



PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

2013-14 AND 2014-15 FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE

VICTORIA POLICE

Legend:

Black text: pre-filled information, from PAEC

Blue text: completed information

SECTION A: Output variances and program outcomes

Question 1 (departments only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 2 (departments only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 3 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

SECTION B: Asset investment (departments only)

Question 4

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 5

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 6

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 7

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 8

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 9 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

SECTION B: Asset investment (non-departments only)**Question 10**

Please provide the following details for any asset investment project where actual expenditure in 2013-14 or 2014-15 varied by \$±10 million or more from the initial budget estimate at the start of the relevant year (**not** the revised estimate).

If there were no asset investment projects for your agency where the actual expenditure varied by \$±10 million or more from the budget estimate, you do not need to answer this question. If this is the case, please indicate 'no relevant projects' in the table(s) below.

(a) in 2013-14

Project	Estimated expenditure in 2013-14 (2013-14 budget papers) (\$ million)	Actual expenditure in 2013-14 (\$ million)	Explanation for variance	Estimated completion date in 2013-14 budget papers	Estimated completion date in 2014-15 budget papers	Explanation for any changes to the estimated completion date
Police information technology refresh (statewide)	25.93 (first reflected in 2014-15 Budget Paper No 4)	15.01	Funding re-cash-flowed into 2014-15 as per the Treasurer's approval due to delays in procurement of desktops/laptops and multi-function devices. Expenditure of \$15.0 million was incurred in 2013-14 against the revised cash-flow of \$15.3 million.	qtr 4 2013-14 (reflected in 2014-15 Budget papers)	qtr 4 2013-14	Funding re-cash-flowed into 2014-15 as per the Treasurer's approval due to delays in procurement of desktops/laptops and Multi-Function Devices. Expenditure of \$15.0 million was incurred in 2013-14 against the revised cash-flow of \$15.3 million.
Police Station infrastructure to accommodate 1,700 frontline police and 940 Protective Services Officers – asset enhancement (statewide)	39.80	28.83	The funding of \$39.8 million in 2013-14 included an allocation by DTF of \$10.0 million which was scheduled to be incurred in 2014-15.	late 2014	qtr 2 2014-15	The funding of \$39.8 million in 2013-14 included an allocation by DTF of \$10.0 million which was scheduled to be incurred in 2014-15.
Upgrade Police Station Stage 2 (various)	18.17	25.40	Funding was spent earlier than anticipated on the Waurn Ponds Police Station (\$4.1 million) and	mid 2015	qtr 4 2014-15	n/a

			Operational Safety and Tactics Training facility (\$4.4 million). Actual expenditure was higher due to works progressing ahead of schedule.			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

(b) in 2014-15

Project	Estimated expenditure in 2014-15 (2014-15 budget papers)	Actual expenditure in 2014-15	Explanation for variance	Estimated completion date in 2014-15 budget papers	Estimated completion date in 2015-16 budget papers	Explanation for any changes to the estimated completion date
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)				
Upgrade Police Station Stage 2 (various)	23.28	13.60	<p>\$1.2 million transferred from Additions to Net Asset Base (ATNAB) to Output which was approved by the Treasurer to account for non-capitalisable costs associated with the Operational Tactics and Safety Training facility.</p> <p>\$3 million was spent earlier than anticipated on the Operational Safety and Tactics Training facility and hence exceeded the estimated expenditure to 30 June 2014 as reflected in the 2014-15 Budget papers due to works progressing ahead of schedule.</p> <p>\$2.71 million was carried over into 2015-16 for specialised hardware and software equipment and to finalise any defects and liabilities associated with the Operational Safety and Tactics Training facility.</p>	qtr 4 2014-15	Completed after publication date and before 30 June 2015	<p>Project was operational ahead of estimated completion date.</p> <p>Funding has been carried over for specialised hardware and software equipment and to finalise any defects and liabilities.</p>

Question 11

Please detail the initial budget estimates (**not** the revised estimate) for 'purchases of non-financial assets' for 2013-14 and 2014-15 (or equivalent line items in the cash flow statements) for your entity, the actual amounts of those line item in your annual reports and an explanation for any variances greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million.

