



OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR  
OF CUSTODIAL SERVICES

2021 INSPECTION OF COURT CUSTODY CENTRES  
AND FIONA STANLEY HOSPITAL SECURE FACILITY

143

JULY 2022

*Independent oversight  
that contributes to a more  
accountable public sector*

*The Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services acknowledges Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people as the traditional custodians of this country, and their continuing connection to land, waters, and community throughout Australia. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to Elders, be they past, present, or emerging.*

## 2021 Inspection of court custody centres and Fiona Stanley Hospital secure facility

Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services  
Level 5, Albert Facey House  
469 Wellington Street  
Perth WA 6000

[www.oics.wa.gov.au](http://www.oics.wa.gov.au)

July 2022

ISSN 1445-3134 (Print)  
ISSN 2204-4140 (Electronic)

This report is available on the Office's website  
and will be made available, upon request,  
in alternate formats.



This document uses environmentally friendly paper, comprising  
50% recycled & 50% totally chlorine free plantation pulp.

# Contents

---

---

## INSPECTOR'S OVERVIEW

Noticeable improvements seen in governance and management of contracts for court custody and court security services ..... iii

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Previous inspection .....	2
1.3	Methodology .....	2
<b>2</b>	<b>CONTRACTED COURT CUSTODY SERVICES</b> .....	<b>4</b>
2.1	CBD Courts Contract: background and function.....	4
2.2	CSCS Contract: background and function.....	5
<b>3</b>	<b>CONTRACT MANAGEMENT</b> .....	<b>8</b>
3.1	Two oversight mechanisms had responsibility for both contracts .....	8
3.2	CBD Courts Contract Governance.....	8
3.3	CSCS Contract Governance .....	11
<b>4</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY</b> .....	<b>13</b>
4.1	Assessment of WLG's performance .....	13
4.2	OICS assessment of WLG's performance .....	13
4.3	Assessment of Ventia's performance .....	15
4.4	OICS assessment of Ventia's performance .....	17
<b>5</b>	<b>SITE INSPECTIONS</b> .....	<b>20</b>
5.1	Built infrastructure.....	20
5.2	Security .....	21
<b>APPENDIX 1</b>		
	Photographs .....	23
<b>APPENDIX 2</b>		
	Bibliography.....	29
<b>APPENDIX 3</b>		
	Abbreviations .....	30
<b>APPENDIX 4</b>		
	Department of Justice response .....	31
<b>APPENDIX 5</b>		
	Inspection team.....	37
<b>APPENDIX 6</b>		
	Key dates .....	38



# Inspector's Overview

## NOTICEABLE IMPROVEMENTS SEEN IN GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF CONTRACTS FOR COURT CUSTODY AND COURT SECURITY SERVICES

---

Our inspection of court custody centres is a complex exercise involving examination of court custody facilities located across the state, the majority of which are managed under two contracts with different private providers.

The first of these contracts covers the court custody centres located in the Central Law Courts and the District Court Building. This contract is managed by the Western Liberty Group Consortium and a sub-contractor G4S Custodial Services Pty Ltd.

The second contract covers the remaining metropolitan and regional court custody centres and includes certain prescribed lock-ups. This contract is managed by Ventia Services Group and a sub-contractor Wilson Security Pty Ltd.

The exception to these is the court custody centre at the Perth Children's Court which is operated by staff from the Department of Justice, Corrective Services.

For the purpose of our inspection mandate, court custody centres are those parts of court premises that are inaccessible to members of the public and where persons in custody are detained. The inspection also included a small number of prescribed lock-ups, usually facilities that double as a police lock-up when the court is not sitting.

We saw improvements in the governance and management of both contracts, including several initiatives that have been implemented following recommendations from our previous inspections. This included better contract monitoring and oversight, and improvements in the integration of updated technology.

We heard that most courts had experienced additional workload pressure due to increased case complexity, including multi-accused trials and the impacts of COVID-19 on court operations. Many staff across the various sites told us that they were under a lot of workload pressure and these views were evident in some negative responses to questions in our staff surveys compared to last inspection. This will be an area that both contract operators should actively monitor, particularly in the current tight employment market.

Despite these concerns, we saw and heard that court custody staff interactions with people in custody and court staff were respectful and professional. This maintains the high standards we have seen in past inspections and is a credit to the staff working in each of these facilities.

Our report also noted the lack of consistency in custodial infrastructure and security mechanisms across the state. We highlighted the need for consistency to maintain security and quality of service delivery. It was pleasing to see that the Department supported our second recommendation about undertaking a review of infrastructure and security at all custodial court facilities across the state to ensure a consistent high standard and level of service.

