THE CENTRE FOR EXCELLENCE IN CHILD AND FAMILY WELFARE
FORUM ON ROYAL COMMISSION INTO INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE: 30 April 2014

Christine Melis[1]

I acknowledge the traditional owners of the land upon which we meet and I wish to pay my respects to their Elders, past and present.

Following on from Jenny I want to take a closer look at how to prepare for an appearance before this Royal Commission if you are summoned to appear of if you seek leave to appear as an interested party.

Some of you may have experience appearing before a court or inquiry and some of you may not. Whatever your experience, you need to be mindful that when appearing before this Royal Commission you will be exposed to:

(a) live streaming over the internet of the public hearing in which you appear;
(b) transcript of the public hearing will be made public via the Commission's website; and
(c) media attention.

In short, you need to prepare and you need to be ready for your appearance.

WHAT IS THE ROYAL COMMISSION ABOUT?

Preparing for the Royal Commission starts with a solid understanding of what it is about. The terms of reference are a touchstone for this understanding. We also, now, can have regard to 11 case studies, practice guidelines published by the Royal Commission and 1 report produced by the Commission in relation to case study No.1 – *The response to institutions to the conduct of Steven Larkins*. I will be taking a closer look at case study No. 1 as an example of how the Commission has been conducting itself.

One thing is certain – preparatory work by the Royal Commission leading up to a public hearing has been thorough and cross-examination has been robust. You can expect both when the Royal Commission sits in Victoria.

At its core the Royal Commission is tasked to inquire into how institutions, like yours, with responsibility for children have managed and responded to allegations of child sexual abuse and make recommendations on how to improve laws, policies and practices to prevent and better respond to child sexual abuse in institutions. They are looking to the past and to the future.

One needs to appreciate the significance of a royal commission. A royal commission is the highest form of inquiry on matters of public importance in Australia. A royal commission is not a court and is not bound by the ordinary rules of evidence. Rather, the *Royal Commissions Act* 1902 grants coercive powers to the Commission to compel the production of documents

[1] Barrister, Victoria Bar. Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

and witnesses to give evidence, even if this would be self-incriminating or the subject of legal professional privilege.

When the details of the impending hearings in Melbourne are published, the Royal Commission will summon witnesses. These witnesses are legally compelled to appear.

At the same time, the Royal Commission will invite written applications from individuals and institutions that may have a direct or substantial interest in the case study. Parties whose applications are approved are granted 'leave to appear', which means that they may examine witnesses and make oral submissions, through legal counsel or otherwise, during a hearing.

The decision to conduct a public hearing will be informed by whether or not the hearing will advance an understanding of systemic issues and provide an opportunity to learn from previous mistakes.

So, in the case of Victoria, it's watch and wait.

THEMES OF THE COMMISSION

Coming back now to our understanding of the themes and scope of the Commission's inquiry. As I have mentioned, we can get an understanding of them in two ways:

1. The letters patent; and
2. The case studies to date.

These provide us with the "flags" and "highlights" needed to properly prepare. I want to deconstruct these and draw out the headlines you need to be taking note of.

The Letters Patent

The letters patent tell us that the Royal Commission is, relevant to our discussion today, inquiring into the following matters:

(a) *What institutions and governments should do to better protect children against child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts in the future*;
Headline: turn your mind to your processes and governance structures; think about those processes and structures in the past and how they may have evolved and where you want to take them in the future; think about things you have recognised that need to be done better and make those concessions; what training do you have in place for your employees, trainees and volunteers as it relates to responding to, reporting and investigating child sexual abuse?

(b) *What institutions and governments should do to achieve best practice in encouraging the reporting of, and responding to reports or information about, allegations, incidents or risks of child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts*;
Headline: how have you gone about developing your policies and procedures and governance structures? What have you had regard to? Have you looked at the policies

and procedures and structures of other organisations nationally or internationally? Have you consulted in this regard? Have you conducted training for your employees, trainees and volunteers? What form does that training take? What would help you achieve best practice and what kinds of recommendations do you want to see the Royal Commission make in this regard as it affects your organisation?

(c) *What should be done to eliminate or reduce impediments that currently exist for responding appropriately to child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts, including addressing failures in, and impediments to, reporting, investigating and responding to allegations and incidents of abuse*;
Headline: consider any matters in which it may be put against your organisation there have been failures or impediments to a victim reporting, investigating and responding to allegations. If there are such matters, acknowledge them and consider how you have or will address them in the future.

