to the four or five staff that have been managing the project? **Mr Manning:** Yes. **Senator SIMMS:** Can you give me a sense of how many staff in addition have been working on this? **Mr Manning:** Again, we will have to take that on notice. As I indicated, in response to Senator Gallagher's questions earlier, as issues are discussed as options, we are trying to position ourselves so that we can respond to them should they be chosen as the policy of the government. In doing that provisions are drafted from time to time, and in doing that issues come up and you might go off to the Australian Government Solicitor and get some advice, but there is not a dedicated team of lawyers in the department sitting around working on this issue. **Senator SIMMS:** No, of course, I understand that. In terms of these legal officers that are providing this advice, can you give me a sense of, again, what kind of level they would be employed at within the department? **Mr Manning:** The ones used so far would work primarily at the Australian Government Solicitor. I would have to take	9 February 2016 L&C: 87, 88 & 89

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				that on notice as I do not have the details. **Senator SIMMS:** If you could, and also the amount of staff time that has been allocated to providing that advice to the government as well. **Mr Manning:** Sure. They cost their time so we will be able to do that. **Senator SIMMS:** Yes, that would be great. *CLARIFICATION:* ***Mr Manning:*** *Can I just clarify one thing in response to the senator's comments. When we spoke about those staff, of course there is the plebiscite issue and there is the issue of amending the Marriage Act. Those same people are working on both. That work has to occur regardless. I just want to clarify that we are unable to break it down to that level. But that work would have to occur because there is the issue of amending the act and any consequential amendments that might arise. I just wanted to clarify that point.* *SUMMARY OF TWO QONS BY SIMMS:* ***Senator SIMMS:*** *The majority of the public support it. Can I summarise so that I ensure we have captured the things I am wanting to get costed. I am wanting to get information on the amount of staff time within the minister's department, and the professional classifications of those. But in addition I am wanting to get information on the senior legal advice that is being provided, and in particular at what rate that has been charged with the six-month increments—* ***Senator Brandis:*** *We will get all of that information to you.*	
AE16/032	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Family Law Branch	Lambie	Costs associated with election day plebiscite	**Senator LAMBIE:** Could I just ask a question on that while you are doing costings. Would I be able to be provided a costing of what it would cost to run that plebiscite on the day of the next election? I have been told that would be about one fifth of what it would cost if you did it stand-alone. **Senator Brandis:** I will take that on notice. **Senator LAMBIE:** Thank you.	9 February 2016 L&C: 89
AE16/033	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Federal Police**	Collins	Security incidents at Australian Parliament House	**Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Mr Colvin, you will be aware of the discussion that occurred in the Finance and Public Administration Committee yesterday when the Department of Parliamentary Services was appearing? **Mr Colvin:** No, I am not. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Can I then ask you this on notice: a number of security incidents were canvassed, so I want to give the AFP the opportunity to respond to those issues as well given your role with the parliament. **Mr Colvin:** I am happy to take that on notice, but if you can give us some context of the security incidents we may know something of them. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** I think there were three particular cases canvassed. There was one about someone gaining access without a pass, there was one about someone riding shotgun of the back of another car into the building, and I cannot quite recall the third case. But as I said, given the AFP's role in the security in the building, I thought it was appropriate you have an opportunity to address those matters. **Mr Colvin:** They do not ring a bell to me. We will take them on notice. As I said, there is a security framework that includes a security committee that has different agencies concerned. Things such as access without a pass may or may not be reported to us. It may just be dealt with by the Department of Parliamentary Services, but we can have a look at it. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** In part, the reason that I raise this with you and encourage you to have a look at the Hansard when it is available is that part of that discussion was about the role of the security board, how effectively it may be functioning and how effectively advice might be getting to the Presiding Officers on particular incidents. I thought that would be relevant to bring to your attention. **Mr Colvin:** That is relevant, and we will have a look at what was said. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** It may well be that, on looking at it, you feel there are some further recommendations to progress about how the security board is functioning. **Mr Colvin:** Absolutely. We will look at that.	9 February 2016 L&C: 93
AE16/034	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Federal Police**	Wang	Fraud and Anti-Corruption Centre's investigations	**Ms L Close:** The Fraud and Anti-Corruption Centre has been established for the past three years, since 2013. **Senator WANG:** Within the three years, how many investigations has the centre undertaken and how many are still ongoing? **Ms L Close:** That would be extensive. I would have to take that on notice— **Senator WANG:** Yes, please. **Ms L Close:** because there have been quite a number of investigations. **Senator WANG:** I also note that the referrals page on your website it states that a federal government department or agency is able to refer matters in which there has been a 'serious breach of federal legislation'. Since the centre commenced operation, how many referrals have been received by the centre?	9 February 2016 L&C: 93 & 94

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				Ms L Close: Again, that would be something that I will take on notice. **Mr Colvin:** Just on that, it is worth noting as well that the Fraud and Anti-Corruption Centre has other departments embedded with it, so there would be matters that they would have brought as part of their secondment to the centre, as well as matters that the department has formally referred. It would be extensive, so we will take that on notice. **Senator WANG:** Do you put your investigations into different categories or types of offences? **Mr Colvin:** Yes, we do. **Senator WANG:** Would you put that on notice and give me a breakdown of the types of offences. **Mr Colvin:** We may aggregate some together, because within fraud there are many sorts of fraud: fraud against the Commonwealth. We will look at how we can best inform the committee, but we can do that, yes. **Senator WANG:** This is probably not a statistical question: generally, has there been any increase in reporting of allegations of corruption and misconduct compared to the period before the centre was set up? **Mr Colvin:** We will take it on notice and give you an exact answer. My inclination is to say yes. We know that we have far more foreign bribery allegations now than we would have had four years ago—that is a simple measure. But we will see if we can get you very specific figures on that.	
AE16/035	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Federal Police**	Lambie	Fraud and Anti-Corruption Centre's charges	**Senator LAMBIE:** Could I just ask a question related to that, just while they are putting questions on notice. I just want to know how many charges have been laid since the establishment. If you would like to put that on notice, I would just like to know how many charges have actually been laid. **Mr Colvin:** Since the establishment of the Fraud and Anti-Corruption Centre? **Senator LAMBIE:** Yes, please. **Mr Colvin:** Yes, we should be able to find that.	9 February 2016 L&C: 94
AE16/036	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Federal Police**	MacDonald	Criminal Code convictions – unauthorised disclosure	**CHAIR:** It is wasting resources, is my point, when we are dealing with criminals, thugs, rapists, murderers, and we have the AFP looking through hundreds of thousands of documents and emails for an offence which, even on conviction, I guess would get a good behaviour bond or something. That would be my experience of how lenient the courts are these days. How difficult would it be to get me some examples of the last time someone was convicted for procuring someone else to make an unauthorised disclosure? Would that be difficult to find? **Ms L Close:** I am not aware of the last matter where a person was convicted, so we will have to take that on notice and do some research. **CHAIR:** I do not want you to do too much research, because I for one appreciate that you have far more important things to do. But if it is easy to get the last couple of times there were convictions—if there have ever been any in the history of the Criminal Code of the Commonwealth—I would be interested to see when they were, what the penalty was and how many there were.	9 February 2016 L&C: 99
AE16/037	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Federal Police**	Lambie	Australian Defence Force crimes reported to the Australian Federal Police	**Senator LAMBIE:** How many members of the Australian Defence Force have approached the Australian Federal Police in the last 10 years wanting to make statements alleging they were victims of crime or misconduct committed by other members of the Australian Defence Force? Do you keep these stats? If you do, I would like to get the answer on that question. **Mr Colvin:** We would have to take that on notice to see how many matters have been referred to us by former or serving members of the Defence Force. **Senator LAMBIE:** How many potentially criminal matters have you referred back to the Australian Defence Force for investigation? **Mr Colvin:** I will take that on notice. … **Senator LAMBIE:** I look very forward to seeing what allegations you have received in the last 10 years and what has been done about those allegations, and how many of them have gone back to the Australian Defence Force. Thank you very much. **Mr Colvin:** We have those records. We will share them.	9 February 2016 L&C: 105, 106
AE16/038	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Federal Police**	Ludlam	Memorandum of Understanding between the AFP and Sri Lankan police	**Ms L Close:** Yes. As well as the areas you are outlining, we also have a memorandum of understanding between the Australian Federal Police and the Sri Lankan police. That sets out the aspects in relation to what equipment, training et cetera that we will provide to them. **Senator LUDLAM:** A formal MoU? **Ms L Close:** Yes. **Senator LUDLAM:** When was that signed? **Ms L Close:** I will have to take that on notice. **Mr Colvin:** It is a while ago. **Senator LUDLAM:** 2009 is— **Mr Colvin:** I think that was the initial one and it may well have been updated since it.	9 February 2016 L&C: 108

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/039	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Transnational Crime Branch	Ludlam	Government policy around tabling of MOUs	**Senator LUDLAM:** It is about the tabling of MoUs between, in this instance, the AFP and their counterparts in other countries where we are providing material support or training capacity building. I sought a copy of the MoU that has been signed between the AFP and the Sri Lanka Police Service. Is it formal government policy that such documents would never be tabled? Why would it not be possible for Australian taxpayers to see that? **Senator Brandis:** I do not immediately know the answer to that question, so I will take it on notice. **Senator LUDLAM:** It is worth asking then. If you are able to take that on notice, I am interested in the specifics but also in the general government policy. In answer— **Senator Brandis:** Obviously, I would have to acquaint myself with the document to which you refer to seek advice as to whether it is the kind of document that might be tabled.	9 February 2016 L&C: 108
AE16/040	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Federal Police**	Lambie	Removal of personnel from a ship by police	**Senator LAMBIE:** Thank you. That would be wonderful. I am sure they will be looking forward to that. I have a couple of questions on the shipping incident that happened last week, Attorney-General, because I know this has nothing to do with the Federal Police. Is it true that 70 civilian police showed up to remove eight men from a ship? Can you clarify that for me, and who gave the order to use 70 civilian police to remove six or eight personnel from a ship? **Senator Brandis:** I do not know. I will take that on notice.	9 February 2016 L&C: 111 & 112
AE16/041	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Federal Police**	Ludlam	Det 88 matters	**Senator LUDLAM:** Are you able to engage in any kind of vetting process for members of the Indonesian police, or specifically Det 88, given that they are in receipt of Australian public funding, or is that out of scope? **Mr Colvin:** To the extent that we can, yes, we are tailoring our efforts and our capacity building to those members and those areas we feel are operating in Australia's interest. **Senator LUDLAM:** Is there anybody, for example, that we have simply refused to train, on the basis of their record? **Mr Colvin:** I might take that on notice, because I want to give the committee a proper answer to these questions. They are very serious allegations and they are proper questions for us. I need to be very careful about the way we answer them. I want to try and give the committee the confidence that the AFP is not acting rashly in the way that we cooperate with these units.	9 February 2016 L&C: 113
AE16/042	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Federal Police**	Ludlam	Mr Nick Ross's case	**Senator LUDLAM:** You have taken a fair number of matters on notice so I might leave it there. I am just going to put one—it is probably going to seem a bit left field—on another matter and then I will let you go. Could confirm for us, whether or not you have received a complaint in relation to a Mr Nick Ross, former employee, tech journalist with the ABC, regarding the recording of a conversation without disclosing it to the other participant of the conversation, which has hit the media over the last couple of weeks. **Mr Colvin:** Senator, the allegation does not ring any bells with me. Looking back, none of my officers- **Senator LUDLAM:** Are looking genuinely mystified. Do you want to take that one on notice and if you can just confirm either way. **Mr Colvin:** We will check. Was the name Nick Ross, did you say? **Senator LUDLAM:** Nick Ross. R-O-S-S. Thanks for your time. Thanks Chair.	9 February 2016 L&C: 114
AE16/043	Emergency Management Australia Outcome 1 Crisis Management Branch	McKim	Management of fires within the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area	**Senator McKIM:** Are you aware of how many fires are currently burning within the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area? **Mr Crosweller:** Not specifically in the wilderness area. I do not think we have that information available tonight, but we can certainly obtain that with a simple phone call to Tasmania tomorrow morning and come back to you on that question if that is helpful. **Senator McKIM:** It would be helpful, and would you also ask how many of those fires are currently actively being managed? **Mr Crosweller:** Yes. **Senator McKIM:** Because I am trying to paint a picture, and I have to say, with the greatest of respect to everyone involved, that the information flow to the public has not been great around the remote area fires. I am referring specifically here to the fires that are not threatening built assets and private property. It is those wilderness fires, specifically those inside the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, that I am asking about. **Mr Crosweller:** We can certainly get more specific information for you. I am aware that there is significant effort being put into those fires in the wilderness area, and I am aware of the sensitivities of the biodiversity. I know for example, from the last statistics I saw, which are probably four or five days old now, that only about two per cent of the wilderness area was in fact impacted by fire. **Senator McKIM:** Yes, that is a number that has been made public. Of course, the issue is that there are non-fire-adapted ecological systems that exist nowhere else in the world, except in those very small parts of Tasmania. **Mr Crosweller:** Yes. **Senator McKIM:** We have already lost some of them. **Mr Crosweller:** Yes, that is right. **Senator McKIM:** I have not seen official numbers on how many hectares we have lost but I have seen photos and I am going to do some more exploration of that myself next week. But could you provide any further information to the committee as soon as possible?	9 February 2016 L&C: 119 & 120

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				Mr Crosweller: We will have this confirmed for you, but we understand that between 14,000 and 17,000 hectares of sensitive biodiversity has been impacted by fire out of a total of 30,000 hectares in the wilderness area. The remainder of that 30,000 hectares is, as I understand it, considered non-endangered for the purposes of the fire regime.	
