## Data quality information — Courts, chapter 7

|  |
| --- |
| Data quality information |
| Data quality information (DQI) was prepared for the first time for the 2011 Report on Government Services. The 2014 Report provides DQI against the ABS data quality framework dimensions, for all of the performance indicators in the Courts chapter. |
|  |
|  |

DQI are available for the following performance indicators:

Fees paid by applicants 2

Judicial officers (as expressed per 100 000 population) 5

Backlog 8

Attendance 11

Clearance 15

Judicial officers per 100 finalisations 18

Full time equivalent (FTE) staff per 100 finalisations 21

Cost per finalisation 24

### Fees paid by applicants

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with the Courts Working Group and the Courts Practitioner Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Courts Equity – Access – Affordability |
| **Indicator** | Fees paid by applicants |
| **Measure (computation)** | ‘Fees paid by applicants’ is defined as the average court fees paid per lodgment. It is derived by dividing the total court fees collected in a year (numerator) by the total number of lodgments in a year (denominator).  Numerator is defined as:   * Total court fees collected in a financial year   Denominator is defined as:   * Total number of lodgments in a financial year   Data for the numerator are adjusted by applying the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price index deflator (see Chapter 2 section 2.5 for an explanation of statistical concepts used in the Report). |
| **Data source/s** | Court fees collected and lodgment data are sourced from administrative data collected by Australian, State and Territory courts authorities and departments. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Numerator – Total court fees collected in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision.  Denominator – Total lodgments in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the courts authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision. |
| **Relevance** | ‘Fees paid by applicants’ is intended to be an indicator of governments’ achievement against the objective of keeping services accessible through charging affordable court fees for services provided.  However, court fees are only a small component of the broader legal costs incurred by applicants. Given that using the courts is often only practically possible with the assistance of lawyers, this indicator should not be interpreted as an indicator of general accessibility to legal services or processes.  Also fee structures and the associated bases for charging differ across jurisdictions, e.g. corporate entities pay more than individuals. Jurisdictions also exempt and waive fees in special circumstances and this affects the amounts of fees paid in the ROGS. |
| **Timeliness** | Numerator - Total court fees collected in a financial year  The reference period for court fees is the 2012-13 financial year. Data are provided in September 2013, for publication in January 2014.  Denominator - Total lodgments in a financial year  The reference period for lodgment data is the 2012-13 financial year. Data are provided in September 2013, for publication in January 2014.  Data can be revised retrospectively up to 5 years later. |
| **Accuracy** | Numerator — Total court fees collected in a financial year  In all jurisdictions the identification of total court fees is done using electronic case management and finance systems.  The data provided are consistent with ROGS counting rules and the requested data reported are for all court levels in each jurisdiction.  The data are sourced from finance and case management systems, which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls, reconciliation, and validation processes to ensure accuracy. Due to the financial nature of the data it is also independently audited for annual reporting purposes.  Denominator — Total lodgments in a financial year  In all jurisdictions the identification of lodgments is done using electronic case management systems. The data provided are consistent with ROGS counting rules and the requested data reported are for all court levels in each jurisdiction.  The data are sourced from case management systems, which are subject to the normal administrative controls, reconciliation, and validation processes to ensure accuracy. Preparation of the data for the RoGS by courts authorities also undergoes checking and verification procedures, including investigation of significant variances with previous years. |
| **Coherence** | Numerator —Total court fees collected in a financial year  For the last five years, the data have been counted and reported relatively consistently and no significant factors have been identified which have prevented or affected the consistent compilation of time series data. Minor exceptions are as follows.   * In the Federal Court of Australia, fees associated with bankruptcy matters are now excluded from current ROGS data (they are included in Federal Circuit Court data). Adjustments have been made to Federal Court data from 2008/09. * Commencing 1 November 2010 the Australian Government introduced, with some exceptions, that all initiating applications attracted a minimum, or reduced, filing fee amount (if a full fee was not owing) in all federal courts. * Since the 2011 report, the WA Magistrates Court reports revenue (court fees) collected on behalf of the court by the Fines Enforcement Registry (Electronic Court). This revenue had previously been recorded in the Electronic Court. Additionally consolidated (or administered) revenue of the Electronic Court relating to fines and infringements was included for the first time. These changes have been made to bring WA in to line with other jurisdictions reporting in this area.   In some jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, e.g. annual reports, in relation to court fees collected. In the other jurisdictions there are differences due to the ROGS counting rules.  Denominator — Total lodgments in a financial year  For the last five years, the data have been counted and reported relatively consistently and no significant factors have been identified which have prevented or affected the consistent compilation of time series data. Minor exceptions are as follows.   * In the Federal Court lodgments associated with bankruptcy matters are now excluded from current ROGS data. Adjustments have been made to the data from 2008-09 onwards. * In South Australia changes in legislation (e.g. offences moving from a court process to an infringement process) have impacted on numbers from 2008-09 onwards. * Changes to legislation in 2008 in Tasmania’s courts have seen a significant number of minor traffic matters (infringement notices) no longer dealt with by the court. These are now enforced by the Monetary Penalties Enforcement Service and are excluded from the data. * For the 2011 report the WA Coroners Court moved from a manual data collection method to an electronic data collection method, and in the 2010 report the WA Supreme court revised the business counting rules to bring data into line with the jurisdiction practices and procedures. * System-based data were unavailable for 2009-10 for NSW civil appeal data. A manual count was used and continues to be used until system data are restored. For civil non-appeal data, NSW has changed from one electronic system to another — the new system was unable to provide pending caseload data for 2009-10 and so an estimate was used.   In most jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, e.g. annual reports, in relation to lodgments. In the other jurisdictions there are differences due to the ROGS counting rules. |
| **Accessibility** | Numerator — Total court fees collected in a financial year  Data on court fees are supplied for the RoGS according to the specific RoGS counting rules. Other data on court fees can be accessed through annual reports and court websites within most jurisdictions and in most jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, e.g. annual reports, in relation to court fees.  However, some data obtained from these other sources in some jurisdictions may not align with the ROGS due to the specific ROGS counting rules.  Denominator — Total lodgments in a financial year  Data on court lodgments are supplied for the RoGS according to the specific RoGS counting rules. In many cases the RoGS aligns with data published in jurisdictional reports, e.g. annual reports. Some jurisdictions may also publish different data which may not align with RoGS. |
| **Interpretability** | Numerator   * Total court fees collected in a financial year   Denominator   * Total lodgments in a financial year   Contextual information for fees collected and lodgment data are provided in the Courts chapter and attachment tables. |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/ issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * While ‘fees paid by applicants’ is an indicator of accessibility to court services, a large proportion of civil matters in the federal courts have fees exempted or waived under certain circumstances. State and territory courts to a lesser extent also exempt and waive some fees. The lodgments for which no fees are paid are included in the total lodgments data which diminishes the reported average fees paid per lodgment. If no-fee lodgments were excluded, or if reliable data could be collected on fees waived and exempted a better comparison of affordability would be achieved. |

