

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 53

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005:

- a) Has Federal funding for the U-Turn project ceased?
- b) Are there any reports available on the effectiveness of the project? If yes, please provide. If not, why not?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) No. Federal funding is scheduled to cease in September 2006 when the Queensland pilot is completed. To date pilots have been completed in Tasmania and New South Wales. The Western Australian pilot is scheduled to be completed in September 2005. Approximately \$420,000 of committed funding is still to be expended.
- b) No. A meta-evaluation of the four pilot programs is being conducted by Urbis JHD. It is expected that a final report will be provided to the Department in September 2005.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 54

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005:

- a) What was discussed at the Australia-Indonesia workshop series?
- b) How has the workshop series assisted the department in developing its understanding of and cooperation with their Indonesian counterparts? Cite practical examples.
- c) Have any further workshop series been commenced, with either Indonesia or any other country?
- d) Are any planned, or have discussions been held with any other country regarding these?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) The Australia-Indonesia workshop series on assistance in criminal justice matters has been conducted under a Government Sector Linkages Program (GSLP). The workshop conducted in July 2004 provided visiting Indonesian delegates with an overview of the federal nature of Australia's legal system, the key Australian law enforcement agencies and investigative procedures used by them. This general overview was followed by analyses of Australia's laws on mutual assistance, extradition, transfer of prisoners, proceeds of crime, people smuggling and people trafficking.
- b) The workshop series has contributed to improved understanding between Australia and Indonesia of each other's legal and criminal justice systems. Obtaining a basic understanding of how each system works is fundamental to strengthening cooperation and goodwill. One useful outcome was to discuss how in some instances the Indonesian police are involved in proceeds of crime procedures where in Australia it would be the role of the courts.
- c) Yes. Two additional workshop series have been developed with Indonesia, one on legislative drafting, the other on international commercial law. Both projects are funded by AusAID under the Government Sector Linkages Program. It is proposed to hold a legislative drafting workshop with Indonesia before the end of June. No dates have been set for the international commercial law workshop.
- d) See answer to (c).

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 1.8

Question No. 55

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005:

Regarding the Justice Alliance:

- a) The initial focus of the forum was to sort out the priorities of the Justice Summit and begin putting them into practice. Is the Department aware of the extent to which this has begun?
- b) What were the priorities of the Justice Summit?
- c) How has the abolition of ATSIC affected the Justice Alliance?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) The first meeting of the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Justice Alliance was held on 26 November 2004 in Melbourne. Included on the agenda were the Justice Summit Outcomes Report and the need to review the Report and identify work priorities. The Justice Alliance remains a priority for National Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee (NAJAC), and NAJAC has indicated that it intends to arrange a further meeting of the Justice Alliance in June 2005.
- b) The Justice Summit identified the following Priority Areas:

Priority Area 1—Addressing the underlying issues

Issues relating to—though not limited to—health, education, employment and childcare were identified as being important to reducing Indigenous offending.

Priority Area 2—National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Justice Alliance

The Summit agreed that there is a need for a strong, united Indigenous voice on Indigenous justice issues at the national level, and agreed that NAJAC should progress this as a matter of urgency.

Priority Area 3—Community safety and reducing Indigenous offending

The Summit agreed that there is a clear need to: address offending in Indigenous communities; make communities safe and healthy; and build the capacity of individuals and organisations.

Priority Area 4—Provision of appropriate justice and legal services

The Summit agreed that, in order to improve justice outcomes for Indigenous people, there is a need to provide culturally appropriate legal services and mechanisms to make the criminal justice system more responsive to the needs of Indigenous people. The introduction of Indigenous-specific courts, the investigation of customary law, and the use of Indigenous interpreters in the NT were all identified as positive measures in this regard.

Priority Area 5—Resourcing

Resourcing issues were identified as major areas of concern by participants at the Summit. The Summit was encouraged by governments and the general public taking a strong interest in family violence, alcohol and substance misuse and offending in Indigenous communities. The Summit agreed that more resources are needed and that existing resources could be better utilised and distributed.

- c) The proposed abolition of ATSIC is not expected to affect the Justice Alliance. ATSIC was not invited to be a member of the Justice Alliance, though it was one of a number of bodies the Justice Alliance was proposing to engage with.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 56

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005:

Since June 2003, has the Department provided advice on, or is the Department working in conjunction with any other government agency on identity theft?

- a) If so, which ones?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

An identity theft kit - *How to prevent and respond to identity theft* – was launched by the Minister for Justice and Customs on 12 February 2004. The kit contains useful information to help Australians identify where they might be vulnerable, and what to do to avoid becoming a victim of identity theft.