Initial budget estimate for 2013-14	Actual for 2013-14	Explanation for any variance greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million
(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
160.6	176.7	Variance predominantly due to additional investment in the Police Information Technology Refresh project, to upgrade the majority of Victoria Police's ageing Information Technology (IT) infrastructure, including software and back-end support to provide a contemporary, reliable and secure IT infrastructure environment.

Initial budget estimate for 2014-15	Actual for 2014-15	Explanation for any variance greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million
(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
168.7	198.1	Variance mainly relates to additional investment in capital projects including: Police Information Technology Refresh, Forensic Services Centre, City West Police Complex, Operations Safety and Tactics Training Facility, and Additional PSOs Infrastructure.

SECTION C: Revenue and appropriations

Question 12

Please explain any variances greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million between the prior year's actual result and the actual result for 2013-14 and 2014-15 for each revenue/income category detailed in your operating statement. Please also indicate what any additional revenue was used for or how any reduced amounts of revenue impacted on service delivery.

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

If there were no revenue/income categories for your department/agency for which the 2013-14 and 2014-15 expenditure varied from the prior year's expenditure by more than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million, you do not need to answer this question. If this is the case, please indicate 'no relevant line items' in the table(s) below.

Revenue category	2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Grants received from Department of Justice.	2,122.0	2,275.8	<p>The growth is due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the incremental indexation for frontline policing services funding increases in existing output initiatives, particularly additional 1,700 frontline police and 940 PSOs output initiatives approved in 2013-14. <p>This growth is offset by an increase in Whole of Government savings.</p>	The additional revenue was used to maintain and increase frontline policing to increase public safety and reduce crime.
Interest	0.1	0.1	N/A	N/A
Sales of goods and services	1.2	1.0	The variance is due to a reduction in miscellaneous revenue in trust funds.	No impact.
Grants received in relation to trusts	1.2	1.3	N/A	N/A
Other trust income	13.2	6.5	Variance is due to the transfer of funds between trusts, this is offset in expenditure.	No impact as the funds were moved between Trusts.

Plant and Equipment received free of charge or nominal consideration	1.6	0.7	<p>The variance is made up of additional assets received free of charge in 2012-13 relating to motor vehicles (armoured car), communications and photographic equipment.</p> <p>Assets received free of charge in 2013-14 included two protective bomb suits (\$40k), electronic counter measure systems (\$350k) and digital forensic devices (\$270k).</p>	No impact.
--	-----	-----	--	------------

Revenue category	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ±10 per cent or \$100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Grants received from Department of Justice.	2,275.8	2,434.3	<p>The growth is due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the incremental indexation for frontline policing services funding increases in existing output initiatives, particularly additional 1,700 frontline police and 940 PSOs output initiatives approved in 2014-15. <p>This growth is offset by an increase in Whole of Government savings.</p>	The additional revenue was used to maintain and increase frontline policing to increase public safety and reduce crime.
Income from sale of goods and services	1.0	1.1	N/A	N/A
Interest income	0.1	0.1	N/A	N/A
Grants received in relation to trusts	1.3	4.4	The variance primarily relates to an increase in Victorian Government grants from TAC of \$2.9 million for additional roadside drug testing.	Additional revenue was provided for roadside drug testing, and equipping regional and metro highway patrol units with testing kits.
Other trust income	6.5	8.3	Additional funding relates to prisoner management costs invoiced to DOJR.	Additional prisoner related costs incurred as a result of the impact of available beds within the Corrections Victoria system.
Plant and equipment received free of charge or	0.7	0.1	Assets received free of charge in 2014-15 include a boat (\$70k) and a crisis response system (\$12k). Assets received free of charge for	No impact.

nominal consideration			previous year included two protective bomb suits (\$40k), electronic counter measure systems (\$350k) and digital forensic devices (\$270k).	
-----------------------	--	--	--	--

Question 13

Please explain any variances greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million between the initial budget estimate (**not** the revised estimate) and the actual result for 2013-14 and 2014-15 for each revenue/income category detailed in your operating statement. Please also identify any actions taken in response to the variations, either to mitigate or take advantage of the impact.

