

**Senator LUDWIG:** I accept that.

**Mr Negus:** I might add that there is precedent for this too, with former Prime Minister Gillard staying there for about three weeks under exactly the same conditions two or three years ago.

**Senator LUDWIG:** Thank you. I was just looking at making sure his health was looked after in terms of his eating. So far I have not been able to find out where he eats, but I suspect I will pursue that somewhere else in another committee.

In terms of threat assessments that are undertaken for the Prime Minister for functions he might attend, one I wanted to look at was the one at Deakin University. Could you explain the role of the AFP—so far as you are able on the public record—in detailing if the Prime Minister is going to Deakin University or to another parliament? What do you do in terms of a threat assessment?

**Mr Negus:** I would again be cautious in the level of detail I provide, but we, ASIO and the Attorney-General's Department all work together in this space to look at the potential risks. There is a threat assessment undertaken, and treatments are put in place. Those circumstances are conveyed to the Prime Minister or another minister who is representing the government at a particular point, and then judgements are made about the treatments that need to be put in place for that. As far as any detail on that, I think it would be counterproductive.

**Senator LUDWIG:** Yes. That is the level I was seeking. Is it advice which then says go or do not go, or is it of the nature of what you do in terms of supporting that function. I am trying to understand whether it is advice to someone to say this is a serious issue, it is a high threat level and you should not go or whether it is a type of assessment that simply says, 'Here's what we're going to do should you decide to go to that particular function; this is what our security detail will look like.'

**Mr Negus:** Unless it was an imminent or very dangerous threat, this would always be done in consultation with the principal person involved. The AFP would not declare that the person could not go there, but they would make them well aware of the treatments and the risks that were there, and it would be done through a process of consultation unless there something where we considered the risk to be at such a high level—and that would be significant. Then strong advice would be that we could not properly protect the person in that environment.

**Senator LUDWIG:** So could you say whether or not that was provided for the Deakin University incident? Was it a serious and imminent threat that you then said that the Prime Minister should not go or was it one of the other more broader ones?

**Mr Negus:** It was done through consultation. The issues and concerns were raised and then a decision was arrived at through consultation in that regard.

**Senator LUDWIG:** What was the decision arrived at through consultation?

**Mr Negus:** If it is the case you are talking about, I will get Deputy Commissioner Drennan, who is in charge of our protection area, to answer. The decision was that it would be an unreasonable risk to put the Prime Minister and the other people around in that circumstance.

**Mr Drennan:** As the Commissioner described, it was part of the ongoing briefing to the Prime Minister's office—what the circumstances were, the resources it would take to provide a safe and secure environment—and the Prime Minister's office, in consultation, thought it was not the best position to be placed in and the decision was made not to go.

**Senator LUDWIG:** I am still asking: whose decision was it? Do you make a recommendation at the bottom of the threat assessment that says to go or not go? Mr Negus seemed to indicate that the only time you would do that is when it is a series of imminent threat. Did you make that assessment? Mr Negus seemed to think that was not the case; that it was made through consultation.

**Mr Drennan:** That is correct. It was made through consultation. I suppose the best way to explain is that the type of threat that would need to exist for us to say not to go would probably be a serious terrorist threat or a threat made by a motivated group which was going to be violent, or from some fixated individual. That was not the case in the set of circumstances, so it was not a matter where we said, 'It is too dangerous for you to be there. We should not go.'

**Senator LUDWIG:** So the decision not to go was by the Prime Minister? Although it was in consultation with you, it was the Prime Minister who decided not to attend?

**Mr Drennan:** That is correct.

**Senator RHIANNON:** On Tuesday, 11 March *The Guardian* reported that the AFP liaison officers in Colombo refused to see a Sri Lankan man who complained of torture, when he was in Sri Lankan police custody,

21  
MAY