

This is an uncorrected proof of evidence taken before the committee and it is made available under the condition it is recognised as such.



HOUSING, BIG BUILD AND MANUFACTURING COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mr CG Whiting MP—Chair
Mr JJ McDonald MP
Mr DJ Brown MP
Mr MJ Hart MP

Staff present:

Ms S Galbraith—Committee Secretary
Dr V Lowik—Assistant Committee Secretary

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE BRISBANE OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES ARRANGEMENTS AMENDMENT BILL 2024

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Monday, 29 April 2024

Brisbane

MONDAY, 29 APRIL 2024

The committee met at 9.00 am.

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare open this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Amendment Bill 2024. My name is Chris Whiting. I am the member for Bancroft and chair of the committee. 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 very fortunate to live in a country with two of the oldest continuing cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people whose lands, winds and waters we all share. With me here today are: Jim McDonald, the member for Lockyer and deputy chair; Don Brown, the member for Capalaba; and Michael Hart, the member for Burleigh. We do not have Robbie Katter or Tom Smith with us today.

This briefing is a proceeding of the Queensland parliament and is subject to the parliament's standing rules and orders. Only the committee and invited witnesses may participate in the proceedings. Witnesses are not required to give evidence under oath or affirmation, but I remind witnesses that intentionally misleading the committee is a serious offence. I also remind members of the public that they may be excluded from the briefing at the discretion of the committee. I remind committee members that department officials are here to provide factual or technical information. Any questions seeking an opinion about policy should be directed to the minister or left to debate on the floor of the House.

These proceedings are being recorded and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and are subject to the committee's media rules and the chair's direction at all times. You may be filmed or photographed during the proceedings and images may also appear on the parliament's website or social media pages. I request that people turn their mobiles phones off or to silent mode, as well as turning computers to silent mode.

de BRUYN, Dr Clinton, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Brisbane 2032 Coordination Office, Department of State Development and Infrastructure

McDOUGALL, Ms Fiona, General Counsel, Legal Services, Department of State Development and Infrastructure

MURRAY, Mr Michael, Acting Executive Director; Finance, Policy and Legal; Brisbane 2032 Coordination Office, Department of State Development and Infrastructure

CHAIR: I welcome representatives from the Department of State Development and Infrastructure. I invite you to brief the committee, after which members will have some questions for you. Before we start, the member for Capalaba has a declaration.

Mr BROWN: I am friends with Dr de Bruyn. We both shared the great honour of being pallbearers at the funeral of the former member for Stretton.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Dr de Bruyn: Firstly, I thank the committee for providing the Department of State Development and Infrastructure with the opportunity to give an overview of the bill today and respond to any questions. The primary purpose of the bill before the committee is to establish a delivery authority for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. This is an important step in delivering a successful games that maximises long-term legacy and benefits for Queensland. For our drafting, we have consulted extensively with games delivery partners, including through providing a draft version of the bill to them for feedback. A draft of the bill was also provided to the International Olympic Committee in accordance with our obligations under the Olympic host contract. I am pleased to advise that the International Olympic Committee raised no issue with the bill. For the benefit of the committee, I will briefly provide some background and outline the bill's key features.

As you know, Brisbane was awarded the hosting rights to the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games in July 2021. The Queensland government, the Brisbane City Council, the Australian Olympic Committee and the Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee are all signatories to the Olympic host contract with the International Olympic Committee. The Olympic host contract sets out the rights and responsibilities of hosts to plan, organise, finance and deliver Brisbane 2032.

The final response to the International Olympic Committee's future host questionnaire proposed that two entities be established for the development and execution of the games. The first one is the organising committee, referred to in the legislation as the corporation and also sometimes referred to as the OCOG, so it is the Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee. This is a statutory body with primary responsibility for organising and staging the event itself. The second one is an Olympic coordination authority to coordinate all non-organising committee government responsibilities, including venues, athlete villages, transport, legacy initiatives and frontline government services.

In December 2021, the organising committee and its board was established under the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021 to undertake and facilitate the organisation, conduct, promotion and commercial and financial management of Brisbane 2032. In May 2022, following consideration of the recommendations of a report about governance arrangements for Brisbane 2032, the Brisbane 2032 Coordination Office was established within the Queensland government to coordinate and integrate essential programs of work for the games. This office has been progressing preparations with other parts of government, undertaking supporting activities including venue development and legacy and sustainability planning.

