

Our performance

Economic and fiscal coordination

Service standards Fiscal coordination	Notes	2018–19 Target/ estimate	2018–19 Estimated actual
<i>Effectiveness measures</i>			
Target ongoing reduction in Queensland's relative debt burden, as measured by the General Government debt-to-revenue ratio		56%	54%
Target net operating surpluses to ensure any new capital investment in the General Government sector is funded primarily through recurrent revenues rather than borrowings		60%	79%
Manage the capital program to ensure a consistent flow of works to support jobs and the economy and reduce the risk of backlogs emerging		Met	\$6.06B
Maintain competitive taxation – own source revenue to remain at or below 8.5% as a proportion of nominal gross state product		8.2%	8.3%
Target full funding of long-term liabilities such as superannuation and WorkCover in accordance with actuarial advice		Met	Met
Maintain a sustainable public service by ensuring overall growth in full time equivalent employees, on average over the forward estimates, does not exceed population growth		1.7%	1.68%
<i>Efficiency measure</i>			
Average cost per hour of advice and support output	1	\$131.18	\$109.29
Service standards Economic policy, analysis and forecasting	Notes	2018–19 Target/ estimate	2018–19 Estimated actual
<i>Effectiveness measure</i>			
Stakeholder and customer satisfaction with Economic Strategy outputs		80%	85%
<i>Efficiency measure</i>			
Average cost per hour of advice and support output	1	\$118.09	\$102.53

Service standards Statistical services	Notes	2018–19 Target/ estimate	2018–19 End of financial year actual
<i>Effectiveness measure</i>			
Stakeholder and customer satisfaction with Queensland Government Statistician outputs (rated satisfied or very satisfied)		95%	100%
<i>Efficiency measure</i>			
Average cost per hour of advice and support output		\$98.65	\$95.81

End-of-year variance notes

1. The average cost per hour of advice and support output is calculated using 2018–19 end-of-year actual information.



Agency performance

Service standards	2018–19 Target/ estimate	2018–19 End of financial year actual
<i>Effectiveness measure</i>		
Overall customer satisfaction with policy and performance advice provided	75%	85%
<i>Efficiency measure</i>		
Average cost per hour of advice and support output	\$106.81	\$98.79

Commercial services

Service standards Commercial projects	2018–19 Target/ estimate	2018–19 End of financial year actual
<i>Effectiveness measure</i>		
Overall customer satisfaction with advice and support provided	80%	85.7%
<i>Efficiency measure</i>		
Average cost per hour of project services	\$127.98	\$121.63
Service standards Investment programs	2018–19 Target/ estimate	2018–19 End of financial year actual
<i>Effectiveness measure</i>		
Overall customer satisfaction with advice and support provided	80%	80%
<i>Efficiency measure</i>		
Average cost per hour of advice and support output	\$108.34	\$101.12
Service standards Shareholder services	2018–19 Target/ estimate	2018–19 End of financial year actual
<i>Effectiveness measure</i>		
Overall customer satisfaction with advice and support provided	80%	76%
<i>Efficiency measure</i>		
Average cost per hour of advice and support output	\$106.46	\$96.56

Our performance

Commercial services

Service standards Financial provisioning scheme	Notes	2018–19 Target/ estimate	2018–19 End of financial year actual
<i>Effectiveness measure</i>			
Overall customer satisfaction with advice and support provided	1,3	75%	Discontinued measure
<i>Efficiency measure</i>			
Average cost per hour of advice and services	2,3	\$110.14	Discontinued measure

End-of-year variance notes

- 1 The service standard has been replaced by a new measure 'Overall stakeholder experience in using processes associated with the Financial Provisioning Scheme'. This is due to the change in focus to reflect the experience that customers have when interacting with the government and provides a better tool to measure and improve government services. As the scheme commenced data migration from April 2019, all aspects of the service haven't been delivered and were therefore unable to be measured in 2018–19.
- 2 The service standard has been replaced by a measure 'Administrative costs as a percentage of Fund revenue'. This new measure reflects the broader costs associated with delivering the Financial Provisioning Scheme as a proportion of the funds received for the Financial Provisioning Fund. As the scheme commenced data migration from April 2019, all aspects of the service haven't been delivered and were therefore unable to be measured in 2018–19.
- 3 Queensland Treasury will commence reporting the performance on new service measures in its 2019–20 Annual Report.

Revenue management

Service standards Revenue services	Notes	2018–19 Target/ estimate	2018–19 End of financial year actual
<i>Effectiveness measure</i>			
Customer satisfaction with services provided		70%	70%
Average overdue debt as a percentage of total revenue collected		2%	1.5%
Total revenue dollars administered per dollar expended – accrual	1	\$188	\$255
<i>Efficiency measure</i>			
Cost of delivering a compliance program as a ratio of the compliance revenue assessed	2	0.096	0.079

Service standards Penalty debt services	Notes	2018–19 Target/ estimate	2018–19 End of financial year actual
<i>Effectiveness measure</i>			
State Penalty Enforcement Registry (SPER) clearance rate (finalisations/lodgements)	3	85%	97%
<i>Efficiency measure</i>			
Average cost per \$100 collected		\$9.30	\$9.69

End-of-year variance notes

- 1 The increase between the target/estimate and the end-of-year actual is mainly due to higher than projected royalty revenues and lower than anticipated operating expenses as a result of the re-profiling of expenses associated with the Office of State Revenue's Transformation Program to future years.
- 2 The decrease between the target/estimate and the end-of-year actual is mainly due to a number of outlier duties cases with significant revenue. These are partially offset by the large, complex royalty cases that are still to be finalised in the following year.
- 3 This higher clearance rate is due to the positive impact of data enrichment and other ongoing initiatives.

