



2019-2020

Department of Communities and Justice

Annual Report



Volume 1 Performance and activities report

Letter to the Ministers

The Hon. Mark Speakman SC MP

Attorney General, and
Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence
Parliament House
Sydney NSW 2000

The Hon. David Elliott MP

Minister for Police and Emergency Services
Parliament House
Sydney NSW 2000

The Hon. Anthony Roberts MP

Minister for Counter Terrorism and Corrections
Parliament House
Sydney NSW 2000

The Hon. Dr Geoffrey Lee MP

Acting Minister for Sport, Multiculturalism, Seniors and Veterans
Minister for Skills and Tertiary Education
Parliament House
Sydney NSW 2000

The Hon. Bronwyn Taylor MLC

Minister for Mental Health, Regional Youth and Women
Parliament House
Sydney NSW 2000

The Hon. Gareth Ward MP

Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services
Parliament House
Sydney NSW 2000

Dear Ministers

I am pleased to submit the *Department of Communities and Justice Annual Report 2019–20* for presentation to the NSW Parliament.

This report was prepared in accordance with the provisions of the *Annual Reports (Departments) Act 1985*, the *Annual Reports (Statutory Bodies) Act 1984* and applicable regulations, and the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1983*.

After the report is presented to Parliament, it will be available for public access on the Department and Communities and Justice (DCJ) website at dcj.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Michael Coutts-Trotter
Secretary

Contents

About this report	4
Secretary's message	5
Part 1 About Communities and Justice	6
1.1 Who we are and what we do	7
1.2 Our structure	12
Part 2 Our performance	15
2.1 Safer Communities	16
2.2 Efficient and effective legal system	18
2.3 Reduce reoffending	20
2.4 Prepared for disasters and emergencies	25
2.5 Active and inclusive communities	26
2.6 Children and families thrive	29
2.7 People have a safe and affordable place to live	33
Part 3 Appendices	36
3.1 Our people	37
3.1.1 Human resources	37
3.1.2 Workforce diversity	40
3.1.3 Work health and safety (WHS)	45
3.2 Legal and risk	47
3.2.1 Legislation administered	47
3.2.2 Legislative changes in 2019–20	54
3.2.3 The Surveillance Devices Act 2007 and Report of the Surveillance Devices Commissioner	60
3.2.4 Risk management and insurance	63
3.2.5 Internal audit and risk management attestation	65
3.2.6 Cyber security policy attestation	66
3.2.7 Section 242(6) of the Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999	67
3.3 Finance	69
3.3.1 Payment of accounts	69
3.3.2 Consultants	71
3.3.3 Land disposal	73
3.3.4 Major works in progress	74
3.4 Governance and other matters	76
3.4.1 Public interest disclosures	76
3.4.2 Privacy management	77
3.4.3 Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009	78
3.4.4 Consumer response	158
3.4.5 Research and development	162
3.4.6 International travel	179
3.4.7 Disability Inclusion Action Plan	182
3.4.8 Compliance with Carers (Recognition) Act 2010	186
3.4.9 Multicultural policies and services program	189
3.4.10 Disclosure of controlled entities and subsidiaries	194
Contact information	195

About this report

The Communities and Justice Annual Report details the operations and financial performance of the Department of Communities and Justice for 2019–20 in accordance with the requirements of the *Annual Reports (Departments) Act 1985*, the *Annual Reports (Statutory Bodies) Act 1984* and applicable regulations, and the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1983*.

This report, **Volume 1: Performance and activities** is one of three volumes of the DCJ Annual Report. Volume 1 reviews and reports on activities and performance for the department.

Volumes 2 and 3 are published separately, as follows:

Volume 2: Audited financial statements contains Department of Communities and Justice consolidated financial statements, including:

- Department of Communities and Justice (Parent Financial Report)
- John Williams Memorial Charitable Trust.

It also contains:

- Home Purchase Assistance Fund financial statements.

Volume 3: Funds granted to non-government organisations contains information about DCJ-funded non-government organisations (NGOs).

After they are presented to Parliament, all volumes of this report will be available for public access on the DCJ website at dcj.nsw.gov.au.

Secretary's message



It's my pleasure to introduce the first annual report of the Department of Communities and Justice.

On 1 July 2019 we brought together the Department of Family and Community Services and the Department of Justice.

We've tried to build on the strengths of the former departments and, by combining the expertise, resources and reach of both, improve the services we provide our community.

This first annual report reflects on a year of adversity for the communities and people we serve: drought, bushfires, and then the COVID-19 pandemic.

We've seen countless inspiring examples of resilience by those individuals and communities. Alongside that, DCJ staff have risen magnificently to the challenge of very significant problems.

Together with our non-government and government partners, we've found solutions and continued to provide essential public services during a time of crisis and uncertainty.

Hundreds of DCJ staff volunteered to run evacuation centres for bushfire victims, while others continued to serve the community in bushfire-affected areas, even as some of their own homes came under threat.

There was no transmission of COVID-19 in a DCJ workplace. We prevented transmission of the virus in NSW prisons and youth justice centres, refuges and crisis accommodation, and residential care homes.

Much of this success is attributed to dedicated collaboration with non-government organisations and their representative bodies.

Our staff supported NSW heads of jurisdiction as they effectively adapted court and tribunal functions to ensure the justice system could continue to operate during the most intense period of lockdown.

In this, we united excellent support from NSW Police, Legal Aid NSW, the Director of Public Prosecutions, and legal stakeholders and participants.

At no point during the pandemic did we suspend any of our critical services in the community in child protection, homelessness or housing.

Less obviously, our staff coordinated four emergency Acts of Parliament to enable the NSW Government to respond to the pandemic as it unfolded.

There was much else achieved during 2019–20, far too much to itemise here.

I'd like to record my thanks for the efforts of all DCJ staff in helping to steady and support our community through this unforgettable period.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Coutts-Trotter'. The signature is stylized and fluid.

Michael Coutts-Trotter

Part 1 About Communities and Justice



1.1 Who we are and what we do

The Department of Communities and Justice (DCJ) commenced on 1 July 2019 following NSW Government Machinery of Government changes that brought together the former departments of Family and Community Services (FACS) and Justice.

DCJ is the lead agency in the new Stronger Communities Cluster. The new cluster brings together NSW Government services aimed at achieving safe, just, inclusive and resilient communities.

We work with the community, our non-government partners and other agencies on improving outcomes for:

- people experiencing or who have experienced domestic and family violence
- people who have experienced sexual assault
- vulnerable children and young people
- people experiencing or at risk of homelessness and people in need of safe and affordable housing
- people with disability
- young people and adults in contact with the justice system
- Aboriginal people, who are overrepresented across all of our services
- people from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds.

Delivering State Outcomes

During 2019–20, DCJ contributed to the development of a new set of State Outcomes:

Safer Communities – an outcome that focuses on supporting crime prevention, maintaining social order and promoting community security and safety, led by NSW Police and the NSW Crime Commission with DCJ playing a supporting role.

Efficient and effective legal system – supporting the resolution of criminal and civil matters through the legal system, the provision of legal services, the administration of courts and tribunals, and the provision of client services to victims and vulnerable people.

This outcome brings together the two pre-existing outcomes, *Efficient and effective legal system* and *Maintain rights and records*.

Reduce reoffending – supporting and managing adult and young offenders in youth justice and correctional centres, and in the community.

This outcome mirrors the pre-existing outcome, *Breaking the cycle of reoffending*.

Prepared for disasters and emergencies – delivering emergency management to enhance response and recovery efforts and build community preparedness.

This outcome mirrors the pre-existing outcome, *Resilience to disasters and emergencies*.

Active and inclusive communities – providing a range of programs and services to improve participation and promote social inclusion and cohesion.

This outcome brings together the two pre-existing outcomes, *Build inclusive communities* and *Enable people with a disability to live independently*.

Children and families thrive – supporting the safety and wellbeing of vulnerable children, young people and families.

This outcome mirrors the pre-existing outcome, *Protect children and families*.

People have a safe and affordable place to live – providing assistance for people unable to access or maintain appropriate housing, including homelessness services.

This outcome mirrors the pre-existing outcome, *Provide a safe and affordable place to live*.

Contribution to Premier's Priorities

DCJ led delivery of the following Premier's Priorities during 2019–20:

- Decreasing the proportion of children and young people re-reported at risk of significant harm by 20 per cent by 2023
- Doubling the number of children in safe and permanent homes by 2023 for children in, or at risk of entering, out-of-home care (OOHC)
- Reducing the number of domestic violence reoffenders by 25 per cent by 2023
- Reducing adult reoffending following release from prison by 5 per cent by 2023
- Reducing street homelessness across NSW by 50 per cent by 2025.

Maintaining support for our clients through the pandemic

Our priority in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic has been to adapt the way we work in order to continue supporting our clients. This has involved a range of measures as described below.

Justice system

New health measures transformed the way the justice system operates, with courts and tribunals across NSW implementing innovative changes to ensure they could continue to function, including:

- courts and tribunals putting measures in place – COVID-19 signage, thermal scanning and queue marshals – in support of social distancing to reduce the risk of the spread of COVID-19 while preserving access to justice and due process
- collaboration with NSW Health to ensure appropriate protocols to allow for jury trials to resume at select locations and gradually be expanded in NSW
- significantly increased use of audiovisual links (AVL), operating over 2,000 video links a week – more than double the normal volume
- using alternative service delivery methods, such as the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT) implementing contactless registry services and phone/virtual meeting room hearings, removing the need for physical appearances in over 99 per cent of NCAT hearings
- further reducing the need for persons to physically attend court by digitising a number of forms, allowing clients to communicate with the court more easily and efficiently.

DCJ also coordinated four emergency Acts of Parliament on behalf of the public sector to amend various legislative arrangements to enable the NSW Government to maintain key services and respond appropriately to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Such changes included increasing scope for AVL use in proceedings, and enabling court administrative staff to take the necessary steps to minimise risks posed by attendance at court and for jury service.

Domestic and family violence

We distributed more than \$21 million to the domestic and family violence sector to support frontline specialist domestic and family violence services, supporting victim-survivors to escape violent homes and to remain safely at home, holding perpetrators to account, and raising awareness about domestic and family violence and available supports. This included funding for the following frontline services that provide support to people experiencing domestic and family violence:

- Staying Home Leaving Violence (SHLV)
- Integrated Domestic and Family Violence Services (IDFVS)
- Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) women's refuges

- Domestic Violence Response Enhancement (DVRE)
- Service Support Fund (SSF) (for those services delivering a domestic and family violence response)
- Women's Domestic Violence Court Advocacy Services, and
- Men's Behaviour Change Programs (MBCPs).

DCJ co-chaired the NSW COVID-19 Government Agency Domestic and Family Violence Action Group with NSW Police to ensure a coordinated government response to domestic and family violence, including risk mitigation and service delivery to the NSW community.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, we established weekly meetings with sexual, domestic and family violence peak bodies and sector representatives to facilitate information-sharing and ensure that planned responses were based on the needs and expert advice of frontline specialist services. Other initiatives included:

- adapting accountability programs and services for perpetrators of domestic and family violence, such as using a mobile app to help perpetrators change behaviour and comply with restriction orders and continuing to provide supports to encourage behavioural change
- uplifting service capabilities via training and increasing service availabilities through online and on-the-ground access points to support victims and their children
- additional funding for the Domestic Violence Line to allow more clients to be addressed and referred, and additional funding for SHLV, IDFVS and women's refuges to provide much-needed environments for safety and stability
- providing \$6.3 million total COVID-19 funding for SHLV, IDFVS and SSF frontline services to support those experiencing domestic violence via remote service delivery
- creating 'Speak Out', a campaign of online and hard copy promotional material which urges victim-survivors to contact the Domestic Violence Line.

Youth Justice

To address the risk of COVID-19, Youth Justice established a centralised command post for overseeing all COVID-19-related activities, action plans and processes across Youth Justice. Youth Justice implemented a number of preventative and support measures for staff, young people and their families, including:

- introducing electronic tablets following the suspension of face-to-face visits in youth justice centres, so that young people could contact their families, friends and other members of their community via AVL
- expanding the use of technology to tablets and AVL and improving access to telephones to replace in-person interaction with people under community supervision where possible
- rolling out temperature reading as an additional mandatory screening measure for anyone entering custody and using it to test young people every morning
- introducing screening forms for all staff, young people and essential workers coming into youth justice centres
- offering testing by Justice Health clinical staff to all new intakes into custody, who were then placed into quarantine for 14 days
- facilitating Justice Health to deliver training sessions for young people on COVID-19 and social distancing upon intake
- working closely with NSW Police and the Children's Court to reduce the number of young people requiring transports to take them to and from court.

Corrective Services

We responded rapidly to the risk of the virus entering our custodial facilities and workplaces, establishing a command post to provide centralised support and consistency. We implemented a range of solutions, including:

- introducing video visits in all correctional centres after in-person visits were suspended, with 48,533 video visits up to 30 June 2020 helping prisoners maintain relationships with their loved ones
- continuing program delivery in correctional centres by having smaller group sizes in order to comply with COVID-safe guidelines
- using technology to replace in-person interactions with people under community supervision wherever possible
- compulsory temperature testing of all persons entering correctional centres, with staff denied entry if exhibiting signs of fever or any other symptom of COVID-19
- establishing a COVID-19 liaison officer in every correctional centre to coordinate personal protective equipment stocks and implementing additional cleaning regimes for all areas of correctional centres
- redeploying correctional staff from other business units to affected sites if required
- constructing a temporary hospital in eight weeks to ensure we could provide necessary care in a secure environment and reduce the burden on the public health system
- reconfiguring our custodial operations to allow a 14-day quarantine period for all fresh custodies.

Housing and homelessness

We responded to increased demand for services for our most vulnerable clients, such as those requiring emergency accommodation, people requiring longer-term housing, those at risk of homelessness, and people escaping domestic and family violence. Responses included:

- providing additional support for rough sleepers to access housing assistance
- increasing the initial temporary accommodation entitlement
- limiting face-to-face interactions to where necessary, and providing more housing services by phone, online or via the MyHousing app
- providing an additional \$14.32 million for temporary accommodation for clients to support self-isolation
- announcing the establishment of the Together Home program, a \$36 million DCJ-led partnership with community housing providers and Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) to transition rough sleepers who accessed temporary accommodation during the COVID-19 pandemic into longer-term housing
- providing an additional \$20.02 million in March for rental subsidies to enable people to access or sustain private rental accommodation
- accelerating the expansion of assertive outreach to rough sleepers across NSW; from April 2020 new outreach patrols commenced in 50 locations across the state (this was in addition to existing outreach teams in inner Sydney, Tweed and Newcastle).

Child protection

With the widespread move to home schooling during the lockdown period leaving at-risk children and young people more vulnerable as schools' capacity for notification of child protection concerns diminished, we sought to provide continuity of support by:

- maintaining frontline services by continuing face-to-face visits with families where safe to do so and virtual home visits using technology so child protection staff could continue to see and work with children and families reported as being at risk of significant harm
- in partnership with our service providers, expanding our use of communication technology and applications to maintain support for families and keep children at risk visible

- introducing a COVID-19 Emergency Action Payment for OOHC service providers to assist with the costs associated with taking emergency action in response to the virus
- working with the NSW Department of Education, the Ministry of Health and NGO service providers to identify and provide additional support to children more vulnerable to the impacts of COVID-19 in terms of health or educational outcomes
- implementing innovative ways to support children and young people in OOHC, families and carers, including using video technology, arranging provision of laptops, tablets and data credit, helping carers to participate in online peer support groups, and providing fun learning activities to help children and carers with school activities
- protecting caseworkers when visiting families by advising on infection prevention for all frontline staff
- partnering with the NSW Department of Education to develop a strategy to support vulnerable children at home, including children in care and those with an open child protection case.

Supporting communities

We supported seniors and carers in NSW by ensuring they received regular and relevant communications that provided information on how to stay safe and connected. The Seniors Card network was an important mechanism for supporting this.

The grants program, Combatting Social Isolation During COVID-19, invested \$700,000 in 24 projects to support seniors to remain socially connected either online or through other methods.

Community Liaison Officers who would normally engage face-to-face with CALD communities to provide vital information on the NSW justice system continued to provide support virtually, with a focus on explaining COVID-19 restrictions as well as providing information sessions on anti-discrimination.

Additional COVID-19-specific responses included:

- assisting families in mandatory hotel quarantine by providing support and referrals to services
- providing technology for children, young people and families in need during the COVID-19 pandemic
- developing and launching online training for NGOs to provide virtual support to families
- collaborating with Service NSW to explore referral pathways and whole-of-government responses from the HyperCare Team for people with complex needs affected by the pandemic
- partnering with the Association of Children's Welfare Agencies to establish the COVID-19 Community of Practice
- supporting vulnerable people and communities by providing additional food relief funding to Foodbank and OzHarvest.

With the cancellation of events and gatherings, including Anzac Day, an Anzac community engagement plan was developed in conjunction with RSL NSW and the Department of Premier and Cabinet. This included a closed Anzac Day service which was live streamed and broadcast on Australian Broadcasting Corporation and a social media plan to acknowledge the service and sacrifice of our veterans.

1.2 Our structure

In 2019–20, the Stronger Communities Cluster was comprised of the following.

Department of Communities and Justice (DCJ)

DCJ was made up of:

- Courts, Tribunals and Service Delivery
- Corrective Services NSW
- Child Protection and Permanency, District and Youth Justice Services
- Strategy, Policy and Commissioning
- Housing, Disability and District Services
- Law Reform and Legal Services
- Corporate Services.

Other DCJ entities

The following entities were also located within the Stronger Communities Cluster in 2019–20 and are reported on within the DCJ Annual Report:

- the John Williams Memorial Charitable Trust – a trust which provides respite and care accommodation for children with disability (financial statements only)
- the Home Purchase Assistance Fund – a fund established by a trust deed which operated (until closing in 1994) as a not-for-profit entity for the purpose of supporting and administering the state's home purchase program (financial statements only).

Members of the executive team

In 2019–20, the executive team was comprised of the following members.

Michael Coutts-Trotter

Secretary
Department of Communities and Justice
BA (Commun), FIPAA

Catherine D'Elia

Deputy Secretary
Courts, Tribunals and Service Delivery
BA (Intl Rel), MEd

Peter Severin

Commissioner
Corrective Services NSW
BSocWk, MA (Pub Admin)

Simone Czech

Deputy Secretary
Child Protection and Permanency, District and Youth Justice Services
BA (Psych), MA (Pub Admin)

Simone Walker

Deputy Secretary
Strategy, Policy and Commissioning
BSocWk, GCCommun

Paul Vevers

Deputy Secretary
Housing, Disability and District Services
BA (Hons), PSM, CQSW, MAICD

Paul McKnight

A/Deputy Secretary
Law Reform and Legal Services
BA (Economics) LLB, LLM, EMPA

John Hubby

Deputy Secretary
Corporate Services
BBA (Acc), MPH

Part 2 Our performance



2.1 Safer Communities

The Safer Communities outcome is led by NSW Police and the NSW Crime Commission, with DCJ playing a supporting role.

It captures a broad range of policing and law enforcement activities, including crime prevention, disruption and response, maintenance of social order, promotion of road safety, and support for emergency management.

While DCJ is not responsible for reporting on any indicators under this outcome, we contribute to it through a range of initiatives, including:

- funding the Automatic Referral Pathway to the Men's Referral Service, launched in January 2019, which assesses men involved or implicated in a domestic and family violence incident as the primary aggressor and refers them from NSW Police to the service
- providing support statewide to victims, witnesses, suspects and defendants with cognitive impairment in contact with the criminal justice system through the Justice Advocacy Service, including explaining pandemic-related operational changes to courts, Legal Aid NSW and NSW Police
- working with NSW Police and Legal Aid NSW, and other agencies such as Multicultural NSW, to develop a community awareness campaign for new laws passed in June 2018 with harsher penalties for those who incite or threaten violence against people based on their race, religion or sexuality, through the Stop Public Threats campaign
- working collaboratively with NSW Police and NSW Health on the Joint Child Protection Response program, which seeks to ensure the safety and wellbeing of vulnerable children and young people through information exchange, joint planning and response to reports of child abuse
- providing Youth Justice early intervention and diversionary programs for young people at risk of offending, such as Youth on Track, the Aboriginal Reintegration and Transition Program in the Shoalhaven and South Coast, the Bail Assistance Line (BAL), and A Place to Go, including:
 - referring 884 suitable young people to Youth on Track, with 437 voluntarily engaging in the program
 - diverting 103 young people (47 Aboriginal) into community-based placements and accommodation through the Youth Justice BAL
- supporting the establishment of the Surveillance Devices Commissioner (with the role commencing on 4 November 2019), a position responsible for providing leadership and working with relevant stakeholders to develop and maintain a comprehensive framework to facilitate appropriate authorisation and use of surveillance devices by law enforcement agencies while ensuring individual privacy is not unnecessarily impinged upon
- providing policy support to Justice ministers for urgent criminal reforms to help keep the community safe, including necessary changes to the *Crimes Act 1900*, police powers and high-risk offenders legislation
- assisting the Attorney General to lead a national reform of evidence law, implementing a key recommendation of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse to provide for greater admissibility of evidence in child sexual abuse matters
- assisting the Attorney General to reform special care offences under the *Crimes Act 1900* to better protect young people from being sexually exploited by adults who hold positions of authority over them, with the legislation being passed in NSW Parliament in June 2020
- assisting the Attorney General to introduce and pass a Justice Miscellaneous Bill which contains various reforms aimed at improving the operation of the justice system
- sitting on several inter-jurisdictional committees and groups that consider issues as diverse as terrorism, transnational serious and organised crime, blockchain technology and child exploitation
- providing policy support to the NSW Crime Commission.

In supporting the Minister for Counter Terrorism and Corrections, DCJ also provides whole-of-government coordination for counter terrorism and for strategic policy countering violent extremism. This includes:

- overseeing the implementation of the NSW Counter Terrorism Strategy and supporting activities such as the evaluation of the NSW Countering Violent Extremism Program and development of a strategy for managing individuals returning from foreign conflict zones
- chairing the State Counter Terrorism Committee
- representing NSW at inter-jurisdictional fora such as the Australia-New Zealand Counter Terrorism Committee and its sub-committees.

From April to June 2020, via Operation Police Assist, the NSW Office of the Sheriff provided assistance to NSW Police and NSW Health in support of Operation Repatriation, the NSW Police operation managing the COVID-19 quarantine hotels. The Office of the Sheriff, through its own Operation Police Assist taskforce, completed over 833 deployments to NSW Police during this period. Sheriff's officers worked side by side with NSW Police and NSW Health to manage travellers quarantined within hotels.

2.2 Efficient and effective legal system

Providing an efficient and effective legal system is critical to maintaining community confidence in the justice system. DCJ seeks to achieve this by providing services in a timely manner, freeing system capacity, resolving matters swiftly, improving victim safety and making the court experience less stressful.

Timely finalisation of domestic violence cases

We focus on timely finalisation of domestic and family violence cases through the outcome indicator:

- **Percentage of domestic violence related criminal offences finalised in the Local Court within three months of the first court appearance**

This brings faster justice, reduces the impact and stress on victims, and contributes to the Premier's Priority to reduce the number of domestic violence reoffenders by 25 per cent by 2023.

In the 12 months to June 2020, the Local Court completed 53.8 per cent of domestic violence related finalised appearances within three months from the time of first appearance.

Data on lodgements of apprehended violence order (AVO) applications and breaches of AVOs have been closely monitored during the COVID-19 pandemic to assist in assessing the impact of government restrictions on domestic violence offending.

Data indicates that the number of lodgements of AVO applications did not significantly increase during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic (March to June 2020). However, while crime data has not shown an increase in domestic and family violence related offences during the pandemic, frontline service providers report that domestic and family violence has increased over this period.

Time to finalise criminal matters

We focus on timely finalisation of criminal matters through the outcome indicator:

- **Percentage of District Court criminal cases finalised within 12 months and 24 months and percentage of Local Court criminal cases finalised within six months and 12 months**

In the 12 months to June 2020, the proportion of defendants with matters finalised in the District Court within 12 months from committal to outcome was 76.2 per cent. This is an increase of 1.4 percentage points from the previous 12-month period. The proportion of District Court finalisations within 24 months was stable at 94.9 per cent.

In the 12 months to June 2020, the proportion of Local Court defendants with matters finalised within six months of their first appearance was 87.5 per cent, which is a reduction from the previous 12-month period of 2.4 percentage points. The proportion of Local Court finalisations within 12 months was stable at 97.6 per cent.

Performance against this indicator was also impacted by COVID-19-related disruption to the operation of the courts. Work is being undertaken to model the recovery period.

DCJ has supported the Chief Judge of the District Court in his review into the indictable offences process, in which His Honour aims to identify efficiencies and improve the case management of criminal matters. This will continue to be supported in 2020–21.

The Local Court has performed well in terms of completing cases within expected timeframes. In 2019–20, there were eight new magistrates appointed. The appointments have allowed the Chief Magistrate to create two new Local Court circuits, in Grafton and Muswellbrook, to take pressure off regional courts.

Throughout 2019–20, we have focused on finalising criminal matters in a timely fashion through the following reforms and initiatives:

- commencing digital projects to improve efficiency and customer experience, including online fine payment, a court booking tool, use of remote monitoring to produce transcripts, and foundational projects to support the move to a digital case file
- modernising NSW's courthouse network by ensuring assets are fit to meet local community needs (for example, constructing additional courtrooms in locations of high demand, and conducting security upgrades in the Downing Centre and more generally across the state)
- improving processes for resolving matters, with 2019–20 beginning to show positive impacts of reforms introduced in the preceding year through including:
 - the addition of further offences to the list of Table Offences that are to be dealt with summarily (which allow the Local Court to hear less serious criminal matters, enabling them to be dealt with more quickly and efficiently, and reducing delays and pressure on the District Court)
 - the Early Appropriate Guilty Pleas scheme, which encourages early appropriate pleas of guilty, avoiding unnecessary costs to the justice system preparing for trials that do not go ahead, allowing earlier sentencing of offenders, and reducing stress for victims and witnesses; the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (BOCSAR) has commenced evaluating the reforms, with the evaluation due for completion in early 2021.

Other 2019–20 DCJ initiatives aimed at creating a more efficient and effective legal system included:

- negotiating a new national partnership agreement between the Australian Government and all states and territories for Commonwealth-funded legal assistance, which secured five years of funding for the NSW legal assistance sector
- securing \$87.7 million over 4.5 years of additional funding for Legal Aid NSW, which will be used to reform the way private lawyers provide legal representation to economically disadvantaged people.

Time to finalise civil and administrative matters

We focus on delivering swift, efficient and effective civil justice through the outcome indicator:

- **Percentage of NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT) cases finalised within six months**

NCAT has a broad jurisdiction and deals with a range of matters, including tenancy issues and building works, decisions on guardianship, and administrative review of government decisions. NCAT is focused on being accessible and responsive to the needs of all of its users and on resolving the real issues in proceedings justly, quickly, cheaply and with as little formality as possible. Many NCAT cases involve relatively small claims and decisions that can be resolved quickly.

In 2019–20, there were 66,688 cases finalised across four NCAT divisions (compared with 67,796 cases finalised in 2018–19).

During the period March to June 2020 the pandemic and resultant shift to digital and phone hearings had an impact on the time taken to list and finalise matters. This was due in part to the need to rapidly change NCAT's processes and procedures. Further matters can take slightly longer when being heard this way.

During 2019–20, 96 per cent of cases were resolved within six months, meeting and exceeding the target of 95 per cent.

NCAT completes nearly all matters within 12 months, with those not completed within this timeframe tending to be extremely complex matters that require additional time.

2.3 Reduce reoffending

Supporting and managing adult and young offenders in correctional centres and youth justice centres, and in the community, gives them a chance at a better future by reducing the risk of reoffending.

Reducing reoffending among adults following release from prison

We measure our progress on this through the outcome indicator:

- **Proportion of adult offenders released from custody who have a new proven personal, property or serious drug offence in the 12 months following release**

We are working to achieve this by providing rehabilitation and support services to break the cycle of reoffending and improve community safety. These initiatives aim to improve the lives of people leaving prison by diverting them from re-entering the prison system and seeking to provide them with the tools to build a more positive life.

We know that people leaving prison face significant personal and social barriers that can make rehabilitation difficult and reoffending more likely. Rates of reoffending have been increasing in NSW, as well as in most Australian and international jurisdictions. Increases within NSW are partly due to improvements in policing which have resulted in targeted arrests and reconviction of repeat offenders.

As at June 2020, 29.6 per cent of adult offenders released from custody in the three months to March 2019 had committed a new proven personal, property or serious drug offence in the 12 months following release. This is an increase of 2.9 percentage points from the baseline for persons released in 2017.

