

PARLIAMENT OF VICTORIA

Public Accounts and Estimates Committee



**2017-18 and 2018-19
Financial and Performance Outcomes
General Questionnaire**

Court Services Victoria

Contents

Contents	i
Introduction – Financial and Performance Outcomes Questionnaire	1
Section A: Output variances and program outcomes	2
Section B: Asset investment	26
Section C: Revenue and appropriations	35
Section D: Expenses.....	41
Section E: Public sector workforce	50
Section F: Government decisions impacting on the finances	55
Section G: General.....	57

Introduction – Financial and Performance Outcomes Questionnaire

The Committee's inquiry into the 2017-18 and 2018-19 Financial and Performance Outcomes examines:

- the Government's actual expenditure and revenue compared to the budgeted expenditure and revenue
- the actual performance outcomes against the targeted performance outcomes at a departmental/agency level.

The inquiry aims to benefit the Parliament and the community by:

- promoting the accountability, transparency and integrity of the executive and the public sector
- encouraging the effective and efficient delivery of public services and assets.

This questionnaire seeks information on the departmental/agency financials for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 financial years, what was achieved during those years and how that compares to expectations.

Timeline and format

Responses to this questionnaire are due by **5.00pm on Thursday 12 December 2019**.

Please email the completed questionnaire (in word and pdf) to paec@parliament.vic.gov.au

Please also email a signed copy.

Consistency with the budget papers

Wherever referring to an initiative/program/project that is referred to in the budget papers, please use the same name as is used in the budget papers. This ensures that the Committee can correlate the information provided by the department with the information in the budget papers.

Basis of consolidation

For departments, please use the same basis of consolidation as was used in the budget papers and in the budget portfolio outcomes statement in the department's annual report.

Guidance

Please contact the secretariat should you require guidance in relation to any questions:

Jessica Strout, Lead Analyst (03) 8682 2870

Janithri Wickramaratne, Analyst (03) 8682 2996

Krystle Gatt Rapa, Research Assistant (03) 8682 2871

Section A: Output variances and program outcomes

Question 1 (all departments) Completed initiatives from past budgets

For all initiatives that were due to be completed in 2017-18 and 2018-19, please provide details of the outcomes expected to be achieved in the community and the outcomes actually achieved to date. Please use initiatives names as specified in *Budget Paper No.3: Service Delivery* and link the initiative to the responsible output(s) and portfolio(s).

2017-18 Response

Initiative	Actual date of completion (month and year)	Expected outcomes	Actual outcomes	Output(s) and portfolio(s)
Bendigo and Werribee Law Courts – Planning	January 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop plans for a new Bendigo Law Court and for the Werribee Law Court (as part of the Wyndham Justice Precinct development). Developing these two new court complexes will relieve current and future demand pressures, improve safety of court users and improve court services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed feasibility investigations, site options identification and preliminary design work were completed. Planning work informed business cases submitted in the 2018-19 Budget and \$20 million to acquire land for both the Werribee and Bendigo Law Courts was provided. 	Courts
Family Drug Treatment Court	June 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Family Drug Treatment Court (FDTC) jurisdiction is parents whose children are in care due to parental drug or alcohol issues. The Court's remit is to address the parents' substance misuse to support families to reunite on a sustainable basis. Funding was to lapse for trial of the FDTC operating at Broadmeadows in 2016-17. To allow for evaluation of the program a 12 month extension of funding was required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2018-19 Budget provided funding of \$3.9 million (which included \$2 million reprioritisation) to enable the continuation and evaluation of the program. Two independent evaluations have been undertaken of the FDTC operations at Broadmeadows – by Health Outcomes International in 2017 and by Swinburne University's Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science in 2018. 	Courts

Initiative	Actual date of completion (month and year)	Expected outcomes	Actual outcomes	Output(s) and portfolio(s)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation outcomes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 72 per cent of participants who maintain engagement with the program for greater than six months achieve reunification, compared with 43 per cent in the mainstream court. – FDTC outcomes are more sustainable with participants 2.2 times less likely than mainstream court users to have a substantiated report to child protection in the post-court period. 	
<p>Coroners Court Death Review Unit</p> <p><i>The 2017-18 Budget provided \$1.9 million over four years to allow the Court to expand the family violence team and strengthen the review of family violence-related deaths.</i></p>	<p>Re-established by December 2017 (funding provided to 2021)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-establish the Victorian Systemic Review of Family Violence Deaths (VSRFVD) within the Coroners Court Death Review Unit. • Undertake specialist investigative analysis into family violence related deaths, identifying individual and systemic determinants to inform future policy development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Coroners Act was amended to establish the Victorian Systemic Review of Family Violence Deaths (VSRFVD), commencing on 16 December 2017. • The Court included information relating to family or domestic violence intervention orders in its findings, recommendations and reports; and reported on the operation of the VSRFVD in its Annual Report. • The Court expanded its family violence team and strengthened the review of family violence-related deaths, in doing so: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Contributed to a national approach to family violence responses as an active contributor to the work of 	<p>Courts</p>

Initiative	Actual date of completion (month and year)	Expected outcomes	Actual outcomes	Output(s) and portfolio(s)
			the Australian Domestic and Family Violence Death Review Network; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1422 375 1883 630">– Established a MoU with Crimes Statistics Agency for the ongoing provision of information about family violence homicide incidents and demographic information about family violence homicide offenders and victims; and <li data-bbox="1422 638 1883 805">– Commenced work on a detailed report on family violence-related homicides that occurred between 2011 and 2015 due to be released in late 2019. 	

2018-19 Response

Initiative	Actual date of completion (month and year)	Expected outcomes	Actual outcomes	Output(s) and portfolio(s)
Court safety and security	October 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Court safety and security improvements for those who attend and work at Victorian Courts and Tribunals. • 16 priority court upgrades (including: separate waiting areas for victims and perpetrators; improvements to registry counters and secure screening; upgraded interview rooms; and entrance modifications). • Expand the 'court security officer model' to increase court security officer presence to 40 courts (which had no formal security support). • Deliver a security presence at all Victorian Court and Tribunal sittings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2016-17 Budget allocated \$58.1 million (\$34.1 million in new funding and \$26.7 million in funding previously allocated to the court security model). • Safety and security upgrades were delivered in 14 locations (with the 2018-19 Budget providing additional funding to upgrade a 15th location - Echuca). • The 'court security officer model' was expanded to 40 courts (complete October 2017) delivering a security presence at all Victorian Court and Tribunal sittings. 	Courts
Shepparton Law Courts	Main court building - March 2018 Specialist Family Violence Court – October 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelopment of the Shepparton Law Courts into a new multi-jurisdictional court complex to meet future demand and improve the safety of court users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2014-15 Budget allocated \$73 million for the redevelopment of the Shepparton Law Courts (including VCAT). • The 2017-18 Budget provided additional capital funding of \$2 million to support the development of Shepparton as a Specialist Family Violence Court (SFVC). • The design of the Courts implemented key recommendations from the Royal Commission into Family Violence (including safe waiting areas, enhanced 	Courts

Initiative	Actual date of completion (month and year)	Expected outcomes	Actual outcomes	Output(s) and portfolio(s)
			<p>entry screening, and the presence of Court Security Officers).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dedicated Koori Court and Elders Room and SFVC also formed part of the building (with access to SFV support services in the refurbished heritage 1930s court house). • The design of the Court also included a 'remote judge' facility to enable remote hearings in Shepparton. • The Shepparton Law Courts officially opened on 23 March 2018, with the first court hearing on 3 April 2018. • The SFVC was opened on 9 October 2019. 	
Sustainable Transport of Deceased Persons Service	June 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective operation of the removal and transport of deceased persons service throughout Victoria (2016-17 Budget). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Coroners Court entered into and managed cost-effective three-year contracts with private sector providers for the transport of deceased persons to Coronial mortuaries. These new arrangements realised significant savings in the cost of transporting deceased persons. • The 2019-20 Budget provided \$17.2 million over four years to assist with this continued service. 	Courts

Initiative	Actual date of completion (month and year)	Expected outcomes	Actual outcomes	Output(s) and portfolio(s)
Fast Track Remand Court	June 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support faster resolution of criminal proceedings involving young people on remand (2017-18 Budget) by continuing the Fast Track Remand Court (FTRC) in the Children's Court. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FTRC has reduced the length of time young people from Melbourne, Sunshine and Moorabbin spend on remand by 24 per cent (from 62 to 47 days). The FTRC has halved the percentage of young people spending more than three months on remand (from 42 to 24 per cent). The number of remanded young people has decreased by 12 per cent (from 49 in April 2017 to 43 in March 2019) within the FTRC catchment area. Over the same period, other courts that do not have FTRC, experienced a 107 per cent increase in young people on remand (from 27 in April 2017 to 56 in March 2019). The 2019-20 Budget provided \$3.8 million over four years to continue the FTRC. 	Courts
Implementation of Youth Justice Reform	June 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliver increased judicial monitoring and case management to implement Youth Control Orders and the Intensive Monitoring and Control Bail Supervision scheme at the Children's Court. Provide more intensive and targeted sentencing and bail programs for young offenders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2017-18 Budget Update provided \$24.02 million to the Children's Court over two years to implement several Youth Justice Reforms. The reforms strengthened Victoria's youth justice system to ensure greater monitoring, control and support for young offenders. Included in these reforms was the creation of a new 	Courts

Initiative	Actual date of completion (month and year)	Expected outcomes	Actual outcomes	Output(s) and portfolio(s)
			<p>Youth Control Order (YCOs) and Intensive Bail Orders (IBOs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YCOs and IBOs commenced operation on 1 June 2018. Three Magistrates were appointed, support staff were recruited, infrastructure was upgraded and state-wide multi-disciplinary training was conducted to support the implementation of these reforms. • The 2019-20 Budget provided \$3.4 million to expand the use of YCOs and IBOs in the Children’s Court. 	
Family Drug Treatment Court	June 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue the Family Drug Treatment Court (FDTC) at Broadmeadows to support a more effective response to drug and alcohol dependent parents, and support family reunification where children are placed in out-of-home care due to parental alcohol and drug dependency (2018-19 Budget). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FDTC was continued and ensured that the ongoing evaluation was completed and used to inform future investment and potential expansion. • Then 2019-20 Budget provided \$8 million over four years to continue the FDTC. 	Courts

Initiative	Actual date of completion (month and year)	Expected outcomes	Actual outcomes	Output(s) and portfolio(s)
Strategic Asset Planning for Courts	<i>The project was due for completion in December 2019. However, the scope was extended to bring forward market consultation and financing strategy, and more detailed consultation with internal and external stakeholders. Completion forecast for June 2020.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake strategic planning for future court infrastructure needs across metropolitan and regional Victoria (2018-19 Budget). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The major deliverables of this project were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBD Legal Precinct Redevelopment Plan Greater Metropolitan Melbourne Plan Regional Plan Multi-year Investment Strategy The project is well underway and is due for completion in June 2020. 	Courts
Werribee and Bendigo Law Courts redevelopment	<p>Expected date of purchase of land near Werribee: April/May 2020</p> <p>Expected date of purchase of land in Bendigo: May/June 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acquire land for the redevelopment of Werribee and Bendigo law courts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSV expects to acquire land for the Bendigo Law Courts by May/June 2020. The 2019-20 budget provided \$166.2 million to proceed with the redevelopment of the Bendigo Law Courts on the site of the current Bendigo TAFE Campus. The land acquisition process for the site of the Wyndham Court is ongoing and expected to be completed by April/May 2020. CSV re-phased \$8 million and carried forward \$12 million of the land purchase resources from 2018/19 to 2019/20, with the full \$20 million available to purchase the land in 2019/20. 	Courts

Question 2 (all departments) Program outcomes

Outcomes reflect the impact on the community of the goods and services provided by a department. The questions in this section all relate to the outcomes that the department contributed to in 2017-18 and 2018-19.

