SERVICE PRIORITY REVIEW
BACKGROUND PAPER
WHOLE-OF-GOVERNMENT TARGETS
This background paper was authored by the Service Priority Review secretariat in consultation with, and to inform the work of, the Service Priority Review Panel. Every effort has been taken to ensure accuracy, currency and reliability of the content. The paper is not intended to be a comprehensive overview of the subject nor does it represent the position of the Western Australian Government. Changes in circumstances after the time of publication may impact the quality of the information.

The following background papers are published in full on the Department of the Premier and Cabinet website: www.dpc.wa.gov.au

1. Agency capability reviews
2. Best practice regulation
3. Overview of the budget process
4. Counterproductive rules and processes
5. Digital transformation
6. Engaging with the community
7. Functional leadership
8. Government boards and committees
9. Government trading enterprises
10. Leader performance management and accountability
11. One sector workforce
12. Privacy and information sharing
13. Procurement of goods and services
14. Public sector employment framework
15. Role of the centre
16. Service design and delivery
17. Successful implementation of reform
18. Whole-of-government targets
SERVICE PRIORITY REVIEW - BACKGROUND PAPER

Whole-of-government targets

Introduction

Early in the Service Priority Review panel’s deliberations, a decision was made to issue early advice to the Western Australia Government on whole-of-sector KPIs. This was in consideration of both the specific reference made in the term of reference as well as the strategic need for work on sector-wide performance indicators to be started as soon as possible. To reduce potential for confusion with other government performance indicators, the term ‘whole-of-government targets’, or ‘targets’, will be used instead.

With the support of central agencies, the Service Priority Review secretariat has been working with agencies to develop and test three prototype targets, including identification of suitable indicators of progress. Prototype targets have been selected to reflect a substantive State issue, for which there is high degree of ministerial engagement, capacity to make a significant difference, readiness for implementation and leadership capability. The intent is, in future, for the State Government to develop up to eight targets, which together underpin a cohesive whole-of-government narrative.

This paper reviews the experience of other jurisdictions and the potential for whole-of-government targets to tackle complex, cross-sectoral issues of community importance and also to strengthen a collaborative, citizen-focused culture in the public sector.

Background

Whole-of-government targets are not the single answer to delivering a more collaborative, innovative and outward facing public sector. However, properly used, targets can be an effective tool to encourage these qualities and to provide clarity and focus around Government priorities to the community and public sector. In addition, targets provide an opportunity for governments to show they are willing to be held to account and be transparent to the community they serve. The symbolic importance of targets should not be understated.

Ideally, whole-of-government targets should span individual agency responsibilities and require collaboration and innovation to resolve. They should be chosen because they are complex and require commitment across the sector to find solutions.

Successful whole-of-government targets are also a tool to encourage and reflect real behaviour change within the public sector. They are a public way of improving the accountability of the public sector through:

- ensuring focus on more effective delivery of services and better value for the WA community by building a system that can mobilise around results, rather than processes
- encouraging innovation and better communication between agencies though the clear identification of common goals.
Whole-of-government targets have been introduced elsewhere in Australia and overseas. While different jurisdictions use different terminology, such as ‘targets’, ‘priorities’ or ‘goals’, there are many good examples from which to learn.

Notably, New Zealand introduced the Better Public Services initiative\(^1\) in 2012 and New South Wales adopted the NSW: Making it Happen plan in 2015.\(^2\) The Better Public Services initiative includes 10 specific results to be measured across seven result areas and the Making it Happen plan sets out 12 Premier’s priorities and 18 State priorities. The Better Public Services initiative updated its specific targets in 2017, with a renewed five-year focus on its achievement. The NZ results and 12 Premier’s priorities are provided in Appendix 1.

Victoria, Queensland and the Commonwealth Government use ‘charter letters’ from the Premier or Prime Minister to each minister respectively, setting out priorities, which then inform directors general or secretary priorities at the departmental level. South Australia has SA’s strategic plan with 100 targets, seven strategic priorities and 10 economic priorities.\(^3\)

Queensland’s targets are supported by legislation. The *Queensland Plan Act 2014* requires the Queensland plan to be developed and to be reviewed five-yearly. The plan sets out 20 targets across nine areas. The Act also establishes a Queensland plan ambassadors council to promote and advocate implementation of the plan. The Premier, directors general and local governments must report against the plan annually.\(^4\)

In addition to NZ, the United Kingdom, Singapore and Scotland all provide international examples where frameworks for publicly reporting against key whole-of-government targets are (or have been) used.

