

**Government Responses to the Recommendations of
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES COMMITTEES**

108th Report - Review of the Auditor-General's Reports January-June 2009 and follow-up of PAEC Reports 82, 86 and 91

DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND FINANCE

Pursuant to Section 36 of the *Parliamentary Committees Act 2003*, this paper provides a response to the recommendations contained in the Public Accounts and Estimates Committee's (PAEC) 108th Report.

Guide for Readers - Following is the explanation of the format of this paper.

1	2	3
Title	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
2		
Chapter number and topic		
1		
PAEC Recommendation		

- Row 1: Indicates the title of this paper.
- Row 2: Indicates the number and topic of the response to the PAEC recommendations.
- Column 1: Contains the PAEC's recommendations as published in its 108th Report.
- Column 2: Indicates the Government's response to each recommendation:
 - Support** – Commitments to further action should include target timeframes, where possible.
 - Under review** – Details of the nature of the review should be provided as well as target timeframes, where appropriate.
 - Not support** – Must be accompanied by an explanation.
- Column 3: Provides an explanation of the Government's position on the recommendation; indicates the actions that have been taken to date, relevant to the implementation of the recommendation; and outlines commitment to further action, relevant to the implementation of the recommendation.

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
<p>Recommendation 1, Chapter 1.6 Management of School Funds (May 2009), page 8</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development ensure that schools and School Councils are made fully aware of, and understand, the legal compliance responsibilities of school co-operatives under the <i>Co-operatives Act 1996</i>.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The <i>CASES21 Bulletin</i> is one of the primary mechanisms to deliver financial policy and operational advice to schools. It is provided to all relevant school-based officers including business managers, principals and school council presidents. An article advising schools of their legal compliance responsibilities regarding cooperatives was published at the end of the 2009-2010 financial year. A similar article was published at the end of the 2010-2011 financial year and subsequent articles are planned for the end of each financial year. Advice on compliance responsibilities regarding cooperatives is also provided to schools via the state wide business managers' network, the <i>Finance Manual for Victorian Government Schools</i> and the <i>School Policy and Advisory Guide</i>.</p> <p>Department staff met with representatives from Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) and Consumer Affairs Victoria (CAV) to discuss improving the processes for school cooperatives applications and compliance. It has been agreed that the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) in conjunction with CAV will directly contact each school currently involved in a cooperative to advise them of their legal compliance responsibilities and offer assistance in meeting those responsibilities. This communication will occur on an annual basis. DEECD is working with CAV and DTF to improve the cooperative application process regarding schools and will ensure that providing schools with a clear understanding of their legal compliance responsibilities is an integral part of this process.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2, Chapter 1.7 Management of School Funds (May 2009), page 9</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development provide appropriate advice to ensure that School Councils are fully apprised of the legal restrictions on borrowings by the School unless through a school co-operative and providing "arms length" arrangements are established between the school co-operative and the School Council. In doing so, the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development should ensure that School Councils have a clear understanding of the legal criteria for establishing an "arms length" arrangement for these purposes.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Schools will be advised with appropriate advice.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
---------------------	----------	---

Recommendation 3, Chapter 1.8 Management of School Funds (May 2009), page 14

<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development:</p> <p>(a) take action to assess the extent of any "under insurance" amongst government schools in relation to facilities deemed excess to entitlement by the Department and ensure that schools and school councils are fully aware of insurance requirements in relation to these facilities; and</p> <p>(b) clarify the Department's insurance and reinstatement procedures as they relate to facilities which are within entitlement but which have been financed by the school itself or jointly with the Department.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>(a) The Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) has completed a review of the risk and insurance arrangements. This review focussed on third party use of school facilities and considered insurance implications for jointly funded facilities. Following from this review advice was provided to all schools clearly outlining obligations for insuring school buildings, including those jointly funded. DEECD continues to provide insurance advice to schools when required. Advice was recently provided to schools clarifying insurance arrangements for Building the Education Revolution facilities, including those that are over-entitled.</p> <p>(b) DEECD is working with the Victorian Managed Insurance Authority to undertake a review of the Department's insurance arrangements.</p>
--	----------------	---

