

Date: 10/11/11 Jm

## TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW

Friday 28 October 2011, 2.34pm Exhibit Number: 951

MS HEDGE: Okay. For the benefit of the tape, my name is Susan Hedge. I'm a lawyer from the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry. I'm in a meeting at 2.34 p.m. on the twenty-----

MS VICKERS: Eighth.

MS HEDGE: -----eighth of October 2011. And also in the room is Mr Barry Ball. Do you want to introduce yourself?

MR BALL: From the University of Queensland. The Deputy Director of the Global Change Institute.

MS VICKERS: And I'm also present; Ros Vickers, lawyer at the Flood Commission.

MS HEDGE: Okay, and we've had a short conversation with Mr Ball before this tape was started and in that we agreed to talk today about the local council decision-making processes regarding development control levels and how they can be improved, that process. Is that a fair account of what we're talking about today?

MR BALL: It is. Thanks, Susan, yep.

MS HEDGE: Okay. Well, in some ways, I think, we could hand over to you and say what are the - maybe you can first tell us about what you see is the role of decision-makers within local governments about these topics and more generally, and then we can go through specific sort of decisions that councils have to make and how you consider they should be done.

MR BALL: Thanks, Susan. So we're talking about river flooding events and not creek and local flooding events. So, in the context of river events, local governments' role is to establish appropriate development levels, and in the context of that, councils would get hydraulic studies and in receiving those hydraulic studies, would look at the range of impacts of various flooding events, logically ranging from probably the Q50 to maybe the Q200-type events. They would assess the impact of those on current development and on the strategic objectives the city might have in redevelopment and would then, I believe, set a defined flood level. And in setting that defined flood level, that would be the standard which

would be used for development from river flooding impacts. This - the city would obviously over time continue to receive improved information about flooding levels because of variabilities in the climate, better modelling, better tools and techniques, but would then have a choice as to whether the significance of those changes or the impact on the community as a whole was of - was worth the variation to the defined flood level. So I think that's role - is to select the standard. I think by calling it a "defined flood level" takes the engineering term out of it and means that it - it's truly making a decision based on engineering information rather than locking it into a continuing varying level, such as - using a term such as the Q100.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm. And so maybe we could just step through the process from how - first of all, how a local council would decide when they need to get a study or get some of those hydraulic reports done. How would you-----

MR BALL: So-----

MS HEDGE: -----that process would happen?

MR BALL: So what would normally happen is that on a regular time scale, it might be five years - in order of five years that - and particularly if, I suppose, entities such as the BOM or others were updating their climate forecast models. So it would either be a trigger on a timescale or a trigger to do with some significant change of information they would - or even, I suppose, there's been situations where there's been changes to engineering standards elsewhere in the country. So there'd be a few triggers which might flag the need to reassess whether there's been - the current value or information around flooding is appropriate and whether there's a need to do a reassessment of that, and so council would make a formal decision then to invest funds to undertake a remodelling of river flooding within the city, for example. And in doing that, based on information, would then have a look at that and bring in external experts to make sure that all of the most appropriate considerations have been taken into account, the right sensitivities, the right - the best practice. And so they could be confident that the information they've got in front of them to make the decision is of the most up-to-date information, and in doing - and so those experts would range from obviously using - you would normally go to the market for an engineering consultant that has those capabilities. You would connect with DERM because of their science and

engineering areas of connections both nationally and internationally. You would - there's some individuals that are known as the best practice experts in Australia. You would engage those to - just to review to make sure that the decision you make is the most appropriate because it is a substantial decision to be made by a city because you have to be able to, I suppose, defend that's an appropriate standard not only to the community but to those wanting to redevelop, because that will always be challenging whether that's an appropriate standard. So you've got to weigh all of that up and make sure that you've made an appropriate decision.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: And, in doing that, you've got to - I think it's - no, it's not a decision in isolation because you've got to think about all of the impacts, whether it be the individual cost to developers, the need to upgrade other infrastructure and assets that the city owns because you've got bridges and other infrastructure. So you - you know, it's an important decision to be made and it's one that needs to be made with all of the right inputs.

