

GPO Box 3123  
Brisbane QLD 4001

Level 2  
North Tower Green Square  
515 St Pauls Terrace  
Fortitude Valley QLD 4006

Tel.: **07 3360 6060**  
Toll-free: 1800 061 611  
(in Queensland outside  
Brisbane)

Fax: 07 3360 6333

mailbox@ccc.qld.gov.au  
www.ccc.qld.gov.au

ABN 32 164 714 360

Our Reference: AD-23-0665 23/109793

7 July 2023

Mr Jon Krause MP  
Chair  
Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee  
Parliament House  
George Street  
BRISBANE QLD 4000

Via email: [pccc@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:pccc@parliament.qld.gov.au)

Dear Chair

**CCC Response to questions taken on notice at the public meeting on 2 May 2023**

I refer to your letter dated 26 June 2023, requesting that the CCC re-issue its letter dated 12 May 2023 in a form which the CCC would view as appropriate to be made public.

The CCC has prepared a redacted form of our correspondence of 12 May 2023. The redactions relate to information which has not previously been made public which is confidential and personal information of third parties and/or information with operational sensitivity for the CCC. The CCC does not consider that publication of the redacted information would be consistent with the considerations of privacy and procedural fairness which were set out in paragraphs 9-12 of the CCC's Investigation Workshop Report dated July 2022.

In the CCC's view, the **enclosed** letter dated 12 May 2023 in redacted form is appropriate to be published along with this covering letter.

Yours faithfully,



**Bruce Barbour**  
Chairperson

GPO Box 3123  
Brisbane QLD 4001

Level 2  
North Tower Green Square  
515 St Pauls Terrace  
Fortitude Valley QLD 4006

Tel.: **07 3360 6060**  
Toll-free: 1800 051 611  
(in Queensland outside  
Brisbane)

Fax: 07 3360 6333

mailbox@ccc.qld.gov.au  
www.ccc.qld.gov.au

ABN 32 164 714 360



Our Reference: 23/067074 | AD-23-0205  
Contact Officer: Bruce Barbour

12 May 2023

Mr Jon Krause MP  
Chair  
Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee  
Parliament House  
George Street  
BRISBANE QLD 4000

Via email: [pccc@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:pccc@parliament.qld.gov.au)

Dear Mr Krause,

**RE: Response to questions taken on notice at the public meeting with the  
Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on 2 May 2023**

During the public meeting between the Crime and Corruption Commission (CCC) and the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee (PCCC) on 2 May 2023, the CCC undertook to provide further information responding to the Chair of the Committee's questions concerning Operation Workshop, an investigation completed by the CCC in April 2022, with further information received until May 2022, and which resulted in the tabling of a report concerning that investigation, in the Legislative Assembly on 4 July 2022.

In addressing the matters below, we have endeavoured to provide fulsome responses to the questions asked by the Committee. However, in order to do so we have referred to matters that are not public. This includes information in relation to the identity of the subject officer, other complaints related to, but not part of, Investigation Workshop, and [REDACTED] – which is not relevant to Investigation Workshop, but for the context in which the complaint arose.

It is our view that it would not be appropriate for the letter to be made public, having regard to those matters. However, if the Committee wishes to publish all or some of this response, we would respectfully request the opportunity to identify particular matters which we consider should be redacted.

**Request number 1** – The Chair referred to a statement in the Operation Workshop report which was tabled in July 2022 where the CCC said that submissions of a non-confidential nature may be annexed to that report. The Chair referred to the statement in the report that advised the CCC did not receive any non-confidential submissions in relation to Operation Workshop. The Chair asked whether the statement set out in that report is correct that there were no non-confidential submissions received in relation to Operation Workshop?

The Chair also requested the CCC, 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.

#### Response

The statement in the report is correct. [REDACTED]

The responses provided in relation to procedural fairness, as well as the underlying investigative materials, are not appropriate to be published because they contain non-public information, including matters relevant to other investigations undertaken, or overseen, by the CCC.

**Request number 2** – The Chair referred to paragraph 4 of the report and the framing of the complaint in the report. The Chair has stated that the framing “is very light in terms of describing a complaint of that type”. The Chair asked “whether the CCC might be able to disclose to the Committee 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”. Further, the Chair asked whether the CCC is able to provide them to the Committee in a public sense.

#### Response

The complaint giving rise to Investigation Workshop arose from information provided by the Integrity Commissioner, [REDACTED]

The concerns centred on the conduct of a Public Service Commission officer (seconded to the Integrity Commissioner's office at the relevant time) who it was suspected may have released confidential documents that were the property of the Office of the Queensland Integrity Commissioner.

[REDACTED]

The complaint centred on the officer's practice of 'blind copying' emails from the Integrity Commissioner mailbox to a '@psc' email account. The emails included confidential Integrity Commissioner information regarding matters relevant to her advice function.

The scope of this investigation was initially focussed on the officer's laptop, emails and files forwarded to the PSC account, however later expanded to investigate the circumstances of the removal and wiping of the laptop and the security of information stored on the relevant servers.

Information security arrangements in relation to confidential information held by the Integrity Commissioner was identified as a particular issue to deal with in the report by reason of correspondence from the Member for Kawana, received on 15 February 2022.

The areas identified in paragraph 4 of the Investigation Workshop report reflect the broad subject areas and scope of the enquiry in the investigation, as opposed to setting out the particulars of a complaint. In any public report it is necessary to distil the subject matter of the investigation in a way that will be readily understood by the reading audience. That was particularly the case in Investigation Workshop, where there were a range of diverse complaints related to the Integrity Commissioner's office. The intent of paragraph 4 was to set out as succinctly as possible the essence of the concerns dealt with by the investigation.