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
<p>Recommendation 4, Chapter 2 Withdrawal of Infringement Notices, page 23</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Justice should stress with enforcement agencies the importance of their attending forums conducted by the Agency Working Group. The Department should publish on its website and/or in its annual report those who do not attend.</p>	<p>a) Support b) Not support</p>	<p>a) The Department of Justice supports the recommendation that it stress the importance of enforcement agencies attending forums conducted by the Enforcement Agency Working Group, and will continue to do so in communications with enforcement agencies.</p> <p>b) The Department does not support publishing on its website and/or in its annual report those who do not attend as issues addressed in Working Group meetings are included in the Department's agency newsletter to make the information accessible to those who were unable to attend a meeting.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5, Chapter 2 Withdrawal of Infringement Notices, page 28</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Justice should seek to confirm the legal status of multiple assessments in the context of section 22(2)(e) of the <i>Infringements Act 2006</i>.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Justice confirms that the <i>Infringements Act 2006</i> is clear on this issue and that only one internal review may be conducted per infringement notice. In addition, section 18 of the <i>Infringements Act 2006</i> gives agencies an additional power to withdraw infringement notices at their discretion.</p>
<p>Recommendation 6, Chapter 2 Withdrawal of Infringement Notices, page 28</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Justice emphasise to all enforcement agencies, the need to maintain an appropriate level of detail on multiple reviews to ensure that such reviews are actioned expeditiously in accordance with the legislation and guidelines.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Justice supports this recommendation. The Department has included an article in its May/June 2012 agency newsletter emphasising the importance of maintaining appropriate records that enable enforcement agencies to identify where an internal review has been conducted on an infringement notice, as well as where a subsequent decision has been made under section 18 of the <i>Infringements Act 2006</i>, to withdraw that infringement notice.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
---------------------	----------	---

Recommendation 7, Chapter 2 Withdrawal of Infringement Notices, page 31

<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Justice consider expanding the Magistrates' Court Enforcement Review Program, to allow persons with special circumstances living in regional and rural Victoria greater access to the specialist services offered by the program.</p>	<p>Under review</p>	<p>This recommendation is under review. The Department of Justice notes the recommendation and will continue to consider how to maximise access to the Magistrates' Court Enforcement Review Program within the context of resource constraints.</p>
--	---------------------	--

Recommendation 8, Chapter 2 Withdrawal of Infringement Notices, page 34

<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Justice's internal audit should undertake periodic reviews of the Department's compliance with the procedural requirements for withdrawing infringement notices related to Victoria Police officers.</p>	<p>Not support</p>	<p>While the Department of Justice continues to work collaboratively with Victoria Police and all enforcement agencies to ensure that the internal review process is fair and consistent, the Department has no power to audit decisions to withdraw, confirm or vary legal proceedings initiated by Victoria Police.</p>
---	--------------------	---

Recommendation 9, Chapter 2 Withdrawal of Infringement Notices, page 37

<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Justice should emphasise to all enforcement agencies, the need to maintain a comprehensive performance measurement framework for their infringement systems.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Justice agrees that enforcement agencies should maintain appropriate records of infringements activity and supports this recommendation. It is important that accurate records are kept of an enforcement agency's infringements activity and that the infringements reports provided to the Attorney-General be both timely and accurate. The Department will continue to reinforce with enforcement agencies the need to maintain appropriate records.</p>
---	----------------	---

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
---------------------	----------	---

