From:	Gleeson, Steve
Sent:	Tue, 12 Jun 2012 17:06:38 +1000
To:	Corbell, Christopher
Subject:	FW: Query
Attachments:	IBSU HS review part 2.doc

Thanks Chris and this is enlightening.

I had been assured on at least two other ocasions when I have asked at the HSMU if a hard copy file exists that no hard copy file exists and all that is available is a collection of audio recordings and administrative papers. HSMU even checked certain safes when I was down there and produced certain recordings and so forth, but no sequential hard copy file???

Given the potential extent of human error evident in the table shown to you, the type of tomb-stoning I would be advocating for with the ICR process is for the system to lock in the identity details of the compositor and validator and the date when each was done, with no capaicty for this to be a manual entry process. So that I am patently clear on this are you saying that on ICRs created and validated on Interpose (as it exists now) that this is actually done? Just want to get this clear in my head.

All the rest is pretty clear and I welcome your comments about appropriate storage of related media. This makes good sense to me.

Thanks again and if you could clarify the ICR issue re tombstoning I will promise to leave you alone for a while.

SG

From:	Corbell, Christopher
Sent:	Tuesday, 12 June 2012 2:06 PM
To:	Gleeson, Steve
Subject:	RE: Query

Hi Steve, sorry for the delay with this but was away in Canberra for work.

I have attached a word document that hopefully answers your questions.

If you still have queries, please get back to me.

Regards

Chris

From:	Gleeson, Steve
Sent:	Wednesday, 6 June 2012 2:47 PM
To:	Corbell, Christopher
Subject:	FW: Query

Thanks Chris and please call me Steve.

I sincerely appreciate your assistance with these matters.

What you provide all makes sense but please indulge me with a couple of other possibly dopey questions so that I am sure I am quite clear on all this.

A 3838 risk assessment done on 20/4/06 reflects that protocols were implemented at the IMU (the fore-runner to HSMU?) for separate and secure storage of 3838 related material (provided from DSU to the then IMU). This, to me implies that some form of process existed for receipt of source related information and file management by HSMU prior to the Interpose uploading occurrence date you mention of 6 February 2009. What was used by HSMU, and DSU to store this information along the way if interpose was not functionally used for this matter until 6/2/09?

I have asked down at SDU and at HSMU if any hardcopy file exists for 3838 and have been advised that everything is on Interpose? I have since learned that this is not the case and other 3838 documentation, such as what is known as "controllers logs" have not made their way onto Interpose. This implies to me that there are electronic holdings at DSU that related to 3838? Would it be the case that the migration to Interpose process has missed this related material? What I am fearful of is possibly missing key documentation having accepted assurances that all related material is on Interpose. Would welcome your advice.

I want to be patently clear on the dates visible on the 3838 contact reports reflecting handler submission and controller adoption. I am sure you will recognise the importance of this. I note your comments that these are tomb-stoned dates and that other systems issues have not impacted on the integrity of these dates for 3838. Just to make absolutely sure I have understood this correctly can I be assured that the dates on the ICR table I provided to you (submission by handler and adoption by controller dates) are system generated dates and are therefore valid and accurate?

If this is the case then how can the ICR's that bear a submission date well prior to the conversation actually occurring be explained? (eg ICR's 048 and 090 as 3838, and 006,007, 008, 009 as 2958)

Just two other matters I wish to query Chris and the first is what is the CaMDOC process you mention?

The second issue is a matter we have in part discussed. This concerns the topic of source related media and where (under current arrangements and optimally) this is to be kept? In the case of 3838 I note that numerous recordings / photos etc have been made and it appears that none of these are attached to the Interpose file for 3838. To me this presents risks (and I recognise that in terms of systems capabilities it probably creates headaches). However when considering the importance and value of some of this material, and its potential value for informing decision making, it would be beneficial to have it all on the one file rather than it being stored elsewhere under some ad-hoc arrangements.

Would welcome your advice and views

SG

From: Corbell, Christopher
Sent: Wednesday, 6 June 2012 12:50 PM
To: Gleeson, Steve
Cc: Pope, Jeff
Subject: RE: Query

Sir;

I have just completed my briefing paper. It is not in a structured report as such. Should you need a 47, Briefing Note etc, please let me know.

If you determine that you still have a gap, please get back to me.

<< File: Interpose Business Support Unit response to Human Source Review.doc >>

Regards

Chris

From: Gleeson, Steve
Sent: Wednesday, 6 June 2012 10:30 AM
To: Corbell, Christopher
Subject: Query

Hi Chris,

How are we tracking with responses to those queries raised last week?

SG.

In reply to email dated 06/06/12:

1. Prior to Interpose use, IMU and DSU had stand alone databases running Microsoft Access to set some fields and create files. For this file DSU would hand deliver ICRs etc on an external portable hard drive. IMU would then sort through the files and upload or complete the IMU database with the information. The external portable hard drive would then be returned to DSU.

2. There is a hard copy file – which I am informed has as of 12/6/12 been scanned and uploaded into Interpose. The hard copy continues to be stored at HSMU in a safe. It cannot be ruled out that information regarding the management of 3838 exists in some form at SDU as I am not certain of how the old database was decommissioned nor how hard copy files were stored or destroyed. A question for SDU considering a hard copy has now been located.

3. The ICR dates – created or adopted within the ICRs were manual entry by DSU on their stand alone computer. Human error can explain where there is conflict between these dates and poor work practices can explain the low controller adoption ratio. The tomb-stoning I spoke of is when the completed document was eventually saved/stored/uploaded into Interpose the date and who uploaded it is set automatically, that is "tomb-stoned" by the system. None of these documents were actually created on Interpose, they are just being saved/stored there after being uploaded.

4. The inconsistent dates within the ICR documents are human error/lack of attention to detail. I can only assume the author has used a previous ICR for this source, kept the header and footer details, forgotten to change the submission date and then completed the body of the ICR with the latest contact information.

5. CaMDOC – is the Controlled and Major Drug Operations Committee. Short cut below will give you more info. Committee is usually made of up to 6 Superintendents, with AC Crime final sign off. Usually sits every Wednesday. To task a human source there must be an approved controlled operation – which is the legislation introduced to cover the old DP&CSA section 51 indemnity. This committee has enforced more oversight over HS management.http://intranet/files/documents/75349_Guidelines-for-Controlled-Operations-funding.pdf

6. Whilst the uploading of digital audio, video and photographs is discouraged by Interpose Business Support due to a massive increase in storage requirements, I believe a recommendation for HSMU to have all data in one place, secure and searchable is fundamental to reduce risk and increase accountability. I therefore support a recommendation of the review that future policy should allow this storage and that Interpose Business Support be tasked with ensuring sufficient storage for HSMU is met.