In December last year, the Premier announced that a delivery authority would be established for the games. To achieve this, the bill before this committee proposes to amend the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021 to establish a Games Venue and Legacy Delivery Authority to ensure Queensland's readiness to successfully host and maximise the legacy and benefits from the games. This legal form of a statutory body was chosen as it will provide the authority with the necessary operational and financial independence and flexibility to achieve its objectives, while ensuring it is subject to an appropriate level of public accountability. It will also reduce the impact that a change in government could have on infrastructure delivery and government services coordination for the games over the next eight years. This is a model similar to that adopted for the highly successful Sydney 2000 and London 2012 games, and we have heard from stakeholders that this is a model that we should emulate for our games.

The new chapter 3 part 5 of the act as proposed provides for the establishment of the board of the authority with up to seven independent members including the chair. Board members are to be selected by a panel of chief executives made up of the nine games delivery partners, including all levels of government as well as Olympic and Paralympic bodies. The selection panel will provide a list of preferred suitable nominees to the minister who will then recommend nominees to the Governor in Council for appointment.

New section 53AD provides for three main functions of this authority: firstly, to deliver venues in time for the games and within budget allocations, including managing effects on users of venues during the development; secondly, to monitor and ensure the delivery of villages in time for the games; and, thirdly, to coordinate and integrate the planning and delivery of state, Commonwealth and local government obligations under or related to the host contract.

Mr HART: Can you repeat the first one please? I missed it.

Dr de Bruyn: The three main functions are: firstly, to deliver the venues in time for the games and within budget allocations; secondly, to monitor and ensure the delivery of the athlete villages in time for the games; and, thirdly, to coordinate and integrate the planning and delivery of state, Commonwealth and local government obligations under the Olympic host contract.

Noting the significant importance of transport infrastructure for delivery prior to the games, a new section 53AI requires the authority to develop a transport and mobility strategy within 18 months of establishment. The strategy will identify critical transport projects needed in time for the games and describe ways in which these projects may be prioritised and integrated. The authority is required to consult with a broad range of entities when preparing the strategy and then seek approval from the nine games delivery partners before publishing the strategy.

New section 53AM requires the authority to produce a Games Coordination Plan within 12 months of establishment which identifies the obligations of state, Commonwealth and local governments under or related to the host contract, which was the last point I mentioned, and sets out how these are allocated and coordinated. In preparing the plan, the authority must consult with Stadiums Queensland as well as games delivery partners.

In delivering the venues and ensuring the delivery of villages in time for Brisbane 2032, the authority is able to make use of Queensland's existing comprehensive planning framework. However, should a planning issue arise that would threaten on-time delivery of venues or villages, the bill does provide the authority the power to seek information, documents or assistance as well as some reserve development powers. The bill provides that the authority will have the power to acquire land for the purpose of performing its function. Similar to planning delays, if a land acquisition delay arises, the authority will have a reserve power to declare by regulation that land can be taken provided certain conditions are met.

The bill before the committee today reflects the ongoing collaborative partnership between games delivery partners which will ensure we deliver the best possible games in 2032. I thank you all for your time. I hope this information has been useful. We are very pleased to take any questions you may have.

CHAIR: Thank you. Going through the bill, it is quite comprehensive in what will be done and what can be done. There are many aspects for this, but one of the things that I was struck by is that it is using those models that internationally have been proven to work for these games. Have I got that right?

Dr de Bruyn: That is correct. We looked at a number of models. This proposed model most closely resembles London 2012 and Sydney 2000, both of which were very successful in terms of planning powers and also relative independence, particularly with respect to London 2012.

CHAIR: You talked about planning powers and they are quite crucial. What is unique to the 2032 games is that it is across jurisdictions with different planning schemes. That is probably something that would differentiate our games from the ones previously. We need to deal with different planning schemes and different authorities with perhaps different outlooks on planning. This is why the planning powers are so important.

Dr de Bruyn: Indeed. We consider them to be important with respect to executing the functions of the proposed authority. With respect to the detail on that, I might pass to my colleague to talk about aspects of the planning powers.

