Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

2016-17 FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE

VICTORIA POLICE

Your responses should be filled in the tables/text boxes under each question in the MS Word document only.

Additional responses to questions can be provided in MS Word or MS Excel documents if required.

The completed MS Word document, including any additional documents, should be emailed to paec@parliament.vic.gov.au

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

SECTION A: Output variances and program outcomes

Question 1 (all departments) Completed initiatives from past budgets

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 2 (departments only) Treasurer's advances and other budget supplementation

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 3 (DTF only) Revenue certification

This question does not apply to your agency.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

SECTION B: Asset investment

Question 4 (all departments) Details of actual investment and variance against budget – current projects

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 5 (all departments) Details of actual investment and variance against budget – projects completed (or expected to be completed)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 6 (all departments) Major Projects Victoria / Development Victoria

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 7 (all departments) High-value high-risk projects and gateway reviews

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 8 (all departments) PPP expenditure and line items

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 9 (all departments) PPP projects in procurement

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 10 (all departments) PPP projects under construction

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 11 (all departments) PPP projects commissioned during 2016-17

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 12 (DTF only) Net cash flows from investments in financial assets for policy purposes – GGS

This question does not apply to your agency.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

Question 13 (DTF only) Purchases of non-financial assets – government purpose classification

This question does not apply to your agency.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

SECTION C: Revenue and appropriations

Question 14 (all departments and entities) Changes from previous year by revenue/income category

Please explain any changes greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million between the actual result for 2015-16 and the actual result for 2016-17 for each revenue/income category detailed in your operating statement. Please also indicate what any additional revenue was used for or how any reduced amounts of revenue affected service delivery.

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

If there were no revenue/income categories for your department/agency for which the 2016-17 expenditure changed from the prior year's expenditure by more than ±10 per cent or $100 million, you do not need to answer this question. If this is the case, please indicate 'no relevant line items' in the table(s) below.

Revenue category	2015-16 actual ($ million)	2016-17 actual ($ million)	Explanations for changes greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue
Output appropriations	2,579.5	2,766.2	The growth is due to: • incremental indexation on frontline services • EBA and banding increases • funding increase for approved ERSC initiatives including the Public Safety – Police Response Capability & Advance Recruitment • funding increase in existing ERSC initiatives, primarily additional Police Custody Officers. This funding was offset by an increase in Whole of Government savings of $28.9 million from the previous year.	The additional revenue was used to maintain and increase frontline policing to improve public safety and address crime.
Special appropriations	2.4	0.6	Funding provided for specific purpose Commonwealth Grants which vary each year, specifically; • 2015-16 funding relates to the Trident Taskfoce (Phase Two) Program and Counter Violent Extremism (CVE) Intervention Program) • 2016-17 funding relates to the Living Safe Together Intervention Program.	No impact.
Interest income	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a
Sale of goods and services	1.3	1.3	n/a	n/a

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

Revenue category	2015-16 actual ($ million)	2016-17 actual ($ million)	Explanations for changes greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million	How the additional revenue was used/the impact of reduced revenue
Grants	7.0	10.4	Variation primarily relates to an increase in grants from the Traffic Accident Commission (TAC) for the replacements of booze and drug buses. Variation primarily relates to: • Family Violence Centre of Learning Grant • Safety Initiative Trust Fund Vehicle Safety.	The additional revenue was used to replace booze and drug buses. The additional revenue was primarily used to maintain and increase frontline policing to improve public safety and address crime.
Fair value of assets and services received free of charge or for nominal consideration	0.5	0.3	Decrease driven by recognition of assets received at a lower fair value when compared to prior year.	No impact.
Other Income	4.3	3.9	n/a	n/a

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

Question 15 (all departments and entities) Variances from budget/target by revenue/income category

Please explain any variances greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million between the initial budget estimate (**not** the revised estimate) and the actual result for 2016-17 for each revenue/income category detailed in your operating statement. Please also identify any actions taken in response to the variations, either to mitigate or take advantage of the impact.

