

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



# **PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE**

## **Members present:**

Hon. ML Furner MP—Chair  
Hon. SM Fentiman MP  
Mr MA Hunt MP  
Mr JJ McDonald MP  
Ms JC Pugh MP  
Mr RA Stevens MP  
Hon. AJ Stoker MP

## **Staff present:**

Ms L Manderson—Committee Secretary  
Ms M Lyons—Assistant Committee Secretary

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

### **TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Tuesday, 17 February 2026**

**Brisbane**

## TUESDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 2026

---

**The committee met at 10.29 am.**

**CHAIR:** Good morning. The committee will now commence its public meeting with the Crime and Corruption Commission. These proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. I take this opportunity to remind those participating to ensure that they turn their microphone on before speaking and off once they have finished to ensure they can be heard clearly and proceedings are accurately captured for broadcast and transcript purposes. I also remind those present to ensure that their mobile phones are either turned off or on silent mode. Members, are there any declarations of interest relevant to the public session with the CCC?

**Mr STEVENS:** Thank you, Chair. I have a conflict of interest with a friend of mine that I will not mention.

**CHAIR:** Okay. The Crime and Corruption Commission's public meeting documents have been circulated. Members are to note that they have been provided with a secretariat briefing, a copy of the CCC's public report for the period from 1 October 2025 to 31 December 2025 and the transcript of the last public meeting with the CCC on 25 November 2025. The motion is that the committee authorise the publication of the Crime and Corruption Commission's public report to the committee for the period 1 October 2025 to 31 December 2025. That is so moved. All those in favour? That is carried.

**CAPPER, Mr Craig, Senior Executive Officer, Corruption, Crime and Corruption Commission**

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

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

**LODER, Ms Sharon, Senior Executive Officer, Crime, Crime and Corruption Commission**

**McMILLAN, Ms Kathryn, Acting Chairperson, Crime and Corruption Commission**

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

**WEBBE, Ms Simone, Ordinary Commissioner, Crime and Corruption Commission**

**CHAIR:** The committee will now commence its public discussion with the Crime and Corruption Commission. Welcome, everyone. I acknowledge that the chairperson, Mr Barbour, is unable to be with us today, but we are joined by the Deputy Chairperson, Ms McMillan, who is acting as chairperson in Mr Barbour's absence. Thank you, Ms McMillan, and thanks to all senior CCC officers and commissioners present to assist us as usual. As per our standard process, I want to provide you with an opportunity to make an opening statement or comments before I turn to members for questions. I invite you to make an opening statement. Thank you.

**Ms McMillan:** Good morning and thank you. Yes, again, the chair offers his apologies about being unable to be here and he wrote, I think, in advance to let you know that he would not be available.

We are pleased to present the Crime and Corruption Commission's report for 1 October to 31 December 2025. The public report sets out in detail our performance and activities for the reporting period, but I would like to highlight some of the work we undertook during this time. Operationally, during the reporting period we continued investigations into major crime as well as conducting investigations referred to us by the Queensland Police Service. The range of criminal activity we investigated included armed robbery, weapons transfer, ammunition, illicit drugs, homicide and child sexual abuse. We also finalised an intelligence operation involving a professional money-laundering syndicate where we identified the syndicate's use of multiple shell companies and financial service

providers, cryptocurrency and their trade-based money-laundering methods. We made progress on a second intelligence operation during the period into a criminal organisation alleged to be involved in the trafficking of commercial quantities of dangerous drugs and money laundering.

Turning to our corruption work, during the reporting period we assessed a total of 1,409 corruption matters. Also during the period we finalised 14 corruption investigations. One of those investigations resulted in four counts of fraud where the defendant was sentenced on a plea of guilty to two years imprisonment, suspended after six months, with an operable period of four years. We also charged four persons with a range of offences including fraud, official corruption and misconduct in relation to public office. These charges will allege that the representatives of a medical device company made secret payments to public officers in return for the use of the company's medical devices in public hospitals. It is also alleged that the public officials failed to declare conflicts of interest concerning these payments and their involvement in the company to Queensland Health. The remaining 12 investigations related to a range of matters, including misappropriation, misuse of authority and misuse of information. Four of those investigations were considered appropriate for referral back to the relevant unit of public administration and the other eight investigations did not substantiate any allegations of corrupt conduct.

