

# Chapter 23

## Recognition of service

23.1 Australian peacekeepers are widely recognised for their commitment, dedication and high standards. Recently, His Excellency Major General Michael Jeffery, Governor-General of Australia, added to the praise often bestowed on these men and women. He said:

All three services of the Australian Defence Force, as well as Federal, State and Territory police officers and experts from other government agencies have served with compassion and professionalism and at times with high personal bravery. They have earned the respect and admiration of governments, aid agencies and civil populations throughout the world. We have a proud history of Peacekeeping service.<sup>1</sup>

23.2 Recognition is important to peacekeepers and takes many forms. In this chapter, the committee considers the recognition given to Australian peacekeepers.

### Importance of recognition

23.3 Rear Admiral Ian Crawford, National President, AVADSC, was just one of the many witnesses who acknowledged the valuable contribution that Australian peacekeepers make to national objectives. He argued that 'Peacekeeping operations and the people who are deployed need to be recognised for their contribution to national objectives'. He noted that recognition 'affects the morale and wellbeing of the people when they are deployed and their peace of mind when they have finished their defence service'.<sup>2</sup>

### Conditions of service

23.4 Australian peacekeepers receive certain allowances and benefits as a way of recognising the difficult environments in which they work. The conditions of service for Commonwealth public servants are provided for in a public service determination under Section 24 of the *Public Service Act 1999*. AusAID informed the committee:

Employees are remunerated through the payment of a package of overseas allowances in addition to salary. These allowances are paid to compensate for the higher costs of goods and services in the overseas locality, the hardship associated with life in that locality and as an incentive to serve overseas.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Governor-General of the Commonwealth Australia, His Excellency Major General Michael Jeffery AC CVO MC, Speech, Reception for Australian Peacekeeping Memorial Project Committee, Admiralty House, Sydney, 25 October 2007.

2 *Committee Hansard*, 20 August 2007, p. 59. See also *Submission* 10, p. 2.

3 AusAID, answer to written question on notice 2c, 25 July 2007.

23.5 The service conditions for members of the ADF and the AFP also take account of the particular circumstances of a peacekeeping operation and make allowances for the different demands of the deployment. A number of witnesses, however, expressed concerns about various aspects of the conditions of service for Australian peacekeepers, including how they are determined, the differences that exist between certain groups and the classification of some operations.

### ***Differences between ADF and AFP***

23.6 In its submission, the Regular Defence Welfare Association (RDWA) drew attention to the difference in the rates of pay and allowances for personnel from different agencies involved in the same peacekeeping operation. He noted that this 'can cause friction'.<sup>4</sup> The AVADSC argued that all personnel, ADF or AFP, should be housed in the same conditions as each other, be it tentage, huts or motel accommodation, eat the same meals and should be paid the same allowance if an allowance is paid for living conditions.<sup>5</sup>

23.7 Assistant Commissioner Walters did not share this view:

I think the terms and conditions between the respective organisations are designed to meet the duties of the officers. Importantly, there is a marked difference between policing and the military in that police officers who deploy into missions do so voluntarily. They are not directed to deploy offshore and into these missions. That itself is a stark difference between military and policing...there is sufficient difference between the sort of work that defence do and the sort of work that the police do that would require there to be some differences in the terms and conditions. I do not think we would get to a point where they would be exactly complementary, but I think they are sufficiently complementary as to not be of particular concern.<sup>6</sup>

23.8 Lt Gen Gillespie took a similar approach with regard to differences in living and working conditions which he believed 'probably disturbs observers more than it does the participants'. He added:

There are different cultures in the Defence Force to those of the police forces of our nation. There is no debate about that, and there is nothing strange or untoward about it.<sup>7</sup>

23.9 Lt Gen Gillespie accepted that there is delineation between the forces: for example, in Solomon Islands, AFP operations and military operations 'are poles apart'. He explained that 'the ADF works, operates and is paid seven days a week, 24 hours a day whereas police work in shifts and attract penalty rates and those sorts of things...!'

---

4 *Submission 8*, paragraph 2b.

5 *Submission 10*, pp. 2–3.

6 *Committee Hansard*, 25 July 2007, p. 29.

7 *Committee Hansard*, 24 July 2007, p. 6.

In his view, it was not appropriate to try to match the service conditions because 'they come from different organisations, operate differently culturally and operate differently in theatre'.<sup>8</sup>

### ***Committee view***

23.10 The committee notes that conditions of service for ADF and AFP members may vary. It believes that the differences in service conditions should not be of primary concern to the government and relevant agencies. The most important consideration is that Australian peacekeepers, whatever their role, are appropriately protected from harm, can work together effectively, are adequately rewarded and receive appropriate recognition for their service.

