CERTIFICATION OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
FOR THE YEAR ENDING 30 JUNE 2006

I hereby certify that the performance indicators are based on proper records, are relevant and appropriate for assisting users to assess the Department of the Premier and Cabinet’s performance, and fairly represent the performance of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for the financial year ended 30 June 2006.

M C WAUCHOPE
ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER

2 August 2006
INDEPENDENT AUDIT OPINION

To the Parliament of Western Australia

DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2006

Audit Opinion
In my opinion,

(i) the financial statements are based on proper accounts and present fairly the financial position of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet at 30 June 2006 and financial performance and cash flows for the year ended on that date. They are in accordance with applicable Accounting Standards and other mandatory professional reporting requirements in Australia and the Treasurer’s Instructions;

(ii) the controls exercised by the Department provide reasonable assurance that the receipt and expenditure of monies, the acquisition and disposal of property, and the incurring of liabilities have been in accordance with legislative provisions; and

(iii) the key effectiveness and efficiency performance indicators of the Department are relevant and appropriate to help users assess the Department’s performance and fairly represent the indicated performance for the year ended 30 June 2006.

Scope
The Director General is responsible for keeping proper accounts and maintaining adequate systems of internal control, for preparing the financial statements and performance indicators, and complying with the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1985 (the Act) and other relevant written law.


The performance indicators consist of key indicators of effectiveness and efficiency.

Summary of my Role
As required by the Act, I have independently audited the accounts, financial statements and performance indicators to express an opinion on the financial statements, controls and performance indicators. This was done by testing selected samples of the evidence. Further information on my audit approach is provided in my audit practice statement. Refer "http://wwwaudit.wa.gov.au/pubs/Audit-Practice-Statement.pdf".

An audit does not guarantee that every amount and disclosure in the financial statements and performance indicators is error free. The term “reasonable assurance” recognises that an audit does not examine all evidence and every transaction. However, my audit procedures should identify errors or omissions significant enough to adversely affect the decisions of users of the financial statements and performance indicators.

D D R PEARSON
AUDITOR GENERAL
25 September 2006
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet’s mission is to “Support the Premier and Cabinet in achieving the Government’s vision for all Western Australians, through leadership and coordination and the promotion of excellence in the public sector”.

The Department achieves these objectives by planning and resourcing its functions and activities to ensure that it is able to address current and emerging Government priorities.

In accordance with Cabinet decisions in February 2006, several functions have been transferred to other Departments as follows:

- the Office of Science and Innovation was transferred to the Department of Industry and Resources as at 1 April 2006;
- the Office of Native Title was transferred to the Department of Treasury and Finance as at 7 April 2006;
- the Environmental Policy Unit, Greenhouse Unit and Sustainability Policy Unit and Sustainability Roundtable were transferred from the Policy Division to the Department of Environment as at 21 April 2006;
- the Regional Policy Unit was transferred from the Policy Division to the Department of Local Government and Regional Development Environment as at 21 April 2006;
- the Office of Crime Prevention functions were transferred to the WA Police and the Department of Community Development as at 1 July 2006;
- the Office of Water Strategy was transferred to the Department of Water as at 1 July 2006;
- the Physical Activity Taskforce was transferred to the Department of Sport and Recreation as at 1 July 2006.

Following the restructuring of the Policy Division, the Federal Affairs function was transferred from Service 2 – Management of Matters of State to Service 3 – Management of Policy effective 1 July 2006.

Three of the Department’s services still report to Ministers other than the Premier as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister</th>
<th>Service #</th>
<th>Service Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon A D McRae, MLA, Minister for Disability Services, Citizenship and Multicultural Interests; Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Management of the Constitutional Centre Programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Promotion and support of citizenship and multiculturalism in Western Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon J C Kobelke, MLA Minister for Police and Emergency Services; Community Safety; Water Resources; Sport and Recreation.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Support for implementation of the State’s Road Safety Initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key effectiveness indicator for Services 1 - 4 is a client satisfaction rating derived from the results of the annual expectations survey issued to the Premier’s Office and Ministerial Offices. This data is reported in accordance with recommendations made by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Unless otherwise indicated, client satisfaction is expressed as a value between one and five, where a value of one indicates that services were well below client expectations and five that services were well above client expectations. Survey instruments used in 2005/06 are consistent with those used for prior periods although response rates have varied over the past five years. As in previous years, some 2005/06 respondents were unable to evaluate all services provided.
Key efficiency indicators reported include all the costs associated with the particular product or service identified and, in aggregate, the total costs of the service. Some key efficiency indicators are an aggregation of internal measures captured for management and other purposes. Corporate and Executive Support costs are distributed across services on a Full-time Equivalent (FTE) basis, and are included in these indicators. The value of grants administered is excluded from key efficiency indicators since it is considered that those expenditures are not a cost of delivering services.

The corporate services costing allocation methodology adopted in 1999/00 has been applied consistently to determine a value for corporate services provided free of charge to external client agencies, and to allocate remaining corporate service expenditures across services.
OUTCOME

The Premier’s requirements and those of Cabinet are met.

SERVICES

Service 1: SUPPORT FOR THE PREMIER AS HEAD OF GOVERNMENT.
Service 2: MANAGEMENT OF MATTERS OF STATE.
Service 3: MANAGEMENT OF POLICY.

The principal clients of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet are the Premier as the Head of Government, Minister for Public Sector Management; State Development; Federal Affairs and the Cabinet Ministers. Services provided for the Premier and Cabinet include, but are not limited to:

- the provision of strategic advice;
- support for Ministers;
- support for Members of Parliament;
- the organisation of Cabinet and Executive Council meetings; and
- the provision of executive and administrative support.

Key Indicators

The diversity of services provided by the Department prevents representation of the Department’s outcomes in a single set of efficiency and effectiveness indicators. Unique key efficiency indicators are reported for each of the Department’s services, and unique key effectiveness indicators for Services 4-13.

The key effectiveness indicator for Services 1-3 is the degree to which the Premier’s Office and Ministerial Office expectations are met by services provided by the Department. This indicator is expressed as a rating between one and five where a value of one indicates that services provided were well below expectations, and five that services provided were well above expectations. A value of three indicates that provision of services met expectations.

**KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premier’s Office and Ministerial Office satisfaction with services provided</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This key effectiveness indicator has been extracted from the responses to the client expectations survey issued to the Office of the Premier and the 16 Ministerial Offices. Responses were received from the Office of the Premier and from 11 of 16 Ministerial Offices surveyed, a combined response rate of 71%. Responses to the question seeking a general rating for all services provided were aggregated to produce this indicator. The Department knows of no circumstances that might have led non-respondents to make a different assessment to respondents that returned surveys.
Service 1

Support for the Premier as Head of Government

The Department provides administrative support and advice to assist the Premier in discharging his responsibilities as Head of Government. This service includes the promotion of Western Australia’s interests overseas, communication of major Government initiatives and promotion of services to the Western Australian community.

Key Efficiency Indicators

Three major activities are reported as the key efficiency indicators for this service. The prime focus for this service is support for the Premier as Head of Government, and therefore, the principal efficiency indicator is the cost of providing services for the effective operation of the Office of the Premier. The remaining indicators recognise the importance of Western Australia’s overseas representation, and the media and communication services provided to the Premier and to Ministers.

In addition to policy advice and professional support, the Office of the Premier provides administrative and secretariat services to the Premier. The costs reported for these indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

Overseas Offices are maintained in Europe (London), the Middle East (Dubai) and North Asia (Tokyo and Kobe) to attract foreign investment to Western Australia and promote Western Australian products and services.

