



# ***PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE***

**Members present:**

Mr JM Krause MP—Chair  
Mr JA Sullivan  
Mr DJ Brown MP  
Ms JM Bush MP (virtual)  
Mr MJ Crandon MP  
Ms JC Pugh MP  
Dr MA Robinson MP

**Staff present:**

Ms A Honeyman—Committee Secretary  
Ms A Groth—Assistant Committee Secretary

## **MEETING WITH THE CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMISSION**

### **TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Tuesday, 2 May 2023**

**Brisbane**

## TUESDAY, 2 MAY 2023

---

**The committee met at 3.01 pm.**

**CHAIR:** Good afternoon. The committee will now commence its public meeting with the Crime and Corruption Commission. I advise that these proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. I welcome all viewers on our parliament's website. The Crime and Corruption Commission has given a public report to the committee for the period 1 January 2023 to 31 March 2023. Deputy Chair, could you move that the committee authorise the publication of the Crime and Corruption Commission's public report to the committee for that period?

**Mr SULLIVAN:** So moved.

**CHAIR:** All those in favour? That is carried.

**BARBOUR, Mr Bruce, Chairperson, Crime and Corruption Commission**

**CHRISTENSEN, Ms Cecelia, Senior Executive Officer (Corruption), Crime and Corruption Commission**

**DARCH, Ms Helen, Ordinary Commissioner, Crime and Corruption Commission**

**DOWLING, Mr Peter AM, Ordinary Commissioner, Crime and Corruption Commission**

**O'FARRELL, Ms Jen, Chief Executive Officer, Crime and Corruption Commission**

**RENTZ, Mr Cameron, Acting Senior Executive Officer (Crime), Crime and Corruption Commission**

**CHAIR:** The committee will now commence its public discussion with the CCC. Mr Barbour, thank you for joining us today. Would you like to make a brief opening statement and then we will go to questions?

**Mr Barbour:** We are pleased to present the Crime and Corruption Commission's report to you for the reporting period 1 January to 31 March 2023. I say this at the beginning of every meeting we have in public, but I consider it important that members of the public understand that, while there is a clear public interest in our activities, there are also important limitations on the matters that we can discuss in open session, particularly in regard to investigations which are still in progress and details relating to sensitive operational matters. With this in mind, I am pleased to highlight some key achievements for the reporting period which are set out in more detail in our public report.

As the committee is aware, we are progressing the implementation of the recommendations made last year by the commission of inquiry relating to the CCC. We have provided five progress reports to the committee, the parliamentary commissioner and the Attorney-General, and on 9 March we published on our website our second public progress report. Of the 29 recommendations for which the CCC has sole responsibility, eight have now been completed, 17 are in progress and four are yet to commence. There are a number of recommendations which require liaison with other agencies, and during the reporting period we met with the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions to review draft policies and procedures developed ahead of a planned joint pilot post-prosecution review in June 2023, which is in response to recommendation 24, and to discuss feedback on the draft memorandum of understanding in relation to practices and procedures for the referral of matters and the provision of advice, in accordance with recommendation 26.

Last month I travelled with the CEO, an assistant commissioner from the Queensland Police Service and two representatives from the Queensland Police Union of Employees to Northern Ireland to meet with academics, law enforcement personnel and police oversight agencies to learn more about their approach to police oversight to help inform work being undertaken on the recommendations arising from the commission of inquiry into Queensland Police Service responses to domestic and family violence, including those options and recommendations which relate to a new police integrity division within the CCC.

During this reporting period, we continued to review the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act. Our review report is on track to be submitted for tabling in the Legislative Assembly in June 2023.