- a) The kits were developed in consultation with the AIC, AFP, ACC, ACPR, Office of the Federal Privacy Commissioner, ATO, ASIC, DFAT, DIMIA, ITSA and Centrelink. As of 20 February 2005 over 93,000 kits have been distributed to government agencies, private organisations and the general community.

The Department has also co-ordinated work across agencies and jurisdictions to develop a whole-of-government identity security initiative. This work has involved working in conjunction with a number of Australian Government, and state and territory agencies. Details of this work and the participants are included in answers to Question Nos. 40 and 49.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 57

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005:

- a) Have the feasibility studies on each of the areas mentioned on page 86 of the Annual Report been completed? If so, please provide.
- b) What did the feasibility studies indicate?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) The feasibility studies mentioned on page 86 of the Annual Report have been completed.
- b) The studies will form the basis of a report to Government. Details of the studies are not available for public release.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 58

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005:

Regarding the proposal to develop a national firearms management system:

- a) Where did this proposal originate from (i.e. Department, industry etc)?
- b) How was the proposed system to have operated?
- c) Which items would it have restricted access to, and which items would it have provided greater access to?
- d) When was the proposal first raised?
- e) Was the proposal ultimately accepted or rejected?
- f) Did the Department prepare briefs for the Minister on this issue?
- g) Has the Department conducted any recent follow-up studies of this proposal?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) The proposal originated from the Australasian Police Ministers' Council. The original proposal was co-sponsored by the Australian Government and Victoria.
- b) The operation of the system has not been determined.
- c) See b).
- d) The matter of an integrated licence and firearms registration system has been discussed in various forms since being raised by the Australasian Police Ministers' Council in 1996. The current proposal for the national firearms management system was first raised in 2003.
- e) The proposal has not been finalised. On 17 November 2004 the Australasian Police Ministers' Council agreed to conduct a scoping study to investigate broad options and costs for the development of a national firearms management system. A request for tender was advertised on 12 January 2005, and closed on 25 February 2005, to engage a consultant to undertake the scoping study.
- f) Yes.
- g) Not applicable.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 59

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005:

Which countries are parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime and the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

The parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime, current to 7 March 2005, are set out in the extract below, taken from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime website (*ref:* http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crime_cicp_signatures_convention.html):

United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime

Entry into force: 29 September 2003, in accordance with article 38.

Registration: 29 September 2003, No. 39574.

Status: Signatories: 147, Parties: 99.

Text: Doc. [A/55/383](#).

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution [A/RES/55/25](#) of 15 November 2000 at the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In accordance with its article 36, the Convention will be open for signature by all States and by regional economic integration organizations, provided that at least one Member State of such organization has signed the Convention, from 12 to 15 December 2000 at the Palazzi di Giustizia in Palermo, Italy, and thereafter at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 12 December 2002.

Country	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Afghanistan	14 December 2000	24 Sep 2003
Albania	12 December 2000	21 Aug 2002
Algeria	12 December 2000	07 Oct 2002
Antigua and Barbuda	26 September 2001	24 July 2002
Argentina	12 December 2000	19 Nov 2002
Armenia	15 November 2001	01 July 2003
Australia	13 December 2000	27 May 2004
Austria	12 December 2000	23 Sep 2004
Azerbaijan	12 December 2000	30 Oct 2003
Bahrain		7 Jun 2004 a
Belarus	14 December 2000	25 June 2003
Belgium	12 December 2000	11 Aug 2004
Belize		26 Sep 2003 a
Benin	13 December 2000	30 Aug 2004
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 December 2000	24 April 2002
Botswana	10 April 2002	29 Aug 2002
Brazil	12 December 2000	29 Jan 2004
Bulgaria	13 December 2000	5 Dec 2001