During the period, our corruption prevention engagement unit undertook seven engagement activities, including hosting the interjurisdictional Corruption Prevention Practitioner's Forum. The forum was attended by prevention representatives from integrity agencies across Australia where topics were discussed relating to emerging corruption risks and prevention strategies in procurement and recruitment and integrity agency oversight of police perpetrated domestic and family violence. As at 19 December, the CCC has implemented all recommendations made by the commission of inquiry into the commission. A final report on the implementation and delivery of the recommendations was provided to the Attorney-General, this committee and the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner. Thank you, Chair and members. We are happy to answer any questions you may have.

**CHAIR:** Thank you so much and thank you for the good work you do at the CCC. I will start with a couple of questions consistent with the responsibilities of the commission. As you would know, last week the government passed laws with regard to electoral reforms providing for donations from developers. The submission from the CCC to the committee indicated that it was—

... a significant departure from Queensland's robust political donations framework and are out-of-step with reforms introduced to manage risks associated with political influence, and perceptions of it.

Is the CCC in a position to elaborate further on that now that it is law?

**Ms McMillan:** I can give you perhaps some contextual information that might assist. The Crime and Corruption Commission was aware this was an election commitment of the government and the chairperson was advised on 10 December that the bill was to be introduced. The Crime and Corruption Commission was not consulted about the bill prior to the bill being introduced to parliament. At the time of making its submission on the bill, the chairperson was aware that he was not available to appear at the committee public hearing scheduled for 16 January this year. The submission made by the commission offered to elaborate and respond to any queries in writing, if required. In early January the commission was contacted by the committee secretary and invited to attend a committee public meeting on 16 January. Since the chair was not available to attend a hearing on that day, the commission responded to the committee secretary to indicate that the commission did not seek to appear and repeating the offer to address queries in writing.

The commission did not receive any request for elaboration or clarification of its written submission and the public statement made by the commission in relation to media inquiries was that the Crime and Corruption Commission regularly makes public submissions on bills which intersect with our purpose to combat crime and reduce corruption and attends committee hearings when our appearance adds value to the substance of our submission. We recognise the importance of the parliamentary committee process and valued the opportunity to make a submission in relation to the bill. We note there was a high level of interest in the bill, with the committee receiving over 80 submissions. Our submission provided a detailed account of our concerns. However, as mentioned in our submission, we would be happy to elaborate and respond to any particular queries in writing, so that is the point at which the commission is at at this stage.

**CHAIR:** Can I just be clear, because you indicated in your response that the chair was unavailable, and I accept that. That is a relevant position to take.

**Ms McMillan:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** However, today the chair is unavailable but you are able to appear before this committee.

**Ms McMillan:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** Is that the practice that the CCC takes with regard to the chair not being available—that no-one is available to attend those hearings?

**Ms McMillan:** Because I obviously will not have as much historical context, I might have Ms O'Farrell answer that I think.

**Ms O'Farrell:** I would say that, no, generally that is not the position of the commission. The commission will always attempt to have an appropriate person appear before the committee process for matters that are consistent with the CCC's mission and purpose. On that occasion, because of the timing of the committee hearing, unfortunately our senior officers were not available to attend.

**CHAIR:** Okay; thank you.

**Mrs STOKER:** Thank you, everybody, for making time to be here today. I noticed in the materials some information about the Corruption Allegations Data Dashboard work that has been underway. As I understand it, it is published on the CCC's website. That webpage currently contains a note that says—

The CCC is currently reviewing the CADD to ensure it reflects our contemporary intake and assessment function and offers value through promoting open data and increased transparency. The CADD will not be refreshed while this work is underway.

My question is about the future intentions for the CADD. Do you intend to refresh it, decommission it, do something else with it? I would be interested in any information you have about how often it is being used and any feedback you might be getting about it in its current form.

**Ms O'Farrell:** I would be happy to respond to that question. As the committee would be aware, we are not currently satisfied with our timeliness in the assessment of our complaints function. In the past when we have assessed complaints we have distilled all of the allegations that arise as a result of the complaint. That is what is on the dashboard, so in the past the dashboard has contained all of the allegations that have been distilled through the complaint assessment process via sector; via UPA; via, in the case of QPS, region; and via, in the case of local government sector, local government authority areas. Because of the change in our complaint assessment process, we are no longer distilling all allegations so we cannot update the CADD because that would misrepresent, as opposed to the previous reporting information, the number of allegations that are coming through to the commission.

