



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

**Members present:**

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

**Staff present:**

Ms L Manderson—Committee Secretary  
Ms A Groth—Assistant Committee Secretary

## **MEETING WITH PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMISSIONER**

### **TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**FRIDAY, 3 FEBRUARY 2023**

**Brisbane**

## FRIDAY, 3 FEBRUARY 2023

---

**The committee met at 9.00 am.**

**CHAIR:** I declare open our public meeting with the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner. I am Jon Krause, the member for Scenic Rim and chair of the committee. Joining me today are: Mr Jimmy Sullivan, deputy chair and member for Stafford; Mr Don Brown, member for Capalaba; Ms Jonty Bush, member for Cooper; Mr Michael Crandon, member for Coomera; Ms Jess Pugh, member for Mount Ommaney; and Dr Mark Robinson, member for Oodgeroo. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land we meet on today and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging whose lands, winds and waters we all now share.

The committee's proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. As parliamentary proceedings, under the standing orders any person may be excluded from today's meeting at the discretion of the chair or by order of the committee. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. I welcome all viewers of our broadcast through the parliament's website. Media may be present and will be subject to my direction at all times. The media rules endorsed by the committee are available from committee staff if required. All those present should note that it is possible you might be filmed or photographed during the proceedings today and your image may appear on the parliament's website or social media pages. Before we proceed, I ask everyone present, including members, to turn their mobile phones off or switch them to silent mode.

The committee is beginning its meeting in public to deal briefly with some committee matters, before commencing its public meeting with the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner. The committee will then close the public part of the meeting and continue its meeting in private with the parliamentary commissioner. Following that, the committee will meet in public from approximately 11 am with the Crime and Corruption Commission, before closing the public part of that meeting to continue in private with the CCC. Before we proceed, can I ask if there are any declarations of interest relevant to the public session.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** Nothing other than my standing declaration.

**Ms PUGH:** My standing ones, Chair.

**CHAIR:** We have the standing declarations that have been made before. I make my standing declaration from past public meetings. Members have been provided with a copy of the agenda for today's meeting and I will move that the agenda for Friday, 3 February 2023 as circulated be adopted. Those in favour? Those against? That is carried.

Members have been provided with a register of incoming and outgoing committee correspondence. The proposed resolution is that the inwards be accepted and the outwards be endorsed. Mr Crandon, will you move that?

**Mr CRANDON:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** Those in favour? Those against? That is carried. Members have been provided with the parliamentary commissioner's public report to the committee for the period 9 November 2022 to 20 January 2023. I propose and move that the committee authorise the publication of the parliamentary commissioner's public report to the committee for the period 9 November 2022 to 20 January 2023. Those in favour? Those against? That is carried.

That brings us to the discussion of the parliamentary commissioner's activities. Members have been provided with a copy of the secretariat briefing paper. The committee will now commence its public discussion with the parliamentary commissioner.

**KUNDE, Mr Mitchell, Principal Legal Officer, Office of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner**

**WOODFORD, Mr Michael, Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner**

**CHAIR:** Welcome. Mr Woodford, would you like to make a brief opening statement, after which members will have some questions for you?

**Mr Woodford:** Thank you. I am here to update the committee today on the work that has been undertaken in the office since we last met on Thursday, 10 November last year. As has been noted, the report to the committee dated 3 February is before you and was supplied in advance of the meeting. The report details the operations that have been undertaken, largely statutory operations, over the last 2½ months. A key table of outputs is contained on page 2.

From a performance point of view, the office has continued to execute its statutory functions in a timely manner. There was some substantial time during the last period that I was away and for a period Mr Kunde was also away. Nonetheless, all of the work required to be done was done. Planning for the next half-yearly statutory inspection and reporting tasks is in hand and that will commence in the coming weeks.

Part of the work of the office is to examine various referrals that come through from the CCC under section 329 in relation to what may be improper conduct. A number of those came through over the period and they have all been examined, considered and responded to. The committee has also referred certain other work through the office for opinion, examination, consideration and reporting. Parts of that work have been completed and other parts are still in progress.