Ms McDougall: Queensland, as you probably know, has a range of tools to ensure timely delivery of development. These tools might include the ministerial infrastructure delegation under the Planning Act and also the priority development areas under the Economic Development Act. The Coordinator-General also has pretty comprehensive tools to ensure timely delivery for development. These tools mean that the proposed planning power given to the authority is only going to be used in really exceptional circumstances.

It is intended that the proposed authority continue to work with existing planning decision-makers, like the council, EDQ and the Coordinator-General, and leverage off the existing planning frameworks. However, the on-time delivery of the venues and villages is absolutely critical so we have considered that it is critical the authority has specific powers to resolve any issues that might arise, such as third party appeals, consultation periods et cetera. These powers, as Clinton outlined, include asking for information or requiring information, requiring documents from interested stakeholders, and a power to declare development for a venue or village to be accepted development, or PDA accepted development when it is within a PDA. This power will only be used in exceptional circumstances and is subject to ministerial approval after the authority has consulted with the Coordinator-General, councils and MEDQ. This means that a venue or village would be exempt from all state and local government planning controls or requirements. Obviously, Commonwealth approvals will still apply.

CHAIR: One of the things that would probably garner most attention is the transport study. It is certainly something that everyone in South-East Queensland can grasp—that is, the need to have that comprehensive and coordinated transport system. Could you talk a bit more about what is being proposed in this bill about the 18 months to produce a plan? What are some things that will be guiding the development of that strategy?

Dr de Bruyn: Under this proposed legislation the authority will be required to develop a transport and mobility strategy within 18 months of inception of the authority to identify critical transport infrastructure required in time for Brisbane 2032 and describe the measures to ensure those transport infrastructure projects are prioritised and integrated with other transport and infrastructure projects. Importantly, in preparing the strategy the authority must consult with a number of people. I can tell you who they are: the CEOs of each relevant local government that is impacted must be consulted; the Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee must be consulted; the chief executives of the departments administering this act, so the DG of this department and the DG of Transport and Main

Roads; Stadiums Queensland; the Police Commissioner; the secretary of the Commonwealth government department responsible for administering the National Land Transport Act, so the Commonwealth transport department; and other games delivery partners.

Once they are consulted the authority will develop the strategy, and at that point prior to publication they will need approval—not just consultation, but approval—from the nine games delivery partners, who are: the Commonwealth government; the state of Queensland; the Brisbane City Council; the Sunshine Coast and Gold Coast councils; the Council of Mayors South-East Queensland; the Australian Olympic Committee; Paralympics Australia; and, of course, the Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee.

Mr McDONALD: Thank you very much for the presentation this morning. There has been some public commentary around the Olympics and the governance arrangements. You mentioned in your briefing, Dr de Bruyn, the Olympic committee requiring two structures: I think it was OCOG and OCA. Was that request made before we made an application for the Olympics or after?

Dr de Bruyn: With respect to the requirement for the two bodies; is that what you mean?

Mr McDONALD: Yes.

Dr de Bruyn: In terms of the first body, the organising committee, the IOC requires that all games hosts establish an organising committee for that version of the games, whether it be summer or winter games. That was a requirement that was easily understood. There was contemplation in the original contract to the development of a coordination authority, as I mentioned in my earlier statement, and that is part of the driver behind the development of this part of the legislation. The authority as proposed is contemplated to be responsible for the delivery of venues, as I mentioned, as well as monitoring and ensuring the delivery of villages and the coordination of those state, local and federal government functions—essentially, the non-organising committee responsibilities. It does get a bit confusing. To put it euphemistically, the organising committee that was set up in 2021 is responsible for putting on the play—that is the euphemism we use—and the authority is responsible for setting the stage, let's say.

CHAIR: That is a good analogy.

Mr McDONALD: Thank you for that explanation. When did the department decide to establish the independent delivery authority?

Dr de Bruyn: As one of his first acts, the current Premier announced the establishment of an independent delivery authority.

Mr McDONALD: But it is not called the independent delivery authority: it is called the OCA?

Dr de Bruyn: In consultation with games delivery partners, within the contract it is called the Olympic Coordination Authority. They all understand that it is the same thing.

