

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Division 32: Western Australia Police, \$1 315 281 000 —

Ms J.M. Freeman, Chairman.

Mrs L.M. Harvey, Minister for Police.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan, Commissioner of Police.

Mr S.A. Brown, Deputy Commissioner, Operations.

Mr G. Dreibergs, Deputy Commissioner, Specialist Services.

Mr P. Zanetti, Assistant Commissioner, Reform and Business Improvement.

Mr A. Kannis, Executive Director.

Mr L. Bechelli, Acting Director, Business Strategy and Finance.

Ms S. Cardenia, Acting Chief Finance Officer.

Mr I. Clarke, Inspector, State Traffic Command.

Mr S. Higgins, Superintendent, Workforce.

Mr D. Gaunt, Superintendent, Structural Reform.

Mr G. Hamley, Chief of Staff.

The CHAIRMAN: We are in Estimates B for division 32. I now ask the minister to introduce her advisers to the committee.

[Witnesses introduced.]

The CHAIRMAN: This estimates committee will be reported by Hansard. The daily proof *Hansard* will be available the following day. It is the intention of the Chair to ensure that as many questions as possible are asked and answered and that both questions and answers are short and to the point.

The estimates committee consideration of the estimates will be restricted to discussion of those items for which a vote of money is proposed in the consolidated account. Questions must be clearly related to a page number, item, program or amount in the current division. It will greatly assist Hansard if members can give these details in preface to their question.

The minister may agree to provide supplementary information to the committee, rather than asking that the question be put on notice for the next sitting. I ask the minister to clearly indicate what supplementary information she agrees to provide and I will then allocate a reference number. If supplementary information is to be provided, I seek the minister’s cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the principal clerk by Friday, 19 June 2015.

I caution members that if a minister asks that a matter be put on notice, it is up to the member to lodge the question on notice with the Clerk’s office.

Are there any questions? Member for Midland.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Page 361 sets out the summary of portfolio appropriations. I refer to the 2014–15 budget compared with the 2014–15 estimated actual figure. I note under “Capital Appropriation” an estimated actual of just \$35 million compared with the actual budget allocated this time last year of \$69 969 000, which indicates a significant reduction in the capital appropriation that occurred during the year. Can the minister explain what was cut there or what has been delayed? Further to that, I note that even with the delivery of services, there was an estimated actual budget of just \$1.223 billion compared with what was budgeted this time last year of \$1.253 billion, which is about \$40 million less. What was the impetus for spending \$40 million less? Was it an efficiency drive or some request from Treasury, and what services were cut or not delivered that the minister anticipated delivering this time last year?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There were quite a few questions in one. With respect to the original total appropriation in the 2014–15 *Budget Statements* of \$1.323 billion, the total appropriation has been reduced to an estimated actual of \$1.259 billion. Is that what the member is referring to?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Yes, that is the global amount and that, of course, is made up of the recurrent and the capital expenditure.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get Mr Kannis to talk to the breakdown of that. The reduction in the total appropriation is due to efficiency measures. There has been some capital repositioning of various projects that

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

are linked in certain circumstances to project delays. I defer to Mr Kannis to explain that breakdown in further detail.

Mr A. Kannis: It is correct that the appropriation has reduced by those amounts. It is important to note that the appropriation is only one element of our funding source, but it is correct that if we look at the total cost of services, which is the real measure of total spend that is shown on page 363 in the table at the top, the member will see that it is reduced by about \$38.8 million between the 2014 budget and the 2014–15 estimated actual. A number of factors have led to that, including those already mentioned by the minister. However, other efficiency measures have been imposed by the government on all agencies, including things such as the one per cent government efficiency dividend, the asset investment program efficiency measure, which our agency chose to fund from recurrent services, and the information and communications technology savings and reform. All those elements are some examples of where the government has reduced our total expense limit due to efficiency measures that we needed to contribute to.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Following up on that, I thank Mr Kannis for that answer. It depends on the calculation that we look at. If we look at page 361, \$64 356 000 less was appropriated from consolidated revenue than we were told was going to be this time last year. If we look at page 363, which Mr Kannis referred to, he has made that calculation, because of other funding sources, down to \$38 million. Mr Kannis said in his response that there are four components to that. I will go through each of them and ask for some further clarification. When was the one per cent further efficiency dividend put in place? Clearly, it was not in place this time last year for it to have made a difference to this. Then there is the asset investment program, which Mr Kannis said was funded from internal funding sources, or some phrase of that nature. What does that mean in real terms? What is the practicality of that? What are the ICT savings? What did not occur or how were the savings made? Then, generally, I am told that reform has saved some money. What are the practicalities of that? What has changed through this reform? For example, does the reform mean that WA Police is giving less overtime or it has cut back on something? I am asking for the detail of those savings that have been made since we sat here last year.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the member for the question. The one per cent general government efficiency dividend formed part of the midyear review for the 2014–15 budget cycle. We announced a package of corrective measures and WA Police was required to respond to that. That one per cent efficiency dividend applied from 1 October 2014. I will get the commissioner to respond shortly and go a little bit further into how much of those savings have been achieved through reform and other measures. In addition to that, on the other parts of the member's question, the asset investment program efficiency measure was also part of the 2014–15 budget process. During the midyear review there was a further asset investment program. This second tranche was a corrective measure endorsed by cabinet, and WA Police was required, through that, to identify a further \$6.7 million in savings to the out years 2018–19. The impact of that is an ongoing budget reduction of around five per cent, which is \$11.1 million over four years, applicable to the total asset investment program.

[2.10 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister has really not added anything to what Mr Kannis has said. What does it really mean? What cuts have been made to the asset investment program? I want the detail of that, not just "It's happening and we had to do it and it's this many dollars".

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member did actually ask me for the date that it came into place and I believe I have provided the member with that. With the ICT savings, that was, once again, effective from 17 November 2014. To get into the detail of how that is being implemented, I will ask the commissioner to probably go to Mr Kannis and potentially also to Assistant Commissioner Paul Zanetti, who is dealing with the reform program. With regard to the ICT savings as a breakdown, I am not sure whether we have that with us, but Mr Kannis will answer in more detail.

Mr A. Kannis: If I can explain, the savings that we are required to identify here, which have been harvested from our expense limit, are not on top of our reform savings. Our service definition and resourcing model identifies a suite of savings in the first phase of up to around \$50 million. We are using those savings to achieve these cuts that have been applied to our budget. So we have no difficulty in achieving these savings, because we have already identified them through our service definition and resourcing model.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Maybe I have not been clear in my question. What I want to know is: what is the suite of savings?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I do not know that we have a list of the savings.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: So you are saving money but you do not know how or on what?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As we said, we are currently in the reform program, member for Midland, and we are going through the SDRM process. For some of the examples of where we are making ICT savings, I would probably go to some of the reform work that we have done in the ICT space.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Madam Chairman, I am not interested in isolated examples. I am asking for the detailed information that we would normally expect to get at estimates. I want a full list of what that suite of savings is. I know that you needed to save the money and I know that you have saved the money. But how have you saved it, and where are those savings occurring on a line item basis?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member will have to place that question on notice.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: But Mr Kannis said he had the information, and the minister is now not letting us have it!

The CHAIRMAN: Members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I beg your pardon, member for Midland. Mr Kannis has just advised me that he does not have an itemised list of every single program and where the savings will be delivered for every single program.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: If I place that question on notice, will the minister answer it in detail?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Madam Chairman, this is a very detailed question. I would request that the member put it on notice. We will not be able to provide it by way of supplementary information in the time frame required, so I request that the member put that question on notice, and I am happy to provide it. We do not have an itemised list of every single expenditure item from every single business section of Police with us today.

The CHAIRMAN: I will allow one further question.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Further to that, perhaps I could be helpful and ask the minister to provide by way of supplementary information that information that she can compile within that two-week time frame—perhaps not in total detail, but something more detailed than what I have been given today. I ask the minister to provide whatever she can provide reasonably within that two-week time frame, and then, armed with that, I will be more than happy to look at that and provide a more detailed question on notice. There is a system in place in the estimates whereby a minister can seek to provide an answer by way of supplementary information if it is not handy for the minister to provide the answer today or she does not have it with her. I am not asking for what the minister considers to be unreasonable because it is too detailed and will take perhaps months for the minister to provide. I am just asking for the level of detail that the minister would be able to provide in a two-week period. Is the minister prepared to do that?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have already said that the member would need to put that question on notice, because it will take a considerable amount of time to go through every single business unit and find where the one per cent efficiency saving is going to be. We have an overall savings target that is available in the budget. I can provide the member with some information, but without specifically knowing the sort of information that the member needs, I dare say I will not be able to satisfy her. So I request that the member put the question on notice.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am just asking for that which the minister can provide by way of detail. Will the minister provide by way of supplementary information whatever detail she can provide on this topic? How can that be unreasonable?

The CHAIRMAN: The minister can answer this and I will then move on.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I can provide the member with the allocation of the service appropriation savings from 2014–15 and where they vary from the estimated actual. I have that information available.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the minister going to provide that now or via supplementary information?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: By supplementary information I can provide that.

The CHAIRMAN: Can the minister outline again what she will be providing?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will provide for the member for Midland a breakdown of where we will be achieving the one per cent general government efficiency dividend, the asset investment program efficiency measure and the ICT savings and reform measures. We will do our best to provide the information about how we are going to achieve those as a general agency program.

[*Supplementary Information No B11.*]

Mr M.J. COWPER: One of the key issues for modern policing is that the police are able to communicate with the public and respond. I refer to page 368 and the dot point about a new computer-aided dispatch system. I recall that when the original CADCOM system was introduced around 2004, we had some problems.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

I understand that was developed by British Aerospace Engineering at the time. It is over 10 years old; therefore, in terms of computers it would be archaic. I am very interested to know why we have to replace the current system, and what advantages there will be to the community from the new system.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, member. The computer-aided dispatch system is indeed one of the essential tools for police officers, so I am really pleased that this system will be replaced. The support program for the current CAD system will end in December 2016. The system helps us measure our response times so that we can stay true to our key performance and efficiency indicators. It helps us allocate our frontline police officers in the best possible way. It also helps inform us of the quality of the initial attendance and investigation. It is used, obviously, in the management of emergencies. As to the detail of the new system, I will throw it to Mr Kannis, the executive director.

Mr A. Kannis: The CAD system is planned to replace the current system, which has been in place for more than 10 years. It will provide all the functionality that is provided by the current system. We hope that we can extract some other benefits from the new system as well. It is pretty much due to the fact that the asset was at the end of its useful life.