As we have, I think, reported to the committee, we are currently building a new internal dashboard and we have plans to then prepare an external dashboard of information that is useful to the public and UPAs, but I would say that UPAs already get a whole lot of information directly from us but it is not yet made public. It is our intention to replace the CADD with a fit-for-purpose picture of complaints and allegations at their highest level in hopefully 2026-27 or 2027-28.

**Mrs STOKER:** Thank you very much.

**Ms O'Farrell:** It is useful information. I know that, to answer the second part of your question, it was a highly landed on page, so we definitely see the value of people accessing that information. We would also like to be able to supplement that information with outcomes in due course and we are in the process and we have had a proof of concept of collecting outcome information from UPAs so that the public and UPAs have the big picture, not just allegations, which are often unsubstantiated in reality.

**Mrs STOKER:** That is really helpful. Being able to take it from beginning to end would be a really valuable uplift. The last part of the question I asked—and thank you for your indulgence, Chair—was around whether you have had any feedback from any of the stakeholders or members of the public.

**Ms O'Farrell:** Not to my knowledge but the SEO (Corruption) may be able to answer that, but we certainly had a media inquiry. So if the media is representing others, then obviously there is interest and we appreciate the interest in the update of the CADD. It is about priorities and we think at this point in time there is a really important priority for us to ensure that we assess complaints as quickly as possible and get them to the place where they need to go to be investigated or if they are retained by us to ensure that we are starting that investigation as soon as possible. We all have choices to make and currently that is the priority of the commission—to uplift that function.

**Mrs STOKER:** Thank you.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** I wanted to ask a few questions about the government's bill with regard to fighting anti-Semitism and keeping guns out of the hands of terrorists which was introduced last sitting week. The CCC in some of its previous reports has commented on freedom of speech, particularly in the context of making it known that there was an investigation occurring, and there are a number of public reports in which the CCC comments on the need to balance Queenslanders' right to freedom of speech. I was just wondering whether or not the CCC had been consulted on that bill and, noting that submissions have closed this morning, whether or not the CCC has made a submission.

**Ms McMillan:** I might pass that one on to Ms Loder to answer.

**Ms Loder:** My understanding is that the commission was not consulted. We were consulted? I certainly was not. I will let Ms O'Farrell answer that question.

**Ms O'Farrell:** In relation to the most recent bill in relation to the expansion of symbols and hate symbols—

**Ms FENTIMAN:** So let's separate the regulation.

**Ms O'Farrell:** Sorry, my mistake. There is a requirement in the act, as I understand it, for the commission to be consulted. We definitely were consulted in relation to the regulation, if that is the case.

**Ms Loder:** Yes, that is the one I was thinking of. My understanding is we were not consulted before the bill was submitted. My understanding is that we are not making a submission on that particular bill.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** Given that the commission has in previous reports talked about the importance of freedom of speech, do you have any views about the bill that you would be willing to talk about in this public session, given that you are not making a submission to that bill?

**Ms O'Farrell:** In relation to the reports that you refer to, I cannot recall a specific report of the commission that may have focused on freedom of speech. In relation to the bill, the bill also deals with some warrant issues. There are some other amending things. It is not considered by the commission as something that is directly relevant to its purpose and mission, so for that reason we are not making a submission.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** I have one final question on this. You mentioned there is a requirement in the existing regulation around hate symbols for the CCC to be consulted before the Attorney prescribes those symbols. In this new bill there is similar drafting around phrases. There is a requirement that the Attorney consult with the CCC, the Human Rights Commission and the Queensland police before prescribing certain phrases, but the Attorney has already announced that two particular phrases will be included. Did the Attorney consult with the CCC before making an announcement about those particular phrases?

**Ms O'Farrell:** I would have to check our records to provide an accurate response on that particular question, I am afraid.

**CHAIR:** You will take that on notice then.

**Ms O'Farrell:** Absolutely, yes.

**Mr STEVENS:** I note that criminal economies and wealth is a strategic area of focus for CCC crime investigations. In relation to the current CFMEU inquiry by the Queensland commission of inquiry, can Ms McMillan advise the committee if there has been any involvement by the CCC or have they been coopted to assist with evidence before the CFMEU inquiry?

**Ms McMillan:** I will answer your question partially in this way. I have a conflict of interest in relation to that inquiry because I appear for a witness at the moment, so I have no particular attitude or knowledge at the Crime and Corruption Commission because obviously I have declared that conflict. I might ask Ms O'Farrell about that.