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

If there were no revenue/income categories for your department/agency for which the 2016-17 expenditure varied from the initial budget estimate by more than ±10 per cent or $100 million, you do not need to answer this question. If this is the case, please indicate 'no relevant line items' in the table(s) below.

Revenue category	2016-17 budget estimate ($ million)	2016-17 actual ($ million)	Explanations for variances greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million	Actions taken in response
Output Appropriation	2,695.7	2,766.2	n/a	n/a
Special Appropriation	0.0	0.6	The variance relates to Commonwealth funding received for the Living Safe Together Intervention Program during 2016-17.	The additional revenue was used to provide support and intervention programmes to those most at risk of radicalisation as a result of overseas conflicts to increase public safety and reduce crime.
Interest	0.1	0.0	n/a	n/a
Sales of good and services	0.0	1.3	The variance is predominantly due to revenue earned from police checks performed by the Record Services Division, donations for the Victoria Police Kokoda Project 2017, funding received for the construction and maintenance of Radio Base Sites and other minor donations.	No action taken.
Grants	14.5	10.4	The variance is mainly driven by lower than expected grants received from Traffic Accident Commission (TAC) for the new booze and drug buses initiative which experienced delays in the procurement process.	No action taken.
Fair value of assets and services received free of charge or for nominal consideration	0.0	0.3	The variance relates to the recognition of assets received free of charge, including protective, forensic science and operating equipment.	No action taken.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

Revenue category	2016-17 budget estimate ($ million)	2016-17 actual ($ million)	Explanations for variances greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million	Actions taken in response
Other income	1.5	3.9	The variance primarily relates to higher than expected donations and grants from the private sector, mainly from Vehicle Safety and Residence & Recruit Rentals.	No action taken.

Question 16 (DTF only) Revenue initiatives

This question does not apply to your agency.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

SECTION D: Expenses

Question 17 (all departments and entities) Expenses changed from previous year

Please explain any changes greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million between the prior year's actual result and the actual result for 2016-17 for each category of expenses detailed in your operating statement. Please also detail the outcomes in the community[1] achieved by any additional expenses or the impact on the community of reduced expenses (if there was no impact, please explain how that was achieved).

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

If there were no categories of expenses for your department/agency for which the 2015-16 expenditure differed from the prior year's expenditure by more than ±10 per cent or $100 million, you do not need to answer this question. If this is the case, please indicate 'no relevant line items' in the table(s) below.

Expenses category	2015-16 actual ($ million)	2016-17 actual ($ million)	Explanations for variances greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million	Outcomes achieved by additional expenses/impact of reduced expenses
Employee expenses	1,972.3	2,114.2	Increase predominantly attributable to: • impact of annual EBA increment • sworn staff associated with the Public Safety - Police Response • additional Police Custody Officers.	The additional expense was used to maintain and increase frontline policing to increase public safety and reduce crime.
Depreciation and amortisation	88.8	96.5	Variance mainly relates to upward revaluation of Buildings associated with the five year scheduled revaluation of all non-current physical assets carried out in 2015-16.	No impact.
Interest expense	1.8	1.6	n/a	n/a
Grants and other transfers	0.0	0.1	n/a	n/a
Capital asset charge	91.5	93.8	n/a	n/a
Purchase of supplies and services	453.4	473.6	n/a	n/a

---

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

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

Question 18 (all departments and entities) Expenses varying from budget

Please explain any variances greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million between the initial budget estimate (**not** the revised budget) and the actual result for 2016-17 for each category of expenses detailed in your operating statement. Please also detail the outcomes in the community[2] achieved by any additional expenses or the impact on the community of reduced expenses (if there was no impact, please explain how that was achieved).

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

If there were no categories of expenses for your department/agency for which the 2016-17 expenditure varied from the initial budget estimate by more than ±10 per cent or $100 million, you do not need to answer this question. If this is the case, please indicate 'no relevant line items' in the table(s) below.

