

## Defence outputs

### Outcome 1: Command of operations

#### QUESTION 1

##### **Inquiry into allegations of misconduct by soldiers in East Timor**

Hansard: pages 53–55, 61, 65, 67, 68 and 70

##### **Senators Johnston and Evans**

- a) Were any sworn statements provided at the hearing into the allegations conducted by the commanding officer? (*Johnston, p. 53*)
- b) How many directions' hearings were conducted by the Defence Force magistrate? (*Evans, p. 54*)
- c) What did each of the directions' hearings deal with in terms of the procedure leading to the hearing date? (*Johnston, p. 54*)
- d) When were the New Zealand authorities first approached to make witnesses available to the hearing by the Defence Force magistrate? On what date was Defence advised informally that the witnesses would not be attending? (*Johnston, pp. 55 and 61*)
- e) What was the total cost of the inquiry? Could a breakdown be provided? (*Johnston, p. 61*)
- f) Were the witness statements, taken as part of the investigation, considered by Major General Lewis in deciding upon administrative action? (*Evans, p. 65*)
- g) Was a New Zealand special forces member, who is now serving in the Australian Army, one of the four persons from the New Zealand Defence Force who did not give evidence at the hearing? (*Evans, p. 67*)
- h) What guidance is provided to commanding officers in dealing with administration actions, especially in making decisions relating to the balance of probability? (*Evans, p. 68*)
- i) What guidance is provided to ADF members on the use of 'zip ties' to restrain prisoners? (*Evans, p. 70*)

#### RESPONSE

- a) a) No. The prosecutor provided the commanding officer with an outline of the prosecution case including a summary of the evidence that prosecution witnesses were expected to give according to their signed statements made to the military police. The commanding officer, as the summary authority, decided not to try the matter and to refer it to a convening authority. This was supported by the prosecutor and defending officers.
- b) There were nine directions hearings before the Defence Force magistrate. Five directions hearings were conducted by tele-conference and there were four face-

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from Department of Defence

to–face appearances which included the arraignment of the accused and the trial of the matter.

- c) The purpose of the first seven directions hearings was to hear applications and objections from both the prosecutor and the accused, and for the Defence Force magistrate to make rulings thereon. On 15 April 2003, the Defence Force magistrate convened the court, where both the prosecutor and accused made applications for suppression orders and pseudonyms. The Defence Force magistrate issued suppression orders for all witnesses but declined to grant a pseudonym to the accused. (It should be noted that such suppression orders would not satisfy the requirements of the NZDF as the orders cannot be enforced outside Australia.) Proceedings were adjourned to 2 May 2003. On 2 May 2003, a tele-conference directions hearing was conducted where the prosecutor sought a week’s extension. A further tele-conference directions hearing was held on 9 May 2003, with the matter being set down for 15 May 2003 for further submissions as to pseudonyms.

On 15 May 2003, the Defence Force magistrate declined to grant orders allowing New Zealand witnesses to give evidence under pseudonym. The Defence Force magistrate called upon the accused to plead and he pleaded not guilty to all charges. A further directions hearing was then set for tele-conference on 29 May 2003 to allow the prosecutor to obtain instructions from the convening authority. The convening authority subsequently requested an extension to deliberate on what directions he would give the prosecutor. The matter was adjourned for tele-conference to 5 June 2003, at which time the prosecutor advised that he did not yet have instructions. The matter was further adjourned for tele-conference to 19 June 2003, when the prosecutor advised that he wished to make a new submission for proceedings to be held in camera. This submission came before the court on 15 July 2003 and was declined. Proceedings were then adjourned without setting a hearing date as the prosecutor wanted to obtain further instructions from the convening authority. A further tele-conference directions hearing was held on 6 August 2003 at which time the prosecutor advised that no evidence would be offered in relation to all charges. A trial date was set for 9 August 2003. On this date, the prosecution offered no evidence and the accused was found not guilty on all charges.

- d) The New Zealand authorities were formally advised on 1 April 2003 of what was about to occur, with respect to preparing witnesses for trial. The cooperation of the New Zealand authorities was obtained in early 2001 before the investigation team travelled to New Zealand to interview possible witnesses. On 4 February 2003, the Deputy Chief of the Army contacted his New Zealand counterpart to confirm that the New Zealand Defence Force remained supportive and would make their people available for the trial. This was further confirmed on 1 April 2003 when the Deputy Chief of the Army held discussions with his New Zealand counterpart about the process to be followed for accessing the witnesses. On 8 April 2003, an Army headquarters staff officer met with the New Zealand Military Adviser to discuss the arrangements for the prosecutor and defending officers to travel to New Zealand to interview the witnesses. The Australian Army first became aware of an issue with the New Zealand witnesses’ attendance

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

requirements on 8 May 2003, when it received a letter from the Chief of the New Zealand Defence Force outlining his identity protection requirements.

- e) The direct cost of the investigation was \$130,269. This does not include the salary of the Service police investigators, Defence legal staff, Reserve senior counsels or the Australian Federal Police who were involved, as these people were performing their principal functions by supporting the investigation. The figure includes the cost of travel to the United Kingdom, New Zealand and East Timor by members of the investigation team. The figure also includes the forensic support from the Department of Forensic Medicine at Westmead Hospital in Sydney. The breakdown is as follows:

Forensic support	\$7,000
Printing Costs	\$513
Drawing Costs	\$300
Travel and Accommodation	<u>\$122,456</u>
Total	\$130,269

- f) Yes.
- g) No. At the time of the court hearings, the former member of the New Zealand Special Forces had become a member of the Australian Army Reserve and resided in Australia. This member was compellable to attend the court to give evidence. The issue which was the subject of the directions hearings was the attendance of the other Special Forces members in New Zealand.
- h) ADF legal officers provide training to commanding officers in administrative decision making, including the balance of probability standard of proof, during regular commanding officer courses. Additional guidance is provided in the following policy documents:
- ADFP 202 *Administrative Inquiries Manual* (May 2000). This publication provides guidance on the balance of probability standard of proof in respect to decisions of administrative inquiries pursuant to the Defence (Inquiries) Regulations and routine inquiries conducted by virtue of command prerogative;
  - DI(G)PERS 35–6 *Formal Warnings and Censures in the Australian Defence Force* (October 2002). This instruction outlines the Defence policy and procedures for imposing a formal warning or censure on a member of the ADF. It distinguishes between the standard of proof required for Defence Force Discipline Act proceedings (proof beyond reasonable doubt) and administrative action, such as formal warnings and censures (proof on the balance of probabilities); and
  - ADFP 06.1.3 *Guide to Administrative Decision-making* (October 2003). This publication sets out the legal guidelines for administrative decisions, providing generic and practical guidance to commanding officers and other ADF personnel who make administrative decisions. It includes an explanation of the balance of probabilities' standard of proof.