Mr McDONALD: There will be seven selected for this authority?

Dr de Bruyn: Yes, for the board. This is actually a very important point. I might elaborate on that, if I could. An important function with respect to this authority is the establishment of a seven-person independent board. The mechanism for that is that the CEOs of the nine games delivery partners I mentioned previously will form a panel. This is all in the legislation. It specifically says they will form a panel and that the panel will select by majority potential nominees for the board. The minister will then consider that list of potential nominees and then from that list can recommend people to be considered for nomination to the board by Governor in Council. Importantly, in the legislation it does not just say 'consult'. The minister must consider the nominees provided by that panel.

Mr McDONALD: Would that list be public?

Dr de Bruyn: I would have to take that on notice, to be honest.

Mr McDONALD: Just so I get the process right, there are nine bodies which include the state, feds and local governments et cetera, as you outlined, and then they make recommendations to the minister?

Dr de Bruyn: That is correct, by majority. One CEO per group mentioned, per games partner, would vote as a panel and put forward nominees for the independent board of up to seven people, including a recommendation on the chair, and then that would be provided to the minister. The minister would then have to propose nominees to the Governor in Council based on that list.

Mr McDONALD: Is there a position description for the board or similar?

Dr de Bruyn: The legislation envisages that certain skills and capabilities required would need to be considered, so that is something that would need to be developed.

Mr McDONALD: Just so I get this right, the nine people appointed to make the recommendation can make the recommendation, but the minister can override that?

Dr de Bruyn: The minister has to consider the recommendation. The minister does not have discretion under the legislation to choose alternate members of the board.

Mr McDONALD: Just go through the make-up of that board again. My background was in local government. Graham Quirk is widely acclaimed to be the 'Godfather of the Games' for his efforts with the Council of Mayors South-East Queensland. Can you tell us the breakdown of the federal, state and local governments on that nine?

Dr de Bruyn: Most certainly. There are nine games delivery partners represented by one CEO or equivalent from each games delivery partner. That is the Commonwealth government; the state of Queensland; the Brisbane City Council; the CEOs of both the Gold Coast and Sunshine Coast councils; the Australian Olympic Committee; Paralympics Australia; the organising committee; and the CEO of Council of Mayors South-East Queensland.

Mr McDONALD: Are there any mayors or political appointments to that nine-person authority, or are they all CEOs?

Dr de Bruyn: Within the legislation they are all the CEOs or chief executives or equivalent, not political. The other point I might make with respect to the board itself is that, as well as your question with respect to the panel, the legislation also contemplates that members of the organisations of those games delivery partners who work for those partners cannot actually be appointed to that board. For example, a director-general from the Queensland government could not be appointed to that board.

Mr McDONALD: That was my next question. Could that board make political appointments? Could they recommend a mayor, a state politician or a former premier?

Dr de Bruyn: Potentially a former one. I might just pass to my colleague Michael Murray in terms of current.

Mr Murray: The bill specifies in section—

Mr McDONALD: I am sorry, I don't have the bill in front of me. I just have the briefing notes.

Mr Murray: Just for the record, section 53BF details the composition of the actual board. Prior to all of that discussion, the nine parties are the selection panel. Focusing on the seven-person board, section 53BF details the composition of it. Part 3 lists the people who are excluded from being appointed to that board, and the first one is an elected office holder.

Mr McDONALD: So there will be.

Mr Murray: No. Is excluded.

Mr McDONALD: Is excluded?

Mr Murray: They cannot be appointed to the board.

Mr McDONALD: Cannot be?

Mr Murray: Yes. It goes on to say 'elected office holder, Public Service employee, an employee of a local government, an APS employee'. It is really driving home the importance of the independence of this board to make sure the board is not going to be stacked, effectively, with one particular games delivery partner.

Mr McDONALD: This is the last question I have for now. Once that board is established through the process we have just gone through, will they then have autonomy in terms of the decisions for venues, villages, legacy projects and transport opportunities? Will they have autonomy, or is that a recommendation again to government?

