

Hon Ruth Forrest MLC
Chair
Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts
Parliament House
Hobart TAS 7000



Macquarie Point Stadium Costs and Governance – Questions on Notice

Dear Ms Forrest

Thank you for your letter of 26 May 2026 on behalf of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts in which you sought responses from the Independent Probity Advisor team to two Questions on Notice arising from the conduct of the public hearing of the Committee on 12 May 2026:

- A copy of the Conflict of Interest Management Plan discussed at the public hearing
- A copy of the report with respect to the establishment of the Design Quality and Integrity Panel, including what was advised and what you observed.

At the time of writing this response, I have been advised that the draft Conflict of Interest Management Plan remains subject to approval through the Governance structure for the project. As soon as possible after that approval process is completed (which I understand may be shortly), I undertake to provide the Committee with a copy of the Plan. I trust that is acceptable to the Committee.

The Independent Probity Advisor report on the establishment of the Design Quality and Integrity Panel was submitted to the Secretary of the Department of State Growth (DSG) on 19 February 2026. I have attached a copy of this report and a checklist against the conditions of the Order relative to the establishment of the Panel that was included with this advice. The Director, Office of the Secretary, DSG has advised that while the checklist was not countersigned by the Secretary, the Secretary endorsed a covering brief which included the IPA advice and checklist.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any additional information or clarification relating to these matters.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Harris".

Andrew Harris
Independent Probity Advisor
Stadium Order
0412 659 539
Email: information@modaconsulting.com.au

cc: Andrew Johnson, Director, Office of the Secretary, Department of State Growth)

11 June 2026

Independent Probity Advisor Report - Establishment of the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel under Condition A9 of the *State Policies and Projects (Macquarie Point Precinct) Order 2025 Statutory Rules 2025, No. 49*

Purpose

This Probity Report provides:

- (a) An assessment of compliance with the administrative decision-making processes relating to Conditions A9 (1) and (2) under the *State Policies and Projects (Macquarie Point Precinct) Order 2025 Statutory Rules 2025, No. 49* (the Order)
- (b) Assurance observations on the framework and procedures applied by the Department of State Growth to identify, evaluate and select members for appointment to the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel.

For the avoidance of doubt, this report does not cover Conditions A9 (3-6) of the Order. These prescribe the role, responsibilities and functions of the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel in operation. Probity and assurance reviews to assess compliance with these conditions will be subject to future processes.

Background and Context

Conditions A9 (1) and (2) under the Order provide that the Secretary of the Department of State Growth (the Secretary) is to establish a panel called the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel (the Panel). The Panel's responsibilities in reviewing architectural, landscaping and urban design solutions for the Macquarie Point Stadium Project are referenced in Condition A9 (3) (a), (b), (c) and (d).

Condition A9 (1) explains the Panel is to consist of at least three members and no more than five members. Condition A9 (2) stipulates Panel members must collectively have experience in architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, historic cultural heritage and design review of major public realm and infrastructure projects.

Condition A9 (2)(b) provides that membership of the Panel must include a State Service officer or State Service employee who is employed or engaged for the purposes of providing strategic advice on architecture or urban design; a person, nominated by Heritage Tasmania, who has expertise in historic cultural heritage; and a person with expertise in landscape architecture.

The Order does not prescribe processes for the Secretary to identify, evaluate or select candidates for appointment to the Panel nor does it mandate consultation to be undertaken by the Secretary in discharging obligations under Condition A9, beyond securing a nominee to the Panel from the Heritage Council.

The objectives of the Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Governance, Oversight and Assurance Framework in meeting the requirements of the Order include transparency and accountability, robust oversight and assurance and informed decision-making. The application of general probity principles to the establishment of the Panel assists in demonstrating that decisions under the Order are to be made on the basis of integrity, fairness and transparency, thereby maintaining public confidence.

Framework to Guide the Establishment of the Panel

In the absence of defined guidelines or processes under the Order for the establishment of the Panel, the Secretary requested advice from the Department of State Growth (the Department) on a framework for the identification and selection of potential candidates.

The framework was designed and implemented on the basis of the Secretary's approval of formal advice and recommendations from the Department developed through the following three Minutes from the Department to the Secretary:

D25/358309	Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel: Establishment of the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel (19/12/2025)
D26/16155	Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel - Selection Process (13/1/2026)
D26/14549	Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel - Pre-Screened Individuals (16/1/2026).