**Ms O'Farrell:** I can give a more fulsome answer in the private session, but hypothetically speaking if the commission were to issue a notice to the CCC, we would be complying with such notice.

**Mr STEVENS:** Will that involve powers of the CCC in that particular investigation if required as a result of the disturbing evidence that has been provided at that inquiry?

**CHAIR:** That might be a hypothetical, given we have not reached a conclusion through the commission of inquiry into the particular entity.

**Mrs STOKER:** I find it pretty disturbing so far.

**CHAIR:** Once again you are asking a hypothetical: what will the CCC judge on the outcomes of a commission that we have not reached a conclusion on.

**Mr STEVENS:** With respect, Chair, my question was basically would they be assisting. I think it is a reasonable question to ask.

**Ms McMillan:** I think Ms O'Farrell has said if there is a summons issued, then I cannot imagine the commission would not be complying with that.

**CHAIR:** I would expect you to be involved.

**Ms McMillan:** Yes, I know that will come as no surprise.

**CHAIR:** That is right.

**Ms PUGH:** The commission of inquiry relating to the CCC has recommended a greater civilianisation of the corruption division. Can you advise the committee of the status of the implementation, which will civilianise investigations more and free up capacity for police so they can do that much needed work on the front line?

**Ms McMillan:** I will pass that on to Mr Capper in relation to the corruption functions.

**Mr Capper:** Following the recommendation the commission reviewed its make-up of police versus civilians. It was determined that the police in the corruption space would be 40 per cent to 60 per cent civilian. That was expected to be reached at the end of this financial year. We have already completed that, so we have already reduced to 40 per cent about 12 months ahead of time.

**Mr McDONALD:** I am keen to understand why the 45-day standard was implemented. Can you expand on that for us in this public session? I note that 74 per cent of those complaints have been met, which is pretty sound.

**Ms McMillan:** I will also pass that on to Mr Capper. He should be able to give you precise information on that.

**Mr Capper:** In relation to the 45-day matter, it was benchmarked against other integrity agencies and the standards that were applied in relation to the assessment of matters. Obviously, people want to obtain an answer to their complaint as quickly as possible, as we would like to do. The triage is to try to get them assessed in the first instance and processed, and certainly every effort is made to do that. The 45 days is certainly slightly longer than what we would like. Obviously, the quicker we can get it done the better, but it has to take into account that we have to get information from other areas, particularly public sector agencies, to assess the complaint and see if there is merit for it to progress further. It gives us that latitude to do that but, as I say, benchmarks against other integrity agencies.

**CHAIR:** It is common knowledge now that Brett Pointing has been appointed as the interim commissioner of the Queensland Police Service. It is an excellent appointment, in my opinion. Was the CCC consulted prior to this appointment being made?

**Ms O'Farrell:** The chairperson was advised of the appointment being made under section 4.11 of the Police Service Administration Act, which is a special power. For an acting commissioner the minister can make that decision. That is as opposed to a longer term appointment, where under the act the chairperson has to agree to the recommendation on appointment. That did not occur, but it is not required to occur either.

**CHAIR:** When was that notice provided to the CCC?

**Ms O'Farrell:** If I recall correctly, it was around 9 or 10 February. It could have been a bit earlier, but in the last week and a half or so.

**Mr HUNT:** Can I just draw your attention to page 20 of your report, 'Service delivery standards, crime fighting and anti-corruption' and table 1, 'service delivery standards'. Item 3 there under 'effectiveness measures' is 'percentage of corruption investigations resulting in significant outcomes greater than or equal to 75 per cent'. For the benefit of the committee, can somebody let us know what is meant by 'significant outcomes', please.

**Mr Capper:** A significant outcome is where a matter is referred for criminal prosecution, where a matter is referred for the purposes of discipline, where procedural recommendations are made to an agency to reform its practices primarily, or where a matter has been referred to the DPP for advice in relation to a prosecution matter. Rather than the matter reaching no conclusion and to say, for example, there is nothing to see here, it is where there has been a referral of a matter to another external agency to action one of those matters.

**Mr HUNT:** Just to be clear, is that greater than or equal to 75 per cent a target, or is that the actual figure of your corruption investigation?

**Mr Capper:** No, that is the target. That is on the basis that obviously a particular outcome of a commission of inquiry would be cause for us to take a particular lens and seriously look at prevention focus and to look for opportunities. Obviously, it fits within our mandate to make recommendations to strengthen the public sector to prevent corruption from occurring in the first place. We certainly look for every opportunity in a matter. Even if something is not likely found to be proven to be corrupt conduct, for example, there is always something that we can have a look at in most cases to say there are some improvements that can be made, even if it does not result in prosecution or potential discipline against somebody.