## NOTICEABLE IMPROVEMENTS SEEN IN GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF CONTRACTS FOR COURT CUSTODY AND COURT SECURITY SERVICES

---

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I acknowledge the support and cooperation we received throughout the inspection from executive leadership in the contracted organisations, management and staff within the courts, and from key personnel in the Department. I also acknowledge the contribution of operational staff at various facilities who spoke with us to share their perspective and experience.

Finally, I would like to thank the members of the inspection team for their expertise and hard work throughout the inspection. I would particularly acknowledge and thank Charlie Staples for his hard work in planning this inspection and as principal drafter of this report.

**Eamon Ryan**  
**Inspector of Custodial Services**

27 July 2022

# Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

---

The Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services (the Office) is required by Section 19 of the *Inspector of Custodial Services Act 2003* (WA) to inspect each Western Australian court custody centre and prescribed lock-up at least once every three years. This is the report of an inspection of those sites in 2020 and 2021.

The *Court Security and Custodial Services (CSCS) Act 1999* (WA) (the Act) defines a court custody centre as that part of the court's premises where people in custody are detained. Sentenced prisoners, people remanded in custody, or those arrested and charged with a crime are held in court custody centres before appearing in court. Depending on the outcome of the court appearance, they are released to freedom or bail, transferred to a prison, or transferred to a lock-up managed by the Western Australian Police Force (WAPF).

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

All the court custody centres in Western Australia are managed by private contractors under two main contracts.

The first of these contracts covers the court custody centres in two major court complexes, the Central Law Courts (CLC) building and the District Court building (DCB), located in the Perth Central Business District (CBD). For ease of reference this contract is referred to as the 'CBD Courts Contract'.

The CBD Courts Contract was managed by the Western Liberty Group Consortium (WLG) and a sub-contractor G4S Custodial Services Pty Ltd (G4S). For ease of reference these are referred to as the 'CBD Contractors', unless otherwise specified.

The second contract covers the remaining metropolitan and regional court custody centres and includes certain prescribed lock-ups and the Fiona Stanley Hospital (FSH) Secure Facility. For ease of reference this contract is referred to as the 'CSCS Contract'.

The CSCS Contract was managed by Ventia Services Group (Ventia) and a sub-contractor Wilson Security Pty Ltd (Wilson) which provided security services in the metropolitan courts. For ease of reference these are referred to as the 'CSCS Contractors', unless otherwise specified.

Eleven metropolitan courts had a custody centre. Most regional courts did not have a custody centre, and persons in custody (PICs) were held at the local WAPF lock-up. They were given into the custody of the contractor only for the duration of their court appearance. At three regional courts, the local WAPF lock-ups have been prescribed under regulation 5 of the Act, which allows those prescribed lock-ups to be managed by the contractor during court sitting hours. When court rose, management of the lock-up reverted to WAPF.

## INTRODUCTION

---

### 1.2 PREVIOUS INSPECTION

Fieldwork for the 2018 inspection (OICS, 2019) was conducted between March and June 2018. It found that:

- The contractor at the CBD courts was meeting the requirements of the CBD Courts Contract.
- Management of the CBD Courts Contract by the Department of Justice (the Department) was mature and effective.
- The requirements of the CSCS Contract were being met by Broadspectrum Australia Pty Ltd (BRS), the contractor at that time.
- Management of the CSCS Contract by the Department was effective but suffered from a lack of adequate contract management tools.
- The Department could gain efficiencies by combining the two court custody management teams.
- The quality of court custody infrastructure varied widely across the state.

The Report included six Recommendations:

- Recommendation 1: Ensure that regional courts receive on-site monitoring.
- Recommendation 2: Develop a CBD Courts Contract audit plan and conduct regular audits of the services agreement.
- Recommendation 3: Improve on-site management of the CBD Courts Contract.
- Recommendation 4: The CSCS Contract Management Board should meet quarterly.
- Recommendation 5: Establish a formal contract management plan for the CSCS Contract.
- Recommendation 6: Improve the CSCS monthly service payment data validation process.

The Department supported Recommendations 2, 4, 5 and 6 (OICS, 2019, pp. 62, 63).

### 1.3 METHODOLOGY

The inspection was formally announced by way of letters to the Director General of the Department, the Commissioner for Corrective Services, contract management teams within the Department, and management at WLG, G4S and Ventia. Senior members of the Judiciary were also invited to comment.