***Copies of the documents have been provided to the committee.***

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- i) At the time of operations in East Timor (1999), guidance provided to ADF members responsible for detaining suspected East Timorese militia members included training and doctrinal publications. The nature of the training itself is classified, as is the doctrine.

During the investigation into allegations of misconduct by soldiers in East Timor, it was found that the Army's interrogation training, while consistent with Australia's obligations under international conventions, was not consistent with its doctrine. As a result, a number of procedural matters were reviewed and amended. The Army has also implemented a system of yearly review, based on Australia's international obligations, to ensure that doctrine and training are aligned.

**QUESTION W12**

**SIEV X—Harbour Master document**

**Senator Collins**

- a) Has Defence received a copy of the apparently official Indonesian document from the Harbour Master at Sunda Kelapa Port, North Jakarta dated 24 October 2001?
- b) Why did the Gates review of intelligence pertaining to SIEV X report the "absence of positional data from either SIEV X itself or the fishing boats that rescued the survivors" without examining the existence of a report from the Harbour Master in Jakarta?

**RESPONSE**

The Gates review was finalised on 4 July 2002. A facsimile of the Harbourmasters document was received by the Public Affairs and Corporate Communication Group via the media on 30 July 2002.

**QUESTION W13**

**SIEV X—Corroboration of coordinates**

**Senator Kirk**

In the advice provided by Rear Admiral Gates to the Senate Inquiry into a Certain Maritime Incident, he discounted the validity of the Harbour Master coordinates at Sunda Kelapa Port. Rear Admiral Gates stated "In the absence of positional data from either SIEV X itself or the fishing boats that rescued the survivors, Defence can only speculate as to where the vessel foundered."

- a) Given that the coordinates 07 40 00S/105 09 00E were provided by the skipper of the Arta Kencana 38, as the location in which the Indah Jaya Makmur found the survivors, is Defence able to corroborate this information?

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- b) If not, why has this not been attempted?
- c) Has the AFP at any time sought to have these coordinates corroborated by Defence? If so, what was the outcome?

**RESPONSE**

- a) No.
- b) It is clear from the Harbour Master's report that the coordinates were passed from one boat captain to another and then to the Harbour Master (by unstated means) before being recorded in the report. Information on the accuracy of the coordinates or their navigational basis remains uncertain. In these circumstances, Defence cannot confirm the veracity of the coordinates.
- c) No.

**QUESTION W14**

**Operation Relex II**

**Senator Evans**

In relation to the incident at Melville Island on 4/5 November 2003:

- a) Why were Defence personnel involved in interviewing the people on the boat?
- b) Why was this not done by DIMIA officials?
- c) What was the state of the boat when it was boarded (ie was the engine operational, etc)?
- d) What proof is there of its state at the time (ie photographic, video, etc)?
- e) When did each of the Navy ships arrive at Melville Island/at the boat?
- f) How many personnel were on each of the Defence craft?
- g) What were their qualifications (ie medical staff, engineering personnel, etc)?
- h) How soon did other personnel arrive?
- i) Where were the Defence and other personnel accommodated whilst undertaking investigations into this boat?
- j) When was the Government first advised of the presence of the boat, (give a time)? At that time, how far in distance and time was the closest Navy vessel to Melville Island?
- k) How long did it take the Navy patrol boats to get to Melville Island (provide this information for both boats)?
- l) What communication did Defence have with Government officials during the first 24 hours of this operation (by phone, fax, email, other communications)?
- m) Who was responsible for giving directions to the ADF personnel?
- n) Who did they report to and on what basis (written or verbal reports)?

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from Department of Defence

**RESPONSE**

- a) HMAS *Geelong* was the first ADF vessel at the scene and the ship's company members interviewed the unauthorised arrivals to assess the situation, confirm the health and safety of those onboard the boat and establish the route they took to reach Australia.
- b) DIMIA officials were not involved in the initial boarding of the vessel on the night of 4 November as they were not on the scene. DIMIA and AFP officers questioned the unauthorised arrivals on 6 November 2003.
- c) On boarding, it was discovered that the vessel's main and auxiliary engines and steering had been sabotaged and were not operational.
- d) Official Defence messages reported the evolving situation. No imagery was taken during the initial boarding, which occurred after dark. The initial repair work was carried out at night under torchlight, the priority being to restore the seaworthiness of the vessel.
- e) HMAS *Geelong* arrived on the scene at 1903 hours, Darwin time, on 4 November 2003 and boarded the vessel at 1915. HMAS *Launceston* arrived on the scene at 1945, Darwin time, on 4 November 2003. HMAS *Warrnambool* arrived on the scene at 0600, Darwin time, on 5 November 2003.
- f) HMA Ships *Geelong*, *Launceston* and *Warrnambool* arrived on the scene with 26, 24 and 44 persons respectively on board. HMAS *Warrnambool*'s total included 17 army personnel from a transit security section and one medical officer.
- g) The patrol boat ship's companies were appropriately trained, in accordance with standard Navy requirements. Each patrol boat has a minor war vessel medical care provider and a ship's medical emergency team qualified member. The transit security section embarked in HMAS *Warrnambool* included a combat first-aid qualified member and the medical officer embarked was a legally qualified medical practitioner in the Northern Territory. Engineering staff qualifications among patrol boat crews ranged from basic marine technician to the ship's senior marine engineer.
- h) Personnel from other government departments arrived at Melville Island in the early afternoon of 4 November 2003. An AFP/DIMIA interview team arrived on the scene on the afternoon of 5 November 2003, embarked in an Australian Customs vessel.
- i) All ADF personnel were accommodated onboard the three patrol boats. AFP and DIMIA personnel were supported by Australian Customs vessels.
- j) Defence is not aware when Customs/Coastwatch was advised of the presence of the vessel. Coastwatch advised Defence at 1321 hours, Darwin time, on 4 November 2003. At that time, HMAS *Geelong* was 105 nautical miles from Melville Island, four hours and 39 minutes steaming time from the scene.
- k) HMAS *Geelong* took four hours and 39 minutes to arrive at the scene, and HMAS *Launceston* took six hours and 25 minutes. HMAS *Warrnambool* departed Darwin at 2200 hours, Darwin time, and took eight hours to arrive on the scene.
- l) At the operational level, Headquarters Northern Command communicated continually with Coastwatch Canberra, Coastwatch Darwin and the AFP in Darwin by either telephone, facsimile or email. Frequent communications were

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

conducted with DIMIA, local Customs and AFP management. Infrequent telephone communications occurred with the Commissioner of the Northern Territory Police and the AFP Director of Operations in Brisbane. At the strategic level, Strategic Operations Division in Canberra was in frequent telephone communication with departments represented on the People Smuggling Task Force. Twice daily meetings of the Task Force were also held.

