



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL  
TERRITORY**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE  
AND COMMUNITY SAFETY**

(Reference: [Inquiry into Annual and Financial Reports 2021-2022](#))

**Members:**

**MR P CAIN (Chair)  
DR M PATERSON (Deputy Chair)  
MR A BRADDOCK**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE**

**CANBERRA**

**TUESDAY, 1 NOVEMBER 2022**

**Secretary to the committee:  
Ms K de Kleuver (Ph: 620 70524)**

**By authority of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory**

Submissions, answers to questions on notice and other documents, including requests for clarification of the transcript of evidence, relevant to this inquiry that have been authorised for publication by the committee may be obtained from the Legislative Assembly website.

## APPEARANCES

<b>ACT Policing .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Justice and Community Safety Directorate.....</b>	<b>1, 20</b>

## **Privilege statement**

The Assembly has authorised the recording, broadcasting and re-broadcasting of these proceedings.

All witnesses making submissions or giving evidence to committees of the Legislative Assembly for the ACT are protected by parliamentary privilege.

“Parliamentary privilege” means the special rights and immunities which belong to the Assembly, its committees and its members. These rights and immunities enable committees to operate effectively, and enable those involved in committee processes to do so without obstruction, or fear of prosecution.

Witnesses must tell the truth: giving false or misleading evidence will be treated as a serious matter, and may be considered a contempt of the Assembly.

While the committee prefers to hear all evidence in public, it may take evidence in-camera if requested. Confidential evidence will be recorded and kept securely. It is within the power of the committee at a later date to publish or present all or part of that evidence to the Assembly; but any decision to publish or present in-camera evidence will not be taken without consulting with the person who gave the evidence.

*Amended 20 May 2013*

## **The committee met at 4 pm.**

### Appearances

Gentleman, Mr Mick, Manager of Government Business, Minister for Corrections,  
Minister for Industrial Relations and Workplace Safety, Minister for Planning and  
Land Management and Minister for Police and Emergency Services

### Justice and Community Safety Directorate

Glenn, Mr Richard, Director-General

Doran, Ms Karen, Deputy Director-General, Community Safety

### ACT Policing

Gaughan, Deputy Commissioner Neil, Chief Police Officer

Crozier, Assistant Commissioner Peter, Deputy Chief Police Officer

Whowell, Peter, Executive General Manager, Corporate Services

**THE CHAIR:** Welcome to the public hearings on the annual and financial reports 2021-22 by the Standing Community on Justice and Community Safety. In these hearings today we will examine the annual and financial reports for the Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

The committee wishes to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land we are meeting on, the Ngunnawal people, and acknowledge and respect their continuing culture and the contribution they make to the life of the city and region. We would also like to acknowledge and welcome other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who may be attending today.

Please be aware that the proceedings are being recorded and transcribed by Hansard and will be published. The proceedings are also being broadcast and webstreamed live.

When taking a question on notice, it would be useful if witnesses used these words, “I will take that as a question taken on notice.” This will help the committee and witnesses to confirm questions taken on notice from the transcript.

In this first session we will hear from the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Mr Gentleman, and officials from the Justice and Community Safety Directorate and ACT Policing. Welcome to our hearing. I remind witnesses of the protections and obligations afforded by parliamentary privilege and draw your attention to the privilege statement. Could you each confirm—those on Webex as well—that you understand the privilege implications of the statement?

**Mr Gentleman:** Thank you, Chair. Yes, we do.

**THE CHAIR:** Thank you. We will not invite opening statements, but I will make a brief comment on substantive questions and the number of supplementaries. I will use my judgement on what I think is a reasonable amount of time for a substantive question. I say that to the questioners as well as to witnesses. I encourage you to be concise. In particular, Minister Gentleman, if you feel you have set the background on material, it will not be necessary for you to refer to an official to give the same background. We want to get through as much as possible this afternoon. I am happy to

pass my question to Mr Hanson.

**MR HANSON:** Good afternoon, Minister, CPO and officials. The annual report talks about Operation Oquendo II, and there is also Operation Toric. Can you explain what the difference is between Oquendo II and Toric? I assume that the Oquendo II work came before Toric; is that right?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I acknowledge the privilege statement. That is correct, Mr Hanson. We had Oquendo 1 and Oquendo 2—property and recidivism. Toric’s primary focus when it was stood up was looking at dangerous driving behaviour. That led to other crime being discovered during the process. Basically, it is also just a naming convention. We tend to name operations for a period of time. That is for recording purposes, not only to record statistics but also for us to be in a position to record resources against that particular operation and to be in a position to record how much cost goes towards that particular operation.

**MR HANSON:** With Oquendo 1 and 2, how many of those offenders were then re-arrested as part of Toric? If you were targeting people who were recidivists, then they were put before the court system and released again for you to have to catch again, is this an ongoing cycle of different named operations to catch the same people? Do you have that data?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** There are a number. I cannot give you the exact number because we prepared ourselves for an annual report hearing. Certainly, that is something we could get for you on notice. I can provide some data, if it is helpful to the committee, in relation to those that were charged during Toric that were on bail and other like things.

**MR HANSON:** That would be good, yes.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** From 1 August 2022 to 27 October 2022, Operation Toric had arrested 122 separate offenders and laid 310 charges for offences, including aggravated dangerous driving, driving at police, taking a motor vehicle without consent, drug driving and firearm offences. Of those charged at this stage, 39 are on bail for other offences, 16 were on good behaviour orders, five were on intensive correction orders, and eight were on parole—six in the ACT and two from New South Wales.

**MR HANSON:** Are you concerned by that high number? These are people who are meant to have been before the courts for similar offences, I would imagine. Is it frustrating to your members to have to continually arrest the same people? That is a bit of a subjective question. In terms of the data, of those that you have just mentioned—the people on bail, good behaviour bonds and so on—how many were held in custody and how many were released again on some form of community corrections order?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** With that particular question, we will have to take the second part of the question on notice. I do not have that data.

**MR HANSON:** Yes, if you could, thanks, and if you could break it down by the same

categories, that would be good.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** In relation to the first part of the question, yes, the officers are frustrated. I think that the biggest concern is public safety. We are finding that these particular offenders, particularly those that are stealing motor vehicles and involved in high-speed pursuits, provide a significant risk to all members of the community, not just police officers. As we have said in our submission to the other inquiry that this committee is undertaking in relation to dangerous driving, we think that there needs to be a conversation in relation to bail in relation to those issues.

**DR PATERSON:** In terms of the 122 offenders, how many were first-time offenders?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I think less than a handful.

**DR PATERSON:** So you know who these people are?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Toric has been established to target people involved in really dangerous behaviour who historically are recidivist offenders. It is very rare for people to go from doing nothing to being involved in pursuits with the police and those sorts of issues. Again, we will provide that data to the committee, but it is a handful out of the 122 that have not come to some type of law enforcement notice previously, whether it is here or in New South Wales.

It is not lost on us, and the minister and I both caught up with the commander of Monaro district this morning. A lot of these offences are occurring cross-jurisdictionally, so it is a challenge not only for us here in the territory, but also for our New South Wales Police colleagues. New South Wales citizens are coming across here to commit crime; our citizens are going across to New South Wales to commit crime. It is a cross-border issue. We are working extremely closely with the New South Wales Police on this issue, and we have some other strategies coming up over the next couple of months that we hope to put in place.

**DR PATERSON:** In terms of what happens in other jurisdictions, is it common, when police are doing a blitz in another jurisdiction, that you are actually getting this level of recidivism?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** The territory's recidivism rates are fairly high. I might ask Mr Glenn to answer some of the detail on that. The bail issue is very complicated and it is also very similar in New South Wales. I had a conversation with Superintendent Klepczarek today about this issue, and they have some similar challenges with bail laws in New South Wales. So it is not just a jurisdictional issue; it is across the country, particularly with juveniles. Mr Glenn might like to talk about recidivism.

**Mr Glenn:** I acknowledge the privilege statement. I do not have the recidivism data in front of me at the moment. What I can say, from speaking to colleagues across the country, is that people involved in justice policy are concerned about the same set of issues; that is, there are relatively small numbers of people committing crimes, by and large. That poses a policy challenge for all sorts of people in the criminal justice system; indeed the courts are alive to that as well—that the same people are coming

before them and that the measures we need to put in place to be able to break those cycles of offending, both within and outside the criminal justice system, are the things on which we work regularly.

**DR PATERSON:** On the car theft issue, motor vehicle thefts are not the highest that they have ever been, but they are pretty high at the moment and they have been escalating over the last few years. We talked in budget estimates about legislative reform in terms of the changes to trespass in a motor vehicle. Is there any other reasoning behind the high level of motor vehicle thefts and around what can be done to address that?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Education is really important. I spoke to the ACT tourism association this morning and I have spoken to the Australian Hotels Association over the last couple of months, in relation to things they can do to target-harden their own premises. Some people in the ACT still think that this is a big country town. Many of the motor vehicles we have seen that have been stolen have been stolen with the keys in them, unlocked—even, in some circumstances, with keys in them unlocked and the engine running, because people have gone inside while they are trying to defrost the windows. I am not victim blaming here, but it is also up to owners of motor vehicles to take some level of personal responsibility. We will continue to push the education aspect.

As to why we have very high instances of motor vehicle theft, I do not have the answer to that. One of the things we can do, obviously, through things such as Operation Toric, is stop people, the recidivists particularly, and put them before the courts. As to why we seem to be an outlier, I really do not have the answer.

**DR PATERSON:** Do we have 1,400 car thieves in the ACT or do we have a small number that are doing this incredibly regularly?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** We certainly do not have 1,400 car thieves in the ACT. We do have some, as I said, that come across the border from New South Wales. That is not lost on us, because some of our stolen vehicles are recovered in places such as Yass, Wagga or Goulburn. Some get rebirthed in Sydney; we know that. We know that occurs.