MS HEDGE: Okay, and if I can ask you then about the point at which you've hired consultants, as you discussed, and how you determine what instructions to give, how long a period of time to give, and-----

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: -----the scope of the work that they'll do.

MR BALL: Well that's not been something that I've been involved in. That's normally the role for the business area, which is the design office. That's entirely processes that they control and manage.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: That's their area of accountability.

MS HEDGE: Okay. And so you don't have any recommendations about how - or opinion about what has gone well and badly in that process of setting timeframes and scopes of work?

MR BALL: No, because it's an area that they totally manage-----

MS HEDGE: Okay.

MR BALL: -----so I might have some perspectives on that, but I would suggest that in - that there's capable people that are able to, you know, to set the right terms of reference to - they go to the market normally, they have to meet certain - those involved in doing the work have to meet certain levels of experience, so that's a market process.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: I - you know - as I said, the value-add, I think, is making sure that when that work is complete, is that you put it in front of a review group that has the right balance and level of expertise to ensure that - because all of that - what that is is a bit of technical information. You then have to put that into a broader context and to ensure that it is the best level of technical information before you make a final decision. It is simply an input into a decision process; it's not the decision in itself. It's simply one of the inputs.

MS HEDGE: So perhaps tell me more at this stage, then, about what sort of review group you envisage as a best practice model - not necessarily what happened, but just what-----

MR BALL: Oh no, well I think the review group is - what you would do is bring together - you would obviously - the particular engineering firm doing the modelling is one member; within council and the design area, the senior expert in that area would be on that group - I mean, they're two key people. You would bring in an external person that was independent of that but was ideally seen nationally as the leading expert in this area. I think you would always bring the DERM expert in because they, again, have a broader set of expertise and knowledge. So I think probably that's your core. Ideally, depending on availability, you might want to sort of supplement that with a couple of others, but I think they're your - they're the core-----

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: -----that you would have.

MS HEDGE: Okay. And if I can just go back one step-----

MR BALL: Yep.

MS HEDGE: -----to - through the process of the flood study-----

MR BALL: Mmm.

MS HEDGE: -----being undertaken - the modelling [indistinct] being undertaken by the engineering firm. How do you see the best way for the local government and the engineering firm to interact and what's the important parts of their interaction and any problems or-----

MR BALL: Well, that would be that terms of reference, because the modelling part of it is simply a - it's an engineering exercise of feeding in information and you've got two ways of doing Q100 modelling. One is by flow information in the river-----

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: -----or the waterway, and that depends on cross-sections and how many cross-sections you've got, and so that's the sort - and the flow in the river, and the other is the - it's more the rainfall. So you've got two ways of - and the - traditionally the model - I haven't been involved in recent times, but normally what happens, these two approaches are done separately and then they are - the results are assessed together and if they come in pretty close, then the modellers would say, "Well, we think we've just about got this right." If they are at variance, then they might go back and have a look at some of the assumptions that were made, because there's assumptions made.

MS HEDGE: Mmm.

MR BALL: That's fundamental, and it depends on how much time and effort and detail that you're asking as to how much refinement goes on in those - that, you know, you can do a cross-section every metre in the river, or you can do every 500 metres, and that's two separate answers because that's a variable-----

MS HEDGE: Yep.

MR BALL: -----and you can do some averages for the whole of catchment as to what the runoff coefficient is, or you can get it down to individual allotments and you can do an assessment there. So, you know, one end of the spectrum might cost you X and the other end of the spectrum might cost you a thousand X.

MS HEDGE: Mmm.