The other significant matter that took place over the last couple of months was that Mr Kunde and I went to Sydney in late November, I think, and met with our counterparts from each of the states and territories around the country. That was a daylong affair and it was really terrific in the sense that we could exchange ideas with different commissioners and staff and get a feel for how things are done in different jurisdictions. It was a very rewarding experience for all who attended. That is all I have to say in terms of an opening.

**CHAIR:** Thank you. I will ask the deputy chair to ask the first question.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** I have more questions for the private session, but I will follow on from what you finished with there. Recognising that there are differences across jurisdictions in terms of your role and your counterparts, was there anything in terms of learnings, even from our own jurisdiction, that was discussed, noting we have had an interesting 18 months in our jurisdiction ourselves?

**Mr Woodford:** Yes. The most significant thing that came out of the day for me was learning about events that had happened in Victoria and New South Wales in relation to witness welfare. That is a topic that might not be the first thing that comes to mind when we think about operations of the CCC and its counterparts in other jurisdictions. What struck me is: the catalyst for the work down there was the suicide of witnesses. That happened down in Victoria and that led to a large body of work being undertaken down there and a report is being produced. My counterpart in Sydney is currently undertaking substantial work in relation to that issue as well.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** I do not mean to interrupt, but I am interested in whether that is witnesses in terms of Star Chamber witnesses or witnesses in terms of committee procedurals.

**Mr Woodford:** Star Chamber—people who are given a compulsory invitation, if you like, to attend. Whether the rights or wrongs or whatever of why those people are there and their interests in proceedings that may take place at some point in time in another place, it has been an interest I know to the legal profession in Queensland—the attendance of witnesses at those sorts of hearings and the welfare of witnesses.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** So you will keep an eye out for when that update comes out?

**Mr Woodford:** We have a number of things that the office is working on at the moment. It is in my mind a priority, once things are sorted out with what we are dealing with at the moment, for some effort to be put in by me particularly to get into the material from Victoria and New South Wales and understand at a deeper level what they have looked at and what they have learned from those experiences. Once that work is done and I am more educated on these matters, I will then move into our local system and start looking through that to see what is in place in Queensland in terms of witness welfare and get a deeper understanding of that. What I expect will happen is that, as I am going through this, maybe the next time we meet we can discuss that matter more deeply.

It is a very serious and significant issue that is worthy of this office investing effort and energy in to make sure we have the best system in place in this state to deal with the welfare of witnesses. For me, that was the light-bulb moment down there. I did not go there expecting to have something come completely out of left field and to walk away with that, so I found the day to be a very good one.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** I will not mention case names or individuals we have discussed, but there are complainants who are fixated, even well intentioned, and their lives spin off. I would be interested to see the welfare bit. We discussed at the last private meeting somebody like that. I think we had a pretty frank discussion around that so I am interested in whether that would be a similar kind of issue too, where somebody—

**Mr Woodford:** Care and direction is needed for them—that is your point.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** Yes. I am being vague deliberately but you understand what I am saying.

**Mr Woodford:** I understand exactly what you are saying. Like going to Sydney and talking with the people from Melbourne and Sydney about these issues, talking with you now has highlighted a different part to the puzzle but a valid part to the puzzle and something I will take into account as well. I think it is something that is worthwhile investing energy in.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** I would agree with you.

**Mr Woodford:** We do not want a system up here where we have a situation where—

**Mr SULLIVAN:** And we do not want to wait until we are in their circumstances before we turn our mind to it.

**Mr Woodford:** And that is what we talk about here—that a lot of the time the terrible events or unfortunate events that happen are a catalyst for us getting into something and changing it. On this issue, at least we have a heads-up now through that process that it is maybe something we can get a bit ahead of.

**Ms PUGH:** How would you see that developing? Do you think it would be wise to develop a policy and would that be work that you would like to do through your office? It has obviously come out of left field. I am keen to hear where that might go from here.

**Mr Woodford:** What I envisage is that, once the issue is completely understood, the next stage is understanding what is actually in place at the CCC to deal with this. Once that is in place, some discussions will have to take place between perhaps the committee and the CCC about their policy in a comparative sense. I expect that once I have done my work on it I can report to the committee what I am seeing and I can report whether what I am seeing locally is better than or perhaps deficient compared to other systems. I think that is the way it will go.

