

HEAD E

JUDICATURE

OVERVIEW

Mission Statement

To provide an effective and accessible system of justice, inspiring public trust and confidence.

FY2016 EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES

Expenditure Estimates by Object Class

Code	Object Class	Actual FY2014	Estimated FY2015	Revised FY2015	Estimated FY2016	Change over FY2015	
	TOTAL EXPENDITURE	\$204,231,452	\$261,184,200	\$254,545,200	\$283,440,000	\$28,894,800	11.4%
	Main Estimates						
	OPERATING EXPENDITURE¹	\$185,835,753	\$216,128,500	\$210,176,700	\$224,577,300	\$14,400,600	6.9%
	<i>RUNNING COSTS</i>	<i>\$185,835,753</i>	<i>\$216,128,500</i>	<i>\$210,176,700</i>	<i>\$224,577,300</i>	<i>\$14,400,600</i>	<i>6.9%</i>
	Expenditure on Manpower	\$137,344,908	\$158,125,100	\$153,658,000	\$158,558,000	\$4,900,000	3.2%
1400	Other Statutory Appointments	35,475,056	41,626,800	41,990,300	41,181,200	-809,100	-1.9
1500	Permanent Staff	101,796,120	116,383,800	111,563,000	117,266,800	5,703,800	5.1
1600	Temporary, Daily-Rated & Other Staff	73,731	114,500	104,700	110,000	5,300	5.1
	Other Operating Expenditure	\$48,490,845	\$58,003,400	\$56,518,700	\$66,019,300	\$9,500,600	16.8%
2100	Consumption of Products & Services	43,935,724	52,576,900	50,616,600	59,792,700	9,176,100	18.1
2300	Manpower Development	1,845,748	2,612,800	2,477,400	2,903,300	425,900	17.2
2400	International & Public Relations, Public Communications	1,119,300	1,360,900	1,760,600	1,363,400	-397,200	-22.6
2700	Asset Acquisition	833,719	628,200	874,300	914,400	40,100	4.6
2800	Miscellaneous	756,354	824,600	789,800	1,045,500	255,700	32.4
	Development Estimates						
	DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE	\$18,395,699	\$45,055,700	\$44,368,500	\$58,862,700	\$14,494,200	32.7%
5100	Government Development	18,395,699	45,055,700	44,368,500	58,862,700	14,494,200	32.7

¹ Estimated FY2016 includes \$6,686,800 Statutory Expenditure (Expenditure on Manpower).

Establishment List

Category/Personnel	Actual FY2014	Estimated FY2015	Revised FY2015	Estimated FY2016
OTHER STATUTORY APPOINTMENTS	18	24	24	24
Chief Justice	1	1	1	1
Judge of Appeal	2	2	2	2
Judge	15	21	21	21
PERMANENT STAFF	816	885	872	900
Administrative	0	1	0	0
Corporate Support	29	31	22	22
Language Executive Scheme (2008)	15	21	22	22
Legal	190	208	196	208
Management Executive Scheme (2008)	170	196	362	378
Management Support Scheme (2008)	255	266	114	114
Management Support Scheme (Language Officer)	85	87	82	82
Operations Support	55	58	58	58
Shorthand Writers	15	15	15	15
Technical Support Scheme (2008)	2	2	1	1
TOTAL	834	909	896	924

FY2015 BUDGET

The revised FY2015 expenditure of the Judicature is \$254.55 million, an increase of \$50.31 million or 24.6% over the actual FY2014 expenditure of \$204.23 million. Of this, \$210.18 million or 82.6% is for operating expenditure and \$44.37 million or 17.4% is for development expenditure.

Operating Expenditure

The revised FY2015 operating expenditure of \$210.18 million is an increase of \$24.34 million or 13.1% over the actual FY2014 operating expenditure of \$185.84 million. This is largely due to increased expenditure on manpower (EOM).

Development Expenditure

The revised FY2015 development expenditure of \$44.37 million is an increase of \$25.97 million or 141.2% over the actual FY2014 development expenditure of \$18.40 million. The increase is largely due to the commencement of the Enhanced Protection of Supreme Court Building Project, progressive payments made for the construction of the New State Courts Complex and minor development projects.

FY2016 BUDGET

The FY2016 total expenditure of the Judicature is projected to be \$283.44 million, an increase of \$28.89 million or 11.4% over the revised FY2015 estimate. Of this, \$224.58 million or 79.2% is for operating expenditure and \$58.86 million or 20.8% is for development expenditure.

Operating Expenditure

Operating expenditure is projected to be \$224.58 million, an increase of \$14.40 million or 6.9% over the revised FY2015 operating expenditure. This is largely due to increased EOM to meet operational needs as well as an increase in consumption of products and services.

Development Expenditure

Development expenditure is projected to be \$58.86 million, an increase of \$14.49 million or 32.7% over the revised FY2015 development expenditure. This increase is largely due to the development of the New State Courts Complex which is currently in progress.

