

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2014
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 205

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: \$60 Million Reduction

Proof Hansard Pages: 10-12 (26 May 2014)

Senator Conroy, Stephen asked:

Mr Mrdak: There are two processes underway. Firstly, we are required, by June this year, to have undertaken an audit of all of our regulatory activities and to have subjected them to a compliance cost calculation, which has been set using a framework determined by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. That gives us the ability to recognise what our total compliance costs on industry are across the portfolio. Secondly, we have been identifying pieces of legislation or regulation that we undertake to identify areas where we can make savings by effectively removing red tape or regulatory impost on industry. At the moment we have been focused on two key portfolios that have delivered significant regulatory reductions. They are the Civil Aviation Safety Authority, through some of their new regulations, and also the Maritime Safety Authority, through some of their new regulations where they have sought to reduce unnecessary regulatory compliance costs going—

...

Senator CONROY: I am just interested in knowing what sort of record keeping could possibly fall into the category of no reporting, but also I am interested in the other areas that have been identified. I have asked about CASA there. With AMSA, is it different areas or just record keeping? Is there anything other than record keeping?

Mr Mrdak: Again I would need to get some more details for you from those agencies, but it is of that order. It is: how do you ensure that the compliance costs are minimised, in terms of reporting and the like, that means that industry is not bearing some of that burden?

...

Senator CONROY: ...With AMSA, is there the same sense of generic issues there, or is there a different set of requirements and legislation being looked at, and will the ones that we are describing at the moment require legislative amendment?

Mr Mrdak: I think some of them relate to marine orders and the like, but I will give you some details through—

...

Senator CONROY: You are in the process of completing this audit?

Mr Mrdak: Yes.

Senator CONROY: So no decisions have been made yet about what is to be removed?

Mr Mrdak: Not at this stage. As I have said, through the work of the regulatory agency, we have identified some savings already. We will complete the audit and then—

Senator CONROY: Could you give me an indication of what saving you have identified already, just to help us to understand the sort of work you are doing?

Mr Mrdak: We anticipate that we have met about 20 per cent of the annual target or thereabouts so far this year.

Senator CONROY: No, I was asking you to give me an example of something that you have already identified that can be removed.

Mr Mrdak: I will come back with more details on that. I am aware of the general—

Senator CONROY: No-one at the table knows? You are the most senior officers.

Mr Mrdak: I do not think we have the specifics of AMSA in relation to it at this stage.

Senator CONROY: Okay, we will come back to this later in the morning.

Mr Mrdak: Yes.

Answer:

AMSA is considering potential cost reductions across all of its regulatory activities which include regulations made for shipping consistent with a range of international conventions, particularly the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea; the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships and Maritime Labour Conventions; and for domestic commercial vessels under the *Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act 2012*.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2014

Infrastructure and Regional Development

It should also be possible to identify savings by reducing the regulatory burden for domestic commercial vessels as a result of a current review of the implementation of the National Law and the National Standard for Commercial Vessels that applies to these vessels. The review has identified a range of proposals that could reduce regulatory costs for vessel operators and seafarers that could be achieved through streamlined administration and application of current regulation. Some reduction in regulatory burden may also be achieved through other areas of AMSA as marine orders are reviewed in consultation with stakeholders.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2014

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 206

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Certification of ACV Ocean Protector and ACV Triton

Proof Hansard Page: 76 (27 May 2014)

Senator Conroy, Stephen asked:

Senator CONROY: Has AMSA provided certification for the ACV Ocean Protector and ACV Triton under the Navigation Act?

...

Senator CONROY: What does the certification involve?

Mr Kinley: For the Ocean Protector and the Triton they have both got certification I think as cargo vessels. I do not have copies of the certificates here.

Senator CONROY: What do vessels need to have before they can be certified?

Mr Kinley: From a commercial shipping point of view?

Senator CONROY: From the point of view of these two being certified?

Mr Kinley: There are different ways to approach that under the Navigation Act. Again, I would have to take it on notice for exactly what certificates the Ocean Protector has. Generally if they meet the requirements under the convention, for example SOLAS or MARPOL, the classification society who is delegated to do that work under the Navigation Act on our behalf would inspect the vessel and do plan approvals to see that the vessel is meeting those standards and eventually issue the international trading certificates to allow that and to attest to that.