**Ms PUGH:** How do you go about undertaking that research work? What needs to happen there?

**Mr Woodford:** I have to get the reports and I have to trawl through the reports to understand them. If there are things I do not understand, I now have a line open to speak with my counterparts in Melbourne and Sydney and discuss these issues with them. There may be things within those reports where I am in a position to have better oral discussions with them, rather than just reading it black and white. It is just that work of reading through it. Then there might be other jurisdictions. I might be reading things in a report from Victoria that speaks of things that are happening in some other common law country that may have information that can be tapped.

It is not my expertise, but I think work can be done to gain a level of knowledge and understanding of it to at least be in a position to comprehend what is happening here and assist with development of that. Witness welfare is not my expertise and it may be that the CCC are all over this issue and that they have spoken to the relevant professionals—psychologists, psychiatrists, people like that—who would assist them with developing and implementing their policies for witness welfare. All we can do is identify the issues and then it turns to other people who would assist the CCC with making sure their witness welfare policies are good. I think if we start it off we can end up somewhere positive.

**Ms BUSH:** I wish to make a comment that I support the work wholeheartedly. I am surprised it has not come up before. Thank you.

**Mr CRANDON:** Thank you, Michael, for bringing that to our attention because I think it is a very important thing, particularly given you have been involved in hearings in the past. Certainly the Police Union has raised concerns around the use of the Star Chamber in Queensland Industrial Relations Commission matters and, in their view, quite wrongly causing fear, if you like, amongst the Police Service and others. Was there any feedback as to the type of witness we are talking about? What I am getting at there is: was it to do with outlaw motorcycle gang members that are being forced to provide advice, or was it Queensland Industrial Relations Commission type matters?

**Mr Woodford:** Local council. Mr Kunde is just reminding me of that. I have not read the reports and the one in Sydney is still a work in progress. It makes you sit up a little straighter when you hear 'local council', given our last year.

**Mr CRANDON:** Yes. We are not necessarily talking about councillors but people working within the council hierarchy and what have you as well?

**Mr Woodford:** One was a councillor.

**Mr CRANDON:** Thank you. It could go further.

**Mr Woodford:** It could go further, but is it an industry or area specific? I do not know anything at the moment to make a comment on that. I would expect that, people being how they are, it would not matter where they come from, where they are working or what area they are in; if you get a compulsory attendance notice, that would send shivers up the spine of any person. Whether they be a parliamentarian, a butcher or a schoolteacher, I do not think it would matter. It is a serious document to receive.

**Mr CRANDON:** Thank you again for bringing that to our attention. We appreciate it.

**Dr ROBINSON:** Michael, in terms of the issues around Star Chamber witnesses when the CCC decides whether a witness is called before it or not—again, like other members, I am not going to particular private matters of discussion and cases—do we also on the flipside run the risk, as potentially can happen and may have happened historically, of investigations then not having sufficient evidence in terms of the public's expectation that potentially a witness could have been called that may have made a difference to a case? Do you have any comments around how we move forward to find and strike the right balance there?

**Mr Woodford:** That is really an operational question. My experience is that the CCC does do very good work in identifying the right people who need to be called in relation to matters. My concern more is with the psychological response to that. I do not have any lingering concern at all that the officers within the CCC conduct, and do their best to conduct, a thorough assessment of matters to only bring before the CCC witnesses that they honestly and genuinely think will be able to offer some assistance to them. I do not have a concern about that. That is not my point. I am looking at things from a different perspective as to when they have received that notice.

**CHAIR:** Mr Woodford, in relation to your potential to do that work on the back of the Victorian and New South Wales reports about witness welfare, will you need to, in your view, seek any sort of direction or resolution from this committee in relation to that, or potentially even resources?

