

## PURPOSE

The Criminal Assets Confiscation Command Capacity Capability Committee (CAC-CCC) has been established to make resource and prioritisation decisions relating to criminal assets confiscation referrals and investigations.

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

## ROLE

The CAC-CCC makes determinations on accepting, rejecting and/or endorsing matters for:

1. Assessment by Criminal Assets Investigations teams;
2. Investigation by Criminal Assets Investigations teams; and
3. Referral to Criminal Assets Litigation (CAL).

Criminal Assets Investigations Team Leaders (CAI TL) are responsible for collating matters pertaining to their team that are to be ratified through the CAC-CCC.

CAI TLs will complete CCC submissions through the [Microsoft Teams](#) page by no later than COB of the Tuesday preceding the CAC-CCC. Referrals will be made utilising the approved [templates](#) on the Microsoft Teams page and by completing the fortnightly CCC submission spreadsheet,<sup>1</sup> listing:

1. New referrals for assessment and triage by CAI;
2. Referrals for investigation by CAI (post initial assessment and triage); and
3. CAI investigations to be referred to CAL for consideration.

The recommendations of each CAI TL will be noted, endorsed or altered by the CAC-CCC membership, with the Secretariat recording decision outcomes centrally.

Decisions where CAI support is not endorsed due to resourcing pressures shall be captured by the Secretariat, for the purpose of capturing unmet demand and understanding future strategic workforce needs.

It is the responsibility of the CAI TL who holds responsibility for the matter to ensure the CAC-CCC outcome for their matter/s are recorded as a Case Note Entry on PROMIS.

Referrals requiring consideration before the next scheduled CAC-CCC (i.e. time critical responses) may be dealt with by an out-of-session (OOS) CAC-CCC. OOS referrals and recommendations must

<sup>1</sup> Fortnightly spreadsheet will be available in the [Meeting Papers](#) folder of the Microsoft Teams page one week prior to the CCC meeting.

be emailed through to the CAC-CCC Secretariat [redacted] s 47E(d) A quorum of no less than three CAC-CCC members is required to endorse an OOS request. Any OOS requests (endorsed or otherwise) shall be tabled at the next scheduled CAC-CCC for awareness and recording.

### **EXPECTED OUTCOMES**

The CAC-CCC will provide rigour in making determinations of resource allocation across Australia.

The CAC-CCC will consider the AFP's National Priorities and respective Command priorities, and any impact on other AFP or CAC related operational activity and resources in making its decision.

### **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER COMMITTEES**

The CAC-CCC is subordinate to the AFP Tasking and Coordination Committee (A-TACC). Where a Command may require additional CAC resources, the Command representative may make National Resource Priority List (NRPL) submissions to the A-TACC. Where the A-TACC issues an NRPL requirement for resources, the CAC-CCC will be the forum that coordinates and endorses a response to that requirement.

The CAC-CCC endorsed matters will be assessed for referral to CAL at the appropriate juncture and tabled at the Criminal Assets Confiscation Taskforce Case Prioritisation Committee (CACT PC) for discussion where required.

### **MEETING FREQUENCY**

The CAC-CCC will meet every second [redacted] s 47E(d) <sup>3</sup> Extraordinary meetings may be called by the Chair and out-of-session decisions can be made if required.

### **CHAIR ARRANGEMENTS**

The Chair is National Coordinator CAC. In the event that the Chair or the member acting as the Chair cannot attend the meeting, the Chair will appoint a proxy Chair for that meeting.

### **MEMBERSHIP**

National Coordinator Criminal Assets Confiscation  
Sergeant (TL) CAC Canberra, Headquarters  
Sergeant (TL) Cryptocurrency Capability  
Sergeant (TL) Canberra Targeting  
Sergeant (TL) CAC Team 1 Western Command

<sup>2</sup> [redacted] s 47E(d) [@afp.gov.au](mailto:[redacted]@afp.gov.au)

<sup>3</sup> Meetings occur every non-pay week.