I would like to also mention some of our operational highlights for the 2022-23 financial year to date. In our crime portfolio, we have finalised 28 crime investigations, provided 159 law enforcement intelligence disclosures and held 102 days of hearings relating to crime investigations. During the same period, our corruption portfolio has finalised 23 corruption investigations, made four recommendations for disciplinary action as a result of a corruption investigation relating to two persons and made 29 prevention recommendations arising out of our corruption investigations and monitoring activities. We received 2,955 complaints of suspected corruption and we assessed 2,412 complaints. Those are my opening remarks. We are obviously very happy to answer any questions the committee may have for us.

**Mr CRANDON:** I was reading with interest about your trip to Ireland. I had been there a few months ago and it was quite an interesting trip for me. I am sure it was far more interesting for you to have a look at the policing side of things there. If I remember correctly, the parliament had not met in Northern Ireland for a very long time. Is that still the case?

**Ms O'Farrell:** Yes, two or three years I think it has been.

**Mr CRANDON:** That was quite a surprise to me. I did not realise that until I got there. I want to go to some conversations we have had with you in relation to your report *Influence and transparency in Queensland's public sector*. We had a conversation with you in a previous public meeting about the lack of any submissions being published with that document. You said there were quite a number of people who requested that their submission remain confidential. How many of those 54 submissions you received were asked to remain confidential?

**Mr Barbour:** I think 10 of the submissions requested confidentiality.

**Mr CRANDON:** So a bit less than 20 per cent of them. I then referenced the appendix in the *Influencing practices in Queensland: have your say* document, dated June 2022. In the appendix 'Making a submission to the CCC', the CCC actually discusses the potential for submissions to be published and it outlined three categories—public submission, anonymous submission and confidential submission. Given that 10 of the 54 submissions were confidential, I am going to ask again why the public submissions and/or the anonymous submissions have not, either fully or in part, been made part of the public record.

**Mr Barbour:** As you say, 10 submitters requested that their submissions retain confidentiality, five submitters were anonymous and 39 submitters either identified their submission could be made public or did not specify that either they could or they could not. The vast majority of submissions that we received contained information that would need to be heavily redacted before they would be suitable for publication for a number of reasons. That includes: they referenced matters that were before the courts; they contained certain sensitive information; matters were subject to further inquiries or investigations or indeed might lead to further inquiries or investigations by the CCC; and there was identifying information about individuals, public sector agencies or private sector companies. Redacting that information would have resulted, in our view, in many of the submissions lacking context or being completely not understandable.

**Mr CRANDON:** How many?

**Mr Barbour:** I do not know the number, but the majority of them had those concerns present. If I can say, we certainly considered this very carefully. The submissions formed an important part but nonetheless only a part of the information that was contained in the report itself. As the committee is aware, much information came from a range of matters that had been either under investigation or as a result of further inquiries or audits that we had done, so the submissions themselves formed only part of the information on which we based those.

In all of these types of inquiries, there needs to be an assessment made about whether it is desirable or not and whether it is actually in the public interest to publish part, redacted, some or not all of the submissions. Where we relied on the submissions, we quoted excerpts from those submissions in the report. Much like, if you like, the Coaldrake report, where there was a decision made by Professor Coaldrake that it would be inappropriate for submissions to be published in relation to his review, we made the same decision.

**Mr CRANDON:** Thank you, but the inference in your original published *Have your say* document in June 2022 clearly indicates to anyone who is going to be putting a submission that the likelihood is that their submission, whether it has some redactions or not, will be published if it is regarded as a public submission or indeed an anonymous submission. You go on to say—

If there is no clear selection of one of these options, the CCC will regard your document as a public submission.

You are making it very clear in quite significant discussion within that appendix that the documents are public, yet none of them were made public—even, may I say, the 17 submissions from peak bodies and groups that were received by you. These are professional organisations that put together these types of submissions all the time. As you have quite correctly pointed out, you have referenced many of these documents in the report itself. In that regard, it surely is your responsibility to give context to those references by publishing the document, whether it has some redactions or not, so that the people who are reading the report can at least reference back.