(d) *What institutions and governments should do to address, or alleviate the impact of, past and future child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts, including, in particular, in ensuring justice for victims through the provision of redress by institutions, processes for referral for investigation and prosecution and support services*.
Headline: how have you ensured justice for victims in the past and how will you be ensuring justice for victims now and in the future?

The letters patent also provide that for the purposes of its inquiry and recommendations, the Royal Commission is to have regard to the following matters as relevant to us today:

(a) The experience of people directly or indirectly affected by child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts;
(b) Systemic issues;
(c) The adequacy and appropriateness of the responses by institutions, and their officials, to reports and information about allegations, incidents or risks of child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts; and
(d) Changes to laws, policies, practices and systems that have improved over time the ability of institutions and governments to better protect against and respond to child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional.

The Royal Commission is informing itself in several ways:

(a) *By considering the experiences of people affected by child sexual abuse in organisations*;
Headline: identify experiences of people affected by child sexual abuse within your organisation that may be subject of a public hearing; be ready to comment upon those cases.

(b) Important to our audience today, *by looking at archives, records and documents and considering submissions and statements from public, non-government and private organisations*;
Headline: record keeping – what is it like in your organization? Poor record keeping is often the subject of criticism in various inquiries. Poor record keeping can hamper an inquiry. Are their any failures in your organization's record keeping? Importantly, where there have been allegations of child sexual abuse, what have your processes been in recording, investigating and responding to those allegations? Do your processes match the way the file has been kept? If not, make the appropriate acknowledgements. What are you doing about managing your record keeping now and for the future?
Headline: submissions – keep abreast, via the Royal Commission website, of roundtables being conducted which you may be invited to attend and make comment at; consider making submissions on issue papers released by the Commission or find out if your peak body is making submissions and ask to contribute.

(c) *By looking at the laws, as well as policies and practices of institutions, organisations and governments to prevent and respond to child sexual abuse*; and
Headline: we have already spoken about the need to look into your organisation's police and practices. If your organisation is involved in a chosen case study by the Royal Commission, you can trust that they will thoroughly investigate your policies and practices. You need to do the same.

(d) *By taking into account the findings, recommendations, and information from past and existing inquiries, where appropriate*.
Headline: important to this point is of course the recent Victorian inquiry which Deb mentioned in her opening. In 2013 the Victorian Government tasked the Family and Community Development Committee to investigate the handling of child abuse in religious and other non-government organisations. This inquiry has now concluded and a report, '*Betrayal of Trust*', has been provided to the Victorian Government. The Victorian Government is due to respond on the Committee's report this month.

It is a good idea to familiarize yourself with this report and the government's response when issued. Both the report and the response will of course be considered by the Commission. If your organization is called to give evidence it may become relevant for witnesses to be familiar with the report and response and further to this be in a position to articulate how the organization itself is responding to the findings and recommendations of the report.

When looking at the findings of the report ask yourself whether any of them are applicable to your organization and if so how your organization is addressing those findings. For example, consider the following findings of the report:

1. Many organisations are seeking guidance in developing the skills and knowledge necessary to respond appropriately to allegations of criminal abuse and to report to police and other authorities. Does this finding resonate with you?

2. Organisations providing services funded by the Department of Human Services are required to report all physical and sexual assault of clients by staff to the police, yet the inconsistent implementation of this requirement indicates that not all personnel in organisations have the appropriate skills and knowledge to determine suspected criminal conduct. Do you think this may be the case with personnel in your organization? Is there room for improvement in this regard?
3. To ensure the appointment of suitable personnel, organisations need to adopt a combination of recruitment and selection, screening and checking processes. What is your process for the selection of suitable personnel?
4. The level of knowledge and the degree of action in establishing and improving child safety policies varied greatly, ranging from proactive to inactive. Where on the scale would you place your organisation?
5. Some organisations indicated a willingness to be subjected to higher levels of accountability through accreditation processes that involve both self-assessment and external scrutiny of prevention systems. Would your organisation be willing to be the subject of higher levels of accountability as suggested?
6. Many organisations have a poor understanding of criminal child abuse and often people find the issue too confronting to acknowledge, respond to or address. Is this perhaps true of your organisation? It's ok to acknowledge it and comment upon what your organisation is doing about it and importantly, what assistance your organisation may need to build this understanding.

