



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

**JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON
INTEGRITY**

Annual Report 2026

*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 Ferguson
Mr George
Ms Haddad

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.....	14
	Monitoring and Reviewing the Office of the Custodial Inspector	19
	Public representations.....	25
	Inquiry into the Establishment of a Parliamentary Privilege Protocol between the Parliament of Tasmania and the Integrity Commission Tasmania.....	26
	Appendix 1 - Joint Standing Committee on Integrity Meeting Attendance 2025-2026.....	27

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 2025-26 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 Due to the 2025 General Election, held on 19 July 2025, the Committee did not meet for the first time in the Reporting Period until 25 September 2025.
- 1.5 At this time, the following membership of the Committee was appointed by the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly respectively: 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 Franklin, Mr *George*; the Member for Clark, Ms *Haddad*; and, the Member for Braddon, Mr *Jaensch*.
- 1.6 On 18 June 2026 Mr *Jaensch* tendered his resignation from the Committee with the Honourable Speaker of the House of Assembly. On 19 June 2026, Mr *Ferguson* was appointed to the Committee.

Annual Report to Parliament

- 1.7 This report details the proceedings of the Committee for 2025-26 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 twenty-one 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. Additionally the Committee continued its work on the Inquiry into the Establishment of a Parliamentary Privilege Protocol between the Parliament of Tasmania and the Integrity Commission (the Inquiry).

Committee Reports

- 3.3 The Committee tabled an Annual Report for the 2024-25 financial year on 13 November 2025.

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 2024-25 – 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 of the Act, the Committee is required to provide its Annual Report by 30 November each year.

- 3.9 Due to the 2025 sitting schedule, the 2024-25 Annual Report of the Integrity Commission was not examined in the Committee's last Annual Report. Consequently, this section of the Annual Report will examine the 2024-25 Annual Report of the Integrity Commission. The Committee will continue to adopt this reporting style in future Annual Reports to ensure the work of the integrity entities can be properly considered.
- 3.10 The Committee has consequentially examined the 2024-25 Annual Report and notes the following activities of the Integrity Commission during the 2024-2025 period: -
- 3.10.1 Greg Melick AO continued as the Chief Commissioner and the Chief Executive Officer was Ellen McKenzie;
 - 3.10.2 Luppo Prins (APM) and Robert Winter departed as members of the Commission's Board, with Phil Foulston continuing his role. Glenn Frame was appointed to the Board in September 2024;
 - 3.10.3 The Commission released its Annual Report, as well as two public reports in the public interest during the reporting period;
 - 3.10.4 Of the complaints received by the Commission in 2024-25, 89 were dismissed, 57 were referred for action and 28 were accepted for assessment;
 - 3.10.5 Of the 89 complaints dismissed at triage, 22 were found not to be in the public interest to investigate, 34 were deemed an unjustifiable use of resources, 35 were found to lack substance or credibility, 15 were dismissed for being unrelated to the Commission functions and none were dismissed for being frivolous or vexatious;
 - 3.10.6 27 assessments were concluded by the Commission in 2024-25, of which 22 were dismissed, none were referred and five were accepted for investigation;
 - 3.10.7 The median working days to complete assessments for 2024-25 was 39 days. The Commission aims to complete such assessments within 40 working days;
 - 3.10.8 The Commission commenced two investigations from referrals during the reporting period and concluded five investigations;
 - 3.10.9 There was one own-motion investigation commenced during the reporting period and three completed;
 - 3.10.10 Of the public authorities referenced in complaints, the majority were related to the Tasmanian State Service, Tasmania Police and Local Government;

- 3.10.11 The percentage of anonymous complaints received was 21.5%, a decrease from 26.2% in the previous financial year;
- 3.10.12 There was a continuation of misconduct awareness and prevention workshops and presentations. A total of 33 training sessions were delivered to a total of 529 attendees, from 10 public authorities. This marked a significant decrease from previous years;
- 3.10.13 Most training sessions were held in the state's South and were predominantly delivered to Tasmanian State Service employees, Local Government and Tasmania Police, and;
- 3.10.14 The Commission relaunched its *Practical Ethics for Managers* programs which explores the ethical challenges and opportunities facing Tasmanian public sector managers.
- 3.11 The Integrity Commission was invited to attend its annual public meeting with the Committee regarding its Annual Report. The public meeting for the 2024-25 reporting period, due to the 2025 sitting schedule of the Parliament of Tasmania, was held on 20 March 2026. In attendance at this meeting from the Integrity Commission was Robert Hay KC, Chief Commissioner ⁴and Ellen McKenzie, CEO.
- 3.12 During this public meeting, the Integrity Commission made reference to its emphasis on its proscribed educative function:
- Mr HAY - I've been doing the job since 10 November [2025]. I actually think we have quite a good model here in Tasmania. I particularly like the fact there's such a heavy emphasis on education, and I think it's much better to have a system where you're teaching people to act appropriately rather than just coming down harshly on people - as I think it's the case - a lot of people don't seem to know what is required with good conduct, including conflicts of interest.*
- I think the model works quite well in that regard. I've got a fantastic CEO and she works pretty hard. I think the system works quite well. I know we cop a lot of flak, but I actually prefer this kind of system rather than one where you have people hung out to dry and nothing eventuates, but people's careers are destroyed. So, I think the focus on education is very important.*
- Obviously, we've got to better deal with complaints as well, and we're constantly doing that and trying to improve how that works.⁵*
- 3.13 The Integrity Commission was later asked in the public meeting as to its opinion on the balance between this educative function and its investigative function:

⁴ The Committee notes that while Greg Melick AO was the Chief Commissioner during the 2024-2025 Reporting Period, at the time at which the public meeting was held, Robert Hay KC was the Chief Commissioner. Mr Hay KC was announced as the incoming Chief Commissioner on 11 November 2025.

