



AFP
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Our ref: CRM 2020/356

31 March 2020

Mr Steve Smith

By email: foi+request-5909-52df4711@righttoknow.org.au

Dear Mr Smith

Freedom of Information request

I refer to your application dated 15 November 2019 under the *Freedom of Information Act* 1982 (the Act) seeking the following:

"I am requesting the documents comprising the briefing pack for Commissioner Kershaw for senate estimates held on 15 November 2019.

Attached at Annexure A to this letter is my decision and statement of reasons for that decision. A "Schedule of Documents" identified as falling into the scope of your request is at Annexure B.

Disclosure Log

It has been decided to publish the documents in part in respect of your request. Publication of the documents and any relevant documents will be made on the AFP website at <https://www.afp.gov.au/about-us/information-publication-scheme/routinely-requested-information-and-disclosure-log> in accordance with timeframes stipulated in section 11C of the Act.

Yours sincerely

Adam Raszewski
Acting Deputy General Counsel
Freedom of Information
Chief Counsel Portfolio

**STATEMENT OF REASONS RELATING TO AN FOI REQUEST BY
STEVE SMITH**

I, Adam Raszewski, Deputy General Counsel, Freedom of Information Team, am an officer authorised under section 23 of the Act to make decisions in relation to the Australian Federal Police.

What follows is my decision and reasons for the decision in relation to your application.

BACKGROUND

On 15 November 2019, this office received your application in which you requested:

"...the documents comprising the briefing pack for Commissioner Kershaw for senate estimates held on 15 November 2019."

On 1 December 2019, you clarified the scope of the request to documents relating to the Inquiry into Press Freedom by the Senate Environment and Communications References Committee, and not Senate Estimates.

On 7 December 2019, you agreed to a 30 day extension of time pursuant to section 15AA of the Act.

On 24 January 2020, a further extension of time was granted by the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (OAIC) pursuant to section 15AB of the Act, to notify you of a decision by 12 February 2020.

I note that the statutory timeframe has expired and apologise for the delay in finalising this matter and any inconvenience this may have caused.

SEARCHES

Searches for documents in relation to this request were undertaken by Ministerial and Crime Operations.

WAIVER OF CHARGES

Given that the request has exceeded all statutory timeframes as outlined at section 15 of the Act, the AFP is not able to impose any fees or charges as outlined at Regulation 5(2) & (3) of the *Freedom of Information (Charges) Regulations 1982*.

DECISION

I have identified one document relevant to your request. A Schedule of the document and details of my decision in relation to the document is at Annexure B.

I have decided that parts of the document are released to you in their entirety. Parts of the document are released with deletions pursuant to section 37(1)(a) of the Act. Parts of the document are exempt in full, pursuant to section 46(c) of the Act.

My reasons for this decision are set out below.

REASONS FOR DECISION

Folios to which subsection 37(1)(a) applies:

Subsection 37(1)(a) of the Act provides that:

- "(1) A document is an exempt document if its disclosure under this Act would, or could reasonably be expected to:*
- (a) prejudice the conduct of an investigation of a breach, or possible breach, of the law, or a failure, or possible failure, to comply with a law relating to taxation or prejudice the enforcement or proper administration of the law in a particular instance;"*

The parts of the document identified in the Schedule as exempt under this section of the Act contain information which if disclosed would or could reasonably be expected to prejudice the conduct of a current investigation.

I find that release of the parts of the document would be an unreasonable disclosure under subsection 37(1)(a) of the Act.

Folios to which subsection 46(c) applies:

Subsection 46(c) of the Act provides that:

"A document is an exempt document if public disclosure of the document would, apart from this Act and any immunity of the Crown:

...

- (c) infringe the privileges of the Parliament of the Commonwealth or of a State or of a House of such a Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly of the Northern Territory;"*

The parts of the document identified in the schedule are subject to parliamentary privilege on the basis the document was accepted by the Senate Environment and Communications Committee on a confidential basis and have not been published by that Committee. Following relevant consultation, I find that release of the parts of the document would breach parliamentary privilege and are therefore exempt under section 46(c) of the Act.