- a) Using the format of the table below, please outline the five programs that delivered the most important outcomes in the community¹ achieved by the department in 2017-18 and 2018-19 including:
- i. The name of the program
 - ii. The relevant output(s) and portfolio(s) responsible for delivery of the program
 - iii. The planned outcome as stated in the budget papers
 - iv. The actual outcome achieved
 - v. The actions taken to deliver the actual outcome (i.e. the most important elements/essential parts that led the Department to deliver the outcome).

2017-18 Response

Program	Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome	Description of actual outcome achieved	Description of the actions taken to deliver the actual outcome
1. Shepparton Law Courts	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redevelopment of the Shepparton Law Courts into a new multi-jurisdictional court complex to meet future demand and improve the safety of court users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The multi-jurisdictional Shepparton Law Courts commenced operating in the new \$73 million building on 3 April 2018. It was the first major asset project completed by CSV. The five-level building features six main courtrooms specifically designed to enable the Supreme, County, Magistrates', Children's and Coroner's Courts, and VCAT to hold sittings locally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning, procurement, project management and stakeholder engagement to deliver a major capital asset in regional Victoria.

¹ 'Outcomes' are the impact of service delivery on the community rather than a description of the services delivered. The Committee considers that an outcome could be considered important for a variety of reasons, such as the amount of funding allocated to the program, the public interest in the service or goods being delivered or where particular actions taken by the Department delivered improved outcomes.

Program		Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome	Description of actual outcome achieved	Description of the actions taken to deliver the actual outcome
2.	Court Safety and Security	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Court safety and security improvements for those who attend and work at Victorian Courts and Tribunals. • 16 priority court upgrades (including: separate waiting areas for victims and perpetrators; improvements to registry counters and secure screening; upgraded interview rooms; and entrance modifications). • Expand the 'court security officer model' to increase court security officer presence to 40 courts (which currently have no formal security support). • Deliver a security presence at all Victorian Court and Tribunal sittings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2016-17 Budget allocated \$58.1 million (\$34.1 million in new funding and \$26.7 million in funding previously allocated to the court security model). • Safety and security upgrades where delivered in 14 locations (with the 2018-19 Budget providing additional funding to upgrade a 15th location - Echuca). • The 'court security officer model' was expanded to 40 courts (complete October 2017) delivering a security presence at all Victorian Court and Tribunal sittings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning, procurement, project management and stakeholder engagement to deliver capital assets. Recruitment of security staff.
3.	Drug Court - Melbourne	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide at Melbourne Drug Court a multidisciplinary approach to alcohol and other drug, mental health and homelessness offending behaviour as an alternative to prison. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melbourne Drug Court has imposed 274 Drug Treatment Orders for offenders who would otherwise be in prison. • To date, 44 participants have completed or graduated from their Drug Treatment Orders (a two-year commitment). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The expansion of Drug Court from Dandenong to Melbourne was achieved in 2016-17 and increased to two Courts in August 2017, marking Victoria as the largest Drug Court program in Australia.

Program		Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome	Description of actual outcome achieved	Description of the actions taken to deliver the actual outcome
4.	Improving state-wide transport of deceased persons	Investigating reportable deaths (service delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operate the removal and transport of deceased persons service effectively throughout Victoria. By having an effective transport service - allow the Coroners Court to focus on investigating the causes of sudden and unexpected deaths and provide closure to families of the deceased. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2017–18 period saw continuing improvements in service delivery for the transport of deceased persons to the Coronial Services Centre in Southbank for identification and medical examination. In addition to service improvements, the new contracts saw the average price per transfer in metropolitan areas decrease from \$475 to \$418 – a reduction of 12 per cent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These service improvements stem from the establishment of new contractual arrangements in late 2016, which include clearly defined service standards and allow for greater oversight of contractor performance.
5.	Access to Justice	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve the accessibility of educational and online materials. Enhance judicial mediation program at the SCV. Provide an online dispute resolution as a fast and affordable way for people to resolve disputes at VCAT. Move all VCAT phone services to a single phone number and unify customer service teams. Provide an online platform for hospitals and social workers to make guardianship applications at VCAT. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research and improvements to the accessibility of educational and online materials delivered. Increased number of judicial mediations at SCV saving 1758 sitting days. Commenced the development of an online dispute resolution pilot at VCAT for people with small civil claims. Replaced in excess of 20 phone numbers with a single phone number and united five separate teams into one group to deliver more consistent and professional services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market research and development of new websites. Delivered new accommodation and managed induction and recruitment of staff. Developed and implemented dispute resolution pilot. Online platform was delivered to six hospital sites where VCAT conducts hearings, ahead of expanding the service in 2019-20.

Program	Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome	Description of actual outcome achieved	Description of the actions taken to deliver the actual outcome
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve access to justice for Victorians with small civil claims by implementing a 'Fast track' mediation and hearing partnership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designed a simple, usable and accessible interface to allow hospital and social workers to lodge and manage guardianship applications. The Fast Track Mediation and Hearing program was established in late 2017 	

2018-19 Response

	Program	Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome	Description of actual outcome achieved	Description of the actions taken to deliver the actual outcome
1.	Specialist family violence integrated court response	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specialist Family Violence Courts implemented at Ballarat, Frankston, Shepparton, Moorabbin and Heidelberg Magistrates' Courts, improving access to legal protection and responses necessary for the safety and recovery of victim survivors. • Courts redesigned and upgraded, enhancing safety and accessibility for victim survivors. • Improvements to ensure that family violence court processes are accessible for all Victorians seeking support. • Additional support workers located at the Melbourne Children's Court, and the Koori Family Violence and Victims Support Program reinstated to ensure culturally appropriate services are available for Aboriginal victim survivors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During 2018-19, CSV completed design work for all locations, and construction commenced at Shepparton, Ballarat, Moorabbin and Heidelberg Specialist Family Violence Courts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning, procurement and project implementation of asset works.

	Program	Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome	Description of actual outcome achieved	Description of the actions taken to deliver the actual outcome
2.	Bail and Remand Court	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since its inception on 1 July 2018, the Bail and Remand Court (BaRC), based out of Melbourne Magistrates' Court, has approximately 920 accused persons appearing per month and approximately 11,000 have appeared in total. • BaRC matters dealt with in a timely manner. • Accused persons introduced to support services to assist with a variety of issues including substance use, homelessness, mental health, family violence and anger management. • Family violence matters expedited and heard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For 2018-19, BaRC statistics include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Of the 11,008 who have appeared in BaRC, 1,933 (18%) accused persons had their matters finalised and 1,545 (14%) had bail granted. – Just under 50% of the accused persons before the BaRC had their matters dealt with outside normal business hours. – Approximately 3,500 accused persons were released from custody on bail or had their matters finalised within a few days of being arrested and incarcerated. – Approximately 700 accused persons were introduced to support services to assist with a variety of issues including substance use, homelessness, mental health, family violence and anger management. – Approximately 2,300 of family violence matters were expedited and heard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BaRC heard after hours applications from across the metropolitan area, with police bringing accused into Melbourne for the hearings. The enhanced service operates from the Melbourne Magistrate's Court between 9am and 10pm seven days a week. • BaRC expanded night court operations to include stakeholders such as Victoria Police prosecutors, Victorian Legal Aid, Protective Services Officers, Community Correctional Services and Court Integrated Services Program.

	Program	Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome	Description of actual outcome achieved	Description of the actions taken to deliver the actual outcome
3.	Aboriginal Justice Agreement 4	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide access to culturally appropriate service responses for Aboriginal people to improve justice outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2017-18 State Budget included an announcement for the largest single investment made in Victorian courts and tribunals towards the Aboriginal Justice Agreement with a total investment of just over \$12 million (plus capital investment) over four years. • The Budget's major investments (\$6.7 million) allowed for the expansion of the Koori Courts across three jurisdictions (County, Magistrates' and Children's courts). Locations for the Koori Court expansion were endorsed by the Aboriginal Justice Caucus in February 2019. Expansion was completed in Shepparton and Warrnambool County Courts and Dandenong and Heidelberg Magistrates' Courts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement with Aboriginal stakeholders. • Planning, procurement, recruitment and project management for expansion of Koori Court.

	Program	Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome	Description of actual outcome achieved	Description of the actions taken to deliver the actual outcome
4.	<p>Court Integrated Services Program (CISP)</p> <p>CISP Remand Outreach Program (CROP)</p>	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address the underlying factors that contribute to offending behaviour and reduce the likelihood of re-offending at 8 CISP locations. • CROP is a collaborative program between Corrections Victoria and the Magistrates' Court of Victoria. CROP is to support accused persons who are on remand and wish to apply for bail. • Make CROP available at all prisons where remand prisoners are held. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased CISP capacity in 8 court locations: Ballarat, Broadmeadows, Heidelberg, Latrobe Valley (Morwell), Melbourne, Bendigo, Moorabbin, Ringwood. • CROP is available at all prisons where remand prisoners are held: Metropolitan Assessment Prison, Metropolitan Remand Centre, Port Phillip Prison, the Dame Phyllis Frost Centre, Marngoneet Correctional Centre, Ravenhall Correctional Centre. • A CROP outreach service provided to HM Barwon Prison, Hopkins and Fulham Correctional Centres available via audio visual link. • Broker services established for clients to access treatment and community support services (i.e. drug and alcohol treatment, crisis accommodation, disability services and mental health services). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased CISP capacity in 8 court locations. • CROP workers conducted assessments, developed case plans, undertook brief client interventions for individuals that are ineligible for CISP case management (in custody and for one-month post release) and set up immediate community-based supports (existing support or new referrals). • Broker services established.

	Program	Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome	Description of actual outcome achieved	Description of the actions taken to deliver the actual outcome
5.	Supreme Court of Victoria – IT Upgrade	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade in-court Audio Visual technology at the Supreme Court to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – reduce unnecessary interruptions and/or delays in proceedings – remove the constraint of limited concurrent conference calls – improve access to justice with increased access/visibility of court proceedings – reduce the need for movement of prisoners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design finalised. • RFT evaluated and awarded. • Proof of concept courtroom completed (April 2019). • Feedback from court users received on proof of concept courtroom and design revised. • CODEC farm and network built. • 2 further courtrooms upgraded in May and June 2019. • Project in implementation and on track for completion by June 2021. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AV design developed. • RFI and RFT processes undertaken. • Upgraded in-court technology installed, including: cabling and infrastructure; sound reinforcement; audio and video recording and conferencing; HD screens; outward transmission of courtroom proceedings to transcription providers; and capture of courtroom content for live streaming and/or on-demand web casting.

