



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

**JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON
INTEGRITY**

Annual Report 2024

*Laid upon the Tables of both Houses of Parliament
pursuant to section 26 of the Integrity Commission Act 2009*

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Legislative Council

Ms Armitage (Chair)
Ms O'Connor
Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)

House of Assembly

Mr Jenner
Ms White
Mr Wood

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	4
	Joint Standing Committee on Integrity	4
	Annual Report to Parliament	4
2	FUNCTIONS AND POWERS.....	5
3	ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE	6
	Overview	6
	Committee Reports	6
	Monitoring and Reviewing the Integrity Commission.....	6
	Monitoring and Reviewing the Office of the Ombudsman.....	13
	Monitoring and Reviewing the Office of the Custodial Inspector	15
	Public representations.....	16
	Appendix 1 - Joint Standing Committee on Integrity Meeting Attendance 2023-2024.....	18

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Pursuant to section 26(1) of the *Integrity Commission Act 2009*¹ (the Act), the Joint Standing Committee on Integrity (the Committee) has the honour to report its proceedings for 2023-24 to the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly.

Joint Standing Committee on Integrity

- 1.2 The Committee is established pursuant to section 23 of the Act.
- 1.3 The Committee consists of six Members of Parliament, comprising: three appointed by the Legislative Council; and three appointed by the House of Assembly.
- 1.4 During the reporting period, the membership of the Committee changed following the House of Assembly General Election held on 23 March 2024.
- 1.5 Prior to the dissolution of Parliament on 14 February 2024, Members serving on the Committee on the part of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly respectively were; the Honourable Member for Hobart, Mr *Valentine* (Chair); the Honourable Member for Launceston, Ms *Armitage* (Deputy Chair); the Honourable Member for Rosevears, Ms *Palmer*; the Honourable Member for Franklin, Mr *Street*; the Member for Bass, Ms *O'Byrne*; and, the Honourable Member for Lyons, Mr *Shelton*.
- 1.6 Following the election and at the end of the reporting period, the membership of the Committee on the part of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly respectively were; the Honourable Member for Launceston, Ms *Armitage* (Chair); the Honourable Member for Nelson, Ms *Webb* (Deputy Chair); the Honourable Member for Hobart, Ms *O'Connor*; the Member for Lyons, Mr *Jenner*; the Member for Lyons, Ms *White*; and, the Member for Bass, Mr *Wood*.

Annual Report to Parliament

- 1.7 This report details the proceedings of the Committee for 2023-24 and is made pursuant to section 26(1) of the Act which prescribes that the Committee reports its activities to both Houses of Parliament by 30 November of each year.

¹ *Integrity Commission Act 2009* (No. 67 of 2009).

2 FUNCTIONS AND POWERS

2.1 The Committee has the following functions:

- (a) monitor and review the performance of the functions of an integrity entity;
- (b) report to both Houses of Parliament, as it considers appropriate, on the following matters:
 - (i) matters relevant to an integrity entity;
 - (ii) matters relevant to the performance of an integrity entity's functions or the exercise of an integrity entity's powers;
- (c) examine the annual reports of an integrity entity and any other report of an integrity entity and report to both Houses of Parliament on any matter appearing in or arising out of such reports;
- (d) report to the Legislative Council or House of Assembly on any matter relevant to an integrity entity's functions that is referred to it by the Legislative Council or House of Assembly;
- (e) review the functions, powers, and operations of the Integrity Commission at the expiration of the period of 3 years commencing on the commencement of this section and to table in both Houses of Parliament a report regarding any action that should be taken in relation to this Act or the functions, powers, and operations of the Integrity Commission;
- (f) provide guidance and advice relating to the functions of an integrity entity under this Act;
- (g) refer any matter to the Integrity Commission for investigation or advice; and
- (h) comment on proposed appointments to be made under section 14(1)(e), (f) or (g), section 15, and section 27.²

2.2 The Committee is not authorised to:-

- (a) investigate any matter relating to a complaint that is being dealt with by the Integrity Commission; or
- (b) review a decision of the Integrity Commission to investigate, not investigate or discontinue an investigation or inquire into or not inquire into a particular complaint; or
- (c) make findings, recommendations, determinations, or decisions in relation to a particular investigation or inquiry of a complaint that is being or has been dealt with by the Integrity Commission.³

² *Integrity Commission Act 2009*, section 24(1).

³ *Ibid*, section 24(2).

