# Improving efficiency and responsiveness of justice services in Noojee:

Department of Treasury and Finance - FICTIONAL

### Redevelopment of Noojee court and services

### Response Options Analysis

## Option 1: Business as usual / Do nothing

Maintains court buildings to current standard and capacity and continues to divert caseload to other courts when capacity is available.

| Interventions | % |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Maintain current court building, capacity and level of operations | 80% |
| 2 | Divert portion of caseload to other regional courts with spare capacity | 20% |

| Benefit score | Capital TEI | Time range | Ranking | Options workshop required? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12.5% | $ mil - $n mil | mm-mm |  | No |

| Risks and Uncertainty |
| --- |
| 1 | Other courts lack capacity to take diverted caseload M |

| Disbenefits |
| --- |
| 1 | Delays and poor access to justice services will increase H |
| 2 | Security risks of precinct are unmitigated H |

| Interdependencies |
| --- |
| None |

## Option 2: Manage overall demand for court services and improve effectiveness of in-court technology

Focuses on managing the demand for court services through targeted community education and diversionary strategies, for both criminal and civil matters. Supplements this with improvements in in-court technology (within constraints of existing infrastructure) to increase efficiency of operations and safety of vulnerable witnesses.

| Interventions | % |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Develop community education programs and diversion strategies to resolve matters through non-court channels | 50% |
| 2 | Divert portion of caseload to other regional courts with spare capacity | 10% |
| 3 | Enhance in-court technology to support more remote-witnessing and digital evidence presentation | 40% |

| Benefit score | Capital TEI | Time range | Ranking | Options workshop required? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 40.0% | $0.8 mil - $1 mil | 36mm-60mm | 3 | No |

| Risks and Uncertainty |
| --- |
| 1 | Community education programs do not have desired and timely impact on behavioural change H |
| 2 | Insufficient non-court channels available and/or generate poor outcomes for users H |
| 3 | Existing infrastructure limits effectiveness of new in-court technology services M |
| 4 | Other courts lack capacity to take diverted caseload M |

| Disbenefits |
| --- |
| 1 | Strategy seen as being 'soft on crime' with long lead times M |
| 2 | Security risks of precinct are not fully mitigated H |

| Interdependencies |
| --- |
| 1 | Active co-operation of other Government agencies in demand management strategies H |
| 2 | Strong support from judicial officers for changed service model & approach H |

## Option 3: Reconfigure existing site and make more use of third party sites and services (multi-site model)

Introduces alternative modes of service delivery, at other sites and/or through partnership arrangements  to address the demand and functionality pressures at  Noojee and improve justice outcomes. In conjunction, the existing site is remodelled and the in-court technology upgraded, making the most effective and efficient use of existing infrastructure and accommodating additional judiciary and staff. This improves the safety of the court precinct and the efficiency of services.

| Interventions | % |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Expand capability to provide more diverse responses in criminal and civil matters | 20% |
| 2 | Enhance in-court technology to support more remote-witnessing and digital evidence presentation | 25% |
| 3 | Provide additional space and reconfigure existing facilities to support a wider range of justice services  | 40% |
| 4 | Improve physical separation between parties and court activities | 15% |

| Benefit score | Capital TEI | Time range | Ranking | Options workshop required? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 95.0% | $50 mil - $80 mil | 12mm-48mm | 1 | No |

| Risks and Uncertainty |
| --- |
| 1 | Suitable land for annex site not available M |
| 2 | Demand increases faster than expected (drug-related crime, domestic violence, sexual offences) placing excessive pressures on remodelled courthouse and requiring reconsideration of other options M |
| 3 | Insufficient skills and service providers in region to support new range of services M |
| 4 | Remodelling is more complex, costly or time-consuming than envisaged H |

| Disbenefits |
| --- |
| 1 | Substantial disruption during construction will impact short to medium term capacity M |
| 2 | Seen to defer consideration of a long-term solution to court service delivery in region M |

| Interdependencies |
| --- |
| 1 | Current policy settings regarding jurisdictional boundaries, and legal, policing and sentencing practices are materially unchanged H |