During 2019–20, we refreshed our strategy on reducing reoffending and initiated four new workstreams to contribute to the Premier's Priority. We are currently seeking to address this challenge by delivering a range of targeted interventions aimed at breaking cycles of reoffending, including the following:

- **Increasing interventions for higher risk offenders** – Over the past four years the total number of offender intervention hours delivered each year has increased from 140,000 hours to 300,000 hours. Despite these efforts many prisoners are not receiving the optimal level of intervention they require in line with their assessed risk of reoffending. This workstream aims to increase program participation for higher-risk offenders so that a greater proportion receive the level of intervention that evidence shows is needed to be effective.
- **Delivering better programs and continuity of care for people with complex needs** – Two cohorts are prioritised under this workstream: women who are parents, and inmates exiting custody with serious mental illness. The workstream involves strong collaboration between DCJ and NSW Health, and seeks to address broader issues and strategies for these two cohorts. In 2019–20, we started a pilot involving the co-location of a child protection caseworker at Emu Plains Correctional Centre to support women in custody who are parents. A collaborative multi-agency service redesign for those with serious mental illness was also undertaken to identify the services most relevant for this cohort.
- **Delivering a prison environment that enables rehabilitation** – This workstream will deliver ways to build a supportive and rehabilitative environment, including increasing positive interactions to ensure that 'every contact counts'. Training in Five Minute Intervention (FMI), an initiative developed in the United Kingdom, has also started to support staff in reinforcing positive messages of change. In 2019–20, we obtained and licensed the FMI package and trained correctional centre staff to pilot the program in three correctional centres. Over 500 correctional centre staff were trained in FMI as part of this pilot.
- **Transforming prisoner rehabilitation through digital technology** – This workstream aims to improve the productivity of in-cell time and improve efficiencies which will have significant benefits, including improving access to interventions as well as improving connection to family and social supports. Achievements to date have included increasing the use of AVL, in particular using AVL to increase the number of visits, which has ramped up as a result of COVID-19. Infrastructure builds have also been completed to facilitate a pilot of in-cell tablets at two correctional centres.

The NSW Government has legislated to better protect the community from the most dangerous sex and violent offenders as well as offenders who pose a risk of committing a serious terrorism offence when released from custody. DCJ and NSW Police work collaboratively to identify high-risk offenders, make applications to the Supreme Court, and manage those offenders who are kept in custody or released to supervision under the legislation. As at 30 June 2020, there were eight cases determined by the Supreme Court under the *Terrorism (High Risk Offenders) Act 2017* and 36 cases determined under the *Crimes (High Risk Offenders) Act 2006*.

Strategy to reduce reoffending

We completed the final year of a program of work developed as the Strategy to Reduce Reoffending (2016–2020) (SRR) as part of the previous State Priority to reduce adult reoffending, which included a system-wide approach focused on higher risk offenders who are responsible for a disproportionate amount of crime.

SRR achievements during 2019–20 included the following:

- We consistently achieved statewide targets for offenders on supervision in the community receiving behaviour change interventions using the Practice Guide for Intervention (PGI); over 37,000 offenders received PGI sessions during 2019–20, with targets being sustained during the COVID-19 pandemic by using video and phone to deliver sessions.
- We expanded the Local Coordinated Multiagency (LCM) offender management program by partnering with NSW Police and NSW Health to deliver collective case management to higher risk offenders with complex needs. It was expanded to three additional locations in regional NSW (Moree, Taree and Wagga Wagga), with the program now operating at 10 sites across the state. During 2019–20, 486 offenders were referred to LCM for intensive multiagency case management, of which 54 per cent (261 of 486) were domestic and family violence offenders.
- A focus on case plan development in 2019 resulted in 83 per cent of all eligible inmates with three months or more to serve having a current complete case plan. Case management contact with eligible inmates has risen to and stabilised at 90 per cent or above. On average, each inmate has monthly contact with a case manager, and in 2019–20 there were 6,576 case management interventions (CMI) provided to 5,025 individuals as part of the case management process. CMIs are used to positively motivate or address criminogenic need and risk issues identified through the case plan.
- EQUIPS (Explore, Question, Understand, Investigate, Practice, Succeed), a suite of programs to address the criminogenic needs of offenders, continued to run in custody but was impacted in the community by COVID-19. We have exceeded the targets for participation and number of programs across custody. During 2019–20, a total of 553 EQUIPS programs was delivered in custody against a target of 453, and 5,607 prisoners participated in an EQUIPS program in custody. However, the targets have not been met for both participation and number of programs delivered across the community. A total of 337 EQUIPS programs was delivered in the community in 2019–20 against a target of 500 programs. A total of 3,904 offenders participated in an EQUIPS program in the community in the fourth quarter of 2019–20.
- There was an overall increase in participation across the entire suite of behaviour change programs, including the Intensive Therapeutic Programs for sexual, violent and chronic substance use offenders, as well as the EQUIPS suite of programs. In 2019–20, 4,664 offenders participated in an intervention addressing violence and aggression, including domestic and family violence (an increase of 9 per cent on the previous year); 7,858 participated in a program addressing alcohol and other drug use; 214 participated in a sex offender-specific program (an increase of 33 per cent on the previous year); 291 participated in a Young Adult Offender program; and 4,285 participated in a program addressing general criminogenic needs.
- More than 1,500 inmates commenced a High Intensity Program Unit (HIPU) in 2019–20; completion rates increased by 58 per cent compared to the previous financial year, with 656 completing the program.

Reduce reoffending among adults sentenced to supervision in the community

We measure our progress against this goal by the outcome indicator:

People on supervised community-based orders represent the largest group of offenders managed by CSNSW (approximately 34,500 people). Community-based sentences can be effective at addressing offending behaviour, reducing reoffending and keeping communities safe.

- **Proportion of adult offenders receiving a supervised community sentence who have a new proven personal, property or serious drug offence within 12 months of sentence**

There are challenges to achieving this target, with the rate of reoffending for people on supervised community-based orders showing an upward trend in Australia and most international jurisdictions in recent years.

Of adult offenders sentenced to community supervision between April 2018 and March 2019, 12.9 per cent had committed a new proven personal, property or serious drug offence in the 12 months following their court finalisation. This is an increase of 1.9 percentage points from the baseline for persons sentenced to community supervision in 2017.

While the rate of reoffending for community corrections offenders compared with those released from prison is lower, our aim is to reduce this rate still further.

Initiatives aimed at achieving this during 2019–20 included:

- updating and implementing the PGI
- introducing practice improvement processes designed to build officer skills in delivering high-quality behaviour change interventions
- making changes to supervision practices to enable continued delivery during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Reduce reoffending among young people

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicator:

- **Number of young people each year who reoffend within 12 months of participation in a Youth Justice Conference or completion of a custodial order or sentence to a supervision order**

In the 12 months to March 2019, 1,065 young people who participated in a Youth Justice Conference or completed a custodial order or were sentenced to a supervision order reoffended within the 12-month period ending March 2020. In the 12 months to March 2018, 1,091 young people who participated in a Youth Justice Conference or completed a custodial order or were sentenced to a supervision order reoffended within the 12-month period ending March 2019. Twenty-six fewer young people reoffended between the two reporting periods.

Over the past two years, reforms to Youth Justice Conferences have led to an increase in outcome plan completion rates from 87 per cent in 2016–17 to 90 per cent in 2018–19 and 91 per cent in 2019–20. The 2019 Youth Justice Conferencing Convenor recruitment drive resulted in 43 new convenors being appointed to deliver conferencing across NSW.

During 2019–20, Youth Justice worked to reduce reoffending rates and supported young offenders through a range of initiatives, as follows.

Expanding the Youth on Track early intervention program

In 2019–20, the NSW Government allocated \$5.8 million to continue Youth on Track in seven locations. The service was expanded to the Riverina for three years, commencing 1 July 2019. In 2019–20, 884 suitable young people (up from 856 in 2018–19) were referred to the program, with 437 voluntarily engaging.

Of the 255 young people who completed Youth on Track in 2019–20, 100 per cent reduced their risk of reoffending, up from 93 per cent in 2018–19.

BOCSAR is currently undertaking an evaluation to measure the effectiveness of Youth on Track in reducing reoffending, compared to a brief intervention. The final report is expected to be released in late 2021.

Reducing the number of children and young people experiencing short-term remand

The volume of young people placed on short-term remand (i.e. remand for up to 24 hours) is a concern for Youth Justice and other agencies. Short-term remand occurs when an initial decision made by NSW Police to refuse bail is reversed less than 24 hours later when the young person appears at court.

A multi-agency short-term remand steering committee with senior executive representatives from NSW Police, the Children's Court of NSW, DCJ, the NSW Department of Education and Legal Aid NSW has been established to identify the drivers of short-term remand and then develop and implement a suite of reforms to address this issue.

Youth detention is closely associated with incarceration later in life as an adult, so avoiding short-term remand can positively change the life trajectory of a young person.

A Place to Go pilot

Youth Justice is continuing to support the A Place to Go (APTG) pilot, which diverts young people from custody by linking them up with appropriate community supports, court liaison staff, cross-agency panels, and dedicated short-term transitional accommodation. As part of the initiative, a DCJ Adolescent Specialist Manager Casework role has been embedded within Penrith Police Station to prevent the avoidable remand of young people through cross-agency collaboration.

In 2019–20, 49 young people were referred to the APTG initiative, of which 30 were able to provide informed consent to receive services and have their data collected for monitoring and evaluation purposes. In addition, the Communities and Justice Court Liaison Officer at the Parramatta Children's Court supported a further 393 young people on 792 occasions, and the Education Court Liaison Officer, funded by the NSW Department of Education, supported a further 276 young people on 1,291 occasions. An independent evaluation of the APTG pilot is due for completion in late 2020.

Implementing reforms in response to the Shearer Report

Youth Justice is implementing a major custodial system reform program in response to the findings of the Shearer Report into the disturbance at Frank Baxter Youth Justice Centre in July 2019. The Youth Justice Reform Delivery Board, chaired by Ms Lee Shearer, was established to oversee the implementation of the 63 recommendations made in the report. This includes:

- an initial commitment in 2019–20 of over \$4 million for infrastructure enhancements across Youth Justice custodial facilities
- establishment of the Enhanced Support Unit at Frank Baxter Youth Justice Centre to support positive behaviour changes and take a rehabilitative, therapeutic and trauma-informed approach to detainees who present with escalating high-risk behaviours
- establishing, in November 2019, interim high-risk units at Cobham and Frank Baxter youth justice centres, with higher staff numbers and an increased focus on security and on detainee and staff wellbeing to immediately improve staff safety and manage high-risk detainees; a detailed co-design process with frontline staff is underway, with the final model expected to be established in the near future

- changes to the youth officer recruitment model, providing more local control and less reliance on temporary staff
- establishment of a new high-risk young offender panel to assist in making decisions about the management of high-risk young people
- a formal security audit of the custodial network and logistics area
- emergency response training for operational staff across all six youth justice centres
- consultation and design of a uniform for Youth Justice operational staff
- improvements in staff and detainee safety in youth justice centres; at the end of 2019–20 there had been significant improvements as compared with 2018–19, including a 43 per cent reduction in staff assaults and a 31 per cent reduction in young person on young person assaults.

Working with our non-government partners

Youth Justice funds NGOs to deliver a range of critical services to young people across the justice system continuum. In 2019–20, Youth Justice invested over \$16 million in these programs to complement interventions delivered directly by Youth Justice and to contribute to reducing youth reoffending. During this time our funded programs included:

- Rural Residential Adolescent Alcohol and Other Drug Rehabilitation Services at Dubbo and Coffs Harbour
- casework support programs across NSW
- crisis accommodation services at six locations across NSW
- the Stand as One mentoring program at Frank Baxter Youth Justice Centre
- the Veterans Young Offenders Mentoring program
- the Aboriginal Reintegration and Transition program (Ngudjoong Billa) in Nowra and the Far South Coast
- Youth on Track at seven sites across NSW
- the statewide BAL.

2.4 Prepared for disasters and emergencies

During 2019–20, DCJ was responsible for coordinating emergency management responses to enhance recovery efforts and build community resilience.

The past year brought this role to the fore as our Office of Emergency Management rose to the challenge of coordinating relevant agencies and providing critical support to the Rural Fire Service (RFS) during one of the worst bushfire crises that NSW has ever experienced.

In recognition of the unprecedented bushfire events of the 2019–20 summer, and in response to the increasing frequency and scale of disasters across the state, on 1 May 2020 the NSW Government established Resilience NSW. The functions and staff of the former Office of Emergency Management transferred to Resilience NSW.

Resilience NSW is an executive agency within the Premier and Cabinet Cluster. Reporting to the NSW Premier and the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Resilience NSW is the lead disaster management agency for the state, responsible for all aspects of disaster recovery and building community resilience to future disasters. It oversees and coordinates emergency management policy and service delivery, with a focus on outcomes for people, the economy, infrastructure and the environment.

Prior to the establishment of Resilience NSW, DCJ contributed to the outcome **Prepared for disasters and emergencies** through a range of initiatives, including:

- during the 2019–20 bushfires, through the former Office of Emergency Management, coordinating the opening of 88 evacuation centres where over 30,000 individuals were registered; the Office of Emergency Management also established 17 disaster welfare assistance points and four recovery centres, with a total of 9,798 people registered at assistance points and recovery centres
- maintaining operations as fire fronts threatened our workplaces, with staff working tirelessly to protect colleagues, prisoners and property and with the evacuation of three correctional centres during the bushfire emergency
- deploying more than 200 DCJ central office staff to assist in evacuation centres during the 2019–20 bushfires, with deployment coordinated by the Allocations Cluster Coordination team
- providing 110 district staff to assist with the disaster welfare response, backed up by 110 staff from central office areas; this support allowed district service delivery to continue in the district while supporting the evacuation centres in operation across affected areas
- 89 sheriff's officers providing 12,600 hours of support to the RFS
- facilitating court appearances through local police station AVL in response to court closures due to the bushfires
- conducting consultations with community organisations to discuss the challenges they have faced in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic
- awarding 56 scholarships, valued at \$1,000 per student, through our Housing and Homelessness division to support students residing in areas that were severely affected by the September 2019 bushfires, the 2020 February floods and persistent cases of droughts which have been ongoing since 2017
- establishing the Bushfire Housing Assistance Response Team in southern NSW, made up of 15 dedicated housing specialists deployed from across NSW to provide critical and case management services to people displaced by the bushfires
- establishing the Bushfire Housing Assistance Line to provide 24/7 access for people affected by the bushfires to emergency temporary accommodation and other private rental assistance products.

Since the establishment of Resilience NSW, DCJ has continued to support the delivery of this State Outcome by working with Resilience NSW, the Minderoo Foundation and the Salvation Army to deliver temporary accommodation pods to bushfire-affected people.

2.5 Active and inclusive communities

DCJ provides a range of programs and services aims to improve wellbeing and promote community participation and social inclusion and cohesion. Under this outcome, DCJ has a particular focus on employment.

The Premier's Priority for a world-class public service aims to implement best-practice productivity and digital capability in the NSW public sector and drive public sector diversity by 2025. This includes having 50 per cent of senior leadership roles held by women and ensuring 5.6 per cent of government sector roles are held by people with a disability.

Increasing the proportion of senior leadership positions held by women

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicator:

- **Proportion of DCJ senior leadership roles held by women**

In 2019–20, 47.6 per cent of DCJ senior leaders were women. The department also achieved over 50 per cent female representation in the senior leadership pipeline, which includes employees at grades 9–10 and 11–12 (and equivalent).

Other initiatives to increase the proportion of women in senior leadership roles in DCJ in 2019–20 included:

- delivering the Women in Leadership Executive Mentoring programs, an Inclusive Leadership Workshop program for senior executives, and Women in Leadership development training courses
- participating in the Public Service Commission's Male Champions of Change program and the Open Doors Career Sponsorship program
- promoting membership of the Women in Justice Staff Network.

Other 2019–20 initiatives to support women included:

- developing, in partnership with the NSW Council for Women's Economic Opportunity, the web-based Women's Financial Toolkit – 'It's your future' to raise the visibility of women's financial literacy, capability and wellbeing and improve accessibility of relevant, trustworthy financial resources
- holding NSW Women's Week in March 2020 to celebrate the social, economic, cultural and political achievements of women and promote gender equality through a series of events and activities; this week coincided with International Women's Day and the NSW Women of the Year Awards
- holding the NSW Women of the Year Awards to recognise and celebrate the outstanding contribution made by women across NSW; the awards profiled women who have demonstrated excellence in their career and elsewhere, women who have made significant contributions in their community, and young women who are leading the way for change
- establishing the Women NSW Business and Entrepreneur Facebook Network following the 2019 Women's Week event 'Business Women' in Western Sydney; the network is growing steadily and has more than 900 members
- providing \$485,867 for the Investing in Women funding program to improve women's financial wellbeing and security and to support diverse and flexible employment opportunities for women and girls.

Increasing the proportion of people with a disability employed in the public sector

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicator:

- **Proportion of DCJ roles held by people with a disability**

This outcome indicator tracks the NSW Government's progress towards achieving the Premier's Priority of ensuring that 5.6 per cent of government sector roles are held by people with a disability by 2025.

We are working hard to increase the proportion of people with disability employed within DCJ. The transfer of disability services from the former Ageing, Disability and Home Care agency to private providers under the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) contributed to a decrease in these numbers, as this workforce had a relatively high proportion of people with disability compared with the sector.

During 2019–20, the overall percentage of employees who had a disability in DCJ was 3.3 per cent (over half of the 5.6 per cent benchmark).

While seven of the 10 divisions had a higher average percentage than the overall figure, the larger divisions (such as Child Protection and Permanency, District and Youth Justice Services) had comparatively lower proportions of employees with a disability.

DCJ 2019–20 initiatives to increase the proportion of people with a disability employed by the department included:

- improving attitudes and awareness of disability in our workplace through the Disability Employee Network
- participating in the Access and Inclusion Index to identify areas of strength and areas requiring additional focus in DCJ to support employees with disability
- participating in the Australian Network on Disability (AND) Stepping Into Internship program
- participating in the AND PACE Mentoring program; as part of this program our senior leaders mentor people with disability external to DCJ
- continuing to follow the Disability Inclusion Action Plan (DIAP), which supports access to meaningful employment as a focus area by:
 - refining recruitment methods to ensure that people with disability experience accessible and fair selection processes
 - developing a workplace culture in which people with disability have equal access to career development opportunities and opportunities to give their best work
 - being an employer of choice for people with disability.

Other actions DCJ took in 2019–20 in support of people with a disability included:

- supporting the NSW Government to establish and fund the independent Ageing and Disability Commission and to appoint the inaugural Ageing and Disability Commissioner
- developing the second *NSW Carers Strategy: Caring in NSW 2020–2030*, a commitment to the 854,000 people in NSW who provide unpaid care and support to others, helping to ensure they are recognised, understood and supported.

Employing more veterans in the NSW public sector

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicator:

- **Numbers of veterans gaining employment in the NSW public sector**

The NSW Government is well on the way to achieving the new target of 1,000 veterans finding new roles by 2023. As of 1 April 2020, the NSW Government achieved the third milestone, with 644 veterans being employed in the 18-month period against the incremental target of 375 (125 per six months). Of these, 125 veterans were employed in new roles during the period 1 October 2019 to 31 March 2020.

The Veterans Employment Program (VEP) continues to be a leader in veterans' employment and has continued to share expertise to assist others to develop their own programs. The VEP recently partnered with the Office of Local Government to produce a Local Government Rank to Grade Guide to assist veterans finding roles with councils across the state.

The VEP supports eligible veterans through a scholarship program to pursue civilian career paths by assisting with TAFE course enrolment fees. Eligible veterans are able to choose from the NSW Smart and Skilled course list. There are 1,400 courses available, ranging from Certificate I through to Advanced Diploma. Funding for each veteran is capped at \$4,000.

The VEP assisted 17 veterans in 2019–20. They enrolled in courses such as Certificate IV in Training and Assessment, Project Management Practice and Work Health and Safety, and Diploma courses in Building Design and Aero skills.

Employing more Aboriginal leaders

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicators:

- **Overall proportion of DCJ workforce who are Aboriginal people, and**
- **Number of Aboriginal people in succession pipeline and senior leadership roles**

During 2019–20, 4.5 per cent of the overall DCJ workforce were Aboriginal people. DCJ also had 5.6 per cent Aboriginal representation in the senior leadership pipeline, which includes employees at grades 9–10 and 11–12 (and equivalent).

In 2019–20, DCJ continued to implement a broad range of initiatives to increase the representation of Aboriginal people across its divisions, salary bands and work locations and to build a culturally capable and inclusive workforce. During 2019–20, DCJ:

- continued to develop and deliver in-house Aboriginal employment pathway programs, including the Communities and Justice Aboriginal Pre-Employment Program, Aboriginal Internship Program, pilot Aboriginal Cadetship Program and Aboriginal Traineeship Program
- completed a pilot Aboriginal Emerging Leaders Development Program in partnership with TAFE NSW and Cbeyond; 16 employees enrolled in the program and graduates attained a Diploma in Leadership and Management
- partnered with Willing Consultancy to conduct an Aboriginal Staff Career Development Survey and develop recommendations for an Aboriginal Career Development Framework
- completed the pilot Corrective Services Aboriginal Mentoring program in partnership with Eora TAFE, with 31 participants completing the program and attaining a Certificate III in Mentoring Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People
- launched and promoted a new DCJ Aboriginal Cultural Capability web app
- continued to deliver the Connecting with Communities program in partnership with the NSW Aboriginal Education Consultative Group, with 1,275 staff completing the training
- participated in the Career Trackers program, in which we offered six participants undertaking undergraduate degrees paid internships
- offered 19 Aboriginal Traineeships in partnership with Yarn'n, which resulted in the conversion of 16 people to ongoing roles within DCJ
- completed the Public Service Commission pilot Open Doors Career Sponsorship Program, with 16 sponsors, mainly women from Aboriginal or CALD backgrounds, participating in and completing the program
- commenced the review and development of a new consolidated DCJ *Aboriginal Employment Strategy 2020–2025*
- supported five Aboriginal employees to enter the Public Service Commission's Aboriginal Employment Development Program, a leadership development program for high-performing clerks designed to prepare them for future roles in the public sector.

2.6 Children and families thrive

We work to support the safety and wellbeing of vulnerable children, young people and families. This work also supports the Premier's Priorities to protect our most vulnerable children, increase permanency for children in out-of-home (OOHC), and reduce domestic and family violence reoffending.

Protecting our most vulnerable children

During 2019–20, our caseworkers saw 35,241 children and young people at risk of significant harm (ROSH). This was a 14 per cent increase from 2018–19. Reducing the number of children and young people who are re-reported as being at ROSH is one way of measuring the effectiveness of our interventions to protect those considered most vulnerable.

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicator:

- **Decrease the proportion of children and young people re-reported at risk of significant harm (ROSH) within 12 months**

This forms part of the 'Protecting our most vulnerable children' Premier's Priority, aimed at decreasing the proportion of children and young people re-reported at ROSH by 20 per cent by 2023.

Re-report rates have reduced overall, from 41.5 per cent in 2016–17 to 38.6 per cent in 2019–20.

Keeping families together where possible

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicator:

- **Number of entries to out-of-home care (OOHC)**

During 2019–20, we worked with our government and non-government partners to support children to remain safely at home and to prevent them from entering OOHC.

We have made good progress towards this target. During 2019–20, caseworkers brought 2,206 children into care – 59 fewer children than in 2018–19. This included 952 Aboriginal children, an increase of 2.4 per cent as compared with 2018–19. In 2018–19, NSW had the lowest rate of children coming into care in Australia.

During 2019–20, our efforts to support the safety and wellbeing of vulnerable children, young people and families and to minimise OOHC entries covered a broad range of initiatives, including:

- continuing with the evidence-based MST-CAN® and FFT-CW® programs, which have supported over 2,800 families since commencing in August 2017, with early evaluation findings showing promising results, including substantially lower entries to OOHC and lower re-report rates for families who have successfully completed programs as compared with control groups
- providing 380 places to help keep families together through Permanency Support Program (PSP) family preservation packages
- providing 4,921 contracted places for families, which delivered services to more than 20,000 children and young people – over a third of whom were Aboriginal children – through a range of evidence-informed family preservation programs, including MST-CAN, FFT-CW, Nabu, Youth Hope, Intensive Family Based Services, Intensive Family Preservation Services and Brighter Futures.

Providing children with safe and permanent homes

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicator:

- **Number of children and young people exiting OOHC to restoration, guardianship or adoption**

In 2019–20, 1,134 children and young people exited OOHC to permanency through restoration, guardianship or adoption. The number of children and young people in care in NSW is the lowest it has been in the past five years, with 16,160 children in OOHC in 2019–20.

This trend brings us closer to the new Premier's Priority goal of doubling the number of children in safe and permanent homes by 2023 for children in, or at risk of entering, OOHC.

Our efforts during 2019–20 to support the wellbeing of children in OOHC and to provide them with greater permanency included:

- safely returning 553 children home to their parents and arranging a record number of 162 OOHC adoption orders and 419 new guardianship orders for children in care who cannot return home, through collaboration with our NGO partners
- 1,090 Aboriginal children exiting care in total, an increase of 13.9 per cent from 2018–19
- placing 74 per cent of Aboriginal children and young people in OOHC with an Aboriginal relative, non-Aboriginal relative or Aboriginal carer, consistent with previous years
- investing \$2.4 million in OurSPACE, a specialist therapeutic trauma service for children and young people aged 15 years and under who are in statutory foster and kinship care experiencing placement instability, which was provided to 1,711 children
- supporting 149 children and young people living in unstable OOHC placements through the LINKS Trauma Healing Service, an evidence-based program to decrease trauma symptoms and improve wellbeing and behaviour
- continuing to implement Intensive Therapeutic Care, the component of the PSP replacing residential care.

Other child protection initiatives in 2019–20 included:

- preparing the fifth *Compliance with the Guiding Principles Responding to Civil Claims for Child Sexual Abuse Report* and supporting senior departmental executives to deliver 261 apologies to survivors of abuse, in compliance with the guiding principles and providing closure to the survivors
- assisting the Attorney General in leading national reform of evidence law to implement a key recommendation of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse to provide for greater admissibility of evidence in child sexual abuse matters
- delivering the Premier's Youth Initiative, a pilot program targeting young people leaving OOHC who are at risk of experiencing homelessness, including:
 - providing up to 446 young people with a combination of personal advice, education and employment mentoring, transitional support and accommodation
 - supporting (as at 24 June 2020) 431 young people who were either living in or had recently exited OOHC, some of whom also had interacted with the youth justice system.

Supporting vulnerable Aboriginal children and families

Stronger Communities Investment and Inclusion (formerly Their Futures Matter) initiated a transformation of the way the service system responds to vulnerable Aboriginal children and young people, through the implementation of a number of local evidence-based initiatives. These include the following:

- DCJ partnered with Aboriginal communities to develop the Aboriginal Evidence Building Partnership Project, to ensure that the broader NSW child protection service system is culturally appropriate and supports the needs of Aboriginal children, families and communities.

- ID Know Yourself, an Aboriginal-designed and delivered culturally-based mentoring program for Aboriginal young people (15 years and older) leaving care in the Redfern/Waterloo area, was supported in order to build the evidence base for Aboriginal-designed service responses. Evaluation planning is now underway.
- The Stronger Communities Investment and Inclusion Directorate led the implementation of a number of pilot projects, including A Place to Go, Thriving Families NSW, Broadmeadow Children's Court Pilot and Coonamble Integrated Service Delivery, Coonamble First 2000 Days and Walgett First 2000 Days.
- DCJ continued to build relationships with four Stolen Generations Organisations and funded Kinchela Boys Home Aboriginal Corporation, Coota Girls Aboriginal Corporation, the Children of Bomaderry Aboriginal Children's Home and the Stolen Generations Council NSW/ACT Inc to employ coordinators and/or support staff to support Stolen Generation survivors and descendants engaging with DCJ services. DCJ has continued to partner with AbSec to deliver five initiatives from the *Aboriginal Child and Family Investment Strategy*.

Reducing domestic violence reoffending

The Premier's Priority for reducing domestic violence reoffending aims to decrease the number of domestic violence reoffenders by 25 per cent by 2023. The priority was first established by the Premier in 2015 and was extended in 2019.

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicator:

- **Number of people charged with a domestic violence assault who had an earlier domestic violence assault charge in the last 12 months**

The NSW Government has invested more than \$431 million over four years to deliver initiatives that work towards meeting the priority. Based on current figures, achieving a 25 per cent reduction in the number of domestic violence reoffenders will mean approximately 450 fewer reoffenders by 2023.

We have seen a decrease in the number of reoffenders since the priority was introduced in 2015. The number of reoffenders has decreased from 1,814 in the year to December 2015 to 1,797 in the year to June 2020.

Premier's Priority to Reduce Domestic Violence Reoffending

Our comprehensive multi-agency approach to addressing domestic violence is outlined in the Premier's Priority to Reduce Domestic Violence Reoffending program, which aligns with the NSW Domestic and Family Violence Blueprint for Reform. The Premier's Priority to Reduce Domestic Violence Reoffending achievements during 2019–20 included:

- funding the expansion of Men's Behaviour Change Programs (MBCPs)
- delivery of the ENGAGE program, a brief voluntary intervention for domestic and family violence perpetrators, at nine sites, with 499 people completing a workshop during 2019–20
- 175 offenders and 25 victims using GPS devices under the Domestic Violence Electronic Monitoring program
- delivering What's Your Plan, a pilot program to reduce apprehended domestic violence order (ADVO) breaches among Aboriginal defendants
- expansion of the ReINVEST program, a world-first clinical trial to determine if an antidepressant treatment is effective in reducing offending behaviour in highly impulsive men with histories of violence, including domestic and family violence
- 3,540 offenders participating in the EQUIPS program
- implementation of sentencing reform statewide, which has seen an increase in the percentage of domestic violence offenders sentenced to supervision in the community compared with the 12-month period prior to the sentencing reform, from 27.4 to 43.6 per cent
- 6,028 sessions of the Remand Domestic Violence Intervention program, an intervention aimed at assisting inmates

- 78,899 Practice Guide for Intervention sessions being delivered to domestic violence offenders
- 298 male domestic violence offenders commencing the assessment phase of the High Intensity Program Unit (HIPU), a program that targets inmates on short sentences based on a set of behaviour change programs and strategies aimed at reducing reoffending, and 175 domestic violence offenders completing the HIPU program; 10 HIPUs are fully operational across seven correctional centres
- commencing reforms to the duration of ADVOs to better keep victims safe; this included increasing the default duration of an ADVO from one to two years and enabling ADVOs to be made for an indefinite period of time in certain circumstances.

