



Suite 5, 18 Napier Close Deakin ACT 2600
PO Box 115, Deakin West ACT 2600

ABN: 36 651 805 702

www.peacekeepers.asn.au

Patron: Colonel Mary Brandy, CSM (Retd)

Date 25 April 2024 (ANZAC Day)

Veterans Compensation and Rehabilitation Legislation

Veterans' Entitlements, Treatment and Support 7 (Simplification and Harmonisation) Act 2024.

The Royal Commission into Defence and Veterans Suicide's Interim Report found the complexity of the current veteran legislation system is adversely affecting the mental health of veterans.

...to simplify and harmonise Veterans Compensation and Rehabilitation Legislation...

Submission by

Dr Martin Hess, Australian Peacekeepers and Peacemakers Veterans Association (APPVA)

Deakin, ACT

ANZAC Day 25 April 2024

Introduction

I welcome the opportunity to provide feedback on the Government's exposure draft of the *Veterans' Entitlements, Treatment and Support 7 (Simplification and Harmonisation) Act 2024* and I make this submission on behalf of non-ADF members of the 'veteran community' as a representative of that cohort with the Australian Peacekeepers and Peacemakers Veteran's Association (APPVA). This cohort includes police, diplomats and government aid workers as well as any other government employee who has deployed internationally as a representative of the Australian Government.

My own background is as follows. I joined the Australian Army Reserve in 1979 and served until 2005 when I discharged due to time constraints arising from my full time employment with the Australian Federal Police. The two primary units I served in were Melbourne University Regiment and 51Bn The Far North Queensland Regiment. I joined the AFP in 1988 and served in all Australian jurisdictions in various capacities. I deployed to UNFICYP in Cyprus in 1996, UNAMET in East Timor in 1999 and Afghanistan in 2010-11 with AFP Operation Illuminate. As such, I have a first-hand perspective on the issues raised in this submission. I worked with the AFP International Deployment Group from 2007 until 2015 when the IDG was amalgamated with other AFP international elements to form International Command. I worked as the AFP adviser to the Australian Civil Military Centre in Queanbeyan NSW and also as AFP Liaison Officer to the ADF HQ Joint Operations Command in Bungendore NSW. I hold several tertiary qualifications including a Master of Defence Studies and a Master of Leadership and Management. In 2018 I was awarded a Doctor of Philosophy from the Asia Pacific College of Diplomacy at the Australian National University. My doctoral thesis is titled *The Australian Federal Police as an International Actor: Diplomacy by Default*.

I am an active supporter of the Team Australia approach to inter-agency and whole-of-government cooperation and coordination, both domestically and internationally, and have practiced this throughout my operational career. I firmly believe that this Team Australia, or whole-of-government and inter-agency cooperation approach in both domestic and international environments is the most effective way to meet the anticipated challenges arising from an increasingly volatile and divided security situation.

It is, however, an unfortunate reality that those who serve the Australian Government internationally in a non-ADF capacity are not well served in terms of post-mission, post-operation and post-service acknowledgment. This submission is made with a view to providing some background to this situation, to highlight a number of the missions and operations the AFP in particular has been involved in and to seek endorsement for a more equitable outcome for non-ADF personnel who have served their Government in their respective capacities.

Background

The 2022-23 *Royal Commission into Defence and Veterans Suicide's Interim Report* found the complexity of the current veteran legislation system is adversely affecting the mental health of veterans. There is now a desire to simplify and harmonise *Veterans Compensation and Rehabilitation Legislation*.

By way of illustrating just how dysfunctional this lack of harmonization actually is, I make this submission on behalf of non-ADF members who have served internationally in hostile, hazardous and arduous circumstances and environments. I do so in an official capacity as a Non-ADF Representative of The Australian Peacekeepers and Peacemakers Veterans Association (AFPVA). If the ADF veterans reading this consider the present system cumbersome, inconsistent and unfair, then the treatment of non-ADF 'veterans' is far worse. Read on.

