



**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES COMMITTEE**

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

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY  
DEVELOPMENT**

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:
Annual Plan 2011-12	Attachment A
DPCD Corporate Statement	Attachment A
2011-12 Business planning across DPCD	Attachment A

**Question 2 (departments only)**

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)		
Veterans' Affairs	3.3	4.1	The variance to published budget figures reflects a carryover of funding for the election commitment to construct Seymour Vietnam Veterans Walk.	Nil Impact
Community Development	55.6	47.0	The variance to published budget figures is due to the re-phasing of programs.	Nil impact

**Question 3 (departments only)**

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:

- (a) why these figures vary (i.e. why was it not possible to provide a more accurate estimate in May 2012); and
- (b) 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?
Increase in client service contacts for members of the Stolen Generations with Connecting Home Limited – <b>(percent)</b>	5	21	The variance reflects the expansion of services to regional clients.	Performance measure was newly established and based on a lower take up rate.
Grants provided to improve public library services – <b>(number)</b>	17	32	Due to the increase success of this program an even greater number of applications were received in the second round of funding which allowed for the funding of more projects than anticipated. <i>(The measure has been replaced by a new measure)</i>	Outcome calculated on the average of cost of the grants from the previous year
Grants acquitted within the timeframe specified in the terms and conditions of the funding agreement: Local Government Infrastructure Account – <b>(percent)</b>	75	100	100% of grants were acquitted.	Outcome calculated on the basis that grants will be acquitted in accordance with agreements.
Meetings held with Ministerial-Mayors Advisory Panel – <b>(number)</b>	3	4	Amendments to the local government elections dates resulted in there being an additional meeting in 2011-12.	Outcome calculated on the original local government election dates.

Stakeholder satisfaction with RDV support for Regional Strategic Planning – <b>(percentage)</b>	75	100	The variance reflects a better than anticipated outcome. All five regional stakeholders expressed satisfaction with the support provided.	Outcome was set as a minimum expected satisfaction response of the five regions.
Regional Urban Development program projects completed – <b>(number)</b>	15	19	The variance reflects a better than anticipated outcome.	This measure relates to 19 identified projects, covering the remaining large cities and approximately 161 small towns across regional Victoria.
Total output cost: Veterans' Affairs – <b>(\$million)</b>	3.3	4.1	The variance reflects carryover of funding for the election commitment to construct Seymour Vietnam Veterans Walk.	Outcome calculated on original outputs.
Authorisations to prepare planning scheme amendments completed in 7 days – <b>(percentage)</b>	80	58	Actual result is lower than target as resources were prioritised to focus on delivery of other government priorities. New processes are being introduced to provide for more efficient processing of authorisation requests.	Outcome calculated against a target of 7 working days internally established by the department. Authorisations completed are considered as a percentage against the total number completed in that period of time.
Energy for the Regions program: Number of towns included - <b>(number)</b>	3	2	The variance reflects the lower than expected response. No significant variance	Outcome calculated on higher response rates from regions.
Appeals lodged against heritage permits – <b>(number)</b>	2	0	This result demonstrates successful negotiations between applicants and Heritage Victoria.	Heritage Permit appeals to the Heritage Council against the Executive Director's decision are considered as a percentage of the total number of permits issued.  The information is held in the HERMES heritage database.

\*It should be noted that expected outcomes are projected early in the calendar year in order to meet the timelines for the preparation of the annual Budget Papers.

**Question 4 (departments only)**

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?

Each year DPCD reviews its contribution to the State Government's Budget Papers, specifically *Budget Paper No. 3 Service Delivery*. The review includes analysis of:

- The performance results for the previous year
- The impact of lapsing programs/services
- The impact of new or renewed funding
- Establishment of new or changed performance measures and targets
- The establishment of new or changed output statements.

In review, some performance measures and targets are discontinued if the measures are no longer relevant. Departmental objectives are also updated in the Budget Papers where they may have changed due to internal corporate reporting purposes.

(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.

<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Planned changes for 2012-13</b>
Premier's Spirit of Anzac Prize: number of entries received	New marketing programs were developed to increase numbers of entries in 2012-13
Authorisations to prepare planning scheme amendments completed in 7 days'	The introduction of an on-line lodgement process for Authorisation requests has been introduced for 2012-13 to enable the streamlining of assessment timeframes. Performance measure for assessment timeframe has been shifted to 10 days consistent with the Planning and Environment Act review recommendations and Ministerial Direction #15 and this change will be reflected In the 2013-14 Budget Papers and reported in the Department's Annual Report.