Media and communication costs include the co-ordination and monitoring of media releases and articles, the preparation of advice and correspondence associated with matters requiring the Premier’s involvement, and support for initiatives such as Regional Cabinet meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02 ($000s)</th>
<th>02/03 ($000s)</th>
<th>03/04 ($000s)</th>
<th>04/05 (a) ($000s)</th>
<th>05/06 ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of services provided to support the Premier (b)</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>3,684</td>
<td>3,140 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of representing WA interests overseas (per region) (d)</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>1,532 (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of media and communication services provided to each Minister (including the Premier) (e)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>175 (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b) Severance expenses of $53,337 in 2001/02 were excluded from this efficiency indicator as they are considered to be abnormal.

(c) The movement in the cost of services provided to support the Premier between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of the removal of one-off carryover from 2003/04 to 2004/05, reduction in base funding for functional review savings and procurement harvesting, reduction in accrual items, and decreased salaries expenditure due to lower average staffing levels for 2005/06.

(d) The movement in the cost of representing WA overseas between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of a significant one-off reduction in leave accrual on retirement of the former Agent General in September 2005. The cost of leave paid on termination was not charged to the European Office.

(e) Severance expenses of $25,782 in 2004/05 and $76,281 in 2005/06 are excluded from this efficiency indicator as they are considered to be abnormal.
The movement in the average cost of media and communication services between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of reductions in base funding and functional review savings, procurement harvesting and accrual items, partially offset by increases in base funding.
Service 2

MANAGEMENT OF MATTERS OF STATE

The Department provides services to support the functions of Executive Government; the administration of entitlements and services to Members of Parliament; and administrative support for Ministerial Offices and the Leaders of the First and Second parties in Opposition.

KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

Key efficiency indicators for this service are the average cost of:

- providing administrative services to Ministers and Members of Parliament;
- providing Executive Government Services;
- providing briefings to the Premier as the Minister for Federal Affairs;
- administration of Indian Ocean Territory service delivery arrangements; and
- undertaking security projects.

The costs reported for these indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

Support provided to Ministers and Members of Parliament includes office staffing, policy advice, general administration services, travel and accommodation, and the provision of executive and corporate services.

The Department has minimal discretion in respect of expenditure of items included in the operational costs of Ministerial Offices. A separate indicator is reported covering administrative support provided. Similarly, Members of Parliament’s entitlements as determined by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal constitute a significant proportion of the expenditure for this service and are non-discretionary. Therefore, expenditure on entitlements is reported separately from the cost of administrative support provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02 ($000s)</th>
<th>02/03 ($000s)</th>
<th>03/04 ($000s)</th>
<th>04/05&lt;sup&gt;(a)&lt;/sup&gt; ($000s)</th>
<th>05/06 ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average operating cost per Ministerial Office (including the Leaders of the Opposition)&lt;sup&gt;(b)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>1,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of administration provided for each Ministerial Office (including the Leaders of the Opposition)</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average entitlement cost per Member of Parliament&lt;sup&gt;(c)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>248&lt;sup&gt;(d)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of administration per Member of Parliament</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of providing an Executive Government Service&lt;sup&gt;(e)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;(f)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per briefing provided to the Premier as Minister for Federal Affairs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per Indian Ocean Territory Service Delivery Arrangement coordinated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;(g)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per security program and project undertaken&lt;sup&gt;(h)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b) Severance expenses of $140,924 in 2001/02, $147,105 in 2002/03 and $1,317,163 in 2004/05 and $1,344,673 in 2005/06 have been excluded from this efficiency indicator as they are considered to be abnormal.

(c) Severance expenses of $60,737 in 2003/04 and $849,920 in 2004/05 and $124,743 in 2005/06 have been excluded from this efficiency indicator as they are considered to be abnormal.

(d) The movement in the average entitlement cost per Member of Parliament between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is due to a significant increase in the base budget to provide additional resources to Member’s Electorate Offices including an increase in FTE for Members of the Legislative Assembly, and second electorate offices for very large regional electorates.

(e) An Executive Government Service may be any of the following: an Executive Council, Cabinet Meeting or Parliamentary Sitting Day supported; an official guest received or a hospitality function organised; and the correspondence service provided for the Premier. Each of these activities utilises resources that are provided by the Department. While the resource requirements for each are not identical, no attempt has been made to weight individual components of the indicator at this time. In 2001/02, 2002/03 and 2003/04 this indicator included the cost of Ministerial Chauffeur Services that is now allocated on an FTE basis. It has not been possible to recast prior period data to make it fully comparable.

(f) The movement in the average cost per government service between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is due to 2004/05 being an election year, with fewer Parliamentary Sitting Days, Cabinet and Executive Council Meetings. As 2005/06 was a non-election year, the level of services provided returned to normal levels.

(g) The movement in the average cost per Indian Ocean Territory Service Delivery Arrangement coordinated between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is principally due to a reduction in salary expense as one of the two officers worked part time during 2005/06.

(h) The Security Planning and Coordination function was only established in 2004/05, therefore no prior period comparisons are available.

Expenditure on Corporate Services of $489,659 provided free of charge to;
- the Office of the Public Sector Standards Commissioner,
- the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations (Ombudsman), and
- the Department of Treasury and Finance

plus, expenditure of $6,222,986 on support provided to Commissions and Inquiries and community service obligations for the year ending 30 June 2006, and severance expenses of $399,656 are excluded from the key efficiency indicators reported for this service.
Service 3

MANAGEMENT OF POLICY

The Department provides advice to and co-ordination for the Premier and Cabinet on key policy matters to ensure an effective government-wide perspective in economic, regional, environmental, social and sustainability policy areas, and advice on whole of government positions on treaties, defence, federal reform and other matters raised through the Council of Australian Governments while managing and coordinating Western Australian Government input to federal negotiations.

KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATOR

The average cost per employee hour of policy advice, development and co-ordination, extrapolated from activity sampling conducted twice per year is the key efficiency indicator for this service. The cost reported for this indicator includes a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02 ($)</th>
<th>02/03 ($)</th>
<th>03/04 ($)</th>
<th>04/05(a) ($)</th>
<th>05/06 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per hour of policy advice, development and co-ordination (b)(c)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>109(e)</td>
<td>91(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b) Severance expenses of $57,121 in 2001/02, $136,396 in 2002/03, $25,679 in 2004/05 and $160,537 in 2005/06 have been excluded from this efficiency indicator as they are considered to be abnormal.

(c) Grants of $1,429,458 in 2001/02, $1,583,449 in 2002/03, $205,545 in 2003/04, $881,823 in 2004/05 and $883,727 in 2005/06, and 175th Anniversary Celebration expenses of $100,525 in 2003/04 and $265,760 in 2004/05 have been excluded from this key efficiency indicator, as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering services.

(d) Key efficiency indicator recast for 2004/05 to exclude Water Strategy functions that are now reported as Service 13.

(e) The movement in the average cost per hour of policy advice, development and co-ordination in 2005/06 compared with 2004/05 is due to a significant increase in the number of hours reported during the two 2005/06 periods of activity sampling, reduction in base funding following removal of one-year 2004/05 initiatives, and functional review savings and procurement harvesting.
OUTCOME

*The Premier’s obligations as Minister for Public Sector Management are met.*

Service 4

**SUPPORT FOR THE PREMIER AS MINISTER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT**

The Department provides advice, assistance and support to the Minister for Public Sector Management and the public sector on a range of public sector management matters, including:

- functions under the *Public Sector Management Act 1994*, including as the employer of Chief Executive Officers and manager of the Senior Executive Service;
- best practice in human resource management including recruitment, employment professional development, skills training and deployment;
- whole-of-government reporting on public sector workforce demographics, trends and management issues; and
- support for organizational restructuring and promotion of whole-of-government management improvement strategies and special projects.