In 2019, I made a personal submission to the *Foreign Affairs and Trade Committee of the Senate in relation to the Australian Veteran's Covenant Bill 2019*.¹ This sought to encourage consideration for similar recognition for non-ADF personnel, particularly police, who have served in hazardous and arduous environments, often alongside their ADF colleagues. For various reasons, this fell on deaf ears and the committee lacked the courtesy to even send me an acknowledgement, let alone a response to the concerns I raised. I don't anticipate that this submission will be treated any differently, but I will submit it nonetheless.

The Status Quo: Disparity and Inequity: Peacekeeping and Warlike Service

*The Government will continue to support those who selflessly serve our nation and protect our interests overseas, and their families, when they come home.*²

A noble statement and no doubt, well-intentioned, but how applicable is this statement and its sentiments when it relates to non-ADF personnel who have deployed internationally?

My primary objective is to ensure synonymous selfless efforts and sacrifice by others, including civilian police, such as Australian Federal Police (AFP) and other government employees, such as those from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), be fairly and equitably acknowledged and supported. These people also *selflessly serve our nation and protect our interests overseas*, often alongside their ADF colleagues in exactly the same environments, and on occasion more hazardous circumstances, yet they have been consistently overlooked for a period exceeding two decades.

There are several examples of disparate treatment of ADF and AFP members serving alongside or in the same mission as AFP, where the roles and hazards were similar, but the post operational treatment in terms of Veteran's Affairs was far different. The AFP, for instance, has had a long history of deploying to challenging environments, predominantly with the United Nations (UN). In 1992, two contingents of AFP were deployed to the United Nations Transitional Authority Cambodia (UNTAC). They were unarmed and faced threats for various participants in the transition and electoral process, including an estimated 250000, well-armed militia groups. Threats to attack UNCIVPOL were a regular occurrence. UNTAC members had been abducted and killed. Thankfully, no Australians were involved in these incidents. The ADF also deployed to UNTAC and both agencies were praised for their efforts. The treatment as far as Veteran's Affairs is concerned was different in terms of acknowledgement and 'veteran' status.

One of the most striking disparities of treatment however, occurred in 1999 in East Timor, where the AFP was deployed in lieu of the ADF due to a refusal by the Indonesian military to have international troops on home soil.³ This related to a UN sponsored ballot, which resulted in an outbreak of extreme post-ballot violence, which required an international military response. Once again, the acknowledgement of the AFP fell well short of the acknowledgement of the ADF. This is not a condemnation of the ADF, rather a long overdue praise of the AFP, particularly those who served with the First UNAMET deployment.

Under the old Veteran's Affairs Act 1986, for the purposes of determining 'veteran' status of participants, service is divided into warlike and non-warlike service.

Warlike service refers to those military activities where the application of force is authorised to pursue specific military objectives and there is an expectation of casualties. This is usually an exclusively military domain and no further discussion on this will be included in this document. There is no doubt the title 'veteran' is applicable in all such circumstances.

Non-warlike service covers those activities short of warlike operations where there is a risk associated with the assigned tasks and where the application of force is limited to self-defence or defence of others. In other words, non-offensive operations. It should be noted that liberal-democratic police such as the AFP are specifically prohibited from engaging in offensive operations. In such environments, casualties could occur but are not expected. Non-warlike service has two sub-categories, hazardous service and peacekeeping service. It is in this context that overseas police service will be discussed in this document.

¹ https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Foreign_Affairs_Defence_and_Trade/Veteransrecognition/Submissions
Submission 10 Dr Martin Hess.

² <https://www.budget.gov.au/2018-19/content/essentials.html>

³ A highly flawed security agreement known as the May 5 Agreement placed the newly formed Indonesian National Police in sole charge of security. 270 unarmed UN Civilian Police (UNCIVPOL), including 50 members of the AFP, were deployed in lieu of between 12000 and 16000 fully armed military peacekeepers, estimated as a requirement to secure the province for the ballot. Despite harassment and intimidation by pro-Indonesian militia groups, the East Timorese registered and voted emphatically to pursue a path towards independence. The post ballot violence was extreme and widespread and was the reason for the deployment of INTERFET.