EVIDENCE/MATERIAL ON WHICH MY FINDINGS WERE BASED

In reaching my decision, I have relied on the following:

- ❖ the scope of your application;
- ❖ the contents of the documents listed in the attached Schedule;
- ❖ advice from AFP officers with responsibility for matters relating to the documents to which you sought access;
- ❖ consultation with relevant Commonwealth Agencies;
- ❖ *Freedom of Information Act 1982*; and
- ❖ Guidelines issued by the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner.

*****YOU SHOULD READ THIS GENERAL ADVICE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS IN THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982*****

REVIEW AND COMPLAINT RIGHTS

If you are dissatisfied with a Freedom of Information decision made by the Australian Federal Police, you can apply either for internal review of the decision, or for a review by the Information Commissioner (IC). You do not have to apply for internal review before seeking review by the IC.

For complaints about the AFP's actions in processing your request, you do not need to seek review by either the AFP or the IC in making your complaint.

REVIEW RIGHTS under Part VI of the Act

Internal Review by the AFP

Section 53A of the Act gives you the right to apply for internal review in writing to the AFP within 30 days of being notified of a decision. No particular form is required. It would assist the independent AFP decision-maker responsible for reviewing the file if you set out in the application, the grounds on which you consider that the decision should be reviewed.

Section 54B of the Act provides that the Internal Review submission must be made within 30 days. Applications should be addressed to:

Freedom of Information
Australian Federal Police
GPO Box 401
Canberra ACT 2601

REVIEW RIGHTS under Part VII of the Act

Review by the Information Commissioner

Alternatively, section 54L of the Act gives you the right to apply directly to the IC, or following an Internal Review by the AFP. In making your application you will need to provide an address for notices to be sent (this can be an email address) and a copy of the AFP decision. It would also assist if you set out the reasons for review in your application.

Section 54S of the Act provides the timeframes for an IC Review submission. For an *access refusal decision* covered by subsection 54L(2), the application must be made within 60 days. For an *access grant decision* covered by subsection 54M(2), the application must be made within 30 days.

Applications for IC Review should be addressed to:

Office of the Australian Information Commissioner
GPO Box 5128
Sydney NSW 2001

Further, the OAIC encourages parties to an IC Review to resolve their dispute informally, and encourages agencies to consider possible compromises or alternative solutions to the dispute in this matter. The AFP would be pleased to assist you in this regard.

Information about this process can be found in Part 10 of the Guidelines which are available on the OAIC's website at <http://www.oaic.gov.au/publications/guidelines.html>.

RIGHT TO COMPLAIN under Part VIIB of the Act

Section 70 of the Act provides that a person may complain to the IC about action taken by the Australian Federal Police in relation to your application.

A complaint to the IC may be made in writing and identify the agency against which the complaint is made. There is no particular form required to make a complaint, but the complaint should set out the grounds on which you consider the action should be investigated.

The IC may be contacted on 1300 363 992.

SCHEDULE OF DECISION – CRM 2020/356

Folio #	Description	Exemption
14	s37(1)(1)	s37(1)(a) Provision of this document would disclose matter that would reasonably be expected to prejudice the conduct of an investigation of a breach, or possible breach, of the law, or prejudice the enforcement or proper administration of the law in a particular instance.
113-121	s46(c)	s46(c) Deletions are made on the grounds that disclosure would be contempt of Parliament and would infringe the privileges of the Parliament of the Commonwealth or of a State or of a House of such a Parliament.
Pages released in full are not itemised.		