**Mr Barbour:** Respectfully, I do not agree with that. The information that was contained in the discussion paper did not say that we would definitely publish submissions that were made. It was simply alerting submitters to the fact that we might do that. Secondly, we have not had any submitter raise any concern about what we have done with their submission. No-one has indicated to us that they were concerned that they were not published. No-one has complained about what we published. We have had no contact from any of the submitters to suggest that what we have done did not meet with their approval or raised any concern.

**Mr CRANDON:** With respect, you are talking about the submitters. This document is not aimed at the submitters; this document is aimed at the people of Queensland and this document is the one that we are talking about. This document is the one that other people reading the document would like to look back on. Indeed, this committee questioned the context to you in a public meeting a few meetings ago where we said, 'No. Where is the context? You have made this comment. Where is the context?'

**Mr Barbour:** All I can do is repeat what I have said. We thought about this very carefully. We looked at all of the submissions. We made a decision to do what we did. We think the report speaks for itself. We think the report is very clear and it substantiates all of the issues that we have put forward.

Importantly, as this committee knows, we have been doing a number of pieces of work over recent years in relation to influencing practices. The work that we have been doing stretches back to 2020—prior to the last election. That work has constituted a body of information that has gone into that document. This is a corruption prevention report. We have spelt out what, in our view, are the corruption risks. It needs to be the commission's view about corruption risks.

What we have referred to by way of public submission is in relation to matters that those submitters have raised with which either we agree or accords with the information that we have identified so that we can put that forward. That I think is a very appropriate way of proceeding in relation to this.

**Mr CRANDON:** For the record, I disagree. For the record, I would like to call on you to give serious consideration to publishing these documents so that the people of Queensland can draw their own conclusions in that regard. I will not labour the point any further, Mr Chair.

**Mr Barbour:** I understand what you are saying, but that consideration has already been given.

**CHAIR:** Mr Barbour, I wanted to ask another question, if I could, about the disclosure of submissions and documents and it relates to the report on Operation Workshop. I understand there was a statement in that report where the CCC said that submissions of a non-confidential nature may be annexed to that report. It also says the CCC did not receive any non-confidential submissions in relation to Operation Workshop. Is the statement set out in that report correct that there were no non-confidential submissions received in relation to Operation Workshop?

**Mr Barbour:** If it is in the report, I believe that it would be accurate, but I am very happy to check. I have not looked at Operation Workshop or the report for a little while. I am very happy to consider that and take that on notice and get back to the committee.

**CHAIR:** Was there an invitation to the former integrity commissioner, through her lawyers or directly, to make a submission, non-confidential or otherwise, to that report?

**Mr Barbour:** My understanding and recollection is that a copy of the draft report was provided to the former integrity commissioner for her comment through her lawyers.

**CHAIR:** If you could take that first question on notice, that would be appreciated.

**Mr Barbour:** Certainly.

**Ms PUGH:** Can I just clarify: with regard to Operation Workshop, are you talking about in addition to the natural justice process or are you talking about the same—

**CHAIR:** It is part of the process.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** I have a question to either Mr Barbour or Ms O'Farrell in relation to the improvements in culture and performance in the witness protection unit. I am mindful that we are in a public setting, but could you talk to what you see, in relation to what I think are good results, are any learnings that could inform or spread across the organisation? I am happy to revisit this in more detail in the private setting.

**Mr Barbour:** Yes, we can certainly discuss in particular detail, if you like, in the private session, and I am happy for Ms O'Farrell to answer. We were very pleased with those results. There was a lot of work that went into achieving those positive results. Ms O'Farrell can provide some detail for you.

**Ms O'Farrell:** Thanks for raising it in the public session. Raising such a good news story in the public session is very good for the people who have done all the hard work in that unit. As you know, COVID was a very difficult time. The transitioning of seconded police officers in and out of the commission is also a difficult process. The development of effective teams and teamwork in such a high-pressure environment as witness protection does depend on good, clear leadership but also the team working cohesively.

