



**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES COMMITTEE**

**2011-12 FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES  
GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE**

**PARLIAMENT OF VICTORIA**

SECTION A: **Output variations****Question 1**

Please provide copies of all of your department's/agency's annual plans, business plans, strategic plans, corporate plans or similar relating to 2011-12 (these are requested in accordance with Section 28(1) of the *Parliamentary Committees Act 2003*) unless they are online. If they are online, please specify the document name and web address:

Document	Web address:
<a href="#">Parliament of Victoria Strategic Directions 2010-2014 (See attachment)</a>	

**Question 2**

In relation to the departmental outputs listed in the budget papers, please provide a detailed explanation for all instances where an output cost for 2011-12 varied from the initial target (**not** the revised estimate) by greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent:

Output	Budget estimate for 2011-12 (2011-12 budget papers)	Actual expenditure 2011-12 (2011-12 annual report)	Explanation	Impact on the community of reduced/increased expenditure compared to budget
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Procedural Support, Documentation Preparation and Provision of Information for Assembly	20.0	26.2	The actual expenditure for both the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly in 2011-12 was higher than 2011-12 Budget estimate due to a three year actuarial assessment of members defined benefits superannuation costs, required under the Parliamentary Salaries and Superannuation Act 1968, which was completed after the publication of 2011-12 Budget. Parliament's special appropriation budget	N/A

			was increased by \$9.3m after the publication of 2011-12 Budget.	
Procedural Support, Documentation Preparation and Provision of Information for Council	10.9	13.4	The actual expenditure for both the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly in 2011-12 was higher than 2011-12 Budget estimate due to a three year actuarial assessment of members defined benefits superannuation costs, required under the Parliamentary Salaries and Superannuation Act 1968, which was completed after the publication of 2011-12 Budget. Parliament's special appropriation budget was increased by \$9.3m after the publication of 2011-12 Budget.	N/A

### Question 3

In relation to the following performance measures where there was a substantial difference between the 2011-12 expected outcome published in the 2012-13 budget papers (May 2012) and the actual outcome for 2011-12, please explain:

why these figures vary (i.e. why was it not possible to provide a more accurate estimate in May 2012); and

how the 2011-12 expected outcome was calculated.

Performance measure	2011-12 expected outcome (2012-13 budget papers)	Actual outcome for 2011-12 (2011-12 annual report)	Why do these figures vary?	How was the 2011-12 expected outcome calculated?
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Reports tabled per annum	25	40	The Government refers inquiries to joint committees via resolutions of both Houses, and to a lesser extent, Orders of Governor in Council. When the number of such referrals increases, the number of reports tabled in the following months increases.	2011-12 was the first full year of the committee operations in the 57th Parliament. In the first full year of the 56th Parliament (2007-08) the actual number of reports tabled was 27.

Regional visits to schools to conduct Parliamentary Information Talks and Parliamentary Role Plays	5	7	<p>We have high demands from schools for regional visits. We are pleased that we managed to include two additional regional visits during the year. Our ability to book visits depends on a number of variable factors outside our control, notably dates requested by schools, sitting weeks, staff availability, and restrictions on travel to country Victoria (bushfires/floods etc). We are not in a position to commit to meeting demands for extra sessions but will try and be flexible where possible. The staff involved will always give priority to supporting the operations of the Chamber.</p> <p>The expected outcome was calculated on what was known at the time about the variables and available resources.</p>	Number of visits to schools.
Committee members satisfied that advice about procedure, research and administration is responsive, clear, objective and prompt	80	96	This measure is based on an independently run annual survey of MPs, most recently conducted in May 2012. As MPs had been appointed to the joint committees and committees were operational by May 2012, the increase in responses received and increased level of advice provided to committee members were reflected in the survey results.	The target has been 80% for many years. Given the survey is based on a limited population size – MPs on committees who are willing to respond to the survey - 80% is seen as a sound target. One to two variations in responses can lead to a noticeable change in the reported statistic.

#### **Question 4**

Regarding the Department's performance measures in the budget papers:

- (a) How did the Department's 2011-12 results influence departmental planning in 2012-13?

There has been a reduction of \$4m in funding for the Parliamentary Departments for 2012-13 and more for future financial years.

The Department of Legislative Council (LC) required to allocate additional funding to the three new Council standing committees in the 57th Parliament. A BEREC submission was made for \$758,000 for 2012-13 and future years but was not approved. Subsequently LC has been allowed to utilise a once-off amount of \$400K in 2012-13 from Parliament's prior year surplus. In addition to this LC has been subject to a further reduction in funding resulting from overall budget cuts.