MR BALL: So that's an absolute choice you make as to which it is, and so that's part of that terms of reference. You would do an evaluation as to, you know, what's an appropriate level of detail required to give you, you know, the best answer and there would be some advice about what is the norm - it is normally a 500 metre spacing in the cross-sections, or is normally a 20, or is it normally a whatever, and in the catchment, what level of sub-catchment do you normally go to, particularly large catchments versus sort-of medium catchments. So all of that is - they're decisions that have to be made in your terms of reference getting a [indistinct] consultant because you don't leave that to the consultant, you don't pay a consultant for the 500 metres, or you don't pay him for the 100 - you know, for the one metre; you've got to agree first what it is and then that's the fee. It's going to cost you a million dollars or \$10 million to do it.

MS HEDGE: Mmm. And-----

MR BALL: So that's all part of that front-end-----

MS HEDGE: Okay.

MR BALL: -----decision-making. Now, that's really the experts [indistinct] the design - the designer - the designer is. That's there accountability to make sure that the modelling techniques, the modelling tools and the criteria around those are the most appropriate to, you know, for the decisions that are needed.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm. And throughout the flood study, there will be times, it appears to me - and please correct me if this is not a right assumption - there'll be times when the engineering firm comes back with "I've now - I'm now at a point where I need to choose one of two things, or are you happy with this approach", and-----

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: -----do you think that - do you have any views on how a local government can effectively engage in that back-and-forth process without ending up with a very long process, if that makes sense, and sometimes that sort of interaction can be-----

MR BALL: Yeah, well again, that's probably something I wasn't directly involved in-----

MS HEDGE: Okay.

MR BALL: -----so - but my perception would be is that's really like managing any contract; you establish the appropriate set of criteria that you want to use, you talk about them - the models that are going to be used because you don't want them using models that are maybe out-of-date in their capability, or you - as a - because what - you know, you've got two sorts of organisations when you're doing this work. You've got one that they don't have any knowledge in the topic at all and they rely totally on the engineering firm expert to tell them what is best practice or most appropriate practice, or you've got - and I would suggest that that's probably the situation with a lot of local governments. The .- Brisbane is probably at the other end of that - or is at the other end of that spectrum and has got a - maybe less now, but certainly back in time, it had a number of senior engineers that had strong experience in this sort of work. So the engineering firm was being asked to do it as a - like any contract arrangement, it was because you don't have it all in-house, you outsource, and so the - so those senior engineering experts would be able to be very specific in the criteria and would be - would have enough expertise to be able to be part of that backwards and - well, set the criteria right and then be part of that backwards and forwards to make sure that it wasn't taking longer than it should, extra work wasn't being done that wasn't needed, you know, all of that sort of thing.

MS HEDGE: Mmm.

MR BALL: I'm not sure - I would assume that in the smaller local authorities they would probably rely a bit on DERM to help them in that space. The amalgamations, I think, has maybe helped to bring, you know, to consolidate some of those smaller local authorities to give them a level of expertise. In some cases they buy that expertise through another engineering firm who manages the, you know, the engineering firm who are doing the detailed work. So there's various ways of doing it, but you do need an expert in your employment that's able to be there to respond to those issues, manage the process, and making sure that the result that you're getting is consistent with what your requirements are.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm. So now back to the review group, I think. What do you think are the major considerations,

the core considerations, that that review group would take into account once it receives the flood study?