A very small number of the Canberra population are involved in recidivist crime offending. It is probably only 200 that are involved in property theft, particularly. That is why things such as Toric have already had a fairly big imprint. We spoke at estimates in relation to the trespass in motor vehicle offence. We know there will be DNA on many of the vehicles that we seize that will be linked to some of those recidivist offenders, and we will manage that as we go through. But it is a very small percentage of the Canberra population involved in crime, full stop.

I will be very clear to the committee and the rest of the community: this is an extremely safe city. I think it is the safest city in Australia, and most of our crime stats would bear that out. We have to be careful that we do not overestimate this issue. It is a small number of people.

**Mr Gentleman:** Whilst police are doing the operational work of ensuring the safety

of Canberrans on the roads, they are doing the educative work, too. Outsmart the offender campaigns, educating Canberrans at home about storing keys in a safe place, and not leaving the motor running—those sorts of campaigns are running alongside this operational work, too.

**DR PATERSON:** In terms of Operation Toric, with these offenders and charges, how many of these offenders would have been caught in a stolen motor vehicle?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** The vast majority have been offenders for stolen motor vehicles. We have found that they have also been involved in burglaries and other property crime. Well over 90 per cent are stolen motor vehicle type offences.

**MR BRADDOCK:** What would be the breakdown of motor vehicle thefts between those who are doing it for some financial incentive and those who are just doing it for joy ride purposes?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Again I do not have the percentage, but the vast majority are not rebirthed, so they are not for financial purposes. A number of vehicles were seized during Operation Toric at second-hand motor vehicle dealers, where people were trying to onsell the car, purporting it to be their own. Again that is a very small number compared to the vast majority of the Toric offenders who were—I do not like to use the term “joy riding”, because there is no joy in it. They drive dangerously, they break the law and they put people’s lives at risk. It is not joy riding; it is dangerous driving, and it needs to be called out for what it is. They are usually committing other offences. They are not using the car to get from A to B; they are using the car to commit a crime.

**MR HANSON:** A number of years ago, the police changed their policy with regard to pursuits. It seems, certainly anecdotally, that since then the number of—not joy riders—reckless drivers, stealing cars and then hooning all over town with impunity has increased. Do you see a correlation between the change in that pursuit policy and the current problem?

**Mr Gentleman:** This was a government policy that was led through work in this Assembly that the government then asked police to instigate—the limited pursuit policy—after we saw some tragedy here in the ACT. I have certainly talked to CPO about my concerns with that limited pursuit policy. Operational police must make a decision, as they go forward, as to whether they will pursue at speed or whether they will leave that pursuit.

**MR HANSON:** We would have to look at the record there, but my understanding is that when that debate occurred—we are going back several years—it was described as a decision for the Chief Police Officer. It was police policy; it was not legislative in its nature. Regardless of whose decision it was, whether it was the minister’s or the CPO’s, the decision was made. The police pursuit policy has changed and we seem to have an escalated amount of those sorts of problems on our streets. It seems that one may have led to the other, but I am interested in your view.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I have said to this committee before that no policy or legislation should stay still. It always needs to be reviewed. We always need to be



nimble and we should admit when we think things need to be looked at. At the moment the pursuit policy is being actively looked at. We have engaged someone external to the AFP to come in and review that, under the leadership of Commander Champion. We will look at it.

I think that pursuits are inherently dangerous. They are inherently dangerous for my members and they are inherently dangerous for the community. When we can avoid a pursuit, we will, and we should, and rightly so. Senior officers in our police operations centre make tactical decisions to terminate pursuits when they become dangerous. At 4 o'clock in the afternoon down Barry Drive, we will usually terminate a pursuit, because we do not want to put the public at risk.

This is a really important point: most of the arrests that have been made with Toric have not been through pursuits. They have been through intelligence-led targeting, where we have put the offenders in a position where we can safely take them out without a pursuit taking place. We have taken people out in shopping centres, we have taken them out in take-away shops and we have taken them out in car parks. We are not pursuing. Whilst we have traffic people involved in Toric, the vast majority of arrests have been done in an extremely safe way, so that not only the community are safe but so are my members, which is really important.

**MR HANSON:** In terms of the review, who is doing it?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** We have an independent person. A lawyer is looking at it for us, and it has been under the leadership of Commander Champion. It will form part of a case review in relation to Toric going forward. We will look at that in relation to whether or not we need to change our policy.

**MR BRADDOCK:** I understand that ACT Policing have initiated a review of the use of spit hoods. I was hoping to obtain some further information in terms of that review, its time frames, its terms of reference and how it would be conducted.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Thanks for the question. I will clarify that the review is not being conducted by ACT Policing. The review has been commissioned by the AFP Commissioner, in commissioner's order 3, to look at how they are utilised. Ultimately, we will implement what the review comes up with.

We believe they are used safely. Obviously, in light of what has occurred in other jurisdictions, and certainly in questioning from you, Mr Braddock, and other people in the Assembly, we think it is timely to undertake a review of that particular item under CO3. I want to reinforce to the committee that we use them sparingly. They are considered safe, in our view, when they are used in accordance with the instructions. Once a person is placed in the holding cells, the spit hood is removed.

The terms of reference are still being developed by the operational safety committee. Intentionally, the senior executive of ACT Policing is somewhat at arm's-length from that review, so that there is a level of independence. The review will examine our use of force of the spit hood over the last five years, the equivalent use of force policy of other Australian law enforcement jurisdictions, and it will also look at alternative options to spit hoods.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Is there a time frame for that review?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I would hope that we would be in a position to have a decision one way or the other by sometime early next year, noting that we are already in November.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Yes. In the meantime, once that review has been undertaken, the use of spit hoods would continue.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** They will be continued, but I have to say that, as I said previously, they are used sparingly and they are used only when we think it is absolutely necessary. As I have said previously in this committee, the best way to stop their use is for people not to spit at police or bite police. I note that the Police Association has also come out with strong views in relation to potential legislative change so that if people spit at police they are subjected to blood tests, as occurs in other jurisdictions. I am sure that the review will look at some of those alternatives as well.

**THE CHAIR:** Thank you. I have a supplementary on that. Will the review include a comparison with other jurisdictions around the country?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Absolutely.

**THE CHAIR:** Which states and territories, as far as you know, right now, use these spit hoods?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** The biggest two at the moment that have spoken about it publicly are Queensland, who have said they will no longer use them, and the Northern Territory, who have said they will no longer use them on juveniles.

**THE CHAIR:** But everyone else uses them?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I would have to take that on notice. As I said, the review will definitely look at the use of force policies and alternatives to how we can protect our members from people spitting at them.

**MR HANSON:** The drug decriminalisation bill that passed the Assembly has 12 months before it is implemented on the ground. You talked about cross-border crime. What conversations have you had with New South Wales Police about the issue where you have now got a very different regime when it comes to both the small substances but also what you would characterise as large substances. Between personal use and trafficable amounts it has been reduced in the legislation from two years to six months. So there is a very different regime here. The last time that there were different regimes, it was relating to outlaw motorcycle gangs. Without consorting laws here, we saw a quadrupling of the number of gangs in the ACT. Have you had conversations with New South Wales Police about how you are going to manage that issue?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Well, it might surprise you that they have raised it

with me.

**MR HANSON:** Really?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** We have got 12 months to work it through. As I said in answer to a previous question, we have people crossing the border to commit crime on a daily basis. I look at the policing of this jurisdiction as not 456,000 but over half a million, and 26,000 border crossings a day. We have got to look at this jurisdiction for what it is, which is a cross-border town that actually has no physical barrier. There is no river like there is on the Tweed border or there is on the Murray border. We are very conscious of that, and our conversations with New South Wales Police will be around how we can actually work better. I am not going to pre-empt some of the discussions we have had, but we are looking at a much closer operating model between ourselves and New South Wales Police, which I think will go some way to addressing the concerns they have at their end. Certainly, I am well aware that this particular issue is being discussed, not just across this border but across the entire Australasia at police commissioners' forums.

**MR HANSON:** What are the concerns that have been raised by New South Wales Police?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** The concern is a drip, almost, if you like, of people from here in the ACT and people across New South Wales also carrying similar amounts of drugs. So education is an important issue. As the bill stipulates, we will work through that with Health and JACS over the coming 12 months to make sure we have in place appropriate mechanisms to educate the community on exactly what the law is about, and that will be the same with our New South Wales colleagues.

**MR HANSON:** In particular, with organised crime, the Federal Police Association have warned about it and they characterise it as rolling out the red carpet and writing a cheque for organised crime. Are you concerned about the attraction to organised crime, particularly that operating in nearby New South Wales areas, due to these change of laws in the ACT?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I think, Mr Hanson, one of the focuses of the next 12 months needs to be demand reduction. You are talking about supply, which is one part of the equation. The bill talks about harm, which I think is appropriate, but what we need to focus on over the next 12 months particularly is that conversation with the community about the demand issue. It is about stopping them from taking drugs. I think that is the bit that is missing at the moment. That is where we will work with Health and JACS very closely over the next 12 months to get that right. I am not overly concerned about an increase in organised crime, because it will only increase if there is an increase in demand, and if we tackle the demand issues and we get on top of that, we will not see an increase.

There is certain intelligence that we are privy to to inform us as to what sort of activity the OMCG groups are up to. At the moment I am comfortable that we will not see an increase in that type of activity. I am not saying that will not change, but there is nothing for us to be concerned about at this stage that we will see an increase. Our focus, the ACT Policing focus as this bill moves to progression and comes to

implementation, is to ensure that we target organised crime groups. That needs to be where we spend our time and our effort.

**MR HANSON:** I will stick on the drugs theme. I know that there is another inquiry being conducted by this committee. In relation to the submission you put to that inquiry, you raised a concern about drug decriminalisation: the impact on road safety, in particular with relation to the fact that there are going to be some drugs there that are decriminalised that are not tested for. Have you had a look at that issue? Can you also give me a bit of an update on both RBT and RDT in terms of numbers and what rates you are getting?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I will get the Deputy Chief Police Officer to answer the more detailed question in relation to numbers, but, yes, we are looking at the ability to test for more drugs than just the ones that we do now, which are primarily meth and cannabis. Certainly, the other drug of primary concern for us is cocaine, with a fairly high percentage of people in the territory utilising cocaine. I might get the Deputy Chief Police Officer to talk through some of the stats in relation to RBT and drug testing.

