



**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES COMMITTEE**

**2009-10 AND 2010-11 FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES  
QUESTIONNAIRE — PART ONE**

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING  
AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND .....	3
SECTION A: Output variations (departments only) .....	4
SECTION B: Asset investment (departments only) .....	7
SECTION C: Revenue and revenue foregone .....	17
SECTION D: Expenditure.....	19
SECTION E: Public sector workforce.....	22
SECTION F: Program outcomes .....	27
SECTION G: Adapting to the change of government .....	29

## BACKGROUND

For the purpose of reporting on the financial and performance outcomes of the Department of Planning and Community Development (DPCD), the following output and portfolio structures are used.

### Departmental structure at end 2009-10:

Output/portfolio
Adult and Community Further Education
Community Development
Developing the Local Government Sector
Disability
Indigenous Community and Cultural Development
Planning
Seniors and Veterans
Sport and Recreation Development
Women's Policy
Youth Affairs

### Departmental structure at end 2010-11

Following machinery-of-government (Mug) changes after the State Election in November 2010, DPCD's output and portfolio structure for 2010-11 was amended as follows:

Outputs	Incoming/ Outgoing	Transferred to/from
Adult, Community and Further Education	Outgoing	Department of Education and Early Childhood Development
Disability	Outgoing	Department of Human Services
Regional Economic Development, Investment and Promotion	Incoming	Department of Business and Innovation
Regional Infrastructure Development	Incoming	Department of Business and Innovation
Seniors	Outgoing	Department of Health
Women's Policy	Outgoing	Department of Human Services
Youth Affairs	Outgoing	Department of Human Services

DPCD's output structure at 30 June 2011 is therefore:

Outputs
Planning
Regional Infrastructure Development
Regional Economic Development, Investment and Promotion
Veterans' Affairs
Indigenous Community and Cultural Development
Sport and Recreation Development
Community Development
Developing the Local Government Sector

## SECTION A: Output variations (departments only)

### Question 1

In relation to the departmental outputs listed in the budget papers, please provide a detailed explanation for all instances where an output cost for 2009-10 or 2010-11 varied from the initial target by greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent:

#### Output costs in 2009-10:

Output	Expected expenditure 2009-10 (2009-10 budget papers)	Actual expenditure 2009-10 (2009-10 annual report)	Explanation	Impact on the community of reduced/increased expenditure compared to budget
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Planning	152.2	126.7	The variance to published budget figures reflects the progress of revitalising Central Dandenong Precinct, against the budgeted timelines.	Minimal impact as the project is still being delivered.
Community Development	61.8	69.5	The 2009-10 target included an adjustment of \$6.1 million for the Community Support fund to reflect the higher estimated payments.	Nil impact.

#### Output costs in 2010-11:

Output	Expected expenditure 2010-11 (2010-11 budget papers)	Actual expenditure 2010-11 (2010-11 annual report)	Explanation	Impact on the community of reduced/increased expenditure compared to budget.
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Regional Infrastructure Development and Regional Economic Development, investment and promotion	55.0	99.4	The variance reflects funding for the Regional Infrastructure Development Fund (RIDF) approved post-budget.	Increased RIDF funding supported the development of infrastructure projects for regional and rural Victoria.
Veterans' Affairs	3.2	3.6	The variation reflects the Community Support Fund contribution to DPCD programs which was not included in the original budget.	The program funds upgrades to Returned Services League facilities across the State.

### Question 2

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

- (a) How did the Department's 2008-09 results influence departmental planning in 2009-10?
- (b) How did the Department's 2009-10 results influence departmental planning in 2010-11?

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

### Question 3

For each of the output costs listed for the Department in the budget papers, please break the expense for 2010-11 down into the first six months and second six months of the financial year and explain any variations greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the two six-month amounts:

Output	Expense 1/7/2010- 31/12/2010	Expense 1/1/2011- 30/6/2011	Explanation for any variations greater than $\pm 10$ per cent
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Regional infrastructure development	N/A	N/A	Refer to the entry for <i>Regional economic development, investment and promotion</i> below.
Regional economic development, investment and promotion	39.8	59.6	Includes initiatives released post budget.
Planning	64.1	101.4	Variance due to Revitalising Central Dandenong milestones occurring in the second half of the 2010-11 financial year.
Veterans' affairs	1.5	2.1	No significant variance.
Indigenous community and cultural development	10.8	12.1	No significant variance.
Sport and recreation development	66.0	43.2	Variance due to milestones for several large grant payments occurring early in the 2010-11 financial year.
Community development	33.0	34.7	No significant variance.
Developing the local government sector	33.8	30.5	No significant variance.

#### Question 4

With respect to the performance measures listed in the 2010-11 budget papers for the Department (including the quality, quantity, timeliness and cost measures), for each measure where the actual result to 31 December 2010 varied by more than  $\pm 10$  per cent from the target result for 31 December 2010, please provide:

- the target for 31 December 2010;
- the actual result for 31 December 2010;
- an explanation for the variation.

This information may be based on the information provided to the Department of Treasury and Finance as part of the half-yearly revenue certification process.