Currently there are 12 Joint Investigatory Committees (JIC) and legislation has been passed to set up two new Joint Investigatory Committees - Accountability and Oversight (AO) Committee and the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission (IBAC) Committee bringing the total to 14 Committees. The two new committees (IBAC and AO Committee) are part of implementation of the 2010 Government election commitments. Additional funding of \$1.168m for 2012-13 and future years was requested through the BEREC process but was not approved. This has caused a significant cost pressure for the Joint Investigatory Committees (JIC). The rental expenditure at St Andrews Place for JIC

increased by \$129K in 2012-13. In addition to this JIC have been subject to a further reduction in funding resulting from overall budget cuts.

The Department of the Legislative Assembly (LA) and the Department of Parliamentary Services (DPS) have also been subject to reduction in their base funding resulting from overall budget cuts. Members' budgets have also been reduced in 2012-13 in order to absorb the overall budget cuts.

The Department of Parliamentary Services has made reductions to service delivery in some areas and cost containment strategies including delayed staff replacement and non-replacement of staff to accommodate budget cuts. In addition to the reduction in funding resulting from these budget cuts, the rental expenditure for Parliamentary Services increased by \$713K in 2012-13 including an estimated increase of \$305K for electorate office rental.

The Department of the Legislative Assembly has made significant reductions in printing and production of bound volumes, given increased use of online publications and databases. In addition to this the Department of the Legislative Council has prematurely terminated 2 fixed term Research Officer positions as well as not replacing one cleaner position.

On 15 September 2011, the Premier announced that 'the Victorian government will host regional sittings of both houses of Parliament, in Ballarat in Bendigo'. Parliament was not permitted to make a BERC submission for additional funding required to host these parliamentary sittings. Parliament will have to absorb the cost of hosting these regional sittings internally in 2012-13.

- (b) Please detail all changes planned for 2012-13 as a consequence of actual results for any performance measures not meeting the targets in 2011-12.

N/A. Targets for all performance measures were met.

***Question 5 (departments only)***

This question does not relate to Parliament.

***Question 6 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)***

This question does not apply to Parliament.

**SECTION B: Asset investment****Question 7**

This question does not relate to Parliament.

**Question 8**

For each of the following asset investment projects, please provide:

- the total expenditure to 30 June 2012 (using actual figures, rather than the estimate in the budget papers);
- the actual expenditure in 2011-12;
- explanations for any variations greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the actual expenditure and what was estimated in the Budget at the start of the year;
- details of any funding carried forward from 2011-12 to 2012-13;
- the completion date as estimated at 30 June 2011;
- the completion date as estimated at 30 June 2012; and
- an explanation for any changes to the estimated completion date between 2011 and 2012.

Project	Actual expenditure to 30/06/2012	Estimated expenditure in 2011-12 (2011-12 budget papers)	Actual expenditure in 2011-12	Explanation for any variations greater than $\pm 10$ per cent between estimated and actual expenditure	Funding carried over from 2011-12 to 2012-13	Estimated completion date as at 30/6/2011	Estimated completion date as at 30/6/2012	Explanation for any changes to the estimated completion date
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		(\$ million)			
Heritage Asset Management Strategy Phase Three (Melbourne)	4.780	4.0	4.780	As per discussion with Christopher Gribbin on 21/1/13, there is no variance as estimated expenditure	-	Jun 2012	The project completed in June 2012.	

				published in 2011-12 budget papers reflect the funding made available from ATNAB and the additional expenditure was incurred from 2011-12 depreciation equivalent.				
Heritage Asset Management Strategy Phase Two (Melbourne)	5.774	1.2	1.225	Nil Variance	-	Sep 2011	The project completed in Dec 2011.	
Parliamentary Broadcast System (Melbourne)	3.8	0.3	0.4	At the time of publishing of 2011-12 Budget Papers, it was estimated to have a carry-over of \$0.280m from 2010-11 to 2011-12. However the actual carry-over from 2010-11 to 2011-12 was 0.4m	-	Sep 2011	The project completed in June 2012.	