**Question 5 (departments only)**

Please provide explanations for the results in the following outputs, where the cost performance and the non-cost performance measures have varied from targets in different directions.

Output	Issue	Explanation
Veterans' Affairs	The expenditure on this output for 2011-12 was 24.2 per cent above budget levels. However, none of the six non-cost performance measures for the output indicates higher-than-expected activity in the area. By contrast, one non-cost performance measures indicates lower-than-expected activity.	Increase in expenditure due to carryover of funding for the Seymour Vietnam Veterans Walk  This was a one-off project with no specific budget performance measures.

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

This question does not apply to your department.

**SECTION B: Asset investment (departments only)****Question 7**

Please provide a detailed explanation in relation to why the TEI has changed for each of the following projects:

Project	TEI (2011-12 budget papers)	TEI (2012-13 budget papers)	Explanation
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Broadmeadows Government Services Building – Construction (Broadmeadows)	17.4	NIL	The Broadmeadows Government Services Building did not proceed with remaining funding allocated to the Central Activities Areas and Strategic Sites Project.
Central Activities Areas and Strategic Sites (various)	19.7	34.4	As above.

**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

(g) 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)			
Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Information System – IT System (Melbourne)	4.0	0.2	0.5	Not applicable	-	June 2012	Completed	
Broadmeadows Activities Area (Broadmeadows)	14.0	17.6	2.8	Part of the funding has been rephrased to 2013-14	-	June 2014	June 2015	Transport approvals process delayed project start.
Broadmeadows Government Services Building – Construction (Broadmeadows)	3.8	14.8	2.2	The project was discontinued	-	June 2013	N/A	
Central Activities Areas and Strategic Sites (various)	9.9	5.6	9.4	Larger funds were expended in this program offset in savings in other programs.	0.84	June 2013	Various dates.	Various newly approved projects with different completion date to original project
Footscray Activities Area (Footscray)	47.9	0.2	1.8	Reflects funds from the previous year, resulting from an under spend being spent in 2011-12.	-	June 2012	June 2014	Amended contractual date for Grocon completion of building.
Geelong Activities Area – Stage3 – Upgrade works (Geelong)	1.7	4.6	1.0	The project was discontinued	-	June 2012	N/A	
Investment in Outdoor Recreation	0.8	0.8	0.8	N/A	N/A	June 2012	June 2012	N/A



Infrastructure – Upgrades (statewide)								
Melbourne Cricket Ground Southern Stand redevelopment and Yarra Park landscaping (Melbourne)* (*the asset project only relates to Yarra Park)	2.0	2.0	2.0	N/A	N/A	June 2013	June 2014	Project managed by MCC, which requested additional time to manage work to minimise impact on Yarra park car parking for major events and timing for installation of grasses.
Northbank Promenade Access and Safety Improvements – Construction (Melbourne)	8.5	7.9	0.3	Unspent funds re-phased to 2012-13 due to delayed project start date.	3.6	April 2013	Late 2013	Delays are due to design review and approval processes for additional funding, arising from tenders coming in above approved budget.
Ringwood Activities Area – Stage1 – Upgrade Works (Ringwood)	15.6	1.9	1.5	Government ceased project part of the way through the 2011-12 financial year.	-	June 2012	N/A	Project re-scoped and now to be delivered by Department of Transport.
State Multi-Discipline Shooting Centre (non-metro)	0	12.5	0	Consultation continuing with key stakeholders	12.5	Proposal not finalised	Proposal not finalised	Consultation continuing with key stakeholders
Statewide Electronic Planning Applications Online – IT Upgrade (Melbourne)	3.0	1.8	0.5	The variance reflects a reduction in system enhancements/up dates until there is an increase in system use by councils.	1.2	June 2013	December 2013	Revised date with expected take-up by local government.

**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	0.2
Projects with a TEI greater than \$250,000 but planned expenditure in 2011-12 under \$75,000	NIL
Capital grants paid to other sectors of government	General Government 10.4 Local Government 103.2
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	32

- (b) If the total of expenditures listed in response to part (a) plus the total of actual expenditures for 2011-12 identified in Question 6 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:

Total expenditure varies from the payments for non financial assets in the Department's budget portfolio outcomes statement in the annual report principally due to some of the above costs being treated as equity contributions in related entities. Such contributions are not included in 'payments for non-financial assets'. In addition, 'payments for non-financial assets' are prepared on a cash basis, whilst the asset project costs above are on an accrual basis.