⁵ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Integrity Commission, p. 4.

Ms O'CONNOR -... You said earlier that you're particularly pleased that the emphasis of the Integrity Commission is on its educative role. One of the criticisms, I guess, of the Commission, I mean, there's a whole range of criticisms that you'd be aware of, is that it, for example, has never had a public hearing; investigations seem to draw on forever. Would you agree that education and training is a very, very important part of the Integrity Commission's work, but so too is an ability to investigate claims of misconduct and to do so rigorously?

Mr HAY - Yes, I agree.

Ms O'CONNOR - It's a bit of carrot and stick, isn't it? It's not all carrot.

Mr HAY - Indeed it is, but I wouldn't want to go down the route of, say, the New South Wales model where, in the past, they've had to have retrospective legislation to fix up breaches of the law that ICAC [NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption] has engaged in. I don't think that's a good route to go down. They've lost cases in the High Court [of Australia] about overstepping powers and things like that. I think the education role, particularly in a state like Tasmania, is very important, getting people to understand what is proper behaviour in a public office.⁶

- 3.14 The role of the Integrity Commission's Integrity Tribunal, as an element of its investigative function, was also discussed:

Mr HAY - ... The Integrity Tribunal has had hearings, but not public hearings. I agree with that, and I am looking at that. In fact, we discussed this issue today, Ellen and I, and we will be looking at this more to see when and how often these things should happen. Obviously, it's going to depend on the facts. I suspect it's when we effectively come to a halt and things are not being investigated or there are a lot of obstacles in our way, that then we might have public hearings.⁷

- 3.15 The functions of the Integrity Commission were also raised in relation to the, at the time, community consultation on the draft Integrity Commission Amendment Bill 2026 (the Bill). this consultation was undertaken by the Department of Justice (DoJ).⁸ Ms McKenzie, CEO, discussed the organisations involvement with the DoJ in drafting the Bill before it was released for consultation, which was the organisations rationale for not providing a submission to the consultation:

Ms McKENZIE - ...no, we haven't [provided a submission on the draft Bill]. The reason being that we were heavily involved in liaising with the Department of Justice legislation team when that was being developed and we had an enormous amount of input into its development before it was actually released for public consultation. Nonetheless though, we will continue to liaise with them in

⁶ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Integrity Commission, p. 5.

⁷ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Integrity Commission, p. 18.

⁸ Department of Justice, Community Consultation, Integrity Commission Amendment Bill 2026, <https://www.justice.tas.gov.au/community-consultation/consultations/2025/integrity-commission-amendment-bill-2026>.

response to any issues that may be raised as a result of the public consultation process and we will provide input as required.

I'm thinking back now to the first bill [Integrity Commission Amendment (Mandatory Notifications) Bill 2025]. I don't think we did - probably for the same reason again, we liaised - I'd have to check that. I might have to take that on notice, just to double check, but we were again very heavily involved with the department when that legislation was being developed and had significant input into its development.

Ms WEBB - Right. There wouldn't be a way, then, we'd be able to see, though, whether the ultimate Bill that is tabled aligns with the Commission's views on what needs to be there in the Bill, or issues relating to that Bill, if the submission hasn't been put in. Are we to take it that the commission is happy with the Bill as it is?

...

Ms McKENZIE - I think, as a general comment, yes, we are, because we had a lot of input into it, but in terms of a definitive answer, once we sit down and make sure that everything has been covered off on, I probably can't give a definitive answer in that respect, because I know that we want to actually undertake that exercise within the office, because we don't know, ultimately, what the Bill is going to look like by the time it's actually put before Parliament and there may be changes.

Ms WEBB - That's right. So, when it does come to Parliament, though, and then you can see whether there have been changes, at that stage how would we, for example, as Members of Parliament, know what the Commission's view was on the Bill in its final form? Is that something we can take up with the Commission or seek a view on at that time, or -

Ms McKENZIE - I don't see why not.

Mr HAY - Yes, of course.⁹

- 3.16 The potential cost and workload impacts on the Integrity Commission as a result of the draft Bill, if enacted, as well as the Integrity Commission Amendment (Mandatory Notifications) Bill 2025 if enacted, were raised. The funding and workload of the Integrity Commission was discussed in relation to the its current budget, as well as in regard to additional resourcing of \$500,000 which the Government had publicly announced at the time of the meeting:

Mr GEORGE - ... When you look at what those amendments are likely to add to the Commission's workload, can you give me an idea of whether you believe the current funding - \$500,000 included, or not - comes anywhere near what you're going to need to be able to do those jobs properly and adequately?

Ms McKENZIE - I won't go near the \$500,000. I will talk about our budget as it sits now. Our current state of resourcing, the answer is: no, we do not. We would not be able to operationalise taking mandatory notifications, as a good example,

⁹ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Integrity Commission, p. 7.

because that is going to represent a very substantial increase in our workload, in our oversight and compliance practice, and that will lead, in turn, to a lot of other work; not just for that team, because there could be investigations or audits or projects that emanate out of all of this information and data, which we're going to be receiving for the first time from a huge number of agencies that are not presently voluntarily notifying matters to us. In fact, it's a very small number presently notifying matters to us.

CHAIR - And you would need extra staff, I would imagine?