Other initiatives aimed at protecting those experiencing, or at risk of, domestic and family violence during 2019–20 included:

- supporting 2,874 women and 441 children to remain safely at home while police removed the offender, through Staying Home Leaving Violence (SHLV)
- helping 4,792 households, including 8,431 children, escaping violence to move into stable housing in the private rental market, through Start Safely
- continuing to deliver Integrated Domestic and Family Violence Services (IDFVS), a multi-agency response delivered across 11 locations in NSW to prevent the escalation of domestic and family violence among high-risk target groups
- receiving 20,371 calls through the Domestic Violence Line, a statewide telephone crisis counselling and referral service to support women who are experiencing domestic and family violence
- providing over \$34,000 from the NSW Charities Fund (Emergency and Food Relief) to 31 IDFVS and SHLV providers to assist clients to access services remotely through the COVID-19 pandemic, assistance such as providing clients with mobile phones and SIM cards
- continuing the NSW Government's Local Domestic and Family Violence Committee grants for the prevention of domestic violence, with a total of \$80,000 in grants up to \$1,200 each in value, which can include childcare with an approved service
- joining Our Watch on 1 July 2019, making NSW part of a cohesive national primary preventative approach to domestic and family violence
- investing \$665 million in the continued implementation of the PSP, one of the most significant reforms to the NSW child protection and OOHV systems in decades
- continuing to deliver the *NSW Domestic and Family Violence Blueprint for Reform 2016–2021: Safer Lives for Women, Men and Children*, a comprehensive strategy to prevent DV, intervene early, support victims, hold perpetrators to account, and improve services and the system; Blueprint activities during 2019–20 included the following:
 - the \$20 million NSW Domestic and Family Violence Innovation Fund (a commitment under the Blueprint) invested in 20 innovative projects across two funding rounds
 - during the 2019 season, 35 regional rugby clubs were involved in Tackling Violence, a program to promote changed attitudes and behaviours towards domestic and family violence
 - high-risk offenders were monitored using Suspect Target Management Plans and High Risk Offender Teams
 - sentencing reforms were implemented to create a presumption that domestic violence offenders will either receive a supervised community-based sentence or be imprisoned
 - the Safer Pathway reform, which ensures that domestic and family violence survivors and their children across NSW receive a consistent, effective response, was continued.

NSW Sexual Assault Strategy

The *NSW Sexual Assault Strategy 2018–2021*, the NSW Government's commitment to reducing sexual assault and providing safe and appropriate responses to victims, continued during 2019–20, including the second phase of the #makenodoubt campaign, which reinforces the message that sexual consent must be voluntary and clearly communicated.

2.7 People have a safe and affordable place to live

We provide assistance for people who are unable to access or maintain appropriate housing, including homelessness services. Our work under this outcome supports the Premier's Priority of reducing homelessness.

Supporting people to move to housing independence so social housing is available for people who need it most

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicator:

- **Proportion of tenants successfully transitioning out of social housing annually**

Transitioning people out of the social housing system to housing independence is an ambitious target that has faced increasing challenges, including factors external to the social housing system, such as insecurity and rising costs in the private rental market. Supporting people to move directly into the private rental market is more immediately successful. For this reason we have also focused our efforts on the goal:

- **Proportion of social housing applicants each year who are diverted from social housing to the private rental market not returning for further assistance 12 months later**

During 2019–20, our efforts to support more tenants to avoid or transition out of social housing included:

- providing 22,296 households² with Private Rental Assistance, including Rentstart Bond Loan, Advance Rent, Rental Arrears, Private Rental Brokerage Service, Tenancy Facilitation, Tenancy Guarantee (known as Bond Extra from June 2020) and Rent Choice products; of Rent Choice recipients, 82.7 per cent did not require further housing assistance in the following 12 months
- investing over \$43 million to support 6,338 households to access and maintain tenancies in the private rental market through a suite of Rent Choice subsidies, including: Start Safely for people escaping domestic and family violence; Rent Choice Youth for young people 16–24 years of age; Rent Choice Assist for people experiencing a life event that places their tenancy at risk, such as loss of income or ill health; and Rent Choice Veterans and Rent Choice Transition for tenants exiting social housing
- commencing the Family Assist pilot in the Sydney and South Eastern Sydney districts to test a private rental subsidy model for families undergoing a restoration and preservation process requiring a housing solution.

Other social housing initiatives DCJ undertook during 2019–20 to increase the supply of social housing included:

- contracting 24 community housing providers to lease over 5,900 properties using \$83.8 million of (Social Housing) funding under the Community Housing Leasing Program (CHLP)
- applying the 10-year funding guarantee to 50 per cent of CHLP funding to assist housing providers in the strategic management of their CHLP portfolio, as well as providing opportunities to secure longer-term leases and/or finance for the acquisition of additional social housing
- contracting community housing providers to deliver over 1,000 additional social and affordable homes under the Social and Affordable Housing (SAHF) program, with a further 1,700 homes under construction for the program as of 30 June 2020; the SAHF program expects to deliver access to over 3,400 additional dwellings by 2023.

2. These are unique households assisted, many of which may have received more than one product/service.

Reducing street homelessness

We measure our progress against this goal through the outcome indicator:

- **Number of homeless persons in NSW living in improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping out**

The NSW Government is working towards zero street homelessness and has signed an agreement with the Institute of Global Homelessness, along with other partners, to halve street homelessness across NSW by 2025.

In 2019–20, DCJ provided long-term housing support (defined as receiving support with Advance Rent, Bond Loan, Rental Arrears, Rent Choice and/or social housing) to over 950 people who were experiencing street homelessness.

From February to April 2020, DCJ conducted a statewide street count of people experiencing street homelessness in collaboration with community housing providers, local councils, police and non-government service providers. Street counts, which were completed in 264 towns and suburbs in 79 local government areas (LGAs) from across NSW, found a total of 1,314 people experiencing street homelessness. While this figure is likely an undercount due to the impact of bushfires and increases in DCJ and partner street patrols due to COVID-19, the street count has provided valuable insights into where to direct homelessness supports.

Since March 2017, the NSW Government, working in partnership with the NGO sector, has helped support people experiencing street homelessness to acquire long-term housing through Assertive Outreach in inner-city Sydney.

The City of Sydney's February 2020 street count showed a 23 per cent reduction in street homelessness as compared with 2017.

In 2019–20, we assisted 1,024 people who were sleeping rough in inner-city Sydney into temporary accommodation and 218 people into long-term permanent housing through the Homelessness Outreach Support Team and COVID-19 responses. A total of 82.5 per cent of people sleeping rough in inner-city Sydney have maintained their tenancies (March 2017 – August 2020).

We have also expanded Assertive Outreach services, beginning with new services in Newcastle and Tweed Heads. We have assisted 189 people into temporary accommodation who were sleeping rough in Newcastle, 100 of whom are now in long-term accommodation, with 98 per cent sustaining their tenancies. In Tweed Heads we assisted 99 people into temporary accommodation who were sleeping rough, 53 of whom are now in long-term accommodation, with 98 per cent sustaining their tenancies.

As part of the NSW Government's commitment to having every person sleeping on NSW streets moved into accommodation to help prevent the spread of COVID-19, DCJ accelerated its expansion of Assertive Outreach services. In June 2020, Assertive Outreach services were operating in 53 LGAs (including existing services in inner-city Sydney, Tweed and Newcastle).

Reducing street homelessness during the COVID-19 pandemic

The NSW Government is committed to supporting every person experiencing street homelessness to secure safe accommodation during the COVID-19 pandemic.

DCJ accelerated its expansion of Assertive Outreach street patrols and bulk-booked additional temporary accommodation facilities.

Between 27 March and 24 June 2020, DCJ, in partnership with 66 specialist homelessness services, local health districts and other providers, conducted 1,150 Assertive Outreach patrols, supported 774 people experiencing street homelessness into temporary accommodation, and supported 216 people transitioning from temporary accommodation into stable long-term housing.

DCJ has partnered with Neami and Innari to provide case management support for people in temporary accommodation to support their transition to long-term housing.

In June 2020, the NSW Government announced \$36 million in new funding for Together Home, the largest ever housing response dedicated to people experiencing street homelessness in NSW.

Together Home will help people in temporary accommodation during the COVID-19 pandemic to transition to long-term housing by rapidly securing hundreds of new homes from the private rental market and delivering up to two years of wrap-around support services.

Other homelessness initiatives that DCJ undertook during 2019–20 included:

- the Reducing Youth Homelessness Premier's Priority (the results of which became available after the priority closed on 30 June 2019), which showed that 36.9 per cent of young people aged 15–24 years (2,063 out of 5,594) accessing homelessness services alone moved to stable accommodation, exceeding the target of 34 per cent by 2.9 percentage points
- supporting 29,835 people experiencing homelessness with referrals to SHS's through Link2home
- assisting 26,965 households with temporary accommodation
- supporting over 230 households through the Rent Choice Assist program across its four pilot locations
- supporting 431 young people leaving OOH through the Premier's Youth Initiative to transition to independence
- through the NSW Charities Fund (Emergency and Food Relief), allocating \$3 million to a homelessness service provider with the aim of ensuring that all people, especially people sleeping rough, who are accommodated in temporary accommodation in metropolitan Sydney as a result of COVID-19 are adequately supported in their temporary arrangements, and to support their transition to long-term permanent accommodation and post-crisis support
- providing over \$214,000 to 222 SHS providers to assist clients to access support services remotely through the COVID-19 pandemic, for example by providing mobile phones or SIM cards
- assisting young people living in social housing and in OOH who are enrolled in education or training through the DCJ Scholarships program, which offers \$1,000 grants to help with school expenses and secondary support services
- contracting 25 community housing providers, some of whom are also SHS funded, to lease over 250 properties using \$4.4 million under Community Housing Leasing Program Homelessness Housing to house people who were homeless or at risk of homelessness
- piloting new ways of supporting clients exiting custody to achieve stable housing, targeting sentenced inmates being released on parole with a focus on pre-planning approximately three months out from an inmate's release to identify appropriate housing options, with 120 clients assisted.

Specialist Homelessness Services achievements

During 2019–20, DCJ's SHS achievements included the following:

- \$210.1 million was invested in SHS, other homelessness programs and critical referral services such as Link2home.
- On 29 May 2020, the first Core and Cluster facility was opened in Griffith. Supporting women and children escaping domestic and family violence in the Western Murrumbidgee region, the facility will enable the women and children accommodated to live independently while also receiving comprehensive support services.
- The seventh of eight women's crisis accommodation services under DCJ's contract with Women's Community Shelters was opened in Parramatta.

Part 3 Appendices



3.1 Our people

3.1.1 Human resources

Policies and practices

Personnel

Post machinery of government changes in 2019, DCJ has progressively reviewed, updated and harmonised HR policies relating to operational human resources, recruitment and employment screening, payroll and governance, work health and safety, performance and conduct, learning and development, and workforce planning.

Industrial relations

The union with coverage of the majority of DCJ staff is the Public Service Association, and formal consultative forums are held on a regular basis. Multiple forums are held across all business streams, including local consultative forums on a workplace or local area basis. Additional regular consultative meetings are held with the Association to address specific issues or reform programs.

Throughout 2019–20, industrial relations staff were actively involved in strategic planning, major reform projects, dispute prevention, industrial tribunal proceedings and monitoring of industrial relations issues.

Workforce statistics

Table 1: Number of DCJ employees by employment category by year

DCJ (department)	2019–20
Ongoing	19,203
Temporary	2,731
Senior Executives ¹	249
Casual	1,012
Others	255
Total	23,450

Source: Workforce Profile Report 2019–20

1. In accordance with the Government Sector Employment Act (GSE) 2013, all Senior Executive employees are now subject to common PSSE employment contracts and are covered by the conditions of employment and guidelines for the Senior Executive. Where staff are performing higher duties to fill a PSSE position and are not already a PSSE employee, these numbers are not included in this table as Senior Executive employees as they are still covered by their substantive conditions of employment while receiving a notional monetary value equivalent to a Senior Executive position.

Table 2: Number of DCJ cluster frontline employees by key occupational group at workforce census period¹

Occupational group by headcount	2019–20
Managers	2,515
Professionals	5,938
Technicians and Trade Workers	665
Community and Personal Service Workers	7,862
Clerical and Administrative Workers	6,297
Sale Workers	2
Machinery Operators and Drivers	36
Labourers	135
Total	23,450

Source: Workforce Profile Report 2019–20

1. Occupational group counts are made using NSW Government standard headcount and ANZCO groupings reported in accordance with NSW Public Service Commission Workforce Profile specifications. The headcount number is consistent with the methodology used for the NSW Public Sector reported through the annual workforce profile and required under the Annual Reports (Departments) Regulation 2010.

Senior Executive grades and remuneration

In this section, the definition of Senior Executive is in accordance with the GSE Act.

Table 3: Number of Public Service Senior Executives employed in each band

PSSE band	2019–20	
	Female	Male
1 (Director)	107	89
2 (Executive Director/Chief Executive)	28	18
3 (Deputy Secretary)	3	3
4 (Secretary)		1
Total	249	

Source: Workforce Profile Report 2019–20. This table includes all employees in PSSE roles as at census date of 30 June 2020.

Table 4: Average remuneration of Public Service Senior Executives employed in each band

PSSE band	2019–20	
	Average remuneration (\$)	Range (\$)
1 (Director)	230,235	192,600–274,700
2 (Executive Director/Chief Executive)	304,466	274,701–345,550
3 (Deputy Secretary)	426,987	345,551–487,050
4 (Secretary) ¹	599,000	487,051–562,650

Source: Workforce Profile Report 2019–20

1. The Secretary is the sole Band 4 Executive in DCJ and his remuneration is subject to a special determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal (SOORT).

Exceptional movement in wages, salaries and allowances

From the first pay period on or after 1 July 2019, DCJ staff received an increase to their salaries of 2.5 per cent.

For the reporting period of 2019–20, Senior Executives' monetary remuneration and the value of employment benefits paid represented 2.7 per cent of DCJ's salary-related expenses.

3.1.2 Workforce diversity

Table 1: Workforce diversity statistics

Workforce diversity group	Benchmark/ target (%)	2019–20 (%)
Trends in the representation of workforce diversity groups¹ (% of total staff)²		
Women	50	61.8
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	3.3	4.5
People whose first language spoken as a child was not English	23.2	9.6
People with disability	5.6	3.3
People with disability requiring work-related adjustment	N/A	0.9
Trends in the distribution of workforce diversity groups (distribution index)³		
Women	100	105
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	100	104
People whose first language spoken as a child was not English	100	103
People with disability	100	104
People with disability requiring work-related adjustment	100	105

Source: NSW Public Service Commission Workforce Profile – Diversity Data 2020

1. Based on staff numbers as at 30 June 2020.

2. Excludes casual staff.

3. A distribution index of 100 indicates that the centre of the distribution of the workforce diversity group across salary levels is equivalent to that of other staff. Values less than 100 mean that the workforce diversity group tends to be more concentrated at lower salary levels than is the case for other staff. The more pronounced this tendency is, the lower the index will be. In some cases, the index may be more than 100, indicating that the workforce diversity group is less concentrated at lower salary levels. The distribution index is not calculated where workforce diversity group or non-workforce diversity group numbers are less than 20.

Achievements in 2019–20

During 2019–20, DCJ completed a review of existing workforce diversity strategies and programs from across both former FACS and Justice, to develop a new consolidated *Inclusion Strategy 2020–2025* that aims to improve employment outcomes for people from diverse backgrounds. The new strategy realigns and expands on existing programs and is tailored to the DCJ workforce.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people

In 2019–20, DCJ offered a significant range of ongoing employment and development opportunities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Highlights included:

- a new Aboriginal Traineeship Program (16 successful in pilot); an Aboriginal Internship Program partnering with CareerTrackers (four university students); a Communities and Justice Aboriginal Pre-Employment Program (CJAPEP) (18 participants), making them eligible to apply for correctional officer and administration roles; a Cert II in either Community Services or Business Administration, in partnership with TAFE NSW; and a pilot Aboriginal Cadetship program (five students from a range of academic disciplines working part-time while studying), offering three roles in Corporate Services under the PSC Aboriginal Employment Development Program
- continuing to conduct targeted recruitment campaigns for the child protection, social housing, corrective services and youth justice areas, and using a range of targeted advertising strategies, including Aboriginal-specific media and social media, to promote DCJ as an attractive and inclusive employer
- commencing the review and development of a new consolidated DCJ *Aboriginal Employment Strategy 2020–2025*.

To support leadership development:

- 16 employees completed a pilot Aboriginal Emerging Leaders Development Program in partnership with TAFE NSW and Cbeyond, with graduates attaining a Diploma in Leadership and Management
- 31 participants completed the pilot Corrective Services Aboriginal Mentoring Program (CAMP) in partnership with EORA TAFE, attaining a Cert III in Mentoring Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People, with this program now expanded to skill mentees in career preparation from August 2020, to be paired with a mentor.

To support inclusion and retention, DCJ:

- continued to promote the Aboriginal Cultural Inclusion e-learning module to new employees as part of their induction and onboarding
- launched and promoted a new DCJ Aboriginal Cultural Capability web app
- continued to deliver the Connecting with Communities program in partnership with the NSW Aboriginal Education Consultative Group, with 1,275 staff completing the training; the program is funded until June 2022; the Aboriginal cultural capability program Connecting with Aboriginal Communities is foundational in helping every staff member become more culturally capable in engaging with local Aboriginal families, elders and community organisations to deliver better outcomes for Aboriginal families; during the year, training was rolled out for central office staff and four districts.

People with disability

In 2019–20, DCJ offered a range of employment and development opportunities for people with disability. For example:

- Paid internship opportunities were provided to university students with disability under the Stepping Into Internship program. DCJ also maintained its status as a Disability Confident Recruiter through the Australian Network on Disability (AND), with 48 recruiters participating in the related training program.
- Inclusive leadership was supported by participating in two new Public Service Commission (PSC) led initiatives for disability inclusive leadership development:
 - the Inclusive Organisation Study Pilot, a six-week focused study program with external facilitation
 - the Disability Inclusive Leader Program, specifically designed for NSW public sector leaders (Executive Director level).

Inclusion was also supported, through:

- significantly increased Disability Employee Network (DEN) representation, now up to 120 members
- developing new DCJ Workplace Adjustment Policy and Procedures, released in October 2020
- implementing actions under the *Disability Inclusion Action Plan 2015–2019* (DIAP); the DIAP contains employment initiatives to recruit, retain, develop and better support people with disability
- promoting across the department the new PSC Disability Awareness e-learning training module for employees and managers and Age of Inclusion disability resources
- promoting the Disability and Flexible Service Delivery e-learning module to new employees as part of their induction and onboarding.

To support leadership development, DCJ:

- participated in the AND Positive Action towards Career Engagement (PACE) Mentoring Program, in which four senior leaders from DCJ are partnered with jobseekers with disability; the program is designed to raise disability awareness within the department while offering a valuable mentoring opportunity to a jobseeker with disability
- continued to provide self-directed digital learning in the Disability Confidence for Managers Program, with 116 managers completing the program; 241 employees completed the Disability Confident Workforce Program.

DCJ also:

- provided secretariat support to the NSW Disability Council, which is appointed by the Minister to provide advice on issues relating to people with disability and the implementation of disability inclusion action plans
- monitored and reported on activity that supports implementation of the *National Disability Strategy 2010–2020* in NSW.

Women

In 2019–20, DCJ remained on track to achieve a level of 50 per cent women in senior leadership roles by or before 2025. As at 30 June 2020, 47.6 per cent of senior leadership roles are occupied by women. To maintain this commitment, a significant number of leadership development programs was offered. During 2019–20 we:

- introduced a pilot Women in Leadership Executive Mentoring Program, with 17 talented women from Corporate Services participating; a further 20 women in grade 11/12 roles commenced the new Women in Senior Leadership Mentoring Program, a 10-month program developed in partnership with the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
- continued to deliver the Women in Leadership training program to women at clerk grade 7/8 or above, alongside the bespoke leadership program Lead the Way for 96 female leaders, with its focus on building critical leadership skills, and launched the DCJ People Leader program, with 54 female leaders building management skills to transition into manager roles and those in entry-level leadership roles
- completed the PSC pilot Open Doors Career Sponsorship Program with 16 sponsees, mainly women from Aboriginal or CALD backgrounds, completing the program, and assisted five women selected to participate in the pilot PSC Women's Platinum + Professional Development
- provided the opportunity for 10 women leaders to participate in the PSC Executive Leadership Program, and provided 17 places in the Public Sector Management Program and three places in the ANZOG Executive Masters in Administration Program
- launched the DCJ Open Learning program, focusing on lifting management skills in managing self and teams; 348 women have participated in the program
- embedded Coaching and Resilience capability programs across multiple DCJ-tailored programs to 24 female managers.

Inclusion was also supported, though:

- a pilot Inclusive Leadership Workshop Program for senior executives that was completed with 222 senior executives and managers
- expanded memberships in the Women in Communities and Justice Staff Network and the Young Professional Women's Network, with a number of successful career development events for women being hosted
- continuing to participate in the NSW Government Male Champions of Change (MCC) initiative² by hosting 'Listen and Learn' sessions and implementing two specific action priorities supporting gender equity: 1) women in leadership, including a new gender pay gap strategy for senior executives; and 2) flexible working through team-based interventions.

2. The MCC initiative aims to accelerate the Premier's Priority to achieve 50:50 men and women in senior leadership across the public sector, including in leadership positions. The MCC initiative works with influential leaders to redefine men's role in being accountable for achieving gender equality.

Culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD)

In 2019–20, 23 per cent of DCJ employees speak a language other than English at home. DCJ:

- employed Multicultural Caseworkers from different cultural backgrounds speaking 22 different languages, providing secondary casework support to other caseworkers and cultural consultation to support CALD communities as well as refugee and newly arrived communities
- conducted targeted campaigns to attract CALD candidates to multicultural child protection and social housing roles
- continued to participate in the Multicultural NSW Community Language Allowance Scheme (CLAS); over 270 employees are now providing language assistance across 37 community languages, including AUSLAN.

Inclusion was also supported through:

- promoting the Valuing Diversity e-learning module to new employees as part of their induction and onboarding
- relaunching the DCJ Multicultural Staff Network across the department
- delivering the self-directed online Multicultural Competence Learning Program, supporting 372 employees.

LGBTIQA+ people

In 2019–20, DCJ:

- hosted a range of events to acknowledge and celebrate days of significance for LGBTIQA+ communities, including Mardi Gras, IDAHOBIT Day, Wear it Purple Day and Pride Week
- continued to promote the LGBTIQA+ Inclusion e-learning module to new employees as part of their induction and onboarding
- assisted the Pride Staff Network in commencing development of a new *DCJ Pride Action Plan 2020–2021*, which aims to improve LGBTIQA+ inclusion, respect and visibility.

Aspirations for 2020–21

In 2020–21, DCJ will continue to develop and implement a broad range of strategies and programs to achieve the Premier's Priority for a World Class Public Service: Driving Public Sector Diversity and improve inclusion and employment outcomes for people from diverse backgrounds.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people

In 2020–21 DCJ will continue to deliver and expand its range of employment programs, including CJAPEP, internships and traineeships, as well as:

- continuing to participate in the PSC Aboriginal Employment and Development Program
- completing and launching the new *Aboriginal Employment Strategy 2020–2025* (AES), including supporting Aboriginal career development programs and progression opportunities as part of the new AES career development framework, and supporting new initiatives to build cultural capability and improve governance, accountability and reporting
- continuing to monitor data so we can track progress against Aboriginal employment targets in the *Inclusion Strategy 2020–2022* and engagement for Aboriginal employees through the People Matter Employee Survey.

People with disability

In 2020–21, DCJ will:

- continue to offer Stepping Into Internship opportunities to university students with disability in partnership with AND.
- participate in the 2021 AND Access and Inclusion Index to continue reviewing current maturity levels for access and inclusion across the department, and continue delivering existing learning programs related to working with people with disability
- participate in the development of the new *DCJ Disability Inclusion Action Plan* and implement employment initiatives to increase the representation of people with disability
- continue to monitor our progress, including employee engagement for employees with disability, through the People Matter Employee Survey, and monitor our progress against disability employment targets in our *Inclusion Strategy*.

Women

In 2020–21, DCJ will:

- continue to provide opportunities for women to participate in programs to strengthen their leadership capabilities and opportunities, and continue to embed the DCJ Women in Leadership Program
- implement the new actions set out in the *DCJ Gender Pay Equity Strategy* for senior executives
- continue to develop and implement flexible work initiatives under the Premier's 'if not, why not' approach
- use data to continue to monitor employee engagement for women through the People Matter Employee Survey, and monitor progress against the Premier's Priority target of 50 per cent women in senior leadership roles.

Culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD)

In 2020–21, DCJ will:

- continue to attract CALD candidates through the use of targeted advertising to promote multicultural child protection and social housing roles
- launch and promote the new *DCJ CLAS Guidelines and Procedures*
- continue to monitor employee engagement for CALD employees through the People Matter Employee Survey
- continue to support the rollout of the Multicultural Competence learning program and develop and provide access to awareness programs that support and build the capabilities of employees who work with clients and colleagues from diverse backgrounds.

LGBTIQA+ people

In 2020–21, DCJ will:

- provide advice and assistance to the Pride Staff Network in implementing actions under the *DCJ Pride Action Plan 2020–2021*.

3.1.3 Work health and safety (WHS)

Work health and safety performance

In 2019–20:

- there were 9,810 incidents across DCJ and 248 near misses; a new safety system, SafetySuite, was implemented to improve reporting and completion of WHS investigations
- the total number of compensable injuries across all policies of DCJ was 1,219, with 22 per cent of all injuries being psychological; these account for 50 per cent of all claim-related costs
- work commenced to harmonise WHS policies and procedures across DCJ and implement new safety management system documentation
- the peer support program in the former Department of Justice was expanded to the Disability Employment Network, Youth Justice and DCJ Pride; the annual peer support network conference was held in 2019 to recognise and support Peer Support Officers
- the safety response to COVID-19 within DCJ workplaces involved significant effort to ensure that there was correct signage, that instructional material was available to staff, and that release of information to support PPE usage related to COVID-19; ergonomic material was revised and released to all staff to support increasing numbers of people working from home
- 30 per cent of the DCJ workforce accessed an influenza vaccination either onsite at their workplace or through a chemist voucher scheme
- as part of the COVID-19 response, the DCJ employee assistance provider, Converge, expanded its services to NGOs to help staff cope with the mental health demands of COVID-19 activity.

Table 1: Number of workers compensation claims, costs incurred and average cost at each year

DCJ (department)	2019–20
Total claims	1,219 ¹
Total cost incurred (\$)	\$16,179,909.67 ²
Average cost per claim (\$) ³	\$13,273.10

Source: NSW Self Insurance Corporation Data Warehouse and icare Portal

1. The rate of injury is highest among those staffing cohorts involved in custodial operations of young offenders and adult inmates.
2. The cost per claim is highest among claims where the mechanism of injury is psychological. This is because it is more difficult for injured workers to recover at work in their usual role where such an injury is incurred.
3. Average cost per claim is for all claims that occurred in 2019–20. As claims are in differing stages of maturity, it is not the final average cost per claim.

Notifiable incidents

Across DCJ, there were 94 notifiable incidents reported, including COVID-19-related activity.

Challenges and future directions

As DCJ has come together, varied operating structures for WHS and injury management roles are being brought together. Reporting methodologies are being aligned to provide the Board with DCJ WHS and injury management trend information.

A review of workers compensation commenced in July 2020 will enable DCJ to develop an overarching injury management strategy using evidence-based data to inform the initiatives and targeted cohorts.

The *Injury Management Strategy* for the former FACS has entered its second year, and an evaluation of early intervention initiatives has indicated positive outcomes for injured workers. Workers who engaged in the initiatives demonstrated increasing capacity and earlier recovery at work compared to workers who did not participate.

The former FACS Wellbeing Roadmap continues to be implemented, with wellbeing checks occurring in some areas of statewide services. Increased communication of WHS and wellbeing information is now occurring, including weekly and monthly newsletters for staff and managers. A peer support program will be expanded to cover all of DCJ.

The influenza vaccination program will continue in 2021.

3.2 Legal and risk

3.2.1 Legislation administered

Legislation administered as at 30 June 2020

The following legislation was administered by the former Department of Justice on behalf of our Ministers for the 2019–20 financial year.

