

IN THE PERTH CASINO ROYAL COMMISSION

WITNESS STATEMENT OF JANINE MARY BELLING

Date of Document: 20 May 2021

Filed on behalf of: The Department of Local
Government, Sport and Cultural
Industries

Date of Filing: 20 May 2021

Prepared by:

STATE SOLICITOR FOR WESTERN AUSTRALIA
DAVID MALCOLM JUSTICE CENTRE
28 BARRACK STREET
PERTH WA 6000

TELEPHONE: (08) 9264 1888
REF: SSO 1253-21

STATEMENT OF JANINE MARY BELLING

I, JANINE MARY BELLING, Contains sensitive information

Contains sensitive Retired/Former Director Licensing and Chief Casino Officer, do say as follows:

1. This statement is provided in response to the witness summons, dated 11 May 2021 and issued under section 8A of the *Royal Commissions Act 1968* (WA), which is directed to me by the Perth Casino Royal Commission (**Royal Commission**).
2. This statement addresses the matters set out in Schedule 1 to the summons. Unless otherwise stated, the information in this statement comes from my knowledge.

Qualifications and Experience

Your qualifications and experience, generally, and in relation to the regulation and oversight of casinos and casino gambling, specifically.

3. My formal qualifications are:
 - (a) Bachelor of Arts (with Distinction)

Majors – Sociology/Anthropology, Literature
Minor - Psychology
University of Southern Queensland, 1999
 - (b) Certificate of Addiction Studies

School of Psychology, Curtin University of Technology,
Western Australia (2002)
 - (c) Pathways to Leadership Executive Program

Department of Premier and Cabinet (WA) (2005/06)
4. I do not have any formal education or training in relation to the regulation of a casino or casino gambling.
5. I have over 25 years experience with Federal, and various State and Territory, Government Agencies. During the last several years of my public service career, ending 2012, I was employed at the Senior Executive Service level in Western Australia.

6. My career as a public servant for the Government of Western Australia commenced with me working for the agency then called the Office of Racing, Gaming and Liquor in October 1996. I started as Team Coordinator in the Liquor Licensing area. Over the next 16 years, I improved my position and progressed through the agency and its succeeding entities in the following roles:
 - a) Team Coordinator – Liquor Licensing (Oct 1996 to July 2000)
 - b) Senior Coordinator – Licensing (July to September 2000)
 - c) Assistant Director of Liquor Licensing (September 2000 to September 2005)
 - d) Manager Policy & Executive Support (September 2005 to May 2007)
 - e) Director Licensing (May 2007 to June 2012 – position subsequently upgraded and became Deputy Director General)
7. Throughout that 16 year period I acted in more senior roles from time to time. For example, from 2007 to 2012, I acted as Director General in certain instances when Barry Sargeant, the then Director General, took short periods of leave.
8. Furthermore, in each of the above roles, I held various statutory functions delegated to me pursuant to various legislation relevant to my role and for which the Department was responsible.
9. I believe I first assumed some responsibility for casino regulation in the early 2000s when, what was then the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor, was restructured (specifically, the liquor and gambling teams merged). Following that, I became the Senior Coordinator, responsible for a team processing all applications for liquor and gambling matters (the latter embracing wagering, gaming and casino activities). To perform that role, I had to become more familiar with and understand certain aspects of the gaming, wagering and casino legislation. Those aspects I became familiar with were the processing and proper determination of applications for approval of casino employees and requests to conduct raffles and community gambling. Beyond the above, at that time I had no further involvement with respect to regulating gambling and casino activity.

