ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 01

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: EconTech Report Hansard Page: 98 (30/10/06)

Senator Carr asked:

Ms Clendinning—Some information was provided on 24 October, but not the material that we felt was essential to a true assessment of their report—the modelling. **Senator CARR**—What additional information is outstanding? **Ms Page**—We would have to take that on notice to give you a detailed answer.

Answer:

EconTech's supplementary paper was provided to the Department of Transport and Regional Services (DOTARS) on 24 October 2006 by the Norfolk Island Administration. This paper did not sufficiently address the questions raised by officials at the 28 September 2006 briefing although general information was provided.

On 31 October 2006, DOTARS contacted EconTech again to seek the following details which were not included in the 24 October 2006 material:

- A breakdown of health, education and welfare expenditure across the modelling period to show the Norfolk Island Government's (NIG) budget response to changing demographic profiles and demands.
- The amount of increased expenditure for all government services assumed by EconTech in its modelling.
- The financial position of each government business enterprise and its contribution to the NIG revenue fund every year over the modelling period.
- The NIG's expenditure to encourage the growth in tourism assumed in the EconTech model.
- The capital expenditure necessary to sustain the higher number of tourists.

EconTech advised that the above information is not available.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 02

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Financial Situation of the Norfolk Island Government

Hansard Page: 102 (30/10/06)

Senator Hogg asked:

Senator HOGG—Do we know what cash reserves the Norfolk Island Government has and, if so, where are those cash reserves?

Ms Page—Twelve months ago, which would have been the last time we had advice from the Acumen Report, they were in the order of \$11 million, but I would like to check that. They are held variously in cash and term deposits by the Norfolk Island Government.

Answer:

The Norfolk Island Government (NIG) audited financial statements for 2005-06 show that the cash balance at 30 June 2006 was \$19.1m, comprising four term deposits and a cheque account in Australian-based banks and cash at hand. Of the \$19.1m, \$17.6m is for specific purposes including government business enterprises.

The NIG's financial indicators at the end of September 2006 show \$12.0m cash at bank.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 03

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Financial Situation of the Norfolk Island Government

Hansard Page: 102 (30/10/06)

Senator Hogg asked:

Senator HOGG—There is no more recent assessment of what the cash assets might be?

Ms Page—I would like to take that on notice. I do not recall formal advice on the level of cash reserves.

Answer:

There has been no further re-assessment of cash assets by the Department of Transport and Regional Services.

However, the Norfolk Island Government's (NIG) audited financial statements for 2005-06 show that the cash balance at 30 June 2006 was \$19.1 m. Of the \$19.1m, \$17.6m is for specific purposes including government business enterprises.

The NIG's financial indicators for the end of September 2006 show \$12.0m cash at bank.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 04

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Norfolk Island Airport Runway

Hansard Page: 103 (30/10/06)

Senator Heffernan asked:

CHAIR—And did the local Public Works Minister win the contract for that or people associated with the Minister?

Ms Page—I do not believe so. I think it was Boral that conducted the work.

CHAIR—Who had the head contract?

Ms Page—I do not believe so, but we could look further into that.

Answer:

As noted in the answer to **TLG 61** from the February 2006 Budget Estimates hearings, this is a matter for the Norfolk Island Government.

However, the Norfolk Island Government has advised that the upgrade of the Norfolk Island airport runway was undertaken by Boral Resources (Qld) Pty Limited. The project was managed by GHD Pty Ltd.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 05

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Asset Management Plan Hansard Page: 105 (30/10/06)

Senator Carr asked:

Ms Page—I would like to correct some earlier evidence. The asset management plan has now been completed and was tabled in the Legislative Assembly, we think, in August.

Senator CARR—We can take it as a tabled document?

Ms Page—Yes.

Answer:

The Asset Management Plan was tabled in the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly on 19 July 2006. A copy of the Plan is provided at **Attachment A**.

[TLG 05 attachment]

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 06

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic: Norfolk Island Asset Management Plan**

Hansard Page: 106 (30/10/06)

Senator Carr asked:

Senator Carr—I am going to the issue here about the financial sustainability of the island based on these figures, these reports we now have. This is not a matter for conjecture. These have been published. You say it has been tabled, so presumably the Norfolk Island Government has been obliged to accept it. It would not have been tabled otherwise. Is that the case?

Ms Page—I am not aware of whether the Norfolk Island Government has indicated a view one way or the other on it. We can find that out for you.

