



# ***ECONOMICS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE***

**Members present:**

Mr LP Power MP—Chair  
Mrs MF McMahon MP  
Mr RA Stevens MP (virtual)

**Staff present:**

Ms L Manderson—Committee Secretary  
Ms R Mills—Assistant Committee Secretary

## **PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE BRISBANE OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES ARRANGEMENTS BILL 2021**

### **TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**THURSDAY, 4 NOVEMBER 2021**

**Brisbane**

## THURSDAY, 4 NOVEMBER 2021

---

### **The subcommittee met at 11.00 am.**

**CHAIR:** Good morning everyone. I now declare this public briefing open. I would like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today and pay our respects to elders, past and present. We are extraordinarily fortunate to live in a country with two of the oldest continuing living cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people whose lands, winds and waters we all share.

My name is Linus Power. I am the member for Logan and chair of the committee. The committee has appointed a subcommittee for today's proceedings, the members of which are: myself; Mr Ray Stevens, the member for Mermaid Beach and deputy chair, who is joining us today via teleconference; and Melissa McMahon, the member for Macalister. The other three members of the committee are not able to be present but may join us.

The purpose of today's briefing is to assist the committee with its examination of the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Bill 2021. The briefing is a proceeding of the Queensland parliament and is subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. It is being recorded and broadcast live on the parliament's website. To assist our Hansard reporters with their transcription of today's proceedings—and with that, I put Deane's name into the *Hansard* record—I ask all participants to please identify themselves by name and title, particularly when speaking for the first time.

I also remind committee members that officers appearing today are here to provide factual or technical information that may help us with our committee proceedings. Any questions about government or opposition policy should be directed to the responsible minister or shadow minister or left to debate on the floor of the House. Finally, before we proceed, I ask all those participating to please turn mobile phones off or to silent mode.

**de BRUYN, Dr Clinton, Executive Director, Finance, Policy and Legal, 2032 Taskforce, Department of the Premier and Cabinet**

**MURRAY, Mr Michael, Director, Policy, 2032 Taskforce, Department of the Premier and Cabinet**

**PETERSEN, Ms Kerry, Deputy Director-General, 2032 Taskforce, Department of the Premier and Cabinet**

**CHAIR:** I now welcome representatives from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's 2032 Taskforce. Good morning. Thank you for agreeing to brief the committee on this important legislation. I invite you to make an opening statement before I turn to committee members for any questions they may have. Ms Petersen, would you or one of your colleagues like to commence and make some opening remarks?

**Ms Petersen:** Firstly, I would like to thank the committee for providing the Department of the Premier and Cabinet with the opportunity to give an overview of the bill today. The passage of this bill and the establishment of an organising committee is a very important first step in delivering on the Queensland government's commitments under the Olympic host contract and laying the foundations to deliver a successful Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2032. Hosting the games is a transformational opportunity that will unlock social, economic and environmental outcomes over a two-decade window for Queensland, including the regions. An independent analysis by KPMG found the games could generate an estimated \$8.1 billion in benefits and 91,600 full-time equivalent job years for Queensland.

The bill before the committee reflects our important partnership with key games partners, including the Australian government and the Brisbane City Council. We consulted extensively with games partners and obtained valuable feedback which has informed and, we believe, enhanced the bill. The partnership between all the games partners will ensure we deliver the best possible games in 2032. For the benefit of the committee, I will briefly outline the purpose of the bill and its key features.

On 21 July 2021 Brisbane was awarded the hosting rights for the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and the Queensland government, the Brisbane City Council and the Australian Olympic Committee executed the Olympic host contract with the International Olympic Committee. The contract sets out the rights and responsibilities of hosts to organise, finance and deliver Brisbane 2032. One of the key requirements is that hosts form an organising committee, endowed with legal personality, within five months following the execution of the contract, which is 21 December 2021, and that persons holding certain positions be appointed to the highest decision-making body of the organising committee, being the board.