The title ‘veteran’ does not currently apply in these circumstances. Is it time to reconsider this?

Hazardous service involves a degree of hazard above and beyond that of normal peacetime duty, and can clearly involve military as well as other government employees including police.

Peacekeeping operations involve military, and police personnel, often without powers of enforcement, to help restore and maintain peace in an area of conflict with the consent of all parties.

But what if there is no ‘peace to keep’? Hazardous Peacekeeping Service as a Distinct Category.

Clearly, there are circumstances where non-military government employees such as police and others have been deployed which don’t fit neatly into any of these traditional categories. It is therefore submitted that perhaps a revision should be considered to account for contemporary circumstances of deployment of non-military personnel to hazardous conflict or disputed environments short of actual open warfare and offensive operations.

It is submitted that these categories are somewhat anachronistic and based on outdated conceptual thinking concerning the nature of contemporary conflict and the inter-agency and whole of government approach to address this. Most people understand and appreciate the notion of ‘warlike’ situations, involving opposing armed forces, organised in accordance with their government’s directions. Some may even appreciate the notion of asymmetric warfare, involving armed forces, and others, clashing or coming into contact with armed, malign non-state actors, such as the Taliban in Afghanistan or ISIS in Iraq.

The term ‘Peacekeeping’ however, covers a range of activities and can include military, police and other civilian elements.

As an inscription on a 2024 ANZAC Day biscuit tin outlines:

*Since the first Australian peacekeepers deployed in 1947 to the Netherlands East Indies (Indonesia) there has never been a year when Australian peacekeepers were not on duty somewhere across the world. Approximately 66,000 Australians have served as peacekeepers in over 70 operations in 60 different countries. Peacekeeping roles are varied and involve infantry, medic, aircrew, logisticians, mine clearance, air traffic controllers and many others. Peacekeeping duties are also undertaken by Police and civilian personnel. The length of operations can be a few weeks to decades with the contingent size from a small group to a substantial size such as that deployed to East Timor (Timor-Leste). Acknowledging the dangers involved with these operations, 16 Australians have died on peacekeeping duties.*⁴

Words are important as they can sometimes define status. As a 2018 article in the Australian Peacekeeper Magazine⁵ highlights:

If the productive successes of Peacekeepers were put on a scale with the results of our involvement in interventionists conflicts like Iraq and Afghanistan, they would tip the balance significantly towards peacekeeping.

Consequently, those of our military [and police] who have served in Peacekeeping deserve the same respect as those who have served in combat deployments.

...Military or Police, who have passed a barrier test to enlist, are screened and selected on merit, undergo rigorous training, are subject to a disciplinary code, and committed to an overseas deployment by the Australian Government in our nation’s interest, into an uncertain environment with the prospect that they may be killed, wounded or injured during their deployment-should all be treated and referred to as veterans and be regarded equally before relevant legislation and regulations.

It is pedantic and petulant to describe one deployment as a war, another as warlike or non-warlike, operational or non-operational or peacekeeping or peacemaking.

The Impact of the change from VEA 1986 to MRCA 2004: the case of the AFP

Australian involvement in East Timor at the dusk of the 20th Century and the dawn of the 21st Century, highlights the changing nature of Australia’s international engagement. Very rarely are contemporary wars fought along traditional lines of opposing armies, in uniform, representing legitimate governments. Intra-state and asymmetric conflict are now more the norm. This has required a ‘whole-of-government’ response, and Australia has done reasonably well in this regard in its deployments, but hasn’t backed it up with the returned members. Police have been very much a part of this response, yet their service is not reflected or acknowledged in the same way as military service. This is particularly so since 2004 when the *Military Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 2004* (MRCA) was enacted replacing the old *Veteran’s Entitlement Act 1986* (VEA). Some designated police missions, particularly those under the United Nations were covered by the Department of Veteran’s Affairs (DVA) under the old VEA, but no coverage of any police missions post 2004 attracted any DVA coverage. Many of these missions include deployment to hazardous and hostile environments which can only be described as ‘warlike’, often under arduous conditions. Many of these missions and operations saw police and military deploying alongside each other, yet their post mission treatment is totally different and absolutely inequitable. This is due entirely to legislation and the definitions contained therein.

