



**STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND COMMUNITY SAFETY**

**JEREMY HANSON CSC MLA (CHAIR), MARISA PATERSON MLA (DEPUTY CHAIR), JO CLAY MLA**

**Inquiry into referred 2019–20 Annual and Financial Reports and Budget Estimates 2020-21**  
**ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE**

---

Asked by Peter Cain MLA:

Ref: Budget Statements D, Public Prosecutions, output class 1.4

In relation to: Director of Public Prosecutions

1. In Budget Statements D on page 15, it is noted that the percentage of cases where indictment case statement and questionnaire are filed within the timeframes specified at the directions in the Supreme Court are 41% below target. The explanation provided for this is that a new indicator has been introduced.
  - a. What measures are currently in place to ensure the government meets this target?
2. In Budget Statements D on page 15, the notes state that the average cost per matter finalised is below target due to automation and electronic document processes.
  - a. How many matters were finalised?
  - b. How much did the implementation of the electronic systems cost?
  - c. What is the return on investment of the systems per matter finalised?

**Shane Rattenbury MLA: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:–**

1a) When a matter is committed from the Magistrates Court to the Supreme Court for trial, it is listed for first directions in the Supreme Court the following week. At first directions in the Supreme Court, the court issues standard orders for the filing of the indictment and case statement in three weeks.

This KPI measures performance in compliance with the standard orders.

The reason the percentage is below target is because the Supreme Court standard orders do not currently accommodate streamlined committal processes. For example, section 88B of the *Magistrates Court Act 1930* allows the Magistrates Court to waive committal proceedings, and commit a matter for trial, often before the brief of evidence has even been received by the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP).



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

JACS No. 82

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

JEREMY HANSON CSC MLA (CHAIR), MARISA PATERSON MLA (DEPUTY CHAIR), JO CLAY MLA

The office of the DPP is in discussions with the Supreme Court with a view to varying the standard orders in circumstances where the committal process has been waived, or in circumstances where the matter is particularly large or complex.

2a) As per pages 94-98 of the Annual Report, there were 5,046 matters finalised across all jurisdictions in the 2019-20 reporting year, noting there is a typographical error on page 93 of the Annual Report of 5,406 (which should also read 5,046).

2b) The CASES system was implemented around 10 years ago.

Two key systems improvements are currently in train:

- a) The development of the means to upload data from the Court ICMS system to an ACT Government Network Drive capable of sorting the data into data fields for incorporation into the DPP CASES system, with further plans to export this and additional data from the DPP CASES system to the AFP PROMIS system, to increase data integrity.
- b) The development of e-Bench sheets to replace hand-written bench sheets.

The cost thus far (comprising external service providers and time invested by DPP staff) is estimated at around \$200,000, with an estimated further \$120,000 to be invested on the remaining project rollouts over the next two years.

2c) The automatic uploading of data from the Courts ICMS straight to the DPP CASES system is almost complete, although some manual data entry is undertaken with "orphan data" being manually allocated to data fields within the DPP CASES system. The e-Bench sheets have been rolled out but are being used in tandem with paper bench sheets whilst we complete our primary testing of the system.

The two final stages will be the full independent import of data from ICMS, then the abolition of paper files.

The return on investment from the partially rolled out improvements is evidenced in the change in our KPI 1.4 over the last 12 months, which amounts to a saving of approximately \$600-800 per matter. It is difficult to accurately estimate the further cost savings from the remaining electronic evolution, but it is anticipated to be around a further \$900-1000 per matter.

Approved for circulation to the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety

Signature:

Date: 15/3/21

By the Attorney-General, Shane Rattenbury MLA