Senate Environment and Communications References Committee

HEARING - INDEX







Briefing	TAB
Hearing Details/Overview	1.
Opening Statement	2.
Previous Senate Environment and Communications References Committee Summary of Submissions, Secretary Briefing, ARTK Proposals	3.
ABC Alumni Additional Questions	4.
PJCIS Inquiry, consolidated QoNS	5.
General approach to answering sensitive questions	6.
AFP Reviews	7.
Investigating Journalists	8.
Op KLASIES ABC Investigation – Sam Clark/Dan Oakes	9.
Op WOOLF News Corp Investigation - Annika Smethurst	10.
Medevac/ASIO Investigation	11.
Au Pair Investigation	12.
Witness K/ AWU Investigation	13.
Prioritising Investigations	14.
Threshold and Powers	15.
The EFI Amendments	16.
JIW and TID stats	17.
FOI	18.
PID	19.
Ministerial Direction	20.
Parliamentary Privilege	21.
Unauthorised Disclosure	22.
Attachments	TAB
AFP Submission	A.
Ministerial Direction/ AG Direction to CDPP	B.
Existing legal protections & safeguards for journalists	C.
Comparison of old and new secrecy offences	D.
Legal thresholds for information access	E.
National Guideline on Politically Sensitive Investigations/Unauthorised Disclosures	F.

Media companies	G.
ABC Alumni Submission	H.

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DECLASSIFIED
AND RELEASED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982
(COMMONWEALTH)
BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Executive Brief

Hearing Details

<p>Contents In This Brief</p>	<p>Content:</p> <p>Committee members</p> <p>Terms of Reference</p> <p>Hearing details</p> <p>Key messages</p> <p>Overview</p>
<p>Committee Members</p>	<div> <div>  <p>Chair Senator Sarah Hanson-Young Australian Greens, SA</p> </div> <div>  <p>Deputy Chair Senator the Hon David Fawcett Liberal Party of Australia, SA</p> </div> </div> <div> <div>  <p>Member Senator Nita Green Australian Labor Party, QLD</p> </div> <div>  <p>Member Senator Sam McMahon Country Liberal Party, NT</p> </div> </div> <div> <div>  <p>Member Senator Marielle Smith Australian Labor Party, SA</p> </div> <div>  <p>Member Senator Anne Urquhart Australian Labor Party, TAS</p> </div> </div>
<p>ToR's</p>	<p>(a) disclosure and public reporting of sensitive and classified information, including the appropriate regime for warrants regarding journalists and media organisations and adequacy of existing legislation;</p> <p>(b) the whistleblower protection regime and protections for public sector employees;</p> <p>(c) the adequacy of referral practices of the Australian Government in relation to leaks</p>

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DECLASSIFIED

AND RELEASED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982
(COMMONWEALTH)
BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

	<p>of sensitive and classified information;</p> <p>(d) appropriate culture, practice and leadership for Government and senior public employees;</p> <p>(e) mechanisms to ensure that the Australian Federal Police have sufficient independence to effectively and impartially carry out their investigatory and law enforcement responsibilities in relation to politically sensitive matters; and</p> <p>(f) any related matters</p>										
Hearing details	<p>Location: Parliament House, Committee Room 2S1</p> <p>Time: 2:00pm – 3:00pm</p> <p>AFP attendees: Commissioner Kershaw</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Time</th><th>Witnesses</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10:45am – 11:30am</td><td>ASIO</td></tr> <tr> <td>11:30am – 12:30pm</td><td>Home Affairs</td></tr> <tr> <td>1:00pm – 2:00pm</td><td>AGD</td></tr> <tr> <td>2:00pm – 3:00pm</td><td>AFP</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Time	Witnesses	10:45am – 11:30am	ASIO	11:30am – 12:30pm	Home Affairs	1:00pm – 2:00pm	AGD	2:00pm – 3:00pm	AFP
Time	Witnesses										
10:45am – 11:30am	ASIO										
11:30am – 12:30pm	Home Affairs										
1:00pm – 2:00pm	AGD										
2:00pm – 3:00pm	AFP										
Key Messages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have commissioned Mr John Lawler AM APM to review AFP processes around sensitive investigations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review is not an audit into current matters at hand; The review will take a holistic approach so that I can make an informed decision on what changes may be necessary or useful to ensure the AFP has investigative policy and guidelines in place that are fit for purpose The offences we investigate are passed by Parliament. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As police we do not target specific sectors of the community, such as the media. We target criminality. It is not appropriate for police to second guess the decisions of Parliament to criminalise certain conduct. While the AFP considers public interest in its investigations, if there is an imbalance between national security and press freedom, that imbalance should be addressed through law. The purpose of an investigation is to collect evidence. This ensures that independent decisions about who, if anyone, to prosecute are informed by all the facts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Warrants are issued by independent judicial officers. Warrants are not designed to be punitive or to intimidate, they are purely used to collect evidence of offences. The focus and priority of unauthorised disclosure investigations is first and foremost on investigating the Commonwealth officer. The AFP is an independent policing agency. We are not directed by Government or the Minister to investigate any individual or organisation. 										