3 ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE

Overview

- 3.1 The Committee met on eleven occasions during the reporting period.
- 3.2 During the course of the reporting period, the proceedings of the Committee focused primarily upon appropriately managing its relationships with the prescribed integrity entities and responding to issues raised by members of the public.

Committee Reports

- 3.3 The Committee tabled an Annual Report for the 2022-23 financial year on 16 November 2023.

Monitoring and Reviewing the Integrity Commission

Protocol

- 3.4 Communication and coordination between the Committee and the Integrity Commission is managed pursuant to an agreed Protocol. This protocol was updated in December 2023.
- 3.5 The Protocol provides for regular meetings between the Committee and the Integrity Commission with an agreed agenda. Whilst having regard to section 24(2) of the Act, the Protocol provides that the Commission will provide to the Committee information as to the volume and the nature of the work being undertaken by it and details of any suggested legislative amendments.
- 3.6 The Protocol also prescribes the communication process to be utilised by the Committee and the Commission in dealing with such complaints and representations about the Commission from members of the public, and also for those circumstances when the Committee seeks information from the Commission on a specific subject.
- 3.7 In accordance with the Protocol, the Committee held three meetings with the Commission during the reporting period.

Annual Report 2023-24 – Integrity Commission

- 3.8 The Integrity Commission is required by section 11 of the Act to report to Parliament “on or before 31 October” each year. Pursuant to section 26, the Committee is required to provide its Annual Report by 30 November each year.
- 3.9 The Committee has examined the Integrity Commission’s Annual Report from the previous year – *Integrity Commission Annual Report 2023-2024*, and noted the following activities during that period: -

- 3.9.1 Greg Melick AO continued as the Chief Commissioner and the Chief Executive Officer Michael Easton departed in April 2024. A new Chief Executive Officer is yet to be appointed;
- 3.9.2 Luppo Prins (APM), Phil Foulston, and Robert Winter all continued their roles on the Commission's Board;
- 3.9.3 The Commission released its Annual Report and five public reports were released in the public interest;
- 3.9.4 Of the complaints received by the Commission in 2023-24, 97 were dismissed, 49 were referred for action and 32 were accepted for assessment;
- 3.9.5 Of those complaints dismissed at triage, 36 were found not to be in the public interest to investigate, 33 were deemed an unjustifiable use of resources, 25 were found to lack substance or credibility, 7 were dismissed for been unrelated to the Commission functions and 1 was dismissed for been frivolous or vexatious;
- 3.9.6 Twenty-seven assessments were concluded by the Commission in 2023-24, of which nineteen were dismissed, one was referred and seven were accepted for investigation;
- 3.9.7 The median working days to complete assessments for 2023-24 was 32 days. The Commission aims to complete such assessments within 40 working days;
- 3.9.8 The Commission commenced four investigations during the reporting period and concluded one investigation. The duration of the completed investigation was 397 working days;
- 3.9.9 There were four own-motion investigations commenced during the reporting period;
- 3.9.10 The Commission held its first Integrity Tribunal during the reporting period, with hearings concluded but the matter still under consideration;
- 3.9.11 As part of the Commission's police oversight program, the Commission audited four complaints managed by Tasmania Police. No own-motion investigations into police misconduct were conducted;
- 3.9.12 The percentage of anonymous complaints received was 26.2%, an increase from 16.8% in the previous year;
- 3.9.13 There was a continuation of misconduct awareness and prevention workshops and presentations. A total of 61 training

sessions were delivered to a total of 921 attendees, in 12 public authorities;

- 3.9.14 Most training sessions were held in the states South and were predominantly delivered to Tasmanian State Service employees, Local Government, and Police;
 - 3.9.15 The Commission commenced its ethics and integrity program for Members of Parliament – *Ethical Standards and Parliamentary Life*. Twenty-two Members participated in the program; and
 - 3.9.16 The Commission’s online training program, *Integrity in the Public Service*, was completed by 251 public officers from seventeen public authorities across the State.
- 3.10 This year the Committee and the Integrity Commission commenced their public meetings for the discussion of the Commission’s Annual Report. A public hearing for this purpose was held on 1 November 2024. In attendance in this meeting from the Integrity Commission was Greg Melick, Chief Commissioner, Julia Hickey, Acting CEO and Sarah Frost, Director Operations.
- 3.11 During this public hearing the Commission made several comments in relation to workload and resourcing:

Mr MELICK -... I think it's important to note that there have been significantly increased demands placed upon us in the last 12 months or during the period of the annual report. We've had twice the number of notifications. We had the commission of inquiry. We've taken on the lobby register. Overall, we've become more sophisticated in the way in which we approach many of the issues we're dealing with, especially in relation to the education program, the audits and the oversights and compliance.

