

Recommendation No.10 (PAEC's Review of the Performance Measurement and Reporting System)

Recommendation 10: The Parliamentary Departments:

- (a) review the performance measures listed in Appendix A4.10; and
- (b) review the targets for the performance measures listed in Appendix A5.10.

Legislative Council

Performance Measure	PAEC Recommendation / Reason for Review	Parliament's Response
Procedural References updated biannually	<p>Can the technical term be explained? (What is a 'procedural reference'?)</p> <p>Could this be replaced by a measure of timeliness or quality?</p>	<p>As set out in our business plan, and reported in our annual report, 'procedural references' refers to hard copy versions of Procedural Bulletins, Rulings from the Chair 1979-2013 and Legislative Council Practice and Procedure Manual.</p> <p>As these resources underpin much of the advice we give to members and the community, and the updates involve a substantial amount of work of high quality and under tight timescales, we consider that the measure is appropriate. It is a business critical function with inherent, and non-negotiable, quality and timeliness objectives.</p>
Bills and amendments processed accurately through all relevant stages and other business of the House conducted according to law, Standing and Sessional Orders	<p>Could a more challenging standard be used?</p>	<p>As the primary function of the Parliament is to legislate, and our principal role is in supporting that function, we do not consider there can be a more challenging objective.</p>

Legislative Assembly

Performance Measure	PAEC Recommendation / Reason for Review	Parliament's Response
Procedural References updated biannually	<p>Can the technical term be explained? (What is a 'procedural reference'?)</p> <p>Could this be replaced by a measure of timeliness or quality?</p>	<p>As set out in our business plan, and reported in our annual reports, 'procedural reference' refers to Rulings from the Chair (hard copy and database versions) and LAPRAC (electronic version).</p> <p>As these resources underpin much of the advice we give to members and the community, and the updates involve a substantial amount of work of high quality and under tight timescales, we consider that the measure is appropriate. It is a business critical function with inherent, and non-negotiable, quality and timeliness objectives.</p>
Bills and amendments processed accurately through all relevant stages in compliance with constitutional requirements and standing orders	Could a more challenging standard be used?	As the primary function of the Parliament is to legislative, and our principal role is in supporting that function, we do not consider there can be a more challenging objective.

Joint Investigatory Committees

Performance Measure	PAEC Recommendation / Reason for Review	Parliament's Response
Inquiries conducted and reports produced in compliance with procedural and legislative requirements	Could a more challenging standard be used?	As the primary function of the parliamentary committees is to conduct inquiries and produce reports, and our principal role is in supporting that function, we do not consider there can be a more challenging objective.
Reports tabled in compliance with procedural and legislative deadlines	Could a more challenging standard be used?	Complying with procedural and legislative requirements, in a political environment and under pressured timescales, is a very challenging objective. It is a credit to our staff that these objectives are consistently achieved, but the high level of success does not reflect a standard that is not extremely challenging.
Committee members satisfied that advice about procedure, research and administration is responsive, clear, objective and prompt	Review the targets for the performance measure. Actual results have varied from the target by an average of more than 10 per cent over the last five years	The objective is measured by means of a confidential survey of members. The participation rate is of members is low, which causes great variation in results. We consider that while the measure is a laudable one, the method of measurement is inherently difficult, as it relies on the active participation of members.

Department of Parliamentary Services

Performance Measure	PAEC Recommendation / Reason for Review	Parliament's Response
Monthly management reports to MPs and departments	Could a more challenging standard be used?	Measure to be replaced with <i>'Monthly management reports provided to MPs and departments within 5 business days after the end of the month to include variance information against budgets'</i>
Provide MPs with a functional electorate office	Is how it is measured clear? (The target is a percentage, but it is not	The requirement is to provide a functional office for 128 MP's &

	clear what it is a percentage of.)	the output measures reflects a target of 95% based on that figure ie 95% means that at least 122 Members must be working out of a functional office.
Clear Audit opinion on Parliamentary Financial Statements (previous year)	Is this a high-priority activity? Could a more challenging standard be used?	Clear audit opinion is a high priority as it represents all underlying probity and governance processes in finance.
Payroll processing completed accurately and within agreed timeframes	Is this a high-priority activity? (Other government organisations do not include this within their performance measures.)	Payroll expenditure accounts for a significant proportion of the Parliament's appropriation and a measurable service delivery outcome. It is recommended to retain this measure unchanged pending strategic review of output measures aligned to the Parliament strategic objectives for the 58th Parliament.