

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
CRIMTRAC

Question No. 209

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 14 February 2006:

- a) Please provide an update on the implementation of the Action Plan for the ANAO report, addressing the specific questions below as well as the general progress of the recommendation?
- b) Are you able to provide a copy of the Action Plan?

Regarding Recommendation 1

- c) Was the draft of the Memorandum of Understanding considered by Strategic Issues Group at the June 2005 meeting?
 - i) If so, what was the outcome of that consideration? Was it adopted by the SIG?
 - ii) If not, has it been considered at a subsequent meeting?
 - (a) If so, when was it considered and what was the outcome? If not, why not?
- d) Have you now implemented the MOU with all jurisdictions? If so, when was this completed?
- e) Have there been any subsequent updates to the MOU? If so, please provide details.

Regarding Recommendation 2

- f) Could you indicate how many times the Strategic Issues Group has met since its formation, and the dates of those meetings?
- g) Could you indicate who is on the Strategic Issues Group?
- h) Are you able to indicate – for each meeting, who was invited and who attended?
- i) Could you indicate the topics that have been discussed in the meetings of the SIG?
- j) Could you provide a copy of the minutes taken at each SIG meeting?

Regarding Recommendation 3

- k) The Table – on its third item – indicates that the review of the Prince 2 templates was due to be completed by September 2004. However, under the ‘status’ paragraph, it is indicated that the review of templates is now expected to be completed by September 2005. Can you indicate what it was that caused the delay of a year in the implementation of that point?
- l) Is the review of templates now complete? If so, when was it completed? If not, why not and when is it expected to be completed?

Regarding Recommendation 4

- m) Could you indicate whether the requirements for new and existing projects – that is the development of a communication plan and the provision of an overview of elements by the SIG – have been followed? That is – have all existing and new projects had a communication plan drawn up for them, and have they all had an overview of elements provided by the SIG?
 - i) If not, which ones have not?

Regarding Recommendation 6

- n) Could you indicate whether or not the disaster recovery procedures have been completed?
 - i) If so, when were they completed?

- ii) If not, when are they due to be completed?

Regarding Recommendation 9

- o) Was this model presented to the board?
- p) When was it presented to the board?
- q) Was it agreed to by the board, or was it sent back for redrafting? If so, why, on what date was it resubmitted to the board and what was the outcome on that occasion?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) A copy is provide in response to QoN 200.
- b) Yes. A copy is included as an attachment to QoN 200.

Regarding Recommendation 1

- c) No.
 - i) N/A.
 - ii) Yes.
 - (a) At the 16 August 2005 meeting SIG examined the draft MOU, and resolved that a new version of the MOU, taking into account amendments made at the meeting, was to be circulated out of session, with a view to SIG supporting the signing of the MOU by Police Commissioners and the Chief Police Officer ACT. A special meeting to discuss the draft partnership was held on 9 December 2005.
- d) No, MOU is finalized and agreed by SIG. Documents are with Police Commissioners (December 2005) for consideration and signature. Northern Territory, New South Wales and Tasmania have already responded that they are willing to sign the MOU as it stands. Western Australia and Queensland have asked for a number of minor technical changes and Victoria, South Australia and ACT/AFP have yet to respond.
- e) No updates have been considered or actioned.

Regarding Recommendation 2

- f) This is answered in QoN 201.
- g) Police Services in all jurisdictions are represented on the Strategic Issues Group, including the AFP National and ACT AFP. The Board approved the addition of a representative from the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department in June 2005.
- h) For each meeting all jurisdictions have been invited to send their representative. All representatives or their delegates attended the meetings except that an apology was received from NT for meetings 1 and 2. An apology was received from AFP ACT for meeting 7. A special meeting was held on 9 December 2005 by teleconference to discuss the draft Partnership MoU and New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania, and Queensland were available to attend. Other jurisdictions provided their views by email to this special meeting.
- i) No. Discussions in the SIG cover Board of Management business, strategic and operational police matters and information. There is the possibility that releasing the content of ongoing discussions of the SIG could jeopardise future CrimTrac/Commonwealth/State and Territory cooperative arrangements. A copy of the Terms of Reference for the SIG is attached for information as it provides a description of the role that SIG plays.
- j) No. The papers for meetings and the record of meetings are 'law-enforcement-in-confidence' as they cover discussions on Board of Management business, strategic and operational police

matters and information. There is the possibility that releasing the content of ongoing discussions of the SIG could jeopardise future CrimTrac/Commonwealth/State and Territory cooperative arrangements.