**Mr HUNT:** One more clarification if I might, Chair. I imagine that you receive a lot of complaints about corrupt behaviour. When you talk about investigations, you are talking about the ones that have been vetted to warrant investigation, not just 75 per cent of every complaint.

**Mr Capper:** That is correct.

**CHAIR:** Ms O'Farrell, following on from my line of questioning with respect to the appointment of Brett Pointing, who advised the CCC of that appointment?

**Ms O'Farrell:** This would have to be confirmed by the chairperson, but my understanding is that it was the Public Service Commissioner who may have advised him.

**CHAIR:** We will take that on notice.

**Ms O'Farrell:** Sure.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** There have been a series of news reports about the Queensland Police Service's plan to disband their domestic and family violence and vulnerable persons operational support unit following a review. Was the CCC involved in any way in that review and do you have any comments or reflections on that decision, particularly in light of the findings of the Richards commission of inquiry.

**Ms McMillan:** I might let Mr Capper answer that one as well, thanks.

**Mr Capper:** To my knowledge we did not receive any communications or consultation around the disbanding of the group. In terms of the issue around domestic violence, we also have recently undertaken—as you would be aware—a thematic review in relation to police perpetrated domestic violence and identified concerns, and we have liaised with the QPS in relation to that. We are continuing to liaise with QPS to understand what the implications of this disbanding will mean in relation to the reforms they had identified that they were already putting in place and how we were going to ensure they would be carried through. Our preliminary officer level discussions are that it will not be a central team. They will be pushed down through officer level and regional levels. Whether or not that impacts its effectiveness is something we are still evaluating.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** In light of that, I also understand the Queensland Police Service has formally closed their internal commission of inquiry into domestic and family violence working group. That working group was also looking at ways to implement the police integrity unit, which was a key recommendation of the Richards inquiry. Is the CCC still working with the Queensland Police Service on implementing a police integrity unit, and have you been consulted recently about ensuring that is established?

**Mr Capper:** We have been contacted recently to continue with the government's working group in relation to the police integrity unit and what that will look like. In terms of working with the police, we continue to engage with them, as I have indicated, about what the implications of the changes in their structure and systems will be. As to the police integrity unit itself, what it will look like, what its make-up will be, what matters will be referred to it, they are matters that will be decided by the working group in due course. I understand they were due to meet late in January. That was the indication, but that has not occurred as yet.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** When was the last time that you were involved in a working group around this key recommendation?

**Mr Capper:** I could not answer that. I will have to take that on notice.

**Mr McDONALD:** I could not let the opportunity go by without asking a question around the intersection of illicit tobacco and the OMCGs or other criminal gangs. I notice the snapshot that you provided in the report and thank you very much for that, but are there any other things you can tell us in the public forum with regard to the work there?

**Ms McMillan:** I will let Ms Loder answer that one.

**Ms Loder:** There are some matters mentioned in our private report that I can expand on in the private session, but, as a general answer, we are continuing to see the illicit proceeds of tobacco in our intelligence operations that are focused on money laundering, and we are continuing to assist the QPS where they refer matters to us for hearing assistance, and there is a matter that is outlined in the private report regarding that. We are also continuing to work with the national Illicit Tobacco and E-cigarette Commissioner and the coordination forum that the ITEC Commissioner convenes.

Also, earlier in 2025, the federal government allocated to the AFP some funding—\$33.5 million over two years—to share with participating agencies, state and territory law enforcement partners, to combat illicit tobacco trade. As a result of a submission that the commission has made in relation to that funding, on 13 February we finalised an arrangement with the AFP under that initiative, and that will mean that the CCC has been allocated around \$100,000 to assist with legal fees in relation to our proceeds litigation that concerns illicit tobacco matters, and approximately \$400,000 which is in kind—and I say that because the proposal is that up to two AFP members will come into the CCC and work in the CCC's Proceeds of Crime Unit, and the expression of interest for that process is currently underway.

**Mr STEVENS:** Ms McMillan, there has been a long-term public inquiry under a former government into the police leasing of a building at Stones Corner. Can you update for the public interest, because it is a public matter already, the status of that long-term inquiry?

**Ms McMillan:** I can, but I will say this: that is really for the closed session. We can provide details about that in the closed session.