Sergeant (TL) CAC Team 1 Southern Command  
Sergeant (TL) CAC Team 2 Southern Command  
Sergeant (TL) CAC Team 1 Northern Command  
Sergeant (TL) CAC Team 2 Northern Command  
Sergeant (TL) CAC Team 1 Eastern Command  
Sergeant (TL) CAC Team 2 Eastern Command  
Sergeant (TL) CAC Team 1 Central Command  
Team Leader CAC Coordination and Strategy Team

Other attendees are permitted to observe and provide critical updates regarding operations to ensure adequate information flow between Commands.


#### **SECRETARIAT**

The CAC-CCC will be supported by the CAC Coordination and Strategy Team. All submissions for the CAC-CCC are to be uploaded to the Microsoft Teams page by **no later than close of business of the Tuesday** preceding the scheduled CAC-CCC. The Secretariat will distribute the referrals for consideration prior to the Committee meeting.

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

**CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION - IMPACT PRIORITISATION MATRIX**

OPERATION:



Low Risk High Impact
Low Risk Low Impact
High Risk High Impact
High Risk Low Impact

s 47E(d)

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982



# AFP

AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

## User Guide

Operational Prioritisation Model

Version 3.0

15 November 2023

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

POLICING FOR A SAFER AUSTRALIA

Date of Issue:	November 2023
Endorsed by:	Commander National Operations Coordination
Owner:	Commander National Operations Coordination
Contact:	Coordinator Tasking and Coordination

Contents

**1 Purpose ..... 2**

**2 Introduction ..... 2**

2.1 Operational Prioritisation Model (OPM).....2

2.2 Scope.....2

2.3 Harm Consequence.....2

2.4 Harm Probability .....3

2.5 Harm Assessment.....3

2.6 Impact Assessment .....4

2.7 Ranking.....4

2.8 Process .....4

2.9 OPM Ranking Committee (ORC) .....5

2.10 Guidance Notes.....5

**3 Descriptions of Harm Consequence ..... 7**

3.1 Fraud and Corruption.....7

s 22(1)(a)(ii) .....8

s 22(1)(a)(ii) .....9

s 22(1)(a)(ii) .....10

3.5 Organised Crime.....11

s 22(1)(a)(ii) .....12

s 22(1)(a)(ii) .....13

s 22(1)(a)(ii) .....14

s 22(1)(a)(ii) .....15

**4 Harm Probability .....16**

**5 Harm Assessment .....17**

**6 Impact Assessment.....18**

**7 OPM Ranking.....19**

**8 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs).....20**

**9 Appendix: ORC Terms of Reference .....22**

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

# 1 Purpose

This User Guide is intended primarily for:

- NOSSC members when creating new Outcome 1 cases for consideration and progressing to CCCs
- Other AFP members who receive a report of an Outcome 1 crime
- Members of the OPM Ranking Committee (ORC) which will collectively review the first pass assessment of the Operational Prioritisation Model (OPM) and confirm or revise the assessment of Harm Consequence, Harm Probability and Impact, and thus the OPM rank for all incoming reports of crime.

It is also useful to inform decision-makers in national and regional Command fora, including the AFP Tasking and Coordination Committee (A-TACC) and regions' Capacity and Capability Committees (CCCs).

This guide and the various tables and matrices within will be subject to review and, if necessary, revision quarterly, under the ownership of Commander National Operations Coordination. The current User Guide is based on reviews of these tables by subject matter experts in October 2023.

Local NOSSC teams are the first point of contact for any queries about the OPM.

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Operational Prioritisation Model (OPM)

The OPM is founded on assessing reports of crime received by the AFP according to the severity of the threat of **harm** and the **impact** that AFP could have in eliminating or reducing that threat. It provides important input into decision-making about which cases are accepted for investigation, referred to another police force or agency, or rejected, and how resources will be deployed – but the OPM ranking does not in itself prescribe the action to be taken.

### 2.2 Scope

The OPM applies to all Outcome 1 reports of crime received from external sources or internally generated, and is to be applied before a report of crime is considered by a CCC or Command. However, certain types of report are out of scope:

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

### 2.3 Harm Consequence

Harm Consequence tables are central to the OPM and have been developed in workshops of subject matter experts in specific crime areas. The following areas are addressed:



- Fraud & Corruption

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

- Organised Crime

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

Whether other crime areas need their own Harm Consequence table will be considered as and when strategic priorities and/or the crime environment change. Each table ranks the potential severity of harm as one of:

- Insignificant
- Minor
- Moderate
- Major
- Severe.