Organising committees are established for every Olympic and Paralympic Games and they coordinate operational games matters such as accommodation; transportation for athletes, officials and media personnel; operation of venues, facilities and the sports program; the torch relay that will be conducted across the state; the opening and closing ceremonies; and the games ticketing program.

Clause 6 of the bill will establish the organising committee for the Brisbane 2032 games referred to throughout the bill as ‘the corporation’ to undertake and facilitate the organisation, conduct, promotion and commercial and financial management of Brisbane 2032.

Clause 8 of the bill provides that the corporation is a statutory body for the purposes of the Financial Accountability Act 2009 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982. The legal form of a statutory body was chosen as it will provide the corporation with the necessary operational and financial independence and flexibility to achieve its objectives whilst ensuring it is subject to an appropriate level of public accountability, which is very important.

Clause 14 establishes a board of directors of the corporation. The purpose of the board is to ensure the corporation performs its functions in a proper, effective and efficient way. A board is considered the most appropriate decision-making body to govern the corporation as it allows key games stakeholders to have effective representation and decision-making power, including those required by the Olympic host contract. The board will add value to the operations of the corporation through the appointment of directors with subject matter expertise and high standing within the community.

Clause 17 of the bill sets out the composition of the board. Currently, on establishment, the board will include the Vice-President of the International Olympic Committee, which is currently Mr John Coates; the President of Paralympics Australia, Mr Jock O’Callaghan; the Chief Executive Officer of the Australian Olympic Committee, Mr Matt Carroll; one recent Olympian, who the Australian Olympic Committee has already nominated as Bronte Barratt; and one recent Paralympian, who Paralympics Australia recently nominated as Kurt Fearnley. There will be four nominees from the Premier, four nominees from the Prime Minister, the Lord Mayor and the Lord Mayor’s nominee. The Queensland minister administering the act and the Prime Minister will also jointly nominate five independent directors, which includes the president of the board. That is all outlined in the bill.

Clauses 31 to 36 set out requirements for how the board must conduct its business, including that the president is to preside over all board meetings and have a casting vote. If the president is absent, one of the five vice-presidents is able to preside and have that casting vote.

Clause 34 provides that a quorum is only able to be formed if two-thirds of directors holding office are present including a president or a vice-president. This ensures that the board’s discussions and decisions will reflect the collective views of all the partners. To ensure transparency and accountability of board directors, clauses 37 to 42 outline how conflicts of interest are to be dealt with, and a brief description of these clauses and their policy intent was provided to the committee yesterday in our written briefing. We are happy to discuss those further if required.

Clause 53 of the bill provides that any outstanding liabilities of the corporation at the time of dissolution will transfer to the state. This clause is required as the Queensland government is the sole party responsible for any financial shortfalls of the corporation under the host contract. Importantly, though, the bill includes a number of safeguards to manage the state’s risks and obligations as the underwriter of the corporation. This includes the corporation being responsible to a minister and subject to their direction—clause 55—there is also a requirement for certain board committees to have a Queensland government representative observer on those committees; and mandating that the corporation enter into a funding agreement with the Queensland government that includes certain reporting requirements.

Clause 65 exempts the application of the Right to Information Act 2009 for information that is received by the corporation carrying out its functions under the act not already in the public domain, communicated in confidence by the Australian or International Olympic Committees. This clause was

included upon the request of the Australian and International Olympic Committees on the basis that some documents developed in connection with the performance of the corporation's function will be sensitive in nature and a similar approach was taken for the Sydney 2000 games under the Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games Act 1993. All other requests for information in relation to the corporation's activities will be subject to the usual processes under the Right to Information Act 2009.

In late September the Queensland government undertook consultation on the draft version of the bill with the Australian government, Brisbane City Council, City of Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast Council, Council of Mayors, Australian Olympic Committee and Paralympics Australia. We invited all these stakeholders to provide written comment on the draft bill and several meetings were held to discuss their feedback. The draft bill was also provided to the International Olympic Committee as their endorsement is actually required under the Olympic host contract.