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DECLASSIFIED
AND RELEASED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

(COMMONWEALTH)

BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We can be given written directions from the Minister outlining the general policy expectations. ● I welcome the direction on unauthorised disclosures issued by Minister Dutton on 8 August 2019.
Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The AFP uses the powers to investigate offences that are enacted by Parliament. ● The purpose of an investigation is to collect evidence. If the AFP is satisfied sufficient evidence exists to support criminal charges, a brief of evidence is provided to the CDPP. This ensures any decision to prosecute is informed by all the facts available. ● As an independent policing agency, the AFP cannot be directed by Government or by the Minister to investigate any individual or Organisation. ● All people – including journalists – must comply with the law. ● Commonwealth criminal law balances press freedom against other public interest matters, including national security and community safety. ● If there is an imbalance between national security and press freedom then that needs to be addressed through amendments to relevant legislation.
Public Interest	<p>Should public interest be defined?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 8.35 'Public interest' should not be defined, but a list of public interest matters could be set out in the new Act. The list would not be exhaustive, but may provide the parties and the court with useful guidance, making the cause of action more certain and predictable in scope. This may in turn reduce litigation. ● 8.36 In Hogan v Hinch, French CJ stated that when 'used in a statute, the term [public interest] derives its content from "the subject matter and the scope and purpose" of the enactment in which it appears'.[25] ● 8.37 In the UK, the Joint Committee on Privacy and Injunctions concluded that there should not be a statutory definition of the public interest, as 'the decision of where the public interest lies in a particular case is a matter of judgment, and is best taken by the courts in privacy cases'.[26] ● 8.38 Including a non-exhaustive list of public interest matters seems more helpful than a definition of public interest, which might necessarily have to be overly general or overly confined and inflexible.[27] ● 8.39 Community expectations of privacy change over time. This is another reason to include a non-exhaustive list of public interest matters for a court to consider, rather than a definition of public interest. It will allow the meaning of public interest to develop in line with changing community attitudes and developments in technology.

- 8.40 There is precedent in Australian law and in regulation for providing guidance on the meaning of 'public interest', including the public interest exemptions in the Freedom of Information Act 1982 (Cth).[28]
- 8.41 A number of stakeholders expressed support for including a non-exhaustive list of factors in the Act.[29]
- 8.42 Other stakeholders said that the Act should not provide guidance on the meaning of public interest.[30] The Law Institute of Victoria submitted:
- This is a phrase commonly used in legislation and one with which courts are familiar. 'Public interest' is a broad concept that is flexible enough to respond to the facts and circumstances of any particular case. Given that privacy is fact and context specific, it is appropriate to keep concepts such as 'public interest' broad and flexible.[31]
- 8.43 Alternatively, broad concepts which go to the meaning of public interest could go in the objects section or the preamble of the Act.

Which public interests should be listed?

