

CRIME AND MISCONDUCT COMMISSION

GPO Box 3123
Brisbane Qld 4001

Level 2, North Tower
515 St Pauls Terrace
Fortitude Valley, Qld

Tel: (07) 3360 6060
Fax: (07) 3360 6333

Toll Free:
1800 061 611

Email
mailbox@cmc.qld.gov.au

www.cmc.qld.gov.au

Your Reference: NA
Our Reference: MI-11-1508 / DBJONES
Contact Officer: Dylan Jones



7 July 2011

PRIVATE & PERSONAL

Mr Richard Koerner
rjkoerner@iinet.net.au

Dear Mr Koerner

RE: YOUR CONCERNS

We refer to your correspondence to the Queensland Competition Authority in which you raised concerns about impropriety in appointments in the South East Queensland water sector. The Queensland Competition Authority referred your concerns to the Crime and Misconduct Commission (CMC).

We have carefully considered the information you provided to the Queensland Competition Authority.

We note your concerns relate to a report by KPMG to the Queensland Government into pricing of water assets.

We understand you allege impropriety in appointments due to Ministers appointing the Queensland Chairman of KPMG as the Chairman of SEQ Water and a former employee of KPMG as Chairman of the SEQ Water Audit Committee.

Though I may have used different words to describe your concerns or not referred to every issue that you raised, please be assured that we have considered all the information you gave us.

Under the *Crime and Misconduct Act 2001* (the Act), the CMC's role is to ensure that complaints involving suspected 'official misconduct' in Queensland's public sector agencies are dealt with effectively and appropriately.

Attached, for your information, are excerpts from the Act that define the term 'official misconduct' and outline the role of the CMC.

In making a decision about the way to deal with a complaint, the CMC must consider the circumstances of the case and the 'misconduct principles' set out in section 34 of the Act. In particular the CMC has regard to the devolution principle, which recognises the responsibility of a chief executive officer and senior managers to manage their agency, including dealing with inappropriate behaviour of staff. It provides that action to deal with official misconduct should, generally, be taken by the agency.

The Act also recognises that in certain circumstances the CMC can decide not to take any action in relation to a complaint.

The CMC considers it is appropriate not to take any further action in relation to your allegation because there is *insufficient* evidence to support a *criminal offence* or *disciplinary breach* to warrant the dismissal of any officer.

If you have any further evidence to support your allegation that there was impropriety in Ministerial appointments in the South East Queensland water sector you may forward that to the CMC for consideration.

Yours sincerely



JEFFREY FARRAH
Principal Legal Officer
Public Sector Program
Integrity Services

Attach.

6 January 2008

Mr Robert Needham
Chairperson
Crime and Misconduct Commission (CMC)
GPO Box 3123, Brisbane Qld. 4001

Dear Mr Needham,

Re: Prices oversight complaint of 13 April 2006 (Refs MI-06-1131)

I refer to your letter of 12 December 2007 in response to the Association's request dated 4 December for a Client Services Review of the CMC's treatment of the complaint of 13 April 2006. In that correspondence it is stated that *"While you have suggested that the Council and the MWS may have provided Treasury with misleading information, the information available to us does not reasonably raise a suspicion of misconduct in that regard."*

In the letter to the Association dated 19 November 2007, the Director Complaints Services stated the following: *"We further note that the Queensland Treasury has also advised the Association that its review of Maroochy Water Services' financial performance was completed in early 2007. The CMC has not been advised by Queensland Treasury of any possible official misconduct concerns arising from the review"*. It is surprising that the letter from the Treasurer dated 16 November, that was an attachment to the CRA's letter to CMC dated 4 December cited above, was silent on the matter of completion of the updated financial performance review completed by Treasury.

Although Treasury has advised that external auditors concluded the 30 June 2003 revaluation of MWS assets was fair and reasonable, that revaluation was not significant relative to the grossly overstated estimates of regulatory capital base quoted by the Ministers in their letter to the Association dated 25 September 2004 (Ref TRO-06280). As the attached letter to the Under-Treasurer shows, average annual returns on regulatory assets have been in fact greater than 20% for the years 1999/00 to 2004/05. More than double the level considered reasonable.

Given Treasury's central role in providing flawed advice to the Minister's QCA that was used in the letter of 25 September 2004 and as the basis for the decision of the Ministers QCA of June 2005, our members do not consider that the advice quoted by the Director Complaints Services is independent. It is the view of the Association that acceptance of such advice without independent verification of possible official misconduct by any of the parties involved, including Treasury, cannot be relied upon. Further, information supplied by the Ombudsman suggests that complaints involving Ministers and Cabinet can't be dealt with.

It appears then that this complaint cannot be investigated by the Ombudsman, as has been suggested by the Director Complaints Services in letters dated 7 June and 8 August 2006, and 19 November 2007. If that is the case, the public interest of residents and ratepayers of Maroochy Shire has not been well served by the CMC in this instance.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Brown, Secretary, Coolum Residents Association

Attached: Letter from Association to the Under-Treasurer dated 12 April 2006