SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Question No. 239

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 31 October 2005:

a) How much of the funding provided to double the strike team capacity of the AFP has been expended?

b) Has all funding been expended?
   (i) If not, how much funding has yet to be expended?

c) Was there any variation to the stated budget for this program?
   (i) If so, what was the variation?
   (ii) Was additional funding provided, or did the program lose funding?
   (iii) If the program lost funding, where was the funding transferred, and why?
   (iv) Were any stop-gap measures put in place to ensure the continued operation of this program despite the variations?

d) What was the stated outcome of the program at the time the funding commenced?
   (i) Did the program meet its stated outcome?
   (ii) If not, in which areas did it not meet its stated outcome?
   (iii) Were any other measures or additional funding required to meet the stated outcome of the program?

e) Has a review been conducted of the program?
   (i) If so, could you provide a copy?
   (ii) If not, why not?
   (iii) Is one being conducted, or will one be conducted?
   (iv) Are there any interim reports available?
   (v) Are there any plans to produce any interim reports?

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

In the 2002-03 Budget, the Government provided the AFP $47m over four years to double the AFP strike team capacity.

a) This program was to expand existing investigative strike team capacity. Once the measure was fully implemented, it was not economically feasible to keep financial data relating to the specific additional funding. However, budgets allocated for AFP investigative teams have been fully expended over the past three years.

b) Yes.

   (i) Not applicable.

c) No.

(i) Not applicable.

(ii) Not applicable.

(iii) Not applicable.

(iv) Not applicable.

d) The stated outcome of the program was to deploy an additional 116 AFP officers throughout Australia to respond to crimes such as people smuggling, terrorism, and enhance community protection from transnational criminal threats and potential acts of terrorism.

(i) Yes.

(ii) Not applicable.

(iii) Since the initial funding was approved, the changing international and domestic environment has resulted in the Government providing the AFP with additional funding programs with similar or expanded outcomes to this new measure.

e) As this measure is ongoing funding, there has been no requirement to conduct a review.

(i) Not applicable.

(ii) Not applicable.

(iii) Not applicable.

(iv) Not applicable.

(v) Not applicable.