



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

**Members present:**

Mr JM Krause MP—Chair  
Mr LP Power MP  
Ms JM Bush MP  
Mr MJ Crandon MP  
Ms JC Pugh MP  
Dr MA Robinson MP  
Mr TJ Smith MP

**Staff present:**

Ms E Hastie—Committee Secretary  
Ms H Radunz—Assistant Committee Secretary  
Mr F Poropat—Senior Committee Support Officer

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

### **TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Friday, 2 February 2024**

**Brisbane**

## FRIDAY, 2 FEBRUARY 2024

---

**The committee met at 11.02 am.**

**CHAIR:** The committee will now commence its public meeting with the Crime and Corruption Commission. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Members, are there any declarations of interest relevant to this public session? No. Members have been provided with the Crime and Corruption Commission's public report to the committee for the period 1 October 2023 to 30 November 2023. The proposed resolution that Michael Crandon will move is—

That the committee authorises the publication of the CCC's public report to the committee for that period.

**Mr CRANDON:** I so move.

**CHAIR:** All those in favour? All those against? The motion is carried. The committee will now commence its public discussion with the CCC.

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

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

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

**LODER, Ms Sharon, Senior Executive Officer (Crime), 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:** I welcome everyone here today. Thank you for joining us. I note that we have one or two apologies from CCC officers and members. I understand and that is okay. Mr Barbour, would you like to make an opening statement to the committee in this public session?

**Mr Barbour:** Although it is a little late, being 2 February, I wish a very happy new year to you all. We are pleased to present the Crime and Corruption Commission's report for the period 1 October to 30 November 2023. The public report sets out in detail our performance and activities for the reporting period. I would like to highlight some of the work we undertook during this time.

We progressed a major crime investigation involving the suspected professional facilitation of money laundering and trafficking of dangerous drugs including heroin and methylamphetamine. We used our coercive hearing powers to advance three investigations referred by the QPS: two into trafficking of dangerous drugs and one into the theft and trafficking of firearms. During the reporting period we progressed an intelligence operation into suspected money-laundering activities as well as the distribution and sale of illicit tobacco and vape products to retail stores throughout Queensland and we made 27 intelligence disclosures to law enforcement agencies.

Two significant pieces of strategic crime related research are currently underway. The first is our review of the Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002. This is being done to ensure Queensland's criminal asset confiscation scheme remains responsive to what is a rapidly changing criminal environment. We called for public submissions and also invited 19 specialist agencies including law enforcement, stakeholder agencies and academics to make submissions. Submissions closed on 5 January. To date, we have received five formal submissions but have received advice that a number of others will be making late submissions.

The second strategic research project that commenced will see us review provisions in the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 that provide police with powers to search places for a high-risk missing person. The definition of a high-risk missing person includes, for example, a child

## Meeting with the Crime and Corruption Commission

under 13 years of age or someone who may suffer serious harm if not found quickly. We have begun our review and I have written to the Minister for Police and Corrective Services and also the minister in relation to the review. We expect to table a report in parliament later this year.

In relation to our corruption work, between 1 October and 30 November we received 745 complaints, notifications and matters identified as falling within jurisdiction. Of these, 79 matters have been triaged as meeting the criteria of serious, systemic and strategic; 12 new matters were referred to public sector agencies subject to CCC monitoring; and 12 were finalised. As at 30 November there were 49 matters currently being monitored by the CCC.

During the reporting period the CCC also finalised two corruption investigations. One investigation resulted in a brief of evidence relating to multiple computer hacking offences being referred to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions for advice as to the suitability of a criminal prosecution. Following receipt of that advice, charges have now been laid. One investigation resulted in allegations being referred to the QPS for consideration of disciplinary action. As at 30 November the CCC was conducting 46 corruption investigations.

During the reporting period, collaboration and capability development continued to be a priority. We continue to work with law enforcement partners on cryptocurrency investigation capability, with a major strategic project due to be completed in June this year. With the local government elections coming up on 16 March, we have begun working with relevant stakeholders, particularly the Electoral Commission of Queensland, on issues of integrity and corruption prevention during the campaign period. An updated dataset relating to corruption allegations across the public sector was published on 12 December through our Corruption Allegations Data Dashboard, or CADD. The dashboard enables public sector agencies to interrogate and identify areas of vulnerability and to formulate appropriate prevention responses. We intend to gather feedback on the use of the dashboard through our various interactions with agencies.