Answer:

The *Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly Hansard* of 19 July 2006, indicates that whilst acknowledging the Asset Management Plan as a very detailed, comprehensive and useful addition to the data for use in planning future capital works and asset maintenance, the Norfolk Island Government did not endorse all of the Plan's conclusions, nor the figures it places on asset management in the immediate future or over the next 15 years.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 07

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: PRL Environment Report Hansard Page: 108 (30/10/06)

Senator Siewert asked:

Senator SIEWERT—In the third paragraph, you say that PRL provides an annual environment report to the Department of Industry and Resources in Western Australia under their Act. There is an annual inspection carried out, but DOTARS does not have access to that report.

Mr Yates—I think I will probably have to take that question on notice. I am afraid I do not have that level of detail with me.

Senator SIEWERT—While you do, if you could find out if that is normal practice on other leases and across the Territories. I believe the States do not provide that information.

Answer:

The WA Department of Industry and Resources has received PRL's annual environment report. DOTARS will be provided with the report when the WA Department of Industry and Resources has completed its review of PRL's documentation.

The Australian Government does not administer any other mining leases on self-governing or non self-governing Territories.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 08

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic: PRL Environmental Performance Audit**

Hansard Page: 108 (30/10/06)

Senator Siewert asked:

Senator SIEWERT—I move onto question **TLG 31**. I have been chasing this for a while, as you can probably tell by the number of questions I have asked on it. The environmental performance audit was paid for by PRL. Then it says that the audit is confidential. Is that also normal practice? Because an audit was paid for by a company it then claims it is commercial-in-confidence and then it is not publicly-available?

Mr Yates—I am not able to answer at the moment whether it is normal practice. That is outside of my knowledge. Again, I would be happy to take that on notice and provide you with some advice on that.

Answer:

PRL's environmental performance review is in-confidence as part of its commercial relationship with the Australian Government, as created by the 1997 mining lease between the company and the Australian Government. Clause 24 of the lease establishes a confidentiality agreement, except where required by law, obliging the agreement of both parties to the public release over the release of information to the public.

[See supplement to TLG 08 – attached]

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 09

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government Topic: Cocos Cultural and Heritage Precinct Project

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Are you aware of the proposal by the Shire of Cocos-Keeling to develop a cultural and heritage interpretation plan for Cocos Island?

Answer:

Yes.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 10

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Cocos Cultural and Heritage Precinct Project

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

It has been suggested that following local consultation and contact with Lotterywest in Perth, that this project has been with DOTARS for quite some time awaiting advice on funding support. Is that correct?

- a. On what date did the Department receive a request for such assistance?
- b. What assistance is the Shire seeking for this project?
- c. What is the current status of that request?

Answer:

The project is currently with DOTARS.

- a. The application was received on 11 July 2005 and forwarded to Lotterywest for assessment under the Indian Ocean Territories State-type Grants programme. The original application was revised and re-submitted as it did not meet the criteria. Lotterywest's recommendation on funding was received by the Perth office of DOTARS on 15 April 2006, but could not be funded in that financial year as the allocation was fully committed and was held over for financial year 2006/2007.
- b. \$69,000.00.
- c. The project is part of a State-type Grants programme submission for financial year 2006/2007 to the Minister for Local Government, Territories and Roads, Hon Jim Lloyd MP, being prepared by the Department.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 11

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Cocos Cultural and Heritage Precinct Project

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Under your new organisational arrangements, exactly who has responsibility for considering such a request - staff in Perth or Canberra?

Answer:

The Minister for Local Government, Territories and Roads, Hon Jim Lloyd MP, is responsible for decisions on applications for funding under the State-type Grants programme, following advice from the Department. The State-type Grants programme is administered by DOTARS.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 12

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Cocos Cultural and Heritage Precinct Project

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Have you advised the Shire Council on any progress or any problems with the proposal?

a. If so, what are the problems identified?

Answer:

The Department has worked closely with the Shire Council in respect of this application.

a. The original application was deemed to be unsatisfactory by the assessment team at Lotterywest. It was subsequently re-worked by the Cocos (Keeling) Island Shire, with assistance by Lotterywest and staff associated with the WA Museum Assistance Program.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 13

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Cocos Cultural and Heritage Precinct Project

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

When do you think that a decision will be made on this request?