**Mr Woodford:** Once we have cleared through what we are doing I will start doing some work, and then I will correspond with the committee suggesting that the committee may consider giving a direction to me to undertake certain work and set out the terms that I think might be appropriate. Then we can perhaps discuss that and the committee may refine what the committee wants me to do, and I can tell the committee where I am up to with my broad reading on the topic and what I am seeing as important. Then we can get something a little bit more directed as to what will help the committee down the track and help parliament with anything it needs to do or any oversight of the CCC. That is probably the logical way to deal with it. Rather than ask something from the committee at the moment, I would rather undertake some work so at least I have a clearer picture of where I think it should go, and then I can engage with the committee and say, 'This is what it looks like. Maybe you want to think about me having to do this.'

**CHAIR:** This is sort of a related question, I suppose, but during a previous meeting you referenced the resourcing and workload impacts on the office of referrals received both from this committee and other work where it involves a lot of information being received that you need to look through, assess and report on. Are you satisfied at the moment that you are able to manage the matters before you with the resources available to you?

**Mr Woodford:** I will look to Mr Kunde on that issue. I think we are at the moment. There are a couple of larger things that we are working on that are time-consuming, but I am confident we will work through those. Once we are through that heavy time, then there will be time to engage in other things like what I am talking about this morning. As I said at the last meeting, it is a balance of the level of work that the committee wants done through this office and if that level of work expands then at some point there needs to be consideration as to resourcing. At the moment, it is not something where I am sitting at home at night thinking, 'I have to raise with the committee that this is getting out of hand.' I am not having any thought like that. Mr Kunde might, but I am not having any thoughts like that at the moment. I think we are managing with the level of resourcing that we have. If it comes to a point where I am thinking resourcing needs to be improved, then I will send you a letter.

**CHAIR:** Mr Kunde, do you want to add anything to that?

**Mr Kunde:** Not really, except there are some matters we have had for a while, but in between those we also have our statutory functions. The statutory functions are all up to date except for one report, which you will get very soon, which is the intelligence data review report. The intelligence data review has been done; the report is just a signing-off on that. It is a matter for the committee as to whether a couple of matters are dragging on a little bit, but we think we will be on top of them very soon. The Christmas and new year break did not help, but we are up to speed now.

**Mr Woodford:** On that issue, Mr Krause, I can indicate that in other jurisdictions—I think Perth has the same system that we have where there is an equivalent of Mr Kunde and me there. Then you move into other jurisdictions and they are rather large organisations. The difference is how expanded the functions are and how much is being done. In some jurisdictions the equivalent office is very large—large staff—but then, funnily enough, Perth and Queensland are quite similar.

**CHAIR:** I will ask another general question. Answer it as you will. Are there any other particular matters or findings you would like to comment on in relation to the investigation work you undertake on referral from our committee at this point in time?

**Mr Woodford:** No, nothing at this point in time, no.

**CHAIR:** It is worthwhile to ask you as well that over the last two years the average time taken for your office to finalise complaints about the CCC has been consistently reported as 22 weeks. Can you speak generally about how the complexity of some of those matters and the time taken to receive information from the CCC respectively impact on those time frames?

**Mr Woodford:** Certainly. When a matter is referred to our office, we will have a referring document and ordinarily a list of issues that has come in from some place, from some person. Then what happens is we need to engage with the CCC and obtain documents and material that they hold in relation to the issues that have been raised. Twenty-two weeks seems like a lengthy period of time, but the CCC has to go through its own processes then to locate all of the relevant material, and that may take weeks to months before material arrives. They do the best they can. Then when that material arrives it can be anywhere from a few folders to a few boxes of material, and that needs to be meticulously gone through to identify the relevant material to the relevant issues of the questions that are being asked. All of that takes time. As a result of those matters, it is not something that we receive a complaint on Monday and have speedy and easy access to limited material to formulate a response within a couple of weeks. It just does not work like that. The issues that come to the office are serious issues and normally require looking at serious volumes of material. Then it is a matter of sifting through the material, considering it and coming to a reasoned response.

**Ms BUSH:** Michael, I appreciate we are going to hear from the CCC as well, but, in regard to section 329, can you say anything in the public hearings around any trends in issues that you have noticed in the reporting period that you would like to highlight?