[2.20 pm]

Mr M.J. COWPER: I can tell the minister firsthand that it was not the most simplistic program when it was introduced and it has been fraught with fish hooks in it ever since. Are we going to go down the same road of developing a system of our own or are we going to get something off the shelf? I am very interested to know. Technology has advanced and obviously police services right across the globe use different systems. I thought it would be a lot more cost-effective, given that technology changes so quickly, to grab something that is already in place and tried and proven as opposed to developing a hybrid.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member is quite correct; we do need to improve the functionality of the existing system with the new computer-aided dispatch system, but I will get the executive director to explain further.

Mr A. Kannis: I also lived through some of those problems that occurred with phase 1 of CAD. The lesson that the agency learnt from that example is that it will look only at demonstrable systems—that is, systems that are working elsewhere in the world. It will pretty much replicate the system that we have in place at the moment. In all cases, the vendors will be able to demonstrate that the system is working in either Western Australia at the moment or another jurisdiction.

Mr M.J. COWPER: Are we going to save money in this process with the purchase of this technology, because we spent a bomb on the previous one? I would have thought it would be more efficient and cheaper to buy something off the shelf.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: One of my bugbears is information technology and the purchasing of IT systems, so the member for Murray–Wellington can be assured that we will try to get the most efficient system that will provide us with the least number of problems in the future. With IT being as it is, sometimes we do not always get what we think we will get, but we will choose very carefully and make sure that whatever we choose will be absolutely best suited for the future of WA Police.

Mr M.J. COWPER: I just hope that we have learnt something along the way.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to the spending changes listed on page 363 of the *Budget Statements*, particularly the one per cent general government efficiency dividend and the 15 per cent procurement savings. Can the minister outline the strategy for meeting these savings and advise what progress has been made to date?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We are meeting our efficiency savings and we are doing that generally by ensuring that we are procuring in the most efficient fashion. We are ensuring that we get best value for money options as we look at purchases within WA Police. I can get the executive director, Mr Kannis, to also respond. We are confident that we can comfortably achieve these efficiency savings, and part of that is obviously linked into the reform program in looking at how we can improve our business process along the way.

Mr A. Kannis: The answer to this question is the same as that for the previous question from the member for Midland.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I hope the answer is different.

Mr A. Kannis: We are using the savings that we have identified out of the service definition and resourcing model to achieve the government's efficiency savings. The detail of that will be provided in the same way as the supplementary information that was promised earlier.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: By way of supplementary.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

The CHAIRMAN: So supplementary information has been offered. Can the minister outline what is in supplementary information B12?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have not offered to provide any further supplementary information. Mr Kannis was referring to the previous request for supplementary information, which is basically, from what I can gather, the same information that the member for Midland requested.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: With respect, minister, I think it is for all the out years. I would like the identified savings for the out years.

The CHAIRMAN: Which is coming in as supplementary.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Perhaps I can put this another way. Is the minister confident that there will not be any staff cuts in this financial year?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member is probably well aware of the fact that WA Police is a government agency that has a growth program currently in train and we are on target to achieve our 550 growth program from the 2013 election, so we will not be cutting staff.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Frontline staff will not be cut. Will other staff be cut?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We do not have any proposal in front of us at the moment to reduce full-time equivalents, except that we have offered voluntary separations to 30 officers of commissioned rank. Those have certainly been oversubscribed, but at present we do not have any plans to reduce our FTEs, aside from those 30 commissioned officers who will be replaced as part of the growth program.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The minister is familiar with the workforce renewal policy. If staff leave voluntarily within the next year, will they have to be replaced under the workforce renewal policy?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Frontline police officers are exempt from the workforce renewal policy.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am talking about all personnel, not just police officers.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: With respect to public servants, Mr Kannis has advised me that, through the SDRM process, we have found some savings from some positions for our public servants, and the Community and Public Sector Union–Civil Service Association of WA is aware of those.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Does that mean there will be cuts of public service officers from the police department?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: At the moment, we have identified 170 positions but we have not reduced our FTEs by that at this time. I will get Mr Kannis to elaborate further.

Mr A. Kannis: The 170 FTEs that the minister has referred to were part of phases 1, 2 and 3 of the service definition and resourcing model. All those savings have been communicated to the Civil Service Association. Some of those officers took redundancy through the last public service voluntary severance program that was available. Others are in the process of being redeployed.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Can the minister say whether any of those public service personnel are call centre operators?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No. The call centre is considered to be front line, so there is none in the call centre.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Following on from the previous question, can the minister give us details of where we stand at the moment with the election promise of 550 extra police officers? Can she confirm whether or not enough people are applying to be recruits in the police service; and, if so, how many, and how many are being rejected?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the member for that question. We are on target to achieve our commitment. The election commitment from 2008 has been achieved. To achieve the growth program from the 2013 election commitment, our target is 6 204 police officers and 357 police auxiliary officers, which is 57 more than were promised. We promised 150 from 2008 and 150 from 2013, but we have shifted our 40 cadets into police auxiliary officer positions and also 17 custody officers into police auxiliary officer positions, so our target for auxiliary officers is 357 at the end of 2017 and our target for police is 6 204. Our recruitment is being assisted at present by the lowest ever attrition rates within police, so fewer police officers are leaving the force now than were leaving when the growth program first started. We are well on target. We have 260 police officers and 74 police auxiliary officers left to recruit by the end of 2017 to meet our commitment.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: How many applicants are in the process to make up that 260 at this time? As I understand it, stacks and stacks of people are applying to become police officers and the academy is working at full blast to try to get them as fully fledged recruits, and then police constables. Is that the situation at the moment? Are there more than enough people applying to become police officers?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Absolutely. Our recruitment strategies have been very successful. We have had adverts on TV and we are starting to see that the applications to join Western Australia Police are very strong. We have had no problem filling our recruitment squads.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: How many applications does the department hold at the moment?

[2.30 pm]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would have to answer that question by way of supplementary information. I need to get the number of applications—I am not sure what the member is asking.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am trying to get to the basic end question that, as I understand it, the department is refusing some people who qualify in many respects to be police officers. They are being told that they can reapply next year. There is no shortage whatsoever of people applying to become police officers, particularly with the downturn in the jobs in the mining sector. At the end of the line, my question is: why on earth are we spending millions of dollars in advertising the Bigger Picture to get people to become police officers when we do not need to?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get the commissioner to answer that question.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is a political question. The Bigger Picture is a political advertising campaign. Unfortunately, it is now being addressed to police; I do not think they should be politicised. I want to know why we are spending millions of dollars on that particular campaign when we do not need to because more than enough people want to join the police force. As I understand it, the department does not need to advertise at the moment.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The Bigger Picture police advertising campaign is not just about recruitment. We have advertisements on television that are specific to recruitment and getting potential police officers to apply to the WA Police for positions. However, part of the Bigger Picture campaign was also advertising our new local policing model and our local policing teams, and ensuring that the community is aware of the change in policing with those local policing teams. It has been an incredibly successful campaign. Whenever we have had those advertisements on television, there has been an exponential increase in the number of hits on the website for WA Police. There has been an increase in the number —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: For recruits?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Not only for recruits, but generally for information. There is an increase in the number of people going to the WA Police webpage to find out the numbers for their local policing teams and to get more information about that. I think the WA Police contribution to those advertisements was around \$600 000 at the end of last year. It has been very successful in ensuring that the community is well informed about the new local policing teams, and the hits on the webpage for people accessing that information about their local policing teams have been incredibly useful.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the minister give us by way of supplementary information the detail of exactly how many hits are made on the WA Police website for, firstly, recruitment, and, secondly, local community policing details in each of the districts?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We will provide that by supplementary information.

The CHAIRMAN: Can the minister outline what she is providing supplementary information for?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will provide the contrast between the hits on the WA Police website for people inquiring about becoming police officers before the television advertisements and after the television advertisements. Is that what the member is interested in?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Not really, no. People have been applying to become police officers for about 12 months now. A lot of them have lost their jobs in the mining sector and are going to the police to get jobs as police officers, which I understand. That is not really the question. The question is: how many hits has the website had in the last 12 months about applications, or potential applications, for becoming a police officer, and how many hits has the website had for details about community policing in those specific areas?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I do not think our system is capable of articulating whether the hits are specifically to find out about becoming a police officer or whether they are hits to the website for other information.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is what the minister told us earlier, that people are going on there to see what is happening about community policing, and that is why I asked the question.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we pull this in? The minister offered to give a supplementary answer. Would the minister like to put on the record what supplementary information she can give? Member for Hillarys, then we

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

will move on because you have the next question, but I have lots of other people putting up their hands who think they are not on the list. We are trying to be quick with the questions.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: My next question will be very quick.

The CHAIRMAN: Okay; good. Can the minister give supplementary information?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Is it my turn to answer?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you. I am willing to provide by supplementary information the number of hits on the WA Police website when the Bigger Picture advertising campaign is running as opposed to when it is not running.

[*Supplementary Information No B12.*]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can the minister tell me the total cost of the recruitment advertising campaign and also for the local police team advertising campaign, and over what period—or provide it by way of supplementary, whichever suits?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would need to provide that by way of supplementary information. I will provide the amount of money that has been allocated specifically for police recruitment advertising as opposed to Bigger Picture local policing team advertising.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: As well as, not as opposed to. I want to know both; that is what I asked for.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will provide both figures.

[*Supplementary Information No B13.*]

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Hillarys, you have a question—make it quick; then the member for Midland and then the member for Belmont, and the member for Girrawheen is on the list.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: My question will be very quick, and it tends to follow on from what we have said already. Can the minister provide a list of the communications and information technology projects currently underway in the police department? For each project, can the minister provide the initial cost estimate and the current estimated cost?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Sorry, which line item is the member referring to?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer to the third dot point on page 368, and it goes on further down where there is reference to ICT under works in progress. It is a very simple question. It needs just a simple answer.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Can the member please repeat the question?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes. Can the minister please provide a list of the communications and information technology projects that are currently underway in the police department? For each project, can the minister provide the initial cost estimate and the current estimated cost? If the minister cannot answer that now, I am happy to take it as supplementary information.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I cannot answer it now, but I will provide it by way of supplementary information.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Okay.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member is asking for a list of the current ICT projects, what the estimated cost was —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: What the initial cost estimate was and what the current estimated costs are for those individual projects.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: For ICT?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: For ICT—for communications and information technology, so it covers more than just ICT.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: By way of supplementary information, I will provide the initial estimated cost and the current anticipated cost for our ICT programs and our communications program.