Clients for these services are principally the Premier as Minister for Public Sector Management, the Deputy Premier as the Minister Assisting the Minister for Public Sector Management and departmental chief executive officers.

The Senior Executive Service, including chief executive officers, is established under the *Public Sector Management Act 1994*. The Department supports chief executive officer appointment processes, development programs, and products and services such as "SES On-Line". The Department co-ordinates public-sector redeployment policy and practices, co-ordinates some sector-wide recruitment programs, and provides expertise to support whole of government organisational improvement initiatives.

The Department supports the Government’s on-line Recruitment Advertising Management System and produces the fortnightly “InterSector” magazine and publications related to workforce demographic and management issues and other matters.

**KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premier’s Office and Minister Assisting Office satisfaction with the support services provided</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS**

The key efficiency indicators for this service are the average cost of:

- support provided to the Minister for Public Sector Management, the Minister Assisting the Minister for Public Sector Management and Senior Executive Service members per SES member;
- co-ordination of redeployment and recruitment functions;
- a visit to on-line facilities provided;
- per workforce development hour;
- per policy advice and implementation hour;
- participants in the Public Sector Management program; and
- the percentage of workforce development cost recovered.
The costs reported for these indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02 ($)</th>
<th>02/03 ($)</th>
<th>03/04 ($)</th>
<th>04/05 ($)</th>
<th>05/06 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of support services provided per Senior Executive Service member</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per recruitment and redeployment service provided</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>2,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per hour of workforce development provided</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per visit to on-line facilities provided</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per hour of policy advice and policy implementation provided</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per Public Sector Management Program participant</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>6,220</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>4,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b) The movement in the average cost of support services per SES member between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of a 6% increase in the number of SES members and CEO positions managed, a 15% decrease in FTE resources allocated to this function and shared service savings and procurement harvesting in 2005/06, partially offset by carryover from 2004/05 to 2005/06.

(c) Grants of $303,656 in 2001/02, $325,385 in 2002/03, $167,258 in 2003/04, $216,449 in 2004/05 and $12,235 in 2005/06 have been excluded from this efficiency indicator, as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering services.

(d) The movement in the average cost per recruitment and redeployment service provided between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is partially due to a 12% decrease in the number of services provided in 2005/06, and a significant variation in accrual items charged to this indicator.

(e) The movement in the average cost per hour of workforce development between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is a result of significant new funding for Leadership Development provided in 2005/06 through the 2006/07 budget process. New indicators are in course of development to more appropriately reflect expenditure of this funding in future. Partially offsetting the increased expenditure is a 24% increase in the hours of workforce development provided in 2005/06, the removal of carryover from 2003/04 to 2004/05 and procurement harvesting and accrual adjustments.

(f) The average cost per visit to online facilities is a new key efficiency indicator developed and reported in 2004/05 following the implementation of the Recruitment Advertising Management System online recruitment system and no comparative data is available for prior periods. A visit to an on-line facility is defined as one that involves downloading information.

(g) The movement in the average cost per visit to on-line facilities provided between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of a 41% increase in the number of visits to the Department’s web sites over the past year, a reduction in the base funding in 2005/06 compared with 2004/05, and removal of carryover from 2003/04 to 2004/05.

(h) Copyright payments of $1,101 in 2001/02, $953,343 in 2002/03, $149,784 in 2003/04, $33,046 in 2004/05 and $26,000 in 2005/06 have been excluded from the average cost per hour of policy advice and policy implementation, as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering that service.
(i) The movement in the average cost per hour of policy advice and policy implementation between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of a 13% increase in the number of hours of policy advice and implementation provided in 2005/06 compared with 2004/05, and a reduction in 2005/06 base funding.

(j) The movement in the average cost per Public Sector Management Program Participant between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of a 20% reduction in the number of participants in the program at 30 June 2006 compared with the number at 30 June 2005.
OUTCOME

A secure, confidential and time critical printing and publishing service for Parliament and Government.

Service 5

PARLIAMENTARY, STATUTORY AND LEGISLATIVE PUBLISHING SERVICE

The Department provides secure, confidential and time critical printing and publishing services to meet Parliamentary and Government requirements. All costs of managing the State Law Publisher office, its staffing and equipment are included in the key efficiency indicators for this service.

KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

The key effectiveness indicators relate to the requirement for timely, secure and confidential printing and publishing. Parliamentary documents such as Hansard and Bills must be delivered to the respective Houses of Parliament within certain timeframes. The first key effectiveness indicator reports the percentage of documents provided within those timeframes.

Certain documents are not to be publicly released until tabled in Parliament (for example, Royal Commission and Inquiry proceedings), or prior to scheduled publishing dates (for example, Government Gazette). The second key effectiveness indicator reports the proportion of documents produced and released in accordance with these security and confidentiality requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Parliamentary documents produced and delivered within agreed timeframes established by each house of Parliament</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of documents produced and released in accordance with security and confidentiality requirements (a)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) This indicator was reported for the first time in 2002/03. Prior period comparative data is not available.

KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

Key efficiency indicators are the average cost per printing image, the average cost per publication and the average sale value. The costs reported for the first two indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02 ($)</th>
<th>02/03 ($)</th>
<th>03/04 ($)</th>
<th>04/05($)</th>
<th>05/06 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per printing image produced (b)(c)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of publication sold</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average sale value</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>13.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b) A printing image is a single pass of a document through the Docutech machine.
(c) Severance expenses of $68,180 in 2002/03 and $122,498 in 2004/05 have been excluded from these efficiency indicators as they are considered to be abnormal.
OUTCOME

*Increased level of community awareness of the Western Australian and Commonwealth Constitutions, and the Australian Federal system of government.*

Service 6

**MANAGEMENT OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL CENTRE PROGRAMS**

The Government is committed to helping educate the community about the Western Australian and Commonwealth Constitutions, and the Federal system of government through the provision of exhibitions and programs at the Constitutional Centre.

**KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS**

The key effectiveness indicators demonstrate the demand for services provided by the Constitutional Centre. The first indicator reports the annual growth in visitor numbers; and the second, participation rates for travelling and outreach programs delivered to regional areas. The third indicator reports the number of people accessing the Centre’s web pages and downloading information about Constitutional matters.

The Constitutional Centre conducts a range of exhibitions and programs providing information about the Western Australian and Commonwealth Constitutions, and the Federal system of government. This chart shows a sharp growth in visitor numbers from 1999/00 to 2000/01 flattening out through 2001/02 to 2002/03 and a steady rise through 2003/04 and 2004/05 before flattening out again in 2005/06. Annual growth at the rate seen between 2003/04 and 2004/05 is considered unlikely in the future.

The visitor data includes attendances at outreach events conducted in regional centres. Demand for these programs has significantly increased (from a low base) over the past five years. While some outreach activities are conducted in the metropolitan area, the number of visitors to such events is excluded from the outreach indicator, as its purpose is to highlight rural and regional activity. The reduced level of outreach activity in 2004/05 was the result of difficulties experienced in recruiting suitably skilled staff to deliver programs. Strategies adopted in 2005/06 addressed the demand that could not be met in 2004/05, resulting in the significant growth shown in the chart on the preceding page.
The Constitutional Centre Web pages are a source of Constitutional information for students and the general public. This indicator demonstrates a sustained level of demand for this facility, and is a meaningful indicator of the site’s effectiveness as a means of providing the community with information about Constitutional matters and the Federal system of government.