*This has come at a cost. We've got very professional staff, and I cannot commend them highly enough for the work they've been doing during the relevant reporting period and, of course, since then. The issue is we just don't have enough money to do it. We get about half what the ACT and the Northern Territory get, and they have smaller populations and smaller public services to deal with. The ACT doesn't even have oversight of their police force and that's a considerable part of our work.*⁴

- 3.12 The Commissioner later noted that limited funding for the Commission is likely to lead to restricting the duties the Commission can fulfill. Of particular concern was the education and training area:

Mr MELICK - What worries me is we have our statutory responsibilities. We're spread fairly thin. We're going to have to make some decisions about what we

⁴ Transcript of evidence, 1 November 2024, p. 2.

don't do. The area that's really suffering at the moment is the education and training area. That's incredibly important because if you really want to reduce misconduct, you have to be able to educate people about what's expected of them - especially when you have local councils which are changing all the time, new members. Most of them haven't had any significant training in relation to the duties you've got to undertake and the conflicts that may arise. A lot of people, we find, before they enter the education training area, have absolutely no idea of the intricacies and how to deal with perceived conflicts of interest.⁵

- 3.13 The Commission also highlighted difficulties it is having in relation to the lack of progress getting necessary amendments made to the Integrity Commission Act 2009:

Mr MELICK -... Life has been made even more difficult because of the over 50 amendments which we need to our Act because we get continually held up because of issues with the Act, which makes life difficult, including things such as we cannot appoint more than one investigator to a particular investigation.

Since 2016, so it's eight years since the Cox review. He recommended 55 issues. The government accepted 50 of them - about five or six have been implemented and since then we've highlighted a significant number of additional problems.

Our investigations continue to get frustrated by court proceedings, people taking points or issues. A lot of the problems could be overcome by clarifying the legislation and making the amendments we've requested.⁶

- 3.14 The Commission also discussed the need for progress on a proposed protocol between the parliament and the Integrity Commission that would outline how the Commission might deal with claims of parliamentary privilege to information sought in their investigations:

Mr MELICK -... In mentioning parliament, we're still having significant problems in reaching a protocol when investigating members of parliament or members of parliamentary staff. The question of parliamentary privilege has got to be dealt with. Queensland and Western Australia have memorandums of understanding which seem to work. We've been trying for two years to get something similar in Tasmania. It makes it almost impossible to investigate a member of parliament or member of parliamentary staff unless they fully comply and consent rather than being compelled. I should give credit to Adam Brooks: we could not have conducted an investigation relating to him if he had not consented to everything and given us access, not relying upon parliamentary privilege.

It's not a desirable situation. The public is entitled to know that members of parliament and parliamentary staff are subject to the same requirements as other members of the public service.⁷

⁵ Transcript of evidence, 1 November 2024, p. 5.

⁶ Transcript of evidence, 1 November 2024, p. 2.

⁷ Transcript of evidence, 1 November 2024, p. 3.

- 3.15 Ms O'Connor questioned the Commissioner on how progress could be made on the protocol with the parliament:

Ms O'CONNOR - ... Chief Commissioner, earlier you were talking about the lack of progress on the protocol between the Integrity Commission and the parliament. The question is how to progress it. That's a question for the parliament; I understand that. But also, your thoughts on how it would work and how to make it workable here.

Mr MELICK - Generally speaking, if you can - and I'm now talking about experience in Western Australia and Queensland, particularly Western Australia where I've spoken in detail to my equivalent over there. When you look at behaviour of parliamentarians and you want to get hold of their emails, a very small part of the emails would be directly related to their parliamentary business and therefore should be covered by parliamentary privilege. Whereas, in relation to the rest of it, no. You then have the problem: how do you determine who actually determines what's relevant or falls within the parliamentary business and what doesn't, and therefore what should be disclosed?

There are various possible models. To take it back to a court situation, if you have litigants before the court and they claim legal professional privilege, if that matter is before a judge, he will then look at the materials himself without disclosing to the other side and make his own mind up as best he can. What you need is some sort of neutral person. Now perhaps if it's a member of parliament, that person could be the Clerk. If it's in the Clerk's area, somebody could be appointed independently.