Answer:

The Australian Customs and Border Protection Vessel (ACV) *Ocean Protector* and *ACV Triton* are commercial cargo vessels chartered to the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service. These ships meet the certification requirements of the *Navigation Act 2012*.

Whilst not a comprehensive list, the major certificates held by both the *ACV Ocean Protector* and *ACV Triton* are:

- Cargo Ship Safety Construction Certificate
- Cargo Ship Safety Equipment Certificate
- Cargo Ship Safety Radio Certificate
- International Air Pollution Prevention Certificate
- International Anti-Fouling System Certificate
- International Oil Pollution Prevention Certificate
- International Sewage Pollution Prevention Certificate
- International Load Line Certificate
- International Tonnage Certificate
- Document of Compliance (ISM)
- Safety Management Certificate (ISM)
- International Ship Security Certificate
- Minimum Safe Manning Certificate
- Certificate of Entry (Protection and Indemnity)
- Bunkers Certificate
- Maritime Labour Certificate
- Declaration of Maritime Labour Compliance Part I and Part II

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2014
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 207

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Deployment of Lifeboats

Proof Hansard Pages: 79-80 (27 May 2014)

Senator Conroy, Stephen asked:

Senator CONROY: You stated that you are confident the means of deployment of lifeboats is satisfactory, which again comes down to the splitting of the hair, that the actual survival craft or lifeboats that are registered to be used by the crew for evacuation purposes are different from the ones that are actually being deployed off the side. You have completely chosen to ignore the process of deploying these survival craft.

Mr Kinley: As we said when we spoke about this last time—

Senator CONROY: Have you inquired?

Mr Kinley: We inquired.

Senator CONROY: And the Navy told you it was fine or Customs told you it was fine and you do not need to look anymore?

Mr Kinley: They told us enough information so that we were satisfied to give—

Senator CONROY: What information did they tell you? How did they explain that they were deploying these large orange survival craft which you have seen being towed and you know the size of them?

Mr Kinley: I would have to take that on notice.

Answer:

The Australian Customs and Border Protection Service (ACBPS) has advised AMSA that the craft are carried strictly as deck cargo, not as part of the ship's safety equipment. AMSA is aware that the vessels are certified with sufficient other equipment to ensure the ship's emergency evacuation systems are compliant with international requirements and have sufficient capacity.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2014
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 208

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Registration of Vessels

Proof Hansard Pages: 83-84 (27 May 2014)

Senator Conroy, Stephen asked:

Senator CONROY: Customs have admitted that they purchased a large number of orange life rafts, survival craft, so Customs have publicly said they have bought these. Do they require certification with you? I got the impression from you earlier on that the answer was yes.

Mr Kinley: As far as I am aware they were bought not as part of the vessel's equipment. I understand that they meet SOLAS's requirements, those boats, but—

Senator CONROY: I will come to that in a second. I am asking whether or not they require certification from you? They are purchased by Customs for use of transporting people on the high seas.

Mr Kinley: Not as a tender for a vessel.

Senator CONROY: I am sorry, not as a?

Mr Kinley: Not as what I would refer to as a tender, a bit of equipment that goes with another vessel.

Senator CONROY: We are agreeing—and you already made this point very clearly—that it is not part of the vessel. It is not part of its natural usage or natural issue. This is a completely separate vessel used for something completely separate from the safety on board of the crew. Are they required to register vessels that are being used to transport people on the high seas? We will get to whether it complies in a minute. I am simply ask a yes/no question.

Mr Kinley: Again, I would have to take that on notice. I am not aware of a registration requirement.

Answer:

No, these craft are not required to be registered.

Section 13 of the *Shipping Registration Act 1981* exempts from registration all vessels less than 24 metres in length and all vessels which are more than 12 metres in length that are owned by a Government Authority, including the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2014
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 209

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Lifeboat Survival Craft

Proof Hansard Page: 84 (27 May 2014)

Senator Conroy, Stephen asked:

Senator CONROY: In relation to these lifeboat survival craft, do they have to comply with SOLAS?

Mr Kinley: Only if they are being used as a lifesaving appliance as part of the ship's—

Senator CONROY: What are you categorising them being used for?

Mr Kinley: As part of a certified ship's equipment.

