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Key Recommendations and Comments

The most important observation from the workshop was the diversity of the participants, the majority of whom had experience in the defence industry, some of whom had experience of military service or service in the Department of Defence but all of whom provided an external view of how the military and the department currently conduct their operations and business.

The attached comments/input should not be ignored by those who will be developing the Defence White Paper – they are a most valid indicator of how the Australian public views the value of the vast sums of expenditure by Defence.

Against this background, a recurring conclusion of the workshop was that the Department considers only the value and benefit of its expenditure to Defence and takes no account of the value and benefits of it to the Nation, other than in the context of the security of the Nation.

Thus the over-riding conclusion of the workshop was that the defence industry policy must be adjusted to ensure it takes into account, and measures, the value it has to the long term economic development of the nation not just the value to the security of the nation.

Key Themes

The workshop identified the following themes which should be included in the defence industry policy to reflect such a change:

- Australia should adopt international best practice for industry support which includes strategic local sourcing as a long term policy.
- A clear statement must be provided of the critical capabilities Defence requires of local industry and which should be linked to the national defence strategy.
- A clear policy for sustainment of defence acquisitions must be provided in the DWP.
- The life cycle cost should be considered in all procurements and ensure that acquisition and sustainment costs are clearly identified and included in the decision making process.
- The tendering process has become very complex, totally risk averse, and unnecessarily costly and needs to be simplified where possible eg for off the shelf projects and minor projects.
- Consideration should also be given to the transfer of the responsibility for the development and implementation of the defence industry policy, as well as the advice to government on it, to the Department of Industry.
• The engagement of Defence with industry is fragmented with a number of programs with unclear outcomes. It should be more strategically focussed and the outcomes of the defence industry policy measured and reported.

• A greater focus on the value of exports by defence industry is required.

• A greater emphasis is required on the need for better engagement of research organisations, defence and defence industry and encouragement of innovation while accepting that it does increase risk.

• IP from defence procurements and systems should be actively exploited not just retained.

• The defence industry policy and DWP 15 must wherever possible have bipartisan political support.
Summarizing Themes with Potential Solutions

**Theme: Risk**

*Problem:* Defence is overly risk averse, leading to cumbersome processes, slow decision making and excessive costs to industry.

**Solution A:** Defence to tailor processes (both internal project approval and external facing ITR/RFP/RFT processes) down fewer sequential gates/signatories. Smaller projects to have proportionately lesser process than larger projects. Defence to have a greater risk appetite for smaller projects, where failure would have less exposure, and where good news stories may be generated more frequently.

**Solution B:** The source of risk aversion is the personal fear of failure felt by defence bureaucrats, which causes paralysis. Ironically, it is this paralysis that causes major programme schedule failure; i.e. the politically expensive failure. To address, for the major programmes, Defence performance to be assessed across the portfolio. “Failure” on a small portion of portfolio may be tolerated so long as across the portfolio there is overall progress.

**Theme: Innovation**

*Problem:* Defence says it wants innovation, but in practice is scared off by the inherent risk.

**Solution:** Defence to internalise that innovation carries risk. Defence to capture (case by case basis) what benefits flow from the innovation. Defence decision making for innovation-rich projects to address not only the down-side risks but also the up-side benefits that flow from innovations. This will be easier for Defence to do on smaller projects. Defence appetite for innovation/risk to be tilted towards smaller projects. Successful small innovative projects to be used to generate positive publicity for defence industry and DMO.

**Theme: Innovation Funding**

*Problem:* Defence largely leaves R&D to be funded by industry. Overseas competitors have government funding. Leads to blockages on multilateral projects.

**Solution:** For key (i.e. PIC) areas, R&D to be funded by Defence as per US model, possibly in exchange for IP ownership by Defence where applicable.
Theme: Selection of Priority Industry Capabilities (PICS's)

Problem. Uncertainty as to how Defence decides which industrial capabilities have priority.

Solution: The following criteria have been suggested:

- An industrial capability that, if Australia lost access to it, our ability to fight would be impeded.
- An industrial capability that is not naturally generated by the commercial market, and is highly dependent on Defence investment.
- An industrial capability that is not readily available on world market, possibly because it relates to something about the needs of the ADF which are (in some way) materially different to the needs of other armed forces.
- An industrial capability that contributes to operational mission readiness of the ADF in a manner that maximises sovereign autonomy over the extended time frames typical of major capability life-of-type.