AE16/044	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 **Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance & Corruption**	Collins	S6D of Royal Commissions Act	**Senator Brandis:** A view was arrived at that the matter should be handled so far as concerned the opposition by offering the opportunity to Mr Dreyfus to inspect the confidential volumes in the terms set out in the letter. The view that the government took was, having offered the opportunity to inspect the confidential volumes to crossbench members of the Senate, it would appropriate to offer the opportunity to a senior person on behalf of the opposition, and it was decided to offer the opportunity to Mr Dreyfus because he was the shadow Attorney-General. For that reason, a judgement was made that he was the most appropriate person to make the offer. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** I go back to my earlier comment that it is officers of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet who proposed supervised access to this report. But in this case you have chosen the shadow Attorney to be relevant person from the opposition, not officers of the Attorney-General's Department. That does not seem odd to you? **Senator Brandis:** No. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Just going back to the issue of the consequences of breaching confidentiality restrictions, given that there is no nondisclosure order in relation to the final report, there are no consequences for breaching the restrictions, are there? **Senator Brandis:** Are you referring to Senator Cash's letter? **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Yes. **Senator Brandis:** As I said to you before, Senator, you really have to ask Senator Cash why she put those words in the letter that she wrote to Senator Lambie. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** I suppose I am seeking confirmation that the provisions in section 6D of the Royal Commissions Act do not apply to the final report. **Senator Brandis:** I would have to have a look at that. So I will take that on notice.	9 February 2016 L&C: 123
AE16/045	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 **Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance & Corruption**	Collins	Access to confidential report	**Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** This information was originally provided to us as the comments that Commissioner Haydon made in relation to confidentiality. I am asking Ms Innes-Brown: is she aware of whether this paragraph is exhaustive on that point? **Ms Innes-Brown:** I understand that, as there was no direction made—as there was in the interim report—but as the commissioner did include this paragraph, basically stipulating that it is recommended that the volume not be published and be kept confidential. That is all I am aware of. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Okay, so you are not aware of whether there were any further conditions he commented on— **Ms Innes-Brown:** That is correct. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Thank you, Ms Innes-Brown. Attorney, maybe you can assist us there. Are the specific limitations proposed by the government based on any recommendations by the commissioner? Or are they issues that the government has come to? **Senator Brandis:** I will have to refresh my memory about that, Senator. The limitations did have a provenance, and I am just trying to recall what it was. So I will take that on notice. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Okay. Looking now at the issue of the presence of an officer of PM&C, was that a recommendation of the commissioner, to your recollection? **Senator Brandis:** Look, just to be on the safe side, I will take that on notice.	9 February 2016 L&C: 124
AE16/046	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 **Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance & Corruption**	Collins	Revelation of Royal Commission documents to members of the opposition	**Senator Brandis:** As I say, Senator Cash wrote to the crossbenchers. I wrote to Mr Dreyfus. I did show Senator Cash a copy of my letter to Mr Dreyfus in draft and she was happy with it. It was not sent to him until it had been cleared by her office as well. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** You have taken on notice what providence there might be from the commissioner in relation to the conditions that the government has applied. Can I ask whether— **Senator Brandis:** I think they did come from the commissioner, but I am just not 100 per cent sure which is why I am taking it on notice. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Yes. So I have further questions in relation to that issue that you might take on notice, please. **Senator Brandis:** Sure. **Senator JACINTA COLLINS:** Does the royal commissioner say anything about it only going to one member of the opposition? **Senator Brandis:** I am not sure. I will take that on notice.	9 February 2016 L&C: 125
AE16/047	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division	Siewert	Engagement of states and territories in redress process	**Senator Brandis:** That is right. And it will be highly relevant what the next Council on Law, Crime and Community Safety decides. What the Commonwealth has decided to do—and Mr Porter, the social services minister, and I	9 February 2016 L&C: 127

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
	Outcome 1 RC Commonwealth Reps			announced this in a joint press release late last year—is to take leadership to try and shape a nationally consistent approach to redress. This is for the obvious reasons that it is a Commonwealth royal commission and we are the lead jurisdiction. On the other hand, we do not have responsibility for most—in fact, for hardly any—of the institutions that are subject to the review, so the Commonwealth sees its role as taking the lead in creating the architecture, as it were, of a nationally consistent approach to redress. **Senator SIEWERT:** Have you already got the agreement of the states and the territories to engage in this process, or is the initial step to seek their agreement to engage in the process? **Senator Brandis:** I wrote to the states and territories at the end of last year—and I had better take on notice how many replies I have received from them so far. Obviously, where one is talking about a very large amount of money that will be paid by way of redress payments to the victims, there is, as there always is in a federation, a back-and-forth, as it were, between the states and the Commonwealth about financial obligations. For the moment the Commonwealth has said that it will take the leadership in creating the architecture, but we have not made any commitments in relation to the assumption of financial obligations. I am sorry—I am corrected. The letters that went to the state and territory ministers went out at the end of last month, not at the end of last year **Senator SIEWERT:** Around the time the announcement was made—on 29 January, is that correct? **Senator Brandis:** Yes. **Senator SIEWERT:** So you have not had time for a response yet? **Senator Brandis:** Yes.	
AE16/048	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions**	Bilyk	Brief of evidence associated with investigation into Serana Pty Ltd	1. In Senate Estimates on 24 November 2015, the Department of Agriculture advised that a brief of evidence with respect to its investigation into Serana Pty Ltd was submitted to the CDPP on 9 April 2015. Can you confirm that you received that brief of evidence? 2. The Department of Agriculture implies that the CDPP has not yet made a recommendation. Can you confirm that you have not yet made a recommendation? Can you confirm that you have not sought a further brief of evidence? 3. Can you advise when you are likely to be making a recommendation; given it has been 10 months since you received the brief of evidence?	Written
AE16/049	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 **Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse**	Lambie	Sexual abuse of children in the military	It's my intention today to find out why Justice Peter McClellan AM- from the Royal Commission into Institutional abuse of Children failed to properly answer all 3 questions I put to him in a letter sent to him on 5th June 2015. 1. Does the representative from the Royal Commission agree that I sent a letter to them on the 5.6.15 and Justice Peter McClellan AM- from the Royal Commission replied to me on the same day? I'm happy to table a copies of the letter sent to and received from the Royal Commission for the Committee's benefit? (Table Letters if given permission) In response to my question: • *Do the Commissioners intend to take action on said child sexual abuse in the military?* Justice Peter McClellan AM from the Commission admitted and wrote: (and I quote) • *"The Royal Commission is required by its Letters Patent to investigate, consider and report on issues relating to the sexual abuse of children in an institutional context.* • *Military establishments, which included children, are relevant institutions."* However, Justice McClellan- from the Royal Commission as you'll no doubt acknowledge after reading his reply wasn't as forth coming to these two questions- which I'd like answered today: • What kind of action do the Commissioners intend to undertake in relation to said child sexual abuse in the Australian military? • Has the Royal Commission requested a copy of the DLA Piper Vol. 2 report which Chair- is the room full of secret Volumes of Defence Abuse? Let's begin by answering those two questions because I'm offended by Justice Peter McClellan AM official attempt at avoiding those 2 important questions. 2. What kind of action do the Commissioners intend to undertake in relation to said child sexual abuse in the Australian military? 3. Has the Royal Commission requested a copy of the DLA Piper Vol. 2 report which Chair- is the room full of secret Volumes of Defence Abuse? 4. Has the Royal Commission made enquiries from the Defence Department about their apprenticeship scheme- where children aged between 14 to 17 years old were employed and trained by the Australian military? 5. Is the Royal Commission aware of the fact that the Defence apprenticeship scheme was conducted from 1948 to 1993? 6. Is the Royal Commission aware of the fact that from 1948 to 1993 tens of thousands of children served and were trained as Apprentices in the ADF? 7. Has the Royal Commission ever established exactly how many children served and were trained as Apprentices in	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				the Australian Military? 8. I estimate that up to 30,000 Australian Children served and were trained as Apprentices in our Military over the 45 years between 1948 and 1993. Do you disagree with my calculations? 9. Does the Royal Commission think that the safety of 30,000 children who were in the care of an Australian Military Institution –is just as important as the tens of thousands of children in the care of the: Roman Catholic Church, Scouts Australia, The Salvation Army and the Uniting Church? 10. Has the Royal Commission been made aware of allegations of institutional child sex abuse in our Defence Force? 11. Apart from my letter has the Royal Commission been made aware of the secret volumes of the Defence Abuse Review Task force? 12. (If Yes) I'd like a list which shows the total numbers of communication broken down into letters, emails and phone calls that have been made by the Royal Commission between its self and the defence department and Military. (put it on notice) 13. I'd like a list which shows the total amount of communication broken down into letters, emails and phone calls that have been made by the Royal Commission between its self and the department of veterans affairs (Put it on Notice) 14. Does the Royal Commission have independent powers of prosecution- or will it reply on either federal or state attorney's general to prosecute alleged offenders? 15. Must the attorneys general or DPP's follow your recommendations with regards to prosecuting alleges sexual offenders? 16. Given the high numbers of children who served in our military, is it likely that there were or still are paedophiles who have served in our military and have never been brought to justice for their sex crimes and assaults? 17. Would you agree that should your Royal Commission fail to conduct hearings into institutional child sex abuse in our military between 1948 and 1993- that failure given- that Justice Peter McClellan AM has admitted in writing to me: *"Military establishments, which included children, are relevant institutions."* Could in itself be viewed by ordinary Australians as either gross dysfunction or evidence of a high level cover up of child sex abuse and/or corruption?	