- b) Using the format of the table below, please outline the five least performing programs that did not deliver their planned outcomes in the community by the department in 2017-18 and 2018-19 including:
- i. The name of the program
 - ii. The relevant output(s) and portfolio(s) responsible for delivery of the program
 - iii. The planned outcome as stated in the budget papers
 - iv. The actual outcome achieved
 - v. Explanation for not achieving the planned outcome (including a description of what actions were taken to try and achieve the planned outcome)

2017-18 Response

Program	Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome to be achieved	Description of actual outcome achieved	Explanation for not delivering the planned outcome
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				

2018-19 Response

Program		Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome to be achieved	Description of actual outcome achieved	Explanation for not delivering the planned outcome
1.	Specialist Courts and Programs	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit specialist staff to delivery integrated and outreach programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partially been able to recruit the number of specialist staff required to deliver the programs within Courts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCV has experienced challenges in attracting specialist staff in high demand markets i.e. to support the ambitious therapeutic jurisprudence agenda in competition with the rollout of NDIS and expanding programs for Corrections and Health.
2.	Expansion of the Drug Court of Victoria	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drug Court at Melbourne provides a multidisciplinary team approach to alcohol and other drug, mental health and homelessness as the key underpinnings of offending behaviour with this cohort as an alternative to prison. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melbourne Drug Court has 106 participants which is below its capacity of 170 due to the requirement of participants being in the CBD catchment area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To assist in increasing Melbourne Drug Court numbers consideration is being given to including participants who live in an area accessible to CBD Melbourne being assessed and referred to the Melbourne Drug Court.
3.	Victims of Crime Assistance	Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2018-19, Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal (VOCAT) received 8,067 applications (a 41% increase from 2013-14 to 2018-19). Over recent years, VOCAT data indicates an increase in workload and pending VOCAT cases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact of the 8,176 pending cases as at 30 June 2019: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 39% of applications have been pending over 9 months and 28% of applications have been pending over 12 months. Notwithstanding the introduction of a significant number of efficiency measures, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VOCAT requires additional staff and judicial resources to finalise backlog applications and to continue to meet the increasing demand for this service. VOCAT has introduced a number of system efficiencies and improvements by streamlining business processes to improve

Program	Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Planned outcome to be achieved	Description of actual outcome achieved	Explanation for not delivering the planned outcome
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planned outcome is to progress work on all VOCAT files in a timely manner. 	<p>backlog is expected to continue to increase both in pending cases and time to finalise as operational funding has not kept pace with the number of VoCAT Applications lodged.</p>	<p>responsiveness and deliver benefits to victims of crime.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risks arise where VoCAT staff do not have capacity to progress work on all files in a timely manner.
4.	Case clearance (Coroners Court)	Service delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalisation of at least the same amount of investigations as new matters coming in to the Coroners Court (i.e. 100% clearance rate). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 89% clearance rate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6010 matters finalised against 6757 matters initiated in 2018–19. The Court recorded a lower case closure rate in 2018-19, as for a portion of the reporting period the Court was operating with one less coroner than in the previous years. During the reporting period the Court also recruited new staff. Training of new staff requires time and resources which temporarily impacted on the Court’s output. The benefit of this investment in staff is evident in the second half of the financial year, with the closure rate increasing from 82.7 per cent for the period 1 July to 31 December 2018 to 95.3 per cent for the period 1 January to 30 June 2019.

Question 3 (all departments) Treasurer's advances and other budget supplementation

Please identify all output(s) and portfolio(s) (and relate them to departmental programs) for which the department received additional funding after the initial Budget in 2017-18 and 2018-19.

For each output, please quantify the additional funding, indicate the source of the additional funding (e.g. Treasurer's Advance, unused prior years appropriations under s32 of the *Financial Management Act 1994* (Vic), supplementation through a Temporary Advance under section 35 of the FMA, or any possible sources of funding as listed in the Resource Management Framework, section 4, pg. 55) and explain why additional funding was required after funding was allocated in the Budget.

2017-18 Response

Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Program	Funding allocated in 2017-18 Budget	Additional funding (\$ million)	Source of additional funding as per the Resource Management Framework	Reasons why additional funding was required
Courts	Access to Justice (Budget 2017-18)	0	1.9	Budget Update	Budget funding released after government endorsement of a departmental response to the Access to Justice review.
Courts	Implementation of Youth Justice Reform (Budget 2017-18)	0	5.1	Budget Update	Budget funding released after approval by the Attorney-General and Treasurer of an implementation plan for Youth Control Orders and the Intensive Monitoring and Control Bail Supervision Scheme.
Courts	Various	0	5.8	Treasurer's Advance	\$2.0m for Bourke St Incident Response; \$1.9m for CISP Expansion (Community Safety); \$1.9m for in-court technology upgrades, website upgrades, Family Law Project Modelling and Guide for Victims in Criminal trial; Additional Judicial Resources for the Court of Appeal staff related costs \$0.03m.
Courts	Court Integrated Services Program (CISP) and CISP Remand Outreach Pilot	2.6	1.1	s28 FMA	Funding brought forward from future years to match expected cash flows for staging of initiative implementation.

Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Program	Funding allocated in 2017-18 Budget	Additional funding (\$ million)	Source of additional funding as per the Resource Management Framework	Reasons why additional funding was required
Courts	Various	n/a	9.7	s31A FMA	Capital to Output \$12.2m to fund depreciation equivalent revenue requirements following periodic statutory revaluation of assets by Valuer-General Victoria; Output to Capital \$2.5m for various minor works and vehicle lease principal payments.
Courts	Various	n/a	-12.1	s32 FMA	Carry over request from 2017-18 into 2018-19: Specialist Family Violence Integrated Courts Response (Budget 2017-18) -\$4.6m; Bendigo and Werribee Law Courts - Planning (Budget 2017-18) -\$3.4m; Courts case management system (Budget 2017-18) -\$0.6m; various other minor -\$3.5m.
Courts	Various	n/a	6.1	s32 FMA	Carry over approved from 2016-17 into 2017-18: Court safety and security (Budget 2016-17) \$2.4m; Expansion of the Drug Court of Victoria (Budget 2016-17) \$0.5m; various other minor \$2.9m.
Courts	Various	n/a	-10.9	s34 FMA	Court safety and security (Budget 2016-17) - \$2.9m; Implementation of Youth Justice Reform (Budget 2017-18) -\$3.6m; Specialist Family Violence Integrated Courts Response (Budget 2017-18) -\$2.6m; Supreme Court of Victoria - IT upgrade (Budget 2017-18) -\$0.1m; Courts case management system (Budget 2017-18) -\$1.8m
Total 2017-18			6.8		

2018-19 Response

Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Program	Funding allocated in 2018-19 Budget	Additional funding (\$ million)	Source of additional funding as per the Resource Management Framework	Reasons why additional funding was required
Courts	Aboriginal Justice Agreement Phase Four	0	2.4	Pre-election Budget Update	Whole of Victorian Government initiative concluded after 2018-19 Budget published. (note: received as Treasurer's Advance but not included in Treasurer's Advance section below). \$0.8m actual expenditure
Courts	Judicial Commission of Victoria	1.3	0.4	Pre-election Budget Update	Funding to support investigation panels (note: received as Treasurer's Advance but not included in Treasurer's Advance section below).
Courts	Various	0	2.7	Treasurer's Advance	Bourke Street Incident Response \$1.5m; Fixed price escalation for the County Court PPP \$0.8m; Supreme Court Master Plan \$0.2m; Extending the intermediary scheme to support victims in court \$0.2m.
Courts	Various	n/a	-2.8	s31A FMA	Output to Capital: Specialist Family Violence Integrated Courts Response (Budget 2017-18) - \$4.4m; Supreme Court of Victoria – IT upgrade (Budget 2017-18) -\$0.2m; Additional Court Capacity (Budget 2018-19) -\$1.3m. Capital to Output: \$1m transfer CSV capital contingency to output contingency; Specialist Family Violence Integrated Courts Response (Budget 2017-18) \$2.0m.
Courts	Various	n/a	-10.9	s32 FMA	Carry over request from 2018-19 into 2019-20: Specialist Family Violence Integrated Courts Response (Budget 2017-18) -\$4.3m; Courts case management system (Budget 2017-18) - \$3.9m; Strategic Planning for Multi-Jurisdictional Courts (Budget 2018-19) -\$1.5m; Additional Court Capacity (Budget 2018-19) \$-

Output(s) and portfolio(s)	Program	Funding allocated in 2018-19 Budget	Additional funding (\$ million)	Source of additional funding as per the Resource Management Framework	Reasons why additional funding was required
					0.226m; Renewing County Court PPP (Budget 2018-19) -\$0.1m; other various -\$0.9m.
Courts	Various	n/a	11.2	s32 FMA	Carry over approved from 2017-18 into 2018-19: Specialist Family Violence Integrated Courts Response (Budget 2017-18) \$4.6m; Bendigo and Werribee Law Courts - Planning (ERSC 2017-18) \$3.4m; A New Case Management System for the Magistrates' and Children's Courts (WoVG ERSC 2017-18) \$0.6m; various other minor \$2.6m.
	Total 2018-19		3.0		

Section B: Asset investment

Question 4 (all departments) Capital expenditure variances, completion date and scope changes – existing projects

Please provide details of all capital asset programs where:

- there was a variance between TEI at announcement compared to the revised TEI in the 2017-18 Budget and 2018-19 Budget of equal to or greater than $\pm 5\%$ or \$50 million and an explanation for the variance
- the estimated completion date at announcement is different to the completion date in the 2017-18 Budget and 2018-19 Budget and an explanation for the change
- the scope of the project at announcement is different to the scope of the project as it is presented in the 2017-18 Budget and 2018-19 Budget.

2017-18 Response

Capital expenditure

Project	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency responsible for the project	Total actual expenditure spent from announcement to 30 June 2018 (\$ million)	TEI at announcement (\$ million)	Revised TEI 2017-18 Budget (\$ million)	Variance between TEI at announcement compared to Revised TEI in 2018-19 Budget ($\pm 5\%$ or \$50 million) explanation
Court safety and security	Courts	4.405	7.275	6.275	TEI has reduced by \$1m to reflect a transfer funding to the Echuca Court safety and security initiative.

Completion date

Project	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency responsible for the project	Estimated completion date at announcement	Revised completion date 2017-18 Budget	Explanation
Court safety and security	Courts	QTR 4, 2017-18	QTR 4, 2018-19	The project completion date was revised in line with an updated project schedule.
Supreme Court of Victoria – IT upgrade	Courts	QTR 4, 2018-19	QTR 4, 2019-20	The project completion date was revised to reflect the implementation of court technology to ensure minimal disruption to court room availability and the delivery of services.
Shepparton Law Courts	Courts	QTR 1, 2018-19	QTR 2, 2018-19	Project timelines was extended due to comprehensive tender process which took longer than anticipated.
Court Integrated Service Program (CISP) and CISP Remand Outreach Pilot	Courts	QTR 4, 2017-18	QTR 4, 2018-19	Estimated completion date revised due to changes in project scope related to relocation.

Scope

Project	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency responsible for the project	Scope at announcement	Details of scope change(s) and date(s) scope changes occurred
Court Integrated Service Program (CISP) and CISP Remand Outreach Pilot	Courts	Funding was to expand and extend CISP and CISP Remand Outreach pilot program to provide specialist court support services operated by the Magistrates' Court of Victoria (MCV).	In 2018-19, a range of functions delivered by MCV was permanently relocated to 350 Queen Street, Melbourne, including the CISP program. This relocation was not included in the original scope of works.