Theme: Isolation of Priority Industry Capabilities PICS’s

Problem. Existing PIC’s seem to have relevance only to Industry Division initiatives. PIC’s need to influence Defence acquisition and sustainment programmes (the Project Offices).

Solution: AIC plans must have greater weight for acquisitions/sustainments in areas that are PIC’s. Rules for procurement (including execution of acquisition/sustainment contracts within the DMO Program Offices and flow-down subcontracts) should be linked to PIC's

Theme: Enforceability of Australian Industry Capability (AIC)

Problem. Fine words in AIC plans, observed more in the breach.

Solution: Contractual enforceability of AIC plans. SME’s to have visibility (possibly under NDA) of plans that are proposed at tender that claim to involve SME’s. SME to have ability to formally notify Defence where AIC plan is not been adhered to by prime.
**Theme: Global Supply Chain (GSC) Effectiveness**

*Problem.* Instead of creating a benefit for SME’s, GSC creates costs. The benefits of GSC’s are restricted to a select few companies that are not in PIC’s. The costs of primes are borne by Defence, without linkage to results.

**Solution:** GSC to pay primes only where actual opportunities and contracts for SME’s result. No payment for holding meetings unless SME’s are also paid. Payments to be weighted to cases that are PIC related.

**Theme: Value of Money vs Value for Money**

*Problem.* Defence is very driven by VfM, while ignoring VoM. This tilts acquisitions away from internal industry on false premise of cost effectiveness.

**Solution:** Defence to develop agreed accounting measures, possibly negotiated with DoF, that identifies extent of project money that flows back to consolidated revenue from projects contracted to local industry. (Note. GST accounting through supply chain probably would provide the required trace). Defence to be given a partial credit by DoF where this arises, so that DoD and DoF split the proceeds of the extra revenue to government from projects conducted by local industry.
NSW Industry Input to the Defence White Paper 2015

Background:

The SADIG NSW Industry DWP 2015 Input Workshop was held on Thursday 19\textsuperscript{th} June 2014, at NSW Department of Trade & Investment, Level 47, MLC Centre, Martin Place Sydney.

In April and May 2014, the SADIG Executive and Supply Chain Committee identified a need to highlight and consolidate key NSW defence industry issues, in order to provide input to the DWP15.

Key objectives of the SADIG DWP15 Workshop were agreed as follows:

- Capture input from a wide range of NSW based industries to ensure their expertise provides substantive input to the content and policy settings in DWP 2015.
- To position NSW defence industries as an active player in the generation of ideas and innovation on defence policy and direction and, to reinforce its position as a current and future supplier of specialist skills and solutions that deliver defence infrastructure and capability.
- To support the building of relationships and collaboration between the diverse industry bodies and businesses that make up the defence industry in NSW – Together we are stronger and therefore have a stronger voice.

This workshop was supported and promoted to defence and aerospace industry in NSW by SADIG and the other supporting groups including AI Group Defence, Australian Business Defence, Australian Industry Defence Network, Engineers Australia, Hunter Defence, NSW Trade and Investment, and Shoalhaven Defence.

There were 47 attendees at the opening, from 53 registrations. Defence industry suppliers and services to defence, industry associations, academia, and government were well represented at the Workshop.

Background reading was pre-circulated to registered attendees, one week before the event in three papers:

1. \textit{NSW Position Paper on Defence 2013}, NSW Government
3. \textit{A Sustainable Australian Naval Industry}, Australian Submarine Corporation Paper
The Workshop:

Speakers presented in the following sequence to set the scene, and provide policy background to previous Defence White Papers in Australia:

- Bob Germaine, Executive Officer of RDA Sydney (representing SADIG)
- Mike Kalms, KPMG Lead Partner Defence Industry, Expert Panel member DWP 2015
- Andrew Davies, Australian Strategic Policy Institute, Expert Panel member DWP 2015

The workshop activity and organization was then led and facilitated by Ross Nicol from Thales University, to ensure ideas and inputs generated were recorded and key topics further discussed and prioritized.