Expenses category	2016-17 budget estimate ($ million)	2016-17 actual ($ million)	Explanations for variances greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million	Outcomes achieved by additional expenses/impact of reduced expenses
Employee expenses	2,076.6	2,114.2	Variance primarily driven by accelerated deployment of 150 police officers as part of the Public Safety – Police Response initiative.	The additional expense was used to maintain and increase frontline policing to improve public safety and address crime.
Depreciation and amortisation	77.6	96.5	Variance mainly relates to depreciation associated with the five year revaluation of all non-current physical assets carried out in 2015-16.	No impact.
Interest expense	3.5	1.6	Variance reflects lower than expected finance charges for VicFleet Motor Vehicle leases due to a decrease in interest rates.	No impact.
Grants and other transfers	0.6	0.1	The variance is mainly due to no grants being paid in relation to the Major Crime Reward Fund during the 2016-17 financial year.	No impact.
Capital asset charge	93.8	93.8	n/a	n/a
Purchase of supplies and services	451.6	473.6	n/a	n/a

---

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

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

Question 19 (departments only) Expenditure reduction targets

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 20 (all departments and entities) Changes to service delivery from expenditure reduction initiatives

(a)   Please detail any changes to your department's/agency's service delivery as a result of expenditure reduction initiatives, e.g. changes to the timing and scope of specific programs or discontinued programs in 2016-17.

No impact on frontline service delivery.

(b)   As a result of the expenditure reduction initiative 'Reduce the use of labour hire firms' for 2016-17 (2015-16 BP3 p.105), please detail any changes to your department's/agency's service delivery.

Vacancy Management Committee during 2016-17 oversaw the recruitment of VPS resources to ensure use of labour hire firms was constrained and applied only when absolutely necessary.

(c)   Please indicate how much the Department spent on 'on hire' arrangements with labour recruitment firms during 2015-16 and 2016-17. On hire arrangements includes the cost of engaging the labour recruiting firm, plus additional costs paid to the labour recruiting firm for the provision of the services of the contractor. Please also indicate reasons for and difference greater than 10 per cent between the two years.

Expenditure on hire arrangements ($ million)		Explanation for change greater than ±10 per cent
2015-16	**2016-17**	Human Resources Services
$2.478m	$3.326m	The net increase in hire arrangements expenditure for 2016-17 was $0.848m. This was brought about by an increase in the hire arrangement expenditure of $1.920m, predominantly from the following agencies: • Hays Personnel Services (Aust) Pty Ltd - $1.322m • Adeco Australia Pty Ltd - $0.134m • Dixon Appointments - $0.083m • Mercer Consulting (Australia) Pty Ltd - $0.072m The above increase was offset by a decrease in hire arrangement expenditure by $1.072m, predominantly from the following agencies: • Clicks Recruit (Aust) Pty Ltd- $0.319m • Hudson Global Resource (Aust) Pty Ltd - $0.259m • Randstad Pty Ltd - $0.187m • Ross Human Direction Limited - $0.099m

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

(d)   Please indicate how much the Department spent on job search assignments where the department has engaged a labour recruitment firm to hire an employee for the department.

Expenditure on job search assignments ($ million)		Explanation for change greater than ±10 per cent
2015-16	**2016-17**	
Nil	Nil	

Question 21 (departments only) Achievement of reprioritisation of existing resources

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 22 (DTF only) Expenses by government purpose classifications

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 23 (PNFC and PFC entities only) Dividends and other amounts paid to the general government sector

This question does not apply to your agency.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

SECTION E: Public sector workforce

Question 24 (all departments and entities) Full-time equivalent staff by level

Please fully complete the table below, providing actual FTE staff numbers at 30 June 2015, at 30 June 2016 and 30 June 2017 (broken down by the categories listed below) for the Department. Please provide figures consolidated on the same basis as the expenditure for the Department in the budget papers.