10. I was appointed to the position of Director Licensing in May 2007 by Barry Sargeant, the Director General of the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor. I do not recall the specific date. At some point in 2007 I believe I was also appointed by the Gaming and Wagering Commission (**GW Commission**) to the statutory role of Chief Casino Officer (**CCO**). I think the role of CCO was 'attached' to the job description of the Director Licensing. I continued to hold both positions until I left the agency in June 2012 and ceased employment as Director Licensing.
11. In my capacity as Director Licensing and CCO, I was required, amongst other things, to provide administrative support and other regulatory services to the GW Commission. For example, one team I oversaw processed casino employee applications, various wagering applications, and applications for the suite of community gaming activities. These applications were generally dealt with administratively but any applications that were contentious were referred by me to the GW Commission for consideration. Not all teams reported directly to me. The Compliance Team performed inspectorial, audit and investigative functions as part of the services delivered to the GW Commission, but its inspectors reported to the Director Compliance with whom I worked closely. During my tenure as Director Licensing, Michael Connolly was Director Compliance, with the exception of a period commencing in, I recall, 2010 when Mr Connolly went on secondment to the Department of Fisheries and Sandy Del Prete acted as Director Compliance.
12. As CCO, I also represented the GW Commission in communications with the Casino Operator.
13. Further, I represented the GW Commission at national and international conferences relating to casino regulation.
14. I also was delegated the responsibility of Deputy Chairperson of the GW Commission. That role would be relevant when the Chairperson (Barry Sargeant) was absent from meetings, in which case effectively I would act as the Chairperson. When the Chairperson was not absent from meetings, I did not exercise any of their functions.

15. Throughout my tenure as Director Licensing, I had primary accountability for the legislative agenda of the Department of Liquor, Racing and Gaming, including a number of significant legislative reviews. These reviews required me to participate in high level negotiations with stakeholders; instruct Parliamentary Counsel on the drafting of amendments and Bills; negotiate with State Solicitor's Office, Parliamentary Counsel and others on various proposals; prepare Cabinet Submissions, Clause Notes and Explanatory Memoranda; present briefings to various groups including Caucus, Members of Parliament and the opposition; and provide assistance to the Government in the Lower and Upper Houses of Parliament during any consideration in detail of Bills.
16. Legislative reviews and amendments for which I had been accountable as Director included:
 - (a) *Betting and Racing Legislation Amendment Bill 2006*;
 - (b) *Racing and Wagering Western Australia Tax Amendment Bill 2006*;
 - (c) *Racing and Wagering Legislation Amendment Bill 2006*;
 - (d) *Racing, Wagering and Betting Legislation Amendment Bill 2006*;
 - (e) *Liquor & Gaming Legislative Amendment Act 2006 (WA)*; and
 - (f) *Liquor Control Amendment Act 2010 (WA)*.

Role as the Chief Casino Officer

Appointment and tenure as CCO

17. See paragraph [10] of this statement.

Your training (if any) related to the performance of your functions as CCO.

18. There was no formal training specific to the functions of the Chief Casino Officer. My learning was entirely grounded in mentorship from Mr Sargeant and the long experience of my colleagues such as Mr Connolly from working in the Department and from other jurisdictions nationally.

19. I attended the Australian Gaming Regulators Conference and twice attended the International Casino Regulators Conference. These forums covered broad issues from problem gambling and the social harms associated with that, the ever-changing landscape of casino and online gambling, new technologies and emerging trends and international criminal activities in a broad philosophical sense. As for specific national issues, the conferences focussed primarily on problem gambling, gaming machines, the proper assessment, oversight and taxation of revenues, and uniformity of regulatory process.
20. Importantly, my firm recollection is that during my tenure as Director Licencing/CCO, there was no formal training program available either in WA or nationally, for Casino Regulation that could be delivered to either a CCO or a member of the GW Commission. Consequently, the knowledge and experience of long serving past and present officers such as Mr Sargeant and Mr Connolly was crucial and should not be undervalued.
21. If specialised training were available during my tenure, I would absolutely have sought it out.

Time spent on CCO and other roles and whether CCO functions were adequately discharged

22. I exercised my CCO functions and responsibilities on a part time basis. It is not possible to say specifically how much time I spent in the role of CCO as I could be called upon to put my 'CCO cape' on at any time of the day. I would say I performed some kind of CCO function every day. Some days, CCO work may have been top priority and consume the full day such as on GW Commission meeting days. At other times I might spend only an hour a day working through papers or applications. Overall, I estimate that whilst I held it, the CCO role took up around 30% of my time spent working.
23. There was significant tension between my CCO and non-CCO responsibilities, and I was not able to discharge my functions as CCO in a way I felt fully satisfied with. My non-CCO responsibilities were to, in essence, be second in charge of the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor and work very closely with the DG and the Minister's Office.