Ms McKENZIE - We definitely need extra staff. We need to increase the staffing of our complaints and oversight team and, ideally, we'd like to see perhaps at least three more people within that team. By the way, we have spoken to Government about this; we've informed government, we made a budget submission, which I know that you're aware of because we notified you that we were doing that.

Mr HAY - It will also require a lot more - the educational role –

Ms McKENZIE - Yes.

Mr HAY - will have to increase significantly, because obviously we've got to help these agencies be able to make reports and understand what they've got to do.

Ms McKENZIE - The other dimension to it as well, in addition to the increase in the education and engagement team's workload as a result of all of that information and intelligence that we'll be receiving, there's also sitting out there - and we don't know yet what will happen to it - but Mr [Peter] Woolcott [AO] in his Review [Independent Review Report: Independent Review into the actions taken in response to the information and concerns raised by the Commission of Inquiry into the Tasmanian Government's Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings] made a recommendation that all senior leaders in the state sector receive mandatory ethical decision-making training and that's part of our job. If ultimately the Government were to accede to that recommendation, we would need extra resourcing in our education and engagement team. Our present calculation about that is probably two additional staff.

Mr GEORGE - On top of the three additional staff you already mentioned.

Ms McKENZIE - Yes. Obviously, I mean, if one was going to be making an ambit claim, we'd be asking for more, indeed.¹⁰

3.17 The Integrity Commission's decision to cancel the launch of the Lobbying Code of Conduct was raised at the public meeting:

Ms McKENZIE - As you know, the Board made the decision to withdraw from implementation of the new lobbying Code of Conduct. I think it would be fair to say that, ultimately, because of the input that the Commission had received from various interested parties, so to speak, during the consultation process leading up to what was meant to be the implementation of the new Code, that it became

¹⁰ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Integrity Commission, pp. 8-9.

apparent that the only venue where, really, this issue could be debated, with enough time being given to all those who had a view about it to be input, was through the parliamentary process.

Ms WEBB - Thank you. Is that still something that the Commission then would like to see, given the work - the two-year process - that went into developing that new framework and model around the Code?

Ms McKENZIE - That was the Board's view, yes.

Ms WEBB - That we should still be progressing it, but via legislation?

Ms McKENZIE - That's the Board's view, yes.¹¹

3.18 The organisation's management of the current Lobbying Code of Conduct was also raised:

Ms McKENZIE - Madam Chair, the way that this works is as follows: we conduct what I suppose you would call ongoing monitoring of the existing Lobbying Code of Conduct. The work involved in that entails both registration and deregistration of lobbyists, as well as an annual process that entails lobbyists providing a statutory declaration (stat dec) about some nominated aspects of their personal situation to enable them to continue to remain on the register. If issues arise during the course of the ongoing administration of that that we have to deal with, then they are dealt with in the usual course.

In terms of how we manage it internally, it has, until relatively recently, sat within our education and engagement unit. Typically the ongoing work - I probably can't put a full-time equivalent value on it, I suppose, but it becomes particularly busy around the annual statutory declaration time, when lobbyists are required to submit that documentation. That is quite labour-intensive and does take up quite a number of staff hours. We've now moved it from the education and engagement unit to the executive unit, and my senior executive officer will now have the ongoing administration of the Lobbying Code of Conduct, with, though, continuing input in terms of advice and guidance from our education and engagement unit, which has overall expertise in relation to the components of the Lobbying Code of Conduct.

Ms WEBB - Thank you. So, fluctuating workload, but now sits in the executive area, rather than education?

Ms McKENZIE - Correct.

Ms WEBB - Can I ask about whether the Commission has received complaints or official concerns regarding the accuracy of the register or the application of the Code of Conduct?

Ms McKENZIE - There was some media coverage earlier in the year, and some media inquiries about a particular lobbyist who was on the register, which we

¹¹ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Integrity Commission, p. 20.

then dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Code. Probably not a lot more I could say about that.

Ms WEBB - That resulted in deregistering a lobbyist?

Ms McKENZIE - That is correct.¹²

- 3.19 The Committee also invited the Integrity Commission to expand on the data contained with the 2024-25 Annual Report which detailed outstanding responses to Board Recommendations:

Ms WEBB - I did just notice on page 37 of the annual report under the Monitoring heading, table 23, titled Outstanding Board Recommendations... The ones I'm interested in are the ones that are outstanding, and how we would understand why they're still outstanding; is that is a problem, are there particular agencies that they relate to, without details of the matters themselves? Just giving us a picture of that.

Ms McKENZIE - This is actually something that we have been looking at within the Commission. One of the things that we propose to do, and again, it's all tied up with the imminent introduction of mandatory notifications, is go systematically through our oversight and compliance practice. That presently comprises a very significant number of matters, both at an earlier stage in their conduct and in a much later stage in their conduct. Some of those matters are matters where, for example, our Board has considered an investigation report and made recommendations to the agency about issues that it needs to address. We have some matters in that practice where those recommendations have been outstanding for quite some time.

Ms O'CONNOR - Years, for example?

Ms McKENZIE - Years, yes. Indeed, there are some matters where we've not heard from the agency, not necessarily just in terms of board recommendations. But we've been waiting to hear about the outcome of a complaint, for example, and we've not heard for years. I'm not exaggerating here. One of the things that we want to do is do our own project, systematically going through each of those matters, and writing to the relevant agencies seeking an update; but the reality is, due to the large number of these matters, even if we were to get extra resources, that size of the practice is frankly not sustainable, really. We will cease to monitor some of those matters and then we will be reporting in our annual report on the outcome of that project in terms of which agencies have not been responding and which agencies in particular have not responded to Board recommendations, some of which are getting quite historic.