Grade	30 June 2015 (Actual FTE number)	30 June 2016 (Actual FTE number)	30 June 2017 (Actual FTE number)
Secretary	-	-	-
EO-1	-	-	2
EO-2	9	6	6
EO-3	13	13	13
VPS Grade 7 (STS)	17	15	15
VPS Grade 6	156	166	189
VPS Grade 5	196	219	253
VPS Grade 4	446	482	557
VPS Grade 3	582	613	671
VPS Grade 2	1,035	1,066	1,095
VPS Grade 1	25	0	-
Government Teaching Service	-	-	-
Health services	5	5	6
Police	13,140	13,299	13,683
Allied health professionals	-	-	-
Child protection	-	-	-
Disability development and support	-	-	-
Police Custodial Officers	0	214	326
Other	-	-	-
Protective Services Officers	1,178	1,353	1,390
Forensic Officers	215	220	234
Total	**17,016**	**17,670**	**18,440**

Notes:

• Data is based on FRD29B.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

- Health Services includes Senior Medical Advisors.
- Protective Service Officer (PSO) includes PSOs in training.
- Police Custody Officers (PCO) includes PCO1, PCO2 and PCO3.
- *Police includes Police, Recruits and Reservists.*
- *Executive Officer figures exclude Sworn Executive Officers (Assistant, Deputy and Chief Commissioner) and officers employed by statutory and nationally funded bodies such as Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency, Office of the Chief Examiner and Police Registration & Services Board.*

Question 25 (all departments and entities) FTE staff numbers by employment type

In the table below, please detail the salary costs for 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17, broken down by ongoing, fixed-term and casual, and explain any variances greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million between the years for each category.

Employment category	Gross salary 2014-15 ($ million)	Gross salary 2015-16 ($ million)	Gross salary 2016-17 ($ million)	Explanation for any year-on-year variances greater than ±10 per cent or $100 million
Ongoing	1,810.1	1,944.6	2,082.7	n/a
Fixed-term	23.3	24.4	30.6	Increase has occurred due to the ramp up of police recruits and the delivery of large IT projects.
Casual	0.4	0.61	0.56	n/a
Total	**1,833.7**	**1,969.6**	**2,113.8**	n/a

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

Question 26 (all departments and entities) Executive salary increases and other bonuses

Please detail the number of executives who received increases in their base remuneration in 2016-17, breaking that information down according to what proportion of their salary the increase was, and explaining the reasons for executives' salaries increasing in each bracket.

Increase in base remuneration	Number of executives receiving increases in their base rate of remuneration of this amount in 2016-17, apart from normal increases due to employment agreements.	Reasons for these increases
0-3 per cent	Nil	Exclude increases due to the annual remuneration adjustment (2.5 per cent in 2016-17)
3-5 per cent	13	In 2016-17, VPS executives received a one-off, uniform increase to their total remuneration packages of 4% for the removal of bonus provisions from their contracts. Some executives also received an increase following a decision to lift the minimum remuneration payable at the lowest (EO-3) remuneration band
5-10 per cent	22	In 2016-17, VPS executives received a one-off, uniform increase to their total remuneration packages of 4% for the removal of bonus provisions from their contracts. Ad hoc or non-standard increases, including increases due to promotion, contract renewal, increased responsibility or work value assessment were also applied to executives in this category.
10-15 per cent	2	In 2016-17, VPS executives received a one-off, uniform increase to their total remuneration packages of 4% for the removal of bonus provisions from their contracts. Ad hoc or non-standard increases, including increases due to promotion, contract renewal, increased responsibility or work value assessment were also applied to executives in this category.
greater than 15 per cent	Nil	Exclude increases due to the annual remuneration adjustment (2.5 per cent in 2016-17)

Question 27 (DTF only) Enterprise bargain agreements (EBA)

This question does not apply to your agency.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

SECTION F: Government decisions impacting on the finances

Question 28 (all departments and entities) Commonwealth Government decisions

Please identify any Commonwealth Government decisions during 2016-17 which had not been anticipated in the State budget but which impacted on your entity's finances or activities during those years (including new funding agreements, discontinued agreements and changes to funding levels). Please quantify the impact on income and expenses where possible.