Answer:

The decision will be made by the Minister for Local Government, Territories and Roads, Hon Jim Lloyd MP. The project is part of a State-type Grants programme submission being prepared by the Department for financial year 2006/2007.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 14

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Buzz Dance Theatre Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

In the experience of the Department, how many such cultural or theatre groups tour the Cocos Islands in an average year?

a. Would you agree that such visits would be important to the community and the cancellation of such visits would be a matter of concern to the community?

Answer:

The first tour of this type was undertaken in September 2005. The present arrangement with the WA Department of Culture and the Arts provides for one annual tour.

a. The Australian Government, through its Service Delivery Arrangement with the WA Department of Culture and the Arts, supports tours of cultural and theatre groups similar to that provided to remote Western Australia.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 15

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Buzz Dance Theatre Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Can you confirm that a tour this month by the WA Company, Buzz Dance Theatre, to give kids their skills development in dance and movement has recently been cancelled?

Answer:

Yes.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 16

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Buzz Dance Theatre Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

It has been suggested to me that the company needed to know by 15th September whether funding had been approved for the tour, but that no such advice was received from DOTARS. Is that correct?

Answer:

The Department understands the company required advice by 15 September 2006. The number of bids for funding from the Indian Ocean Territories Administered Programme for 2006/2007 prevented finalisation of allocations for approval by the Minister for Local Government, Territories and Roads, Hon Jim Lloyd MP, before the tour coordinator's deadline of 15 September 2006.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 17

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Buzz Dance Theatre Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Did the Department receive a request for funding or other assistance to enable this tour to proceed?

- a. If so, on what date was that request received by the Department?
- b. Was there any delay in considering this request?
- c. Where was it considered: in Perth or in Canberra?

Answer:

To support the delivery of cultural programmes to the Indian Ocean Territories (IOT), a Service Delivery Arrangement (SDA) is in place with the Western Australian Department of Culture and the Arts (DCA). This is funded from the IOT Administered Programme. A component of that SDA is tours by theatre troupes and the like.

- a. The Department received the 2006/2007 proposed budget from DCA on 09 March 2006. The Buzz Dance Theatre tour formed a part of the programme, but was not specifically identified within the DCA bid.
- b. The number of bids for funding from the IOT Administered Programme delayed finalisation of advice to the Minister for Local Government, Territories and Roads, Hon Jim Lloyd MP, until October 2006.
- c. Decisions for funding through the IOT Administered Programme are made by the Minister for Local Government, Territories and Roads, Hon Jim Lloyd MP, following advice by the Department.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 18

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Buzz Dance Theatre Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Why was it not possible to make this decision in time for the tour to proceed?

Answer:

Refer to the response to TLG 16.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 19

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Buzz Dance Theatre Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Do you consider that the Department acted in a timely manner on this issue?

Answer:

Refer to the response to TLG 16.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 20

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Buzz Dance Theatre Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Are you aware of any other similar cultural visits or tours that have had to be cancelled because the Department could not provide advice or agreement in time?

Answer:

No.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 21

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Buzz Dance Theatre Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Do you anticipate that you will be able to reach a decision to allow the proposed re-scheduled tour year to take place in April next?

Answer:

The WA Department of Culture and the Arts (DCA), under the Service Delivery Agreement (SDA) with the Australian Government for the provision of cultural activities to the Indian Ocean Territories (IOT) through the IOT Administered Programme, makes recommendations for tours. If a proposal for a tour is received, it will be assessed by DCA against their criteria and a recommendation made to the Department. A submission for approval by the Minister for Local Government, Territories and Roads, Hon Jim Lloyd MP, will then be made by the Department.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 22

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Christmas Island Crane at Flying Fish Cove

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

The crane at Christmas Island was out of action for months due to cracked footings. It was supposed to be back in use by July. Was the crane at Flying Fish Cover finally repaired and put back into use by the July deadline stated during last Estimates?

- a. If not, how do you explain the further delay?
- b. If there was a delay, when did the crane finally become fully operational?
- c. If repairs are not complete, what is the timeline now and what is happening to the off-loading of cargo and the loading of phosphate?

Answer:

CI Ports, the Department's contracted port manager, notified port users on 28 July 2006 that the crane would be operational as from 31 July 2006. The crane was returned to service on 31 July 2006.

The crane was then removed from service once again from 19 August to 21 August 2006, due to movement in one of the tower legs at the starter leg attachment. New bolts were fitted to the crane with specialised equipment (torque multiplier).