Output	Performance measure	Cumulative Target at Q4 (30 June 2011)	YTD Actual (31 December 2010)	Explanation for variation.
Community Development	Grant projects which are completed and have successfully met their objectives.	90%	100%	All grants acquitted in Q1/2 have met their agreed objectives. The Q4 result was 100% above the annual target of 90%.
Community Development	Projects funded through the Victorian Community Support Grants program for the purpose of planning, community strengthening and infrastructure.	100	58	The Q1/2 result is due to a higher number of applicants than originally anticipated.
Developing the Local Government Sector	LGV's Living Libraries grants provided to improve public library services.	8	15	More projects were funded than anticipated.
Indigenous Community and Cultural Development	Governance training programs implemented.	7	4	An additional training program was held in Q2.
Indigenous Community and Cultural Development	Participants who complete governance training.	120	72	An additional training program was held in Q2.
Planning	Appeals lodged against heritage permits.	5%	2%	The Q4 result was 2% against a target of 5%.
Planning	Development facilitation priority projects considered.	50	13	The Development facilitation unit has now been disbanded due to MOG changes.
Planning	Places or objects assessed for the Victorian Heritage Register.	80	38	This is dependent on a number of factors including the volume of applications.
Seniors and Veterans	Digitised veterans' histories completed.	60	20	The collection of stories at a regional workshop in October 2010 was cancelled.

Output	Performance measure	Cumulative Target at Q4 (30 June 2011)	YTD Actual (31 December 2010)	Explanation for variation.
Seniors and Veterans	New University of the Third Age (U3A) programs funded.	45-60	0	A new funding model was implemented in 2010-11. This measure has since been transferred to the Department of Health due to MOG changes.
Seniors and Veterans	Premier's Spirit of ANZAC Prize: number of entries received.	150	174	Additional entries received.
Women's Policy	Projects delivered within agreed timeframes.	90	81	The measure was transferred to the Department of Human Services due to MOG changes.
Women's Policy	Queen Victoria Women's Centre occupancy rate.	85	100	The measure was transferred to the Department of Human Services due to MOG changes.
Youth Affairs	Youth central website total page impressions.	950	1100	The measure was transferred to Department of Human Services due to MOG changes.

If the Department is unable to provide this information to the Committee, please explain:

- (a) why this information is not available; and  
(b) how the Department tracks its progress during the year with respect to its performance measures.

Not applicable.

## SECTION B: Asset investment (departments only)

### Question 5

Please provide a detailed explanation in relation to why the TEI has changed for each of the following projects and when the new TEI was approved:

The Ringwood Activities Area (Stage 1- Upgrade Works) total estimated investment was changed from \$37.892m to \$18.362m. As outlined on Budget Paper 4, page 39 the change reflects a return of unallocated funding to the consolidated fund.

**Question 6**

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

- (a) the actual expenditure in 2009-10 and 2010-11;
- (b) 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; and
- (c) descriptions of the impact of any variations.

Note: For projects in 2009-10, the column 'Estimated expenditure in 2009-10 (2010-11 budget papers)' is calculated by deducting the estimated expenditure to 30 June 2009 listed in Budget Information Paper 1 (2009-10) from estimated expenditure to 30 June 2010 in Budget Information Paper 1 (2010-11) for the project. Under some circumstances this may result in a negative number, which should be explained in the departmental response. A similar approach is used in calculating the corresponding column for projects in 2010-11.

**Projects in 2009-10:**

Project	Estimated expenditure in 2009-10 (2009-10 budget papers)	Estimated expenditure in 2009-10 (2010-11 budget papers)	Actual expenditure in 2009-10	Explanation for any variations greater than 10 per cent.	Impact of any variations
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
State sports facilities project – Upgrade (Albert Park)	26.8	8.1	8.3	The project was delayed due to a redesign of scope not originally costed by the former government.	Redesign of scope.
Ringwood Activities Area – Stage 1 – Upgrade Works (Ringwood)	9.6	7.6	7.7	Variation less than 10%	
Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Information System - IT System (Melbourne)	2.6	1.7	1.4	Staging of the program was deferred by six months.	Project deferred by six months.
Electronic Document and Records Management System - IT Upgrade (Melbourne)	2.2	1.7	1.9	Project was re-scoped post-MOG changes.	No impact.
State Basketball Centre - Construction (Knox)	1.0	2.0	2.0	Variation less than 10%	



**Projects in 2010-11:**

Project	Estimated expenditure in 2010-11 (2010-11 budget papers)	Estimated expenditure in 2010-11 (2011-12 budget papers)	Actual expenditure In 2010-11	Explanations for any variations greater than 10 per cent.	Impact of any variations.
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Melbourne and Olympic Park redevelopment – Stage 1 (Melbourne)	56.6	26.1	37.6	Cash flow revised due to timing of capital works.	No impact.
State sports facilities project – Upgrade (Albert Park)	30.0	29.7	32	Variation less than 10%	
Ringwood Activities Area – Stage 1 – Upgrade Works (Ringwood)	17.2	5.2	2.7	As outlined on Budget Paper 4 (page 39) the change in TEI reflects a return of unallocated funding to the consolidated fund.	
State Multi-Discipline Shooting Centre – Construction (Lang)	12.4	0.0	0.0	The project is being reviewed.	Project delayed.
Broadmeadows Government Services Building - Construction (Broadmeadows)	8.5	0.4	1.1	The project is being reviewed.	Project delayed.
Broadmeadows Activities Area (Broadmeadows)	8.1	9.5	9.0	Variation less than 10%	
Central Activities Areas and Strategic Sites (various)	8.0	3.1	0.0	The program is being reviewed.	Project delayed.

**Question 7**

Please provide details of the status of each of the following asset projects for which the 2010-11 Budget Information Paper No.1 indicates that expenditure would occur after 2010-11 but the project does not appear in the 2011-12 Budget Paper No.4:

**Urban Regeneration of Corio-Norlane – Upgrade.**

The project is no longer a capital project and was transferred to output funding.

**Question 8**

Please provide the following details of any asset investment projects not covered in Question 6 where the actual expenditure in 2009-10 or 2010-11 varied from the budget estimate for expenditure by greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent.