- m) The Commander Australian Theatre, through the Maritime Commander Australia and Commander Northern Command.
- n) Commander Australian Theatre reported, via Defence messages, to the Chief of the Defence Force through Strategic Operations Division.

**QUESTION W15**

**Solomon Islands deployment**

**Senator Evans**

- a) What has been the total cost of the ADF operation in the Solomon Islands to date? Please provide a full breakdown of these costs (personnel costs, transport costs, maintenance costs, other logistics costs, etc)
- b) What is the current breakdown by nationality of military personnel involved in the operation (ie how many personnel from Fiji/Tonga/PNG/NZ etc)?
- c) Please outline the nature of accident involving the HMAS *Diamantina* that was reported in the *Courier Mail* on 8 October 2003.
- d) What caused the accident? What was the damage? What repairs were necessary? How much did the repairs cost?

**RESPONSE**

- a) Costs are being increased on an ongoing basis. The Government will provide figures through the budget process.
- b) As at 17 November 2003 there were 128 New Zealand, 45 Fijian, 35 Tongan and 45 Papua New Guinea military personnel involved in the operation. On that date, 855 Australian military personnel were deployed in the Solomon Islands.
- c) On 2 October 2003, HMAS *Diamantina* struck a coral bomboora while conducting maritime patrol operations within the Solomon Islands. While minor damage was sustained, the ship remained operationally available for Operation Anode and returned to HMAS Waterhen as scheduled on 14 November 2003.
- d) An investigation into the cause of the accident has been conducted. A decision has not been made regarding the outcomes of the inquiry. Only minor damage was sustained to the propeller and underwater telephone during the incident and the hull sustained superficial damage. There was no internal damage and no compromise of watertight integrity. HMAS *Diamantina* will be undertaking a planned maintenance period in dry dock from December 2003 to January 2004. The exact nature of damage incurred will be determined while the ship is in dry dock. The subsequent cost of repairs can only be determined after this inspection.

### **Outcome 3: Army capability**

#### **QUESTION 2**

##### **Army review of Military Police**

Hansard: page 63

##### **Senator Hogg**

Is the report of the review, expected around the middle of 2004, for phase one or for both phases of the review?

#### **RESPONSE**

The entire review will be completed by mid-2004. The first stage of the review into the Army's investigative capability was conducted in late 2002, when the Army addressed immediate, short-term staffing requirements for the 1<sup>st</sup> Military Police Battalion. The second stage is a study to design and implement a revised investigative architecture. The initial phase of the study, completed in June 2003, was a scoping activity that generated a road map for the future direction and conduct of the review. The road map provided sufficient information to release, in August 2003, an invitation to tender for the conduct of the study. A preferred tenderer was selected in October 2003. A contract was signed on 26 November 2003 and work commenced on 1 December 2003.

### **Outcome 4: Air Force capability**

#### **QUESTION W19**

##### **Air traffic controllers**

##### **Senator Evans**

Please provide an update of current staffing figures for air traffic controllers at each Air Force base (actual staffing compared to establishment staffing).



## Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from Department of Defence

### RESPONSE

Base	Establishment	Strength	Difference
Williamstown	43	36	-7
Amberley	20	18	-2
Darwin	39	38	-1
East Sale	19	12	-7
East Sale School of Navigation	25	19	-6
Edinburgh	6	6	0
Nowra	14	10	-4
Oakey	19	17	-2
Pearce	28	23	-5
Richmond	8	10	+2
Tindal	17	12	-5
Townsville	31	31	0
Canberra and Other*	37	30	-7
<b>Total All Bases</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>-44</b>

Note: \*Other locations include Butterworth (Malaysia), Glenbrook and Sydney.

Strength includes nine Reserve air traffic control officers and eight officers from other specialisations filling air traffic controller positions that do not require specialist air traffic control skills.

Other air traffic controllers, not included in actual staffing, comprise four personnel on leave without pay, two that have been re-categorised and two who are non-effective on medical grounds.

### Outcome 5: Strategic policy

#### QUESTION W1

##### Defence capability review

##### Senator Evans

- Please provide a list of all changes to the former Defence Capability Plan that have been agreed as part of the Defence Capability Review.
- For each of these changes, indicate all changes in schedule and budget (compared to the former Defence Capability Plan). Also indicate the basis on which each change to the plan was made.
- In tabular form, please provide a list of all projects that are now included in the revised Defence Capability Plan (following the Defence Capability Review), including schedule information (proposed year of decision/year of delivery etc), and budget (cost band) information.
- Please indicate, in tabular form, how much money was to have been spent on equipment projects under the former Defence Capability Plan for each year in the life of the Plan?

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- e) Please indicate, in tabular form, how much money will be spent on equipment projects under the revised Defence Capability Plan for each year in the life of the Plan?

**RESPONSE**

a) to e)

A public version of the rebalanced Defence Capability Plan, taking into account the decisions announced by the Minister for Defence on 7 November 2003, was released on 4 February 2004. The Government remains committed to maintaining the overall level of spending on the Defence Capability Plan announced in the Defence 2000 White Paper.

**QUESTION W21**

**Missile defence**

**Senator Bartlett**

Has there been any defence expenditure towards collaboration with the US on missile defence research?

**RESPONSE**

The Australian Government has only recently announced its participation in the US National Missile Defence Program. In the past there has been some project collaboration and for many years Australia has supported early detection of ballistic missile launches.

**QUESTION W22**

**Links with Kopassus**

**Senator Evans**

- a) Has there been any discussion of counter-terrorism training with/of Kopassus by Australia during 2003?
- b) Has there been any discussion with Indonesia, at either Ministerial, military or bureaucratic level, about forming a joint Australian-Indonesian counter-terrorism taskforce? When? At what level did the discussions take place and what were the outcomes?
- c) What is Indonesia's current position on the prospect of training links between the Australian Army and Kopassus?

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- d) With respect to the \$5.3m budgeted for Indonesia under the Defence Cooperation Program:
- i) How is this money expected to be spent?
  - ii) In 2002-03, was any of the funding spent on training of Kopassus soldiers in either Australia or Indonesia?
- e) What, in general terms, is the capacity (as assessed by the Australian military) of the Indonesian military to deal with:
- iii) hijacking and/or hostage taking;
  - iv) other terrorist activities?
- f) Has Defence been asked to prepare for any activities (eg. joint exercises, training) with the Indonesian military?
- g) Has there been any discussion within Defence and/or with Indonesia about whether there are any provinces of Indonesia where no joint exercises should take place?