Session 1 - Innovations and new ideas

The aim of the first session was to encourage new thinking and innovative idea generation in predefined groups of 6-7 people on each of six tables. Key questions were put to the tables to facilitate their introductions to each other and to encourage discussion and new thinking ideas to improve policy to support industry and enterprise development.

Output summaries from this innovation and ideas session are in the attached appendices Section 1 – Session 1 (pages 12-15)

Session 2 - Group Work on Key DWP15 Questions

Six questions on key topics, included in Questions A to E had been identified in consultation with DWP Expert Panel members:

**Question A**

What are the key elements that a 2015 DWP industry policy should seek to achieve?

What is missing from the following?

- Role of industry in defence and national security
- Create opportunities for industry
- Encourage collaboration, innovation and entrepreneurship
- Encourage skills development
- Describe how SMEs might successfully service
- Defence Describe how value for money analysis is employed in Defence decision making
Question B
What's the best defence industry policy for Australia? What should it contain? What programs are preferred? How should it be developed and implemented?

Question C
What's right and wrong about current defence industry policy settings? What works well currently? What needs to be changed?

Question D
How can industry policy better support innovation, entrepreneurship, collaboration and enterprise in the long term?

Question E
Is there a place for identifying strategic defence industry capabilities and, if so, how should it work?

Question F
How can industry policy support and develop long term strategic SME capabilities in global supply chains?

Two table groups then proceeded to cover two topics for 30 minutes and produce priority ideas onto paper flipcharts. Each of these items were consolidated in merged table groups (Table 1+Table 4), (Table 2+Table 5) (Table 3+Table 6) with recording of key points by the table facilitators.

Output Summaries from each of the tables and merged groups have been captured in the attached appendices Section 2 - Session 2 (pages 16-21)

Session 3 Expansion of topics from Sessions 1 and 2 (Innovation & Ideas sessions).

Five topics were identified from review of the output from all six groups in the morning sessions and placed on flipcharts around the room.

Q1. How should the political classes be engaged in Defence Industry policy?

Q 2 How do we change the risk appetite of the buyer?
Q 3. Could ‘non-traditional’ innovation techniques be applied here?

Q 4. How should PIC/SICS be - Identified? - Sustained? - Are they Defence PIC’s or just industry

Q 5. Other Ideas

Groups then moved around room adding comments to the questions raised, which focused on recommendations for new directions in delivery of defence capability and effectiveness, also the role NSW industry can play.

Outputs summaries from each of the tables and merged groups have been captured in the attached appendices Section 3.- Session 3 (pages 21-22)
INNOVATION AND NEW IDEAS BRAINSTORMING SESSION
SUMMARY NOTES

Table 2

1. No innovation without risk so therefore
   a. Need better risk management
   b. Determine/quantify benefits of addressing risk.

2. Alignment of Acquisition and Sustainment over life cycle of asset
   a. Skilling requirements over the life cycle
   b. Sustainment defence and industry expertise involvement in the acquisition decision-making process.

3. Value of Money versus Value for Money ie the long term strategic benefit to Australia and Australian industry via Defence industry multipliers to other key industries.
   a. Comment Discussion around the concept that there is a difference in the value for money at the government level and that at the Defence Department level. Value for Money concept needs to be reconsidered with different accounting mechanism in place. Also money spent in Australia generates innovation, supports skills etc. in Australia- and money contracted offshore does not.

4. IP funding and ownership by Defence is needed to progress innovation solutions.

5. Ideally we need big business to generate ideas and support smaller players/start- ups (Small is beautiful!).

Table 5

1. Get new NSW Premier briefed and involved in the potential strategic Defence industry benefits to NSW as a whole. Need to consider whole of life consider versus OEM e.g. current ship programs - Daewoo, Navantia,

   Comment while the government (via DMO) rhetoric is for Value-for-Money over the Whole-of –Life; the recent decision to to pursue a limited tender with two overseas OEM (Navantia and Daewoo) returns the focus to initial procurement costs where the value of using the local Australian industry(which will be collocated with the vessel bases for their entire operating life) may be overlooked.
2. Focus on niche and sustainment (where we have as a country, strategic competitive advantage or we must maintain strategic capability for long term security reasons.