**Mr Woodford:** No, there is no particular trend. There is a consistent theme, I guess. The threshold for report is very low. That is how it is set up in the legislation, which is a good thing. It generates lots of work because you have people at the CCC who, when something relatively minor may happen, still trigger a statutory referral. Why I raise that is that a consistent trend is simple human error, completely devoid of any malice aforethought, if you like. People make mistakes; we are not robots. No-one is perfect. You have people in the CCC who may have made a simple mistake but it leads to a referral. Since I have been in the role that has been one thing. As to more serious matters that are referred, no, I have not seen any theme develop.

**Ms BUSH:** I am interested in your comment around the reporting threshold being intentionally low, and I certainly am not debating that. Is that consistent with other jurisdictions and, in your view, is the response appropriate to the reporting threshold, if that makes sense? Coming back to the mental health conversation that we have had and corrective action to make sure that human error is identified and corrected, are you comfortable with the response back to referees on that?

**Mr Woodford:** I have thought about that because on a few occasions we have had a report about the same person in the CCC making errors, and my instinctive response is to say, 'I hope that person is okay because this seems to be out of character.' Everything will be going alright and then there will be some silly error and then you think, 'Oh, well, that is a silly error,' but six months later or something like that, something else might happen and again it is a silly error, yet the reports we are getting from the CCC are detailing an exemplary work history.

I think the way it is set up is right. As someone makes more errors, then the consequence there becomes more significant, as you would expect, with an explanation to the person and the counselling and retraining. In terms of the way the system is set up in the other jurisdictions, I cannot comment on that. I have not sat down and done a black-letter comparison of the different jurisdictions, so I cannot answer that. Mr Kunde tells me that the committee did that at some stage in the past.

**Mr Kunde:** There has been a comparison of all of the reporting thresholds and not every jurisdiction requires the reporting of improper conduct as we know it. Mostly there is oversight by either the committee or our colleagues, but it is different thresholds in different states. The committee, a few years back, did a big analysis of all of that to compare.

**Ms BUSH:** Was the analysis also looking at outcomes—

**Mr Kunde:** Not so much. It was looking at thresholds—I think that was the main thing it was looking at—and comparing the level of oversight in other jurisdictions with either committees or commissioners or inspectors.

**Ms BUSH:** I am always interested when reporting thresholds are so low—sorry, I am not suggesting that it is low—and that perverse outcome of people not then disclosing and the impacts that has in terms of culture. Thank you.

**Ms PUGH:** With regard to the 329 notifications, obviously when you have a low threshold like that, in my view—and I am interested to hear if this is what you are reflecting—that can be a problem if the response is always meant to be punitive. However, with the CCC I think that low threshold was put in place to ensure there is an opportunity to counsel or to work with employees to catch those small mistakes so they do not become large ones where you could be talking about a punitive response right off the bat. Certainly that is the flavour of the feedback I have gathered from you; is that correct?

**Mr Woodford:** That is completely correct, because I have seen a few cases where there have been a number of errors over time and you do see that gradual increase from counselling or assisting, if you like, to something a little more punitive. That is correct.

**Ms PUGH:** In most cases it does not get to that point if there is that early intervention and that discussion about it. In some cases people decide that having a job where typing out emails perfectly every time is not actually the thing they want to do in life, and that is fine too.

**Mr Woodford:** What I have noticed is that with internal CCC staff proper, what we have just discussed is completely correct. What I have noticed is that for seconded police officers to the CCC—am I correct?—it seems to me a more firm approach is taken.

**Mr Kunde:** It may also be the nature that seconded police are not doing data entry so if there is improper conduct it can be of a higher level.

**Ms PUGH:** Thank you for that. That is really interesting.

**Mr CRANDON:** In the progressive work program attached to your public work report you mention that, as part of your intelligence data review work, you plan to check details of the QPS command structure and obtain details of joint meetings with the CCC during the next reporting period. Can you explain how those actions will help to inform the outcome of your review and report?

**Mr Kunde:** Every year there are slight changes at the QPS, it seems, about their command structure. It is just a matter of us reporting that and setting it out so that the committee can understand how the QPS deals with its intelligence function. That is the relevance of that.