To illustrate this, a table of pre 2004 and post -2004 AFP missions and operations is provided at Annex 1.

⁴ ANZAC Biscuit Tin Commemorative Series 2024.

⁵ [Australian Peacekeeper Magazine, Summer 2018; *The Changing Nature and Characteristics of Post WW2 Conflicts in which Australians served as Peacekeepers; In consultation with Concerned Peacekeeper Veterans*, p.20]

Some of these missions and operations are armed and some are not. If they are armed, police only carry firearms (side arms) for self-defence or defence of another at risk of death or serious injury. There are very few occasions where AFP has deployed international with 'executive police powers', namely a law enforcement authority and capacity. The early days in Cyprus, RAMSI and UNTAET are three examples. It needs to be remembered that police DO NOT conduct offensive operations and by definition their activities cannot therefore be 'warlike service' because the DVA definition of 'warlike' involves the ability to return fire and conduct offensive operations. This does not mean that the environments AFP and other deploy into are 'peaceful' because in many cases they are not. It seems if we take UNAMET, UNTAET and Afghanistan as three examples, both 'warlike' and 'peace' operations can take place simultaneously in the same location, as both AFP and ADF have deployed to these locations simultaneously, and in Afghanistan shared accommodation and messing facilities. So, depending upon which uniform one is wearing and whether they have the ability to both return fire in self-defence or conduct offensive operations, determines whether they are a warrior or a peacekeeper. Same place, same time, totally different post-Mission and Operation treatment.

Does the Committee consider this is consistent with a Team Australia approach?

The police, in Australia's case the AFP, is the 4th armed (or unarmed) service which can be deployed by the government to a war or conflict zone to work in conjunction with the military and the local authorities. Each branch of the services brings different technical skills which can be applied accordingly. This is the true essence of the concept of 'Team Australia'.

The nature of contemporary asymmetric warfare means that wars aren't fought only by soldiers in the front-line shooting at each other, such as the tragic stalemate in 1918. The nature of conflict and the approach to resolving it has changed, and often involves alternatives to the use, or threat of, military force. Effective policing is one such example, and the service Australian police have provided in hazardous environments and circumstances such as East Timor, Iraq and Afghanistan, over the past two decades provide ample justification for the anachronistic division between 'warlike' and 'peace' operations to be revisited.

One tangible way of addressing this is to acknowledge a separate class of overseas service, distinct from 'warlike' and 'peace' operations, such as 'hazardous' service.

Recognition of Hazardous Service

In a *Senate Committee on Peacekeeping* in 2008,⁶ the then Australian Governor General His Excellency Major General Michael Jeffery commented at para 23.1:

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.

The Committee made the following observation at para 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.

It seems that as far as non-ADF personnel are concerned, for those involved in politics and policy in Canberra, it is easier and far more expedient to forget them and their service to the nation. Australian peacekeepers, both military and police, are widely recognised for their commitment, dedication and high standards. As has been discussed, this acknowledgment and recognition has become very much diminished with the disparate treatment and status of peacekeeping generally taking very much a second place to 'warlike' service in relation to 'veteran' status. This is compounded with non-recognition of police service in hazardous circumstances in active conflict zones such as East Timor in 1999, Afghanistan between 2007 and 2014 and Ukraine in 2014, to name just a few examples.

AFP Service in Hazardous Environments: UNAMET (East Timor 1999), Op Arew (Ukraine 2014) and AFP Op Contego, Synergy and Illuminate (Afghanistan 2007-2024)

Noteworthy is the discussion in which unarmed police and military liaison officers serving with UNAMET between June and September 1999, were exposed to deliberate and asymmetric conflict conducted by Indonesian-backed militia groups, designed to provide a plausibly deniable cover for direct Indonesian Government involvement in widespread humanitarian crimes. It should be recalled that the risk of death or serious injury was a daily reality and that these police were isolated and unarmed and that there was no form of back-up from a larger force, nor any prospect of medical evacuation or treatment had they incurred serious injury.