**Projects in 2009-10:**

Project	Estimated expenditure in 2009-10 (2009-10 budget papers)	Actual expenditure in 2009-10	Explanation	Impact of Variation.
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Footscray Transit City – Upgrade (Footscray)	24.6	20.6	The underspend is due to timing of construction for the Footscray forecourt.	No Impact.
Northbank Promenade Access and Safety Improvements - Construction (Melbourne)	4.8	5.5	Flow of capital payments in line with milestones.	No impact.
Broadmeadows CAD - Upgrade	2.5	2.2	Insignificant variation	
Broadmeadows Government Services Building - Construction	0.4	0.5	Insignificant variation	
Central Activity Districts and Employment Corridors - Upgrade	1.1	0.5	Flow of capital occurs in line with projects	No impact.
Statewide ePlanning Applications Online - IT Upgrade	1.5	1.1	Project was adjusted to reflect funding.	Funds were not expended.





**Question 12**

For any asset projects where some components are funded/delivered by the Government directly and some are funded/delivered through Partnerships Victoria arrangements in 2009-10 or 2010-11, please supply the following details of the Government funding:

Nil.

**Question 13**

How many staff (full-time equivalent numbers) were employed by the Department to work on public private partnerships on 30 June 2009, 2010 and 2011? Please break this number down by how many are ongoing, fixed-term, contractors and consultants.

Nil.

**Question 14**

to work on alliancing projects on 30 June 2009, 2010 and 2011? Please break this number down by how many are ongoing, fixed-term, contractors and consultants.

Nil.

**Question 15**

Regarding the Partnerships Victoria Contract Management Training delivered by the Department of Treasury and Finance:

- (a) How many contract managers does your organisation currently employ for Partnerships Victoria projects, how many have undertaken this training, within how many months from their appointment in this role and at what cost?

Nil.

- (b) What proportion of the contract managers currently working on Partnerships Victoria projects have sought, and what proportion gained, an exemption to this training?

Nil.

- (c) Have other people in your organisation undertaken this training? If so, how many and for what reason?

Nil.

**Question 16**

Regarding the Partnerships Victoria Contract Managers' Forums:

- (a) What proportion of your organisation's current contract directors and contract managers participate in these forums, and at what stage of the public-private partnership project?
- (b) Have other people in your organisation participated in the forums? If so, how many and for what reason?
- (c) Has an assessment or evaluation of the usefulness of these forums, and any other services provided by Partnerships Victoria, been done? If so, please provide the results of this evaluation.

Nil.

**Question 17)**

Please detail any other training and development arrangements (including training delivered by the Department of Treasury and Finance, other providers and internal training) that are in place within your organisation for staff involved in overseeing, evaluating or managing asset projects delivered through Partnerships Victoria, alliancing or other arrangements, including:

- (a) the type of training;
- (b) the purpose of the training;
- (c) the number of people trained; and
- (d) expenditure incurred on the training.

Type of training	Purpose	Number of people trained	Expenditure (\$)
Nil			

**Question 18**

For each category into which financial assets, non-financial assets and liabilities are broken down in your agency's balance sheet in its annual report, please provide the balances as at 30 June 2010, 31 December 2010 and 30 June 2011 and explain any variations greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent from one date to the next:

**30 June 2010 and 31 December 2010:**

Financial asset, non-financial asset and liability categories	Balance as at 30 June 2010	Balance as at 31 December 2010	Explanation for any variances greater than $\pm 10$ per cent
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
<b>Financial Assets</b>			
Cash and deposits	76	81	No significant movement.
Receivables	64	19	Receivable collections that were outstanding at 30 June 2010 were received from another department.
<b>Non Financial Assets</b>			
Property, plant and equipment	190	209	Increase in Asset initiatives as outlined in the State Budget.
Intangible assets	15	17	No significant movement.
<b>Liabilities</b>			
Payables	52	9	Decrease in payables is due to expenses accrued for at 30 June 2010 being subsequently paid.
Borrowings	3	2	No significant movement.
Provisions	24	24	No significant movement.

**31 December 2010 and 30 June 2011:**

Financial asset, non-financial asset and liability categories	Balance as at 31 December 2010	Balance as at 30 June 2011	Explanation for any variances greater than ±10 per cent
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
<b>Financial Assets</b>			
Cash and deposits	81	268	Significant increase due to transfer of funds from the Department of Business and Innovation as part of MoGs.
Receivables	19	81	Increase reflects amount receivable from another government department.
<b>Non Financial Assets</b>			
Property, plant and equipment	209	266	Increase is due to additional Asset investment activities as outlined in the State Budget.
Intangible assets	17	17	No significant movement
<b>Liabilities</b>			
Payables	9	68	Variance due to increased accruals at 30 June 2011.
Borrowings	2	4	No significant movement.
Provisions	24	25	No significant movement.

**Question 19**

For each of the following projects, please provide the latest approved TEI, explaining any changes that have occurred from the original and their impact.

Project	Original TEI (\$M)	Current TEI (\$M)	Explanation for any changes (scope)	When change to TEI was approved.	Impact of variation.
Melbourne and Olympic Park redevelopment- Stage 1	363	363	No change.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Rectangular sports stadium- Construction (Olympic Park)	143	No current TEI as project is completed in 2009-10	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
States Sports facilities – Upgrade (Albert Park)	50.3	66.7	Additional funds were provided in the 2011-12 budget, to reflect scope not originally provided for by the former government.	Budget Papers, May 2011.	Project can be completed.

**Question 20**

Please identify all asset projects where the construction completion date (including the commissioning phase) was revised in 2009-10 or 2010-11, providing:

- the original and revised completion dates for each project;
- when the change to the completion date was approved; and
- specific reasons for any revision to completion dates.