In 2005/06, the Department implemented in-house website hosting. While the statistics provided report the number of people accessing the Centre’s web pages and downloading information about Constitutional matters, the number sharply increased in 2005/06. Analysis of the data did not identify any inaccuracies, so it is assumed that data for prior periods may have been under-reported.

**KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATOR**

The cost per customer of the Centre is the key efficiency measure for this function. The cost reported for this indicator includes a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02 ($)</th>
<th>02/03 ($)</th>
<th>03/04 ($)</th>
<th>04/05 (a) ($)</th>
<th>05/06 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per customer of the Constitutional Centre (b)</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>12.82 (c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b) Grants of $50,334 in 2001/02, $116,455 in 2002/03, $279,667 in 2003/04, $382,666 in 2004/05 and $322,333 in 2005/06 and expenditure on 175th Anniversary of European Settlement celebrations of $1,869,494 in 2003/04 and $2,612,042 in 2004/05 have been excluded from this efficiency indicator as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering services.

(c) The movement in the average cost per customer of the Constitutional Centre between 2004/05 and 2005/06 results from a 3% increase in the number of customers in 2005/06, a reduction in administrative expenditure (activity undertaken in support of the 175th Anniversary Celebrations in 2004/05 that was separately funded), and shared services savings and procurement harvesting.
OUTCOME

A Western Australian public sector which recognises that Western Australian citizens play a significant role in setting policies that shape their society, and in which there is widespread acceptance of the principle of multiculturalism to enable the achievement of substantive equality for culturally and linguistically diverse communities.

Service 7

TO ENABLE AND ENCOURAGE THE PARTICIPATION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIANS IN SETTING POLICIES THAT SHAPE THEIR SOCIETY, AND TO LEAD THE PUBLIC SECTOR IN REALISING THE IDEALS OF MULTICULTURALISM, ACHIEVING SUBSTANTIVE EQUALITY FOR CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITIES.

The Office of Citizens and Civics coordinates the implementation of the Western Australian Citizenship Strategy, ‘A Voice for All: Strengthening Democracy’, by:

- developing policy in the areas of citizenship and governance, civics and strengthening democracy;
- identifying information, skills and mechanisms required for effective participation in public life and decision-making; and
- facilitating and fostering dialogue between the people of Western Australia, their governments and other institutions.

The Office of Multicultural Interests assists in delivering Government's commitments set out in the Western Australian Charter of Multiculturalism by:

- promoting the ideals of multiculturalism to public sector agencies by developing and influencing policies that reflect these principles; and
- providing information to the culturally and linguistically diverse communities on the availability of public sector services.

KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

Citizens and Civics

A key effectiveness indicator focussed on the implementation of the Western Australian Citizenship Strategy, ‘A Voice for All: Strengthening Democracy’ was developed and is reported below.

This data is extracted from a survey instrument provided to participants engaged in major and/or contentious consultation between government and the community, and where the Citizens and Civics Unit provides strategic advisory and/or validation support. The indicator reports participants’ assessment of the Unit’s contribution to the process and the extent to which policies within the Western Australian Citizenship Strategy delivered beneficial outcomes for the parties. Respondents include government agencies and instrumentalities, non-government organisations and community members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which coordination provided by the Citizens and Civics Unit enhances Western Australian citizens’ ability to influence government policies that shape their society</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) New effectiveness indicator first reported in 2004/05. No prior period data is available for comparison purposes.
Multicultural Interests

The key effectiveness indicators, first reported in 2003/04 are:
- the extent to which culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities in Western Australia experience substantive equality through the multicultural principles of civic values, fairness, equality and participation in their dealings with the public sector, and
- the extent to which the policies and practices of public sector agencies reflect the principles of multiculturalism.

A standard survey instrument, administered by telephone to a random sample of CALD community organisations and to public sector agencies interacting with those groups is used to gather data. The target population is drawn from the Office of Multicultural Interests customer database, and in each case, the invited respondent was the individual with whom the Office interacts. Administration by telephone follows an initial contact to arrange a suitable time, using a structured methodology to ensure validity and reliability of responses.

Separate survey instruments were used for the CALD community and public sector agencies. Each instrument includes specific questions relating to the principles embedded in the Charter. The CALD Community population was 210 from which 119 responses were received; a response rate of 56.7% and the Public Sector Agency population was 139, from which 88 responses were received, a response rate of 63.3%. The responses to four questions in each survey have been aggregated to derive the key effectiveness indicators reported hereunder (the results are published as a percentage of all responses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which CALD communities in Western Australia experience substantive</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equality through the multicultural principles of civic values, fairness, equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and participation in their dealings with the public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the policies and practices of public sector agencies reflect</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the principles of multiculturalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

All costs of the Citizens and Civics Unit and the Office of Multicultural Interests are included in the efficiency indicators for this service. Key efficiency indicators report the cost of promoting multiculturalism to the wider community and supporting its implementation across the public sector, and the cost of significant policy/research activities. The costs reported for these indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

Existing data was recast for 2003/04 comparative information for the Office of Citizens and Civics indicators, and 2001/02 comparative information for the Office of Multicultural Interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02</th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per client assisted to support public sector agency implementation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51,816</td>
<td>27,138</td>
<td>25,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of State Citizenship Strategy policies, strategies and principles (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per initiative undertaken to achieve substantive equality for</td>
<td>48,027</td>
<td>44,437</td>
<td>53,797</td>
<td>42,127</td>
<td>47,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culturally and linguistically diverse communities (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Average cost per initiative undertaken to support public sector agency implementation of policies and practices reflecting the principles of multiculturalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Cost per Initiative ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>31,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>38,492&lt;sup&gt;(d)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>34,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05&lt;sup&gt;(a)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>23,281&lt;sup&gt;(f)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

- <sup>(a)</sup> Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.
- <sup>(b)</sup> New key efficiency indicator developed in 2004/05. Existing data was used to provide 2003/04 comparative information reported, however this data may not be fully comparable with 2004/05 and 2005/06 values.
- <sup>(c)</sup> Grants totalling $504,133 in 2001/02, $376,287 in 2002/03, $502,345 in 2003/04, $597,624 in 2004/05 and $590,961 in 2005/06 have been excluded from these key efficiency indicators, as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering services.
- <sup>(d)</sup> Severance expenses of $372,966 in 2002/03 have been excluded from these key efficiency indicators as they are considered to be abnormal.
- <sup>(e)</sup> The movement in the average cost per community initiative between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is principally due to new one-year funding received in 2005/06 and an increase in the staffing resources allocated to these initiatives, partially offset by repositioning part of the new funding to 2006/07 and the effect of a 9% increase in the number of initiatives undertaken.
- <sup>(f)</sup> The movement in the average cost of public sector initiatives between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is due to new one-year funding received in 2005/ and an increase in the staffing resources allocated to these initiatives, partially offset by repositioning part of the new funding to 2006/07 and a 10% increase in the number of initiatives undertaken.
- <sup>(g)</sup> The movement in the average cost per unit of policy and/or research between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is due to the reallocation of significant staffing resources to community and public sector initiatives and a 28% increase in the number of units of policy and/or research delivered.
OUTCOME

Resolution of Native Title matters in accordance with Government Policy.