**Mr STEVENS:** Thank you very much.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** Noting the CCC remit regarding terrorism and the tragic events at Wieambilla that was labelled an act of terrorism by the Queensland Police—Service we have now had the coroner hand down recommendations into that tragic matter—I was wondering whether or not the CCC had a view on mandatory mental health checks for weapons licence owners in the context of keeping Queenslanders safe from gun related incidents, which was one of the recommendations handed down by the coroner.

**Ms McMillan:** I was just checking. It is a matter that obviously will be considered by the Crime and Corruption Commission, along with other findings that the coroner made, and no doubt, in view of more recent events in terms of what happened in December, those are very timely considerations.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** Given that and given that there are significant reforms, or some reforms in the government's bill that I mentioned before, I am surprised that the CCC has decided not to put in a submission particularly around the provisions around weapons. I think Ms O'Farrell said there was no submission from the CCC because the CCC did not take the view that it really was within their primary remit, but obviously there are a lot of provisions in that draft bill that relate to weapons and trying to keep Queenslanders safe. I was wondering whether or not there may be some further commentary from the CCC about the significant reforms or further reforms that might be needed to keep Queenslanders safe when it comes to weapons?

**Ms McMillan:** I will defer that to Ms Loder because in her area there are, no doubt, consistent issues that arise about weapons. I will ask her to answer that.

**Ms Loder:** I could probably elaborate a little bit more in the private session, given that the bill has just been introduced. The thing to note is that the increases in penalties, for example, are significant for the commission because it means that some of the offences that we may not have been able to assist the QPS with now will fall within our jurisdiction because we have a minimum penalty. But in terms of the policy around strengthening the processes around who can hold a weapons licence and the details of that, there was nothing that the commission could add to those aspects of the bill in terms of if they strengthen the process of acquiring firearms et cetera, then that seemed to be a positive thing.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** On that, does the CCC have a view about nationally consistent gun laws, particularly in respect of a gun buyback, given the work that you do around organised crime?

**Ms Loder:** I think as a general principle—and we have said this in relation to other aspects of legislation—we live in a borderless environment. We have to move from this concept of understanding our role as managing our borders and what occurs within those borders physically to really Brisbane

understanding how we can manage and cooperate to manage impact within those borders because much of the crime occurs either in cyberspace or is occurring physically all over the place with networks of networks that are integrated. So, anything that provides a coherent, consistent, national inter-operative policy is actually going to be a positive step in allowing law enforcement to cooperate.

**Mr HUNT:** In relation to digitising the workplace, what updates can you provide the committee into the new case management systems for the crime and corruption divisions and some of the challenges you have had in navigating in working to replace the existing system?

**Ms O'Farrell:** We have a digital transformation road map in the commission. We have made some rather large investments already this financial year in establishing a new investigation case management system. That system is for our crime and corruption division investigators, and is currently in its discovery phase which is the detailed project planning phase for implementation. Implementation is expected by the end of this calendar year, hopefully—that is the ambition. We have also just finished the procurement of major infrastructure upgrades in relation to an offsite data centre which is the removal and remediation of significant risk of the commission in relation to on-premises data centres. They come as a real expensive purchase, and that is a real issue that we see right across the sector, not just with the commission in terms of the increasing price of memory.

With the proliferation of AI and the AI market consuming essentially in pre-condition contracts about 50 per cent of that market, we are seeing high volatility in the pricing of memory. Where prices were being held for 60 days, they are now only being held for seven or 14 days, so it really presents a risk right across the sector. We were very fortunate that we were in a position to make our expenditure late last year. Had we delayed that, it would have cost us a million dollars more. For the commission, that is a significant amount of money. We only have a budget of \$80 million-odd per year, so we have to make sure that we spend our money wisely and that it is very targeted spending.

We are also, on our road map, looking to replace other operational systems, including our complaints intake and assessment system. It is 25 years old now and presents a risk. We have started that process and we will continue it in the 2026-27 financial year and beyond. That project will take about two to three years to do it well and to ensure we are getting the right product and we are implementing it successfully.

We are also looking to replace our covert human source system. That is less problematic. We actually have the system in place; we just have to manage our implementation timeline on that. We replaced our core charge records database this year. That is approaching finalisation now and will be done by the end of the financial year. We are also implementing a new human resource information system which will move our payroll provider as well as our talent management and attraction modules from that system. So, there is quite a bit of work. There is a large commitment over the forward estimates for those projects, and with government support, we have the funding for that.

