

JOINT COMMITTEE, PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Group – National Security & Criminal Justice Group

Program – Inquiry into ANAO audit report – Safer Streets Programme (Round One)

Question No. 1-7

Mr Conroy asked the following questions at the hearing on 17 September 2015:

- 1. What percentage of (Safer Streets) projects were awarded to coalition seats?...But the best information available at today's hearing is that 124 of the 150 projects were for coalition seats, and 90 per cent of funding going to coalition seats is what we think, roughly, it is looking like without being held to account. The department will take on notice both of those questions, and will come back to me with hopefully—since this is a considerable amount of Commonwealth expenditure—locations for these projects so that we can work out what electorates they are happening in. (pgs 10 and 11)**

While there were 150 election commitments for Round One of the Safer Streets Programme, an organisation may elect to deliver multiple commitments as one project. Therefore, there are 84 projects in total arising from the 150 commitments.

Please note that of the 84 projects, two organisations declined to apply for funding in Round One of the Programme and one project was found unsuccessful (Greater Toukley Vision).

Of the 81 projects that were awarded funding:

- 63 projects are to be delivered in electorates held by the Coalition (77.78% of projects)
- seven projects are to be delivered in multiple electorates that are held by different parties, which include both Coalition and non-Coalition seats (8.64% of projects), and
- 11 projects are to be delivered in electorates held by a party other than the Coalition (13.58%).

Of the 81 projects that the Minister for Justice has agreed to fund, four do not yet have a funding agreement in place. The total value of the projects where there is an executed funding agreement comes to \$18,692,666, with:

- \$12,500,279 allocated to projects to be delivered in Coalition held electorates (66.87%)
- \$3,293,776 allocated to projects to be delivered in electorates held by multiple parties (it is not possible to apportion the funding to each individual electorate) (17.62%), and
- \$2,898,611 allocated to projects to be delivered in electorates held by other parties other than the Coalition (15.51%).

For the four projects where no funding agreement is in place, the final value of the project is yet to be confirmed. Accordingly, the department did not include these values in the above calculations.

- 2. The Audit Office has clearly found evidence that the pre-election commitment was made. They are very specific that the LNP candidate for Moreton had announced on Thursday, 15 August 2013 that they will make this commitment. If the ANAO could find that then why couldn't the department? (pg 14)**

The two Moreton commitments were included in the list of 30 announcements the department identified and provided to the Minister's Office on 4 October 2013. They were also included in the Minister's Office's original list of 150 commitments.

- 3. Were those four projects (that were ultimately removed from the list of election commitments) on the original list of 53 projects that you provided to the minister's office as projects you identified that commitments had been made?... Can you take on notice whether they were on the original list and, if they were, whether they were on the list of 150 projects that came back? (pg 14)**

The two Moreton commitments were included on the list of 30 announcements the department provided to the Minister's Office. The remaining two commitments (Eden-Monaro and Hughes) were not on that list.

All four commitments were originally included in the Minister Office's list of 150 commitments.

- 4. So they (the four removed projects) were not removed subsequent to the 150 projects being listed. Mr Anderson, your reasoning for why they potentially dropped off does not appear consistent with that, so what other reason could there be for these projects being removed? Would you mind taking on notice and coming back to this committee with why they were taken off the list and who instructed the department to take them off the list, please? (pgs 14 and 15)**

On 12 May 2014, an Assistant Adviser to the Minister for Justice advised the department by email to remove the four commitments (the two Moreton, the Eden-Monaro and the Hughes commitments) from its original list of 150 commitments. No reason was provided.

- 5. Could you take that on notice and inform the committee when you have resolved that issue (in relation to the Safer Streets Programme grant to Liverpool City Council)? (pg 18)**

As agreed to by Mr Conroy, the department will inform the Committee on the outcome concerning the Liverpool City Council's Safer Streets project once the matter has been resolved.

- 6. Twenty-eight applications did not include a quote for the crime-prevention solution ... Could you provide, on notice, the total amount funded, covering those 28 applications? (pg 19)**

Following consultation with the ANAO, the ANAO has advised the department that it will provide the relevant information in response to this question on notice directly to the Committee.

- 7. Could the department provide a list of the—I think there are 26 projects? In paragraph 3.10, with the four categories, we have 88 projects located in an electorate where a coalition member held the seat before the election and retained it. We have 36 projects where the coalition won the seat. Could you list the electorates with the three projects where the coalition lost the seat? And, in a separate table, could you list the electorates with the 23 projects where the coalition were unsuccessful in winning that seat? I would**

just be interested in what electorates we are talking about here... Could you provide the list of all projects in the four categories? ...Yes (on four separate lists) —just so that we can understand according to those four dot points. (pg 22)

Following consultation with the ANAO, the ANAO has advised the department that it will provide the relevant information in response to this question on notice directly to the Committee.