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

The tables will be reviewed and updated as required to take account of changing crime environments and AFP's strategic priorities.

## 2.4 Harm Probability

A similar five-step scale assessing the likelihood of the harm happening is also part of the OPM (see Section 3).

## 2.5 Harm Assessment

Mapping the Harm Consequence against the Harm Probability generates a Harm Assessment (Section 4).

## 2.6 Impact Assessment


As well as Harm, the OPM takes account of the prospective impact AFP could have to mitigate that harm (Section 5)

## 2.7 Ranking

An overall OPM ranking from 1 to 5 is derived by mapping the Harm Assessment against the Impact Assessment (Section 6).

## 2.8 Process

The process flow for incoming reports of crime is shown below:



### 2.8.1 Initiation

On creation of a new case in IMS (noting that this automatically generates a shadow PROMIS case) or PROMIS, a member needs to launch the OPM Digiflow process opening a new form; this requires the member to:

- input the PROMIS number
- “copy and paste” the report of crime summary into the Digiflow “Report Description”
- answer the simple questions that follow
- assess the Harm Consequence, Harm Probability, and Impact Assessment for the report as a “first pass” assessment
- enter the IMS reference in the “Professional Judgement” section if one exists
- enter any observations or comments in the “Professional Judgement” section to highlight any issues and/or suggested actions, such as:
  - “Harm Probability Assessment may be on the high side” (or on the low side, as appropriate)
  - Note CAOC involvement
  - “Check with International Command”

Digiflow will workflow the proposed OPM to the ORC for review and confirmation or revision of the assessments.

Once the ORC has reviewed and, if necessary, refined the assessments, Digiflow will progress the case to the relevant NOSSC and CCC for decision-making on the action to be taken.

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

## 2.9 OPM Ranking Committee (ORC)

Reports will be assessed within a week by the ORC, comprised of representatives from each regional command, generally the NOSSC Inspector or team leader, chaired by the Canberra NOSSC Superintendent on a Thursday afternoon. The ORC is responsible for reviewing the information available at that point and categorising the potential Harm Consequence, the Harm Probability and the Impact Assessment, thus generating the OPM ranking number. See Appendix for the ORC Terms of Reference.

A sub-group of the ORC, comprising the Canberra NOSSC Superintendent and the Coordinator, Tasking and Coordination in National Operation Coordination, meets on a Tuesday afternoon to review reports assessed since the previous full ORC session. If they agree with the first pass assessment they will endorse this “out of session” and submit for Digiflow to pass on to the relevant NOSSC for decision-making at the region’s CCC or other decision-making body. If they disagree then the assessment will be considered at the next full ORC meeting or,

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

The ORC then refers all reports to the relevant decision-making body; this will normally be a regional command CCC.

## 2.10 Guidance Notes

The various ranking tables in this guide are intended to be self-explanatory. This section addresses a small number of areas to avoid uncertainty.

### 2.10.1 Response cases

- When the AFP receives a report that requires an immediate response (“Act Now”) then the OPM is only to be applied after the initial response has been carried out and if further action is determined to be required.

### 2.10.2 Agency Assistance Requests

- Requests from Commonwealth agencies for assistance from AFP, e.g. with execution of search warrants, are analogous to MARs but are more discretionary in nature
- Such requests should be assessed in accordance with the relevant Crime Area Harm Consequence table if possible (or as Other Crime) and both the Harm Probability and Impact Assessment tables.

### 2.10.3 Offences already committed

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

### 3 Descriptions of Harm Consequence

#### 3.1 Fraud and Corruption

Consequence	Description
Insignificant	<p>THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982</p> <p>s.47E(d)</p>
Minor	
Moderate	
Major	
Severe	

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

### 3.5 Organised Crime

Consequence	Description
Insignificant	<p>s 47E(d)</p> <p>THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982</p>
Minor	
Moderate	
Major	
Severe	

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982



## 4 Harm Probability

The likelihood of a threat of harm happening in practice is assessed in OPM in accordance with the following (AFP standard) table:

Category	Probability	Description
Rare		
Unlikely		
Possible		
Likely		s 47E(d)
Almost certain		