### Judicial officers (as expressed per 100 000 population)

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with the Courts Working Group and the Courts Practitioner Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Courts Equity – Access – Geographical access |
| **Indicator** | Judicial officers (as expressed per 100 000 population) |
| **Measure (computation)** | ‘Judicial officers’ are officers who can make enforceable orders of the court. This can include judges, associate judges, magistrates, coroners and judicial registrars. The number of judicial officers is expressed in full time equivalent units and, where judicial officers have both judicial and non-judicial work, refers to the proportion of time allocated to judicial work. The number of judicial officers is also presented in comparison to the population.  Numerator is defined as:   * Number of full time equivalent judicial officers   Denominator is defined as:   * Estimated residential population in jurisdiction as at 31 December   Expressed as rate: calculation is 100 000 x (Numerator / Denominator) |
| **Data source/s** | Numerator  Judicial officers data are sourced from administrative data collected by Australian, State and Territory courts authorities and departments.  Denominator  ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) (unpublished) 2013 and previous years, *Australian Demographic Statistics*, Cat no. 3101.0, Canberra. For more detail about the population data used in the Report see RoGS Attachment Table 2A statistical context) |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Numerator — Number of FTE judicial officers  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision.  Denominator — Estimated residential population  For information on the institutional environment of the ABS, including the legislative obligations of the ABS, financial and government arrangements, and mechanisms for scrutiny of ABS operations, see *ABS Institutional Environment.*  The calculations associated with the use of ABS data are applied by the Report on Government Services Secretariat. |
| **Relevance** | ‘Judicial officers’, as expressed per 100 000 population, is an indicator that represents the availability of resources to provide judicial services.  Numerator — Number of FTE judicial officers  Denominator — Estimated residential population  This indicator seeks to reflect the availability of judicial officers to the community, by relating the number of judicial officers to the size of the jurisdictional population. However geographical and other factors such as remoteness of populations and workload, which are not represented in the indicator, need to be considered when comparing results. |
| **Timeliness** | Numerator — Number of FTE judicial officers  The reference period for judicial officers is the 2012-13 financial year. Data are provided in September 2013, for publication in January 2014.  Data can be revised retrospectively up to 5 years later.  Denominator — Estimated residential population  The reference period for population data is the financial year midpoint (31 December) estimate. |
| **Accuracy** | Numerator — Number of FTE judicial officers  The identification of judicial officer numbers is done using data in payroll and human resource management systems. This is mostly electronic with some manual data counting. This is then adjusted to meet the RoGS data collection rules.  The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules and the requested data reported are for all court levels in each jurisdiction. In order to meet the needs of the RoGS, costings and resourcing are apportioned across civil and criminal categories. This is mostly done on activity based costing approaches and the use of estimations. This may affect accuracy.  The data come from payroll and human resource management systems, which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls and reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy. Preparation of the data for the RoGS by court authorities also undergoes checking and verification procedures, including investigation of significant variances with previous years. |
| **Coherence** | Numerator — Number of FTE judicial officers  For the last five years the data have been counted and reported relatively consistently and no significant factors have been identified which have prevented or affected the consistent compilation of time series data. Minor exceptions to this are as follows.   * The apportionment of judicial officers between civil and criminal in Victoria is done on estimates; * In the 2011 report WA changed the basis of apportionment between civil and criminal functions from previous years; * Difficulties in apportionment of some federal magistrates’ time between the Federal Magistrates’ Court and the Federal Court of Australia; * During 2009 the Federal Magistrates’ Court changed its HR management system which may have resulted in slight changes to FTE calculations.   In some jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, e.g. annual reports, in relation to judicial officer numbers. In the other jurisdictions there are differences due to the FTE approach and exclusions set out in the ROGS counting rules. |
| **Accessibility** | Numerator — Number of FTE judicial officers  Data on judicial officers are supplied for the RoGS according to the specific RoGS counting rules. Other data on judicial officers can be accessed through annual reports and court websites within most jurisdictions and in some jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, e.g. annual reports. However, some data obtained from these other sources in the other jurisdictions may not align with the RoGS due to the specific RoGS counting rules.  Also, while courts in most jurisdictions make information available as to who holds a commission as a judge or master and which officers of the court are registrars, the information is not necessarily designed to provide a FTE number that can be matched to the number reported in RoGS. |
| **Interpretability** | Numerator — Number of FTE judicial officers  Contextual information for judicial officers data are provided in the Courts chapter and attachment tables. |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/ issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Jurisdictions may need to apportion or estimate FTE judicial staff numbers between criminal and civil levels of the magistrates, children’s, district/county and supreme courts. This may affect accuracy and comparability of data. * Not all jurisdictions calculate judicial officer FTEs in the same way for purposes of RoGS data collection. This may affect comparability of data. |