My time in the role (2007 to 2012) was a time of enormous and controversial legislative implementation and change and of course we had a change in Government as well. The Department also underwent a significant internal restructure. So, I feel I needed more time to fully understand the complexity of the Perth Casino and the very quickly changing landscape of casino regulation and online gambling internationally.

24. Both Mr Connolly, Director Compliance, and I, along with the support of the Department's Director of Corporate Services, were developing a vision for how we wanted to better deliver support to the GW Commission and in terms of the Perth Casino regulation. We were developing a proactive and strategic regulatory plan that we hoped to present to the DG and GW Commission for consideration. That plan would have required additional resources and had resource implications for the Department. That, in itself, would have been a significant challenge based on government budgetary processes among other things. I was not naïve to that and the challenges that posed. My circumstances changed however in 2012, when my partner was offered work in the United States and we decided that it would be best for our family to pursue that opportunity overseas. I left the Department and was unable to see that proposed plan come into fruition. I think it is fair to say that my role as Director Licensing was exhausting in its complexity and responsibility and consequently the functions of the CCO suffered.

Remuneration

25. There was no remuneration for the role of CCO.
26. Although it is some years now and my memory may not be correct, but I believe my substantive position as Director Licensing was at Senior Executive Level 8 or 9 and remunerated accordingly.

Powers, duties and obligations of the CCO

Information about the CCO's powers and responsibilities and my understanding of them

27. The first source of information I turned to, to better understand my responsibilities and obligations and those of the GW Commission, was

the relevant legislation (particularly the *Gaming and Wagering Commission Act 1987* (WA) (**Gaming and Wagering Commission Act**) and *Casino Control Act 1984* (WA) and regulations thereunder) and the materials explaining that legislation (e.g. explanatory memorandums and reports). I also paid attention to the instruments of delegation to the CCO executed by the GW Commission, and my Job Description Form. I made a point of consuming reports and writings available to me on the establishment of gaming and wagering and its regulation, and the history of Perth Casino.

28. Equally significant was Mr Sargeant spending a great deal of time with me in helping me to understand the role, its powers and responsibilities.
29. I also asked exhaustive questions of my colleagues in relation to the Perth Casino and its operations, and compliance audits/inspections.
30. When the opportunity presented, I learned from colleagues in other Australian jurisdictions.
31. It is fair to say the CCO role was very much a hands on/learn as you go experience.

Understanding of GW Commission's Perth Casino and RISKS policies and procedures

32. Before addressing my understanding of policies and procedures with respect to RISKS specifically, it is useful to set out my general approach to policies and procedures.
33. The relevant legislation establishes the purpose, duties and responsibilities of the GW Commission and the CCO as to gaming, wagering and casino regulation.
34. In addition to and in support of that, the GW Commission had numerous policy and procedures to assist staff in the exercise of powers on the GW Commission's behalf, addressing matters like community gaming the conduct of raffles *etcetera*.
35. I availed myself of every document and mentoring opportunity I could. In doing so, if I identified a gap in the knowledge base, for example in a GW Commission procedure, I instructed my policy team to work to rectify that.