**RESPONSE**

- a) Yes. In line with Government direction, Deputy Secretary Strategic Policy and Special Operations Commander Australia visited Jakarta from 8 to 11 June 2003. They held preliminary discussions with senior Indonesian Armed Forces members and Indonesian National Police about options for resuming limited cooperation in the areas of counter-hijack and hostage recovery. The Chief of Army also discussed options for cooperation on this issue during his visit to Jakarta in late July.
- b) No.
- c) It would be inappropriate for Defence to speak for the Indonesian Government in relation to training links between the Australian Army and Kopassus.
- d)
- i) The \$5.3m allocated for Defence Cooperation for Indonesia will be spent on:
    - ongoing staff college exchanges for Australian and Indonesian officers;
    - provision of a broad range of training, including English language and intelligence analyst training, for Indonesian Armed Forces personnel in Australia;
    - strategic dialogue and senior-level visits, both to and from Indonesia;
    - professional exchanges between Defence and the Indonesian Armed Forces, covering Defence Science and Technology initiatives, Air and Navy doctrine, and study visits; and
    - the following Defence Cooperation projects:
      - Nomad Aircraft Maintenance Team—a three-man team located in Surabaya with the Indonesian Navy Nomad maritime surveillance aircraft; and
      - English Language Project—an exchange position with an ADF captain located in the English language school in Jakarta, and an Indonesian

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

captain located at the Defence International Training Centre in Melbourne.

- ii) No.
- e) It would be inappropriate for Defence to make public its assessments on the capacity of the Indonesian military.
- f) As outlined in d) above, the Defence Cooperation Program provides an ongoing program of wide-ranging engagement activities between Australia and Indonesia.
- g) No.

**Outcome 6: Intelligence**

**QUESTION 11**

**Service record of Mr Brigitte's wife**

Hansard: page 117

**Senator Evans**

In relation to the former ADF member who is married to Mr Brigitte, when was she discharged, what was her rank, and what was her security clearance and was she involved in any sensitive intelligence or high security work?

**RESPONSE**

To respect the privacy of the individuals concerned, Defence does not provide personal information on serving or former ADF members.

**QUESTION 12**

**Iraqi attempts to procure uranium in Africa**

Hansard: page 118 and 119

**Senator Evans**

- a) Prior to January 2003, was the Defence Intelligence Organisation aware of US doubts over Iraqi attempts to acquire uranium from Niger? If so, when?
- b) Did Defence receive a copy of a memorandum from the Bureau of Intelligence and Research in the US State Department sent to Secretary of State, Colin Powell, on 28 February 2002 which disputed the Niger claim? If so, when?

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

**RESPONSE**

- a) No.
- b) No.

**QUESTION 13**

**Shipment of aluminium tubes**

Hansard: page 127

**Senator Evans**

Did a Defence official have contact with the agents who were dealing with the on-shipment of aluminium tubes from China to Iraq? If so, in which area of Defence was that person employed?

**RESPONSE**

Yes, the person was employed in the Defence Materiel Organisation.

**QUESTION W23**

**Defence security clearances**

**Senator Evans**

- a) What is the current backlog of security clearance applications?
- b) What is the current backlog of security clearance re-evaluations?
- c) What is being done to ensure that the current backlog of clearances does not increase further?

**RESPONSE**

- a) As at 22 December 2003, there was a backlog of some 200 positive vetting requests that fall outside Defence's benchmark timeframe of three months and a backlog of some 2,670 negative vetting requests in which processing time falls outside Defence's benchmark timeframes. These negative vetting timeframes are eight weeks for a top secret clearance, six weeks for a secret clearance, and three weeks for a confidential or restricted clearance.
- b) As at 22 December 2003, there was a backlog of some 23,370 re-evaluations—approximately 1,360 for positive vetting and 22,010 for negative vetting.
- c) Over the past year, Defence has significantly increased the number of staff devoted to security vetting. There has been a 100 per cent increase in positive vetting staff, to an equivalent of 60 full-time staff, and a 50 per cent increase in negative vetting

## **Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

staff, to an equivalent of 87 full-time staff. External providers are also assisting with the processing of some clearances. Staff have worked steadily to improve the completed number of initial and upgrade clearance requests. These clearances are needed either to start work or to access higher classified material. These initiatives have meant that the number of clearances falling outside benchmark timeframes has been reduced by half since this time last year.

Significant effort has also been devoted to ensuring that vetting staff are working in the best way possible to reduce numbers, while still maintaining the quality of the process. In particular, common training, work practices and performance targets have been introduced.

Work has commenced to address the overdue re-evaluation backlog. This involves ensuring that clearances showing up as overdue are still required, checking to determine whether the clearance holder's circumstances have changed markedly since the clearance was done and then re-evaluating the clearances. Some 10,500 or 48 per cent of people holding clearances overdue for re-evaluating have been contacted to validated their need for the clearance and provide details of any changes in circumstances. The overdue re-evaluations which represent the highest risk are being actioned first. Re-evaluations are being processed with the assistance of external providers. Defence expects to see a steady reduction in overdue re-evaluations over the course of 2004.

## **Business processes**

### **Corporate services**

#### **Golf Courses**

#### **QUESTION W24**

#### **Senator Evans**

- c) How many golf courses are operated by Defence and/or situated on Defence property? Please indicate the location of each of these golf course, and the size of each course.
- d) How much does Defence pay for the upkeep of these golf courses?
- e) How are these golf courses staffed? Please indicate the number of staff assigned to the work at the golf courses (for each course). Also indicate the rank/levels of all staff assigned to work at the golf courses.
- f) What are the annual staffing costs for these golf courses?
- g) What fees are charged for membership of the Defence golf courses?
- h) What is the operational or military incentive for Defence operating golf courses?
- i) What is the mix of membership for Defence golf clubs, ie how many serving military versus retired persons are members?
- j) Could any of the Defence golf courses be disposed of without imperilling the military function of existing Defence bases? Which courses?

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

k) Is it anticipated that any of the Defence golf courses will be sold in the next five years?

**RESPONSE**

a) There are currently 20 golf courses situated on Defence property. The location and size of these courses are shown in the table below. Courses are operated by Clubs which are not part of Defence.