### Backlog

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with the Courts Working Group and the Courts Practitioner Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Courts Effectiveness – Access – Timeliness |
| **Indicator** | Backlog |
| **Measure (computation)** | ‘Backlog’ measures the age of a court’s pending caseload against nominated time standards. The number of cases in the nominated age category is expressed as a percentage of the total pending caseload. It is derived by dividing the number of cases that have been pending for a nominated period (numerator) by the total pending caseload for the year (denominator).  In calculating this measure for this report, some matters are excluded, eg. civil cases affected by deeming rules and matters that are inactive due to the issue of bench warrants that have not been executed.  Numerator is defined as:   * Number of cases pending longer than 12 months in a financial year (Higher Courts, Federal Court, family courts & Coroners Courts) * Number of cases pending longer than 24 months in a financial year (Higher Courts, Federal Court, family courts & Coroners Courts) * Number of cases pending longer than 6 months in a financial year (Federal Magistrates' Court, magistrates’ courts and children’s courts) * Number of cases pending longer than 12 months in a financial year (Federal Magistrates' Court, magistrates’ courts and children’s courts)   Denominator is defined as:   * Total number of cases pending in a financial year |
| **Data source/s** | Backlog data are sourced from administrative data collected by Australian, State and Territory court authorities and departments. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Numerator — Number of cases pending longer than a nominated period in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision.  Denominator — Total number of cases pending in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision. |
| **Relevance** | ‘Backlog’ is intended to be an indicator of governments’ achievement against the objective of processing matters in an expeditious and timely manner.  However time taken to process cases is not necessarily due to court delay. Some delays are caused by factors other than those related to the workload of the court. These factors will vary across jurisdictions and can include any or all of the following:   * parties' refusal of the first available hearing date in favour of a later date * referral of cases to diversionary programs, or to alternative dispute resolution lengthening the duration of a case but offering better quality and more cost-effective outcomes for parties and the community * time taken to process interlocutory appeals in appellate courts * time taken to ensure that interlocutory or pre-trial issues are resolved so that a fair outcome ensues * a witness being unavailable * delays in the finalisation of post mortem reports for Coroner’s Court in jurisdictions where post mortems are undertaken by agencies outside the court jurisdiction.   For further information on the backlog indicator refer to Box 7.9, Box 7.10, and Box 7.11 in chapter 7 of the Report. |
| **Timeliness** | The reference period for cases pending data is the 2012-13 financial year. Data are provided in September 2013, for publication in January 2014.  Data can be revised retrospectively up to 5 years later. |
| **Accuracy** | The identification of cases pending longer than a nominated period is done using electronic case management reporting systems except for the following:   * In the Supreme Court of New South Wales manually maintained data is used for the majority of civil appeal and all of criminal appeal and criminal non-appeal. A small proportion of the civil appeal data comes from an electronic system but for the 2009-2010 collection the NSW electronic system was unable to provide civil non-appeal data so an estimate was given for 2009-10.   The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules, eg. rules relating to deeming, warrants, bail matters, consolidations etc. and are reported in a consistent manner for all court levels in each jurisdiction, except the Supreme Court of NSW in 2009-10 (NSW civil children’s courts are unable to provide pending or backlog data).  The data are extracted from case management systems which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls, reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy. |
| **Coherence** | For the last five years backlog data have been counted and reported relatively consistently with the following exceptions:   * In the Federal Court pending bankruptcy matters are now excluded from ROGS data. Data from 2008-09 have been retrospectively adjusted to exclude these matters in the 2012 report. * In South Australia changes in legislation (e.g. offences moving from a court process to an infringement process) have impacted on numbers from 2008-09 onwards. * From 2007-08 changes to legislation in Tasmania’s courts have seen a significant number of minor traffic matters (infringement notices) no longer dealt with by the court. These are now enforced by the Monetary Penalties Enforcement Service and are excluded from the data from 2007-08. * From 2007-08 Western Australia’s Supreme Court criminal appeals include Single Judge of Appeal (SJA) matters. Prior to 2007-08 these appeals were included in the WA Supreme Court data for civil appeals. * System-based data was unavailable for 2009-2010 for New South Wales civil appeal data. A manual count was used and continues to be used until system data are restored. For civil non-appeal, New South Wales has changed from one electronic system to another - the new system was unable to provide pending caseload data for 2009-2010 and so an estimate was used that year.   In most jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, eg. annual reports, while in other jurisdictions there are differences due to the ROGS counting rules in relation to exclusions. |
| **Accessibility** | Pending caseload data are provided for the Report on Government Services according to the specific RoGS counting rules. Other data on pending cases is available through court annual reports, court websites, on application from the Chief Jurisdictional Officer in the relevant state, territory or federal jurisdiction. Pending case data for the Australian Capital Territory courts can also be found in the Justice & Community Safety Directorate's Annual Report. |
| **Interpretability** | Numerator — Number of cases pending longer than a nominated period in a financial year  Backlogs can be caused by factors not associated with the performance of the court as detailed previously under “Relevance”. Additionally, comparisons over time and between courts must take into consideration the impact of an increase/decrease in the number of complex cases or cases that typically take longer to finalise, or alternatively an increase/decrease in the number of undefended or typically straightforward cases that are quickly finalised. These will eventually alter the composition of the pending caseload and hence the age profile of that caseload (as measured by the backlog indicator) over time.  For further information on the backlog indicator refer to Box 7.9, Box 7.10, and Box 7.11 in chapter 7 of the Report. |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/ issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Due to limitations of the data management system, NSW has been unable to provide pending caseload or backlog data for the civil Children’s courts. It is hoped that this situation may be rectified for future reports. |