During consultation we received a variety of feedback from stakeholders on several aspects of the bill, and a summary of the key changes made to the bill as a result of the feedback was included. We have also included a summary of the change requests that were not incorporated into the bill. Those changes are in the explanatory notes.

I am pleased to advise that in concluding our consultation with games partners, the International Olympic Committee provided their support for the bill that is now before the committee. Thank you for your time. I hope this information has been helpful to committee members. We are pleased to take any questions in relation to the bill.

**CHAIR:** I extend congratulations to the team here. Being awarded the Olympics is certainly an extraordinary thing. I know from the outside it seemed smooth and like there was really only one choice for the Olympic community, but I imagine a lot of work went on behind the scenes in the months and years leading up to that. Thank you for that. I now turn to questions.

**Mr STEVENS:** I have a couple of questions in a couple of different areas. The first one I would like to refer to and look for some clarity about is in relation to the right to information, particularly the request from the AOC and the IOC for a clause about the limitation to right to information because this was done 20 years ago with the Sydney Olympics. We have seen a lot of corruption and non-accountability matters in the Olympic area between the Sydney Olympic Games and our winning bid this year. There is a lot of Queensland taxpayers' dollars at stake in these matters. One would expect that we would see a keenness to keep this transparent, open and accountable by ensuring matters in relation to the 2032 Olympic Games to be held in Brisbane are well informed and totally aboveboard rather than being cloaked in commercial in confidence. Can Ms Petersen perhaps give me some idea in relation to those aspects that will be commercial in confidence? One example is the building of stadiums. What is going to be commercial in confidence, because there is the supply of food and all those sorts of matters? What aspects are going to be held up as commercial in confidence under clause 65? Can you explain to me why there has not been a keenness to preclude this covering up of certain information?

**CHAIR:** I was timing that question. You are almost competitive with Ms Petersen's introduction, but you got to your question, which is great.

**Mr STEVENS:** I am a politician.

**Ms Petersen:** Thank you for the questions. Transparency is very important in everything we are doing, and the IOC, the AOC and all the partners are very keen to see that transparency. In fact, the Olympics host contract is publicly available, so our commitments under the contract are all publicly available, including our submission and the future host questionnaire. Everything we have put forward is in the public realm.

The International Olympic Committee considered our RTI framework and requested the Australian Olympic Committee and the International Olympic Committee be exempt from the operation of the RTI Act only as it relates to confidential information. That has specifically been nominated in the bill. It is not subject to all exclusions; just specific information, which I will elaborate on in a minute. This is the basis upon which Sydney was taken. Yes, that was a while ago, but the International Olympic Committee has also confirmed that all recent games have had this particular provision for organising committees right up to recent Olympics.

As per the written briefing provided to the committee, as we said, it is important to note that the exclusions only relate to confidential information that is provided by the AOC or the IOC. All other requests will be subject to the usual process. Information could be around sponsorship deals. The IOC has some very big commercial sponsorship deals that are in place. There could also be other

information that is communicated around highly sensitive security information or personal information. In fact, the RTI Act actually covers that anyway, but the IOC and the AOC felt comfortable that we specifically called that out as an additional requirement. In fact it is probably no more than our RTI Act already accommodates. It is potentially sensitive security information, potentially a range of really sensitive personal matters that the IOC and AOC felt to have that extra line in the legislation, but we do not feel it is any more than the RTI Act already contemplates to a degree.

**Mr STEVENS:** In other words, the other matters that I mentioned—the building costs, the costs of the catering et cetera—they will be available under RTI, is that correct?

**Ms Petersen:** The infrastructure costs particularly are not related to the OCOG bill. The organising committee, the state in collaboration with the federal government and the councils will be fully responsible for any infrastructure that is constructed in preparation for the games. Our proposal to the International Olympic Committee proposes that this is infrastructure we need for our growing South-East Queensland region anyway, regardless of the games. All those processes and buildings are subject to our usual government processes. Things like procurement—in fact, domestic sponsorship—it will just be a question of whether there are commercial deals in place that are particularly relevant, and the RTI officer will be able to consider those arrangements. If there is communication or agreements or sponsorship deals that the organising committee establishes—any costs—that will be subject to the usual RTI process that will be considered by the RTI officer.