MR BALL: I suppose it would just - it would be a fairly straightforward review in the sense that it has - if it's applied a certain model to do that - to do those modelling, is it the latest version. You know, it would be a straightforward thing like that. The inputs that are being used into the model - are they the latest information, for example, from the Bureau of Meteorology. If you're probably having a review of the criteria such as, you know, simple things like the spacing of the cross-sections through the river, you know, if they've used 20 metres, well that's probably about the right one. You know, if they've used 50 metres, then that might be stretching it a bit as to whether that's the appropriate one. So there'd be some views out of the group about what is seen as best practice or appropriate practice. So they just look through those inputs, the techniques used, just to make sure that it is the most appropriate/best practice and they would have a view about the outputs based on that. They would say that "based on that process that's been used, we would have a level of comfort that that" - because there's always a range; it's never an absolute number. They'd say - they would say that "based on that, we think that it's about the right number, plus or minus, you know, 10 per cent, or something like that", or they would say "no, what's happened is that they haven't - there's some work going on that we're aware of, you know, here or there that they haven't taken into account and we would suggest that it's a fairly critical element that they need to be using because it'll help better refine the information they have, and things like that". So that's the value they'd be adding. They'd be bringing the knowledge or the expertise they have and giving the person having to make decisions some level of comfort that either the number that's come out of that process is in the order of the right number or the process that's being used hasn't picked up some key areas that it needed to.

MS HEDGE: Okay, so that's effectively a technical review?

MR BALL: Technical review.

MS HEDGE: And then there'd be a separate policy review or like a - where the decision-maker is, can you tell us about how it would move - what would - what were [indistinct] feed into that-----



MR BALL: Yeah - yeah. So the-----

MS HEDGE: -----policy review-----

MR BALL: So the technical review gives you a level of comfort about the number. Policy review says based on using that number, here is the impact on the city on redevelopment or development in the city, this is the number of homes that are impacted, this is an order of the cost for if you apply this standard to redevelopment that is happening in the city, this is the impact on the infrastructure that the city has ownership around. So it would be a - it would have been assessment of the impact of current level and if we chose to change that level to a different one, here is the impact in a - not only in a city financial, but in a community financial sense, in a community - broader community impact. So decision-makers need information to make decisions so then you'd understand financial, social, other sort of environmental impacts in making the decision. You know, they need to get - it's the business case for the change.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: One's the - one's "what is the new value?" and then, like any decision, "what's the business case to make that change?" And that's what effectively what the politician needs, "is the business case for the change?"

MS HEDGE: And so you would envisage a policy review body that set up that information, for then a politician to make the decision?

MR BALL: Yes, well, I'd probably call it a "policy" - whether you call it a "policy review", but a - it's a bit of technical information-----

MS HEDGE: Yes.

MR BALL: -----and what you do is get the people that are most appropriate to work through the business case of that change, the value of the - to the city of making that change.

MS HEDGE: Mmm. And who - just in a best practice way, who should be making the decision?

MR BALL: Oh, well, Cabinet - you know, council.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: It's a council decision.

MS HEDGE: Yep.

MR BALL: If you're talking about it local government level, yeah.

MS HEDGE: I am.

MR BALL: Yeah, yeah.

MS HEDGE: But just generally around Queensland-----

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: -----because there's - I think there are different-----

MR BALL: Yeah, well-----

MS HEDGE: -----people who do different things.

MR BALL: -----that's right. Well, for me it's always the - it's a political decision, it's pure and simple. But politicians need information - the right information to make the right decisions, so whether in some cases if it's - it could be a state - you know, it could be a state minister decision - if that's the case, then it's no different. The state minister needs the business case for that decision - the impact on whatever it is in making that decision.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: You're getting little-----

MS VICKERS: Sorry, I was just getting a look through the glass.

MS HEDGE: Do you need to?

MS VICKERS: Do you mind if I just pop out for two seconds?

MS HEDGE: No, I'm sure that's-----

MS VICKERS: Thanks.

MS HEDGE: -----fine. Where - I see it's one minute to 3, which is when we'd said we we'd - and so are you-----

MR BALL: I'm right for a bit longer.

MS HEDGE: Just roll a couple of minutes and then we'll just work out where we can go from here. I guess my - I'm interested in the social and community impacts and the sort of impacts that you'd consider should be taken into account in that sense.