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** Thank you, CPO. I acknowledge the privilege statement. Mr Hanson, in terms of the number of tests for the previous financial year, it was almost 14,000 random tests that we did and 1,760 roadside drug tests over the financial year. There were 726 charges for drink driving and 383 charges for drug driving.

**MR HANSON:** How does that compare trend-wise in terms of the number of tests that you have been doing, and also the positive tests?

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** There are probably two points that I would make. One is that the previous year was impacted by COVID and the redirection of some resources to be able to address the issues that the pandemic caused across the community of the ACT. So there was a significant reduction in the number of tests that were carried out. What I can say is that most of our testing in this regard has a level of intelligence linked to it. So whilst it is random in terms of the term “RBT”, there is a level of science that we put around it to ensure that we are targeting areas where there is a likelihood that people who may be involved in these sorts of offences may commit those sort of crimes.

Importantly, as well, there are areas of concern. Where we have seen previously collision areas or the like, areas of concern, we will try and put some resourcing into those areas to make sure we are targeting at the right times and we are targeting the right sorts of groups. We are acknowledging that there are individuals maybe on a Friday night who would be going to a location, having a few beers and driving home. We want to make sure that we are targeting those areas to try and reduce that actually occurring.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Can I just add something, Chair. It goes to Mr Hanson’s question around numbers. As an example, over the weekend just gone, between Friday, 28 and Sunday, 30 October, we conducted 900 roadside breath tests and close to 70 roadside drug tests around across the weekend. It was a focused event;

I concede that. Five drivers were found to exceed the prescribed concentration of alcohol and a further two drivers were found to be driving with a prescribed drug concentration. Clearly, the message is not getting out there about the fact that people should not drink and drive or take drugs and drive. We have a “random breath testing any time anywhere” sort of philosophy. Any car can do a random breath test. But I suppose the message to the community is that we will still do these large, targeted events. Nine hundred in a weekend is a pretty big number.

**MR HANSON:** Anecdotally, I never see an RBT and most of the people I speak to say, “I never see an RBT.” That might be because you are not targeting there. And maybe I just do not live that sort of lifestyle. My life is pretty dull, so I am probably in the wrong spots. But you are not more broadly out there and visible; you know what I mean? Your average punter does not ever see an RBT. Is that having an impact where people think, “Oh there are no RBTs. I’ll be right”? That might be asking for an opinion.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I will say a couple of things and then Peter can take the rest of it. I did random breath testing when I started as a recruit here. To be honest with you, it was a total waste of time because we would do 2,000 tests in a weekend and we would get no positive results. It was not intelligence led. It was not targeted. It was basically just a statistical figure that we could then present to an estimates hearing. We are present. We are where we need to be. I think that the targeted approach is much better.

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** Mr Hanson, I think it is important to note that, regarding the idea of having a random breath station as such, we have got to be mindful that some people may actually know that those are the locations that we traditionally use, so they avoid those. You may not see something such as that, with a number of police vehicles undertaking that sort of activity. But what you might not recognise is that if there is a vehicle being pulled over on the side of the road, there is a possibility that that is a targeted test and we are actually undertaking an RB test at that time because we have some concerns or we have some intelligence that suggests that is an area with people driving. So it might be one or two vehicles.

**THE CHAIR:** In a concise description, how do you use intelligence gathering most effectively to test cars on the road for drugs and alcohol?

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** As the CPO just mentioned, he has been speaking to a range of key businesses within the ACT, including hoteliers. It is in their interest to ensure that people are driving safely. So they can be telling us. That is the sort of information and intelligence we are receiving. We are aware of it from reporting that might come through to us about people driving or individuals who are a risk to us and a risk to the broader community. That all goes into a form of intelligence so that we can get that out to the vehicles and ensure that the focus is not just about numbers. The focus is about really disruptive and preventative activity.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay. Thank you.

**DR PATERSON:** My question is in respect to the offence of sexual intercourse with no consent. In 2021-22 there were 148 reported offences. In the same year there were

76 that proceeded to charges against perpetrators. The number of charges has increased significantly from previous years, which I think is a good thing. I am wondering what has changed in the policing or in the collection of evidence to lead to that increase in proceedings against offenders?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I will get the DCPO to provide the details of the answer, but I think we have changed our structure a little bit as well, in relation to having more senior oversight of those investigations, which I think has been helpful.

The other thing that I think is also important to note is that we have promoted a number of sergeants this calendar year, which also has enabled us to put more experienced officers into those key roles. We had a large number of vacancies in the previous financial years, which we have been able to address. That was not just an issue for ACT Policing; it was an AFP issue, and an AFP bulk recruitment round has addressed that.

I might get the DCPO to provide some of the details in relation to some of the things we have done with the sexual assault team.

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** Dr Paterson, our reporting talks about 500 offences in the previous year. As the CPO recognised, we have changed our investigations and the make-up of the teams. That is also about ensuring that, in the determination of going forward for an investigation, and therefore a prosecution, there is more oversight.

We have a range of mechanisms that are looking throughout the course of the investigation at: how is our evidence collection going? Do we have sufficient resources and expertise undertaking that? Are we providing the right level of assistance to the victim? That is the most important part of this. It is victim led. As long as those mechanisms are in place, we maintain the confidence of the victim, the survivor of this crime. We are providing that support. We are keeping them up to date and, importantly, we are working with other agencies to provide that service and that support as well.

There are some other mechanisms, including the online historical reporting process, that are giving us the chance for people to feel a greater level of support and—comfort is probably not the right word—a level of confidence to come forward and make those reports. And then there is a better process of us providing feedback on how the investigation is going, what are the mechanisms, and working closer with the DPP in relation to going forward into a prosecution.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I also think, Dr Paterson, that the review that was released by the government just before Christmas last year certainly raised the profile of the issue. That raising the profile. A commitment by all agencies in this area, not just law enforcement but the DPP and the Victims of Crime Commissioner et cetera, to actually address it I think has given some more confidence to victim-survivors to come forward.

**DR PATERSON:** And do you think that, given all that work that has gone on, the collaborative approach and multi-agency approach is helping?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Absolutely. But there is more work to be done.

**DR PATERSON:** Yes.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I think that is only a beginning. Certainly, we will be working with those agencies that I mentioned, and others, to ensure that the appropriate models are put in place to address victim-survivors' concerns and ensure that they get what they deserve.

**DR PATERSON:** Thank you.

**MR BRADDOCK:** I would like to ask a question about bail breaches. I have seen many reports that we are on track to have the most bail breaches ever, I believe. I am trying to understand this. What is the underlying reason for this? Are there more people committing offences whilst on bail or breaching the bail conditions? Is it a case of increased policing, which has been maybe leading to people who would not have previously been caught on a bail breach now being caught?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I think the vast majority of people that we have charged with bail breach have been for not only the breaching of the bail but for other serious crimes. Again, if I look at the TORIC data, of 122 offenders arrested in a three-month period, 39 of those, a quarter—more than a third almost—were on bail. That is a pretty large number, and that is not us targeting the breach of the bail. That is actually us targeting the recidivist behaviour, whether it be the dangerous driving, the stolen motor vehicles or the burglaries.

There is no doubt that some people are charged only for a breach of bail, but a majority of those happen in the family violence space, where an alleged offender will contact a victim of family violence when they should not, and the discretion for law enforcement to do anything but arrest them is not there. The law is very clear that if someone breaches bail whilst on charges of family violence they are to be put before the court. So my answer, I suppose, to your question is that the vast majority of people that we are charging with breach of bail are committing other substantive offences.

**MR BRADDOCK:** I notice that in the *CityNews* article they talk about 940 bail breaches in the first six months of the year. Is that correct, that data? If so, that is a massive increase from previous years, where the record was 1,300.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I do not have that data in front of me. I presume that came from a *Canberra Times* article. I am not actually sure. We might have to take that on notice, because the 40 out of TORIC alone is a fairly large number.

**MR BRADDOCK:** I am happy to provide you with a copy of the article so that you can see the numbers I am referring to, which come from the AFPA.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** It is not in our annual report, so unfortunately I do not have a brief in front of me to answer the question.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Thank you.

**MR HANSON:** Where I go to the gym there is a fellow who is a security guard at nightclubs. He works the big nightclubs and he tells me that that at three in the morning, four in morning, a lot of incidents happen outside the big nightclubs. He says that what would be very useful is a body-worn camera that then would record those incidents, because there are a lot of them and they are in dispute.

I am not asking for a policy announcement at all; there is a lot of complexity to that. I am just interested, because I thought that was an interesting idea. Would it assist police or would it be better with CCTV at those venues? What are we doing, outside those particular venues in Civic, because I know that they are hotspots, to see what the truth is?

I imagine you have allegations of: “He did this,” or “She did that,” happening, and assaults and so on happening at those spots. Have you looked at that as an issue? Would it be useful to you? I need to get back to him next time we are at the gym and let him know what your thoughts are.

**Mr Gentleman:** Well, it would be useful.

**MR HANSON:** It would be useful?

**Mr Gentleman:** Any information that we can provide to police to assist them in keeping Canberra safe I think would be useful. Quite often they will use information from ACT government cameras, for example, in investigating events that occur.

**MR HANSON:** Yes. I that appreciate there are privacy issues and a whole bunch of stuff to work through—

**Mr Gentleman:** Yes, there are.

**MR HANSON:** But you would not need it everywhere. If you know that there is a particular venue, a type of venue, or areas where there is a propensity for a lot of things to happen at night—assaults and whatever it is—is that a—

**Mr Gentleman:** I would stay clear of it, Mr Hanson, I think, on those particular nights. You know, do not—

**MR HANSON:** Stay clear of them. I normally stay all night, you see, so I am out. I have not seen you at those venues lately, actually.