**Mr CRANDON:** Have you always done that?

**Mr Kunde:** Yes.

**Mr CRANDON:** You have always looked at it in the past?

**Mr Kunde:** Yes.

**Mr CRANDON:** I am sorry; I thought this might have been something new.

**Mr Kunde:** No, it is just a matter of us working out how their various sections interlink.

**Mr CRANDON:** And you compare it with previous—

**Mr Kunde:** I do not think there was much of a change this year, I must say, but there has been in the past a complete overhaul of the security intelligence branch and that sort of thing. That is just something that we include in our reports just as an overview about the structure at the QPS.

**Mr Woodford:** The relevance of that is that under the act there has to be some flow, some mechanism, for exchange between the organisations. Where it comes into the report and what we are looking at is part of that, to satisfy ourselves that there is proper exchange between the two organisations.

**CHAIR:** Mr Woodford, can you tell the committee if you hold any concerns or if in any of your work, as far as you can tell us, any concerns have been raised about the potential for personnel at the CCC to be compromised by organised crime or even corruption in the course of their work?

**Mr Woodford:** The potential for people to be compromised—

**CHAIR:** By organised crime syndicates or corrupt activity within the Public Service that the CCC oversees—either/or?

**Mr Woodford:** There is only one instance that has come to my attention where there was a potential. That is an operational matter. I do not want to get into too much detail and I think you understand what I am talking about. I think there needs to be some very careful vetting by the CCC

with respect to employees, which I think they do. Whether or not the QPS system of vetting is the same system that operates at the CCC is something that perhaps the CCC need to consider and ongoing consideration of vetting by employees within the CCC about associations they may have. I think there needs to be perhaps some work undertaken in the CCC, and perhaps there might be some work being undertaken at the CCC, to make sure of the policies with respect to employees and ongoing disclosure of any potential for any conflicts may arise.

This is an age at the moment where most people have high visibility on social networking. A function of that is: we have spoken before, publicly and perhaps privately, about the capture of individuals by organisations. This is where the training of staff at the CCC perhaps is something that will be further considered by the CCC in relation to the ongoing attention to disclosure. It is about employees being made aware, and perhaps being made aware regularly, about their social footprint, if you like, through the various social media channels they are on. It is not too difficult for people these days to ascertain, when you have a social presence, where you work. For nefarious characters it is not too difficult to groom people and get an in into an institution like that through a social platform. It is a function of how people communicate and put themselves out there into the world these days and it is something that perhaps the CCC will do work on to bring its policies and procedures and training perhaps more up to date in terms of being aware of these issues and, more importantly, making the staff aware of these issues and having regular training and reporting about that.

In terms of direct corruption, which your question first flagged, no. In terms of operationally seeing something that made me think, 'I think things can be done a little bit better in the age that we live in with the way that people put themselves out there in the media,' yes. I think that is serious and substantial work. It is a substantial issue that the CCC needs to think about very seriously and make sure that its policies and procedures and training are up to date.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Mr Woodford. In answer to a previous question, you mentioned that the size of your office and WA are roughly similar compared to other states and that is a function somewhat of the duties you undertake and the roles you have.

**Mr Woodford:** Correct.

**CHAIR:** That leads to the following question: what further powers would you like to have or roles would you like to have, ideally? I give you one minute.

**Mr Woodford:** That is not an issue that I have considered. It is not an issue that I would publicly shoot from the hip with, if you like.

**CHAIR:** I understand.

**Mr Woodford:** That is a serious question. I will think about that.

**CHAIR:** It is something that we have discussed generally as a committee publicly before, I think during the five-year review process especially.

**Mr Woodford:** What has come to my mind: you asked me that question last time I was here about the resourcing. It was one of those things that came out of left field for me and I thought, 'Why is Mr Krause asking me about this? Are we not doing enough? Are there other things that the committee wants us to do?'

**CHAIR:** Sometimes I just like to check.

**Mr Woodford:** That was the third option. I thought, 'Maybe they are just making sure our welfare is okay.'

**Mr Kunde:** One of our current referrals is dragging out. I accept that. I thought that might have been what it was about.