**Mrs McMAHON:** I wanted to confirm that this board is being underwritten by the state of Queensland?

**Ms Petersen:** Yes, the organising committee, so the corporations' costs—that is the group that will run the games event—yes, it is underwritten. It is noted under the Olympic host contract and the guarantee letter that the state of Queensland, through the Premier, provided to the IOC, that the Queensland government will underwrite any economic shortfall or loss.

**Mrs McMAHON:** In terms of remuneration for appointed people, is that again through the state government?

**Ms Petersen:** It is. The remuneration of the directors of the board will be subject to the usual Queensland board remuneration arrangements. The remuneration of the CEO and other working members that then work for the organising committee will be subject to the board's approval.

**Mrs McMAHON:** How would that remuneration work for appointed nominees who are either currently elected officials or current state employees?

**Ms Petersen:** There is no remuneration for elected officials or public servants, should they be on the board or have a role. That is specifically called out.

**Mrs McMAHON:** Referring to clause 8, this is a statutory body under Queensland law and is a unit of public administration under the Crime and Corruption Act. I note in clause 8(2), however, the Crime and Corruption Act does not apply in relation to a director who is a member of parliament of the Commonwealth. So it is quite possible that we have 20 members on the board, however, if one of those members happens to be a federal member of parliament, they are exempt from the corruption and accountability aspect of their appointment?

**Ms Petersen:** Yes.

**Mrs McMAHON:** Is there any particular reason a federal member of parliament is exempt from corruption and accountability?

**Ms Petersen:** In the exposure draft of the bill, all members were initially subject to the Crime and Corruption Act, but the Commonwealth government specifically requested that amendment.

**Mrs McMAHON:** Was there any justification for that exemption?

**Ms Petersen:** There were not any particular details provided to us.

**CHAIR:** If at some future point the Crime and Corruption Commission needed to do an investigation, then others would be compelled and subject to the same rules, but there would be just those who are not subject to those rules?

**Ms Petersen:** The Prime Minister's nominees are yet to be confirmed, but should those nominees be federal government parliamentarians, then at this point in time, based on the drafting of the bill and the request that was put to us, they are not subject to that. I imagine they would be subject to their own ethics obligations as parliamentarians.

**Mrs McMAHON:** If we had a federal ICAC hopefully that will not exist.

**Ms Petersen:** Yes. We cannot comment too much more on that policy. It was a request that was specifically made.

**CHAIR:** To clarify, at the moment a federal parliamentarian who was not part of this committee, and in the future is not part of this, would still be subject to the rules of the CCC and they would just have an omission if they are on this committee?

**Ms Petersen:** If they are on the board.

**CHAIR:** On the board—that is what I meant.

**Ms Petersen:** If they are a member of the board, as a nominated member by the Prime Minister on the organising committee board, that is correct.

**Mr STEVENS:** They should put Daryl Maguire on it—there you go. Getting back to another issue and another area, I note the Lord Mayor has been appointed to the board, and that is a logical thing for the Brisbane Olympic Games. However—as you are aware, I am very keen on local government—the fact of the matter is that the Gold Coast is the sixth largest city in Australia and it just amazes me that with nine venues going forward for the Olympic Games, as I have been advised, that the other representative was not the mayor of the Gold Coast as the other local government representative. I cannot understand what the department's thinking was when they said 'Lord Mayor and his nominee'. As I understand it, in the draft there was a gender-based selection. That has disappeared from the actual legislation and they have decided now to call it 'Lord Mayor and his nominee'. Why was it not identified that the sixth largest city in Australia, providing nine of the venues, would have a representative on that board?

**CHAIR:** Ms Petersen, you may be aware that the member for Mermaid Beach was previously the mayor of the Albert shire and no doubt—

**Mr STEVENS:** And the Gold Coast.

**CHAIR:**—if we had the Albert shire it would have been written into the legislation that the Albert shire was to be represented, but, unfortunately—a longer story.