Ms WEBB - Is that a project that's occurring in this financial year [2025-26]?

Ms McKENZIE - Not yet, because at the moment I'm not resourced to do it.¹³

¹² Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Integrity Commission, p. 2.

¹³ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Integrity Commission, pp. 13-14.

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 2024-25 - Office of the Ombudsman

- 3.22 Due to the 2025 sitting schedule, the 2024-25 Annual Report of the Office of the Ombudsman (the Ombudsman) was not examined in the Committee's last Annual Report. Consequently, this section of the Annual Report will examine the 2024-25 Annual Report of the Ombudsman.
- 3.23 The Committee has examined the Ombudsman's Annual Report from the previous financial year, *Ombudsman Tasmania Annual Report 2024-25*, and noted the following activities during that period: -
 - 3.23.1 This was the final report of the former Ombudsman, Mr Richard Connock, who retired on 11 July 2025. The report includes a farewell from Mr Connock and introduction to the newly appointed Ombudsman, Dr Grant Davies.
 - 3.23.2 The Ombudsman received a total of 696 complaints, of which 67% related to Government departments, 10% to Local Government, 10% were out of jurisdiction, 9% related to public authorities and Government Business Enterprises (GBE's), and 3% were public interest disclosures. One percent of complaints related to personal information protection;
 - 3.23.3 The Department of Justice (DoJ) continues to be the most complained about Department, with the Department of Education, Children, and Young People (DECYP) also having a larger amount of complaints compared with other Departments;
 - 3.23.4 Issues complained about in relation to DECYP largely included allegations of; sexual abuse, harassment, discrimination, racism, bullying, assault, with access to education and other services, administration, and fees and charges, also being raised;
 - 3.23.5 Issues complained about in respect of prisons included classification/placement of prisoners, property complaints, officer misconduct and administration;

- 3.23.6 A large percentage of complaints were dealt with by the Ombudsman in one week or less (33%), with 18% taking eight to thirty days, 39% taking one to six months, and 9% taking longer than six months;
- 3.23.7 Of the complaint activity to the Ombudsman, 696 complaints were opened in the reporting period and 723 were closed;
- 3.23.8 Of those complaints closed by the Ombudsman, 23 were discontinued, 155 found no defective administration, 160 were fully or partially substantiated or a determination made, and 338 complaints were declined, referred, out of jurisdiction or withdrawn;
- 3.23.9 In the Ombudsman's Right to Information (RTI) jurisdiction, further reductions were achieved to the historical backlog of external review applications awaiting finalisation, with cases at their lowest level since 2015-16;
- 3.23.10 In relation to RTI's the Ombudsman noted a number of challenges including that 86% of decisions were varied or set aside the findings of a given public authority on a given matter, indicating a high percentage of errors in the application of RTI legislation;
- 3.23.11 The Ombudsman also noted continued long backlogs and delays for responses from state service departments, with particular emphasis on DECYP;
- 3.23.12 The Ombudsman did however note that there had been significant engagement with the Office in relation to training for RTI officers;
- 3.23.13 In the Energy Ombudsman's jurisdiction, the most common complaints related to billing issues (65%) with other issues being credit, customer service, land, provision and supply; and
- 3.23.14 The Energy Ombudsman opened 202 complaints in the reporting period and closed 235 complaints.
- 3.24 The Ombudsman attended its annual public meeting with the Committee regarding its 2024-25 Annual Report on 20 March 2026. In attendance at this meeting on behalf of the Office of the Ombudsman was Dr Grant Davies, Ombudsman; Natasha Freeman, Deputy Ombudsman and Leah Dorgelo, Principal Officer – Right to Information.

- 3.25 Dr Davies commenced the session with an explanation of the role and current priorities of the Office of the Ombudsman:

Dr DAVIES - ... *The Office operates on a no-surprises approach, engaging early and constructively with public authorities to identify issues and encourage improvements in administrative practice. While investigation and scrutiny remain central to the Ombudsman's role, the Office also seeks to influence better systems and decision-making across Government. In doing so, it contributes to greater transparency, stronger administrative practice and increased public confidence in public administration.*

Another priority has been increasing awareness of the Ombudsman's role within the community. The Office is expanding its engagement through presentations, stakeholder forums and professional networks to ensure that individuals and organisations understand how the Office can assist when concerns arise about public administration.

Improving accessibility is also a key focus. Many people who approach the Ombudsman have experienced frustration or difficulty navigating Government processes and may be vulnerable. It's therefore important that the Office provides a respectful, trauma-informed and supportive response so that all members of the community can engage with the Office confidently and effectively. At the same time, the Office continues to respond to growing demand. Complaint volume remains stable, while enquiry demand and right to information (RTI) review applications are increasing.

*The Office has been focused on improving timeliness and operational performance, including work to address historical backlogs and to strengthen internal processes.*¹⁴

Dr Davies also confirmed during his attendance that the Office of the Ombudsman is looking to have its new Strategic Plan finalised for the 2026-27 financial year.¹⁵

- 3.26 The Committee invited Dr Davies to discuss the response from the Office to the *Independent Review of Tasmania's Right to Information Framework: Getting Back on Track* (RTI Independent Review), conducted by Professor Tim McCormack and Adjunct Associate Professor Rick Snell. Dr Davies noted the four recommendations that he had not supported and, on Notice, provided confirmation to the Committee that his responses were not 'an in-principle objection to the full recommendation in any instance'¹⁶ but that some concern was held regarding them, leading to the non-

¹⁴ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Office of the Ombudsman, pp. 21-22.