These Minutes document consultation, candidate identification, nomination, pre-screening and selection process steps and sought to preserve consistency with Condition A (9) of Order, including the responsibilities and authority of the Secretary.

Departmental advice was supplemented by advice from the Independent Probity Advisor (IPA) from 28 January 2026.

Consultation - Identification of nominees

The Secretary conducted consultation with a range of stakeholders and subject matter experts (internal and external to the State Government) to seek advice on potential Panel members and to invite nominations from suitably qualified individuals.

The Secretary requested the Department to independently consider potential candidates from the Office of the Victorian Government Architect (OVGA) Register and the New South Wales Design Panel Register.

These processes resulted in the creation of a long list 28 nominees. Of these, 17 individuals expressed an interest in participating in the Panel.

Consultation – Head of the State Service

The Secretary consulted with the Head of the State Service via letter on 22 January 2026. As the regulator for Condition A (9) under the Order, the Secretary is not required to consult with the Head of the State Service in establishing the Panel but made a determination to do so in this instance on the basis of advice from the Crown Solicitor.

The correspondence to the Head of the State Service sought feedback on the pre-screened candidates and included Curricula Vitae and the evaluation criteria to be applied to short-listed candidates. The Secretary received a response to this correspondence dated 29 January 2026 which included a suggestion that the following be considered in establishing the Panel:

- Tasmanian Government's Women on Boards Strategy 2020–2025;
- Knowledge of the Tasmanian context, supported by local experience; and
- The importance of managing any actual or perceived conflicts of interest with the Proponent.

Pre-Screening

Pre-screening of the long list of candidates was undertaken by the Department through the Deputy Secretary, Strategy, Housing, Information and Planning against four criteria:

- Consistency with requirements of clause A9 (2) (a)(i-v) of the Order
- Large-scale civic experience
- Stadium related experience
- Curriculum Vitae.

This initial evaluation process confirmed a shortlist of 17 candidates to be subject to an internal assessment against six criteria.

Evaluation Criteria Benchmarking

Six evaluation criteria were established by the Department prior to the conduct of the evaluation. The criteria were based on the New South Wales State Design Review Panel approach along with relevant considerations for selecting members to the Office of the Victorian Government Architect Panel.

The evaluation criteria were documented in the Secretary's correspondence to the Head of the State Service on 22 January 2026 and in the Selection Report for the Panel.

Conflicts of Interest

In the letter to the Head of the State Service on 22 January 2026 the Secretary declared previous working relationships or role driven interactions with 10 potential nominees.

On 3 February 2026, prior to the evaluation, the Secretary executed a Conflict of Interest Declaration to record these interactions. The declaration did not rise to a level of materiality sufficient to impact – or be perceived to impact – on the Secretary's ability to discharge obligations under Condition A9 of the Order.

Engagement with candidates

In advance of the evaluation, the Secretary declared a discussion with a candidate on a matter unrelated to Condition A9 or the evaluation. Beyond this, there was no engagement between candidates and the Secretary prior to the conduct of the evaluation.

Evaluation and Selection of Nominees

The evaluation of the shortlisted candidates was conducted by the Secretary on 6 February 2026. The evaluation was supported by the Director of the Office of the Secretary who documented the ratings for each candidate and the rationale for their comparative performance against the criteria.

This assessment resulted in the identification of five candidates suitable for appointment, subject to satisfaction with conflict-of-interest requirements and other terms and conditions to be conveyed to candidates by the Department.

Post Evaluation Process

In advance of the Secretary making a final determination on the composition of the Panel, the Secretary sent letters to the five shortlisted nominees on Wednesday 11 February 2026 to secure:

- Confirmation from candidates that their skills and experience align to the roles and responsibilities of the Panel under Condition A9 (2) under the Order
- A Conflict of Interest declaration, as a mandatory precondition for acceptance.

One candidate self-identified as having a potential conflict of interest relating to the Stadium project. This candidate was thereby excluded by the Secretary from further consideration.

Final Selection and Establishment

The post-evaluation correspondence provided a further verification of candidate suitability for selection, given there was no interview process which would test candidate alignment with the duties of Panel membership.