Dr de Bruyn: They will have relative autonomy. With respect to the venues, the proposal in the legislation is that the authority is the delivery authority to deliver the venues. In terms of investment decisions, there is currently an intergovernmental agreement between the state and federal government in the amount of \$7.1 billion in capital. Investment decisions would need to be considered by the federal and state government under that intergovernmental agreement following the development of project validation reports. With respect to transport, as I said earlier, that is something that would have to be agreed to by games delivery partners. The legislation envisages that the majority of games delivery partners, the nine people I mentioned, would have to agree to the publication of that transport management strategy. It would not just be to consult.

CHAIR: I will just point out that part 5 division 2 is quite extensive with respect to how the board and panel are created.

Mr BROWN: With respect to planning powers, during consultation did councils give any feedback or did they accept the powers in this bill?

Dr de Bruyn: I might start and then I will refer to Fiona. During consultation, which was very wideranging, with the games delivery partners, including the councils, they were accepting and understanding of the need for these planning powers.

Ms McDougall: Yes, I agree. I think they recognised that these are really reserve powers to be used in exceptional circumstances, so on that basis they accepted it.

Mr BROWN: With these powers you want to make sure that the main objective is delivering these venues on time. Do you envisage how these planning powers will help with regard to any EPBC problems we have with any venues?

Ms McDougall: The planning powers in this particular act do not help us ensure timely delivery of the venues or villages for EPBC because it is a federal jurisdiction that we cannot interfere with.

Mr BROWN: The federal government is a partner, and do you envisage any issues with regard to the EPBC Act and any of the venues?

Ms McDougall: Certainly, we will need to comply with any requirement to seek EPBC approval. This bill does not circumvent or make it an easier road to get an EPBC. Certainly, in the project validation reports we have done there may be a requirement for some of the venues to at least look at EPBC approval.

Mr BROWN: Have they all been completed now?

Ms McDougall: Some have; some are still ongoing.

Mr HART: Dr de Bruyn, how many people are in the Brisbane 2032 Coordination Office in the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning?

Dr de Bruyn: I am happy to answer the question, but I will just be guided by the chair. Does that relate to the bill specifically? Are you happy for me to answer that question?

CHAIR: It is a good point. You are talking about the allocation of staff within a government department. I can understand what the member is trying to do here. I think you can probably answer that broadly about the intended composition of this authority.

Mr HART: There is nothing sinister in my question.

CHAIR: You may want to speak in brief and broad terms about how we envisage this particular authority will be staffed.

Mr HART: I just want a number.

Dr de Bruyn: I would say approximately just under 40 FTEs.

Mr HART: Where did you come from?

Dr de Bruyn: I came from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr HART: This is a pretty big shift, going from the Queensland government controlling the process of infrastructure to what sounds like a completely independent board now. Was there advice received from external parties that this was the best thing to do moving forward, or was this purely a policy decision?

CHAIR: I think that is question on policy.

Mr HART: If it is policy I will not ask it.

CHAIR: I understand where you are going. It may well be a policy decision by the government. I will let Dr de Bruyn answer that.

Dr de Bruyn: I can answer part of that. When we started looking at various other models in January when the Premier made a decision to set up a delivery authority, we looked at a number of them. We looked at Paris and we looked at Rio, but in particular we looked at London 2012 and also Sydney 2000. When we then consulted with games delivery partners, including the nine that I have mentioned, I think it is fair to say there was unanimous support for something like this: for an organisation with an independent board and that sort of thing. There has certainly been unanimous support, I think it is fair to say, with respect to having the panel to select the board from games delivery partners.

Mr HART: When was the IOC shown this bill? What date?

Dr de Bruyn: Michael?

Mr Murray: The International Olympic Committee was consulted and provided with a draft exposure bill, but I would have to come back to the committee on the precise date.

Mr HART: Can you take that on notice?

Mr Murray: Yes, sure.

Mr HART: How long after they saw the bill did they give advice that they supported it? Do you know that?

Mr Murray: I can come back, but it was shortly thereafter.

Mr HART: Can you take that on notice as well?

Mr Murray: Yes.

Mr HART: With regard to the taking of land, that will have some sort of oversight by a particular minister, I would imagine, or is this authority going to be able to do that all by themselves?

Dr de Bruyn: The minister would have to endorse that, given that it is a reserve power. Is there anything you want to add to that, Fiona?

