

Appendix C:

Audit scope and method

Scope of this audit

Who we examined

We examined the following agencies:

Agency	Their key responsibilities
The department	Has overall accountability for the delivery of the program. Manages Jenoptik's performance through provisions in contract.
Victoria Police	Proposes camera locations and issues the roster. Exercises prosecutorial discretion on whether to issue infringements.
Jenoptik	Operates the trailers containing the cameras, manages the AI, is responsible for the IT systems and processes used to record and verify data for offences.

Our audit objective

To determine if the distracted driver and seatbelt camera program is contributing to road safety.

What we examined

We examined how effectively:

- Victoria Police and Jenoptik work together to identify camera sites, roster cameras to those sites and deploy cameras according to the roster
- Jenoptik manages the cameras and AI, and conducts verification activities
- Victoria Police issues infringements
- the department manages and oversees of the program, including managing Jenoptik and providing overall strategic direction.

Aspects of performance examined

Our mandate for performance audits and reviews includes the assessment of economy, effectiveness, efficiency and compliance (often referred to as the '3Es + C').

In this audit we focused on the following aspects:

Economy	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Compliance
○	●	○	○

Key:

- Primary focus
- Secondary focus
- Not assessed

Conducting this audit

Assessing performance To form a conclusion against our objective we used the following lines of inquiry and associated evaluation criteria.

Line of inquiry	Criteria
1. Are the department and Victoria Police managing the program appropriately?	1.1 For camera rostering: <ul style="list-style-type: none">the program's criteria for locating cameras align with road safety objectivesVictoria Police ensures that cameras are rostered according to those criteriathe department and Victoria Police monitor, report and act on Jenoptik's compliance with the rosters.
	1.2 For identifying offences: <ul style="list-style-type: none">the department and Victoria Police ensure the program processes images and issues infringement notices effectively.
2. Is the department evaluating the program's contribution to road safety?	2.1 The department has an evaluation framework that measures the program's contribution to road safety.
	2.2 The department is collecting reliable data and evaluating the performance of the program.

Our methods As part of the audit we:

- reviewed the department, Victoria Police and Jenoptik's documentation for the program
- conducted site visits at Jenoptik's premises and observed how staff performed verification tasks
- conducted interviews and briefing sessions with department, Victoria Police and Jenoptik staff
- attended demonstrations of processes and systems by the department, Victoria Police and Jenoptik.

Level of assurance

In an assurance review, we primarily rely on the agency's representations and internally generated information to form our conclusions. By contrast, in a performance audit, we typically gather evidence from an array of internal and external sources, which we analyse and substantiate using various methods. Therefore, an assurance review obtains a lower level of assurance than a performance audit (meaning we have slightly less confidence in the accuracy of our conclusion).

Compliance We conducted our audit in accordance with the *Audit Act 1994* and ASAE 3500 *Performance Engagements* to obtain reasonable assurance to provide a basis for our conclusion.

We complied with the independence and other relevant ethical requirements related to assurance engagements.

We also provided a copy of the report to the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Cost and time The full cost of the audit and preparation of this report was \$780,000.

The duration of the audit was 11 months from initiation to tabling.