2018-19 Response*Capital expenditure*

Project	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency responsible for the project	Total actual expenditure spent from announcement to 30 June 2019 (\$ million)	TEI at announcement (\$ million)	Revised TEI 2018-19 Budget (\$ million)	Variance between TEI at announcement compared to Revised TEI in 2019-20 Budget (±5% or \$50 million) explanation
Court Integrated Service Program (CISP) and CISP Remand Outreach Pilot	Courts	2.322	1.262	2.466	TEI includes transfer of funding from operating to capital for the Drug Court fit out at 350 Queen Street, Melbourne.
Specialist Family Violence Integrated Court Response	Courts	5.957	39.600	37.558	TEI has been reduced due to a funding transfer from capital to operating.
Supreme Court of Victoria – IT upgrade	Courts	3.146	9.562	10.501	TEI includes funding transfer from operating to capital for the procurement of digital software.

Completion date

Project	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency responsible for the project	Estimated completion date at announcement	Revised completion date 2018-19 Budget	Explanation
Bendigo and Werribee Law Courts Redevelopment	Courts	Qtr 4 2018-19	Qtr 4 2019-20	The project completion date has been revised due to delays associated with the land acquisition process.
Court safety and security	Courts	Qtr 4 2018-19	Qtr 4 2019-20	The project completion date has been extended to allow for post construction works.
Implementation of Youth Justice Reform	Courts	Qtr 4 2018-19	Qtr 4 2020-21	The estimated completion date has been extended following a detailed planning process.

Project	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency responsible for the project	Estimated completion date at announcement	Revised completion date 2018-19 Budget	Explanation
Shepparton Law Courts	Courts	Qtr 2 2018-19	Qtr 4 2018-19	The completion date was extended following the discovery of asbestos during construction.
Specialist Family Violence Integrated Court Response	Courts	Qtr 4 2019-20	Qtr 4 2020-21	The estimated completion date has been extended to align with the updated project plan.
Supreme Court of Victoria – IT upgrade	Courts	Qtr 4 2019-20	Qtr 4 2020-21	The estimated completion date has been extended due to logistical timing issues in accessing courtrooms.

Scope

Project	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency responsible for the project	Scope at announcement	Details of scope change(s) and date(s) scope changes occurred
Supreme Court of Victoria – IT upgrade	Courts	The initiative was to implement a number of IT fit outs and upgrades across a number of Supreme Court locations.	Due to the nature of the works to be completed on heritage sites, scope of works was revised in order to meet the requirements which were unforeseen during the initial planning stages.

Question 5 (all departments) Details of actual capital expenditure – completed projects (or expected to be completed)

Please provide the following details about asset investment projects that were completed in 2017-18 and 2018-19:

- a) Project name and Department(s), Output(s) and Portfolio(s) and/or Agency/Agencies responsible for delivery of the project
- b) Total Estimated Investment (TEI) at announcement
- c) Actual cost of project
- d) Estimated completion date at announcement
- e) Actual completion date
- f) Explanations for any variance in capital expenditure and/or completion date.

2017-18 Response

Project	Responsible Department(s), Output(s) and Portfolio(s) and/or Agency/Agencies	TEI at announcement (\$ million)	Actual cost of project (\$ million)	Estimated completion date at announcement	Actual completed date	Variance explanation (\$ value variance and/or time variance)
Court Integrated Service Program (CISP) and CISP Remand Outreach Pilot	CSV	1.262	1.218	Qtr 4 2017-18	Qtr 4 2019-20	In 2018-19, a range of functions delivered by MCV was permanently relocated to 350 Queen Street, including the CISP program. This relocation was not included in the original scope of works. In addition to this, a ticketing machine is expected to be installed at the Drug Court in 2019-20.
Court safety and security	CSV	7.275	4.405	Qtr 4 2017-18	Qtr 4 2019-20	Funding from prior year depreciation equivalent funding was applied to complete the upgrades in 2018-19.

2018-19 Response

Project	Responsible Department(s), Output(s) and Portfolio(s) and/or Agency/Agencies	TEI at announcement (\$ million)	Actual cost of project (\$ million)	Estimated completion date at announcement	Actual completed date	Variance explanation (\$ value variance and/or time variance)
Bendigo and Werribee Law Courts Redevelopment	Courts	20.000	0.000	Qtr 4 2018-19	Qtr 4 2019-20	The project completion date was revised due to delays associated with the land acquisition process, however is expected to be completed in 2019-20.
Access to Justice	Courts	5.277	5.294	Qtr 4 2018-19	Qtr 4 2018-19	Project was delivered in 2018-19 with minor variation.
Court Integrated Service Program (CISP) and CISP Remand Outreach Pilot	Courts	1.262	2.322	Qtr 4 2018-19	Qtr 4 2019-20	TEI has been increased from a transfer of operating funding to capital for the Drug Court fit out at 350 Queen Street, Melbourne, which will accommodate the delivery of the specialist court program.
Court Safety and Security	Courts	6.275	6.713	Qtr 4 2017-18	Qtr 4 2019-20	The project completion date has been extended to allow for post construction works. TEI was reduced by \$1m to reflect funding transfer to the Echuca Court safety and security initiative.
Implementation of Youth Justice Reform	Courts	13.670	3.274	Qtr 4 2018-19	Qtr 4 2020-21	As per 2019-20 BP4, project completion date extended in line with detailed planning process.
Shepparton Law Courts	Courts	68.090	67.065	Qtr 2 2018-19	Qtr 1 2019-20	Has reached practical completion with approved carry-over in 2019-20 remaining to be spent on 1930s building.

Question 6 (all departments) High-value high-risk projects, gateway reviews and business cases

Under the High Value High Risk (HVHR) Framework, a project will be classified as HVHR if it is a budget funded project that has a Total Estimated Investment (TEI) of over \$250 million. HVHR projects are subject to compulsory Gateway reviews, where Gates 1 through 6 are compulsory for all eligible projects: Gate 2 outlines the development of a business case.

Please list all projects included in the 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget papers that were allocated to the department and were classified as HVHR. Please also specify which gateway reviews, if any, were completed during 2017-18 and 2018-19 and business case details for each project. Please use project names as specified in *Budget Paper No.4: State Capital Program*.

2017-18 Response

HVHR Project	Gateway review name/ Date completed	Date business case completed	Business case – publicly available? Y/N	Business case link (URL)
A new case management system for the Magistrates’ and Children’s Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gate 1 & 2 (Business case): 5-8 December 2016 • Gate 3 (Readiness for Market): 3 – 6 September 2018 • Gate 4 (Tender decision): 10 - 15 May 2019 	January 2018	N	N/A

2018-19 Response

HVHR Project	Gateway review name/ Date completed	Date business case completed	Business case – publicly available? Y/N	Business case link (URL)
N/A				

Question 7 (all departments) Public Private Partnership (PPP) expenditure – existing and completed

Please provide the following information related to the department’s PPP projects:

- a) The total estimated PPP investment value, the total actual expenditure from announcement to 30 June 2018 and 2019, or the actual cost spent to 30 June 2018 and 2019 (actual cost spent in the respective financial year) and the benefits of using the PPP financing model when delivering/funding a project over other financing methods.
- b) Where the estimated completion date at announcement is different to the completion date in the 2017-18 Budget and 2018-19 Budget and an explanation for any variance.
- c) Where the scope of the PPP at announcement is different to the scope of the project as it is presented in the 2017-18 Budget and 2018-19 Budget.

2017-18 Response

Investment value and benefit of using PPP model

Project name	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency	Total estimated PPP investment value (\$ million)	Total actual expenditure from announcement to 30 June 2018 (\$ million)	Actual expenditure in year ending 30 June 2018 (\$ million) **	Benefits of using PPP model versus other delivery/funding models
Melbourne County Court	Courts	343.1	* Refer notes to table	46.3	Government does not bear risks associated with construction of asset.

Completion date

Project name	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency	Estimated completion date	Revised estimated completion date	Variance explanation
Melbourne County Court	Courts	31-May-22	n/a	n/a

Scope

Project name	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency	Original scope	Revised scope	Explanation for scope changes
Melbourne County Court	Courts	Provision of accommodation for life of contract (20 years).	No change	n/a

2018-19 Response*Investment value and benefit of using PPP model*

Project name	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency	Total estimated PPP investment value (\$ million)	Total actual expenditure from announcement to 30 June 2019 (\$ million)	Actual expenditure in year ending 30 June 2019 (\$ million)	Benefits of using PPP model versus other delivery/funding models
Melbourne County Court	Courts	343.1	* Refer notes to table	46.4	Government does not bear risks associated with construction of asset.

Completion date

Project name	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency	Estimated completion date	Revised estimated completion date	Variance explanation
Melbourne County Court	Courts	31-May-22	n/a	n/a

Scope

Project name	Output(s) and portfolio(s) and/or agency	Original scope	Revised scope	Explanation for scope changes
Melbourne County Court	Courts	Provision of accommodation for life of contract (20 years).	No change	n/a

* County Court PPP commenced operation in late 2002. Details of full operational expenditure since commencement are not readily available, in part due to a change in government in late 2014.

** Actual expenditure includes all output and capital outgoings associated with the PPP including land tax and depreciation expense. Capital asset charges (CAC) are excluded as it is a non-cash expense.

Section C: Revenue and appropriations

Question 8 (all departments and entities) Revenue – variances from previous year

Please explain any changes equal to or greater than $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million between the actual result for 2017-18 and 2018-19 and the actual result for 2017-18 and 2018-19 for each revenue category detailed in your operating statement. Please also indicate what any additional revenue was used for or how any reduced amounts of revenue affected service delivery and then link it to the relevant output and portfolio.

Please also detail the outcomes in the community² achieved by any additional expenses or the impact on the community of reduced expenses (if there was no impact, please explain how that was achieved).

For departments, please provide data consolidated on the same basis as the budget portfolios outcomes statement in your annual reports.

If there were no revenue/income categories for the department/agency for which the 2017-18 and 2018-19 expenditure changed from the prior year's expenditure by more than $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million, you do not need to answer this question. If this is the case, please indicate 'no relevant line items' in the table(s) below.

2017-18 Response

Revenue category	2016-17 actual (\$ million)	2017-18 actual (\$ million)	Explanations for changes $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue. If no impact, how was this achieved	Relevant output(s) and portfolio(s)
Output appropriations	332	378	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$31m of the total variance of \$46m is due to new initiatives announced in 2017-18 Budget \$9m of the variance is due to incremental increases in 2016-17 Budget initiatives for Court Safety and Security (\$6m) and Expansion of the Drug Court (\$3m); 2017-18 Treasurer's Advances were \$3m higher, mainly due to the Bourke St Incident Response. 	New and incremental revenues were used to deliver agreed outputs.	Courts

²That is, the impact of service delivery on the community rather than a description of the services delivered.

