

Question on Notice

No. 939

Asked on 21 August 2024

MR S ANDREW asked the Minister for State Development and Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing (HON G GRACE) –

QUESTION:

With reference to the Queensland Government’s delivery of the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games—

Will the Minister advise what transparent disclosure and reporting standards the government has put in place to mitigate the known ‘corruption risks’ around the management and multibillion dollar spending decisions of the Games’ organisers?

ANSWER:

State departments and statutory bodies responsible for preparing for and organising the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, including the Brisbane Organising Committee for the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games (OCOG) and the Games Venue and Legacy Delivery Authority (GVLDA), are subject to a range of disclosure and reporting standards.

Firstly, all Queensland Government departments and Games statutory bodies must comply with rigorous public accountability and transparency requirements under the *Integrity Act 2009*, *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2010*, *Crime and Corruption Act 2001* and *Financial Accountability Act 2009* (including the *Financial and Performance Management Standard 2019*). They are also subject to regular financial and performance audits by the Queensland Audit Office under the *Auditor-General Act 2009*. As statutory bodies, both the OCOG and GVLDA are also subject to controls under the *Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982*.

Secondly, there are specific disclosure and accountability requirements regulated under the *Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021* (BOGPA Act). For example, in recognition of the public importance of successfully delivering the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games and the significant amount of money the OCOG and GVLDA will be responsible for, the directors and CEOs of the two bodies have a duty to act honestly in the performance of their functions and the exercise of their powers under the Act, with breaches attracting statutory set penalties. Directors of the boards of the two bodies must also comply with disclosure of interest requirements, including maintaining a register of interests. Further, the BOGPA Act requires both bodies to enter into a funding agreement with the State which includes reporting requirements.

Finally, I am advised that OCOG and GVLDA have their own operational policies and controls to prevent, detect and respond to occurrences of fraud or corruption. For example, the OCOG has established several policies to ensure ethical standards and behaviours are carried out across the organisation in accordance with good governance

practices and corporate and legal requirements. This includes a Fraud and Corrupt Conduct Policy, Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower) Policy, and Personnel Interest Management Policy. Further, the OCOG has a Finance and Audit Committee that meets quarterly and is responsible for:

- oversight and approval of financial statements and reporting;
- oversight and approval of performance management compliance;
- oversight and input into risk management;
- oversight and input into compliance and policy matters; and
- oversight and input into internal and external audit processes and reporting.

Following the establishment of GVLDA in July 2024, they are in the process of establishing their policies which requires all GVLDA employees to complete mandatory training on commencement of employment, which includes fraud and corruption training. Further, GVLDA has probity plans for significant venue infrastructure projects to mitigate corruption risks in procurement and contract management activities. To provide assurance that probity principles and practices are applied in a consistent manner, GVDLA also engages external probity advisers – independent of the evaluation of tenders – to observe and monitor its infrastructure procurement processes.