<p>Recommendation 10, Chapter 3 Connecting Courts -- the Integrated Courts Management System (June 2009), page 45</p> <p>To enhance accountability and transparency, the Department of Justice should publicly disclose in its annual report and/or on its website:</p> <p>(a) details of the revised timelines for the roll-out of the Integrated Courts Management System to jurisdictions and tribunals, together with the reasons for their re-scheduling;</p> <p>(b) revised estimates for the total development and operational costs of the Integrated Courts Management System; and</p> <p>(c) a complete analysis of the major cost overruns and implementation delays of the Integrated Courts Management System.</p>	<p>Not support</p>	<p>The Department of Justice is not in a position to support this recommendation due to significant changes to the Integrated Courts Management System (ICMS) project since this recommendation was made. The ICMS project was subject to an Ombudsman's review (<i>Own motion investigation into ICT - enabled Projects</i>) in November 2011. The ICMS project in its existing form was discontinued on 30 June 2012.</p> <p>Revised estimates for total development costs of ICMS were published in the Ombudsman's report and have not varied. Operational costs will be part of the overall cost of maintaining the Courts' case management systems and will not be able to be disaggregated, however the costs will be published each year.</p> <p>A complete analysis of the major cost overruns and implementation delays has been conducted by the Department, the Auditor-General and the Ombudsman. The reviews by the Auditor-General and Ombudsman are publicly available. Reviews conducted by the Department detail commercial-in-confidence material that is not appropriate to distribute in this manner.</p>
<p>Recommendation 11, Chapter 3 Connecting Courts -- the Integrated Courts Management System (June 2009), page 47</p> <p>In the interests of accountability, the Department of Justice's Courts Technology Group should, at the earliest opportunity, formalise service level agreements with jurisdictions.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Justice supports the recommendation. A Memorandum of Understanding has been developed with the Supreme and Coroners' Courts by the Courts Technology Group. Work is underway to establish agreements with the remaining jurisdictions, including establishing detailed performance measures and reporting.</p> <p>Additionally, the Courts Technology Group is in the process of establishing a "service catalogue" in-line with the Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) methodology. Operational Level Agreements will be established along with detailed reporting and performance measures. These are expected to be in place within the next financial year.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
Recommendation 12, Chapter 3 Connecting Courts – the Integrated Courts Management System (June 2009), page 48		
<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Justice conduct a cost/benefit analysis to reaffirm that the benefits of the Integrated Courts Management System still outweigh the costs involved. This analysis should identify what other additional but avoidable costs have been or will be incurred because of the delay in roll-out of the System.</p>	Support	<p>The Integrated Courts Management System (ICMS) project was subject to an Ombudsman's review (<i>Own motion investigation into ICT – enabled Projects</i>) November 2011) leading to a review of the project and resulting in the project being discontinued in its existing form on 30 June 2012. Under the ICMS project, the CourtView case management system has been rolled out in the Supreme and Coroners Courts. Following 30 June 2012, the ICMS project focuses on finalising work in these jurisdictions. Upgrades to the case management systems of the remaining Victorian Courts and Tribunals will be based on individual business cases. Any resulting system upgrades will be separately implemented and will not form part of the ICMS project.</p>
Recommendation 13, Chapter 3 Connecting Courts – the Integrated Courts Management System (June 2009), page 48		
<p>Within two years of full implementation of the Integrated Courts Management System, the Auditor-General audit the extent to which benefits have been realised, including the success of the integration of all system components and the effectiveness of ongoing program monitoring.</p>	n/a	<p>The Victorian Auditor-General's Office responds directly to the Committee in relation to Public Accounts and Estimates Committee recommendations.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
<p>Recommendation 14, Chapter 3 Connecting Courts – the Integrated Courts Management System (June 2009), page 52</p> <p>The Department of Justice include in its Project Management Excellence Framework, comprehensive guidance on how to realistically and accurately determine the size and complexity of IT transformation programs and to more accurately estimate program development costs.</p>	Support	The Department of Justice will ensure that the Project Management Excellence Framework includes the requirement to perform a sizing and complexity assessment and include references to available tools for use depending on the nature of the program.
<p>Recommendation 15, Chapter 3 Connecting Courts – the Integrated Courts Management System (June 2009), page 56</p> <p>The Department of Justice's Project Management Excellence Framework should include a requirement for periodic independent specialist reviews for all large and complex IT transformation projects.</p>	Support	The Department of Justice will ensure that the framework requires independent specialist reviews of all large and complex IT transformation projects at appropriate points in the project's lifecycle.
<p>Recommendation 16, Chapter 3 Connecting Courts – the Integrated Courts Management System (June 2009), page 58</p> <p>The Department of Justice should include independent IT specialist representation in its governance arrangements for future complex IT transformation projects.</p>	Support	The Department of Justice has implemented this recommendation.