MR BALL: I suppose it - each situation is different. It is understanding if you've got a certain level that's applied at the moment, particularly if there's a proposal to amend that level, then what are all of the impacts that might come into play with that decision. So, for example, will it change the - will it change the value of property-----

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: -----and will it mean that there'll be a - and it's related to the value of property - will there be a transformation of what the communities in that area perceive as - you know, the suburb might be going through - might have to go through a transformation because it's seen, well, there's - more of the suburb is becoming impacted by river flooding and so people want to start moving out and start transforming a community because of a change in a standard which starts to devalue property, because, you know, once that decision is made, then people will find it more difficult to sell property because it's got this new line drawn through it, maybe at the value that it is today. When the line's drawn through it tomorrow, it becomes a lower value property.

MS HEDGE: Mmm.

MR BALL: And so there's a social - that's a social thing-----

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: -----to me. So it's - there are - there's that sort of element that needs to be part of it. You know, if - I mean, that's only one part of it, so you've got to think about that part of it in the context of all of the other benefits of changing that line.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: And so it's not always a straightforward decision. It's not just simply drawing a new line on the

map. Once you draw a new line on the map, that starts to have a value - impact on property.

MS HEDGE: Mmm.

MR BALL: And that has a social impact.

MS HEDGE: And what do you see as the social benefit of changing the line, if any?

MR BALL: If any? The social - if it - if it's only - I don't see it as strong social benefit if it's only a marginal thing because the - I'm still not sure that the - that there's the level of refinement in the inputs into the model. The actual modelling itself is refined enough for minor changes. It - I think it's - it would be more of a social value if, for example, the Bureau said, "We've now redone our modelling for climate change, climate variability, and when you plug that into the model, it changes the Q100 event by a metre." And I think, you know, it's those more substantial changes is where I think that's the social - I think you'll - I think that's right then to go to say, "We really now need to think about whether it is worth amending the defined flood level because it means that when we upgrade our infrastructure, whether it be wastewater treatment outlets, stormwater outlets, redevelopment of a city, then we should be thinking about the future. We should be making sure that those locations down near the river mouth and all the rest of it - if there are substantial investments being made there for airports or other infrastructure, then we need to make sure that we are planning them for the future." So I think if it's only tweaking it, then I think there's no real social value. But I think if the inputs basically say that it is substantial and that's agreed, then I think there is a social benefit for the long term. Because continuing to invest with the current standard is just potentially putting money - bad money. Now, if we choose to say we want to change our standard, then that's a different issue. If we say, "Okay, it's gone up a metre and that means we're probably now under a Q50", there's nothing wrong with having a Q50 standard, but that's the - but that's just everyone saying, "Okay, well we've moved from this level to now we've got to - we're more likely to get an event two per cent of the year than we are one per cent, and when we do go to that event, you know, more properties are going to be impacted." So it's a - it's like any decision. I mean, we could decide today to make the speed limit 20 ks, but - and no one would get injured and no one would die on the roads, but that's a - you

know, that's a decision you can always make, you can always a low-risk decision. But we've chosen as a community that we'd accept X number of deaths and X number of injuries for convenience of travel time. So there's no difference; we've chosen a level here. We could easily increase or decrease those levels if we wanted to risks out of the equation. That's why it's a bit - purely is a political decision, weighing up the impact on community and on infrastructure investment.

MS HEDGE: And you've probably led into another question I had, which was about community education or how that decision once made is communicated. For example, if you did decide that the risk level would be a Q50, how that would be communicated.