For the entire duration of UNAMET, police were consistently required to de-escalate volatile situations throughout the province by means of persuasion and negotiation, and on several occasions by physically placing themselves between armed and angry belligerents and their intended victims. That they did so, with nothing more than 'soft, empty hands', moral courage and physical bravery, stands as testimony to their character.

⁶ Senate Committee on Peacekeeping 2008.

[https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Foreign_Affairs_Defence_and_Trade/Completed_inquiries/2008-10/peacekeeping/report/c23]

In Afghanistan and also in Ukraine, both active conflict zones, police carried side arms as a requirement to deploy but these were for self-protection and protection of others at risk of death or serious injury which is in accord with Commissioner's Order 3 in relation to the use of force in domestic circumstances. Police are specifically prohibited from conducting offensive operations. Being authorized and capable of conducting offensive operations appears to be the sole distinguishing criteria which defines 'warlike' service. This by definition, police are incapable of engaging in 'warlike' service. It seems the actual environment and the level of hostility, including active armed opposition is not a defining factor in determining 'warlike' service. This is a very Canberra-centric definition.

This begs the question: Is it time to address the outmoded 19th Century approach to acknowledgment and recognition of service above self in the face of clear developments of contemporary 21st Century threat, including asymmetric conflict to acknowledge the reality of the whole-of-government and inter-agency cooperative nature of the current Team Australia approach to international engagement?

The 2008 Committee on Peacekeeping notes at para 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.

The Australian Honours system recognises various categories of conduct such as bravery and courage, distinguished service and conspicuous service. Noteworthy is the fact that awards for distinguished and conspicuous service are reserved exclusively for military personnel. There are no police or civilian equivalent honours or awards. A proposal for the introduction of a Meritorious Service Medal was put forward to Government by the AFP some years ago, but again this appears to have fallen on deaf ears and may well be sitting in someone's 'too hard' basket in an office somewhere in Canberra.

Is the Status Quo acceptable?

It is submitted that the entire system of recognition of service is based on outmoded thinking and is in urgent need of re-consideration to match contemporary threats and modes of conflict, including asymmetric warfare, and the distinctly Australian whole-of-government responses to them. Prominent among this type of response are Australian Police, whose actions, in East Timor during UNAMET and in Ukraine in response to the downing of Malaysian Airlines MH 17 in 2014, can only be described as Conspicuous and Distinguished, and reflective of the highest of Australian values and virtues of physical bravery and moral courage. Yet there is no way of acknowledging and recognising this in the current Australian Honours and Awards.

It is therefore submitted that a distinct category of service, known as 'hazardous' service be considered by the Committee, to acknowledge and recognise those who provide service above self in environments other than strictly 'warlike' or strictly 'peaceful' environments. It is also submitted that should the term 'veteran' remain an unacceptable form of address, an alternative term be sought to acknowledge the moral courage and physical bravery of such members. Furthermore, it is suggested that the Committee consider a separate form of Conspicuous and Distinguished service for police and other Australian Government employees to parallel those honours and awards reserved exclusively to members of the Australian Defence Force. A review to the proposed Meritorious Service Medal is suggested as an appropriate place to start.

Mental Health and Moral Injury

One of the emerging challenges arising from service, both domestic and international is related to mental health. The concept of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) is relatively well known, and it relates primarily to reaction to a physical event or series of events. What is impacted or compromised is a sense of safety and security. Less well known is the concept of Moral Injury. Whilst related, the two have distinct differences. There is a growing body of literature in relation to Moral Injury, and it relates primarily to the impact the subject may potentially suffered from situations where they are exposed to situations which impact on their 'moral compass' or deeply ingrained sense of right and wrong. What is impacted or compromised is trust and confidence. This can often lead to feelings of guilt, anger and a strong sense to betrayal. The continued official non-recognition of the contribution made by non-ADF agencies such as the AFP, in the service of the national interest, tends to exacerbate this sense of betrayal. This is an emerging issue for police and others and is likely to become increasingly prominent.