For International Anti-Corruption Day on 9 December we ran a campaign focused on educating public sector employees about corruption risks. The four most persistent of these are: failure of duty, misuse of authority, misuse of confidential information and misappropriation or unauthorised use of resources. Given the time of year, our campaign also reinforced the actual and perceived risks associated with someone in their role being offered or accepting gifts or benefits.

In relation to the recommendations from the commission of inquiry into the CCC, as at 9 December 2023 we had implemented 11 recommendations in full and made significant progress on 16 recommendations. The remaining five either require legislative amendments or relate to future reporting requirements that are not the responsibility of the CCC. We have now published five public reports detailing our progress with implementing the recommendations. The most recent one was published on our website in early December.

Finally, I want to advise the committee that during the reporting period the CCC has continued to consult in relation to proposed amendments to the Crime and Corruption Act. The proposed amendments largely relate to chapters 3 and 4 of the act to consolidate the CCC's statutory provisions in relation to crime and corruption operations. As the committee would be aware, the review had been recommended by the committee in its last two five-yearly review reports.

I also note that, as a result of the High Court's decision on the Carne matter, other proposed amendments to the reporting provisions in the Crime and Corruption Act are being considered by the government. At this stage, however, we have not been provided with any proposed amendments for consideration. I hope to be able to report on the progress of those amendments at our next meeting.

Those are my opening remarks. I thank the committee very much. We are happy to answer any questions you might have.

**CHAIR:** In your opening statement you mentioned the International Anti-Corruption Day and various corruption risks and you listed some of them. Part of the Coaldrake review that was published some time ago now dealt with public sector appointments. I will read part of that to you and ask for some comments. Coaldrake said—

Confidence in recruitment and selection processes is important in fostering trust both outside of and within the public sector and counters the risk of politicisation.

I want to ask for your view about the importance of recommendations made by Coaldrake along those lines for public sector appointments and how important you think they are, especially when it comes to dealing with corruption risks in the Public Service.

**Mr Barbour:** Firstly, I think the recommendations on that particular issue and the thoughts of Coaldrake really mirror and echo what the Crime and Corruption Commission has said repeatedly in reports of its own when it has looked at particular issues around recruitment in the public sector, particularly for senior positions. I think it is certainly sound that wherever possible there is an open and transparent process, and that is something that we would support.

**CHAIR:** I wish to be a little more specific and to seek your comments as well. In recent days there have been media reports about the Premier's former chief of staff being appointed to a new role in the public sector without that role having been advertised publicly. I would like to seek your view about that role, particularly given the political nature of the individual involved and the role they previously occupied and how that might relate to corruption risks in the public sector.

**Mr POWER:** I raise a point of order. Are you seeking Mr Barbour's opinion?

**CHAIR:** I am asking for his views about corruption risks as the chair of the CCC, thank you, member for Logan.

**Mr Barbour:** Firstly, I do not mean to be rude, but I just want to correct you. You mentioned that the appointment related to the former chief of staff, but I think in fact it related to the former head of the department.

**CHAIR:** No, I am talking about Danielle Cohen, the former chief of staff when the Premier was deputy premier.

**Mr Barbour:** There have been a number of matters in the press recently.

**CHAIR:** Indeed there have. I understand you could get confused because there have been a number of matters.

**Mr POWER:** Order!

**CHAIR:** Member for Logan, I am chairing this committee and I would ask you to refrain from asking me to be in order. If you have a point of order to make, please make it. Otherwise, please let Mr Barbour answer the question uninterrupted.

**Mr POWER:** I raise a point of order. The chair should maintain good order within the committee in exchanges.

**CHAIR:** Member for Logan, please do not reflect on the chair. You are warned. Mr Barbour, I have asked a question. Could you give me your views about that appointment and how it relates to corruption risks in Coaldrake's recommendation?

**Mr Barbour:** I think my views are as I stated before. They apply to significant public appointments. I think it is highly desirable that all appointments are made in a transparent and open way. I also recognise that there are certain circumstances where that cannot necessarily be undertaken and there may well be good reason in certain circumstances.