**Request number 3** – What other information (reports or other intelligence) did the CCC have which may have accompanied the complaints?

#### Response

[REDACTED] At the time the complaint was made (in August 2021), the Integrity Commissioner provided various numerous documents relevant to the subject areas of the investigation, [REDACTED]

**Request number 4** – The Chair also referred to paragraph 17 of the report. The Chair stated as follows:

“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”?

In requesting specific information from the CCC the Chair stated “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?”

#### Response

The reference in paragraph 17 of the report to the administrative and staffing arrangements becoming a point of contention between the Integrity Commissioner and the Public Service Commission (PSC) “by March 2021” is a reference to when those issues began to manifest, rather than when the CCC became aware of them. It is the nature of an investigative report to set out factual events in a logical, chronological fashion where possible – even where the facts detailed in the report were not known to the investigation until sometime thereafter.

That is to say that the statement in paragraph 17 is intended to reflect what events were occurring at the time these issues arose, rather than when the CCC became aware of them.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Request number 5** – The Chair stated:

“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?”

**Response**

Investigators performed a thorough file search and file carve of the acquired encrypted extraction of the Executive Officer’s laptop and determined that no documents, email containers or email files were located on the laptop relating to the former user.

Further, investigators performed a review of data created by way of a backup copy of the data contained in the Office 365 environment (Emails) and the user’s OneDrive folder which also captures items saved to the user’s desktop. This back-up process effectively wipes the data previously stored on the laptop.

The backup process does not capture the user’s download or pictures folders or any other location in the operating system, and therefore the CCC cannot exclude the potential that such information relevant to the investigation was saved on laptop # [REDACTED] and was deleted during the backup and re-purposing process.

In light of the above, the CCC considered the manner in which the PSC dealt with the concerns about removal of the computers, and the deletion of data from one of the laptops.

This was dealt with at paragraphs 50-77 of the Workshop report. Those paragraphs summarise the results of the CCC’s investigation in that regard.

Regarding the broader issue of the PSC’s handling of the laptops, the evidence obtained through the investigation established that:

- The two laptops were removed from the Integrity Commissioner’s office for different purposes
- The laptop which was removed for the purposes of the Public Service Commission (PSC)’s ongoing investigation was stored with a notation that it not be wiped
- The other laptop (which was removed for reallocation) was wiped – not having been identified as potentially relevant to the PSC’s investigation

- When it was identified that the second laptop may have ongoing relevance to the investigation, it was secured until retrieved by CCC investigators. However, by that time the data had been wiped
- The standard process for reimaging devices meant that it was unlikely that relevant data was lost
- A review of the laptop image suggested that relevant data was not lost – although it was not possible to definitively conclude this

A further issue that was considered by the investigation (which was raised in correspondence from the Member for Kawana dated 15 February 2022) was whether the arrangements which were in place for support to the office of the Integrity Commissioner gave rise to a risk that confidential information held by the Integrity Commissioner may have been improperly accessed. As set out at paragraphs 83-102, the investigation concluded that, while there was no evidence that these arrangements led to compromise of such information, the investigation identified opportunities for improvements in the arrangements around support and information security for the Integrity Commissioner.

**Request number 6** – The Chair asked “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?”

Further the Chair stated, “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? What was the nature of those emails?”

**Response**

[REDACTED] the CCC obtained a complete export of all the relevant mailboxes related to the Executive Officer.

In total, the CCC conducted key word searches on **18,766 emails** (10,664 unique items) across 4 discrete email address pertaining to the OIC and the Executive Officer.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

As noted in the investigation report, the investigation did not find any evidence that any confidential Integrity Commissioner information was improperly disclosed by the Executive Officer.

**Request number 7** – The Chair also asked questions in relation to the process of carriage of the public report and briefing the Commission seeking its approval of the report.

**Response**

Various officers, including the lead investigator and a lawyer assigned to the task, were involved in preparing a draft report for the A/SEO's review.

The final draft was prepared by the SEO, and reviewed by the investigative team, Communications, the A/Chairperson and Chief Executive Officer. Feedback and commentary was received on the report in relation to factual matters to ensure precision and accuracy; and matters relating to formatting and communication style. The feedback did not involve, nor result in, changes of substance to the conclusions of the investigation.

The A/SEO Corruption was on leave from 20 to 24 June 2022. As such, the A/Director, Corruption Legal, along with the lawyer who had been involved in preparing the report, dealt with incorporating the procedural fairness comments from the affected parties, in consultation with the A/SEO Corruption.

The A/Director, Corruption Legal, prepared the briefing note to the Commission requesting approval of the report.

At its meeting on 24 June 2022, as the A/SEO was on leave, the CEO took carriage of presenting the briefing note to the Commission for decision. The Commission approved the report, and the Chairperson then wrote to the Committee pursuant to s69 CC Act seeking the required direction.

**Other matters**

In relation to the matters regarding the Integrity Commissioner more generally, we refer the Committee to the public and private hearings of 25 February, 3 May, 19 August, and 3 November 2022, where these matters were discussed in detail. In particular, the meeting of 25 February involved provision of a detailed outline of the various matters which came to the CCC's attention, and how they were dealt with.

We note that this is a matter which has occupied the Committee's interest for some time. As we identified in the most recent meeting with the Committee, if there are specific concerns which the Committee has about this investigation, we are happy to address them directly. If the Committee has received a complaint in relation to this investigation, we would like to receive it to understand the complaint, and allow the CCC to provide a direct response to it.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries.

Yours sincerely



**Bruce Barbour**  
Chairperson