**Note**

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

## 5 Harm Assessment

Mapping the Harm Consequence against the Harm Probability produces an overall Harm Assessment as per the following risk matrix:

PROBABILITY	CONSEQUENCE				
	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Severe
Almost certain	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Extreme
Likely	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Very high
Possible	Low	Medium	Medium	High	High
Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
Rare	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
 THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
 UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

## 6 Impact Assessment

In addition to the Harm Assessment of a report, there is a need for objective assessment of the extent to which AFP action will eliminate or reduce the threat of that harm. This table has been refined in October 2023 in consultation with experienced members:

Extent	AFP action
Nil	<p>THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982</p> <p>s 47E(d)</p>
Minimal	
Moderate	
High	
Very high	

## 7 OPM Ranking

The overall OPM ranking is determined by mapping the Harm Assessment against the Impact Assessment in this matrix:

IMPACT	HARM				
	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Extreme
Full / Very High	5	4	3	2	1
High	5	4	3	2	2
Moderate	5	4	4	3	3
Minimal	5	5	4	4	4
Nil	5	5	5	5	5

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

## 8 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

### Why is OPM replacing the CCPM?

The CCPM has served the AFP well since its introduction in 1996. However, the crime environment and community expectations of how we respond have both evolved since then. The OPM is designed to respond to these changes – and to be easier for members to use.

s 47E(d)

### What is OPM based on?

OPM is based on assessing the harm that might be caused by a reported crime against the impact the AFP could have to eliminate or reduce that harm.

### What does Harm mean in this context?

The nature of possible harm depends on the type of crime involved. Harm Consequence tables have been developed with five levels of possible harm to an individual, a community, the Commonwealth, Australia, or the national interest.

The likelihood that the harm would occur in practice is considered against a Harm Probability table, using the five standard AFP categories from Rare (<5%) to Almost Certain (>95%).

Mapping the Harm Consequence of a reported crime against its Harm Probability gives an overall Harm Ranking.

### What does Impact mean in this context?

The extent to which action by the AFP would mitigate the harm of a reported crime, again using a five-point categorisation, from Nil to Very High.

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

**Does the OPM ranking determine how AFP should respond to a report?**

No. The OPM ranking is a tool to assist the appropriate decision-making authority to make better informed judgment on the action to be taken, if any.

**How does it work?**

When a report is accepted and an IMS or PROMIS case initiated, an OPM Digiflow form must also be created by whoever is processing the report; this may usually, but not always, be a NOSSC team member. Using Digiflow the member then makes a preliminary judgment of Harm Consequence, Harm Probability, and Impact for the report. This then workflows to the OPM Ranking Committee (ORC) to endorse or revise the ratings, and their decision then workflows to the appropriate regional NOSSC for local decision-making.

**Who decides the OPM ranking for a report?**

The initiator of the Digiflow form makes a preliminary assessment. The ORC then collectively determines the ranking for each report. It meets weekly with representation from all regional NOSSCs to assess all reports in the preceding seven days.

**Why do we need an ORC?**

The ORC ensures that all reports are treated equally and assessed on a consistent basis nationally, minimising any inherent biases or preferences within any particular command.

**Isn't the ORC unnecessarily bureaucratic?**

No. All reports received by the AFP have to be reviewed and the OPM/ORC process standardises the approach and ensures consistency.

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

## 9 Appendix: ORC Terms of Reference

### 9.1 PURPOSE

The **OPM Ranking Committee** (hereafter referred to as the **ORC**) reviews incoming reports received by means of the OPM Digiflow form weekly to determine their ranking (1 to 5) under the Operational Prioritisation Model (OPM). The ORC is chaired by a representative from the national NOSSC who takes executive accountability for decisions and reporting them.

The ORC is responsible for ensuring that all reports are ranked on a consistent basis using the Harm Consequence, Harm Probability, Harm Assessment, and Impact Assessment tables established for the OPM. It is responsible for progressing all reports to the relevant NOSSC for consideration and decision making at local CCC meetings. In referring for decision the ORC will flag any perceived media, political, or international issues that need to be taken into account as well as the OPM Ranking.