Based on the experiences of other jurisdictions, in order to be most effective in achieving their purpose, whole-of-government targets should:

- **Be limited in number**

Too many targets risks diluting the level of focus and resources that are dedicated by government agencies. A large number of targets can be unwieldy and difficult to report on, diluting the narrative about the importance and priority of the subjects selected.

Also, given that whole-of-government targets do not currently exist in WA and are intended to encourage a recommitment to working horizontally across agencies, the number should be limited to allow agencies to develop strong processes around the dedication of common resources and effort.

---


• Resonate strongly with the community and the public sector

The targets chosen need to be important to the community and have potential to make a tangible difference when they are achieved. Well-chosen targets can demonstrate that the Government is community focused and committed to improving the lives of the people in the community. They also provide an incentive for the community to engage in the issue and the actions being taken.

Targets also need to resonate with the public sector. The chance for public servants to see that their organisations are working to solve critical issues and making a real difference to the community is an important part of reinvigorating the public sector workforce. Targets that resonate help ensure that focus on it will be sustained.

• Key levers of influence need to be within control of the Government

In selecting targets, consideration must be given to both the mechanisms the State Government can use to change outcomes and the degree of influence those mechanisms have in terms of other relevant factors.

While outcomes might be affected by factors outside the Government’s control, a target should be able to be directly influenced as a result of government intervention. While an issue may be of critical importance, if the most significant levers of influence are not controlled by those responsible for the target, the ability to achieve results is limited.

• Be measurable and transparent

Being measurable includes two components. Firstly, a target must include identifiable, measurable indicators of progress that can be clearly linked back to the target. Secondly, data to demonstrate progress against those indicators must be timely, readily available and capable of being reported on publicly in an intelligible, meaningful form.

Measures of progress need to make sense to the public and be able to be easily tracked. Public servants who work directly with the community need to be able to measure their contribution to the target and there needs to be a clear logic to support how what is being measured is influencing outcomes. Transparency is key to reinforcing accountability to the community.

• Balance aspiration and achievability

Not all targets should be easily achieved. In some situations, a short-term result will be realistic, whereas in others, it is more important to adopt a longer-term view and provide evidence of progress towards that target and ongoing commitment to continuous improvement.

By creating a mix of aspirational and achievable targets, the focus can shift away from compliance towards innovation. Problems that don’t have an easy answer can still be chosen. Having several achievable targets provides a useful balance and also creates the opportunity for targets to be refreshed once some have been achieved. For example, in the case of NZ, an achievable target that has been set around access to services is that, by 2021, 80 per cent of the transactions for the 20 most common public services will be completed digitally. In contrast, reducing the number of children experiencing physical and sexual
abuse by 20 per cent by 2021 to improve the lifetime wellbeing of vulnerable children, might not be reached within the timeframe, by setting such a significant target around such a complex issue the NZ Government is clearly signalling that it is not shying away from difficult issues.

- Include a mechanism for accountability

Targets need to have commitment from leadership, with responsibility for achieving results clearly allocated. Strong leadership will be essential to success and sustaining commitment to achieving results. This leadership needs to come from both the Government and from within agencies. Ultimate responsibility for each target should be allocated to a particular minister (lead minister) and a chief executive (lead chief executive) to ensure a commitment to progress.

- Be properly supported

Targets need to be supported as a clear priority by the Government, in particular the Premier and lead ministers, to provide agencies with the incentive and authority to commit resources over time. In addition, the leads charged with achieving each target need to be assisted, particularly through the implementation process and as new working practices are developed.

Communication and collaboration between agencies must be supported and adopted as a cultural norm among agencies. This is particularly important not just to deliver the work in support of targets, but to ensure that targets in themselves drive collaboration.

- Minimise the potential for adverse consequences

A poorly considered approach to targets can have negative consequences. If the scope is too narrow, or mechanisms to achieve targets are inappropriate, there can be negative consequences for behaviour, risk preferences, culture and non-target work areas. Having too many targets – targets that are too specific or too challenging, timeframes that are inappropriate and targets that inhibit learning or create a culture of cheating – harm motivation. Being aware of the negative effects and designing targets to avoid these, incorporating critical success factors and undertaking regular review, are all necessary aspects of a targets approach.