I do not propose to comment on any specific appointments or any specific individuals, for obvious reasons. I have no idea whether or not any matters associated with such appointments might find their way to the commission and we might be in a position where we need to review something that comes to us, so it would be inappropriate for me to comment on any specific matters. As a general principle, I simply echo what I said before and I think that is consistent with what Mr Coaldrake raised.

**CHAIR:** Is there zero corruption risk with politicisation of the public sector?

**Mr Barbour:** There is always a perception of a corruption risk if there are appointments made that are not open and transparent to particular positions. I think that is what Professor Coaldrake was alluding to, and it is certainly what we have indicated in previous reports. Undoubtedly, perception is an important issue and it is something that should be guarded against.

**CHAIR:** It has also been in the public domain, as I understand, that a person appointed to that new associate director-general role that was not advertised has put out an expression of interest for people to join a team headed by that person within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I understand the comments that you have just made, but in terms of a process that has been undertaken where you have a former political staffer in a high role in the DPC putting out an expression of interest process for three days for people to join a team within that department, specifically does that process raise concerns for you about politicisation and how that power in that team may be used?

**Mr Barbour:** I am not going to comment on any specific issues, and I certainly am not familiar with exactly what process was adopted, so I would not be commenting on that.

**Mr CRANDON:** Reflecting on what you were saying a moment ago about not wanting to comment on any specific appointments—I am looking at this opinion piece here from the *Courier-Mail*: ‘That nobody in the Premier’s orbit thought the rehiring of the state’s former public service boss just weeks after she was paid \$400,000 to resign’—the question that comes to my mind in relation to this is that what we are looking at here is the previous boss, if you like—the person who was ruling the roost in government in relation to matters—is now going to be doing a review of what she was ruling the roost about. Is there not some form of conflict there that would exclude someone who is coming from that role from then going and having a look at doing a review of that situation?

**Mr Barbour:** I can only repeat what I said before. I am not going to comment on specific issues. I do not know the particular facts behind that matter. I do not rely on simply what is reported in the media to form a view about matters. I think it would be inappropriate for me to speculate, so I will not be making any comment on that.

**Mr CRANDON:** Thank you for that. Let’s put Rachel Hunter to one side for a minute. What we are talking about here—if I may use a recent example, the previous chair of the CCC leaving the post and then coming back into the CCC to do a review of the CCC. Would you think an example like that would pass the pub test?

**Ms BUSH:** Chair, I am sorry, but that is a hypothetical.

**CHAIR:** Yes. Member for Coomera, that is a fair point of order. That may be hypothetical. Is there another way you can ask it without making it hypothetical?

**Mr CRANDON:** Leaving anybody aside, if we are talking about someone who has been in a manager role within a department or within government then being asked to do a review of that role—regardless of the background, particularly if there have been issues in relation to the matters they are going to be doing a review of—does that sound like an appropriate way to go, from a corruption perspective? Are there opportunities to push things to one side, hide things et cetera?

**Mr Barbour:** Once again, all I can say is that I will not comment on any specific examples. In the most general of senses, there are multiple factors that need to be weighed up in relation to bringing anybody on board for a role which requires a review to be done for the government. Whether you look at the particular instances you are referring to, or any others, there are a multitude of things that ought be considered, and appropriately so. I am not sure that you can automatically rule somebody out simply because of their previous position, unless there is a statutory reason or some sort of legal reason they cannot do it. It may well be that someone’s previous experience is extremely helpful, appropriate and relevant to the task they are given. In these particular circumstances it is inappropriate for me to comment, and I cannot comment more than that.

**Mr CRANDON:** Does it pass the pub test?

**Mr Barbour:** I am interested in the CCC test, not the pub test.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, member for Coomera. We will go to government members’ questions.

**Ms PUGH:** My question is going back to corruption. You mentioned in your opening statement about the corruption legislation amendments that you were seeking at the last public meeting that we had, and you mentioned at the time, I believe, that you had met with the Attorney-General. I am seeking an update as to whether you have had any subsequent meetings or meetings that were scheduled to discuss those legislation amendments coming up in the coming weeks, or if you have had any since our last meeting late last year?

**Mr Barbour:** No, I have not have any further meetings with the Attorney about those matters. I do have a meeting with the Attorney next week, and I imagine during the course of that meeting this will be an issue that will be discussed.