### 9.2 MEMBERSHIP

The ORC includes representation from each NOSSC around the country. Each regional command nominates a lead representative and it is that member's responsibility to attend each session of the ORC or to nominate an alternate. Initial membership from January 2023 is shown below.

Role	Name	Position	Command/Unit
Chair	s 47E(c)	A/Superintendent	National NOSSC
Deputy Chair	s 47E(c)	Coordinator	National Operations Coordination
Member	s 47E(c)	NOSSC Team Leader	EC NOSSC
Member	s 47E(c)	NOSSC Team Leader	SC NOSSC
Member	s 47E(c)	NOSSC Team Leader	CC NOSSC
Member	s 47E(c)	NOSSC Team Leader	WC NOSSC
Member	s 47E(c)	NOSSC Team Leader	NC NOSSC
Member	To be determined		
Secretary	s 47E(c)	A/Superintendent	NOSSC Canberra

### 9.3 FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

Meetings will be held weekly. Out-of-session review of a report may be conducted if deemed necessary by the Chair.

### 9.4 DECISION MAKING

The ORC plays a critical role in the decision-making process by determining the OPM ranking for incoming potential cases, but the ORC has no authority of its own to make decisions on whether or how cases will be taken on, resourced or rejected.

Decisions on how to respond to reports will be taken in accordance with arrangements established as a result of the Tasking and Co-ordination Review.

## **9.5 APOLOGIES**

If the Chair cannot attend a meeting Members shall appoint one of their number as Chair for that meeting with the appropriate decision-making delegation. If other Members are unable to attend a meeting an alternate representative from their command is to be nominated.

## **9.6 AUTHORITY**

ORC members have a responsibility to consider matters circulated out-of-session and communicate their position on the ranking components to the Chair, and Deputy Chair.

The outcome of out-of-session business will be noted in the subsequent meeting agenda and is subject to the Chair's agreement.

## **9.7 MEETING PAPERS**

Each ORC member will receive a copy of each report received by AFP in the previous seven days at least one day prior to the scheduled meeting.

Members of the ORC will properly consider all matters brought to the attention of the ORC, either at meetings or out-of-session.

Following the ORC meeting, the Secretary will ensure that the OPM ranking and the component assessments are recorded in a Teams database generated by the Digiflow form used to process incoming reports.

## **9.8 REVIEW**

The ORC will review the various OPM ranking tables and the operation of the OPM quarterly and make appropriate recommendations to the OPM Governance Board (or COPC).

Last updated 14/11/2023

Coordinator Tasking and Coordination





## Better Practice Guide on Processing Report/Requests within the AFP

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
UNDER THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

Date of initial endorsement:	26 May 2017
Date of last review:	16 November 2020
Endorsed by:	Commander National Operations Coordination
Owner:	Commander National Operations Coordination
Contact:	Superintendent NOSSC
Identifier:	CNOC025 (old identifier MAOCC005)
IPS status	Full

### Disclosure and classification

This document is classified **OFFICIAL** and is intended for internal AFP use. Disclosing any content must comply with Commonwealth law and the [AFP National Guideline on information management](#).

### Compliance

This instrument is part of the AFP's professional standards framework. The [AFP Commissioner's Order on professional standards \(CO2\)](#) outlines the conduct expected of AFP appointees. Inappropriate departures from the provisions of this instrument may constitute a breach of AFP professional standards and be dealt with under Part V of the [Australian Federal Police Act 1979](#) (Cth).

This document is a functional governance instrument as defined in the [AFP Commissioner's Order on governance \(CO1\)](#).

THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982

## Contents

Definitions .....	3
Acronyms .....	5
Introduction .....	6
Exclusions .....	6
Receipt by the AFP .....	6
Recording a Report or Request .....	7
Receipt of AFP appointee (not a NOSSC appointee) .....	7
Information that is classified above Protected .....	8
Sensitive Investigations .....	8
Categorisation .....	8
After-hours and exceptional circumstances .....	9
Role of a Regional and Canberra Capacity and Capability Committee .....	9
Reports and Requests received through the International Network .....	11
Further Advice .....	11
Guideline Commencement Date and Review Process .....	11
Legislation .....	11
Other sources .....	11
Annex A – Flow chart .....	12

## Definitions

<b>AFP</b>	Australian Federal Police
<b><u>AFP Act</u></b>	<i>Australian Federal Police Act 1979</i> (Cth)
<b>AFP appointee</b>	Deputy Commissioner, an AFP employee, special member, special protective service officer or other person engaged by the AFP to perform duties as an AFP employee or otherwise assisting the AFP as per s. 4 of the <i>AFP Act</i> .
<b>Allegation</b>	An assertion of criminal conduct.
<b>CCC</b>	Capacity and Capability Committee will consist of representatives from each Command's and Business Areas within a geographical location.