Commonwealth Government decision	Impact in 2016-17	
	on income ($ million)	on expenses ($ million)
Living Safe Together Intervention Program*	0.6	0.0

Funding received upon signing of the MOU. Expenditure to be incurred in 2017-18.

Question 29 (all departments and entities) COAG decisions

Please identify any COAG decisions during 2016-17 which had not been anticipated in the State budget but which impacted on your entity's finances or activities during those years (including new funding agreements, discontinued agreements and changes to agreements). Please quantify the impact on income and expenses where possible.

COAG decision	Impact in 2016-17	
	on income ($ million)	on expenses ($ million)
n/a	n/a	n/a

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

SECTION G: Economic environment

Question 30 (DTF only) Economic variables

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 31 (DTF only) Actual impact on GGS of variances in economic variables

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 32 (DTF only) Impact on PFC net result of variances in economic variables

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 33 (DTF only) Impact on PNFC net result of variances in economic variables

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 34 (all departments and entities) Effects of variances in economic variables

Please identify any key economic variables for which there were variances in 2016-17 between what was estimated in the initial budget for each year (**not** the revised estimate) and what actually occurred which had a significant impact on your department's/agency's finances, service delivery or asset investment. For each variance, please indicate:

   (a)   what had been expected at budget time

   (b)   what actually occurred

   (c)   how the variance impacted on the budget outcomes (quantifying the impact where possible)

   (d)   what decisions were made in response (including changes to service delivery, asset investment, borrowings etc.).

Expected economic result in 2016-17	Actual result in 2016-17	Impact of the variance on budget outcomes	Impact of the variance on service delivery
1.99 percent bond rate	2.61 percent bond rate	$6.2m gain on revaluation of long service leave which reduced the value of the provision held for long service leave.	No impact on service delivery.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

SECTION H: DataVic Access

Question 35 (All departments and entities) Department/agency data and research strategy

a) How is 'big data' and/or the digital research component incorporated within the Department/Agency's Strategic/Corporate Plan?

Victoria Police has a comprehensive business technology strategy that identifies the required foundational technology platforms for the future of effective frontline policing services.

This strategy supports the Victoria Police Capability Plan 2016-2025, through the development of position papers that review the existing application suite to ensure operational sustainability. The specific initiatives presented in the strategy will build an enabling platform to manage information securely, present it logically and support the highest quality policing outcomes for today and tomorrow.

b) Does the Department/Agency have a dedicated digital research strategy? If yes, please provide a copy of this to the Committee.

A consultation draft of a Big Data Strategy has been approved by the Victoria Police Information Management Committee and a dedicated digital research strategy is due to be finalised during quarter 1, 2018.

Question 36 (All departments and entities) Department/Agency use of the DataVic Access

a) What have been the challenges the Department/Agency has found in implementing the DataVic Access?

The responsibility for the publication of crime statistics lies with the Crime Statistics Agency (CSA) therefore Victoria Police only publishes a small number of datasets annually (i.e. the data tables already published in the annual reports).

For Victoria Police the implementation of the DataVic Access policy is limited as the majority of Victoria Police data contains security classified or personal data that is therefore not suitable for release.

b) What have been the key risks the Department/Agency has identified in relation to DataVic Access and how have these been managed?

Key risks that have been identified and managed in relation to DataVic Access are:

- publishing data that is inconsistent with published CAS information
- publishing secure, personal or classified data
- other agencies publishing data about Victoria Police without communicating with Victoria Police before publication.

Internal risks are managed by training staff about which agency publishes which data.