Attorney General, and Attorney General/Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence

- *Administrative Decisions Review Act 1997 No 76*
- *Anglican Church of Australia (Bodies Corporate) Act 1938 No 15*
- *Animals Act 1977 No 25*
- *Anti-Discrimination Act 1977 No 48*
- *Antiochian Orthodox Church Property Trust Act 1993 No 20*
- *Application of Laws (Coastal Sea) Act 1980 No 146*
- *Australian Mutual Provident Society Act 1988 No 47*
- *Australian Mutual Provident Society (Demutualisation and Reconstruction) Act 1997 No 56*
- *Bail Act 2013 No 26*
- *Benevolent Society (Reconstitution) Act 1998 No 153*
- *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1995 No 62*
- *Charitable Trusts Act 1993 No 10*
- *Child Protection (Offenders Prohibition Orders) Act 2004 No 46*
- *Children (Criminal Proceedings) Act 1987 No 55*
- *Children (Protection and Parental Responsibility) Act 1997 No 78*
- *Children's Court Act 1987 No 53*
- *Choice of Law (Limitation Periods) Act 1993 No 94*
- *Christian Israelite Church Property Trust Act 2007 No 41*
- *Churches of Christ in New South Wales Incorporation Act 1947 No 2*
- *Churches of Christ, Scientist, Incorporation Act 1962 No 21*
- *Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Enforcement Act 1995 No 63*
- *Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013 No 2*
- *Civil Liability Act 2002 No 22*
- *Civil Liability (Third Party Claims Against Insurers) Act 2017 No 19*
- *Civil Procedure Act 2005 No 28*
- *Commercial Arbitration Act 2010 No 61*
- *Common Carriers Act 1902 No 48*
- *Commonwealth Bank (Interpretation) Act 1953 No 29*
- *Commonwealth Places (Administration of Laws) Act 1970 No 80*
- *Commonwealth Powers (De Facto Relationships) Act 2003 No 49*
- *Commonwealth Powers (Family Law—Children) Act 1986 No 182*
- *Community Justice Centres Act 1983 No 127*
- *Compensation to Relatives Act 1897 No 31*

- *Confiscation of Proceeds of Crime Act 1989* No 90
- *Constitutional Powers (Coastal Waters) Act 1979* No 138
- *Co-operative Schemes (Administrative Actions) Act 2001* No 45
- *Coptic Orthodox Church (NSW) Property Trust Act 1990* No 67
- *Coroners Act 2009* No 41
- *Corporations (Administrative Actions) Act 2001* No 33
- *Corporations (Ancillary Provisions) Act 2001* No 32
- *Corporations (Commonwealth Powers) Act 2001* No 1
- *Corporations (New South Wales) Act 1990* No 83
- *Costs in Criminal Cases Act 1967* No 13
- *Council of Law Reporting Act 1969* No 59
- *Court Information Act 2010* No 24
- *Court Security Act 2005* No 1
- *Court Suppression and Non-publication Orders Act 2010* No 106
- *Crimes Act 1900* No 40
- *Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999* No 93, section 183(2)(a)
- *Crimes (Appeal and Review) Act 2001* No 120
- *Crimes at Sea Act 1998* No 173
- *Crimes (Criminal Organisations Control) Act 2012* No 9
- *Crimes (Domestic and Personal Violence) Act 2007* No 80
- *Crimes (Forensic Procedures) Act 2000* No 59
- *Crimes (High Risk Offenders) Act 2006* No 7
- *Crimes (Serious Crime Prevention Orders) Act 2016* No 15
- *Crimes Prevention Act 1916* No 80
- *Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999* No 92
- *Criminal Appeal Act 1912* No 16
- *Criminal Procedure Act 1986* No 209
- *Criminal Records Act 1991* No 8
- *Crown Advocate Act 1979* No 59
- *Crown Proceedings Act 1988* No 70
- *Crown Prosecutors Act 1986* No 208
- *Defamation Act 2005* No 77
- *Director of Public Prosecutions Act 1986* No 207
- *District Court Act 1973* No 9
- *Dividing Fences Act 1991* No 72
- *Domicile Act 1979* No 118
- *Dormant Funds Act 1942* No 25
- *Drug Court Act 1998* No 150
- *Drug Misuse and Trafficking Act 1985* No 226 (except Part 2A, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, the Minister for Health and Medical Research and the Minister for Mental Health, Regional Youth and Women)
- *Dust Diseases Tribunal Act 1989* No 63

- *Electronic Transactions Act 2000* No 8
- *Employees Liability Act 1991* No 4
- *Evidence Act 1995* No 25
- *Evidence (Audio and Audio Visual Links) Act 1998* No 105
- *Evidence on Commission Act 1995* No 26
- *Factors (Mercantile Agents) Act 1923* No 2
- *Federal Courts (State Jurisdiction) Act 1999* No 22
- *Felons (Civil Proceedings) Act 1981* No 84
- *Financial Transaction Reports Act 1992* No 99
- *Fines Act 1996* No 99, Divisions 1 and 2 of Part 2 and sections 13, 120 (in so far as it relates to registrars of the courts and the Sheriff) and 123
- *Forfeiture Act 1995* No 65
- *Frustrated Contracts Act 1978* No 105
- *Government Information (Information Commissioner) Act 2009* No 53, jointly with the Minister for Customer Service
- *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009* No 52
- *Graffiti Control Act 2008* No 100 (except Part 4, jointly with the Minister for Local Government)
- *Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia Consolidated Trust Act 1994* No 65
- *Guardianship Act 1987* No 257
- *Guardianship of Infants Act 1916* No 41
- *Habitual Criminals Act 1957* No 19
- *Health Practitioner Regulation (Adoption of National Law) Act 2009* No 86, section 4 in so far as it applies section 165B of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (NSW) as a law of New South Wales, and the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (NSW), section 165B
- *Holy Apostolic Catholic Assyrian Church of the East Property Trust Act 1992* No 10
- *Hunters Hill Congregational Church Property Trust Act 2013* No 67
- *Imperial Acts Application Act 1969* No 30
- *Inclosed Lands Protection Act 1901* No 33
- *Industrial Relations Act 1996* No 17, sections 180, 185(2)(d)–(e), 197, 197B, 207 and 208, Part 3 of Chapter 7, section 407 (in relation to provisions administered by the Attorney General, and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence) and Schedule 4 (in relation to provisions administered by the Attorney General, and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence)
- *Infants' Custody and Settlements Act 1899* No 39
- *Insurance Act 1902* No 49
- *Insurance (Application of Laws) Act 1986* No 13
- *James Hardie (Civil Liability) Act 2005* No 106
- *James Hardie (Civil Penalty Compensation Release) Act 2005* No 107
- *James Hardie Former Subsidiaries (Winding up and Administration) Act 2005* No 105
- *Judges' Pensions Act 1953* No 41
- *Judicial Office (Papua New Guinea) Act 1979* No 177
- *Judicial Officers Act 1986* No 100
- *Jurisdiction of Courts (Cross-vesting) Act 1987* No 125
- *Jurisdiction of Courts (Foreign Land) Act 1989* No 190

- *Jury Act 1977* No 18
- *Justices of the Peace Act 2002* No 27
- *Land and Environment Court Act 1979* No 204
- *Law and Justice Foundation Act 2000* No 97
- *Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) Act 2002* No 103, jointly with the Minister for Police and Emergency Services
- *Law Reform Commission Act 1967* No 39
- *Law Reform (Law and Equity) Act 1972* No 28
- *Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1944* No 28
- *Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1946* No 33
- *Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1965* No 32
- *Law Reform (Vicarious Liability) Act 1983* No 38
- *Legal Aid Commission Act 1979* No 78
- *Legal Profession Uniform Law Application Act 2014* No 16 and the Legal Profession Uniform Law (NSW)
- *Lie Detectors Act 1983* No 62
- *Limitation Act 1969* No 31
- *Local Court Act 2007* No 93
- *Lutheran Church of Australia (New South Wales District) Property Trust Act 1982* No 101
- *Marketable Securities Act 1970* No 72
- *Married Persons (Equality of Status) Act 1996* No 96
- *Mental Health (Forensic Provisions) Act 1990* No 10 (except Part 5, jointly the Minister for Health and Medical Research and the Minister for Mental Health, Regional Youth and Women)
- *Methodist Church of Samoa in Australia Property Trust Act 1998* No 96
- *Mining Act 1992* No 29, section 293
- *Minors (Property and Contracts) Act 1970* No 60
- *Moratorium Act 1932* No 57
- *National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Act 2018* No 17
- *Native Title (New South Wales) Act 1994* No 45
- *NSW Trustee and Guardian Act 2009* No 49
- *Oaths Act 1900* No 20
- *Parliamentary Papers (Supplementary Provisions) Act 1975* No 49
- *Partnership Act 1892* 55 Vic No 12 (except parts, jointly with the Minister for Better Regulation and Innovation)
- *Personal Property Securities (Commonwealth Powers) Act 2009* No 35 (except parts, jointly with the Minister for Better Regulation and Innovation)
- *Piracy Punishment Act 1902* No 69
- *Presbyterian Church of Australia Act 1971* No 42
- *Pre-Trial Diversion of Offenders Act 1985* No 153
- *Printing and Newspapers Act 1973* No 46
- *Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998* No 133, jointly with the Minister for Customer Service
- *Probate and Administration Act 1898* No 13
- *Property (Relationships) Act 1984* No 147
- *Public Defenders Act 1995* No 28

- *Public Notaries Act 1997* No 98
- *Recovery of Imposts Act 1963* No 21
- *Relationships Register Act 2010* No 19, jointly with the Minister for Customer Service
- *Reorganised Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints Trust Property Act 1959* No 13
- *Restraints of Trade Act 1976* No 67
- *Restricted Premises Act 1943* No 6
- *Roman Catholic Church Communities' Lands Act 1942* No 23
- *Roman Catholic Church Trust Property Act 1936* No 24
- *Royal Blind Society (Merger) Act 2005* No 87
- *Royal Institute for Deaf and Blind Children Act 1998* No 6
- *Russian Orthodox Church (NSW) Property Trust Act 1991* No 91
- *Sale of Goods Act 1923* No 1
- *Sale of Goods (Vienna Convention) Act 1986* No 119
- *Scout Association of Australia (New South Wales Branch) Incorporation Act 1928* No 26
- *Sea-Carriage Documents Act 1997* No 92
- *Sheriff Act 2005* No 6
- *Solicitor General Act 1969* No 80
- *St. Shenouda Coptic Orthodox Monastery (NSW) Property Trust Act 2014* No 40
- *Standard Time Act 1987* No 149
- *Status of Children Act 1996* No 76
- *Stewards' Foundation of Christian Brethren Act 1989* No 172
- *Succession Act 2006* No 80
- *Suitors' Fund Act 1951* No 3
- *Summary Offences Act 1988* No 25
- *Sunday (Service of Process) Act 1984* No 45
- *Supreme Court Act 1970* No 52
- *Surrogacy Act 2010* No 102
- *Surveillance Devices Act 2007* No 64
- *Telecommunications (Interception and Access) (New South Wales) Act 1987* No 290
- *Terrorism (Commonwealth Powers) Act 2002* No 114
- *Terrorism (High Risk Offenders) Act 2017* No 68
- *Terrorism (Police Powers) Act 2002* No 115
- *Trees (Disputes Between Neighbours) Act 2006* No 126
- *Trustee Act 1925* No 14
- *Trustee Companies Act 1964* No 6
- *Unauthorised Documents Act 1922* No 6
- *Uniting Church in Australia Act 1977* No 47
- *Vexatious Proceedings Act 2008* No 80
- *Victims Rights and Support Act 2013* No 37
- *Westpac Banking Corporation (Transfer of Incorporation) Act 2000* No 71
- *Witnesses Examination Act 1900* No 34

- *Workplace Injury Management and Workers Compensation Act 1998* No 86, sections 368, 369 and 373 and Schedule 5 (remainder, the Minister for Customer Service)
- *Workplace Surveillance Act 2005* No 47
- *Young Offenders Act 1997* No 54 (except parts, the Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services).

Minister for Police and Emergency Services

- *Crime Commission Act 2012* No 66.

Minister for Counter Terrorism and Corrections

- *Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999* No 93 (except part, the Attorney General)
- *Crimes (Interstate Transfer of Community Based Sentences) Act 2004* No 72
- *Inspector of Custodial Services Act 2012* No 55
- *International Transfer of Prisoners (New South Wales) Act 1997* No 144
- *Parole Orders (Transfer) Act 1983* No 190
- *Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Act 1982* No 104.

Minister for Sport, Multiculturalism, Seniors and Veterans

- *Ageing and Disability Commissioner Act 2019* No 7
- *Anzac Memorial (Building) Act 1923* No 27
- *Combat Sports Act 2013* No 96
- *Community Services (Complaints, Reviews and Monitoring) Act 1993* No 2
- *Crown Land Management Act 2016* No 58, in so far as it relates to the Crown land known as Parramatta Park, Wollongong Sportsground, Newcastle International Sports Centre and Newcastle Showground
- *Discharged Servicemen's Badges Act 1964* No 49
- *Institute of Sport Act 1995* No 52
- *Motor Vehicle Sports (Public Safety) Act 1985* No 24
- *Multicultural NSW Act 2000* No 77
- *RSL NSW Act 2018* No 48
- *Sporting Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1977* No 3
- *Sporting Venues Authorities Act 2008* No 65
- *Sydney Cricket and Sports Ground Act 1978* No 72.

Minister for Mental Health, Regional Youth and Women

- *Advocate for Children and Young People Act 2014* No 29, jointly with the Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services.

Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services

- *Aboriginal Housing Act 1998* No 47, jointly with the Minister for Water, Property and Housing
- *Adoption Act 2000* No 75
- *Advocate for Children and Young People Act 2014* No 29
- *Ageing and Disability Commissioner Act 2019* No 7
- *Boarding Houses Act 2012* No 74, Part 4 and Part 2 of Schedule 2, and Parts 1 and 5 and Part 1 of Schedule 2 jointly with the Minister for Better Regulation and Innovation
- *Carers (Recognition) Act 2010* No 20
- *Child Protection (International Measures) Act 2006* No 12.

- *Child Protection (Working with Children) Act 2012* No 51
- *Child Welfare (Commonwealth Agreement Ratification) Act 1941* No 11
- *Child Welfare (Commonwealth Agreement Ratification) Act 1962* No 28
- *Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998* No 157
- *Children (Community Service Orders) Act 1987* No 56
- *Children (Detention Centres) Act 1987* No 57
- *Children (Interstate Transfer of Offenders) Act 1988* No 85
- *Children's Guardian Act 2019* No 25
- *Community Housing Providers (Adoption of National Law) Act 2012* No 59
- *Community Services (Complaints, Reviews and Monitoring) Act 1993* No 2
- *Community Welfare Act 1987* No 52 (except parts, the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Regional New South Wales, Industry and Trade and the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, jointly)
- *Disability Inclusion Act 2014* No 41
- *Housing Act 2001* No 52
- *National Disability Insurance Scheme (NSW Enabling) Act 2013* No 104
- *National Disability Insurance Scheme (Worker Checks) Act 2018* No 82
- *Residential Tenancies Act 2010* No 42, Part 7, jointly with the Minister for Water, Property and Housing and the Minister for Better Regulation and Innovation
- *Young Offenders Act 1997* No 54, sections 49, 60 and 61 and Schedule 1.

3.2.2 Legislative changes in 2019–20

Changes in Acts and subordinate legislation

Changes in Acts allocated to the Attorney General, and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence

- *Administrative Decisions Tribunal Act 1997*
- *Anti-Discrimination Act 1977*
- *Application Act 2014*
- *Bail Act 2013*
- *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1995*
- *Child Protection (Offenders Registration) Act 2000*
- *Children (Criminal Proceedings) Act 1987*
- *Children's Court Act 1987*
- *Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013*
- *Civil Liability Act 2002*
- *Civil Procedure Act 2005*
- *Coroners Act 2009*
- *Court Security Act 2005*
- *COVID-19 Legislation Amendment (Emergency Measures—Attorney General) Act 2020*
- *COVID-19 Legislation Amendment (Emergency Measures—Miscellaneous) Act 2020*
- *COVID-19 Legislation Amendment (Emergency Measures) Act 2020*
- *Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999*
- *Crimes (Domestic and Personal Violence) Act 2007*
- *Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999*
- *Crimes Act 1900*
- *Crimes Amendment (Special Care Offences) Act 2020*
- *Crimes Legislation Amendment Act 2018*
- *Criminal Appeal Act 1912*
- *Criminal Procedure Act 1986*
- *Criminal Records Act 1991*
- *De Facto Relationships Act 1984*
- *Defamation Act 2005*
- *Drug Misuse and Trafficking Act 1985*
- *Dust Diseases Tribunal Act 1989*
- *Electronic Transactions Act 2000*
- *Evidence (Audio and Audio Visual Links) Act 1998*
- *Evidence Act 1995*
- *Evidence Amendment (Tendency and Coincidence) Act 2020*
- *Health Practitioner Regulation (Adoption of National Law) Act 2009*
- *Industrial Relations Act 1996*
- *Jury Act 1977*
- *Justice Legislation Amendment Act 2019*

- *Justice Legislation Amendment Act (No 2) 2019*
- *Justice Legislation Amendment Act (No 3) 2018*
- *Justices of the Peace Act 2002*
- *Land and Environment Court Act 1979*
- *Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) Act 2002*
- *Legal Aid Commission Act 1979*
- *Legal Profession Uniform Law*
- *Legal Profession Uniform Law Application Act 2014*
- *Mental Health and Cognitive Impairment Forensic Provisions Act 2020*
- *Mining Act 1992*
- *NSW Trustee and Guardian Act 2009*
- *Oaths Act 1900*
- *Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998*
- *Relationships Register Act 2010*
- *Restricted Premises Act 1943*
- *Sheriff Act 2005*
- *Status of Children Act 1996*
- *Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act (No 2) 2019*
- *Succession Act 2006*
- *Surveillance Devices Act 2007*
- *Surveillance Devices Amendment (Statutory Review) Act 2018*
- *Trees (Disputes Between Neighbours) Act 2006*
- *Trustee Act 1925*
- *Victims Rights and Support Act 2013*
- *Workplace Injury Management and Workers Compensation Act 1998*
- *Young Offenders Act 1997.*

Changes in Acts allocated to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services

- *Child Protection (Offenders Registration) Act 2000*
- *Drug Misuse and Trafficking Act 1985*
- *Firearms Act 1996*
- *Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) Act 2002*
- *Scrap Metal Industry Act 2016*
- *Weapons Prohibition Act 1998*
- *Witness Protection Act 1995.*

Changes in Acts allocated to the Minister for Counter Terrorism and Corrections

- *Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999*
- *Crimes (Interstate Transfer of Community Based Sentences) Act 2004*
- *Parole Orders (Transfer) Act 1983*
- *Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Act 1982.*

Changes in Acts allocated to the Minister for Sport, Multiculturalism, Seniors and Veterans

- *Crown Land Management Act 2016.*

Changes in Acts allocated to the Minister for Mental Health, Regional Youth and Women

- *Drug Misuse and Trafficking Act 1985*
- *Health Practitioner Regulation (Adoption of National Law) Act 2009*
- *Health Services Act 1997*
- *Human Tissue Act 1983*
- *Private Health Facilities Act 2007*
- *Public Health Act 2010*
- *Mental Health Act 2007*
- *Mental Health and Cognitive Impairment Forensic Provisions Act 2020.*

Changes in Acts allocated to the Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services

- *Children's Guardian Act 2019*
- *Child Protection (Working with Children) Act 2012*
- *Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998*
- *Children (Community Service Orders) Act 1987*
- *Children (Detention Centres) Act 1987*
- *Children's Guardian Act 2019*
- *Children (Interstate Transfer of Offenders) Act 1988*
- *Children (Protection and Parental Responsibility) Act 1997*
- *Housing Act 2001*
- *National Disability Insurance Scheme (Worker Checks) Act 2018*
- *Residential Tenancies Act 2010*
- *Young Offenders Act 1997.*

Amendments to Regulations in 2019–20

Changes in Regulations allocated to the Attorney General, and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence

- Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Regulation 2017
- Crimes (Domestic and Personal Violence) Regulation 2019
- Criminal Procedure Amendment (Fees) Regulation 2019
- Criminal Procedure Amendment (Fees) Regulation 2020
- Criminal Procedure Amendment (Miscellaneous) Regulation 2019
- Criminal Procedure Regulation 2017
- Dust Diseases Tribunal Amendment (Fees) Regulation 2019
- Dust Diseases Tribunal Amendment (Fees) Regulation 2020
- Dust Diseases Tribunal Regulation 2019
- Electronic Transactions Amendment (COVID-19 Witnessing of Documents) Regulation 2020
- Evidence (Audio and Audio Visual Links) Amendment (Emergency Measures—COVID-19) Regulation 2020
- Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) Amendment (Custody Notification Service) Regulation 2019
- Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) Regulation 2016
- Legal Profession Uniform Law Application Amendment (Savings and Transitional) Regulation 2020
- Privacy and Personal Information Protection Regulation 2019
- Relationships Register Amendment (Fees) Regulation 2019

- Status of Children Regulation 2019
- Succession Amendment (Will Deposit Fee) Regulation 2019
- Succession Amendment (Will Deposit Fee) Regulation 2020
- Surveillance Devices Amendment (Body-Worn Recording Devices) Regulation 2019
- Trees (Disputes Between Neighbours) Regulation 2019
- Victims Rights and Support Regulation 2019
- Young Offenders Regulation 2016.

Changes in Regulations allocated to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services

- Firearms Amendment (COVID-19) Regulation 2020
- Firearms Amendment (Museum Firearms Permits) Regulation 2019
- Firearms Regulation 2017
- Law Enforcement (Powers and Responsibilities) Regulation 2016
- Weapons Prohibition Amendment (COVID-19) Regulation 2020
- Weapons Prohibition Regulation 2017.

Changes in Regulations allocated to the Minister for Counter Terrorism and Corrections

- Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Amendment (COVID-19) Regulation 2020
- Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Amendment (Inmate Mail) Regulation 2020
- Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Amendment (Use of Force) Regulation 2019
- Crimes (Interstate Transfer of Community Based Sentences) Regulation 2020
- Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Regulation 2019.

Changes in Regulations allocated to the Minister for Sport, Multiculturalism, Seniors and Veterans

- Combat Sports Amendment (International Budo Federation) Regulation 2019.

Changes in Regulations allocated to the Minister for Mental Health, Regional Youth and Women

- Mental Health Regulation 2019.

Changes in Regulations allocated to the Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services

- Child Protection (Working with Children) Amendment (Assessment Requirement Triggers and Reporting Bodies) Regulation 2020
- Child Protection (Working with Children) Amendment (COVID-19 Proof of Identity) Regulation 2020
- Child Protection (Working with Children) Amendment (Proof of Identity Requirements) Regulation 2019
- Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Amendment (Private Health Facility Staff) Regulation 2019
- Children (Interstate Transfer of Offenders) Regulation 2020
- Children (Protection and Parental Responsibility) Regulation 2019
- Children's Guardian (Transitional) Amendment Regulation 2020
- Children's Guardian (Transitional) Regulation 2020
- National Disability Insurance Scheme (Worker Checks) Regulation 2020
- Young Offenders Regulation 2016.

Significant judicial decisions in 2019–20

***Baldwin v State of New South Wales* [2020] NSWCA 112** was an appeal to the Court of Appeal by Mr Wayne Baldwin in relation to a successful application by the Attorney General for a second extended supervision order (ESO) against the defendant. Mr Baldwin argued that the Court could not impose certain conditions requiring him to tell the “truth” and to consent to “search and seizure” because they abrogate the privilege against self-incrimination. At first instance, Justice Beech-Jones held that the common law privilege against self-incrimination is abrogated by the *Crimes (High Risk Offenders) Act 2006* (CHRO Act). The Court of Appeal granted Mr Baldwin leave to appeal but unanimously dismissed the appeal, determining that the trial judge made no error in considering that s. 11(1) of the CHRO Act unambiguously permits conditions to be imposed on an offender as part of an ESO that abrogates the privilege against self-incrimination, and the impugned conditions are not otherwise unlawful or invalid.

***Hackett (a pseudonym) v Secretary, Department of Communities and Justice* [2020] NSWCA 83** was a case in which the NSW Court of Appeal broadened the definition of the term ‘Aboriginal child’ under the *Adoption Act 2000*, finding that the court can determine that a child is an Aboriginal child where there is evidence that the child is a descendant of the people who lived in Australia before British colonisation. The Court found it was not necessary for the child to satisfy the three limb test set out in the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983* (that is, the child is a member of the Aboriginal race, identifies as an Aboriginal person, and is accepted by an Aboriginal community as Aboriginal) or for the child to have an ancestor who satisfies the three limb test, for the child to be considered an Aboriginal child. The Court also held that there was substantial flexibility in the sort of evidence required for a court to determine that a child was an Aboriginal child, noting that there was often little documentary evidence. Oral family history evidence may therefore be sufficient.

***Hamzy v Commissioner of Corrective Services NSW and State of NSW* [2020] NSWSC 414** involved a series of challenges brought by Mr Hamzy, an inmate designated as an Extreme High Risk Restricted inmate by the Commissioner. Mr Hamzy challenged decisions of the Commissioner requiring legal practitioners to undergo criminal records enquiry as part of the approval process to visit high-risk restricted inmates, to deny him access to AVL facilities for the purposes of conferring with his legal representative, and to implement a practice to permit limited monitoring of calls between Mr Hamzy and his legal representative. The Court rejected the challenges, affirming the general principles applicable to the interpretation of prison legislation and the general reluctance of courts to interfere in matters of prison administration. The Court noted the necessity to recognise the difficulty of the task of managing prisons and recognised Parliament’s intention to give those responsible for the management of prisons a broad discretion commensurate with their task. The Court also rejected a challenge to the Constitutional validity of provisions that required that communications to which Mr Hamzy was party during visits in custody be in English.

***State of NSW v Cheema (Preliminary)* [2020] NSW 876** was heard before his Honour Justice Johnson. On 15 June 2020, his Honour dismissed the application by the defendant, Mr Cheema, seeking a permanent stay of the proceedings and a Constitutional challenge to the legislation on the basis that the provisions defining ‘convicted NSW terrorism activity offender’ breached the implied freedom of political communication. His Honour granted the State’s application for an interim supervision order pursuant to the *Terrorism (High Risk Offenders) Act 2017*, ordering that the defendant be made subject to an interim supervision order for a period of 28 days. Note: the decision has been appealed (yet to be heard).

***State of New South Wales v Lawrence (Preliminary)* [2019] NSWSC 1101** was a successful application by the Attorney General for an interim detention order (IDO) under the *Terrorism (High Risk Offenders) Act 2017*. Fullerton J stated, after concluding the allegations, if proved, amounted to an unacceptable risk, that discretionary factors would need to be strong before the Court declined to make an interim order. Her Honour considered the extremist material the offender had viewed, the activities he had engaged in, and the assessment of the defendant as being at high risk of engaging in extremist violence, and consequently made an IDO for 28 days. Note: this decision has been appealed (heard on 28 July, judgment reserved).

The Secretary of the Department of Communities and Justice (DCJ) and the Stonsky Children [2019] NSWChC 8 is a significant decision in which Children’s Magistrate Hayes interpreted the new short-term care order (STCO) provision of the *Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act 1998* as amended on 4 February 2019 and made an STCO approving the young children’s permanency plan of open adoption (s.79(9)) by their authorised carers. In making the STCO, Children’s Magistrate Ryan applied the permanency placement principles (s.10A) that preference adoption over long-term out-of-home care for non-Aboriginal children, and referred to expert evidence, finding there “are good reasons for placing adoption as a preferred outcome to achieve permanency” [at 35]. His Honour found that the children’s adoption plan was real and not simply aspirational and that the carers had “‘runs on the board’ for providing a safe, nurturing, stable and secure environment” for the children [at 53]. He therefore found that permanency planning for the children had been appropriately and adequately addressed and that the children’s plans provided the Court with a reasonably clear picture as to how the children’s needs, welfare and wellbeing would be met in future and would provide the children with a stable and secure permanent home.

Turner v State of New South Wales [2019] NSWCA 164 was an appeal to the Court of Appeal by Craig Turner in relation to the making of an interim detention order (IDO) under the *Crimes (High Risk Offenders) Act 2006*. The decision clarifies that an IDO may be made upon an offender who is not in ‘lawful custody’, that a hiatus in detention does not invalidate an IDO, and that *State of New South Wales v Haouchar [2018] NSWSC 979* was wrongly decided.

3.2.3 The Surveillance Devices Act 2007 and Report of the Surveillance Devices Commissioner

Statistical information about section 45A of the Surveillance Devices Act 2007

Section 45A Surveillance Devices Act 2007		2019-20
The number of matters in which the advice of the Attorney General has been sought in respect of a prospective application for a warrant	Notices received pursuant to section 17(5A) in relation to pending applications	1,081
	Notices culminating in consultation (Attorney General's delegate with applicant agency)	235
	Consultation culminating in further development of warrant application	165
The number of applications for a warrant that have been made		955
The number of applications in which the Attorney General was heard before the Judge or Magistrate in the determination of the application	Written submissions	42
	In-person submissions	0
The number of applications that were withdrawn before being determined	Notices served pursuant to section 17(5A) but application not made to eligible Judge	6
	Applications made to eligible Judge but withdrawn prior to determination	0
The number of applications that were refused		20
The number of warrants in respect of which a direction was given under section 52(1) to supply information to a person about the warrant or use of a surveillance device (or both)		0

Report of the Surveillance Devices Commissioner

The *Surveillance Devices Amendment (Statutory Review) Act 2018* was enacted in November 2018 and commenced on 28 October 2019. The Act followed the release of the Acting NSW Ombudsman's Operation Prospect report in December 2016 and a statutory review as mandated by section 63 of the Act. Two key changes to the Act were:

- the introduction of 'objects'
- the establishment of the role of Surveillance Devices Commissioner (SD Commissioner).

The objects of the Act are:

- (a) to provide law enforcement agencies with a comprehensive framework for the use of surveillance devices in criminal investigations
- (b) to enable law enforcement agencies to covertly gather evidence for the purposes of criminal prosecution
- (c) to ensure that the privacy of individuals is not unnecessarily impinged upon by providing strict requirements around the installation, use and maintenance of surveillance devices.

Donald McKenzie was appointed the inaugural SD Commissioner under section 51A of the Act, commencing in the role on 4 November 2019.

The SD Commissioner exercises functions of the Attorney General under Parts 3 and 5 of the Act through a delegations power in section 51B of the Act. These functions have existed in essentially the same form since they were established in the (now repealed) *Listening Devices Act 1984*. The functions involve the SD Commissioner:

- receiving notice of pending warrant applications
- retaining a right to be heard on each application
- receiving reports in relation to the use made by applicant agencies of the surveillance devices authorised by issued warrants.