	<p>Regional CCC are located within the Command structure outside of Canberra and may include representatives from other Command areas located within their geographic area.</p> <p>CCC will consist of the following:</p> <p>CCC Canberra</p> <p>CCC Central</p> <p>CCC Eastern</p> <p>CCC Northern</p> <p>CCC Southern</p> <p>CCC Western</p>
<b>Command</b>	<p>ACT Policing</p> <p>Chief Learning Officer</p> <p>Chief of Staff</p> <p>Counter Terrorism and Special Investigations Command</p> <p>Crime Command</p> <p>Criminal Asset Confiscation</p> <p>Eastern Command</p> <p>International Command</p> <p>Northern Command</p> <p>Operational Science and Technology</p> <p>People and Culture Command</p> <p>Southern Command</p> <p>Specialist Protective Command</p> <p>Western and Central Command</p>
<b>Decision</b>	<p>The making of a decision by an individual or a committee</p>

<b>Investigation</b>	A process of seeking information relevant to an alleged, apparent or potential breach of the law, involving possible judicial proceedings
<b>Investigative Service</b>	A service that supports an (internal or external) investigation or requires the execution of police powers.
<b>NOSSC</b>	National Operations State Service Centre.  The NOSSC consists of:  NOSSC Canberra  NOSSC Central  NOSSC Eastern  NOSSC Northern  NOSSC Southern  NOSSC Watchfloor (24/7 capability)  NOSSC Western
<b>NOSSC Appointee</b>	An AFP appointee that is performing duty as a member of a NOSSC
<b>Report</b>	A notification to the AFP which makes an allegation that a crime has been, is being, or may be committed.
<b>Request</b>	For the purpose of this Better Practice Guide, means a request for Investigative Service only.

## Acronyms

<b>ACT</b>	Australian Capital Territory
<b>AFP</b>	Australian Federal Police
<b>BPG</b>	Better Practice Guide
<b>CCC</b>	Capacity and Capability Committee
<b>CCPM</b>	Case Categorisation and Prioritisation Model
<b>CNE</b>	Case Entry Note
<b>MOU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding
<b>PROMIS</b>	Police Real-time Online Management Information System.

## Introduction

This Better Practice Guide (BPG) provides guidance for Australian Federal Police (AFP) appointees to manage Reports and Requests received by the AFP. This BPG should be read in conjunction with the [National Guideline on Sensitive Investigations](#); and [PROMIS Standard Operating Procedures \(SOP's\) on Briefings](#) and National Operations and State Services Centre (NOSSC) Interim Procedure - Case Creation and finalisation.

The NOSSC is the AFP's primary gateway for receiving Reports and Requests. The NOSSC provides a centralised monitoring, initial response, coordination, and communications support service. The NOSSC is physically located within geographical Commands, with a 24/7 presence located on the NOSSC Watchfloor located within AFP Headquarters. The NOSSC delivers effect through its use of NOSSC appointees in NOSSC Commands.

## Exclusions

Whilst there are some exclusions, to receipt and handling of some Reports and Requests this has been undertaken due to the special requirements of the areas concerned. The intention will be, as information systems mature, to review these exclusions and apply consistent governance.

On that basis this BPG is not intended to address:

- processes used by ACT Policing in investigating crime and responding to requests
- the operations of the Australian Centre to Counter Child Exploitation
- the operations of the Joint Counter Terrorism Teams
- operations/projects initiated within Intelligence Operations
- the AFP's response to a disclosure under the *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2013* (Cth)
- requests made to the AFP under the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* (Cth)
- AFP Professional Standards conduct issues under the [Commissioner's Order on Professional Standards](#) (CO2) and the AFP National Guideline on complaint management.