CASE STUDIES

There have been 11 case studies to date across NSW, QLD, WA and SA. The Commission is currently sitting in Perth where you have no doubt been following in the news they are investigating the experiences of a number of male residents operated by the Christian Brothers.

We are going to take an in depth look at case study No. 1 principally because the report for case study No.1 was released in March this year and is the best indication of how the case studies are being used for the basis of findings and recommendations.

Before doing so, a few observations:

Main themes from public hearings:

The main themes that have emerged from the case studies are as follows:

1. ***Responses to allegations*:**
   The Royal Commission has been inquiring into:
   - Responses to information and allegations
   - The process of investigation
   - The thoroughness of investigations
   - The clarity of outcomes of investigations and documentation
   - Staff knowledge of allegations

- Management of allegations and appropriate communication to authorities

2. ***Employment*** (including volunteers):
   The Royal Commission has been inquiring into:
   - Circumstances of employment
   - Adequacy of carer assessment
   - Working with Children Check: assessment and review of assessment
   - Process to identify, investigate, discipline, remove and or transfer staff accused or found to be engaged in child sexual abuse
   - Monitoring, supervision and oversight of accused

3. ***Policies***:
   The Royal Commission has been inquiring into:
   - Policies, practices and procedures in place including training and supervision (at the time of the offence and now)
   - History of policy development
   - The application and adequacy of these policies, practices and procedures

4. ***Documentation***:
   The Royal Commission has been inquiring into:
   - Documentation of processes and investigations
   - Thoroughness of documentation
   - Documented communication of investigation and outcomes to appropriate authorities, persons and organisations
   - Record keeping

5. ***Victims***:
   - The Experience of victims and parents with organisations

REPORT OF CASE STUDY NO. 1: the response of institutions to the conduct of Steven Larkins

This case study provided an opportunity to examine how both Scouts Australia NSW and the Hunter Aboriginal Children's Service responded to the behaviour of Larkins. It also allowed the commission to look at the work of regulatory agencies and consider whether:

- their practices and procedures were appropriate
- if appropriate, they were effectively followed

Steven Larkins was an active member of Scouts Australia NSW from childhood and progressed to leadership roles in 1990s. During his time as a scout leader, Larkins faced complaints about his conduct with young scouts. Later, after joining the Hunter Aboriginal Children's Service in 2000, further allegations of inappropriate conduct arose relating to a young person in his care. Larkins was eventually prosecuted in 2012 for offences he had committed 15 years earlier.

The systemic issues that arise from this case include:

- the circumstances in which employers, including those with responsibility for volunteers, must report allegations of child sexual abuse to an external agency; and

- the adequacy of the current policies and procedures of institutions such as Scouts Australia NSW in preventing, reporting and responding to child sexual abuse.

The following figures give you an idea of the size and scope of this case study:

- Leave to appear was granted to Scouts Australia NSW, the State of NSW and 3 former employees of Hunter Aboriginal Children's Service;
- 9 summons to attend were issued, producing 4,290 documents;
- 30 exhibits consisting of a total of 314 documents;
- Evidence of 16 witnesses was heard between 16-19 September 2013. Not all witnesses gave oral evidence with some evidence entering the record with the tender of witness statements; and
- 27 findings were made in the report.

Time does not permit us to look at all the findings. Rather what I want to do is give you some examples of the cross examination faced by some of the witnesses and how that examination founded some of the findings. In particular, note the thoroughness of the Royal Commission's preparation in questioning the witnesses. There is often very little or no 'wriggle' room available to the witness. These examples, again, go to highlight the importance of good preparation.

Examples of cross examination in case study No. 1

(a) ***Cross examination of Allan Currie – former District and Regional Commissioner and Executive Committee Member of Scouts Australia NSW (transcript of hearing: p130:33 – p134:8)***

Background: This first piece of cross-examination relates to the official warning given to Larkins in 1997 related to a complaint about his conduct at Stockton public pool. On receiving the complaint, Armand Hoitink, Group Leader of Stockton Scouts, told the police about the incident. The next day, Mr Hoitink wrote to Allan Currie. Mr Hoitink's letter stated that the police had contacted Larkins and confirmed that he had been at the pool and had bought the children bags of lollies. In that letter Mr Hoitink said the police told him that, while Larkins' behaviour was 'highly suspicious', there was no specific law against what he was doing and they could not charge him with any offence.