**Mr HUNT:** That is great. Thank you for the comprehensive update. Congratulations on the savings you made in foreseeing that risk. Further to the ongoing risk in terms of data pricing, is that locked in for you for a period of time now?

**Ms O'Farrell:** Yes, that infrastructure is capital work, so we will depreciate that over its life span and we will continue to monitor obviously the market pricing on memory and see where that falls in the next four to five years, which is probably the life span of the equipment.

**Ms PUGH:** The opposition has recently identified some issues with crime data published by the QPS which saw a number of offences seemingly removed from the data. Thankfully that data has now been updated and re-included. Stakeholders have told the opposition that some of the data being published is done so in a way that does not currently allow for comparison. Will the CCC support an independent body to publish data such as corruption allegations, crime data et cetera to ensure Queenslanders can compare like for like?

**Mrs STOKER:** Point of order, Chair. I am concerned that is asking for a hypothetical, given that there is not a specific proposal before anyone.

**CHAIR:** Would you like to respond to that?

**Ms PUGH:** I am asking if they would support the establishment of an independent body. Can you explain how that is a hypothetical? That is not a hypothetical. That is asking—

**Mrs STOKER:** The fact that independent bodies exist and that independence can be a structure is not hypothetical, but I think you would need to know a lot more about precisely what it does, its remit, its size, its funding and all the rest for it to go beyond being something that is hypothetical.

**CHAIR:** I understand it is a question in regard to your remit. If you can keep that general in your response, that would be appreciated.

**Ms McMillan:** I do not think from that question—I apologise—that there is enough context really that we could comment on that at this stage. I am not clear about the premise in the sense of what data is being talked about, so I do not think we could usefully add anything at this stage.

**Mr McDONALD:** I thought the CCC was separate.

**Mr STEVENS:** Again, to Ms McMillan, for public edification, for my edification and hopefully for the commissioner's edification, could you explain or elaborate on the difference from the CCC's point of view of a crime investigation as to a fact-finding inquiry?

**Ms McMillan:** I think that probably falls within Ms Loder's remit, luckily for her.

**Ms Loder:** I want to clarify that you are talking about the commission's crime functions as opposed to the corruption functions?

**Mr STEVENS:** Yes. In terms of crime investigations, if I can quote from your document, you basically say that none have been done in the 2025-26 period, but I am sure there is ongoing work for the CCC on those matters. I am hoping that you can explain the difference between those two monikers, if you like.

**Ms Loder:** The CCC has within its investigations several different types of investigations. The confiscation investigations are performed to support the functions of its confiscation functions under the Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act. Within our major crime area, we have what we call CCC crime investigations. They are CCC led. We are responsible for ensuring arrest and charges et cetera. They are usually done by police officers who are seconded to the commission. We may or may not do those jointly with the QPS or an external agency, but we are the lead agency on those. There are no current matters in that category that we are pursuing at the moment. We also undertake specific intelligence operations related to criminal organisation and criminal organisation participants. That at the moment is the major focus of our work and it will continue to be in the future. I will come back to that.

We also have another type of investigation which we call referred major crime investigations. Those are matters that are referred to us by the Queensland Police Service for specific assistance by way of investigative hearings. We currently probably do about 45 per cent of the matters that are referred to us. We generally get referred at least 25 or so matters—25 upwards a year. About 45 per cent of those relate to investigating cold or hot homicides. Probably the balance of those is split between organised crime investigations that we assist them with and child abuse and child deaths.

Getting back to the specific intelligence operations, there are three things that we focus on. Our approach is that we do not duplicate what the QPS do. We are not Fortitude Valley CIB No. 2. We focus on those specific functions that are given to the commission that the QPS do not have and that can add value to their primary function, which is enforcing the criminal law in Queensland. Intelligence operations is one area. The QPS are unable to take intelligence operations where there is a whole range of powers that are available to assist them. That is one of the areas that we currently focus on and we will continue to focus on that. Occasionally we will do some organised crime matters if they are referred to us from the QPS. They are very important but there maybe, for example, a resourcing or a specific capability that that particular investigation involves. Then we will look at that.

**Mr STEVENS:** Thank you for that fulsome explanation. Does that mean that it is good news that there is no CCC crime investigations for that period?

**Ms Loder:** I do not know that it is a good news or bad news or news. What it means is that we are focusing on areas where we can make a difference. Like I said, we are not here to simply supplement the resources of the QPS. We are here to provide specific assistance where that assistance is going to be significant in solving or preventing serious and organised crime.