¹⁵ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Office of the Ombudsman, p. 36.

¹⁶ Office of the Ombudsman, Response to Questions on Notice, p. 4, https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/105293/Response-to-Questions-on-Notice-Ombudsman.pdf.

support.¹⁷ Full detail of Dr Davies' confirmed positions are available on the Committees webpage.¹⁸

- 3.27 Dr Davies was also invited to note the potential resourcing impact of the implementation of the recommendations from the RTI Independent Review:

Mr GEORGE - Do you see, even within your own response which includes accepting and rejecting of recommendations ... what impact would that have on your need for resourcing?

Dr DAVIES - Significant, I would think. We'd need significant resources.

Mr GEORGE - Can you tell me how many staff you have working at the moment in this area, and what would you perceive as an adequate staffing resource? Dozens and dozens.

Ms WEBB - Give us your Christmas list.

Dr DAVIES - I worry about Christmas lists. In terms of the RTI, we have six people in the RTI team at the moment. Three of them are fixed term: we have a senior investigation review officer who's permanent; we've got a principal officer who's permanent; and we've got an intake and assessment officer who's permanent, but that's it. So, if we were to undertake a –

Mr GEORGE - So, that's six in all, you're saying?

Dr DAVIES - Correct: three of whom are on fixed-term. So, if we were to take on an education and training function, for example, I would expect at least one or two more people. If we were doing an audit and compliance function, again, one or two more people. So, once you start adding different functions into that role then the team would grow. Of course, we need to find desks for them, so that would be a challenge, I suspect. So, the accommodation will become an issue.¹⁹

- 3.28 Potential legislative amendments relating to the operations of the Office of the Ombudsman, including legislation it oversees, was raised at the hearing:

Ms O'CONNOR - Dr Davies, you talked earlier about there might need to be some changes to your act to enable the Office of the Ombudsman to prepare guidelines and the like on right to information. Has there been any conversation with the Attorney-General or the Department of Justice about potential legislative amendments to the Ombudsman Act?

¹⁷ Office of the Ombudsman, Response to Questions on Notice, https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/105293/Response-to-Questions-on-Notice-Ombudsman.pdf.

¹⁸ Office of the Ombudsman, Response to Questions on Notice, https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/105293/Response-to-Questions-on-Notice-Ombudsman.pdf.

¹⁹ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Office of the Ombudsman, p. 28.

Dr DAVIES - When I first assumed this role, I had a conversation with the legal section in the Department of Justice. They suggested that it would be good to get a suite of legislative changes together across all of my jurisdictions as a coordinated document to provide to them. I've done that. I have not heard back from that, but I am aware that they're actively looking at the suggestions that we've made in the RTI space.

Ms O'CONNOR - Would it be possible to just talk the Committee through, a little bit, some of the - and I don't know if they're all tweaks - but some of the potential amendments to the [RTI] Act that your Office and you would particularly like to see?

...

Ms DORGELO - One of the key ones that we have, there is an interaction between the Personal Information Protection Act 2004 [PIP Act] and the Right to Information Act 2009. There's an access to information provision in Personal Information Protection 2004, principle 6, which gives access to an individual to seek their own personal information. There's also the right to information under the RTI Act. The two processes don't neatly align and they're sort of two parallel processes, and if you don't receive all the personal information, it's treated as if it's under the RTI Act. It's created a less-than-ideal system.

That's probably one of the key things that is quite - it's a reasonably significant change, multiple pieces of legislation needing to work more effectively together, that we have been pushing for but, obviously, it's beyond what we can do individually in relation to that but it is something that is causing some difficulties. People accessing their own personal information is very important, and to have that work in a way like the RTI Act has a really regimented- like it is a full system in relation to how you do that and there's exemptions and it must be in some of those categories to not be released.

Under the PIP Act, it's a little bit less clear and how they interact is less clear. So, that's probably a main one that we're pushing for in relation to that.

Ms O'CONNOR - In that case, what prevails? What Act ultimately prevails?

Ms DORGELO - The RTI Act probably does ultimately but there's a step that an applicant has to ask twice for it to be then treated as if it's under the RTI Act, and then there's some question about whether that automatically imports it or whether there needs to be work to make it an RTI request and how that happens and agencies are treating that differently. The Department of Health and the Department for Education, Children and Young People are the two main ones that have high volumes of people seeking information on the PIP Act and they don't - there is inconsistency in the way that that is operating and it is our view that it would be ideal for that to be harmonised and made clear but there is the issue under the RTI act that there is a fee, whereas under the PIP Act there isn't.

So, there's also the harmonisation that would need to happen there to make sure that people weren't then having to pay to access their own information, which they currently don't have to under the PIP Act. So, the fee waivers, the categories

would need to be looked at. So, there's a lot of complexity around the drafting that would need to be looked...²⁰