**Ms BUSH:** In terms of the strategic research work you are doing, would you like to give any updates that you can and what might be preliminary findings or themes? I think one involved the Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act and the police powers act.

**Mr Barbour:** I will hand over to Ms Loder to answer specifically. We have done quite a bit of work and obviously started to amass quite a bit of information, but she can provide you with an update on exactly where we are at.

**Ms Loder:** We are still writing our reports, so I cannot give you any specific findings. We released a discussion paper on 24 November, and there are three things the paper looks at. One is about revising how the Queensland asset confiscation scheme operates; another is looking at the mechanisms available to achieve its objectives and whether they are fit for purpose and whether there are other mechanisms that we can engage in the scheme; and the third is amending some of the

provisions, or looking at amendments to provisions, that are barriers to success—and some of those have been considered by the committee previously, such as the current money laundering offence. Some of the other gaps in that area are around how that legislation—and also the investigative legislation such as the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act and the CCC's legislation—captures, for example, what is required for the investigation and seizure of digital assets which is a new area on which we have no specific legislation at all.

Some of the considerations and the possible solutions that the review is looking at are within our own agency capacity to do do not require legislative change, but they require reassessing the ways of working together. Of course, other aspects of it would require some legislative change.

**Ms BUSH:** I think the chair made a comment that, particularly with the Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act, that it is a rapidly changing environment. Is that to do with the nature of laundering? What is the dynamic nature of that space?

**Ms Loder:** I think there are probably a couple of areas. The crime environment has changed, particularly around there are still a lot of profits being derived from illicit drug trafficking and firearm trafficking and those kinds of things. Obviously there are a lot more profits and benefits being engaged from what we call more victim crimes—around cybercrimes and scams and things like that—where incredible profits are being made. Of course, the illicit tobacco market is extremely profitable. So there is a shift there. Our legislation is not necessarily geared to enable us to pivot to those kinds of crimes.

**Ms BUSH:** Ms Loder, I have become quite interested/obsessed with artificial intelligence and to see the impact that is starting to have. Are there any comments you can make on what you are seeing? Chair, do you see any impacts of AI in what you are doing in terms of the corruption risks?

**Mr Barbour:** It is something that is certainly on our radar. I agree with you: it certainly will potentially change the way we do business and it is important to be responsive. We are certainly looking at various things in terms of how we might be able to not only do appropriate research to see where it is being used but also look at how to deal with it in the particular context of our work. A classic example is identity theft and identity fraud and being able to be certain that who we are dealing with, who we are speaking to and who is allegedly committing offences is actually the real person. Even in that very fundamental space there is an issue. It is across our work. It is not only in relation to corruption but also in relation to crime. I think it is the nature of our business that we have to try to be as proactive as we possibly can. That is why we have done so much work in the crypto space, for example, to be very proactive as well.

**Ms BUSH:** I would be interested in getting further updates in future hearings on that and how that is going.

**Ms Loder:** Another key issue is that when you are in the business of fact-finding—and AI creates an incredible capacity to generate alternative facts—I think there are significant challenges to the way the criminal justice system deals with evidence and its reliability, so there is some work to do in looking at the impacts there.

**Ms BUSH:** Do you have any early suggestions or ideas of where you see legislators going in that space?

**Ms Loder:** I think a lot of work needs to be done so that that would be evidence-based and informed.

**Mr POWER:** Is that when prosecuting authorities are trading digital security over evidence gathered? If that was to be challenged by—

**Ms Loder:** One thing is around the ability to create evidence, but it is also the ability to create doubt about what would be truthful evidence, because everybody questions everything these days.

**Ms BUSH:** Yes, it is a big issue.

**Mr SMITH:** My question relates to crypto. I know that there is a project underway—and I might ask for the CCC to speak to that in a moment, but, perhaps in more a global context if it is easier to answer, what are the trends we are seeing around cryptocurrency and corruption and criminal activity, and how is it possibly changing the face of what organised crime looks like on a demographic level?

**Mr Barbour:** This is very much front and centre of the work we are doing. I think Ms Loder can provide some detail for you.

**Ms Loder:** I cannot rattle off any specific statistics for you right here around the extent to which cryptocurrency transactions are involved in serious and organised crime, but they are becoming a more significant feature in our investigations. Obviously in relation to how benefit is transferred from the commission of offences but also for professional money laundering, it provides a significant avenue to conceal how benefit is transferred, and that obviously has very much global reach.