Total Expenditure by Programme

Code	Programme	Running Costs	Transfers	Operating Expenditure	Development Expenditure	Total Expenditure
EA	Judicature	224,577,300	0	224,577,300	58,862,700	283,440,000
	Total	\$224,577,300	\$0	\$224,577,300	\$58,862,700	\$283,440,000

Development Expenditure by Project

Project Title	Total Project Cost	Actual Expenditure up to end of FY2013	Actual FY2014	Estimated FY2015	Revised FY2015	Estimated FY2016
DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE	...	...	\$18,395,699	\$45,055,700	\$44,368,500	\$58,862,700
<i>GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT</i>	...	...	<i>18,395,699</i>	<i>45,055,700</i>	<i>44,368,500</i>	<i>58,862,700</i>
Judicature Programme						
Minor Development Projects (ITD)	...	...	655,860	1,781,600	1,591,000	3,011,300
Integrated Criminal Case Filing and Management System	28,901,000	12,595,133	3,353,956	4,731,200	4,691,000	1,250,300
Sentencing Information Repository System	5,150,000	2,251,559	1,144,670	242,700	241,500	199,000
Enhanced Protection of Supreme Court Building	15,400,000	0	0	5,100,000	2,100,000	4,000,000
Family Application Management System (FAMS2)	15,606,500	0	0	0	1,273,400	3,399,300
Minor Development Projects (Supreme Court)	...	...	1,233,651	8,696,100	8,183,500	3,838,200
Minor Development Projects (State Courts)	...	...	1,309,223	1,984,200	1,863,200	2,164,600
New State Courts Complex	665,780,000	2,111,237	8,072,004	20,000,000	24,300,000	41,000,000
Completed Projects	...	...	2,626,334	2,519,900	124,900	0

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Desired Outcomes

Public trust and confidence in the dispensation of justice based on the values of:

- Fairness
- Accessibility
- Independence, Integrity and Impartiality
- Responsiveness

Key Performance Indicators

Desired Outcome	Performance Indicator	Actual FY2013	Actual FY2014	Revised FY2015	Estimated FY2016
Supreme Court					
Fairness	World ranking of Singapore's fairness in administration of justice in the IMD's World Competitiveness Yearbook	5th	10th	13th	Top 10
Accessibility	% of written grounds that are published online within 1 week of delivery	96.8	94.3	100	100
	Uptime of eLitigation system ²	N.A.	99.8	99.8	>99.5
Independence, Integrity and Impartiality	Number of justified complaints about the lack of independence, integrity and impartiality	0	0	0	0
	World ranking of Singapore's judicial independence in the WEF's Global Competitiveness Report	17 th	20 th	23 rd	Top 20
Responsiveness	% of cases heard within service timelines ³	100	100	100	100
State Courts^{4,5,6}					
Fairness	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts administer justice fairly to all regardless of race, language or religion ⁷ .	99	98	>95	> 95
	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts administer justice fairly to all regardless of whether the party is an individual, company or government institution ⁸ .	97	97	>95	> 95
Accessibility	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts' facilities are easily available to the public ⁹ .	95	96	>95	> 95

² Results are only available from FY2014 onwards due to upgrade of the electronic filing system.

³ Data is reported on a CY basis.

⁴ Data is reported on a CY basis.

⁵ The survey results are obtained through the Public Perception Survey and Court Users Survey which are conducted once every 2 to 3 years. The 2013 survey results are obtained from the Court Users Survey. The 2014 survey results are obtained from the Public Perception Survey. The 2015 figures will be obtained from the Court Users Survey.

⁶ The values for Revised FY2015 are the targets set for the Performance Indicators. The 2015 actual figures will be available in the beginning of FY2016.

⁷ The indicator description was refined to "% of respondents who agreed that the Courts administer justice fairly to all regardless of race, language or religion" in 2014.

⁸ The indicator description was refined to "% of respondents who agreed that the Courts administer justice fairly to all regardless of whether the party is an individual, company or government institution" in 2014.

⁹ The indicator description was refined to "% of respondents who agreed that the Courts' facilities are easily available to the public" in 2014.

Desired Outcome	Performance Indicator	Actual FY2013	Actual FY2014	Revised FY2015	Estimated FY2016
Independence, Integrity and Impartiality	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts independently carry out justice according to the law	98	99	>95	> 95
Responsiveness	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts are efficient and deal with cases in a timely manner ⁸ .	91	98	>95	> 95

⁸ In 2014, 2 indicators reported in the past budget books (" % of respondents who agreed that the Courts are efficient in dealing with their cases") and (" % of respondents who agreed that the Courts deal with cases in a timely manner") were merged as follows: "% of respondents who agreed that the Courts are efficient and deal with cases in a timely manner". The 2013 figure is computed by averaging the percentages obtained for these 2 indicators.