The cross examination by Senior Counsel Assisting the Commission went like this:

"Q. So you were satisfied that you had the power, as it were, to issue the warning?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. You describe it in the letter as an "official written warning", and, indeed, you write to Mr Larkins in the same terms.
A. Yes.

Q. What did, in your mind at the time, an official written warning mean?
A. It was the first stage in any disciplinary action. In those days, and again in my working life, before you could actually take action on anybody, you had to make sure they had written warnings before you could go any further, and

that was the procedures in those days. This was the first warning, and if we had a bit of documented evidence, we could go further with any action. As I was not aware of any documented evidence at that stage, this was where I was going.

Q. When you say "documented evidence", documented by whom?
A. By anybody. By my predecessor, by anybody. I had not seen any documented evidence of any misdeeds.

Q. What about the letter from Mr Hoitink?
A. Except from Mr Hoitink.

Q. You said in your response to Mr Hoitink, that the "official written warning will be attached to his record".
A. Yes.

Q. By "his record", did you mean his member report?
A. Yes.

Q. Can we have Mr Larkins' member report up on the screen? Perhaps if we could scroll to the top so the witness can see the name of Mr Larkins. Do you recognise that as a member report?
A. Yes, yes.

Q. And do you accept it's Mr Larkins'?
A. Yes.

Q. If we can move down to his formation history and appointment history, do you see that?
A. Yes.

Q. There's reference to "status". Can you tell the Commission where it would be on this member report that one would expect to see the official written warning that

was attached to his record?
A. I don't believe it would have been put on there. I believe it would have been in a file. We had a file in the region office in Newcastle with that on there, but I don't think it would have gone on to this sort of report I don't know. I didn't do the administration, so I couldn't swear to that.

Q. No, I understand you didn't do it, but it would be something that you could have caused to occur; is that not

right?
A. Possibly, yes. Yes, probably. But we did have a file in the region office with any correspondence.

Q. The file that you had - presumably you had access to it and others that you knew of had access to it; is that right?
A. The regional office manager and myself at the time, yes.

Q. But the member report was something that others could have access to as well?
A. Yes.

Q. So if it were to be on the member report, then is it safe to assume that there would be many more people in the Scouting movement who would know about it?
A. The member reports weren't generally out for plain view. They were in a file in the regional office, and those people who had a need could go through them, but they weren't out in the public arena.

Q. What did you do to ensure that those who needed to know that Mr Larkins had a written warning and that he has been removed from regular face-to-face contact --
A. There would have been a word of mouth in one of my regular monthly commissioners meetings.

Q. So when you say "word of mouth", there was nothing in writing that was circulated to others?
A. No. It probably wouldn't have been put in minutes, either, because of privacy constraints. So it was word of mouth.

Q. Whose privacy would you be protecting there, Mr Currie?
A. Both his and ours. Larkins - we weren't sure of any particular proof of anything.

Q. You were sufficiently concerned to remove him from face-to-face contact?
A. Yes, I know, yes.

Q. Weren't you?
A. But there was no real proof of anything, except what I'd had in Mr Hoitink's letter at that stage.

Q. When you say there was no real proof, you had Mr Hoitink's letter, which set out, among other things, the view of the police; is that right?
A. I can't remember exactly what the word says about that at the moment, the part about the police. I know he went to the police, but I didn't hear anything from the police.
Q. Perhaps if we can turn, then, back to the letter that Mr Hoitink wrote to you. If we can scroll down to the second page, the first full paragraph on the second page, you will see it begins, "The detective called me back"?
A. Oh, okay.

Q. "and confirmed that it was indeed Steven Larkins". Do you see that?
A. Yes.

Q. And that:

> ...he had admitted approaching children and bought them bags of lollies. He said that he was trying to get them to join Scouts at Newcastle ...

And then the detective is quoted as having said:

> ... "that while this was all highly suspicious, it was not unfortunately a chargeable offence and that they could not do much more than keep an eye on him".

32 Do you see that?
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. What more proof did you need, Mr Currie?
36 A. Well, I can't honestly say, it was that long ago.
37 I just don't remember what my thought processes were at
38 the time.
39
40 Q. Just looking at it now, that seems to indicate,
41 doesn't it, that the police were satisfied as to what he
42 did and had a view about it?
43 A. It does, yes, it does point out that.
44
45 Q. So just sitting as you are now in the witness box,
46 can you see what other proof you might have required?
47 A. No, that would have been sufficient, in these days.