Service 8

NATIVE TITLE POLICY DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION AND NEGOTIATION

The Office of Native Title implements Government’s Native Title objectives through:

- resolution of Native Title determination applications and compensation applications wherever possible by agreement;
- resolution of Native Title matters in accordance with the requirements of the Native Title Act 1993 (Cth) and relevant case law;
- ensuring valid future acts that minimise the extinguishment or impairment of Native Title and minimise the State’s exposure to compensation liability;
- developing, implementing and monitoring policies, procedures and practices across government that ensure Native Title matters are administered efficiently and consistently;
- concluding agreements that deal in a comprehensive way with the determination of Native Title, compensation and arrangements for future acts; and
- negotiating and participating in the implementation of project agreements.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTION

The Native Title function was transferred to the Department of Treasury and Finance on the 7 April 2006. The indicators reported hereunder apply to the period 1 July 2005 – 6 April 2006, thus may not be fully comparable with prior data that relates to full year operations.

KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

The key effectiveness indicators for this service reflect the reduction in the number of outstanding claims awaiting resolution, and the proportion of claims resolved by mutual agreement between the parties.

A reduction in the number of outstanding claims was an undertaking in the Government’s 2001 election policy.

This data shows that 122 claims were outstanding at the 6 April 2006 after the addition of 4 new claims, the settlement of 1 existing claim, and 8 claims being rejected, struck out, dismissed, subsumed, withdrawn or discontinued.
The Government’s Native Title strategy promotes settlement of land title claims by negotiation wherever possible, leading to consent rather than litigated outcomes.

From 1 July 2005 - 6 April 2006, one claim was determined through litigation.

KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

The key efficiency indicators are the average cost per native title determination achieved during the year, average cost per native title application managed and average time taken to achieve resolution of prioritised native title applications. A determination is deemed to have taken place when the Federal Court makes an order, and may cover one or more claims. A native title application managed is one that the parties (Native Title Tribunal, the State Agency and the Representative Bodies) have agreed to prioritise, and to which resources are allocated. Applications managed are those being progressed towards determination, but not determined during the reporting period. Activities included in this indicator include non-Native Title outcomes such as Industrial Land Use Agreements.

The average time taken to resolve prioritised native title applications is a moving average of the time from the date the parties agree to prioritise the application to its determination.

Existing data was recast to produce comparisons for 2002/03 and 2003/04. The costs reported for these indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>02/03 ($000s)</th>
<th>03/04 ($000s)</th>
<th>04/05&lt;sup&gt;(c)&lt;/sup&gt; ($000s)</th>
<th>05/06 ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per native title determination&lt;sup&gt;(b)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>689&lt;sup&gt;(d)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per native title application managed&lt;sup&gt;(b)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>102&lt;sup&gt;(e)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average time taken to achieve resolution of prioritised native title applications (years)&lt;sup&gt;(f)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5&lt;sup&gt;(g)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b) Indicators were reviewed in 2004/05 to provide better activity-based cost information. Existing data was recast to provide the 2003/04 comparisons reported above, however in the absence of similar data for prior periods, it is not possible to provide information for earlier periods.

(c) Grants of $625,181 in 2003/04, $2,197,541 in 2004/05 and $1,748,464 in 2005/06 have been excluded from these key efficiency indicators as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering services.

(d) The significant movement in the average cost per native title determination between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of the significant reduction in the number of claims determined. In 2004/05,
five claims were determined, whereas in the year to the 6 April 2006 only 1 claim was
determined. The cost of services is reported for 9 months rather than a full year.

(e) The significant movement in the average cost per native title application managed between
2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of a 55% reduction in the number of applications managed in
2005/06, and reporting the cost of service for 9 months rather than a full year.

(f) This key efficiency indicator was reported for the first time in 2004/05. Comparative information
for 2003/04 was prepared from Departmental records.

(g) The movement in the average time taken to achieve resolution of prioritised native title claims
between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is an outcome of the litigation process to determine the claim
settled in 2005/06. Generally, the process of litigation takes considerably longer than the
negotiation process used to settle claims by consent agreement.
OUTCOME

*Science and innovation has increased in significance as a driver of economic growth for Western Australia.*

Service 9

SCIENCE AND INNOVATION PROMOTION AND SUPPORT

The Office of Science and Innovation coordinates implementation of Government’s Innovate WA policy and strategy by:

- undertaking science policy development and providing support to the Premier’s Science Council;
- identifying and promoting science and innovation opportunities;
- supporting the development of Western Australian research capability and infrastructure;
- administering science grants, scholarships and fellowships; and
- promoting science and innovation in schools and through the Scitech Discovery Centre.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTION

The Science and Innovation function was transferred to the Department of Industry and Resources on the 1 April 2006. The indicators reported hereunder are for the period 1 July 2005 – 31 March 2006, thus may not be fully comparable with prior data that relates to full year operations.

KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

The key effectiveness indicators address the service’s objective of increasing the significance of science and innovation as a driver of economic growth in Western Australia. The key effectiveness indicators for this service are the leverage (cash only) achieved through grants made to enhance and develop local science capability and infrastructure (primarily grants provided through the Centres of Excellence in Science and Innovation program), and the change over time in the level of gross investment in scientific research and development in Western Australia.

Science capability development grants are provided to assist local scientific research bodies seeking Commonwealth, private and international investment to undertake scientific research. The term leverage refers to the ratio of total funding (cash only) from all other sources compared to Government’s investment through grant funding provided. The target established in 2002/03 was 8:1, that is $8 for every $1 provided by Government.

![Science Capability Grants Leverage](image)

This indicator shows the value of Commonwealth, international and private investment attracted for every dollar invested with Western Australian scientific research bodies by the Government through the Centres of Excellence program.

This program provides grant funding to local Centres of Excellence and Commonwealth-funded Cooperative Research Centres. While leverage for the Cooperative Research Centres often exceeds 8:1, local Centres of Excellence are generally lower in the range 1.5:1 to 3:1. In 2005/06, one Cooperative Research Centre and six Centres of Excellence were funded. This
indicator reports leverage at the time the grant is approved, although the investment is realised over several years and leverage may increase over time.

The second effectiveness indicator is the Gross Investment in Research and Development sourced from Australian Bureau of Statistics data. This indicator reports the level of investment in research and development by all research sectors including government, business and higher education in Western Australia.

The Gross Investment data is sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics Research and Experimental Development data (ABS 81120), and is reported every two years. As this indicator lags investment, the effect of Government stimulation through grant programs and other direct investment will take time to appear.

The most recent data available for government and business relates to 2002/03 and calendar year 2002 for higher education. The next data for government and industry for 2004/05 and higher education for calendar year 2004 is scheduled for publication in September 2006.

KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

The key efficiency indicators for this service are the average cost per FTE for support provided to the Science Council, science policy development and advice; the average cost per research capability grant administered; and the average cost per program and project managed. These indicators demonstrate the significant resource commitment made to these key activities.

The Science Council advises the Minister on science and innovation opportunities for Western Australia and makes recommendations to realise InnovateWA objectives. The Office of Science and Innovation provides executive and administrative support to the Council, undertakes development of science policy and provides advice to the Minister, Cabinet, Government Departments and the business and academic sectors.

The Office of Science and Innovation is a major grant-making body, and the average cost of grant administration is an appropriate key efficiency indicator. The remaining indicator is the average cost for science and innovation programs and projects managed. Major projects include the International Square Kilometre Array radio-telescope project, the Premier’s Research Fellowships and Collaborative Grants, the provision of financial support to the Scitech Discovery Centre, and WA Major Research Facilities support. The dollar value of grants provided to external recipients is excluded from these costs.