Country	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Burkina Faso	15 December 2000	15 May 2002
Canada	14 December 2000	13 May 2002
Cape Verde	13 December 2000	15 Jul 2004
Central African Republic		14 Sep 2004 a
China 1	12 December 2000	23 Sep 2003
Colombia	12 December 2000	4 Aug 2004
Comoros		25 Sep 2003a
Cook Islands		04 March 2004a
Costa Rica	16 March 2001	24 July 2003
Croatia	12 December 2000	24 Jan 2003
Cyprus	12 December 2000	22 April 2003
Denmark 2	12 December 2000	30 Sep 2003
Ecuador	13 December 2000	17 Sep 2002
Egypt	13 December 2000	05 March 2004
El Salvador	14 December 2000	18 March 2004
Equatorial Guinea	14 December 2000	07 Feb 2003
Estonia	14 December 2000	10 Feb 2003
European Community	12 December 2000	21 May 2004 AA
Finland	12 December 2000	10 Feb 2003
France	12 December 2000	29 Oct 2002
Gambia	14 December 2000	05 May 2003
Grenada		21 May 2004 a
Guatemala	12 December 2000	25 Sep 2003
Guinea		9 Nov 2004 a
Guyana		14 Sep 2004 a
Honduras	14 December 2000	02 Dec 2003
Jamaica	26 September 2001	29 Sep 2003
Kenya		16 June 2004 a
Kyrgyzstan	13 December 2000	02 Oct 2003
Lao's People's Democratic Republic		26 Sep 2003a
Latvia	13 December 2000	7 Dec 2001
Lesotho	14 December 2000	24 Sep 2003
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 November 2001	18 Jun 2004
Lithuania	13 December 2000	9 May 2002
Malaysia	26 September 2002	24 Sep 2004
Mali	15 December 2000	12 April 2002
Malta	14 December 2000	24 Sep 2003
Mauritius	12 December 2000	21 April 2003
Mexico	13 December 2000	04 March 2003
Micronesia (Federal States of)		24 May 2004 a
Monaco	13 December 2000	5 June 2001

Country	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Morocco	13 December 2000	19 Sep 2002
Myanmar		30 March 2004
Namibia	13 December 2000	16 Aug 2002
Netherlands	12 December 2000	26 May 2004
New Zealand ³	14 December 2000	19 July 2002
Nicaragua	14 December 2000	9 Sep 2002
Niger	21 August 2001	30 Sep 2004
Nigeria	13 December 2000	28 June 2001
Norway	13 December 2000	23 Sep 2003
Panama	13 December 2000	18 Aug 2004
Paraguay	12 December 2000	22 Sep 2004
Peru	14 December 2000	23 Jan 2002
Philippines	14 December 2000	28 May 2002
Poland	12 December 2000	12 Nov 2001
Portugal	12 December 2000	10 May 2004
Romania	14 December 2000	04 Dec 2002
Russian Federation	12 December 2000	26 May 2004
Rwanda	14 December 2000	26 Sep 2003
Saint Kitts & Nevis	20 November 2001	21 May 2004
Saudi Arabia	12 December 2000	18 Jan 2005
Senegal	13 December 2000	27 Oct 2003
Serbia and Montenegro	12 December 2000	06 Sep 2001
Seychelles	12 December 2000	22 April 2003
Slovakia	14 December 2000	03 Dec 2003
Slovenia	12 December 2000	21 May 2004
South Africa	14 December 2000	20 Feb 2004
Spain	13 December 2000	01 March 2002
Sweden	12 December 2000	30 April 2004
Tajikistan	12 December 2000	08 July 2002
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	12 December 2000	12 Jan 2005
Togo	12 December 2000	2 Jul 2004
Tunisia	13 December 2000	19 June 2003
Turkey	13 December 2000	25 March 2003
Ukraine	12 December 2000	21 May 2004
Uzbekistan	13 December 2000	09 Dec 2003
Venezuela	14 December 2000	13 May 2002

The parties to the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air are set out in the extract below, taken from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime website (*ref:* http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crime_cicp_signatures_migrants.html)

Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air

Entry into force: 28 January 2004, in accordance with article 22 which reads as follows: "1. This Protocol will enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the fortieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, except that it shall not enter into force before the entry into force of the Convention. For the purpose of this paragraph, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member states of such organization. 2. For each State or regional economic integration organization ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to this Protocol after the deposit of the fortieth instrument of such action, this Protocol shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit by such State or organization of the relevant instrument or on the date this Protocol enters into force pursuant to paragraph 1 of this article, whichever is the later."

Status: Signatories: 112, Parties: 66.

Text: [Doc. A/55/383](#).

Note: The Protocol was adopted by resolution [A/RES/55/25](#) of 15 November 2000 at the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In accordance with its article 21, the Protocol will be open for signature by all States and by regional economic integration organizations, provided that at least one Member State of such organization has signed the Protocol, from 12 to 15 December 2000 at the Palazzi di Giustizia in Palermo, Italy, and thereafter at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 12 December 2002.