PAFC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
<p>Recommendation 17, Chapter 4 Implementing Victoria Police's Code of Practice for the Investigation of Family Violence, page 64</p> <p>In the interests of ensuring that investigations of family violence incidents are undertaken efficiently, the Committee recommends that Victoria Police capture and analyse the time spent in undertaking investigations and associated costs against suitable benchmarks.</p>	<p>Not support</p>	<p>In responding to family violence incidents, the principal priority for police is to secure the safety of the affected family member and any children, and to hold the perpetrator accountable for their use of violence. These principles are enshrined in the Code of Practice for the Investigation of Family Violence and are reflective of the principles of whole-of-government reform.</p> <p>An understanding of time spent at family violence incidents, in court proceedings and finalising documentation to support intervention order applications, is of benefit in resource allocation.</p> <p>In a response context, consideration of costs and time spent would potentially undermine the efficacy of the police response, and create conflicting interests for frontline members. The primary focus of any investigation and response is upon keeping victims safe and holding perpetrators accountable, and this will occur regardless of the time required to provide an appropriate response. For example, the costs associated with enforcing a breach of an intervention order would be considered in the process of undertaking an investigation, but would not be a primary driver of whether or not to proceed. Safety is a paramount consideration.</p> <p>Victoria Police have internal mechanisms in place such as 'Comparison of Statistics' (COMPSTAT) to hold police accountable for the response to and investigation of family violence incidents.</p>
<p>Recommendation 18, Chapter 4 Implementing Victoria Police's Code of Practice for the Investigation of Family Violence, page 66</p> <p>The Committee recommends that Victoria Police review the need to develop data systems that will enable the impact that police applications for intervention orders and the findings of criminal prosecutions are having on the safety of victims of family violence.</p>	<p>Not support</p>	<p>Victoria Police monitors a range of metrics in relation to implementing Victoria Police's role in both the Criminal and Civil systems in relation to family violence. For example, police-initiated applications for intervention orders have exceeded the 10 per cent increase target, and police use of civil options has also increased. Recent data from the Magistrates' Court of Victoria indicate that more than half of family violence intervention order applications are made by police. In addition, charges laid by police at family violence incidents have increased by 36.6 per cent between 2008-09 and 2010-11. These are all positive indicators of use of the system. However, determining the overall impact of intervention orders on the safety of the victims of family violence is not a role best performed by Victoria Police. The most enduring contact of victims is generally with support services rather than police. This work would best be undertaken as a whole-of-government research initiative.</p>
<p>Recommendation 19, Chapter 4 Implementing Victoria Police's Code of Practice for the Investigation of Family Violence, page 67</p> <p>The Committee recommends that Victoria Police ensure the development of technological capacity to track referrals through the service system and monitor referral outcomes.</p>	<p>Not support</p>	<p>Victoria Police maintains a strong relationship with the Department of Human Services to monitor service demand and regularly consider outcomes at a systemic level. The Victoria Police and Department of Human Services <i>Family Violence Referral Pathways Protocol</i> sets out criteria for making referrals to specialist services. However, development of capacity (including technology) to track referrals through the service system would require multi-agency cooperation and significant infrastructure funding.</p> <p>Through the Strengthening Risk Management Demonstration Sites, currently operating in Hume and Greater Geelong, police are engaged in monitoring the safety and outcomes of high risk victims and their children. This project offers capacity for multi-agency collaboration and information sharing, such that a holistic response to safety can be considered. This project will be subject to an evaluation and inform future planning in regard to monitoring client outcomes.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
---------------------	----------	---

Recommendation 20, Chapter 4 Implementing Victoria Police's Code of Practice for the Investigation of Family Violence, page 68

<p>The Committee recommends that Victoria Police ensure that performance measures and targets form part of the process of publicly reporting against the objectives of the <i>Living Free from Violence, Upholding the Right: Victoria Police Strategy to Reduce Violence Against Women and Children 2009-14</i>.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>In 2012 Victoria Police will report publicly against the objectives of <i>Living Free from Violence, Upholding the Right: Victoria Police Strategy to Reduce Violence Against Women and Children 2009-14</i>. Currently consideration is being given to the best method for reporting on data against the performance measures contained in the Strategy.</p>
---	----------------	--

Recommendation 21, Chapter 4 Implementing Victoria Police's Code of Practice for the Investigation of Family Violence, page 70

<p>The Committee recommends that the Government commission a formal evaluation of the whole-of-government family violence reform agenda.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>This recommendation is supported, noting that the objective of this recommendation will be achieved through the development and implementation of the whole-of-government Action Plan to Address Violence against Women and their Children, including family violence and sexual assault, which are the most prevalent forms of violence against women. Finalisation of the Action Plan is being informed by extensive feedback received from stakeholders about the current system. The Action Plan will set future directions and include a range of actions across government to address violence against women (including family violence) and it will provide a critical mechanism for monitoring and evaluating these actions and their impact. Evaluation of specific reforms and programs to address violence against women, such as the Preventing Violence against Women in our Community Program, will also occur to inform future policy development and system reform. A number of evaluations have already been undertaken, such as the police safety notices evaluation, and some are underway, such as the strengthening family violence risk management demonstration project.</p>
--	----------------	--

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
---------------------	----------	---

<p>Recommendation 22, Chapter 4 Implementing Victoria Police's Code of Practice for the Investigation of Family Violence, page 71</p> <p>The Committee recommends that Victoria Police ensure that the position of family violence liaison officers be strengthened through undertaking a competitive recruitment process.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>There is a Family Violence Liaison Officer (FVLO) located at every 24-hour police station in Victoria, and at some 16-hour police stations.</p> <p>On 24 November 2011, the Chief Commissioner of Victoria Police launched the Enhanced Family Violence Service Delivery Model. This model signals Victoria Police's commitment to family violence and applies through to 2014. The model includes a range of operational reforms aimed at managing repeat victims, holding recidivist offenders accountable, and identifying and responding to high risk victims. As part of the implementation of the Enhanced Family Violence Service Delivery Model, standard operating procedures (SOPs) will be developed for the FVLO portfolio. The SOPs will articulate the specific tasks to be completed by the FVLO in supervision of other staff, and outline responsibilities in relation to oversighting risk assessment and management. This will ensure consistency in the delivery of FVLO functions and provide a foundation of minimum expectations for all portfolio holders.</p>
---	----------------	---