<b>Project</b>	<b>Original completion date</b>	<b>Revised completion date<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>When change to completion date was approved (month and year)</b>	<b>Explanation for revision</b>
State Sports Facilities Project	Q2, 2011-12	Q2, 2012-13	Reported in 2011-12 budget.	Additional funds were provided in the 2011-12 Budget to accommodate for scope not originally costed by the former government.
Rectangular Pitch Stadium	Q3, 2009-10	Q4, 2009-10	Q2 2009-10.	Engineering challenges on the complex roof led to later completion of the project. The opening match was held as planned.
Broadmeadows Government Services Building - Construction (Broadmeadows)	June 2013	To be determined	Not applicable.	
Central Activities Areas and Strategic Sites (various)	June 2013	To be determined	Not applicable.	
Ringwood Activities Area – Stage1 – Upgrade Works (Ringwood) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Centre South</li> <li>• Land acquisition</li> </ul>	June 2011	June 2012	Reported in 2010-11 budget.	Government cancelled the Town Centre South project in January 2011.  Land acquisition is delayed due to a longer than expected acquisition and compensation process.

---

<sup>1</sup> These dates are indicative only and based on advice.



**SECTION C: Revenue and revenue foregone**

**Question 21**

For 2009-10 and 2010-11, please explain and detail the impact of any variances greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent in any revenue/income category detailed in your agency's operating statement in its annual report and the total revenue/income for the year compared to:

- (a) the initial budget for the year; and
- (b) the actual for the prior year.

**Revenue in 2009-10 (\$m):**

Revenue category	2008-09 ACTUAL	2009-10 BUDGET	2009-10 ACTUAL	Explanation for variances	Impact.
Output appropriations	429	434	419	No significant variance	
Special appropriations	101	99	97	No significant variance	
Interest	4	3	2	Interest is determined by the prevailing cash balance.	No significant impact.
Grants and other income transfers.	56	3	61	Funding for sports and recreation major events funded post budget.	
Other income	2	1	2	No significant variance.	

**Revenue in 2010/11 (\$m):**

Revenue category	2009-10 ACTUAL	2010-11 BUDGET	2010-11 ACTUAL	Explanation for variances	Impact
Output appropriations	419	456	473	No significant variance.	
Special appropriations	97	103	69	The Community Support Fund was transferred to the Department of Treasury and Finance.	
Interest	2	2	6	Due to MOG changes.	No significant impact.
Grants and other income transfers.	61	4	70	Recognition of grants from the Department of Treasury and Finance for the Community Support Fund.	
Other Income	2	0	1	No significant variance.	

**Question 22**

For each of the income from transactions categories listed by your agency in its comprehensive operating statement in its annual report (e.g. output appropriations, grants, sales of goods and services), please break the income for 2010-11 down into the first six months and second six months of the financial year and explain any variations greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the two six-month amounts:

Income from transactions	Income 1/7/2010-31/12/2010	Income 1/1/2011-30/6/2011	Explanation
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Output Appropriations	231	242	No significant variance.
Special Appropriations	53	16	Transfer of Community Support Fund to the Department of Treasury and Finance.
Interest	1	5	MOG changes which occurred in second half of the year (from the Department Business and Innovation).
Grants and Other income transfers	9	61	Community Support Fund projects funded through grants from the Department of Treasury and Finance in second half of the year.
Other Income	1	0	No significant variance.

**Question 23**

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 2009-10 and 2010-11. For each item, please:

- describe the purpose of the concession/subsidy;
- explain any variations greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the actual expenditure and the initial budget for the year;
- explain any variations greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the actual expenditure and the actual for the prior year;
- indicate the number of concessions/subsidies granted in each category; and
- explain whether the outcomes expected to be achieved by granting these concessions or providing these subsidies have been achieved.
- Please also detail all new concessions/subsidies provided in 2010-11 by your agency that were announced after the change of government in 2010, their impact on your agency and the social outcomes achieved to date.

Nil.
------

**Question 24 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)**

This question does not apply to your department.

**SECTION D: Expenditure****Question 25**

For 2009-10 and 2010-11, please explain and detail the impact of any variances greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent in any expense category detailed in the agency's operating statement in its annual report **and** the total expenditure for the year compared to:

- (a) the initial budget for the year; and
- (b) the actual for the prior year.

**Expenditure in 2009-10 (\$m):**

Expenditure category	2008-09 actual	2009-10 Budget	2009-10 actual	Explanation for variance	Impact of variances.
Employee Benefits	94.0	88.4	101.5	A review of classifications post MOG changes resulting in a re-allocation of budget.	No significant impact.
Depreciation and Amortisation	4.5	5.7	6.2	Depreciation on asset initiatives approved in the budget.	No significant impact.
Interest Expense	0.3	-	0.3	No significant variance	
Grants and other transfers	408.9	368.5	402.5	Due to Sport and Recreation Victoria expenditure approved post-budget.	No significant impact.
Capital Asset Charge	5.3	5.8	5.8	No significant variance	
Other Operating Expenses	80.9	77.2	81.9	No significant variance	

**Expenditure in 2010-11 (\$m):**

Expenditure category	2009-10 actual	2010-11 Budget	2010-11 actual	Explanation for variance	Impact of variances.
Employee Benefits	101.5	104.3	101.3	No significant variance	
Depreciation and Amortisation	6.2	6.0	6.2	No significant variance	
Interest Expense	0.3	-	0.2	No significant variance	
Grants and other transfers	402.5	381.2	406.7	No significant variance	
Capital Asset Charge	5.8	6.5	5.8	No significant variance	
Other Operating Expenses	81.9	70.3	82.8	Reclassification of some capital projects to output expenditure.	No significant impact.