- Include a process for review

A process for cyclical review is required to embed whole-of-government targets as an ongoing framework. The review process will allow any changes in the working environment, or significant progress or shifts in priority to be captured so the targets can remain relevant to the Government and the community.5

---

5 New Zealand recently undertook a review of its whole-of-government targets after five years and Queensland also has five-yearly reviews built into the legislation that supports its Queensland Plan. Given the fixed four-year terms of Government in Western Australia, review of the targets on a four-yearly cycle would allow the targets to be reviewed toward the beginning of each term of Government and re-committed to at this time. The challenge for the public sector is to develop targets that are strong and community-focused enough to withstand changes in government through their continued relevance.
**Current WA reporting**

While whole-of-government targets do not currently exist in Western Australia, agencies currently respond to Government goals by reporting on efficiency and effectiveness key performance indicators (KPIs). This is done through the budget process in the Outcome Based Management (OBM) framework.

Under the OBM, agencies seek to achieve one or more high level ‘desired outcomes’ through the provision of ‘services’, with the achievement of desired outcomes measured through ‘key effectiveness indicators’ and the efficiency of the delivery of services measured through ‘key efficiency indicators’. The reporting related to OBM is covered by the *Financial Management Act 2006* and supported by Treasurer’s Instructions.

**Figure 1. Existing Outcome Based Management (OBM) framework**

To date, the Government goals have been very broad. For example, under the previous Government these were:

- Results-based service delivery
- Financial and economic responsibility
- Social and environmental responsibility
- Stronger focus on the regions
- State building: major projects

Interim goals have been endorsed for the 2017-18 budget process (see Appendix 2), however it is understood there is a commitment to develop new, longer-term goals in future.
Under the OBM, agencies must select at least one Government goal to report against and this becomes a budget reporting tool. Agencies report their expenditure against these indicators but without program detail. An example of the Department of Corrective Services OBM reporting is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government goal OBM reporting (example)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency:</strong> Department of Corrective Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government goal</strong> (only one currently allocated to Corrective Services): Results-based service delivery: Greater focus on achieving results in key service areas for the benefit of all West Australians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desired outcome:</strong> A safe, secure and decent corrective services which contributes to community safety and reduces offenders’ involvement in the justice system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness indicators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of escapes – adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of escapes – youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of serious assault per 100 prisoners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average out-of-cell hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion of community correction orders – adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion of community-based orders – juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of return – offender programs (adult)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of return to detention – juveniles: Adult justice services; youth justice services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency indicators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per day of keeping an offender in custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per day of managing an offender through community supervision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the goals are broad, the OBM KPIs are agency-specific, so may discourage a whole-of-government approach. Government goals are not readily found together on any public website.

Arguably, under the current system, many OBM KPIs fail to give sufficient information on real outcomes being achieved for the community. As mentioned previously, agencies are currently required to account for all expenditure in KPIs. This leads to high level data being published which makes it difficult to measure agencies’ performance and the information is often not relevant or useful for decision making.

There is also a limited link between OBM and program-level information. The information that is reported is high level and does not provide detail of how the OBM is used operationally by agencies. Again, this limits its capacity as an evaluation tool and leads to minimal internal management of OBM throughout the year to assess how services are tracking and if targets will be achieved.

While agencies may have more detailed data, it may not be auditable (fit for the Office of the Auditor General’s (OAG) purposes). Under the *Financial Management Act 2006* (FMA), the OAG is required to audit agencies’ KPIs, which has led to it becoming a compliance process rather than encouraging progress towards achieving KPIs. WA is the only jurisdiction that requires the OAG (or equivalent) to audit agencies’ KPIs.
Similarly, the Government goals are too broad to provide any real direction to either agencies or the community, but rather exist to capture all work already being done. The work being done with targets and the development of new Government goals provides an opportunity for Government to also review the OBM and the way KPIs are currently used to report on outcomes.

**Relationship of OBM to whole-of-government targets**

While whole-of-government targets are also intended to support Government goals, they are different in purpose from OBM KPIs, particularly in their current form. Targets intentionally sit above individual single agency reporting as they aim to deliver a cross-agency, whole-of-government response to selected issues.

Ultimately, it is expected that, where agencies are involved in achieving a target, there will be an opportunity to develop KPIs within an OBM process reflecting the work being done towards that target as part of their response to a specific Government goal. That is, the systems are not inconsistent with each other and could be adapted to work in concert. However, the incentives underlying OBM – which ultimately exists to provide accountability around expenditure and allow agencies to secure ongoing program funding – have the potential to undercut the higher-order aims around cross-sector collaboration on complex issues that the whole-of-government targets framework seeks to achieve.

