

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Question No.39

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 31 October 2005:

- a) Regarding the diversionary program for juveniles in the Northern Territories, are you able to provide a copy of the independent evaluation of the Northern Territory agreement that was conducted by Urbis J H D in 2003/2004?
- b) Were any recommendations made by this report?
- c) If so, what recommendations were made?
- d) Where is the Department at in implementing the recommendations?
 - (i) Could you provide a breakdown for each recommendation?
 - (ii) How much has the implementation of the recommendations so far cost, and how much was originally budgeted for the implementation of each recommendation?
 - (iii) Could you provide a cost breakdown for each recommendation?
- e) Could the Department provide a breakdown of the additional \$1.079 million dollars allocated in 05/06?
- f) Regarding the Juvenile Diversion Scheme is there any indication as to why the rate of diversions offered differed between non indigenous juveniles and indigenous juveniles by 16%?
 - (i) Are there any reports or reviews into why this is the case?
 - (ii) Is there any research why this is the case?
 - (iii) Does the department know why this is the case?
- g) Have any specific funding measures been aimed to address this problem?
 - (i) If so, what are they? If not, why not?
- h) With regard to the formal programs what constitutes a satisfactory completion?
- i) What further follow up work was done in the 10% of referrals who do not satisfactorily complete the program?
- j) Is there any follow up work done with the 90% who did satisfactorily complete the program?
- k) How were the locations for the community youth and developments units selected?
 - (i) What criteria was used?
 - (ii) How much funding has been given to each location?
 - (iii) How was that determined?
 - (iv) How often is it revised?
 - (v) Have there been any requests for more funding from any of the regions?
- l) What was the form of the consultation for the over 300 agencies, organisations, service providers and community councils that were consulted in the community program development?
- m) How much did the government allocate for expenditure remote and regional CDU's in:
 - (i) 2001-02,
 - (ii) 2002-03,
 - (iii) 2003-04 and,
 - (iv) 2004-05?

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

Funds under the Agreement between the Australian and Northern Territory Governments (The Northern Territory Agreement) in relation to funding for a Juvenile Pre-Court Diversion Scheme and an Aboriginal Interpreter Service were provided by the Attorney-General's Department to the Northern Territory Government. Individual funding agreements between the Northern Territory Government and local services are matters for the Northern Territory Government. The Attorney-General's Department does not oversee those agreements.

- a) A copy of the report entitled 'Evaluation of the Northern Territory Agreement (Pre-Court Diversion Scheme and Aboriginal Interpreter Service)' is enclosed. The report is also available from the Department's website www.crimeprevention.gov.au (under the *NT Agreement* link).
- b) No. The main purpose of the report was the evaluation of the effectiveness of the NT Agreement and identification of strategies to achieve aims.
- c) and d) See answer to b).
- e) The figure of \$1.079 million dollars for the Aboriginal Interpreter Service comprises \$900,000 operational expenses and \$179,000 administration expenses. Administration expenses comprise:
- | | |
|--|-----------|
| • 0.05 SES Band 1 (including salary, on costs of 33.06%, supplier expenses of 40% and property lease expenses) | \$11,283 |
| • 0.10 EL2 (including salary, on costs of 33.06%, supplier expenses of 40% and property lease expenses) | \$38,608 |
| • 1.0 APS 6. (including salary, on costs of 33.06%, supplier expenses of 40% and property lease expenses) | \$128,612 |
| • TOTAL | \$178,503 |
- f) The report 'Evaluation of the Northern Territory Agreement (Pre-Court Diversion Scheme and Aboriginal Interpreter Service)' discusses possible reasons for the different rate of diversion. The Department is not aware of any other reasons for this difference.
- g) Yes
- (i) Under the Northern Territory Extension Agreement, the Australian Government provided funding of \$3 million for a period of 10 months from 1 September 2004 for the Juvenile Diversion Scheme. Funds under the Extension Agreement were administered by the Northern Territory Government. A stated aim of the Extension Agreement was to enable the Northern Territory Government to increase the effectiveness of the Juvenile Diversion Scheme with Indigenous young people.
- h – l) This is a matter for the Northern Territory Government.
- m) The time frame for the Northern Territory Agreement did not coincide with the financial year and was from 1 September to 31 August for four years commencing in 2000. The table below shows the amounts allocated for the purchase of community based programs in the twelve months ending on 31 August of the indicated years (ending on 30 June for 2005).

2001	1,338,490
2002	2,685,235
2003	1,889,000
2004	1,789,000
2005	2,473,000