Monitoring and Reviewing the Office of the Custodial Inspector

Annual Report 2024-25 – Office of the Custodial Inspector

- 3.29 Due to the 2025 sitting schedule, the 2024-25 Annual Report of the Office of the Custodial Inspector was not examined in the Committee's last Annual Report. Consequently, this section of the Annual Report will examine the 2024-25 Annual Report of the Custodial Inspector.
- 3.30 The Committee examined the *Office of the Custodial Inspector Tasmania, Annual Report 2024-25*, and noted the following matters as highlighted by the Inspector: -
 - 3.30.1 This was the first report of the new Custodial Inspector (the Inspector), Dr Grant Davies, with Mr Richard Connock having retired on 11 July 2025;
 - 3.30.2 A new role of Assistant Principal Inspection Officer was appointed in November 2024. This position has allowed the Office of the Custodial Inspector to have an increased capacity to monitor and report on the conditions at the Ashley Youth Detention Centre;
 - 3.30.3 The Office of the Custodial Inspector prepared eight reports for publication in the reporting period including; Children in Tasmania's prisons – review report 2025; Overcoming Barriers to voting in prison – review report 2025; Adult wellbeing inspection report 2024; Inhumane treatment in dry cells – review report 2024; Youth wellbeing inspection report 2024; Youth health care inspection report 2023; and Adult health care inspection report 2023;
 - 3.30.4 It was noted that lockdowns in Tasmanian adult custodial centres are likely to continue to be the worst in Australia, with Tasmania consistently one of the worst states when it comes to time out of cell;
 - 3.30.5 The prison population has experienced an increase in the number of women in custody, with data indicating that the average daily number of women in custody for June 2025 was 13.8% higher than that of July 2024 and 43.1% higher than that of July 2023;
 - 3.30.6 Concerns were raised regarding an erosion over the last year of more therapeutic and trauma informed approaches in the Mary Hutchinson Women's Prison;

²⁰ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Office of the Ombudsman, pp. 34-35.

- 3.30.7 The Inspector commented that a member of the Tasmanian National Preventative Mechanism Advisory Council had raised concerns over the number of attempted suicides in Tasmanian prisons. Over 2024-25 there were 211 incidents of self-harm, involving 96 individuals in custody;
- 3.30.8 A mobile polling service in Tasmanian prisons was offered for those eligible to vote in prisons in the 2025 Federal election. Of the approximately 642 people in Tasmanian prisons eligible to vote, 194 did vote;
- 3.30.9 Further mobile polling services were offered by the Tasmanian Electoral Commission in prisons for the Legislative Council elections in May 2025 and the House of Assembly election in July 2025. 21 votes were cast in the Legislative Council elections and 179 people voted from prisons in the House of Assembly election;
- 3.30.10 In relation to prison phone accounts, the Inspector commented on improvements to the number of external service providers available on the common auto dial list, which allows people in custody to call several pre-programmed organisations;
- 3.30.11 Concerns were raised by the Inspector in relation to the Ron Barwick Prison facilities. Adequate heating has been an issue, as has the portable showers in some of the accommodation division; and
- 3.30.12 During the reporting period the Inspector published its *Expectations on the treatment of people deprived of their liberty in adult custodial centres*. These expectations provide a new framework to guide mandatory inspections of Tasmanian prisons and is a comprehensive list of expectations relating to the treatment of people in Tasmanian prisons.
- 3.31 For the first time, the Custodial Inspector attended a public meeting of the Committee, at which the 2024-25 Annual Report was discussed. Dr Grant Davies, Custodial Inspector was supported at the meeting on 20 March 2026 by Natasha Freeman, Deputy Ombudsman and Sam Christensen, Principal Inspection Officer.
- 3.32 Dr Davies provided an overview of his focus since commencing the role of Custodial Inspector:
- Dr DAVIES** - *Since commencing in the role, my focus has been on strengthening the impact and visibility of custodial oversight while maintaining independence as a statutory officer. The inspection function is critical in identifying risks, monitoring conditions and supporting continuous improvement across custodial environments. The Office [of the CI] continues to engage constructively with*

custodial agencies, to identify issues early and support improvements in operational practice.

Inspection activity is supported by a coordinated oversight approach, including collaboration with other oversight bodies where appropriate. In the prison system, key issues remain in relation to time out of cell, operational pressures and healthcare oversight. In youth detention, challenges persist around staffing, safety and operational practices such as isolation and incident management.

Increased inspection activity has strengthened monitoring and contributed to the identification of systemic risks, including those relating to the transport and safeguarding of young people in detention. However, ongoing effectiveness of the functions depend on stable resourcing and clarity regarding future oversight arrangements. The purpose of the Custodial Inspector function is to ensure that people in custody are treated safely, fairly and lawfully and that systemic risks are identified and addressed...²¹

- 3.33 The Committee requested further information about the observations made in the annual report about the treatment of prisoners within the Mary Hutchinson Women's Prison:

Ms O'CONNOR - I am interested and slightly horrified to see what's happening in Mary Hutchinson Women's Prison in your annual report [2024-25]. The average daily number of women in custody as at June last year [2025] was 43 per cent higher than it had been two years previously. It's an extraordinary increase in the prison population and the annual report [2024-25] goes on to explain that there seem to be legitimate concerns that have been raised with the Custodial Inspector about a kind of collective punishment approach at Mary Hutchinson Women's Prison, including, for example, the removal of a DVD player from a unit for three weeks after one woman took the DVD player to her cell.

All women from the Hartz Unit being locked out of the basketball court for a morning because one woman had yelled at someone in the Wellington Unit. What is this telling us about the way Mary Hutchinson is being run?

Dr DAVIES - Certainly, on the face of it, it would seem to be a quite punitive approach. The introduction of more therapeutic approaches, trauma-informed approaches would be beneficial but, as I've indicated, the new Director of Prison Service is implementing a series of changes which will help address that.²²

- 3.34 Mr Christensen continued discussions of the Mary Hutchinson Women's Prison in relation to the current hostile management review:

Mr CHRISTENSEN - The hostile management regime review primarily focused on the men's prison [Risdon Prison] in terms of the Tamar [Unit] and Franklin [Unit] but I think, if you'd like to address some of the issues around that, in terms of the commentary in the annual report [2024-25] and in fairness to Grant, that was during Richard's [Connock] tenure.