The problem is to claim blanket parliamentary privilege when a very small percentage or proportion of the material would actually be classified or could be classified as material that privilege should attach.⁸

- 3.16 Ms Webb also questioned the Commission on the topic of the protocol and where the burden may lie for determining what information is covered by privilege:

Ms WEBB - ... When you say it could be quite a cumbersome process, where does that burden lie in terms of, say, adding to a workload?

Ms FROST - It would lie on the person who's been authorised by parliament to determine claims of privilege.

Ms WEBB - Right. So, either if that was internally, say the Clerks, then it would be on to them an additional workload, or if somebody was to be appointed to be an independent arbiter of some sort in this space, that would have to be funded in some way or come from some resourcing that is as yet unidentified, I presume.

⁸ Transcript of evidence, 1 November 2024, pp. 16-17.

Ms FROST - Yes, the problem is that if we receive parliamentary privileged material, even if we don't intend to use it in evidence and we don't want it, it's a use of it, and that's not permissible given this recent case law. So, it might be quite a simple legislative fix to say that we can receive material, not use it in evidence at all, but we can still take receipt of that material inadvertently in email accounts, for example.

Ms WEBB - ... What you're saying is: in order to search through that member of parliament's emails to see if there was a paper trail about, say, procuring prostitutes or booking flights for personal use with public funds, to get at those emails you would perhaps be provided access to - or somebody has to go through and pick out those ones as opposed to ones that are genuine parliamentary business. This is the task that we're talking about, that, at the moment, no-one here is allowed to do, essentially.

Ms FROST - Yes, that's correct. We normally get an email account for a certain period of time and then we have special software that trawls through it and finds the things that we're looking for.

Parliament doesn't have software like that at the moment. I understand that people have to manually go through email accounts and pull out the privileged material before the email account is handed over. So, it's quite a laborious process.

Ms WEBB - So wherever the task to do that, let's say we do progress this and that task becomes assigned to somebody, whether it's internal in parliament in some sense or an external independent arbiter of some sort, they realistically speaking will need that software or similar to do the task.

Ms FROST - Yes, it would be helpful.⁹

3.17 The Committee also questioned the Commission in relation to the lobbyist register:

Ms O'CONNOR - ... The former Treasurer says, 'We should be alert to sectional interests'. How might the lobbyists register mitigate some of that undue and potentially corrupting influence of the gambling industry or any other corporate vested interest on government?

Mr MELICK - I'll open up generally and leave it to Julia for more precision. One advantage of a lobby register provides transparency as to who's had conversations with whom, and therefore it allows relevant questions to be asked in parliament if necessary. I just think that once people know who is speaking to who, it not only increases transparency, but it also increases the ability to interrogate or investigate as to what influence or otherwise may have been used. Julia, do you want to add into that?

⁹ Transcript of evidence, 1 November 2024, p. 18.

Ms HICKEY - We're expanding the scope of lobbyists who need to be registered from not only third-party lobbyists who are engaged to lobby on behalf of an organisation, but also to include in-house lobbyists - organisations that employ people whose main part of their role is to lobby government on behalf of the organisation they work for.¹⁰

3.18 Ms Hickey continued:

Ms HICKEY - If there's an organisation that employs someone and the main part of their role as an employee is to lobby the government, they will have to be registered under our new code, so that expands. I can't anticipate which organisations would actually have those kinds of positions, but that is something that we heard throughout the consultation process, that those in-house lobbyists need to be regulated in the same way as third-party lobbyists.

Ms O'CONNOR - In practical terms, how does a lobbyists register work to mitigate the influence of sectional interests? If the Premier, for example, or another minister, has a meeting with the head of the Tasmanian Hospitality Association, how is that meeting captured within that structure that's been created?

Ms HICKEY - Meetings with organisations such as that would not necessarily be captured by the lobbying code of conduct. It's only if the lobby - sorry, I should backtrack. All lobbying activities as defined in the new code of conduct will need to be disclosed by public officials, irrespective of whether that lobbying is by a registered lobbyist or a non-registered lobbyist. Public officials will need to disclose when they have been subject to all lobbying activities.¹¹

3.19 The Commission were also questioned in regard to the review of the Commission due to be undertaken as a result of an agreement between the government and crossbench members.

Ms WEBB -... What, if any, additional value do you see would be added by a review process that could occur now? Ideally, if there is a process that's going to happen between now and next April, from the Integrity Commission's point of view, what could it add as value into the space where we've already got that body of work sitting there?