### Attendance

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with the Courts Working Group and the Courts Practitioner Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Courts Efficiency – Inputs per unit of output – Attendance |
| **Indicator** | Attendance indicator |
| **Measure (computation)** | The ‘attendance indicator’ is defined as the average number of attendances recorded for those cases that were finalised in a financial year. The number of attendances is the number of times that parties or their representatives are required to be present in court to be heard by a judicial officer or mediator/arbitrator where binding orders can be made. The number includes appointments that are adjourned or rescheduled.  Numerator is defined as:   * Total number of attendances in a financial year   Denominator is defined as:   * Total number of cases finalised in a financial year |
| **Data source/s** | Attendance and case finalisation data are sourced from administrative data collected by Australian, State and Territory court authorities and departments. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Numerator — Total number of attendances in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision. |
| **Relevance** | ‘Attendance’ is intended to be an indicator of governments’ achievement against the objective of providing court services in an efficient manner. However the results for this indicator may not relate to the performance of the courts as the number of attendances in a case can be influenced by many factors outside the control of the court, eg. prosecution readiness, defence availability, nature of issues and offence, whether a case is defended or undefended.  For further information on the attendance indicator refer to Box 7.12 in chapter 7 of the Report. |
| **Timeliness** | The reference period for attendance and finalisation data is the 2012-13 financial year. Data are provided in September 2013, for publication in January 2014.  Data can be revised retrospectively up to 5 years later. |
| **Accuracy** | Numerator — Total number of attendances in a financial year  The identification of attendances is done using electronic case management reporting systems except for the following:   * Attendance data are unavailable for reporting by New South Wales but are expected to be available upon completed implementation of a new electronic data management system * Attendance data for civil cases are not available for the Tasmanian Supreme Court * Attendances associated with appeal cases in the Queensland Supreme Court were not reported in 2009-10.   The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules and are reported for all court levels in each jurisdiction, except currently for NSW children’s courts and Tasmanian Supreme Court.  The data are extracted from case management systems which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls, reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  The identification of cases finalised is done using electronic case management reporting systems except for the following:   * In the Supreme Court of New South Wales manually maintained data is used for the majority of civil appeal and all of criminal appeal and criminal non-appeal. A small proportion of the civil appeal data comes from an electronic system but for the 2009-2010 collection the NSW electronic system was unable to provide civil non-appeal data so an estimate was given for 2009-10.   The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules, eg. rules relating to deeming, warrants, bail matters, consolidations etc. and are reported for all court levels in each jurisdiction.  The data are extracted from case management systems which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls, reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy. |
| **Coherence** | Numerator — Total number of attendances in a financial year  For the last five years attendance data have been counted and reported relatively consistently with the following exceptions:   * In the Federal Court attendances associated with bankruptcy matters are now excluded from ROGS data. Data from 2007-08 have been retrospectively adjusted to exclude these matters in the 2012 report. * In the Queensland Supreme Court attendances for appeal cases were not reported for 2009-10. * Attendance data have been unavailable for reporting by NSW but are expected to be available upon completed implementation of a new electronic data management system.   In most jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, eg. annual reports, while in other jurisdictions there are differences due to the RoGS counting rules in relation to exclusions or where data on attendances are not reported.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  For the last five years data have been collected, counted and reported relatively consistently with the following exceptions:   * In the Federal Court bankruptcy matters are now excluded from ROGS data. Data from 2007-08 have been retrospectively adjusted to exclude these matters in the 2012 report. * In South Australia changes in legislation (e.g. offences moving from a court process to an infringement process) have impacted on numbers from 2008-09 onwards. * From 2007-08 Western Australia’s Supreme Court criminal appeals include Single Judge of Appeal (SJA) matters. Prior to 2007-08 these appeals were included in the WA Supreme Court data for civil appeals. * System-based data was unavailable for 2009-2010 for New South Wales civil appeal data. A manual count was used and continues to be used until system data are restored. For civil non-appeal, New South Wales has changed from one electronic system to another - the new system was unable to provide data for 2009-2010 and so an estimate was used that year.   In most jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, eg. annual reports, while in other jurisdictions there are differences due to the ROGS counting rules in relation to exclusions and differing definitions. Finalisation counting rules for civil courts in this report also include a “deeming rule” which means that RoGS finalisation data are unlikely to match the court’s own published data. |
| **Accessibility** | Attendance and finalisation data are provided for the Report on Government Services according to the specific RoGS counting rules. Other data on attendances and finalisations may be available through court annual reports, court websites, on application from the Chief Jurisdictional Officer in the relevant state, territory or federal jurisdiction. Attendance data for the Australian Capital Territory courts can also be found in the Justice & Community Safety Directorate's Annual Report. |
| **Interpretability** | Numerator — Total number of attendances in a financial year  Fewer attendances may suggest a more efficient process. However, this should be balanced against the likelihood that the number of attendances will increase if rehabilitation or diversionary programs are used, or if intensive case management is used. Both of these paths are believed to improve the quality of outcomes.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  The application of the deeming rule can complicate the counting of finalisations because deemed finalisations for the reporting year have to be added to the court’s actual disposal count, and actual finalisations that have been counted in any previous year as a ‘deemed finalisation’ need to be removed from the finalisation count for RoGS for the current year.  For further information on the attendance indicator refer to Box 7.12 in chapter 7 of the Report. |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/ issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Due to limitations of the data management system, NSW has to date been unable to provide attendance data. It is hoped that this situation may be rectified for future reports, upon completed implementation of a new electronic data management system. Tasmania is unable to provide data for Supreme Court civil cases. |