²¹ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Custodial Inspector, pp. 40-41.

²² Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Custodial Inspector, pp. 43-44.

...

Mr CHRISTENSEN - I think that that commentary arose as a consequence of engagement with civil society, engagement with staff and people in custody, and observations that we've made over a period of time in terms of a shift in what had been a really therapeutic approach at the Mary Hutchinson Women's Prison, and I think there's a range of contributing factors potentially to that change and I think, in fairness to the Prison Service, there's been a significant increase in the number of women in custody.

Thankfully, it's positive to see that number has come down quite significantly.

Ms O'CONNOR - Alright, what is it? What's the latest figures?

Mr CHRISTENSEN - ...So, in the women's prison today, for example, the population's like 45, which is what I would expect normally in terms of, when it peaked, it was up to sort of around the 80 mark but don't quote me on that, but it was essentially almost doubled and so that's going to have flow-on effects.

Ms O'CONNOR - Sure, especially if there's a staff resourcing issue within the Women's Prison. So, can I take it from your answer that, in fact, these reports, a number of these reports about a more punitive approach, have in fact been validated to some extent to the point that they're detailed in the annual report [2024-25] but this is –

Mr CHRISTENSEN - We've heard multiple reports from multiple sources that provide me with comfort to sort of have put that in the annual report [2024-25] in terms of the veracity of that. So, I think there has been a shift, a noticeable shift, in talking to staff within the prison service as a whole and talking to people in custody as a whole. You certainly see the change in the approach –

Ms O'CONNOR - What sort of shift are you talking about? Over what period?

Mr CHRISTENSEN - Oh, well like the more punitive sort of approach towards, like, the use of group punishment. We've discussed in a previous annual report [2024-25] the use of group punishment and how it's contrary to Nelson Mandela Rules. I think that if you're applying a more therapeutic approach, sort of providing, hitting off on those sort of principles is really important and that more punitive approach we're seeing isn't really sort of in line with that.

Ms O'CONNOR - Can I ask how this happens? I mean, are there not protocols in place for the management of challenging behaviours, if you like, in Mary Hutchinson? Are there no rules in the Prison about how managers deal with discipline?

Mr CHRISTENSEN - I think there's an element of culture as well. The disciplinary process is one that I'm really interested to look at in a future work and I think also the thing I'd say as well is, like Grant was saying, the new director of prisons has obviously focused on the women's prison. They've sort of recently been recruiting for a new position as a practice lead in focusing on the Women's Prison. So, I

would hope that would sort of redirect some of the changes we have seen in the women's prison.²³

- 3.35 The previous existence of an informal hostile-management regime within some high-security units in Tasmanian prisons was discussed at the meeting, including movements to manage it out of use:

Ms O'CONNOR - ...I need to backtrack a bit to the hostile management regime and understand a bit better what that is.

The annual report [2024-25] talks about a review of it, and it's a high-security prison issue, particularly in the Tamar and Franklin units. Is that correct? What is the hostile management regime?

Mr CHRISTENSEN - The hostile management regime was an unsanctioned regime that was occurring within primarily the Franklin and Tamar units. It raised some pretty significant human rights concerns from the perspective of the previous custodial inspector, which I'm sure Grant shares, and he's sort of decided to conduct a review into it.

I think in previous annual reports we've sort of called out for information from people in custody and civil society about any observations or experiences they've had in the hostile management regime. We had a really positive uptake from that. I think as part of that review, we've interviewed over 20 people in custody to sort of better understand their experiences. We've also sought information from correctional staff.

That report is in the process of being finalised - sorry, the draft is in the process of being finalised for Grant's consideration, then subject to that will then go to the department for comment as procedural fairness requirement.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, but what is the hostile management regime?

Mr CHRISTENSEN - I was sort of dithering, sorry. It was basically a regime where if someone's behaviour, as deemed by correctional officers, was hostile, then they would be put on this regime.

It was, I think, a seven- or 14-day regime and each day that would start from with literally basically nothing and then, each day, based on their behaviour, they would get something and so -

Ms O'CONNOR - They're rewarded with something or get sort of punishment?

Mr CHRISTENSEN - Yes, well they would get something. So, day zero, they would have no mattress and then day one, they would get a mattress. Day two, they would get some other thing like - and I don't have the document in front of me - but there was literally an internal TPS document that was created sort of specifying what people would get each day and TPS management weren't aware of the process. They only became aware of it when we raised it with them as part of our monitoring work.

²³ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Custodial Inspector, pp. 44-45.

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay, and is the hostile management regime, the unsanctioned hostile management regime, still in place?

CHRISTENSEN - No, no, so I think, really positively - a young person raised it with us during an inspection, we wrote to the Prison Service to request information about it because they spoke to us about having their mattress taken away from them and so that prompted us to ask questions.

Ms O'CONNOR - What would they sleep on?

Mr CHRISTENSEN - They were sleeping on the floor or on the concrete plinth and so when we got the response back from the Prison Service, it was a really good response. They were really open in terms of disclosing that it was unsanctioned, that the management wasn't aware of it and they put a stop to it immediately, but I think it prompted Richard Connock to consider conducting a review of it in light of some of the concerns that it raised.²⁴

3.36 The Committee also received an update on operational changes that the Custodial Inspector had noted recently at Ashley Youth Detention Centre (AYDC):

Ms O'CONNOR - ... Has anything tangibly changed for the children and young people at Ashley (AYDC) in the past - well, since the Commission of Inquiry [into the Tasmanian Government's Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings] handed down its recommendations. Has anything identifiably tangibly changed?