For this reason, further work is required to review whether and how the targets should interact with existing reporting structures such as the OBM. It is anticipated that the introduction of targets will create an opportunity to review the current reporting through OBM, both to align the two processes and to assess the way in which the OBM currently works as a tool for agencies to focus on outcomes.

**Options for reform**

The Service Priority Review has looked at other jurisdictions to learn from their experiences to better understand what might work in WA. In particular, the established systems in New Zealand and NSW were more closely reviewed.\(^6\)

Clearly, the model adopted by WA needs to be suitable for its own environment, taking into consideration the reporting mechanisms already in place as well as the changes and reform processes already under way.

The review panel reached the view that, in the short term, and to take advantage of the restructures that have occurred as part of the machinery of government changes, the State Government should implement a whole-of-government targets framework, incorporating about eight targets, which are consistent with the existing interim Government goals.

---

\(^6\) New Zealand has had targets for a number of years and much has been learned as the process has evolved, while still remaining an important and highly visible government tool. One of the important features of the NSW system is the similarities of their public sector to our own. In addition, similar to Western Australia, NSW has undertaken a significant process of government reform with a view to returning the citizen to the centre of public sector decision making and is at a point where the impacts of this reform are being felt and where important lessons can be taken.
It is proposed that agencies be supported to work in clusters to provide a short list of proposed targets for consideration by Cabinet. Each target selected by Cabinet would be assigned to a lead minister and lead agency chief executive who would be responsible for working towards achieving it. Each lead agency should be required to develop an action plan, which is to be subject to regular review, with support from the cluster and central agencies.

Regular, transparent, formal reporting processes should be developed to update both the Government and the community. Information on progress towards each target should be regularly and publicly reported. Consideration can be given to how progress towards the targets might be incorporated into performance management agreements of agency chief executives.

In the more medium term, it is recommended that the targets framework is integrated to work within other accountability mechanisms and support structures. In particular, it is essential to clarify and evolve the relationship between whole-of-government targets and the OBM framework. It is recommended that the OBM is reviewed and the framework is developed to support the targets, as well as more collaborative behaviour and better evaluation of, and reporting to, outcomes more generally.

Implementation support

One of the clear messages received through review consultation is that WA has not been short on recommendations for reform. The bridge between making recommendations for reform and achieving real change is the commitment to and support for the implementation process. Based on experience elsewhere, it is recommended that a centrally-placed implementation support unit be set up, or dedicated implementation support be provided, to ensure the success of the targets.

The role of an implementation unit/implementation support would be to:

- support the creation of a single narrative for the collective group of targets
- actively help agencies to develop plans to achieve targets
- bring agencies together to promote collaboration by facilitating regular meetings between agency leads as well as between agencies linked to each whole-of-government target
- develop and coordinate regular reporting to government and act as a facilitator between agencies and the Government on the collective targets
- identify issues early and bring them to attention as required to facilitate resolution
- continue to review and refine opportunities for other existing reporting arrangements (such as OBM) to work better to complement the targets
- be responsible for making available information about the targets

7 New South Wales and the United Kingdom have had centrally placed implementation units which are a core element of the whole-of-government reporting on policies or targets. The implementation units report regularly and have oversight of business plans that present the key milestones and initiatives, with the view to report progress in real time. In NSW, the unit also plays a strong role in facilitating the collaboration between agencies and the Lead CEOs who are accountable to the Premier’s priorities.
• provide recommendations to government for any issues that arise through implementation of the targets
• develop a process for the review of the targets.

**Figure 2. Proposed whole-of-government target framework**

While the lead agencies and lead ministers are likely to have ultimate accountability for the targets, the implementation unit would have a strong role in supporting the process and ensuring that the information on the collective group of targets is clearly and consistently presented. It is also important that, while there are up to eight individual targets, there is a single narrative around responding to the issues of importance in the community that can be readily conveyed.

It is envisaged that the implementation unit would also have a strong review role and would act to provide independent advice to government as required. For example, in NSW the implementation unit that supports and facilitates the Premier’s priorities comprises a team of 14 FTE. The work undertaken by this unit is significant and ranges from on-the-ground visits to public servants who are responsible for the delivery of the services; coordination of the reporting to the public; tracking analysis of progress on the targets, facilitation of meetings of lead DGs; and the provision of monthly updates to the Premier.