Course	Size (hectares)	Location	Membership Fees	
			Fees per annum	Membership classification
HMAS Creswell	25	Jervis Bay, NSW	\$110 \$55 \$20	Full Fleet Junior
School of Military Engineering	14	Moorebank, NSW	\$165 \$99 \$275 \$165 \$66	Full Defence Limited Defence Full civilian Limited civilian Junior
Kapooka	60	Wagga Wagga, NSW	\$85 \$125	Military Civilian
RAAF Wagga	15	Wagga Wagga, NSW	\$120	All
RAAF East Sale	20.6	East Sale, Vic	\$115	All
HMAS Cerberus	27	Hastings, Vic	\$265 \$221 \$336.50 \$287 \$10 \$90 \$120 \$110 Nil	7 day pass ADF/Defence civilian 6 day pass ADF/Defence civilian 7 day pass civilian 6 day pass civilian Clubhouse member Absentee serving member Junior Course staff Life member/CO
RAAF Williams	39	Laverton, Vic	\$150 \$300	Joining fee Membership
Puckapunyal	8	Puckapunyal, Vic	\$120	Family
Bandiana	28.5	Wodonga, Vic	\$70 Nil	Off-base members On-base members
RAAF Amberley	26.6	Brisbane, Qld	\$135	All
Borneo Barracks	25	Cabarlah, Qld	\$170 \$253	Defence Civilian
Canungra	26	Gold Coast, Qld	\$150	All
Lavarack	20	Townsville, Qld	\$211 \$236 \$266 \$291 \$50 \$20	ADF male ADF female Non-ADF male Non-ADF female Junior Social
Wallangarra	30	Wallangarra, Qld	\$70	Restricted

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

			\$100	Full
RAAF Edinburgh	35	Edinburgh, SA	\$75 \$320	Full ADF/APS Honorary
Duntroon	26	Canberra, ACT	\$595 \$385 \$555 \$359	Male civilian Male military Female civilian Female military
Fairbairn	46.4	Canberra, ACT	\$400 \$500 \$325 \$425 \$50 \$100	Male ADF Male civilian Female ADF Female civilian Juniors < 16 Juniors 16-21
RAAF Darwin	26	Darwin, NT	\$310 \$240 \$45	Full Social Junior
Tindal	39	Katherine, NT	\$120 \$190 \$35	Full Family Junior
DSTO Salisbury	20	Salisbury SA	\$473 \$385 \$429 \$231	Full Ladies Provisional Juniors

b) Defence paid \$428,858 during 2002–03 for the upkeep of golf courses on Defence property. This includes \$2,000 expenditure on Defence Estate Orchard Hills (not shown above) which closed in July 2003.

c)&d)

There are no ADF, Defence civilian or Defence contractor staff assigned to the operation of any of the golf courses situated on Defence property. Staff are either volunteer members or are self-funded by the club.

e) The individual golf clubs determine membership fees. A breakdown of fees is provided in the table at a).

f) Defence does not operate golf courses but helps to sustain them by providing land and some maintenance/upkeep. Defence establishments are required to be surrounded by appropriate buffer and safety zones in order to allow the activities undertaken at the establishment to be conducted safely. Golf courses have usually been constructed on undeveloped buffer land of this nature. The operational incentive in keeping the land upon which golf courses are constructed is that the land occupied by the courses is typically used for multiple purposes, for example buffer land, firebreaks or other Defence activities such as emergency aircraft landing areas. Should the land in question not be used for golf, it would still need to be held by Defence.

g) As Defence does not operate any of the golf courses, it is not able to provide the information requested.

h) Although the maintenance of golf courses is not considered of vital importance to the military function of Defence establishments, it is considered that the



**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

requirement to retain appropriate buffer land around such establishments is important. Appropriate buffer and safety areas are necessary to ensure the operational integrity of the bases and that Defence's activities on base do not conflict with surrounding land uses. No land occupied by a golf course, other than Fairbairn and Salisbury which are being disposed of, has been identified as being surplus to Defence requirements. Defence does, however, continue to review the status of golf courses and the use of the land on which they operate.

- i) The only Defence golf courses currently due for disposal are Fairbairn ACT and DSTO Salisbury SA.

## **People**

Defence personnel

### **QUESTION 4**

#### **Recruitment for new CEO for DMO**

Hansard: page 85

#### **Senator Evans**

Can the committee be provided with a copy of the duty statement and selection criteria given to prospective applicants?

### **RESPONSE**

The following information is an extract from the information pack provided to potential applicants for the position of Chief Executive Officer of the Defence Materiel Organisation.

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

**Chief Executive**

**Defence Acquisitions**

Position reports to: Minister for Defence

Number of direct reports: 12 (approximately)

Total number of staff: 8,200 (approximately)

Budget: \$6 billion per annum

**Key relationships:**

**Internal:**

Minister for Defence

Ministerial staff

Heads of Divisions

Scientific Adviser

Head, Human Resources and People Management  
(others to be advised by Defence)

**External:**

Minister for Finance

Advisory Board

Secretary of Defence

Chief of Defence Force

Head, Capability Group, Department of Defence

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

Department of Finance and Administration

Head, Defence Science & Technology Organisation

International counterparts

Industry leaders

**About the position**

Reporting to the Minister for Defence, the Chief Executive will be responsible for the leadership, management and strategic direction of this high profile and commercially complex organisation. With an annual budget of around \$6 billion and a staffing complement of some 8,200, the Chief Executive will be expected to further develop and implement recent procurement reforms aimed at improving the management of Australia's Defence acquisition strategies. The primary objective will be to ensure that Australian Defence Force capability requirements are delivered on time and on budget and that Australia continues to be acknowledged as a global leader in the acquisition and through life support of Defence platforms and equipment.

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

**Primary responsibilities**

The primary responsibilities are as follows:

1. Manage the affairs of the DMO on behalf of the Government in accordance with legislation;
2. Develop and implement strategic and tactical plans to deal with issues of concern and to ensure that the recommendations of the Kinnaird Review are progressed;
3. Provide high level strategic advice to the Minister, Advisory Board and other key stakeholders;
4. Assume ultimate responsibility, and provide high level leadership for the day to day corporate management of the organisation;
5. Review and improve staffing and remuneration policies in order to attract and retain high quality staff;
6. Strengthen policies and procedures in line with the Kinnaird Review to make improvements to the delivery and management of Defence projects;
7. Establish appropriate relationships with Ministers, departmental secretaries, members of the Advisory Board, industry and other important stakeholders within the community, both nationally and internationally;
8. Represent the organisation in negotiations with key suppliers, the Government and at the ministerial level; and
9. Ensure that the proper financial reports and accounts are maintained, meet government legislative requirements and are prepared and presented accurately and on time.

