Program: n/a **Division/Agency:** (CASA) Civil Aviation Safety Authority **Topic:** CASA Hire and Maintenance of Indoor Plants **Proof Hansard Page/s:** 74 (12/02/13)

Senator NASH asked:

Senator NASH: That does not surprise me. Having ascertained that it is \$150,000, thank you, Chair. I would hate to think that CASA has to go through the same restrictions that we in this building do and not have plants. I am sure they do a great deal for those of us in this place who need a little bit of greenery every now and again. If you could just take on notice for me the current amount of plants that you have, the current cost of maintenance, who is maintaining them and why you are moving to get a new maintenance regime?

Answer:

Details of CASA's operating expenses are contained in the Annual Report.

Program: n/a **Division/Agency:** (CASA) Civil Aviation Safety Authority **Topic: Explanation for Accounting Treatment and Funding Issues Proof Hansard Page/s:** 76 (12/02/13)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: Just a question on the portfolio statements. The appropriations estimated for 2011-12 were \$152,948,000. I notice what was actually received was \$42,739,000, but the other figure in the column has basically done a similar swap, so clearly there are changes in accounting rules there. In net terms, there has been a reduction of about \$100,000 in your budget, but given that there are cost growth pressures, clearly you have made some savings measures, along with some changes in your accounting rules. I am happy for you to take it on notice, but could you come back to the committee highlighting what those changes are, why we have seen the change in appropriations in 'Other', what that actually means, and where your key areas of savings have been that have allowed you, regardless of inflation and cost growth pressure, to make that reduction in your overall budget position?

Mr J McCormick: I will take that on notice.

Answer:

There was a change in accounting treatment requested by the Department of Finance and Deregulation for General Appropriation to be recognised against account line "Price of Outputs" rather than "Grants received from Portfolio Department". The account line "Price of Outputs" is recognised in the major revenue category, "Appropriations" in the Portfolio Budget Statements, whereas, the account line "Grants received from Portfolio Department" is recognised in the major revenue category, "Other". This took effect from 2012-13 onwards. The adjustment was made during the development of the 2012-13 Portfolio Budget Statements.

There has been a reduction of \$0.064m in CASA's General Appropriation from \$42.739m (2011-12) to \$42.675m (2012-13). The reduction is the result of the one–off efficiency dividend (2.5%) for 2012-13, \$0.087m – refer Table 1.2.

Program: n/a **Division/Agency:** (CASA) Civil Aviation Safety Authority **Topic:** Status of the 2009 Federal Aviation Administration Audit **Proof Hansard Page/s:** 77 (12/02/13)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: I would like to refer you back to the FAA audit that was conducted a couple of years ago. My understanding is that there were a number of deficiencies found during that. Can you give us a status report of rectifications of those?

Mr J McCormick: We can take most of that on notice, if you like. What I can give you now is that the majority issue was around the fact that we did not have sufficient training, in their mind, for our inspectorate. We had already set in place a training school which is now up and running and, in particular, their concerns were over the inspectors who oversaw what is called FAR 129 foreign operators operating RPT, regular public transport, into the US. It was around the amount of training that people had done, where most of the training in the past of say six or seven years ago revolved a lot around on-the-job training and then people had their basic training either that way or through a course to start with was perhaps not as extensive as it should have been. Since then we have rectified that completely.

Senator FAWCETT: I am happy for you to take those on notice.

Answer:

CASA was advised by the FAA in late 2010 that, as CASA had rectified all identified deficiencies, all of these matters are considered resolved.

Program: n/a **Division/Agency:** (CASA) Civil Aviation Safety Authority **Topic:** Aviation Treaties Audits **Proof Hansard Page/s:** 77 (12/02/13)

Senator FAWCETT asked:

Senator FAWCETT: Recently the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties looked at some aviation treaties whereby we set up agreements with other nations about access to Australia's airspace and routes. One of the clauses in there was that either party could audit the other party. Given that the FAA has deemed it necessary to come and audit us, are there any incidents where we have gone and audited another nation, because I note that some of the countries that were in that list are not known for their world-leading status of aviation, shall I put it? The treaty essentially says that we will accept their governance of aviation as being equal to ours, but provides the option for audit. Have we ever done that? **Mr J McCormick:** We have done work with countries to our north. I would prefer to answer that on notice, if I could.

Senator FAWCETT: If you could, thank you.

Answer:

CASA does not audit foreign National Aviation Authorities (NAA). However, it does conduct entry control and surveillance of foreign operators in accordance with the International Civil Aviation Organization and the *Civil Aviation Act 1988*, which allows for consideration to be given to aspects of the performance of foreign regulatory authorities having responsibility for the safety oversight of the operator.

The audit results of other NAAs by the Federal Aviation Administration, European Aviation Safety Agency and the International Civil Aviation Organization are accessible to CASA, and if there was a concern with a foreign NAA, CASA can pursue the possibility of an audit or provide assistance to other States if requested.