**Question 9**

- (a) Please detail (in aggregate for each of the following categories) the expenditure of the Department (including any controlled entities)<sup>1</sup> on asset projects not listed in the 2011-12 Budget Paper No.4:

Category of projects	Expenditure in 2011-12 (\$ million)
Projects with a TEI less than \$250,000	1.109 (\$913K for Fire Detection & \$196K for Waterproofing of Front Steps to Parliament House) from Parliament's prior years surplus.
Projects with a TEI greater than \$250,000 but planned expenditure in 2011-12 under \$75,000	-
Capital grants paid to other sectors of government	-
Other projects included in 'payments for non-financial assets' on the cash flow statement for the Department but not listed in Budget Paper No.4 for 2011-12	-

- (b) If the total of expenditures listed in response to part (a) plus the total of actual expenditures for 2011-12 identified in Question 8 is not equal to the 'payments for non-financial assets' in the Department's budget portfolio outcomes statement in the annual report, please explain why:

<sup>1</sup> i.e. please provide this information for the Department on the same basis of consolidation as is used in the budget papers

**Question 10**

Please provide the total actual investment (i.e. how much the project actually cost) for each of the following asset projects which were completed in 2011-12 and explain any differences between that and the TEI published in the 2011-12 budget papers:

Project	TEI in the 2011-12 budget papers	Total actual investment	Explanation for any variations greater than $\pm 10$ per cent	Impact of any variations
Heritage Asset Management Strategy Phase Three (Melbourne)	4.0	4.780	As per discussion with Christopher Gribbin on 21/1/13, there is no variance as TEI published in 2011-12 budget papers reflect the funding made available from ATNAB and the additional expenditure was incurred from 2011-12 depreciation equivalent.	Not Applicable
Heritage Asset Management Strategy Phase Two (Melbourne)	5.8	5.774	Variance < 10%	Not Applicable
Parliamentary Broadcast System (Melbourne)	3.8	3.8	Nil Variance	Not Applicable

**Question 11**

This question does not relate to Parliament.

**Question 12**

For each of your entity's public private partnership projects in 2011-12, please detail the entity's expenditure in 2011-12 in the following categories:

- (a) the amount paid that was classified as 'finance charges on finance leases' and a description of what that money was for;
- (b) the amount paid as 'operating lease payments' and a description of what that money was for; and
- (c) any other expenses and a description of what that money was for.

Project	Finance charges on finance leases in 2011-12		Operating lease payments in 2011-12		Any other expenses in 2011-12	
	(\$ million)	What that money covered	(\$ million)	What that money covered	(\$ million)	What that money covered

**None. Parliament does not have any public private partnership projects.**

**Question 13**

Please list each project funded by the Department (including controlled entities)<sup>2</sup> for which the funding is included in the 'net cash flows from investments in financial assets for policy purposes' in the general government sector cash flow statement, detailing for each:

- (a) the estimated expenditure in 2011-12;
- (b) the actual expenditure in 2011-12; and
- (c) for any project completed in 2011-12, what policy purposes were achieved.

Project	Estimated expenditure in 2011-12	Actual expenditure in 2011-12	What policy purposes were achieved (where applicable)

**Not applicable to Parliament**

---

<sup>2</sup> i.e. please provide this information on the same basis of consolidation as the budget papers

## SECTION C: Revenue and revenue foregone

### Question 14

Please explain and detail the impact of any variances greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the prior year's actual result and the actual result for 2011-12 for:

- each revenue/income category detailed in your operating statement; and
- the total revenue/income in your operating statement.

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

Revenue category	2010-11 actual	2011-12 actual	Explanations for variances greater than $\pm 10$ per cent	Impact of variances
Output Appropriations	\$86,594,374	\$87,081,443	Variance < 10%	
Special Appropriations	\$40,003,220	\$32,096,625	Members defined benefits superannuation costs decreased by \$8.7m from 2010-11 to 2011-12 (total cost decreased from \$18m in 2010-11 to \$9.3m in 2011-12) following an actuarial assessment of these benefits. Also Members salary & on-costs and Members allowances increased by \$793K from 2010-11 to 2011-12.	Mainly decrease in members defined benefit superannuation cost in 2011-12.
Grants	\$131,015	\$42,050	Parliament received revenue from Ombudsman Victoria for providing payroll services to Ombudsman Victoria as a grant in 2010-11. This revenue was received under section 29 of Financial Management Act 1994, in 2011-12.	N/A
Fair Value of assets and services received free of charge	\$67,377	\$126,853	Services received free of charge from VAGO increased from \$67.4K in 2010-11 to \$112.8K in 2011-12. Also Parliament received Premier's portrait free of charge in 2011-12 that was valued at \$14K.	N/A
Parliament refreshment rooms	\$1,324,185	\$1,393,645	Variance < 10%	

*Note: The above figures are from 2010-11 & 2011-12 DPS Annual Reports.*

**Question 15**

Please explain and detail the impact of any variances greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the initial budget (**not** the revised estimate) and the actual result for 2011-12 for:

- (a) each revenue/income category detailed in your operating statement; and
- (b) the total revenue/income in your operating statement.