Data provided by the former Department of Industry and Technology was used for 2001/02 comparisons, although significant changes in the operation of this function following its transfer to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet mean that the data may not be fully comparable. The costs reported for these indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01/02 ($)</th>
<th>02/03 ($)</th>
<th>03/04 ($)</th>
<th>04/05(a) ($)</th>
<th>05/06 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per FTE for support provided to the Science Council, science policy development and advice (b)</td>
<td>98,956</td>
<td>206,706</td>
<td>127,442</td>
<td>122,069</td>
<td>181,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Average cost per research capability and infrastructure grant administered\(^{(d)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3,011</th>
<th>9,122</th>
<th>7,525</th>
<th>10,020</th>
<th>9,464</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Average cost per science and innovation program and project managed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>52,051</th>
<th>86,698</th>
<th>53,014</th>
<th>107,216</th>
<th>91,661(^{(e)})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(a)  Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b)  This key efficiency indicator refers to resources allocated to provide support to the Science Council, undertake policy development and provide policy advice. It is expressed as an average cost per full time equivalent (FTE) and includes salary and contingency expenditures, that is, it is not the average salary for an FTE. For this indicator, FTE’s are treated as units of effort. 2.64 FTEs (approximately 19% of the Office of Science and Innovation’s average staffing resources for the period 1 July 2005 - 31 March 2006) were required to support the Science Council, develop policy and provide policy advice in 2005/06.

(c)  The movement in the average cost per FTE for support between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is attributable to reporting the cost of service for 9 months rather than a full year, and a marginal increase in the FTE resources allocated to this key efficiency indicator.

(d)  Grants totalling $16,362,000 in 2001/02, $10,319,843 in 2002/03, $14,159,115 in 2003/04, $15,448,633 in 2004/05 and $14,168,702 to the 31 March 2006 have been excluded from this efficiency indicator as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering services.

(e)  The movement in the average cost per science and innovation program and project managed between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is attributable to reporting the cost of service for 9 months rather than a full year, partially offset by a 20% reduction in the number of projects and programs undertaken.
OUTCOME

Reducing the number of fatalities in Western Australia through the implementation of Road Safety programs.

Service 10

SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATE’S ROAD SAFETY INITIATIVES

Support is provided to the Road Safety Council to undertake implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the State’s road safety initiatives.

The key effectiveness indicators for this service report the number of deaths per 100,000 estimated residential population resulting from road crashes, and injuries resulting from road crashes per 100,000 estimated residential population (defined as hospital admissions). The Road Safety Council’s objective is to reduce fatalities from road crashes in Western Australia to a level equivalent to the lowest in Australia over a five-year timeframe commencing 2002/03. These indicators are consistent with those reported prior to 2001/02 when the Office was part of the Department of Transport.

KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

In 2005, 162 people were killed in road crashes on Western Australian roads. As a result, Western Australian fatalities per 100,000 population (8.11 deaths per 100,000 population) remain marginally above Australian average rates (8.05 deaths per 100,000 population), and the number of fatalities at 1.07 deaths per 10,000 registered vehicles in Western Australia is marginally lower than the Australian average rate of 1.18 deaths per 10,000 registered vehicles.

The graph on the following page demonstrates the extent of change in the fatality rate per 100,000 population and per 10,000 registered vehicles over time for Western Australia, compared to the Australian averages. Since 1990 there has been a downward trend in death rates nationally and in WA, characterised by fluctuations up and down. These downward trends are occurring in a context of strong economic growth and increases in vehicle traffic in WA in recent years, broad indicators that are regarded as having a negative influence on road safety outcomes.

In 2001 in WA there was a ‘stepdown’ effect where the number of deaths dropped, a step that has been maintained at a new lower level. This ‘stepdown’ effect is experienced in jurisdictions when major impacts are felt. While it is difficult to identify one particular factor, the ‘stepdown’ in WA in 2001 coincided with the lead-in to the introduction of 50km/h speed limits in WA in December 2001 and is associated with a corresponding small drop in travel speeds across the road network. These drops are experienced in other jurisdictions when network wide speed limits and travel speed reductions occur.

While Western Australia and Victoria have achieved the biggest percentage reductions from 2000 to 2005, the WA average fatality rate is still marginally above the national average. Over the first three years of implementation of the WA Strategy, Arriving Safely 2003-2007, actual fatality rates for 2002 (179 fatalities or 9.30 deaths per 100,000), 2003 (179 fatalities or 9.23 deaths per 100,000), 2004 (179 fatalities or 9.00 deaths per 100,000) and 2005 (162 fatalities or 8.11 deaths per 100,000) lie above the levels identified as required to meet the 2007 target.

Although fatality rates for 2002-2005 exceed predicted levels, the five year target set under Arriving Safely 2003-2007 is deliberately ambitious when compared to the target set for Australia under the National Road Safety Strategy 2001-2010. In this regard, the Council has set a goal of achieving a similar target within a shorter timeframe, requiring significant and
aggressive action. This action will see a focus on education of road users and compliance enforcement, coupled with a stronger commitment to safer roads and safer vehicles over the remaining life of the Strategy.

Data for this table is sourced from:
(i) Rates taken from Road Deaths Australia 2005 Statistical Summary by the Australian Transport Safety Bureau (published 11/04/2006)
(ii) Population data are from Australian Bureau of Statistics Population by Sex and Age: States and Territories (ABS Catalogue No. 3201.0 (2005)). The population estimates are as at June 30 of each year. Only preliminary data are available for 2005.

As shown in the graph on the following page, Police reported 3,064 people hospitalised in 2005 as a result of their involvement in road crashes, a 4% decrease from 2004. Hospital reported admission data for the same period indicates that 3,020 people were admitted to hospital as a result of their involvement in road crashes, a 1% increase over 2004. The variance between hospital-reported admissions and Police-reported hospitalisations is a result of definitional data collection and analysis inconsistencies. The Police-reported admissions for 2005 are somewhat higher than the moving 5-year average, an adverse trend that is being considered by the Road Safety Council.

It should be noted that there have been some changes in how hospital admission data from the Health Department are reported. In previous years, it is most likely that hospital admission data included all traffic and some non-traffic crashes, whereas data now refers solely to traffic crashes. These changes have been made so that road user classifications from the Health Department are as close as is possible to those used for the Police reported data.

The hospital admission data in the following graph uses the most up-to date coding system available and matches hospital admission data published for the years 1996-2003 in recent
annual road crash publications. Advice from the Health Department also indicates that data provided in the past may have counted admitted persons more than once if they were admitted on more than one occasion in a calendar year.

The de-coupling trend, i.e. declining death rates and stable injury rates is being experienced in other Australian and international jurisdictions where road safety is progressive. This de-coupling trend is subject to significant research and analysis. A factor is the definition of reporting of injuries (admitted to hospital), which does not identify if the severity of injuries is trending down or not. These issues are being considered through the Road Safety Council interagency Measuring Progress Advisory Group formed in May 2006.

Data for this table is sourced from:
(i) Police Reported Crash Data: Main Roads, Western Australia; Data Analysis Australia, June 2006. This data is preliminary and may be subject to change.
(ii) Hospital Reported Admissions: Department of Health, Western Australia; Data Analysis Australia, June 2006. This data is preliminary and may be subject to change.

KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

The key efficiency indicators are the average costs for major awareness-raising campaigns targeting speeding, drink-driving, driver fatigue and seatbelts conducted during the year, and for road safety initiatives identified by the Road Safety Council (advertising and other campaigns focusing on particular issues, eg double demerit points over public holiday periods), and the average costs per FTE required to provide support to the Road Safety Council. Support provided to the Road Safety Council and its subsidiary committees and working groups includes executive support, coordination, research, and preparation of papers for consideration and routine administrative support. This cost includes, but is not limited to salaries and salary-related expenses. The costs reported for these indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

Comparative values for the 2001/02 key efficiency indicators were provided by the Office of Road Safety using existing data, however due to differences in costing and recording methodology, the data may not be fully comparable.
## Average cost of awareness-raising Campaigns (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>01/02 ($000s)</th>
<th>02/03 ($000s)</th>
<th>03/04 ($000s)</th>
<th>04/05(a) ($000s)</th>
<th>05/06 ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,049(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Average cost of road safety initiatives (b)(d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>01/02 ($000s)</th>
<th>02/03 ($000s)</th>
<th>03/04 ($000s)</th>
<th>04/05 ($000s)</th>
<th>05/06 ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>612</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Average cost per FTE for support services to the Road Safety Council (b)(e)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>01/02 ($000s)</th>
<th>02/03 ($000s)</th>
<th>03/04 ($000s)</th>
<th>04/05 ($000s)</th>
<th>05/06 ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b) Data from the former Department of Transport was used to provide comparative information for 2001/02 and prior periods, however due to differences in costing methodology and the conversion of previous indicators, data published may not be fully comparable with that reported for subsequent periods.

(c) The movement in the average cost of awareness-raising campaigns between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of the increase in the number of campaigns conducted in 2005/06.

(d) Grants totalling $4,499,000 in 2001/02, $9,390,299 in 2002/03, $7,288,162 in 2003/04, $7,077,031 in 2004/05 and $8,943,560 in 2005/06 have been excluded from this key efficiency indicator as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering services.

(e) This key efficiency indicator relates to resources allocated to provide support to the Road Safety Council, and to undertake policy development and the provision of policy advice. It is expressed as an average cost per full time equivalent (FTE) and includes salary and contingency expenditures, that is, it is not the average salary for an FTE. For this indicator, FTE's are treated as units of effort. 3 FTEs (approximately 16% of the Office of Road Safety’s resources) were required to support the Road Safety Council, develop policy and provide policy advice in 2005/06.
OUTCOME

The strategic transformation of the operations of Government, using technology as a tool, to improve internal efficiency, service delivery to citizens and community participation.

Service 11

e-GOVERNMENT POLICY AND COORDINATION

The Office of e-Government is responsible for:

- promoting and leading the implementation of the e-Government Strategy for the Western Australian Public Sector;
- developing a policy framework, standards and guidelines that are consistent with the e-Government Strategy for the Western Australian Public Sector, and with national and international best practice;
- coordinating and facilitating cross sector implementation of the e-Government Strategy for the Western Australian Public Sector and policy framework;
- initiating, leading and coordinating strategic e-government projects that deliver improved internal efficiencies, integrated service delivery and greater opportunities for community participation; and
- encouraging a better understanding of e-government and promoting its benefits to the public sector, business and the community.

The Office of e-Government was created in 2003 in response to the Functional Review Taskforce recommendations and incorporates a range of functions previously undertaken by the former Department of Industry and Technology.

KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

The key effectiveness indicators developed for this service are the extent to which Departments adopt and implement the policies, standards and guidelines developed by the Office, and satisfaction ratings from the Strategic Management Council e-Government Sub-Committee and the Premier’s Office.

The first indicator reports the level of agency commitment to implementation of e-government policies, standards and guidelines, developed by the Office and endorsed by the Strategic Management Council e-Government Sub-Committee to improve internal efficiency, service delivery to citizens and community participation. Twenty-three Departments were surveyed to assess the degree to which they had adopted policies, standards and guidelines issued in relation to State Government Web Sites and the WA Electronic Government Interoperability Framework. A 96% response rate to this survey was achieved.

The remaining indicators recognise the close working relationship with the Premier and the e-Government Sub-Committee necessary for the effective development and implementation of e-government strategy within the Western Australian public sector. The survey issued to the e-Government Sub-Committee was completed by 8 of the 10 members, an 80% response rate.
### ANNUAL REPORT – 2005/2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>02/03</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Departments that adopt and implement policies, standards and guidelines developed by the Office</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management Council e-Government Sub-Committee’s satisfaction with quality and timeliness of work undertaken to support the committee</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier’s Office satisfaction with advice and support provided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

The key efficiency indicators are the average cost per Department adopting and implementing policies, standards and guidelines, and the average cost per significant e-government initiative in which the Office is involved. These indicators have been identified to appropriately recognise the allocation of resources to major activities designed to achieve e-government objectives. As this is a new initiative, no comparative data is available for periods prior to 2002/03. The costs reported for these indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>02/03 ($a)</th>
<th>03/04 ($a)</th>
<th>04/05 ($b)</th>
<th>05/06 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per Department that adopts and implements policies, standards and guidelines</td>
<td>31,624</td>
<td>40,428</td>
<td>83,465</td>
<td>92,800 ($b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per significant e-government initiative in which the Office is involved</td>
<td>126,188</td>
<td>268,256</td>
<td>141,229</td>
<td>131,054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Key performance indicator costs reported for 2002/03 apply to the period 3 February 2003 – 30 June 2003 only and are therefore not comparable with full-year activity reported for subsequent periods.

(b) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(c) Grants totalling $5,700,000 in 2003/04 and $2,300,000 in 2004/05 have been excluded from these key efficiency indicators as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering services.

(d) The movement in the average cost per Department between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of funding repositioned and carryover from 2004/05 to 2005/06, that is partially offset by a 24% increase in the number of Departments adopting/implementing policies, standards and guidelines, and the removal of carryover from 2003/04 to 2004/05.
OUTCOME

A safer and more secure community

Service 12

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATE CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGY

The Office of Crime Prevention implements the State Crime Prevention strategy by:
• providing high level policy advice to the Government;
• conducting policy research and development to identify effective methods to reduce crime;
• establishing community safety and crime prevention partnerships and plans;
• communicating with key stakeholders and the community; and
• directly managing and evaluating projects, and supporting community based projects by grant funding.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTION

The Crime Prevention function was transferred to the WA Police (apart from the ParentSupport function that was transferred to the Department of Community Development) on the 1 July 2006.

KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

The key effectiveness indicators reported for this service are the reported rate of home burglary per 1,000 residential dwellings and the proportion of the community who feel “safe” or “very safe” at home alone during the day or after dark.

The first indicator reports the rate of home burglary in Western Australia using data provided by the Crime Research Centre at the University of WA. The Government’s Crime Prevention strategies are designed to reduce the incidence of home burglary, and the results signalled by this indicator are the outcome of the policies, programs and actions of several departments working together across government.

![WA Burglary Rate per 1,000 dwellings, 1993-2004](image)

This lagging indicator is reported on a calendar year basis, and is published during the following year, thus the indicator value reported in 2005/06 relates to the 2004 calendar year. It is anticipated that 2005 calendar year data will be released in December 2006 and will therefore be reported in 2006/07.
The second and third effectiveness indicators are data published annually in the Report of Government Services ("perception of safety at home") using data sourced from the Australasian Centre for Policing Research National Survey of Community Satisfaction with Policing. A quarterly, stratified random survey of households in each state is conducted by AC Nielsen to gather the data. The sample size is designed to maximise reliability of the data and for WA, the standard error is 4%. These indicators report the extent to which people feel safe about being home alone.