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

If there were no revenue/income categories for your department/agency for which the 2013-14 and 2014-15 expenditure varied from the initial budget estimate by more than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million, you do not need to answer this question. If this is the case, please indicate 'no relevant line items' in the table(s) below.

Revenue category	2013-14 budget estimate	2013-14 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million	Actions taken in response
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Output appropriation	2,280.3	2,273.8	N/A	
Special appropriation	0.0	2.0	Funding for <i>Trident Taskforce</i> received post budget	
Interest	0.1	0.1	N/A	
Sale of Goods and Services	0.0	1.0	N/A	
Grants	3.7	3.7	N/A	
Fair value of assets and services received free of charge or for nominal consideration	0.0	1.0	No budgeted amount for assets received free of charge.	

Other income	1.5	2.7	Increased trust revenues from grants from the Commonwealth for projects including CrimTrac and grants from private sector for projects which includes the Vehicle Safety Initiative.	
--------------	-----	-----	--	--

Revenue category	2014-15 budget estimate	2014-15 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million	Actions taken in response
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Output Appropriations	2,428.7	2,432.2	N/A	
Special Appropriations	2.1	2.1	N/A	
Interest	0.1	0.1	N/A	
Sale of Goods and Services	0.0	1.1	N/A	
Grants	3.7	8.5	The variance is largely due to additional payments from TAC in relation to the roadside drug testing program.	
Fair value of assets and services received free of charge or for nominal consideration	0.0	0.0	N/A	
Other income	1.5	2.6	Additional funding relates to prisoner management costs invoiced to the Department of Justice & Regulation.	

Question 14 (departments only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 15 (departments only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 16

Regarding the trust accounts listed in the 'trust account balances' note to the financial statements in your entity's annual report, please identify any accounts from which payments were passed directly to other bodies without being counted in your entity's comprehensive operating statement. For each relevant account, please identify:

- (a) the value of payments;
- (b) the recipients of the payments; and
- (c) the purpose of the payments.

(d) Trust account	Total payments from the account to bodies other than the Department, 2013-14 (\$ million)	Recipient of the payment	Purpose of the payment
4165: Departmental Suspense Account	7.4	Department of Treasury and Finance (held in trust)	Under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> , to record the receipt and disbursement of seized money.
4742: Treasury Trust Fund	1.7	Department of Treasury and Finance (held in trust) : unclaimed monies Department of Justice & Regulation : confiscated monies	Under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> , to record the receipt and disbursement of unclaimed and confiscated money.
4765: Public Service Commuter Club	0.6	Public Transport Victoria (PTV)	Under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> , to record the receipt of amounts associated with the scheme and deductions from Club members' salaries as well as recording payment to the Public Transport Corporation.

Trust account	Total payments from the account to bodies other than the Department, 2014-15	Recipient of the payment	Purpose of the payment
	(\$ million)		
4165 : Departmental Suspense Account	12.7	Department of Treasury and Finance (held in trust)	Under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> , to record the receipt and disbursement of seized money.
4742 : Treasury Trust Fund	10.9	Department of Treasury and Finance (held in trust) : unclaimed monies Department of Justice & Regulation : confiscated monies	Under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> , to record the receipt and disbursement of unclaimed and unidentified money.
4765 : Public Service Commuter Club	0.6	Public Transport Victoria (PTV)	Under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> , to record the receipt of amounts associated with the scheme and deductions from Club members' salaries as well as recording payment to the Public Transport Corporation.

SECTION D: Expenses

Question 17

Please explain any variances greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million between the prior year's actual result and the actual result for 2013-14 and 2014-15 for each category of expenses detailed in your operating statement. Please also detail the outcomes in the community¹ achieved by any additional expenses or the impact on the community of reduced expenses (if there was no impact, please explain how that was achieved).

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

¹ That is, the impact of service delivery on the community rather than a description of the services delivered.

If there were no categories of expenses for your department/agency for which the 2013-14 and 2014-15 expenditure varied from the prior year's expenditure by more than ±10 per cent or \$100 million, you do not need to answer this question. If this is the case, please indicate 'no relevant line items' in the table(s) below.