**Developing and selecting targets**

It is important that agency heads accept ownership and accountability for targets. It should also be expected that agencies have the strongest understanding of the critical issues facing their portfolios as well as knowledge regarding the information and data available to measure progress towards targets. For these reasons, it is recommended that targets and their measures of progress should be developed by agencies, with options provided to government for final selection and endorsement.
In other jurisdictions, this is done with coordination and support from the central agencies. Central support for this process maintains oversight of the whole process and helps ensure:

- feedback or direction from government, including Cabinet subcommittees and relevant working groups and taskforces
- the development of potential targets by agencies provides the right balance of priorities when brought together
- the submissions are consistent and provide the level of information required for Cabinet to make confident decisions
- the roles of the contributing agencies are clearly specified and are fully supported.

**Chief executive accountability**

The formal process for chief executive accountability in WA is through performance agreements under the *Public Sector Management Act 1994* (PSM Act). Chief executive performance agreements are between the chief executive, the Public Sector Commissioner and the board, committee or minister responsible for the chief executive’s agency. Although performance agreements are not legally enforceable, they involve an assessment by the relevant board, committee or minister of the chief executive’s performance against criteria set out in the agreement.

To assist chief executives with clarifying government commitments and expectations in a changing public sector environment, including the 2017 machinery of government changes and the commitment to whole-of-government targets through the review, the Public Sector Commission (PSC) has developed an interim framework for the 2017-18 chief executive performance cycle. The 2017-18 chief executive performance agreement framework addresses key priorities for the 2017-18 performance cycle and chief executives’ contributions to 2017-18 sector-wide initiatives.

The introduction of the new framework allows for targets to be included in current and future performance management agreements.

The PSC has noted that further work needs to be done with regard to managing the accountability of chief executives. For example, following 2017 machinery of government changes, some chief executives may be answerable to more than one minister, as well as multiple boards. This issue will need to be addressed around chief executive accountability both generally and specifically with respect to accountability for targets and associated performance indicators.

It is also noted that government trading enterprises (GTEs) are not covered by the PSM Act process, and the mechanisms for ensuring accountability to the Government on performance for GTE chief executives vary. Many GTEs will have a key role in ensuring targets can be achieved, and further consideration of ways in which their contributions can be managed will be required.
Performance pay

While the review’s terms of reference do not include the provision of advice regarding the linkage of pay to the targets, as part of its election commitments the current Government announced that 20 per cent of chief executive pay would be linked to achievement of whole-of-government KPIs.8

The review is undertaking a separate body of work to provide recommendations on workforce reform. A significant component of this is expected to be around leadership and how that fits into the broader public workforce framework. Any specific recommendations on performance pay would need to be developed as part of this work to ensure a cohesive approach to workforce reform, as opposed to the narrower objective of accountability for the targets.

More specifically, any recommendations that link pay to targets would need to:

- complement any other workforce reforms that are being undertaken
- consider the available research on the most effective way to ensure accountability for chief executives in this context
- allow time for the targets and their reporting to become established, to ensure the targets are properly set and fit for purpose
- ensure that the focus of chief executives is supported to be appropriately balanced between:
  - the continuous improvement of the day-to-day business
  - the legislative requirements of the agency
  - the accountability against the targets.

It is noted that both statutory and contractual issues may need to be overcome before performance pay arrangements could be introduced in WA. In particular, changes to the Salaries and Allowances Act 1975 and the Public Sector Management Act 1994 are likely to be required.

Conclusion

Whole-of-government targets can shift the focus of the public sector from process towards achieving community outcomes. Targets are a tool that can help the Government and the public sector to tackle some of the most complex issues facing the community. They can help the Government to provide clarity and express a narrative about the priorities it will put collective effort into for the medium and long term. The intention is that the community is front and centre in terms of reaping the benefits, and progress is reported to the community through indicators drawn from accessible data.

---

While a whole-of-government targets framework will not fix all the issues faced by the WA public sector, targets have been shown to be an effective tool to model a way of working that encourages collaboration, innovation and a citizen-centric approach to services.