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

Revenue category	2011-12 Budget	2011-12 actual	Explanations for variances greater than $\pm 10$ per cent	Impact of variances
Output Appropriations	\$94,428,562	\$87,081,443	Variance < 10%	
Special Appropriations	\$23,434,000	\$32,096,625	2011-12 actual was higher than 2011-12 Budget due to a three year actuarial assessment of members defined benefits superannuation costs, required under the Parliamentary Salaries and Superannuation Act 1968, which was completed after the publication of the 2011-12 Budget. The 2011-12 output costs for the Department of Legislative Assembly & the Department of Legislative Council were revised and increased in 2012-13 Budget Paper No 3 (2011-12 Revised Budget) to reflect an increase of \$9.3m in members defined benefits superannuation costs.	N/A. The cost of these benefits was unknown and was not included in 2011-12 Budget at the time of publication of 2011-12 Budget.
Sale of goods and services	-	\$1,393,645	This is due to no budget allocated for sale of goods and service. Catering revenue cannot be estimated and it does not contribute to any of Parliament's outputs.	N/A
Grants	\$54,000	\$42,050	The actual grant from Department of Education was received as per calendar year (\$54K in 2011 & \$30K in 2012), however the grant budget was allocated on a financial year basis.	N/A
Fair value of assets and services received free of charge or for nominal	-	\$126,853	This is due to no budget allocated for services received free of charge.	N/A

consideration				
---------------	--	--	--	--

*Note: The 2011-12 Budget refers to published 2011-12 Budget (excluding VAGO). 2011-12 Budget Paper No 5 data includes VAGO.*

**Question 16 Not Applicable**

Please provide an itemised schedule of any concessions and subsidies (revenue foregone) (see the Explanatory Memorandum for a definition of concessions and subsidies) provided by your organisation in 2011-12. For each item, please:

- (a) describe the purpose of the concession/subsidy;
- (b) explain any variations greater than ±10 per cent between the actual expenditure and the initial budget for the year;
- (c) indicate the number of concessions/subsidies granted in each category; and
- (d) explain whether the outcomes in the community<sup>3</sup> expected to be achieved by granting these concessions or providing these subsidies have been achieved.

Concession/ subsidy	Purpose	2011-12 Budget	2011-12 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ±10 per cent	Number of concessions/subsidies granted in 2011-12	Outcomes achieved

<sup>3</sup> 'outcomes' are the impact of service delivery on the community rather than a description of the services delivered

***Question 17 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)***

This question does not apply to Parliament.

## SECTION D: Expenditure

### Question 18

Please explain and detail the impact of any variances greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the prior year's actual result and the actual result for 2011-12 for:

- each expenditure category detailed in your operating statement; and
- the total expenditure in your operating statement.

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

Expenditure category	2010-11 actual	2011-12 actual	Explanations for variances greater than $\pm 10$ per cent	Impact of variances
Employee expenses	81,854,154	75,759,168	Variance < 10%	
Depreciation	5,412,824	5,718,443	Variance < 10%	
Interest expenses	174,200	155,125	Variance due to interest expense based on actual charge from TCV Vicfleet for the lease of motor vehicles.	N/A
Capital asset charge	1,669,106	1,928,106	The variance is due to additional capital funding approved in 2011-12 for phase 3 of HAMS project.	Additional capital works were carried out in 2011-12.
Parliament refreshment rooms	1,593,134	1,570,599	Variance < 10%	
Communication, postage and printing	11,265,785	9,981,057	The variance was due to decrease in Members postage and printing cost by \$1.3m from 2010-11 to 2011-12.	Members carried over a greater amount of their budgets from 2011-12 to 2012-13 (\$4.6m) compared to carry over from 2010-11 to 2011-12 (\$3.4m).
Property rental cost	6,680,154	6,976,019	Variance < 10%	
Other operating expenses	15,863,960	16,649,717	Variance < 10%	

*Note: The above figures are from 2010-11 & 2011-12 DPS Annual Reports.*

### Question 19

Please explain and detail the impact of any variances greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the initial budget (not the revised budget) and the actual result for 2011-12 for:

- (a) each expenditure category detail in your operating statement; and
- (b) the total expenditure in your operating statement.