<p>Recommendation 23, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 77</p>		
<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Treasury and Finance complete their review of the Financial Reporting Directions as they relate to the expenditure of public funds on advertising and public relations activities in an effort to further improve the transparency and quality of public reporting.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Treasury and Finance, in conjunction with the Department of Premier and Cabinet, is in the process of reviewing Financial Reporting Direction 22 in relation to the disclosure requirements for government advertising, with the objective of further improving transparency in this area.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
<p>Recommendation 24, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 79</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Treasury and Finance take action to ensure that all major tenders undertaken by public sector entities (departmental and non-departmental) use the Probity Practitioner Services Panel and comply with all relevant government procurement and tendering policies and guidelines.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Entities bound by the Victorian Government Purchasing Board (VGPB) policies (11 departments and 12 administrative offices) are obligated to use the panel for high value or complex tenders, where the capability does not exist within the department.</p> <p>In addition, these entities are required to comply with established procurement policies and breaches, which are reported annually to Parliament.</p> <p>Entities that fall outside of the scope of the VGPB are encouraged to utilise these policies.</p>
<p>Recommendation 25, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 80</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Health ensure that all current Service Agreements with public sector residential aged care providers include details of the relevant State asset management policies, principles and minimum performance standards with which providers must comply.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The <i>Victorian Health Services Policy and Funding Guidelines</i> (P&F Guidelines) are the primary mechanism for this purpose, and relate to all health service assets, including those buildings used for delivery of residential aged care.</p> <p>The draft 2012 P&F Guidelines have been amended and include asset management responsibilities and State requirements. It is however important to note that the Commonwealth Government is the primary funder and regulator of residential aged care services. All providers (including public sector residential aged care services) are required to comply with Commonwealth aged care accreditation standards, which include requirements relating to the condition of the buildings in which services are provided and emergency preparedness. In addition, all services are required to meet the Commonwealth's building certification requirements.</p> <p>The Commonwealth thus has an important role to play in monitoring the condition of aged care facilities and setting standards regarding this.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
<p>Recommendation 26, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 80</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Health ensure that an appropriate and reliable performance management system is in place to monitor the compliance of residential aged care service providers with the terms and conditions of Service Agreements as they relate to the condition of aged care buildings and facilities.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Health <i>Victorian Health Services Policy and Funding Guidelines</i> are the main vehicle to address this. The Department of Health is responsible for the state wide health service performance framework and has a central <i>Service Performance and Governance</i> program with metropolitan health services and a rural program involving the Department's rural regions.</p> <p>The Department of Health monitors asset performance at the system level. Health services/ hospitals locally manage the condition of assets under their control.</p> <p>As highlighted in the previous response, the Commonwealth government also plays an important role in setting standards for residential aged care facilities and monitoring compliance with these standards.</p>
<p>Recommendation 27, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 80</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Health seek to implement a system or method of asset review which enables information about the current physical condition of aged care buildings and facilities to be collected and updated in a timely manner.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Health is trialling a tool kit to make it simpler for health services to collect information and monitor the condition of their facilities, in a manner that will be consistent across the State. The tool kit is to provide guidance to health services on the data to collect, data definitions, and templates for data collection.</p> <p>Under this approach, health services collect data in the templates provided, and forward these to the Department of Health which will generate consolidated reports back to the service. This will provide health services with clearer more effective information regarding the condition of their facilities over time. The reporting is being structured to align with central agencies' asset management requirements.</p> <p>The trial will be completed in 2012 and a decision on subsequent roll out and associated timeframes is expected thereafter.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
<p>Recommendation 28, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 83</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Business and Innovation, in consultation with the Department of Treasury and Finance, seek to formalise guidance for the economic assessment of major events which have been funded in excess of \$10 million per annum by the State.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Consistent with the recommendations of the Victorian Auditor-General's 2007 report, State Investment in Major Events, Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) modelling is used for the Grand Prix to assess its impact on the Victorian economy (with regard to Gross State Product, private investment, consumption and employment).</p> <p>The Department of Business and Innovation is consulting with the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department of Premier and Cabinet and other relevant stakeholders to develop guidance material outlining factors to be taken into consideration when determining the approach to be used for specific events funded in excess of \$10 million per annum by the State.</p> <p>The economic assessment approach should be fit for purpose, in order to meaningfully assess the impact of events on the economy. While CGE modelling is principally considered for larger and more complex events, more suitable and cost-effective approaches may be considered, particularly for any event just exceeding the \$10 million per annum threshold, where the level of expenditure may not be sufficient to generate a sizeable impact in an economy the size of Victoria's.</p>