Mr MELICK - I think it could add value in that the issues I've discussed today, it could actually verify them. At the moment, this is us saying these are problems, I'm fairly certain we've got it right and we're not exaggerating. If you have an independent review that says everything the Integrity Commission said is correct, and what's more that there are these additional things, that would be very useful and would place the appropriate pressure on government to get on with it.

¹⁰ Transcript of evidence, 1 November 2024, p. 11.

¹¹ Transcript of evidence, 1 November 2024, p. 12.

Ms WEBB - Ideally, if you were to be able to have a say and input into a term of reference, you'd like to see a term of reference that had the scope to look at these issues. Are you able to point to the things that you would like to see in a term of reference?

Mr MELICK - Basically, what resourcing is - sorry, you would start with what the roles are. You'd look at the roles. Do we need to review the roles of the Integrity Commission? No. If the roles are okay, is it fit for purpose? If not, what needs to be done in terms of staffing, legislative review, et cetera. That's the sort of direction I would assume and would like to see a review undertake.¹²

Monitoring and Reviewing the Office of the Ombudsman

Protocol

- 3.20 Communication and coordination between the Committee and the Ombudsman is managed pursuant to an agreed Protocol.
- 3.21 The Protocol also prescribes the communication process to be utilised by the Committee and the Ombudsman in dealing with such complaints and representations concerning the Ombudsman from members of the public, and also for those circumstances when the Committee seeks information from the Ombudsman on a specific subject.

Annual Report 2023-24 – Office of the Ombudsman

- 3.22 The Committee has examined the Ombudsman's Annual Report from the previous year – Ombudsman Tasmania Annual Report 2023-24, and noted the following activities during that period: -
 - 3.22.1 The Ombudsman received a total of 691 complaints in 2023-24 down from 756 in 2022-23;
 - 3.22.2 Complaints relate to largely to state government departments (56%), followed by public authorities and GBE's (11%), local government (9%), personal information protection matters (3%) and public interest disclosures (1%). Out of jurisdiction complaints accounted for 20%;
 - 3.22.3 The Justice Department continues to be the most complained about Department with many of these complaints coming from prisoners. Prisoner concerns cover topics such as administration, officer misconduct, classification/placement issues and failures to ensure physical safety;

¹² Transcript of evidence, 1 November 2024, pp. 14-15.

- 3.22.4 Complaints received relating to local government included issues such as administration and general management of councils, rates and charges, planning and nuisance complaints;
- 3.22.5 Issues were also raised with the Ombudsman in relation to the Department of Children and Young People regarding allegations of sexual abuse/harassment/discrimination/racism/ bullying/assault, access to educational and other services, administration and duty of care;
- 3.22.6 The large percentage of complaints are dealt with by the Ombudsman in one week or less (39%), with 15% taking eight to thirty days, 38% taking one to six months, and 8% taking longer than six months;
- 3.22.7 Of the complaint activity to the Ombudsman, 691 complaints were opened in the reporting period and 708 were closed;
- 3.22.8 Of those complaints closed by the Ombudsman, fourteen were discontinued, 203 found no defective administration, 146 were fully or partially substantiated or a determination made, and 314 complaints were declined, referred, out of jurisdiction or withdrawn;
- 3.22.9 Complaints received in relation to the *Personal Information Protection Act 2004* were 21 with 21 closed;
- 3.22.10 In the right to information (RTI) space, the historical backlog of external review applications awaiting finalisation was significantly reduced, with 97 external reviews finalised. It was noted that this number is the highest number of external reviews closed since 2018-19;
- 3.22.11 The Ombudsman highlighted a number of challenges in the RTI space including that 80% of his decisions varied or set aside a public authority's findings, showing a continued high error rate in decision-making; limits on staffing resources has resulted in the office been unable to offer sufficient training of RTI decision makers; and poor communication by public authorities with applicants and the failure to provide appropriately detailed reasons in decisions remains an issue; and
- 3.22.12 The Energy Ombudsman opened 244 complaints during the reporting period and closed 225. Complaints largely reflect issues with billing, but other issues included customer service, credit, land, provisions and supply.