Expenses category	2012-13 actual	2013-14 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ±10 per cent or \$100 million	Outcomes achieved by additional expenses/impact of reduced expenses
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Employee expenses	1,575.4	1,676.8	The increase is due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the incremental indexation for frontline police and PSO salaries and on-costs existing output initiatives, particularly additional 1,700 frontline police and 940 PSOs. 	The additional expense was used to maintain and increase frontline policing to increase public safety and reduce crime.
Depreciation and amortisation	72.1	76.5	N/A	
Capital asset charge	78.9	86.9	The variance reflects the higher asset base in 2013-14 as compared to 2012-13.	No impact
Supplies and services	421.7	449.2	N/A	
Interest expense	3.5	2.9	The variance reflects a lower finance charge for Vic Fleet Motor Vehicles lease due to a lower interest rate in 2013-14 compared to prior year (5.61 per cent in 2013-14 compared to 6.41 per cent in 2012-13).	No impact

Expenses category	2013-14 actual	2014-15 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ±10 per cent or \$100 million	Outcomes achieved by additional expenses/impact of reduced expenses
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Employee expenses	1,676.8	1,833.7	The increase is due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the incremental indexation for frontline police and PSO salaries and on-costs growth in existing output initiatives, particularly additional 1,700 frontline police and 940 PSOs 	The additional expense was used to maintain and increase frontline policing to increase public safety and reduce crime.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> commuted overtime allowance as a result of claims from police officers associated with the Fair Work Commission decision output initiatives approved in 2014-15. 	
Depreciation and amortisation	76.5	76.7	N/A	
Capital asset charge	86.9	93.7	N/A	
Supplies and services	449.1	458.8	N/A	
Interest expense	2.9	1.8	The decrease of 36 per cent reflects a lower finance charge for Vic Fleet Motor Vehicles leases due to a lower interest rate compared to last year (4.77 per cent in 2014-15 compared to 5.61 per cent in 2013-14).	No impact.

Question 18

Please explain any variances greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million between the initial budget estimate (**not** the revised budget) and the actual result for 2013-14 and 2014-15 for each category of expenses detailed in your operating statement. Please also detail the outcomes in the community² achieved by any additional expenses or the impact on the community of reduced expenses (if there was no impact, please explain how that was achieved).

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

If there were no categories of expenses for your department/agency for which the 2013-14 and 2014-15 expenditure varied from the initial budget estimate by more than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million, you do not need to answer this question. If this is the case, please indicate 'no relevant line items' in the table(s) below.

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

Expenses category	2013-14 budget estimate	2013-14 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ±10 per cent or \$100 million	Outcomes achieved by additional expenses/impact of reduced expenses
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Employee benefits	1,651.7	1,676.6	N/A	
Depreciation and amortisation	78.4	76.5	N/A	
Interest Expense	3.6	2.9	The initial budget was based on an average interest rate of 4.77 per cent but lower rates were experience during the year.	No impact.
Capital Asset Charge	86.9	86.9	N/A	
Purchase of supplies and services	450.7	447.1	N/A	
Grants and other transfers	11.3	1.0	ESTA service payment (\$10.8 million) was originally budgeted against "Grants and other transfers". This was later corrected prior to Budget Update and now is budgeted for in "Purchase of supplies and services".	No impact.

Expenses category	2014-15 budget estimate	2014-15 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ±10 per cent or \$100 million	Outcomes achieved by additional expenses/impact of reduced expenses
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Employee expenses	1,780.8	1,834.7	N/A.	
Depreciation and amortisation	76.9	76.7	N/A	

Interest expense	3.5	1.8	The variance reflects a lower finance charge for VicFleet Motor Vehicles lease due to a lower interest rate compared to last year (4.77 per cent in 2014-15 compared to 5.61 per cent in 2013-14). Budget was based on the higher rate.	No impact
Grants and other transfers	0.5	0.0	N/A	
Capital Asset Charge	93.7	93.7	N/A	
Purchase of supplies and services	447.7	456.7	N/A	

Question 19 (departments only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 20

Please detail any changes to your department's/agency's service delivery as a result of expenditure reduction initiatives, e.g. changes to the timing and scope of specific programs or discontinued programs:

(a) in 2013-14

Nil impact on frontline service delivery.

(b) in 2014-15

Nil impact on frontline service delivery.

