



Summary of Performance

Key Performance Indicators

Key Effectiveness Indicators

The Ombudsman aims to improve decision making and administrative practices in public authorities as a result of complaints handled by the Office, reviews of certain child deaths and family and domestic violence fatalities and own motion investigations. Improvements may occur through actions identified and implemented by agencies as a result of the Ombudsman's investigations and reviews, or as a result of the Ombudsman making specific recommendations and suggestions that are practical and effective. Key Effectiveness Indicators are the percentage of these recommendations and suggestions accepted by public authorities and the number of improvements that occur as a result of Ombudsman action.

Key Effectiveness Indicators	2015-16 Actual	2016-17 Target	2016-17 Actual	Variance from Target
Where the Ombudsman made recommendations to improve practices or procedures, the percentage of recommendations accepted by agencies	100%	100%	100%	Nil
Number of improvements to practices or procedures as a result of Ombudsman action	156	100	109	+9

Another important role of the Ombudsman is to enable remedies to be provided to people who make complaints to the Office where service delivery by a public authority may have been inadequate. The remedies may include reconsideration of decisions, more timely decisions or action, financial remedies, better explanations and apologies. In 2016-17, there were 270 remedies provided by public authorities to assist the individual who made a complaint to the Ombudsman.

Comparison of Actual Results and Budget Targets

Public authorities have accepted every recommendation made by the Ombudsman, matching the actual results of the past four years and meeting the 2016-17 target.

In 2007-08, the Office commenced a program to ensure that its work increasingly contributed to improvements to public administration. Consistent with this program, the 2016-17 actual number of improvements to practices and procedures of public authorities as a result of Ombudsman action (109) has exceeded the 2016-17 target (100). There may, however, be fluctuations from year to year, related to the number and nature of investigations finalised by the Office in any given year.

Key Efficiency Indicators

The key efficiency indicators relate to timeliness of complaint handling, the cost per finalised allegation about public authorities, the cost per finalised notification of child deaths and family and domestic violence fatalities, the cost to monitor the Infringement Notices provisions of *The Criminal Code* and the cost of monitoring and inspection functions.

Key Efficiency Indicators	2015-16 Actual	2016-17 Target	2016-17 Actual	Variance from Target
Percentage of allegations finalised within three months	95%	95%	94%	-1%
Percentage of allegations finalised within 12 months	100%	100%	100%	Nil
Percentage of allegations on hand at 30 June less than three months old	93%	90%	94%	+4%
Percentage of allegations on hand at 30 June less than 12 months old	100%	100%	100%	Nil
Average cost per finalised allegation	\$1,886	\$1,890	\$1,889	-\$1
Average cost per finalised notification of death	\$18,597	\$18,950	\$16,731	-\$2,219
Cost to monitor the Infringement Notices provisions of <i>The Criminal Code</i>	\$851,068	\$557,000	\$549,267	-\$7,733
Cost of monitoring and inspection functions	\$413,821	\$415,000	\$412,129	-\$2,871

Comparison of Actual Results and Budget Targets

The 2016-17 actual results for the Key Efficiency Indicators met, or were comparable to, the 2016-17 target. Overall, 2016-17 actual results represent sustained improvement in the efficiency of complaint resolution over the last five years.

The average cost per finalised allegation in 2016-17 (\$1,889) met the 2016-17 target (\$1,890). Since 2007-08, the efficiency of complaint resolution has improved significantly with the average cost per finalised allegation reduced by a total of 36% from \$2,941 in 2007-08 to \$1,889 in 2016-17.

The average cost per finalised notification of death (\$16,731) improved on the 2016-17 target (\$18,950) and the 2015-16 actual result (\$18,597), reflecting continuous improvement of the finalisation of notifications.

The cost to monitor the Infringement Notices provisions of *The Criminal Code* (\$549,267) met the 2016-17 target (\$557,000). The 2016-17 actual result is lower than the 2015-16 actual result (\$851,068), reflecting the final year of funding for this function.

The cost of monitoring and inspection functions (\$412,129) met the 2016-17 target (\$415,000).

For further details, see the [Key Performance Indicator section](#).

Summary of Financial Performance

The majority of expenses for the Office (76%) relate to staffing costs. The remainder is primarily for accommodation, communications and office equipment.

Financial Performance	2015-16 Actual	2016-17 Target ('000s)	2016-17 Actual ('000s)	Variance from Target ('000s)
Total cost of services (sourced from Statement of Comprehensive Income)	\$10,663	\$10,595	\$11,106	+\$511
Income other than income from State Government (sourced from Statement of Comprehensive Income)	\$2,048	\$1,989	\$2,055	+\$66
Net cost of services (sourced from Statement of Comprehensive Income)	\$8,615	\$8,606	\$9,051	+\$445
Total equity (sourced from Statement of Financial Position)	\$2,837	\$2,302	\$2,436	+\$134
Net increase in cash held (sourced from Statement of Cash Flows)	\$395	\$20	-\$458	-\$478
Staff Numbers	Number	Number	Number	Number
Full time equivalent (FTE) staff level at 30 June	65	67	69	+2

Comparison of Actual Results and Budget Targets

The variation between the 2016-17 actual results and the targets for the Office's total cost of services and net cost of services and the decrease in cash held is primarily due to the staffing required to monitor the Infringement Notices provisions of *The Criminal Code*, as a result of a change in the timing of the commencement of the function in 2014-15 and, as a consequence, a change in the completion date in 2016-17. The decrease in cash held also included asset purchases committed in 2015-16 but paid in 2016-17.

For further details see [Note 29 'Explanatory Statement' in the Financial Statements section](#).