Between December 2020 and July 2021 members of the inspection team visited all 11 metropolitan courts, the FSH secure facility, and the eight regional courts with custody centres or lock-ups.



## INTRODUCTION

---

Before the site visits, we invited relevant staff from the CSCS Contractors, the CBD Contractors and the Department to complete a survey asking about their working conditions, and their interactions with management, stakeholders and PICs.

At each site, we spoke with contractor staff, court staff, and people in custody. At most sites, we also spoke with WAPF staff who had dealings with the court. At some sites we spoke with legal representatives and members of the public.

In Perth, members of the team met with the corporate managers of WLG, G4S and Ventia, and with Department contract managers and their supervisors. We also met with the Chief Magistrate at the CLC.

# Chapter 2

## CONTRACTED COURT CUSTODY SERVICES

---

### 2.1 CBD COURTS CONTRACT: BACKGROUND AND FUNCTION

#### **WLG was mid-way into a 27-year partnership with the state**

In June 2005 the State entered into a 27-year Public Private Partnership (PPP) with WLG for the provision of facilities and services associated with the operation of the CBD courts. The PPP was formalised under the CBD Courts Contract, which comprised two agreements, a facilities agreement and a services agreement.

The facilities agreement was to design, build and maintain the DCB, and refurbish custodial areas and security systems at the CLC. The services agreement was to provide custody services, court security services, facility management services (including security systems) at the DCB and the CLC, and all court recording and transcription services at the DCB.

WLG subcontracted G4S to provide court security and custodial services at both sites. This inspection was limited to looking at the custodial areas and security systems as specified under the facilities agreement and looking at the court security and custodial services as specified under the services agreement.

#### **Court security and custody services were clearly defined in the CBD Courts Contract**

Under the CBD Courts Contract and the WLG subcontract, G4S was responsible for:

- managing all PICs
- managing persons received into custody from bail
- ensuring PICs were delivered to court on time
- preventing deaths in custody
- preventing escapes from custody.

PICs were brought to the secure court sally ports by Ventia, the separately contracted custodial transport service, or by WAPF. G4S responsibility commenced with receiving a PIC in the secure sally ports or from bail. Services included:

- security checks of the PICs received
- escort of PICs within the court complexes to holding cells
- regular monitoring of PICs within those cells
- escort of PICs to and from the relevant court
- provision of dock guards while the PIC was in court
- return of PICs to the holding cells where required after court proceedings
- escorted return of PICs to the custodial transport service.

## CONTRACTED COURT CUSTODY SERVICES

---

All movements, observations and incidents affecting PICs were recorded in the Department's Custodial Services Support System (C3S) electronic records management system.

The treatment of PICs was required to comply with standards that have been approved by the Department. A comprehensive abatement regime existed for failure to deliver the required services in accordance with specifications. For custodial services, abatements could be applied for a failure in:

- preventing a death in custody
- preventing serious injury to a PIC
- preventing escape from custody
- preventing unlawful releases from custody
- preventing assault upon a court user by a PIC
- ensuring that PICs were delivered to court on schedule
- reporting custodial incidents within specified times.

Daily and monthly performance reports were provided through the WLG Project Manager to the Department's CBD Contract Management Branch. In addition, WLG was required to self-report any incidents affecting PICs within specified time frames.

### **G4S submitted invoices through WLG to the Department**

G4S was paid by WLG on monthly invoices to provide court custody and court security. WLG checked the G4S invoices for accuracy and passed them on to the Department for payment. Service demand and payment for the custodial services component of the CBD Courts Contract was based on a fixed annual price for an anticipated band of court custody hours, with allowance for an adjustment if hours fell outside the band. In 2020–2021 the actual custody hours fell below the band. Payment for the court security component of the contract was based on a fixed annual price plus a volume-based adjustment for variable services such as court orderlies and gallery guards.

## **2.2 CSCS CONTRACT: BACKGROUND AND FUNCTION**

### **Ventia had acquired BRS, and with it, responsibility for the revised CSCS Contract**

The CSCS Contract has been in existence since 2000. Serco Australia (Serco) took on the contract in 2011. In March 2017 the CSCS Contract with Serco was terminated, and BRS took on a revised CSCS Contract with an expanded scope of services and operational improvements. The revised contract was projected to yield a saving of 18 per cent, or \$11 million per annum.

In December 2019 Ventia commenced a take-over of BRS from its parent organisation Ferrovial. In May 2020 the Department consented to Ventia taking over responsibility for the CSCS Contract.