External risks are managed by monitoring the DataVic website and contacting the relevant agency if data is published about Victoria Police which is secure or classified data.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

c) Who are the major beneficiaries of the data the Department/Agency has made available as a result of the DataVic Access policy?

> Interested members of the public and advocacy groups.

d) The guidelines currently state that the benefits of the policy include:

- stimulating economic activity and driving innovation and new services to the community and business;
- increasing productivity and improving personal and business decision making based on improved access to data;
- improving research outcomes by enabling access to primary data to researchers in a range of disciplines; and
- improving the efficiency and effectiveness of government by encouraging better management practices and use of the data.[3]

Please provide three examples of how the Department/Agency have seen the benefits materialised.

> n/a

e) What are the main future opportunities regarding the Department/Agency's data that have not been realised to date?

> n/a

---

[3]Department of Treasury and Finance, *DataVic Access Policy Guidelines for the Victorian Public Sector* (2015), p.1

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

Question 37 (All departments and entities) Department/Agency arrangements for data access

a) What accountability arrangements are in place within the Department/Agency for implementing DataVic Access?

Victoria Police has established a Public Information sub-committee. This committee is responsible for developing and governing the public information release process.

Any data proposed to be released under DataVic goes through a checklist/authorisation process prior to release.

b) Has the Department/Agency established an Information Management Governance Committee (IMGC)?

Victoria Police has an Information Management Committee which consists of senior management, chaired by the Chief Information Officer. There is an endorsed terms of reference which covers the committee's accountabilities, membership and the meeting schedule.

c) Does the Department/Agency have an information asset register?

Victoria Police has implemented an Information Asset Register, managed by Enterprise Information Management. This asset register has been endorsed by the Information Management Committee.

d) How regularly is the information asset register reviewed and updated?

A complete review is undertaken every 12 months and refreshed regularly as new information is received.

e) Please describe the main types of information assets that are logged on the Department/Agency's register.

High risk, high value or vital assets are captured these include hardcopy holdings, data sets and system data.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

Question 38 (All departments and entities) Use of DataVic website

a) How many and which data sets did the Department/Agency make available on the DataVic website in 2015-16 and 2016-17?

2015-16: Six DataSets were made available (consultancies, contractors, financial statements, output performance measures, workforce data, budget portfolio outcomes).

2016-2017: Two DataSets were made available (employee by location, local government area to police service areas.

b) To what extent does the Department/Agency comply with the format guidelines set out in DataVic Access?

Victoria Police fully complies with DataVic Access format guidelines.

c) Please list the datasets held by the Department/Agency that have been given approved commercialisation authorisation by the Minister for Finance. Please explain why they have been approved for commercialisation. What are the typical costs associated with accessing these datasets?

Nil.

d) How many requests has the Department/Agency received via the 'suggest a dataset' function on the DataVic website in 2015-16 and 2016-17?

Nil.

e) How many of these requests were successfully actioned in 2015-16 and 2016-17?

n/a

f) How many datasets that were compiled by the Department/Agency as a result of a successful FOI application were subsequently made available on the DataVic website in 2015-16 and 2016-17?

Nil.

g) How many datasets that were compiled by the Department/Agency as a result of a successful FOI application were not made available on the DataVic website in 2015-16 and 2016-17 and what were the reasons for this?

Victoria Police receives over 3,000 FOI requests per year and for 2015-16 and 2016-17 if a data set has been requested nil have then been made available to DataVic.

Email rcvd by PAEC 2/11/2017
Victoria Police
Public Accounts and Estimates Committee: 2016-17 Financial and Performance Outcomes General Questionnaire

SECTION I: Treasury Corporation of Victoria

Question 39 (TCV only) Dividends

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 40 (TCV only) Commodity risk management

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 41 (TCV only) Foreign exchange risk management

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 42 (TCV only) Public Private Partnership (PPP) projects

This question does not apply to your agency.

Question 43 (TCV only) Green Bonds

This question does not apply to your agency.