.16/09/2013 (2) 133 A J CURRIE (Ms Furness)
Transcript produced by Merrill Corporation

1
2 Q. I beg your pardon?
3 A. In these days, it would have been sufficient to go
4 further, yes.
5
6 Q. And you're suggesting it was different in those days?
7 A. Yes, well, back in those days, as I say, I can't
8 remember why I particularly went that way, but --

Finding: This cross-examination founded "Finding 3" in the report: *"the 'official warning' against Steven Larkins was not effectively recorded or communicated to those who were responsible for appointing and supervising leaders within Scouts Australia NSW.*

(b) *Cross examination of Allan Currie – former District and Regional Commissioner and Executive Committee Member of Scouts Australia NSW (transcript of hearing: p155:41 – p157:37)*

Background: In a letter informing Larkins of his 'official warning', Mr Currie wrote that the publicity from the incident at Stockton pool was something that Scouts Australia could 'well do without'. He said the Stockton Group was in 'damage control' and that, as Regional Commissioner, one of his responsibilities was improving the public image of Scouts and doing what was 'necessary to keep our good name'.

The cross-examination by Senior Counsel Assisting the Commission went like this:

41 Q. Do you recall having written to Mr Larkins?
42 A. Yes.
43

Q. That is now on the screen, and it was by this letter that you gave him an official warning?
A. Yes.

Q. And indicated he couldn't have face-to-face work with Scouts?
A. Yes.

Q. I was asking you some questions yesterday as to the view you took of the incident at the pool and the seriousness with which you considered it. Can I direct you to the fifth paragraph of your letter to Mr. Larkins It begins with:

> *This type of publicity as you would well realise is something that we in the Scout Association can well do without.*

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

Q. And:

> *The Stockton Group are at present running in damage control mode ...*

Do you see that reference?
A. Yes.

Q. And then two paragraphs down, there is a further reference to image in the second sentence:

> *One of my responsibilities as Regional Commissioner is improving our public image and I must do what is necessary to keep our good name.*

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

Q. And then the next paragraph, the final sentence, you state that "this" - that is, if further incidents occurred and that you would ask him to leave the movement:

> *... would be done reluctantly because of the years of good work you have put into Scouts, but would have to be done to preserve our good name.*

Now, is it fair, Mr Currie, to read this letter of yours to Mr Larkins in such a way that your primary concern was the

reputation of the Scouts in taking the action you did against him?
A. Probably, in that last bit I was trying to soften it a bit to make it not sound really nasty and critical, but at the time I don't know why, because I was only fairly new at the job had and no training whatsoever in this sort of area, but, yes, I would - it would have been trying to preserve the good name of Scouts, but we would take the necessary action if required.
Q. When you say "didn't have any training", what training are you referring to?
A. Well, no training to be a regional commissioner, I was just appointed to regional commissioner, that was it. My only training in that particular role was something like about 10 to 12 years before, when I trained to be a group leader, and there is training supplied by the Scout Association for all ranks, Scout leader, Cub leader, group leaders, district commissioners. These days it's called "leader of adults", and I hadn't done any of that.
Q. Did you take it upon yourself when you became regional commissioner to acquaint yourself with any of the current thinking in relation to child protection?
A. Not in any particular concentrated manner. It's just the different conferences and meetings we went to, we had regular chief commissioners councils, as they were called, in Sydney three times a year where anything new would be discussed and promoted to us back in those days.
Q. Do you now recall child protection being a topic on any of those meetings that you attended?
A. That far back, no, no.
Q. By "that far back", you're referring to the mid-1990s, are you?
A. Yes.

Finding: This cross-examination founded “Finding 4” in the report: *Mr Currie’s actions in relation to Steven Larkins in 1997 was influenced by his desire to protect the reputation of Scouts Australia NSW*

(c) Jacqueline Henderson – former out-of-home case worker with the Hunter Aboriginal Children's Service (HACS) and Chair of the Hunter Aboriginal Children's Service Management Committee and relative of Steven Larkins (Transcript: p418:22-p419:39)

Background: The HACS was a community based non-government agency, its management committee was responsible for the agency operating effectively and meeting its legal, contractual and financial obligations.

