

HEAD E

JUDICATURE

OVERVIEW

Mission Statement

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

FY2017 EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES

Expenditure Estimates by Object Class

Code	Object Class	Actual FY2015	Estimated FY2016	Revised FY2016	Estimated FY2017	Change over FY2016	
	TOTAL EXPENDITURE	\$250,977,672	\$283,440,000	\$288,391,300	\$376,743,700	\$88,352,400	30.6%
	Main Estimates						
	OPERATING EXPENDITURE ¹	\$207,942,616	\$224,577,300	\$233,507,400	\$238,737,200	\$5,229,800	2.2%
	<i>RUNNING COSTS</i>	<i>\$207,942,616</i>	<i>\$224,577,300</i>	<i>\$233,507,400</i>	<i>\$238,737,200</i>	<i>\$5,229,800</i>	<i>2.2%</i>
	Expenditure on Manpower	\$151,887,753	\$158,558,000	\$168,856,400	\$166,945,800	-\$1,910,600	-1.1%
1400	Other Statutory Appointments	40,377,657	41,181,200	45,138,300	42,935,900	-2,202,400	-4.9
1500	Permanent Staff	111,403,951	117,266,800	123,558,000	123,885,600	327,600	0.3
1600	Temporary, Daily-Rated & Other Staff	106,146	110,000	160,100	124,300	-35,800	-22.4
	Other Operating Expenditure	\$56,054,862	\$66,019,300	\$64,651,000	\$71,791,400	\$7,140,400	11.0%
2100	Consumption of Products & Services	50,488,261	59,792,700	58,520,700	65,185,500	6,664,800	11.4
2300	Manpower Development	2,252,891	2,903,300	2,783,300	3,228,300	445,000	16.0
2400	International & Public Relations, Public Communications	1,569,929	1,363,400	1,468,700	1,745,500	276,800	18.8
2700	Asset Acquisition	790,680	914,400	672,600	554,400	-118,200	-17.6
2800	Miscellaneous	953,102	1,045,500	1,205,700	1,077,700	-128,000	-10.6
	Development Estimates						
	DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE	\$43,035,057	\$58,862,700	\$54,883,900	\$138,006,500	\$83,122,600	151.5%
5100	Government Development	43,035,057	58,862,700	54,883,900	138,006,500	83,122,600	151.5

¹ Estimated FY2017 includes \$7,471,100 Statutory Expenditure (Expenditure on Manpower).

Establishment List

Category/Personnel	Actual FY2015	Estimated FY2016	Revised FY2016	Estimated FY2017
OTHER STATUTORY APPOINTMENTS	24	24	25	25
Chief Justice	1	1	1	1
Judge of Appeal	2	2	4	4
Judge	21	21	20	20
PERMANENT STAFF	870	900	906	920
Corporate Support	22	22	21	21
Language Executive Scheme (2008)	22	22	23	23
Legal	197	208	220	229
Management Executive Scheme (2008)	359	378	395	404
Management Support Scheme (2008)	114	114	96	91
Management Support Scheme (Language Officer)	82	82	81	82
Operations Support	58	58	53	53
Shorthand Writers	15	15	13	13
Technical Support Scheme (2008)	1	1	4	4
TOTAL	894	924	931	945

FY2016 BUDGET

The revised FY2016 expenditure of the Judicature is \$288.39 million, an increase of \$37.41 million or 14.9% over the actual FY2015 expenditure of \$250.98 million. Of this, \$233.51 million or 81.0% is for operating expenditure and \$54.88 million or 19.0% is for development expenditure.

Operating Expenditure

The revised FY2016 operating expenditure of \$233.51 million is an increase of \$25.56 million or 12.3% over the actual FY2015 operating expenditure of \$207.94 million. This is largely due to increased expenditure on manpower (EOM) and an increase in consumption of products and services.

Development Expenditure

The revised FY2016 development expenditure of \$54.88 million is an increase of \$11.85 million or 27.5% over the actual FY2015 development expenditure of \$43.04 million. The increase is largely due to the progressive payments made for the construction of the New State Courts Complex.