AE16/050	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes-Division Outcome 1 Criminal Law Policy Branch	Wang	National Anti-Corruption Plan and other initiatives on anti-corruption	1. I understand that in 2013 the Attorney-General's Department developed a National Anti-Corruption Plan for the former Government, following a consultation process. I understand that the plan did not include a federal corruption watchdog. Can the Department outline what the plan did in fact include? 2. What gaps in the current framework were identified during the consultation process? 3. How were those gaps addressed in the National Anti-Corruption Plan? 4. Can the Department outline the mechanisms put in place since the plan was developed in 2013 to improve prevention, detection and investigation of corruption and misconduct in the federal sphere? 5. What has been done to improve coordination across the agencies involved in preventing, detecting and investigating corruption and misconduct? 6. The Department's website states that it "is playing an active role in combating corruption through developing domestic policy on anti-corruption and engagement in a range of international anti-corruption forums". a. Can the Department please detail its developments in respect of domestic policy under the current Government? b. Can the Department please outline its engagement with the international anti-corruption forums under the current Government, including: i. The names of the forums and the participants, together with the date, time and location of any forums attended by the Department; ii. The recommendations made at the forums; iii. The action/s the Department has considered, or is considering, as a result of these forums; and iv. The action/s the Department has taken, or elected not to take as a result of these forums? 7. What mechanisms does the Department consider would be necessary to facilitate effective cooperation between a federal integrity commission and state agencies, should a federal agency become a real prospect?	Written
AE16/051	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Crime Commission**	Collins	ACC and AIC merger	1. What is the nature of the discussions and consultations currently occurring within the Federal Government concerning the Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC) and the Australian Crime Commission (ACC)? 2. Has there been any collaborating to explore the risks and benefits of such a merger? 3. What are the results? 4. Has there been any consultation with criminologists outside of the AIC, for example with the Aust NZ Society of Criminology, universities and government crime statistics agencies regarding the risks and benefits? 5. When is this merger anticipated to take effect? 6. Is there a timeline for implementation? 7. Has a committee been established to oversee the merge? 8. Before the decision was made to merge the two organisations were both the AIC and the ACC consulted? 9. What was their response?	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				10. Did they raise any concerns? 11. Were their concerns taken into consideration? 12. Has there been any consultation with existing employees within both the AIC and the ACC? 13. Have existing employees been provided early advice and assistance? 14. What measures have been taken to avert or mitigate any adverse effect of the merger on employees? 15. How many people currently working for the AIC? 16. How many people currently working for the ACC? 17. Can we expect to see a change in those numbers? 18. What are the financial implications of this merger? 19. What is the current budget of the AIC? 20. What is the current budget of the ACC? 21. Can we expect to see a change to these figures? 22. Will the Criminology Research Council survive the merger? Will its funding continue? 23. Will conference convening continue at all, and, if so, will conferences be convened on subjects other than organised crime and terrorism (the key focus of the ACC)? 24. Will the current publications series continue to be provided to the public free of charge? 25. Will the States and Territories still be able to seek fee-for-service responses to particular questions? 26. Will those seeking access to criminological data have to seek registration as users? 27. What will happen to the resources of the JV Barry library and where will it be housed? Will it be open to the public? 28. How the independence of the research produced by the AIC be maintained? 29. Who will be responsible for determining the research priorities of the AIC? 30. Will the current contract for secretarial services provided by the AIC to the Aust & NZ Society of Criminology be honored?	
AE16/052	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Crime Commission**	Collins	ACC and CrimTrac merger	The Government have announced that CrimTrac will be folded into the Australian Crime Commission; 1. When is this merger anticipated to take effect? 2. Is there a timeline for implementation? 3. What are the details of the transition? 4. When will the details of the transition be finalised? 5. Has a committee been established to oversee the merge? 6. How many people working at CrimTrac before the merger? 7. How many people working for CrimTrac have retained their jobs under the merger? 8. How many people previously working for CrimTrac did not survive the merger? 9. Were voluntary redundancy offered? 10. How many staff took this option? 11. Has there been any consultation with existing employees within both CrimTrac and the ACC? 12. Have staff in both organisations been kept informed on what is happening? 13. Have existing employees been provided early advice and assistance? 14. What measures have been taken to avert or mitigate any adverse effect of the merger on employees? 15. Will the merger hinder current projects for either the ACC or CrimTrac? 16. Has there been any collaboration to explore the risks and benefits of such a merger? 17. What are the results? 18. What were the recommendations? 19. Who made these recommendations? 20. Were industry professionals consulted on this matter? 21. What are the financial implications of this merger? 22. What is the budget of CrimTrac before and after the merger? 23. What safeguards and oversights is the ACC subject to? 24. What safeguards and oversights is CrimTrac subject to? 25. How many agencies does CrimTrac share information with? 26. Post-merger would CrimTrac be subject to the same safeguards and oversights as the ACC? 27. CrimTrac's primary responsibility is to develop and maintain national information-sharing services between state, territory and federal law enforcement agencies. Will CrimTrac's information-sharing capabilities be affected by this merger? 28. Will CrimTrac be exempt from the privacy restrictions imposed on the ACC?	Written
AE16/053	Strategy and Delivery Division Outcome 1	Bilyk	Vacancies	Please provide a list of all statutory, board and legislated office vacancies and other significant appointments vacancies within the portfolio, including length of time vacant and current acting arrangements.	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
	Strategy and Delivery Division				
AE16/054	Strategy and Delivery Division Outcome 1 Strategy and Delivery Division	Bilyk	Official functions	In relation to any functions or official receptions by any Ministers or Assistant Ministers/Parliamentary Secretaries in the Attorney-General's portfolio since 20 October 2015, can the following information please be provided: a) List of functions; b) List of attendees including departmental officials and members of the Minister's family or personal staff; c) Function venue; d) Itemised list of costs; e) Details of any food served; f) Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage; and g) Details of any entertainment provided.	Written
AE16/055	Strategy and Delivery Division Outcome 1 Strategy and Delivery Division	Bilyk	Secretary's speeches to staff	Can a copy of any speeches delivered by the Secretary of the Attorney-General's Department at any staff meetings in 2015 please be provided?	Written
AE16/056	Corporate Services Division Outcome 1 Service Centre	Bilyk	Upgrade to Secretary's office	Can an itemised list of the costs of any upgrades to the Secretary's office since 20 October 2015 please be provided?	Written
AE16/057	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions**	Bilyk	AFP investigations into allegations against Mal Brough	Has the Australian Federal Police consulted with the DPP in relation to criminal allegations against Mal Brough? Has the DPP considered a brief of evidence from the AFP in relation to this matter? Has the DPP provided the AFP with any advice in relation to this matter?	Written
AE16/058	Criminal Casework Outcome 1 Criminal Casework	McKenzie	Firearms and Weapons Policy Working Group	a) What involvement does the Firearms Weapons and Policy Working Group have in decision-making? b) In relation to my QON no. SBE15/040 where I asked for a summary of the top 5 points raised by uninvited submissions and the number of such submissions, could the Department provide a breakdown of the numbers of submissions under the listed categories of issues, as well as table the submissions? c) Where any of the emails or letters petition-type correspondence? d) What impact did the aforementioned non-invited stakeholders' concerns have on decision-making? e) Is there a formal mechanism for firearms owners and others to interact with the government on this issue? f) In relation to my questions on notice SBE15/088, questions 8 to 31 were not fully answered, could the exchanged correspondence referred to therein be tabled? g) Is there a scientific/technical base for policy decisions on magazine capacity and categorisation in general? h) How many licenced firearms were reported as stolen across Australia in 2015? i) Does the Attorney-General's department intend to review licencing and storage requirements in the near future? j) Has the AGD considered the implementation of national standards to firearm storage and licensing? k) Has the AGD considered the implementation of shared data collection or a national database involving all states and territories? l) How many firearms related charges were laid in 2015? What is the breakdown of such offences? m) At what point in the Martin Place Review did the Commonwealth know or learn that the Adler shotgun was not "new technology" nor had it "evolved significantly"? n) What was the cost of the consulting performed by the Firearms and Weapons Policy Working Group? o) Given that the Department did not seek the input of those law-abiding firearm owners who would be impacted by any regulatory changes, and given that the Department did not reply to emails enquiring whether or not they could make submissions, and given that one of the Department's senior officials spoke dismissively of the unsolicited submissions the Department did receive because some of them are "not necessarily well expressed in terms of English and grammar", does this silent and dismissive behaviour satisfy the Department's own standards in relation to public communications? If not, what is being done to train staff in dealing appropriately with some enquiries? p) What mechanisms or training are in place to ensure that public enquiries are respectfully dealt with by employees of the Department? q) Firearms owners have a "lack of trust of government in relation to firearms regulation" and it has been suggested that the manner in which the Department handled this review has contributed toward this lack of trust. What is your response? r) Whose decision was it that public submissions would not be accepted? Was any cost/benefit analysis done? Was this approach cleared with the Minister? Why was this approach chosen when the recent Senate Inquiry	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				demonstrated that a call for public submissions would almost certainly attract a large number of very relevant and informative submissions?	