The SD Commissioner's delegated functions were previously exercised by the Solicitor General and, in his absence, the Crown Advocate. There are two key differences in the SD Commissioner's circumstances. First, the SD Commissioner has greater resources, as the administration of these functions is the role's primary responsibility. Second, the role has the authority and responsibility that comes with the legislative designation as SD Commissioner. Accordingly, since the SD Commissioner's commencement in the role there has been a legitimate expectation that the SD Commissioner will play a stronger leadership role in the development and maintenance of the Act's regulatory framework.

The functions of the Attorney General delegated to the SD Commissioner under the Act can be conveniently delineated into two key categories – 'front-end' and 'back-end' functions.

The front-end functions involve the SD Commissioner receiving notices of pending applications by law enforcement agencies, and exercising (or not exercising) the right to be heard on the application. The SD Commissioner's aim in exercising these functions is not to make his own assessments as to which applications have merit or not, but to use his position to ensure that eligible Judges or Magistrates are placed in a primary position to make these assessments. Although the Act is specific about the information to be included in a notice of pending application to the Attorney General, the SD Commissioner negotiates with applicant agencies to provide him with the full material they are using in support of each application. He reviews this and works with applicant agencies to address any substantive deficiencies in terms of confusion or dysfunction, information deficiencies, or failures to adequately address the requirements of the Act. From the SD Commissioner's commencement in the role to the end of the reporting period, 676 notices of pending applications were reviewed. Consultation with applicant agencies occurred on 235 occasions in relation to proposed applications, and these consultations culminated in the amendment and development of application materials on 165 occasions. Written submissions to highlight key issues or provide independent guidance were provided on 42 occasions. The SD Commissioner seeks to guide and assist rather than to promote a specific position unless he considers the application substantively threatens the public interest, in which case he will seek the opportunity to challenge this application with direct submissions. Such a situation has not arisen in this reporting period.

The SD Commissioner has been working with applicant agencies to improve application templates and practices with a view to standardising and enhancing the application materials that are being generated and passed to eligible Judges and Magistrates.

The back-end of the Attorney General's functions under the Act involves the receipt and review of reports on the use made of surveillance devices pursuant to issued warrants (use reports). Warrant recipients are required to submit such a report in accordance with section 44 of the Act. This provides an opportunity to assess the use made of the authority provided by issued warrants, contrast this use with the information and intentions canvassed in the application materials, hold warrant recipients accountable for commitments made during the application process, and identify where remedial action might be warranted (such as that provided by section 52(1) of the Act). Given the significant variation among use reports in terms of the focus, extent and quality of information being provided, the SD Commissioner has worked with the NSW Police Force to develop its use report template so that it more effectively guides its officers and facilitates consistent standards of reporting. There has been a lag time between the issuing of the new guideline template and the arrival of reports in keeping with the template's requirements. When these new reports come in, the SD Commissioner intends to be more robust in his expectations, and he will be in a stronger position to seek further information when these reports fall short of expected standards. Over the next reporting period, the SD Commissioner intends to negotiate with other applicant agencies to develop and align their use report templates and practice standards.

The administration of warrant applications and warrant use involves the consideration of highly confidential information that necessitates the exclusion of public access from key deliberative processes. The community is ultimately represented by eligible Judges or Magistrates who consider warrant applications as they are presented. The SD Commissioner is well placed and should operate to ensure, on behalf of the community, that the administration of surveillance device authorisations and use takes place in keeping with community values and expectations. In this respect the SD Commissioner will be examining ways of enhancing accountability in relation to the administration of the Act, including accountability for his own performance in this role. In particular, the SD Commissioner hopes to use this Annual Report to provide some additional insight into the operation of the Act's accountability scheme and his own performance. The SD Commissioner also plans to consult widely to facilitate community input. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, consultation has been difficult during the reporting period, but the SD Commissioner was able to talk to representatives of the NSW Law Society and the NSW Bar Association. The SD Commissioner hopes these organisations will consult further with him over the next reporting period and that he can meet with other interested persons and associations. It is the SD Commissioner's intention to report on the conduct of these consultations and their outcomes in each Annual Report.

3.2.4 Risk management and insurance

Risk management activities

DCJ maintains several management disciplines to comply with the NSW Treasury *Internal Audit and Risk Management Policy for the NSW Public Sector* (TPP 15-03). The following management disciplines are complementary and constitute the foundation of the department's resilience.

Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)

DCJ is committed to the proactive management of risk, recognising that risk management is an integral part of sound management practice and an essential element of good corporate governance.

DCJ's ERM aims to provide greater assurance that it will achieve its objectives and realise its outcomes by minimising threats and seizing opportunities. It realises this through the use of a consistent risk management process wherever decisions are being made. This includes all projects, functions and activities, at all levels.

ERM sets out the arrangements for the management of risk within the department, promoting a risk-aware culture and providing a tool for leadership to manage existing and emerging risks across all activities.

Business Continuity Management (BCM)

DCJ is committed to integrating BCM principles and practices into its business processes. Our approach to BCM is based on best practice outlined in the international Business Continuity Standards (ISO 22301:2019) and NSW Treasury's *Organisational Resilience: Practitioner Guide for NSW Public Sector Organisations* (TPP 18-07).

DCJ uses its BCM framework to identify critical business functions and develop up-to-date plans for responding to unplanned disruptions. Business continuity plans document the requirements for continuing to provide essential services or restoring them as quickly as possible.

During 2019–20, the department developed a *Pandemic Management Plan* and a *Crisis Management Plan* to ensure DCJ can respond swiftly and effectively to major incidents similar to those experienced as a result of the bushfire crisis and COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, DCJ made considerable progress in developing a new and harmonised overarching policy and framework for BCM that draws upon the ex-Justice and ex-FACS BCM approaches.

Fraud control and corruption prevention

The *Fraud and Corruption Policy* provides guidelines for employees to control, prevent, detect and mitigate risks associated with fraud and corruption. During 2019–20, the draft *Fraud and Corruption Policy and Procedure* was reviewed as a result of the changes in the Machinery of Government and the establishment of the DCJ. The policy and procedure will be finalised in the coming financial period.

Compliance and governance support

The DCJ Business Ethics and Compliance Unit (BECU) administers and coordinates the following department-wide programs, which assist in meeting the risk management requirements of TPP 15-03:

- Conflicts of Interest
- Secondary Employment & Private Work
- Gifts, Benefits and Bequests
- Legislative & Administrative Compliance Program.

The BECU also manages and coordinates declarations of DCJ senior executive and nominated non-senior executive private interests to meet the centralised oversight requirements of Public Service Commissioner Circular 2015-08.

Insurance activities

DCJ (department) and John Williams Memorial Charitable Trust

Insurance is provided for all major assets and significant risks through the NSW Government self-insurance scheme – the Treasury Management Fund (TMF). This includes full workers compensation, motor vehicle, property, public liability and miscellaneous insurance cover.

QBE Insurance manages the department's workers compensation insurance and Gallagher Bassett manages the department's other insurances. To reduce the number and value of workers compensation insurance claims, the department monitors its claims experience on an ongoing basis, with a focus on occupational health and safety and claims management.

Table 1: Number of claims, costs incurred and average cost for the department in 2019–20

	No. of claims	Total costs incurred \$ ¹	Average cost \$
Motor vehicle accident	1,047	2,897,243	2,767
Property	213	7,624,673	35,797
Miscellaneous	13	342,951	26,281

Source: icare Portal Dashboard

1. Total costs incurred = Latest estimate + amount paid – amount recovered. This is used to understand the whole and true value of a claim.

Public liability claims

The estimated outstanding value of potential claims in 2019–20 against the current public liability policy (subject to TMF actuarial assessment) is \$24,362,812.

3.2.5 Internal audit and risk management attestation

Internal Audit and Risk Management Attestation Statement for the 2019–20 Financial Year for the Department of Communities and Justice

I, Michael Coutts-Trotter am of the opinion that the Department of Communities and Justice has internal audit and risk management processes in operation that are, excluding the exceptions or transitional arrangements described below, compliant with the eight (8) core requirements set out in the *Internal Audit and Risk Management Policy for the NSW Public Sector*, specifically:

Core Requirements	For each requirement, please specify whether compliant, non-compliant, or in transition
Risk Management Framework	
1.1 The agency head is ultimately responsible and accountable for risk management in the agency	Compliant
1.2 A risk management framework that is appropriate to the agency has been established and maintained and the framework is consistent with AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009	Compliant
Internal Audit Function	
2.1 An internal audit function has been established and maintained	Compliant
2.2 The operation of the internal audit function is consistent with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing	Compliant
2.3 The agency has an Internal Audit Charter that is consistent with the content of the 'model charter'	Compliant
Audit and Risk Committee	
3.1 An independent and Audit and Risk Committee with appropriate expertise has been established	Compliant
3.2 The Audit and Risk Committee is an advisory committee providing assistance to the agency head on the agency's governance processes, risk management and control frameworks, and its external accountability obligations	Compliant
3.3 The Audit and Risk Committee has a Charter that is consistent with the content of the 'model charter'	Compliant

Membership

The chair and members of the Audit and Risk Committee for the 2019-20 Financial Year were:

- Independent Chair, Carolyn Burlew, 1 August 2019 to 31 July 2022
- Independent Member 1, Christine Feldmanis, 1 August 2019 to 31 July 2022
- Independent Member 2, Denise Aldous, 1 August 2019 to 31 July 2022
- Independent Member 3, Abby Bloom, 1 August 2019 to 31 July 2022
- Independent Member 4, John Hunter, 25 October 2019 to 24 October 2022
- Independent Member, Ralph Kelly, 1 August 2019 to 15 September 2019



Michael Coutts-Trotter
Secretary
Department of Communities & Justice
25 September 2020

3.2.6 Cyber security policy attestation

Cyber Security Annual Attestation Statement for the 2019–2020 Financial Year for Department of Communities and Justice (DCJ)

I, Michael Coutts-Trotter, am of the opinion that DCJ has managed cyber security risks in a manner consistent with the Mandatory Requirements set out in the NSW Government Cyber Security Policy and in alignment with DCJ's enterprise risk management framework.

DCJ has prioritised investment in cyber security since the Machinery of Government changes, to account for the substantial threat increase posed by the new department's role and the quantity and nature of information the new Department holds. To ensure the department's cyber security strategy and investments are focused appropriately, cyber security is considered and governed at various levels, including the DCJ Board, the Audit and Risk Committee, cross-business sub-committees and locally within divisions.

DCJ undertakes numerous independent internal and external audits each year which validate the appropriateness of specific controls, integrity of systems and effectiveness of processes, including the Information Security Management System.

DCJ maintains an appropriate cyber incident response plan, which has been tested logically and technically during the period. This plan has well supported the organisation as it has undertaken business continuity events brought about by COVID-19.



Michael Coutts-Trotter

3.2.7 Section 242(6) of the Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999

Junee Correctional Centre

Junee Correctional Centre (Junee) has been privately managed since April 1993 by the GEO Group Australia Pty Ltd (GEO). In its current configuration it is operating as a multi-functional facility housing predominantly sentenced and remand inmates. Although privately operated, managed correctional centres remain under the oversight of Corrective Services NSW (CSNSW) and must contribute towards the achievement of the CSNSW's key objectives, must interface with other NSW correctional centres, and must adhere to CSNSW operational strategic outcomes. Accordingly, operational activities and inmate services and programs must be consistent with those provided by other NSW correctional centres as detailed in the Operating Agreement (Contract).

The Governance and Continuous Improvement (G&CI) Branch within CSNSW has responsibility for these functions, with the Operational Performance Review Branch (OPRB) conducting all contract management activities, including performance monitoring and reporting for the operations of managed correctional centres in accordance with section 242 of the *Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999*.

The current contract for the operations of Junee details 35 Performance Linked Fees (PLF) Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) with financial consequences if non-compliance is identified, and 76 Operating Specifications which reflect the service delivery requirements of the operator against key operational outputs.

The ongoing assessment of performance against the Operating Specifications and PLF KPIs by CSNSW monitoring staff is underpinned by a risk framework which provides flexibility, including increasing monitoring activities reflecting any identified operational risks.

Junee is currently undergoing an expansion project to add a 480-bed maximum security section. On completion of this build, new output specification and performance regimes will be introduced to replace the existing PLF model. This will align the Junee contract model with other privately managed correctional centres. The information below is for the most recent contract year and mandatory reporting period for Junee, which is 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2020.

PLF Performance Assessment Report

A review of performance against PLF criteria was undertaken by CSNSW Custodial and Integrated monitoring staff; evidence was then collated and a recommendation was made regarding the payment of the PLF.

Due to the sound performance of GEO against contractual performance requirements, it was determined that 100 per cent of the PLF funds would be paid to GEO for the 2019–20 contract year for the operation of Junee.

Operating Specifications – minimum standards

There were no significant non-compliance issues, a situation which is reflected in the PLF payment to GEO for the contract year. Using a risk-based qualitative and quantitative monitoring framework, Junee was assessed for compliance against the outcomes of the Operating Specifications that were reviewed during the contract year, with no issues of significance being found.

Overall assessment

GEO met its contractual obligations for the operation of Junee for the contract year. The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted upon the operations of Junee.

Parklea Correctional Centre

Parklea Correctional Centre (Parklea) was privately operated by GEO from 1 November 2009 until 31 March 2019. At the time of management by GEO, Parklea was operating as a facility housing predominantly sentenced and long-term remand inmates.

Since 31 March 2019, Management & Training Corporation Pty Ltd and Broadspectrum (Australia) Pty Ltd (MTC-Broadspectrum) have operated Parklea as a multifunctional facility predominantly housing new reception and remand inmates.

At the time of transition to MTC-Broadspectrum, Parklea was also undergoing a major construction project to expand the centre to accommodate an additional 500 maximum security beds. This new area is now operational.

The current contract for the operation of Parklea details a suite of KPIs with financial consequences if non-compliance is identified and Output Specifications (service requirements) which reflect the service delivery requirements of the Operator against five key operational areas.

The ongoing assessment of performance against the Output Specifications and KPIs by CSNSW monitoring staff is underpinned by a risk framework which provides flexibility, including increasing monitoring activities reflecting any identified operational risks. Using a risk-based qualitative and quantitative monitoring framework, Parklea was assessed for compliance against the outcomes of the Operating Specifications that were reviewed during the year.

KPI Performance Assessment Report

For the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 there were four default charge events:

- August 2019 – death in custody – suspected suicide
- April 2020 – death in custody – suspected murder by another inmate
- February 2020 – erroneous detention event
- May 2020 – erroneous release event.

MTC-Broadspectrum was required to submit cure plans against these default events, with remedial actions subject to monitoring by the State.

Over the past five months, the COVID-19 pandemic has had a major impact on the operations and performance management of Parklea. This has posed various challenges and unprecedented demands on its operations.

Overall assessment

MTC-Broadspectrum completed 12 months of operations under the new contract on 31 March 2020.

The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted upon the operations of Parklea.

The OPRB conducts continual performance monitoring and reporting against the operations of Parklea, with any areas of non-compliance to contractual service and performance requirements immediately raised with MTC-Broadspectrum for remediation.

3.3 Finance

3.3.1 Payment of accounts

The payment of accounts for goods and services is closely monitored by each entity to ensure accounts are paid in accordance with NSW Treasury directions. Process improvements across DCJ and related entities are being undertaken to further improve payment-on-time performance. Accounts payable policies and procedures are in accordance with the guidelines established by the NSW Small Business Commissioner.

Department of Communities and Justice

Aged analysis at the end of each quarter

Measure	Sep 2019	Dec 2019	Mar 2020	Jun 2020
All suppliers				
Current not yet due ('000)	54,569	33,490	30,993	129,113
Overdue 1–30 days ('000)	593	542	374	5,378
Overdue 31–60 days ('000)	294	262	171	686
Overdue 61–90 days ('000)	176	41	5	278
Overdue 91 days and over ('000)	1,189	798	832	1,415
Small business suppliers				
Current not yet due ('000)	1,817	433	735	5,012
Overdue 1–30 days ('000)	71	10	36	1,570
Overdue 31–60 days ('000)	27	2	3	290
Overdue 61–90 days ('000)	34	2	0	10
Overdue 91 days and over ('000)	22	22	23	30

Source: OneSAP, ADHC SAP, JSAP, Ellipse and Pronto. Please note that the amount (\$) figures are in \$'000.

Accounts due or paid within each quarter

Measure	Unit	Sep 2019	Dec 2019	Mar 2020	Jun 2020
All suppliers					
Accounts due for payment	Number	239,264	239,590	194,974	193,619
Accounts paid on time	Number	236,502	236,745	192,015	191,120
Accounts paid on time (based on number of accounts)	Per cent	98.8	98.8	98.5	98.7
Accounts due for payment (\$'000)	\$	2,354,885	1,108,054	1,550,113	2,087,105
Accounts paid on time (\$'000)	\$	2,318,852	1,105,277	1,543,062	2,077,430
Accounts paid on time	Per cent	98.5	99.7	99.5	99.5
Payments for interest on overdue accounts	Number	0	0	0	0
Interest paid on overdue accounts	\$	0	0	0	0
Small business suppliers					
Accounts due for payment	Number	11,601	11,526	10,900	11,496
Accounts paid on time	Number	10,883	11,196	10,209	10,875
Accounts paid on time (based on number of accounts)	Per cent	93.8	97.1	93.7	94.6
Accounts due for payment (\$'000)	\$	65,945	48,250	27,545	77,357
Accounts paid on time (\$'000)	\$	63,770	47,883	25,720	74,674
Accounts paid on time	Per cent	96.7	99.2	93.4	96.5
Payments for interest on overdue accounts	Number	0	0	0	0
Interest paid on overdue accounts	\$	0	0	0	0

Source: OneSAP, ADHC SAP, JSAP, Ellipse and Pronto. Please note that the amount (\$) figure are in \$'000.

3.3.2 Consultants

Department of Communities and Justice

Consultancies equal to or over \$50,000

Consultant	Project description	Amount (\$)*	Category
Nous Group Pty Ltd	Social housing cost benefit – homelessness analysis for business case	145,531	Management Services
Johnstaff Advisory Pty Ltd	Enhanced Support Unit (ESU) Business Case	223,740	Management Services
KPMG	NSW Reoffending Business Case Cost Benefit Analysis	193,050	Management Services
KPMG	Demand modelling offender programs	148,225	Management Services
Lee Shearer & Associates	Independent Review – Frank Baxter Incident 21–22 July 2019	222,805	Management Services
Pricewaterhouse Coopers	Office of Emergency Management – commercial and financial advisory services	181,358	Financial Services
Pricewaterhouse Coopers	Offender Journey Mapping Review	92,840	Management Services
Pricewaterhouse Coopers	System redesign to support better prison release planning and access to wrap-around services in health and housing with an initial focus on those with serious mental illness	148,500	Management Services
Pricewaterhouse Coopers	Pilot mobilisation for a new model of care that aims to reduce reoffending for higher risk offenders with psychosis	115,500	Management Services
Sapere Research Group Ltd	Research and delivery of report for National Insurance Project	99,715	Management Services
University of New South Wales	Kirby Institute – optimum care model	61,408	Management Services

* Amount includes GST and is rounded to nearest dollar.

Consultancies under \$50,000

Nature of services	Number of engagements	Amount (\$)*
Management Services	4	57,562
Total	4	57,562

* Amount includes GST and is rounded to nearest dollar.

Consultant definition

Procurement Board Direction 2019–20 defines a consultant as follows:

A consultant is defined as a person or organisation engaged under contract on a temporary basis to provide recommendations or professional advice to assist decision-making by management. Generally it is the advisory nature of the work that differentiates a consultant from other contractors.

Services provided under the NSW Government Legal Services Panel are excluded from the definition of a consultant for annual reporting purposes.

Common characteristics of consulting engagements under the definition are that consultancies provide agencies with recommendations or professional advice that often have one or more of the following characteristics:

- is developed without direct supervision from the agency
- represents an independent view
- is the sole or majority element of the contract in terms of relative value or importance.

3.3.3 Land disposal

Department of Communities and Justice

There were no sales of \$5 million or more in 2019–20 other than by tender or public auction. There were no family or business connections between any of the parties involved in property sales.

Note: Access to documents relating to property disposals may be obtained under the *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009*. More information is available at dcj.nsw.gov.au.

3.3.4 Major works in progress

This section lists major works in progress, including the cost of those works to date and the estimated dates of completion. It also includes details of any significant delays, cancellations or cost overruns in major works.

Project description	Program project funded under	Total estimated cost (\$'000) ¹	Cost up to 30 June 2020 (\$'000) ²	Expected completion	Status: completed, in progress, delays, cancellation or cost overruns
New works					
Queanbeyan Courthouse Upgrade	Treasury Consolidated Fund	18,000	1,411	June 2021	In progress
Electronic Monitoring for Sex Offender Parolees	Treasury Consolidated Fund	3,759	2,468	June 2021	In progress
Establishment of New Office of Ageing and Disability	Treasury Consolidated Fund	745	809	June 2020	Completed with minor overrun
Works in progress					
Clarence Correctional Centre	Public Private Partnership funded \$706m and Treasury Consolidated Fund \$92.8m	798,824	72,049	July 2020	In progress
Criminal Justice Reform	Treasury Consolidated Fund	100,158	92,566	June 2021	In progress
Civil Justice Strategy	Treasury Consolidated Fund	2,930	1,849	June 2022	In progress
Justice Shared Corporate Services	Treasury Consolidated Fund	47,370	43,092	June 2021	In progress
Accommodation of Co-location and Upgrade	Treasury Consolidated Fund	3,000	2,424	June 2021	In progress
FACS Enable	Treasury Consolidated Fund	7,589	7,231	June 2020	Completed

1. Total estimated cost is the estimated cost for the whole project.

2. Cost up to 30 June 2020 is the total cost from project inception through to 30 June 2020.

Prison Bed Capacity Program

In 2016, the NSW Government launched the Better Prisons initiative – a \$3.8 billion investment and the largest ever capital works program undertaken by an Australian corrective services agency. A key deliverable of the Prison Bed Capacity Program is to add 6,074 new beds to the prison system by mid-2021. The program is on track to meet this target and has delivered 5,634 beds so far.

By increasing capacity and delivering fit-for purpose infrastructure, the department has improved the safety of inmate management and provided social benefits through job creation, delivering on the department's commitments including Reducing Adult Reoffending and Addressing Counter-Terrorism and Violent Extremism.

3.4 Governance and other matters

3.4.1 Public interest disclosures

DCJ has a *Public Interest Disclosure Internal Reporting Policy* covering all staff. The policy is consistent with the NSW Ombudsman model reporting policy and the requirements of the *NSW Public Interest Disclosures Act 1994* (PID Act).

Actions have been taken to ensure staff are aware of their responsibilities under the PID Act, and the policy and corresponding procedures are available to staff on the DCJ intranet. The department's public interest disclosure officers are also identified on the intranet. Under the PID Act, DCJ staff are required to report certain information; this information is shown in the tables below.

Department of Communities and Justice

Table 1: Number of public interest disclosures (PIDs)

Category	Course of their day-to-day functions	Made pursuant to a statutory obligation	All other disclosures
Public officials who have made a PID to the public authority	3	0	0
PIDs received by the public authority in total:			
Corrupt conduct	1	0	0
Maladministration	2	0	0
Serious and substantial waste of public or local government money	0	0	0
Government information contraventions	0	0	0
Local government pecuniary interest contraventions	0	0	0
PIDs finalised	5	0	0

3.4.2 Privacy management

Department of Communities and Justice

Privacy Management Plan

The DCJ *Privacy Management Plan* (PMP) is under review with a view to finalising a single PMP for DCJ. The new PMP will replace the PMPs for the former Department of Justice and Department of Family and Community Services (FACS).

The FACS PMP is available on the internet via the following link:

https://www.facs.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/594787/FACS-Privacy-Management-Plan-2018.pdf

Privacy training

The privacy e-learning course was reviewed and a single module promoted via the department's training portal. The privacy training module promotes the key compliance obligations of DCJ and its employees in relation to the handling of personal and health information.

Targeted, face-to-face privacy training with content specific to the roles of managers, caseworkers and contractors providing services to DCJ was delivered at a number of sites across NSW in the reporting year using online videoconferencing software. The training provided practical and scenario-based modules that highlighted the interaction between DCJ's privacy obligations and its obligations under legislation administered by DCJ.

Privacy policies and practices

In 2019–20, DCJ commenced a review of collection notices and consent forms for programs and services delivered by DCJ to ensure compliance with privacy obligations. The review was aimed to ensure that documents were fit for purpose and accurately reflected the services and programs provided by DCJ. The collection notices and consent forms were also reviewed from the perspective of providing transparency in relation to DCJ's information-handling practices.

Internal reviews

In 2019–20, DCJ received 65 applications for internal review under section 53 of the *Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998* (PPIP Act). Out of the 65 applications:

- 17 were determined within the statutory period permitted for completion of internal reviews
- 28 were completed outside the 60-day statutory timeframe by agreement with the applicant
- 9 were withdrawn/made outside the 60-day time period for lodging an internal review
- the remaining 11 applications were carried forward to 2020–21.

Of the 45 completed applications for internal review in 2019–20, 13 resulted in a finding of a breach of the PPIP Act by DCJ.

Privacy access

DCJ Legal received 20 applications for access under section 14 of the PPIP Act. Fifteen of those access applications were completed in the reporting period. The remaining applications were carried forward to 2020–21.

Privacy amendments

From 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, DCJ Legal received and completed five applications for amendment under section 15 of the PPIP Act.

Section 45 complaints

DCJ Legal received no complaints under section 45 of the PPIP Act.

3.4.3 Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009

Departmental reporting (Points 1–4)

In the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, DCJ Legal received 2,151 valid, formal access applications for information under the *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009* (GIPA Act). The number of valid formal access applications received this year increased by 317 (15 per cent) from 2018–19.

DCJ Legal also processed 846 informal requests for information in 2019–20, an increase from 467 (81 per cent) in 2018–19. This demonstrates DCJ's commitment to the principles of the GIPA Act and the release of information, where possible, at no cost to the applicant and without the need for a formal access application.

In the same reporting period, DCJ Legal also responded to 4,923 subpoenas, summonses and other requests for access to information, an increase from 4,539 (8.5 per cent) in 2018–19.

The reporting information below is provided in accordance with clause 8 of the Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2018.

1. Review of proactive release program – Clause 8(a)

Under section 7 of the GIPA Act, agencies must review their programs for the release of government information to identify the kinds of information that can be made publicly available. This review must be undertaken at least every 12 months.

DCJ regularly reviews its programs to ensure that information that is in the public interest and assists people to access services is made publicly available. DCJ provides information about major plans and services to individuals, families, carers and service providers.

During the reporting period, DCJ harmonised and updated its Agency Information Guide following the Machinery of Government changes. During this process, DCJ's proactive release obligations were addressed. A proactive disclosure of information factsheet was developed and published on the intranet to raise awareness and to help employees understand their proactive disclosure obligations. DCJ's General Counsel provided a copy of the factsheet to all deputy secretaries, advising of their proactive disclosure obligations and asking them to provide information about what information had been proactively released. As a result a number of documents were proactively released under section 7 of the GIPA Act via the DCJ website, such as policies, resources, reports, plans, papers, newsletters and statistical data.

In accordance with DCJ's obligations under section 25 of the GIPA Act, the disclosure log was regularly updated with information considered to be of interest to the public.

2. Number of access applications received – Clause 8(b)

During the reporting period, DCJ received 2,151 valid, formal access applications under section 9 of the GIPA Act. This number includes withdrawn but not invalid applications.

3. Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information – Clause 8(c)

During the reporting period, DCJ refused 14 formal access applications in full and 184 in part on the basis that it was conclusively presumed that there was an overriding public interest against disclosure.

4. Statistical information about access applications for period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 (Schedule 2)

Table 1: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome¹

Type of application	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refused to deal with application	Refused to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Total	Percentage of total
Media	5	4	1	4	0	5	0	2	21	1.1
Members of Parliament	6	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	12	0.6
Private sector business	4	2	2	4	0	3	1	5	21	1.1
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	3	4	0	2	0	1	1	0	11	0.5
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	348	500	13	107	65	126	3	67	1,229	63.3
Members of the public (other)	117	351	20	63	24	34	5	34	648	33.4
Total	483	862	37	181	89	171	10	109	1,942	100
Percentage of total	25	44.4	2	9.3	4.5	8.7	0.5	5.6	100	

1. More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table 2.

Table 2: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome

Type of application	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refused to deal with application	Refused to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn	Total	Percentage of total
Personal information applications ¹	457	806	24	145	84	152	7	92	1,767	91
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	19	24	10	29	4	10	2	9	107	5.5
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	7	32	3	7	1	9	1	8	68	3.5
Total	483	862	37	181	89	171	10	109	1,942²	100
Percentage of total	25	44.4	2	9.3	4.5	8.7	0.5	5.6	100	

1. A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the GIPA Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

2. More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision.

Table 3: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications	Percentage of total
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the GIPA Act)	813	99.3
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the GIPA Act)	6	0.7
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the GIPA Act)	0	0
Total number of invalid applications received	819	100
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	576	N/A

Table 4: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the GIPA Act

Consideration	Number of times consideration used ¹	Percentage of total
Overriding secrecy laws	3	1.4
Cabinet information	2	1.0
Executive Council information	0	0
Contempt	0	0
Legal professional privilege	11	5.4
Excluded information	9	4.4
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	2	1.0
Transport safety	0	0
Adoption	0	0
Care and protection of children	177	86.8
Ministerial code of conduct	0	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0	0
Privilege generally Sch 1(5A)	0	0
Information provided to High Risk Offenders Assessment Committee	0	0
Total	204	100

1. More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table 5.

Table 5: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the GIPA Act

Consideration	Number of times consideration used	Percentage of total
Responsible and effective government	310	30.8
Law enforcement and security	135	13.4
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	504	50
Business interests of agencies and other persons	24	2.4
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0	0
Secrecy provisions	31	3.1
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	3	0.3
Total	1,007	100

Table 6: Timeliness

Timeframe	Number of applications	Percentage of total
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	1,699	86
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	270	13.6
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	8	0.4
Total	1,977¹	100

1. Total number completed during the reporting period, noting some applications were carried forward to 2020–21.

Table 7: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the GIPA Act (by type of review and outcome)

Type of review	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total	Percentage of total
Internal review	13	19	32	53.4
Review by Information Commissioner ¹	4	11	15	25
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of the GIPA Act	3	2	5	8.3
Review by NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT)	1	7	8	13.3
Total	21	39	60	100
Percentage of total	35	65	100	–

1. The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table 8: Applications for review under Part 5 of the GIPA Act (by type of applicant)

Type of applicant	Number of applications for review	Percentage of total
Applications by access applicants	59	98.3
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the GIPA Act)	1	1.7
Total	60	100

Table 9: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the GIPA Act

Type of transfer	Number of applications for transferred	Percentage of total
Agency-initiated transfers	105	73.5
Applicant-initiated transfers	38	26.5
Total	143	100

Ministerial reporting (Point 5)

Each agency referred to in Schedule 3 to this Regulation (the subsidiary agency) is declared to be part of and included in the parent agency specified in Schedule 3

The regulation was updated on 31 August 2018 to correctly reflect subsidiary agencies under their parent agency (as specified in Schedule 3).