Revenue category	2016-17 actual (\$ million)	2017-18 actual (\$ million)	Explanations for changes $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue. If no impact, how was this achieved	Relevant output(s) and portfolio(s)
Special appropriations	126	140	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$6m of the total variance of \$14m is due to increases related to salaries (set by statute) and allowances changes recommended by the Judicial Remuneration Tribunal; • \$2m for BP3 2017-18 initiatives; • \$1m for the VCAT Property Lists (planning, building, etc) due to demand pressures; • \$5m is due to demand pressures in the courts and fluctuations in cash requirements to meet employee provisions obligations. 	Revenues were used to deliver agreed outputs.	Courts
Grants	27	25	n/a		Courts
Other income	7	-2	The variance of \$9m relates almost entirely to the recognition of insurances and other economic flows associated with the building works for Heidelberg Court after major flooding damage.	The 2017-18 adjustment of -\$2m is due to the finalisation of the Heidelberg Court works undertaken prior to 2017-18.	Courts

2018-19 Response

Revenue category	2017-18 actual (\$ million)	2018-19 actual (\$ million)	Explanations for changes $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue. If no impact, how was this achieved	Relevant output(s) and portfolio(s)
Output appropriations	378	429	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$16m of the total variance of \$51m is due to new initiatives announced in 2018-19 Budget; • \$13m of the variance is due to incremental increases in 2017-18 Budget initiatives; • \$10m of the variance is due to the Shepparton Court Redevelopment commencing its first full year of operations; • \$3m is due to increased s29 FMA revenues from court fees; • \$10m incremental change due to carry over and re-cash flows; • -\$3m savings implemented in 2018-19 (per 2017-18 BP3, p114). 	New and incremental revenues were used to deliver agreed BP3 outputs. Efficiencies were generally achieved in corporate support to accommodate the savings initiative without reducing outputs.	Courts
Special appropriations	140	158	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$4m of the total variance of \$18m is due to new initiatives announced in 2018-19 Budget; • \$2m is due to incremental changes to 2017-18 Budget initiatives; • \$7m is due to increases related to salaries (set by statute) and allowances changes recommended by the Judicial Remuneration Tribunal; • \$2m for the VCAT property lists (planning, building, etc) due to demand pressures; • \$3m is due to demand pressures in the courts and fluctuations in cash requirements to meet provision obligations. 	Revenues were used to deliver agreed BP3 outputs.	Courts
Grants	25	28	The \$3m increase is due to incremental funding changes in grants from other government departments, in particular DJCS, for services	The additional revenue was used according to the relevant output of the purchaser department,	Courts

Revenue category	2017-18 actual (\$ million)	2018-19 actual (\$ million)	Explanations for changes $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue. If no impact, how was this achieved	Relevant output(s) and portfolio(s)
			provided through the Courts interface with the public that are financed from and contribute to the purchaser department's outputs.	examples include short term accommodation for at risk persons affect by court proceedings and Men's' Behavioural Change Programs.	
Other income	-2	1	The variance of \$3m is materially due to the one-off effect of the finalisation of the Heidelberg Court flooding remediation works in 2017-18 against minor other economic flows.	Other economic flows, such as retirement of book values of assets has no effect on the delivery of funded outputs.	Courts

Question 9 (all departments and entities) Revenue – variances from budget to actual

Please explain any variances equal to or greater than ±10% or \$100 million between the initial budget estimate (not the revised estimate) and the actual result for 2017-18 and 2018-19 for each revenue category detailed in your operating statement. Please also indicate what any additional revenue was used for or how any reduced amounts of revenue affected service delivery and then link it to the relevant output and portfolio.

For departments, please provide data consolidated on the same basis as the budget portfolios outcomes statement in your annual reports.

2017-18 Response

Revenue category	2017-18 Budget estimate (\$ million)	2017-18 actual (\$ million)	Explanations for changes ±10% or \$100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue. If no impact, explain why	Relevant output(s) and portfolio(s)
Output appropriations	362	378	Variance within threshold.		Courts
Special appropriations	154	140	Variance within threshold.		Courts
Grants	17	25	The variance of -\$8m is due to post Published Budget finalisations of agreements with other Victorian Departments. VCAT received an additional \$4m in grants from Consumer Affairs Victoria (CAV) to fund VCAT lists that arbitrate on matters arising from CAV managed Acts. The remaining \$4m of the variance represents funding provided mainly by DJCS agencies and Victoria Police to expedite program delivery under their outputs by assigning	The additional revenue is used either to manage demand for hearings relating to CAV lists at VCAT or to deliver services to persons affected by Court matters, e.g. emergency accommodation for persons affected by court matters and counselling arising from court orders.	Courts

Revenue category	2017-18 Budget estimate (\$ million)	2017-18 actual (\$ million)	Explanations for changes $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue. If no impact, explain why	Relevant output(s) and portfolio(s)
			funding to Courts as the most appropriate interface agency with the public.		
Other income		-2	Non-budget items (other economic flows).		Courts

2018-19 Response

Revenue category	2018-19 Budget estimate (\$ million)	2018-19 actual (\$ million)	Explanations for changes $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue. If no impact, explain why	Relevant output(s) and portfolio(s)
Output appropriations	432	429	Variance within threshold.		Courts
Special appropriations	166	158	Variance within threshold.		Courts
Grants	18	28	The variance of -\$10m is due to post Published Budget finalisations of agreements with other Victorian departments. The drivers of the variance are the same as those outlined in the variance explanation for the budget to actual variance in 2017-18.	The additional revenue is used either to manage demand for hearings relating to CAV lists at VCAT or to deliver services to persons affected by Court matters, e.g. emergency accommodation for persons affected by court matters and counselling arising from court orders.	Courts
Other income		1	Non-budget items (other economic flows).		Courts

Section D: Expenses

Question 10 (all departments and entities) Expenses changed from previous year

Please explain any changes equal to or greater than $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million with regards to the actual result for 2016-17 and 2017-18 for each category of expenses detailed in your operating statement, the initial budget estimate (not the revised budget), and 2017-18 and 2018-19 actual results. Please also detail the outcomes in the community³ achieved by any additional expenses or the impact on the community of reduced expenses (if there was no impact, please explain how that was achieved).

For departments, please provide data consolidated on the same basis as the budget portfolios outcomes statement in your annual reports.

2017-18 Response

Expenses category	2016-17 Actual \$ million	2017-18 Budget estimate \$ million	2017-18 Actual \$ million	Explanations for variances $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million	Outcomes achieved by additional expenses/impact of reduced expenses. If no impact, how was this achieved
Employee benefits	278	318	309	Approximately \$11m of the \$31m variance is due to EBA salaries provisions and changes to judicial remuneration. Of the remaining \$20m of the variance, around \$15m is due to Government funding increases announced in 2017-18 Budget and around \$5m is due to incremental increases in initiatives announced in Budget papers over the previous three years.	Additional expenditure has contributed to increased outputs associated with 2017-18 BP3 initiatives as well as incremental increases in initiatives announced in other recent budget papers.
Depreciation	44	34	47	Variance is within threshold.	
Interest expense	7	11	6	The reduction in interest expense of \$1m is primarily due to the amortisation of the finance lease for the County	The reduction in expense is due to scheduled amortisation of finance leases and therefore has no impact on outcomes.

³That is, the impact of service delivery on the community rather than a description of the services delivered.

Expenses category	2016-17 Actual \$ million	2017-18 Budget estimate \$ million	2017-18 Actual \$ million	Explanations for variances ±10% or \$100 million	Outcomes achieved by additional expenses/impact of reduced expenses. If no impact, how was this achieved
				Court Public Private Partnership.	
Grants and other transfers	6	2	6	Variance is within threshold.	
Capital asset charge	40	39	39	Variance is within threshold.	
Other operating expenses	118	128	131	The variance of \$13m reflects increased activity due to new initiatives announced in 2017- 18 Budget and incremental funding increases for initiatives announced in 2016-17 and other recent financial years.	Additional expenditure has contributed to increased outputs associated with 2017-18 Budget initiatives as well as incremental increases in initiatives announced in other recent budget papers.

2018-19 Response

Expenses category	2017-18 Actual \$ million	2018-19 Budget estimate \$ million	2018-19 Actual \$ million	Explanations for variances ±10% or \$100 million	Outcomes achieved by additional expenses/impact of reduced expenses. If no impact, how was this achieved
Employee benefits	309	347	343	Approximately \$12m of the \$34m variance is due to EBA salaries provisions and changes to judicial remuneration. Of the remaining \$22m of the variance, around \$10m is due to Government funding increases announced in 2018-19 Budget and around \$10m is due to incremental increases in initiatives announced in 2017-18 Budget.	Additional expenditure has contributed to increased outputs associated with 2018-19 Budget initiatives as well as incremental increases in initiatives announced in other recent budget papers.
Depreciation	47	49	54	The variance of \$7m is due in part to statutory requirements to apply building indices to asset values; recent capitalisations funded through initiatives announced in recent budget papers; and through asset replacement programs as funded under the DTF Resource Management Framework.	Depreciation is a non-cash outflow; however, it is indicative of capital investment by government in agreed outputs.
Interest expense	6	6	5	The reduction in interest expense of \$1m is primarily due to the amortisation of the finance lease for the County Court Public Private Partnership.	The reduction in expense is due to scheduled amortisation of finance leases and therefore has no impact on outcomes.

Grants and other transfers	6	3	7	The \$1m variance is due mainly to increased grant payments arising from the 2017-18 Budget initiative Specialist Family Violence Integrated Courts Response.	Grants payments were made to organisations to support Koori programs and programs for children affected by court matters.
Capital asset charge	39	45	45	The variance of \$6m is almost entirely due to the completion of the Shepparton Court Redevelopment in late 2017-18.	Capital Asset Charge is a non-cash outflow and therefore does not directly affect outputs. However, the increase is associated with the commencement of operations of a significant regional court redevelopment.
Other operating expenses	131	166	149	The variance of \$18m reflects increased activity due to new initiatives announced in 2017-18 Budget and incremental funding increases for initiatives announced in 2016-17 and other recent financial years.	Additional expenditure has contributed to increased outputs associated with 2018-19 Budget initiatives as well as incremental increases in initiatives announced in other recent budget papers.

Question 11 (all departments and entities) Changes to service delivery from savings initiatives

Please provide the following details of the impact on service delivery as a result of the savings initiatives announced in the 2017-18 and 2018-19 Budget:

- a) Savings target in the 2017-18 and 2018-19 Budget and the amount of the savings target allocated to the department/entity
- b) Actual savings achieved in 2017-18 and 2018-19 and the actions taken to achieve the savings target allocated and their impact, including the link to the relevant output and portfolio impacted.

2017-18 Response

Savings initiative in the 2017-18 Budget \$ million	Savings target allocated to the department/entity in 2017-18	Actual savings achieved in 2017-18 \$ million	Actions taken to achieve the allocated savings target	What was the impact as a result of the measures taken to achieve the savings target? <i>(e.g. frontline and/or other areas of business that saw the impact)</i> If no impact, how was this achieved	Which output(s) and portfolio(s) were impacted (if relevant)
Centralised banking and cash management reform	N/A	N/A	CSV was not affected by this measure as any efficiencies had already been gained.	N/A	N/A

2018-19 Response

Savings initiative in the 2018-19 Budget \$ million	Savings target allocated to the department/entity in 2018-19	Actual savings achieved in 2018-19 \$ million	Actions taken to achieve the allocated savings target	What was the impact as a result of the measures taken to achieve the savings target? <i>(e.g. frontline and/or other areas of business that saw the impact)</i> If no impact, how was this achieved	Which output(s) and portfolio(s) were impacted (if relevant)
Residual 2017-18 Budget Savings (Whole of Government Efficiencies announced in 2017-18 Budget)	2.7	2.7	Ongoing Savings target (rising to \$3.7m by 2020-21) was distributed largely pro rata across the business units of the organisation with each business area (Courts and VCAT) responsible for making its savings target.	Across CSV, savings were achieved without affecting outputs or frontline services by finding efficiencies in corporate infrastructure.	Courts

Question 12 (all departments) Achievement of reprioritisation of existing resources

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget papers include targets for ‘funding from reprioritisation of existing resources’ to fund new initiatives (2017-18 Budget Paper No.2, p.55 and 2018-19 Budget paper No.2, pg. 54). This is in addition to any savings or efficiencies resulting from expenditure reduction measures. For the department (including all controlled entities),⁴ please indicate:

- a) what areas of expenditure (including projects and programs if appropriate) the funding was reprioritised from (i.e. what the funding was initially provided for)
- b) what areas of expenditure were the funds actually spent on
- c) for each area of expenditure (or project or program), how much funding was reprioritised in each year
- d) the impact of the reprioritisation (in terms of service delivery) on those areas.