<p>Recommendation 29, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 87</p>		
<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Health finalise its review and update of the health promotion funding formula as originally advised in November 2009. The most recent health status data across various population groups should be referenced in determining funding allocations.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The current three-year planning cycle for <i>Integrated Health Promotion</i> of 2009-2012 has been extended to four-years to align with <i>Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing</i> planning, making it now 2009-2013. Therefore, changes to the funding formula for health promotion will be considered during the additional year of the current planning cycle - 2012-13 - to inform the next planning cycle of 2013-2017. Changes to the formula of other health promotion funding will also be considered in this context and will be discussed in detail with the relevant sector.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
Recommendation 30, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 87		
<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Health finalise the publication of the results collected through the Victorian Health Monitor in relation to cardiovascular disease and diabetes risk factors and the food and nutrition survey.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Health has completed the <i>Victorian Health Monitor</i> which collected data on the prevalence of diabetes, cardiovascular disease, kidney disease, and associated risk factors for these chronic diseases including obesity and hypertension, in adults aged 18 to 75 years.</p> <p>The <i>Victorian Health Monitor</i> has also collected comprehensive information on the dietary habits and nutritional status of the adult population. The results are due to be released later in 2012.</p>
Recommendation 31, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 87		
<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Health consider undertaking evaluations of the Department's past health plans and strategies such as the <i>Go for your life Strategic Plan 2006-10</i>, the <i>Cancer Action Plan 2008-11</i> and the <i>Diabetes Prevention and Management Strategic Framework 2007-10</i>, to assess the their effectiveness in achieving specified objectives and also to provide input to future strategic health prevention actions.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>All plans and strategies are time-limited and included an element of funding to evaluate effectiveness and impact on target population.</p> <p>For example, a review of <i>Go For Your Life</i> reported that 'there was a lack of agreed targets and outcomes for the (<i>Go For Your Life</i>) strategy' and that 'it is clear from population level data that there have not been significant positive shifts in healthy eating, physical activity or overweight/obesity during the time period of <i>Go For Your Life</i>'.</p> <p>The evaluations have informed future plans and strategies.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
Recommendation 32, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 87		
To avoid the risk of duplication and inefficient application of resources, the Committee recommends that the Department of Health ensure that State preventative health programs and initiatives do not duplicate health initiatives being implemented under National Agreements on Preventive Health and Indigenous Health.	Support	The Department of Health has reviewed and is bringing together current preventive health programs and establishing new programs to provide a coordinated platform to contribute to the achievement of the <i>Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2011-2015</i> . For the first time in Victoria the <i>Public Health and Wellbeing Plan</i> provides an opportunity to take a comprehensive and high level view of the scope of preventive health activity undertaken in this state. By taking a whole-of-government, whole-of-system, and whole-of-life approach the plan provides the basis for resources to be used more efficiently, and for improved outcomes for individuals, the healthcare system, and the wider economy and society.
Recommendation 33, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 91		
The Committee recommends that the Department of Health and the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development need to establish a means to improve inter-sectoral collaboration and coordination in relation to preventative health initiatives to ensure that: (a) public health promotion goals and objectives are clearly articulated and understood; (b) the implementation of health promotion programs and initiatives in schools is monitored; and (c) the impacts/outcomes of programs and initiatives are evaluated.	Support	The Department of Health (DH) and the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) have been working together on a preventative health agenda. DH and DEECD are collaborating to promote the health of Victoria's children and young people through a range of initiatives through the <i>Healthy Children, Healthy Communities</i> program, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of initiatives under the <i>Victorian Healthy Eating Enterprise (VHEE)</i> for schools and their communities, • the <i>Prevention Community Model (PCM)</i> in 14 demonstration sites across Victoria; and • <i>Victorian Prevention and Health Promotion Achievement Program</i> benchmarks – for primary and secondary schools and early childhood services. Collaboration and coordination between DH and DEECD has been formalised through a high level steering group jointly chaired by DH and DEECD, with membership from across government and from non-government organisations. The steering group provides advice on the child preventative health agenda as well as implementation of recommendations from the Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry into the Potential for Developing Opportunities for Schools to Become a Focus for Promoting Healthy Community Living. Specific initiatives include the development of health promotion guidelines for children and young people and a new achievement program to support schools, early childhood services and other settings in becoming health promoting environments.