36. During my 16 year tenure, at all of my positions, I undertook internal policy and procedure reviews to eliminate gaps, red tape and clarify the legislative framework and relevant forms and documentation. We did this in particular as part of a much larger restructure of the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor and its delivery of services to the Director of Liquor Licensing, the Liquor Commission and to the GW Commission.
37. In terms of RISKS and casino operations directly, there was a Casino Operation Manual, approved by the GW Commission, which determined much of the conduct of business by the Casino Operator. This manual, if I recall correctly, was very prescriptive and set out parameters for all aspects of the conduct of business including accounting procedures, audits, cash management, main cage issues, payouts, security and surveillance, table supervisions of table games, rules of games, movement of assets such as chips, IT systems and so on.
38. The Casino Operation Manual placed obligations on the Perth Casino Operator as to internal controls and in reporting to the GW Commission. The inspectors of the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor would conduct audits of compliance against this Manual. The parameters of these audits were clearly set out and defined, I believe, by the Director Compliance.
39. I recall that during my tenure the GW Commission and the Department primarily operated on a risk-based approach with regular programmed and random inspections and audits. They also relied on adverse self-reporting from the Operator as informed or required by the Casino Operation Manual.
40. My recollection is that the GW Commission would have worked when necessary, including with respect to RISKS matters, with other national casino regulators and agencies such as the Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (**AUSTRAC**), ASIC, the WA Police and other law enforcement agencies. These endeavours would most likely have been reactive.
41. Probity assessment was conducted on all applications for casino employee and key casino employee applications, including security

personnel. If and when a probity issue was identified, the fitness and propriety of the individual was referred to the GW Commission for consideration.

42. Beyond that, on a larger scale, my understanding of RISKS was constrained and limited by the Department's resources and expertise. I also believe that RISKS were largely matters within the remit of other authorities such as AUSTRAC and law enforcement agencies. It is my view that the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor and the GW Commission were not equipped or skilled to detect, investigate and manage more complex matters arising with respect to RISKS and we would have relied on law enforcement agencies and other agencies like AUSTRAC and WA Police that were resourced and skilled to undertake those investigations.
43. In terms of junkets and junket operators specifically, the matter of conducting a probity assessment of individual operators was covered in regulations until sometime in 2010. Until that point, the Department, on behalf of the GW Commission, conducted probity checks on junket operators through WA Police. I am familiar with the fact that at a point in 2010 the Department and the GW Commission ceased requiring approval for junket operations, but I do not recall being involved in the background or direct discussion and formulation of the regulatory amendments which effected that change. I was absent on leave without pay in mid 2009 through until late March 2010. However, I have a vague recollection that the decision to make those amendments had something to do with the introduction of AUSTRAC legislation relating to anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism financing nationally. I do not have access to GW Commission agenda papers to cross-check my recollection. It seems likely to me that I was on leave when the above amendments were discussed and implemented.
44. Outside of the pre-2000 function of conducting a probity assessment of junket operators, my recollection is that I had very little experience with junket operators and in fact, I don't recall directly dealing with any matters or issues relating to a junket activity. The Department inspectors had more involvement as they sometimes observed junket tour activity while on site at the Perth Casino. I believe the Casino

Operation Manual also placed obligations on the operator to satisfy itself about the probity and conduct of junket operations.

45. I cannot recall the Department nor GW Commission ever, during my tenure, conducting forensic investigations into money laundering or risks of money laundering.

Discharge of duties, powers and functions of the CCO

Manner and regulatory philosophy as CCO and extent of direction by others

46. As CCO I was responsible for administrative functions, such as the approval of casino employee applications, that were discharged on a self-directed basis without direction. That is, applications were routinely processed and approved by me or my officers consistent with the relevant Act, Regulations, policy and procedure guidelines and instrument of delegation. These matters were considered straightforward and low risk and did not require the GW Commission's intimate knowledge. Nevertheless, I reported at each GW Commission meeting on these matters, the exercise of delegation and delivery of services by the Department.
47. On other matters, I acted on the specific direction of the GW Commission. For example, where the GW Commission was considering a change in gaming rules, it may have instructed me to obtain more detailed information or to engage technical experts to meet with the members and walk them through the proposal. This kind of assistance was most frequently provided to GW Commission members by the Director Compliance.
48. Another example may be where a person was banned by the Perth Casino Operator from the Perth Casino premises. I recall an instance where the GW Commission instructed me to make further inquiries of the operator into the banning of an individual. That individual subsequently sought a review under the legislation of the banning notice. I was instructed by the GW Commission to facilitate that review by obtaining all information necessary so as to assist the GW Commission in determining the review. In achieving this, I worked

closely with the Director Compliance to bring this information together and facilitate that review hearing and process.