**Mr Gentleman:** No, you would not have. No.

**MR HANSON:** No.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** I think the Deputy Chief Police Officer would like to comment on that, Mr Hanson.

**MR HANSON:** I am interested. He might be a more frequent visitor—



**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** Well, yes; any time past about half-past seven at night, Mr Hanson, I am not awake.

**MR HANSON:** You and me both.

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** There is no question where the areas of concern are, where late night antisocial behaviour occurs. A number of those individuals do have information and we do reach out to them and speak to them about it.

I think what we have got to be very mindful of is that when we are using body-worn cameras we are also using those in conjunction with our use of force options. If we are going to go into a situation because something is quite violent, that is part of the material that we are capturing, not only in terms of what is actually happening but also our use of force and how we use that for other purposes.

The provision of a body-worn camera to a person in a security location may in itself provide us with some intelligence, but also they need to be very mindful about their activity and what they are doing at the time. There are a whole lot of protocols and frameworks around that that they would need to be very mindful of.

**MR HANSON:** I think that is part of the concern: to make sure that you keep them honest and meanwhile protect them from false allegations and provide intelligence and so on.

**Mr Gentleman:** I think what the DCPO is trying to say is that there is a legal structure behind the use of force that police use. That sits within general law, as the AFP, under the AFP Act, for example, so you would need that sort of cover or legal position to allow private security officers to do the same. Of course, they can carry firearms if they are licensed—

**MR HANSON:** Yes.

**Mr Gentleman:** So there may be an opportunity.

**Mr Glenn:** Mr Hanson, I will just add to that—

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** You go, Richard.

**Mr Glenn:** Only to reinforce that there are some policy complexities around body-worn cameras being used in any circumstance.

**MR HANSON:** Yes.

**Mr Glenn:** But we are always open to engagement with businesses around the placement and monitoring of the ACT government CCTV network to be able to address these types of issues.

**MR HANSON:** Yes; okay.

**Mr Glenn:** The CPO and I have conversations with businesspeople around the town

when they are detecting issues, to help us focus those resources to be able to address issues.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** That is the point I was going to make, so thank you.

**MR HANSON:** Can you give me an update on the work on facilities? I know that we covered this at the last hearings. There is the strategy that you will not give me a copy of, but can you give me a bit of a heads up on, since we last met, what progress has been made in the various locations? I note Gungahlin in particular, but also others.

**Mr Glenn:** Thanks, Mr Hanson. I might ask Ms Doran to address some of that.

**Ms Doran:** Thank you. I acknowledge the privilege statement. Mr Hanson, there has not been a lot of time elapsed since we last met and discussed this. The piece of work that is being done is a fairly significant strategic mapping piece of work, and it is progressing. It is still on target for the next budget cycle, so early in the new year to have the outputs of that. There is not a lot to update in that space.

The master accommodation planning work that Policing have done themselves, which is feeding into this broader piece of work, is an existing document. Under that piece there are existing infrastructure projects that are progressing at the moment. The traffic operations centre, which is now called something different, is nearing finalisation in its new premises out at Hume. I think that one is due for operational opening around February in the new year. There have been some delays to that because of supply issues that are impacting the market and the construction industry as a whole.

The other project that is underway at the moment is the JESC at Gungahlin, which again, we talked about last time. It is a staged process over a number of years. That one is crystallising the first stage, which is the movement of some of the ESA components out of the premises, which will allow ACT Policing to expand back into some of that space.

**DR PATERSON:** My question is in respect to the use of force table in the annual report. I would like to run an assumption past you and see what you think. The use of handcuffs is 640 uses in the ACT. I would assume for every other use of force that you would subsequently use handcuffs afterwards. For example, if there is a firearm used, a chemical agent, a baton, you would then put someone in handcuffs. So when you subtract all the other offences, there were only 87 handcuff uses in the ACT where you did not have to use other uses of force. So my question is: if you reduce the use of handcuffs, will that overall reduce the use of force?

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** Dr Paterson—

**DR PATERSON:** It is complicated; sorry.

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** Yes, yes. It is a little bit complicated.

**DR PATERSON:** Okay.

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** Handcuffs are used not only proportionately for the outcome of other matters but also for sometimes quite routine movements of people and the like. That happens more so in a custodial situation. It is not something that I have really thought about. If you would not mind, we will take it on notice and come back to you on how that might reflect? That is a bit of a challenging question.

**DR PATERSON:** Okay. Thank you. Sorry about that.

**MR BRADDOCK:** I have a question about ACT Policing's decision to release more information in its media releases about those that are charged or arrested. I want to understand what is the decision-making process in terms of each one. How is the community interest being served by releasing that information and does that actually help make Canberra a safer place?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Do you want to provide me with an example of that?

**MR BRADDOCK:** There was an article on 7 October in the *Canberra Times* where you were talking about having to seek legal advice as to whether you would be releasing this information. I note that there are a number of media releases issued by ACT Policing that are talking about offenders having been arrested, charged—just details of their offences. I am trying to understand what is the decision-making cycle that you go through for each of those media releases.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** There was a strategic decision that I took, as Chief Police Officer, that I would be a little bit more transparent with the community, because I think they need to know, in relation to when people were arrested or were on bail. I made that decision. You will probably see that now in all our press releases. We will make a statement very overtly about whether someone is on bail or not, because I feel the community has a right to know that. We should not be censored in relation to giving that information.

At an independent level, in relation to what we say, what we normally do is issue a press release prior to a person attending court, where we will stipulate the charges that a person has been charged with. That occurs in pretty much all circumstances, unless there is a juvenile, where we are a bit limited in what we can say. But we still will talk about the charge. Once a person appears before the court, we usually do not say anything further. It is the same when we do press releases and stand-up media events. They will usually be in the morning before someone appears in court.

We are very careful that we are not committing offences in relation to sub judice. Once a matter is before the court, we do not make public commentary on it. Obviously, there are some very, very significant high-profile matters at the moment before the court. We have said nothing, and that is the way it should be. We should not be getting into public commentary.

In short, we make a decision as circumstances arise, at a strategic level, as to what we will do. As far as the individual approval of a particular press release goes, it is done either at the superintendent level or executive level 2, with the person in charge of our media unit. Depending on the sensitivity, it may actually be done by one of our commanders. I do not think it ever escalates to DCPO. It certainly never escalates to

me. But we set the strategic direction. Am I right?

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** Yes; that is correct, CPO.

**MR BRADDOCK:** So how do you ensure that certain groups are not being presented negatively to the community? For example, with people under the age of 18, you are regularly reporting on that age group. It does create a narrative out there in the community as to what young people may be up to.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Well, we are being factual. That is the answer. We are being factual.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Do you make sure that you do not release any other information, for example, based on race or disability or anything like that, to ensure that you are not leading to community commentary against a particular group?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Yes. That is a fair question. I stand to be corrected, but I am pretty sure we do not release press releases where we talk about those issues. We talk about age, absolutely.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Does that lead to a negative portrayal of young people in the community?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** No. I think it gives the community visibility of what is occurring in the territory. I think it is important, as we move into other debates, that they have visibility of what is taking place in Canberra.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Thank you.

**MR HANSON:** I want to go to the annual report this year, compared with the annual report in 2012. I asked this in the Assembly, and I think it was taken on notice by the acting minister at the time. In 2012 there were 702 sworn officers. In the annual report now there are 691. I know that these numbers fluctuate a bit, but that is a dozen fewer police now than a decade ago, even though the population has gone up by 70,000. You could argue that law enforcement has become more complex. Can you explain what the impact of that is and how you are dealing with the fact that police numbers are flatlining whilst the population goes up?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Yes. I am sure the DCPO will have a comment on this as well. What was not articulated in the annual reports was a fairly substantial change that occurred in that interim period in relation to the workforce. Two areas were, for want of a better word, civilianised. We moved from a staff profile where we primarily had sworn police officers operating in those two areas to a staff profile where we now have primarily non-police officers in those two areas.

One of those areas is police communications, our police operations centre, where the vast majority of people in police communications are no longer police officers. Certainly, the two senior officers are police officers, but the vast majority of people in there at the moment are professional staff members who undergo a substantial training regime to get them in a position where they can take calls and they can dispatch calls.

They are actually on the radio, very professional; that is their full-time career. What that enabled us to do was then shift those police officers that were in that communications centre to frontline services, which was a better use of operational police.

**MR HANSON:** What is that number? Do you know, off the top of your head?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** It is well over 100. We will have to give you the exact number, but it is well over 100.

The other area where we moved to probably a 50 per cent civilian workforce was our intelligence area, for the primary reason that we found that the best candidates for intelligence were people that had been professionally trained through universities in relation to that particular activity. A lot of them come from the intelligence services across the lake. We ingest them into our organisation and they are a better fit for us than sworn police officers.

So it is those two areas. Again, we will have to take on notice, Chair, the exact number that transferred through. It has seen a fairly substantial shift in sworn police from what was traditionally an area that we would have police officers in. That is consistent with what takes place in, as far as I am aware, every jurisdiction, particularly on the east coast.

**MR HANSON:** How many unsworn members, then, do you have at the moment, off the top of your head?

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** Mr Whowell, do you want to take that one?

**DR PATERSON:** It is page number 96.

**MR HANSON:** I will find it in the annual report somewhere.

**DR PATERSON:** It is page 96.

**MR HANSON:** Page 96, is it?

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** 233.

**MR HANSON:** 233. And what was that number a decade ago, or am I asking too much?

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** We will have to take that on notice. We do not have the 2012 annual report with us.

**MR HANSON:** All right. Okay.

**DR PATERSON:** Just quickly, could you update us on the progress of PACER and how that has been progressing over the last 12 months?