Amendments in 2024 to the Safety Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988

As the *Military Rehabilitation and Compensations Act 2004* is ADF exclusive, the vast majority of post 2004 AFP Operations and Missions, are not covered at all by the Department of Veteran's Affairs. Instead they are covered by the *Safety Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988* (SRCA), aka Comcare. This is an insurance company and it behaves like an insurance company. They admit Comcare is designed for benign domestic environment, not active conflict zones like Ukraine or Afghanistan. It is not fit for purpose for international police deployments. Some of these Missions and Operations are both Hazardous and Arduous and some one or the other.

The sense of betrayal by this continued legislative disparity and inequity, is exemplified by a communique sent by the Commission of the AFP in late 2023. This acknowledges and recognizes the *'the impact of the high-risk environment in which our members operate'* and acknowledged that the *Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988* would be amended to reflect a presumptive nature for PTSD arising from police service.

This is long overdue, but the disregard of those who fall between the passing of the MRCA in 2004 and the amended SRCA in 2024 is compounded by the fact that:

The new provisions will apply to PTSD injuries sustained from the date the legislative amendments are formally implemented, which is expected to be in the very near future.

This means none of the provision will relate to any AFP activities prior to this Bill receiving Royal Assent, predicted to be some time in 2024. This means that, by definition, all of those who have served in hazardous and arduous missions and operations in the twenty-year period between 2004 and 2024 are completely written off as far as mental health impacts such as PTSD and Moral Injury are concerned. This disparity and inequity are all due to changes in legislation and the contents therein. If this is an oversight then it needs to be corrected. If it is deliberate then there is no other way to describe this other than a betrayal of those who have deployed internationally in the service of peace and justice-based outcomes.

This twenty-year period includes AFP deployment to missions and operations to:

Operations:

Op Arew (MH 17 Ukraine 2014)

Op Synergy, Contego, Illuminate (Afghanistan 2007-2014)

United Nations Missions

UNMISS – United Nations Mission in South Sudan 2011

UNMIT – United Nations Integrated Mission in East Timor

Police Capacity Development Programs (Timor Leste and Solomon Islands)

TLTDP – Timor Leste Police Development Program

SIPDP – Solomon Islands Police Development Program

RAPP – Royal Solomon Islands Police Force-AFP Partnership

Papua New Guinea

PNG-ECP – Papua New Guinea-Enhanced Cooperation Program 2005

PNG-APP – Papua New Guinea-Australia Police Partnership 2008

Pacific

Nauru - Nauru-Australia Policing Partnership (N-APP)/Nauru Police Force Police Capacity Program (NPFPCP)

Vanuatu – Vanuatu-Australia Police Program (VAPP) 2002/ Vanuatu Australia Policing and Justice Program (VAPJP) 2016

Tonga – Tonga Police Development Program (TPDP) 2006/ Tonga-Australia Policing Partnership (TAPP) 2020

Samoa - Samoa-Australia Police Partnership (SAPP) 2009

Indonesia

Various bombings in Indonesia, esp the bombing of the Australian Embassy in Jakarta in September 2004

Summary and Conclusion

Some of the above missions and operations were hazardous and arduous and some not so. If the service and sacrifice of Australian peacekeepers, police, military and others, can be recognized by both a former Governor General and on a biscuit tin then surely the Australian Government can address some of the issues raised in this submission concerning:

- 1-better recognition of peacekeeping service generally for both police and military as well as other non-ADF personnel
- 2-consideration of veteran status, or something commensurate, for non-ADF personnel who have deployed internationally as representatives of the Australian Government
- 3-official DVA recognition of hazardous non-ADF service in hostile and arduous environments, particularly those that fall between the MRCA in 2004 and the amendments to the SRCA in 2024
- 4- the inclusion of post-2004 missions and operations as part of a suite of non-ADF engagements under the Department of Veterans Affairs

In my view, this level of post-mission, post operation and post-service inequity is unacceptable and needs to be addressed urgently. This is especially so in light of anticipated 'Team Australia' requirements as the security environment transitions to a more 'warlike' footing with regional and global events evolving the way they are at present. This can be done by addressing the concerns raised in this submission by incorporation into any proposed legislation intended *to simplify and harmonise Veterans Compensation and Rehabilitation Legislation*.