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

Expenditure category	2011-12 Budget	2011-12 actual	Explanations for variances greater than $\pm 10$ per cent	Impact of variances
Employee benefits	60,923,000	75,759,168	2011-12 actual was higher than 2011-12 Budget mainly due to a three year actuarial assessment of members defined benefits superannuation costs, required under the Parliamentary Salaries and Superannuation Act 1968, which was completed after the publication of the 2011-12 Budget. The 2011-12 output costs for the Department of Legislative Assembly & the Department of Legislative Council were revised and increased in 2012-13 Budget Paper No 3 (2011-12 Revised Budget) to reflect an increase of \$9.3m in members defined benefits superannuation costs. Also the split between 2011-12 budget for employee benefits & other operating expense needed adjustment.	N/A. The cost of these benefits was unknown and was not included in 2011-12 Budget at the time of publication of 2011-12 Budget.
Depreciation and amortisation	5,758,000	5,718,443	Variance < 10%	
Interest expense	282,000	155,125	Variance due to interest expense based on actual charge from TCV Vicfleet for the lease of motor vehicles.	N/A
Grants and other transfers	0			

Capital asset charge	1,928,106	1,928,106	Variance < 10%	
Other operating expenses	49,025,456	35,177,392	2011-12 actual was lower than 2011-12 Budget due to MPs budget was underspent by \$4.6m which was carry over to 2012-13. Also the split between 2011-12 budget for employee benefits & other operating expense needed adjustment.	N/A. \$4.6m of MP budgets were carried over from 2011-12 to 2012-13.

*Note: The 2011-12 Budget refers to published 2011-12 Budget (excluding VAGO). 2011-12 Budget Paper No 5 data includes VAGO.*

**Question 20**

The 2011-12 budget papers indicate that \$184.2 million of output funding allocated for expenditure in 2011-12 by previous budgets was ‘reprioritised or adjusted’. This is in addition to any savings or efficiencies resulting from savings measures. For the Department (including all controlled entities),<sup>4</sup> please indicate:

- (a) what areas of expenditure (including projects and programs if appropriate) the funding was reprioritised/adjusted from (i.e. what the funding was initially provided for);
- (b) for each area of expenditure (or project or program), how much funding was reprioritised; and
- (c) the impact on those areas of the reprioritisation/adjustment.

Area of expenditure originally funded	Value of funding reprioritised/adjusted (\$ million)	Impact of reprioritisation/adjustment of funding

<sup>4</sup> i.e. please provide this information for the Department on the same basis of consolidation as is used in the budget papers


**No funds were reprioritised from Parliament in 2011-12 for new output initiatives.**

**Question 21**

Please provide details of any evaluations of grants programs that were conducted by your department/agency in 2011-12, including any findings about:

- (a) the outcomes in the community<sup>5</sup> achieved by the programs; or
- (b) the effectiveness of grants at achieving planned outcomes compared to other modes of service delivery.

Grant program	Evaluation conducted	Outcomes achieved	Effectiveness as a mode of service delivery

**Not applicable to Parliament**

**Question 22**

- (a) Please provide the following details about the realisation of efficiency and savings targets in 2011-12. In providing savings targets, please provide the cumulative target rather than the change in savings from one year to the next (i.e. provide the target on the same basis as in the budget papers). Please provide figures for the Department including its controlled entities.<sup>6</sup>

Initiative	Total value of efficiencies/savings expected to be realised in 2011-12 from that initiative	Actual value of efficiencies/savings achieved from that initiative	Explanation for any variations greater than $\pm 10$ per cent
General efficiencies (2009-10 Budget)			
Government election commitment savings (2011-12 Budget)			
Measures to offset the GST reduction (2011-12 Budget)			
Maintain a sustainable public service (2011-12 Budget Update)*			
Other			

<sup>5</sup> 'outcomes' are the impact of service delivery on the community rather than a description of the services delivered

<sup>6</sup> i.e. please provide this information for the Department on the same basis of consolidation as is used in the budget papers

\* In contrast to the other savings initiatives, the Budget Update indicated that, in the first year, it expected this initiative to have an increased cost rather than make a saving. Please clearly indicate whether the target and actual for your department for this initiative is an increased cost or a saving.

- (b) If any savings targets differ from what was initially indicated in the budget papers, please provide details.

--

**Not applicable to Parliament**

**Question 23 (departments only)**

This question does not relate to Parliament.

**Question 24**

Please detail all measures introduced to increase efficiency in 2011-12, including the cost of introducing each measure and the estimated savings as a result of the measure in 2011-12.