**Ms Petersen:** At the moment, the make-up of the board is reflecting the level of investment and risk in the delivery of the games. As we talked about earlier, the Queensland government is underwriting the organising committee, we are guaranteeing the venues, the transport, pretty much underwriting all aspects of the games and the financial responsibilities for that. The Lord Mayor is a position as a signatory under the host contract; that is actually called out as Brisbane City Council are signatories to the contract. Every signatory to the contract gets an automatic position on the board. It was agreed that that there would be a second position. The full policy decision-making around those numbers—it reflects the level of investment is the key there. There are other independent members who could reflect the Gold Coast or be from the Gold Coast potentially, so that is still an option, and there are also committees and commissions that sit and report to the board, and there definitely could be members from the Gold Coast on those committees and commissions potentially.

**Mr STEVENS:** In terms of investment, I understand that the federal government puts in 50 per cent and the state puts in 50 per cent. That makes 100. I was not aware that the Brisbane City Council was contributing on a financial basis as well.

**CHAIR:** Is that separate to the explanation that Ms Petersen gave you about being a signatory?

**Mr STEVENS:** That is the explanation. The explanation Ms Petersen gave me was that the board was representative of the investment in the games. The investment basically, I understood, was 50/50 state and federal. I am not aware of a Brisbane City Council taxpayer—ratepayer, in other words—investment, other than costs involving a figure—I suppose the supplying of venues, and in that case the Gold Coast is supplying quite a number of venues as well, if that was deemed as investment.

**CHAIR:** It may have been unclear, Ms Petersen. Perhaps you could reiterate the section where you stated the requirements to have the signatories as part of the board.

**Ms Petersen:** The Olympic host contract requires—

**Mr STEVENS:** I understand how the Lord Mayor has to be on it, I do understand that, but I am not understanding why the second place, if you like, had to be the Lord Mayor's nominee.

**CHAIR:** I see. Ms Petersen, in the local government sphere there might be a suggestion that others—I am not sure what the deputy chair is suggesting, but that is clarifying the question.

**Ms Petersen:** I am not sure that there is too much more to add. The Brisbane City Council will have a significant investment from an operations perspective—transport and security. They are the host city; there will be a significant investment from them as well. The 50/50 is only about Brisbane

infrastructure, so that is specifically referring to infrastructure investment. I am not sure that we can add too much more on that position. We note the comments, but there is probably not too much more, I do not think, that we can add on that question.

**Mrs McMAHON:** To clarify, the member for Mermaid Beach's question on that appointment also referred to the gender equity rule. My understanding is that that second position, that nominee from the council, does fall under clause 17 as one of the nominated directors, so therefore does fall within the gender equity requirement?

**Ms Petersen:** In the exposure draft of the bill, it specifically called out that the Lord Mayor's nominee needed to be female, but then it was proposed that if the Lord Mayor one day is female as well, then it was better to have an overriding clause about the nominations considering gender equity and diversity. So that was removed, but it was reapplied through the broader position. I am not sure which clause that was.

**Mr Murray:** It is 17(3).

**Mr STEVENS:** The board has to have it across the board?

**Ms Petersen:** Correct. The aim is that as the board changes and ebbs and flows and the ex officio positions of the presidents and the members through the life of the board will change, there is a broader need to consider the diversity of the board.

**Mrs McMAHON:** That is not all 20 members, though. There are certain positions that are exempt from that?

**Ms Petersen:** Correct.

**Mrs McMAHON:** It is the definition of 'nominated director'?

**Ms Petersen:** Correct.

**Mrs McMAHON:** So we will not see 10 of the 20 necessarily be female; it might actually be eight of the 16?

**Ms Petersen:** It could be. It will be an ongoing balance. The intention is to get a broader balance, but technically the nominated directors is what the diversity clause applies to because the other positions will be who they are as they are ex-officio positions.

**Mrs McMAHON:** To clarify, the Council of Mayors South East Queensland, or COMSEQ, was one of the original drivers of this bid; that is my understanding. Was the Gold Coast actually on board with COMSEQ when the bill was being formulated?