**CHAIR:** No.

**Ms PUGH:** He would say that if that is what he thought.

**Mr SULLIVAN:** Mr Woodford, they just like to ask questions about the budget because they do not pass it.

**Mr Woodford:** The way I look at it, the volume of work done by us rises and falls on where the committee is at with the extent of work that it wants done. If the committee decides, 'There's a range of things we are very much interested in and we would like to ramp up the office of the parliamentary commissioner to get into these issues,' that is all fine. On the flip side, you say, 'Okay, well, let's resource the office a little more.'

**Mr SULLIVAN:** On that point, Mr Woodford, you did come into this role at a particular high peak of activity.

**Mr Woodford:** Exactly.



**Mr SULLIVAN:** In terms of the troughs and everything, I think it is a bit of a reflection in terms of—

**Mr Woodford:** And I thought about that. I was somewhat fortunate that when I came into here I think my role started probably about two months too late, because if I had come here two months earlier I might have found myself asking a lot of questions for a number of weeks and that would have been very much a full-time role. It would have been something that I would have enjoyed but when you just arrive in a particular position that would have been a baptism of fire. It would have been like being briefed to be counsel assisting from the bar to do something. I was somewhat fortunate, I thought, that counsel assisting had been appointed to assist the committee. In other matters you might not need to appoint people.

**Ms PUGH:** I have a follow-up very generally and without reflecting on any matters before the committee or before you, Mr Woodford. Going back to people's online presence, you used two terms. You used 'social media profile'. You also used the term 'online footprint', which I think is increasingly valid and more to the point because what we often see with social media platforms is that their uses change over time. Social media platforms that start out being purely for business can morph. Social platforms can go from being something that young people use to being used by much older people. You rightfully pointed out the potential for grooming and identification of CCC staff and many other members of the Public Service as well, for that matter, and politicians. Do you have any views as to other states and how they run their online footprint policy and how that might be implemented here in Queensland? Do you have any other views that you might care to share with the committee in that space that you can share at the public meeting?

**Mr Woodford:** No, I do not, is the simple answer. I am not aware of the policies that they have in place at the equivalents of the CCC in other states to deal with these sorts of policies. However, I know it is something that is of great interest to the committee at the moment. I understand that perhaps the CCC may be looking into their own internal policies on these matters. That may be a question that is very well asked of the CEO of the CCC about whether or not any consideration has been given to what is happening in other states.

It is, again, one of those issues like we were talking about with witness welfare—how many times people say, 'Ask a lawyer to have a look at it,' but the lawyer has no idea about witness welfare. The lawyer has no idea about how to limit the capture of people within an organisation. I do not know who has that power. Indeed, when we were talking a little while ago about redesigning things at the CCC following all of last year, my comment was that I would hope that a professor at the University of Queensland is being consulted about how you redesign this position or organisationally within the CCC how this happens. That was my comment. The chair of the CCC walked in here half an hour later and you asked him that question and he told you, 'In fact, we've engaged with the university and the experts.' For me that was extremely positive because I thought, 'Let's hope they're not going to ask some silk how to design this,' because they don't have the expertise. That is not their role. If you want to know, it is not a black-letter law question. Organisations need to understand that they need to tap the right resources to achieve the best outcomes and not the outcome that someone who has a number of letters after their name or a number of degrees in something completely irrelevant and has high standing thinks is a good outcome.

That is a long answer to your question. I do not know what has happened in other states. It is a bit like witness welfare. I am interested in the issue and I can take that so far and then it becomes other people who are needed to draw on to assist the CCC to make sure that witness welfare is well in hand. I think the social media might be a similar thing. I do not know who the experts are in those sorts of issues, but the CCC is a serious organisation and if they are doing serious work in relation to this issue then one would expect that they are tapping the right resources to make sure they are getting it right.

**Mr CRANDON:** This is just an observation: human rights comes into it. Social media is part of our life these days so there is a question of human rights as well when restricting people's access to that type of thing because of their employment. That gets tossed into the equation as well, doesn't it?

**Mr Woodford:** Yes, it does. It is all there in the Human Rights Act and we have discussed that before. That is one of the variables that the CCC needs to wrangle with to make sure it gets it right.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Mr Woodford and Mr Kunde, for your contribution here in our public session. We will close the public session with the parliamentary commissioner and continue in private session.

**The committee adjourned at 9.47 am.**