### Clearance

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with the Courts Working Group and the Courts Practitioner Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Courts Efficiency – Inputs per unit of output – Clearance |
| **Indicator** | Clearance indicator |
| **Measure (computation)** | The ‘clearance indicator’ is measured by dividing the number of finalisations in the reporting period by the number of lodgments in the same period. It indicates whether the volume of case finalisations has matched the number of case lodgments during the reporting period. It can also indicate whether a court’s pending caseload would have increased or decreased over that period.  Numerator is defined as:   * Total number of cases finalised in a financial year   Denominator is defined as:   * Total number of cases lodged in a financial year |
| **Data source/s** | Lodgment and case finalisation data are sourced from administrative data collected by Australian, State and Territory court authorities and departments. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Numerator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision.  Denominator — Total number of cases lodged in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision. |
| **Relevance** | ‘Clearance’ is intended to be an indicator of governments’ achievement against the objective of providing court services in an efficient manner. However variations in the rate over time do not necessarily relate to the performance of the court. The clearance indicator can be affected by external factors outside of the court system which cause changes in lodgment rates, as well as by changes in a court’s case management practices.  For further information on the clearance indicator refer to Box 7.13 in chapter 7 of the Report. |
| **Timeliness** | The reference period for case lodgment and finalisation data is the 2012-13 financial year. Data are provided in September 2013, for publication in January 2014.  Data can be revised retrospectively up to 5 years later. |
|  |  |
| **Accuracy** | The identification of lodgment and finalisation data is done using electronic case management reporting systems except for the following:   * In the Supreme Court of New South Wales manually maintained data are used for the majority of civil appeal, and all criminal appeal and non-appeal cases. A small proportion of the civil appeal data is derived electronically but for the 2009-10 collection the NSW electronic system was unable to provide civil non-appeal data so an estimate was given for 2009-10.   The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules and are reported for all court levels in each jurisdiction.  The data are extracted from case management systems which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls, reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy. |
| **Coherence** | For the last five years lodgment and finalisation data have been collected, counted and reported relatively consistently with the following exceptions:   * In the Federal Court bankruptcy matters are now excluded from ROGS data. Data from 2007-08 have been retrospectively adjusted to exclude these matters in the 2012 report. * In South Australia changes in legislation (e.g. offences moving from a court process to an infringement process) have impacted on numbers from 2008-09 onwards. * Changes to legislation in 2008 in Tasmania’s courts mean that a substantial number of minor traffic matters (infringement notices) are no longer dealt with by the court. These are now enforced by the Monetary Penalties Enforcement Service and are excluded from the data. * From 2007-08 Western Australia’s Supreme Court criminal appeals include Single Judge of Appeal (SJA) matters. Prior to 2007-08 these appeals were included in the WA Supreme Court data for civil appeals. * System-based data was unavailable for 2009-2010 for New South Wales civil appeal data. A manual count was used and continues to be used until system data are restored. For civil non-appeal, New South Wales has changed from one electronic system to another - the new system was unable to provide data for 2009-2010 and so an estimate was used that year.   In most jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, eg. annual reports, while in other jurisdictions there are differences due to the ROGS counting rules in relation to exclusions and differing definitions. Finalisation counting rules for civil courts in this report also include a “deeming rule” which means that RoGS finalisation data are unlikely to match the court’s own published data. |
| **Accessibility** | Lodgment and finalisation data are provided for the Report on Government Services according to the specific RoGS counting rules. Other data on lodgments and finalisations may be available through court annual reports, court websites, on application from the Chief Jurisdictional Officer in the relevant state, territory or federal jurisdiction. |
| **Interpretability** | The clearance indicator should be interpreted alongside lodgment and finalisation data and the backlog indicator. Trends over time should also be considered. The clearance indicator can be affected by external factors outside of the court system such as complexity of cases, capacity to handle workload, changes in lodgment rates, as well as changes in a court’s case management practices.  The application of the deeming rule can complicate the counting of finalisations because deemed finalisations for the reporting year have to be added to the court’s actual disposal count, and actual finalisations that have been counted in any previous year as a ‘deemed finalisation’ need to be removed from the finalisation count for RoGS for the current year.  The usual interpretation is that a clearance rate of 100% or more is good. The rate at which cases are lodged is as much responsible for the clearance indicator results as is the finalisation rate. Any surge in lodgments during the final months of the reporting period will worsen the clearance rate result because those cases are unlikely to be ready for finalisation before the reporting period closes. That surge in lodgments may well produce a surge in finalisations in the following year, which then favourably impact the next reporting period as finalisations – these fluctuations may or may not reflect efficiency.  For further information on the clearance indicator refer to Box 7.13 in chapter 7 of the Report. |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/ issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * As noted under ‘Interpretability’ |