<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:

<b>Project</b>	<b>TEI in the 2011-12 budget papers</b>	<b>Total actual investment</b>	<b>Explanation for any variations greater than <math>\pm 10</math> per cent</b>	<b>Impact of any variations</b>
Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Information System – IT System (Melbourne)	4.4	4.0		
Investment in Outdoor Recreation Infrastructure – Upgrades (statewide)	1.5	1.5		
Ringwood Activities Area – Stage1 – Upgrade Works (Ringwood)	18.4	15.6	Project will no longer proceed	

**Question 11**

This question does not apply to your department.

**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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**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)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

<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:

- (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	2010-11 actual (\$ million)	2011-12 actual (\$ million)	Explanations for variances greater than $\pm 10$ per cent	Impact of variances
Output Appropriations	472.5	478.7		
Special Appropriations	69.0	18.0	Mainly due to the Community Support fund now being administered by the Department of Treasury and Finance.	Nil Impact
Interest	6.2	10.6	Mainly due to the full year impact of the Regional Growth Fund (RGF).	Increased cash held in the Regional Growth Fund.
Grants	70.0	61.4	Due to fluctuations in funding for major sporting events.	
Other Income	1.5	2.6	Due to the return of some unexpended grants.	
	<b>619.2</b>	<b>571.3</b>		

**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 (\$ million)	2011-12 actual (\$ million)	Explanations for variances greater than $\pm 10$ per cent	Impact of variances
Output Appropriations	515.1	478.7		
Special Appropriations	8.5	18.0	Due to increased Growth Areas Infrastructure Contributions.	Increased Contributions available for distribution.
Interest	8.5	10.6	Due to a higher than anticipated cash balance	Increased funds available for distribution.
Grants	62.2	61.4		
Other Income	1.1	2.7	Due to the return of some unexpended grants that were not anticipated.	
	<b>595.4</b>	<b>571.3</b>		

**Question 16**

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  $\pm 10$  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 $\pm 10$ per cent	Number of concessions/subsidies granted in 2011-12	Outcomes achieved
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

This question does not apply to your department.

---

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

## 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:

- (a) each expenditure category detailed 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	2010-11 actual (\$ million)	2011-12 actual (\$ million)	Explanations for variances greater than $\pm 10$ per cent	Impact of variances
Employee benefits	101.3	95.1		
Depreciation and amortisation	6.2	6.7		
Interest expense	0.2	0.2		
Grants and other transfers	406.7	356.6	Principally due to Machinery of government changes.	Nil impact
Capital asset charge	5.8	6.3		
Other operating expenses	82.8	71.3	Principally due to one off project costs incurred in 2010-11 and some efficiency measures.	Nil impact
<b>Total expenses from transactions</b>	<b>602.9</b>	<b>536.2</b>		



**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.

<b>Expenditure category</b>	<b>2011-12 Budget (\$ million)</b>	<b>2011-12 actual (\$ million)</b>	<b>Explanations for variances greater than <math>\pm 10</math> per cent</b>	<b>Impact of variances</b>
Employee benefits	94.9	95.1		
Depreciation and amortisation	5.9	6.7	Due to the capitalisation of some assets earlier than anticipated.	Nil Impact
Interest expense	0.0	0.2		
Grants and other transfers	422.6	356.6	This reflects a re-phase of grant expenditures to better align with project milestones.	Nil Impact
Capital asset charge	6.3	6.3		
Other operating expenses	73.3	71.3		
<b>Total expenses from transactions</b>	<b>602.9</b>	<b>536.2</b>		

**Question 20 (departments only)**

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
DPCD is funded on a global basis through the annual appropriation act. Where relevant, reprioritisations were considered as part of standard internal budget allocation processes with minimal impact on service delivery.		