Ms McDougall: No, the minister would have to.

Mr HART: Which minister?

Mr Murray: The minister in the act.

Mr HART: Which minister is in the act? Is it state development?

Mr Murray: The admin arrangement orders will identify which act sits under which minister. At the moment it is the Minister for State Development and Infrastructure.

Mr HART: We do not know yet?

CHAIR: We do know. It is the Minister for State Development and Infrastructure.

Mr HART: At the moment it says state development?

Ms McDougall: At the moment it is state development, subject to any change.

Mr HART: It could change?

Ms McDougall: Yes.

Mr HART: This authority will have control of how it spends its funds; is that correct?

Dr de Bruyn: That is correct, yes.

Mr HART: How will these funds be allocated? Will there be funds allocated each budget cycle?

Dr de Bruyn: Part of the bill contemplates a funding agreement between the state government and the authority, which has to be developed and signed within six months. This is similar to what was in the bill in 2021 in relation to the organising committee. That funding agreement will outline responsibilities with respect to its spend to make sure that the authority is fiscally responsible in terms of allocation of its funds. It is up to the authority to put forward its plan for how it chooses to spend those funds and then to negotiate a funding agreement with the state.

Mr HART: I imagine when they work out what they are going to do or want to do they will know how much money they need to spend and they will negotiate with the state. It sounds like that would happen every budget cycle. Is there any money allocated initially—in the last budget or maybe the next one that you know of?

Dr de Bruyn: In terms of the establishment, let us say, of the authority—secretariat functions for the board, corporate functions, that sort of thing, which initially should be fairly minimal—it is anticipated that would be funded internally by the department. However, you are correct: it would be necessary for a CEO, whether it be an interim or full CEO, to come forward and develop a plan and a budget for the authority and then to consult with games delivery partners, most particularly the state government.

Mr HART: Who will appoint that CEO you just mentioned?

Dr de Bruyn: The legislation suggests that the minister must consult with games delivery partners and the minister would appoint an interim CEO for up to 12 months. However, after that period or before that period, it would be up to the board to appoint a permanent CEO.

Mr HART: Given your coordinating office has a fair bit of experience in this, is it likely that some of your office will go over to that?

Dr de Bruyn: The legislation contemplates that people could move over under mobility arrangements. It is contemplated that a number of people in the office—the majority, in fact—would consider, on a voluntary basis, moving over to the authority for around 12 months or so. They would still be public servants at that point.

Mr HART: Still public servants?

Dr de Bruyn: They will still be public servants, but at some point in the future they would have to make a decision as to whether they want to be employed by the authority on a full-time capacity if the authority wanted them. At some point in the future they have to make a determination. To be clear, the authority would employ under the Fair Work Act, under the federal statute, not as a state public sector employee if the choice was made at the end of the secondment to move into the authority, but that is all voluntary.

CHAIR: Looking at division 3, which is the acquisition of land for venues and villages, once again it details quite extensively what will happen. I note under 53AV(3) the authority's power to acquire land for the villages and venues, under (a)(i), 'the taking of the land is for conferring rights or interests in the land on another entity'. Is this what happened in Sydney 2000 or London 2012, that kind of ability to confer those rights or interests in the land to another entity?

Dr de Bruyn: Yes, it is contemplated the ability, as per the legislation you quote, may be required. I might just pass over to Fiona.

Ms McDougall: Yes, that is correct. The acquisition of land powers here are subject to the Acquisition of Land Act processes, so it is slightly different to the processes that were in London and Sydney, but, yes, fundamentally they are from there.

CHAIR: I do not know what happened in those two cases, but certainly that land may not be held by the authority but perhaps invested in another entity that would be best placed to manage that land; do I have that correct?

Ms McDougall: Exactly. Some of the venues might be owned by council, Stadiums Queensland, all of those types of entities, so land potentially could be vested in those types of entities, yes.

CHAIR: The parts of the bill that detail the selection of the panel are quite extensive. A lot of time and effort has gone into getting those arrangements right and acceptable and supported by those partners. It seems to me that one of the focuses of constructing this bill is making sure we are getting those arrangements right and keeping everyone happy. Do I have that right?