### ***Classification of service***

23.11 One of the most contentious issues with regard to recognition is the classification of service. AVADSC pointed out the classification of warlike service or non-warlike service affects the morale and working of peacekeeping personnel because it determines access to allowances and entitlements.<sup>9</sup>

23.12 A number of veterans' organisations registered their concerns about what they believed were inappropriate classification of service. As noted in Chapter 7, the APPVA and two members from ATST-EM were concerned that although ATST-EM personnel operated under high-risk situations and were under warlike conditions, their service was classified as non-warlike.<sup>10</sup>

23.13 The committee has noted that ATST-EM members have had their service reclassified to warlike service in recognition of their 'special service' in East Timor between March 2001 and July 2005. This reclassification means that around 200 ATST-EM members are entitled to the benefits attached to serving in a warlike service. Defence explained that the decision to reclassify means that they would be granted:

...the same conditions of service that applied to other deployed ADF personnel. Training team members will also now be eligible for the Active Australian Service Medal and an approach will be made to the UN for the award of the appropriate UN medal.<sup>11</sup>

23.14 Other peacekeeping contingents have had questions raised about their classification. The APPVA identified Operation Astute, which commenced in May 2006, as a mission that should be re-classified. In its view, Australian troops deployed

---

8 *Committee Hansard*, 6 September 2007, p. 44.

9 *Submission 10*, p. 2.

10 *Submission 5*, p. 3 and *Committee Hansard*, 21 August 2007, p. 47.

11 Defence, answer to written question on notice W15, 24 July 2007.

to Timor-Leste as part of Joint Task Force 631 for Operation Astute were on warlike service from the very first day commencing 25 May 2006.<sup>12</sup> It noted:

Current serving members who have served in both INTERFET, and/or [UNTAET] have commented that OP [operation] ASTUTE, has been more dangerous than that of service during INTERFET and UNTAET. Both INTERFET and UNTAET were classified as [warlike service]. OP ASTUTE was classified as [non-warlike service]...This had considerable effect toward the morale of the Soldiers and continues as a matter of concern for those who have served on JTF 631.<sup>13</sup>

23.15 The APPVA also drew attention to the circumstances experienced by Australian peacekeepers in Rwanda reporting with mental illness.<sup>14</sup> After sustained lobbying and a 'long battle', the APPVA succeeded in having the service of Rwanda reclassified to warlike service. According to the APPVA, as a result of this reclassification, the veterans are now entitled to VEA entitlements—eligibility for War Service Pension, Gold Card, Active Service Medal and Returned from Active Service Badge.<sup>15</sup>

23.16 Mr Johnson explained that DVA does not make determinations on service classification: they are made by the Minister for Defence and the classifications are longstanding; they were in the VEA and are now in the MRCA.<sup>16</sup> With regard to the classification of service, Defence informed the committee that ADF personnel can request a review of the classification of specific elements of their service history:

- through their chain of command; or
- by writing to the Minister for Defence directly seeking a review of their classification of service.

23.17 Defence also noted that a nature of service review team had been established 'to review outstanding anomalies in service classifications, with individuals and groups able to provide submissions'.<sup>17</sup>

---

12 *Committee Hansard*, 21 August 2007, p. 48.

13 *Submission 16*, paragraph 4.10, p. 4. See also *Committee Hansard*, 21 August 2007, pp. 47–48.

14 *Submission 16*, paragraph 4.2, p. 4. It explained 'These veterans were unable to seek additional Income Support (IS), under the provisions of NWLS, whilst been Totally & Permanently Incapacitated (TPI), under the *Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986* (VEA). This situation placed inordinate stress on these veterans, particularly in order to maintain a quality of life on the TPI pension alone'.

15 *Submission 16*, paragraphs 4.1 and 4.3, p. 4.

16 *Committee Hansard*, 24 July 2007, p. 31.

17 Defence, answer to written question on notice W28, 24 July 2007.

### ***Committee view***

23.18 The committee understands the problems created by imposing a specific classification on an overseas deployment. Inevitably, different interpretations will be placed on a particular mission, some may regard the service as warlike, while others as non-warlike. The committee believes that it is important for members of a peacekeeping operation to have an appropriate mechanism whereby they can express their concerns about a classification and be assured that their views will be heard and considered.

### ***Recordkeeping of personnel movements***

23.19 The APPVA also identified a situation, which it considered as not isolated, where a specialist performing a specific task in an area classified as warlike service was not eligible for relevant benefits.<sup>18</sup> It cited the case of Captain McAuley, who has been denied an ADF entitlement of a subsidised housing loan under the ADF Home Loan Scheme.<sup>19</sup> He was an active reservist who conducted a risk assessment of a water supply for INTERFET troops and provided geological advice about a section of damaged road. The classification of his trip is central to the dispute between him and Defence. Defence understands that he was classified as a visitor and not 'force assigned, which means that he is not deemed eligible to access benefits to those recognised as providing operational service in East Timor'.<sup>20</sup>

23.20 Although the committee did not pursue this particular case, it does note a relevant observation by the Auditor-General. In 2002, an Auditor-General's report found that 'from the start of deployments to East Timor, there was no reliable system for keeping accurate records of the personnel going into and out of East Timor'. It stated that in 2000, 8,800 personnel were on the Defence list of personnel who had served in East Timor but that Defence found errors in detail of more than half of those listed personnel.<sup>21</sup>

### ***Committee view***

23.21 While the committee is not in a position to judge the merits of APPVA's claim in relation to Captain McAuley, it accepts that confusion and disappointment may arise where accurate advice on service status is not made available to personnel being deployed. A clear understanding of the conditions under which personnel are to be deployed, especially those who are performing special tasks, and proper and sound record keeping would go some way to prevent these types of disputes.

---

18 *Submission 16*, paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9, p. 4.

19 *Submission 16*, paragraph 4.9, p. 4.

20 Captain Bill McAuley, confidential correspondence to committee, 24 August 2007.

21 Auditor-General, *Management of Australian Defence Force Deployments to East Timor*, Audit Report No. 38, 2001–02, Performance Audit, paragraph 5.12, pp. 92–93.

## **Medals**

23.22 The awarding of medals is a well-established and widely accepted means of recognising service but it also gives rise to disagreements about the type of medals to be awarded. For example, the APPVA would like special recognition given to ADF peacekeepers in addition to the Australian Service Medal (ASM) to recognise the actual special service that has been rendered by that veteran.<sup>22</sup> AVADSC recommended that 'All personnel, both ADF and AFP be granted the one medal with the bar of the area served': the ASM or the Australian Active Service Medal (AASM), 'whichever is applicable'.<sup>23</sup>

23.23 According to the PFA and the UNPAA, 'The issue of [Police Overseas Service Medal] POSM has caused great disquiet amongst police for some time'. They stated that there is confusion about the eligibility for the POSM and that under the current regulations members may not be eligible if they served in Iraq, Jordan, Papua New Guinea, Nauru or Vanuatu.<sup>24</sup> The AFP explained that missions in Jordan, Papua New Guinea, Nauru, East Timor (Timor-Leste Police Development Program) and Vanuatu are classified as capacity building missions that provide training and general support to those nations' police forces. The AFP did identify an anomaly with the deployment of the AFP to RAMSI and Operation Serene. It stated:

...it was identified that the current POSM regulations do not make provision for bilateral peacekeeping missions that are undertaken in response to a request from a foreign government. To rectify this, a draft Regulation has been developed with PM&C to make the necessary amendments and to rewrite the Regulations in a plain English style. The amendments have been agreed by PM&C, AFP and Government House and will be prepared for submission to Her Majesty for approval.<sup>25</sup>

23.24 The committee notes the various views on the awarding of medals for peacekeeping service.

## **War Memorial Roll of Honour**

23.25 The APPVA recommended that Australian peacekeeper deaths be listed in the Australian War Memorial (AWM) Roll of Honour.<sup>26</sup>

23.26 The AFP noted that the AWM has established the eligibility criteria for inclusion of names onto its Roll of Honour in post-1945 conflicts. It accepts these criteria and does not consider it necessary to seek amendment. It noted further that there is a National Police Memorial, commemorated in 2006, which will honour all

---

22 *Committee Hansard*, 21 August 2007, p. 49.

23 *Submission 10*, p. 4.

24 *Submission 14*, p. 13.

25 AFP, answer to written question on notice 30, 25 July 2007.

26 *Submission 16*, pp. 6 and 10.

police members who die while on police service; such service includes peacekeeping operations. In its view, should an AFP member be a sworn Special Member at the time of death, this recognition as well as other police jurisdictions' memorials are considered appropriate recognition.

### ***National Peacekeeping Memorial***

23.27 According to Major General Ford, Australian peacekeeping veterans have felt for many years that an Australian Peacekeeping Memorial should be built in Canberra to honour those who have served and will continue to serve on peacekeeping operations. The first meeting of the Australian Peacekeeping Memorial Project in May 2006 marked a significant step toward achieving such a memorial.<sup>27</sup> A site on Anzac Parade, Canberra, has been allocated for the memorial by the National Capital Authority, and the Canberra National Memorials Committee has given the project its approval. The National Capital Authority launched an international design competition for the memorial. The memorial is scheduled to be unveiled on 14 September 2009. The estimated cost of the memorial is \$3 million. The Australian Government has provided \$200,000 towards its construction.<sup>28</sup>

23.28 The proposed memorial is to commemorate and celebrate Australian peacekeeping and 'the courage, sacrifice, service and valour of Australian Peacekeepers given in the same spirit as in other conflicts honoured by cenotaphs and memorials across Australia and on Anzac Parade'.<sup>29</sup> It is to be a living memorial that 'will identify past and future peacekeeping operations and ongoing national and individual commitment and sacrifice'.<sup>30</sup>

23.29 The APPVA recommended greater assistance in funding for the National Peacekeeping Memorial.<sup>31</sup> Major General Ford also expressed the hope that the government would provide some additional funding to help construct the memorial.<sup>32</sup>

### **Recommendation 32**

**23.30 The committee recommends that the Australian Government consider additional funding for the proposed Peacekeeping Memorial.**

---

27 The Australian Peacekeeping Memorial Committee, chaired by Major General Tim Ford AO, has representatives from former and present members of the ADF and AFP officers who have served in peacekeeping operations.

28 AFP, answer to written question on notice 33, 25 July 2007.

29 [http://peacekeeping.nationalcapital.gov.au/commemorative\\_purpose.asp](http://peacekeeping.nationalcapital.gov.au/commemorative_purpose.asp) (accessed 28 November 2007).

30 [http://peacekeeping.nationalcapital.gov.au/commemorative\\_purpose.asp](http://peacekeeping.nationalcapital.gov.au/commemorative_purpose.asp) (accessed 28 November 2007).

31 *Submission 16*, paragraph 9.1.9.3, p. 10.

32 *Committee Hansard*, 20 August 2007, p. 17.

### ***Knowledge of Australia's contribution to peacekeeping***

23.31 Major General Ford was of the view that Australians do not have 'a strong understanding of the work that Australia has done over 60 years in peacekeeping and the sacrifices that have been made by peacekeepers—who have been injured, wounded or killed—and their families, who have often been affected by the work they have done...'.<sup>33</sup> Although he believed that Australians have had a better understanding since Australia's involvement in East Timor in 1999, he argued:

I think that we need to make sure, first of all, that Australians recognise with pride what has been done in the past and what we are doing now. Australia is stepping forward and accepting its responsibility as a member of the international community in contributing not only to things that directly affect our interests but also a little bit outside that and helping the international environment. I think we should be promoting that more.<sup>34</sup>

23.32 The committee notes that the War Memorial has a special exhibition on Australian peacekeepers. It is also aware that the Australian Government has authorised the Australian War Memorial to produce a four-volume *Official History of Australian Peacekeeping, Humanitarian and Post-Cold War Operations*. Professor Horner told the committee that the project allows the historians to 'tell the story of Australian peacekeeping that goes back to 1947 and to deal with a whole range of operations that the ADF has been involved in since the end of the Cold War'. They are authorised to research and write on all peacekeeping missions except for Iraq from 2003, recent operations in Afghanistan and East Timor. Speaking of these limitations on the research, Professor Horner said that the INTERFET and subsequent operations in East Timor make up the largest mission that Australia has been involved in:

It certainly leaves a huge gap in what we hope is a very comprehensive history of Australian peacekeeping, and is one which I would have thought that the public would have an expectation of reading about. Writing official histories takes a fair bit of time, and, if we were given permission to work on East Timor now, it would be perhaps five years before anything would appear. So that would be something in the order of 12 or 13 years from the time of INTERFET, and that certainly is a fairly reasonable period of time to have passed.<sup>35</sup>

23.33 The committee believes that this project is not only a means of recognising the contribution that Australia has made to peacekeeping but also of informing Australians about this important aspect of the country's history. It notes Professor Horner's advice that as presently authorised the official history will not include Australia's peacekeeping activities in East Timor and agrees with his view that this omission leaves an obvious gap in the history of Australia's peacekeeping.

---

33 *Committee Hansard*, 20 August 2007, p. 31.

34 *Committee Hansard*, 20 August 2007, pp. 31–32.

35 *Committee Hansard*, 5 September 2007, pp. 43–44.



**Recommendation 33**

**23.34 The committee recommends that the Australian Government include Australia's involvement in peacekeeping operations in East Timor in the terms of reference for the Official History of Australian Peacekeeping, Humanitarian and Post-Cold War Operations.**



## **Part VI**

### **Improving Australia's effectiveness**

The final part of this report focuses on how the Australian Government and its agencies evaluate their performance in peacekeeping operations and use lessons learnt to better prepare for future missions. It also reviews international peacekeeping research and training institutes and considers the case for the development of such an institution in Australia.