**THE CHAIR:** You need to be brief.

**Mr Gentleman:** They have been doing a fantastic job. We have expanded PACER, provided more resources to policing and paramedics to go through that process. It is really assisting those people with mental health conditions, to stop them from entering into the criminal justice system. I will ask the directorate officials to give you the detail.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** And I think, Minister, you gave an award out today to one of my members for their involvement in PACER.

**Mr Gentleman:** That is correct.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** So it is getting community recognition, not just recognition within law enforcement.

**THE CHAIR:** I think we might wrap up. On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank the minister and the officials for their attendance today. I would like to say, too—and I am sure I speak on behalf of our community—how much we appreciate the work of ACT Policing and what you do. You put yourselves in harm’s way and you are doing it to protect the community and to make sure that we can enjoy our lives more fruitfully and fully. So thank you.

**Dep Commissioner Gaughan:** Thanks, Chair.

**Asst Commissioner Crozier:** Thank you, Chair.

**THE CHAIR:** If witnesses have taken any questions on notice, could you please provide answers to the committee secretary within five working days.

**Short suspension.**

## Appearances

Gentleman, Mr Mick, Manager of Government Business, Minister for Corrections, Minister for Industrial Relations and Workplace Safety, Minister for Planning and Land Management and Minister for Police and Emergency Services

### Justice and Community Safety Directorate

Glenn, Mr Richard, Director-General

Doran, Ms Karen, Deputy Director-General, Community Safety

Johnson, Mr Ray, Commissioner, ACT Corrective Services

Pamplin, Ms Narelle, Assistant Commissioner, Offender Reintegration, ACT Corrective Services

Aloisi, Mr Bruno, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Community Corrections, ACT Corrective Services

**THE CHAIR:** We will now hear from the Minister for Corrections and officials from the Justice and Community Safety Directorate and ACT Corrective Services. Welcome back, Minister Gentleman, and some of the same officials, as well as some new ones.

Please be aware that the proceedings are being recorded and transcribed by Hansard and will be published; they are also being broadcast and webstreamed live. When taking a question on notice, it would be useful if witnesses used these words, “I will take that as a question on notice.” This will help the committee and witnesses to confirm questions taken on notice from the transcript.

I remind witnesses of the protections and obligations afforded by parliamentary privilege and draw your attention to the privilege statement. Could those present and those on Webex please confirm for the record that you understand the privilege implications of the statement? Thank you.

As we are not inviting opening statements, we will proceed to questions. Can I ask the minister and officials to be concise with your questions? Please do not hand over to another official if they are just going to say the same thing. I will lead off, and I will pass my question to Mrs Kikkert.

**MRS KIKKERT:** I would like to talk about the reintegration centre. In the annual report it says that the project is not progressing. However, when I asked about the funding for the reintegration centre in the 2020-21 estimates hearings, Minister, you said that the funds still sit there for the moment; yet the project funding has been revised down to \$1.5 million. How much of the originally allocated \$35 million is still sitting there, as you said?

**Mr Gentleman:** There was, of course, funding for that. We then needed some critical repair to be done to other parts of the AMC and improvement to AMC following storm damage and damage from incidents, in addition to the strategic assessment of the long-term future accommodation needs of the facility. We were able to use that flexibility to do that work. I will ask directorate officials to give you the detail on the funding.

**Ms Doran:** I acknowledge the privilege statement. With the reintegration centre, when the wording says that it is not progressing, it means it is not progressing at the moment, at the construction phase. Certainly, the consideration around the best option there is still progressing.

The funding that was originally allocated to the reintegration centre is being held in the budget in what is called a provision, which means it is not directly allocated, but it is sitting there for the time when government reconsiders the options of either the timing of a reintegration centre or another facility that serves the needs of the AMC.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Is that the full \$35 million that is sitting there—or would it be less than that, because of the 1.4?

**Ms Doran:** The amounts that were originally allocated, yes, less what has already been spent.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Minister, you mentioned that some of that money from the funding has gone into fixing damage at AMC. In the estimates hearings in 2021-22, when I asked whether that funding had gone into fixing hailstorm damage and damage from fires and riots, you said:

Sorry, no. Those funds are being allocated from our insurance costs. The funds still sit there at the moment.

Could you please clarify whether any funding from the reintegration centre, the \$35 million, was spent on fixing the damage from the fires, as well as from the hailstorm? Minister, you did say that the funding for that is not actually coming from the reintegration centre but from the insurance costs.

**Mr Gentleman:** Yes. In my response to you just now, I said there is also funding for the facilitation of critical repair and improvements at AMC. That is on top of the TRC funding, the integration centre funding.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Is any of the funding going towards improvement at the transitional unit?

**Ms Doran:** I can confirm that no money has gone from the sources that were originally allocated for the reintegration centre to the other repair works. The original provisions in the budget, as I said, less a small amount that was spent on early design work for the reintegration centre, is all being held, in a sense, for what might be the future works to be undertaken in that context.

With the various repair works, while no money has been spent on them, they have cost, in a sense, in terms of resourcing and time at the AMC. That was certainly part of the reason for deferring further construction works at the AMC at the same time—so deferring the reintegration centre works. The two repairs that were happening as a result of the incident, as well as the hail damage repairs, are being substantially covered by insurance moneys.



**MRS KIKKERT:** Could you answer the other question about the transitional unit? Was any of the funding for the reintegration centre forwarded to the transitional unit upgrade?

**Ms Doran:** Again, I would answer that by saying that the original moneys allocated in the budget for the reintegration centre, apart from the \$1.45 million, are being held as a provision for future considerations of the government. There have been moneys spent from other sources on some upgrades to the transitional release centre to facilitate it being used in a more efficient way.

**DR PATERSON:** Through estimates—and I appreciate that it was only a matter of weeks ago—we discussed the issue of education at AMC and the lack of an RTO operator there. Has that progressed any further since we last spoke?

**Mr Johnson:** Thank you for the question. I acknowledge the privilege statement. It has; and I commented last time—as you say, it was only a few weeks ago—that we were at a sensitive point in the discussions with a potential provider, after the tender process. Ultimately, we could not obtain value for money, as we are required to do for the territory, through that process. I terminated that tender process because we could not get what we wanted out of it.

We have approached it differently. This approach will certainly be an interim measure, but I think it has some merit for us in a longer term approach. That approach is to go to existing panel providers. We have gone through the process of working out what our priority programs are, in consultation with detainees, Skills ACT and others. We are now going out on multiple statements of requirements to panel providers who are already on government panels to provide those programs. We will insource some of the management of the coordination of those efforts.

We already have seven statements of requirements out in the market. I expect another four or five to go in the next week. I would hope to have people on contract for the provision of those services. Whilst it would be great to have it before Christmas, the reality is that we will be delivering programs soon after Christmas, based on that approach. That will give us a bit of time to reconsider whether going to one single provider for all services out there is the right way to go about it, or whether we are better managing internally and we can better control which training programs or which courses are being delivered, and be a bit more nimble about delivering them, and perhaps a wider range of them.

We are even turning our mind to how we might be able to use our own RTO status, which is primarily for training of staff, but it is still a status that we could use, potentially. I am trying to look a bit more innovatively at how we will do it, on the basis of what was not a successful tender process.

**DR PATERSON:** Is it possible to give a little bit of scope of what areas of training you are looking at?

**Mr Johnson:** Yes, I can. There are 21 currently in the list of priority programs. There are things like general education for adults—literacy and numeracy—a certificate in kitchen operations, a certificate II in agriculture, a certificate I in horticulture, a

certificate in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural arts, a certificate in transport and logistics, certificates in retail services, information and cultural services, and certificates in business.

There is a certificate in general education which can be applied to a range of things that people might want to do. There is asbestos awareness training, which is practical, in terms of working on sites where there is asbestos. There are certificates in baking. They are the programs that are in that top tier. There is a certificate I in conservation and ecosystem management, which opens up opportunity for jobs in conservation and community.

**MR BRADDOCK:** The ACT Inspector of Correctional Services, in the review of the death in custody on 1 February, made reference to a risk that had been identified and reported by AMC facilities management staff in 2015 but had not been addressed by the then AMC general manager. How do we ensure that any risks that have been identified are effectively addressed at AMC?

**Mr Johnson:** If the question is about how we are trying to do that now, there are a couple of levels to that. There is a small team at the AMC that work directly to the general manager, and that work on compliance. They review compliance on a range of things that happen at the AMC that we are required to do under legislation and so forth.

We also have a quality assurance team, which is designed primarily to take things that we learn about how to do our work, be it from an inspector's review, a court outcome or a range of other things. That might well include an issue that was identified that needed to be addressed from a facilities point of view. We would have a central process of knowing that we had it; then there would be regular reviews. That is how we manage recommendations and so forth. We have the same process for ourselves.

If it came out of an internal operational review, the same process would exist. If we said, "We need you to do something," it would go to what we call our recommendations management process, and we would track it from there.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Would there be a risk register of known risk to detainee safety, an assessment of whether action needs to be taken, and whether it has been accepted?

**Mr Johnson:** With a single register, not necessarily. Certainly, anything that is identified is assessed and drawn out, and there will be a risk assessment undertaken. We obviously do risk assessments regularly on things like COVID-19 risk. We have risk assessments, for example, on the design and use of our vehicles. We do a risk assessment on what we need to do to make it as safe as reasonably possible. With any new initiatives, we will do a risk assessment on the scanners—not so much the scanners themselves but the processes that go either side of it, in terms of legal compliance, safety and security. That is the process that we would go through.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Where did the system fail for this particular incident?

**Mr Johnson:** I do not necessarily want to say that it had failed at this point. That will be a matter for the Coroner to turn his mind to. I probably would not want to get into

the specifics of it. I think there is more to the story. I am a bit uncomfortable with going into the story at this point. I would be happy to, once the Coroner has done his work.