[*Supplementary Information No B14.*]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I refer to pages 366 and 367 of the budget papers. There are three sections under the heading “Services and Key Efficiency Indicators” on page 366: “Metropolitan policing services”, “Regional and Remote Policing Services” and “Specialist Policing Services”. The budget papers list the number of full-time

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

equivalents, and I notice that in many instances the department is down on the number of full-time equivalents that it was expecting to have when we sat here this time last year. For example, under the first section for metropolitan policing services, 3 638 officers were budgeted for. That is what the minister told me the department would have last year, yet we have gone through the year and the estimated actual number of officers servicing the metropolitan area is 116 fewer than that at 3 522. Although the number is up from the year before, that is not what the department budgeted for. I am seeking some explanation for those variations.

Regional and remote policing services is again down on what was budgeted. Last year's budget stated that there would be 2 010 people in regional and remote areas, but there are only 1 957 people. The specialist policing services is up marginally by 19 officers, which is not very many and does not account for that. I assume that part of that may be to do with the number of redundancies WA Police has had. There has been more than one scheme of redundancies. Why is there this variation? If someone wants to start preparing the information for an answer for my second question, it is whether I can have a breakdown for each of those categories of FTEs as to sworn and unsworn officers.

[2.40 pm]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Those figures do not reflect the actual FTE posted to the metropolitan region. The allocation of each of those service areas varies from year to year. We have had some reductions in unsworn FTEs that we discussed previously. We have also had a restructuring of our model, particularly in metropolitan, which will be rolled out through regional Western Australia.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Minister, if I can be of some assistance here, I have added up those three categories of total numbers of staff—FTEs—and have come up with a budget this year of 8 160 FTEs. Can the minister advise whether there are any FTEs hidden anywhere else or have they all been divided between those three categories?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get the executive director, Mr Kannis, to answer that question in more detail.

Mr A. Kannis: There is an apportioning of FTEs between these services; therefore, there is movement. The member is right to say that there has been a reduction in the total number of FTEs compared with the number we budgeted. The majority of that reduction would be due to the public servant midyear reductions that we referred to earlier. There has been some reallocation. The member asked whether this represents all our FTEs. Yes it does, because even our overheads are spread across these three services as well. This is our total FTE at this point in time on average over the year. If I can clarify, this is not a point in time.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can I please have a point clarified? Can the minister tell me whether the total FTE number includes school crossing wardens?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It does include school crossing wardens and that obviously fluctuates from year to year. The 2014–15 budget figure for the total FTE is 8 095. The estimated actual is 7 955. Our budget estimate for 2015–16 is 8 160 as a total.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I thank the minister for clarifying that. Those are exactly the same figures that I added up. Last year's budget was for 8 095 FTEs, but the estimated actual number of officers and staff employed this year is significantly less than that—it is 7 955. I am trying to quickly add that up. That is 130 or 140 fewer than what the minister said. That is the difference between 8 095 and 7 955. That is significantly fewer. Has the minister partly achieved cost savings by employing fewer FTEs this year?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, member. I think we explained earlier that the reduction in FTE has come from the SDRM process and we actually offered the redundancies. We predicted a different figure from the one we achieved. I do not think we can provide any further information. The member is correct that there are 140 fewer FTEs than what was budgeted and what we estimate we will actually finish with, but I point out that for the 2015–16 financial year our estimate is that we will achieve 8 160 FTE.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister might end up with maybe 160 fewer FTEs than that, and that means nothing based on last year's effort. I am waiting for the minister to indicate whether she can give me the breakdown for each of those categories of sworn FTEs versus others. Given redundancies is an issue, could I have the figures on how many officers have been made redundant in each month of last year?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I can tell the member that the 2014–15 budgeted FTE is 5 894 police officers; 13 police liaison officers or, formally, Aboriginal police liaison officers; 259 police auxiliary officers; 1 764 police staff; 30 contract cleaners and people who fall outside the usual enterprise bargaining agreement arrangements; and 135 crossing guards and traffic wardens. The estimated actual for 2014–15 is 5 862 police officers, 10 police liaison officers, 258 police auxiliary officers, 1 658 police staff, 29 individual contractors and cleaners and 138 crossing guards and traffic wardens.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What is the total?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The total for 2014–15 comes in at 7 955 against the budget of 8 095.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I originally asked for details under the three headings: metropolitan policing services, regional and remote, and specialist policing services. Can I have a breakdown of the FTEs, separating out sworn and unsworn staff?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I can provide that by way of supplementary information. I will provide the metropolitan, regional and specialist policing services and the breakdown of police sworn officers and public servants.

[*Supplementary Information No B15.*]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister said that the total staff this year will be 7 955. The overall number of staff in the police service in 2008 was 7 474. Can the minister explain why there has been a staff increase of only 481 since 2008?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I think we have explained that we have had the voluntary severance program and the redundancies. But I would need to go back to the 2008 figures, which I do not have in front of me.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Those figures are not in dispute; it is 7 474.

Mrs G.J. GODFREY: It took 50 minutes to get a question. I refer to page 371, “Details of Controlled Grants and Subsidies” and, in particular, to the CCTV network infrastructure fund. Can the minister please outline what this funding will be used for?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the member for the question. The CCTV strategy was one of our election commitments, so I am very pleased to see that we are now achieving that. That program comprises \$0.5 million to set up the draft CCTV strategy and we allocated \$1 million last year to provide grants to local governments for CCTV installation.

We have added funding of \$7 million to the strategy over the forward estimates, which comprises \$2 million per annum in 2015–16 and 2016–17 for grants and \$3 million in capital funding in 2016–17 to refresh the state register and the former Blue Iris project, and to implement some other recommendations. The election commitment was for \$13.5 million. Funding to date is \$8.5 million. However, part of that commitment involved an upgrade of the facility at Maylands, which, out of the reform process, police believe is no longer required. Some money was also set aside for upgrading the link from the Public Transport Authority to the police system but we have managed to achieve that within the existing budget, so additional funds are no longer required for that project.

[2.50 pm]

Mr M.J. COWPER: I have a further question.

The CHAIRMAN: I will take that further question. That is why I am taking so long. If the member for Belmont does not like the way I am chairing, she is always welcome to move dissent to the Chair.

Mrs G.J. GODFREY: I did not know I could do that.

Mr M.J. COWPER: We have a situation in which technology is emerging. Closed-circuit television is very interesting and exciting in the way we will deal with crime in the future. Everyone carries an iPhone these days. The new ones will have 16 megapixels. We have dashboard cameras and all that. Given the amount of information that must be floating around relating to traffic offences, crimes and all the rest of it, how will the government manage all that in the current structures? I would be very interested to hear how the government will structure this, where it fits into the crime and traffic portfolios and how that information will be retrieved. Obviously, it is a matter of separating the wheat from the chaff and then feeding it back into the system so that police officers can respond. Basically, I am asking: how will this impact on operations and how will the information be delivered to police officers given the amount of information available?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The CCTV program is somewhat separate from what the member is describing, which is generally, from what I can gather, how police will manage the influx of information that they receive. It is true that data storage and data management is one of the challenges that the agency will face. Every government agency faces that. That is certainly one of the areas that we are attempting to address. As far as the CCTV strategy is concerned, it is important to ensure that local governments that were applying for grants had the right kind of cameras in place that could clearly identify offenders, for example, and that footage could be downloaded or accessed easily. A lot of our footage can now be accessed by logging into an internet protocol address. A CCTV strategy goes some way to addressing the best technology for police officers to access. We are running a trial involving fitting cameras to the uniforms of our police officers. We have been running that trial with our traffic policing officers as well. A lot of information is scrolling through those cameras. The next challenge is storage and recording offences.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mr M.J. COWPER: We only have to go to social media, dashcam.com or whatever it is, to see the number of offences that have now been recorded. Most people have dash cameras. They can buy them from \$20 to \$100 and put them on their dashboard. People put them there for insurance purposes. How will the police deal with that? We see these offences from time to time.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The commissioner has been working on some of these strategies involving the cameras we are providing to police officers. I will ask the commissioner to respond.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: It is a good question. There is a range of issues. I think we have to approach it in a practical way and in a way that can be afforded by whichever government is in power at the time. The member is suggesting the take-up of many thousands of gigabytes of video material for potential evidentiary value. Clearly, we are starting to move down the path of trying to gather more evidence by way of video. We are seeing the cam trial that officers are starting now. We have seen that in other countries as well. That has to be managed and secured. Once an officer takes that vision, it cannot be put somewhere; it has to be secured for evidentiary value. It is clear that when we start to include the public in that, we need to have the capacity to upload that information, store it and retrieve it. This project is on our horizon and one that we have been talking about. It is a question of priorities. It will always be a question of priorities. I do not think we will be in a position to simply upload information from mobile phones automatically, say, through the web, for some time yet. For the more serious offences, we serve notices on people and we take mobile phone vision or any other type of vision but it is always done on a priority basis. Lots of material will be out there for more minor traffic matters that we may not choose to take. There will be material for more serious matters that we will need to take—for criminal matters and that sort of thing. The time is coming when we will have to have a capacity for the public, through the web, to upload material to WA Police but we are not there yet. We want to ensure that when we are ready for it, we can handle it properly and manage the evidence so that we know where it is and how we can retrieve it for its continuity, as the member would appreciate, for court.

Mr M.J. COWPER: It has a potential —

The CHAIRMAN: We have had that question. I have been told off! I ask the member to ask a quick question and for the minister to give a quick answer.

Mr M.J. COWPER: It was a great answer. It has the potential to cost the service a great deal of money in the future. Has the minister forecast that?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the commissioner to respond on whether we have any estimates on what that may cost the agency in the future.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: We do not have that. We should bear in mind that as technology such as cloud technology becomes more and more available and storage becomes cheaper, it becomes more possible but there are still security and continuity issues around doing that. It is on ICT horizons. We are working towards being able to do that but we are not there in an en masse way yet.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I refer to significant issues impacting the agency on page 364 of the *Budget Statements*. The fifth dot point refers to officers who are non-operational due to illness or injury. Can the minister provide details of the number of officers who are deemed to be non-operational due to illness or injury? What is the trend? Is it increasing or decreasing or is it an average?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We have about 150 non-operational police officers within WA Police at present. Part of the workforce optimisation tranche of reform is looking at and focusing on how we manage those non-operational workers, and how we assess fitness to serve in our injury management system for work-related injuries, sick leave provisions and medical retirements. We are looking at a range of factors and how we can support those officers who become unwell while they are on the job. We also try to not only prevent officers from becoming unwell or injured, but also manage them effectively when they are, with a view to trying to retain them within WA Police’s “fit for frontline” policy. That is what the workforce optimisation tranche reform will be focusing on and what it is focused on at present.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Can the minister advise the measures that are taken to identify or prevent post-traumatic stress disorder in police officers? Of those 150 non-operational police officers, how many are estimated to be non-operational because of post-traumatic stress disorder?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the director of human resources, Scott Higgins, to respond to that question.