Efficiency measure	Cost of introduction	Estimated savings as a result

**Not applicable**

**Question 25**

Please detail any changes to your department's/agency's service delivery as a result of savings initiatives released since the change of government, e.g. changes to the timing and scope of specific programs or discontinued programs.

There has been a reduction of \$4m in funding for the Parliamentary Departments for 2012-13 and more for future financial years. Parliamentary Departments have made reductions to service delivery in some areas and cost containment strategies including delayed staff replacement and non-replacement of staff to accommodate budget cuts.

**SECTION E: Public sector workforce****Question 26**

Please detail the total full-time equivalent number of staff in your department/agency as at 30 June 2011 and 30 June 2012 in each of the following bands of levels, and explain the changes from one year to the next:

Level	Total FTE (30 June 2010)	Total FTE (30 June 2011)	Explanation for changes
VPS Grades 1-3			
VPS Grade 4			
VPS Grades 5-6 and STS			
EO			
Total of all staff (including non-VPS grades)			

[See attachment for question 26.](#)

**Question 27**

In the tables below, please detail the salary costs for 2011-12, broken down by ongoing, fixed-term and casual and explain any variations greater than 10 per cent between the years for each category.

Employment category	Gross salary 2010-11	Gross salary 2011-12	Explanation for any variations greater than $\pm 10$ per cent
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Ongoing			
Fixed-term			
Casual			
<b>Total</b>			

[See attachment for question 27.](#)

**Question 28**

Please detail the impact on your department's/agency's expenditure of any EBAs agreed in 2011-12 and how any additional costs were funded.

EBA	Impact in 2011-12 (\$ million)	How the impact was funded

**NO EBA's were agreed to in 2011-12.**

**Question 29**

Please provide the following details about staff number changes in 2011-12. Under 'Pre-SGI', please show staff changes that would have been made during the year via the various methods prior to the release of the Sustainable Government Initiative (SGI) in December 2011. Under 'Post-SGI', please show how the SGI altered the targets under 'Pre-SGI'. That is, the addition of the two cells will show the total target for the year.

(Please include VPS and fixed-term staff, and provide all data as FTE):

	Target for 2011-12		Actual for 2011-12	Reason for any variation between target and actual	Impact of reduction or increase in staff numbers on services delivery
	Pre SGI	Post SGI			
Total change in staff numbers (please indicate + for increase and – for decrease)					
Change in the number of head office staff* (please indicate + for increase and – for decrease)					
Change in the number of front-line staff* (please indicate + for increase and – for decrease)					
Number of staff reduced through resignation and retirement					
Number of staff reduced through non-renewal of contracts					
Number of staff reduced through VDPs					
Number of staff reduced through TSPs					

Number of staff reduced through other means					
Costs associated with staff reductions (e.g. VDP and redundancies pay-outs)					

Note: 'SGI' refers to the Sustainable Government Initiative of December 2011.

\* Please indicate how you have defined 'head office staff' and 'front-line staff'.

**There were no targets for change in staff numbers in 2011-12 either prior to or post SGI. See Q26 for actual FTE changes**

**Question 30**

- (a) For what roles within your organisation were contractors or contract staff used in 2011-12 (refer to Explanatory Memorandum for definition of contractors)?

- Internal & External Audit Fee (Exec, DPS Common and A&A)
- Temporary and Contract Staff for Back Filling, Maternity Leave Replacement, Admin Support and Special Projects
- Parliament's risk management database development (Exec & LA)
- Fatigue management review (LA, LC & Exec)
- Development of Communication Strategy (Exec)
- Facilitation of investment management package (Exec)
- Records & Storage Audit (Exec)
- Contractors for Specialist Services for Employment, OH&S, Editorial and IT related services (OD)
- Statutory valuations (A&A)
- IT systems support and minor database modifications (A&A and SEPU)
- Lotus Notes Development and Specialised IT Services (IT)
- Specialised education advice and materials (E&C)
- Production of audio visual educational resources (E&C)
- Programming fee, software updates and Migration of Hansard and Library Systems to new servers (Library)
- Where no internal expertise exists, for example technical IT support and facilitation (LA)
- Drafting of Members Bill, Support for database application, Facilitation of planning day and Preparation of Annual Reports (LC)
- Editing, transcription, IT and archiving services (Committees)

- (b) Please itemise the services delivered by contractors or contract staff in 2011-12:

Service category	Number of contractors/contract staff	Value of services (\$)
Audit fees (Exec), External audit (A&A)	2	98,625
Temp Staff and Admin Support (Exec, SEPU, Library, Hansard, A&A, OD)	24	306,789
Parliament's risk management framework implementation, database design and development, training (Exec & LA)	1	72,720
Fatigue management review (LA, LC & Exec)	1	27,021
Development of Communication Strategy (Exec)	1	9,600
Facilitation of investment management package (Exec)	1	5,909
Records & Storage Audit (Exec)	1	45,976
Contractors for Specialist Services for Employment, OH&S, Editorial and IT related services (OD)	8	51,220

Statutory valuations (A&A)	5	41,100
IT systems support and minor database modifications (A&A and SEPU)	5	110,602
Lotus Notes Development and Specialised IT Services (IT)	15	224,529
Specialised adult literacy and secondary materials and presentations (E&C)	2	\$13,530
Pre-production, production and post-production services for the remake of the DVD <i>From Westminster to Spring St</i> (E&C)	1	\$43,561
Programming fee, software updates and Migration of Hansard and Library Systems to new servers (Library)	4	55,200
Business planning facilitation and preparation (LA)	1	3,850
Staff climate survey design, implementation, analysis and reporting (LA)	1	16,100
Technical support and updates: eCompress publication of LAPRAC (LA)	1	3,775
Technical support: database updates due to migration to Office 2010 (LA)	1	5,000
Technical support: questions database (LA)	1	4,400
Technical support: tabled documents database development (LA)	1	3,068
Technical support: timesheets database (LA)	1	5,115
Technical support: TRIM (LA)	1	1,013
User interviews, functional specification and	1	22,500

user feedback for Parliament Facebook application (LA)		
HR staff issue review (LA)	1	3,383
Drafting of Private Members' Bills and provision of legal advice (LC)	1	\$1,320
Provision of support for questions on notice database application (LC)	1	\$4,400
Facilitation of business planning day and preparation of annual plan (LC)	1	\$4,600
Transcription services (DCPC)	2	780
Editing services (DCPC)	1	11,000
Transcription services (EDIC)	1	7,655
Editing services (ETC)	1	1,820
Database upgrade (FCDC)	1	4,200
Transcription services (LRC)	1	10,919
Transcription services (OSISDC)	2	13,360
Editing services (RRC)	1	3,240
Ergonomic assessments (C'ttees)	2	600

- (c) For each specific contractor or contract staff paid in excess of \$100,000 per annum that has been engaged by your organisation during 2011-12, please supply the following details:

Supplier	Purpose	Value of services (\$)	Number of contractors/contract staff (FTE) employed for longer than 12 months	Reasons why a VPS employee or equivalent could not undertake the work
Granite Recruitment (No individual contract staff received in excess of \$100,000 per annum)	Back Fill of Staff	214,965	0	Short term requirements due to back filling of staff who had left or on leave

Note:-

The information provided above in Question 30 is in accordance with the PAEC explanatory memo p.3, where all the below stated conditions are satisfied.

- to provide goods, works or services which implement a decision;
- to perform all or part of a new or existing ongoing function to assist a department carry out its defined activities and operational functions; and
- to perform a function involving skills which would normally be expected to reside within the department but which are not currently available.

### Question 31

- (a) For what roles within your organisation were consultants used in 2011-12 (refer to Explanatory Memorandum for definition of consultants)?

Review of catering services, OHS review & dilapidation report where no internal expertise existed (Exec)  
To comply with DTF BEREC requirements and to advise on new media where no internal expertise existed (LA)  
Specialist inquiry work, or other analysis where we do not have relevant expertise (Committees)

- (b) Please itemise the services delivered by consultants in 2011-12:

Service category	Number of consultants	Value of services (\$)
Review of catering services, OHS review & dilapidation report (Exec)	1	61,414
BEREC submission as per DTF requirements (LA)	1	33,500
Development of Parliament's social media strategy (LA)	1	33,750

Inquiry consultant (DCPC)	1	35,636
Tax advice (CSO)	1	7,875
Inquiry consultant (ENRC)	2	8,394
Inquiry consultant (PAEC)	2	93,650
Legal advice (PAEC)	1	4,396
Inquiry consultant (SARC)	3	70,370
Human rights advice (SARC)	1	82,896

(c) For each specific consultant paid in excess of \$100,000 per annum that has been engaged by your organisation during 2011-12, please supply the following details:

Supplier	Purpose	Value of services (\$)	Number of consultants (FTE) employed for longer than 12 months	Reasons why a VPS employee or equivalent could not undertake the work
Evans & Peck	Effective Decision Making Inquiry (PAEC)	109,040.00	Nil	Specialised skills