- 8.44 Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which recognises the right to respect for private and family life, provides that there should no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right:
- except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.
- 8.45 The public interests that will perhaps most commonly conflict with a plaintiff's interest in privacy are the public interest in freedom of speech and in a free media.[33]
- 8.46 Many who oppose a new cause of action for privacy fear that it will impede freedom of speech and the freedom of the media. In the absence of a human rights legal framework in Australia, it seems important for the statutory cause of action for serious invasion of privacy to give express recognition to the public interest in freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DECLASSIFIED
AND RELEASED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

(COMMONWEALTH)

BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

- 8.47 When balancing an interest in privacy with a public interest in freedom of expression, the nature of the expression will be relevant. Not all speech is of equal value to the public. Political communication, for example, should be given considerable weight in the proposed balancing exercise, particularly considering that freedom of political communication is implied in the Australian Constitution.[34]
- 8.48 In Campbell, Baroness Hale LJ said that there are 'undoubtedly different types of speech, just as there are different types of private information, some of which are more deserving of protection in a democratic society than others':
- Top of the list is political speech. The free exchange of information and ideas on matters relevant to the organisation of the economic, social and political life of the country is crucial to any democracy. Without this, it can scarcely be called a democracy at all. This includes revealing information about public figures, especially those in elective office, which would otherwise be private but is relevant to their participation in public life. Intellectual and educational speech and expression are also important in a democracy, not least because they enable the development of individuals' potential to play a full part in society and in our democratic life. Artistic speech and expression is important for similar reasons, in fostering both individual originality and creativity and the free-thinking and dynamic society we so much value. No doubt there are other kinds of speech and expression for which similar claims can be made.[35]
- 8.49 Other matters of public interest may also conflict with privacy interests. The ALRC has listed some of these in Proposal 8-2.
- 8.50 Finally, it should be noted that privacy is also a public interest, not merely a personal interest. Although it is not included in the list proposed above which deals with countervailing matters of public interest, the ALRC considers that the public interest in respecting privacy should be considered in the proposed balancing exercise.

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DECLASSIFIED
AND RELEASED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982
(COMMONWEALTH)
BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Executive Brief

Previous SECC Hearing

<p>General Themes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large focus on the adequacy of PID laws and FOI laws. • Concern that existing legal protections only protect journalists, not their sources. • Concern over the AFP's reliance on other offences (e.g. theft and receipt of stolen property), and suggestion this is being done to side-step legal safeguards. • Role of the AG in approving prosecutions (witnesses differed in opinion as to whether this is a good thing or not).
<p>Overview</p>	<p>Australia's right to know (Representatives from News Corp, Entertainment and Arts Alliance, SBS, ABC, Nine and Free TV Australia)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants to amend the legislation to stop journalist being prosecuted. They have had concerns about journalist or their contacts being prosecuted – this had has a chilling effect. • Problematic FOI Laws – request the government to look at the laws surrounding providing information, process & resources. Re The Hawk review. • Need audit of classification of government agencies documents. • PID legislation requires amendments/review. • Public interest require a decision to prosecute before the raid. • Comparison to UK regime – Australia should be raising the bar for the issue of warrants. • Chris Uhlmann tabled an AFP FOI Response in relation to an investigation details on a government MP. He criticised the AFP of heavily redacting the document. He has referred one application to the information commission. The tabled <i>document is not available yet.</i> <p>ABC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised concerns about adequacy of PID legislation. • Criticised FOI responses on operational matters • ABC was asked how much notice ABC had of the warrant. ABC responded: the day before. • ABC questioned on the negotiations in the lead up to the warrants. ABC stopped responding to the AFP's requests when AFP requested fingerprints. • Did AFP request assistance re gathering evidence – seeking documents ABC declined to provide them. Did AFP attempt to negotiate a mutually beneficial time? No. Did the ABC choose to cause stress and angst among the ABC colleagues – could they just not provide their documents? At no stage did the AFP give you an indication of what documents they were after. • Asked, was the option of a warrant by appointment discussed with the ABC? No. • ABC asked about costs of the legal proceedings – taken on notice. • ABC welcome the AG's Ministerial Direction re prosecution of journalists. • Crimes Act section 70 was repealed and section 122 didn't apply yet so the AFP side-stepped the requirement for AG's consent by using other offences. • Centre for Governance and Public Policy, Griffith University • (Professor AJ Brown)

- **PID legislation needs amendments.**
- Private sector regime has leaped ahead the public sector in relation to whistle-blowers.
- The whistle-blower regime should be overseen by independent courts. Independently of industry, Government and the person concerned.