49. On RISK matters, it is my belief that the GW Commission would have relied on agencies such as law enforcement and AUSTRAC and would have reacted to adverse findings, allegations or reports. As CCO I expect that if such circumstances had arisen I would have been directed by the GW Commission on what action to take. I believe that neither the Department nor the GW Commission were equipped or resourced for these more complex and serious forensic matters. However, I do not recall being presented with any situations where law enforcement identified an adverse finding, allegation or report to the GW Commission or me with respect to RISKS.

Conduct of risk assessments in relation to the Perth Casino

50. I do not recall ever personally conducting a risk assessment, or causing one to be conducted, in the course of my roles as Director Licensing or CCO.
51. To the best of my knowledge, the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor, through the Compliance division, did, from time to time, conduct formal risks assessments.
52. For example, I recall Mr Connolly, as Director Compliance, discussed with me as a senior colleague and as the CCO, a formal risk-based audit program in which he identified areas of the Perth Casino operations that he believed required furthering monitoring. In doing so, based on my recollection of Mr Connolly's style, I believe he would have thoroughly explained his reasoning and the proposed approach.
53. From time to time the audit program would have been discussed at the GW Commission, and in my time, Mr Connolly would attend the meeting to answer any questions of the GW Commission. Assuming the GW Commission was satisfied with the proposed approach, Mr Connolly would then be responsible for the execution of that program. Mr Connolly and I worked closely together in relation to Perth Casino so we often discussed compliance matters, areas that warranted monitoring and the program generally.

54. I cannot recall if I made specific recommendations with respect to the resourcing of the Perth Casino regulatory team on the basis of a risk assessment. Having regard to what I have said above, I consider it is likely that my thinking was indirectly informed by the results of risk assessments of the Compliance Team.

Awareness whilst CCO of risk assessments carried out for the Perth Casino by others

55. I am not aware of other risk assessments conducted during my tenure beyond those mentioned previously.

Efficacy of current licensing, audit and inspection requirements imposed by the Commission in respect of Perth Casino and RISKS

56. I cannot comment on the current effectiveness of the program in relation to the regulation of the Perth Casino. I left the department in June 2012.
57. If I was asked to evaluate the efficacy of the regulatory system for Perth Casino and RISKS as it stood during my tenure as CCO, I would say that it was fit for purpose and generally worked well notwithstanding the evolving industry environment/climate.
58. I note that in 2007, Mr Connolly and I were of the view that the overall operations of the Department (including the regulatory system) could be improved by restructuring. Over the following years we undertook a major restructure, looking at everything, such as the corporate structure, whether positions should be defined and structured on an operational (activities) or functional (outcomes and aims) basis and how the audit and inspection team could be better utilised. It is my view that these changes were for the better and by the end of my tenure the regulatory system performed as effectively as it could given the resources and structure we had at the time.

Interaction with interstate regulators; section 13(1) of the *Gaming and Wagering Commission Act 1987* (WA)

59. In my observation, the regulators in Australia had an effective and collaborative relationship and regularly interacted on various gaming, wagering and casino matters affecting all jurisdictions. We met once or twice a year formally.

60. In terms of section 13 of the Gaming and Wagering Commission Act, I cannot specifically recall any circumstances where I provided information under section 13 to other authorities. I have a vague recollection that, at some point in time when the GW Commission was called upon to reassess company directors as key personnel, associates or operators of the Perth Casino, information was shared between the Western Australian and (at least) Victorian jurisdictions, likely informally and not pursuant to section 13. So, to say that section 13 was not used should not suggest that information was not shared appropriately and regularly, it was just that the protections of section 13 were not necessarily sought.

Delegation

Delegation of GW Commission powers to the CCO and instructions

61. Both the CCO and inspectors were delegated powers under section 16 of the Gaming and Wagering Commission Act.
62. If I recall correctly:
- (a) the instrument of delegation was very specific about the extent of that delegation and the circumstances under which it could be exercised; and
 - (b) the GW Commission had also issued some policy and procedure for delegates to follow.

However, I do not recall specifically the wording of that instrument of delegation and I do not have access to it any longer.

Delegation of CCO powers to GW Commission officers

63. Officers at various levels within the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor were delegated powers in accordance with the nature of the service they provided to the GW Commission. For example, some staff were delegated the functions of gathering information and approving applications such as for approval of casino employees. With that delegation they were issued with policies and procedures to ensure they exercised the delegation appropriately.

64. I do not recall specifically the wording of those instruments of delegation or policies and procedures, nor do I have access to them.

Section 25(1) of the *Gaming and Wagering Commission Act 1987* (WA)

65. I do not recall ever, during my tenure, being requested to exempt persons under section 25(1) of the Gaming and Wagering Commission Act.

Obstruction

66. I do not consider that I ever was obstructed in the performance of my duties, or exercise of powers, as CCO.

Relationships

CCO and GW Commission relationship

67. The roles of CCO and Director Licencing were, in my view, interchangeable. I never experienced difficulty in understanding my obligations and responsibilities across both roles.
68. As Director, I was accountable for overseeing the provision of all administrative services in support of the GW Commission. That included overseeing staff processing and approving applications, assisting the Director Compliance where possible in the facilitation of inspections and investigations and engaging technical expertise on behalf of the GW Commission when necessary.
69. In a practical sense, the compliance program and all inspections were undertaken by the Compliance Team under the oversight of Mr Connolly as Director Compliance.
70. You could say that in either role I was accountable for developing and executing policy and procedure on behalf of the GW Commission and for reporting to the GW Commission on the delivery of services. I attended all GW Commission meetings as CCO and gave a report on activities, and the outcomes of the exercise of any powers delegated to me by the GW Commission.
71. I, along with Mr Connolly, also met with representatives of the Casino Operator on a monthly basis where all manner of matters relating to

the conduct of business by the operator were discussed. These were long standing meetings going back long before my time. Crown facilitated this meeting. The meeting minutes historically were prepared by its staff. This meeting was generally attended by me, Mr Connolly and occasionally, if necessary, other Departmental staff such as an inspector, along with Joshua Preston from Crown, and if I recall correctly one or two other staff from Crown. Usually those staff were senior members of the inspectorial branch/compliance/legal team of the Perth Casino. I reported to the GW Commission on matters arising from these meetings.

Nature of and decision-making process behind briefing papers provided to the Commission on Perth Casino and RISKS matters and regulation

72. Briefing papers covered all manner of issues from specific casino employee applications, to changes in gaming rules or proposed changes to the Casino Operation Manual. In essence, any aspect of the conduct of business at the Perth Casino could form a briefing paper or agenda item.
73. In all cases, the papers had a proforma style layout which required:
 - (a) the facts and the legislative framework underlying the issue to be identified; and
 - (b) the problems/issues for the GW Commission's consideration and the recommendations and options available to it to be spelled out.
74. Attached to briefing papers/agenda items were any relevant submissions, research or other papers.
75. I authored some papers, but in practice, most of the papers were authored by other staff within the Department.
76. I had access to all papers before the GW Commission meeting.
77. In terms of papers I authored, my approach was very much an inclusive one. I believed that more information was better as it would enable the GW Commission to make the most informed decision. Sometimes that meant I would seek permission for an officer with the relevant knowledge and expertise on the matter to also attend the GW

Commission meeting to speak in more detail on the issue. In essence, nothing to the best of my knowledge was omitted.

78. I don't recall any papers dealing specifically with RISKS, but that is not to say that the issue did not arise.

Recommendations provided to the Commission as to the licensing, audit and inspection requirements for Perth Casino and RISKS

79. Recommendations on any matters were always included in briefing papers/agenda items to the GW Commission. Sometimes recommendations would include suggested changes to policy or procedure, the Casino Operation Manual or an inspection or audit program (in any case, the suggestion may be made because further monitoring might be necessary based on known or possible risks).
80. Briefing papers in relation to compliance matters were generally prepared by Mr Connolly as Director Compliance or by one of his team. Sometimes matters would arise outside of the GW Commission meeting schedule that required immediate action. In that case, I would meet with the GW Commission Chair (the Director General of the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor) along with Mr Connolly as Director Compliance and we would seek approval to proceed with a particular course of action. The outcome of that would then be reported on to the GW Commission at the next meeting.
81. I authored some papers, but practically, most of the papers were authored by other staff within the Department and that is certainly so for papers relating to audits and inspections.

Conflicts of Interest

Information received as to dealing with conflicts of interest

82. As a public sector employee, I was subject to the WA Government's codes of conduct and policies for conflicts of interest. I recall that the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor had a consistent Code of Conduct that dealt with conflicts, given to me on my employment.
83. I can't recall whether, during my tenure, the GW Commission had its own specific Code. However, I was of the view, and accordingly

conducted myself on the basis, that the Department's Code provisions applied to me as a public sector employee and as CCO.

84. I was provided relevant documents on my initial employment and as they were amended from time to time.
85. Further, I undertook various formal WA Government employee training over the years which dealt with conflict of interests. As an SES employee I also undertook high level training on the management of conflicts. The WA government, if I recall, had some excellent resources available to assist in understanding conflicts.
86. The Department's Code dealt with issues such as:
 - (a) personal behaviour;
 - (b) communication and official information;
 - (c) fraudulent or corrupt behaviour;
 - (d) use of public resources;
 - (e) record keeping and use of information;
 - (f) conflicts of interest and gifts and benefits; and
 - (g) reporting suspected breaches of the code.
87. In terms of conflicts, the guiding principle as I understood it, was that decision makers needed to demonstrate integrity by:
 - (a) serving the public interest;
 - (b) using powers responsibly;
 - (c) acting with honesty and transparency; and
 - (d) addressing improper conduct.
88. A conflict of interest is a situation arising from conflict between the performance of public duty and private or personal interests. Conflicts of interest may be actual, or be perceived to exist, or potentially exist at some time in the future. Managing conflicts and the perception of a conflict is important because of its impact on public confidence in the integrity of an organisation.
89. Conflicts of interest were required to be reported and to the best of my knowledge the Department maintained a register. I do not recall if the

GW Commission maintained a separate independent register or whether conflicts were merely recorded in meeting minutes.

Information received as to avoiding conflicts of interest

90. Over and above the information I referred to above, Mr Sargeant as GW Commission Chair and DG of the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor, spoke directly with me around conflict issues and concerns and would from time to time, re-confirm with me again my position and any possible conflict issues.

Known or declared conflicts of interest

91. I did not have, to the best of my knowledge, any areas of conflict of interest in relation to my role on the GW Commission or at the Department.

Discussion and awareness of GW Commission conflicts of interest policy

92. Whilst I was CCO I absolutely was aware that I was bound to a conflict of interest policy.
93. My view was and is that the CCO, like all Departmental officers appointed/delegated by the GW Commission, is subject to a conflicts of interest policy which was the Department's policy. My experience is that all Department staff were made aware of the policy.
94. As stated above, I don't recall whether the GW Commission had its own specific policy.
95. I believe that members of the GW Commission were also made aware of Government policy and the need for declaring any potential conflict. It may have been, in fact, that such conflict management was dealt with in the 'new members' folder we provided when a member commenced on the GW Commission. I do not recall any discussion during GW Commission meetings as to whether a GW Commission-specific policy or Code of Conduct should exist.

96. I declare that this statement is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and that I have made this statement knowing that if it is tendered in evidence I will be guilty of a crime if I have wilfully included in this statement anything which I know to be false or that I do not believe is true.

Contains sensitive
information

Signed _____

Witnessed at _____

On _____ at _____

By