MR BALL: But you don't - what you're saying is that as a - "we've done the work and we're saying that we've said that the analysis basically says that there's a very low probability that we're going to get flooded based on this level"-----

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: -----and you can talk about one per cent or you can talk about two per cent; that doesn't mean anything to - it doesn't - you know, one per cent or two per cent is in the same margin. If you said it was 10 per cent chance, then people who say, "Well, that's - you know - that's a fairly high risk." But if you talk about on per cent or half a per cent or two per cent, you know, people are going to look at it - you've got a 50 per cent of - chance of being flooded. They're saying, "Well that's - you know - it looks like I'm going to get flooded." But if you say there's a 10 per cent - well, you know, that's got a fairly high probability. If you look at one per cent, there's still saying, "Well, at least they know that at some point in time they're going to get flooded." If there's a zero per cent, or whatever, then they expect it to be a zero per cent.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: And I think - I don't think it's about that; I think it's that people believe that, you know, things up in the catchment, like a dam, real or perceived, that stops flooding in the river. But it didn't stop flooding; it just lowered the percentages. That's all it did. If you live on the river, you're going to get flooded no matter how many dams you build.

MS HEDGE: Mmm.

MR BALL: It might be .1 of a per cent, but there is a probability. It's a lower probability than there was before.

MS HEDGE: Do you want to [indistinct].

MR BALL: No, that's all right.

MS HEDGE: I just know that I kept you here.

MR BALL: Okay - that's okay.

MS HEDGE: I'm very sorry I've discussed your time. Look, I might just add one more question for you-----

MR BALL: Yep.

MS HEDGE: -----just to talk about where we'd go from here, which is of all these pieces of information you've told us that you need to have in the decision-----

MR BALL: Mmm.

MS HEDGE: -----which are the ones that, in your experience, were difficult to obtain or difficult to use in the decision?

MR BALL: I don't think any of it's difficult. It's simply - the information is always there. You can choose to refine the level of that information. You can choose to gather more experts. You can choose to access more data and more information. But there's a point in time where you have to make a decision. So it's not that it's difficult to get information. There's plenty of information. It's not difficult to get experts together. The - I think the challenge is deciding what standard is the most appropriate. What level of risk is acceptable to the community. That's the - so, you know, the information there - it's making that decision, it's what the most appropriate level of risk. Some of the community might think it should be zero, particularly if you live on the river. Some might accept a minimal - you know, one per cent, or two per cent, or five per cent, But that - so that's the - you know, as I said, it goes back to the example I used. I mean, you know, it's an easy decision to say 20 ks an hour, but that's a very hard political decision to make. I don't think any - it's an easy - that's a logical decision to make if you want to stop injuries and deaths on roads. You wouldn't

have any - I don't there'd be many that would make that decision because we trade-off every day the risk of being injured on a road to - and I know I'm just using an analogy here - the risks on a road to trying to get somewhere quicker that takes us, you know, takes a third of the time or a tenth of the time to get somewhere. That's the decision we make every day. And there's no difference in the decisions here. The defined level - flood level on the river could be Q10, it could be Q100, it could be Q500 - that's simply a - that's an easy decision to make, which one you choose, but there are implications in making those decisions. That's a very expensive decision. That's a very cheap - but, you know, that one's going to have significant community issues and this one's going to - this one's probably going to have not necessarily any community issues but how do you fund it, because it's going to cost you 10 times as much for development. So it - that's the challenge in decision-making, is getting the balance between what is an acceptable risk, you know, what's an acceptable speed limit on roads. We've - you know - we've tweaked it around schools and we've tweaked it around other places because we've said, "Well, we don't - we want to manage the risk there a bit more, but" - and that's all it is, it's just a - that's - do we make those decisions every day. That's what government does every day. It balances lives and costs and against risk every day.

MS HEDGE: Mmm-hmm.

MR BALL: And this is no different. That's why I don't see there's any different - it doesn't matter what number you choose. There's pluses and minuses in whatever number you choose. And I think that communities have generally said, "Well, you know, the number around, you know, this sort of one per cent to two per cent risk is the right number. Ten per cent is sort of getting too high and 50 per cent's unacceptable." And so this is where the number is and I'm not sure that, you know, going down to half a per cent or .1 of a per cent - that's going to be a fairly high cost solution. That's really for me the - that's what it's all about.

MS VICKERS: I know. It makes sense.

MS HEDGE: Did you have any questions?