*Comment* “Niche defined as to where Australia has a western world leading technology (eg CEAFAR radar) or where there is a high likelihood Australia could be denied access to technology it is seeking—even from our allies eg stealth submarine detection technology.

3. Adopt international best practice for industry support which includes strategic sourcing as long term policy.

*Comment* What is regarded as best practice in western NATO countries? Why look elsewhere if current supplier is western world best practice supplier? Why do the majority of our allies retain Offsets policies if they have proven to be ineffective?

4. Review effectiveness of Global Supply Chain (GSC) (process versus outcomes). We need more measurable Performance Outcomes.

*Comment* Only a few companies have achieved benefits that to-date outweigh costs of pursuing. Australian “Industry Capability (AIC) policy is considered ‘broken’ as any enforcement is invisible to affected SMEs. Known instances where a requirement for an AIC (ie projects>$20m value) have been waived and anticipated work share to SMEs has not eventuated.

5. Need to develop more innovative whole of life sustainment systems around our major defence asset programs and where possible on-sell to foreign countries.

*Comment* Much of the primary discussion about this was with respect to Offsets.

**Table 4**

1. Need for better engagement with research organizations i.e. CRCs, NICTA, other research etc – such as Capability & Technology Demonstrator Program CTDS, and Priority Industry Capabilities Innovation Program PICIP.

2. Needs to be greater industry engagement/clarity with DSTO academia to make 2-way interaction supporting Defence and industry in general.

3. Consider the US government’s Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) Model as an alternative model to that used in Australia. DARPA is responsible for the development of new technologies for use by the military. It is felt that the DARPA encourages and fosters more timely development of Defence procurement. It was noted
4. Politicians and senior public servants in Defence should ideally have industry/Defence experience

5. Focus on growing defence exports. Need more support from government and have Defence supplier export capability directory listings highlighting experience with ADF.

**Table 1**

1. Defence Procurement Policy should be *Triple bottom line* for the following:-
   a. Security- *short and long term*
   b. Cost / best *long term* value – “true” opportunity cost.
   c. Engagement.
      i. Sustainability and industry health
      ii. Encourage SME engagement (SA is the benchmark)
      iii. Encourage and facilitate new start ups
      iv. Encourage development & support innovation

2. Government support to exporting – needs to be more effective (New Governor General and NSW Governor could be helpful in understanding defence matters and in international relations?)

3. In light of recent world events, we need urgent reassessment of threats and prioritization to address this.

4. Encourage development of *agile/small/high tech/no humans/space* defence products & services

5. Support manufacturing capability not only just services- NSW needs to maximize its opportunities in national defence defence asset procurement and sustainment projects.


**Table 6**

1. Identify opportunities for land zoning and clustering of defence related industries.

2. Improve the national coordination of research.

3. Identify opportunities for Defence to buy R & D outcomes.
4. Consider the implications of import tariffs as applied by our competitors, our suppliers, and our customers in purchase/sustainment decisions (debate on Import tariffs vs protectionism?).

5. Need better security risk management--ie appetite of Defence in exploring new activities/processes that could achieve the same or better outcomes.

6. Seek Offsets policy like the rest of the world? (debated!).

7. Encourage more exports.

8. Encourage creative innovation.

9. Encourage entrepreneurial innovation.

**Table 3**

1. Need better Supply Chain Capability identification and integration. Need to develop better collaboration and cooperation between companies- work to gain entry and support developments of exports into targeted global supply chains.

2. Develop Strategic National Industry Policy which
   a. Provides national coverage and national coordination
   b. Is *beyond Defence*, but integrates with other major industry policy sectors.
   c. Considers long term strategic issues *beyond Australia* ie security, fuel security
   d. Encourages diversification- both within local industry to support long term sustainability in the market, but also the involvement of new technology companies from other industry sector (ie IT) who may bring to market new technological innovations useful to defence product or service development.

3. Encourage, support and recognition of Excellence.

4. Encourage Exports.
SESSION 2

KEY QUESTIONS- WORKSHOP SESSION SUMMARY NOTES

Question A

What are the key elements that a 2015 DWP industry policy should seek to achieve?