**Mr STEVENS:** I understand it initially was not but then it was.

**CHAIR:** Member for Mermaid Beach, I think the question was not directed to yourself, but I appreciate your feedback.

**Mr STEVENS:** Sorry, Chair, I could not see who asked the question.

**CHAIR:** Just as a general rule of the committee, we do not direct questions to other members of the committee. We have people here—

**Mr STEVENS:** Thanks, Chair. I thought one of our—

**CHAIR:** Order, member for Mermaid Beach. Restate the question.

**Mrs McMAHON:** What was the role of the Gold Coast in being involved in COMSEQ and when did they come on board?

**Ms Petersen:** I cannot confirm the exact dates but when I was involved COMSEQ really led the process right back from about 2015. It is thanks to them that we are here today, really. I understand that the City of Gold Coast was not a member of COMSEQ through most of the duration of those deliberations, but they did join. I would have to get the exact date for you.

**Mr Murray:** April 2020.

**Ms Petersen:** April 2020 we believe, but we can confirm that precisely. They now are involved, I understand, as a COMSEQ member.

**CHAIR:** With so many of our Olympic heroes being women, it must be fantastic to be the first committee with this broader participation of women on the board leading into the games?

**Ms Petersen:** I am quite sure it is the first committee that has had it actually called out in legislation, but it is a requirement of the IOC. We led with that with the Commonwealth Games. We had equal medals for men and women, as you might remember, for the Commonwealth Games. That  
Brisbane

is something that is really important to the IOC. They have seen what we are doing in Queensland with the Premier's cabinet and the policy around women, diversity and directors on boards. We already are doing it, but it very much aligns with the IOC's values.

**Mr STEVENS:** When the Olympic Games is done and dusted, if you like, the state has to wear any debt. Even though the modelling shows there will not be one, you never know what will happen with COVID or something else around the traps that comes up in 2032. Under the current legislation, the state wears the debt left over. Has there been any thought of underwriting insurance? If not, why not?

**Ms Petersen:** In terms of being here today to discuss the bill, that has not been included in the bill. The make-up, the membership, the independence and the diversity of the board is all about ensuring that the games are delivered on a cost-neutral basis for the organising committee. One of the most important tasks of that board will be to ensure that they get to the finish line on a cost-neutral basis, at no cost to taxpayers. There will be ongoing challenges that they will have to continually manage—manage their budget and manage their revenue versus expenses. Hence, the importance of the diversity of the board and the skills of the board—particularly the Queensland government's representation on those boards and those finance committees—to ensure that commitment is being met. Some recent organising committees actually have operated and made a small profit which has been redistributed through the IOC to the sporting bodies. In a few recent games, they actually have got to the end with a positive outcome. That is something that we as a board definitely have to work towards.

**Dr de Bruyn:** The future host questionnaire provided to the IOC in May 2021—that is a public document; it is actually available on the IOC's website—actually contains a budget for the OCOG. It is very transparent. I will not take you through it all unless you want to be guided through it, but, essentially, revenues equal expenditure, at \$4.9 billion. Importantly, in the expenditure line item there is a contingency of 16 per cent, which we think is fairly healthy given the nature of the operational costs assumed by the OCOG. It was checked by the IOC as well, and they felt that, both on the revenue side and the expenditure side, it was sound.

**Mr STEVENS:** Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I am not questioning the capacities or the intent of board members and the people involved. What I am saying is that Japan probably would have ended up with a massive debt out of COVID. In terms of earthquakes, floods or whatever—I am not blaming the board and their financial planning, but should there be a surprise detriment to the operation of the games and it comes in at a massive loss, as I am sure Japan's Olympic Games have done with COVID, what measures is the board or this legislation taking to cover that absolute detriment to Queensland taxpayers of carrying any debt?