Ms Henderson joined the committee after she left her paid position with HACS in mid-2003. She recalled that DoCS and the Association of Child Welfare Agencies provided some training for the HACS Management Committee when she was Chairperson. The training was to 'understand a bit more about the service, the policies and procedures, especially with variation orders and understanding what they were.'

Ms Henderson gave evidence that HACS was 'very poorly governed', but she took no steps to address this when she was Chairperson. Ms Henderson said she did not feel adequately equipped to do the job.

The cross-examination of Senior Counsel Assisting the Commission went like this:

```
22      Q.   What did you do to make sure that the governance
23      was better than it was when you were a worker?
24      A.   Probably nothing.  I was - I should have done
25      more but didn't.
26
27      Q.   What should you have done?
28      A.   To ensure that all regulations and legislations
29      were followed by law and that the children's service
30      were following those guidelines, policies and
31      procedures.
32      Q.   When you became a member of the committee, did
33      you check to see whether there indeed was a clear
34      Working With Children Check in relation to Mr
35      Larkins?
36      A.   No.
37      Q.   You hadn't considered it was your position when
38      you were a caseworker, had you?
39      A.   No.
40
41      Q.   It was your position, however, when you became
42      a member and then chair, wasn't it?
43      A.   To a degree, yes.
44
45      Q.   Well, it completely was your role, wasn't it?
46      A.   I would say chairperson, yes.
47
```

Q. And why didn't you?
A. Well, I just assumed - you shouldn't assume, but one would assume that given that he had already been there in the role of the manager of the children's service and there was only ever one Working With Children Check carried out, I was under the assumption that it was all clear and fine.
Q. But the files were accessible by you, weren't they, to check?
A. Yes, they were.

Q. And you knew yourself that you hadn't had a Working With Children Check, or you believed you hadn't had a Working With Children Check while you were there, didn't you?
A. That's correct.

Q. Before or soon after you joined the committee, did you do anything to better understand the rules and regulations and laws that applied to offering out-of-home care?
A. We - the committee had done some training.
Q. Was that when you were on it?
A. Yes.
Q. When was that?
A. I don't know exact dates, but I do recollect that there was some training for committee to understand a bit more about the service, the policies and procedures, especially with variation orders and understanding what they were.
Q. Who provided the training?
A. Department of Community Services did some and ACWA provided some.

Q. Did you feel, during the time you were chair, adequately equipped with knowledge to do the job?
A. No.

Finding: This cross-examination founded “Finding 26” of the report:

“Hunter Aboriginal Children’s Service Management Committee members who gave evidence to the Royal Commission were inexperienced in organizational management and lacked knowledge of governance and legislative and regulatory frameworks relevant to Hunter Aboriginal Children’s Service.”

and part of “Finding 27” of the report:

“A number of factors helped Steven Larkins to wield influence over the Hunter Aboriginal Children’s Service Management Committee:

- *Ms Henderson and Ms Elphick accepted their appointments as Chairperson without experience in organisational management or understanding of the regulatory regime governing out-of-home care.”*

TAKE HOME MESSAGES

- **Practice guidelines:** the Royal Commission has practice guidelines (published on their website) that explain the procedures of the Commission, how to provide a statement or information, how to submit electronic material and how to claim client legal privilege. Read the practice guidelines and familiarize yourselves with them. Ask questions about them. Seek legal advice if you need to.
- **Witness statements:** in preparing your statement remember it is your statement and you need to be 100% comfortable with its content including annexures. You must be very familiar with this statement. It is the basis of cross-examination against you.
- **Preparation:** Anticipate questions and prepare answers.
- **Concessions:** make concessions where appropriate but similarly hold fast where appropriate.
- **Working with your legal representatives:** be forthcoming with your legal representatives who will assist you to prepare and “mop up” matters that have arisen in cross-examination where necessary.
- **In the witness box**: direct questions to the Commissioners, drink water, breathe, ask for clarification or for the question to be repeated where necessary.
- **The bigger picture**: remember your examination is not just about you but about the organisation you represent. If you do not have personal knowledge of a matter, say so. If you do not know the answer to a question, say so. You will be cross-examined by Counsel Assisting, counsel for the other interested parties and the Commissioners themselves and re-examined by your own counsel where necessary.
- **Debrief**: debrief after your appearance both with your legal representatives and your colleagues.
- **Stay informed:** get instant updates on the work of the Royal Commission through the Commission’s twitter feed; keep abreast of the activities of the Commission through its website and watch public hearings live where you can.

Thank you