What is missing from the following?

- Role of industry in defence and national security.
- Create opportunities for industry.
- Encourage collaboration, innovation and entrepreneurship.
- Encourage skills development.
- Describe how SMEs might successfully service Defence
- Describe how value for money analysis is employed in Defence decision making

Table 4  What is Missing?

- DWP15 need to contain a clear sustainment policy/policies as part of the acquisition process.
- AIC/PICS/SIGS/M50/OECO/GSC/FMS/OSIO - all the acronyms need to be combined/aligned with Industry Department
- If at all possible, a bipartisan approach as a national strategic decision
- Simplified and less costly Request for Tender RFT process
- Promote and support Defence Exports (equipment and services)
- Defence needs to be broader than just the immediate supply of goods and services to defence but about the benefits to the whole country. Consideration of the economic benefit to NSW/Australia. There should be some way to incorporate these broader benefits into the tender process?
- Defence interaction with industry needs to be aligned and combined and connected to those with an industry interest as opposed to a direct defence interest.

Table 1  What is missing?

- Combined focus on capability delivery.
- Prioritisation of threat and linkage to defence strategy
- Structured long term skills development to sustain critical capabilities
- Identify Defence priorities and apply input/output multiplier to justify funding commitment
- SME investment requires consistent Defence funding in essential capabilities
Question B

What’s the best defence industry policy for Australia? What should it contain? What programs are preferred? How should it be developed and implemented?

Table 2 Within the best defence industry policy there should be:-

- Strategic alignment
- Move to acquisition + sustainment model
- Rules for procurement (including the project and execution of Program) – (should be linked to PIC’s)
- Transparent risk evaluation- Strategic compared with sovereign risk.
- Programs should flow down to Primes
- Enforcement of policy should be through supply chains
- Resolution of current blurred responsibility in DMO ie risk aversion (projects versus procurement)
- Value Chain- *Value of $* versus *Value for $*
- Programs
  - Some programs work well but need to align with Strategic Capability Plan and PIC’s.
  - Command decision should be an aid for ADF

Table 5 Within the best defence industry policy there should be:-

- Identification by benchmarking of International Best Practices that is aligned with National interest.
- Support for Sovereign Sustainment and Preparedness of ADF eg current JSF project - manufacturing wing-flap component, being able to conduct battle damage repair or contribute to whole-of-capability sustainment for JSF for its lifetime?
- Focus on *Clever Niche* capabilities
- Export Assistance to strategic partners through *Team Australia*
- Export Accelerator Program
**Question C**

What's right and wrong about current defence industry policy settings? What works well currently? What needs to be changed?

**Table 3  What is wrong?**

- Initiatives need to be more interdependent and aligned, currently vague.
- Need an industry policy which is clear and outcomes required are not linked
- Needs to be in global context - market conditions (take into consideration protection policies and practices of other countries)

**Table 6  What is wrong?**

- Vagueness
- Lack of link between procurement and sustainment
- Risk averse policy in procurement
- Government's desired outcome of industry
- Industry engagement

**What is Right?**

- GSC Concept
- Contracts - once assigned – final
- Recognition of the importance of exports

**What needs to be changed?**

- Define what it is they want improved
- More Australian industry participation
- Better engagement with industry
- Improved tender evaluation Policy.
- Needs to be in global context - market conditions (take into consideration protection policies and practices of other countries)
- Current industry policy should written so able to be honed and improved
- Broader industry policy changes:
  - Diversification to encompass other potential industry technologies
  - Keep but further develop DIIC, SCIP, SADI
  - Broad Industry wide coverage not sectoral
**Question D**

How can industry policy better support innovation, entrepreneurship, collaboration and enterprise in the long term?

**Table 4**

- Defence arm of R&D needs to be open and collaborative- for example CSIRO
- Tradeability and commercial exploitation of IP
- Tax incentives and employee stock options for entrepreneurs/startups. Creating a financial environment that is conducive to entrepreneurial activity. In particular, addressing venture capital gap in NSW.
- Change in focus of DSTO within defence requires increased alignment for opportunities.