**CHAIR:** Ms Petersen highlighted that the bill only deals with certain things, but I might just—

**Mr STEVENS:** Underwriting of insurance is a certain thing that (inaudible) the bill.

**CHAIR:** I understand. I was going to allow the question, Deputy Chair. I just wanted to highlight that it probably was not something directly arranged with the bill but it is something of interest to the committee. Ms Petersen, can you give us a broad overview of those financial matters and the possible measures that future finance committees could undertake?

**Ms Petersen:** You are correct, Deputy Chair: that is a consideration that will definitely be considered by the board. We did look into those types of insurances—cancellation insurance and worst scenario, Armageddon situations—for the Commonwealth Games. Insurance is something that definitely can be considered, taking into account what happened in Tokyo. It is a matter for the board. At this stage, it is not included in the legislation. That is not to say it would not be considered.

**Mrs McMAHON:** Obviously we have the board structure here and underneath that board you made reference to committees and commissions that may be established by the board. Can you outline the types of work of committees and commissions, the differences between them and how they are accountable as entities themselves?

**Ms Petersen:** The committees are envisaged under the bill. Michael, would you like to add anything?

**Mr Murray:** Within the bill, there are provisions that allow for the board to establish committees and commissions. The key difference between the committees and the commissions is that the committees will have decision-making powers that can be delegated from the board. They are to be made up of only members of the board—the standard sort of finance, audit and risk committees and so forth. On the other hand, you have commissions of the board. Commissions of the board would be able to be made up of members of the board but also members of the community. It would



ultimately be a decision for the OCOG board to make, but they would be able to make particular commissions that are advisory in nature and advise them on things related to athletes, to regions or to other benefits that the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games can offer.

**Mrs McMAHON:** Subject matter experts based on the remit of that particular commission?

**Mr Murray:** Correct.

**Mrs McMAHON:** Is remuneration envisaged for work on those commissions?

**Mr Murray:** There is not remuneration.

**Ms Petersen:** Not at this stage and not included within the bill, but I suppose it could be up to the OCOG and the board, depending on who they were and where they were coming. They could potentially allow them travel if they were bringing them together. I think that is a matter for the corporation. They would have that flexibility.

**Mrs McMAHON:** With similar organising groups, what types of committees and commissions have we previously seen, so we can get an idea of what is being established under this bill?

**Ms Petersen:** I think the committees are normal committees that exist under normal boards. As you said, there would be finance and audit committees. For an Olympic Games, there would be committees to do with sport and the technical nature of the games. There could be opening and closing ceremony committees. They would be specific. They are not outlined in the bill as such. The commissions are an opportunity to ensure there is broader engagement about the games.

It is really specific to each of the games. We know that the engagement of the regions and the engagement of the whole state, nationally and potentially even Oceania is important. I think they would be developed by the corporation.

Climate positive is a key initiative that we committed to under the Olympic Host Contract. We committed to being climate positive. Committees and commissions particularly around sustainability and ensuring those stakeholders are involved would probably be another key aspect. Regional engagement could be another one.

I think it will be very much fit for purpose. In our discussions with the IOC to date, they are very keen to see the way these are developed. It will be very much up to the corporation of the games. It will be ensuring that it is the right size and the right type of committee that is needed to get the best for Queensland.

**Mrs McMAHON:** I note that throughout the bill there is reference to conflict and managing conflicts. This board is going to be full of appointees and nominees who are there because of their role within sporting bodies or because of the geographical areas they represent. I imagine that almost everyone on this board is going to have a level of conflict, and we are going to hear quite a lot about it. Could you briefly explain how this board will manage what are going to be some fairly obvious and perhaps not so obvious conflicts of the appointees?

**Ms Petersen:** That is a good question. As you say, people who are on the board are there because they have an interest and a potential conflict. The first thing is that they will be on the board as they normally are under corporations law or under existing acts and laws. They will have a standing based on being on any board. I might ask Michael go into a bit more detail.

The other part of that is that they could be cabinet ministers or parliamentarians and it is the same with the Lord Mayor. They will know information from their other duties. There is a requirement under the bill that they do not have to disclose that information, but then they may learn information on the board and they will have to exercise discretion about the information they can take back to their colleagues. I use the example of a mascot. The mascot will be a very sensitive and exciting piece of information, and people who are on the board will have to work out when they have to maintain that confidentiality and when they can share it more broadly.