ABC Alumni Limited

- Criminal code should be amended to protect whistle-blowers.
- AFP QoNs about communication between AFP and HA about which offences Oaks/Clarke would be. Where did the offence come from in relation to Oaks/Clarke? Suspicions surrounding why the AG wasn't consulted.
- Reference a/Commissioner press conference and the offences of the warrant. Reference the Au Pair matter – whether the AFP regards Unauthorised disclosure as theft? Is this the first time this provision has been used?
- Ministerial Direction has been comforting since issued.

Public Interest Journalism Initiative

(Associate Professor Margaret Simons & Mr Gary Dickson)

- Not satisfied with the journalism definition – it is not broad enough.
- Would like data retention to be linked with current legislation.
- PID Act requires improvement.
- State/Territory/Commonwealth definitions of journalist don't link in with one and other.
- The warrants have had an effect on whistle-blowers.

Alliance for Journalists' Freedom

(Professor Peter Greste, Mr Peter Wilkinson and Mr Chris Flynn)

- Lack of trust between media, national security agencies and private sectors.
- Proposed a taskforce be set up to regain whistle-blowers confidence.
- The general lack of public trust with the media was exasperated by the AFP warrants.
- There should be amendment of current legislation to ensure journalists cannot be prosecuted.
- Morrison government declined invitations to attend media summit on 26th August – Dreyfus attended.

Associate Professor Johan Lidberg and Dr Denis Muller in their personal capacity

- Trust in journalism is at an all-time low.
- Suspicious of the difference in AFP's responses to the ASIO leak and the ABC / Smethurst cases.
- **In regards to ASIO leak 200 suspects should not be an insurmountable barrier for police. The police should have invested the resources.**
- The situation is made worse by having a politician (AG) is making decisions about prosecutions.

Journalism Education and Research Association Australia

	(Associate Professor Johan Lidberg)
--	-------------------------------------

- Suggests there should be a self-regulating body of journalists to create a clearer definition of 'journalist' that is protected by law.

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DECLASSIFIED
AND RELEASED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982
(COMMONWEALTH)
BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Executive Brief

ABC Alumni Questions

<p>ABC Alumni Questions to the AFP</p>	<p>Who suggested to the AFP that it was appropriate to charge David McBride with “theft” rather than with releasing confidential information? Why did the AFP do so? Was it because that offence carries with it a “mirror” offence that could be applied to the ABC journalists, that of “receiving”?</p> <p>The decision to charge, and what to charge is determined by the CDPP in consultation with the AFP based on the available evidence collected (see CDPP – Steps in Prosecution). Appropriate charges are chosen to adequately reflect the nature and extent of the criminal conduct (disclosed by the evidence) and provide the court with an appropriate basis for sentence.</p> <p>David McBRIDE has been charged with releasing information in addition to the Theft charge.</p> <p>If material has been stolen, then it is common to charge a person who has received the stolen material with receiving. Most ‘theft’ type offences carry a mirror offence of ‘receiving’ or similar, this is standard in Australian criminal law.</p> <p>The consideration of the theft charge of David McBride, was not based on there being a “mirror” offence would apply to the ABC journalists. The decision to charge with theft was based on the evidence obtained in the course of the investigation, reflecting the criminality and culpability of the alleged offender in the circumstances.</p> <p>Why did the AFP Commissioner and DC on the days following the ABC and Smethurst “raids”, that they were pursuing offences under Parts 6 and 7 of the Crimes Act, while avoiding any mention of the “theft” offence?</p> <p>This is best answered by the Deputy Commissioner.</p> <p>However a theft offence did not apply in relation to the Smethurst search warrant.</p> <p>Why, having indicated on 1 April that they suspected Oakes and Clark of breaching s79(6) of the Crimes Act, was that offence not mentioned in the search warrant obtained on 3 June?</p> <p>A criminal investigation is dynamic and initial offences are discounted or strengthened through the collection of evidence, which addresses the elements of each offence, and the most appropriate offences are then determined based on that evidence and any other factors. It was not mentioned in the ABC warrant because by that point in the investigation the investigations team had determined it not to be the most appropriate offence, given the evidence obtained.</p> <p>Was it because, between 1 April and 3 June 2019, the AFP or the CDPP sounded out the Attorney-General’s office about the likelihood of receiving consent to a</p>
--	--

