

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
CRIMTRAC

Question No. 136

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 31 October 2005:

National Criminal Investigation DNA database

- a) When is intra-jurisdictional matching expected to begin occurring in the states that do not currently have it?
 - (i) How does that match up with the original estimated timeframe for the deployment of the matching?
- b) Have any trials of the system been undertaken in these jurisdictions?
- c) Other than Western Australia and Queensland, what other states have commenced inter-jurisdictional matching?
 - (i) For each state, when was it originally intended to occur?
 - (ii) When are other states expected to begin inter-jurisdictional matching?
- d) Have any other states provided you with notification of their ability to use NCIDD within their bi-lateral agreements?
 - (i) If so, which ones, and when is NCIDD expected to begin in those states?
 - (ii) Once a state notifies you, what is the process from there – can data-matching begin immediately, or is there a further wait?
 - (iii) If there is a further wait, how long is the wait?
 - (iv) What other checks and preliminary work needs to be done post-notification?
- e) Regarding the lower than expected than usage of NCIDD/SQL*Lims, is this caused by the non-usage of the system by several states, or is it due to under-usage in the states that are using it, or both?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) Jurisdictions have the option to use the NCIDD for intra-jurisdictional matching. Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia currently do not use NCIDD for inter-jurisdictional matching and CrimTrac has no indication of when they will. Western Australia has chosen not to use the NCIDD for this purpose.
- b) These jurisdictions have trialled the system in the NCIDD Test environment during user acceptance testing participation.
- c) Queensland and Northern Territory commenced inter-jurisdictional matching in accordance with their bi-lateral Ministerial Arrangement on 26 October 2005.
 - i) Based on officer discussions, CrimTrac has anticipated inter-jurisdictional matching between all jurisdictions for at least the last two years. Commonwealth, State and Territory Attorney-General's Departments, police services and CrimTrac are in discussions in an attempt to seek resolution of the remaining legislative and procedural obstacles to inter-jurisdictional matching.
 - ii) Tasmania has advised that they expect to commence inter-jurisdictional matching with Queensland and Northern Territory within the next two months. The Australian Government has written to all jurisdictions seeking agreement to begin inter-jurisdictional matching with the Commonwealth. It is not known when the other states are expected to begin inter-jurisdictional matching.
- d) No.
 - i) Not applicable.

- ii) Data matching can commence almost immediately if both jurisdictions have: an endorsed MOU with CrimTrac; provided CrimTrac with the relevant inter-jurisdictional matching table; notified CrimTrac of their ability to commence matching; and have entered their data on the NCIDD.
- iii) This depends on the timeframe in which CrimTrac is provided with the required information.
- iv) CrimTrac would check to see whether prerequisites are met by each jurisdiction.
- e) The lower than expected use of the NCIDD/SQL*LIMS system is due to under-utilisation by some jurisdictions and non-use by other jurisdictions due to outstanding legislative and ministerial issues.