2017-18 Response

Area of expenditure originally funded	Area of expenditure actually funded	Value of funding reprioritised in 2017-18 (\$ million)	Impact of reprioritisation of funding (if no impact, how was this achieved)	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted (if relevant)
Children's Court of Victoria base budget	Family Drug Treatment Court	0.171	There was no impact on overall outputs as the reprioritisation effectively shifted some matters from the Children's Court to the Family Drug Treatment Court.	Courts

2018-19 Response

Area of expenditure originally funded	Area of expenditure actually funded	Value of funding reprioritised in 2017-18 (\$ million)	Impact of reprioritisation of funding (if no impact, how was this achieved)	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted (if relevant)
N/A				

⁴ That is, please provide this information for the Department on the same basis of consolidation as is used in the budget papers.

Question 13 (all departments) Contractors, Consultants and Labour Hire Arrangements

Please indicate how much the department spent on contractors, consultants and labour hire arrangements during 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19. Labour hire arrangements include the cost of engaging the labour recruiting firm, plus additional costs paid to the labour recruiting firm for the provision of the services of the contractor. Please also explain variances equal to or greater than $\pm 10\%$ between years and list the business areas impacted and how.

2016-17 Actual \$ million	2017-18 Actual \$ million	2018-19 Actual \$ million	Explanation for variances (year on year) $\pm 10\%$	Which business areas were impacted/benefitted and how?	Please link your response to relevant output(s) and portfolio(s)
15.9	24.7	32.6	<p><u>Variance 2016-17 and 2017-18</u></p> <p>The variance was due to an increase in contractor services necessary to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Courts case management system; • Safe and Sustainable Victorian courts; • Specialist Family Violence integrated court response; • Court Integrated Services Program (CISP) and CISP Remand Outreach Pilot; and • Expansion of the Drug Court of Victoria. 	All Victorian Courts, VCAT and the Judicial College of Victoria	Courts
			<p><u>Variance 2017-18 and 2018-19</u></p> <p>The variance due to an increase in contractor services, to deliver the initiatives noted above as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional court capacity; • Family Drug Treatment Court; and • Strategic asset planning for the courts. 	All Victorian Courts, VCAT and the Judicial College of Victoria	Courts

Question 14 (PNFC and PFC entities only) Dividends and other amounts paid to the general government sector

Please detail the type and value of dividends, amounts equivalent to dividends, non-dividend grants, and capital repatriations paid by your agency to the general government sector in 2017-18 and 2018-19, explaining the reasons for any significant changes over that period and the impact of any changes on the entity.

2017-18 Response

Type of dividend paid	2017-18 Budget (\$ million) <i>BP 5, pg. 21</i>	2017-18 Actual (\$ million)	Explanations for variances $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million	Impact on the agency. If no impact, how was this achieved	Funding ratio at 30 June 2018
N/A as CSV is not PNFC or PFC					

2018-19 Response

Type of dividend paid	2018-19 Budget (\$ million) <i>BP 5, pg. 21</i>	2018-19 Actual (\$ million)	Explanations for variances $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million	Impact on the agency. If no impact, how was this achieved	Funding ratio at 30 June 2019
N/A as CSV is not PNFC or PFC					

Section E: Public sector workforce

Question 15 (all departments and entities) Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff by level and category

Please fully complete the table below, providing actual FTE staff numbers at 30 June 2016, at 30 June 2017 and 30 June 2018 (broken down by the categories listed below) for the department. Please include specific categories as relevant to the department/entity and where relevant, provide a description of what categories constitute 'other'. Please provide figures consolidated on the same basis as the expenditure for the department in the budget papers and detail which, if any, entities are included in the FTE numbers provided.

Category	30 June 2017 Actual FTE number	30 June 2018 Actual FTE number	30 June 2019 Actual FTE number
Secretary/EO-1	1	1	1
EO-2	7	7.8	6.9
EO-3	4	9	10
VPS Grade 7 (STS)	9	14.8	17.8
VPS Grade 6	131.2	145.1	160.8
VPS Grade 5	192.8	236.4	270.5
VPS Grade 4	258.2	312.8	371.1
VPS Grade 3	481.2	540.3	630
VPS Grade 2	661	626	599.6
VPS Grade 1			2
Government Teaching Service			
Health services			
Police			
Nurses/Midwives			
Allied health professionals	1.3	1.1	1.1
Child protection	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disability development and support	N/A	N/A	N/A
*Youth custodial officers	N/A	N/A	N/A
*Custodial officers	N/A	N/A	N/A
**Other – Solicitor Grade 3	N/A	N/A	0.8
Total	1746.7	1894.3	2071.6

NOTE: the figures in the above table do not include Judicial and Statutory Appointees.

*Please provide a breakdown for Youth custodial and Custodial officers by level (for example, YW1, YW2, YW3, YW4, YW5 and YW6).

**Other includes: Solicitor Grade 3

Numbers include FTE for the following entities:

Court Services Victoria delivered across Supreme Court of Victoria; County Court of Victoria; Magistrates' Court of Victoria; Children's Court of Victoria; Coroners Court of Victoria; Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal; Judicial College of Victoria; and Judicial Commission of Victoria.

Question 16 (all departments and entities) Salary by employment category

In the table below, please detail the salary costs for 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19, broken down by ongoing, fixed-term and casual, and explain any variances equal to or greater than $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million between the years for each category.

Employment category	Gross salary 2016-17 (\$ million)	Gross salary 2017-18 (\$ million)	Gross salary 2018-19 (\$ million)	Explanation for any year-on-year variances $\pm 10\%$ or \$100 million
Ongoing	\$113.160	\$127.790	\$139.896	<p>Ongoing and fixed term employment across CSV increased over consecutive years due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the commencement of the Judicial Commission of Victoria in July 2017; • continued implementation of recommendations arising from the Royal Commission into Family Violence; • funding through the Additional court capacity initiative. • expansion of the Assessment and Referral Court; • Court Integrated Services Program; and • 2017 Bourke Street Inquest.
Fixed-term	\$17.423	\$21.815	\$29.550	
Casual	\$0.649	\$0.833	\$0.885	
Total	\$131.232	\$150.439	\$170.333	The increase in casual salaries between 2016-17 and 2017-18 is mainly attributed to the increased number of sitting hours of Aboriginal Elders and Respected Persons at Koori Courts.

Question 17 (all departments and entities) Executive salary increases

Please detail the number of executives who received increases in their base remuneration in 2017-18 and 2018-19, breaking that information down according to what proportion of their salary the increase was, and explaining the reasons for executives' salaries increasing in each bracket.

2017-18 Response

Increase in base remuneration	Number of executives receiving increases in their base rate of remuneration of this amount in 2017-18, apart from normal increases due to employment agreements	Reasons for these increases
0-3%	10	Premier's annual adjustment guideline rate.
3-5%	Nil	
5-10%	Nil	
10-15%	1	Premier's annual adjustment guideline rate and approved remuneration review outcome.
greater than 15%	1	Premier's annual adjustment guideline rate and approved remuneration review outcome.

2018-19 Response

Increase in base remuneration	Number of executives receiving increases in their base rate of remuneration of this amount in 2018-19, apart from normal increases due to employment agreements	Reasons for these increases
0-3%	14	Premier's annual adjustment guideline rate.
3-5%	1	Approved role review outcome.
5-10%	Nil	
10-15%	1	Approved role review outcome.
greater than 15%	1	Premier's annual adjustment guideline rate and approved remuneration review outcomes.

Question 18 (all departments and entities) Enterprise Bargaining Agreement (EBAs)

Please list the Enterprise Bargaining Agreement (EBAs) concluded in 2017-18 and 2018-19 that had an impact for the department/agency. For each EBA, please show the number of employees affected and the growth in employee expenses attributable to the EBA.

2017-18 Response

Enterprise Bargaining Agreement	Number of employees affected	Number of employees as a % of department/entity	Growth in employee expenses attributable to the EBA (\$ million)	Growth in employee expenses attributable to the EBA (\$ million) as a % of total employee expenses
Nil				

2018-19 Response

Enterprise Bargaining Agreement	Number of employees affected	Number of employees as a % of department/entity	Growth in employee expenses attributable to the EBA (\$ million)	Growth in employee expenses attributable to the EBA (\$ million) as a % of total employee expenses
Nil				

Section F: Government decisions impacting on the finances

Question 19 (all departments and entities) Commonwealth Government decisions

Please identify any Commonwealth Government decisions during 2017-18 and 2018-19 which had not been anticipated/not been concluded before the finalisation of the State budget in 2017-18 and 2018-19 and their impact(s) on the department's/entity's finances or activities during those years (including new funding agreements, discontinued agreements and changes to funding levels). Please quantify the impact on income and expenses where possible.

2017-18 Response

Commonwealth Government decision	Impact(s) in 2017-18	
	on income (\$ million)	on expenses (\$ million)
N/A		

2018-19 Response

Commonwealth Government decision	Impact(s) in 2018-19	
	on income (\$ million)	on expenses (\$ million)
N/A		

Question 20 (all departments and entities) Council of Australian Governments (COAG) decisions

Please identify any COAG decisions during 2017-18 and 2018-19 which had not been anticipated/not been concluded before the finalisation of the State Budget in 2017-18 and 2018-19 and their impact(s) on the department's/entity's finances or activities during those years (including new funding agreements, discontinued agreements and changes to agreements). Please quantify the impact on income and expenses where possible.

2017-18 Response

Commonwealth Government decision	Impact in 2017-18	
	on income (\$ million)	on expenses (\$ million)
N/A		

2018-19 Response

Commonwealth Government decision	Impact in 2018-19	
	on income (\$ million)	on expenses (\$ million)
N/A		

Section G: General

Question 21 (all departments and entities) Key audit matters

Please list any Key Audit Matters (KAMs) identified by the Victorian Auditor General in the department/entities 2017-18 and 2018-19 annual reports and provide information about the associated actions taken by the department/entity to benefit future disclosures or manage associated risks, since the KAMs were identified.

2017-18 Response

Key audit matters identified	Actions taken
N/A as no Key Audit Matters were identified by the Victorian Auditor General in the CSV 2017-18 Annual Report.	

2018-19 Response

Key audit matters identified	Actions taken
N/A as no Key Audit Matters were identified by the Victorian Auditor General in the CSV 2018-19 Annual Report.	

Question 22 (all departments and entities) Reviews/studies undertaken

- a) Please list all internal and external reviews/studies commenced or completed by or on behalf of the department/agency in 2017-18 and 2018-19 and provide the following information:
- i. Name of the review/study and which portfolio and output/agency is responsible
 - ii. Reasons for the review/study
 - iii. Terms of reference/scope of the review/study
 - iv. Timeline for the review/study
 - v. Anticipated outcomes of the review/study
 - vi. Estimated cost of the review/study and final cost (if completed)
 - vii. Final cost if completed
 - viii. Where completed, whether the review/study is publicly available and where.