I am a true believer in 'Team Australia' but it seems many of those with influence don't. Perhaps the Committee could turn its mind to those non-ADF 'veteran's who also *selflessly serve our nation and protect our interests overseas*, with a view to a more equitable outcome for those who are not members of the ADF. Formally recognizing their service in any proposed simplified veteran's compensation and rehabilitation legislation would be a most welcome outcome of this process. I am prepared to work with the Committee in this regard.

This submission has been made in consultation with the Australian Federal Police Veteran's Association (AFPVA).

Dr Martin Hess

Australian Peacekeepers and Peacemakers Veteran's Association

Deakin, ACT



ANZAC Day

25 April 2024



Annex 1 DVA and Non DVA coverage: AFP Missions and Operations 1964-2024

Global and Pre 2004 [except Sudan and South Sudan]

Mission	Date Established	DVA
UNFICYP- United Nations Force in Cyprus	14MAY64	VEA
UNBRO- United Nations Border Relief Operations in Cambodia	01FEB89	VEA
UNTAC - United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia	18MAY92	VEA
ONUMOZ - United Nations Operation in Mozambique	27MAR94	VEA
Haiti - Multi-National Force in Haiti (U.S. Op Uphold Democracy)	10OCT94	VEA
UNMIS - United Nations Mission in Sudan	01JAN06	VEA
UNMISS – United Nations Mission in South Sudan	2011	No DVA coverage

Regional

Mission	Date	DVA
Bougainville TMG – Truce Monitoring Group PMG – Peace Monitoring Group	1997-2003	No DVA coverage
East Timor/Timor Leste	1999-2024	
UNAMET - United Nations Mission in East Timor	21JUN99	VEA
UNTAET - United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor	25OCT99	VEA
UNMISSET - United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor	20MAY02	VEA
UNMIT – United Nations Integrated Mission in East Timor		No DVA coverage
TLTDP – Timor Leste Police Development Program		No DVA coverage

Solomon Islands	2000-2024	
IPMT – International Peace Monitoring Team Solomon Islands	2000-2002	No DVA coverage
RAMSI - Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands	24JUL03	VEA
SIPDP – Solomon Islands Police Development Program		No DVA coverage
RAPP – Royal Solomon Islands Police Force-AFP Partnership		No DVA coverage
Papua New Guinea	2005-2024	
PNG-ECP – Papua New Guinea-Enhanced Cooperation Program 2005	2005	No DVA coverage
PNG-APP – Papua New Guinea-Australia Police Partnership 2008	2008	No DVA coverage
Pacific		
Nauru - Nauru-Australia Policing Partnership (N-APP)/Nauru Police Force Police Capacity Program (NPFPCP)		No DVA coverage
Vanuatu – Vanuatu-Australia Police Program (VAPP) 2002/ Vanuatu Australia Policing and Justice Program (VAPJP) 2016		No DVA coverage
Tonga – Tonga Police Development Program (TPDP) 2006/ Tonga-Australia Policing Partnership (TAPP) 2020		No DVA coverage
Samoa - Samoa-Australia Police Partnership (SAPP) 2009		No DVA coverage
AFP Operations		
Op Alliance (Bali Bombings 2002)	2002	No DVA coverage
Boxing Day Tsunami response	2004	No DVA coverage
Op Arew (MH 17 Ukraine 2014)	2014	No DVA coverage
Ops Synergy, Contego, Illuminate (Afghanistan 2007-2014)	2007-2014	No DVA coverage