**MRS KIKKERT:** I would like to talk about the Inspector of Correctional Services funding. Minister, you said that you support the inspector of corrections budget submissions, yet for the last three years you have not done so, with their efforts to secure funding for one or more full-time employees. In relation to the inspector's budget bids, you have said you are working closely with the office and that you support their claims, and that you will consider any additional resourcing as part of the usual budget processes. The estimates and JACS committees have both recommended for the last two years that you increase funding to the inspector's office. Will you increase funding for the inspector now?

**Mr Gentleman:** These are budget submissions that go to ERC and are discussed at budget cabinet. They are decisions for budget cabinet. I refer to the comments I have made to you previously, Mrs Kikkert. I do support the funding that the inspector has requested, and I put those arguments forward.

**MRS KIKKERT:** This is *deja vu*. You said that two years ago, yet you still have not, Minister. In relation to this—

**Mr Gentleman:** No, that is not the case, Mrs Kikkert. I should clarify that these are decisions for budget cabinet. They are not decisions for a single minister. When I say I support them, I do.

**MRS KIKKERT:** You are advocating to cabinet on their behalf, to increase the funding?

**Mr Gentleman:** Yes, we put forward those budget cabinet submissions, and I advocate for them.

**MRS KIKKERT:** And the cabinet denied them having that opportunity to increase their funding?

**Mr Gentleman:** There are many budget submissions that we put forward, Mrs Kikkert, over the financial year, and discussions in budget cabinet. Some are quite successful; others are not. That is a matter for budget cabinet, of course.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Minister, the inspector for corrections said that it is clear to OICS that lack of human resources limits their ability to effectively perform some of their functions, such as following up on the implementation of recommendations and maintaining regular oversight of Bimberi. He went on to say that, in an earlier phase of OICS evolution, "we attempted a validation process for government-agreed recommendations but found that we did not have staff resources to support this process". The inspector himself has expressed reservations that they cannot perform as effectively with the resources they have. That is pretty serious. Do you agree with his assessment?

**Mr Gentleman:** I have supported the correctional services inspector in his claims

before. As to matters that are in front of Bimberi, that would be a matter for the minister to discuss at that time.

**MRS KIKKERT:** How concerned are you that the Inspector of Correctional Services does not have the resources to verify that recommendations he has provided in his reports are being implemented by you and your department?

**Mr Gentleman:** I think we have accepted all of the recommendations that the inspector has put forward and moved to implement those recommendations. I am not concerned about our response to that. I think it has been forthright.

**MRS KIKKERT:** That is part of his duty, though, to make sure that it is done properly. You said, “Yes, we have done the recommendations,” but not all of the recommendations in his reports have been implemented.

**Mr Gentleman:** Yes, we have agreed to the recommendations, and we go forward with implementing those recommendations.

**MRS KIKKERT:** If the inspector is not able to fulfil his duty in verifying the implementation of those recommendations, who is?

**Mr Gentleman:** We report back on the outcomes of those recommendations and the actions from them.

**DR PATERSON:** My question is about drugs and contraband coming over the fence at AMC. What is done about that and what can be done about that, particularly in areas where the fence line is close to cell blocks or accommodation?

**Mr Johnson:** We have had a good example quite recently of the cooperation between police and corrections, and the value of intelligence. I do not say that intelligence will solve the problem every time, but it has certainly proved useful on occasions. Recently, in the last day or so, we saw a media release about an individual arrested who was alleged to have attempted an introduction over the fence at the AMC. That was an interdiction that was prevented. Evidence also came to light about contraband that was in the facility at the same time, so an amount of contraband was taken out of the system as a result.

There is good CCTV coverage of the fence lines. I would not want to go into too much detail around how that looks and what security measures are in place, lest somebody might work out a way to circumvent them. Clearly, something that we focus on a lot, from a security perspective, is the risk of over-the-fence introductions. We have talked before about things like drones and other things. Somebody with a good hand and a tennis ball can do quite a bit.

Officers have done an excellent job in recent times in identifying those. They will identify them on camera or in person and manage to collect it. They might have to close down a unit and collect it before somebody gets to it. Unfortunately, it does not always happen that way, but we have been quite successful on that front.

We continue to build our relationships with Policing. I am limited in what I can say

about the work that the security team do. Are we always successful? No. But our success rate, I think, has gone up.

**DR PATERSON:** It is proactive policing on the fence?

**Mr Johnson:** Yes, indeed.

**MR BRADDOCK:** I have a question about body scanners. When are they likely to be operational and are there policies in place for the use of those scanners?

**Mr Johnson:** Yes. Pretty much all of the work is done to allow the body scanners to work, but we need to have a radiation certificate. We are in the machinery of getting a certificate to operate a radiation device. We were to appear before the Radiation Council last month. That meeting did not occur, but we are waiting for the next meeting to come up and we will appear before them to get the licence done.

We have done the training of staff, in terms of managing radiological equipment—not for everyone, but for core staff that can use the facility. We have training done for staff on how to operate the machinery. Technically, we cannot operate it until we have the certificate, so it is, in a sense, virtual, but they will be ready to go once the machines can be turned on.

We have a network system. We have them installed. The policies and procedures are pretty much signed off now, for use. We are pretty advanced and we are now just waiting for that final radiation certificate for operation.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Are you anticipating in the next month or two being able to obtain that certificate and start operation?

**Mr Johnson:** I am always loath to predict government machinery. Yes, I would hope to have them operating well and truly before Christmas.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Will there be a drop in the number of physical inspections or strip searches of detainees once the body scanners become operational?

**Mr Johnson:** I would expect so. We will see another drop in strip searches. We have seen a drop in strip searches already, based on some changes in policy and procedure. From the previous financial year to last financial year, we saw nearly a halving of the number of strip searches.

**MR BRADDOCK:** What was the change in policy or procedure connected to that drop?

**Mr Johnson:** Previous to that, detainees were strip searched to and from court. We discontinued that process. We have come up with another way to manage that. If you are admitted, as part of the admission process, with your first appearance in our custody, usually the search is done at the court transport unit. That mixing of detainees is not the issue anymore. That is usually the only strip search that is done in any fashion that the act requires. The rest of them are done on the basis of suspicion or it comes back to the question of contraband. It has dropped quite substantially in

numbers, even before we introduce the X-ray scanners. I would expect them to drop again as a result of the operation. That is the experience in New South Wales as well. They have dropped, again, as a result of their use of it.

**MRS KIKKERT:** How many body scanners will there be and how much do they cost?

**Mr Johnson:** There were two body scanners purchased. We were funded from an earlier budget bid for the first one; then we received funding for the second one, post the inspector's review last year. I think that funding came for the minister about 12 months ago. I might have to take on notice, unless somebody has the figures in front of them, exactly what we fully spent on them. It was about \$700,000, I think, on the two machines.

**MRS KIKKERT:** On the two machines; okay.

**Mr Johnson:** Plus all of the connections, the fittings and the labour that go into installing it et cetera.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Infrastructure.

**Mr Johnson:** I think it was in that order, but we can certainly give you the figure on notice, to be precise.

**MRS KIKKERT:** I want to go back to the question on education. When did the government first send out a tender for a new contract?

**Mr Johnson:** 21 November 2021 was the release of the tender.

**MRS KIKKERT:** When was the first expression of interest received?

**Mr Johnson:** I would have to check when the tender closed. I do not have that in front of me. I think it was in the new year, this year.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Did you say 21 November 2020 or 2021?

**Mr Johnson:** 2021; a bit less than 12 months ago.

**MRS KIKKERT:** A bit after the fact that the education provider's contract had expired, in June 2021; correct?

**Mr Johnson:** We extended the current provider for six months. With that contract, they were not working at that time in the centre because of the COVID lockdowns. We extended them; then they withdrew from the contract extension. They did that in October.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Did you know at some point that they were not going to continue being the provider of education programs at AMC, before their contract had expired in June 2021?

**Mr Johnson:** No.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Is it the normal process of the government to seek out a tender process for a particular program after the expiry of the contract?

**Mr Johnson:** The process to get ready to go to the contract—it is going back to my early days, but it was already underway. There is quite a bit of work that needs to be done before you can actually go to market on that process. Would it have been ideal if we had done it sooner? Yes, it would have been.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Was there any discussion between your department or AMC with the education provider before the contract expired in June, asking them whether they were thinking of extending their contract with AMC for a couple more years?

**Mr Johnson:** There was certainly a conversation about extending the contract, in line with the ability to extend the contract, which was the initial extension of six months. Our expectation was that they would have fulfilled that six months and be open to any other contract extensions. We were not necessarily expecting them to not continue their service past October.

**MRS KIKKERT:** I am trying to wrap my mind around the fact that the AMC, the prison in the capital city of Australia, does not have proper education for our detainees. The government knew full well that their education provider would be gone by October 2021, yet the tender process went out in November. If you knew that the education provider was not going to be there, why didn't you send out a tender before the expiry date?

**Mr Johnson:** As I said, we were not necessarily aware that the provider was not going to continue services past October. That was a surprise to us. There is a reasonable amount of work that has to be done before you can let a tender of that size and complexity to the market. That process had started before they had finished their services. Would it have been ideal to have started it earlier? Yes, it probably would have been. Certainly, there was not a process of saying, "Now we've got no-one as a service, we'd better go out to market." That work had already well started.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Because it is now a struggle again to find an education provider for AMC, would CIT be in a position to provide education for AMC? Considering you mentioned the programs that the previous provider extended to AMC—horticulture, agriculture, retail, business and baking—all of those programs are conducted by CIT. Is that something that the government has considered before? We could then get an education provider at AMC earlier, rather than the detainees not having an education pretty much for over a year now.

**Mr Gentleman:** Mrs Kikkert, I am not sure that CIT are expert in providing education settings within a custodial setting. So there are those considerations. You raise an interesting point. I would like to certainly see CIT used more regularly across government. If there is an opportunity to do that, we will certainly engage.

**Mr Johnson:** I think with the process that we have now embarked upon that is a better chance. I cannot get into the machinations, I do not think, unless somebody tells

me otherwise, in terms of the contract process, which is still who tendered and who did not. The results of those tenders would still be commercial-in-confidence, I would expect, as CIT is in the market and could have, would have, may have tendered and been successful or not been successful. It makes it very difficult to go to someone else to provide a service while we are in the market for a tender.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Okay.