**Mr SMITH:** As I said, I would like to see what the CCC's assessment is of trends and the way that crime and corruption are changing across the world more broadly. When we think about cryptocurrency, we are thinking about people who are very computer literate, very savvy. Is it changing the nature of what we in the general public normally think organised crime looks like in terms of illegal motorcycle gangs and mafia style organisations? Are we now getting much more sophisticated criminals who effectively do not look like what organised crime used to look like or are those old methods reaching out and employing, in a sense, those more savvy people who can trade in cryptocurrency and corruption?

**Ms Loder:** Certainly from our own experience, it is not so much changing the crime in terms of the groups that you mentioned. It has definitely provided a market for facilitators who have expertise in those areas.

**Mr SMITH:** This may lead potentially to being able to elaborate more on the stages of the project that you are going through. Is the CCC communicating with other anti-corruption watchdogs around the country and around the world to find what is best practice and the key identifiers to assist you in your investigations?

**Ms Loder:** I can speak from a crime perspective rather than necessarily an anti-corruption perspective. Yes, we are engaging. We are engaging extensively with other agencies in this space. Recently, the Commonwealth and all of the state law enforcement agencies, including some of our officers, attended a national two-day forum where they exchanged information and discussed issues around that and also for capability building. The expectation is that that will become a regular type of forum. Those sorts of forums are also developing in other areas of technology—for example, the encrypted communications area. We are part of a national forum that gets together regularly. We also have similar forums nationally that our staff participate in in relation to money laundering and money-laundering methods.

**Mr Barbour:** I think it would be fair to say that most of what we have seen in terms of the use of cryptocurrency has been in the crime space. We have not really seen much in the corruption space. However, the project that we have underway is really to skill up our staff in terms of understanding how crypto works, how crypto is used by various entities and how money is transferred so that we have expertise on the ground and, if we do start to identify any of that activity within the corruption space, we have a resource within the organisation that is able to provide assistance and support.

**CHAIR:** Mr Barbour, just following on from our discussion earlier, in relation to the corruption risk issues and the prevention function that the CCC has, can you explain to the committee why not advertising a position in the public sector is an issue and could lead to corruption risks?

**Mr Barbour:** I think it is very difficult to talk about things in generalities because I think it very much depends on the position. There are positions, clearly, such as the head of a government department, where all sorts of issues come into play in terms of considering their recruitment. There are positions where people are appointed for very limited purposes—simply to conduct an inquiry or to head up a working group or to provide advice to government. There are going to be different measures in place for each of those. Obviously, any kind of corruption prevention focus would take into account all of those factors to see what degree of risk there was. That is going to obviously reflect on the role of the position, staff numbers and budget controls right through to whether or not it is extremely minimal in terms of capacity to influence or change which might lead to a corruption risk.

**CHAIR:** Is proximity to decision-makers a factor?

**Mr Barbour:** Potentially—also whether or not the person themselves is a decision-maker in relation to lots of issues, how they might be able to contribute to policy development and so forth. There are many factors that would be considered.

**CHAIR:** Are you able to say in a general sense that senior public servant roles should be advertised?

**Mr Barbour:** I think I have already said that and we have made that clear. Once again, there are different roles or different periods of time for different purposes. It is all very much a case-by-case situation.

**CHAIR:** I want to take you to the issue you mentioned in your opening statement in relation to the High Court decision in the matter of Carne, and it obviously had a flow-on effect in relation to the matter of Trad as well and the report which has been prepared. There has been various public commentary around that in the media and in parliament. That report and also a previous report of the CCC in relation to the appointment of the Inner City South State Secondary College principal, which also related to Ms Trad, related to the interference, or alleged interference in one case, in the appointment process for senior public servants or a school principal. The Premier has been on the record in recent times indicating that any legislative change regarding reporting may be forward-looking only, not retrospective or backward-looking. From an educational point of view if nothing else, can you explain your view about why CCC reports such as Carne and Trad should be released? You have said to this committee on various occasions that they should be.