NSW Ministers

A Minister's office is classified as a separate agency under the GIPA Act and under section 125(2) of the Act is required to comply with GIPA reporting requirements. Statistics for formal applications received by these agencies are provided in the table below.

These statistics cover the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020. They were provided to DCJ and collated for publication in DCJ's annual report as required by section 125(3) of the GIPA Act.

GIPA applications received: 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

The following table relates only to GIPA Act applications received by the Minister or his/her office in his/her capacity as Minister and NOT the Department.

New South Wales Ministers

Name	Position	Entries
The Hon. Gladys Berejiklian MP	Premier of NSW	Entries recorded
The Hon. John Barilaro MP	Deputy Premier Minister for Regional New South Wales, Industry and Trade	Entries recorded
The Hon. Dominic Perrottet MP	Treasurer	Entries recorded
The Hon. Paul Toole MP	Minister for Regional Transport and Roads	Nil
The Hon. Don Harwin MLC	Special Minister of State Minister for the Public Service and Employee Relations, Aboriginal Affairs, and the Arts	Entries recorded
The Hon. Mark Speakman MP	Attorney General, and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence	Nil
The Hon. Damien Tudehope MLC	Minister for Finance and Small Business	Nil
The Hon. Brad Hazzard MP	Minister for Health and Medical Research	Entries recorded
The Hon. Rob Stokes MP	Minister for Planning and Public Spaces	Entries recorded
The Hon. Victor Dominello MP	Minister for Customer Service	Entries recorded
The Hon. Andrew Constance MP	Minister for Transport and Roads	Entries recorded
The Hon. Sarah Mitchell MLC	Minister for Education and Early Childhood Learning	Entries recorded
The Hon. David Elliott MP	Minister for Police and Emergency Services	Entries recorded
The Hon. Melinda Pavey MP	Minister for Water, Property and Housing	Entries recorded
The Hon. Stuart Ayres MP	Minister for Jobs, Investment and Tourism Minister for Western Sydney	Entries recorded
The Hon. Matt Kean MP	Minister for Energy and Environment	Entries recorded
The Hon. Adam Marshall MP	Minister for Agriculture and Western New South Wales	Entries recorded
The Hon. Anthony Roberts MP	Minister for Counter Terrorism and Corrections	Entries recorded
The Hon. Shelley Hancock MP	Minister for Local Government	Entries recorded
The Hon. Kevin Anderson MP	Minister for Better Regulation and Innovation	Entries recorded
The Hon. Dr Geoffrey Lee MP	Minister for Skills and Tertiary Education	Nil
The Hon. Dr Geoffrey Lee MP	Acting Minister for Sport, Multiculturalism, Seniors and Veterans	Entries recorded
The Hon. Bronwyn Taylor MLC	Minister for Mental Health, Regional Youth and Women	Nil
The Hon. Gareth Ward MP	Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services	Nil

The Hon. Gladys Berejiklian MP
 Premier
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 9

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	1	2	0	6	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	1
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	9
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	9

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	1	0	1
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	1	0	1
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	2	0	2

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	1
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. John Barilaro MP
Deputy Premier, Minister for Regional New South Wales, Industry and Trade
Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 5

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	2
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	2
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	1

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	4
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	1
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	5

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Dominic Perrottet MP
Treasurer
Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 1

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	1
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	1

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Paul Toole MP
 Minister for Regional Transport and Roads
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 0

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	0
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	0

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Don Harwin MLC
Special Minister of State, Minister for the Public Service and Employee Relations,
Aboriginal Affairs, and the Arts
Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 4

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	4
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	4

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	1	0	1
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	1	0	1

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	1
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Mark Speakman MP
 Attorney General, and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 0

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	0
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	0

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Damien Tudehope MLC
 Minister for Finance and Small Business
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 0

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	0
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	0

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Brad Hazzard MP
 Minister for Health and Medical Research
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 3

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 1

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is 1

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	1
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	1
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	1

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	1
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	1
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	3
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	3

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	1
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Rob Stokes MP
 Minister for Planning and Public Spaces
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 7

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 1

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 1

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	1
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	1
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	4
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	3
Business interests of agencies and other persons	1
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	6
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	1
Total	7

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	1	0	1
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	1	0	1
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	2	0	2

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	2
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Victor Dominello MP
 Minister for Customer Service
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 2

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but not including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 2

Total number of access applications that were refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused wholly on that basis is 1

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused partly on that basis is: 1

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	1
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	1
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	1
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	2
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	2

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	1
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Andrew Constance MP
 Minister for Transport and Roads
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is: 7

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is 1

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 1

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	1
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	3
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	3
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	3

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	1
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	3
Business interests of agencies and other persons	1
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	7
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	7

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	1	1
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	1	1
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	2	2

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	1
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	1
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Sarah Mitchell MLC
 Minister for Education and Early Childhood Learning
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 4

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but not including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 3

Total number of access applications that were refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused wholly on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused partly on that basis is: 3

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	1
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	2
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	1
Law enforcement and security	1
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	3
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	3
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	1
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	4

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	3
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. David Elliott MP
 Minister for Police and Emergency Services
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 3

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received in between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	1
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	3
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	3

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions, but can make recommendation to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Melinda Pavey MP
 Minister for Water, Property and Housing
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 3

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but not including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused wholly on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused partly on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	2
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	2 (1 withdrawn)

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Stuart Ayres MP
 Minister for Jobs, Investment, Tourism and Western Sydney
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 5

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but not including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused wholly on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused partly on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	2	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	1
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	1
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	5
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	5

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Matthew Kean MP
 Minister for Energy and Environment
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 2

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but not including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 1

Total number of access applications that were refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused wholly on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused partly on that basis is: 1

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	1
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	1
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	1
Total	2

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Adam Marshall MP
 Minister for Agriculture and Western New South Wales
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 2

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but not including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused wholly on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused partly on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	2
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	2

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Anthony Roberts MP
 Minister for Counter Terrorism and Corrections
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 4

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 1

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 1

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	1
Executive Council information	1
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	4
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	4

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	1	1
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	1	1

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	1
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Shelley Hancock MP
 Minister for Local Government
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 1

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but not including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused wholly on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused partly on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	1
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	1

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	1
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Kevin Anderson MP
 Minister for Better Regulation and Innovation
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is: 1

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information

Total number of access applications that were refused, **either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	1
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	1

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Dr Geoff Lee MP
 Minister for Skills and Tertiary Education
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 0

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but not including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were refused, either wholly or partly, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused wholly on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused partly on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	0
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	0

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Dr Geoff Lee MP
 Acting Minister for Sport, Multiculturalism, Seniors and Veterans
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 2

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 1

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 1

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	1
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	2
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	2

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Bronwyn Taylor MLC
 Minister for Mental Health, Regional Youth and Women
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 0

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	0
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	0

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

The Hon. Gareth Ward MP
 Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services
 Reporting period 1 July 2019 – 30 June 2020

Number of access applications received 0

Total number of applications (including withdrawn or transferred applications but **not** including invalid applications) received between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 is:

Number of refused applications for Schedule 1 information 0

Total number of access applications that were **refused, either wholly or partly**, because the application was for the disclosure of information in Schedule 1 of the Act (information for which there is conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure) is:

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **wholly** on that basis is: 0

Of the applications refused, the number that were refused **partly** on that basis is: 0

Table A: Number of applications by type of applicant and outcome*

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of Parliament	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Private sector business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not-for-profit organisations or community groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (application by legal representative)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Members of the public (other)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* More than one decision can be made in respect of a particular access application. If so, a recording must be made in relation to each such decision. This also applies to Table B.

Table B: Number of applications by type of application and outcome

	Access granted in full	Access granted in part	Access refused in full	Information not held	Information already available	Refuse to deal with application	Refuse to confirm/deny whether information is held	Application withdrawn
Personal information applications*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications (other than personal information applications)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Access applications that are partly personal information applications and partly other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* A personal information application is an access application for personal information (as defined in clause 4 of Schedule 4 to the Act) about the applicant (the applicant being an individual).

Table C: Invalid applications

Reason for invalidity	Number of applications
Application does not comply with formal requirements (section 41 of the Act)	0
Application is for excluded information of the agency (section 43 of the Act)	0
Application contravenes restraint order (section 110 of the Act)	0
Total number of invalid applications received	0
Invalid applications that subsequently became valid applications	0

Table D: Conclusive presumption of overriding public interest against disclosure: matters listed in Schedule 1 of the Act

	Number of times consideration used*
Overriding secrecy laws	0
Cabinet information	0
Executive Council information	0
Contempt	0
Legal professional privilege	0
Excluded information	0
Documents affecting law enforcement and public safety	0
Transport safety	0
Adoption	0
Care and protection of children	0
Ministerial code of conduct	0
Aboriginal and environmental heritage	0

* More than one public interest consideration may apply in relation to a particular access application and, if so, each such consideration is to be recorded (but only once per application). This also applies in relation to Table E.

Table E: Other public interest considerations against disclosure: matters listed in table to section 14 of the Act

	Number of occasions when application not successful
Responsible and effective government	0
Law enforcement and security	0
Individual rights, judicial processes and natural justice	0
Business interests of agencies and other persons	0
Environment, culture, economy and general matters	0
Secrecy provisions	0
Exempt documents under interstate Freedom of Information legislation	0

Table F: Timeliness

	Number of applications
Decided within the statutory timeframe (20 days plus any extensions)	0
Decided after 35 days (by agreement with applicant)	0
Not decided within time (deemed refusal)	0
Total	0

Table G: Number of applications reviewed under Part 5 of the Act (by type of review and outcome)

	Decision varied	Decision upheld	Total
Internal review	0	0	0
Review by Information Commissioner*	0	0	0
Internal review following recommendation under section 93 of Act	0	0	0
Review by NCAT	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0

* The Information Commissioner does not have the authority to vary decisions but can make recommendations to the original decision-maker. The data in this case indicates that a recommendation to vary or uphold the original decision has been made by the Information Commissioner.

Table H: Applications for review under Part 5 of the Act (by type of applicant)

	Number of applications for review
Applications by access applicants	0
Applications by persons to whom information the subject of access application relates (see section 54 of the Act)	0

Table I: Applications transferred to other agencies under Division 2 of Part 4 of the Act (by type of transfer)

	Number of applications transferred
Agent-initiated transfers	0
Applicant-initiated transfers	0

3.4.4 Consumer response

DCJ recognises that the effective management of feedback and complaints is critical to service delivery and improvement. It provides us with an opportunity to address concerns and issues to create an environment of accountability and transparency in service delivery.

Community Services

The Enquiry Feedback and Complaints Unit (EFCU) provides a centralised intake and referral point for feedback relating to child protection services, including funded NGOs.

EFCU operates 9.00am–4.30pm Monday to Friday. The unit can be contacted via telephone (1800 000 164), online, post or email complaints@dcj.nsw.gov.au. EFCU aims to resolve complaints within 20 working days, although some complex issues may take longer.

During 2019–20, EFCU managed 10,759 contacts from clients and stakeholders. This resulted in 460 (4 per cent) formal complaints for review, a 1 per cent reduction from the previous year. Complaints related to service access, processes or procedures (202), communication (100), service quality/delivery (93), staff behaviour (63) and other feedback (2).

EFCU continued to focus on building cooperation and facilitating reconciliation between dissatisfied clients and Community Services; 96 per cent of communication was resolved at first contact by the unit by providing relevant advice or immediate resolutions to requests.

Housing Services

The Housing Contact Centre Client Feedback Unit (CFU) provides a centralised intake and referral point for feedback and complaints relating to NSW government housing services. This includes Housing NSW, the Land & Housing Corporation and funded Community Housing providers.

CFU operates in the spirit of minimising client effort by providing one readily accessible unit to process a range of requests for clients and stakeholders. CFU staff are available via telephone (1800 422 322) 9.00am–4.30pm, Monday to Friday. Alternatively, clients are able to submit online feedback, send a letter or email feedback@dcj.nsw.gov.au.

Initiatives across housing services continued to focus on increased communication with clients and improving the timeliness of service requests. During 2019–20, CFU managed 35,643 contacts from clients and stakeholders; 3,653 (10 per cent) of these contacts were formal complaints, a 5 per cent reduction from the previous year.

The majority of contacts related to clients requesting a maintenance or tenancy service. Complaints primarily related to service quality and delivery (1,378), service requests and referrals (1,032), service access, processes or procedures (974), and behaviour of staff (269).

Corrective Services NSW

Minister and Commissioner

In 2019–20, 748 written complaints to the Minister and Commissioner were registered. The highest number of complaints related to visits, property and unfair treatment of inmates.

The majority of complaints are received from inmates, family and friends of inmates, solicitors and the NSW Ombudsman. Complaints from the general public concerning the construction of new or expanded correctional centres were also received.

Official Visitors

Official Visitors are community representatives, appointed by the Minister for Counter Terrorism and Corrections to visit correctional facilities. Their role is to facilitate the resolution of enquiries and complaints made by inmates and staff, and to report on the condition of centres.

The majority of enquiries are resolved through discussion with centre management and medical, education, welfare, programs or administration staff.

Official Visitors provide a combined written report to the Commissioner of Corrective Services, the Minister for Counter Terrorism and Corrections and the Inspector of Custodial Services every six months.

Corrective Services Support Line (CSSL)

In 2019–20, the CSSL answered 12,111 telephone calls from inmates. This was an increase of 24 per cent on the number received in 2018–19 (9,753).

Of the calls answered in 2019–20, there were 2,509 (21 per cent) recorded as complaints, compared to 2,625 (27 per cent) of the calls in 2018–19. The category 'medical issues' received the highest number of complaints (368). The CSSL also received a high number of complaints about property, placement, money and phone.

The category 'phone' received the highest number of enquiries (1,034). The 'phone' enquiries were mostly inmates seeking instructions on how to make a personal call. The CSSL also received a high number of enquiries about court matters, parole/release, sentence details, money, classification, and medical issues.

Feedback Assist

In 2019–20, through the Feedback Assist complaints management system, CSNSW received 10 complaints and one compliment. Most of the complaints were about visits to NSW correctional centres; the compliment was about a staff member.

Corrective Services NSW General Enquiries email box

In 2019–20 the General Enquiries email box, which is available on the landing page of the CSNSW website, received 1,700 emails. They comprised 1,609 general enquiries, 56 complaints, eight suggestions and 28 compliments. All consumer responses to the CSNSW General Enquiries email box were responded to in a timely manner.

Courts, Tribunals and Service Delivery

The Courts, Tribunals and Service Delivery Division received 837 complaints in 2019–20.

Superior Courts

In 2019–20 the Superiors Courts received 10 complaints. Complaints related to Supreme Court registry services (2), directions or decisions made in the Land and Environment Court (5), and directions or decisions made in the Industrial Relations Commission (3).

NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal

In 2019–20 the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT) received 462 complaints. The number of complaints received by NCAT was less than 0.7 per cent of all matters lodged. Categories of complaints received during the year included decision dissatisfaction, member or conciliator conduct, timeliness of outcomes, and complaints about policy and procedure.

Court Services

Court Services receives complaints for the Local Court, District Court, Sheriff's Office and Dust Diseases Tribunal.

In 2019–20 Court Services received 162 complaints, comprising complaints related to service (58), policy or procedure (3), costs (4) and other issues (97). Other issues comprise complaints that are not related to the key categories of service, policy/procedure or costs and are predominantly complaints related to court outcomes, sentencing decisions and court maintenance.

Victims Services

Victims Services receives three types of complaints – complaints about services, complaints about an Approved Counsellor engaged under the Approved Counselling Services, and complaints relating to the Charter of Victims Rights. Under the *Victims Rights and Support Act 2013* the Commissioner of Victims Rights is responsible for overseeing and promoting the Charter, of Victims Rights, including compliance by government and government-funded agencies.

In 2019–20, Victims Services received 192 complaints. Complaints related to services (109), Approved Counsellors engaged under the Approved Counselling Services (35), and Charter complaints (48).

Alternative Dispute Resolution and Community Justice Centres

In 2019–20, Community Justice Centres (CJCs) received 11 complaints. Categories of complaints received during the year included access to service (IT issues); staff/mediator knowledge, skills and ethics; legal authority of a CJC; and appropriateness of court referral to a CJC.

Office for Veterans Affairs

In 2019–20, the NSW Office for Veterans Affairs (OVA) received no complaints with respect to the services delivered by the OVA. However, they did receive a number of questions and complaints from veterans regarding concession entitlements in NSW, which are the responsibility of Transport for NSW.

Services improved/changed in response to complaints/suggestions

NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal

NCAT uses the complaints process to improve internal procedures, the NCAT website and other publications and to identify training gaps for staff and members. For example, following feedback the NCAT Hearing Lists link is now included on the Courts Lists website. NCAT also reviewed and improved the wording in its money order communication to parties to reflect the NSW online registry process, to make it easier for parties to know what steps to take to enforce their money order.

Alternative Dispute Resolution and Community Justice Centres

In 2019–20, the Alternative Dispute Resolution Centres and CJCs:

- established an internal SLA to improve timelines for court referred matters to minimise adjournment requests
- improved staff rostering processes to increase the number of staff available to answer calls; where calls cannot be answered, voicemail messages are cleared twice daily to ensure the Case Coordinator is able to act in a more timely manner to respond to client message
- revised the unsuitability assessment framework to provide clarity for staff and clients, including producing a detailed factsheet.

Office for Veterans Affairs

The OVA recognised that information about transport and other concessions and programs available in NSW was not easily accessible to veterans, so it led a project with the Department of Customer Service and Transport for NSW to develop a dedicated veterans page on the Service NSW website. It is a one stop shop bringing together information on programs, services and concessions available to veterans in NSW. The page went live prior to Anzac Day 2020 and was designed specifically for veterans and tested by them to ensure the best possible user experience. This initiative was designed to help veterans transition from military to civilian life and to assist with their cost of living expenses. All veterans are able to use this page to test their eligibility for available services, programs and concessions. This will help to reduce the number of complaints, questions and concerns received by the OVA.

Victims Services

In 2019–20, Victims Services:

- reviewed feedback categories to be consistent between complaints and surveys to accurately capture all feedback to determine areas of improvement (in progress)
- updated complaint handling procedures (in progress)
- conducted root cause analyses with Victims Services staff in August and November 2019 to determine quality improvement areas
- changed telephone access processes for clients and counsellors.

Youth Justice NSW

In 2019–20, there was a total of 59 complaints received by Youth Justice. Complaints related to service (33), policy/procedure (24) and other feedback (2); of these, 53 complaints were from young people and six were from family members.

In 2019–20, 77 per cent of complaints were resolved within 48 hours, 21 per cent within three weeks and two per cent within four weeks.

Youth Justice has clear complaints handling procedures. Internal and external oversight mechanisms are also in place to monitor and ensure appropriate treatment of young people, including the protection of their rights under international conventions and NSW legislative frameworks.

Young people in Youth Justice facilities are able to make complaints to external agencies as well as internally through the complaints system. These external agencies include:

- **Official Visitors** – Official Visitors are community representatives, appointed by the Minister for Counter Terrorism and Corrections to visit Youth Justice centres. Their role is to facilitate the resolution of enquiries and complaints made by young people and staff, and to report on the condition of centres.
- **NSW Ombudsman** – Young people can contact the NSW Ombudsman to make a complaint about their treatment while in Youth Justice custody. The NSW Ombudsman visits youth justice centres regularly to ensure that young people have the opportunity to make a complaint that is external to the Youth Justice complaints process.

DCJ – Feedback Assist

In 2019–20 the Feedback Assist complaints management system was available on 36 DCJ public-facing websites. During the year, there were 4,812 cases received via the Feedback Assist widget: 1,787 complaints, 1,994 compliments, 235 enquiries and 796 suggestions.

3.4.5 Research and development

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
COVID-19 pandemic and crime trends in NSW	Examines changes in crime in NSW in the six-week period (15 March – 26 April 2020) following the implementation of social distancing strategies to mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic. Published June 2020.	N/A ¹	Completed
Has domestic violence increased in NSW in the wake of COVID-19 social distancing and isolation? Update to April 2020	Monitors changes in the incidences and patterns of domestic violence in NSW related to the unprecedented societal changes in response to the global COVID-19 pandemic. Published May 2020.		Completed
Monitoring changes in domestic violence in the wake of COVID-19 social isolation measures	Monitors changes in the incidence of domestic violence in NSW in light of the unprecedented societal changes in response to the global COVID-19 pandemic. Published April 2020.		Completed
An update of long-term trends in property and violent crime in New South Wales: 1990–2019	Analyses trends in the rates of annual recorded incidents of 10 categories of property and violent crime for the period 1990 to 2019 in NSW. Published March 2020.		Completed
NSW trends in the age-specific rates of offending, 1995–2018	Describes the trends in age-specific rates of offending in NSW for break and enter, motor vehicle theft, robbery and serious non-domestic assault from 1995 to 2018. Published October 2019.		Completed
The effect of lockout and last drinks laws on non-domestic assaults in Sydney: an update to March 2019	Assesses the long-term effects of the 2014 NSW liquor law reforms on levels of violence in the inner-city Sydney area. Published August 2019.		Completed
Youth on Track randomised controlled trial: process evaluation	Determines whether the Youth on Track randomised controlled trial is being implemented as intended and whether there are any unexpected consequences of the trial. Published August 2019.		Completed
Circle Sentencing, incarceration and recidivism	Examines the relationship between Circle Sentencing (CS) and the likelihood of incarceration and recidivism. Published April 2020.		Completed

1. These research reports and statistical reporting products were prepared by internal resources by BOCSAR. The full-year budget for BOCSAR in 2019-20 was \$4,144,098.

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
The long-term effect of routine police activity on property and violent crime in NSW, Australia	Examines the long-term effect of two routine police activities on property and violent crime in NSW. Published November 2019.	N/A ¹	Completed
Crime, deterrence and punishment revisited	Shows that the criminal justice system exerts a large influence on crime activity. Published September 2019.		Completed
Can pre-recorded evidence raise conviction rates in cases of domestic violence (DV)?	Follows up on the initial short-term evaluation and determines whether or not the presence of a Domestic Violence Evidence in Chief (DVEC) statement raises the probability of a conviction in cases of DV assault. Published August 2019.		Completed
Public confidence in the New South Wales criminal justice system: 2019 update	This study examines the level of public confidence in the NSW criminal justice system in 2019, explores confidence levels across different segments of the population, and documents changes in public confidence, punitiveness and knowledge from 2007 to 2019. Published June 2020.		Completed
Predicting repeat domestic and family violence in NSW: improving the accuracy of the Domestic Violence Safety Assessment Tool (DVSAT)	An evaluation of the predictive accuracy of DV risk assessment tools, including the current tool used by the NSW Police (i.e. DVSAT). This research will attempt to identify ways to improve the reliability of the DVSAT in predicting which domestic violence victims will be most at risk of future harm.		In progress
Evaluation of the Bail Assistance Line	An examination of the operation of the Bail Assistance Line in NSW, including its reach and geographical dispersion, the characteristics of the young persons it places and its impact on the likelihood of incarceration and recidivism.		In progress
What factors influence police and court bail decisions?	This study identifies factors associated with the probability that the police refuse bail, and factors associated with the probability that the courts refuse bail. This work also considers whether these factors differ for young people and adults.		In progress
Outcome evaluation of Youth on Track (YoT)	An outcome evaluation of the YoT Randomised Control Trial. This study examines whether participation in YoT impacts recidivism rates of young people and other social outcomes such as education and employment.		In progress

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
An evaluation of the Suspect Target Management Plan	An evaluation of the impact of a NSW Police program (called the Suspect Target Management Plan) on recidivism and the probability of imprisonment. Due to be published in October 2020.	N/A ¹	In progress
An evaluation of the DC7 reforms	An evaluation of the effect of hiring seven additional District Court judges on reducing backlog in the District Court.		In progress
An evaluation of the Early Appropriate Guilty Plea (EAGP) reforms	Evaluates the impact of the Early Appropriate Guilty Plea reforms on various court efficiency measures. Both a process and an outcome evaluation are being undertaken. Due to be completed in April 2021.		In progress
An Evaluation of the Mandatory Alcohol Interlock Program (MAIP)	This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of MAIP, a program that enables breath test devices to be installed in the vehicle of an offender convicted of drink driving. The study will consider the impact of MAIP on various criminal justice and road safety outcomes.		In progress
The impact of the Practice Guide for Intervention (PGI) on recidivism among parolees	A study investigating the impact of the PGI on reoffending among high-risk parolees in comparison with offenders released from prison unconditionally in NSW. Due to be published in September 2020.		
The impact of PGI on recidivism among community-based orders	A study investigating the impact of the PGI on reoffending between supervised and unsupervised offenders serving a community-based order (specifically, either a good behaviour bond or a suspended sentence). Due to be published in September 2020.		In progress
Social impact investment and recidivism: Evaluating the On TRACC program	An evaluation of the effectiveness of the On TRACC social impact investment in reducing recidivism among high-risk parolees compared to existing supervision services. Due to be published in December 2020.		In progress
Traineeships, vocational training, and recidivism	A study exploring the relationship between participating in a prison-based traineeship program on post-release recidivism.		In progress
Estimating the impact of audio-visual link on being granted bail	This study estimates the causal impact of appearing via AVL on the defendants' likelihood of being granted bail, when compared with those that appeared in person.		In progress

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
The impact of High Intensity Program Units on reoffending	The aim of this study is to estimate the impact of completing a behaviour change intervention at a High Intensity Program Unit on the likelihood of reoffending, relative to the counterfactual of not receiving any program while they are incarcerated.	N/A ¹	In progress
The impact of the 'What's Your Plan?' intervention on ADVO breaches and reoffending	This study reports the results of a quasi-experimental evaluation of the 'What's your Plan' intervention implemented by the Aboriginal Services Unit, looking at the impact that the program had on reoffending and breaches of ADVOs.		In progress
The long-term effect of the NSW Drug Court on recidivism	A joint study between BOCSAR and the National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre that extends a 2008 evaluation of the NSW Drug Court. It aims to assess whether the Drug Court has any long-term positive effect on reoffending. Due to be published in September 2020.		In progress
Evaluating the first tranche of the Table Offences reform	To examine the impact of the first tranche of the Table Offences reform on court finalisations and sentencing outcomes. Due to be published in October 2020.		In progress
NSW sentencing reforms: results from a survey of judicial officers	This study aims to assess whether the NSW sentencing reforms introduced in 2018 are operating as intended and to identify any impediments to implementation. Due to be published in August 2020.		In progress
The impact of the NSW sentencing reforms on supervised community orders and short-term prison sentences	This research examines whether the 2018 sentencing reforms (1) increased the proportion of offenders sentenced to supervised community-based orders and (2) reduced the proportion of offenders serving short-term prison sentences. Due to be published in August 2020.		In progress
Pathways of Care Longitudinal Study (POCLS)	The POCLS examines the risk and protective factors influencing the outcomes of children and young people in out-of-home care (OOHC).		\$1,366,000
NSW Child Development Study	This research partnership with the University of NSW is a longitudinal population study of the mental health and wellbeing of a cohort of NSW children.	\$110,000	In progress

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Achieving better mental health for maltreated children: translating population data into policy	A research partnership with the University of NSW that uses the NSW Child Development Study dataset to assist DCJ in the review of inter-agency referral services, to promote timely and efficient risk determination and resource allocation at the earliest time in child protection reporting processes.	\$100,000	In progress
45 and up study	More than a quarter of a million people – one in 10 in NSW – are participants in the 45 and up study, the largest ongoing study of health ageing in the southern hemisphere. It is a world-class resource that can be used to boost our understanding of how Australians are ageing.	\$25,000 ²	In progress
Evaluation of the men's behaviour change program (MBCP) pilots	An evaluation was undertaken by the University of NSW between May 2017 and October 2019 to review the implementation process and outcomes of the MBCP pilots.	\$233,400	Completed
Evaluation of Tackling Violence	Women NSW engaged ARTD Consultants to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the Tackling Violence program.	\$100,000	Completed
Evaluation of the Innovation Fund Round 2	DCJ has engaged KPMG to undertake an independent evaluation of 12 of the 13 funded programs under Round 2 of the Innovation Fund to inform future policy and program development.	\$1,035,600	In progress
Evaluation of WDVCS Case Management	The Parenting Research Centre (PRC), in partnership with the University of Sydney and Deakin University, was commissioned by DCJ to evaluate case management services at the Wagga Wagga and Macarthur Women's Domestic Violence Court Advocacy Services (WDVCAS).	\$59,900	Completed
Evaluation of NSW Domestic and Family Violence Blueprint for Reform	KPMG was engaged by Women NSW to evaluate the <i>Domestic and Family Violence Blueprint for Reform 2016-2021: Safer lives for women, men and children</i> (the Blueprint). The purpose of the evaluation was to assess implementation of the Blueprint, progress on outcomes, and how the approach could be strengthened into the future. The final report was published online in August 2020.	\$253,300	Completed

2. From Women NSW budget

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Mapping Networks and Narratives of Online Right-Wing Extremists in New South Wales	Led by Macquarie University's Department of Security Studies and Criminology, in collaboration with academics from Victoria University and experts from the non-government sector. The aim of the research was to consider the nature of the online Right-Wing Extremist (RWE) environment in NSW, how themes and narratives are framed in different online contexts to mobilise support, and the level of risk posed by the online RWE environment.	\$180,177	In progress
Evaluation of the Housing Assistance Support Initiative (HASI) and HASI-Plus programs	Evaluations of the HASI and HASI-Plus programs – state-wide programs funded by the NSW Ministry of Health (MOH) to provide housing and other support to people who have a severe mental illness.		In progress
A study of Birth Family Contact for children in the NSW child protection system	A PhD research project with Western Sydney University that examines current contact visits between birth parents and children who are in OOHCC placements following statutory child protection intervention.		In progress
Practices of giving due weight to the views of children and young people in OOHCC policy making in Australia	A qualitative PhD research project with Southern Cross University (SCU) which aims to understand the policy-making practices associated with giving due weight to the views of children and young people who have been in OOHCC.	\$0 ³	In progress
Mental Health Disorders and Cognitive Disability Databank (MHDCCD) – Update	A research partnership with the University of NSW that provides data from across DCJ to update the MHDCCD databank.		In progress
Seeding Success	A data linkage with the University of NSW that aims to identify health factors that predict developmental vulnerability and to generate evidence about the characteristics of services and programs that improve outcomes for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal children.		In progress

3. Where research, development or evaluation projects have \$0 against the budget, this indicates that the support provided by FACSIAR is either in kind support or provision of administrative data only. This research can include those funded by external grants, such as an Australia Research Council grant, which is funded by other NSW Government departments, PhD student research or other academic projects. We may have funded part of the project in the past but the research has now gained funding from other sources.