Senator CONROY: I can show you a YouTube video to show you what they are being used for but what I am asking is whether they have to comply, if they are being deployed, whether they are part of the ship's actual safety equipment for the ship itself, but if they are deploying this vessel does it have to comply with SOLAS?

Mr Kinley: That is an interesting legal question. I would say no.

Senator CONROY: So they would not require certain materials to be loaded like food, communications equipment and medical supplies? They do not have to have any of those things on board?

Mr Kinley: No. There is a whole list of requirements and the lifesaving appliance code which goes with SOLAS about what a certified lifeboat that is part of a ship's equipment should have.

Senator CONROY: We are back to that hair split but that is fine. So as far as you are concerned, in charge of safety at sea in this country, these survival craft can be deployed and they do not have to comply with any standards, whatsoever?

Mr Kinley: I would have to take that one on notice because I would have to go back and do some more investigation about what other standards may be out there. Any standards whatsoever is a wide—

Answer:

As these survival craft are not part of the ship's dedicated lifesaving equipment, they do not need to meet the International Maritime Organization requirements of the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) Convention and its associated Lifesaving Appliances Code (LSA Code). However, they are built to SOLAS requirements and meet the type approval certification of an Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) recognised classification society.

In regard to operational considerations, AMSA is advised that the boats are only used if weather conditions permit and when in close proximity to land.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
 Budget Estimates May 2014
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 210

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Enforcement of Minimum Seafarer Standards

Proof Hansard Page: 89 (27 May 2014)

Senator Conroy, Stephen asked:

Senator CONROY: Does this include enforcement of minimum seafarer standards?

Mr Kinley: Yes.

Senator CONROY: Can you advise on how many occasions AMSA has taken enforcement action under the convention since it came into effect?

Mr Kinley: I would have to take that one on notice, but certainly, in general terms, it is part of our port state control program now. I think we may have had two detentions. Again, I will take that on notice, but we are issuing deficiencies. ...

Senator CONROY: So, you said you would take some of that on notice. Could you provide us with a list of your actions?

Mr Kinley: I can happily do that, yes.

Answer:

The *Maritime Labour Convention (MLC) 2006* is implemented in Australia through the *Navigation Act 2012* and *Marine Order 11 – Living and Working Conditions on Vessels*. These legislative instruments provide for a variety of enforcement actions. AMSA has not applied criminal or civil sanctions or issued infringements since the MLC came into effect internationally on 20 August 2013. The actions taken between 20 August 2013 and 31 May 2014 have been in the form of deficiencies issued to ships and detention of ships when those conditions were serious enough to warrant that action.

Details of those actions taken between 20 August 2013 and 30 May 2014 are as follows:

Deficiencies issued under the MLC.

MLC Regulation	Title	Number of deficiencies
4.3	Health and safety protection and accident prevention	473
3.1	Accommodation and recreational facilities	194
3.2	Food and catering	193
2.3	Hours of work and hours of rest	30
2.0	Conditions of Employment (General)	30
2.2	Wages	27
1.4	Recruitment and placement	19
2.1	Seafarers' Employment Agreement	18
4.0	Health protection, medical care, welfare and social security protection (General)	13
5.1.3	Maritime labour certificate and declaration of maritime labour compliance	12
3.0	Accommodation, recreational facilities, food and catering (General)	11
5.1.5	On-board complaint procedures	6
4.1	Medical care on board ship and ashore	6
1.0	Minimum requirements for seafarers to work on a ship (General)	4
1.2	Medical Certificate	1
1.3	Training and qualifications	1
Total		1047

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
 Budget Estimates May 2014
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Table 2. Detentions for MLC deficiencies:

Date detained	Code 30 (detainable) deficiency
12-Nov-13	19 MLC deficiencies. Code 30 stated: The above deficiencies are objective evidence that the company has failed to maintain decent living and working conditions as required by MLC 2006.
5-Dec-13	Seafarer's employment agreements. No leave provided in contract. No paid leave actually provided.
19-Dec-13	Crew members repeatedly were not paid wages at monthly interval.
25-Dec-13	Insufficient provisions for the intended voyage.
6-Jan-14	Insufficient provisions for the intended voyage.
30-Jan-14	For deck and engineer officers, more than 20 occasions in December 2013 identified where rest hours indicated violations with MLC requirements.
24-Feb-14	Seafarer Employment Agreements, unavailable for 5 of 8 crew. 3 provided were found incorrect, not signed.
8-Mar-14	MLC 2006 not effectively implemented on board, as evidenced by 6 deficiencies
12-Mar-14	Crew wages not paid monthly in accordance with MLC (February 2014 pay not paid as at 12/03/2014, January on board allotment not paid until 12/03/2014)
14-Mar-14	9 identified deficiencies are clearly hazardous to seafarers' health in accommodation space including galley and sanitary facilities.
22-Apr-14	Provisions on board not adequate for intended voyage. Payment of wages not being made in accordance with the Seafarers Employment Agreements.
1-May-14	Section 11 of the Collective bargaining agreement applicable to crew members, constitutes a serious breach of the requirements of the Convention - seafarers' rights (Articles III and IV).
31-Mar-14	Deficiencies with Seafarer Employment Agreements.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2014

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 211

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Search for MH370

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Whish-Wilson, Peter asked:

1. What briefings did AMSA provide to the Prime Minister prior to his statement in the House of Representatives on March 20 where he stated that:
“new and credible information has come to light in relation to the search for Malaysia Airlines flight MH370 in the southern Indian Ocean. The Australian Maritime Safety Authority has received information based on satellite imagery of objects possible related to the search.”
2. What was the new and credible information the Prime Minister referred to?
3. The Prime Minister made a statement when he was in China on April 11 that “we are confident that we know the position of the black box flight recorder to within some kilometres” Did AMSA provide advice to the Prime Minister before he made this statement?
4. On the same day as the Prime Minister’s statement on April 11 the Joint Agency Co-ordination Centre put out a media statement saying “Today the Australian Maritime Safety Authority has planned two search areas in close proximity totalling about 46,713 square kilometres. The centre of the search areas lies approximately 2312 kilometres north west of Perth.” Can AMSA explain the discrepancy between what AMSA were doing and what the Prime Minister was saying?
5. There have been allegations in the media that the signals heard on April 11 were of a different frequency to a black box. The allegations in the media state it was a 33.3 kilohertz frequency which is very different to the 37.5 kilohertz generated by underwater acoustic beacons.
 - a. What kilohertz frequencies were the Joint Agency Co-ordination Centre searching for when they were looking for the black box?
 - b. What kilohertz frequency were the signals that were picked up on or around April 11 that led the Prime Minister to make that statement?

Answer:

1. The Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) provided the Prime Minister’s Office with speaking points should he wish to update the House on developments in the search for missing Malaysia Airlines Flight MH370 on Thursday 20 March 2014.
2. The reference to credible information referred to advice AMSA received from the Geospatial-Intelligence Organisation, based on commercial satellite imagery that indicated sightings of objects in the vicinity of the area being searched for the plane from Malaysia Airlines flight MH370 which were identified for closer analysis.
3. No.
4. The Prime Minister’s statement referred to a search operation for the black box flight recorder on the bottom of the ocean. This sub-surface search operation was under the coordination of the Australian Transport Safety Bureau and the Department of Defence. The 11 April 2014 media statement from the Joint Agency Coordination Centre (JACC) detailing AMSA’s planned search activities referred to the surface search for floating material from the missing aircraft. There is therefore no discrepancy in relation to the Prime Minister’s statement of 11 April 2014 and the JACC media statement of the same date.
5.
 - a. Phoenix International Holdings Inc, under contract to the USN SUPSALV on board the Australian Defence Vessel Ocean Shield, was searching for a standard performance 37.5 kHz beacon but used a bandwidth of 25 kHz-50kHz to detect signals outside the performance standards, e.g. a damaged beacon.
 - b. Around 32-34kHz.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2014
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 212

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Role of AMSA in State Waters

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Whish-Wilson, Peter asked:

1. What role does AMSA have in investigating alleged unsafe marine operations or incidents in both State and Commonwealth waters?
2. Does AMSA become aware of and investigate reports of alleged unsafe marine operations or incidents made to State agencies?
3. How many investigations into alleged unsafe marine operations or incidents have been made in Commonwealth waters adjacent to WA State waters in the past year?