**Question 26**

For each of the expenses from transactions categories listed by your agency in its comprehensive operating statement in its annual report (e.g. employee expenses, grants, depreciation and amortisation), please break the expense for 2010-11 down into the first six months and second six months of the financial year and explain any variations greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the two six-month amounts:

Expenses from transactions	Expenses 1/7/2010-31/12/2010	Expenses 1/1/2011-30/6/2011	Explanation for any variations greater than $\pm 10$ per cent
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Employee Benefits	50.7	50.6	Variation less than 10%.
Depreciation and Amortisation	2.9	3.3	The variance is largely due to the timing of MoG changes.
Interest Expense	-	0.2	No significant variance.
Grants and other transfers	196.1	210.6	Variation less than 10%.
Capital Asset Charge	3.2	2.6	The variance is largely due to the timing of MoG changes.
Other Operating Expenses	36.8	46.0	Due to milestones for some Central Activity Area projects occurring in the second half of the year.

**Question 27**

Please provide details of any evaluations of grants programs that were conducted by your agency in 2009-10 or 2010-11, including any findings about:

- the outcomes achieved by the programs; or
- the effectiveness of grants at achieving planned outcomes compared to other modes of service delivery.

The evaluation of grants programs by successive governments is used to inform future government policy and decision-making. These documents are prepared for DPCD, are not public, and therefore cannot be provided in this questionnaire.

The following Auditor-General's reports on DPCD-related grant programs which are publicly available ([www.audit.vic.gov.au](http://www.audit.vic.gov.au)) include:

- Local Community Transport Services (2010-11)
- The Community Building Initiative (2009-10)
- Management of the Community Support Fund (2009-10)

**Question 28**

- Please provide the following details about the realisation of efficiency and savings targets in 2009-10 and 2010-11:

DPCD was allocated \$3 million worth of savings in 2009-10 and \$4 million in 2010-11. Savings targets have been achieved in both years.

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

Nil.

**Question 29**

- a) Please outline the Department's expenditure in 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 and the savings achieved in 2010-11 for these areas targeted in the Government's election commitment savings:

Budget Paper No. 3 outlines the relevant election commitment savings. The department made internal decisions to achieve this target across the areas as specified.

Category	Actual expenditure			2010-11 savings target	2010-11 actual savings
	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11		
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)
Ministerial staff	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Media and marketing positions	2.38	3.06	2.88		
Consultants	0.04	0.12	-		
Government advertising	1.09	1.27	2.04		
Political opinion polling	0.00	0.00	0.00		
External legal advice	2.14	1.93	3.28		
Senior public service travel	n/a	n/a	n/a		
Government office floor space	8.58	9.39	8.55		
Supplies and consumables	80.89	81.87	82.76		
Shared services	9.33	8.86	10.22		
Head office staff	84.31	87.14	84.87		
<b>Total</b>				<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.00</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 management meetings.

- c) If the total savings target for 2010-11 for the Department differs from the figure in the budget papers (\$3.1 million), please explain why.

Not applicable.

**Question 30**

Please detail any impacts on the Department's service delivery of the election commitment savings, e.g. changes to the timing and scope of specific programs or discontinued programs.

The Department met its contribution to the government's election commitment savings through back office categories as outlined in question 29.

## SECTION E: Public sector workforce

### Question 31

Please detail the total full-time equivalent number of staff as at 30 June 2009, 30 June 2010, 31 December 2010 and 30 June 2011, and explain any significant variations (greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent) from one date to the next in the following tables:

Total FTE (30 June 2009)	Total FTE (30 June 2010)	Total FTE (30 June 2011)	Variance.
1047.7	1077.2	973.0	Less than 10% between periods.

### Question 32

In the tables below, please detail the salary costs for 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11, broken down by ongoing, fixed-term and casual and explain any variations greater than 10 per cent between the years for each category.

#### Costs in 2009-10:

Employment category	Gross salary 2008-09	Gross salary 2009-10	Explanation for any variations greater than $\pm 10$ per cent
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Ongoing	78.2	81.2	Variation less than 10%.
Fixed-term	17.2	20.3	Increase in gross salary due to increase in FTE number and general wage movements.
Casual	0.1	0.0	Variation less than 10%.
<b>Total</b>	<b>95.5</b>	<b>101.5</b>	Variation less than 10%.

#### Costs in 2010-11:

Employment category	Gross salary 2009-10	Gross salary 2010-11	Explanation for any variations greater than $\pm 10$ per cent
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Ongoing	81.2	83.3	Variation less than 10%.
Fixed-term	20.3	18.3	Variation less than 10%.
Casual	0	0	Variation less than 10%.
<b>Total</b>	<b>101.5</b>	<b>101.3</b>	Variation less than 10%.

For each of the employment categories, please break the expense for 2010-11 down into the first six months and second six months of the financial year and explain any variations greater than  $\pm 10$  per cent between the two six-month amounts:

Employment category	Gross salary 1/7/2010-31/12/2010	Gross salary 1/1/2011-30/6/2011	Explanation for any variations greater than $\pm 10$ per cent
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Ongoing	41.6	41.7	Variation less than 10%.
Fixed-term	9.1	8.9	Variation less than 10%.
Casual	0.0	0.0	Variation less than 10%.
<b>Total</b>	<b>50.7</b>	<b>50.6</b>	Variation less than 10%.

**Question 33**

- a) For what roles within your organisation were contractors or contract staff used in 2009-10 and 2010-11 (refer to Explanatory Memorandum for definition of contractors)?