**CHAIR:** I have to put on the record that the committee very much supports Borobi. We are very much Borobi fans. That should be stated for the record.

**Ms Petersen:** We are getting mascot options at the moment.

**CHAIR:** It has tough competition.

**Mrs McMAHON:** I declare that I represent the Yugambeh language being spoken.

**CHAIR:** Of course.

**Ms Petersen:** I might ask Michael, who has been very involved in some of these clauses, to add a bit more information.

**Mr Murray:** Ms Petersen covered it very well. Subdivision 2 of the bill deals with disclosure of interests. It confirms that directors of the board must disclose their interests. However, clause 37(2) provides that the application of that subdivision does not apply in relation to any interest that a director holds in their capacity as an elected office holder. The Lord Mayor is written into the bill as a member of the board. There is provision there, should any other nominated directors be an elected representative, that if they have a conflict that is received in their capacity and their role as an elected official there is not a requirement for them to declare it.

**CHAIR:** I note in the explanatory notes on pages 9 and 10 that there is considerable transparency about some of the ideas that were put forward through the consultation process—many of which you have adopted. Naturally enough, not all ideas put forward were adopted, and there is transparency of some of the key change requests that were considered but not put forward. Is there some oversight you could give us about why some of those requests were not considered in the bill? Probably given the time constraints, not necessarily all of them would have been considered. It may be worthwhile giving the committee some oversight about why it was not useful for the legislation.

**Ms Petersen:** In the spirit of collaboration with the partners, we did work very closely with them. We received their information and we met with them to try to really understand where they were coming from, as far as possible. Sometimes there was a misunderstanding in the bill and it was already covered. We spent quite a lot of time working with them on how we could support in principle their requests through another mechanism or where we just did not support it.

A couple of the changes that were included were removing the cap on the number of board directors required under the Olympic Host Contract from an IOC member perspective. At the moment there is one IOC member. The option is ‘member’ or ‘members’, plural. We do not think there will be many more members in the future because Australia might have one or two but they need that flexibility.

We made sure that at least 50 per cent of the nominated directors complied with the Queensland women on boards policy. The independent director question was raised by many of the partners about what truly is an independent director. That was clarified as not being an elected official, an employee of any level of government, or a member or employee of the AOC, Paralympics Australia or the IOC. Right to information I think we have covered and the CC Act we have covered. There was another amendment where we authorised the corporation to transfer an individual’s personal information to the IOC as required under the contract.

In terms of the items that we did not support, we have talked about the local government representatives. There were several requests to list multiple contractual documents, of which we had many—but once you start listing one you might miss one, so we left it as all documents required under the Olympic Host Contract. Another one was not lengthening the appointment of the directors, as an unlimited appointment. Under good practice, it was requested that we retain it at four-year terms, but there was nothing to stop directors being extended beyond the four-year term. The duration of the board and the responsibilities of the board will probably change over the 10 years because the priorities—

**CHAIR:** And the skills required et cetera.

**Ms Petersen:**—and the skills required, but there is absolutely nothing to stop the continuity of board members who are there, who are totally relevant and who are doing a great job. There is nothing to stop their term being extended. It is just not an automatic extension.

There was a request for the board to self-appoint the president, but that will be specifically appointed through agreement with the Prime Minister and the Premier. There was also a request that the corporation could borrow and invest without gaining approvals under the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act, but that was also not endorsed. There is a process that we need to follow. We believe the corporation can still follow our standard government processes.

**CHAIR:** Thank you all for your appearance here today. Thanks for the level of detail you have given us about this important piece of legislation. We thank our Hansard reporters and the parliamentary broadcasting service for their assistance. A transcript of these proceedings will be available on the committee’s parliamentary webpage in due course. The committee look forward to receiving submissions and the response to them. With that, I declare this public briefing closed.

**The committee adjourned at 11.49 am.**