The final selection by the Secretary was also informed by the objective of achieving an optimal blend of candidates which could demonstrably meet the requisite areas of expertise specified under Condition A9 of the Order and reflect balance in membership across gender, cultural background and location. This balance in membership was incorporated in the construction of evaluation criterion No. 6.

The evaluation and selection process was witnessed by the IPA as an independent observer.

The selection was conducted without any emergent material probity considerations. No unauthorised personnel attended the evaluation meeting and the IPA was present at all times during the meeting.

The follow up correspondence to prospective candidates was managed by the Office of the Secretary with no probity matters raised, beyond the self-identification of the candidate with a potential conflict of interest.

The IPA can verify that the process established by the Secretary on advice from the Department was followed and that the assessment was conducted consistently with accepted probity principles. Based on the above summary, the required compliance steps and timelines have been met and there has been adherence to the mandatory obligations set out in the Order. On this basis, there is sufficient justification and confidence to support a decision by the Secretary to establish the Panel.

Selection Report

The Office of the Secretary prepared a Selection Report which documents the ratings for each candidate and comments against the evaluation criteria. The report records that one candidate withdrew prior to the evaluation, one candidate was not progressed through the evaluation on the basis of previous engagement/involvement with the Proponent and one was removed for further consideration, following evaluation, based on potential conflict of interest.

As noted above, the final selection includes a consideration of candidate balance and diversity.

The Selection Report provides an accurate summary of the deliberation and outcomes of the evaluation meeting. The Selection Report includes qualitative and quantitative evidence in support of the final rankings for shortlisted and non-shortlisted candidates and addresses Condition A9 (2) (b)(i-iii) which mandates candidates with State Service tenure, nomination from Heritage Tasmania and a person with expertise in landscape architecture.

Timeline Requirement

The Order provides that the Panel is to be established before any design review takes place. The Department of State Growth has confirmed that no design review activities pursuant to Condition A9 under the Order have been undertaken prior to the establishment of the Panel.

Information Security and Privacy

No unauthorised release of information was identified during the process for the establishment of the Panel. All material relating to the nominees and their evaluation was stored securely by the Department, noting that information on candidates was released to stakeholders during consultation by the Secretary in establishing the Panel.

Documentation

The following documentation or artefacts were created to support the establishment of the Panel. Each document has been sighted by the IPA in preparing this Report.

Stage	Documentation/Artefact	Date
Order Conditions	<i>State Policies and Projects (Macquarie Point Precinct) Order 2025 Statutory Rules 2025, No. 49</i>	21 October 2025
Identification of Candidates	Letters from the Secretary to stakeholders and subject matter experts to seek potential Panel members: - Major Infrastructure Project Advisors (x2) - Chief Executive Officer, Macquarie Point Development Corporation - Strategic Architectural and Urban Design Adviser to the Tasmanian Government - Chief Executive Officer, Stadiums Tasmania - Chief Executive Officer, Hobart City Council - Secretary, Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania	19 December 2025
Terms of Reference	Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel	16 January 2026
Consultation on nominees	Letter to the Head of the State Service from the Secretary	22 January 2026
Framework and Process	D25/358309: <i>Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel: Establishment of the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel</i> D26/16155: <i>Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel – Selection Process</i> D26/14549: <i>Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel – Pre-Screened Individuals</i>	D25/358309: 19 December 2026 D26/16155: 13 January 2026 D26/14549: 16 January 2026

Stage	Documentation/Artefact	Date
Conflict of Interest - Secretary	Declaration of Conflict of Interest by the Secretary, Department of State Growth	6 February 2026
Post-evaluation confirmation of candidate skills and experience	Letters from the Secretary to shortlisted candidates to seek confirmation of skills and experience relevant to the duties of the Panel	11 February 2026
Conflict of Interest - candidates	Responses from candidates regarding conflicts of interest	Various - February 2026
Evaluation and Selection of Candidates	Selection Report, including scoring and ranking matrix	19 February 2026

Conclusions

- (a) As the Independent Probity Advisor, we certify that we have reviewed the documentation and processes required under Order Condition A9 (1) and (2) of the *State Policies and Projects (Macquarie Point Precinct) Order 2025 No. 49*.
- (b) Based on the documented evidence sighted and observing the process for the establishment of the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel, we are satisfied that all required compliance steps and timelines have been met and that the establishment of the Panel demonstrates adherence to the mandatory obligations set out in the Order.
- (c) We confirm that the establishment of the Panel was conducted consistently against the framework designed by the Secretary and the Department of State Growth for this purpose.
- (d) The processes which supported the identification, evaluation and selection of nominees for the Panel were applied by the Secretary of the Department of State Growth and officers of the Department of State Growth consistently with accepted probity principles and protocols.