Dr de Bruyn: That is correct, Chair. We have consulted extensively with the partners on all parts of the bill, but as I said previously I think it is fair to say that there was very strong support for that particular provision of the bill from games delivery partners to ensure a truly independent board.

Mr McDONALD: I am reading your briefing note. In May 2022, following consideration and then governance arrangements, it was agreed to bring this work inside the Premier's department. There was a consultant's report, a Deloitte report, that discussed that and you supported that recommendation. Was there any work done by consultants, on top of that report, to recommend back to this?

Dr de Bruyn: With respect to additional work done by consultants, I would have to take that on notice. I am not sure. In terms of what is being contemplated for the current governance arrangements, I can take you through that. As you say, governance arrangements were contemplated a couple of years ago. From that two main bodies were established, the Brisbane 2032 Intergovernmental Leaders' Forum and the Brisbane 2032 CEO Integration Group from a governance perspective, and they represent the games delivery partners essentially at different levels, whether it be at the highest level or at the CEO level. It is envisaged that those groups be retained but retitled or repurposed as the Brisbane 2032 Government Partners Leadership Group and the Brisbane 2032 Government Partners Executive Group to provide visibility of the coordination, planning and delivery activities being undertaken by the authority, an assurance that reputational risks and strategic opportunities associated with the event are being managed for those three levels of government, confidence that the games delivery partners have a seat at the table when decisions impacting their specific areas need to be addressed, notwithstanding the other provisions about the transport et cetera that we have discussed, and providing strategic advice to the authority on complex matters that affect the games delivery partnership.

Mr McDONALD: What are the time frames for the nine to make the decision for the seven independent board members? I am unsure about the interim CEO appointment; is that for a full 12 months or can the board make changes to that before that?

Dr de Bruyn: With respect to the second part of your question regarding the interim CEO, the board could make changes prior to the 12 months. At any time after the appointment of the interim CEO the board could make an appointment of a permanent CEO. Essentially that is a transitional function and we explicitly mention it is transitional in the legislation just so we can get things going, I suppose. With respect to the first part of your question in terms of timing, I might refer to Michael. Is there any timing contemplated with respect to the decision of the panel?

Mr Murray: No. The bill does not provide that a decision has to be reached by a certain period of time. However, I think it is fair to say that all games delivery partners, including the Queensland government, would have an interest in having the independent board established sooner rather than later so that the authority can move from its, say, interim arrangements into its more permanent way of operating.

Mr HART: Having an independent delivery authority, how would they deal with infrastructure that is owned by somebody else? An example might be something on the Gold Coast that they want to repurpose or completely rebuild or tear down or whatever. How will they deal with the owner of that property?

Dr de Bruyn: The contemplations that exist in planning pathways would be utilised, including consultation with that owner, but, as we have discussed previously, there is a reserve power there, if you like, both with respect to planning and land. Again, Fiona, would you like to say anything more on that?

Ms McDougall: I think we have pretty substantial reserve powers both for acquiring land and also exempting from any of the Planning Act or planning considerations, so it is quite a—

Mr HART: Ultimately that could override the actual owner of the property?

Ms McDougall: Only in exceptional circumstances and only after extensive negotiation.

Mr HART: I get it. Thank you.

Mr Murray: I think the other thing worth noting here is that for those venues that might be owned by a different entity, say a local government or even a private owner, what is largely proposed is for venues to be upgraded. It would be a rare instance where an owner of a facility would look to not accept that upgrade.

Mr HART: That property is upgraded and given back to the owner; is that what we are saying?

Mr Murray: That is what usually occurs with most arrangements.

CHAIR: We have some questions on notice. One is whether the nominees that go to the minister will be made public; when was the IOC shown the draft bill and when was the response received—

Mr Murray: If I may, Chair, I can confirm the IOC was provided with a copy of the draft bill on 7 April and raised no issue prior to introduction.

CHAIR: Thank you. The third one was any additional work done by consultants. We will get the specific wording to you. I ask that we have the answers to those questions on notice by 5 pm on Wednesday, 1 May. Thank you to Hansard. Thank you to our secretariat. A transcript of these proceedings will be available on the committee's webpage in due course. Thank you for participating today.

The committee adjourned at 9.45 am.