2017-18 Response

Item	Name of the review (portfolio(s) and output(s)/agency responsible)	Reasons for the review/study	Term of reference/scope	Timeline	Anticipated outcomes	Estimated cost (\$)*	Final cost if completed (\$)*	Publicly available (Y/N) and URL
1	Prefeasibility Study into the Future Accommodation Needs of the County Court CSV – County Court	The County Court facility is owned and operated under a Public Private Partnership contractual agreement over 20 year duration which commenced in 2002 and concludes in 2022.	Scoping of market and prefeasibility.	July 2017 to January 2018	This prefeasibility study was to provide advice on the feasibility of proposed options for the County Court.	518,935	518,935	N
2	County Court Regulatory Fees Scoping Study CSV – County Court	The County Court Fee Regulations expired in 2017 and Interim Fee Regulations expired	Assess fees charged and develop framework for new fees.	2017-18	Advice on scope of planned review	16,110	16,110	N

Item	Name of the review (portfolio(s) and output(s)/agency responsible)	Reasons for the review/study	Term of reference/scope	Timeline	Anticipated outcomes	Estimated cost (\$)*	Final cost if completed (\$)*	Publicly available (Y/N) and URL
		in 2018. The scoping study assessed fees charged at other jurisdictions and set a roadmap on a new fees framework in accordance with government policy.						
3	Review the regional service model and staffing structure	Need to review the regional service model and staffing structure	Revise delivery method and resources.	2017-18	Advice on operations and resources	43,364	43,364	N
4	Supreme Court Building for the Future - feasibility study	Supreme Court Building is not fit for purpose and planning work is required to determine future options.	Feasibility study of issues and options.	2017-18	Advice on feasibility of proposed options	63,780	63,780	N
5	Melbourne Magistrates Court review CSV – Magistrates' Court	Review of Melbourne Magistrates' Court	Review of operation and resourcing.	2017-18	Advice on operations and resources	178,750	178,750	N
6	Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) feasibility study CSV-VCAT	Due to volume and nature of matters Online Dispute Resolution maybe	Feasibility of use of ODR at VCAT.	2017-18	Advice on feasibility of proposed options	99,875	99,875	N

Item	Name of the review (portfolio(s) and output(s)/agency responsible)	Reasons for the review/study	Term of reference/scope	Timeline	Anticipated outcomes	Estimated cost (\$)*	Final cost if completed (\$)*	Publicly available (Y/N) and URL
		an effective and efficient delivery model for some VCAT matters.						
7	County Court Regulatory Fees Review CSV – County Court	The County Court Fee Regulations expired in 2017 and Interim Fee Regulations expired in 2018.	Fees review project plan.	2017-18	The consultant would provide specialist support by producing a project plan and communication plan for the fees review project.	3,870	3,870	N
8	Fees Regulation Review CSV – Supreme Court	2017 Fees Review July and August 2017	Advice on revised fee structure and fee levels.	2017-18	Advice on revised fee structure and fee levels.	18,022	18,022	

2018-19 Response

Item	Name of the review (portfolio(s) and output(s)/agency responsible)	Reasons for the review/study	Term of reference/scope	Timeline	Anticipated outcomes	Estimated cost (\$)*	Final cost if completed (\$)*	Publicly available (Y/N) and URL
8	Review of the current support model for the Court's case management system CSV- Supreme Court	Review current Court Case Management support model	Assessment and recommendation on support model.	Commenced 2018-19 and ongoing	Advice on proposed model	100,000	Not yet completed	N

Item	Name of the review (portfolio(s) and output(s)/agency responsible)	Reasons for the review/study	Term of reference/scope	Timeline	Anticipated outcomes	Estimated cost (\$)*	Final cost if completed (\$)*	Publicly available (Y/N) and URL
9	Counselling Order Program Model and Guidelines CSV – Magistrates’ Court	Review models of Family Violence Counselling Orders (FVCO) program and Family Violence Intervention Orders (FVIO) program.	Review FVCO and FVIO programs.	March to October 2018	Advice on program models	137,641	137,641	N
10	Architecture Review - VCAT Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) CSV - VCAT	Due to volume and nature of matters Online Dispute Resolution maybe an effective and efficient delivery model for some VCAT matters.	Architecture review and design to support ODR.	Commenced 2018-19 and ongoing	Advice on proposed project	226,510	Not yet completed	N

* Amount exclude GST.

b) Please outline the Department’s/Agencies in house skills/capabilities/expertise to conduct reviews/studies/evaluations/data analysis of the programs and services for which the Department /Agency is responsible.

CSV employs staff with a range of in house skills/capabilities/expertise to conduct reviews/studies/evaluations/data analysis of the programs and services it delivers, including skills in relation to:

- Policy development and review
- Program review
- Evaluations
- Data analysis
- Financial analysis
- Forecasting

Question 23 (all departments and entities) Annual reports – performance measure targets and objective indicators

a) Please provide the following information on performance measures that did not meet their 2017-18 and 2018-19 targets

2017-18 Response

Performance measure	2017-18 target (Budget)	2017-18 actual (Annual report)	Variance (%)	Explanation	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted
Average cost per case – Civil matters disposed in the County Court	\$5,319	\$5,963	12.1	The 2017-18 outcome is higher than the estimate due to increased one-off funding for initiatives.	Courts
Average cost per case – Family Division matters disposed in the Children’s Court	\$1,014	\$1,213	19.6	The 2017-18 outcome is higher than the estimate due to increased funding finalised after the publication of the 2017-18 Budget. The Court amended the distribution of expenses between the Family and Criminal Divisions to reflect new or increased funding for initiatives including Family Drug Treatment Court, Specialist Family Violence Integrated Court Response and Youth justice Reform.	Courts
Average cost per case – Civil matters disposed in VCAT	\$708	\$823	16.2	The 2017-18 outcome is higher than the estimate due to changes in VCAT’s finalisations (driven by lower case initiations in 2017-18 than expected) and increased funding finalised after the publication of the 2017-18 Budget.	Courts
Average cost per case – Criminal matters disposed in the Supreme Court	\$41,167	\$38,993	-5.3	The 2017-18 outcome is lower than the estimate due to a significant increase in criminal applications (including Bails) to the criminal division.	Courts

Performance measure	2017-18 target (Budget)	2017-18 actual (Annual report)	Variance (%)	Explanation	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted
Average cost per case – Criminal matters disposed in the Magistrates' Court	\$632	\$893	41.3	The 2017-18 outcome is higher than the estimate due to a number of initiatives at the Magistrates' Court, and new counting rules, which more accurately quantify the number of disposals, resulting in lower than initially estimated numbers	Courts
Average cost per case – Criminal matters disposed in the Children's Court	\$313	\$519	65.8	The 2017-18 outcome is higher than the estimate due to increased funding finalised after the publication of the 2017-18 Budget. The Court has amended the distribution of expenses between the Family and Criminal Divisions to reflect new funding initiatives including Youth Justice Reforms. There has also been a reduction in the number of unpaid infringements registered for enforcement, which has resulted in fewer cases finalised.	Courts
Case clearance rate – Civil matters disposed in the Magistrates' Court	100%	92.4%	-7.6	The 2017-18 outcome is lower than the estimate as the Court operates at capacity, with higher than anticipated demand leading to a decrease in the clearance rate.	Courts
Case clearance rate – Family Division matters disposed in the Children's Court	100%	91.6%	-8.4	The 2017-18 outcome is lower than the estimate due to a disparity between a high clearance rate in the metropolitan venues of the Court and a lower clearance rate in regional venues* of the Court, where an increase in initiations and broader demand Courts	Courts

Performance measure	2017-18 target (Budget)	2017-18 actual (Annual report)	Variance (%)	Explanation	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted
				pressures have been experienced. The overall effect is a lower than estimated clearance rate. *Children's Court cases in regional areas are managed by the local Magistrates' Court using its infrastructure and judicial and staff resources.	
Case clearance rate – Criminal matters disposed in the County Court	100%	91.6%	-8.4	The 2017-18 outcome is lower than the estimate due to a large increase in criminal initiations in 2017-18, alongside increasing matter complexity and an increase in post-sentencing workload.	Courts
Case clearance rate – Family violence intervention orders disposed in the Magistrates' and Children's Courts	100%	92.9%	-7.1	The 2017-18 actual outcome is lower than the estimate due to an increased focus on quality outcomes, informed decision making and greater access to court-based support services and responses.	Courts
Court file integrity in the County Court – availability, accuracy and completeness	90%	96%	6.7	The 2017-18 outcome is higher than the estimate as the County Court has maintained a focus on streamlining procedures, which has led to an improvement in court file integrity results. The above result excludes the April 2018 audit as this occurred during the rollout of civil e-case files, with paper files in the process of being back-scanned into the system at the same time.	Courts

Performance measure	2017-18 target (Budget)	2017-18 actual (Annual report)	Variance (%)	Explanation	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted
Court file integrity in VCAT – availability, accuracy and completeness	90%	83%	-7.8	The 2017-18 audits identified file availability as the key issue affecting file integrity. VCAT commenced a process improvement program in 2016-17, which continued throughout 2017-18 and will address file availability over the next two years. In addition, VCAT is also undertaking digital enhancement, which will reduce reliance on manual processes and paper files, and is anticipated to further drive improvement in file integrity.	Courts
On time case processing – Family Division matters resolved or otherwise finalised within established timeframes in the Children’s Court	90%	85.4%	-5.1	The 2017-18 outcome is lower than the estimate due to an increase in initiations and broader demand pressures experienced in the regional venues of the Court, where Children’s Court cases are managed by the local Magistrates’ Court using its infrastructure and judicial and staff resources.	Courts
On time case processing – Coronial matters resolved or otherwise finalised within established timeframes in the Coroners Court	80%	85.4%	6.8	The 2017-18 outcome is higher than the estimate due to the Coroners Court continuing to review and streamline processes and information requirements. The Coroners Court will review the estimate for future years if this trend continues.	Courts
On time case processing – Criminal matters resolved or otherwise finalised within established timeframes in the Supreme Court	80%	94%	17.5	Criminal applications, including bail applications, have increased, and these are finalised in very short time frames due to their urgent nature. The on-time	Courts

Performance measure	2017-18 target (Budget)	2017-18 actual (Annual report)	Variance (%)	Explanation	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted
				case processing estimate is currently under review to determine if the estimate should be increased for 2019-20 in alignment with current activity.	
On time case processing – Criminal matters resolved or otherwise finalised within established timeframes in the County Court	85%	91%	7.1	The 2017-18 outcome is higher than the estimate. This is partly affected by a high proportion of appeals from the Magistrates' Court and Children's Court finalising within 12 months. The results can also be attributed to ongoing enhancements to listings processes, including the utilisation of civil circuits to hear and finalise intervention order appeals.	Courts

2018-19 Response

Performance measure	2018-19 target (Budget)	2018-19 actual (Annual report)	Variance (%)	Explanation	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted
Average cost per case – Civil matters disposed in the County Court	\$6,417	\$6,494	5.6	The 2018-19 outcome is higher than the estimate due to one-off funding initiatives designed to improve and reform court systems and processes, and lower than expected number of finalisations.	Courts
Average cost per case – Civil matters disposed in the Magistrates' Court	\$781	\$823	5.4	The 2018-19 outcome is higher than the estimate due to higher than estimated costs and a lower than expected number of cases finalised.	Courts