AE16/059	Criminal Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Federal Police**	Xenophon	Metadata domestic preservation order	1. Have any federal politicians been the subject of an AFP initiated metadata domestic preservation order in the last 12 months? If so, how many? 2. Have any federal politicians phone or internet metadata been accessed by the AFP in the last 12 months? If so, how many? 3. Have any federal political staffers been the subject of an AFP initiated metadata domestic preservation order in the last 12 months? If so, how many? 4. Have any federal political staffer's phone or internet metadata been accessed by the AFP in the last 12 months? If so, how many? 5. Have any journalist information warrants been requested by the AFP within the last 12 months? If so, how many? 6. Have any journalist information warrants been granted to the AFP within the last 12 months? If so, how many?	Written
AE16/060	National Security Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Security Intelligence Organisation**	Xenophon	Metadata domestic preservation order	1. Have any federal politicians been the subject of an ASIO initiated metadata domestic preservation order in the last 12 months? If so, how many? 2. Have any federal politicians phone or internet metadata been accessed by the ASIO in the last 12 months? If so, how many? 3. Have any federal political staffers been the subject of an ASIO initiated metadata domestic preservation order in the last 12 months? If so, how many? 4. Have any federal political staffer's phone or internet metadata been accessed by the ASIO in the last 12 months? If so, how many? 5. Have any journalist information warrants been requested by the ASIO within the last 12 months? If so, how many? 6. Have any journalist information warrants been granted to the ASIO within the last 12 months? If so, how many?	Written
AE16/061	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia**	Xenophon	Caseload	1. With respect to the greater Sydney Metropolitan Area: a. What are the current caseloads across the Family Court? b. What was the total caseload number for each of the past 5 financial years? c. How many Family Court Judges are there presently in the area? d. How many Family Court Judges are set retire from the area? i. If there are to be retirements, when is the Attorney likely to appoint replacement judges? ii. How often has the Chief Justice made (informal or formal) representations with respect to the replacement of those judges? e. How many Family Court Judges were there in the area at the conclusion of each of the past 5 financial years? f. What is the current average time frame from application to first hearing? g. How does this average time frame compare to the each of the past 5 financial years? h. What is the current average time frame for matters to be handled from application to finality in the court's original jurisdiction? i. How does this average time frame compare to the each of the past 5 financial years? 2. Please provide the same answer set for the greater Melbourne Metropolitan Area 3. Please provide the same answer set for the Adelaide Area.	Written
AE16/062	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	Xenophon	SeMPRO	Since the AHRC delivered Audit Report "The implementation by Defence of the recommendations of the Review into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force" in early 2014 Defence informed the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee, in September 2014, that in its first year of operations SeMPRO had not had a single report within 72 hours of an incident and, in November 2015, in SeMPRO's second year of operations "... SeMPRO records indicate fewer than five reports of sexual assault were received within 72 hours of an incident. Noting the reasons given by Commissioner Broderick in 2012 for strongly recommending the introduction of restricted reporting, is the AHRC concerned that: 1. In SeMPRO's first year of operations 2013-2014 not a single victim of sexual assault made a restricted report to SeMPRO within 72 hours of an incident? 2. In SeMPRO's second year of operations 2014-2015 'fewer than five' reports of sexual assault were received within 72 hours of an incident'? 3. Since the AHRC presented its 2014 audit report, has the AHRC had any discussions with Defence about why victims of sexual assault in the ADF have not been making restricted reports to SeMPRO within the first 72 hours after the assault? 4. If yes, what has been the outcome of those discussions? 5. If no, why not? 6. Does the AHRC regard the version of 'restricted reporting' which has been introduced by Defence as being	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				substantially the kind of restricted reporting which Commissioner Broderick recommended in 2012?	
AE16/063	Civil Law Unit Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Human Rights Commission**	Xenophon	SeMPRO	The VCDF informed the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee in September 2014 that Defence had put limitations on when SeMPRO could accept reports of sexual assault to ensure compliance with the Sex Discrimination Act 2014. 1. Does the AHRC accept that the Sex Discrimination Act requires Defence to put the limitations on when SeMPRO can accept reports of sexual assault on a confidential basis?	Written
AE16/064	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Family Law Branch	Waters	Cross-examination of DV victims by alleged perpetrators in Family Court	1. Over the last year, there has been a broad sweep of support for changing the rules in the Family Court to stop perpetrators of DV from cross-examining victims in court to bring the Family Court up to the standard of State and Territory Courts. Have you got current plans to implement a change like that? 2. If not, why not? 3. What is the status of that reform if any? When does the Court expect it to take place? 4. This was a recommendation of the Productivity Commission's Access to Justice report – recommendation 24.2 – recommending this change be made is it the government's intention to respond to that recommendation? 5. Is it your view that a rule change like that could be achieved by the Court acting alone (i.e. a change to the Court Rules), or does it require an amdt to the Family Law Act?	Written
AE16/065	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Family Law Branch	Waters	Family Report Writers	1. Are you familiar with the reporting in *The Monthly* and ABC's *Background Briefing* by Jess Hill from last year that called into question the practices of some prominent family report writers operating in private practice? 2. Are you satisfied that the concerns raised in those reports have been adequately addressed? 3. Has the government identified the individual cases reported in the above coverage? 4. Does the government have any plans to ensure those individual cases receive attention and review?	Written
AE16/066	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia**	Waters	Cross-examination of DV victims by alleged perpetrators in Family Court	1. Over the last year, there has been a broad sweep of support for changing the rules in the Family Court to stop perpetrators of DV from cross-examining victims in court to bring the Family Court up to the standard of State and Territory Courts. Have you got current plans to implement a change like that? 2. If not, why not? 3. What is the status of that reform if any? When does the Court expect it to take place? 4. This was a recommendation of the Productivity Commission's Access to Justice report – recommendation 24.2 – recommending this change be made is it the government's intention to respond to that recommendation? 5. Is it your view that a rule change like that could be achieved by the Court acting alone (i.e. a change to the Court Rules), or does it require an amdt to the Family Law Act?	Written
AE16/067	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia**	Waters	Family Report Writers	1. Are you able to paint a rough picture of the breakdown of the Court's caseload between family report writers employed directly by the Court, those employed by Legal Aid, and those in private practice? 2. Are the caseloads broadly the same, or are they skewed one way or another? 3. Is that breakdown similar for more complex cases, such as those including allegations of DV and child abuse? 4. In response to a question from Senator Waters about whether the Court has ever considered accrediting family report writers, the court stated *"The Principal of the Court's Child Dispute Services is responsible for the quality and standard of reports provided to the Court, prepared by internally-employed family-consultant report writers"* and then discussed recruitment, induction, professional development, and evaluation to support that objective. What about reports written by report writers who are not "internally-employed"? 5. The Court's answer also discussed "professional directions for Family Consultants" which set out certain procedures in relation to family violence – do those apply only to "internally employed staff"? Or to external experts as well? 6. Does the same apply to the *Australian Standards of Practice for Family Assessment and Reporting* released by the Chief Justice of the Family Court and the Chief Judges of the Federal Circuit Court and Family Court of Western Australia, and the *Family Violence Best Practice Principles?* I.e. what is the status of those documents? Are they on all family report writers? 7. Are you familiar with the reporting in *The Monthly* and ABC's *Background Briefing* by Jess Hill from last year that called into question the practices of some prominent family report writers operating in private practice? 8. Are you satisfied that the concerns raised in those reports have been adequately addressed?	Written
AE16/068	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia**	Waters	Video recording of family report interviews	1. Does the court have any plans to implement video recording for all family report writers' interviews with children? 2. If not, what is the justification for this?	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/069	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Family Court of Australia**	Waters	Cost of Family Court transcripts	1. Can you confirm that the sole provider of transcripts for the Family Court is AusScript? 2. Can you comment on the relative costs of getting a day's transcript during a trial in the Family Court as opposed to, say, State Supreme Courts in their criminal jurisdictions, or in workers compensation? 3. Can you point to anything to explain that discrepancy (if any)?	Written
AE16/070	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Administrative Appeals Tribunal**	Collins	Migration and Refugee Division matters	1. Can you please advise the current number of decisions by the Migration and Refugee Division for this financial year? 2. Can you please provide the number of cases currently on hand for the Migration and Refugee Division for: a. Student refusal; b. Partner refusal; c. A temporary work 3. Can you advise the number on hand for these categories as at 31 January 2016? 4. Can you please provide the number of cases currently on hand for the Migration and Refugee Division for: a. China; b. India; c. Sri Lanka 5. Can you advise the number on hand for these categories as at 31 January 2016?	Written
AE16/071	AusCheck Outcome 1 AusCheck	Collins	Domestic Violence	1. Can you advise the progress of the National Domestic Violence Order Information Sharing System (NDVOISS) being developed by CrimTrac? 2. Will the merging of the Australian Crime Commission and CrimTrac have any effect on this program? 3. With respect to the national DVO information sharing system, what progress has been made on the interim technical solution as discussed at the 5 November 2015 Law, Crime and Community Safety Council? 4. Will the Government release, before its consideration by COAG, the model legislation to underpin a National Domestic Violence Order Scheme, which was endorsed at the 5 November 2015 Law, Crime and Community Safety Council? 5. On 5 November the Law, Crime and Community Safety Council agreed the recommendations developed by the National Cybercrime Working Group on possible areas of action to address technology-facilitated abuse should be presented to the Council of Australian Governments next meeting. What were those recommendations, and were they presented to the COAG meeting on 11 December? 6. Up to $15 million has been allocated to enable police in Qld to better respond to domestic violence in remote communities and for measures that reduce reoffending by Indigenous perpetrators. Can the Minister provide details as to how this is being spent and on what programs? 7. $17 million is allocated to keep women safe in their homes by expanding successful initiatives like the Safer in the Home programme to install CCTV cameras and other safety equipment, and a grant to the Salvation Army to work with security experts to conduct risk assessments on victim's homes, help change their locks and scan for bugs. How is this money being allocated? 8. $5 million has been allocated for safer technology, including working with telecommunications companies to distribute safe phones to women, and with the eSafety Commissioner to develop a resource package about online safety for women, including for women from CALD communities. How will this project be administered? 9. Can you advise of the progress made to date in developing the family violence bench book? Have ANROWS or another organisation with family and domestic violence expertise been involved in its production?	Written
AE16/072	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 RC Commonwealth Reps	Collins	National redress scheme	1. Recommendation 28 of the Child Abuse Royal Commission was very clear about the timeline the Government would need to stick to in implementing a National Redress Scheme. It stated: "28. The Australian Government should determine and announce by the end of 2015 that it is willing to establish a single national redress scheme." Why did the Government not meet this timeline? It's true that the Government had received the Commission's Final Report on Redress in August, isn't it? 2. The Commission recommended in its report, delivered to the Government in August, that the Government spend the remainder of the year considering its recommendations and how it would implement them. What progress has been made on that work? 3. Is it fair to say that the Government is still only at a very preliminary stage of determining its response to the Commission's report? 4. The Government's announcement on 29 January omitted a number of key details. Can you now advise: a. Whether the Commonwealth is committed to a single, national scheme, administered by the Commonwealth, or whether it would accept a nationally consistent scheme, administered by the states; b. Whether the Commonwealth is committed to ensuring perpetrators of abuse and institutions pay for the crimes committed against children in their care;	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				c. Whether the Commonwealth is committed to a 1 July 2017 commencement date for the redress scheme, as recommended by the Royal Commission; d. When the Commonwealth will begin discussion with the institutions, states and territories; e. How survivors and other groups with specific expertise will be involved in the design of the scheme, and whether they will have a place at the table in negotiations with jurisdictions; f. What the Commonwealth's financial contribution to the National Redress Scheme will be; g. What forms of redress will be made available to survivors. 5. If the Government cannot clear these key issues up now, when will it be able to? 6. Does the Government still aim to meet the 2017 start date set by the Royal Commission?	