This BPG also does not apply to existing AFP arrangements established under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or similar protocols (such as certain Taskforces) where they are inconsistent with this BPG.

It is expected that excluded areas will provide reports to the Capacity and Capability Committee (CCC), in their geographical location, advising of their capacity and capability requirements and relevant case loads.

## Receipt by the AFP

The NOSSC is the AFP's primary gateway for receiving Reports or Requests.

s 47E(d)

Persons seeking to make a Report or Request should, where possible be directed to the AFP web page to complete a Report a Crime or a Request for Investigation Service form. The information provided will then be assessed by the NOSSC. If an AFP appointee receives a Report or Request directly, and it is not one of the excluded areas, it must be briefed into the NOSSC as soon as practicable, unless exceptional circumstances exist. Where a member of the public or an agency cannot access the forms they should be directed to the NOSSC contact points in their relevant State/Territory.

When the NOSSC receives a Report or Request, the NOSSC will create a PROMIS case in accordance with NOSSC Interim Procedure - Case Creation and finalisation or existing [PROMIS Procedures](#).

Upon initial receipt of the report the NOSSC appointee may determine on immediate face value, the matter is one automatically transferred to another agency, or is a type of correspondence where it is apparent an investigation would not commence. In these cases the information will be stored in approved AFP systems by the NOSSC appointee with reasons as to why an individual PROMIS case was not commenced.

Upon receipt of a Report or Request the originator should be notified of the receipt of the Report or Request by the AFP by either letter or email. This should be noted within the PROMIS case.

## Recording a Report or Request

Upon receipt of a Report or Request, the NOSSC appointee is responsible for providing liaison with the relevant Command Capability and Capacity Committee (CCC). The NOSSC appointee will:

- create a PROMIS case ensuring all the relevant entities are created and all supplied documentation is uploaded
- set the Status as Investigations/Project/Request
- set the Reason as 'Unassigned'
- complete a case note entry CCC submission
- undertake a risk assessment if the matter is management significant and/or the matter should be marked as a [sensitive investigation](#) in accordance with the National Guideline on Sensitive Investigations.
- ensure the originator of the Report or Request has been advised of its receipt by the AFP.

## Receipt of AFP appointee (not a NOSSC appointee)

Where a receipt of a Report or Request is received by an AFP appointee outside of the NOSSC structure, and the Report or Request requires immediate action the AFP appointee receiving the Report or Request will be responsible for creation of a PROMIS case in accordance with the above instructions. The AFP appointee is only required to complete the CCC Submission template with as much information as they have to hand. The responsibility for submission of the case to the relevant CCC for endorsement or other action rests with the NOSSC area in that physical location.

The NOSSC supporting the relevant CCC must be notified of the case creation, at the earliest opportunity, to ensure all relevant information has been recorded and for submission to the relevant CCC for endorsement or other decision. This notification should be undertaken by way of a PROMIS tasking.

Information that is classified above Protected

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

Sensitive Investigations

s 22(1)(a)(ii)

Categorization

Reports or Requests are categorized as either Response or Routine.

Type	Definition
Response	Response matters are Reports or Requests where there is no initial requirement for CCC consideration and approval prior to actioning. These are matters where the AFP has a mandatory requirement to immediately action and the decision to respond is made by operational areas.
Routine	Reports and Requests not requiring urgent CCC consideration and endorsement. These Reports and Requests should be considered and a decision made to accept, reject or seek further information within the normal meeting cycles of a CCC.

For Response matters the AFP appointee creating the case will ensure that information is included in the CCC submission clearly identifying who approved the acceptance of the matter and reasons why.

In circumstances where a Response matter requires endorsement by a CCC and will impact across the resources of multiple business areas, the relevant NOSSC should be advised and consideration should occur for a CCC Submission CNE to be completed. The relevant NOSSC will then present this information to the next CCC or an 'out of sessions' CCC if required. Only the areas of the CNE relating to the endorsement of the matter need to be completed.


For Routine investigations the relevant NOSSC will be responsible for completing the CCC Submission CNE.



The NOSSC appointee is responsible for gathering information, relevant to the Report or Request, to enable basic risk factors to be considered by the CCC. This may include use of the current Case Categorisation and Prioritisation Model tool and Determinations, which include:

- whether a Report or Request should be actioned by the AFP
- if further action is required, to whom a Report or Request should be assigned
- whether a Report or Request is categorized as Response or Routine

Factors which may influence determinations regarding a Report or Request include:



Until the relevant CCC assign or endorse the case it will be marked as Case Status 'Investigations/Project/Request' and a Reason of 'Unassigned'.

Once a case is assigned to a case officer the reason should be changed to 'assigned'. The originator of the Report or Request must be advised of the status of the matter and information relating to the area and members assigned to the investigation.

### After-hours and exceptional circumstances

Where a Report or a Request requires an immediate response, it may be initiated by phone call or email. The NOSSC Watchfloor is available to receive Reports and Requests outside of business hours. In the event of contact outside of business hours, the NOSSC appointee will contact the responsible Command, or Business Area, through the relevant on-call arrangements. If the Report or Request is made orally, it must be followed up in writing as soon as is practicable.

If the matter does not require further action the case will be finalised by the NOSSC in accordance with NOSSC Interim Case Creation and Finalisation.

### Role of a Regional and Canberra Capacity and Capability Committee

A Regional or Canberra CCC has responsibility for decisions relating to Reports or Requests. This can include where a case is to be assigned to a responsible Business Area or to make a decision where a Business Area has

accepted a Report or Request. The Canberra CCC's structure will enable Command areas based in Canberra, that have operational teams, to follow the same procedures and processes used by Regional CCC's ensuring a consistent approach by the AFP.

A CCC will generally consist of:

- a Chair selected by the Command
- Commanders and/or Superintendents representing Business Areas;
- NOSSC Regional or Canberra Team Leader; and
- any business area required to provide information to the CCC.

The CCC can make decisions to:

- continue the investigation and allocate resources
- facilitate the Request and allocate resources
- reject the Report for continued investigation or the Request
- request additional information
- transfer the Report or Request to another Command for consideration
- refer the Report to another agency, by rejecting the report/request with a reason of 'referred to another agency'.

The determination, reasons and any supporting documentation must be recorded on the PROMIS case, subject to security classification. The Regional or Canberra NOSSC that is handling the Report or Request must maintain contact with the person or entity who made the Report or Request and provide notification of the outcome of the AFP's decision.

If the CCC determines that the AFP will take no further action in respect of a Report or Request, the PROMIS case must be either finalised, rejected or terminated, in accordance with PROMIS procedures and reporting person(s) is to be advised.

If the CCC determines the Report or Request will be assigned, the PROMIS case is to be assigned to the relevant Business Area team and member/s.

As required by section 9 of the [National Guideline on Sensitive Investigations](#), any Report or Request which is identified as a sensitive investigation must also consider whether the determination, including a determination to reject the Report or Request, requires escalation within the Command or escalation to the Sensitive Investigations Oversight Board (SIOB).

All Reports or Requests received by the AFP should, where possible, be determined by a CCC within twenty eight (28) days of receipt. Where this timeline is exceeded a CNE should be added noting the reason for the delay in making a determination.

## Reports and Requests received through the International Network

AFP appointees located within the International Network may receive Reports or Requests. When this occurs International Command must ensure that all information, supporting documentation and relevant entities are recorded within a PROMIS case, which should then be brought to the attention of the NOSSC.

When Reports or Requests are received by the International Network and allocated to a responsible Command, the relevant International Post must be informed of subsequent determinations. Post is responsible for notifying the originator of the Report or Request of such determinations.

## Further Advice

Queries about the content of this document should be referred to the Commander National Operations Coordination.

## Guideline Commencement Date and Review Process

This document will take effect from publication.

Due to the potential for the delivery of new Information Systems and use of other existing AFP information systems this guideline will be reviewed regularly until March 2021 and then on an annual basis.


## Legislation

- [Australian Federal Police Act 1979](#) (Cth).

## Other sources

- [AFP Investigations Doctrine](#)
- [PROMIS Procedures](#)

Annex A – Flow chart



THE DOCUMENT IS RELEASED BY  
 THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
 UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 1982