Contractors and contract staff are engaged by the Department for short term roles to backfill for fixed term or ongoing roles to provide:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• generalist services; and/or</li> <li>• specialist professional services, e.g. legal, audit or organisational development services.</li> </ul>

- b) Please itemise the services delivered by contractors or contract staff in 2009-10 and 2010-11:

**Contractors/contract staff in 2009-10**

Service category	Value of service (\$m)	Number of contractors/contract staff
Aboriginal Affairs	3.5	Due to the high volume of transactions (one per payment), it would be burdensome to calculate the number of individual contractors/contract staff by service category.
Adult and Community Further Education	1.1	
Community Development	5.5	
Whole-of-DPCD	6.8	
Local Government Victoria	1.3	
Neighbourhood Houses	0.1	
Office of Disability	1.2	
Office of Senior Victorians	1.1	
Office of Women's Policy	0.8	
Planning	19.7	
Sport & Recreation Victoria	1.9	
Veterans & Ex-Services Unit	0.2	
Youth Affairs	0.6	

**Contractors/contract staff in 2010-11:**

Service category	Value of service (\$m)	Number of contractors/contract staff
Aboriginal Affairs	3.5	Due to the high volume of transactions (one per payment), it would be burdensome to calculate the number of individual contractors/contract staff by service category.
Community Development	5.6	
Whole-of-DPCD	6.7	
Local Government Victoria	2.6	
Planning	19.3	
Sport & Recreation Victoria	2.4	
Veterans & Ex-Services Unit	1.1	

- c) For each specific contractor or contract staff paid in excess of \$100,000 per annum that has been engaged by your organisation during 2009-10 or 2010-11, please supply the following details:

In accordance with government requirements, summary details of all contracts with a commitment value greater than \$100,000 are disclosed on the Victorian Government Purchasing Board (VGPB) website at [www.contracts.vic.gov.au](http://www.contracts.vic.gov.au)

Year	Total value of all contract and contract staff services regardless of length of engagement	Number of contractors/suppliers engaged for more than 12 months	Number of contract staff engaged for more than 12 months
2009-10	\$10,335,505	13	8
2010-11	\$8,812,371	12	10

#### Question 34

- a) For what roles within your organisation were consultants used in 2009-10 and 2010-11 (refer to Explanatory Memorandum for definition of consultants)?

A consultant was engaged in 2009-10 to support the Department with specialist research, analysis and advice that supported strategy decisions and for which skills were not available in the Department.

- b) Please itemise the services delivered by consultants in 2009-10 and 2010-11:

#### Consultants in 2009-10:

Service category	Number of consultants	Value of services (\$)
Corporate services	1	\$120,000

#### Consultants from 1 July to 30 June 2011:

Service category	Number of consultants	Value of services (\$)
Nil		

- c) For each specific consultant paid in excess of \$100,000 per annum that has been engaged by your organisation during 2009-10 or 2010-11, please supply the following details:

#### Consultants in 2009-10:

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
Ernst & Young	Review of human services and financial services	\$120,000	1	Expert analysis and advice was needed which was not available within DPCD.

#### Consultants 2010-11:

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 35**

- a) Please break down the staff turnover ratio (total left employment during the year expressed as a percentage of total headcount) for your organisation during 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 according to the following age brackets.

<b>Age group</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
Less than 30 years old	22% of the total turnover <i>(21% of age group)</i>	26% of the total turnover <i>(23% of age group)</i>	25% of the total turnover <i>(37% of age group)</i>
30-54 years old	66% of the total turnover <i>(15% of age group)</i>	63% of the total turnover <i>(13% of age group)</i>	64% of the total turnover <i>(18% of age group)</i>
55 years or older	12% of the total turnover <i>(11% of age group)</i>	11% of the total turnover <i>(9% of age group)</i>	11% of the total turnover <i>(12% of age group)</i>
<b>Total for DPCD</b>	<b>16.0% turnover</b>	<b>14.0% turnover</b>	<b>19.4% turnover</b>

- b) Please describe the factors contributing to any variations greater than ±10 per cent from one year to the next.

The lower turnover rate in 2009-10 may be attributable to increased learning and development programs and health and wellbeing initiatives designed to make DPCD an inclusive and vibrant workplace. There was also an increased focus on raising the Department's people management capability to enhance team dynamics, engagement with staff and building high performance teams.  
In 2010-11 there were several lapsing/sunsetting programs which resulted in a higher than average turnover.

- c) Please describe any strategies that are planned to be introduced to retain staff, reduce the level of voluntary staff turnover and reduce the likelihood that critical roles will become vacant in future?

The State Services Authority and departments within the VPS are constantly dealing with the challenges of demographic change in the public sector in this State, and nationally, and with retaining specific skill sets. DPCD has a range of learning and development programs for all staff, as well as health and wellbeing programs designed to foster an inclusive and vibrant workplace. The DPCD Leadership and Management Strategy aims to attract, develop and retain talented and capable leaders and managers to deliver DPCD's business objectives.

### Question 36

The State Services Authority (*The State of the Public Sector in Victoria 2008-09*, Chapter 4) has identified collaboration, agility and innovation as important to the future of the Victorian public sector. Please detail any initiatives undertaken by your organisation in 2009-10 or in 2010-11 prior to the change of government that have been designed to enhance these three qualities and what outcomes have been achieved by these initiatives:

Category	Initiative	Outcomes
Innovation and collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate a focus on innovation and collaboration in the 2010-2014 Corporate Plan;</li> <li>• Conduct DPCD Senior Leaders Group Forums;</li> <li>• Conduct a series of internal workshops (centrally and regionally) to build an understanding of, and encourage, innovation.</li> <li>• Develop an Innovation Action Plan.</li> <li>• Offer Innovation Workshops to all VPSG5/6.</li> <li>• Promote the use of 'Yammer' (online social network) for collaboration and sharing of ideas within DPCD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear direction and culture of innovation and collaboration to improve organisational performance</li> <li>• Developed a set of actions and priorities to inform Innovation Action Plan. Ensure local thinking is included in Innovation Action Plan.</li> <li>• Approximately 120 senior officers attended workshops to create a culture of innovation in their local business units.</li> <li>• Yammer has increased internal sharing of ideas, innovative solutions and networking. There are currently 567 members on the network.</li> </ul>
Innovation and collaboration	Develop <i>A Right to Respect: Victoria's Plan to Prevent Violence Against Women 2010-2020</i> .	<p>This Plan was launched in 2009, with Victoria the first state to develop a long-term plan to specifically address the primary prevention violence against women.</p> <p>This 10-year strategy aimed to address the underlying causes of violence against women by building models of good practice, toolkits and resources for use in five key settings: education and training; local government; health and community services; sports and recreation, workplaces; the media; arts and popular culture.</p>