The work the team has done under a new officer in charge has been excellent. They have devoted a lot of time and effort to reviewing their operations. We are still doing their policies and procedures, which we will hopefully finalise by the end of June. To have a team now operating effectively in what is a high-pressure, high-stress situation and looking after each other and working effectively together is a pleasing result.

In terms of the second part of your question, I think, yes, there are lessons to be learned through both the process that was adopted by that unit and the mindset of those who are involved in such a process that we can apply across the commission more broadly. In that respect, we are doing some similar work in our corruption investigations area at the moment. We are applying similar processes and approaches. I hope to be able to provide some results around that before the end of the year. That is directly related to one of the recommendations from the PCCC's inquiry into the Logan matter. We are progressing that as well. It is pleasing to see and, as I said—

**Mr SULLIVAN:** In terms of cultural change?

**Ms O'Farrell:** In terms of cultural change, exactly. Thank you for asking.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** Can you update us in terms of your work in the cryptocurrency space? I think I speak on behalf of members when I say that we enjoyed the briefing you provided for us out on premise. Can you outline what has occurred since then or where to from here in that space?

**Mr Barbour:** We are continuing with the plan which we have indicated to the committee is in stages. We are moving forward in relation to that. There has not been a huge amount of additional work other than a lot of training and a lot of information processes that have gone on for a broader group of people. Obviously it is matter which is constantly the subject of discussion with a lot of other law enforcement agencies and groups with which we deal. It is a current matter for all law enforcement agencies around the country and one that we obviously see of some significant importance and attach significant importance to in terms of development.

**Ms O'Farrell:** We recently looked at our budget internally for 2023-24. We have continued some internal funding for the development of that project. It will go into stages 2 and 3 over the next couple of years.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** I wanted to pick your brain about your recent visit to Northern Ireland. With my name, I am sure you can appreciate that I have some sense of the historic challenges that the Northern Ireland community deal with. Were there particular learnings that you think you could take from issues of building trust, transparency and openness in a community like Northern Ireland?

**Mr Barbour:** Yes. This committee knows how busy we are at the commission so to set aside a week to race to Northern Ireland and meet with lots of people we saw as a very important thing to do, given the commission of inquiry's recommendations. As you say, the context of Northern Ireland is such that policing through the troubles and all of the issues since then has led to extraordinary levels of distrust within the community around police, around military, around any law enforcement agencies. You not only have the sectarian divide but also have the divide between unionists and royalists. Those are still very prevalent. You still have paramilitary groups and so forth. The

discussions were extremely interesting. They obviously focused on the existing model within Northern Ireland, although we did have opportunity to talk to representatives from the Garda in the Republic of Ireland and also their oversight agency.

What became very clear about the Northern Ireland system is that it is a split system. Whilst there is a very enhanced and quite an outlier civilian public complaint-handling process, it is a split system. If you are a member of the public and you make a complaint it goes to PONI—the Police Ombudsman of Northern Ireland—and it is dealt with in a very open and transparent way with systems that are designed to provide comfort, assurance and confidence to members of the community that their complaint is going to be dealt with and dealt with without the involvement of the police. Interestingly, any complaints that are made by police on police or that come out of policing intelligence operations or other things are done by police with very little transparency and very little understanding of numbers, approach and various other things. What was comforting to us when we met with the deputy chief constable of the PSNI was that they have a very strong approach to discipline. For matters that in our context would be dealt with with relatively minor disciplinary action, over there police officers are effectively dismissed. There is generally no review option.

The timing of our visit was interesting. During the course of the visit the recent report on the Met in London also came out. What it did was not only reinforce the findings of our own commission of inquiry, because they were very much in parallel, but also resonate with everybody we spoke to. It did not matter whether we spoke to academics, people in civilian oversight or civilian control models, the police, the unions that represented the various layers of police—both commissioned and non-commissioned officers—absolutely everybody spoke of the importance to community confidence of having strong civilian oversight. Not one entity that we spoke to suggested that that should not be present.