## Option 4: Deliver the full range of court services from a purpose-built new facility at Noojee

This option allows for investment in  entirely new integrated court facilities, including new in-court technology, that fully address the current and forecast capacity, service, and safety issues.

| Interventions | % |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Enhance in-court technology to support more remote-witnessing and digital evidence presentation | 15% |
| 2 | Expand capability to provide more diverse responses in criminal and civil matters | 25% |
| 3 | Provide additional space to increase capacity, improve safety and provide full range of court services from Noojee | 60% |

| Benefit score | Capital TEI | Time range | Ranking | Options workshop required? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 100.0% | $300 mil - $350 mil | 36mm-72mm |  | Yes |

| Risks and Uncertainty |
| --- |
| 1 | A suitable site is not available M |
| 2 | Long-term demand does not grow in accordance with current forecasts leading to either renewed pressure on capacity or excess capacity H |
| 3 | Lack of interest from local government or private market to buy or take over responsibilities for old courthouse H |

| Disbenefits |
| --- |
| 1 | Public recognizes little value for the investment because of the long delivery time M |

| Interdependencies |
| --- |
| 1 | Current policy settings regarding jurisdictional boundaries, and legal, policing and sentencing practices are materially unchanged H |

## Option 5: Adopt a regional approach to delivery of court services

Builds capacity at neighbouring regional courts and develops a centre of excellence model, providing some economies of scale and operating efficiencies. Noojee becomes a specialist centre for therapeutic justice and ADR services, serving wider geographical area than currently.

| Interventions | % |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Reallocate majority of Noojee case load to other regional courts | 20% |
| 2 | Expand court capacity, technology and services at other courts in the region | 50% |
| 3 | Upgrade capacity at Nooje to develop specialist centre for ADR and therapeutic justice services | 30% |

| Benefit score | Capital TEI | Time range | Ranking | Options workshop required? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 92.5% | $100 mil - $120 mil | 18mm-48mm | 2 | Yes |

| Risks and Uncertainty |
| --- |
| 1 | Delivery of new services across wider region is more complex and costly than envisaged H |
| 2 | Centres of excellence approach insufficiently flexible to respond to changing volumes and patterns of demand M |
| 3 | Difficulty securing appropriately qualified and skilled staff to support speciliased services in each region M |

| Disbenefits |
| --- |
| 1 | Court users face longer travel times to court H |
| 2 | Multiple communities perceive loss of service and resist change H |

| Interdependencies |
| --- |
| 1 | Strong leadership from key stakeholders across multiple jurisdictions, LGAs, and communities H |
| 2 | Adequate investment in supporting digital and online services M |

# Overall assessment

Option 3 is the preferred option. It delivers well on the benefits, with a manageable risk profile and significantly lower costs than the other two high benefit delivery options - Options 4 and 5. Option 3 does continue to invest in an existing asset which has inherent limitations and is likely not to be a long-term solution for the region but it represents a cost-effective and pragmatic response to current issues whilst other more innovative options of service delivery can be researched and developed. Option 4, as a new-build option, is an entirely asset-based response to the problems at Noojee which locks in a court capacity for the region which has a high risk of not matching future demand. Option 5 is a regional approach which is innovative and demonstrates value for money. It would, however, give rise to community and political concern and would demand strong leadership and stakeholder management, and highly effective support from digital services, for full benefit delivery. Option 2 has low benefit delivery but represents an innovative non-asset based approach which could generate better community outcomes in the longer term, although with risks around the nature and timing of benefit delivery. It would need strong stakeholder support and is highly dependent upon effective co-operation between agencies. Option 1 confirms the significant risks and disbenefits of continuing with current situation at Noojee and is not recommended.

# Recommendation

That Option 3 is further developed to confirm that the scale of benefit delivery is accurate and that the cost, risk and timeframe estimates can be validated. Options 2 and 5 should also be analysed in more detail as potential alternatives to Option 3, if the assumptions behind Option 3 cannot be validated.