**Managerial and personal attributes:**

To be a strong contender for this appointment you will need to be an entrepreneurial leader and manager with a substantial record of achievement, preferably gained in a large, highly complex and operationally devolved organisation. You will be an astute risk manager, have an innate sense of business timing and strategy and extensive experience in major project management. You will also be politically aware and capable of building strong relationships with key national and international industry and government stakeholders. Your vision, intellectual rigour, personal drive, integrity and credibility will set you apart from others.

**Demonstrated competencies:**

- a reputation for independence and integrity;
- strong leadership skills and the ability to inspire confidence;
- a high degree of commercial and business acumen;
- the ability to manage ambiguity in a fragmented and complex environment;
- high level professional authority and credibility;

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- keen intelligence, persuasiveness and the influence necessary to provide both formal and informal leadership to this initiative;
- a record of achievements, a results orientation, resilience, integrity and a positive approach that wins the respect of stakeholders;
- astute judgement and political awareness;
- high level strategic and policy development and analysis skills; and
- a proactive approach to professional and organisational development and the ability to engender this enthusiasm and professionalism in others.

**Selection criteria**

The successful candidate must demonstrate experience in and/or ability to:

**1. Shape strategic thinking**

*Relevant capabilities and behaviours:*

- Develop and promote a vision for the new DMO
- Agent for change
- Translate the broad strategy of Kinnaird to create a shared understanding of the new organisation of what has to be achieved
- Introduce a more business-like focus to the organisation
- Identify and progress a program of process reform in acquisition and through life support of platforms and equipment

**2. Achieve results**

*Relevant capabilities and behaviours:*

- Achieve the Kinnaird cultural change
- Deliver improved project management
- Respond to stakeholder requirements and changing circumstances
- Marshal professional expertise, through merit selection and appropriate remuneration strategies
- Proven record in oversight of complex project management
- Proven record in managing a complex public or private business enterprise, with significant cash and equipment assets and a large number of staff
- Develop effective contracts and wider relationships with Defence industry

**3. Cultivate productive working relationships**

*Relevant capabilities and behaviours:*

- Build relationships with Ministers and Parliament, and with other Government and international agencies
- Manage relationships with Defence and other stakeholders

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- Grow professional capability and a constructive industrial environment
- Manage military staff placed within the organisation
- Set and monitor clear performance standards

**4. Exemplify personal drive and integrity**

*Relevant capabilities and behaviours:*

- Comply with public sector accountability framework
- Adhere to and promote Defence and APS Values and Code of Conduct
- Commit to action, display resilience

**5. Communicate with influence**

*Relevant capabilities and behaviours:*

- Identify and manage risks associated with ill-defined project proposals
- Implement policy on SME, Regional Australia and Industry
- Establish credibility
- Negotiate persuasively
- Proven ability to deal with public communications, such as in the media and with parliamentary committees

**QUESTION 5**

**Drug incidents at RAAF Amberley, Queensland**

Hansard: page 98

**Senator Evans**

What internal disciplinary action has the Air Force taken against the two serving members charged by Queensland police with various offences? What were the circumstances that led to one of the members leaving the Air Force? What is the position of the other member?

**RESPONSE**

Internal disciplinary action has not been taken against either member at this stage. However, Leading Aircraftman Challen was subject to administrative action. An adverse report was raised by the unit but not upheld by the Director of Personnel Airmen, as Leading Aircraftman Challen had not been found guilty of any offence. Leading Aircraftman Challen was discharged from the Air Force on 14 November 2003, under the medically unfit for further service provisions. Leading Aircraftman Challen was originally declared medically unfit for further service in March 2003, seven months prior to being fined \$150 and ordered to pay \$350 in compensation by the court, for assaulting Aircraftman Moore. The seriousness of the assault charge against Leading Aircraftman Challen was reduced on the recommendation of the

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

prosecution, with Aircraftman Moore's concurrence. A conviction has not been recorded against Leading Aircraftman Challen for assault.

The other member, Leading Aircraftman Albest, had assault charges against him dropped on 14 October 2003 and subsequently the charges of possession of property suspected of being unlawfully obtained were also withdrawn. He attended court on 7 January 2004 and following legal argument over the admissibility of the prosecution's evidence, the prosecution decided to withdraw all charges including possession of dangerous drugs and possession of utensils for use with dangerous drugs against Leading Aircraftman Albest.

There are no further civil charges pertaining to these matters.

**QUESTION 6**

**Drug testing regulations in the ADF**

Hansard: page 102

**Senator Evans**

When was the decision taken to draft regulations concerning random drug testing of ADF members?

**RESPONSE**

The Defence Legal Service was tasked on 31 October 2003 with drafting regulations under Part VIIIA of the Defence Act to support random drug testing.

**QUESTION 7**

**ADF mental health strategy**

Hansard: page 104

**Senator Payne**

How are you evaluating the effectiveness of trying to improve the literacy and the capacity of senior officers and commanders to identify individuals who may have mental health problems?

**RESPONSE**

Defence has not evaluated such effectiveness to date, but intends to consider this issue as part of the evaluation of the Mental Health Strategy.

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

**QUESTION 8**

**Drug incidents at Robertson Army Barracks, Darwin**

Hansard: page 107

**Senator Evans**

- a) Were all 97 Army personnel identified for drug testing at Robertson Barracks interviewed?
- b) Were the 47 members who tested positive across a range of ranks, or were they confined to certain ranks?

**RESPONSE**

- a) Yes.
- b) Of the members who tested positive, five were junior non-commissioned officers and the remainder were private soldiers.

**QUESTION 9**

**Reporting of drug incidents on Defence ‘hotlines’**

Hansard: page 109

**Senator Evans**

On how many occasions have Defence hotlines been used to report drug incidents?

**RESPONSE**

Defence switchboard operators are required to refer calls of this nature to the Defence Whistleblower Scheme, which came into effect on 1 July 2002. Twelve allegations about drug dealing have been made through the Defence Whistleblower Scheme.

Prior to 1 July 2002, there was one allegation of drug use to the Army Fair Go Hotline.

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

**QUESTION 10**

**Death of Private Lindsay**

Hansard: page 110

**Senator Evans**

Do you have any information as to whether the coroner is inquiring into Private Lindsay's death?

**RESPONSE**

Yes, the coroner is inquiring into the cause of death of Private Lindsay. In addition, the Army will conduct a separate wide-ranging investigation into Private Lindsay's service in the Army and the circumstances surrounding the tragedy.