**Table 1**

- Certainty of Defence vision to foster innovation.
- Embrace R & D with *Defence funding assistance* to industry with established links with universities.
- Control and management of intellectual property between the innovator and Defence.
- Product sustainment innovation to address obsolescence to retain capability.
- Binding obligations for local industry capability.
**Question E**

Is there a place for identifying strategic defence industry capabilities and, if so, how should it work?

**Table 2** Yes, there is a place for strategic defence industry capabilities

- Conceptual framework aligned with *Strategic Capabilities* of ADF (if we lost this capability could we still fight)
- Acquisition and sustainment (e.g. In the event that the Supply Chain is cut/finished). Suggested that we should look at data on AWD for example.
- Industry policy <> Defence policy should be aligned, so as to ensure proper PIC and SICS identification and alignment
- Customization to *Australian* needs for our ADF force structure

**Table 5** Yes, there is a place for strategic defence industry capabilities

- But needs process/strategy to identify what we need in future? - rather than (necessarily) what we already do (e.g. Remote Weapon Station) or what is easy (having military clothing produced in Australia –rather than eg China).
- What *(in 2030)* is *essential* to support future defence capability? *Idea that these are Strategic industry requirements* not just ones to assist DMO etc in the procurement phase of a project. Eg Fuel refineries, national carrier ie Qantas
- Should be driven by Strategy *not* DMO - involve all stakeholders
- Should leverage our acquisitions for tech transfer necessary to support capability through life.
**Question F**

How can industry policy support and develop long term strategic SME capabilities in global supply chains?

**Table 3**

- Link Australian Industry Capability to Global Supply Chain via industry. Traditional / High-tech. ?
- High TRL/Low TRL (Comments ‘measure total impact’, ‘non-optional with teeth’)
- Long term - measure total impact.
- Short term - non optional with teeth.
- Take a long term strategic approach focused on technology TRL.
- Develop Export policy which supports industry.
- Extend GSC to all Primes as a lead into the AIC.
- AIC linked to developing tech/innovation in SME's.
- Government to Government negotiation (international)
- Strategic Training policy.

**Table 6**

- Create a body of knowledge.
- Recognise and adopt Australian innovation wherever possible
- Early integration of Australian Technologies into major planned projects during development
- More innovation funding.
- Develop Export support, encourage top SME’s to become global – has GSC already started this?
- Have *Defence Industry* policy within the overall *Department of Industry* policy
SESSION 3

EXPANSION OF TOPICS FROM INNOVATION & IDEAS SESSION

1. How should the political classes be engaged in Defence Industry policy?
   - Long term commitments?
   - Involved (genuinely) in processes?
   - What will we do differently this time?

   **Comments from Group**
   - 5-10 year plans with State buy-in.
   - Bipartisan political support - e.g. Denmark.
   - Closer industry liaison and political influence outcomes
   - Regular dialogue with politicians re Defence

2. How do we change the risk appetite of the buyer?

   **Comments from Group**
   - Portfolio concept. Some failures allowed, judged on overall rate of success across many programs.
   - Have an EFIC type organization to back up SME dealing with internal contracts to Austrade.

3. Could non-traditional innovation techniques be applied here?
   - DARPA?
   - Crowd-funding/sourcing?
   - New funding arrangements?

   **Comments from Group** Yes they could!
   - DARPA Not a good example - challenges suck funding from other projects/sponsors.
   - Create willingness for risk and failure.
   - Cluster portfolio of projects for independent investment e.g. Super funds, Rich investors, Banks.
   - Open innovation concepts.
   - Open sharing of problems to solve.
   - Defence & Security industries are early adopters of new technology – use opportunity to drive to mass market for diverse markets.
➢ Interface should operate like a SME – with simple agreements etc.

4. How should PIC/SICS be
   • Identified?
   • Sustained?
   • Are they Defence PIC's or just industry?

Comments from Group

➢ Why should they be defined at all – ‘Dried rabbit skins’ are a PIC,
➢ Alternatively define the outputs required from the AIC - sustainment through life.

5. Other Ideas?

Comments from Group

➢ Leadership to set the vision.
➢ Bipartisan political engagement to ensure acquisition and sustainment decisions are delivered.
➢ Sovereignty/patriotism.