**DR PATERSON:** Recently the UN subcommittee on the prevention of torture visited Australia, and they actually suspended their visit because of a lack of cooperation. I saw on the news that Queanbeyan—I think it might have been their police station—would not let them in there. Did they come to AMC?

**Mr Johnson:** Yes, they did. They came to AMC. They were in Canberra, of course, for consultations with commonwealth government, the attorney's office, and the ACT government as well. We sort of expected they might, and they did. They came in the afternoon of whatever date that was.

**DR PATERSON:** Did we let them in?

**Mr Johnson:** We let them in.

**DR PATERSON:** Okay.

**Mr Johnson:** In fact, the feedback, I understand, was quite positive. We had a couple of staff not escort them but allow them access around the facility. They spoke to a number of detainees. They spoke to a number of staff. As it turns out, the deputy inspector was out there, doing what she does, and ran into them. I think they were impressed by the fact that the deputy inspector had her own keys and was able to go where she wanted in the facility. I was pretty pleased by the way staff dealt with it. We had quite a bit of preparation for them to understand what the mechanism was about, what they were about. It seemed to work pretty well. They were well engaged with. My understanding is that the feedback was positive from our experience with the SPT.

**DR PATERSON:** And will they give formal feedback about their visit?

**Mr Gentleman:** My understanding is that they give formal feedback to the country.

**DR PATERSON:** Okay.

**Mr Gentleman:** So it will be to the commonwealth, and then that would feed back down through us.

**Mr Glenn:** Yes. Thanks, Minister. I acknowledge the privilege statement. Yes, there is a discussion now between the SPT and the commonwealth as to whether the SPT might resume their visit. Typically, they would report back to the commonwealth about their experience of going around the country, at the conclusion of their time. It is a little bit unknown as to whether they will resume their visit and when they might report, but commonwealth colleagues are in liaison with the SPT now.



**DR PATERSON:** Will they make recommendations on what should be improved?

**Mr Gentleman:** It is usually observations on what occurs.

**Mr Glenn:** It is usually observations. To the extent that they make suggestion, it is about compliance with OPCAT and those things, as opposed to more granular observations about particular facilities.

**DR PATERSON:** Thank you.

**MR BRADDOCK:** The ACT Official Visitor annual report makes mention of female detainees being moved from a special care centre back to the women's community centre. That led to a large number of complaints about violence, a lack of access to activities and programs, and distress to vulnerable detainees. Are you in a position to respond, particularly to the complaints about violence and the distress to vulnerable detainees?

**Mr Johnson:** I suppose it is due to a couple of things. The move back to the women's centre was something that women were keen on. There were a lot of reasons for them to move from where they were, because it was within the male part of the facility, which brings its challenges. The reason they were originally moved was that the numbers were too high for the existing women's centre. That move was to a less ideal location, based on the numbers. They were moved back more than 12 months ago, I think, in that process.

Initially, there was a desire for the people who were occupying it to not leave, because they quite liked it there. The women moved back in and it was working quite well. We were aware then that there were some issues with violence. There were interpersonal relationships that were challenging. There are some limitations with the women's centre in terms of segregation and association challenges and so forth. But a considerable amount of work has been done on the women's centre in light of what we call the integrated offender management program, to pilot what we are trying to do across the whole centre.

I can hand to Narelle, who is the Assistant Commissioner, Offender Reintegration, to talk a little bit about the journey we have had since those early days when they moved back to WCC.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Thank you.

**Ms Pamplin:** I acknowledge the privilege statement The Integrated Offender Management Framework has been a whole-of-system reform that we have been piloting with the women's area. We have partnered specifically with Karralika alcohol and drug treatment in the community centre to deliver a core set of service delivery methodologies for the women in that area. That has been supported also by structured day activities and by intensive case management. We have dedicated case managers, ongoing case conferencing, and we have been looking at the integration of additional programs into that—parenting programs, some wellbeing programs, and moving towards much more life skills based programs.

We started with the initial AOD pilot, and we have been doing the wraparound services for the women. We expect to have some data on that first 10-week program by the end of the year. We will make some amendments and then look to how that will look for women with their structured day activities into the new year.

**Mr Johnson:** On top of that, coming back to your point about the suggestion of violence in that space, there were a couple of things, I think, in the early days, that we learnt, and one was the desire to stabilise our staff there, rather than having staff moving too regularly through it. So we put in people with more of an experience with the women in that area. We put great effort into stabilising the staff. It is not always possible, because of rosters, but we certainly have a corrections officer level 3 that is particularly focused now on the women's centre.

Narelle could probably give a bit more detail, if you would like, about some work done in the early days to try and remediate the interpersonal conflicts with particular women in the centre at the time. There was some really intensive counselling and coaching and, for want of a better word, mediation that was done to try and relieve some of the tension in the centre. That would have been probably nine or 10 months ago.

**Ms Pamplin:** Yes, by our specialist clinicians, who were there every morning and undertook some specialist mediation for the women, focusing on the interpersonal conflicts. That actually worked to enable them to be in the rooms. Those who previously would not associate agreed through verbal and written contract to actually work together to complete their activities, such that no-one was disadvantaged. Obviously, that is an ongoing process and we aim to step that up into far more intensive work. It a very delicate balance of intense therapeutic work in very small and close confines, such as the women's area, and we have to maintain that very, very delicate balance quite carefully.

**MR BRADDOCK:** When you do conduct the review of this particular program or activity, however you wish to describe it, will that include assessment of the number of complaints about violence and also the perception of safety from the detainees?

**Ms Pamplin:** It will.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Thank you.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Page 73 refers to the CTU and how it will have new vehicles entering the fleet from the first half of the 2022-23 financial year. I am just curious: will any of those fleets replace Romeo or can you give us an update on Romeo?

**Mr Johnson:** Yes, they will. I got an update on it only today. It has been a frustrating journey, in fact, because the vehicles to replace it were ordered back in January, to get them into the country and then get them fitted out. Fitting out requires you to access companies who are also fitting out equipment for a whole heap of other services who also did not get cars for a period of time, so we have been in a bit of a queue.

There are couple of things I can say. We were very kindly provided the opportunity to

transition a vehicle from the AFP to us. That was completed and that vehicle is in our fleet. That is an extra vehicle that is in our fleet which is particularly focused on the AMC but does free up a vehicle in the CTU to allow them to do what they need to do.

At least three vehicles were ordered together. After the design work was done, they are in the country, they are with the company that is doing all the fit-out and we are told that we will be able to inspect them in the next week or so and we should have them by the end of the month. They will then decommission the vehicles that need decommissioning on receipt of those three. There are a couple more vehicles in train, but it will be next year by the time they come through.

**MRS KIKKERT:** So can you clarify: is the Romeo being refitted? Your first comment was that some vehicles are being refitted but that you had issues with transportation. Is Romeo being refitted or is—

**Mr Johnson:** No. The vehicles that will come out of service are Romeo 5 and the other vehicle that is due to come out of service—Romeo 4. They will come out of service and these vehicles will replace them.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Okay. Thank you. Regarding the Justice Housing Program reference on page 76 of the annual reports, is there a maximum length of stay for a detainee in the justice house?

**Mr Johnson:** Sorry; would you repeat the question?

**MRS KIKKERT:** Is there a maximum length of day for a detainee to stay there?

**Mr Johnson:** Length of stay?

**MRS KIKKERT:** Yes.

**Mr Johnson:** There is no hard rule on the length of stay. Perhaps I can again hand to Narelle, who has got the detail about that. The Justice Housing Program sits in her portfolio. She can give you some more detail.

**Ms Pamplin:** The Justice Housing Program is a transitional model that is based on the initial contract being a 12-week period, with the option of extension for 12 weeks post that. We do not tend to have people stay longer than that. Again, we try very hard to wrap around supports such that they move into longer term accommodation, but there is nothing that would preclude somebody from staying in the accommodation for any length of time.

**MRS KIKKERT:** All right. So they can stay there a little bit longer if they have nowhere else to go.

**Ms Pamplin:** Yes.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Okay. Great. Thank you.

**DR PATERSON:** Just in respect to recruitment, I saw recently a media release on

10 new recruits. Again, I am interested in the gender balance and how you encourage women into correctional services.

**Mr Gentleman:** Yes, we certainly do. I was pleased to join the commissioner for the new recruits' college coming out. There were just a couple of women in this course. There were quite a number of people that applied and, in this case, 10 people that graduated from that recruit course. That goes into our compounding recruiting for the future as well.

We do like to see, of course, a better gender balance. We have had some success in the past, but it normally depends on those really wanting to be involved in the job. I had the opportunity to have a conversation with quite a few of them during the graduation process and they came from quite a wide variety of backgrounds. The women I spoke to had done shift work before, which was good, and security work as well. That, I think, helps them integrate into this sort of work. I will ask the commissioner to give you more detail.

**Mr Johnson:** Yes. Thank you. I appreciate your interest in this subject. We have talked a bit about it. I would have liked more women on that program, yes; absolutely. We had two out of 10. That is 20 to 25 per cent, which tends to be what comes through the applicant process.

We are going to have to look differently, I think, at how we deal with increasing the numbers. I would love to consider, perhaps, thinking of the women's cohort and the men's cohort separately. I would like to prequalify both and then decide what the ratio is on courses and so forth. We have been in the market now for a course that starts next year. It will fill both AMC custodial and the court transport unit in the one course.

We have gone out twice for those two particular places and I am watching with some interest to see what the applicant make-up is. If I was a betting person, I would probably say it is about 25 per cent. How we get the best out of that group and how we get the most women on the program is a consideration. That diversity is really important for good outcomes and, again, comes back to the women's area. The women can work through that area and work through the male area, the more it suits us. It is very effective.