**QUESTION W18**

**Special Air Service issues**

**Senator Evans**

- a) For each unit in the Special Air Service (including the Incident Response Regiment), please indicate establishment staffing and current actual staffing.
- b) Are there any areas of the SAS in which recruitment/retention problems are being experienced? If difficulties are being experienced, please indicate the nature of the problems being experienced.
- c) Have any SAS members expressed concern about the impact of the new direct recruitment scheme on training standards? What has been the nature of the concerns expressed?
- d) Is there a concern that standards may decrease once the scheme is up and running?
- e) Please provide an outline of the training (length of time, cost etc) that the average SAS member has to undertake.
- f) What is the average length of service of an SAS member?
- g) What is the process for reporting unsatisfactory equipment? Please indicate the number of reports of unsatisfactory equipment over the last 3 financial years.
- h) What is the process for following up on these reports?
- i) How long does it take for the reports to be followed up and addressed?
- j) Has Defence undertaken any exit surveys of SAS members who leave the SAS? Please provide a summary of what these surveys found.



**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from Department of Defence

**RESPONSE**

a) ADF unit establishment and actual staffing numbers are classified. As at 30 September 2003, the Special Air Service Regiment was staffed at 96 per cent and the Incident Response Regiment was fully staffed.

b) No.

c) No.

d) No.

e) The initial training period comprises a Special Forces entry test—48 hours, Special Air Service selection—18 days and basic Special Air Service training—17 months. The direct cost to the regiment of this training, which includes the salaries of trainees and instructors, is around \$400k to \$450k per trainee.

Advanced training occurs throughout service in the regiment and is associated directly with promotion and changing operational roles. To quantify this training is difficult as there are many variations, but up to four to five years additional training on formal courses is required. In addition to formal training, there are collective exercises and exchanges conducted in Australia and overseas that offer unique training opportunities.

f) 10 to 20 years.

g) Army members can submit a report on defective or unsatisfactory material by mail, fax, message or on-line entry to the Defence Materiel Organisation's Land Engineering Agency in Melbourne. Once received, the report is registered and allocated to an appropriate investigating authority. The investigating authority acknowledges receipt of the report to the user within 24 hours for safety-related issues, and within five working days for others, and commences an investigation. Once the investigation is resolved, a formal message is sent to all relevant parties detailing the initial concern, the investigating authority's conclusions and the actions required, if any.

Three hundred and fifty-one reports were received from the Special Air Service Regiment between 1 July 2000 and 14 November 2003. A small number related to matters considered to be operationally critical or safety related and they were given the highest priority. The vast majority were suggestions for improvements to equipment which were acted upon according to merit. The process is a particularly useful complement to feedback through the command chain.

h) Once the receipt of a report has been formally acknowledged, the responsibility for regular updates passes to the relevant Defence Materiel Organisation chief engineers. Chief engineers conduct monthly management reviews of current reports.

i) The amount of time required to complete an investigation varies according to the nature of the report. Safety-related reports receive the highest priority. If a safety-related report cannot be resolved within 24 hours, then risk mitigation strategies are sent to all users of the equipment as an interim measure.

j) No specific issues attributable to service in the Special Air Service Regiment have been identified in exit surveys as key considerations in members electing discharge.

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

**Medals**

**QUESTION W25**

**Senator Bartlett**

- k) Will veterans who applied for ‘South East Asia’ clasps and National Service medal in 2002 have received these awards by Anzac Day 2004? (Noting that Mr Ron Karnaghan, a TPI veteran who served in Malaya May 1960–November 1961, applied in November 2002, and received an acknowledgment card in December 2002 for ‘South East Asia’ clasps and the National Service medal, but no further indication of the timeline to receive his awards.)
- l) What is the cause of delay in the processing of Army medal applications?

**RESPONSE**

- a) Other than application for the Anniversary of National Service Medal (ANSM), some applicants who applied in 2002 may not receive their medal entitlements by Anzac Day 2004. The Army Medals Section is currently processing applications received in June 2002. As Mr Karnaghan applied for an Australian Service Medal 1945–75 with Clasp ‘South East Asia’ in November 2002, there is still a considerable number of applicants yet to have their eligibility confirmed and their applications processed before Mr Karnaghan. More staff have been allocated to targeting the backlog of general Army medal applications and the timeframes can be expected to reduce over the coming months. Dedicated staffing arrangements for the ANSM will enable all applicants for the ANSM who applied in 2002 to receive their ANSM prior to Anzac Day in 2004.
- b) Increased operational tempo, widening of the eligibility criteria for existing medals as a result of recent reviews, and establishment of the ANSM, have generated thousands of inquiries, in the last few years, in relation to award entitlements.

The processing of Army medal applications and ANSM applications was disrupted as a result of the transfer of the Army Medals Section from Melbourne to Canberra in May 2003, as none of the Melbourne-based staff members elected to move to Canberra. Recruitment and training of replacement staff, although undertaken as a priority, has taken some time.

The collocation of all honours and awards functions has provided opportunities for processing efficiencies to be made. As a result, processes in relation to the assessment of applications have been streamlined and significant progress has been made in dealing with the backlog.

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from Department of Defence

**QUESTION W26**

**Management Advisory Committee report**

**Senator Carr**

Work–life balance issues have been identified as important for the public service. The March 2003 Management Advisory Committee report *Organisational Renewal* discussed workforce planning issues, stating:

As the labour market tightens into the future, there will be increased pressure on attracting the skills required and maintaining competitive remuneration packages which support effective recruitment at the base grade and lateral levels. Employment conditions and the capacity for work/life balance will be an important element of such packages, and may offer APS agencies a competitive edge ... Increased flexibility in working patterns and arrangements will be an important part of the response to the demographic changes, recognising the life stage dynamics influencing workforce participation. The APS has been a leader in providing family friendly work practices (e.g. part–time work, flexible working hours, home based work, purchased leave) and needs to continue in this role through flexible conditions and supportive management approaches as part of its attraction and retention strategy.

In light of the Management Advisory Committee report, the following questions are asked of each department:

- a) What has been the department's response to the Management Advisory Committee report to date?
- b) Which issues identified in the Management Advisory Committee report have been identified as priority areas for the department?
- c) What family friendly or work–life balance initiatives:
  - i) exist in the department;
  - ii) are available to staff through the certified agreement; or
  - iii) are contained in the certified agreement, but the granting of them in individual cases is discretionary on the part of the organisation.
- d) What family friendly or work–life balance initiatives has the department introduced in, or since, the implementation of the department's most recent certified agreement?
- e) With respect to certified agreement-based family friendly or work-life balance provisions, what number and proportion of departmental staff are making use of such provisions in areas including:
  - i) purchased leave (also known as 48/52 schemes);
  - ii) negotiated part–time work arrangements;
  - iii) parental leave;
  - iv) use of information, advice or counselling services made available by the department;
  - v) departmental provision of facilities (such as family care facilities);
  - vi) home based work.