On 17 September 2006, the slew motor casing fractured causing the crane to again be removed from service. It was returned to service on 19 September 2006. The slew motor casing fractured for a second time on 9 October 2006 at 05:00 and the crane was returned to service at 13:30 on the same day.

An independent expert is being engaged to assess the crane and its maintenance regimes and operations. The assessment will include recommendations for improvement in both the maintenance and operations where appropriate. It is expected that this assessment will begin in early December.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 23

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Christmas Island Crane at Flying Fish Cove

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

What were the current costs of repairs?

Answer:

The cost of the repairs at 16 November 2006 was \$572,024.36. The total cost of the repairs including outstanding commitments is expected to be \$653,305.02.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 24

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Christmas Island Crane at Flying Fish Cove

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

What is the estimated total cost of repairs? Is this a greater figure than your original estimate of costs?

Answer:

The estimated total cost of repairs to the Department is \$653,305.02, which is greater than the original estimate of costs.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 25

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Christmas Island Crane at Flying Fish Cove

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Who meets these costs?

Answer:

The Australian Government meets these costs from the Indian Ocean Territories Administered Programme.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 26

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Christmas Island Crane at Flying Fish Cove

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

What is the total cost to the Department of these repairs?

Answer:

The total cost to the Department of these repairs will be \$653,305.02.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 27

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Christmas Island Crane at Flying Fish Cove

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

You have previously indicated that possible action against contractors or other parties associated with the installation and maintenance of the crane was being considered. Is that still the case?

Answer:

The Department has not yet received final legal advice on this issue.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 28

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Christmas Island Crane at Flying Fish Cove

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

What is the current status of possible action to recover costs?

Answer:

The Department has not yet received final legal advice on this issue.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 29

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Christmas Island Crane at Flying Fish Cove

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

What legal options and advice has the Department received?

Answer:

The Department has received preliminary legal advice but has not yet received final legal advice.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 30

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Christmas Island Crane at Flying Fish Cove

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

In seeking legal advice, has the Department relied on in-house advice or sought external advice?

- a) If the latter, from what legal firms?
- b) When was this advice sought and received?

Answer:

The Department has sought external legal advice from Clayton Utz. The Department has received formal interim legal advice on 22 August 2006. The Department has sought further legal advice, as recommended in the advice of 22 August 2006, but has not yet received that further advice.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 31

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Christmas Island Crane at Flying Fish Cove

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

What is the gist of this advice – does the Commonwealth have a case to recover costs from contractors or other parties?

a) If not, why?

Answer:

The Department has not yet received final legal advice on this matter.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 32

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Linkwater Road

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Has the land for the Linkwater Road on CI project been finally resumed from the resort and has the proposed road work been carried out?

a. If not, why not and what is now the expected time line for this project?

Answer:

No.

a. Documentation for the surrender of the Linkwater Road corridor has been lodged with the WA Department of Land Information. Clearance is expected in the near future.

It is anticipated that tenders will be sought for the roadworks in the second half of 2006/07.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 33

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Mammography Services Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

The mammography screening on Christmas Island has been operational for some months now. Do you have any statistics available as to how many women have used it, and how many have had to be sent on for further examination and/or treatment?

Answer:

162 women were screened. A breakdown of age groups as follows:

Age 30-39: 1 Age 40-49: 86 Age 50-69: 74

Four were referred to Perth for further examination.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 34

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Mammography Services Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Are any statistics broken down to show how many women accessing this service were actually from Cocos Island?

Answer:

The screening service provided in August and September 2006 was for Christmas Island residents only. It was originally envisaged that it would extend to residents of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands. However, due to the logistical and social impacts of removing a sizeable population from CKI, the service was only provided to Christmas Island residents.

The Department of Transport and Regional Services is proposing to implement a similar service for Cocos residents in 2007 [refer to **TLG 38**]. In the interim, initial breast screening services are available on CKI in the form of breast examinations performed by the local doctor on-island. Where a mammogram is clinically indicated as necessary, the patient will be sent to Perth under the Patient Assisted Travel Scheme.

In addition, the Indian Ocean Territories Health Service runs promotional activities including community information sessions to encourage women to self-examine. The Health Service also encourages CKI women over 40 years of age to have routine breast screening when off-island for business or on holiday.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 35

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Mammography Services Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

The women from Cocos would mostly be Muslim I imagine, certainly far more so than on CI, given the breakdown of Cocos population. Have there been any cultural problems with these women accessing the screening service? For example, do they travel alone or do they have to be accompanied by a relative or husband?

a. If so, who pays for this?

Answer:

Refer to response to **TLG 34**.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 36

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Mammography Services Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

If women from Cocos have to travel across to Christmas Island who is paying for this and what happens about accommodation for them as they would have to stay at Christmas Island a matter of days before there was a return flight?

Answer:

Refer to response to TLG 34.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 37

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Mammography Services Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Is there any ongoing education awareness program being run in conjunction with this screening program?

- a. Who is providing it?
- b. Is it for both CI and Cocos?

Answer:

The ongoing education of breast cancer awareness is consistent with what is provided in Western Australia. The Indian Ocean Territories Health Service runs promotional activities on both Christmas Island and the Cocos (Keeling) Islands, including community information sessions to encourage breast cancer awareness and the importance of regular self examination.

Translated pamphlets and educational material are available through the Health Service and BreastScreen WA's website. The Health Service also promotes breast screen awareness through local media channels, for example, through community radio.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 38

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Mammography Services Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Given the seeming welcome that this service has received and given the distance and difficulties involved and cultural differences for the women from Cocos, are there any plans to have a mammography machine at the Cocos Islands?

Answer:

The Government is proposing to implement a similar service for residents of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands in 2007. This proposal includes the purchase of a mammography machine similar to the machine provided on Christmas Island. It is envisaged that BreastScreen WA will provide this service to the Cocos (Keeling) Island, in addition to the service they provide on Christmas Island.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 39

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: DOTARS Restructure Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

How has the restructuring of DOTARS Territories and Local Government Division into Territories West (IOT) and East (Norfolk Island) affected any operations for the IOT?

a. If so in what way?

Answer:

The Department of Transport and Regional Services has created an additional General Manager position. This position has direct oversight of DOTARS' portfolio responsibilities in the Indian Ocean Territories, and reflects the growing workload associated with both Norfolk Island and the Indian Ocean Territories.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 40

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: DOTARS Restructure Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

How many staff are in each division and how does this compare to the former arrangement?

Answer:

As at 27 October 2006, the Territories and Local Government Business Division has 82.48 full-time equivalent employees. Each branch consists of:

| Territories West Branch: | 25.7 | FTE |
|---|-------|-----|
| Territories East Branch: | 23.44 | FTE |
| Local Government and Natural Disaster Relief: | 24.34 | FTE |
| Corporate (includes four Senior Executive Service officers) | 9.0 | FTE |

The restructure has not resulted in any significant changes to the Division's staffing profile other than the creation of an additional General Manager position [Refer to **TLG 39**].

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 41

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: DOTARS Restructure Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

In terms of the IOT, has this resulted in the up-grading of Perth operations or do Canberra-based officers still undertake the same roles and responsibilities that they did previously?

Answer:

The restructure has not resulted in any changes to the operations or responsibilities of the Department of Transport and Regional Services' Perth Office.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 42

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: DOTARS Restructure Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

How has this restructure affected the presence of DOTARS in the IOT?

Answer:

The restructure has not resulted in any changes to the Department of Transport and Regional Services' presence in the Indian Ocean Territories.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 43

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: DOTARS Restructure Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Is there any plan to increase on-island representation?

Answer:

There are no plans to increase the Department of Transport and Regional Services' on-island representation in the Indian Ocean Territories.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 44

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Cocos Island – Wind Generators

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Have you any reports on the performance of the wind generators on Home Island (at Cocos) – have there been any problems, not just technical but including say bird strikes or kills?

Answer:

The wind turbine generators on Home Island were commissioned on 11 February 2005.

Since July 2006, the wind farm has experienced some technical problems, notably an electrical control problem due to water ingress to the inverters and a problem with the winch used to furl the tail prior to lowering the turbine to the ground for maintenance.

The manufacturer agreed to modify the housings to prevent the fault from recurring, and repair the inverters. As of November 2006, all four modified housings have been received and installed. Two of the inverters have been repaired and installed; the remaining two inverters have been sent to Darwin for repair, and are expected to be installed during the first half of December 2006.

The Department is working with the manufacturer to resolve the problem with the winch and the associated rigging arrangements.