Answer:

1. The objects of the *Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act 2012* (National Law) include forming a part of a cooperative scheme between the Commonwealth, States and the Northern Territory that provides a single national framework for ensuring the safe operation, design, construction and equipping of domestic commercial vessels.
The National Law applies only to domestic commercial vessels which are defined as vessels that are for use in connection with commercial, government or research activity.
The Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA), as the national regulator under the National Law, exercises powers and performs functions which apply to domestic commercial vessels, to the full extent of the constitutional reach of the Commonwealth, and also where the National Law is applied by state and territory law. Those powers and functions include undertaking investigation, monitoring and enforcement activities under, or for the purpose of the National Law.
The objects of the *Navigation Act 2012* (the Navigation Act) are to promote safety of life at sea, promote safe navigation, prevent pollution of the marine environment and to ensure that AMSA has the necessary power to carry out inspections of vessels, and enforce national and international standards. The *Navigation Act* also implements some of Australia's international obligations, principally through marine orders, made under the *Navigation Act*.
The *Navigation Act* provides a range of investigatory, compliance and enforcement powers which may be exercised by AMSA (as well as inspectors appointed by AMSA), for the purposes of ensuring compliance with and enforcement of the *Navigation Act*, where it applies.
Although the *Navigation Act* is applicable both within and outside Australia, the question of whether it applies to a particular incident (therefore giving rise to investigatory, compliance and enforcement powers) is generally contingent on a range of factors. Factors include whether a vessel is a Regulated Australian Vessel for the purposes of the Navigation Act, a foreign vessel, a recreational vessel or a domestic commercial vessel for the purposes of the National Law.
Currently, under National System arrangements, the state and Northern Territory maritime agencies investigate matters as delegates of AMSA. AMSA provides a coordination role in these investigations.
2. Yes, if the report relates to a domestic commercial vessel and therefore subject to the National Law. The National Law imposes obligations on certain persons to report particular incidents to AMSA. Incidents reported in accordance with the obligations under the National Law may be reported to state and territory maritime agencies. A condition on this delegation is that the incident report is provided to AMSA.
If the alleged unsafe operation or incident relates only to recreational vessels, the matter will generally be dealt with by State or Territory agencies, exercising their own powers and functions, rather than as delegates of the national regulator.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2014

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Incidents reported in accordance with obligations under the *Navigation Act* are generally reported directly to AMSA.

3. Obligations to report incidents to AMSA under the *Navigation Act* or the National Law arise as a consequence of the application of each law. The reporting and investigation statistics do not differentiate between coastal waters and the territorial sea. Following is a summary of incidents and investigations carried out reported as having occurred in waters within or adjacent to Western Australia, during the period 1 July 2013 (the date of commencement of the National Law) to 31 May 2014:

National Law

Number of incidents reported to AMSA	89
Number of subsequent investigations (a)	21
Number of separate compliance and enforcement actions taken by Marine Safety Inspectors in Western Australia (b)	60

- (a) A number of incident reports are under review and these may lead to larger scale investigation.
(b) Includes notices issued and separate breach report offences that have been actioned.

Navigation Act

In the period between 1 June 2013 and 31 May 2014, AMSA received 612 incident reports from vessels within the Western Australia area. These reports were made subject to the *Navigation Act 2012*, *Occupational Health and Safety (Maritime Industry) Act 1993* and the *Protection of the Seas (Prevention from Pollution from Ships) Act 1983* and their associated subordinate legislation.

These reports are required to be made when the vessel is subject to the specific Act whenever in Australian waters. For example, a foreign flagged ship in an Australian port is still subject to the *Navigation Act 2012* and must report relevant incidents.

Of these 612 reports, 39 related to pollution incidents and 573 to other reportable incidents (across the full range of severity). Of those reports subject to the above Acts, determining whether they were within state waters would require each incident to be individually plotted and it is therefore not possible to provide a breakdown in the terms sought without an unreasonable diversion of resources. The *Navigation Act 2012* defines a marine incident as any of the following:

- (a) a death of, or injury to, a person associated with the operation or navigation of a vessel;
- (b) the loss or presumed loss of a vessel;
- (c) a collision of a vessel with another vessel;
- (d) a collision of a vessel with an object;
- (e) the grounding, sinking, flooding or capsizing of a vessel;
- (f) a fire on board a vessel;
- (g) a loss of stability of a vessel that affects the safety of the vessel;
- (h) the structural failure of a vessel;
- (i) a close quarters situation;
- (j) an event that results in, or could have resulted in:
 - (i) the death of, or injury to, a person on board a vessel; or
 - (ii) the loss of a person from a vessel; or
 - (iii) a vessel becoming disabled and requiring assistance;
- (k) the fouling or damaging by a vessel of:
 - (i) any pipeline or submarine cable; or
 - (ii) any aid to navigation;
- (l) an incident that is prescribed by the regulations and involves a vessel.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2014

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 213

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Illegal Fishing Vessel in Southern Ocean

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Whish-Wilson, Peter asked:

1. Has AMSA managed to collect any further information on the sunken fishing vessel which set off an emergency beacon in the Southern Indian Ocean at the end of March?
2. Has AMSA done any further work on investigating where the vessel was flagged?
3. What other Departments or agencies were involved in the search?
4. I understand assets who were undertaking the search for Malaysian Flight 370 were diverted to search for this boat. In normal circumstances what resources does AMSA have to undertake a search of this nature in the Southern Ocean?
5. Is the Ocean Protector built for and equipped for these types of searches?
6. Was the Department aware of a sister ship (Changbai) in the area at the same time?
 - a. Was radio contact established with this ship?
 - b. Was this ship fishing illegally?
 - c. Was this ship pursued by Australian assets?
 - d. Is AMSA aware of where this ship is flagged?
 - e. Does AMSA know where this ship is currently located?

Answer:

1. No.
2. No. The Australian Maritime Safety Authority does not have a role in any investigation and ceased to have involvement at the suspension of the search on 31 March 2014. The Australian Fisheries Management Authority would be the appropriate agency to respond to questions relating to suspected illegal fishing vessels.
3. Search resources were provided by the Department of Defence (RAAF P3C Orion long range maritime patrol aircraft) and Little Aviation Pty Ltd who provided a civilian long range jet.
4. The location of the incident is beyond the range of AMSA's contracted Dornier 328 search aircraft. Under the National Search and Rescue Plan, the Department of Defence is able to provide assistance when the incident response is beyond the capability of civilian resources.
5. AMSA does not operate the ACV *Ocean Protector*.
6. Yes.
 - a. AMSA attempted to contact the vessel via satellite communications but was unsuccessful.
 - b. AMSA does not have information to answer this question.
 - c. The vessel was overflown by the RAAF P3C Orion which attempted to contact the vessel without success.
 - d. No.
 - e. No.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2014

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 214

Program: n/a

Division/Agency: Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Topic: Resourcing

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

1. Are you aware of the Government's request to make savings of \$60M across the Infrastructure and Regional Development portfolio?
2. Since September, has the Department requested further savings from AMSA? If so, can you indicate your agency's response?
3. Did you implement savings? If so, what were they?
4. Can you comment on how this will be reflected in the ordinary operations of AMSA?

Answer:

1. AMSA is aware of the Infrastructure and Regional Development portfolio's regulatory cost reduction target of \$60m per annum.
2. Yes. AMSA has been asked to identify regulatory reductions in the order of \$12m per annum towards the portfolio's regulatory cost reduction target. AMSA is considering potential cost reductions across all of its regulatory activity which includes regulations made for international shipping, domestic commercial vessels and other areas of AMSA.
3. Since October 2013, AMSA has finalised two deregulatory measures:
 - National Standard for Commercial Vessels – Part C1 (Arrangement, Accommodation and Personal Safety). This measure updates design and construction standards for the arrangement of accommodation and personal safety on domestic commercial vessels. Cost savings to industry of \$5.85 m were achieved from this measure; and
 - Marine Order 54 (Coastal pilotage) 2014. This measure provides clarity on the regulatory arrangements for pilotage providers in Australian waters. The changes have resulted in \$0.04 m in regulatory costs savings for marine pilots, pilotage providers and approved pilotage training providers.
4. AMSA's regulatory framework plays a key role in the safety and efficiency of Australia's growing maritime sector and in maximising the value of growing shipping activity to Australia. AMSA must and will be guided overall by its commitment to continuous improvement in provision of safety and environment protection services and by the requirement to comply with international obligations.