Please also supply details of initiatives designed to enhance these three qualities undertaken since the change of government in November 2010:

Category	Initiative	Outcomes
Innovation and collaboration	Process improvement	<p>Four internal business processes were identified as high priority for innovative changes to increase efficiency. These include the briefings process, electronic document management, delegations and to the way in which new business processes are introduced.</p> <p>Workshops were held to map current processes and to brainstorm ideas for change. These changes are currently being implemented.</p>
Agility	Management of machinery (MoG) — of-government changes	A MoG Transition Team was established to ensure seamless implementation of the MoG changes. An Organisational Improvement project was commenced to manage ongoing organisational change.

**Question 37**

Please complete the following tables showing number of executive staff and total value of bonuses paid in the 2009-10 and 2010-11 performance periods:

**Bonuses in 2009-10:**

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	Combined with EO2	Combined with EO2	Combined with EO2
EO2 <sup>(a)</sup>	18	2	16	274,888
EO3	23	6	17	165,212
Other Executives				

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

**Bonuses in 2010-11:**

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	Combined with EO2	Combined with EO2	Combined with EO2
EO2 <sup>(a)</sup>	16	2	14	226,359
EO3	28	9	19	150,015
Other Executives				

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

**Question 38**

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

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

Rating	Proportion of total remuneration package actually paid	
	2009-10	2010-11
Exceptional	9-12%	9.6-9.6%
Superior	4-8%	3.3-7.9%
Competent	0	0
Improvement required	0	0

**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 the Department contributed to in 2009-10 and 2010-11.

**Question 39**

For each of the following *Growing Victoria Together* outcomes for which the Department had partial or full responsibility, please indicate what was achieved by 26 November 2010 for each of the established measures:

Not applicable. This was a program of the previous government. The latest update by the former government was in the 2009/10 budget and can be found at the Department of Treasury and Finance budget web site ([www.budget.vic.gov.au](http://www.budget.vic.gov.au)).

**Question 40**

- (a) Using the format of the table below, please outline the five most important outcomes achieved by your organisation's programs/activities between 27 November 2010 and 30 June 2011 (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.

The planned priorities and outcomes achieved are reported to Parliament each year in the Budget Papers and in the relevant annual reports. For the period November 2010 to June 2011, DPCD focussed on the following outcomes:

- Planning communities for growth and change.
- Investing in community infrastructure and heritage.
- Strengthening communities and promoting equity and diversity.
- Building organisational performance.

- (b) Please also identify any significant program outcomes that were planned but not achieved between 27 November 2010 and 30 June 2011 and the underlying reasons.

Not applicable

**Question 41**

For the following initiatives that were due to be completed in 2009-10 and 2010-11, please provide details of the outcomes expected to be achieved and the outcomes actually achieved to date. Please quantify outcomes where possible.

Initiative	Expected year of completion	Actual date of completion (month and year)	Expected outcomes	Actual outcomes
Better Pools Program and Community Sports Grants - Output initiative from budget 2007-08	2010-11	June 2011	The target for the number of approvals for community sport and recreation facilities was >160 in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. The target included a number of community facility programs in addition to the Better Pools Program and Community Sports Grants.	The contribution of Better Pools and Community Sports Grants to the annual targets (for community facility projects approved) was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 117 of a total of 235 approvals in 2009-10.</li> <li>• 113 of total of 196 approvals in 2010-11.</li> </ul> The target for the number of approvals for community sport and recreation facilities was exceeded in both 2009-10 and 2010-11.
Renewing the Regional Infrastructure Development Fund - Output initiative from budget 2006-07	2009-10	Funding fully allocated at 30 June 2010	The Government's Budget allocation to the Regional Infrastructure Development Fund (RIDF) to be fully committed by 30 June 2010.	The Government's Budget allocation to the RIDF was fully committed by 30 June 2010.
Creating a new Provincial Victoria Growth Fund - Output initiative from budget 2006-07	2009-10	June 2011	Initiatives to be funded under the Provincial Victoria Growth Fund.	More than 45 initiatives funded under the Provincial Victoria Growth Fund to drive economic and population growth across provincial Victoria.
Rectangular Sports Stadium - Asset initiative from budget 2007-08	2009-10	May 2010	Construction of a rectangular pitch stadium for rugby union, rugby league and soccer. Provide new administration and training headquarters for numerous sporting organisations.	A facility which has four match tenants representing the three football codes that use a rectangular pitch. A sport campus with administration facilities for eight tenants including training facilities for three of these tenants.

**SECTION G: Adapting to the change of government****Question 42**

- (a) Were any planned organisational priorities changed during 2010-11 as a result of the change of government in 2010? If so, please specify.

Organisational priorities changed during 2010-11 to reflect the incoming government's policies, priorities and relevant machinery-of-government changes. Most significant of these changes is the Department's broadened role in planning for, and developing, strong regions across Victoria.

- (b) Were any corporate plans or similar documents modified in 2010-11 as a result of the change of government in 2010? If so, please specify.

Departmental business plans are routinely updated throughout the financial year, as circumstances dictate.