While sensational media reporting may influence perceptions about safety, it is considered that over time this data will reveal the effectiveness of the range of policies and strategies implemented by Government to address community concerns about safety at home. Positive change in these indicators is the result of work by many departments and agencies.

**KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS**

The key efficiency indicators are the average cost per community safety and crime prevention partnership established, the average cost per hour for research, policy development and support to the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Council, the average cost per $1 million in grant funding administered and the average cost per referral to ParentSupport. These indicators have been identified to recognise the allocation of resources to major activities designed to achieve Government’s Crime Prevention objectives. Comparative data is not available for prior periods due to the significant change in the activities undertaken by this service during 2003/04.

ParentSupport is a new initiative that commenced in the southeast corridor in 2004/05 designed to reduce anti-social behaviour, criminal activities and school absenteeism amongst children up to 15 years of age. The Departments of Education and Training, Community Development and Justice refer cases to this program.

The costs reported for these indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>03/04 ($)</th>
<th>04/05 ($)</th>
<th>05/06 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per community safety and crime prevention partnership managed (b)</td>
<td>33,595</td>
<td>42,665</td>
<td>28,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per hour for research, policy development and support to the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Council (b)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per $1 million in grant funding administered(^{(b)})</td>
<td>03/04 ($), 306,822</td>
<td>04/05 (^{(a)}) ($), 142,895</td>
<td>05/06 ($), 253,819(^{(e)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per referral to ParentSupport(^{(f)})</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>33,013</td>
<td>15,761(^{(g)})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been recalculated for compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b) Grants totalling $3,096,381 in 2003/04, $3,894,249 in 2004/05 and $2,732,053 in 2005/06 have been excluded from this key efficiency indicator as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering services.

(c) The movement in the average cost per community safety and crime prevention partnership managed between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of a 64% increase in the number of partnerships in 2005/06, partially offset by shared service savings and procurement harvesting.

(d) The movement in the average cost per hour of research, policy development and support between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of a 36% increase in the number of hours in 2005/06, partially offset by the removal of 2003/04 to 2004/05 carryover, and shared service savings and procurement harvesting.

(e) The movement in the average cost per $1 million in grants administered between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is partially due to the 30% reduction in the value of grants in 2005/06 compared with 2004/05, and repositioned funding and carryover from 2004/05 to 2005/06.

(f) This is a new activity that was established in 2004/05, and no comparative data is available to be reported for prior periods.

(g) The movement in the average cost per referral between 2004/05 and 2005/06 is the result of a 300% increase in the number of referrals in 2005/06 compared with 2004/05, partially offset by the substantial increase in base funding for 2005/06 less a portion of that funding repositioned to 2006/07.
OUTCOME

The State’s water needs are met

Service 13

COORDINATED DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF WATER STRATEGY

The Office of Water Strategy supported the Minister for Water Resources by:

• Providing advice to Government in relation to water strategy and industry policy
• Coordinating Government activities in water including new source development, demand management and water re-use
• Facilitating development and implementation of strategic water initiatives

This is a new service area, reported for the first time in 2005/06. It was transferred to the Department of Water on 1 July 2006. It is likely that the Department of Water will develop alternative indicators as the functions are amalgamated with other ongoing activities.

KEY EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

The key effectiveness indicators reported for this service are the per capita water consumption in the Perth Metropolitan area (kilolitres per person), the percentage of existing licensed irrigation water managed through regional water plans and the value of farm gate product sales per megalitre of water used for production.

The first indicator, the per capita water consumption in the Perth Metropolitan area (kilolitres per person) indicates the effectiveness of strategies developed and implemented to reduce metropolitan water use, and increase the volume of water recovered through efficiency savings and reuse. The indicator is indexed against 2003 when the target of 155 kilolitres per capita was adopted.

The second indicator addresses regional water use. 2005/06 was the first year for this initiative, and while considerable preparatory work was undertaken, no regional water plans were implemented.

The third indicator, average value of farm gate sales per megalitre of irrigation water used relies on data gathered by the Department of Agriculture and Food. Sustainable water resource management practices encourage irrigators to make more efficient use of available water by shifting to high-value production. An increase in the value of farm gate sales per megalitre (other factors remaining constant) is an indication that irrigators are making better use of a scarce resource by investing in higher value production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita water consumption in the Perth Metropolitan Area (kilolitres)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage existing licensed irrigation water managed through regional water plans</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average value of farm gate product sales per megalitre of irrigation water (^{(a)})</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(a)}\) Data provided by the WA Department of Agriculture and Food

KEY EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

Two cost effectiveness indicators are reported for this service. The first, average cost per capita to maintain water usage at or below the target of 155 kl per capita in the Perth Metropolitan Area.

Department of the Premier and Cabinet
Metropolitan area is directly related to the Key Effectiveness Indicator “per capita water consumption in the Perth Metropolitan area (kilolitres per person)”. The data for the Perth Metropolitan area (defined by the Water Corporation) is sourced from the Water Corporation Perth Metropolitan water use statistics, and shows the actual water use per person per annum and the percentage shift of water use. The target of 155 kl per capita per annum was set when actual usage was 185 kl per annum in 2000/01 prior to the introduction of water restrictions. The target was reached in the first year, and since that time the annual consumption has been at or less than the target.

However, while the target has been achieved (in large part due to the introduction of water restrictions), the needs of an expanding metropolitan population will require new water sources and increased water recycling to maintain per capita usage at or below the target, and this indicator relates to expenditure incurred in developing and pursuing strategies to reduce water consumption and increase water recovery through efficiency savings and re-use in the Perth Metropolitan area.

The second indicator, cost per percentage point shift of the proportion of existing licensed irrigation water managed through regional water plans is directly related to the Key Effectiveness Indicator “percentage of existing licensed irrigation water managed through regional water plans”.

Currently irrigation water across the State is licensed and managed through the Department of Water, and its consumption information is based on water licence allocations rather than actual volume. Sustainable water resource management will be influenced by regional water plans, taking catchment and local conditions into consideration. In 2004/05 and 2005/06, preparatory work to establish regional plans was undertaken and the indicator reported is the cost of that work.

Several other Government agencies contribute to this indicator including the Department of Water, the Department of Environment, the Department of Agriculture and Food, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure, the Water Corporation, regional water boards and water service providers, and irrigation cooperatives.

Comparative indicators reported have been derived by recasting 2004/05 data (functions were previously undertaken in Service 3, Management of Policy). The costs reported for these indicators include a proportion of the expenditure on Departmental executive and corporate services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>04/05 ($)</th>
<th>05/06 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average cost per capita to maintain</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water metropolitan water usage below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the target of 155 kilolitres per</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of development of Regional</td>
<td>513,879</td>
<td>1,110,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Key efficiency indicator values reported for 2004/05 have been calculated from existing data ensuring compliance with the Australian equivalent to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

(b) The comparative data reported for 2004/05 has been derived from existing data, but is not fully comparable as the scale and scope of activity for the two periods was not consistent, leading to a significant variation in the cost over the two periods. This activity is in ‘start-up’ mode.

(c) Grants totalling $376,277 in 2004/05 and $1,079,182 in 2005/06 have been excluded from this key efficiency indicator as they are not considered to be a cost of delivering services.

(d) The development of regional water plans was commenced in 2004/05, and continued through 2005/06. It is anticipated that the first plans will be implemented in 2006/07.