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
---------------------	----------	---

Recommendation 34, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 91

<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Health and the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development seek to improve the sustainability of health prevention programs in schools with a view to maximising the impact of those programs on long-term public health objectives.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>(See Recommendation 33.) The Department of Health and the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, in partnership with local communities, are currently developing the <i>Victorian Prevention and Health Promotion Achievement Program</i>. This promotes a sustainable model for improving student health and wellbeing outcomes. It sets benchmarks and provides tools to support schools to implement initiatives around the following eight health priority areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • healthy eating and oral health, • physical activity, • mental health and wellbeing, • safe environments, • sun protection, • sexual health and wellbeing, • tobacco control; and • alcohol and other drug use. <p>The achievement program for schools and early childhood services will integrate the array of different programs with which schools and early childhood settings are currently engaged into one cohesive model using a health promoting schools approach.</p>
---	----------------	--

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
Recommendation 35, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 91		
<p>The Committee recommends that the Department Education and Early Childhood Development establish timeliness and target dates for the implementation of the recommendations of the Parliamentary Education and Training Committee's Inquiry into the Potential for Developing Opportunities for Schools to Become a Focus for Promoting Healthy Community Living.</p>	Support	<p>The Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) will develop a series of circulars to all schools and early childhood settings promoting the <i>Victorian Healthy Eating Enterprise (VHEE)</i> Initiatives and broader Healthy Children Healthy Communities Initiatives (Timeline: June – Dec 2012).</p> <p>Schools and early childhood settings will be invited (via circular and through correspondence to existing Go For Your Life schools) to register to participate in the <i>Victorian Prevention and Health Promotion Achievement Program</i>.</p> <p>Schools will be directed via circular to access the <i>Victorian Healthy Eating Advisory Service</i> for advice or a free canteen menu assessment.</p> <p>The current DEECD website will be enhanced to reflect the new Healthy Children Healthy Communities Initiatives and further promote this to schools via content and resource materials plus web-links to other departments.</p> <p>DEECD will liaise with the Department of Health to identify media opportunities for the Ministers' for Education and Early Childhood Development related to the range of health promotion initiatives. (Timeline: June – Dec 2012).</p>
Recommendation 36, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 91		
<p>The Committee recommends that the Department Education and Early Childhood Development ensure that school health promotion programs and initiatives are regularly assessed and the outcomes measured so that proven initiatives can be incorporated into regular and sustained practices within the school curriculum and school environment.</p>	Support	<p>The Department of Health (DH) and the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) have developed benchmarks in relation to the eight health priority areas of the <i>Victorian Prevention and Health Promotion Achievement Program</i>.</p> <p>DH and DEECD will work in partnership with the Centre of Excellence in Intervention and Prevention Science to assess the success of prevention activities under the Healthy Children Healthy Communities Initiatives.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
<p>Recommendation 37, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 91</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department Education and Early Childhood Development make better use of the data and reports produced through the Victorian Children and Adolescent Monitoring System, VichHealth and the Australian Health Promoting Schools Association to assist in identifying and targeting the required health promotion interventions and activities in schools.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) is reviewing its use of Victorian Children and Adolescent Monitoring System data to support sustainable health initiatives.</p> <p>DEECD has established a relationship with Vic Health and the Australian Health Promoting Schools Association to ensure access to latest data and reports to inform the development and implementation of the Achievement Program and other Healthy Children Healthy Communities initiatives.</p> <p>The Department of Health and DEECD will continue to work in partnership with the Centre of Excellence in Intervention and Prevention Science to assess the success of prevention activities under the Healthy Children Healthy Communities initiatives.</p>
<p>Recommendation 38, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 93</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Justice finalise the draft Workforce Plan of the Melbourne Magistrates' Court of Victoria and continue to investigate staff rotation and secondment opportunities for the administrative staff of the Court.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The draft Workforce Plan for the Magistrates' Court of Victoria (MCV) was completed in 2010. The Workforce Plan informed the 2010 MCV strategic plan, which developed a requirement to further develop formal learning pathways and leadership development. Within these initiatives active 'rotations' and secondments to secure learning have been progressed.</p> <p>Specifically, in 2011, this was actioned by the development of a capability framework, which classified the main capabilities of the court and identified the various levels of skills and knowledge from beginner to advanced. This framework offers the basis for formal policy and programs to rotate staff to develop required learning in meeting capabilities established via the performance management program and to meet business goals or key performance indicators. The MCV have inbuilt learning via rotations for all entry level trainee registrars. This rotation program is locally defined as a 'transfer' program and staff develop their capability by working at different court locations. Particularly, working within a regional location allows staff to develop broader capability in the operations of other Victorian court jurisdictions.</p> <p>The work completed by the MCV is forming the basis for an all of court capability framework. This initiative is due for phase one completion soon. This framework progresses current informal processes to rotate staff from other jurisdictions to work within the MCV to develop their capability under the entry level learning, Certificate IV program. The progress will allow for formal programs and policy on capability development across all courts. Finally, internal rotations and secondments occur regularly across the MCV through opportunities found in acting arrangements for all roles once the role incumbent is on short-term or long-term leave or undertaking a secondment opportunity in a more senior role.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
<p>Recommendation 39, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 97</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Primary Industries implement treatment actions to address all "significant risks" identified in the risk assessment of the Department's agricultural research investment framework as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Primary Industries (DPI) has developed a risk management plan to address the "significant risks" identified in the risk assessment of the DPI Agriculture and Fisheries Investment framework.</p> <p>The first significant risk (<i>that DPI's Performance measurement Framework does not adequately demonstrate the overall public value of investment leading to reduced funding</i>) has been addressed by the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All programs (called key projects) have Evaluation Plans. • A four year forward schedule of evaluations has been developed for each key project and is updated annually. • Output and impact assessments have been conducted according to the schedule. • Key findings and recommendations of evaluations are reported at the evaluation and planning conference held annually in August. • External stakeholders attending this conference (including the Department of Treasury and Finance and the Department of Premier and Cabinet) contribute to the discussion on how these recommendations and findings are used to tighten the investment strategy and guide future investment decisions. • Progress towards the implementation of earlier recommendations is also reported at the annual evaluation conference. • Evaluation reports are publically available and the findings are disseminated externally. • Performance indicators have been developed and will be reviewed in 2012 to ensure they align to the new DPI Strategic Plan (2012-2016). • Findings of major evaluations (such as the "Dairy Mega Evaluation of the Contribution of 30 years of RD&E" conducted in 2011) are considered for inclusion in the DPI annual report and industry-wide media and communication activities. <p>The second significant risk (<i>that DPI's Business Systems do not provide accurate and timely information that may lead to less efficient investment processes and less informed investment decisions</i>) is discussed below in the response to Recommendation 41.</p>