FY2017 BUDGET

The FY2017 total expenditure of the Judicature is projected to be \$376.74 million, an increase of \$88.35 million or 30.6% over the revised FY2016 estimate. Of this, \$238.74 million or 63.4% is for operating expenditure and \$138.01 million or 36.6% is for development expenditure.

Operating Expenditure

Operating expenditure is projected to be \$238.74 million, an increase of \$5.23 million or 2.2% over the revised FY2016 operating expenditure. This is largely due to an increase in consumption of products and services.

Development Expenditure

Development expenditure is projected to be \$138.01 million, an increase of \$83.12 million or 151.5% over the revised FY2016 development expenditure. This is largely due to the increase in progressive payments for the construction of the New State Courts Complex, development of Family Application Management System (FAMS 2) and eLitigation Technology Refresh.

Total Expenditure by Programme

Code	Programme	Running Costs	Transfers	Operating Expenditure	Development Expenditure	Total Expenditure
EA	Judicature	238,737,200	0	238,737,200	138,006,500	376,743,700
	Total	\$238,737,200	\$0	\$238,737,200	\$138,006,500	\$376,743,700

Development Expenditure by Project

Project Title	Total Project Cost	Actual Expenditure up to end of FY2014	Actual FY2015	Estimated FY2016	Revised FY2016	Estimated FY2017
DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE	...	...	\$43,035,057	\$58,862,700	\$54,883,900	\$138,006,500
GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT	...	...	43,035,057	58,862,700	54,883,900	138,006,500
Judicature Programme						
New Projects (Supreme Court)	...	...	0	0	0	4,896,000
Minor Development Projects (ITD)	...	...	1,525,853	3,011,300	2,567,400	2,221,100
Integrated Criminal Case Filing and Management System	28,901,000	15,949,089	4,632,601	1,250,300	1,823,100	1,106,300
Enhanced Protection of Supreme Court Building	15,400,000	0	2,606,454	4,000,000	2,850,000	3,800,000
Family Application Management System (FAMS2)	15,606,500	0	0	3,399,300	1,754,600	7,781,600
Minor Development Projects (Supreme Court)	...	...	7,349,940	3,838,200	2,940,200	2,054,000
Minor Development Projects (State Courts)	...	...	1,909,696	2,164,600	1,749,600	970,000
New State Courts Complex	665,780,000	10,183,242	23,608,325	41,000,000	41,000,000	115,000,000
New Projects (State Courts)	...	...	0	0	0	177,500
Completed Projects	...	...	1,402,188	199,000	199,000	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 FY2014	Actual FY2015	Revised FY2016	Estimated FY2017
Supreme Court					
Fairness	World ranking of Singapore's fairness in administration of justice in the Institute of Management Development's World Competitiveness Yearbook	10 th	13 th	14 th	Top 10
Accessibility	% of written grounds that are published online within 1 week of delivery	94.3	100	100	100
	Uptime of eLitigation system (%)	99.8	99.9	99.9	>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	20 th	23 rd	23 rd	Top 20
Responsiveness	% of cases heard within service timelines ²	100	91	93	95
State Courts^{3,4,5}					
Fairness	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts administer justice fairly to all regardless of race, language or religion.	98	99	>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	97	99	>95	> 95
Accessibility	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts' facilities are easily accessible to the public ⁶	96	89	>95	> 95

² Data for the indicator is reported on a CY basis.

³ Data for the indicators are reported on a CY basis.

⁴ The survey results are obtained through the Public Perception Survey and Court Users Survey which are conducted once every 2 to 3 years. The 2014 and 2015 survey results are obtained from the Public Perception Survey and the Court Users Survey respectively.

⁵ The values for Revised FY2016 are the targets set for the Performance Indicators and the actual figures will be available in the beginning of FY2017.

⁶ The description of the performance indicator is revised from "% of respondents who agreed that the Courts' facilities are easily available to the public" to "% of respondents who agreed that the Courts' facilities are easily accessible to the public".

Desired Outcome	Performance Indicator	Actual FY2014	Actual FY2015	Revised FY2016	Estimated FY2017
Independence, Integrity and Impartiality	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts independently carry out justice according to the law	99	99	>95	> 95
Responsiveness	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts are efficient and deal with cases in a timely manner.	98	96	>95	> 95