### Judicial officers per 100 finalisations

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with the Courts Working Group and the Courts Practitioner Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Courts Efficiency – Inputs per unit of output – Judicial officers per finalisation |
| **Indicator** | Judicial officers per 100 finalisations |
| **Measure (computation)** | ‘Judicial officers per 100 finalisations’ is measured by dividing the number of total FTE judicial officers within each court level for the financial year by the total number of finalisations for the same period and multiplying this number by 100.  Numerator is defined as:   * Number of full time equivalent judicial officers   Denominator is defined as:   * Total number of cases finalised in a financial year. |
| **Data source/s** | Judicial officers data and case finalisation data are sourced from administrative data collected by Australian, State and Territory court authorities and departments. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Numerator — Number of FTE judicial officers  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision. |
| **Relevance** | ‘Judicial officers per 100 finalisations’ is an indicator of governments’ achievement against the objective of providing court services in an efficient manner.  For further information on this indicator refer to Boxes 7.7 and 7.14 in Chapter 7 of the Report. |
| **Timeliness** | The reference period for judicial officers and finalisation data is the 2012-13 financial year. Data are provided in September 2013, for publication in January 2014.  Data can be revised retrospectively up to 5 years later. |
| **Accuracy** | Numerator — FTE Judicial officers  The identification of judicial officer numbers is done using data in payroll and human resource management systems. This is mostly electronic with some manual data counting. This is then adjusted to meet the RoGS data collection rules.  The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules and the requested data reported are for all court levels in each jurisdiction. In order to meet the needs of the RoGS, costings and resourcing are apportioned across civil and criminal categories. This is mostly done on activity based costing approaches and the use of estimations. This may affect accuracy.  The data come from payroll and human resource management systems, which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls and reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy. Preparation of the data for the RoGS by court authorities also undergoes checking and verification procedures, including investigation of significant variances with previous years.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  The identification of cases finalised is done using electronic case management reporting systems except for the following:   * In the Supreme Court of New South Wales manually maintained data are used for the majority of civil appeal, and all criminal appeal and non-appeal cases.   The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules and are reported for all court levels in each jurisdiction.  The data are extracted from case management systems which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls, reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy. |
| **Coherence** | Numerator — Number of FTE judicial officers  For the last five years the data have been counted and reported relatively consistently and no significant factors have been identified which have prevented or affected the consistent compilation of time series data. Minor exceptions to this are as follows.   * The apportionment of judicial officers between civil and criminal in Victoria is done on estimates; * In the 2011 report WA changed the basis of apportionment between civil and criminal functions from previous years; * Difficulties in apportionment of some federal magistrates’ time between the Federal Magistrates’ Court and the Federal Court of Australia; * During 2009 the Federal Magistrates’ Court changed its HR management system which may have resulted in slight changes to FTE calculations.   In some jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, e.g. annual reports, in relation to judicial officer numbers. In the other jurisdictions there are differences due to the FTE approach and exclusions set out in the ROGS counting rules.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  For the last five years data have been collected, counted and reported relatively consistently with the following exceptions:   * In the Federal Court bankruptcy matters are now excluded from ROGS data. Data from 2007-08 have been retrospectively adjusted to exclude these matters. * In South Australia changes in legislation (eg. offences moving from a Court process to an infringement process) have impacted on numbers from 2008-09 onwards. A ‘one number’ system introduced into the Magistrates court has also enabled a more accurate count of lodgment and finalisation data when cases are transferred within the one court level. * Changes to legislation in 2008 in Tasmania’s courts mean that a substantial number of minor traffic matters (infringement notices) are no longer dealt with by the court. These are now enforced by the Monetary Penalties Enforcement Service and are excluded from the data. * From 2007-08 Western Australia’s Supreme Court criminal appeals include Single Judge of Appeal (SJA) matters. Prior to 2007-08 these appeals were included in the WA Supreme Court data for civil appeals. * System-based data was unavailable for 2009-2010 for New South Wales civil appeal data. A manual count was used and continues to be used until system data are restored. For civil non-appeal, New South Wales has changed from one electronic system to another - the new system was unable to provide data for 2009-2010 and so an estimate was used that year.   In most jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, eg. annual reports, while in other jurisdictions there are differences due to the ROGS counting rules in relation to exclusions and differing definitions. Finalisation counting rules for civil courts in this report also include a “deeming rule” which means that RoGS finalisation data are unlikely to match the court’s own published data. |
| **Accessibility** | Data on judicial officers are supplied for the RoGS according to the specific RoGS counting rules. Other data on judicial officers can be accessed through annual reports and court websites within most jurisdictions and in some jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, e.g. annual reports. However, some data obtained from these other sources in the other jurisdictions may not align with the RoGS due to the specific RoGS counting rules.  Also, while courts in most jurisdictions make information available as to who holds a commission as a judge or master and which officers of the court are registrars, the information is not necessarily designed to provide a FTE number that can be matched to the number reported in RoGS. |
| **Interpretability** | Numerator — Number of FTE judicial officers  Contextual information for judicial officers data are provided in the Courts chapter and attachment tables.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  The application of the deeming rule can complicate the counting of finalisations because deemed finalisations for the reporting year have to be added to the court’s actual disposal count, and actual finalisations that have been counted in any previous year as a ‘deemed finalisation’ need to be removed from the finalisation count for RoGS for the current year. |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/ issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Jurisdictions may need to apportion or estimate FTE judicial staff numbers between criminal and civil levels of the magistrates, children’s, district/county and supreme courts. This may affect accuracy and comparability of data. * Not all jurisdictions calculate judicial officer FTEs in the same way for purposes of RoGS data collection. This may affect comparability of data. * The deeming rule can complicate the counting of finalisations. |