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
---------------------	----------	---

Recommendation 40, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 98

<p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Primary Industries undertake an independent review of its Agricultural Science Investment Framework to test the validity and effectiveness of the Department's current approach to research investment.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Primary Industries (DPI) is currently conducting an independent review of the <i>Agriculture and Fisheries Investment Framework</i> (formerly known as the <i>Science Investment Framework</i>). The Allen Consulting Group is conducting the review. Their final report and recommendations were due in mid-June 2012.</p> <p>The findings of this review will be considered as part of our plans to refresh and continually improve the framework. Further improvements of the framework will also be informed by the implementation of DPI-wide strategic and performance management frameworks aligned to Department of Treasury and Finance expectations.</p>
--	----------------	---

PAEC Recommendation	Response	Action Taken to Date and Commitment to Further Action
<p>Recommendation 41, Chapter 5 Status of PAEC Recommendations, page 98</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department of Primary Industries review the agricultural and scientific research information systems used in other Australian jurisdictions to identify an appropriate system for adoption in Victoria to reduce the current duplication of agricultural research investment data collection systems within the Department and assist in streamlining the Department's reporting framework.</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Department of Primary Industries (DPI) is taking a national leadership role in the development of the National Primary Industries Research Development and Extension Framework. DPI is working with other jurisdictions, the Commonwealth, and the Rural Research and Development corporations on Improved Knowledge management and information systems to be used nationally to reduce duplication and to achieve efficiencies by all parties. This collaborative approach extends to national work, led by the Commonwealth, to identify improved data collection metrics.</p> <p>DPI has also reviewed the agricultural and scientific research information systems used in other Australian jurisdictions as part of a DPI-wide Project and Portfolio Management (PPM) Initiative. The PPM Initiative aims to develop the business requirements and specifications, procure, implement and manage the change of an off-the-shelf project and portfolio management IT solution that will enable DPI to better and more regularly prioritise its portfolio of work, more flexibly allocate resources and monitor performance, improve workforce planning and capability development, and increase operational efficiency.</p> <p>The PPM initiative was initially expected to run over four years, to sequentially deliver the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stage 1: Improved workforce and consequence management Stage 2: Improved Financial Management Stage 3: Improved Portfolio & Program Management <p>In May 2010, following the successful funding of Stage 1 of the PPM Initiative as part of the Natural Disasters and Emergencies initiative, the DPI Executive endorsed the continuation of the PPM program of work to the completion of Stage 1 and a requirements analysis for Stage 2 and Stage 3. The scope and duration of the program of works in the PPM initiative is now currently being re-evaluated in the context of the DPI organisational restructure, the <i>Sustainable Government Initiative</i>, and the directions emerging from the <i>Better Services Implementation Taskforce</i>.</p>