Records of bird strike events have not been documented, but the local manager of Water Corporation, the Home Island Power Station operator, provided a verbal estimate that during the last twelve months there were six instances of a bird striking a turbine.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 45

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Cocos Island – Wind Generators

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Kim Carr asked:

Are there any figures on how these wind generators have affected the cost of power generation for the island?

Answer:

During the 2005-06 financial year, the wind generators produced 122,002 kw/hrs of electricity. This represented:

- 5.4% of the Home Island annual electricity demand;
- An annual saving of around 30,000 litres of diesel fuel or approximately \$37,000; and
- A reduction in greenhouse gas emissions of approximately 90 tonnes of CO₂ (calculated from www.greenhouse.gov.au/challenge/members/emissions.html)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 46

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government **Topic:** Cocos Island – Water on Home Island

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

There was another study proposed earlier this year into the water problem on Home Island. Has this been done?

b. If not, what is the position regarding this matter?

Answer:

Yes. A report on the cost benefit risk analysis for the Home Island water supply was completed in June 2006. Further environmental analysis of long-term options is required. A temporary desalinisation plant will be operational (if required) in December 2006.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 47

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Cocos Island - Desalinisation Plant

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

The Minister announced that a temporary desalination plant would be put at Cocos for the dry season, or until rains replenish the water table. Is the temporary water desalination plant in place yet? What is the cost of this?

Answer:

No. The temporary desalinisation plant has been ordered and is expected to Arrive on-island in late November and be operational in December 2006. The cost of obtaining a temporary unit has been estimated at \$144,000.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 48

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Cocos Island - Hovercraft Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Can you give me an update on the position regarding the provision of a hovercraft at Cocos Islands to run between Home and West Islands and also to be used as a possible means to unloading cargo containers at Home island?

Answer:

On 9 June 2006, the preliminary agreement with Hover Cocos Pty Ltd to undertake preparations for a Cocos (Keeling) Island hovercraft service was terminated. The termination occurred as a result of advice from Hover Cocos that it was unable to obtain finance for the project.

The Cocos community was advised of the project's termination by notice in *The Atoll* published July 2006.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 49

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Cocos Island - Rumah Baru Wharf

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Indian Ocean Territories Policy Forum has recently expressed concern at the continuing delays to the Rumah Baru wharf project? How do you explain the continuing delays and lack of reasonable progress on this project?

Answer:

The construction of the proposed Rumah Baru freight and passenger facility was suspended in 2003 due to tender costs coming in at a significantly higher level than the funds available. Subsequent to this suspension, Toll Ports (formerly Western Stevedores), the Government's port managers in the IOTs, submitted a proposal for an alternative freight handling system for the Cocos (Keeling) Islands.

Work on Toll's proposal was delayed during 2005/06 due to uncertainty around the hovercraft ferry proposal. Since the termination of the hovercraft project in June 2006, the Department has been working toward an outcome that meets not only the current freight infrastructure requirements, but also all future marine services infrastructure requirements on West Island.

The marine services that will be dependent on the new facility include the public transport service, the search and rescue service, the marine refuelling service, and recreational marine services to the Cocos community.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 50

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Cocos Island - Rumah Baru Wharf

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

Has a decision been made on what facility to put in there in order to facilitate the safe and secure unloading of cargo on West Island?

What is the date for project completion now?

Answer:

No. The Department is engaging a consultant to test the feasibility of Toll's proposal against both the infrastructure requirements of the dependant marine services, and environmental requirements under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.

No date for the construction of a new facility has been set.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 51

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Cocos Island – Rumah Baru Wharf

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

What works are now proposed and do you have a revised timetable for works?

Answer:

Refer to TLG 50.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 52

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Cocos Island – Rumah Baru Wharf

Hansard Page: Written Question

Senator Carr asked:

What is the date for project completion now?

Answer:

No date for the construction of a new facility has been set.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Estimates October 2006

Transport and Regional Services

Question No: TLG 53

Division/Agency: Territories and Local Government

Topic: Norfolk Island Airport Runway

Hansard Page: p.59 (30/10/06)

Senator O'Brien asked:

Senator O'BRIEN—Are there any legal requirements for that airport to have insurance?

Mr Doherty—I am not aware that there would be, as part of the normal regulatory arrangements for airports, an insurance requirement, but we can check that.

Answer:

The Norfolk Island Airport is owned and operated by the Norfolk Island Government. The Norfolk Island Government has advised that all required insurances, including those relating to air services operators and contractors to the Airport, are in place.