Question 21 (departments only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 22 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 23 (PNFC and PFC entities only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

SECTION E: Public sector workforce**Question 24**

Please detail the total full-time equivalent number of staff in your department/agency as at 30 June 2013, 30 June 2014 and 30 June 2015 in each of the following bands of levels, and explain the changes:

Level	Total FTE (30 June 2013)	Total FTE (30 June 2014)	Total FTE (30 June 2015)	Explanation for changes
VPS Grades 1-3	1,548.99	1,603.79	1,669.02	Change of rank for members of the police band from Constable to VPS3 = 8.4 FTE. Increases in: - Public Support Services Department - Record Services = 14.6 FTE - Licensing Services = 10.8 FTE - Crime Command = 8.2 FTE.
VPS Grade 4	411.12	451.04	457.18	
VPS Grades 5-6 and STS	337.91	360.48	378.57	

EO **	16.00	17.80	21.80	Growth in Executive Officers is in accordance with approvals from Department of Premier and Cabinet.
Forensic officers	208.17	209.94	223.78	
<i>Sub-Total Public Servants</i>	<i>2,522.19</i>	<i>2,643.06</i>	<i>2,750.34</i>	
Police and Recruits	12,642.74	13,221.06	13,258.73	Increase in Police numbers in line with government targets.
Protective Services Officers (PSOs)	589.74	1,086.74	1,186.74	Increase in PSO numbers in line with government targets.
Reservists	7.00	5.00	4.00	
<i>Sub-Total Sworn Staff</i>	<i>13,239.48</i>	<i>14,312.80</i>	<i>14,449.46</i>	
Total of all staff (including non-VPS grades)	15,761.67	16,955.86	17,199.80	

****Notes:**

1. The statutory positions [Police Registration and Services Board, the Office of Chief Examiner and the Commissioner for Privacy and Data Protection] and nationally funded executive positions within Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency have been excluded.
2. This listing of executive numbers only includes Victorian Public Servants and excludes Police Commissioners (Assistant Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Chief Commissioner of Police).
3. This table is FTE and the totals do not include vacancies.

Question 25

In the table below, please detail the salary costs for 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15, broken down by ongoing, fixed-term and casual, and explain any variances greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million between the years for each category.

Employment category	Gross salary 2012-13	Gross salary 2013-14	Gross salary 2014-15	Explanation for any year-on-year variances greater than ± 10 per cent or \$100 million
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Ongoing	1,556.7	1,655.8	1,810.1	Increases in salary costs due to increases in police and PSO numbers in line with government targets. Increases in VPS salary costs due to increases in FTE in Public Support Services Department, Licensing Services and Crime Command.
Fixed-term	18.1	20.4	23.3	
Casual	0.7	0.7	0.4	
Total	1,575.4	1,676.8	1,833.8	

Question 26

Please detail the number of executives who received increases in their base remuneration in 2013-14 and 2014-15, 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 in 2013-14	Reasons for these increases
0-3 per cent	27 total <i>Break-up =</i> 14x Executive Officer 13x Assistant Commissioner/Deputy Commissioner/Chief Commissioner of Police	Executive Officer annual remuneration review

3-5 per cent	1x Executive Officer	New Contract
5-10 per cent	2 total <i>Break-up =</i> 1x Executive Officer 1x Assistant Commissioner	New Contract
10-15 per cent	N/A	
greater than 15 per cent	1x Assistant Commissioner	New contract and significant new role with expanded responsibilities

****Note 1:**

3x Executive Officer and 3x Assistant Commissioner positions did not receive an increase in this period due to new appointments (total of 6)

****Note 2:** This includes all Executives within Victoria Police including; VPS Executives, Police Assistant Commissioners, GIC appointments (Police Deputy and Chief Commissioners). Executives from statutory bodies (PRSB, CPDP, Chief Examiner's Office & ANZPAA) have been excluded.