<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

## 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
Significant Sporting Events Program	September to November 2011	The Program supports sporting events which provide economic benefits to communities, increase participation and enhance Victoria's reputation.	The review supported the provision of grants for sporting events in Victoria.
Elements of the Community Facility Funding Program related to soccer facilities and sustainable sport facilities.	Completed in December 2011.	The programs supported the construction of community facilities to increase participation in sport and recreation activities.	The method of using Government grants leveraged by additional funding from Local Government and the community was supported.
Facilitating planning approvals: cultural heritage management issues (Registered Aboriginal Parties)	Evaluation conducted by Aboriginal Affairs Victoria in 2012 to evaluate the extent to which the grant program achieved objectives of supporting Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) to implement their statutory obligations and to transition to operational sustainability.	The evaluation found that all RAPs were successfully implementing their statutory obligations. The report also found that while several RAPs were 'operationally sustainable', the varying income levels and organisational capacity of RAPs to develop revenue opportunities posed a challenge to the future sustainability of RAPs.	The evaluation acknowledged that funding of \$0.5m was provided for one year in 2011-12, in recognition of the pending report of the Parliamentary Inquiry into the establishment and effectiveness of RAPs, which would inform the future support provided to RAPs by government, including mode of delivery and funding.
Indigenous Leadership and Capacity Building Initiatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Victorian Indigenous Youth Advisory Council (VIYAC)</li> </ul>	Conducted in 2011	The VIYAC evaluation found that VIYAC was a unique model and had been effective in engaging with young Indigenous people across Victoria. Highlights included regional youth consultations, the Community Spirit Police Awards, and the input to a number of key policy development processes.	The VIYAC evaluation found that the VIYAC model was working well as a model for providing policy advice for government, and is an important avenue of advocacy for young Indigenous Victorians

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

<p>Indigenous Leadership and Capacity Building Initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indigenous Leadership Network Victoria (<b>ILNV</b>)</li> </ul>	<p>Conducted in 2011</p>	<p>The evaluation found that the ILNV was gaining profile within the Aboriginal community. The Community Conversations Project in 2010-11 successfully engaged people in regional communities in discussions on culture, leadership and young people. The evaluation further found that the ILNV was well placed to provide a structured leadership program for Aboriginal Victorians (which has subsequently been delivered in 2012).</p>	<p>The evaluation confirmed the value of having an Aboriginal community controlled organisation deliver leadership initiatives, as it promotes stronger engagement and participation by the Aboriginal community.</p>
<p>Indigenous Leadership and Capacity Building Initiatives-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indigenous Leadership Fellowship</li> </ul>	<p>Conducted in 2011</p>	<p>The evaluation found that the Fellowship had successfully supported two Emerging Leaders each year to engage with a range of leadership development activities and assisted them to develop their professional networks.</p>	<p>The Fellowship is a partnership which leverages funding through philanthropic and other bodies to support Indigenous leadership development, and had proven to be a cost effective way of delivering tailored leadership development opportunities for selected individuals.</p>

**Question 22 (departments only)**

- (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>

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Total value of efficiencies/savings expected to be realised in 2011-12 from that initiative</b> <b>(\$ million)</b>	<b>Actual value of efficiencies/savings achieved from that initiative</b> <b>(\$ million)</b>	<b>Explanation for any variations greater than <math>\pm 10</math> per cent</b> <b>(\$ million)</b>
General efficiencies (2009-10 Budget)	6	6	-
Government election commitment savings (2011-12 Budget)	6.2	6.2	-
Measures to offset the GST reduction (2011-12 Budget)	9.9	9.9	-
Maintain a sustainable public service (2011-12 Budget Update)*	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-

\* 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.

--

<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

**Question 23 (departments only)**

- (a) Please outline the Department's expenditure in 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 and the savings targets for 2010-11 and 2011-12 for these areas targeted in the Government's election commitment savings. 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>7</sup>

Category	Actual expenditure			2010-11 savings target	2011-12 savings target	Explanation for any category that does not change between 2010-11 and 2011-12 in line with the savings target
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12			
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)			
Ministerial staff	0.00	0.00	0.00			
Media and marketing positions	3.06	2.88	2.42			
Consultants	0.12	0.00	0.20			
Government advertising	1.27	2.04	1.99			Note: Comparison of actual expenditures between financial years is impacted by machinery of government changes occurring in December 2010.
Political opinion polling	0.00	0.00	0.00			
External legal advice	1.93	3.28	1.42			
Senior public service travel	n/a	n/a	n/a			

<sup>7</sup> i.e. please provide this information for the Department on the same basis of consolidation as is used in the budget papers

Government office floor space	9.39	8.55	8.35			
Supplies and consumables	81.87	82.76	71.35			
Savings from shared services	8.86	10.22	8.30			Note: This is the cost incurred by the Department for shared services.
Head office staff	87.14	84.87	80.17			Note: Only CBD staff included for consistency purposes.
<b>Total</b>				<b>3.0</b>	<b>6.2</b>	

(b) If details are not available for any of these categories, please advise:

(i) why details are not available; and

Senior public service travel is included in total staff expenditure and, therefore, is not available.