Regarding Recommendation 3

- k) The review was addressed at the earliest possible opportunity. The delay had not impacted adversely on overall project management because alternative guidance was available on a case-by-case basis.
- l) The review was completed in January 2005.

Regarding Recommendation 4

- m) The CPPMF requires the preparation of a communication plan and a template is provided. There is no requirement for the SIG to formally review these plans.

The status of the preparation of communication plans for open projects is as follows:

- MNPP – being developed in conjunction with the project plan for the national ramp-up and roll-out of the system, to be endorsed by the Steering Committee
- ANCOR – being developed within Stage 1 of the current project for Steering Committee endorsement
- EAMS III (NSS) – has been developed and will be endorsed by the Steering Committee in March 2006
- Common Services & Infrastructure – to be developed
- LAN upgrade – to be developed
- NAFIS 3.1 upgrade – to be developed
- NHBSS – project complete.

- i) N/A.

Regarding Recommendation 6

- n) Yes. March 2006.

Recommendation 9

- o) No. the proposal was dealt with by the SIG on 30 March 2005.
- p) N/A.
- q) It was agreed to by the SIG as an operational matter.

Strategic Issues Group

Terms of Reference, 1 September 2004

Purpose

The SIG is established to improve the partnership between CrimTrac and police through the provision of strategic direction, executive coordination of jurisdictional responses, more authoritative communication arrangements and the early identification of obstacles to information exchange.

Roles and Functions

The role of the SIG is to:

- A. Review the current status of programmes to:
 1. Identify obstacles to achieve operational delivery of the agreed CrimTrac Inter-Governmental Agreement (IGA) deliverables and other Board of Management (BoM) endorsed programmes, eg legal, policy, resourcing and other issues;
 2. Identify required action to assist CrimTrac to mitigate or remove obstacles to managing and improving the existing programs prioritised in the CrimTrac Strategic Plan 2004-07;
 3. Ensure that CrimTrac systems assist police business processes in an optimal way;
 4. Identify resource gaps and options for sustainability of the CrimTrac initiative;
 5. Provide BoM with proposed strategies to achieve CrimTrac's programmes;
 6. Review progress of implementation of agreed strategies;
- B. Provide input into the CrimTrac BoM's business planning by:
 1. Working with CrimTrac to identify emerging issues, including environmental and jurisdictional trends;
 2. Providing ongoing strategic and policy advice to the CrimTrac BoM and CrimTrac;
 3. Examining opportunities for jurisdictions to commission new initiatives involving CrimTrac. The SIG will give consideration to:
 - Greater sharing of existing police data holdings;
 - Development of new data holdings which could be shared nationally;
 - Police access to external data holdings;
 - Revenue opportunities;
- C. Undertake tasks and activities at the direction of the CrimTrac BoM.

Membership

The SIG is comprised of one representative from each of the jurisdictions and CrimTrac. A senior officer from each police jurisdiction should be appointed to provide an overall coordination role in regards to all

CrimTrac issues and initiatives. This person would provide a central reference point for all CrimTrac matters, and have sufficient authority and contact with management to make decisions on behalf of the organisation.

The CrimTrac representative will provide advice on information technology and implementation issues and ensure the operational policing requirements are actioned.

The SIG reports to the CrimTrac BoM and will be chaired by a member of the group, as agreed within the group. The chairmanship will be reviewed after 12 months. A deputy chair will be appointed under similar arrangements.

Members should serve a term of at least two years. All members should endeavour to attend all meetings. Each member will provide an additional contact point within their agency, who may attend meetings when the ordinary member is unavailable and would be properly briefed and given the decision making capability. The member and the alternate should, wherever possible, remain the same nominees, to ensure continuity for the SIG. Members and alternates should possess the appropriate level of expertise to effectively meet the purpose of the committee.

The SIG will have authority to request, through the CEO CrimTrac, support from CrimTrac work groups or project managers and enlist experts and advisers, where technical expertise is required.