**Mr Barbour:** Yes. I believe that it is both appropriate and the safest response to the decision of the High Court to legislate to permit a variety of actions by the CCC, including public reporting, to proceed and that that ought be retrospective to ensure not only that the work that has already been completed and where reports have been prepared can be tabled but also that there is no legal risk or issue arising from any of the previous work done by the CCC which might now be viewed as potentially not having an appropriate foundation in the act. I think it is desirable both for reports that are already the subject of public discussion to be tabled but also for there to be absolutely no doubt that the work undertaken for previous reports that have been tabled through parliament is protected by any amendment.

**CHAIR:** In your view and from the CCC's point of view, would it be complementary to the work of Coaldrake in the recommendations about the independence of the appointment processes and also guarding against risk of politicisation in the judiciary if these reports were made public? Would it complement all of that work and join together to enhance integrity?

**Mr Barbour:** I think it complements the work. I do not necessarily see it as being exactly the same. From my perspective, it is absolutely unarguable that it is in the public interest for the CCC to be able to have robust reporting provisions, to be able to report publicly and to tell the community about our work—what we do and how we do it. There is clearly a consistency of approach with that across all integrity agencies throughout the country. If you look at other similar work of entities, we have the Auditor-General, for example, who is able to report through parliament and has similar provisions to what we understood operate. You have commissions of inquiry that can take evidence and can report publicly. It is very difficult to understand why a different standard would even be contemplated in relation to the CCC.

**CHAIR:** On the matter of Ms Trad's case against the CCC, that is finalised now—done and dusted. I understand from media reports that the CCC agreed to a proposal to pay Ms Trad's costs in that matter. I have previously asked you about the CCC's costs in that matter, so I will ask you about that again. I would also like to ask you how much the CCC paid to Ms Trad in respect of her costs.

**Mr Barbour:** As at this point there has been no payment made by the CCC. In relation to issues associated with the cost orders and negotiations that are currently underway, I am happy to provide more information in the private session.

**CHAIR:** My first question was about the CCC's costs.

**Mr Barbour:** The CCC's costs have not changed since—

**CHAIR:** Can you answer that?

**Mr Barbour:** Yes. They have not changed since we provided the figures to you on the last occasion. The Trad costs are \$91,953 for the CCC.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

**Mr CRANDON:** You mentioned interstate counterparts. Has the CCC looked at similar legislation from interstate that perhaps changes the impact of the High Court decision on them versus the High Court decision made in our particular case? Are they immune, first of all? Is there something that we can learn from interstate legislation that we could put forward as part of the changes to legislation in Queensland?

**Mr Barbour:** First of all, the High Court decision has no applicability to any other jurisdiction apart from Queensland. The High Court decision was purely a decision which related to construction of the Crime and Corruption Act. It looked very specifically at particular provisions and about whether or not those provisions permitted the CCC to publicly report. You are aware of the decision. Firstly, it has no applicability to any other anti-corruption or crime agency in the country.



Secondly, we have done a comparative analysis of other jurisdictions in relation to their reporting provisions. All other jurisdictions are able to report publicly in relation to their activities. We believe that the provisions which are in place for the Victorian Independent Broad-Based Anti-Corruption Commission are probably the best of all of the provisions. They make clear that that organisation can report at any stage on any matter it thinks appropriate in relation to its functions and/or investigation. We believe that is an appropriate model for Queensland.

There is also no requirement on other corruption agencies to provide reports through a parliamentary oversight committee process. All of them are in one way or another able to table directly with either a Speaker or a Clerk of the parliament. With a few exceptions, there are also obligations with a couple of agencies to report to either an attorney-general or the relevant minister at the same time, and there is an element of them having a role in relation to that process as well.

I am very happy to provide that analysis to the committee. I am sure it would be of interest to the committee. I note from the parliamentary commissioner's evidence earlier that he has an interest in this as well, and we are very happy to provide a copy to the parliamentary commissioner as well.

**Dr ROBINSON:** My question is on a different matter. In terms of the commission of inquiry into the CCC and recommendation 6, which talks about the organisational culture within the CCC, could you provide some comment or some detail around the review in terms of organisational culture within the Corruption division and the culture review group?

**Mr Barbour:** I think Ms Christensen can answer that question.

**Ms Christensen:** The CCC engaged a consultant last year to assist us with a culture review of the Corruption division. That process has been completed. As part of that, the staff were part of those workshops contributing their views, and it was a very positive contribution. Out of that, we have developed a culture action plan as a division. We have just updated that again, taking account of feedback through the Working for Queensland results as well and our ongoing progress in corruption strategy initiatives.