(ii) what measures the Department has in place to monitor its achievement of the Government's election commitment savings targets.

The Department undertakes monthly financial reporting to monitor departmental expenditure. The monthly reports are provided to, and discussed at appropriate departmental level meetings.

### **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
Measures Introduced are consistent with efficiency and savings measures captured in the 2011-12 State Budget.		As per Budget Paper No. 3

### **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.

- Ending Respect Agenda program;
- Discontinued funding for the Community ICT program; and
- Reduction in funding for some Regional Blueprint projects.



**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 2011)	Total FTE (30 June 2012)	Explanation for changes
VPS Grades 1-3	181.5	161.2	Consistent with reductions pertaining to the Sustainable Government Initiative.
VPS Grade 4	204.0	185.5	Consistent with reductions pertaining to the Sustainable Government Initiative.
VPS Grades 5-6 and STS	541.4	494.3	Consistent with reductions pertaining to the Sustainable Government Initiative.
EO	36.0	33.8	Consistent with reductions pertaining to the Sustainable Government Initiative.
Total of all staff (including non-VPS grades)	972.9	887.8	Consistent with reductions pertaining to the Sustainable Government Initiative.

**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	83.3	82.4	
Fixed-term	18.0	12.7	Lapsing of fixed term contracts
Casual			
<b>Total</b>	<b>101.3</b>	<b>95.1</b>	

**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
NIL		



**Question 29**

Please provide the following details about staff number changes in 2011-12 (please 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)	There was no Pre SGI or Post SGI target in 2011-12.		-85.3 FTE		
Change in the number of head office staff* (please indicate + for increase and – for decrease)			-85.3 FTE		
Change in the number of front-line staff* (please indicate + for increase and – for decrease)			N/A		
Number of staff reduced through resignation and retirement			Resignation -85.6FTE Retire -11.8FTE		
Number of staff reduced through non-renewal of contracts			-43.6 FTE		
Number of staff reduced through VDPs			N/A		
Number of staff reduced through TSPs			-7.6 FTE		
Number of staff reduced through other means			-3.0 FTE		
Costs associated with staff reductions (e.g. VDP and redundancies pay-outs)			\$0.4m		

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

All staff are considered head office.

**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)?

Contractors and contract staff are generally engaged by the Department for purposes such as IT support, internal audit and professional and commercial support for specific projects where required.

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

Service category	Number of contractors/contract staff	Value of services (\$) million
Aboriginal Affairs		2.4
Community Development		4.6
Local Government Investigations and Compliance Inspectorate		0.1
Local Government Victoria		1.7
Planning		9.7
Regional Development Victoria		5.9
Sport & Recreation Victoria		1.5
Veterans & Ex-Services Unit		0.1
Whole of DPCD		3.3
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,118</b>

- (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/c contract staff (FTE) employed for longer than 12 months *	Reasons why a VPS employee or equivalent could not undertake the work**
Accelerator communications Pty Ltd	Advertising and campaign	664,369		
Access economics Pty Ltd	Regulatory services	138,272		
Accuteque	Office for the community sector common funding agreement project	760,070		
Ashurst Australia	Legal Advice	105,757		

Baade harbour Australia Pty Ltd	Assessment of Infrastructure requirements for key Indigenous Organisations	177,073		
Birru Australia Pty Ltd	Reviews and business case development for state sports facilities	176,600		
Camp Jungai Cooperative ltd	Capital works, lease negotiations and appointment of administrator	239,908		
Capire Consulting Group Pty Ltd	Community and stakeholder engagement for structure planning in Frankston, Broadmeadows and Epping	113,992		
Charter Keck Cramer	Structure Plan economic advice, analysis and review for Frankston & Southland	281,328		
CPG Australia Pty Ltd	Structure plan and associated planning controls for Broadmeadows	174,526		
Davis Langdon Australia Pty Ltd	Bushfire management overlay (BMO) statutory planning and permit assistance	100,781		
Deloitte Touché Tohmatsu ltd	Professional Services	286,723		
Ernst & young	Professional Services	337,389		
Freehills	Legal Advice	123,022		
GHD Pty Ltd	Regional bushfire planning assessments, bushfire mapping support and survey of utilities infrastructure	500,294		
Hays Personnel Services (Aust) Pty Ltd	Technical and program support (Note this includes 12 contract staff paid in excess of \$100,000)	1,543,115		
Hudson global resources (Aust) Pty Ltd	Technical and program support (Note this includes 3 contract staff paid in excess of \$100,000)	417,952		
Informa Australia Pty Ltd	Project management	500,000		
Kelg Pty Ltd	Biofuels Project	154,847		
KPMG	Professional Services	559,427		
Ladoo Pty Ltd	IT Services	219,252		