Mr CHRISTENSEN - I think we've been really fortunate to have a new assistant principal inspection officer join us on a sort of temporary contract which finishes up in November [2026]. That's enabled us to increase our visiting up to Ashley Youth Detention Centre. I think the observations from that increased monitoring have been really fantastic. I think one clear observation is that every time you go up there, things can be dramatically different. I think that our assistant principal inspection officer was up there just this week and there was a really positive vibe. There seemed to be a lot of sort of changes. Obviously, there are significant challenges as well, but the mood of the Centre [AYDC] can change quite a lot. I think that there seems to be - there was a stabilisation task force that was established by the department to try to address some of the significant staffing issues there. We saw a few of those changes trying to implement - coming through. I think it was to that task force that we provided the organisational psychologist report that we obtained as part of our staffing review, because that had a real focus on the leadership at Ashley Youth Detention Centre at various different levels. We're hoping that will be of valuable assistance to that task force.

In terms of changes, there have been some really fantastic changes to the infrastructure. There has also been some deterioration in some of the infrastructure and some units, so there have been some really great refurbishments to the Franklin unit - the Liffey unit now has an outdoor exercise

²⁴ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Custodial Inspector, pp. 52-53.

area. I think I've previously flagged with the response to the Commission of Inquiry recommendations committee [Joint Sessional Committee on the Recommendations of the Final Report of the Commission of Inquiry] that there was no exercise yard for the Liffey unit. That's been addressed. That's a significant improvement. That unit is much nicer now. It's got sound baffling. Ms Ruth Forrest was quite interested in that particular issue, but then some of the units, for example, Rubicon, which used to be the unit that would be used for young people who were sort of - their behaviour was much more trusted behaviour. That unit, the quality of that unit has gone downhill significantly.

Ms O'CONNOR - The infrastructure quality, the fabric of it.

Mr CHRISTENSEN - There's quite a lot of graffiti. There was an incident in that unit as well that had an impact. Peaks and troughs. I don't want to give you –

Dr DAVIES - It's worth noting, though, that the oversight network, which is a network committee that was set up in –

Mr CHRISTENSEN - It's almost reached it's one-year anniversary.

Dr DAVIES - Having a presence at AYDC has actually assisted in that, shining a light on the issues out at Ashley.²⁵

- 3.37 The witnesses also noted that work continues to ensure that the Office of the Custodial Inspector maintains appropriate resources to ensure regular visits and investigations at AYDC continue.²⁶

Public representations

- 3.38 The Committee has received a number of representations from citizens of Tasmania during the reporting period.
- 3.39 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.
- 3.40 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.

²⁵ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Custodial Inspector, pp. 54-55.

²⁶ Transcript of Evidence, 20 March 2026, Custodial Inspector, pp. 55-56.

- 3.41 In relation to these representations from dissatisfied complainants, the Committee has on a number of occasions, referred these matters to the Commission to consider the issues raised by the complainant. Three matters were referred to the Commission for comment in 2025-26, and additional information sought in an ongoing matter which was consequentially considered and closed.
- 3.42 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.

Inquiry into the Establishment of a Parliamentary Privilege Protocol between the Parliament of Tasmania and the Integrity Commission Tasmania

- 3.43 After its recommencement after the 2025 General Election, the Committee resolved to continue the Inquiry. At the time of the prorogation of the Parliament of Tasmania and Dissolution of the House of Assembly in June 2025, the Committee had received submissions to the Inquiry and arranged public hearings. These were consequently cancelled due to the Dissolution of the House.
- 3.44 Upon recommencing its work on the Inquiry, the Committee resolved to hold public hearings, reflecting its earlier decision. Accordingly, two public hearings were held in October and November 2025, which were attended by 11 witnesses.
- 3.45 Following the public hearings, the Committee entered its private deliberations which remain ongoing. These deliberations have included the Committee's considerations of evidence received, including in relation to the 2023 Draft Protocol. The Committee is considering the core principle positions which should guide any Protocol between the Parliament and the Integrity Commission which ultimately recognise and uphold the principle of parliamentary privilege.

Parliament House
HOBART
8 September 2026



Hon. Rosemary Armitage M.L.C.
CHAIRPERSON

Appendix 1 - Joint Standing Committee on Integrity Meeting Attendance 2025-2026

Meeting Date	In attendance	
	Legislative Council	House of Assembly
Thursday 25 September 2025	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Friday 10 October 2025	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Friday 17 October 2025	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Monday 27 October 2025	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Tuesday 4 November 2025	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Wednesday 12 November 2025	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Ms Haddad
Friday 14 November 2025	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Tuesday 2 December 2025	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Tuesday 3 February 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Mr Jaensch

Monday 2 March 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Tuesday 17 March 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Friday 20 March 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Mr Jaensch
Tuesday 24 March 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Friday 10 April 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Tuesday 14 April 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Friday 17 April 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Thursday 30 April 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Friday 1 May 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Tuesday 19 May 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair) Ms O'Connor Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)	Mr George Ms Haddad Mr Jaensch
Friday 22 May 2026	Ms Armitage (Chair)	Mr George

	<i>Ms O'Connor</i> <i>Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)</i>	<i>Mr Jaensch</i>
Tuesday 26 May 2026	<i>Ms Armitage (Chair)</i> <i>Ms O'Connor</i> <i>Ms Webb (Deputy Chair)</i>	<i>Mr George</i> <i>Ms Haddad</i> <i>Mr Jaensch</i>