There are a number of themes in that culture action plan: trust, and a key aspect of that is around how we work cohesively as a division, and our connection. We are working in that theme there around communication and connecting people to the purpose of the work we do, updating initiatives and ensuring staff have what they need to perform their role.

Another aspect of that is around leadership capability and staff capability. Also, a corruption strategy initiative is the development of a capability framework for the Corruption division. We are currently focused on corruption investigations in the framework. That flows through to our position descriptions and capability training. We are this month currently offering training to respond to their particular needs and improve their skill set for the type of work they do. We are well advanced on the capability side.

The other part is communication, as I mentioned earlier, and that has been important for the group—consistency of messaging. We have introduced new channels, and we will monitor those in terms of pulse surveys so that we are meeting the staff's needs and staff, again, are getting what they need to do their jobs. We can certainly provide more information than that, but we are well advanced in delivering on those initiatives.

**Dr ROBINSON:** That sounds like already a lot of work is underway in terms of efficiency and improving continuous effectiveness. Are there any other specific recommendations or areas that you feel will add further improvements?

**Ms Christensen:** There are a number of examples. Again, examples already delivered are also around and connect also with commission inquiry orientation guides. We have delivered a fresh orientation guide for the organisation and we are tailoring for each group as well. It is the importance of people, again: what is your role, what are your expectations and, again, connection to purpose in the work we do and the value. This is important for attracting people and then retaining them from a recruitment point of view and our corporate strength. I have mentioned leadership in terms of things. Trust leadership: we are focused on our leadership capability. In terms of programs there, the CCC offers a 'leader as a coach' program and a great managers program and other initiatives our staff are participating in. We are also introducing a new leadership focused forum. That will focus on leadership capability development.

In terms of workload and efficiency, another piece around culture is around workload assessment. That is being inbuilt into the reviews we have done. As the committee is aware, we have undertaken a review of the intake, and assessment workload is part of that. That is now more business as usual as we will keep working to improve that business and, in that, the workload. That comes

back to timeliness as well as our customer service. We have completed a review of monitoring and assessment. In doing that, culture is part of that as well so we gain new processes, continuing to embed and improve that as well and improve work constructions in that process there, which will deliver into our quality and into our customer service.

Investigations has also had a review. We are consulting and working through a number of those initiatives. Those reviews as well as the culture review are linked and we are delivering those initiatives. For me, what is very positive is ... the combination ... the reviews have demonstrated, the corruption strategy initiatives. We support the delivery of what we are already programed to do and have been working on and will continue to work on over the rest of the year and beyond.

**Ms BUSH:** Another area of interest or obsession of mine—this is going to sound really wrong—is vaping and tobacco and illegal tobacco distribution networks. I think you mentioned that that was something you were looking into in your research team or your investigations. Is there anything you would like to share with the committee around Queensland trends, any disruption that you are doing in that space with the police or how it is all working?

**Ms Loder:** I think I mentioned at the last meeting that the next step that was proposed was a round table at officer level from a number of different agencies, including Queensland Health. That took place on 12 December. We also had the officers who were involved in the Victorian strategies present to that forum. The purpose of it was really getting an understanding of what were some of the issues that we needed to understand better and focus on and what were some of the pain points that different agencies were experiencing.

The results of that went to our agency joint management group. I represent the commission on that group. Some further strategic work is being done, which is being led by the QPS. Our intelligence analysts working group, which is a joint working group, is also doing some work on identifying specific what we call lines of effort that might be deployed having regard to different agencies' expertise and capacities and identifying who might be responsible for leading those lines of effort. That work is still ongoing. We are not expecting the assessment for that intelligence assessment part of it to be completed until probably mid to end of March.

**Ms BUSH:** My mind is still ticking but I will think about that.

**CHAIR:** Are there any further questions?

**Ms PUGH:** I have a question but I am not sure if I should ask it now or in private.

**CHAIR:** Give it a go. Just do not disclose any confidential committee business.

**Ms PUGH:** Going back to the report you published last January, I recall there were a number of submissions that you did not want to publish because there were some investigations that were happening. I believe that was a discussion we had in the public session.

