

## Chapter 3

### Australian Crime Commission performance measurement

3.1 This chapter considers the performance of the Australian Crime Commission (ACC) against the outcomes found in the Attorney-General's Department Portfolio Budget Statement (PBS) and the ACC's key performance indicators (KPIs). It examines the measurement tools utilised to inform the KPIs and to track performance over time. The committee notes that 2015–16 marks the third year of reporting against the current KPIs.

#### Portfolio Budget Statement

3.2 The ACC is required, by the PBS, to contribute to outcomes that are intended results, impacts or consequences of actions by the Commonwealth government:

Commonwealth programmes are the primary vehicle by which government entities achieve the intended results of their outcome statements. Entities are required to identify the programmes that contribute to government outcomes over the budget and forward years.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Outcome 1*

3.3 The ACC is required to reduce:

Reduced serious and organised crime threats of most harm to Australians and the national interest including through providing the ability to discover, understand and respond to such threats.<sup>2</sup>

3.4 The PBS describes the ACC's approach to achieving this outcome:

The ACC's strategic approach of discovering new and emerging threats, understanding them more deeply, and initiating preventative or disruptive responses with partners, will direct the allocation of resources and ACC capabilities to the serious and organised crime threats of most harm to Australians and the national interest. Core elements of this strategy include providing national strategic advice on serious and organised crime threats and coordinating and participating in national responses with partners. A highly developed understanding of the threats posed by serious and organised crime will underpin the ACC's provision of specialised criminal intelligence capabilities including special coercive powers and will focus response strategies on targets that pose the highest risk to Australians. The ACC will specifically focus on two core areas—building capability and working with partners—to deliver its outcomes and guide internal strategy development.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Attorney General's Department (AGD), *Portfolio Budget Statement 2015–16*, p. 112.

2 AGD, *Portfolio Budget Statement 2015–16*, p. 112.

3 AGD, *Portfolio Budget Statement 2015–16*, p. 113.

## Key performance indicators

3.5 As noted earlier, this is the third year that the ACC has reported against the current KPIs. As noted in the annual report, the ACC:

...will continue to develop [its] ability to capture and report on [its] performance in both qualitative and quantitative terms and to build relevant comparisons over the coming years.<sup>4</sup>

3.6 The KPIs align with the performance framework outlined in the ACC's *Strategic Plan 2013–18*.<sup>5</sup>

3.7 The ACC has provided data from the two previous reporting periods for all KPIs in the 2015–16 annual report.<sup>6</sup> The information in the annual report is presented by reference to analysis and results of qualitative and quantitative achievements.

3.8 The committee has not reproduced all of the measures within each KPI, but has selected notable highlights that are demonstrative of the ACC's work and effectiveness against each KPI.

### ***KPI 1—Producing useful intelligence that identifies and provides insights on new and emerging serious and organised crime threats***

3.9 The ACC worked towards this KPI through numerous achievements, including:

- identifying individuals who display characteristics consistent with a terrorism lone actor; and
- the addition of 65 new targets to the National Criminal Target List.<sup>7</sup>

3.10 The annual report notes that 85 per cent of stakeholders agreed or strongly agreed that the ACC achieved this KPI.<sup>8</sup> This is a three per cent reduction from the last reporting period (88 per cent).<sup>9</sup>

### ***KPI 2—Fills intelligence gaps through the identification of vulnerabilities and indicators of serious and organised crime***

3.11 The ACC worked towards this KPI through, for example:

- producing 159 intelligence products, including disclosures that advanced investigations and supported operational activity related to previously unknown entities threatening national security, foreign fighters, terrorism financing and vulnerabilities in the aviation sector that may be exploited by serious and organised crime; and

---

4 Australian Crime Commission (ACC), *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 30.

5 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 30.

6 Results and analysis against some KPIs also refer to data from the 2012–13 reporting period.

7 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 31.

8 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 31.

9 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 31.

- providing 25 515 real time alerts on nationally significant crime targets, up from 4333<sup>10</sup> in 2014–15.<sup>11</sup>

3.12 The annual report notes that 76 per cent of the ACC's stakeholder survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the ACC achieved this KPI, a two per cent decrease from the result in 2014–15 (78 per cent).<sup>12</sup>

***KPI 3—Collects and maintains national holdings of serious and organised crime threats and targets***

3.13 The work of the ACC towards this KPI included:

- maintaining the National Criminal Target List and the Australian Criminal Intelligence Database, and conducting 202 coercive examinations;
- producing over 590 intelligence products on outlaw motorcycle gangs that were provided to over 50 agencies to support multiple investigations; and
- responding to 733 requests for information from national and international partners, including in respect of firearms traces.<sup>13</sup>

3.14 The annual report notes that 90 per cent of respondents to the ACC's stakeholder survey agreed or strongly agreed that the ACC met this KPI, a decline of one per cent from the result in 2014–15 (91 per cent).<sup>14</sup>

***KPI 4—Interprets and analyses national holdings to create a national serious and organised crime intelligence picture***

3.15 The ACC worked towards this KPI through its production of numerous publications, including the *Organised Crime Threat Assessment*, *Illicit Drug Data Report* and the *Precursor Chemicals Information Resource 2016*. The ACC also:

- enhanced knowledge of the illicit/non-medical use of pharmaceuticals through theft and diversion of chemicals;
- produced a joint report with the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) on characteristics of cybercrime; and
- produced 1859 information reports.<sup>15</sup>

3.16 The annual report notes that 79 per cent of the ACC's stakeholders agreed or strongly agreed that the ACC had achieved KPI 4, a decrease from 88 per cent in 2014–15.<sup>16</sup> The annual report notes that the ACC 'will be exploring the decline in

---

10 This figure represents six months of 2014–15. 2015–16 is a full year figure.

11 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 32.