Importantly, and particularly in an environment of fiscal constraint, targets are a tool that enables groups of agencies to align their actions and resources to achieve more benefit for the community than they could by acting alone.
References


General Reading


## Appendix 1

### New Zealand: Better Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Reducing long-term welfare dependence</td>
<td>Reduce working-age client numbers by 25 per cent (from 295,000 to 220,000) and achieve an accumulated actuarial release of welfare liability of $13 billion by June 2018 (baseline 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Healthy mums and babies</td>
<td>By 2021, 90 per cent of pregnant women are registered with a Lead Maternity Carer in the first trimester, with an interim target of 80 per cent by 2019, with equitable rates for all population groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Keeping kids healthy</td>
<td>By 2021, a 25 per cent reduction in hospital admission rates for a selected group of avoidable conditions in children aged 0-12 years, with an interim target of 15 per cent by 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Improve the lifetime wellbeing of vulnerable children</td>
<td>Reduce the number of children experiencing physical and sexual abuse by 20 per cent by 2021.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5  Improve mathematics, pāngarau, literacy and te reo matatini skills for all students | The targets to raise the achievement of all our children and young people in mathematics and pāngarau, writing and tuhituhi are that, by 2021:  
  - 80 per cent of Year 8 students will be achieving at or above the National Standard in mathematics, or at Manawa Ora or Manawa Toa in Ngā Whanaketanga Rumaki Māori pāngarau.  
  - 80 per cent of Year 8 students will be achieving at or above the National Standard in writing, or at Manawa Ora or Manawa Toa in Ngā Whanaketanga Rumaki Māori tuhituhi. |
| 6  Upskill the NZ Workforce                                            | 60 per cent of 25-34 year olds will have advanced trade qualifications, diplomas and degrees (level 4 or above on the New Zealand Qualifications Framework) by 2018.                                                                                                      |
| 7  Reducing serious crime                                              | The target is 10,000 fewer serious crimes by the year ended 2021. This will be supported by three measures: the rate of reoffending, the rate of family violence and the rate of sexual violence. (Baseline 2017)                                        |
| 8  Better access to social housing                                     | Reduce the time to house Priority A clients from the social housing register by 20 per cent by 2021. (Baseline 2016)                                                                                                                                                        |
| 9  Business gains value from easy and seamless dealings with government | • Business costs from dealing with government will reduce by 25 per cent by 2020, through a year-on-year reduction in effort required to work with agencies. (baseline 2012)  
  • Government services to business will have similar key performance ratings as leading private sector firms by 2020.                                                                                         |
| 10 People have easy access to public services, which are designed around them, when they need them | By 2021, 80 per cent of the transactions for the 20 most common public services will be completed digitally.                                                                                                                                                              |

---

*State Services Commission. 2017.*
New South Wales: Premier’s priorities

**Building infrastructure**: Key infrastructure projects to be delivered on time and on budget across the State.

**Creating jobs**: 150,000 new jobs by 2019.

**Driving public sector diversity**: Increase the number of women and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in senior leadership roles.

**Faster housing approvals**: 90 per cent of housing approvals determined within 40 days.

**Improving education results**: Increase the proportion of NSW students in the top two NAPLAN bands by eight per cent.

**Improving government services**: Improve customer satisfaction with key government services every year, this term of government.

**Improving service levels in hospitals**: 81 per cent of patients through emergency departments within four hours.

**Keeping our environment clean**: Reduce the volume of litter by 40 per cent by 2020.

**Protecting our kids**: Decrease the percentage of children and young people re-reported at risk of significant harm by 15 per cent.

**Reducing domestic violence**: Reduce the proportion of domestic violence perpetrators re-offending within 12 months by five per cent.

**Reducing youth homelessness**: Increase the proportion of young people who successfully move from specialist homelessness services to long-term accommodation by 10 per cent.

**Tackling childhood obesity**: Reduce overweight and obesity rates of children by five per cent over 10 years.

---

Appendix 2. Interim government goals

Sustainable finances: Responsible financial management and better service delivery

- Meet financial targets
- Deliver major projects on time and on budget
- Modernise service delivery

Future jobs and skills: Grow and diversify the economy, create jobs and support skills development

- Reduce barriers to business growth
- Encourage new industries and innovation
- Attract investment and maximise its impact
- Create new jobs and apprenticeships
- Build a skilled workforce for the future
- Develop economic infrastructure

Strong communities: Safe communities and supported families

- Foster equality and inclusiveness
- Improve health and education outcomes
- Enhance community safety and resilience
- Protect vulnerable children, families and individuals

Better places: A quality environment with liveable and affordable communities and vibrant regions

- Deliver well-planned liveable communities, and integrated transport networks
- Build strong and vibrant regions
- Protect and enhance environmental and heritage values and assets
- Deliver effective regulation to support sustainable development
- Develop thriving arts, culture and sporting scenes