MS VICKERS: No, I don't.

MS HEDGE: I think we've covered a lot of ground and it may be that we come back with some specific questions about some of those things.

MR BALL: Yep.

MS HEDGE: But I thought it was good today just to have an overview of the whole process-----

MR BALL: Yep.

MS HEDGE: -----and your thoughts on it. And so, can I just confirm with you that you're comfortable with - it'll be me, personally, preparing a statement on the basis of-----

MR BALL: Sure.

MS HEDGE: -----of the tape, on this basis, and on the basis next weekend-----

MR BALL: Yeah, yeah.

MS HEDGE: -----of something you'd have a lot of - all - total control over-----

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: -----the content of it. But this was the-----

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: -----way we do it just to make it easier for people.

MR BALL: Just - I suppose, just for me, I - I've been out of this area probably now for, I don't know, five years. So I suppose these perspectives and views reflect views and perspectives of five years ago. I don't think that I've - because I haven't really - so I suppose I - that's just a context in the sense-----

MS HEDGE: Mmm.

MR BALL: -----that I'm not - there may well be better information, knowledge, or better understanding of processes of that, because I haven't kept up to speed. I've moved into different areas. This is really me reflecting on history and perspectives I had - I suppose-----



MS HEDGE: Yes.

MR BALL: -----I've hung on to some of those, obviously, as these things come up, but - so - yeah, so, there could be better best practice processes and techniques. You know, you're asking me for my opinion on some things. There might well be some very good processes in place which I'm sure you're, you know, you're able to access elsewhere. My views are dated, is what I'm saying.

MS HEDGE: We understand.

MR BALL: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

MS HEDGE: And we're just asking on basis of your-----

MR BALL: Yeah, that's okay.

MS HEDGE: -----involvement - yes.

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: But we will also access-----

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: -----current processes, examples and things like that.

MR BALL: Yeah, yeah.

MS HEDGE: But sometimes people who have had some distance can have some insight.

MR BALL: Yeah, that's right.

MS VICKERS: Yeah.

MR BALL: Yeah, that's right.

MS HEDGE: It's hard to have when you're-----

MR BALL: Yeah, in the middle of it.

MS HEDGE: -----in the middle of it.

MR BALL: Yeah, I agree. No, that's fine. I just wanted to make sure.

MS HEDGE: Okay. And I might just say that we also agreed before the tape was put on and-----

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: -----please correct what I now say - that we would - we, the Commission, would look through the Crime and Misconduct Commission report on this matter and before we next meet, write a list of specific clarifications or questions that we had and that you'd feel comfortable also - subject to those questions, of course-----

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: -----feel comfortable including that sort of information in-----

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: -----the statement as well.

MR BALL: Yeah.

MS HEDGE: So it'll be a combination of your memory of what - your recollection of what occurred-----

MR BALL: Yep.

MS HEDGE: -----and your views on how a best practice method would occur-----

MR BALL: Yep.

MS HEDGE: -----and the advantages and disadvantages of different things that occurred in the past.

MR BALL: Yeah. And that's accurate. Again, the comment there is that reflected a point in time. What the processes and techniques are in place now, I don't know, and so it'll again be a perspective based on how it operated then rather than how it operates today. That's-----

MS HEDGE: Yeah.

MR BALL: -----the context.

MS HEDGE: Yes. That's fine.

MR BALL: Thanks [indistinct].

MS HEDGE: Okay. Do you have any questions?

MR BALL: No, not at all.

MS HEDGE: Okay. Do you have your diary with you? We might be able to set up a time. I have one appointment next week at 2 o'clock on Tuesday.

MR BALL: You're very lucky.

MS HEDGE: The Melbourne Cup [indistinct].

MS VICKERS: Shall we turn the tape off now?

MS HEDGE: Okay, we'll just finish the tape there at a quarter past 3.

TAPE RECORDING CONCLUDED