Monitoring and Reviewing the Office of the Custodial Inspector

Annual Report 2023-24 – Office of the Custodial Inspector

3.23 The Committee has examined the Custodial Inspector's Annual report from the previous year – *Office of the Custodial Inspector Tasmania, Annual Report 2023-24* and noted the following matters highlighted by the Inspector: -

- 3.23.1 The Custodial Inspector, Mr Richard Connock, noted that this would be his last annual report as Custodial Inspector. The Committee thanks Mr Connock for his valuable contribution;
- 3.23.2 In 2023-24 three inspections were undertaken which were; Transitioning to adulthood in Tasmania's prisons: the management and treatment of children and young adults; Education, vocational training, prison industries and work release programs in Tasmania's prisons; and Education, vocational training and work-related activities in Ashley Youth Detention Centre;
- 3.23.3 The Custodial Inspector prepared five reports for publication; the Adult Health Care Inspection Report 2023; the Youth Health Care Inspection Report 2023; the Youth Wellbeing Report 2024; inhumane Treatment in Dry Cells – Review Report 2024; and the Adult Wellbeing Report 2024;
- 3.23.4 The Custodial Inspector highlighted that in previous reports there were recommendations for a number of legislative changes to the *Custodial Inspector Act 2016*. It was noted there has been no progress on these reforms;
- 3.23.5 The Custodial Inspector noted that lockdowns continue to be of concern, particularly in the Risdon Prison Complex. The Mary Hutchinson Women's Prison and the Ron Barwick Prison remain relatively free from lockdowns;
- 3.23.6 Concerns were raised regarding the accommodation for people who have swallowed razor blades. It was noted that some people who have swallowed razor blades are being placed for observation in the Reception and Admission holding cells which do not have access to an intercom in the case of an emergency. Additionally, these areas have potentially unreliable camera coverage and no correctional officers stationed there in the evening;
- 3.23.7 Concerns were raised over the use of a Hostile Management Scheme within the Tamar unit of the Risdon Prison Complex. The Tasmanian Prison Service confirmed there was a Hostile

Management Scheme in place when questioned but noted that it was an unsanctioned practice, contrary to policies and procedures. Use of the regime was stopped following the Custodial Inspector raising its concerns;

- 3.23.8 An instance of collective punishment was raised at the Risdon Prison Complex which is contrary to rule 42 of the Nelson Mandela Rules; and
- 3.23.9 Finally, the Inspector notes his disappointment in not being able to pass on the reigns of an established Office of the National Preventative Mechanism (NPM) to the next office holder. Recommendations arising from a scoping exercise for the requirements of establishing the NPM has not progressed.

Public representations

- 3.24 The Committee has received a number of representations from citizens of Tasmania during the reporting period.
- 3.25 As reported in previous years, the Committee continues to receive representations from the public that detail their negative experiences in dealing with the Ombudsman and Integrity Commission. These representations often wrongly assume that the Committee is able to review and independently investigate their case. The Committee is working to assist complainants in their understanding of the Committee's role, functions and powers.
- 3.26 It is noted that section 24(2) of the Act, however, proscribes the Committee from: investigating any matter before the Integrity Commission; reviewing a decision of the Commission regarding its investigatory powers; or make findings, recommendations, determinations or decisions in relation to investigations or inquiries of the Commission.
- 3.27 In relation to these representations from dissatisfied complainants, the Committee has on each occasion, referred these matters to the Commission to consider the issues raised by the complainant. Two matters were referred to the Commission for comment in 2023-24.
- 3.28 The Committee is unable to take any further action to investigate complaints against the Integrity Commission beyond writing to the Integrity Commission because of restrictions placed on the Committee's level of oversight by section 24(2) of the Act.

Parliament House
HOBART
26 November 2024

Hon. Rosemary Armitage M.L.C.
CHAIRPERSON

Appendix 1 - Joint Standing Committee on Integrity Meeting Attendance 2023-2024

Meeting Date	In attendance	
	Legislative Council	House of Assembly
Tuesday 15 August 2023	Ms Armitage Ms Palmer (Deputy Chair) Mr Valentine (Chair)	Mr Shelton Mr Street
Thursday 28 September 2023	Ms Armitage Mr Valentine (Chair)	Mr Shelton Mr Street Ms O'Byrne
Tuesday 17 October 2023	Ms Armitage Ms Palmer (Deputy Chair) Mr Valentine (Chair)	Ms O'Byrne
Tuesday 31 October 2023	Ms Armitage Mr Valentine (Chair)	Mr Street Ms O'Byrne
Tuesday 14 November 2022	Ms Armitage Ms Palmer (Deputy Chair) Mr Valentine (Chair)	Mr Street
Friday 1 December 2023	Ms Armitage (Deputy Chair) Mr Valentine (Chair)	Mr Shelton Mr Street
Tuesday 18 June 2024	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr Jenner Ms White Mr Wood