HEAD E

JUDICATURE

OVERVIEW

Mission Statement

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

FY2015 EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES

Expenditure Estimates by Object Class

Code	Object Class	Actual FY2013	Estimated FY2014	Revised FY2014	Estimated FY2015	Change ov	er FY2014
	TOTAL EXPENDITURE	\$186,755,545	\$237,969,000	\$202,851,100	\$261,184,200	\$58,333,100	28.8%
	Main Estimates						
	OPERATING EXPENDITURE ¹	\$171,776,669	\$189,597,900	\$186,003,700	\$216,128,500	\$30,124,800	16.2%
	RUNNING COSTS	\$171,776,669	\$189,597,900	\$186,003,700	\$216,128,500	\$30,124,800	16.2%
	Expenditure on Manpower	\$125,693,667	\$138,788,000	\$138,298,600	\$158,125,100	\$19,826,500	14.3%
1400	Other Statutory Appointments	34,338,251	36,143,900	35,759,300	41,626,800	5,867,500	16.4
1500	Permanent Staff	91,245,609	102,512,600	102,450,000	116,383,800	13,933,800	13.6
1600	Temporary, Daily-Rated & Other Staff	109,807	131,500	89,300	114,500	25,200	28.2
	Other Operating Expenditure	\$46,083,002	\$50,809,900	\$47,705,100	\$58,003,400	\$10,298,300	21.6%
2100	Consumption of Products & Services	40,750,249	45,733,700	42,964,800	52,576,900	9,612,100	22.4
2300	Manpower Development	1,810,666	2,217,100	2,041,000	2,612,800	571,800	28.0
2400	International & Public Relations, Public Communications	1,973,706	1,278,900	1,134,200	1,360,900	226,700	20.0
2700	Asset Acquisition	721,224	579,200	853,300	628,200	-225,100	-26.4
2800	Miscellaneous	827,157	1,001,000	711,800	824,600	112,800	15.8
	Development Estimates						
	DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE	\$14,978,877	\$48,371,100	\$16,847,400	\$45,055,700	\$28,208,300	167.4%
5100	Government Development	14,978,877	48,371,100	16,847,400	45,055,700	28,208,300	167.4

¹ Estimated FY2015 includes \$4,096,600 Statutory Expenditure (Expenditure on Manpower).

Establishment List

Category/Personnel	Actual FY2013	Estimated FY2014	Revised FY2014	Estimated FY2015
OTHER STATUTORY APPOINTMENTS	17	24	21	24
Chief Justice	1	1	1	1
Judge of Appeal	3	3	2	2
Judge	13	20	18	21
PERMANENT STAFF	786	979	851	885
Administrative	0	1	0	1
Corporate Support	31	32	30	31
Driving	1	1	0	0
Language Executive Scheme (2008)	15	15	16	21
Legal	187	203	189	208
Management Executive Scheme (2008)	149	203	183	196
Management Support Scheme (2008)	241	350	267	266
Management Support Scheme (Language Officer)	87	94	91	87
Operations Support	55	60	58	58
Shorthand Writers	17	17	15	15
Technical Support Scheme (2008)	3	3	2	2
TOTAL	803	1,003	872	909

FY2014 BUDGET

The revised FY2014 expenditure of the Judicature is \$202.85 million, an increase of \$16.09 million or 8.6% over the actual FY2013 expenditure of \$186.76 million. Of this, \$186 million or 91.7% is for operating expenditure and \$16.85 million or 8.3% is for development expenditure.

Operating Expenditure

The revised FY2014 operating expenditure of \$186 million is an increase of \$14.22 million or 8.3% over the actual FY2013 operating expenditure of \$171.78 million. This is largely due to increased expenditure on manpower (EOM).

Development Expenditure

The revised FY2014 development expenditure of \$16.85 million is an increase of \$1.87 million or 12.5% over the actual FY2013 development expenditure of \$14.98 million. The increase is largely due to the progressive payments made for the construction of the New State Courts Complex.

FY2015 BUDGET

The FY2015 total expenditure of the Judicature is projected to be \$261.18 million, an increase of \$58.33 million or 28.8% over the revised FY2014 estimate. Of this, \$216.13 million or 82.8% is for operating expenditure and \$45.06 million or 17.2% is for development expenditure.

Operating Expenditure

Operating expenditure is projected to be \$216.13 million, an increase of \$30.12 million or 16.2% over the revised FY2014 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 \$45.06 million, an increase of \$28.21 million or 167.4% over the revised FY2014 development expenditure. The increase is largely due to the commencement of the enhanced protection of the Supreme Court Building project and new projects, increase in minor development projects as well as 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	216,128,500	0	216,128,500	45,055,700	261,184,200
	Total	\$216,128,500	\$0	\$216,128,500	\$45,055,700	\$261,184,200

Development Expenditure by Project

		Actual Expenditure				
Project Title	Total Project Cost	up to end of FY2012	Actual FY2013	Estimated FY2014	Revised FY2014	Estimated FY2015
DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE			\$14,978,877	\$48,371,100	\$16,847,400	\$45,055,700
GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT			14,978,877	48,371,100	16,847,400	45,055,700
Judicature Programme						
Integrated Electronic Litigation Systems	23,590,000	18,882,353	1,773,534	2,495,100	2,495,100	124,900
Minor Development Projects (ITD)		•••	1,146,086	1,920,500	744,800	1,781,600
Integrated Criminal Case Filing and Management System	28,901,000	8,322,619	4,272,514	3,044,700	3,515,300	4,731,200
Sentencing Information Repository System	5,150,000	317,248	1,934,311	1,132,000	1,137,300	242,700
New Projects			0	0	0	2,395,000
Enhanced Protection of Supreme Court Building	15,400,000	0	0	0	0	5,100,000
Minor Development Projects (Supreme Court)		•••	981,614	1,269,800	1,242,500	8,696,100
Minor Development Projects (State Courts)		•••	1,523,207	1,409,000	1,379,000	1,984,200
New State Courts Complex	618,412,300	1,622,117	489,121	37,000,000	6,200,000	20,000,000
Completed Projects			2,858,489	100,000	133,400	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 FY2012	Actual FY2013	Revised FY2014	Estimated FY2015
Supreme Court					
Fairness	World ranking of Singapore's fairness in administration of justice in the IMD's World Competitiveness Yearbook	10th	5th	10th	Top 10
Accessibility	% of written grounds that are published online within 1 week of delivery	100	96.8	89.2	100
	Uptime of eLitigation system ²	N.A.	N.A.	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	20 th	17 th	20 th	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.	NA	99	98	> 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.	NA	97	97	> 95
Accessibility	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts' facilities are easily available to the public.	NA	95	96	> 95
Independence, Integrity and Impartiality	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts independently carry out justice according to the law	NA	98	99	> 95
Responsiveness	% of respondents who agreed that the Courts are efficient and deal with cases in a timely manner.	NA	91	98	> 95

² Due to upgrade of the system, results are only available from FY2014 onwards.

³ The indicator is reported on a CY basis.

⁴ Data for the indicators are reported on a CY basis.

⁵ NA.The survey results are obtained through the Public Perception Survey and Court Users Survey which are conducted once every 2 to 3 years. No survey was conducted in 2012. The 2013 survey results are obtained from the Court Users Survey. The 2014 survey results are obtained from the Public Perception Survey.

⁶ The values for Estimated FY2015 are the targets set for the KPIs.

⁷ 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") are 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.