**CHAIR:** I cannot recall, actually. Are you talking about the influencing practices paper?

**Ms PUGH:** Yes. The public report and then a discussion that ensued around publishing—

**CHAIR:** Mr Barbour can probably remind us if it was in public or private.

**Mr Barbour:** I think you are referring to our report on influencing practices.

**Ms PUGH:** That is correct.

**Mr Barbour:** There was certainly some discussion at previous meetings with the committee, both in public and in private sessions, in relation to those reports. I think in the public session it revolved primarily around the decision of the commission not to actually publish submissions as part of the publishing process. There were a range of reasons that I put forward to explain why we had made that decision. One reason, amongst many, was that some of the issues that have been raised may well end up being the subject of investigation; you are correct. I would not be proposing in public session to be discussing anything further about that.

**Ms PUGH:** Absolutely. If I could ask a follow-up on a slight tangent: based off that report, have you considered changing how you, I suppose, interact or disclose with people who are making submissions to make that future disclosure of submissions to reports such as that one easier, to make it clearer to people who are submitting whether their submissions will be published or not published?

**Mr Barbour:** I think we already do make that very clear. We make it clear in what we publish and in our discussion papers that people should identify whether they wish to have their submission maintained in confidence or whether they are happy for it to be publicised. We also emphasise that

we may or may not publish submissions. That is always going to be at our discretion and we need to make a decision in each individual case, each individual report, about whether it is appropriate to do that or not. It is not an automatic situation, yes or no.

**Ms PUGH:** Yes, there is nuance around that. Thank you. I appreciate the update.

**CHAIR:** Mr Barbour, in relation to your previous answer, I note your answer in relation to the legal costs and the fact that none have been paid to Ms Trad at this point in time. Can you tell the committee how much potentially may be payable to Ms Trad in the case that the CCC is ultimately required to pay those costs?

**Mr Barbour:** As I said, and perhaps I can be a little more detailed in my answer, in relation to both the Trad matter and the Carne matter there are currently confidential legal negotiations underway in relation to costs issues. I am happy to provide more detail in private session but I do not think it is appropriate, given that, to discuss these issues, quantum or potential quantum in public session.

**CHAIR:** When the matter is finalised, is that something that you will be able to inform the committee about?

**Mr Barbour:** Yes. I would imagine we would be noting it in various reports.

**Mr CRANDON:** I see that you have met with people from the Complaints Clearinghouse Governance Project and the chair of the Complaints Oversight Board. We had a brief discussion about the complaints clearinghouse proposal at our last public meeting and I note the public report that I have just outlined there. Do you have any updates in relation to how the Complaints Oversight Board will function and how it may impact on the work of the CCC?

**Mr Barbour:** Yes. There was a meeting of the Complaints Oversight Board on 4 December. At that meeting there was the provision of documents relating to a proposed charter for that board and responsibilities for that board. After that meeting there was provided to proposed members of the board the terms of reference that had been prepared to set up this particular unit and also the board. On review of those documents, each of the integrity agencies that had been asked to be on the board expressed significant reservations about being on the board and how the work of the board as proposed presented significant risks to the independence of each of the agencies. That was discussed at the last meeting. We also foreshadowed that the nature of the work of the board and even the title of it presented challenges in relation to the independence of the organisations. Those concerns are currently the subject of further consideration.

**CHAIR:** Is the CCC contesting cost orders or something like that with Ms Trad?

**Mr Barbour:** I am happy to discuss those issues further with you in the private session.

**CHAIR:** I have to try these things, Mr Barbour, but you are not giving me much joy here.

**Mr Barbour:** I understand, and you do very well—

**CHAIR:** There is a very good public interest in this matter.

**Mr Barbour:** I am aware of that.

**CHAIR:** As the oversight body, we are entitled to ask these questions. I suppose we need to respect your entitlement not to answer them on occasion. I understand. Are there any other questions from government members? We are pushing up against midday.

**Ms PUGH:** I am ready for the private session.

**CHAIR:** Michael and Mark?

**Mr CRANDON:** Nothing more from me, thank you, Chair.

**CHAIR:** We will close the public section of this meeting. Thank you very much to those watching online and in the gallery. We will move into the private session with the CCC.

**The committee adjourned at 11.59 am.**