Country	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Albania	12 December 2000	21 August 2002
Algeria	6 June 2001	09 March 2004
Argentina	12 December 2000	19 November 2002
Armenia	15 November 2001	01 July 2003
Australia	21 December 2001	27 May 2004
Azerbaijan	12 December 2000	30 October 2003
Bahrain		7 Jun 2004 a
Belarus	14 December 2000	25 June 2003
Belgium	12 December 2000	11 Aug 2004
Benin		30 Aug 2004
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 December 2000	24 April 2002
Botswana	10 April 2002	29 August 2002
Brazil	12 December 2000	29 January 2004
Bulgaria	13 December 2000	5 December 2001
Burkina Faso	15 December 2000	15 May 2002
Canada	14 December 2000	13 May 2002
Cape Verde	13 December 2000	15 Jul 2004
Costa Rica	16 March 2001	07 August 2003
Croatia	12 December 2000	24 January 2003
Cyprus	12 December 2000	06 August 2003
Ecuador	13 December 2000	17 September 2002
El Salvador	15 August 2002	18 March 2004

Country	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Estonia	20 September 2002	12 May 2002
France	12 December 2000	29 October 2002
Gambia	14 December 2000	05 May 2003
Grenada		21 May 2004 a
Guatemala		01 April 2004 a
Jamaica	13 February 2002	29 September 2003
Kenya		5 Jan 2005 a
Kyrgyzstan	13 December 2000	02 October 2003
Lao's People's Democratic Republic		26 September 2003a
Latvia	10 December 2002	23 April 2003
Lesotho	14 December 2000	24 Sep 2004
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 November 2001	24 Sep 2004
Lithuania	25 April 2002	12 May 2003
Mali	15 December 2000	12 April 2002
Malta	14 December 2000	24 September 2003
Mauritius		24 September 2003
Mexico	13 December 2000	04 March 2003
Monaco	13 December 2000	5 June 2001
Myanmar		30 March 2004 a
Namibia	13 December 2000	16 August 2002
New Zealand 1	14 December 2000	19 July 2002
Nigeria	13 December 2000	27 September 2001
Norway	13 December 2000	23 September 2003
Panama	13 December 2000	18 Aug 2004
Peru	14 December 2000	23 January 2002
Philippines	14 December 2000	28 May 2002
Poland	4 October 2001	26 September 2003
Portugal	12 December 2000	10 May 2004
Romania	14 December 2000	04 December 2002
Russian Federation	12 December 2000	26 May 2004
Saint Kitts and Nevis		21 May 2004 a
Senegal	13 December 2000	27 October 2003
Serbia and Montenegro	12 December 2000	6 September 2001
Seychelles	22 July 2002	22 Jun 2004
Slovakia	15 November 2001	21 Sep 2004
Slovenia	15 November 2001	21 May 2004
South Africa	14 December 2000	20 February 2004
Spain	13 December 2000	01 march 2002
Tajikistan		08 July 2002 a

Country	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Thailand	18 December 2001	12 Jan 2005
Tunisia	13 December 2000	14 July 2003
Turkey	13 December 2000	25 March 2003
Ukraine	15 November 2001	21 May 2004
Yugoslavia	12 December 2000	6 September 2001

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 60

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005:

- a) When was the review of the Extradition Act initially planned to begin?
- b) What issues were intended to be examined in the review?
- c) Which stage is the review of the Extradition Act currently at?
- d) Are there any interim reports available?
- e) Has work progressed on the Extradition Act so far this year?
- f) When is the review expected to be completed?
- g) What stakeholders are to be involved in the review of the Extradition Act?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- (a) The Government tabled its response to the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties (JSCOT) report 'Extradition - Australia's Law and Policy' (report no. 40) on 13 May 2004. In its response, the Government announced that it would review the *Extradition Act 1988* and Australia's extradition practice. The Government's intention was to commence the review as soon as departmental resources were available. A review team has been established in the Criminal Justice Division of the Attorney-General's Department and the review has commenced.
- (b) As the Government indicated in its response to the JSCOT report, the Government will review the *Extradition Act 1988* and Australia's extradition practice, taking into consideration the issues identified by the Committee.
- (c) A review team was established in the Attorney-General's Department in April 2005 and the review has commenced.
- (d) No.
- (e) A review team was established in the Attorney-General's Department in April 2005 and the review has commenced.
- (f) 2006.
- (g) Commonwealth and State law enforcement agencies will be directly involved in the review. Broader consultation arrangements will be developed as part of the review process.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Question No. 61

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005:

How many extradition requests were made last year (since the publication of the Annual Report)?

- a) Which countries made the extradition requests?
- b) For what crimes were the extraditions requested?
- c) Of the requests Australia was still considering at time of publication of the last report, how many of those have been resolved and how have they been resolved?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

a) and b) The statistics published in the Annual Report are for 2003-04. The following answers relate to information available for the period from 1 July 2004 until 28 February 2005.