**Question 43**

Please detail the impact on your agency of any machinery-of-government changes following the change of government in 2010, including:

- (a) how your agency adapted;
- (b) any disruptions to program or project delivery; and
- (c) Any improvements to program or project delivery that have been enabled as a result of the change.

Following the election of the Liberal National Coalition Government in November 2010, DPCD underwent a number of significant changes to its structure and role. Functions that joined the Department were Regional Development Victoria (RDV) and the integrated transport planning function from the Department of Transport. Functions that left the Department were the Offices for Youth, Disability, Women's Policy and Senior Victorians; Community Development programs addressing disadvantage; administration of the Community Support Fund; and Adult, Community and Further Education (ACFE).

Since November 2010, DPCD has:

- Transferred 142.1 FTE staff out of the Department and 92.2 FTE staff into the Department.
- Developed a new integrated Regional Delivery Model, including the establishment of an expanded regional office network servicing multiple ministerial portfolios.
- Supported a significant program of regional stakeholder engagement by Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries to establish a shared understanding of policy challenges, opportunities and program-based options for regional development.
- Commenced work on all key election commitments with some being successfully delivered.
- Government endorsement of Victoria's continued participation in the COAG National Indigenous Affairs Reform Agenda.
- Programs (eg the Small Towns Adaptation) have been redesigned to take account of Government's interest in better-defined and practical local outcomes, as well as greater alignment with regional development objectives.
- Worked with the Departments of Business and Innovation and Premier and Cabinet to deliver their regional activities under DPCD's regional model.

Machinery-of-government change	Adaptations in response	Improvements to program/project delivery
Incoming function/portfolio: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated transport planning.</li> <li>• Regional Development Victoria (RDV).</li> </ul>	Transferred 92.2 FTE staff in to the Department. DPCD worked with the Departments of Business and Innovation and Premier and Cabinet to deliver their regional activities under DPCD's regional model.	Integrate land use and transport planning will facilitate improved responses to rapid population expansion in growth areas. The regional model includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint management of investment funds.</li> <li>• Parallel endorsement processes for Ministerial approval for projects, grants and initiatives developed.</li> <li>• Cross DBI-DPCD membership of investment inter-departmental Committees.</li> </ul>

**Question 44**

Please detail any new processes that were introduced into your agency following the change of government in 2010 for monitoring or managing expenditure on output or asset projects/programs:

In association with the Department of Treasury and Finance, DPCD is continuing to refine and implement improved processes for monitoring and managing expenditure.

**Question 45**

For each program and project (delivering either outputs or assets) which was curtailed, deferred or discontinued in 2010-11 following the change of government in 2010, please provide the following details:

- (a) the name of the program/project;
- (b) whether it delivered outputs (i.e. goods and services) or assets;
- (c) the budgeted and actual expenditure in 2010-11; and
- (d) The reasons for which the program/project was curtailed, deferred or discontinued.

A number of programs and projects ceased in 2010-11 either because:

- the work was completed;
- the previous government did not allocate funding in the forward estimates; or
- The incoming government had different priorities for funding, guided either by project evaluation or on the basis of policy priorities.

In line with Government policy, the following changes occurred in DPCD;

- the Ringwood CAD bus interchange was altered to reflect the Government's commitment to upgrade the whole precinct;
- the replacement of Development Assessment Committees with Planning Application Committees;
- the discontinuation of the Development Facilitation Units in line with the government's commitment for a new Urban Planning Unit; and
- Ending of the Respect Agenda program.

**Question 46**

For each program and project (delivering either outputs or assets) which was introduced in 2010-11 following the change of government in 2010 which had not been planned prior to the change of government, please provide the following details:

- (a) the name of the program/project;
- (b) whether it delivered outputs (i.e. goods and services) or assets;
- (c) the budgeted and actual expenditure in 2010-11; and
- (d) The reasons for which the program/project was introduced.

Program/project	Output or asset delivery	Budgeted 2010-11 expenditure	Actual 2010-11 expenditure	Reasons why it was introduced
		(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Fire Recovery Unit	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Fire Recovery Unit commenced operation on 1 July 2011. The Fire Recovery Unit has been established to assist people and communities affected by the 2009 Victorian bushfires.
Housing affordability	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Housing Affordability Unit was established in January 2011 to provide a whole-of-government overview to the Planning Minister about state and local government policies, legislation or procedures that could be reformed to help improve housing affordability.

Program/project	Output or asset delivery	Budgeted 2010-11 expenditure	Actual 2010-11 expenditure	Reasons why it was introduced
		(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Peri-urban	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>The Peri-Urban Council Unit was established in February 2011 to assist councils in peri-urban areas with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• long-term strategic and structure planning of towns and future communities;</li> <li>• population management; and</li> <li>• Environmental and biodiversity issues being faced in planning.</li> </ul>



## CONTACT DETAILS

<b>Organisation:</b>	Department of Planning and Community Development
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Tam Quach
<b>Position:</b>	Manager, Corporate Reporting and Performance
<b>Contact numbers:</b>	Telephone: 03 92083029
	Fax: 03 9208 3679
	E-mail: tam.quach@dpcd.vic.gov.au

**The completed questionnaire must be returned by no later than COB, 2 December 2011.**

Please return the response (including an electronic version) of the questionnaire to:

Valerie Cheong  
Executive Officer  
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee  
Level 3, 55 St Andrews Place  
EAST MELBOURNE VIC 3002

Telephone: 03 8682 2867  
Fax: 03 8682 2898  
Email: paec@parliament.vic.gov.au

For inquiries on this questionnaire, please contact the Executive Officer or:

Christopher Gribbin  
Senior Research Officer  
03 8682 2865

Ian Claessen  
Research Officer  
03 8682 2861