**Ms PUGH:** Would the commission like to take the opportunity to update the committee on the status of investigation into the appointment of the CHO by the LNP government?

**Ms McMillan:** That is probably best handled in the closed session.

**Mrs STOKER:** I want to ask about the efforts that have been put into improving the CCC's analytics capability. I know there has been a lot of emphasis in that space in recent times. How are you going with those efforts to centralise data sources and make that operate more effectively? Can you tell us anything about what that is doing for the staff experience and for their productivity and output?

**Ms O'Farrell:** A lot of the work of the team so far has been internal. They have been extremely productive and useful in developing internal dashboards that absolutely have been able to assist management and staff, particularly in the intake and assessment function to understand timeliness and the time taken for different types of assessment complaints. We can monitor how long it takes us to triage complaints, how long it takes us to allocate those complaints, how long it takes us to assess a simple matter, how long it takes us to assess a strategic or systemic matter, how long it takes us to do a complaints service review, how long it takes us to send a piece of correspondence from an assessment decision to the actual complainant.

That is why over time I think you will start to see some different performance measures being promoted by the commission in relation to the different types of complaints. Not everything is the same and not everything should be treated the same way. The team has been instrumental in developing all of that business intelligence that has enabled us to focus on how we can improve that function.

They have also built us dashboards around our budget and financial expenditure. They have also built us dashboards in relation to the management of our human resources and our base establishment. They have also completed a proof of concept with the Department of Education in relation to the efficient exchange of investigation outcomes—where we devolve a complaint to the Department of Education. We thank the department for their contribution and participation in this proof of concept as well. They are one of our largest complaint UPAs, along with Health and obviously QPS.

We have been able to build a system and proof of concept for the efficient exchange of outcomes which has been beneficial for both the Department of Education and us. Now we are looking in the next little while at how we scale that across the sector so that you can then feed into the new CADD and get that complete picture of what happened to a complaint and what was the outcome. That is a quick snapshot of their time.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** I had a question about Queensland's electoral redistribution. Given Queensland's history with electoral boundaries—and it was something that came up extensively in the Fitzgerald inquiry—the opposition has heard from multiple sources that the government has been provided informally a draft copy or information about the electoral boundaries from the independent Queensland Redistribution Commission.

**Mrs STOKER:** Point of order: I ask for authentication of the information that forms the basis of the question.

**CHAIR:** Can you provide that, member for Waterford?

**Ms FENTIMAN:** Yes. Those sources have told members of the opposition.

**Mrs STOKER:** Sorry, that is not authentication; that is just repeating the ambit claim.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** I am sorry. I am absolutely entitled to ask a question from information from whistleblowers to the opposition.

**Mrs STOKER:** It is hardly authentication.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** That has been the practice in this place for some time. My question to the commission—

**Mrs STOKER:** Chair, I ask that you deal with the point of order rather than allowing the member for Waterford to—

**CHAIR:** I am in the process of doing that. I am waiting to hear the complete question. Have you concluded, member for Waterford?

**Ms FENTIMAN:** My question is: noting the CCC's corruption function and, as I said, Queensland's extensive history around electoral boundaries, is it appropriate that the government is provided information before information is made public by the independent Queensland Redistribution Commission?

**Mrs STOKER:** Point of order: I reiterate the lack of authentication is a problem. I would also suggest that, in the absence of authentication, it is a hypothetical.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** To the point of order, Chair, whistleblowers talking to the opposition is sufficient for us to raise matters before the Speaker in the parliament.

**Mr HUNT:** You are making stuff up.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** Secondly, it is not a hypothetical. Is it appropriate for the government to receive information about electoral boundaries before it is made public?

**CHAIR:** Just hold on and I will get some advice.

**Government members** interjected.

**CHAIR:** Let's have some order please. Given the conjecture between the question and the points of orders, in your capacity are you in a position to answer any part of the question that has been put to you?

**Ms McMillan:** No.

**CHAIR:** It being close enough to 11.30 am, I declare the public session closed. You do have some questions on notice. If you can provide responses to those by Friday, 27 February 2026, that would be great.

**Ms O'Farrell:** Just to confirm, I have three.

**CHAIR:** That is correct. We will get the secretariat to confirm in writing what they are. That draws the public meeting to a close.

**The committee adjourned at 11.27 am.**