Sixteen extradition requests have been made in the period 1 July 2004 to 28 February 2005. The following table provides the answer to parts a) and b):

Requesting Country	Number of Requests	Type of offences
Australia	8	Murder, manslaughter, assault, sexual assault, child sex, robbery, drugs, escape lawful custody.
Lebanon	2	Terrorism
United Kingdom	2	Murder, child sex
Germany	1	Sexual assault
South Africa	1	Conspiracy to murder
Belgium	1	Robbery, extortion
India	1	Child sex

c) Of the requests to Australia under consideration at 30 June 2004, thirteen were resolved by 28 February 2005. Of these, ten people have been surrendered to the requesting country, one request was withdrawn by the requesting country and two requests have been refused by the Attorney-General's Department because they do not meet the requirements of the *Extradition Act 1988*.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 62

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005:

Regarding the 10 per cent increase in the number of incoming and outgoing extradition requests, did that increase come from a large increase in a specific crime or country, or was it a general across-the-board increase?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

It was a general across-the-board increase.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 63

Senator Ludwig asked the following question during the hearing on 14 February 2005:

Other than PNG, does the department provide advice or personnel to the governments of the South Pacific regions, or to any governmental agencies?

a) If so, which ones?

If personnel, what positions are they filling and where?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

Personnel

An AGD officer is currently attached to the Solomon Islands Public Solicitor's Office. The officer assists the Solomon Islands Public Solicitor in preparing defence cases for persons charged with criminal offences.

Advice

The Department does not provide advice to the governments of Pacific Island Countries.

The Department has at various times provided technical assistance to law and justice agencies and officials in the following countries:

- Nauru – concerning international money laundering standards; the Pacific Islands Forum's (PIF) 2002 Nasonini Declaration on Regional Security (Nasonini Declaration) dealing with international counter-terrorism instruments; and the establishment of a new law library.
- Kiribati – concerning legislation under the Nasonini Declaration; the PIF's 1992 Honiara Declaration on Law Enforcement Co-operation (Honiara Declaration) dealing with extradition, mutual assistance in criminal matters, proceeds of crime and money laundering.
- PNG, Vanuatu and Cook Islands – concerning the Nasonini and Honiara Declarations
- Fiji, Tuvalu, Tonga and Samoa – concerning the Honiara Declaration.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 64

Senator Ludwig asked the following question during the hearing on 14 February 2005:

Which positions in the PNG government is the Attorney-General's Department providing personnel for?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

The Attorney-General's Department has placed two senior officers from the Department in policy and law reform positions in the PNG Department of Justice and Attorney-General.

The Department is also responsible for the recruitment of officials for the following positions:

- Five prosecutors to be placed in the PNG Public Prosecutor's office. Four prosecutors were recruited from the Office of the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions and have been deployed. Recruitment of the fifth prosecutor should be finalised by late April 2005.
- One Senior Deputy Registrar to be placed in the PNG Registry of the National and Supreme Courts. A senior officer will be recruited from the Family Court to fill the position.
- Two Correctional Service Managers to be placed in PNG Correctional Services. One officer was recruited from the Queensland Department of Correctional Services and the other from a private security firm. Both have been deployed.
- Solicitor-General to head the PNG Solicitor-General's Office. The recruitment process is ongoing.
- Three litigators to be placed in the PNG Solicitor-General's Office. Recruitment will commence as soon as possible after the Solicitor-General is appointed.
- Four Australian judges to be appointed to the PNG judiciary.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 65

Senator Ludwig asked the following question during the hearing on 14 February 2005:

Has the Department provided advice on placing officials from any other Departments to any South Pacific nation?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

See the answer to Question No. 64.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Output 2.1

Question No. 66

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2005

- (a) Please provide a copy of the recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force.
- (b) How many of the recommendations of the Task Force are to be implemented?
 - i. Which ones aren't, and why not?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- (a) The recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering are attached.
- (b) There are Forty Recommendations on anti-money laundering measures and Nine Special Recommendations on counter-terrorist financing measures.

In December 2003 the Government committed to implementing the revised Forty Recommendations and the then 8 Special Recommendations on terrorist financing through significant reforms to Australia's anti-money laundering system. An extensive consultation process is continuing with industry representatives to design a cost effective anti-money laundering system that will meet international standards while responding to the needs of Australian industry.

A ninth Special Recommendation which was recently adopted by the Financial Action Task Force to regulate cross-border transportation of cash and monetary instruments is under consideration by the Government. Implementation details are under development.

Further information on Australia's anti-money laundering reform process can be found at www.ag.gov.au/aml