

BUDGET ESTIMATES 2025-2026
ICAC ANSWERS TO SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

Questions from Hon Mark Latham MLC

Q1 Did ICAC notify OLG of:

(a) the subject matter or

(b) the contents of its Brief Of Evidence against Bill Saravinovski to the ODPP (on 29 August 2024)?

If so, when did this occur?

A1 The Commission did not notify OLG of the subject matter of the brief of evidence it provided to the ODPP or provide OLG with a copy of the brief.

Q2 Did ICAC's two s112 variations for OLG in the Saravinovski matter involve access to information that OLG ultimately used in its referral to NCAT, that is:

(a) the temper tantrums with Bayside staff, and

(b) the so-called partial declaration of a pecuniary interest?

If not, what did they involve?

A2 Enquiries as to what information OLG referred to NCAT are best directed to OLG. The Commission cannot disclose what information was disclosed to OLG pursuant to s 112 of the ICAC Act as to do so would be in breach of that section.

Q3 With charges now laid against him, has ICAC concluded its inquiries into Bill Saravinovski, concerning the various matters it has examined, dating back to 2016?

A3 The brief of evidence provided to the ODPP related to evidence given by Mr Saravinovski as part of the Commission's Operation Aspen investigation. That investigation is now closed.

Questions from the Opposition

Q4 ICAC outlined in an email to The Hon. Jeremy Buckingham on the 4th of March that, “were a candidate to win office, and misuse their official functions to advocate the allocation of the promised funds, the Commission might have a basis for commencing an investigation or taking further preventative action in circumstances where the conduct came within s 8 of the ICAC Act and was not excluded by s 9 of the ICAC Act”. Is this still the commission’s view?

(a) In Budget Estimates on Tuesday 19 August 2025, there was a refusal to disclose whether or not the Minister had declared a conflict of interest over a \$50 million bridge project near her home under the Regional Roads Fund. If the Auditor General’s report confirmed knowledge that the project with no business case and no benefit cost ratio, paid from the minister’s own regional roads fund, had the perception of impropriety, would ICAC investigate the matter or pursue action under ss 8 and 9 of the Act?

A4 Yes.

A4(a) It is difficult to provide a definitive answer without further information and analysis. The Commission’s process is to carefully assess all complaints/allegations, which can entail speaking with complainants, gathering certain evidence, examining existing information holdings and liaising with relevant public authorities.

Once this assessment is completed, the Commissioners and senior officers of the Commission determine whether a matter should be investigated. Among other things, this determination is based on ss 12 and 12A of the ICAC Act, which state:

12 Public interest to be paramount

In exercising its functions, the Commission shall regard the protection of the public interest and the prevention of breaches of public trust as its paramount concerns.

12A Serious corrupt conduct and systemic corrupt conduct

In exercising its functions, the Commission is, as far as practicable, to direct its attention to serious corrupt conduct and systemic corrupt conduct and is to take into account the responsibility and role other public authorities and public officials have in the prevention of corrupt conduct.

Q5 The budget papers demonstrate a technology uplift for ICAC funded over 10 years. What is this project and how urgent is this project?

(a) Is this project fully resourced in the budget?

A5 This project is to shift the Commission's IT Infrastructure from a fully on-premise model to a cloud based one. The approach prioritises data security, compliance, flexibility, and scalability, ensuring the Commission can adapt to emerging technologies including leveraging AI for tasks such as evidence collation and analysis, and best practices while maintaining the highest standards of integrity and operational excellence.

The shift was an urgent priority for the Commission for the following reasons:

- Companies are moving their products to the cloud and will no longer continue to maintain on premise system products. This is estimated to occur by mid-2026.
- We are moving to a new premise in late 2026, and it is not reasonable to have expensive specialised IT environments in server rooms to accommodate hardware when alternate infrastructures are readily available.
- Preventing increasing risk of cyber-attack, as well as the specialist skills set required in managing systems to a proficient level given a small agency team.

A5(a) Yes, the Commission received the resources it sought for this project.