Performance measure	2018-19 target (Budget)	2018-19 actual (Annual report)	Variance (%)	Explanation	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted
Average cost per case – Civil matters disposed in Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal	\$787	\$878	11.6	The 2018-19 outcome is higher than the estimate due to higher than estimated costs and a lower than expected number of cases finalised.	Courts
Average cost per case – Coronial matters disposed in the Coroners Court	\$3,688	\$4,311	16.9	The 2018-19 outcome is higher than the estimate due to higher one-off investment in health and wellbeing and the digital program at the court, and lower case finalisations than originally anticipated.	Courts
Average cost per case – Criminal matters disposed in the County Court	\$14,776	\$16,280	10.2	The 2018-19 outcome is higher than the estimate due to one-off funding initiatives designed to improve and reform court systems and processes, and lower than expected number of finalisations.	Courts
Average cost per case – Criminal matters disposed in the Magistrates' Court	\$967	\$1,149	18.8	The 2018-19 outcome is higher than the estimate due to higher than estimated costs and a lower than expected number of cases finalised. Contributing to the reduction in finalisations is a reduction in infringement related matters and low-level offending coming before the court.	Courts
Average cost per case – Criminal matters disposed in the Children's Court	\$766	\$1,017	32.8	The 2018-19 outcome is higher than the estimate due to higher than estimated costs and a lower than expected number of cases finalised.	Courts
Case clearance rate – Civil matters disposed in the Magistrates' Court	100%	93%	-7	The 2018-19 outcome is lower than the estimate due to a higher than expected number of initiations and a lower than expected number of finalisations.	Courts

Performance measure	2018-19 target (Budget)	2018-19 actual (Annual report)	Variance (%)	Explanation	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted
Case clearance rate – Family Division matters disposed in the Children’s Court	100%	87%	-13	The 2018-19 outcome is lower than the estimate as the court finalised more matters in 2018-19 than in 2017-18 but also experienced a higher than expected number of initiations.	Courts
Case clearance rate – Coronial matters disposed in the Coroners Court	100%	89%	-11	The 2018-19 outcome is lower than the estimate due to the impact of transitional arrangements resulting from recent staffing changes and new Coroner appointments.	Courts
Case clearance rate – Criminal matters disposed in the Supreme Court	100%	93.2%	-6.8	The 2018-19 outcome is lower than the estimate due to a higher than expected number of initiations and a lower than expected number of finalisations.	Courts
Court file integrity in the Children’s Court – availability, accuracy and completeness	90%	80%	-11	The 2018-19 outcome is lower than the estimate due to variation in registry practice in venues around the state. The court is reviewing processes to improve compliance.	Courts
Court file integrity in the Coroners Court – availability, accuracy and completeness	90%	67%	-25.6	The 2018-19 outcome is lower than the estimate due to deficiencies identified by the Court in relation to induction process for court file tracking. The court is working to remediate this to improve compliance.	Courts
Court file integrity in Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal – availability, accuracy and completeness	90%	77%	-14.4	The 2018-19 outcome is lower than the estimate due to lower than expected availability and accuracy, being addressed through process mapping to refine and improve file management procedures.	Courts

Performance measure	2018-19 target (Budget)	2018-19 actual (Annual report)	Variance (%)	Explanation	Output(s) and portfolio(s) impacted
On time case processing – Criminal matters resolved or otherwise finalised within established timeframes in the Supreme Court	80%	86.8%	8.5	The 2018-19 outcome is higher than the estimate due to a higher than expected proportion of cases finalised within 12 months from initiation.	Courts
On time case processing – Criminal matters resolved or otherwise finalised within established timeframes in the Magistrates' Court	85%	70%	-17.6	The 2018-19 outcome is lower than the estimate due to an increase in specialist lists extending the finalisation of cases beyond six months, increased case complexity, and lower than expected infringement and low-level offending matters.	Courts

b) Please provide the following information for objective indicators where data was not available at publication of the annual report

2017-18 Response

Objective indicators stated in annual report for which data was not available at date of publication	Best available data for 2017-18 and relevant date (i.e. 95 through January 2018)	Explanation for the absence of data in annual report
N/A		

2018-19 Response

Objective indicators stated in annual report for which data was not available at date of publication	Best available data for 2018-19 and relevant date (i.e. 95 through January 2019)	Explanation for lack of timely data in annual report	Action taken to ensure timely data for 2019-20 annual report
N/A			

Question 24 (all departments and entities) Challenges experienced by department/agency

Please list a minimum of five main challenges faced by the department/agency in 2017-18 and 2018-19.

A significant challenge may be any matter or strategy that impacted the department/agency, whether it arose externally or internally or as a result of new policy or legislation.

2017-18 Response

	Challenge experienced	Internal/ External	Causes of the challenge
1.	Significant increase in demand for court services	External	<p>Demand (volume and complexity) for court services have grown in recent years and are expected to grow more as a result of: population increases; socio-demographic changes; expanding police numbers; implementation of Government policy and legislation (such as bail reforms, offences relating to drug and alcohol dependencies and family violence); and Royal Commissions into family violence, institutional sexual abuse, and banking and financial sectors.</p> <p>Growing caseloads are accompanied by increased case complexity, as a result of ongoing changes to government policy, law reform, increased technical case complexity and the expanding number of self-represented litigants.</p>
2.	Ageing and not-fit-for-purpose court infrastructure	Internal	<p>CSV's asset portfolio consists of seventy-five separate buildings, which are distributed across sixty-six Victorian court locations. Of the seventy-five buildings 41 per cent of the court buildings are over 50 years old and of those, 78% are over 100 years old</p> <p>Recent asset condition assessments estimate that 65 per cent of the portfolio is below the identified standard for courts based on size and use. CSV's current available maintenance funding is inadequate (less than industry benchmark) to properly maintain existing Court buildings.</p> <p>The current asset base is largely not fit-for-purpose, in terms of capacity to meet demand for services, configurations that do not adequately meet the needs of modern service delivery models and in some instances the required level of safety and security for court users.</p>
3.	Judicial Officer and staff wellbeing		Resourcing of courts has not kept pace with the significant growing demand (volume and complexity). One of the compounding effects of demand exceeding available resources is

	Challenge experienced	Internal/ External	Causes of the challenge
			<p>increasing workload and stress on judicial officers and VPS staff, impacting on health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Judicial officers are uniquely exposed to a range of risk factors for stress including the: isolating nature of the role; limited capacity to delegate; critical spotlight of media attention; exposure to a cumulative trauma load; and substantial workloads.</p> <p>CSV have undertaken substantial work in this area however more investment and work is required to build organisational resilience and provide adequate support over the appointment/employment 'life-cycle' of judicial officers/VPS staff.</p>
4.	Disparate and legacy ICT systems (including case management systems)	Internal	<p>A significant constraint to improving service delivery and access to justice is legacy ICT systems.</p> <p>In particular the legacy architecture of existing case management system in a number of Courts and VCAT limits efforts to reform work practices and improve services. Case management systems are outdated and (in some cases) unsupported. In addition, they are disparate and not able to readily share case information.</p> <p>Due to legacy in court technology (i.e. video conferencing) there is a heavy reliance on in-person court attendance for matters resulting in the need for movement of prisoners and sub-optimal utilisation of court staff time and facilities.</p>
5.	Public understanding and confidence in the Court system.		<p>Increased community interest in public institutions produces demands for greater engagement, openness and transparency from Courts.</p> <p>Many people in the community are unfamiliar with the courts. Inaccurate media commentary and coverage is contributing to shaping public perceptions and, in some cases, eroding trust in the courts.</p> <p>Courts have undertaken substantial work to engage the community to improve transparency and accessibility of information however more investment and work is required to build further understanding about the judiciary, court processes and decisions.</p>

2018-19 Response

	Challenge experienced	Internal/ External	Causes of the challenge
1.	Significant increase in demand for court services	External	<p>Demand (volume and complexity) for court services have grown in recent years and are expected to grow more as a result of: population increases; socio-demographic changes; expanding police numbers; implementation of Government policy and legislation (such as bail reforms, offences relating to drug and alcohol dependencies and family violence); and Royal Commissions into family violence, institutional sexual abuse, and banking and financial sectors.</p> <p>Growing caseloads are accompanied by increased case complexity, as a result of ongoing changes to government policy, law reform, increased technical case complexity and the expanding number of self-represented litigants.</p>
2.	Aging and not-fit-for-purpose court infrastructure	Internal	<p>CSV's asset portfolio consists of seventy-five separate buildings, which are distributed across sixty-six Victorian court locations. Of the seventy-five buildings 41 per cent of the court buildings are over 50 years old and of those, 78% are over 100 years old</p> <p>Recent asset condition assessments estimate that 65 per cent of the portfolio is below the identified standard for courts based on size and use. CSV's current available maintenance funding is inadequate (less than industry benchmark) to properly maintain existing Court buildings.</p> <p>The current asset base is largely not fit-for-purpose, in terms of capacity to meet demand for services, configurations that do not adequately meet the needs of modern service delivery models and in some instances the required level of safety and security for court users.</p>
3.	Judicial Officer and staff wellbeing		<p>Resourcing of courts has not kept pace with the significant growing demand (volume and complexity). One of the compounding effects of demand exceeding available resources is increasing workload and stress on judicial officers and VPS staff, impacting on health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Judicial officers are uniquely exposed to a range of risk factors for stress including the: isolating nature of the role; limited capacity to delegate; critical spotlight of media attention; exposure to a cumulative trauma load; and substantial workloads.</p>

	Challenge experienced	Internal/ External	Causes of the challenge
			CSV have undertaken substantial work in this area however more investment and work is required to build organisational resilience and provide adequate support over the appointment/employment 'life-cycle' of judicial officers/VPS staff.
4.	Disparate and legacy ICT systems (including case management systems)	Internal	<p>A significant constraint to improving service delivery and access to justice is legacy ICT systems.</p> <p>In particular the legacy architecture of existing case management system in a number of Courts and VCAT limits efforts to reform work practices and improve services. Case management systems are outdated and (in some cases) unsupported. In addition, they are disparate and not able to readily share case information.</p> <p>Due to legacy in court technology (i.e. video conferencing) there is a heavy reliance on in-person court attendance for matters resulting in the need for movement of prisoners and sub-optimal utilisation of court staff time and facilities.</p>
5.	Public understanding and confidence in the Court system.		<p>Increased community interest in public institutions produces demands for greater engagement, openness and transparency from Courts.</p> <p>Many people in the community are unfamiliar with the courts. Inaccurate media commentary and coverage is contributing to shaping public perceptions and, in some cases, eroding trust in the courts.</p> <p>Courts have undertaken substantial work to engage the community to improve transparency and accessibility of information however more investment and work is required to build further understanding about the judiciary, court processes and decisions.</p>

Question 25 (all departments) Newly created bodies

Please list all newly created bodies (authorities, offices, commissions, boards and/or councils) created within the department in 2017-18 and 2018-19 and provide the following information:

- Date body created
- Expenditure in relevant financial year
- FTE staff at end of relevant financial year
- purpose/function(s) of the body.

2017-18 response

Name of the body	Date body created	Expenditure in 2017-18	FTE staff	Purpose/function(s) of the body
Judicial Commission of Victoria	1 July 2017	\$1.236 million	5.6	The Judicial Commission of Victoria was established in July 2017 to investigate complaints and concerns regarding the conduct of judicial officers, judicial registrars and Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) members.

2018-19 response

Name of the body	Date body created	Expenditure in 2018-19	FTE staff	Purpose/function(s) of the body
N/A				