prosecution of the ABC journalists under s79, and received an answer similar to that which Mr Porter gave publicly on 19 June, that he would be “seriously disinclined” to consent to such a prosecution?

No. The AFP at no time approached the Attorney General’s office or asked the CDPP to approach the Attorney General’s office. The process for obtaining the “consent to prosecute” of the Attorney General, is undertaken by the CDPP and only after the full brief of evidence has been provided by the AFP, and the brief of evidence has been appropriately considered by the CDPP.

In the light of Mr Dutton’s Direction that it should “take into account the importance of a free and open press in Australia’s democratic society”, does the AFP still consider that the prosecution of Dan Oakes, or any other journalist, for “receiving stolen property” is in the public interest?

Whilst the investigation is ongoing it is inappropriate to speculate on whether a journalist may or may not be charge or on what charges may be considered appropriate to the circumstances. The consideration of a “free and open press” will be taken into consideration as part of all facets of “public interest” considerations.

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DECLASSIFIED
AND RELEASED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982
(COMMONWEALTH)
BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Executive Brief

PJCIS Inquiry on Press Freedom

<p>Background</p>	<p>PJCIS INQUIRY ON PRESS FREEDOM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AFP has received and responded to over 160 questions on notice from the Committee as well as appearing at two public hearings and making a public written submission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The unclassified responses are published on the Committee's website. <p>Process for providing responses to the Minister's Office and the Department of Home Affairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AFP has consulted with the Department of Home Affairs throughout the process. • It is also standard process to provide the Minister's Office with a copy of any submission or response to questions on notice for noting prior to lodging with a parliamentary Committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is consistent with how we interpret our obligations under the Government Guidelines for Official Witnesses before Parliamentary Committees, particularly section 2.4. • The AFP does not consult the Minister for Home Affairs on the contents of a submission or response to Questions on Notice. <p>Process for providing responses to the Department of Home Affairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where appropriate, the AFP also consults the Department or other partner agencies in the development of a submission or response to questions on notice. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For example, where the response attaches classified documents that are owned by another agency. • The final draft of a submission or response to questions on notice is typically also provided to the Department of Home Affairs for information prior to lodging with a Committee.
--------------------------	---

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DECLASSIFIED
AND RELEASED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982
(COMMONWEALTH)
BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Time line of PJCIS Hearing and QoNs		
AFP provided written submission into inquiry		
14 August 2019 First PJCIS Hearing	AFP took 11 Questions on Notice during the hearing	Received an additional 126 Written Questions
27 August 2019 Second Press Freedom Hearing	AFP took 15 Questions on Notice during the hearing	Received an additional 26 Witten Questions
<p>Of interest to the PJCIS Committee</p> <p>Additional Warrant Activity - Wednesday 4 September 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AFP executed a search warrant in the ACT suburb of Griffith on Wednesday, 4 September 2019. <p style="text-align: center;">s37(1)(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This activity does not relate to any current or impending threat to the Australian community. • The search warrant activity is in relation to a Commonwealth official. • As this is an ongoing matter, it would not be appropriate to comment further at this time. 		

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DECLASSIFIED
AND RELEASED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982
(COMMONWEALTH)
BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE