

come about with the introduction of the Office of Police Ombudsman. They also encourage me to develop stronger links with the Irish Government officials in the Anglo-Irish Secretariat than had hitherto been the case.

3. The organisation that I took over as Chair was characterised by a dearth of personnel and IT resources, low staff morale, inefficient administrative processes and ineffective performance in fulfilling its statutory mandate. While the staff, for the most part, were acutely aware of the complaints' system's numerous shortcomings, overwhelmingly the Members displayed complacency in respect of the organisation's systemic flaws, a disturbing level of collusiveness with investigating police officers in the exercise of their supervision and direction of complaints and general deference to the police that was little short of sycophancy. Many of the Members expressed misgivings about, or opposition to, the pending introduction of the Office of Police Ombudsman. Minutes of the Commission's monthly meetings, which were not open to the public, were dominated by accounts from my predecessor of his numerous networking meetings, locally, nationally and, particularly, internationally, "on behalf of the Commission". There was no recorded evidence of the probing discussion and constructive debate that one would expect from such a gathering. Likewise, the Annual Reports were a catalogue of, often self-congratulatory, descriptions of the complaints that had passed through the ICPC's hands in the previous twelve months. There was an almost total absence of serious critique of the complaints' system, or of the organisation's own performance.
4. The relevant Statutory Instruments provided little guidance on the role and function of the Commission's Chairman, but essentially the relationship