We came back with, I think, very clear information about things that were driven by the context within Northern Ireland that are not necessarily transferable or appropriate to Queensland, but some of the key elements of civilian oversight, transparency, greater confidence in the community as a result of that civilian oversight and certainly getting the intake and assessment elements right were critical elements of any system that was successful over there. Northern Ireland is still looked at being the best model and they regularly are hosting people from around the world to have a look at it. It was interesting that you have this dual system. We were not as aware until we got there that it was so different and that there was very little transparency in terms of the police equation.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** In a totally different context, the history of your organisation—or the CJC as it was—is of coming out of a time when there was no faith in the independence of the police force and the need for civilian oversight and that sort of thing, so I can understand the parallel.

**Mr Barbour:** The PONI model is currently under enormous stress because of the legacy matters. There are enormous numbers of matters that have come out and continue to be investigated that relate to incidents of policing, murders—

**Mr SULLIVAN:** Quite serious.

**Mr Barbour:** Very serious issues.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** The misconduct we are talking about.

**Mr Barbour:** Absolutely. You see multigenerations who are all continuing to be affected by the fact that there has been no clarification, no proper investigation of how their loved one was killed in a policing operation.

**Dr ROBINSON:** In terms of outlaw motorcycle gangs, they continue to feature, it appears, consistently in CCC investigations into money laundering, fraud and drug trafficking in Queensland and it appears particularly on the Gold Coast. Can you comment on the way in which these types of organisations feature in these crimes, the challenges for the CCC in seeking to detect and disrupt their illegal activities and whether there are any further powers that would assist in those matters?

**Mr Barbour:** Let me deal with the last part of the question first. I do not think we necessarily need any additional powers, but I think it is an ongoing challenge for any organisation, not just ours, to deal with organised crime, no matter how it is put forward—whether it is within an outlaw motorcycle group or whether it is some other group of players. There is obviously an intersection with much of our drug trafficking, money laundering, illicit goods transfers. All of those feed into organised crime. You are quite correct: the outlaw motorcycle gangs figure prominently in relation to that. We have, as the committee is aware, a number of matters that are on foot in relation to that, but I do not think we need any additional powers. I think it is going to be an ongoing challenge.

In terms of the issue of cryptocurrency and the issue of expert assistance that is being provided to these groups, they are becoming far more sophisticated and they have extraordinary amounts of money at their disposal. They are now retaining expert accountants, lawyers, people with significant technological capacity to build systems that are less detectable. It is a constant challenge and one that comes up with all of our law enforcement partners during conversations and work that we do. Cam, did you want to add anything to that?

**Mr Rentz:** One of the gaps, if you will, is developing our capability to deal with those ongoing trends, and the cryptocurrency capability project is part of that.

**Dr ROBINSON:** In terms of comparing that to other states, I was not long ago in South Australia and talking to some police officers who were appreciating some of the historical powers that they had gleaned from Queensland and continued to be of the view that they were very useful powers that one could argue we may or may not still have. How do you reference this in Queensland in terms of other states, perhaps the example of South Australia or others?

**Mr Barbour:** I cannot give you a response in terms of a comparative analysis of other states. It is interesting that we have a meeting of corruption commissioners coming up on Friday but not crime commissioners. Unlike other organisations which are separated within states, I would need to talk to them in a little bit more detail to answer that question fully. The important thing to remember is that we operate as an adjunct to the QPS. The QPS have primary responsibility in this space for investigating and dealing with these issues, and we assist them. We also assist other law enforcement agencies—federal and so forth. There is a great deal of cooperation. Whilst I cannot speak with any direct knowledge about the comparative nature, I am sure that those issues do come up in conversations amongst our law enforcement colleagues, and we would be aware of what their capacities are and vice versa.

**CHAIR:** I will ask the last question I asked previously to the other two relevant officers who were around during the time of the preparation of the Investigation Workshop report, and that was in relation to the statement that the CCC did not receive any non-confidential submissions. Ms Darch, is that your view of the matter as well, that that statement is correct?

**Ms Darch:** I really could not say yes or no to that at this point of time.

**CHAIR:** I understand. Ms O'Farrell, as CEO?

**Ms O'Farrell:** I am going to say I assume it is correct because it is in the report, but, as Mr Barbour said, we would have to take that on notice and confirm that that is actually the case.

**CHAIR:** Sure. Thank you.

**Mr Barbour:** Chair, is there anything specific that you would like to ask in relation to that? Is there any specific information or substance to the question? It may well be that if you do have that we could respond more fully rather than taking it on notice.

**CHAIR:** I would like to verify that is correct and also, in answering that question, if there was anything further to add to that in relation to submissions, that that would be appreciated by the committee as well.

I wanted to touch also on the issue of the complaint itself in relation to that report. I have had plenty of time to look at it, given we have had only a couple of public meetings since it was issued last year. Paragraph 4 of the report frames the complaint in 50 words, and that is very light in terms of describing a complaint of that type. I wondered whether the CCC might be able to disclose to us some of the documents leading to that investigation, including the complaint itself, and also any other briefs of evidence or reports that may have formed part of the commission's assessment of that complaint, whether they be internal reports or even external reports. As I said, 50 words is a very light description of that complaint. I have the report here. One of the first things that struck me in reading paragraph 4 was that it was quite a limited scope of the report. Could you enlighten the committee about whether that might be possible?

**Mr Barbour:** We are happy to provide whatever information the committee wants. As I said, it is always important to provide context so that we know what it is that we are responding to, and I am just a little bit uncertain about what the context is. I recall that at a previous meeting, Chair, you asked us whether our investigation had changed once I became chair. We were not sure about what was behind that either; we sought some clarification but have not received any. It helps us respond fully to the committee if we know exactly what the issues are.

**CHAIR:** The investigation would have been triggered by a complaint or concerns being raised with the CCC or another party—maybe a public sector entity—and none of those documents have been incorporated into the report. As I said, the complaint was encapsulated in just 50 words. If you are able to provide them to the committee in a public sense, that would add context to the report.

I also wanted to ask more specifically about paragraph 17 of the report. It refers to that in March 2021 that a ‘point of contention’ had arisen about staffing and other matters in the office of the former integrity commissioner. It states—

Arrangements with the PSC had become a point of contention—

that is the Public Service Commission—

for the Integrity Commissioner, who considered that those arrangements impaired the integrity of her office, and therefore her ability to fully carry out her functions.

By March 2021—and I think this also goes to the fulsomeness of the report—had the CCC received the complaint documents or a brief of evidence or anything like that from the Office of the Integrity Commissioner or another party?

**Mr Barbour:** I cannot answer that question at this stage, obviously, Chair. I have mentioned before that it would be very helpful if any of these kinds of matters were in your mind to ask us to let us know so that we could actually read the report, have the information here and be able to respond. I was not aware that we were going to be talking about Investigation Workshop. These questions are quite detailed. I am very happy to answer them, but I am sure you understand that it is extremely difficult to answer such questions without knowing that you are wanting to raise those kinds of issues.

**CHAIR:** I have asked for the complaint document and any briefs of evidence, any external reports if you aware of any that were prepared in relation to this matter. Did the—

**Mr SULLIVAN:** Chair, are you asking for those materials to be produced as a question on notice?

**CHAIR:** Yes, I am.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** So you are asking for material that would need to be public facing? I do not know what documents you are referring to.

**Mr Barbour:** I do not know either, and I was going to say that it might be helpful to actually get a letter from the committee specifying what it is you want so that we can answer fully, because it is unclear. We are going into areas where I am not sure what information you specifically want.

**CHAIR:** There was a complaint made about matters in the Office of the Integrity Commissioner to the CCC.

**Mr Barbour:** There are a lot of issues that could be categorised as a complaint and there were also a lot of issues that were identified during the investigation that did not come from the initial complaint, so it is not quite as straightforward as I think you believe it is. We are very happy to provide you with whatever information you would like; however, it really needs to be quite specific because there is a lot of information there and I am still not sure what it is that you are wanting from us. Perhaps the committee could write to us and set out quite specifically what it is you are wanting and then we can provide the committee with that information.

**CHAIR:** Thank you for that guidance, Mr Barbour.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** Mindful, too, Chair, that this committee and the commission itself have very strict privacy rules. Asking for material that you are suggesting is initiating complaint is not necessarily for public airing, right?

**CHAIR:** It is a non-operational matter now. There is no prohibition on it being provided to the committee. There were concerns—and they were alluded to in the report—about the relationship between the Public Service Commission and the Integrity Commissioner’s office. In the assessment of the preparation of the report, did the CCC consider how the Public Service Commission dealt with those concerns when they were initially raised by the Integrity Commissioner? I am talking specifically about the emails that were subject to complaint or concern by the Integrity Commissioner and also the use of data or deletion of data from two laptops—one laptop in particular—and how those concerns were dealt with by the Public Service Commission. Was that part of the report assessment?

**Mr Barbour:** Once again, I will happily look at that for you, but what became clear during the course of the investigation was that the Integrity Commissioner’s concerns in respect of those matters were not, in fact, justified and that information was provided to the Integrity Commissioner, and the



Integrity Commissioner had no concerns with that and provided no commentary in a contrary way to what was provided in the report. I am not sure what the purpose is of that request, but we are really happy to provide it to you.

**CHAIR:** I am curious, I suppose, because the report is very light on some of these details, including details of the complaints and documents behind it. It is a very brief report which appears to make findings with very little detail put in behind those findings, at least on the public record, so perhaps there is more you can add to the public record.

**Mr BROWN:** Chair, I do not think it is your role to prosecute concerns as complaints on behalf of someone else.

**CHAIR:** I am not doing that, member for Capalaba.

**Mr BROWN:** I think you are.

**CHAIR:** I ask you to withdraw that. I am asking questions based on my review of the report.

**Mr Barbour:** I think the dilemma here for me, Chair, if I can be frank, is that the people who are directly involved in that matter have been provided with a copy of the report, have commented on it and have raised no concerns with it. I am uncertain about what the concerns are which are predicating the questions that are being asked. We will provide the information, but it would be really helpful for us in doing so to understand what the particular concerns are, given that they are not concerns that are replicated by any of the parties involved in the matter.

**CHAIR:** You said just then no-one has raised concerns.

**Mr Barbour:** Not that I am aware of. I do not know whether they have raised them with you, but they certainly have not raised them with me.

**CHAIR:** That goes to my first question on notice, which is about whether there were any submissions provided to the commission which could have been incorporated in this report on a natural justice basis. You are going to come back to us about it.

**Mr Barbour:** We will, but, once again, with respect, with the commission's reports, whether it be the influencing practices report or whether it be Investigation Workshop, we have to make judgement calls about what is included and what is not included in those reports, and we stand by that. Certainly the information behind that we are very happy to provide to the committee, but it is difficult for me to see what the purpose is in questioning what has been produced publicly and what was produced publicly many months ago.

**CHAIR:** Mr Barbour, in relation to paragraph 34 of Workshop—and I understand it was some time ago, but, as I said, we do not meet often—

**Mr Barbour:** No, and I also do not have the report in front of me.

**CHAIR:** I understand. Maybe it is another one to take on notice. In relation to paragraph 34, it says that there were a number of emails subject to concern. How many emails were reviewed by the CCC in relation to this report?