AE16/073	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Courts, Tribunals & Admin Law Branch	Collins	Federal courts	1. Judge Roberts of the Federal Circuit Court is set to retire in the middle of this year. Will the Government replace the judge when he retires? a. Has the Government begun selecting a new judge? b. Has the Government sought expressions of interest? c. Has the Government consulted with the profession or with the head of the jurisdiction about a new appointment? d. Has the Government interviewed any candidates for appointment? e. When will the Government announce the replacement candidate? 2. Does the Government guarantee that the services currently provided across North and North-West Tasmania by Judge Roberts will be maintained? 3. Does the Government have any plan to increase the proportion of female judges it appoints?	Written
AE16/074	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Legal Assistance Branch	Collins	Legal Assistance	1. The Productivity Commission's *Report on Access to Justice Arrangements* was released on 3 December 2014. In that Report, the Productivity Commission concluded that *"More resources are required to better meet the legal needs of disadvantaged Australians".* The Productivity Commission also found that *"...not providing legal assistance in these instances can be a false economy as the costs of unresolved problems are often shifted to other areas of government spending such as health care, housing and child protection. Numerous Australian and overseas studies show that there are net public benefits from legal assistance expenditure."* Given these findings of the Productivity Commission, and the direct and severe impact on the delivery of legal services that the Government's cuts have already caused, why does the Government plan for assistance to CLCs to be slashed as soon as the previous Labor's Government's funding injection ends in two years' time? Why is the Turnbull/Abbott Government doing exactly the opposite of what the Productivity Commission recommends? (See pp 30, 38 and 63 of volume 1 of the report) 2. In a statement provided by the Attorney-General to the ABC Radio Current Affairs *PM* program (1 February 2016), the Attorney-General stated: *the Government has committed $1.6 billion over the next five years to Legal Aid commissions, community legal centres, and Indigenous legal assistance services.* Please provide a breakdown of this by year and by legal assistance service category. 3. In Senate debates (13 October 2015), Senator Michaelia Cash acknowledged cuts to community legal centres in the 'out years' (after previously denying them) and advised that these would be looked at as part of MYEFO/Budget processes. There was no additional funding for community legal centres in MYEFO, so what consideration will be given to restoring and boosting community legal centre funding as part of the 2016 federal Budget in line with the Productivity Commissioner's recommendation? 4. In announcing the backflip on cuts to legal assistance services, on 26 March 2015, Senator Brandis stated: *The Community Legal Centres are very often the front line against domestic violence, they are an extremely valuable resource, the Commonwealth has always funded them, or contributed to the funding of them. And I'm delighted to be able to, particularly from the perspective of the Community Legal Centres that does such wonderful work in dealing with the consequences of domestic violence, I'm delighted to be able to announce the restoration of their funding* Given this sentiment, why is the Government drastically cutting funding to CLCs in two years' time, when the Government has been told explicitly that these cuts will have a devastating impact on frontline legal assistance providers and therefore on the most vulnerable in our community? 5. The Attorney-General has often liked to declare that it is only advocacy that he wants to stop CLCs from engaging in. He has said that he is only seeking to gag CLCs from engaging in law reform, but not to reduce their front-line services. The Darebin Community Legal Centre in Victoria has suffered a massive cut to its Commonwealth funding, and we are advised that as a consequence of these cuts the centre will not be able to assist over 150 women with family law matters (unless those women are eligible for legal aid grants). How does the Turnbull Government justify this impact given what you have said about the importance of CLC work?	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				6. The Goulburn Valley Community Legal Centre (incorporating Loddon Campaspe CLC) has lost over $100,000 in Commonwealth funding for the coming year. This allocation, soon to be cut, pays for a full-time lawyer providing Family Violence, Family Law and generalist services in Shepparton (a high need area). The Commonwealth Government's own 2015 Yearbook shows that the Goulburn Valley is one of the most disadvantaged areas in Victoria. Family Violence and Family Law matters make up more than half of all the work the CLC does in that area, and the loss of a full position would have a devastating impact on highly vulnerable clients. How does the Turnbull Government justify this impact given what you have said about the importance of CLC work?	
AE16/075	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 Courts, Tribunals & Admin Law Branch	Collins	Environment protection law	1. How extensively has the Minister for Environment been consulted regarding the repeal of s 487 of the EPBC Act, which is within his portfolio responsibilities? 2. Can the Government provide any examples of the kind of alleged "vigilante litigation" or "lawfare" to which the Attorney-General has referred in justifying the repeal of s487? 3. On 27 September 2015, the Attorney General insisted that "no decision has been made by the Government not to proceed with [the repeal of s487]". Is this still the case? 4. Has there been any change of policy on this matter since the change of Prime Minister? 5. The Attorney General has stated s 487 is a "unique" provision. Are there in fact other extended standing provisions under various parts of Commonwealth law?	Written
AE16/076	Criminal Casework Outcome 1 Criminal Casework	Collins	Potential extradition of members of the Bali Nine to Australia	1. Questions have been asked at previous Estimates about the consideration by various agencies of the potential for members of the Bali Nine facing the death penalty in Indonesia to be extradited to Australia to face prosecution in Australia instead. The Committee has been provided with some information on what inquiries were made or processes pursue by various agencies, including the Attorney-General's Department, the Australian Federal Police and the Commonwealth DPP. To be clear, did the Attorney-General or the Justice Minister at any stage decide not to proceed any further with these inquiries or processes?	Written
AE16/077	TBA Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Security Intelligence Organisation**	Collins	Security protocols and programs to counter violent extremism	1. How important is it for senior office holders of the Australian Government [i.e. ministers and senior public servants] to comply with security protocols when they are dealing with sensitive or secret information across electronic communications such as telephone and email? Is espionage a real risk? 2. To the extent you are able to provide them, what are the basic protocols for the communication of sensitive or secret materials across electronic networks? 3. What risk would arise from communication of secret information across non-secure networks, in breach of established security protocols? 4. How important are programs to counter violent extremism in the fight against terrorism here in Australia? 5. How successful would you say these programs have been in achieving their objectives? 6. Approximately how many Australians are currently participating with terrorist organisation in the conflicts in Syria and Iraq? 7. How many Australian have travelled to the Middle East to participate with terrorist organisations in the last 12 months? Is that figure higher than in the previous 12 months? What is the trajectory of numbers of Australians going to join terrorist organisation overseas? 8. Approximately how many Australians have returned from fighting with terrorist organisation in Iraq and Syria? 9. Approximately how many Australians have been killed fighting with terrorist organisation in Iraq and Syria?	Written
AE16/078	Civil Justice Policy and Programmes Division Outcome 1 (Other Agency) **Australian Law Reform Commission**	Collins	Freedoms Inquiry and references	1. Please provide an update on the ALRC's progress with the Freedoms inquiry: a. Has the ALRC delivered its report to the Government? When? b. Will there be any further work on this inquiry done by the ALRC? c. Were any substantive recommendations made for amendments to the law? 2. Does the ALRC have any other references? 3. Is it unusual for the ALRC to be left with no references to work on? When did this last occur? 4. Is it true that the ALRC often has several ongoing references at once? 5. Has the Government discussed any other potential references with the ALRC? 6. How many full-time staff does the ALRC presently employee? How many of those are lawyers?	Written
AE16/079	Portfolio	Ludwig	Taxi costs	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How much did each department/agency spend on taxis during the specified period? Provide a breakdown for each business group in each department/agency. 2. What are the reasons for taxi costs? How much did the department spend on taxis during the specified period for their minister or minister's office?	Written
AE16/080	Portfolio	Ludwig	Hospitality and entertainment	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. What has been the Department/Agency's hospitality spend including any catering and drinks costs. 2. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total hospitality spend. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs.	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				3. What has been the Department/Agency's entertainment spend? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. 4. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total entertainment spend. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. 5. What hospitality spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. 6. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what hospitality spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. 7. What entertainment spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. 8. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what entertainment spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. 9. Is the Department/Agency planning on reducing any of its spending on these items? If so, how will reductions be achieved?	
AE16/081	Portfolio	Ludwig	Executive coaching and leadership training	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Please provide the following information in relation to executive coaching and/or other leadership training services purchased by each department/agency: 1. Total spending on these services 2. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification 3. The number of employees who have utilised these services, their employment classification and how much study leave each employee was granted (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) 4. The names of all service providers engaged 5. For each service purchased from a provider listed under (4), please provide: 1. The name and nature of the service purchased 2. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based 3. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification 4. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) 5. The total amount spent on the service 6. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package) 6. Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide: 1. The location used 2. The number of employees who took part on each occasion (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) 3. The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) 4. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location 7. In relation to education/executive coaching and/or other leadership training services paid for by the department what agreements are made with employees in regards to continuing employment after training has been completed? 8. For graduate or post graduate study, please breakdown each approved study leave by staffing allocation and degree or program title.	Written
AE16/082	Portfolio	Ludwig	Staffing profile	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has there been any change to the staffing profile of the department/agency? 2. Provide a list of changes to staffing numbers, broken down by classification level, division, home base location (including town/city and state)	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/083	Portfolio	Ludwig	Staffing reductions	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How many staff reductions/voluntary redundancies have occurred? 1. What was the reason for these reductions? 2. Were any of these reductions involuntary redundancies? If yes, provide details. 3. Are there any plans for further staff reductions/voluntary redundancies? If so, please advise details including if there is a reduction target, how this will be achieved, and if any services/programs will be cut. 4. If there are plans for staff reductions, please give the reason why these are happening. 5. Are there any plans for involuntary redundancies? If yes, provide details. 6. How many ongoing staff left the department/agency? What classification were these staff? 7. How many non-ongoing staff left department/agency from? What classification were these staff? 8. What are the voluntary redundancy packages offered? Please detail for each staff level and position 9. How do the packages differ from the default public service package? 10. How is the department/agency funding the packages?	Written
AE16/084	Portfolio	Ludwig	Staffing recruitment	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How many ongoing staff have been recruited? What classification are these staff? 2. How many non-ongoing positions exist or have been created? What classification are these staff? 3. How many staff have been employed on contract and what is the average length of their employment period?	Written
AE16/085	Portfolio	Ludwig	Kitchen Appliances	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the department/agency purchased, leased or rented any kitchen appliances over the value of $1000? 1. If yes, provide a list that includes the type of appliance, the cost, the amount, and any ongoing costs such as purchase of consumables and when the appliance was purchased? 2. Why were the appliances purchased? 3. Has there been a noticeable difference in staff productivity since the appliances were purchased? Are staff leaving the office premises less during business hours as a result? 4. Where did the funding for the appliances come from? 5. Who has access? 6. Who is responsible for the maintenance of the appliances? How much was spent on maintenance, include a list of what maintenance has been undertaken. Where does the funding for maintenance come from? 7. What are the other ongoing costs of the appliances?	Written