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Early parenthood and out-of-home care: placements, services, and supports	A PhD research project with the University of Sydney that examines young parents with lived experience of OOHC and foster/kinship carers' and frontline practitioners' perceptions of the availability, nature and extent of support available within different types of OOHC placements for adolescent mothers and their young children.	\$0 ³	In progress
How Children's Courts make Decisions about Children	A research partnership with the University of Sydney examining how Children's Courts use the evidence and assessments provided by caseworkers, clinicians and other professionals when determining child protection cases.		In progress
Removals of infants by the child protection system: examining their nature, extent and impact to guide prevention and early intervention	A research partnership with the Australian Catholic University that aims to increase knowledge about the nature, extent and impact of the removal of infants and newborns from their mothers.		In progress
Treating substance use and traumatic stress among adolescents	A research partnership with the University of Sydney that is the world's first randomised controlled trial of an integrated treatment for co-occurring post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and substance use disorder among adolescents aged 12-18 years.		In progress
Predicting and preventing child removals and optimising the child protection system for Aboriginal children in partnership with Aboriginal communities and health services	A research partnership with the University of Melbourne that aims to identify factors that will help reduce the number of Aboriginal children going into OOHC and ways to better support families at risk, children in care and kinship carers.		In progress
Mandatory Reporters	A qualitative study that aims to reduce over-reporting and under-reporting by mandatory reporters by developing and evaluating a learning task to complement existing training programs.		In progress
Aboriginal Dispute Resolution Models for Indigenous Justice	A qualitative study that aims to examine the Aboriginal Care Circle Program in Lismore and Nowra as a culturally appropriate alternative to the formal court process.		In progress

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Needs of pregnant women and new mothers with a history of current injecting drug use	A qualitative study that investigates whether healthcare and social services are meeting the needs and expectations of, and providing support for, women who are pregnant or have a new baby and have a recent history of injecting drug use by interviewing DCJ staff that work closely with this group.	\$0 ³	In progress
Sexual exploitation of children in OOHC	A comparative study of practice between young people at risk of child sexual exploitation (CSE) and the professionals working with them in the OOHC context.		In progress
A place-based model for Aboriginal community-led solutions to complex health and social issues	This study aims to address a gap in knowledge of how Aboriginal Cultural Community Organisations and the holistic models they develop contribute to the social health and wellbeing of Aboriginal people.		In progress
Lived experience of administrative legal change for a cohort of persons with intellectual disability who were institutionalised (Watt St, Newcastle)	A qualitative research project that aims to identify and examine the lived outcomes of administrative interventions on a group of individuals with intellectual disabilities who went into full-time state care as children at Newcastle Mental Hospital, NSW.		Completed
African Communities and the Child Protection System in Australia	A mixed-design study that investigates specific cultural beliefs, values, attitudes, practices and experiences within the various African communities in Western Sydney that influence parenting practices to inform the development and implementation of culturally effective early intervention strategies.		In progress
Lost in Transition: supporting young people with complex support needs	Australian Research Council (ARC) Linkage research project with the University of NSW that aimed to audit and evaluate current approaches to supporting young people with an intellectual disability in three jurisdictions (NSW, Vic and Qld), with a specific focus on support services available for young people transitioning into or from OOHC, Youth Justice or educational placements. Paper has been produced.		In progress
Review of Safer Pathway Referral Expansion Pilot Phase 3	The scope of Phase 3 included piloting a Safer Pathway referral approach with three non-statutory service providers in Nowra and five in Wagga Wagga from 18 August 2019 to 18 February 2020.		Completed

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Review of Automatic Referral Pathway (ARP)	The purpose of this review was to improve service delivery for men who use violence in their intimate and family relationships and facilitate behaviour change in persons of interest.	\$0 ³	In progress
Evaluation of EQUIPS treatment pathways for domestic violence offenders in NSW	This project examined characteristics of the EQUIPS treatment pathways delivered to DV offenders by CSNSW, to compare the effectiveness of EQUIPS treatment pathways by identifying the relationship between participation in different EQUIPS programs and reoffending outcomes among DV offenders.	N/A ⁴	Completed
Process evaluation of the Practice Guide for Intervention (PGI): staff experiences of implementation and continuing service delivery	This study sought to gain a clearer understanding of the process of implementation of the PGI by CSNSW, and explore the experiences of NSW Community Corrections Officers (CCOs) in their ongoing use of the PGI with offenders.		Completed
Process evaluation of the Practice Guide for Intervention (PGI): staff perceptions of community supervision in the context of change	This study sought to explore how NSW CCOs perceive and deliver the aims, core functions and activities of community supervision in the context of implementation of the PGI.		Completed
Effectiveness of the Initial Transitional Support (ITS) service 2014-2017	This study sought to evaluate the impact of the ITS service, a 12-week reintegration support service for priority offenders under community supervision, on recidivism outcomes.		Completed
Maintaining Safety in the Prison Environment: a Multilevel Analysis of Inmate Victimization in Assaults	Theoretical models of victimisation emphasise the importance of context. However, few studies have assessed the influence of prison environmental variables on inmate harm in physical assaults. This study used a multilevel model approach to examine individual- and facility-level factors associated with the incidence of assaults among inmates housed at correctional centres in NSW.		Completed
Desistance in an ageing inmate population: an examination of trends in age, assessed risk of recidivism and criminogenic needs	The NSW inmate population is ageing, and recent research suggests that this is associated with increasing representation of older inmates who are in active phases of persistent recidivism and reimprisonment (Howard & Corben, 2018; Stavrou, 2017).		Completed

4. Where projects have N/A expenditure, this indicates they were done internally by multiple staff members working on multiple projects simultaneously.

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Associations Between Parole Outcomes and Characteristics of People Under Supervision, Supervising Officer, and Supervising Office	Community-based supervision is a key feature of contemporary correctional practice, and, while it is often assumed that the supervising officer is the agent of change, few previous studies have considered the relative importance of the characteristics of either those under supervision or the supervising office.	\$15,000	Completed
Identifying the demographic, sentencing and criminogenic features of offenders entering the EQUIPS programs in custody and in the community	A briefing report intended to give an overview of the first stages of a process evaluation, conducted by the Matilda Centre for Research in Mental Health and Substance Use, the University of Sydney, into the EQUIPS program run by Corrective Services NSW for offenders in custody and in the community.	\$30,000	Completed
Permanency Support Program (PSP) evaluation – process/ implementation, outcome and economic evaluations	A consortium has been formed, led by the Centre for Evidence and Implementation, to conduct the evaluation.	\$231,000	In progress
Family Group Conferencing (FGC) evaluation – implementation, outcome, and economic evaluation	DCJ has been progressively implementing FGC as a statewide program. The aim of FGC is to assist vulnerable parents to identify supports and strengthen relationships in order to keep children safe and connected to their extended family.	\$130,000	In progress
LINKS Trauma Healing Services Evaluation (LINKS)	DCJ commissioned the Parenting Resource Centre (PRC) and their partners, the Cultural and Indigenous Research Centre and Deakin Health Economics, to conduct an independent evaluation of the LINKS program comprising process, outcomes and economic components.	\$218,873	Completed
OurSPACE	DCJ, Stronger Communities and Investment and Inclusion commissioned the University of NSW National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre (NDARC) to provide an independent evaluation of the OurSPACE program.	\$136,000	In progress
Multisystemic Therapy for Child Abuse and Neglect (MST-CAN) and Functional Family Therapy through Child Welfare (FFT-CW)	The Application of FFT-CW and MST-CAN to NSW: An early evaluation of processes, outcomes and economics.	\$114,875	Completed

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Institute of Open Adoption Studies	Funding to support a program of applied research related to permanency options for children, including open adoption for children from OOHC.	\$814,000	In progress
Fostering lifelong connections for children in out-of-home care: ARC Linkage Project	DCJ is a partner with the University of Sydney in this project, exploring how the OOHC sector can encourage positive interactions between children's birth and permanent care families.	\$30,000	In progress
Targeted Earlier Intervention (TEI) Program process, outcome and economic evaluation	The purpose of the evaluation is to measure the overall impact of the TEI program and build the local evidence base to inform program design and implementation.	\$0	In progress
Evaluation of the Supported Transition and Engagement Program (STEP)	The STEP evaluation seeks to determine the feasibility, effectiveness and economic benefit of STEP.	\$0 ⁵	In progress
NSW Brighter Futures SafeCare Trial	SafeCare is a highly structured, empirically supported parenting program for parents at risk for, or with a history of, child neglect or abuse.	\$124,448	In progress
Voices and Choices Trial in Brighter Futures	The Voices and Choices trial is a new model of support for vulnerable families based on the recommendations arising out of the 2016 Behaviour Insights Unit summary report, endorsed by the FACS Executive Board on 24 November 2016.	\$119,863	In progress
Nabu Demonstration Pilot formative evaluation	Indigenous Professional Services has been commissioned to undertake an evaluation which seeks to understand what is working, what needs improvement and lessons learnt while also ensuring that data collection is efficient and effective at demonstrating the Nabu programs impact.	\$150,000	In progress
Premiers Youth Initiative (PYI)	Initially developed in 2017 to deliver the PYI Continuous Quality Improvement and Evaluation.	\$51,818	In progress
Evaluation of the FACS Scholarships and the Social Housing Mentoring pilot programs	The Miller Group was engaged to deliver an evaluation of the FACS Scholarships and Social Housing Mentoring programs over two implementation periods (2016-2017 and 2017-2018).	\$59,250	Completed

5. Contract value is \$399,740 (GST inclusive) over four financial years, with six payment milestones. There were no payment milestones reached in 2019-20.

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Community Engagement research into improving the provision of specialist homelessness services for Aboriginal people in NSW	Aboriginal social change agency Cox Inall Ridgeway (CIR) was commissioned to lead a community engagement process and undertake related research which could progress DCJ's commitments to Aboriginal people, in relation to increasing the delivery of specialist homelessness services to Aboriginal people by Aboriginal people, and increasing the cultural competence of non-Aboriginal service providers.	\$150,000	Completed
Assertive Outreach (AO) Formative Evaluation	Dr Gregory Smith from Southern Cross University was engaged in June 2020 to undertake a client-focused qualitative evaluation of the AO pilot program in Tweed and Newcastle.	\$40,000	In progress
AHURI National Housing Research Program (NHRP)	Each year AHURI develops the NHRP research agenda. DCJ, among representatives of all State and Territory jurisdictions, is participating in a prioritisation process to nominate our preferred research projects out of AHURI's 2021 agenda.	\$1.179m	In progress
Evidence review of two priority vulnerable population groups	The Stronger Communities Investment Unit commissioned the University of Sydney to conduct a systematic evidence review.	\$69,057	Completed
Evidence bank development for two priority vulnerable groups	The Stronger Communities Investment Unit commissioned Western Sydney University to develop an evidence bank for two priority vulnerable groups.	\$136,364	In progress
Community attitudes survey on data sharing and privacy	The Stronger Communities Investment Unit commissioned Lonergan Research Pty Ltd to survey community attitudes towards the sharing and use of de-identified, linked government administrative data and protection of individual privacy.	\$45,455	In progress
Evidence review of Under 12 Cohort Initiative	The Stronger Communities Investment Unit undertook a qualitative review of the Under 12 Cohort Initiative.		Completed
Evidence review of Professional Individualised Care (PIC) pilot	The Stronger Communities Investment Unit undertook a qualitative review of the PIC pilot.	\$0 ⁶	Completed
Evidence review of Treatment Foster Care Oregon (TFCO) pilot	The Stronger Communities Investment Unit undertook a qualitative review of the TFCO pilot.		Completed

6. This work was performed by SCIU staff (i.e. utilising existing departmental resources).

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019–20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Universal Screening and Supports (USS) Evaluation	SPRC was engaged to deliver an evaluation of the USS program over the implementation period 2019–2022.	\$147,273	In progress
Sustaining Tenancies in Social Housing (STSH)	ARTD Consultants were engaged to deliver an evaluation of both the Sustaining Tenancies in Social Housing (STSH) and Tenancy Management Pilot (TMP) programs to ensure a robust evidence base about the outcomes achieved from the investment in both pilots.	\$116,250	In progress
Place Plans Interim Outcome Evaluation	Interim outcomes evaluation of Place Plans, an initiative designed to work in partnership with communities to develop and implement place-based approaches to strengthening social housing communities in disadvantaged estates.	\$0 ⁷	Completed
Place Plan Strategic Review	SGS Economics and Planning Pty Ltd was commissioned by DCJ to undertake a strategic review and provide advice on different options for continuation of the Place Plan program, an initiative designed to work in partnership with communities to develop and implement place-based approaches to strengthening social housing communities in disadvantaged estates.	\$120,000	Completed
Towards an effective practice model for youth detention in NSW	This ARC Linkage Project is being conducted by researchers from Monash, Swinburne and NSW universities.	\$26,198	In progress
Bail and Remand: Exiting Options for Young People Experiencing Homelessness	This project is being conducted by Yfoundations. The project aims to examine appropriate options for young people who are unable to meet bail conditions due to homelessness, or may experience homelessness upon discharge from Youth Justice.	\$0 ⁸	In progress
Collaborative Family Work in Youth Justice: A Model for Reducing Recidivism in Young Offenders	This project is being conducted by Dr Chris Trotter from Monash University. The project is evaluating the effects of collaborative family work (the Act Now, Together Strong program) on youth offenders and their families.		In progress

7. The cost of the Place Plan Evaluation is included in the contract to evaluate the Future Directions SII due to be completed in mid-2022, with a total contract value of \$1,297,500 (ex GST).

8. Research and development and evaluation projects with \$0 expenditure indicate that they were provided with in-kind support from the YJNSW Research & Information Unit (RIU), and in-kind support by relevant YJNSW operational units, e.g. Youth Officer supervision of detainees, researchers and evaluators when in detention centres. The RIU also provided administrative data and liaison with BOCSAR for reoffending data, when relevant.

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Growing Up With Family Trauma and Violence: Positive and Negative Interpretations in Young Adult Life	This project is being conducted by a Masters student from the University of Newcastle. The study aims to explore personal meaning and sense making for people with a shared experience of family trauma and to examine the positive and negative interpretations of young adults who grew up with such experiences.	\$0 ⁸	In progress
Policing Young People in Care – Impacts of Not-For-Profit Carer Decision Making on Sentencing and Bail	This project is being conducted by Dr Alison Gerard, Dr Andrew McGrath and Dr Emma Colvin of Charles Sturt University. This project seeks to expand on research by McFarlane (2010) which has shown that young people in OOHc are 68 times more likely to appear in the Children's Court than young people not in care. In particular, the project seeks to examine the role that out-of-home carers play in policing young people.		In progress
Positive Pathways for Vulnerable Adolescents: The Role of a Life Management Program Approach	This project is being conducted by Dr Sally Nathan of the University of NSW. The project seeks to examine the short-term and longer-term outcomes and pathways of young people who participate in the Ted Noffs Program for Adolescent Life Management.		In progress
Stages of Psychosis in the Prison Population	This project is being conducted by Associate Professor Kimberlie Dean of the University of NSW. The aim of this project is to establish the prevalence of ultra-high-risk, first-episode and established psychosis within the population of incarcerated young people. The study will examine the relationship between different stages of psychosis and offending.		In progress
Assessing the Needs of Local Youth to Help Guide Drug and Alcohol Prevention Strategies	This project is being conducted by researchers from Youth Solutions, University of Wollongong, and Western Sydney University. It aims to understand the needs and perspectives of Youth Solutions program participants and the socio-cultural factors that influence their alcohol and other drug attitudes and behaviours.		In progress

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
What Service Pathways are available within the New South Wales Criminal Justice System for the purposes of Identifying and Managing Young People (under 18) with Neurodevelopmental Impairments?	This project is being conducted by a Masters of Criminology (Research) student from the University of Sydney. It seeks to understand what assessments, services and other means of assistance currently exist for the purposes of identifying and managing young people with neurodevelopmental impairments in contact with the criminal justice system in NSW.	\$0 ⁸	In progress
Investigating recidivism among Australian justice-involved youth	This project is being conducted by Professor Eva Kimonis of the University of NSW. It aims to examine the validity of the ICU and test the ICU's ability to predict antisocial behavioural outcomes using Youth People in Custody Health Survey data.		In progress
Participation is not Enough: The Practices of Giving Weight to the Views of Children and Young People in Out-of-Home Care Policy Making in Australia	This project is being conducted by a PhD candidate from Southern Cross University to understand the policy-making practices associated with giving due weight to the views of children and young people who have first-hand experience of statutory OOHC.		In progress
Children must be heard when they cannot be seen	This project is being conducted by a PhD candidate from the Royal Melbourne University of Technology. It seeks to look at international human rights and regulation and how these are met or not met by Youth Justice NSW, and to understand what avenues young people in custody have to raise issues about their rights.		In progress

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Name Narrate Navigate – DV Intervention	This project is being conducted by Dr Tamara Blakemore from the University of Newcastle. Evaluation of a six-week DV group intervention for young offenders in the Hunter New England Region.	\$0 ⁸	In progress
Evaluation of Ngudjoong Billa	This is an internal evaluation, conducted by the Research and Information Unit, of Ngudjoong Billa, an Aboriginal Transition and Re-integration Program offered by the South Coast Medical Service Aboriginal Corporation in Nowra and the Far South Coast. This evaluation will look at both development of the demonstration project as well as outcomes.		In progress
Evaluation of the EPIC Scheme	This is an internal evaluation, conducted by the Research and Information Unit, of the Positive Behaviour Scheme being trialled at Acmena Youth Justice Centre. This evaluation will look at both development of the trial and outcomes for both staff and young people at the Centre.		In progress
Evaluation of the Enhanced Support Unit	This is an internal evaluation, conducted by the Research and Information Unit, of the Enhanced Support Unit at Frank Baxter Youth Justice Centre. This evaluation will look at both development of the unit and outcomes for the staff and young people involved.		In progress
Assessment of Outcomes: Junaa Buwa! and Mac River Rural Residential Rehabilitation Services	This is an internal review of outcomes, conducted by the Research and Information Unit. It will examine the throughput of young people referred to Mac River and Junaa Buwa! Rural Residential Rehabilitation Services, as well as outcomes from self-report questionnaires.		In progress
Prevalence of Hearing Loss and Spatial Processing Disorder in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Adolescents in Juvenile Justice Centres (JJs)	This project is being conducted by the National Acoustics Laboratories and the Justice Health and Forensic Mental Health Network. The project aims to assess the hearing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people in custody in quiet rooms in JJs.		Completed

Research and development project or evaluation name	Description	2019-20 expenditure (GST exclusive)	Project status
Criminal Identity Formation – The Aspects of Identity Development Amongst Adolescent Males in the NSW Juvenile Justice System	This project is being conducted by a PhD student from Monash University. It aims to thematically examine how such criminal identities may be developed, how they are defined, and how they are maintained.	\$0 ⁸	Completed
Evaluation of the Veterans Mentoring Program	This is an internal evaluation of the Veterans Mentoring Program, a Youth Justice NSW Demonstration Project, offered by SHINE.		Completed
Correlates of Oral Language Skills of Young Offenders	This project is being conducted by a PhD student from the University of Sydney. The aim of the project is to examine the association between oral language skills, social cognition and emotional reactivity, and the severity of antisocial and offender behaviour.		Completed

3.4.6 International travel

Department of Communities and Justice

Officer	Dates	Destination	Purpose of visit
Rebecca Magoffin	13–20 July 2019	Singapore	To complete core subject as part of university course – Executive Masters of Public Administration (EMPA) through Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG) (scholarship through Public Service Commission)
John Cornochan	23–28 July 2019	Glasgow, Scotland, to Sydney	Keynote speaker for ACYP End Violence Solutions Summit
Jeremy Hillman	30 July – 3 August 2019	Wellington, New Zealand	Attend EMPA Emergency Management conference in Wellington and meet with senior officials from Prime Minister and Cabinet, New Zealand Police and Christchurch Council following the Christchurch terror attack
Caseworker ¹	25–31 August 2019	New Zealand	To accompany a child
Edwina Crawford	1–7 September 2019	London, United Kingdom	Present at Behavioural Exchange Conference (BX2019) on What's Your Plan
Anne Campbell	1–8 September 2019	Glasgow, Scotland	Attend the Institute of Global Homelessness 2019 Vanguard City Summit in Glasgow
Joanna Murray	18–27 September 2019	London, United Kingdom	Research trip about the treatment of offenders who are convicted of terrorism offences or who are at risk of committing terrorism offences, with the aim of looking towards intervention models
Lida Kaban	2 November 2019	Wellington, New Zealand	EMPA program with ANZSOG
Lisa Charet	4–22 November 2019	New Zealand and Singapore	ANZSOG Executive Fellows Program
Mr Samuel Ardasinki	6–8 November 2019	Singapore	Attended the Australian and New Zealand Association of Psychiatry, Psychology and Law (ANZAPPL) Conference
Sally McKay	12 November – 21 December 2019	Auckland and Whakatane, New Zealand	Provide recovery coordination service for the recent bushfires, noting that Sally is an expert on this area and has provided similar services to Office of Emergency Management (OEM) since the 2013 Blue Mountain Bushfires

1. Caseworkers are not identified by name in order to protect the identity of the children and young people they have accompanied.

Officer	Dates	Destination	Purpose of visit
Mr Lyncoln Chee	12–15 November 2019	Queenstown, New Zealand	Attended the Annual Asia Pacific Coroners Society Conference
Ms Katie Llewelyn	12–15 November 2019	Queenstown, New Zealand	Attended the Annual Asia Pacific Coroners Society Conference
Ms Skye McKinnon	12–15 November 2019	Queenstown, New Zealand	Attended the Annual Asia Pacific Coroners Society Conference
Mr Don McLennan	13–15 November 2019	Queenstown, New Zealand	Attended the Annual Asia Pacific Coroners Society Conference
Ms Rebel Kenna	22–30 November 2019	Wellington, New Zealand	To undertake compulsory work based project component of the EPMA course
Rebecca Magoffin	23–28 November 2019	Wellington, New Zealand	To complete core subject as part of university course EMPA through ANZSOG (scholarship through Public Service Commission)
Rebecca Jeyasingam	23–30 November 2019	Wellington, New Zealand	EMPA program with ANZSOG
Thayalini Wigneswaran	23–28 November 2019	Wellington, New Zealand	EMPA program with ANZSOG
Jennifer Mar Young	24–28 November 2019	Wellington, New Zealand	EMPA program with ANZSOG
Matthew Fusarelli	24–29 November 2019	Wellington, New Zealand	EMPA – training
Daniel Barakate	27 November – 1 December 2019	Wellington, New Zealand	Work-based project attendance – university block – organised by ANZSOG
Grant Turner	10–13 December 2019	Bangkok, Thailand	Transfer inmate from Bangkok to Sydney
Donna Davy	10–13 December 2019	Bangkok, Thailand	Transfer inmate from Bangkok to Sydney
Trudy Ekert	17–19 December 2019	Auckland, New Zealand	To participate in a Family Group Conference to determine safety for three children
Azure Green	17–19 December 2019	Auckland, New Zealand	To participate in a Family Group Conference to determine safety for three children
Sally McKay	8 January – 16 February 2020	Auckland and Whakatane, New Zealand	Recovery coordinator services for bushfire event
Janice Raveneau	8–15 March 2020	Auckland, New Zealand	To promote innovation in Aboriginal cultural practice(s). The visit also contributed towards key outcomes outlined in the <i>Youth Justice Aboriginal Strategic Plan 2018–2022</i>

Officer	Dates	Destination	Purpose of visit
Ronald Ferguson	8–15 March 2020	Auckland, New Zealand	To promote innovation in Aboriginal cultural practice(s). The visit also contributed towards key outcomes outlined in the <i>Youth Justice Aboriginal Strategic Plan 2018–2022</i>
Nathaniel Morrison	8–15 March 2020	Auckland, New Zealand	To promote innovation in Aboriginal cultural practice(s). The visit also contributed towards key outcomes outlined in the <i>Youth Justice Aboriginal Strategic Plan 2018–2022</i>
Eric Brown	8–15 March 2020	Auckland, New Zealand	To promote innovation in Aboriginal cultural practice(s). The visit also contributed towards key outcomes outlined in the <i>Youth Justice Aboriginal Strategic Plan 2018–2022</i>
Samantha Smith	8–15 March 2020	Auckland, New Zealand	To promote innovation in Aboriginal cultural practice(s). The visit also contributed towards key outcomes outlined in the <i>Youth Justice Aboriginal Strategic Plan 2018–2022</i>
Yvonne Weldon	8–15 March 2020	Auckland, New Zealand	To promote innovation in Aboriginal cultural practice(s). The visit also contributed towards key outcomes outlined in the <i>Youth Justice Aboriginal Strategic Plan 2018–2022</i>
Alepano Savelio	8–10 March 2020	Wellington, New Zealand, to Sydney	Tokelauan interpreter from New Zealand required for a court matter at Mt Drui Court

Note: Local and Supreme Court judicial officers' travel information (attendance to conferences or speaking engagements) are reported in their Annual Review documents. As such, they have not been included in the above table.

3.4.7 Disability Inclusion Action Plan

The *Disability Inclusion Act 2014* (DIA) formalises NSW's commitment to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and requires the creation of two different types of plan: the NSW Disability Inclusion Plan (DIP) and the Disability Inclusion Action Plan (DIAP).

Disability inclusion planning is one way for governments, public authorities and other organisations to reduce and remove barriers for people with disability and foster a more accessible and inclusive community. Disability inclusion planning is about making a plan that outlines the actions that government departments and agencies will take to remove barriers in access to government information, services and employment and to foster the promotion of the rights of people with disability.

NSW Disability Inclusion Plan

The NSW DIP is the high-level, whole-of-government plan to support and improve inclusion for people with disability. The plan has four focus areas: developing positive community attitudes and behaviours, creating liveable communities, supporting access to meaningful employment, and improving access to mainstream services through better systems and processes.

The current NSW DIP was launched in February 2015, and work is currently underway to develop the next NSW DIP to replace it. This updated plan will be informed by the review of the NSW DIP that was undertaken in 2018 by the Sax Institute and will include the NSW Government's strategy to optimise the NDIS within the state, a function currently performed under the *NSW Disability Delivery Plan 2018–2020*. Consultation with groups external to and within the NSW Government will also inform the preparation of the new NSW DIP.

Disability Inclusion Action Plan

All NSW Government departments are required to create their own DIAP. DIAPs set out the measures the departments intend to put in place to ensure that people with disability can access services and participate fully in the community.

DCJ came into being on 1 July 2019, bringing together the former departments of Justice and Family and Community Services. DCJ is developing a new DIAP that provides increased opportunities to share disability inclusion insights across a spectrum of services and consult with people with disability and their representative organisations to ensure our department better reflects the NSW community and understands the value of equitable and inclusive services.

Key initiatives in 2019–20

During 2019–20, DCJ continued to implement a range of disability inclusive strategies, services and initiatives, as detailed below.