Mr S. Higgins: Our health and safety division has in-house counsellors, so there are measures for dealing with officers who have symptoms along those lines or who are suffering some kind of stress or disorder along those lines. There is also peer counselling and there are external counsellors whom our officers are able to consult. We provide those officers with medical reimbursement. In relation to numbers, we do not have a specific breakdown

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

of how many of the officers who are non-operational, either temporary or permanently, are non-operational due to post-traumatic stress disorder.

[3.00 pm]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I just want to add to that response that we started a three-day mental health first-aid course within WA Police, which is quite intensive. Part of the course helps police officers identify PTSD in other police officers. So far, 10 per cent of the workforce has gone through the course, which is more than 600 people. The intention is to roll that out across the agency so that we build a greater awareness of PTSD and other stress-related illnesses and mental health issues within Western Australia Police, and also equip police officers to deal with that when they deal with the community as well.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Am I to take it that the minister anticipates that all relevant officers will be trained in psychological first aid in six or seven years?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The intention is to have all existing police officers trained as part of the mental health first-aid course, but we have also ensured that that training has been incorporated into the program for new recruits through the academy training program. We know that mental health issues are front and centre as far as frontline policing is concerned, but we also see that it is very important that police officers be taught to recognise the symptoms of PTSD and stress-related illness in themselves and in their co-workers. Our strategy is to ensure that the entire workforce is trained in this and, yes, within six to seven years we expect the agency to achieve that.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Minister, recruit training is not three days in length, is it?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No. I said that the mental health training —

Ms M.M. QUIRK: What time is allocated for recruits?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask Scott Higgins to respond.

Mr S. Higgins: It is certainly not three days. I will have to chase up the exact time frame, but it is certainly not three days' worth and it is not as intensive as the mental health first-aid program. It is enough information for a police officer to recognise the symptoms and issues and to be able to get more professional help for a person who is suffering from a mental health issue, but certainly not to the degree that they would be deemed as being a mental health first-aid responder.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Murray–Wellington.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: There was a trail of questions that came from my first question. I asked a pre-emptive question and now I want to ask a substantive question.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Mandurah.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Minister, I refer to the second last dot point on page 364, which refers to the focus or opportunity for the WA Police service to provide a more agile, mobile and responsive service to the community. I also refer to the commissioner's comments in the weekend newspapers about the challenges of congestion. In terms of the mobility of police, are there now roads or main thoroughfares that WA Police avoid or no longer use because of the congestion and the implications of congestion on response times? This is a reflection of the commissioner's comments on the weekend.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am not aware of any specific roads that have been singled out by WA Police officers. The commissioner has just indicated that there are no specific roads or points within the metropolitan area that police have identified as congestion points.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: We know now that at significant periods of the day, the freeway, for example, is gridlocked, particularly mornings and afternoons. Surely from an operational perspective, the police would be advised—I would have thought—that that is not the most efficient and effective means by which to get from A to B. Therefore, what is the planning from a police operational perspective in maintaining their agility and mobility in responding to the community as the congestion issue gets worse.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the commissioner to elaborate further on my comments, but the way we have structured the policing model and system—this is also an essential component of the new computer-aided dispatch system—is to allocate the closest resource to the call for assistance. Police in the operation centre and in the assistance centre routinely do this as a way of managing our resources and getting the closest officer to respond to the call from the community for assistance. I will ask the commissioner to elaborate further as to how we will manage that into the future.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: I think the minister broadly covered it, but with the new policing model each district has a district control centre so that although a job might be dispatched from the police operations centre, which is in Midland, if a vehicle reports that it is caught in traffic, and it is the closest vehicle at the time, the district control centre will take control and reallocate it to another vehicle that can get there quicker. Their job is to be on top of vehicle movements, where they are and what they are doing. It is not uncommon for someone to say that they are stuck in a roadworks zone or whatever is going on. There could be any number of reasons that a vehicle is delayed, which is why we put in an intermediate step in the middle between the police operations centre and the vehicles being dispatched on the street. It is for greater control and flexibility when we are deploying vehicles. At the moment we are getting around not only congestion challenges, but also challenges that might slow down a police vehicle and make it take longer to get to where it wants. That is how we manage the process.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Given that the populations of metropolitan Perth and Peel are expected to grow substantially, and we have moved to a model that has centralised the dispatching operations so that the south metropolitan, for example, is now a hub, can the minister see a situation potentially in the south metropolitan through to the Peel corridor where we might need to decentralise in the future to deliver efficiency, agility and mobility for that population growth?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We obviously have a number of strategies to address population growth and part of that is our growth strategy of an additional 550 police and police auxiliary officers. Obviously, as the metropolitan area expands and the population grows we will need more police officers to service the community. Part of the key to managing the growth in population in Western Australia is to also ensure that there is commensurate growth in police numbers to cope and that they have the resources they need to respond to the community. With respect to the way that the new district model is working I will ask the commissioner to elaborate further, because even though the jobs are dispatched centrally from the operations centre, the district teams in each of the metropolitan districts—the central control teams—are the ones managing the resources within that precinct. I think we have an enhanced model compared with the model that existed prior to the new scheme. I will ask the commissioner to respond further.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: There are four district control centres, one for each district, so there is one in the district for which the member is the local member. The control centre there is responsible for making sure that the vehicles are most efficiently deployed. They will often intervene after a dispatch has been made from the police operations centre to make sure that someone can get there as quickly as possible. I think possibly more important is that when we implemented this model, our regional operations group and our traffic enforcement group were centralised. One was in Maylands and one was in Midland. The outlying areas of the metropolitan area—for argument’s sake, Mandurah or north to Clarkson and beyond—were always a long way out from those regional centres. As part of the process, we split up those two units and deployed them in three locations; one is central, one is north and one is south, and that puts them more proximate to the challenges in those areas and increases the response times. When we think about district resources and who is attending jobs, not only is it about the people who are stationed at Mandurah Police Station or Fremantle Police Station, but also it includes all the rapid deployment groups as well. When we are dispatching, we are dispatching to the nearest available vehicle that can do the job we are asking it to do. We are not thinking in terms of police stations and single points of deployment; they come from multiple points, but we have decentralised our previously centralised squads to make that process more efficient.

[3.10 pm]

Mr M.J. COWPER: I refer to “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency” on page 364 of the *Budget Statements*. The first dot point states —

- Western Australia Police continues to address the challenges of providing quality policing services in an environment of increasing demand for services and population growth. The continuation of Frontline 2020 is aimed at making extensive reforms to its structure and service delivery, including the ongoing implementation of a new police operating model ...

Can the minister please tell me whether there will be a flat two-year tenure policy in relation to the allocation of police officers in regional WA; and, if so, what sort of financial implications would that have on the budget?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am sorry; could the member please repeat the question?

Mr M.J. COWPER: I hear there will be a flat two-year tenure policy for police officers placed in regional Western Australia.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, that is incorrect, member. That is not being proposed.

Mr M.J. COWPER: I thank the minister. That is very good.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to page 368 and the third bullet point addressing the police facilities major refurbishment and upgrade program. I note that money has been allocated to critical works. Can the minister indicate whether cell or lockup refurbishment is included in that; and, if so, identify the locations?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get the executive director to expand on that program. Is the member talking about the custodial facilities upgrade program for our police cells?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes.

Mr A. Kannis: The police facilities and major refurbishment program that the member refers to does not include cell upgrades, but there is another program for cell upgrades and I can give the details of that if the member likes. We planned on doing some work during 2015–16 to Augusta Police Station. It will be a new station, but there will be upgrades to the facilities there. There will also be upgrades to Kalbarri Police Station and upgrades are happening at Margaret River Police Station at this point. Other upgrades to be effected in 2015–16 are to Nannup Police Station, Northampton Police Station and Pemberton Police Station and some work is already progressing in the west metropolitan region.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Do these upgrades depend on one officer or two officers being in the station at one time? Will they be such that only one officer will need to be present?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get the commissioner to respond. Is the member asking whether the upgrades to custodial facilities—the cell upgrades—will be done so that offenders can be managed by one police officer?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: The two things are not interdependent. The upgrades, the decisions on the upgrades and the money spent on the upgrades are not related to the policy about how many police officers look after prisoners. I think the question was that the two things were connected, or was the member asking about the policy in general?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The commissioner is one question ahead.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I beg the member for Girrawheen’s pardon.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I said the commissioner was answering my next question.

The CHAIRMAN: Further question then, member for Girrawheen?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What about the first question?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Is the policy for all lockups that one sworn officer can manage cells at any one time—there does not need to be two present at the station?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The commissioner will answer that. My understanding is that the custodial facility upgrade program is to ensure that those cells consist of expanding —

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Minister, I am asking a different question.

The CHAIRMAN: Quiet, the minister is speaking.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I think the commissioner basically articulated the answer to the member’s question, but I will get him to answer it again.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: If the question was about the policy for all lockups or watch houses, the answer is that it depends on the watch house. Obviously, the larger watch houses will require a number of police officers to look after them. The member may be referring to what happens in a smaller country station if a prisoner has to stay in overnight—so a single prisoner in a cell—and whether it is okay for one or two officers to look after that prisoner. We have changed the policy to say a single officer can do it, providing assistance is not too far at hand. In most of those small country stations—for argument’s sake Pemberton—the officer who is not on duty will probably only be a few hundred metres away, and if it was necessary to call for assistance the officer on duty could call for assistance. Previously, we had a policy by which two officers would be required to look after a prisoner, for argument’s sake overnight, if there was a single prisoner in the watch house. If there were three or four prisoners in the watch house it might be different, so it is a contextual problem. It depends on the circumstances—single prisoner, single officer. Also, it is a risk-based decision, so if it is a high-risk prisoner they might request that and be granted it by the officer in charge. It is not a hard and fast rule that is not bendable; it is flexible, but it depends on the circumstance.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer to page 364 and the second dot point under the heading “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency”. I would like some detail, and it may have to be given by way of supplementary information, on the number of cameras and their hours of operation and I would like them split up by different

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

areas. One issue is the static boxes hung on the Mitchell Freeway and, I think, the Kwinana Freeway and other areas—I think there are five static boxes. How many cameras are permanently in the static boxes and how long have they been there? I understand that only one camera was floated between two or three of the boxes for quite a while because too many people were being caught speeding. Can I also have the detail on the number of static speed and red-light cameras at intersections? I would also like the number of cameras placed on the roadside to catch speeding and errant drivers and their hours of operation. The answer is quite comprehensive and the minister may want to give it by way of supplementary information. I would like to know the number of cameras in those five locations for a start, how long they have been in operation and whether they are in operation 24/7 or just for some of the time and only in some locations. At one time there was only one camera floating between some of those boxes.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member is quite correct. When the five fixed-point cameras were put in place, the advice given to the government at the time, I think, by the Curtin–Monash Accident Research Centre, was that we would get the best effect by having one camera and rotating it through the five spots.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Could the minister elaborate on that?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That was the advice when the program was first put in.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: From whom?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I do not want to get this wrong. It was not during my time as minister, but my understanding is that the advice at the time those five fixed-point cameras were put in was that there should be one camera rotated between the five spots.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Rubbish. That is absolute bunkum; that truly is bunkum.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Hillarys, the minister has the floor.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I was the minister of the time and that is bunkum, I assure the minister. There was only one camera and there was only one box, and then there were two boxes, one on each freeway. Now there are five and the questions are: Are there five cameras? Are they located and operating 24/7 in those five fixed locations; and, if so, for how long? Then there is the other part of the question I have already asked.

The CHAIRMAN: We will take that as a supplementary question.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I can actually respond to that. I did not think that having one camera amongst five boxes was sufficient —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Nor did I.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: — so I announced several months ago that a camera would be put in each box and they would operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. I understand that is occurring at present. I would need to provide by way of supplementary information the date that those cameras were put in place, unless the deputy commissioner, Gary Dreibergs, can advise me of that.

Mr G. Dreibergs: I can advise that it was around December 2014, but I cannot provide the exact date on which the five cameras were installed in the five boxes.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: And are they working 24/7?

Mr G. Dreibergs: Yes, 24/7.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: On or about December 2014, the cameras were put in place, so we now have five cameras operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week in those five fixed-speed-camera locations. I will provide by way of supplementary information the date that those cameras were installed. My understanding is that the last camera may have been purchased as part of the procurement program that the police had in train this year. I will get the date on which that fifth camera became operational in those boxes. In addition to that, we have 30 intersection cameras, which are red-light and speed cameras. We are expanding that program to 90 intersections.

[3.20 pm]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Are they 24/7?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: They are operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week in those 30 fixed locations. That is my understanding, and we are expanding that to 90 places. I believe that the last of those fixed cameras was installed around May this year—last month—but I can get that information for the member by way of supplementary information, as I indicated earlier.

The CHAIRMAN: Can the minister clarify for Hansard exactly what supplementary information she will be providing?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will provide by way of supplementary information the date on which we achieved the full 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week operation of those five fixed-camera locations.

[*Supplementary Information No B16.*]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: There was more to it, actually. I also require the number of roadside cameras that are being used to catch speeding and errant drivers, and how many hours they have been in operation over the past 12 months. As I understand, the number of hours of operation has gone down from what it was 12 months ago.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Deputy Commissioner Gary Dreibergs has that information, so he can provide that response for the member.

Mr G. Dreibergs: The roadside cameras are operating for 3 200 hours a month. I do not have the exact number of operating cameras we have at the moment.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is what I want supplementary information about. I would like to know how many cameras there are, and how many hours per month they were in operation for the past 12 months.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will provide by way of supplementary information the number of hours that the roadside speed cameras have been operating each month for the past 12 months.

[*Supplementary Information No B17.*]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can I also have information about the number of hand-held cameras that police officers use at locations such as school zones to catch speeding motorists? I would like to know how many cameras are in operation.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will provide by way of supplementary information the number of handheld speed cameras currently used by WA Police.

[*Supplementary Information No B18.*]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: My questions relate to page 366, headed “Outcomes and Key Effectiveness Indicators”. Halfway down the table headed “Outcome: Contribute to community safety and security”, is the line item “Percentage of priority one and two incidents in the metropolitan area responded to within 12 minutes”. The line item states that in 2014–15 the budgeted target was 80 per cent, although the estimated actual is 68 per cent. The next item down is “Percentage of priority three incidents in the metropolitan area responded to within 60 minutes”. The budget for 2014–15 is 80 per cent and the estimated actual is 87 per cent. My recollection is that at this time last year the budget papers referred to a nine-minute response time for priority 1 calls and a 25-minute response time for priority 3 incidents. Those response times had been the targets for at least a decade or more. Given that at this time last year we were presumably looking at targeting those amounts—the target was not changed until sometime after the budget estimates—can the minister advise me what percentage of calls for priority 1 and 2 incidents were responded to within nine minutes and what percentage of priority 3 incidents were responded to within 25 minutes? Can the minister also advise me of the average response time for priority 4 incidents, which no longer appears to be reported on at all?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Back in 2011 the Auditor General engaged with police about our key performance indicators. The view of the Auditor General’s office was that we should not be taking an average of response times for these priority calls and that we should be using a measure more consistent with other jurisdictions that looks at the bell curve of the response times. For example, in policing we are looking at the eighty-fifth percentile for response times, which is achieving priority 1 and 2 calls within 12 minutes. We have set our KPIs consistent with other jurisdictions in consultation with the Auditor General’s office.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: My question is quite specific. I know that these are the KPIs and I know how they were set. The KPI last year was for response within nine minutes—not an average—for priority 1 and 2, and within 25 minutes for priority 3. If I measure this against last year’s KPIs, what percentage were responded to within those time limits?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the executive director, Mr Kannis, to respond in more detail.

Mr A. Kannis: I will be able to answer part of the question, and Mr Zanetti might be able to provide further detail on the KPI results. These KPIs were published in last year’s budget papers, so this is not the first time these have been published. They were also alluded to in our annual report. My understanding is that the structure of this KPI is not changing our threshold. I will use an example here. If we were to achieve 80 per cent of our calls within 12 minutes, the result would be the same as a nine-minute average across all calls. We have not moved the target at all; we have just restructured the way it is interpreted. I can say that we are not achieving that target, and if we applied that to our older threshold the average would be higher than our target was. The

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

measure is comparable with the KPI that was in place before. More detail on how we have performed could be provided by Mr Zanetti, if required.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I ask Mr Zanetti to respond further, if he has that information.

Mr P. Zanetti: I have some information on a like-to-like comparison we did by applying the previous KPIs to this year and this year's formula to previous years. It is a bit problematic because we are applying a part year and we are dealing with an average for this year. Essentially, priority 3 this year is sitting at about 34 minutes on average but that is only 10 months, and as the jobs decline towards winter we often find that will come down and we will probably end up sitting around a 30-minute average. The previous two years for priority 3 were the same. If we apply the new KPI, we are achieving the priority 3 outcomes. I have not done the calculations for priority 3 to go backwards, but I have done it for priority 2. Applying the current grade of service KPI for priority 1 and 2 tasks retrospectively to permit comparison, the percentage of tasks attended within 12 minutes has decreased from 80 per cent in 2012–13 and 70.7 per cent in 2013–14 to an estimated actual of 68.7 per cent. As the former KPI for priority 1 and 2 response was a whole-of-year average it is problematic to make part-year comparison with previous full years, but for the sake of comparison if we apply the previous KPI measure the current year-to-date, 10-month average for priority 1 and 2 tasks is 11 minutes, whereas the previous two years was 10 minutes and 49 seconds—a 10-second difference—and nine minutes in 2012–13. However, the current year average, as I said before, is only 10 months, and it may well change by the end of the full year. The inability to attain the 80 per cent target within 12 minutes is primarily due to a statewide increase in priority 1 and 2 incidents. In effect, in the past two years, there has been a doubling of the number of incidents allocated as priority 2 attendance—that is, a 113 per cent increase, or some 19 000 extra jobs. That is due to a range of factors. The factor contributing mostly to that growth is our internal allocation practices, where we are applying far more stringent criteria to the allocation of tasks that receive an urgent response, and that has led to that doubling. That doubling started to occur in about November 2013 and it has increased since. It occurred statewide at that time and is not attributable to a metro model for that reason. I do have more information about that, but it depends on whether I have answered the question or the member wants me to go on.

[3.30 pm]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Minister, with respect to the priority 3 calls, the limit that police used to aim for was 25 minutes, and the minister approved, as is pointed out in the annual report, 60 minutes as the new KPI or target for priority 3. The police annual report defines a priority 3 incident as one where someone requires immediate police assistance. Traditionally, 25 minutes was the KPI or target that people looked to police to meet; and, yes, they could not meet it on all occasions. But from what Mr Zanetti says, based on the period of time that he mentioned, police are currently achieving 30-something minutes as an average. What justification can the minister give for now setting a time limit of 60 minutes as the KPI for a priority 3 call that requires immediate police attendance? How on earth can the minister justify a target of 60 minutes rather than 25 minutes; and how can the minister expect people not to be cynical about this and say she is just setting an easier target so that she can say that police have met that target and that her new policing model is working because police have met that target, potentially on 99 per cent of occasions, we would hope, if we stretch it out to 60 minutes? How does the minister justify more than doubling the targeted response time for an incident that requires immediate police attendance as defined in the police annual report?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Member, I will get Mr Zanetti to respond further, but Mr Zanetti did go to lengths to explain that we are not achieving our KPIs within the new measure. So the member's assertion that we have changed the targets to try —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: You are wrong. The question was about —

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland, the minister is speaking.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The assertion that we have changed the KPIs to suit our own purposes—that we have shifted the goalposts to achieve our own purposes—is basically refuted by our own evidence that we have just given to the member —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What—that you have failed?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: — in the context of the new KPIs, which have been structured in consultation with the Office of the Auditor General and the Department of Treasury —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That were signed off by you.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: — so that we have consistent KPIs and we can benchmark ourselves against other jurisdictions. The purpose of the new KPIs is so that we can compare our own performance not only with previous years, but against other jurisdictions. That is the purpose of the change in the KPIs. If we were going to

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

shift the KPIs to make ourselves look better, I would put it to the member for Midland that we would probably be achieving a different result. So, yes, there is more work to do. That is what our growth program is about and that is what our reform program is about. I will get Mr Zanetti to go into more detail with respect to the change in the KPI for those priority 3 jobs.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I was not seeking more detail from the officers or Mr Zanetti; I was asking the minister a rather direct question about her role in things. Did the minister approve going from a target of a 25-minute response time for priority 3 calls for immediate assistance to a 60-minute target; and how does the minister justify more than doubling the target response time for a member of the public who requires immediate assistance?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Member, I am going to get Mr Zanetti to explain the methodology.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Did you sign off on it or not?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes, I signed off on the new KPIs. But the member is misrepresenting what the change in the KPI is. Previously, we were taking an average. Now we are looking at a time-monitored target. I will get Mr Zanetti to explain the methodology around the change in the KPIs. It is not correct to say that we have, effectively, doubled an acceptable response time. We are changing the way we measure the response generally of police with respect to priority 3 incidents. Mr Zanetti, can you explain the methodology around the change in the KPIs, please.

Mr P. Zanetti: It is certainly correct that the previous measure was an average of the entire year's priority 3 responses, or priority 1 and 2 responses, in the two different time frames. The averages are subject to a whole lot of outliers that can really skew the numbers. It is not an accurate reflection of either good or bad performance when we use an average, which is why every other state uses percentage. The difference between an average of 25 and a percentage of 80 per cent or 60 is not the difference between 25 and 60. I am not being smart when I say that. If we look at the actual numbers and do that reverse calculation, it is a very similar target that we are trying to achieve, but it is actually a more meaningful target. It certainly was not connected to the reform program. The process started back in 2011 due to questions raised by the Office of the Auditor General. Mr Shaun Hodges worked on it over the intervening period of 2012–13. We did not even start the reform until late 2012 and the new model was not even designed until 2013. So, the two are certainly not connected.

Mrs G.J. GODFREY: At page 368, the third dot point under the heading “Asset Investment Program” refers to the police facilities major refurbishment and upgrade program. What does this program address and what are the expected outcomes?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I thank the member for the question. This refurbishment and upgrade program is about ensuring not only that we can adapt to the growth in the police figures but also that all our facilities are suitable for modern policing. I am looking at whether we can provide more detail of this. We have \$16.8 million over the four years for category 3 works under the program. We have a statewide asset survey in train of all the WA Police building stock. We are creating a permanent specialised building asset database to ensure that we can provide an ongoing evidence-based asset management system. We are replacing police stations at Eucla, Augusta, Waroona and Yalgoo. We are currently refurbishing and upgrading Margaret River Police Station. We are working on critical infrastructure improvements at a variety of sites—Curtin House, for example—with upgrades to air-conditioning systems, lifts, power, and security systems, to ensure that we have the best policing facilities that are fit for purpose for our officers in Western Australia.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to page 364, and there are a couple of issues that I want to canvass with the minister. The first relates to the sixth dot point, which is about workforce attraction and retention, and diversity. The minister may need to supply this by way of supplementary information, but what are the current percentages of police officers and auxiliary officers from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would need to provide that by way of supplementary information.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be B19.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Hold that thought. The executive director might have that information. Based on the January 2015–March 2015 human resources report, 4.7 per cent of the Police Act workforce self-reports as being of culturally and linguistically diverse descent, and projections indicate an increase to 5.5 per cent by 2020; and 13.3 per cent of the police staff workforce self-reports as being of culturally and linguistically diverse descent, and projections indicate a potential increase to 15.5 per cent by 30 June 2020.

[3.40 pm]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: What did the minister say was the target by 2020?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We do not have a target. We are projecting a potential increase to 15.5 per cent for police staff and 5.5 per cent for officers employed under the Police Act—that is, police officers and police auxiliary officers.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: What measures has the minister put into the recruitment process to indicate whether there are any impediments or issues relating to the recruitment of culturally and linguistically diverse officers?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get Mr Higgins to respond to this question. We certainly have put some effort into looking at our recruitment practices to encourage more female police officers, as we are obviously interested in improving gender diversity—at present our female representation is 22 per cent—and those with CALD backgrounds.

Mr S. Higgins: A couple of positive strategies have been put in place, including recruitment advertising that reflects diversity groups —

Ms M.M. QUIRK: So that means having an Aboriginal in one of the advertisements; is that what Mr Higgins means?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that is an appropriate question.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: No; I want to know what he means by that.

The CHAIRMAN: I am ruling that out of order. Please continue.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would like Mr Higgins to continue his answer before we get a further question.

Mr S. Higgins: We are also applying substantive equality during the recruitment process for supplementary assessments for applicants with culturally and linguistically diverse and Aboriginal backgrounds. Those are areas in which people need a little more assistance or a different approach to assess their capability to become police officers. We apply that during the recruitment process. There is also a separate project in relation to our Aboriginal representation that we are looking at developing with Edith Cowan University at Joondalup. There is a program we are looking at doing that will include a police preparation course that will help Aboriginal applicants become more competitive in the recruitment process, a diversity recruitment model that is based on substantive equality principles, the academy training model that takes into account those diversity needs, and a supportive mentorship–buddying program for those Aboriginal applicants.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: From those answers, it sounds as though the principles of substantive equality were not previously applied. Is this seen as the problem with the lack of police representation from CALD communities?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It certainly is looking at our recruitment practices to ensure that we have more diversity within police. It has been one of the priorities that the Commissioner of Police has focused on and it has certainly been a priority for me as minister. I cannot speak for what happened prior to my appointment to the role. They are certainly areas that we believe are important, and that is why we have requested that the academy come up with some strategies to ensure that we can get more people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, more Aboriginal people and also more women into the police mix.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The minister said that one of her targets is to increase representation. What personally has the minister done to assist in that regard?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Part of the strategy is that the commissioner and I have had a number of forums with a range of people with culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds to speak to them about the impediments that people with CALD backgrounds have faced when trying to enter WA Police. They came up with a range of impediments that certainly hark back to our recruitment practices. At that point, the commissioner requested that the academy start to develop some strategies to interrogate those recruitment practices. For example, there is the aptitude test and the psychology test, and a number of those exams had not been revisited for quite some time. In fact, as I recall, a few people within police could not recall who had constructed the aptitude test and what its purpose was, so we went back to the drawing board and asked the academy to look at that to see whether our recruitment practices could be improved to ensure that we can improve the diversity of police. I do not know whether Mr Higgins has anything further to add.

Mr S. Higgins: No, nothing further.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer to the heading “Grants and Subsidies” in the net appropriation determination table on page 374 of the *Budget Statements*. The 2015–16 budget figure for the line item for the road trauma trust account is \$18 048 000. Can the minister tell me what that represents?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get Mr Kannis to further elaborate on where that \$18 million will be allocated.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mr A. Kannis: I should think that the member is noting that the amount in that year has increased above the figures for previous years and that is because we are implementing the additional funding for the speed camera replacement and enforcement program. We are expanding the number of cameras, which is being funded by the road trauma trust fund.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is WA Police spending \$18 million on cameras?

Mr A. Kannis: No; there are other programs —

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am asking where the whole of that \$18 million is going. I asked the minister for a breakdown of the road trauma trust account budget last week, but she refused to give it to me. I would not have had to ask this question if she had given it to me, quite frankly. I did not know what it was going to be.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Consistent with practice in every year since I have been minister, I gave an undertaking to provide to the estimates committee the breakdown of the expenditure from the road trauma trust account, and that will be available when we move to the Office of Road Safety component of this estimates hearing. Of the amount of \$18 million allocated to police, member for Hillarys, the enhanced speed enforcement administration costs comprise \$7.834 million; \$4 737 000 is going to increased breath and drug testing; \$2 228 000 is going to phase 2 of the enhanced speed enforcement program; \$2 252 000 is going to speed camera replacement, which is part of the increase; \$866 000 is going to the expansion of our drug testing capability; and \$131 000 is going to legal services.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Basically, there is \$4 million for expanding the breath-test facilities. I think that is what the minister said.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There is \$4 737 000 for increased breath and drug testing, but we also have \$866 000 for the expansion of our drug testing capability, which is the oral fluid testing program at the roadside; new contemporary drug-test equipment at the roadside, which is the Cozart test kits that we have in the booze buses; and additional testing by the ChemCentre of the drug tests that are taken at the roadside.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Apart from the funds that will be spent for the booze bus operations, which includes police officer time, how many police officer hours will be funded from that money from the road trauma trust account?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: An additional 20 police officers will form part of the \$4 437 000. I might need to provide the number of hours by way of supplementary information. Does Mr Kannis have that?

Mr A. Kannis: If I make the assumption that 20 additional officers contribute towards this program, approximately 800 hours a week will be applied towards the testing.

[3.50 pm]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the cost involved here be broken down? Is the cost for those 20 extra police officers over and above the promise that was made in the expansion program for 550 police officers because they are going to be dedicated to breath and drug testing?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That is correct. In fact, the target of 6 204 police officers by 2017 also includes the additional 20 police officers for this project. They are not part of the 550 growth program; they are additional.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the minister provide by way of supplementary information the breakdown of the costs involved here? What is the cost of the extra booze buses? Are there two extra booze buses? Are there any more booze buses or is it just 20 extra police officers?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I can provide a breakdown of where that \$4 737 000 is allocated. Is that what the member for Hillarys is after? Does he want to know how much of that is allocated to the booze buses and how much of that is actual officer time?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes; and if they are going to do booze and drug testing, why is there the extra funding that the minister just mentioned—that \$600 000 or 400 000? I do not know what the amount was because I did not write the figure down when the minister mentioned it. I take it that is extra money for drug testing, which is separate from booze and drug testing?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member for Hillarys is right; extra money is in there for roadside drug testing. We know that people are driving with illegal drugs in their system, so we have provided an additional \$866 000 for police to be able to test at roadside for a range of drugs in motorists.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: With respect, the government has not funded it; the road trauma trust account has funded it. Why was that figure for the drug testing not in the figure for breath and drug testing—that \$4 million or nearly \$5 million that the minister mentioned? Why is that a separate amount?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is a separate amount because it is an additional program. It funds additional drug-test equipment and the cost of the tests of the saliva samples at the ChemCentre. Roadside drug testing requires police officers to take a swab from motorists. If that returns as positive, the driver then has to provide a saliva sample. With the Cozart drug-test machines, the sample gets divided into two vials. One sample goes into the machine at the booze bus. If it comes back with a positive result, the sealed sample goes off to the ChemCentre for analysis and testing. The additional \$866 000 is allocated to that Cozart drug-test program.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Where did the change of heart come from? A couple of years ago the Premier refused to allow me to pay for an extra 40 officers and booze bus operations through the road trauma trust account, which would have saved lives and critical injuries in the last two and a half years. Where has the change of heart come from? Is it from the minister or the Premier? Has he seen the light at the end of the day? Has it taken an enormous number of deaths and critical injuries on our roads to make the minister and the Premier realise that what they have been doing in refusing the funding is wrong?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I cannot tell the member for Hillarys why he was not successful in having that program funded.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The Premier would not allow it.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: What I can tell him is that I am very pleased I was.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: He simply said no and threw the paper across the table. I just wondered who had the change of heart.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Hillarys, I do not think that is part of the dot points. I think we will move on.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I think it is very relevant.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I have a further question. For how many hours each month have the booze buses been on the roads for the last six months?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I cannot tell the member for Midland off the top of my head, but I can provide by way of supplementary information the number of hours the booze buses have been deployed for each month for the last six months.

[Supplementary Information No B19.]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I think it is notorious that the number of drug tests done in Western Australia is far fewer than that in other jurisdictions. I have been advised that that is due to some legislative problem. Is the minister aware of that and how does she intend to remedy it?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: What was the question again?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Western Australia is conducting far fewer drug tests than other state jurisdictions, and one of the reasons that has been proffered for why we conduct fewer drug-driving tests in Western Australia is that there is an issue with the legislation—a technicality in the legislation—that prevents officers from conducting the same volume of testing that is done in other states.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: First of all, Western Australia did not have the testing facility to conduct the tests at roadside, and we have certainly made an effort to expand that. With respect to any legislative impediment to roadside drug testing, I am not aware of any legislative impediment to police officers conducting roadside drug testing.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: There is not a legislative impediment to conducting roadside drug testing. The difference between Western Australia and Victoria is that there is an extra step in the process in Western Australia that creates extra time pressure on police. I understand that in Victoria they go from Cozart to analysis. We go from Cozart to Dräger to analysis, so there is an extra step in Western Australia. I am not sure that that is an impediment; it just impacts on police time.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: What impact does that have on the capacity to do a larger number of drug tests?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Mr Clarke will respond.

Mr I. Clarke: Effectively, when a police officer conducts a roadside oral fluid test, they will take the initial wipe from the driver. If that wipe gives a positive response, they will take it to, for example, the booze bus, and the driver will go before the Dräger machine, when a fluid sample will be taken. Depending on the nature of the drug, particularly with methamphetamine, that can take some time because the production of saliva is much lower, and that can expand the time that it takes to do that test. Some of those tests can take up to an hour or an hour and 25 minutes. On average, we are probably looking at about 30 or 40 minutes. The time taken for that test is quite long on occasions. Once that sample is taken, it is then taken to the ChemCentre where the evidentiary

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

test occurs. There is a preliminary wipe and a secondary screening test, and then the actual evidentiary test is done by the ChemCentre. Once that evidentiary test is done, it is sent back to us, advising that it is a positive, and we create a brief from there to prosecute the driver.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Notwithstanding that it is a longer process here in Western Australia than in other states, it is a priority for police and we have no desire —

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It is clearly not a priority. We do a minuscule proportion of what other states do; it has clearly not been a priority.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Other states do a range of things very differently from what is done in Western Australia.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: This is why a third of the drivers on the road are drug affected and are getting away scot-free.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I think the member for Girrawheen needs to remember that drug testing in Western Australia is far more targeted than it is in other states, so we have seen an exponential increase in the number of positive tests. At the roadside, police officers will initially do a blood alcohol test—a breath test—and if the driver is exhibiting signs of impairment or intoxication that are not consistent with the random breath test result, police will then target those people specifically for a roadside drug test. We have a targeted approach, and out of that targeted approach we are getting a significant increase in the number of people testing positive at roadside, but we are also doing random drug testing at roadside as well trying to determine the level of drug-affected drivers within the community.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Finally on this, does the greater time taken relate to taking police resources off the road and has there been some problem in doing that, which has reduced the number of people tested? Of what relevance is the time?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As I said previously, I accept that we have come from a low base, but we have ramped that up. In my tenure as minister, we have allocated a significant increase in resources to roadside drug testing, and we will continue to ensure that police have the resources to get drug-affected and alcohol-affected drivers off the roads.

[4.00 pm]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: How is the longer time it takes to complete that process here than in Victoria relevant?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Short of going to Victoria and analysing their process and cross-referencing that with our process, I am not sure that I can actually get the member an answer to her question. We do not do that sort of comparison. All I can say is that within the constraints of the Western Australian environment, we prioritise our testing.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: This was proffered to me as an explanation as to why we do fewer drug tests here. The minister is saying that she does not understand why it is relevant. Which is it?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I think the member for Girrawheen is taking part of the response out of context. We said that it is a slower and longer process here, but we still fund and resource roadside drug testing so we can get those drivers off the road. That funding is via the road trauma trust account.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I refer to financial statements under “*Expenses*” on page 370, which states —

... a planned increase in the Total Cost of Services of \$52.9 million ... in 2015–16 compared to the 2014–15 Estimated Actual. This increase is mainly attributable to the additional employee program and provision for increases in salary and employee benefits.

What is the exact cost of the additional employee program, and can the minister provide a breakdown of the components within that? With respect to the provision for increases in salary and employee benefits, can the minister provide me with the total amount and a breakdown of how that figure is compiled? For example, what component is increase in salary and what is other employee benefits?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The additional employee program funding is for the 2014–15 budget. The estimated actual is \$35.4 million. Sorry, that is the growth between 2014–15 and 2015–16. Did the member want a breakdown of how much is actual salary and how much is on costs?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Exactly as outlined in those three lines on page 370. The last line states —

... increases in salary and employee benefits.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get the executive director to answer that question in more detail.

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mr A. Kannis: The note in the financial statements refers to growth between the estimated actual in 2014–15 and the budget for 2015–16. The \$35.4 million is attributed to the growth program and another \$38.4 million is attributed to general salary and cost escalation. There are some offsets that bring that down. That and a number of other factors, being unders and overs, comes to a total of \$52.9 million. I am not sure what level of detail the member wants me to go into further than that.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I seek further detail. For example, Mr Kannis said \$35.4 million is for growth. I seek clarification as to whether that specifically refers to the recruit 550 program or to something else. If so, how many employees does that \$34.5 million cater for? Mr Kannis said that \$38.4 million is for salary and cost escalation. Could I have a further breakdown of that as to what is actually salary, what is other employee benefits and what is cost escalation? Overall, Mr Kannis said that that gives the \$52.9 million. Of course, if one adds those two figures together it is more than \$52.9 million, so clearly there have been savings made in other areas. I wonder how one gets from those two figures to \$52.9 million?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We can provide that by way of supplementary information. I will provide a breakdown of the wages and general salary and cost escalation component, the additional employee program funding and the breakdown of some of the other categories that have us arrive at the \$52.9 million difference in the 2015–16 budget compared with the 2014–15 budget.

[*Supplementary Information No B20.*]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Halfway down page 371, under the heading “Income from State Government” there is a reference to resources received free of charge. What are those resources? How are those figures arrived at?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will provide that by way of supplementary information.

[*Supplementary Information No B21.*]

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I refer to “Income” on page 370, which states that total own source revenue is expected to increase by \$0.4 million and so forth. How is that increasing by \$0.4 million? It also states that there needs to be an increase from the road trauma trust account because of the conclusion of the existing criminal property confiscation proceeds arrangement. Is there any money left in that criminal property confiscation proceeds arrangement? Why did the arrangement cease, when did it cease and what is the impact of this on police?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The criminal property confiscation proceeds arrangement is subject to a memorandum of understanding currently in progress. That has not been finalised yet. To go into detail on the \$0.4 million increase; it comes from a collection of unders and overs. There is \$1.5 million from the road trauma trust account and \$100 000 less from the National Anti-Gangs Squad, which is a commonwealth funding commitment. There is \$200 000 less from other revenues, fees and charges and other forms of recouping income. There is \$100 000 additional from the Gold Stealing Detection Unit recouping funds and a reduction of \$900 000 from the proceeds of confiscated criminal property. The net amount of that is \$0.4 million.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Specifically, with respect to the criminal property confiscation proceeds arrangement, it states on page 370 of the budget papers that —

This increase has largely been offset by the conclusion of the existing Criminal Property Confiscation Proceeds arrangement.

The minister referred to getting less money from that arrangement, but she also referred to a potential new memorandum of understanding. Does the minister anticipate getting the same, more or less money from the criminal property confiscation proceeds arrangement once the MOU is executed?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We anticipate either receiving the same or possibly more, but that is subject to the MOU that is currently in progress.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: If the minister anticipates getting exactly the same money from the criminal property confiscation proceeds arrangement, why is she saying they got less with the conclusion of the arrangement and why is this phrase needed if the minister anticipates the funding being the same?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We have to provide budget figures based on the current scenario. Under the current arrangements our expectation is that we would see a reduction of \$900 000 from that fund. Once the new MOU is signed, we may see an increase, but I think it is prudent financial management to make an estimate based on what existed at the time of the budget going to print. When the MOU changes, obviously, we may have the opportunity or we will update that at the midyear review process.

[4.10 pm]

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: When does the minister anticipate that the memorandum of understanding will be concluded?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We are hoping that it will be finalised within the next month.

The CHAIRMAN: Just before we go on to new questions, we have just ticked over the halfway mark and I was going to offer a comfort break if people want one. People are happy to continue; no worries.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to the fourth bullet point on page 364, which relates to the increased levels of effort and security measures that have been assigned to counterterrorism. I am aware that no projects are being undertaken by the federal government with funding for identifying potentially marginalised youths who might get themselves involved in terrorism. I want some specifics on what are the increased levels of effort and what work is being done with what communities.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the deputy commissioner, Mr Dreiberger, to respond.

Mr G. Dreiberger: In terms of the extra effort for WA Police in the counterterrorism environment, the national security hotline reporting has increased dramatically, which required us to do a significant amount of extra work in the intelligence investigations relative to that. It is a very specific operational effort. Our relationship with the Australian Federal Police continues and we work in cooperation with the AFP. The national countering violent extremism strategy is being piloted in the eastern states, not in Western Australia, and it is a federal arrangement at this point. Western Australia has been closely monitoring what is going on with that particular strategy, and it will ultimately identify whether there are any benefits or a capacity for a countering violent extremism strategy to be used in WA. Having said that, it is quite complex; there are a number of issues. It is targeted at the very high end and the really complex circumstances we could be confronted with for specific individuals, as opposed to a more generic, across-the-board, community engagement process.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I take it, minister, that there is no community engagement process coming out of events of the last year or so in particular groups?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will get the deputy commissioner, Mr Dreiberger, to respond further, but we are very much guided by the relationship that we have with our federal counterparts in what is required for the community of Western Australia. Mr Dreiberger, do you have anything further to add?

Mr G. Dreiberger: I can add that we have a community engagement division within WA Police in which we try to engage with communities wherever possible. We have meetings with people from the community to give an opportunity for people to come forward with specific issues, however they see fit, at the local policing team level. In that context, we are expecting local policing teams and local police districts to manage their community as they see fit. The state security situation is that if we see a specific issue in a specific area, we certainly communicate with the local district for it to engage locally. We do not run specific programs for that.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: By way of supplementary information, could I have a list of all the meetings that the deputy commissioner has referred to in relation to the community engagement section; what communities it has met with; and on what dates in the last 12 months?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am prepared to provide that information by way of supplementary information, but I will put a caveat on it that we will provide information about engagements with those groups that is not operationally sensitive.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: That is understood, minister.

[*Supplementary Information No B22.*]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer to page 363, “Spending Changes”, and the line item “15% Procurement Savings”. Can the minister tell me on what goods and services WA Police expect to realise the 15 per cent procurement savings already deducted from its budget?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Certainly. I will get the executive director, Mr Kannis, to respond on where we will achieve those 15 per cent procurement savings.

Mr A. Kannis: This represents a small percentage of our total procurement budget and we anticipate that we will monitor our general procurement expenditure. There are no specific items that we have determined will be cut at this point, but we have chosen to monitor expenditure during the year. If we were to come towards the end of the year and our budget for procurement of goods was hitting the budget, we would then pull back on some of that expenditure. However, we have not found it necessary due to savings that we have achieved through our service definition and resource model process. We have been able to identify general savings in that area.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the minister give me some examples of procurement where savings may be made?

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

Mr A. Kannis: Savings may be made in any area such as stationery, it could be in aspects of uniforms—not critical aspects of uniforms, but more areas where we have the opportunity to review. It could be any type of procurement. We have not been specific in this case about which areas we will target.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: My final follow-on question is if the department gets 10 months down in the next 12-month period and finds that it has spent the budget, allowing for a 15 per cent procurement cut, could we see cuts in uniforms, notebooks, pens, papers, all sorts of stationery, fax machines, email stuff—whatever? Could we see cuts in all those areas? So the department might be without notebooks for a couple of months.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The answer to that is no. Police officers will be provided with everything they need operationally to do the job. The savings in procurement are around stockpiling stationery orders, for example; making sure that we are running a lean organisation and that we are not purchasing stationery and equipment that is superfluous to requirements. The answer is no, member for Hillarys. We will be managing this very efficiently and effectively, and we will not be having police officers go without pens and without uniforms.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is wonderful.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I go back to the earlier issue that I raised of actual total staff numbers. When I look to the “Report on Government Services”, which has total police numbers for every state in Australia —

The CHAIRMAN: Member, for the purposes of *Hansard* and for my own, can you tell us what part of the budget papers you are referencing?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Sorry, you were not chairing previously when I was here. I refer to pages 366 and 367 where all the full-time equivalent employees for Police are listed. The minister gave us a total figure there of how many staff it had in 2014–15. The minister advised that the number was 7 955, yet when I look at the total police staff in the “Report on Government Services”, which is a commonwealth document, it states that in 2008–09 there were 7 474 total staff in Western Australia. It would seem that after six years, between 2008–09 and 2014–15, the total increase was only 481 staff. My first question is: how can the minister say she has delivered 700 extra staff from the government’s 2008 promise and how can she say that any progress whatsoever has been made when it comes to the second 550?

[4.20 pm]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I do not have the “Report on Government Services” in front of me. I will say that we know the number of police officers who were employed by WA Police in 2009–10, which is when the original growth program of 500 police and police auxiliary officers started. We know what our target is and we are on target.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That is not the question I asked. I asked about the total number of police staff because I am interested in the total number of staff. I am not asking about police officers per se. The reference to the 700 was a promise of 700 staff—500 sworn and 200 unsworn.

The CHAIRMAN: Member, you have asked a question. The minister is answering it.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The short answer is that they measure different things. The “Report on Government Services” measures a head count. We measure FTE. We are committed to achieving our target of 550 additional police and police auxiliary officers. We know that the number we need to achieve for police officers by 2017 is 6 204 officers, from memory. That is what we are gliding towards achieving and we are well on track to get there.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is not just the 2015 “Report on Government Services” that gives that figure of 7 474. That figure is also in the WA Police annual report of 2008–09. I put it to the minister that those figures do not lie. I am wondering whether the minister will advise this house how many fewer public servants there are today than there were at the same time last year. How many public service positions will the minister be getting rid of over the next 12 months?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: To go back to the premise of the member’s question, we measure full-time equivalents, not the number of people performing those roles. To mix the two measures and try to use one as a baseline to report on the growth program is not correct.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The heading is FTE; it is not total numbers.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Midland, you can ask further questions; you do not need to interject.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The other aspect of the RoGS is that it takes an average of FTE over the year. We have looked at the number of police officers and police auxiliary officers who were employed when we started our growth programs. We have added to that to achieve our target. Through our recruitment process, we are

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B — Tuesday, 9 June 2015]

p145b-169a

Chairman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Murray Cowper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson;
Mrs Glenys Godfrey; Mr David Templeman

achieving our growth program. We are well on track to achieving 550 additional police and police auxiliary officers by the end of 2017.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The second part of my question was: Will the minister advise how many fewer public servants in terms of FTE are employed today than were employed at the same time last year? How many public service FTEs will disappear next year to meet the government's budget cuts?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We are not planning on reducing any FTE at this point with respect to budget cuts. If the member looks at where the agency is required to find efficiencies, it is targeted at procurement and a range of matters that we have canvassed quite extensively throughout this estimates committee process. It may well be the case in the future through this SDRM process and through improving the IT opportunities available to WA Police for consumers and people in the community to take advantage of online options to report and update incident reports and report traffic crashes through "report my crime" that we need fewer public servants to perform roles that people are now doing themselves. At this point we do not have a strategy to reduce public servants aside from the ones that we have previously mentioned.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Which ones did the minister previously mention?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That was the 170 that were identified through the SDRM process.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the minister saying that those 170 positions have been abolished?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the executive director to update the member on where we are up to with that because some FTE are being deployed to different areas.

Mr A. Kannis: Through the SDRM process, approximately 170 positions could be abolished over time. The time frame for that varies according to the initiative. Some of those people have already taken redundancies under the public sector voluntary scheme that applied earlier this year. We will aim to redeploy the balance into other roles.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: How many of those 170 positions have been abolished so far and are the other roles that Mr Kannis referred to within Western Australia Police or would they potentially be in other agencies?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: At present 170 positions have been identified. That is the answer.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister has not answered the question. Of those 170 positions, how many have already been vacated or am I to assume that none have been vacated if the minister is still saying there are 170 positions?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We can provide that by way of supplementary information. Of those 170 positions that have been identified, I will provide how many have been abolished and the status of the people who currently occupy those positions.

[*Supplementary Information No B23.*]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to the heading "Outcomes: Contribute to community safety and security:" on page 366 of the *Budget Statements*. It refers to the line item "Percentage of family and domestic-related incidents where an offender was processed for an offence against the person within seven days". I would like to get an appreciation of what offences that covers and what is meant by "family and domestic-related incidents".

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: This is looking at the KPIs that give us a measure of the police performance and the aspects of domestic violence that we can control and direct our resources into. Generally, I understand that these would cover arrests, charges and summons. I will ask Deputy Commissioner Dreibergs to respond.

Mr G. Dreibergs: The type of offences could vary greatly depending on the type of incident. Effectively, it could be a breach of an order in the first instance. It could be assault and various levels of assault. It can also be for breach of bail offence because quite often an offender could be reoffending and already on bail. Predominantly, they would be assault related, domestic assault related and breach of bail and breach of order-related offences.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Would this description include offences of elder abuse?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We do not have a specific offence that separates elder abuse. I understand that that comes under domestic violence. I will see whether Mr Dreibergs can elaborate further.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The description is "domestic-related incidents". The word "violence" is not used. Is that information recorded somewhere else?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask Deputy Commissioner Dreibergs to respond.

Mr G. Dreibergs: I would have to find this out by way of supplementary information but I imagine that elder abuse could be picked up in the family violence area.

[4.30 pm]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: How many offences against domestic-related incidents against older people have been recorded in the last 12 months? That is domestic related, so, in other words, the perpetrators have been relations.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: My understanding is that we do not do a breakdown of domestic violence incidents —

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It is not violence necessarily, minister.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will change my vernacular. We do not delineate domestic-related incidents based on the age of the victim or the offender, as I understand it. We do identify the relationship and record whether it is mother/father or parent/child. Correct me if I am wrong, Mr Dreibergs, but my understanding is that we do not necessarily age profile our victims in domestic-related incidents.

Mr G. Dreibergs: I will have to follow that up by way of supplementary and find out exactly whether we do record what the relationship is in terms of a domestic family incident or a family violence incident.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would not be prepared to provide that by way of supplementary information because it is my understanding that we would need to go through the system and do a search of domestic-related incidents and look at the age of offenders and victims, which would be somewhat time consuming. We do not separate out that information in our current system. If it is a family or domesticated-related incident, it would be recorded in that category for the purposes of our key performance indicators.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Can the minister answer this: how do we identify incidents of offences of elder abuse in our community if it is not recorded in the way she described?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will ask the Commissioner of Police to respond. The police do not have a category of offence called elder abuse. We have a range of offences, including assault, theft and coercion, which can be linked to a domestic-related incident between a person and an elderly person, but we do not have an actual offence of elder abuse. As far as trending goes with police reporting, I do not know whether the commissioner can elaborate as to whether there is a trending of increases in offences against elderly people —

Ms M.M. QUIRK: You would not know. If you are not recording it, you would not know.

Dr K.J. O’Callaghan: There is no specific category of elder abuse, so it is not recorded as a separate category that can be extracted and analysed. Although there are specific offences against children, for argument’s sake, we can identify those by interrogating the system, but there is no category of elder abuse in Western Australia so the system cannot easily be interrogated for that information. It would take an enormous amount of effort to separate out victims over a certain age to identify and we would not know what type of abuse it is. It is quite a difficult situation for us because we do not record it as a separate offence because it is not a separate offence under the Criminal Code.

The appropriation was recommended.