AE16/086	Portfolio	Ludwig	Boards (for Departments or agencies with boards)	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. how often has each board met, break down by board name; 2. what travel expenses have been incurred; 3. what has been the average attendance at board meetings; 4. List each member's attendance at meetings; 5. how does the board deal with conflict of interest; 6. what conflicts of interest have been registered; 7. what remuneration has been provided to board members; 8. how does the board dismiss board members who do not meet attendance standards? 9. Have any requests been made to ministers to dismiss board members? 10. Please list board members who have attended less than 51% of meetings 11. What have been the catering costs for the board meetings held during this period? Please break down the cost list.	Written
AE16/087	Portfolio	Ludwig	Corporate cars	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How many cars are owned by each department/agency? 1. Where are the cars located? 2. What are the cars used for? 3. What is the cost of each car during the specified period? 4. How far did each car travel during the specified period? 2. How many cars are leased by each department/agency? 1. Where are the cars located? 2. What are the cars used for? 3. What is the cost of each car during the specified period? 4. How far did each car travel during the specified period?	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/088	Portfolio	Ludwig	Government payments of accounts	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. What has been the average time period for the department/agency paid its accounts to contractors, consultants or others? 2. How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in under 30 days? 3. How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in between 30 and 60 days? 4. How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in between 60 and 90 days? 5. How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in between 90 and 120 days? f) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in over 120 days? 6. For accounts not paid within 30 days, is interest being paid on overdue amounts and if so how much has been paid by the portfolio/department agency since Estimates, 2014? 7. Where interest is being paid, what rate of interest is being paid and how is this rate determined?	Written
AE16/089	Portfolio	Ludwig	Hire cars	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How much did each department/agency spend on hire cars during the specified period? Provide a breakdown of each business group in each department/agency. 2. What are the reasons for hire car costs? 3. How much did the department spend on hire cars during the specified period for their minister or minister's office?	Written
AE16/090	Portfolio	Ludwig	Credit cards	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Provide a breakdown of any changes to employment classifications that have access to a corporate credit card. 2. Have there been any changes to action taken in the event that the corporate credit card is misused? 3. Have there been any changes to how corporate credit card use is monitored? 4. Have any instances of corporate credit card misuse have been discovered during the specified period? If so: 5. Please list staff classification and what the misuse was, and the action taken. 6. Have there been any changes to what action is taken to prevent corporate credit card misuse? 7. How any credit cards available to the Minister or their office? If so, please list by classification. Have there been any misuse of credit cards by the Minister or their office? Has any action been taken against the Minister or their office for credit card misuse? If so, list each occurrence, including the cost of the misuse.	Written
AE16/091	Portfolio	Ludwig	Functions	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Provide a list of all formal functions or forms of hospitality conducted for the Minister . Include: 1. The guest list of each function 2. The party or individual who initiated the request for the function 3. The menu, program or list of proceedings of the function 4. A list of drinks consumed at the function 2. Provide a list of the current wine, beer or other alcoholic beverages in stock or on order in the Minister's office. Breakdown by item, quantity and cost.	Written
AE16/092	Portfolio	Ludwig	Red tape reduction	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Please detail changes to structures, officials, offices, units, taskforce or other processes has the department dedicated to meeting the government's red tape reduction targets? 1. What is the progress of that red tape reduction target 2. How many officers have been placed in those units and at what level? 3. How have they been recruited? 4. What process was used for their appointment? 5. What is the total cost of this unit? 6. What is the estimated total salary cost of the officers assigned to the unit. 7. Do members of the unit have access to cabinet documents? 8. Lease list the security classification and date the classification was issued for each officer, broken down by APS or SES level, in the red tape reduction unit or similar body. 9. What is the formal name given to this unit/taskforce/team/workgroup or agency within the department?	Written
AE16/093	Portfolio	Ludwig	Land costs	1. How much land (if any) does the Department or agencies or authorities or Government corporation within each portfolio own or lease? 2. Please list by each individual land holding, the size of the piece of land, the location of that piece of land and the latest valuation of that piece of land, where that land is owned or leased by the Department, or agency or authority or Government Corporation within that portfolio? (In regards to this question please ignore land upon which Australian Defence force bases are located. Non-Defence Force base land is to be included) 3. List the current assets, items or purse (buildings, facilities or other) on the land identified above.	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				1. What is the current occupancy level and occupant of the items identified in (3)? 2. What is the value of the items identified in (3)? 3. What contractual or other arrangements are in place for the items identified in (3)? 4. How many buildings (if any) does the Department or agencies or authorities or Government Corporation within each portfolio own or lease? 5. Please list by each building owned, its name, the size of the building in terms of square metres, the location of that of that building and the latest valuation of that building, where that building is owned by the Department, or agency or authority or Government corporation within that portfolio? (In regards to this question please ignore buildings that are situated on Australian Defence force bases. Non-Defence Force base buildings are to be included). 6. In regards to any building identified in Q4, please also detail, the occupancy rate as expressed as a percentage of the building size. If occupancy is identified as less than 100%, for what is the remaining space used?	
AE16/094	Portfolio	Ludwig	Contracts for Temporary Staff	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How much did the department/agency spend on temporary or contract staff? 2. How many temporary or contract staff have been employed? 3. What is the total number of temporary or contract staff currently employed? 4. How much was paid for agencies/companies to find temporary/contract staff? 5. Have there been any changes to the policies/criteria that govern the appointment of contract staff?	Written
AE16/095	Portfolio	Ludwig	Printing	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How many documents (include the amount of copies) have been printed? 1. How many of these printed documents were also published online? 2. Has the Department/Agency used external printing services for any print jobs? 1. If so, what companies were used? 2. How were they selected? 3. What was the total cost of this printing by item?	Written
AE16/096	Portfolio	Ludwig	Communications staff	1. For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following: 2. How many ongoing staff, the classification, the type of work they undertake and their location. 3. How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location 4. How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location 5. How many are graphic designers? 6. How many are media managers? 7. How many organise events? Have these arrangements changed since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015? If yes, please detail.	Written
AE16/097	Portfolio	Ludwig	Reviews	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How many new reviews (defined as review, inter-departmental group, inquiry, internal review or similar activity) have been commenced? Please list them including: 1. the date they were ordered 2. the date they commenced 3. the minister responsible 4. the department responsible 5. the nature of the review 6. their terms of reference 7. the scope of the review 8. Who is conducting the review 9. the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review 10. the expected report date 11. the budgeted, projected or expected costs 12. If the report will be tabled in parliament or made public 2. For any review commenced or ordered, have any external people, companies or contractors being engaged to assist or conduct the review? 1. If so, please list them, including their name and/or trading name/s and any known alias or other trading names 2. If so, please list their managing director and the board of directors or equivalent 3. If yes, for each is the cost associated with their involvement, including a break down for each cost item 4. If yes, for each, what is the nature of their involvement 5. If yes, for each, are they on the lobbyist register, provide details. 6. If yes, for each, what contact has the Minister or their office had with them	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				7. If yes, for each, who selected them 8. If yes, for each, did the minister or their office have any involvement in selecting them, 1. If yes, please detail what involvement it was 2. If yes, did they see or provided input to a short list 3. If yes, on what dates did this involvement occur 4. If yes, did this involve any verbal discussions with the department 5. If yes, on what dates did this involvement occur 3. Which reviews are on-going? 1. Please list them. 2. What is the current cost to date expended on the reviews? 4. Have any reviews been stopped, paused or ceased? Please list them. 5. Which reviews have concluded? Please list them. 6. How many reviews have been provided to Government? Please list them and the date they were provided. 7. When will the Government be responding to the respective reviews that have been completed? 8. What reviews are planned? 1. When will each planned review be commenced? 2. When will each of these reviews be concluded? 3. When will government respond to each review? 4. Will the government release each review? 1. If so, when? If not, why not?	
AE16/098	Portfolio	Ludwig	Commissioned reports	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How many reports (including paid external advice) have been commissioned by the Minister, department or agency? 1. Please provide details of each report including date commissioned, date report handed to Government, date of public release, Terms of Reference and Committee members. 2. How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost? How many departmental or external staff were involved in each report and at what level? 3. What is the current status of each report? When is the Government intending to respond to these reports?	Written
AE16/099	Portfolio	Ludwig	Appointments	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Please detail any board appointments made to date. 2. What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio? 3. Has the department instigated of changed its gender ratio target and/or any other policy intended to increase the participation rate of women on boards? If yes, please specify what the target and policy is for each board. 4. Please specify when these gender ratio or participation policies were changed.	Written
AE16/100	Portfolio	Ludwig	Stationary Requirements	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How much has been spent by each department and agency on the government (Ministers / Parliamentary Secretaries) stationery requirements in your portfolio to date? 1. Detail the items provided to the minister's office. 2. Please specify how many reams of paper have been supplied to the Minister's office. 2. How much has been spent on departmental stationary requirements to date. 3. Has any customised stationery been requested or provided to the Minister or Ministerial Staff? If yes, please include a photo/scan, detail the type of stationary, date it was requested, date it was provided and the cost.	Written
AE16/101	Portfolio	Ludwig	Electronic equipment	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Other than phones, iPads or computers – please list the electronic equipment provided to the Minister's office. 1. List the items 2. List the items location or normal location 3. List if the item is in the possession of the office or an individual staff member of minister, if with an individual list their employment classification level 4. List the total cost of the items 5. List an itemised cost breakdown of these items 6. List the date they were provided to the office 7. Note if the items were requested by the office or proactively provided by the department	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/102	Portfolio	Ludwig	Media subscriptions	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. What pay TV subscriptions does your department/agency have? 1. Please provide a list of channels and the reason for each channel. 2. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? 3. What is provided to the Minister or their office? 4. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? 2. What newspaper subscriptions does your department/agency have? 1. Please provide a list of newspaper subscriptions and the reason for each. 2. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? 3. What is provided to the Minister or their office? 4. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? 3. What magazine subscriptions does your department/agency have? 1. Please provide a list of magazine subscriptions and the reason for each. 2. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? 3. What is provided to the Minister or their office? 4. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? 4. What publications does your department/agency purchase? 1. Please provide a list of publications purchased by the department and the reason for each. 2. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period? 3. What is provided to the Minister or their office? 4. What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period?	Written