12 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 32.

13 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, pp 33-34.

14 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 34.

15 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, pp 35-36.

16 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 36.

performance against this KPI during the coming year' and in its next stakeholder survey.<sup>17</sup>

***KPI 5—Informs and influences the hardening of the environment against serious and organised crime***

3.17 The ACC worked towards this KPI through, for example:

- contributing to the National Ice Taskforce and Australia's Cyber Security Strategy;
- providing advice on Commonwealth public sector bribery and whether there is intelligence to support concerns of systemic corruption; and
- identifying an independent money remitter laundering proceeds of crime, leading to cancellation of their registration.<sup>18</sup>

3.18 The annual report notes that 66 per cent of stakeholders surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that the ACC had achieved KPI 5, a decrease from 78 per cent in 2014–15.<sup>19</sup> The annual report notes that the ACC will also explore this decline in performance during the coming year and in its next stakeholder survey.<sup>20</sup>

***KPI 6—Influences or enables the disruption, disabling or dismantling of serious and organised crime***

3.19 The ACC worked towards this KPI though, for example:

- disrupting 65 serious and organised criminal groups or networks;
- seizing \$12.59 million in cash, over \$1.81 million estimated street value of illicit drugs, \$0.02 million precursor chemicals and 61 firearms; and
- restraining more than \$104.87 million in assets.<sup>21</sup>

3.20 The annual report notes that 76 per cent of respondents to the ACC's survey agreed or strongly agreed that the ACC had achieved KPI 6, a decline of seven per cent from 2014–15 (83 per cent).<sup>22</sup> The annual report notes that '[t]he reasons behind this decline in stakeholder perception are not clear and will be further explored during the coming year and in next year's stakeholder survey'.<sup>23</sup>

---

17 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 36.

18 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 37.

19 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 37.

20 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 37.

21 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, pp 38–40.

22 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 40.

23 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 40.

---

***KPI 7—Participates in or coordinates collaboration in joint operations and investigations to prevent and disrupt serious and organised crime***

3.21 The ACC worked towards this KPI through its leadership or participation in a variety of joint operations and investigations, including:

- Eligo National Task Force (money laundering);
- maritime task forces (operations to disrupt organised crime exploitation of the maritime sector in Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia);
- Joint Organised Crime Task Forces/Groups (the disruption of jurisdictional and organised crime groups in Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia); and
- Project Jacto (exploitation of Australia's migration system).<sup>24</sup>

3.22 The annual report notes that 83 per cent of respondents to the stakeholder survey agreed or strongly agreed that the ACC had met KPI 7, a decrease of two per cent from 2014–15 (85 per cent).<sup>25</sup>

**Analysis of results**

3.23 As noted in paragraph 3.7, the ACC possesses data to compare its performance scorecard between each reporting period. An analysis provides a review of its qualitative and quantitative results, and an overall summary of the ACC's performance for each KPI. In the results and analysis of all KPIs, the ACC has included other comparable quantitative results. Data is primarily from the last two reporting periods; however, in some cases the ACC has included data from 2012–13.<sup>26</sup>

3.24 The ACC provides commentary on the both the qualitative and quantitative results for the 2015–16 KPIs. As in the 2014–15 annual report, these comments include the expansion of existing activities and new performance measures.

***Stakeholder survey responses***

3.25 All comparable quantitative results for each KPI are inclusive of the ACC's stakeholder survey responses. All reported results from this survey are lower than the 2014–15 reporting period. Where the decline is marginal, the annual report comments that the overall results are 'solid', 'strong' or 'very strong'. The annual report notes that the more significant declines against KPIs 4, 5 and 6 will be further explored during the coming year and in next year's stakeholder survey.

**Committee view**

3.26 As in the 2014–15 annual report, the 2015–16 annual report shows a significant shift from primarily focusing on qualitative data to include quantitative KPIs. This change has addressed the committee's concern and commentary that

---

24 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, pp 40–41.

25 ACC, *Annual Report 2015–16*, p. 41.

26 See for example: ACC, *Annual report 2015–16*, p. 33.

previous reports lacked quantitative KPIs. The committee congratulates the ACC for continuing with this form of reporting.

3.27 The committee continues to acknowledge the ongoing complexity of the new qualitative KPIs the ACC has developed, and acknowledges that some of the ACC's work remains unquantifiable.

3.28 The committee notes that the ACC's stakeholder survey indicates that generally the ACC has maintained a high level of satisfaction, despite all results being slightly lower in this reporting period than in the previous two reporting periods. The committee acknowledges the ACC's commitment to explore the more significant decline in results in respect of KPIs 4, 5 and 6, and looks forward to the analysis and conclusions in the ACC's next annual report.