- Induction of new Sheriff's officers included disability awareness, with an emphasis on creating inclusion through providing reasonable adjustments.
- Commencement on 1 July 2019 of the Justice Advocacy Service, which provides 24-hour support for people with cognitive disability navigating the NSW justice system.
- Continuation of the ENGAGE domestic violence intervention, which involves a suitability assessment including questions related to intellectual and physical disability so that DCJ can support people to ensure full access and participation in workshops.
- Continued application of the NSW Countering Violent Extremism Strategy, which offers support to people with disability and works closely with the NDIA for eligible clients and with other DCJ programs to assess an individual's disability and impairment, evaluate risks and needs, and to identify the appropriate service model in consultation with other government departments and non-government organisations.
- User testing of the prototype of the Women's Financial Toolkit – It's Your Future by people with disability to ensure ease of navigation and compliance with accessibility requirements.
- The Investing in Women program funded NSW organisations to develop and implement projects that support people with disability.

- The *NSW Domestic and Family Violence Blueprint for Reform 2016–2021* prioritises people with disability as one of the vulnerable focus groups at higher risk of experiencing domestic and family violence, for initiatives associated with primary prevention, early intervention and improved service delivery.
- The *NSW Sexual Assault Strategy: 2018–2021* recognises people with disability as a priority group who may experience higher rates of sexual violence and greater barriers in reporting sexual assault and accessing services.
- Participating in the Stepping Into Internship program, through which we offered university students with disability an opportunity to participate in a 152-hour paid internship in placements across DCJ.
- DCJ worked towards achieving AND Disability Confident Recruiter (DCR) status (the former Department of Family and Community Services had previously attained this status) across the whole of DCJ, with a target date of November 2020.
- Working to improve our recruitment and selection practices to make them more accessible and inclusive for people with disability.
- Developing a significantly revised *Workplace Adjustment Policy and Procedure* in recognition that access to workplace adjustments can be a major barrier for people with disability when applying for roles and during their employment.
- The DCJ Disability Employee Network (DEN), - an employee-led group with over 160 members with disability and colleagues who are active supporters, continued to grow and evolve into a highly effective and innovative body. The DEN now has a network of 60 Disability Champions, mostly executives who have a personal commitment to ensuring staff with disability are supported in a genuinely inclusive and accessible workplace.
- DCJ signed and implemented a Memorandum of Understanding with the National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA) and the Department of Social Services (DSS) that provides joint support for families who are struggling to cope with supporting their child with a disability in the family home through the NDIS and DCJ.
- DCJ worked collaboratively with Commonwealth, State and Territory jurisdictions to establish a seamless interface between the mainstream child protection system and the NDIS so that children and young people in NSW can receive the care and disability supports they need jointly, through the NSW Government and the NDIA.
- DCJ built the capacity of its caseworkers to engage with the NDIS so that children and young people in statutory care receive the disability supports they need to meet their goals, participate as active and valued members of the community, and reach their full potential.
- Earlier in 2020 a Justice Liaison Officer role was implemented in Youth Justice to provide a single point of contact for staff seeking to assist young people access the NDIS. This position also acts as an escalation point to the National Access Team and has improved communication with the NDIS significantly.

CSNSW implemented a number of disability inclusive strategies for both staff and offenders, including the following:

- A pilot of the Stand TALR initiative, a mental health awareness training program developed by correctional staff for correctional staff.
- Trainee Custodial Correction Officers, case managers, and Offender Services and Program staff all completed disability awareness training specifically tailored to their roles.
- The NDIS Community Engagement Team, in collaboration with CSNSW, provided NDIS training for 14 Community Corrections locations and 13 correctional centres, involving a combined total of 253 staff.
- The Statewide Disability Service Psychology and Neuropsychology team provided training to a psychology forum regarding specific needs of clients and opportunities for collaboration.
- CSNSW Statewide Disability Services increased the number of criminogenic programs to inmates with cognitive impairment located in Additional Support Units by 50 per cent as compared with 2018-19.
- Courts, Tribunals and Service Delivery continued to engage a disability service provider to clean the NSW NCAT Courts and Tribunal Services premises in Civic Tower, Local Courts and District Courts wherever possible.

- The NCAT Guardianship Division was engaged by the Australian Guardianship and Administration Council Project to lead a project to develop national guidelines for tribunals about practical steps that can be taken to enable people with decision-making disabilities to participate in guardianship proceedings. The guidelines recognise that, to give effect to the statutory obligation to have regard to the views of people with decision-making disabilities, tribunals must acknowledge the real difficulties for them in participating in tribunal proceedings.
- The NCAT Guardianship Division Member Induction program, conducted on 28 November 2019, included a presentation for members on assessing dementia and decision-making capacity.
- NCAT continues to support employment of people with a disability through engagement with disability employment enterprises.
- As part of the Supported Group Accommodation pilot program, the Community Justice Centre (CJC) established a panel of 20 mediators with experience in working with people with disabilities, who, along with CJC's case coordination team, attended training delivered by People with Disabilities Australia to further enhance understanding of CJC's service delivery model.
- Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 covers a wide range of recommendations for making web content more accessible. Following these guidelines will make content accessible to a wider range of people with disabilities, including blindness and low vision, deafness and hearing loss, learning disabilities, cognitive limitations, limited movement, speech disabilities, photosensitivity and combinations of these. In 2019–20, we improved our Courts and Tribunals websites to make it easier for everyone to be able to understand our services and interact with us online.
- Anti-Discrimination NSW (ADNSW) continued to make changes to improve website access for people with disability. The website has been improved as part of an ongoing review to meet WCAG 2.0 standards.
- ADNSW planned and researched a disability employment initiative, including consulting with stakeholders to identify potential partners to co-design a project.
- ADNSW actively engaged with disability stakeholders to discuss working together in the area of disability employment, as well as COVID-related discrimination.
- ADNSW participated in 18 community events and stakeholder meetings.

DCJ staffing initiatives

In 2019–20 we:

- continued our partnership with the Australian Network on Disability (AND) to offer paid Stepping Into Internships for university students with disability
- participated in the AND Positive Action towards Career Engagement (PACE) mentoring program, in which DCJ managers and executives provided mentoring for people with disability
- partnered with DEN to develop a DCJ-wide *Workplace Adjustment Policy and Procedures* to remove barriers in the workplace and provide equal access to career development opportunities
- maintained (as the former FACS) Disability Confident Recruiter status, which means that our recruitment and selection processes are accessible and inclusive for people with disability
- promoted DCJ roles through the National Disability Recruitment Coordinator (NDRC) to people with disability
- provided the Disability Confidence e-learning module for managers and employees across DCJ; this module provides managers and employees with greater awareness of disability legislation, responsibilities relating to providing workplace adjustments and the value of inclusion.

In 2020–21, we aim to:

- work to achieve AND Disability Confident Recruiter status across the whole of DCJ
- upgrade our talent acquisition processes to improve accessibility and inclusiveness for people with disability
- offer a minimum of 10 paid internships to university students with disability under the AND Stepping Into Internship program
- launch our new *Workplace Adjustment Policy and Procedures*
- support the expanded DEN to drive improvement projects across DCJ through consultation.

3.4.8 Compliance with Carers (Recognition) Act 2010

DCJ recognises the valuable contribution that carers make to our society, and is the public sector agency responsible for implementing and reviewing the *Carers (Recognition) Act 2010* (the Act).

The NSW Carers Charter, which forms a part of the Act, contains 13 guiding principles for NSW public sector human service agencies on issues of significance for carers, including respect and recognition, inclusion in decision-making, and access to services they may need.

A carer, for the purposes of the Act, is an individual who provides ongoing personal, care, support and assistance to any other individual who needs it because that other individual:

- is a person with a disability within the meaning of the *Disability Inclusion Act 2014*
- has a medical condition (including a terminal or chronic illness)
- has a mental illness, or
- is frail and aged.

During 2019–20, DCJ supported carers in a variety of ways, as described below.

Consultation and liaison with carers

Carers Advisory Council

- DCJ provided secretariat support to the Carers Advisory Council, which was established under the Act to advance the interests of carers in NSW and provide advice on legislation, policy and other matters relating to carers.
- As stipulated by the Act, the majority of Council members have current or previous experience of being a carer. Members have diverse backgrounds and expertise and come from a range of metropolitan and regional areas in NSW.
- The Council provides advice and submissions to the NSW Government about the impact of policies and programs on carers. Priorities for the Council in 2019–20 included:
 - commissioning research on the social and emotional wellbeing of carers and carers who may be missing out on support following the introduction of the NDIS
 - engaging with carers through face-to-face conversations forums; two forums were held in 2019–20, at Fairfield and Kiama.
- The Council was consulted in the establishment of the NSW Ageing and Disability Commission and the development of the *NSW Carers Strategy*. Council members are represented on committees supporting the Department of Education's *Disability Strategy*.
- The Council met regularly through 2019–20 at Parliament House (and online during COVID-19).

NSW Carers Strategy

- DCJ commissioned a review of the *NSW Carers Strategy 2014–19* and during 2019–20 undertook co-design to develop the next *NSW Carers Strategy: Caring in NSW 2020–2030* and *Action Plan 2020–2022*, which was launched in October 2020. The Carers Strategy Program Management Group included carer representatives to ensure that the carer perspective is central to reviewing the Strategy.
- The co-design process between March 2019 and February 2020 included 10 face-to-face workshops with approximately 200 participants, of whom 50 per cent were carers. The workshops broadly represented the diversity of carers, and in addition two targeted workshops/focus groups were held with Aboriginal carers, one with CALD carers and two with young carers. An online survey explored the issues discussed in the workshops, attracting 204 responses from carers. A consultation was held with the Disability Council of NSW.
- The findings and themes from these workshops and survey were analysed, and the research and evidence base and emerging priorities were tested with stakeholders in developing the 10-year Strategy and action plan.

Carers Investment Program

- Through the Carers Investment Program, the NSW Government is reinvesting \$5.6 million over three years for innovative projects that will improve the wellbeing of carers in NSW. Funding commenced in 2018–19 and is focused on projects that are evidence based and aligned with carer priorities as identified in the *NSW Carers Strategy 2014–19*, the *Carers (Recognition) Act 2010* and other relevant reforms in the sector. A diverse range of projects is funded, such as support for carers to re-engage with paid work, carer-targeted functionality in a medicines app, and projects that focus on young carers, CALD carers and Aboriginal carers. A key project includes the establishment of a Centre for Research at the University of Technology Sydney.

Carers Week

- Carers Week, which is supported by NSW Government, is an annual national awareness week held in the third week of October. During Carers Week in October 2019, DCJ arranged the following:
 - 491 events for carers across NSW, funded by the NSW Government
 - a social media campaign – using videos and animations to raise awareness of carers and their contribution to our community
 - a Parliament House event hosted by Minister Ward
 - pop-up carers event in Martin Place, Sydney
 - a successful FACS-funded Carers NSW 2019 one-day conference, with papers presented by the DCJ Carers team and DCJ People.

Companion Card

- The Companion Card program supports people with severe and lifelong disability to participate in the community by providing free access to venues and events for a cardholder's companion. The Companion Card is provided for life, free of charge, and is exempt from means testing.
- As at 30 June 2019, there were more than 33,000 cardholders in NSW.

Women offenders

- The Premier's Priority to Reduce Recidivism in the Prison Population has a dedicated workstream for women as parents. CSNSW leads a number of initiatives under this workstream, in partnership with Community Services, to improve outcomes for mothers in custody. A number of these initiatives involve increasing court-ordered and case-managed visits, and many of these initiatives require carer input. A reference group has been established which includes agencies that work closely with carers, to ensure their input is captured.

Aboriginal offenders

- Strategy for Supporting Aboriginal Offenders to Desist from Reoffending – The Aboriginal Strategy and Policy Unit (ASPU) is dedicated to implementing processes and providing advice to CSNSW staff and organisations that are engaged with Aboriginal people involved with the justice system.
- The ASPU holds a number of roles in local and statewide reference groups which provide the opportunity to engage and offer services to support those in the Charter, including but not limited to the:
 - Women's Advisory Council
 - Harm Reduction Reference Group
 - NSW Legal Assistance Forum
 - Dubay Gunyah Steering Committee
 - Never Going Back Steering Committee
 - Northern Domestic Violence Regional Strategy Group.
- Aboriginal Advisory Council (AAC) – The AAC is a forum for Corrective Services NSW (CSNSW) to engage with Aboriginal people of significant standing in the community. The AAC provides advice and advocacy to the Commissioner of CSNSW on matters identified by them as being important and relevant to achieve a range of better outcomes for Aboriginal offenders and their communities.

Families of offenders

- CSNSW implemented the *Family Matters Strategy 2018–2021* to promote the interests of families, and lessen the impact on them, in the development of CSNSW policies and procedures that apply to offenders' case management during their contact with CSNSW.
- Key priority areas within the Strategy are supporting parents and children, case management support and reintegration. Supporting these priorities involves work to ensure that family and other supports are informed, capable and available to assist the offender prior to and after their release from custody.
- Post-release support for families through family engagement workers is provided to offender families, as well as post-release services to high-risk offenders, via the Funded Partnership Initiative. Feedback and input on service delivery is channelled through the Children and Families of Offenders Steering Committee (CFOSC).

Actions taken to ensure staff are aware of and understand the principles of NSW Carers Charter

During 2019–20, DCJ ensured staff awareness and understanding of the NSW Carers Charter by:

- achieving Level 1 Carers Accreditation (Activate) from Carers NSW; this accreditation means that DCJ is now recognised as a supportive employer of people with caring responsibilities
- harmonising our human resource policies and procedures while ensuring they support the needs and aspirations of carers
- promoting flexible work practices across DCJ to provide better support for employees who are carers.

Aspirations for 2020–21

In 2020–21, DCJ will:

- lead the implementation of the *NSW Carers Strategy: Caring in NSW 2020–2030*, and implement the DCJ Year 1 actions in the Strategy's Action Plan 2020–22
- work to achieve Level 2 Carers Accreditation (Commit) across DCJ; achieving Level 2 accreditation will mean that we are improving in our maturity as a supportive employer of carers
- embed and extend the application of flexible work practices for employees with caring responsibilities
- partner in a Centre of Excellence in Population Ageing Research (CEPAR) project conducted by the University of Sydney to examine the experiences and needs of mature workers aged 45 and over.

3.4.9 Multicultural policies and services program

All NSW Government agencies are expected to provide high-quality services and programs for all people of NSW. The Multicultural Policies and Services Program (MPSP) is the mechanism by which agencies can show that they are planning effectively for people of CALD backgrounds, and report on progress.

During 2019–20 DCJ commenced development of a new multicultural plan for the new department. While this plan was still being developed in 2019–20, DCJ continued to implement a range of initiatives and programs under the MPSP to support the diverse communities we serve.

Key initiatives in 2019–20

During 2019–20, we supported our CALD clients across a range of programs and initiatives, as detailed below.

Responding to COVID-19

- In response to the pandemic, DCJ worked with crisis communication experts to develop a strategic communications package designed to strengthen social cohesion – Together Against COVID-19.
- Training focused on interpreting in court and legal proceedings was streamed to over 500 new interpreters.
- Additional funding to support the response to domestic and family violence during COVID-19 was provided to a range of funded services across the state, including many that provide domestic and family violence services for CALD communities.
- The Safeguarding Community Cohesion Consultation – COVID 19 sought to assess needs and capacities of multicultural communities and religious organisations in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Research findings will be shared with organisations in 2020–21 and will be used to inform further workshops aimed at promoting NGO preparedness and response strategies to future collective trauma events.

DCJ staffing initiatives

- Continued to participate in the Multicultural NSW Community Language Allowance Scheme (CLAS), with 269 employees being paid an allowance to provide interpreting services to our clients.
- Conducted targeted recruitment campaigns to attract people from CALD backgrounds to our caseworker, social housing, courts and tribunals and corrective services roles.
- Continued to offer a Multicultural Cultural Competence Program for managers and employees to build capability around cultural diversity and inclusion in the workplace and to improve the delivery of services to our CALD clients.
- Introduced prescreening questions for caseworker candidates on cultural background and languages spoken other than English to contribute to building a diverse range of casework practitioners.

CALD services and initiatives across DCJ

- Community Liaison Officers continued to work closely with multicultural communities in NSW, with a focus on refugees and newly arrived migrants. They work to build bridges between multicultural communities and the justice system in order to provide better access to services.
- Held 72 community engagement activities involving a total of 6,336 attendees, including court open days, workshops for specific CALD groups and community expos.
- Continued partnerships with other agencies, such as Legal Aid, Victim Services and Law Access, to provide CALD communities with information about the NSW legal system.
- Developed the internal training module Best Practice Working with Multicultural Communities – Cultural Capability.
- Held three seminars for religious and community leaders, involving 43 leaders (who may be the first point of contact for those experiencing violence or seeking assistance and guidance).
- Held the annual DV conference – Research to Action, delivered by South West Sydney Domestic Violence Committee. The conference has a strong multicultural focus and was attended by approximately 250 participants.

- DCJ's Diversity Services unit continued to sit on the Language Service Advisory board and the Multicultural Coordinators Forum, both of which are chaired by Multicultural NSW.
- Women NSW coordinated the NSW Government launch of an in-language radio ad campaign on domestic and family violence that ran across six stations, designed to reach people from Chinese, Indian and Arabic communities.
- Three Muslim community roundtables were conducted in 2019 which sought to bring together Muslim community leaders from diverse religious practices, ethnicities and cultures, with the aim of better understanding barriers that may exist for Muslims to engage with existing Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) initiatives and gain insights into possible new approaches to CVE.
- A conference addressing the impact of extremist right-wing views and Islamophobia on social cohesion, organised by Charles Sturt University in November 2019, brought together community organisations, academics and government policy-makers to collaborate on solutions to address threats to social cohesion and democracy.
- The onboarding process for the ENGAGE domestic violence intervention involves a suitability assessment that includes questions related to cultural and language barriers; where these barriers exist, DCJ purchases the services of qualified and experienced interpreters to ensure participants are supported to understand information provided at workshops and at follow-up interviews.
- DCJ has translated the ENGAGE material, including the participant workbook and a video on domestic violence legal literacy, into Arabic and Vietnamese, which are the two most commonly identified languages spoken by participants.
- The *NSW Domestic and Family Violence Blueprint for Reform 2016–2021* identifies CALD communities as one of the focus groups at higher risk of experiencing domestic and family violence; such communities are therefore prioritised for initiatives associated with primary prevention, early intervention and improved service delivery.
- Office of the Senior Practitioner's Multicultural Caseworker Program continued, with 15 new multicultural caseworkers commencing in four of the DCJ seven districts to support growing CALD communities. The DCJ-Community Services Multicultural Consultative Group held quarterly meetings with peak multicultural agencies on DCJ services and programs. This included Justice Strategy & Program consultation on the Domestic and Family Violence, Inclusion and Early Intervention Volunteering Strategy and SCIU.
- The Office of Senior Practitioner Child Protection Conference – Cultural Hub, A partnership between Multicultural Services Unit and Aboriginal Outcomes, delivered a two-day conference aimed at enabling practitioners to gain a deeper understanding of the role of country, family, community and personal identity in the expression of culture and belonging. The hub engaged practitioners in learning activities focusing on Aboriginal, Indian, Chinese, African and Afghani communities.
- The Pasifika Cultural Program at Cobham Youth Justice Centre, which was completed twice over a three-month period during 2019–20, enabled young men from Pacific communities to participate in cultural activities and lessons aimed at understanding their evolving sense of identity and addressing their criminogenic needs. In June 2020, 15 young men graduated from the program.
- Corrective Services NSW (CSNSW) utilised a range of language services (interpreter services and Auslan), including engaging officers who assist under the CLAS, which assists CALD offenders in custody as well as those in the community and their families.
- CSNSW also has 64 officers as part of the CLAS who work across custodial and community corrections to provide on-the-spot, basic language assistance to offenders and the public in 30 community languages.
- CSNSW works in partnerships with a variety of community organisations to support the specific reintegration support needs of CALD offenders.
- DAMEC, in partnership with the South Seas Communities, conducted the first 'Journeys' program for Pacific Islander offenders (Maori, Fijian, Tongan and Samoan) at John Morony Correctional Centre, with 53 offenders on remand attending the therapeutic program, which was well supported by offenders and staff.
- CSNSW is currently conducting a case management pilot project to address the specific needs of Muslim offenders in custody.

- In 2019 CSNSW and the Service for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture and Trauma Survivors met to discuss the implementation of the African Prison Support Program (APSP) pilot project.
- CSNSW works closely with Jewish Care through the provisions of the Prison Outreach Program to support the religious and reintegration needs of Jewish offenders in custody and their families.
- CSNSW case management, cultural and religious services and language services policies and procedures were updated to improve processes and increase staff awareness of the specific cultural and religious needs of CALD offenders in custody and the mechanism to increase their responsiveness to engage in programs and services to support their reintegration into the community.
- Courts, Tribunals and Service Delivery promotes relevant departmental training, and identified modules are mandatory for all staff—cultural capability for frontline staff, Aboriginal Cultural Inclusion, and Valuing Diversity.

Anti-Discrimination NSW (ADNSW)

- Anti-Discrimination NSW participated in 85 community events with multicultural agencies or with a focus on understanding and addressing discrimination in CALD communities, worked with Multicultural NSW as a member of COMPLAN to report race-related discrimination which occurred due to COVID-19, engaged with several agencies who provide assistance to refugees to ascertain how ADNSW can improve their services in this area.

Key multicultural strategies proposed for 2020–21

During 2020–21, we will continue to support our CALD clients through the following planned initiatives:

- developing the inaugural DCJ Multicultural Plan, which formally captures strategies aimed at maximising the inclusiveness of our programs and services
- working with the department’s procurement team to implement a department-wide Interpreter Policy and tender process to establish a pre-approved panel of interpreting and translation services
- adapting community engagement events to an online platform to support continued connection with CALD communities in the event of continued COVID-19 restrictions on large social gatherings.

DCJ staffing initiatives

Initiatives will include:

- automating the CLAS application process to streamline the application process for employees applying for CLAS, and revising the CLAS Guidelines for the whole of DCJ
- continuing to conduct targeted recruitment campaigns to attract more people from CALD backgrounds, with a focus on our frontline roles
- monitoring employee engagement levels for CALD employees through the 2020 People Matter Employee Survey.

Housing Contact Centre

Initiatives will include:

- Aboriginal awareness training targeted at all Housing Contact Centre staff to ensure they have a sound knowledge of cultural safety and sensitivity
- working towards increasing the number of languages offered through our publications and online services.

Western Sydney Nepean Blue Mountains District

- The Western Sydney Nepean Blue Mountains District’s Multicultural Advisory Committee’s predominant purpose is to improve access, equity and participation rates in local DCJ services and programs for CALD families and communities.

- The committee will collaborate with government and non-government agencies to:
 - build consistent government and non-government responses to CALD families' and communities' needs to support improved outcomes
 - provide input and advice on government and non-government organisations' current effective responses of services to CALD communities in the district
 - provide input and advice on gaps in current responses of services to CALD communities in the district.

Office of the Senior Practitioner

Initiatives will include:

- Multicultural Caseworker Program – enhancing cultural consultation practice, developing multicultural community snapshots resources and building capacity with Statewide Services to access consultation and program promotion in regional NSW, with a focus on refugee settlement areas
- Multicultural Information Sessions – delivering up to 10 sessions on understanding child protection in NSW to newly arrived migrant and refugee communities statewide
- FACS Multicultural Consultative Group – convening quarterly consultations with community partners on FACS programs and initiatives
- Interpreters and Language Services Mandate – providing an annual review to ensure ongoing practice
- delivering three Culturally Reflective Practice training workshops in the Hunter Central Coast and New England regions
- continuing to partner with the Hunter District Western Corridor Project to support refugee families
- redeveloping the Child Protection and Out-of-Home Care Practice Standards, which will include a dedicated standard for culturally safe practice with diverse communities; CALD young people were involved in developing the child statement for this standard
- the upcoming Child Neglect Practice Kit, which will include a working with CALD communities chapter.

Practice learning

Initiatives will include:

- developing a Practice Leadership learning program which will be culturally responsive and will support leaders to strengthen their practice with families from a CALD background
- developing further learning initiatives for caseworkers in their first two years of employment to strengthen their skills in working with families from a CALD background
- ensuring the reviews of mandates on the Casework Practice intranet site support culturally responsive practice with children, families and communities
- exploring further opportunities to share resources and information on the Casework Practice intranet site to strengthen culturally responsive practice with children, families and communities.

Youth Justice Multicultural Advisory and Working Group

- In 2019–20, Youth Justice established the Youth Justice Multicultural Advisory and Working Group (MAWG). The group aims to promote good practice in working with young people from CALD backgrounds in contact with Youth Justice by providing ongoing input into the *Youth Justice Multicultural Action Plan: Shine a Light on Culture* and other relevant documents and projects, including the Young People's Voices: Pacific Communities project.

Youth Justice Child Safe Policy Framework

- Youth Justice developed the Child Safe Policy Framework to provide the context for our work with young people and directly address the Child Safe Standards overseen by the Office of the Children's Guardian. The framework seeks to put young people at the centre of our work with them, to keep them safe and to empower them to realise their full potential. Young people from CALD backgrounds participated in identifying the goals and outcomes of the framework.

CSNSW

Initiatives will include:

- identifying relevant culturally competent community organisations that are able to support the reintegration needs of CALD offenders
- increasing partnership with STARTTS to support African offenders in custody and their families
- collaborating with the Drug and Alcohol Multicultural Education Centre and South Seas communities to expand the Wellbeing Program across remand correctional centres for Pacific Islander offenders
- implementing the findings of the case management pilot for Muslim offenders in custody
- increasing engagement with CALD communities to inform policy development
- identifying internal and external assistance for CALD offenders in custody, particularly those who lack family contact and support
- increasing access for CALD offenders to programs and services to address their criminogenic needs.

Anti-Discrimination NSW (ADNSW)

ADNSW will:

- continue to engage with stakeholders about COVID-19 and discrimination as the situation continues to develop in NSW
- develop an organisational Multicultural Policy and Services Plan to ensure we are providing inclusive services and addressing the needs of CALD communities
- consult with community stakeholders about how we can better assist them and to develop more targeted resources
- develop strategies to assist young people of refugee and migrant backgrounds to deal with issues they experience
- continue to review the website to ensure it meets Easy English Standards and to improve accessibility to meet stakeholder and client needs.

Information as to the multicultural policies and services plans of any bodies reporting to the department

- *Youth Justice Multicultural Action Plan: Shine a Light on Culture.*

Description of any agreement entered into with Multicultural NSW under the Multicultural NSW Act 2000 and statement setting out progress in implementing any agreement

- DCJ has an ongoing Memorandum of Understanding with Multicultural NSW for the provision of interpreting services in all NSW courts.
- Section 3 of the *Multicultural NSW Act 2000* outlines the multicultural principles public authorities are required to observe when conducting its affairs. The department does this through its Multicultural Plan.
- Multicultural NSW has previously identified and classified DCJ as a Designated MPSP Agency (DMA). DMAs provide particularly important functions to a CALD society and have additional planning and reporting requirements. As an identified DMA, the department is required to submit comprehensive multicultural plans and detailed progress reports to Multicultural NSW.

3.4.10 Disclosure of controlled entities and subsidiaries

The parent department of DCJ reporting entity in 2019–20 incorporates:

- the employee-related transactions and balances of the NSW Trustee and Guardian (including the Office of the Public Guardian)
- the employee-related transactions and balances of the Legal Profession Admission Board
- the employee-related transactions and balances of the Trustees of the Anzac Memorial Building
- the employee-related transactions and balances of the Legal Services Council
- the employee-related transactions and balances of the Ageing and Disability Commissioner
- Courts and Tribunals
- Corrective Services NSW (including Corrective Services Industries)
- Youth Justice NSW
- Office of Emergency Management (OEM) (up to 30 April 2020)
- NSW Office of Veterans Affairs
- Family and Community Services
- 52.5 per cent of all transactions and balances of Law Courts Ltd by Joint Arrangement.

DCJ as a reporting entity comprises all divisions and clusters under its control as noted above.

The DCJ consolidated reporting entity incorporates DCJ parent department and John Williams Memorial Charitable Trust (JWMCT).

John Williams Memorial Charitable Trust

JWMCT is a special-purpose reporting entity. It owns eight properties in NSW which are used to provide respite care and accommodation for children with disability. The net book value of the properties was \$9.7 million with a cash balance of \$1.4 million at 30 June 2020. The cash balance is held in interest-earning facilities and is used to facilitate ongoing maintenance of the properties. JWMCT has no performance targets or measures.

Separate financial statements are prepared for DCJ (parent) and JWMCT. The DCJ consolidated financial statements represent DCJ (parent) and JWMCT.

Joint arrangement

The NSW Government has an investment in Law Courts Limited, which is an entity controlled jointly by the NSW Government and the Australian Government and accounted for as a joint arrangement in accordance with AASB 11 Joint Arrangements.

Both governments have equal representation on the board of directors and in the membership of Law Courts Limited, with all decisions requiring unanimous consent. Law Courts Limited is located at Level 3, Law Courts Building, Queen's Square, Sydney, NSW 2000, and its principal activity is the provision of accommodation for courts, courts registries and support services at a standard that is suitable and available for occupation. The joint arrangement, entered into between the NSW Government and the Australian Federal Government, requires the recognition of 52.5 per cent of all revenues, expenses, assets and liabilities of the entity.

Contact information

Department of Communities and Justice

219–241 Cleveland Street, Strawberry Hills NSW 2016

Locked Bag 10, Strawberry Hills NSW 2012

Phone: (02) 9377 6000

Email: dcjinfo@dcj.nsw.gov.au

Business hours for divisional head offices are 9am to 5pm.

The total production cost of the DCJ Annual Report 2019–20 is \$8,850.