### Full time equivalent (FTE) staff per 100 finalisations

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with the Courts Working Group and the Courts Practitioner Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Courts Efficiency – Inputs per unit of output – FTE staff per finalisation |
| **Indicator** | Full time equivalent staff per 100 finalisations |
| **Measure (computation)** | ‘FTE staff per 100 finalisations’ is measured by dividing the total number of FTE staff (including judicial officers) within each court level by the total number of finalisations in the financial year and multiplying this number by 100.  Numerator is defined as:   * Number of full time equivalent staff employed by courts or umbrella authorities   Denominator is defined as:   * Total number of cases finalised in a financial year. |
| **Data source/s** | FTE staff data and case finalisation data are sourced from administrative data collected by Australian, State and Territory court authorities and departments. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Numerator — Total number of FTE staff  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision. |
| **Relevance** | ‘Total FTE staff per 100 finalisations’ is an indicator of governments’ achievement against the objective of providing court services in an efficient manner.  For further information on this indicator refer to Box 7.15 in Chapter 7 of the Report. |
| **Timeliness** | The reference period for total FTE staff and finalisation data is the 2012-13 financial year. Data are provided in September 2013, for publication in January 2014.  Data can be revised retrospectively up to 5 years later. |
| **Accuracy** | Numerator — Total FTE staff  The identification of total FTE staff numbers is done using data in payroll and human resource management systems. This is mostly electronic with some manual data counting. This is then adjusted to meet the RoGS data collection rules.  The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules and the requested data reported are for all court levels in each jurisdiction. In order to meet the needs of the RoGS, costings and resourcing are apportioned across civil and criminal categories. This is mostly done on activity based costing approaches and the use of estimations. This may affect accuracy.  The data come from payroll and human resource management systems, which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls and reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy. Preparation of the data for the RoGS by court authorities also undergoes checking and verification procedures, including investigation of significant variances with previous years.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  The identification of cases finalised is done using electronic case management reporting systems except for the following:   * In the Supreme Court of New South Wales manually maintained data are used for the majority of civil appeal, and all criminal appeal and non-appeal cases.   The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules and are reported for all court levels in each jurisdiction.  The data are extracted from case management systems which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls, reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy. |
| **Coherence** | Numerator — Total number of FTE staff  For the last five years the data have been counted and reported relatively consistently and no significant factors have been identified which have prevented or affected the consistent compilation of time series data. Minor exceptions to this are as follows.   * The apportionment of staff between civil and criminal in Victoria is done on estimates; * In the 2011 report WA changed the basis of apportionment between civil and criminal functions from previous years; * Difficulties in apportionment of some federal magistrates’ time between the Federal Magistrates’ Court and the Federal Court of Australia; * During 2009 the Federal Magistrates’ Court changed its HR management system which may have resulted in slight changes to FTE calculations.   In some jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, e.g. annual reports, in relation to judicial officer numbers. In the other jurisdictions there are differences due to the FTE approach and exclusions set out in the ROGS counting rules.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  For the last five years data have been collected, counted and reported relatively consistently with the following exceptions:   * In the Federal Court bankruptcy matters are now excluded from ROGS data. Data from 2007-08 have been retrospectively adjusted to exclude these matters. * In South Australia changes in legislation (eg. offences moving from a Court process to an infringement process) have impacted on numbers from 2008-09 onwards. A ‘one number’ system introduced into the Magistrates court has also enabled a more accurate count of lodgment and finalisation data when cases are transferred within the one court level. * Changes to legislation in 2008 in Tasmania’s courts mean that a substantial number of minor traffic matters (infringement notices) are no longer dealt with by the court. These are now enforced by the Monetary Penalties Enforcement Service and are excluded from the data. * From 2007-08 Western Australia’s Supreme Court criminal appeals include Single Judge of Appeal (SJA) matters. Prior to 2007-08 these appeals were included in the WA Supreme Court data for civil appeals. * System-based data was unavailable for 2009-2010 for New South Wales civil appeal data. A manual count was used and continues to be used until system data are restored. For civil non-appeal, New South Wales has changed from one electronic system to another - the new system was unable to provide data for 2009-2010 and so an estimate was used that year.   In most jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, eg. annual reports, while in other jurisdictions there are differences due to the ROGS counting rules in relation to exclusions and differing definitions. Finalisation counting rules for civil courts in this report also include a “deeming rule” which means that RoGS finalisation data are unlikely to match the court’s own published data. |
| **Accessibility** | Data on FTE staff are supplied for the RoGS according to the specific RoGS counting rules.  Also, while courts in most jurisdictions make information available as to who holds a commission as a judge or master and which officers of the court are registrars, the information is not necessarily designed to provide a FTE number that can be matched to the number reported in RoGS. |
| **Interpretability** | Numerator — Total number of FTE staff  Contextual information for total FTE staff data are provided in the Courts chapter and attachment tables.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  The application of the deeming rule can complicate the counting of finalisations because deemed finalisations for the reporting year have to be added to the court’s actual disposal count, and actual finalisations that have been counted in any previous year as a ‘deemed finalisation’ need to be removed from the finalisation count for RoGS for the current year. |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/ issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Jurisdictions may need to apportion or estimate FTE staff numbers between criminal and civil levels of the magistrates, children’s, district/county and supreme courts. This may affect accuracy and comparability of data. * The deeming rule can complicate the counting of finalisations. |

