

8. If the DPP's legal personnel find that they need additional materials, for example further statements, that documentation would come back through the C2 department. It was a flexible system. The whole objective was to make sure that the information put before the DPP was the best that could be achieved given the incident that you were investigating, the circumstances of that investigation and the quality of the witnesses that you had to support your case or otherwise. Suggesting lines of investigation was a role that was shared between the C2 department and the DPP. There was absolutely nothing to stop a senior officer in C2 expressing dissatisfaction about the weight of evidence or the quality of the witness statement. It was a proactive as opposed to a passive administrative role.

9. The second part of our quality control function was to ensure that there was no slippage so that timeframes were observed. The government laid down timeframes for how quickly investigations should be conducted, processed by the DPP and put before the court. These timeframes were in place to ensure that people were not sitting on remand while interminable investigations dragged on, so our role had a bearing on the wellbeing of any individual in custody. An audit trail was created, with 40 days from the date of the incident to the submission of the investigation file. The DPP then imposed upon himself a turnaround time to give us directions or interim directions. If additional material or tests were required, they would go out with directions from C2 for that work to be done within a given period. Everything was fixed within a timeframe, and we had to quality control the cases to the government's satisfaction from the commission of the incident to hearing the ^{case} report.

10. I would say that it was fairly robust system. It was staffed by personnel who had all been time served as senior investigators and knew what a quality investigation and crime file should contain. People were not making recommendations for prosecution if they read the documentation and could question what it was being based on. If, for example, the documentation did not include the necessary eye witness evidence or there was only one eye witness, it would not pass the acid test from the DPP because it could not be substantiated.