Logica Australia Pty Ltd	IT Support	203,170		
Maddocks	Legal Advice	137,517		
Media Monitors Australia Pty Ltd	Media monitoring services	184,137		
Meinhardt Infrastructure & Environment Pty Ltd	Development of material for implementation of new bushfire planning provisions	114,033		
Mitchell & Partners Australia Pty Ltd	Media Advertising	1,017,021		
Nous Group Pty Ltd	Strategic projects	166,220		
Object Consulting Pty Ltd	IT maintenance	275,850		
Orsini lidia	Planning and other expert advice	152,708		
Planisphere	South West Victoria Landscape Assessment Study	350,139		
Price Waterhouse Coopers	Principally Internal audit services	978,614		
Right Lane Consulting Pty Ltd	Consulting services for integrated business planning project	157,273		
RMCG	Analysis of regional projects	188,341		
Roberts Evaluation Pty Ltd	Evaluation of grant program	102,300		
Sacs Consulting Pty Ltd	Training and workshops	103,411		
SGS Economics & Planning Pty Ltd	Economic Social Impact Study and Land Use Survey	150,401		
Sinclair Knight Merz Pty Ltd	Regional Bushfire Planning Assessment	387,175		
SJB Urban Pty Ltd	Development of specialist place quality and evaluation and monitoring tool to evaluate quality change over time for all CAAs	196,224		
Spatial Economics Pty Ltd	Economic analysis and strategy	483,545		

Spatial Vision	Support the implementation of bushfire planning provisions	205,324		
Squiz Australia Pty Ltd	Volunteering portal website development	224,460		
The Maytrix Group	Project Evaluation	135,255		
Tract Consultants Pty Ltd	Project Review	219,744		
Ultimate Design & Build Pty Ltd	Project Management of building works	298,156		
Zincara Pty Ltd	Project Review	128,978		

\* FTE information is not captured

\*\* Contractors are generally used to provide short term specialist expertise and ongoing technical services such as IT support.

### Question 31

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

- Expert advice and analysis of proposed changes to the *Environment Effects Act 1978*
- Review of the Volunteering Portal and to make strategic recommendations for the future of the portal
- Latrobe Valley Competitive Advantage Report
- A socio economic analysis of the timber industry in Gippsland

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

Service category	Number of consultants	Value of services (\$)
Professional services	4	\$273,400 (Actual paid \$199,612)

- (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
NIL				





**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>	Combined with EO2			
EO2 <sup>(a)</sup>	16	2	14	\$226,359
EO3	28	9	19	\$150,015
Other Executives				
Other staff			6	\$33,038

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

**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	7.5%-9.6%
Superior	3.3%-7.1%
Competent	0%
Improvement required	0%

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

Ratings were based on DPCD receiving a 5% result and all bonuses paid were reduced accordingly.

**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	34	Annual Remuneration adjustment
3-5 per cent		
5-10 per cent		
10-15 per cent		
greater than 15 per cent	1	Work value review

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

This question does not apply to your department.

## 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>8</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
<p>The Planned priorities and outcomes achieved are reported to Parliament each year in the Budget Papers and in the relevant annual reports. In 2011-12 DPCD focussed on the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning communities for growth and change</li> <li>• Investing in communities</li> <li>• Growing Regional and Rural Victoria</li> <li>• Improving organisational performance</li> </ul>				

<sup>8</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	

### Question 37

This question does not apply to your department.

## SECTION G: Previous recommendations

### Question 38 (departments only)

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:

- whether or not the action specified in the recommendation has been implemented;
- if so, how it has been implemented and what publicly available information (if any) demonstrates the implementation of the recommendation; and
- 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 to the question.	A response to the Committee's report was tabled on 19 October 2012. This contains details of responses to			

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.	individual recommendations and those recommendations which were supported. Implementation of these responses is continuing.			
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.	In relation to performance measures, processes are in place to review the quality of the measures and changes to and additional information relating to measures will be contained in the State Budget Papers.			
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.				
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.				
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.				