AE16/103	Portfolio	Ludwig	Meeting costs	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How much has the Department/Agency spent on meeting costs? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events, including any catering and drinks costs. 2. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total meeting spend from to date. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event including any catering and drinks costs. 3. What meeting spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs. 4. For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what meeting spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event including any catering and drinks costs.	Written
AE16/104	Portfolio	Ludwig	Media training	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. In relation to media training services purchased by each department/agency, please provide the following information: 1. Total spending on these services 2. An itemised cost breakdown of these services 3. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification 4. The number of employees who have utilised these services and their employment classification 5. The names of all service providers engaged 6. The location that this training was provided 2. For each service purchased from a provider listed under (1), please provide: 1. The name and nature of the service purchased 2. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based 3. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) 4. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) 5. The total amount spent on the service 6. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package) 3. Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide: 4. The location used 5. The number of employees who took part on each occasion 6. The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification) 7. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/105	Portfolio	Ludwig	Consultancies	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How many consultancies have been undertaken? Identify the name of the consultant, the subject matter of the consultancy, the duration and cost of the arrangement, and the method of procurement (i.e. open tender, direct source, etc.). Also include total value for all consultancies. 2. How many consultancies are planned for this calendar year? Have these been published in your Annual Procurement Plan (APP) on the AusTender website and if not why not? In each case please identify the subject matter, duration, cost and method of procurement as above, and the name of the consultant if known. 3. Have any consultancies not gone out for tender? 1. List each, including name, cost and purpose 2. If so, why?	Written
AE16/106	Portfolio	Ludwig	Provision of equipment - ministerial	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. For departments/agencies that provide mobile phones to Ministers and/or Parliamentary Secretaries and/or their offices, what type of mobile phone has been provided and the costs? 1. Itemise equipment and cost broken down by staff or minister classification 2. Has electronic equipment (such as iPad, laptop, wireless card, vasco token, blackberry, mobile phone (list type if relevant), thumb drive, video cameras) been provided by the department/agency? If yes provide a list of: 3. What is provided? 4. The purchase cost. 5. The ongoing cost. 6. A list of any accessories provided for the equipment and the cost of those accessories. (e.g. iPad keyboards, laptop carry bags, additional chargers etc.). 7. A breakdown of what staff and staff classification receives each item.	Written
AE16/107	Portfolio	Ludwig	Provision of equipment - departmental	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has electronic equipment (such as iPad, laptop, wireless card, vasco token, blackberry, mobile phone (list type if relevant), thumb drive, video cameras) been provided by the department/agency to departmental staff? If yes provide a list of: 2. What has been provided? 3. The purchase cost. 4. The ongoing cost. 5. A list of any accessories provided for the equipment and the cost of those accessories. (e.g. iPad keyboards, laptop carry bags, additional chargers etc.). 6. A breakdown of what staff and staff classification receives each item.	Written
AE16/108	Portfolio	Ludwig	Computers	1. List the current inventory of computers owned, leased, stored, or able to be accessed by the Ministers office as provided by the department, listing the equipment cost and location and employment classification of the staff member that is allocated the equipment, or if the equipment is currently not being used 2. List the current inventory of computers owned, leased, stored, or able to be accessed by the department, listing the equipment cost and location 3. Please detail the operating systems used by the departments computers, the contractual arrangements for operating software and the on-going costs	Written
AE16/109	Portfolio	Ludwig	Travel costs – department	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Is the minister or their office or their delegate required to approve all departmental and agency international travel? 2. If so, under what policy? 3. Provide a copy of that policy. 4. When was this policy implemented? 5. When is the minister notified, when is approved provided? 6. Detail all travel (domestic and international) for Departmental officers that accompanied the Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary on their travel. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals). 7. Detail all travel for Departmental officers. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals). Also provide a reason and brief explanation for the travel. 8. What date was the minister or their office notified of the travel? 9. What date did the minister or their office approve the travel? 10. What travel is planned for the rest of this calendar year? Also provide a reason and brief explanation for the travel.	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/110	Portfolio	Ludwig	Grants	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. What guidelines are in place to administer grants? 2. How are grants applied for? 3. Are there any restrictions on who can apply for a grant? If yes, please detail. 1. Can these restrictions be waved? If yes, please detail the process for waving them and list any grants where the restrictions were waved. 4. What is the procedure for selecting who will be awarded a grant? 5. Who is involved in this selection process? 6. Does the minister or the minister's office play any role in awarding grants? If yes, please detail. 1. Has the minister or the minister's office exercised or attempted to exercise any influence over the awarding of any grants? If yes, please detail. 7. Provide a list of all grants, including ad hoc, one-off discretionary grants awarded to date. Provide the recipients, amount, intended use of the grants, what locations have benefited from the grants and the electorate and state of those locations. 8. Update the status of each grant that was approved prior to the specified period, but did not have financial contracts in place at that time. Provide details of the recipients, the amount, the intended use of the grants, what locations have benefited from the grants and the electorate and state of those grants.	Written
AE16/111	Portfolio	Ludwig	Departmental rebranding	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the department/Agency undergone a name change or any other form of rebranding? If so: a. Please detail why this name change / rebrand were considered necessary and a justified use of departmental funds? i. Please provide a copy of any reports that were commissioned to study the benefits and costs associated with the rebranding. b. Please provide the total cost associated with this rebrand and then break down by amount spent replacing: i. Signage. ii. Stationery (please include details of existing stationery and how it was disposed of). iii. Logos iv. Consultancy v. Any relevant IT changes. vi. Office reconfiguration. c. How was the decision reached to rename and/or rebrand the department? i. Who was involved in reaching this decision? ii. Please provide a copy of any communication (including but not limited to emails, letters, memos, notes etc.) from within the department, or between the department and the government regarding the rename/rebranding.	Written
AE16/112	Portfolio	Ludwig	Media monitoring	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the Minister's office during the specified period? 1. Which agency or agencies provided these services? 2. What has been spent providing these services during the specified period? 3. Itemise these expenses. 2. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency during the specified period? 1. Which agency or agencies provided these services? 2. What has been spent providing these services during the specified period? 3. Itemise these expenses	Written
AE16/113	Portfolio	Ludwig	Procedure Manuals (Ministerial)	1. Does the minister's office have a procedure manual for communication between the minister's office and the department? If yes, please provide a copy and: 2. When was the manual last updated? 3. Who is responsible for updating the manual? 4. Who is the manual distributed to? 5. Is anyone responsible for clearing communications before they are sent to the department?	Written
AE16/114	Portfolio	Ludwig	Enterprise Bargaining Agreements (EBAs)	1. Please list all related EBAs with coverage of the department. 2. Please list their starting and expiration dates. 3. What is the current status of negotiations for the next agreement/s? Please detail.	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/115	Portfolio	Ludwig	Existing Resources Program	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How many projects, work, programs or other tasks has the department started as a consequence of government policies or priorities that are required to be funded 'within existing resources'? 2. List each 3. List the staffing assigned to each task 4. What is the nominal total salary cost of the officers assigned to the project? 5. What resources or equipment has been assigned to the project?	Written
AE16/116	Portfolio	Ludwig	Conditions of Government Contracts and Agreements	1. Do any contracts managed by the Department/Agency contain any limitations or restrictions on advocacy or criticising Government policy? If so, please name each contact. When was it formed or created? 2. What are the specific clauses and/or sections which state this, or in effect, create a limitation or restriction? 3. Do any agreements managed by the Department/Agency contain any limitations on restrictions on advocacy or criticisms of Government policy? If so, please name each agreement. When was it formed or created? 4. What are the specific clauses and/or sections which state this, or in effect, create a limitation or restriction? 5. For each of the contracts and agreements, are there any particular reason, such as genuine commercial in confidence information, for this restriction? 6. Have any changes to financial or resource support to services which advocate on behalf of groups or individuals in Australian society been made? If so, which groups? What was the change? 7. Has any consultation occurred between the Department/Agency and any individuals and/or community groups about these changes? If so, what consultation process was used? Was it public? If not, why not? Are public submissions available on a website? 8. If no consultation has occurred, why not? 9. Did the Minister/Parliamentary Secretary meet with any stakeholders about changes to advocacy in their contracts and/or agreements? If so, when? Who did he/she meet with?	Written
AE16/117	Portfolio	Ludwig	Statutory Review Provisions	Please list all current legislation, covered by the department's portfolio, which contain a statutory review provision/s. For each, please provide: 1. What work has been done towards preparing for the review? If none, why not? 2. Please provide a schedule or a workplan for the review 3. When did/will this work begin? 4. When is/was the review due to commence. 5. What is the expected report date. 6. Who is the minister responsible for the review 7. What department is responsible for the review 8. List the specific clauses or legislation under review caused by the statutory provision. 9. List the terms of reference. 10. What is the scope of the review. 11. Who is conducting the review. How were they selected? What are the legislated obligation for the selection of the person to conduct the review? 12. What is the budgeted, projected or expected costs of the review? 13. When was the Minister briefed on this matter? 14. What decision points are upcoming for the minister on this matter? 15. List the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review 16. Will the report will be tabled in parliament or made public. If so, when?	Written
AE16/118	Portfolio	Ludwig	Sunset Provisions	1. Please list all current legislation, covered by the department's portfolio, which contain a sunset provision/s. For each, please provide: 1. What work has been done towards preparing for the activation of sunset provisions? If no work has commenced, why not? 2. Has any consideration been given to delaying or alerting the sunset provisions? 3. Please provide a schedule or a workplan for the sunset provisions becoming active 4. When did/will this work begin? 2. Will there be any reviews of or relating to the legislation before or after the sunset provision is enacted? If yes: 1. When is/was the review due to commence. 2. What is the expected report date. 3. Who is the minister responsible for the review 4. What department is responsible for the review 5. List the specific clauses or legislation under review caused by the statutory provision. 6. List the terms of reference. 7. What is the scope of the review.	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				8. Who is conducting the review. How were they selected? What are the legislated obligation for the selection of the person to conduct the review? 9. What is the budgeted, projected or expected costs of the review? 10. When was the Minister briefed on this matter? 11. What decision points are upcoming for the minister on this matter? 12. List the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review 13. Will the report will be tabled in parliament or made public. If so, when?	
