

Appendix 4 Performance against service standards

The service areas presented in the following tables reflect the machinery-of-government changes, effective 1 March 2015, under which the department was renamed from the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning to the Department of State Development.

As a result of the machinery-of-government changes, one service area transferred to the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and performance against this in the 2014–15 financial year is reported in that department’s annual report.

The transferred service area is:

- Reforming Queensland's planning system.

The department retained two service areas, which are:

- Driving Business and Economic Growth (in 2015–16 this service area absorbed the service area Leading Infrastructure Policy and Planning for the State)
- Major Project Assessment, Approval, Facilitation and Delivery.

Our core service areas align with our strategic objectives and in the *Service Delivery Statements 2015–16*, these service areas are described as:

- Driving Business Development, Economic Growth and Job Creation
- Assessing, Approving, Facilitating and Delivering Major Projects.

Service standards are set with the aim of defining a level of performance that is appropriate and expected to be achieved, enabling government and the public to assess whether or not agencies are delivering services to acceptable levels.

The following tables report the department’s performance over the 2014–15 financial year against our service standards as articulated in the *Service Delivery Statements 2014–15*.

Service standard	2014-15 Target / estimate	2014-15 Estimated actual	2014-15 Actual	
------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------	--

Driving Business and Economic Growth¹

Percentage of land transactions being delivered which meet committed timeframes and approved revenue targets ²	90%	75%	100%	▲
Value of private sector capital investment leveraged through industry facilitation ³	\$277M	\$330M	\$334M	▲
Private sector capital investment leveraged per dollar spent on industry facilitation ⁴	\$23	\$35	\$32	▲

Leading Infrastructure Policy and Planning for the State⁵

Value of infrastructure investment enabled through the Royalties for the Regions program ⁶	\$230M	\$134M	\$134M	▼
Value of infrastructure investment enabled per dollar invested in the management of the Royalties for the Regions program ⁷	\$100	\$107	\$107	▲

Major Project Assessment, Approval, Facilitation and Delivery⁸

The number of statutory decisions made by the Coordinator-General ⁹	100	98	119	▲
Average percentage reduction in the assessment timeframes for coordinated projects ¹⁰	50%	57%	57%	▲
Percentage of projects being managed, delivered or facilitated, which meet committed timeframes and approved budgets ¹¹	75%	95%	92%	▲
Percentage of industry proponents indicating they are satisfied with services provided for the management, delivery or facilitation of projects ¹²	75%	N/A	N/A	

achieved or exceeded ▲ not achieved ▼

Notes:

1. For the 2015–16 SDS, this service area is amended to better reflect the whole-of-government priority to create jobs and a diverse economy and is articulated as ‘Driving Business Development, Economic Growth and Job Creation’.
2. The 2014–15 estimate target was based on the three year revenue target. Sales are currently ahead of target. From 2015–16 this service standard will be reported under an effectiveness measure ‘Percentage of land transactions being delivered which meet committed timeframes’ and an efficiency measure ‘Percentage of land transactions being delivered which meet approved budgets’, which will better reflect the efficiency and effectiveness of the land transaction business. The 2014–15 target estimate of 90% is corrected from the 75% value which was published in the 2015–16 SDS in error.
3. The variance between the 2014–15 target estimate of \$277 million and the 2014–15 actual of \$334 million is largely due to the awarding of a contract for a major defence project. In 2015–16 this service standard will be reported with the target estimate and performance for each contributing business area: State Development (SD) and Major Projects Office (MPO). In 2014–15 MPO reported a reduced actual compared to their 2014–15 estimate due to two development leases not progressing.
4. The variance between the 2014–15 target estimate of \$23 and the 2014–15 actual of \$32 is largely due to the awarding of a contract for a major defence project. In 2014–15 this service standard is reported as a total for all contributing business areas: State Development (SD) and Major Projects Office (MPO). In 2015–16 this service standard will be reported with the target estimate and performance for each contributing business area indicated separately.
5. From 2015–16, this service area is discontinued and the service standards will be reported under the Driving Business Development, Economic Growth and Job Creation service area.
6. The variance between the 2014–15 target estimate of \$230 million and the 2014–15 actual of \$134 million is due to the funds being allocated as appropriate across the full four years of the program. The overall program amount was as per original program estimates. The 2014–15 target estimate and 2014–15 actual are for the third funding round. In 2015–16 this service standard has been amended to ‘Value of infrastructure investment enabled through the Final Round Royalties for the Regions’.
7. In 2015–16 this service standard has been amended to ‘Value of infrastructure investment enabled per dollar invested in the management of the Final Round Royalties for the Regions’.
8. For the 2015–16 SDS, this service area is amended to ‘Assessing, Approving, Facilitating and Delivering Major Projects’.
9. This service standard is being discontinued in 2015–16 as this is an activity measure which is not a measure of effectiveness or efficiency.
10. A reduction in average assessment timeframes demonstrates the effectiveness of processes and activities implemented to simplify and streamline the system. For the 2015–16 SDS, this service standard is amended to include assessment timeframes for Applications in State Development Areas (SDAs) in addition to Coordinated Projects (CP).
11. This service standard is being discontinued in 2015–16 to better reflect the efficiency and effectiveness of the project delivery business. The variance between the estimated actual of 95% and the actual of 92% is due to some projects that were initially included in the 2014–15 target/estimate calculation being substantially altered during 2014–15 as a result of current government priorities. This service standard is being reported in the 2015–16 SDS under an effectiveness measure ‘Percentage of projects managed, facilitated or delivered which meet committed timeframes’ and an efficiency measure ‘Percentage of projects managed, facilitated or delivered which meet approved budgets’.
12. This service standard is being discontinued in 2015–16 as this is a satisfaction measure which primarily relates to stakeholder views about changes to processes, not the effectiveness or efficiency of the service. Due to the 2015 election and the subsequent machinery-of-government changes, the department was unable to proceed with a meaningful survey of clients for the 2014–15 period. The client survey program will be continued following a review of the remaining service areas and re-development of the survey instrument.