### Question 32

Please complete the following tables showing number of executive staff and total value of bonuses paid in the 2011-12 performance periods:

Executive category	Number of staff (FTE)			Total value of bonuses paid (\$)
	Eligible for a performance bonus	Not awarded bonus payment	Awarded bonus payment	
Secretary or CEO, EO1 – Deputy <sup>(a)</sup>				
EO2 <sup>(a)</sup>				
EO3				
Other Executives				
Other staff				

Note (a): Combine categories to preserve confidentiality where necessary

**No executive staff received bonuses for this period.**

**Question 33**

In the following table, please show for your organisation the actual range of bonuses paid in 2011-12 (expressed as a percentage of total remuneration).

Rating	Proportion of total remuneration package actually paid (expressed as a range from x% to y%)
Exceptional	
Superior	
Competent	
Improvement required	

The above format is based on the Executive Employment Handbook. If your organisation adopted another approach for awarding bonuses, please provide details.

--

**No executive staff received bonuses for this period.**

**Question 34**

Please detail the number of executives who received increases in their remuneration in 2011-12, 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.

Increase in base remuneration	Number of executives receiving increases in their base rate of remuneration of this amount	Reasons for these increases
0-3 per cent	8	Annual CPI Increase
3-5 per cent		
5-10 per cent		
10-15 per cent		
greater than 15 per cent		

**Question 35 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)**

This question does not apply to Parliament.

## SECTION F: **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 your department/agency contributed to in 2011-12.

### **Question 36**

- (a) Using the format of the table below, please outline the five most important outcomes in the community<sup>7</sup> achieved by your organisation's programs/activities in 2011-12 (where your organisation has been the key player) including:
- (i) what was planned;
  - (ii) what was achieved;
  - (iii) quantitative or qualitative data to demonstrate this achievement;
  - (iv) any other Victorian public sector organisations or agencies from other jurisdictions that have worked across organisational boundaries to contribute to this outcome; and
  - (v) the relationship of these outcomes to any government strategies or goals.

Planned outcome to be achieved	Description of actual outcome achieved	Quantitative or qualitative data to demonstrate outcome	Other agencies involved	Relationship to major government strategy
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				

<sup>7</sup> 'outcomes' are the impact of service delivery on the community rather than a description of the services delivered

(b) Please also identify any significant program outcomes that were planned but not achieved in 2011-12 and the underlying reasons.

Outcome not achieved	Explanation

**Not applicable to Parliament**

**Question 37**

This question does not relate to Parliament.

**SECTION G: Previous recommendations**

**Question 38**

For each recommendation in the Committee’s *Report on the 2009-10 and 2010-11 Financial and Performance Outcomes* that relates to an area relevant to your department or one of its portfolio agencies, please indicate:

- (a) whether or not the action specified in the recommendation has been implemented;
- (b) if so, how it has been implemented and what publicly available information (if any) demonstrates the implementation of the recommendation;  
and
- (c) if not, why not.

No.	Recommendation	Has the action specified in the recommendation been implemented?	If yes:		If no:
			How has it been implemented?	What publicly available information, if any, shows the implementation?	Why not?
1	In future years, departments provide timely responses to the Committee’s questionnaires, with answers that are informative and without modifications	Only Q29 was modified in consultation with PAEC to present MP advertising and			

	to the question.	Parliamentary advertising expenditure separately.			
21	All departments which transition to shared services ensure that they set up appropriate mechanisms to capture and report the savings that result from the transition.	Not Applicable			
30	Where departments have performance measures that are based on project milestones, they calculate results based on the original milestones for the project, and not milestones that have been subsequently altered to reflect changes.	Not Applicable			
31	Departments review quality performance measures that are solely based on compliance with legislation, to identify whether more challenging service levels might be set as targets.	The Parliament of Victoria undertakes an annual review of quality of services to Members and electorate staff from its clients by questionnaire. Typically results range from 90% to 100% satisfaction.			
33	Departments review their performance measures to determine whether providing results at the 50th and 90th percentiles would convey a more comprehensive understanding of departmental performance to stakeholders.	As discussed with PAEC on 24/1/13, the recommendation is made in regard to medical or other emergency situations, where an understanding of the greatest length of wait is critical and where the performance measures report on 'queue length'. The recommendation is not applicable to Parliament.			

34	Departments review those performance measures which solely indicate whether or not a task was performed and, where meaningful, replace them with measures of the timeliness or quality of the task's performance.	We are satisfied that the output measures as a whole meaningfully measure our services.			
----	---	---	--	--	--