**DR PATERSON:** This may be a stupid question, but can you become a correctional officer if you have been detained in the past?

**Mr Johnson:** I think it would become difficult.

**DR PATERSON:** Okay; yes.

**Mr Johnson:** You do need to go through a criminal history check. It would be difficult. I suppose it depends. There are inevitably people who would have probably drink driving things in the past. There are people I know that we have allowed through who maybe 10 years ago were either juvenile or young offenders with minor offences, so, yes. But they would potentially still qualify or enough time has gone by to show that they have got on with life and that time is behind them. I think it becomes difficult particularly if it is in the jurisdiction. If it was in this jurisdiction

that you were in custody in, to then be back in the facility as a custodial officer I think would be very difficult.

**DR PATERSON:** In terms of the training that custodial officers go through, is there any engagement with people with lived experience, such as people who have been detained, to understand their perspective or what it is like as a detainee? I know they are engaging on a daily basis but—

**Mr Johnson:** Yes. A lot of that comes through placement. In the 12-week course, they have quite a number of weeks of placements in different posts in different locations and an ability to talk and engage with detainees. That is an informative exercise.

**Mr Gentleman:** In fact, they spoke about that, didn't they, at the graduation?

**Mr Johnson** Yes. Most of the time they seem a bit more energised by that process. There is a great fear of what the unknown looks like, so once they have got some experience of detainees and have a stake in their journey, I think that gives them some comfort that they are actually able to do the job that they are doing.

So that is usually the way that we engage with them. There are opportunities, through the course, for people to talk about lived experience, particularly Aboriginal people and their experience with the justice system. That is a really important part of the journey for them. There are multiple opportunities to do that through their course. They are technically on probation, whilst they finish their certificate of correctional services, for a period of time after that. So they stay in the learning world for a period of time past that.

**DR PATERSON:** In policing in the Northern Territory they have Aboriginal community police officers that have different training and different job requirements. Is there any scope for having Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander correctional officers here? Are there incentives to recruit Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander correctional officers, but also are there other roles for people to create a more culturally safe prison?

**Mr Johnson:** Yes. I think the work is ongoing there, absolutely. We have a number of Aboriginal custodial officers who are trained custodial officers. We also have roles in the Indigenous services team, which provides a particular service with Indigenous detainees and that has some arm's length distance from custodial. The design is for them to build more trusted relationships with Indigenous people in custody because, inevitably, the trust level is quite low. We are trying to build some trust. If there was an analogy to your concept of the community policing officer, I think that is probably it, to a degree. But I think we have still got learning to do about how to do it better. I think it is a journey for us.

**DR PATERSON:** Thank you.

**Mr Glenn:** I will say that, Dr Paterson, as I look across the workforce of all of JACS, corrections ranks very highly on the rate of employment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. They are very successful, from a directorate perspective, in

being able to attract and retain Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff. That is a testament to the work that the teams have been putting in to make it a culturally safe employment experience for people.

**DR PATERSON:** Thank you.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Has there been any progress on detainee access to computers and the internet for the purposes of external study?

**Mr Johnson:** I might have to take that on notice. It is certainly something we are conscious of. I know some detainees do not think we are making much progress on that front. The team were going away to consider that. A lot of work was being done with the universities to try and come up with another way to provide the services, because there inevitably are some challenges with the secure facility. Our prison PC system, whilst it was cutting edge some years ago, is now obviously not. There is newer technology, so we are trying to look at how we can implement that. The challenge, though, is always with external access to the internet. It is tricky and difficult. I know the person responsible for this work has been working really hard with the universities and others, on technology and so forth, to work out what we can put on a government computer that will allow that to happen.

Do I say I have fixed it? No, I cannot say that. I would love to be able to say to you at the next estimates hearing that we have got a solution to that. I think the challenge with technology is that they have got a longer way to run. There are real opportunities in using technology better in the centre. We are trying to use iPads, for example, to improve our ability for people in the cell to consult with clinicians. It is supervised to a degree, and we are not issuing them to everyone, but it is the first step into a world where we may be able to do some more handheld computing. So, again, it is a bit of a journey.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Yes. Can you please take it on notice, if there is anything else that you might not have mentioned just now in terms of progress in that space? I would be interested.

**Mr Johnson:** Yes, certainly. We can do that.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Thank you.

**MRS KIKKERT:** You mentioned handheld computing and some detainees having iPads. Is that what you said before?

**Mr Johnson:** Not so much the detainee issue with the iPad, but our staff having the iPad and then allowing them to use it on occasions. Narelle, is that something you want to speak a little bit more on?

**Ms Pamplin:** Yes. On occasions, with telehealth, we do not use external but if there is an internal provided who needs a follow-up psychology assessment or needs access to a psychiatrist, some of those are done in the room with a qualified clinician there. So we actually are monitoring that in an appropriate and clinically sound manner but they are not disadvantaged by either the lack of access to the facility or the fact that we do

not have the person with the appropriate qualifications on tap.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Okay. Thanks for that clarification. In the last estimates hearing we were speaking about support and case management, in regard to them receiving support psychologically. Has there been any improvement in that area?

**Mr Johnson:** I will hand back to Narelle. Do you want to speak on that one?

**Ms Pamplin:** Sure.

**Mr Johnson:** The short answer is yes, but I will let Narelle expand.

**Ms Pamplin:** Correct me if I am wrong, but I think the conversation was around the employment of a forensic psychologist in order to give advice on cases. We do have access to a forensic psychologist. They are contracted and they are available to all of our case management and sub-specialty areas on a case-by-case basis. If you are talking about individual staff support, that would be a different matter.

**MRS KIKKERT:** No, not individual staff support, but in a workshop-type of environment where they get taught how to deal with detainees with sexual behaviours and very challenging aggressive behaviours. That is the kind of support that I am talking about.

**Ms Pamplin:** Yes. We have a contracted specific forensic psychologist. We have two dedicated sex offender treatment specialists who also are psychologists, and we are looking to broaden that as well. There are a number of other discipline-specific and specialist areas that we would like to contract out as well.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Very nice. How often do they come in and give a workshop or support to the case managers?

**Ms Pamplin:** I would have to get back to you exactly on how many. I have just signed off on two this week. They are usually around specific cases, rather than specific training or as a whole-of-team approach.

**MRS KIKKERT:** That is great.

**Ms Pamplin:** But, yes, we do that quite regularly. That would be the answer.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Okay; thank you.

**Mr Johnson:** Also relevant to that, I think, and slightly off topic, is that we are doing some work now with the corrections officers and a program they call the Five-Minute Interventions Program. It is particularly designed to make the interventions, the conversations that the custodial officers have with detainees, very purposeful. Everyone gets an opportunity, as they should, to contribute to the case management of a particular detainee on their journey. It does not always work, but we are trying to prepare staff to have those conversations not only with difficult detainees but with any detainee, to help them on their journey. That is in its infancy, but we have rolled that out to a number of staff and we have got some training to train the trainers and we are

thinking about how we are going to continue that program as well.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Thank you. In regard to the community corrections improvement project, what policies were completed as part of this project?

**Mr Johnson:** This gives me a great opportunity to hand over to Bruno Aloisi, who is our assistant commissioner of community corrections, who led that work.

**Mr Aloisi:** I acknowledge the privilege statement. There were a range of policies and procedures and they covered pretty much all areas of operation. That might include how we supervise someone on bail and what sort of input we might put into reports for court assessments. We have really covered the whole spectrum of our operations and proceduralised pretty much all our day-to-day work.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Okay. Great. Thank you. Are any aspects of the project yet to be completed?

**Mr Aloisi:** No, the project has now been fully completed. That project, I think, was closed around June or July this year.

**MRS KIKKERT:** And are they publicly available, those projects?

**Mr Aloisi:** Yes. As per all policies and procedures, they are available through open access.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Okay. Great.

**Mr Johnson:** I would note that the work is coordinated with the innovative offender management team as well. For example, case management in the community now should be relatively seamless with case management in detention, if somebody moves from detention into the community, to make sure that that all comes together properly and well. That was part of that body of work.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Great. Thank you.

**MR BRADDOCK:** You will probably have to take this on notice. How many sentenced detainees were released from AMC in the financial year?

**Mr Johnson:** In the financial year?

**MR BRADDOCK:** Yes.

**Mr Johnson:** I may have to take that on notice. I think there was a question on notice on that subject that was for six months. We have got that. Do we have those figures from the financial year for sentenced detainee releases?

**Ms Pamplin:** It is the last 12 months, until 28 October, so it is not—

**Mr Johnson:** Yes. It is a 12-month period. would that suit your purpose?



**MR BRADDOCK:** If it is a 12-month period, I will take it.

**Ms Pamplin:** 797 detainees were released from custody.

**Mr Johnson:** In total, but that is not just sentenced; that is remandees.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Okay, but I would be interested in sentenced over a 12-month period.

**Mr Johnson:** We will have to take that on notice.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Thank you.

**Mr Johnson:** We can do that for you.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay. thank you. It has just turned 6 o'clock and the committee's hearing for today is now adjourned.

**Mr Johnson:** Chair, I can take a question on notice off notice, if you could give me a moment. I can answer one of the questions that I took on notice.

**THE CHAIR:** Okay; sure. Thank you.

**Mr Johnson:** It went to the cost of the scanners. The cost, excluding GST, for all installation was \$601,000.57.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Thank you.

**THE CHAIR:** Today's hearing is now adjourned. I would like to thank the minister and officials from corrections for your attendance today. If witnesses have taken any questions on notice, could you please provide the answers to committee support within five working days of the receipt of the uncorrected proof of the transcript.

I want to say, as I said earlier, that I realise that corrections work is not always the easiest task, so we do thank you for being in that environment, with the goal of really assisting people who have taken a wrong turn to maybe make some better decisions. Thank you for that and for all those that support you.

If members wish to lodge questions on notice, please get them to the committee secretariat within five working days of the hearing. Thank you, everyone.

**The committee adjourned at 6.01 pm.**