AE16/119	Portfolio	Ludwig	Legal Costs	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. List all legal costs incurred by the department or agency 2. List the total cost for these items, broken down by source of legal advice, hours retained or taken to prepare the advice and the level of counsel used in preparing the advice, whether the advice was internal or external 3. List cost spend briefing Counsel, broken down by hours spent briefing, whether it was direct or indirect briefing, the gender ratio of Counsel, how each Counsel was engaged (departmental, ministerial) 4. How was each piece of advice procured? Detail the method of identifying legal advice	Written
AE16/120	Portfolio	Ludwig	Procedure Manuals (Departmental)	1. Does the department have a procedure manual for communication between the department and the minister? If yes, please provide a copy and: 2. When was the manual last updated? 3. Who is responsible for updating the manual? 4. Has the minister's office had any input into the content of the manual? If so, please detail. 5. Who is the manual distributed to? 6. Is anyone responsible for clearing communications before they are sent to the minister or the minister's office?	Written
AE16/121	Portfolio	Ludwig	Vending machines	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the department/agency purchased or leased or taken under contract any vending machine facilities? 1. If so, list these 2. If so, list the total cost for these items 3. If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure 4. If so, where were these purchased 5. If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased 6. If so, what is the current location for these items? 7. If so, what is the current usage for each of these items?	Written
AE16/122	Portfolio	Ludwig	Self-initiated work	1. Does the department have a program for staff to engage in self-initiated work (projects, plans etc. that are devised by staff without being directed by the minister's office or department management)? 2. Please list all ongoing projects. For each, please detail: 3. When did the project commence? 4. When is it expected to conclude? 5. What will the total cost of the project be? 6. Where did the money for the project come from? 7. Where is the project based?	Written
AE16/123	Portfolio	Ludwig	Staff Awards	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the Department / Agency given out awards to staff for any reason? If yes: 1. What was the reason for the awards? 2. What was the criteria for the awards? 3. What form did the award take? (e.g. Certificate, gift vouchers etc.) 4. How much was spent on the award? 2. How were the awards presented? 3. Who presented the awards? 4. Was there a ceremony or party for the awards? If yes: 1. Where was it held? 2. Was there a fee for the venue? If yes, how much? 3. How much was spent on catering? 4. How many people attended? 5. Did the minister attend? 6. Did the minister's staff attend? If yes, how many?	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/124	Portfolio	Ludwig	Change Management	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the Department/Agency engaged in a policy of Change Management? If yes: 1. Please detail the policy. 2. When was the policy introduced? 3. What are the goals of the policy? 4. How much was spent on consulting for the policy and who was contracted for this consultation? 5. How much was spent implementing this policy?	Written
AE16/125	Portfolio	Ludwig	Departmental Staff Misconduct	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Please provide a copy of the departmental staff code of conduct. 2. Have there been any identified breaches of this code of conduct by departmental staff? 1. If yes, list the breaches identified, broken by staffing classification level. 2. If yes, what remedy was put in place to manage the breach? If no remedy has been put in place, why not? 3. If yes, when was the breach identified? By whom? When was the Minister made aware? 4. If yes, were there any legal ramifications for the department or staff member? Please detail.	Written
AE16/126	Portfolio	Ludwig	Fee for services	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Have any existing services provided by the department / agency moved from being free to a user-pay service? Have any additional fees been placed on existing services? If yes please provide a list and include: 2. Name of the fee and a short description of what it covers. 3. How much is the fee (and is it a flat fee or a percentage of the service). 4. The date the fee came into place. 5. Were any reviews requested, commenced or complemented into the benefits and drawbacks of attaching the fee to the service? If yes, please detail and provide a copy of the review. 6. What consultation was carried out before the fee was put into place? 7. How was the fee put into place (e.g. through legislation, regulation changes etc.)? 8. What justification is there for the fee? 9. test	Written
AE16/127	Portfolio	Ludwig	Documents provided to minister	1. Excluding policy or correspondence briefs, how many documents are provided to the Minister's office on a regular and scheduled basis? Including documents that are not briefs to the minister and do not require ministerial signature. 2. List those documents, their schedule and their purpose (broken down by ministerial signature and office for noting documents) 3. How are they transmitted to the office? 4. What mode of delivery is used (hardcopy, email) for those documents? 5. What level officer are they provided to in the minister's office?	Written
AE16/128	Portfolio	Ludwig	Merchandise or promotional material	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the department purchased any merchandise or promotional material? 2. List by item, and purpose for each item, including if the material is for a specific policy or program or for a generic purpose (note that purpose) 3. List the cost for each item 4. List the quantity of each item 5. Who suggested these material be created? 6. Who approved its creation? 7. Provide copies of authorisation 8. When was the Minister informed of the material being created? 9. Who created the material? 10. How was that person selected? 11. How many individuals or groups were considered in selecting who to create the material?	Written
AE16/129	Portfolio	Ludwig	Domain Usage	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Please provide a breakdown of the domain usage for the 50 most utilised (by data sent and received), unique (internet) domains accessed by the minister's office. Please provide: 1. Domain name of the website being accessed (or IP address if the Domain is unavailable in the tracking system). 2. Amount of data downloaded and uploaded to the site. 3. Number of times the site was accessed.	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/130	Portfolio	Ludwig	Ministerial Website	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How much has been spent on the Minister's website? 1. List each item of expenditure and cost 2. Who is responsible for uploading information to the Minister's website? 3. Have any departmental staff been required to work outside regular hours to maintain the Minister's website? Please detail.	Written
AE16/131	Portfolio	Ludwig	Report Printing	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Have any reports, budget papers, statements, white papers or report-like documents printed for or by the department been pulped, put in storage, shredded or disposed of? 2. If so please give details; name of report, number of copies, cost of printing, who order the disposal, reason for disposal	Written
AE16/132	Portfolio	Ludwig	FoI Requests	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How many requests for documents under the FOI Act have been received? 2. Of these, how many documents have been determined to be deliberative documents? 3. Of those assessed as deliberative documents: 1. For how many has access to the document been refused on the basis that it would be contrary to the public interest? 2. For how many has a redacted document been provided?	Written
AE16/133	Portfolio	Ludwig	Ministerial Motor vehicle	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the minister been provided with or had access to a motor vehicle? If so: 1. What is the make and model? 2. How much did it cost? 3. When was it provided? 4. Was the entire cost met by the department? If not, how was the cost met? 5. What, if any, have been the ongoing costs associated with this motor vehicle? Please include costs such as maintenance and fuel. 6. Are these costs met by the department? If not, how are these costs met? 7. Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine if a minister is entitled to a motor vehicle. 8. Have these guidelines changed during the specified period of time? If so, please detail. 9. Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine how a minister is to use a motor vehicle they have been provided with. Please include details such as whether the motor vehicle can be used for personal uses. 10. Have these guidelines changed during the specified period of time? If so, please detail.	Written
AE16/134	Portfolio	Ludwig	Ministerial Staff vehicles (non-MoPS)	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Outside of MoPS Act entitlements, have any of the Minister's staff been provided with a motor vehicle? If so: 1. What is the make and model? 2. How much did it cost? 3. When was it provided? 4. Was the entire cost met by the department? If not, how was the cost met? 5. What, if any, have been the ongoing costs associated with this motor vehicle? Please include costs such as maintenance and fuel. 6. Are these costs met by the department? If not, how are these costs met? 7. Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine this entitlement to a motor vehicle. 8. Have these guidelines changed during the specified period? If so, please detail. 9. Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine how a motor vehicle is to be used that they have been provided with. Please include details such as whether the motor vehicle can be used for personal uses. 10. Have these guidelines changed during the specified period? If so, please detail.	Written
AE16/135	Portfolio	Ludwig	Lobbyist Register Meetings	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. List all interactions between the department/agency with any representative listed on the lobbyist register 2. List the participants in the meeting, the topic of the discussion, who arranged or requested the meeting, the location of the meeting 3. List all interactions between the Minister/parliamentary Secretary and/or their offices with any representative listed on the lobbyist register during the specified period. List the participants in the meeting, the topic of the discussion, who arranged or requested the meeting, the location of the meeting	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/136	Portfolio	Ludwig	Workplace assessments	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How much has been spent on workplace ergonomic assessments? 1. List each item of expenditure and cost 2. Have any assessments, not related to an existing disability, resulted in changes to workplace equipment or set up? 3. If so, list each item of expenditure and cost related to those changes	Written
AE16/137	Portfolio	Ludwig	Freedom of Information - Stats	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How many FOI requests were received to date. 2. How many of those requests were finalised within the regular timeframes provided under the FOI Act? 3. How many of those requests were granted an extension of time under s 15AA of the FOI Act? 4. How many of those requests were granted an extension of time under s 15AB of the FOI Act? 5. How many of those requests were finalised out of time?	Written
AE16/138	Portfolio	Ludwig	Multiple tenders	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. List any tenders that were re-issued or issued multiple times: 1. Why were they re-issued or issued multiple times? 2. Were any applicants received for the tenders before they were re-issued or repeatedly issued? 3. Were those applicants asked to resubmit their tender proposal?	Written
AE16/139	Portfolio	Ludwig	Market Research	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. List any market research conducted by the department/agency: 1. List the total cost of this research 2. List each item of expenditure and cost, broken down by division and program 3. Who conducted the research? 4. How were they identified? 5. Where was the research conducted? 6. In what way was the research conducted? 7. Were focus groups, round tables or other forms of research tools used? 8. How were participants for these focus groups et al selected? 9. How was the firm or individual that conducted the review selected? 10. What input did the Minister have? 11. How was it approved? 12. Were other firms or individuals considered? If yes, please detail.	Written
AE16/140	Portfolio	Ludwig	Departmental Upgrades	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the department/agency engaged in any new refurbishments, upgrades or changes to their building or facilities? 1. If so, list these 2. If so, list the total cost for these changes 3. If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure 4. If so, who conducted the works? 5. If so, list the process for identifying who would conduct these works 6. If so, when are the works expected to be completed?	Written
AE16/141	Portfolio	Ludwig	Wine Coolers / Fridges	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the department/agency purchased or leased any new wine coolers, or wine fridges or other devices for the purpose of housing alcohol beverages, including Eskies? 1. If so, list these 2. If so, list the total cost for these items 3. If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure 4. If so, where were these purchased 5. If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased 6. If so, what is the current location for these items? 7. If so, what is the current stocking level for each of these items?	Written
AE16/142	Portfolio	Ludwig	Office Plants	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the department/agency purchased or leased any office plants? 1. If so, list these 2. If so, list the total cost for these items 3. If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure 4. If so, where were these purchased 5. If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased 6. If so, what is the current location for these items?	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
AE16/143	Portfolio	Ludwig	Office recreation facilities	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. Has the department/agency purchased or leased or constructed any office recreation facilities, activities or games (including but not limited to pool tables, table tennis tables or others)? 1. If so, list these 2. If so, list the total cost for these items 3. If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure 4. If so, where were these purchased 5. If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased 6. If so, what is the current location for these items? 7. If so, what is the current usage for each of these items?	Written
AE16/144	Portfolio	Ludwig	Building Lease Costs	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. What has been the total cost of building leases for the agency / department? 2. Please provide a detailed list of each building that is currently leased. Please detail by: 1. Date the lease agreement is active from. 2. Date the lease agreement ends. 3. Is the lease expected to be renewed? If not, why not? 4. Location of the building (City and state). 5. Cost of the lease. 6. Why the building is necessary for the operations of the agency / department. 3. Please provide a detailed list of each building that had a lease that was not renewed during the specified period. Please detail by: 1. Date from which the lease agreement was active. 2. Date the lease agreement ended. 3. Why was the lease not renewed? 4. Location of the building (City and state). 5. Cost of the lease. 6. Why the building was necessary for the operations of the agency / department. 4. Please provide a detailed list of each building that is expected to be leased in the next 12 months. Please detail by: 1. Date the lease agreement is expected to become active. 2. Date the lease agreement is expected to end. 3. Expected location of the building (City and state). 4. Expected cost of the lease. 1. Has this cost been allocated into the budget? 5. Why the building is necessary for the operations of the agency / department. 5. For each building owned or leased by the department: 1. What is the current occupancy rate for the building? 2. If the rate is less than 100%, detail what the remaining being used for.	Written
AE16/145	Portfolio	Ludwig	Government advertising/marketing	Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: 1. How much has been spent by the department / agency on marketing? 1. List the total cost 2. List each item of expenditure and cost 3. List the approving officer for each item. 4. Detail the ministerial or ministerial staff involvement in the commissioning process. 5. Which firm provided the marketing? 2. How much has been spent by the department / agency on government advertising (including job ads)? 1. List the total cost 2. List each item of expenditure and cost 3. Where the advertising appeared 4. List the approving officer for each item. 5. Detail the ministerial or ministerial staff involvement in the commissioning process. 6. Detail the outlets that were paid for the advertising. 3. What government advertising is planned for the rest of the financial year? 1. List the total expected cost. 2. List each item of expenditure and cost. 3. Where the advertising will appear 4. List the approving officer for each item. 5. Detail the ministerial or ministerial staff involvement in the commissioning process.	Written

Q No.	Division/Outcome/Agency	Senator	Subject	Question	Hearing Date and Proof Hansard Page *or* Written
				6. Detail the outlets that have been or will be paid for the advertising. 4. Provide copies of approvals for advertising, including but not limited to, approvals made by the Prime Minister or his delegate, the Minister or their delegate, or the Department or their delegate.	
AE16/146	National Security Division Outcome 1 Communications Security Branch	Moore	COAG Advisory Panel on Reducing Violence against Women	1. Who is the lead agency with respect to technology-facilitated abuse?	Written
AE16/147	Emergency Management Australia Outcome 1 Disaster Resilience Strategy Branch	Urquhart	Funding for fire mitigation research	How much funding has the Commonwealth government allocated to state governments for fire mitigation research projects, and how will the states report back to the Commonwealth on the outcomes?	Written WITHDRAWN