### Cost per finalisation

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with the Courts Working Group and the Courts Practitioner Group, with additional Steering Committee comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator definition and description** | |
| **Element** | Court Efficiency – Inputs per unit of output – Cost per finalisation |
| **Indicator** | Cost per finalisation |
| **Measure (computation)** | ‘Cost per finalisation’ is measured by dividing the total net recurrent expenditure within each court for the financial year by the total number of finalisations for the same period. Cost is defined as the total net recurrent annual expenditure, excluding payroll tax. Net cost refers to expenditure minus income (where income is derived from court fees and other revenue but excludes revenue from fines).  Numerator is defined as:   * Total net recurrent expenditure in a financial year   Denominator is defined as:   * Total number of cases finalised in a financial year |
| **Data source/s** | Expenditure, income and case finalisation data are sourced from administrative data collected by Australian, State and Territory court authorities and departments. |
| **Data Quality Framework Dimensions** | |
| **Institutional environment** | Numerator — Total net recurrent expenditure in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  In most jurisdictions, the data are collected and compiled by the court authority. In the other jurisdictions, it is collected and compiled by governing departments.  The data are requested and submitted in accordance with the authority of the terms of reference of the Review of Government Service Provision. |
| **Relevance** | ‘Cost per finalisation’ is an indicator of governments’ achievement against the objective of providing court services in an efficient manner. This indicator is not a measure of the actual cost per case.  For further information on the cost per finalisation indicator refer to Box 7.16 in chapter 7 of the Report. |
| **Timeliness** | The reference period for cost and finalisation data is the 2012-13 financial year. Data are provided in September 2013, for publication in January 2014.  Data can be revised retrospectively up to 5 years later. |
| **Accuracy** | Numerator — Total net recurrent expenditure in a financial year  In all jurisdictions the identification of total net recurrent expenditure is done using electronic case management and financial systems which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls, reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy. Due to the financial nature of the data it is also independently audited for annual reporting purposes.  The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules and the requested data reported are for all court levels in each jurisdiction.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  The identification of cases finalised is done using electronic case management reporting systems except for the following:   * In the Supreme Court of New South Wales manually maintained data are used for the majority of civil appeal, and all criminal appeal and non-appeal cases. A small proportion of the civil appeal data is derived electronically but for the 2009-10 collection the NSW electronic system was unable to provide civil non-appeal data so an estimate was given for 2009-10.   The data provided are consistent with RoGS counting rules and are reported for all court levels in each jurisdiction.  The data are extracted from case management systems which are subject to the normal legislative financial and administrative controls, reconciliation and validation processes to ensure accuracy. |
| **Coherence** | Numerator — Total net recurrent expenditure in a financial year  For the last five years data associated with net recurrent expenditure have been reported relatively consistently with the following exceptions:   * In the Federal Court bankruptcy matters are now excluded from ROGS data. Data from 2007-08 have been retrospectively adjusted to exclude these matters in the 2012 report. * Changes made for 2009-10 data collection involved a 40% loading for superannuation for judicial officers, and payroll tax expenditure by umbrella and other departments were excluded from net recurrent expenditure * In the Northern Territory a new procedure in collecting and extracting financial data was implemented in 2008 – data are consistent from then.   In most jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, e.g annual reports, while in other jurisdictions there are differences due to the RoGS counting rules in relation to exclusions, or the data are not published elsewhere.  Denominator — Total number of cases finalised in a financial year  For the last five years data have been collected, counted and reported relatively consistently with the following exceptions:   * In the Federal Court bankruptcy matters are now excluded from ROGS data. Data from 2007-08 have been retrospectively adjusted to exclude these matters in the 2012 report. * In South Australia changes in legislation (eg. offences moving from a Court process to an infringement process) have impacted on numbers from 2008-09 onwards. A ‘one number’ system introduced into the Magistrates court has also enabled a more accurate count of lodgment and finalisation data when cases are transferred within the one court level. * Changes to legislation in 2008 in Tasmania’s courts mean that a substantial number of minor traffic matters (infringement notices) are no longer dealt with by the court. These are now enforced by the Monetary Penalties Enforcement Service and are excluded from the data. * From 2007-08 Western Australia’s Supreme Court criminal appeals include Single Judge of Appeal (SJA) matters. Prior to 2007-08 these appeals were included in the WA Supreme Court data for civil appeals. * System-based data was unavailable for 2009-2010 for New South Wales civil appeal data. A manual count was used and continues to be used until system data are restored. For civil non-appeal, New South Wales has changed from one electronic system to another - the new system was unable to provide data for 2009-2010 and so an estimate was used that year.   In most jurisdictions there is an alignment with other publications, eg. annual reports, while in other jurisdictions there are differences due to the ROGS counting rules in relation to exclusions and differing definitions. Finalisation counting rules for civil courts in this report also include a “deeming rule” which means that RoGS finalisation data are unlikely to match the court’s own published data. |
| **Accessibility** | Data on net recurrent expenditure and finalised cases are provided for the Report on Government Services according to the specific RoGS counting rules. Other data on net recurrent expenditure and finalisations may be available through court annual reports, court websites, on application from the Chief Jurisdictional Officer in the relevant state, territory or federal jurisdiction. |
| **Interpretability** | The total net recurrent expenditure for the latest financial year associated with the report is expressed in real dollars – previous years have a General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price index deflator applied. This aligns previous years’ results to current year values for comparative purposes (see chapter 2 section 2.5 and tables 2A.51 and 2A.53 for how deflator is applied).  The RoGS data for the Federal Court do not include non-initiating documents such as interlocutory applications, subpoenas etc. However fees are charged and impact on the numerator.  The application of the deeming rule can complicate the counting of finalisations because deemed finalisations for the reporting year have to be added to the court’s actual disposal count, and actual finalisations that have been counted in any previous year as a ‘deemed finalisation’ need to be removed from the finalisation count for RoGS for the current year.  For further information on the cost per finalisation indicator refer to Box 7.16 in chapter 7 of the Report. |
| **Data Gaps/Issues Analysis** | |
| **Key data gaps/ issues** | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * The ‘cost per finalisation’ indicator is not yet directly comparable across jurisdictions and is under ongoing review to improve consistency and comparability in how income and expenditure data are extracted and reported. |