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

**RESPONSE**

- a) Defence sees the Management Advisory Committee Report as a timely and substantial initiative. Defence recently completed a Strategic Workforce Planning Review which coincided with the report and reached similar conclusions on future challenges to the retention and recruitment of civilian employees and ADF members.

The Defence Strategic Workforce Planning Review 2003 clarified the specific detail and implications of demographic and social trends that will affect the supply of Defence personnel over the next ten to twenty years, with particular reference to functions critical to the delivery of Defence capabilities. The report also concluded that superannuation issues for older Defence APS employees are manageable provided flexible arrangements are in place.

Defence will continue to participate in forums organised by the Public Service Commission at which APS-wide progress on workforce planning and on the Management Advisory Committee recommendations are discussed. Work on appropriate arrangements to retain the expertise of key older personnel will be particularly useful.

- b) While Defence has identified that, by the next decade, the ageing workforce and competition for 18–25 year old employees will provide a challenge for the ADF workforce, it does not see that this demographic trend will be to the detriment of its APS workforce. As advocated by the Management Advisory Committee report, the application of flexible employment policies will assist in ensuring that the quality of the Service is maintained, despite an ageing workforce.

The Defence Strategic Workforce Planning Review 2003 contains recommendations designed to facilitate participation by older workers, both civilian and military. These initiatives will include the promotion of flexible work arrangements such as part-time work and job sharing and the improved implementation of provisions already available to support APS recruitment and retention—such as partnering with industry, broadbanding and Australian Workplace Agreements. In 2002, a program was initiated to encourage retiring ADF members to consider seeking civilian employment in Defence, allowing Defence to retain skills, knowledge, and the benefit of expensive training. Defence, within the provisions of the *Defence Employees' Certified Agreement 2004-06*, also proposes to develop a program of phased retirement as a mechanism to improve the transfer of corporate knowledge and memory from one workforce generation to the next and, simultaneously, to ease the transition of departing staff into retirement.

Defence is developing a program to create ongoing regional relationships with secondary and tertiary academic institutions to address future generations of its workforce. The aim is to meet government requirements to ease the transition of students into the workforce and also to influence students' career choices by projecting Defence (both ADF and APS) as an employer of choice.

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

c)

i) In addition to employee benefits provided under the *Defence Employees' Certified Agreement* (detailed in c(ii) below), APS staff in many locations enjoy a degree of access to ADF facilities, subject to ADF operational requirements, including libraries, gymnasiums, swimming pools, sporting venues and child-care centres.

ii) APS employees in Defence are covered by the *Defence Employees' Certified Agreement 2004–2006*. One of the core principles of the agreement is 'assisting employees to balance their work and private commitments'. This is expanded in part G of the agreement: 'Balancing Work and Life'. (*A copy of part G is attached*). The following is an overview of its provisions:

- ***Flexible working arrangements***: such as flexible working hours; flex time; home based work; part-time work; job sharing; and time off in lieu for travel undertaken outside the normal working day.
- ***Flexible leave arrangements***: annual leave with an option to purchase an additional four weeks per year; Christmas stand down; personal leave for illness and caring purposes; long service leave; leave without pay; maternity leave and miscellaneous leave for bereavement; parental leave; special leave and leave for study purposes; and one leave day per year which can be taken for unspecified purposes. With agreement, employees may work on public holidays and substitute an alternative day off for their own cultural or religious commitments.
- ***Nursing mothers' and family rooms***: for family responsibilities such as breast-feeding and short-term emergency dependant care. Family and nursing mothers' rooms may also be used for medical treatment, religious purposes and a quiet space for meditation or reading.
- ***Access to Defence provided child care***: centre-care initiatives such as vacation/holiday programs to meet regional needs.
- ***Reimbursement of dependant care costs*** when Defence places additional work demands on an employee and no other option but paid care is available.
- A ***Health and Wellbeing Strategy*** which incorporates work/life balance and health and fitness initiatives, to assist staff to develop resilience in times of change and crises.
- ***Participation of APS employees in Australian Defence Force (ADF) representative sporting, cultural or community activities on an on-duty basis***, where appropriate.
- A ***Defence-wide employee assistance program*** to provide access to professional counselling services for all employees and their dependants.

iii) Flexible working and leave arrangements both involve managerial discretion. Flexible working arrangements need to be negotiated by supervisors and managers to ensure Defence provides the flexibility required by employees whilst continuing to meet operational requirements. Some managerial discretion may also be exercised regarding employees' leave arrangements.

**Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**

Budget supplementary estimates 2003–2004, 6 November 2003

Answers to questions on notice from **Department of Defence**

- d) The *Defence Employees Certified Agreement 2004–06* which commenced on 1 January 2004 has three major changes in relation to flexible work arrangements: an increased emphasis on encouraging staff to take leave; a commitment to further exploring strategies to facilitate phased retirement; and an increased emphasis on the need for managers and staff cooperatively to implement policies to balance work and life. The agreement emphasises the importance of staff taking recreation leave and requires managers to discuss their staff's proposed leave plans in order to ensure that all staff have a reasonable opportunity to take leave throughout the year. This is reinforced in the proposed agreement, with staff encouraged to utilise three weeks' annual leave per annum over a two-year period, while still allowing staff to accumulate leave for specific purposes. In addition, Defence has commenced a review to determine the necessary support required to assist managers in developing better skills for managing their people.
- e)
- |  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| i) Purchased leave as at April 2003                      | 363 or 2% (APS staff)      |
| ii) Part-time positions in Defence                       | 560 or 3% (APS staff)      |
| Job-share positions/arrangements<br>(as at October 2003) | 20 or 0.1% (APS staff)     |
| iii) Parental leave accessed<br>(as at April 2003)       | 335 or 1.8% (of APS staff) |
- iv) There are a number of information, advice and counselling services available within Defence relating to equity and diversity, safety management, alternative dispute resolution, and the provision of Employee Assistance Programs. The Defence equity and advice line was accessed by 231 APS employees in 2002–03. The latest available figure for expenditure on the provision of the Employee Assistance Program is \$376,000 (2001–2002 figures).
- v) Defence provides access to nursing mothers and family rooms, child-care and vacation programs. Exact figures for access to these initiatives are not available. Child-care places are provided primarily for ADF members to meet operational requirements, with APS employees having access to these places where vacancies occur. In addition, the Russell Child-care Centre in Canberra provides APS employees with direct access to 37.5% of places.
- vi) Access to home-based work is subject to local negotiation and approval. Figures are not available.

**Attachment:** 'Part G—Balancing work and life'.

[This document is not available on the Committee's website. For further information, contact the secretariat.]