Increase in base remuneration	Number of executives receiving increases in their base rate of remuneration of this amount in 2014-15	Reasons for these increases
0-3 per cent	20 total <i>Break-up =</i> 14x Executive Officer 6x Assistant Commissioner/Deputy Commissioner/Chief Commissioner of Police	Executive Officer annual remuneration review
3-5 per cent	2x Assistant Commissioner/Deputy Commissioner	Sworn Executive Officer Remuneration Review plus Executive Officer annual remuneration review
5-10 per cent	12 total <i>Break up =</i>	Sworn Executive Officer Remuneration Review plus Executive Officer annual remuneration review.

	4x Executive Officer 8x Assistant Commissioner/Deputy Commissioner	Remuneration Review & Renewal of contract. Employee was reclassified to an EO-2. New contract and change in scope of control and responsibility.
10-15 per cent	1x Assistant Commissioner	Due to annual remuneration review and change in role which significantly increased span of control and responsibility
greater than 15 per cent	N/A	

****Note 1:**

5x Executive Officer and 1x Assistant Commissioner did not receive an increase in this period due to new appointments (total of 6).

****Note 2:** This includes all Executives within Victoria Police including; VPS Executives, Police Assistant Commissioners, GIC appointments (Police Deputy and Chief Commissioners). Executives from statutory bodies (PRSB, Chief Examiner's Office & ANZPAA) have been excluded.

SECTION F: Inter-sector flows***Question 27 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)***

This question does not apply to your agency.

SECTION G: Government decisions impacting on the finances

Question 28

(a) Please detail any costs incurred during 2014-15 in the following categories as a result of machinery-of-government changes:

	(\$ million)
Consultants and contractors (including legal advice)	N/A
Relocation	N/A
Telephony	N/A
IT and records management	N/A
Rebranding	N/A
Furniture and fit-out	N/A
Other	N/A

(b) If these costs were met out of existing budgets, please indicate what projects, programs or areas the money was originally budgeted for.

N/A

(c) Please identify any benefits achieved during 2014-15 as a result of machinery-of-government changes, quantifying the benefits where possible.

N/A

Question 29

Please identify any Commonwealth Government decisions during 2013-14 or 2014-15 which had not been anticipated in the State budget but which impacted on your entity's finances or activities during those years (including new funding agreements, discontinued agreements and changes to funding levels). Please quantify the impact on income and expenses where possible.

Commonwealth Government decision	Impact in 2013-14		Impact in 2014-15	
	on income (\$ million)	on expenses (\$ million)	on income (\$ million)	on expenses (\$ million)
Trident Taskforce	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.1

Question 30

Please identify any COAG decisions during 2013-14 or 2014-15 which had not been anticipated in the State budget but which impacted on your entity's finances or activities during those years (including new funding agreements, discontinued agreements and changes to agreements). Please quantify the impact on income and expenses where possible.

COAG decision	Impact in 2013-14		Impact in 2014-15	
	on income (\$ million)	on expenses (\$ million)	on income (\$ million)	on expenses (\$ million)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SECTION H: Fiscal and financial management strategies (Department of Treasury and Finance only)**Question 31**

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 32

This question does not apply to your agency.

SECTION I: Economic environment

Question 33 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 34 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 35 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 36 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 37

Please identify any key economic variables for which there were variances in 2013-14 and 2014-15 between what was estimated in the initial budget for each year (**not** the revised estimate) and what actually occurred which had a significant impact on your department's/agency's finances, service delivery or asset investment. For each variance, please indicate:

- (a) what had been expected at budget time
- (b) what actually occurred
- (c) how the variance impacted on the budget outcomes (quantifying the impact where possible)
- (d) what decisions were made in response (including changes to service delivery, asset investment, borrowings etc.).

(e) Expected economic result in 2013-14	Actual result in 2013-14	Impact of the variance on budget outcomes	Decisions made in response
\$3.6 million for finance lease interest expense.	\$2.9 million.	The initial budget was based on an average interest rate of 6.41 per cent but lower rates were experienced during the year (5.61 per cent).	No impact

Expected economic result in 2014-15	Actual result in 2014-15	Impact of the variance on budget outcomes	Impact of the variance on service delivery
\$3.5 million for finance lease interest expense.	\$1.8 million.	The initial budget was based on an average interest rate of 5.61 per cent but lower rates were experienced during the year (4.77 per cent).	No impact

SECTION J: Previous recommendations**Question 38 (departments only)**

This question does not apply to your agency.