We have executed the attached assurance certification document which confirms the above advice.



Andrew Harris
 Director, Moda Consulting
 t: 0412 659 539
 e: information@modaconsulting.com.au
 19 February 2026

Order Condition A9: Design Quality & Integrity Review Panel – Independent Probity Assurance Checklist

Condition A9 (1) and (2) under the *State Policies and Projects (Macquarie Point Precinct) Order 2025 Statutory Rules 2025, No. 49* (the Order) provides that the Secretary of the Department of State Growth (Secretary) is to establish a panel, called the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel (Panel).

The Panel is to consist of at least 3 members and no more than 5 members (Condition A9 (1) and members must collectively have experience in architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, historic cultural heritage and design review of major public realm and infrastructure projects (Condition A9 (2)).

Condition A9 (2)(b) provides that membership of the Panel must include a State Service officer or State Service employee who is employed or engaged for the purposes of providing strategic advice on architecture or urban design; a person, nominated by Heritage Tasmania, with expertise in historic cultural heritage; and a person with expertise in landscape architecture.

1. Overarching Requirements (Condition A9)

- ☒ Secretary has established the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel (3–5 members).
- ☒ Panel includes required expertise: architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, historic cultural heritage, design review of major infrastructure and public realm.
- ☒ Panel includes required designated members (State Service officer or employee, Heritage Tasmania nominee, landscape architecture expert).
- ☒ Panel must be established before any design review occurs (timeline requirement).

Probity Sign-Off Statement

I, the Independent Probity Advisor, certify that I have reviewed the documentation and processes required under Order Condition A9 (1) and (2) of the *State Policies and Projects (Macquarie Point Precinct) Order 2025*.

Based on the documented evidence sighted and observing the process for the establishment of the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel, I am satisfied that all required compliance steps and timelines have been met and that the establishment of the Panel demonstrates adherence to the mandatory obligations set out in the Order.

Signed: 

Name: ANDREW HARRIS

Position: Independent Probity Advisor

Date: 19/2/26

Secretary Approval and Attestation

I, the Secretary (or delegate), confirm that:

- ☐ all relevant documentation has been provided to the Independent Probity Advisor
- ☐ No conflicts of interest have arisen.

Signed: _____

Name: _____

Position: Secretary / Delegate

Date: _____

Appendix 1

Conditions A9 (3-6) cover the role responsibilities and functions of the Design Quality and Integrity Review Panel in operation. These are provided below for noting only. Assurance reviews to assess compliance with these conditions will be subject to future processes.

2. Panel Functions and Responsibilities

- ☐ Panel reviews design solutions at earliest opportunity.
- ☐ Panel provides feedback before Secretary approval of B3, B5, B7 plans.
- ☐ Panel provides consensus-related feedback under AA3.
- ☐ Panel provides general feedback on design and staging.
- ☐ Feedback must be provided within 10 working days of request (timeline).

3. Proponent Requirements Under A9

- ☐ Proponent must seek Panel feedback before submitting plans for Secretary approval.
- ☐ Panel must provide written feedback within 10 working days.
- ☐ Proponent must publish statement outlining Panel-suggested changes before plan approval.
- ☐ Publication must occur after Panel feedback and before approval (timeline).

4. Documentation Requirements

- ☐ Evidence Panel established before review commenced.
- ☐ Timestamped feedback requests showing they occurred before approvals.
- ☐ Evidence of Panel meeting 10-day response timeline.
- ☐ Public statement on Panel suggestions retained.
- ☐ Documentation must exist before Secretary approval of B3/B5/B7 (timeline).

5. Compliance Assurance and Review Controls

- ☐ Internal control ensures A9 consultation occurs before plan submission.
- ☐ Tracking mechanism verifies no plan progresses without Panel feedback.
- ☐ Monitoring of 10-day response timeline.
- ☐ Non-adopted Panel recommendations published before finalisation.