**Mr Barbour:** Which emails are you talking about?

**CHAIR:** I am talking about emails that were subject to concern by the Integrity Commissioner. It is said in paragraph 36 that there was a review of restored mailboxes undertaken in July 2021, and there appears to be blind copy to an individual Public Service Commission email address, created for the executive officer. Were those emails reviewed and how many were there?

**Mr Barbour:** We will take that on notice, but my understanding is that it was a significant number and it accorded with what the Integrity Commissioner had identified concerns with. However, we will check that for you, Chair.

**CHAIR:** What was the nature of those emails? Do you need to take that one on notice, too?

**Mr Barbour:** Sure.

**CHAIR:** There is one further issue I want to canvass briefly, if I may, again in relation to Workshop. Which team at the outset was responsible for investigating this matter? Was it Corruption Operations or Corruption Legal?

**Mr Barbour:** Corruption Investigations.

**CHAIR:** Who is in that team?

**Mr Barbour:** As you know, there is a progression in terms of matters. Initially, matters that are the subject of a complaint would go through intake and assessment; that would be Integrity Services. Once a decision is made to go to feasibility, it would normally be allocated to a team within Corruption Investigations. They would then determine whether or not it was recommended to go to investigation

stage and then a team, in conjunction with legal advice from the legal area within Corruption Investigations, would prepare the report. It would normally have a great deal of involvement and input from the SEO (Corruption), then ultimately it would come up to the chair and also it would be reviewed by the commission.

**CHAIR:** The SEO (Corruption) when this kicked off was Mr Alsbury?

**Ms O'Farrell:** When it kicked off, it was Mr Alsbury.

**CHAIR:** Yes, that is right.

**Ms O'Farrell:** When the report was drafted it was Mr Caughlin.

**CHAIR:** Mr Caughlin was acting SEO prior to Ms Christensen coming on board?

**Ms O'Farrell:** At that time, I think there were five or six investigations teams within our Corruptions Investigations area, so it would have been allocated to one of those teams.

**CHAIR:** Mr Caughlin would have had oversight of the report process as it went through the final stages towards completion?

**Mr Barbour:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** Would he have been the one, as Acting SEO (Corruption), responsible for seeing the report come to completion and adoption or approval?

**Mr Barbour:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** In that role, are the Acting SEO or the SEO (Corruption) subject to anyone's direction in the commission?

**Mr Barbour:** Mine.

**CHAIR:** The chair's?

**Mr Barbour:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** Not the CEO?

**Ms O'Farrell:** Not for an operational matter.

**CHAIR:** Mr Caughlin carried the report, so to speak. We had a discussion in November last year about the approval of this report, and there might be an ongoing discussion about that at another time. Mr Caughlin had the carriage of it to the end. Could you tell us who presented the report to the commission for approval when it came up, as it were, to be approved and then to be published?

**Mr Barbour:** My recollection is that we wrote to the committee on 9 November last year in relation to the issue of this in terms of the Workshop report. I think that letter referenced the fact that a briefing note had been prepared by the SEO (Corruption), which went to the commission for approval.

**CHAIR:** You are telling us today it was the SEO (Corruption), to the best of your knowledge, who carried the report through to approval for publication?

**Mr Barbour:** That is my recollection, but I am happy to check on it for you. I think in our letter to you of 9 November the details of that were covered, as I recall. I am just seeing if I can find it here. The letter does not reference who prepared the briefing note, but I imagine it would have been Mr Caughlin, but I am happy to check that for you. The letter documents the fact that a briefing note went to the commission and that was at its meeting on 24 June.

**CHAIR:** Thank you very much. I appreciate that. There are no further questions from this committee for this public session. In relation to the questions on notice, if you could please respond to us by the close of business on Friday, 12 May that would be appreciated. Thank you very much. This concludes the public meeting. The committee will continue the remainder of its meeting in private session. I thank all those members of the public who have been watching our broadcast. We will move now into private session.

**The committee adjourned at 3.49 pm.**