## CONTRACTED COURT CUSTODY SERVICES

---

Under the CSCS Contract Ventia provided court custody and court security services at metropolitan and regional courts. Like BRS, Ventia subcontracted court security services at metropolitan courts to Wilson. Under the contract Ventia was also responsible for the provision, maintenance and replacement of the secure vehicle fleet and other transportation for PIC movements across the state. This inspection did not include assessment of the secure vehicle fleet, or PIC transport where it was not associated with court custody.

### **Responsibilities under the CSCS Contract were clearly defined**

Ventia provided court custody services at: eight metropolitan courts; the Supreme Court (Stirling Gardens); the FSH secure facility; six regional centres; and lock-up management services at Albany and Kalgoorlie Courts. The contract required:

- management of custody centres where one formed part of a court complex
- security services within the court custody centre and the secure circulation paths leading to and from courtrooms
- dock guards in courtrooms for the management of PICs.

Other obligations required of Ventia included:

- developing and regularly updating an approved operating manual
- ensuring staff had appropriate qualifications and ongoing training
- extensive reporting requirements including self-reporting of performance failures within specified time frames as well as regular monthly and annual reporting
- extensive record keeping requirements including both paper-based records and electronic records maintained through its electronic Prisoner Escort Management System (ePEMS)
- developing and implementing a process for gathering intelligence about PICs to inform the Department.

Under a sub-contract, Wilson provided security services at: seven metropolitan courts; the Supreme Court (Stirling Gardens and Cathedral precinct); the Family Court; the David Malcolm Justice Centre; and the State Administrative Tribunal. Services included:

- staffing primary security checkpoints
- operating a security control room
- providing gallery guards and court orderlies
- staffing perimeter security.

## CONTRACTED COURT CUSTODY SERVICES

---

### **Ventia submitted monthly invoices directly to the Department**

A monthly service payment was payable to the contractor through two invoices applicable to each operating month:

- invoice Part A (related to the fixed component of prices)
- invoice Part B (variable reconciliation of volume of services provided).

The pricing tables were very complex, having differing regional fixed components and variable components relating to volumes, and various volume bands. In addition, the variable component of invoices took account of:

- performance incentive payments
- assessment of mitigating factors relating to performance failures
- specified event abatements.

We were told that the Ventia monthly invoices were comprehensive and timely.

# Chapter 3

## CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

---

There were two oversight mechanisms in place to monitor the CBD Courts Contract and the CSCS Contract. These were the Court Risk Assessment Directorate, and the Senior Officers Group.

In addition to this, there were separate governance arrangements for each of the CBD Courts Contract and the CSCS Contract.

These oversight and management arrangements are detailed in the following sections.

### 3.1 TWO OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS HAD RESPONSIBILITY FOR BOTH CONTRACTS

#### **The Court Risk Assessment Directorate monitored security and provided thorough briefings**

The Department's Court Risk Assessment Directorate (CRAD) evaluated potential threats to the secure operation of all courts across the state and recommended mitigation strategies. The CRAD gathered and analysed intelligence about potential disruption to court operations and provided regular briefings to court registry staff and to court custody and security staff.

The CRAD's processes were thorough and their briefings were detailed and timely. That gave G4S and Ventia staff capacity to prepare for complex or contested cases that might present risk. The Senior Officers Group advised on cross-agency operational matters

The Senior Officers Group (the Group) consisted of representatives from the Branch, the CRAD, WAPF and Treasury. It met quarterly, chaired by the Department's contract management staff. The Group brought court users together to refine cross-agency delivery of all CSCS services. The terms of reference for the Group were finalised in 2018 and focused on supporting operational efficiency and effectiveness. From a contract management perspective, the Group was responsible for advising on interagency operational matters which affected the contracts, and also assessing the implications of individual agency proposals for contract variations.

### 3.2 CBD COURTS CONTRACT GOVERNANCE

#### **A CBD Courts Contract Management Plan was in place**

At the commencement of the CBD Courts Project, a Services Agreement Contract Management Plan (the CBD Contract Management Plan) had been formally endorsed by the Department and was regularly updated. The plan clearly identified:

- the purpose of the plan
- the contract objectives, structure, conditions and pricing
- governance and consultative committee structures used to identify and resolve issues arising under the contract
- contract management delegations, roles, responsibilities, obligations, and contract management resource requirements

## CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

---

- contract performance reporting and monitoring procedures and recognised principles for relationship management, dispute resolution and issue management
- contract management administrative procedures including procedures for invoice verification, data sources for verification, counting rules and standards for routine payments, and the rules for any payment adjustments and abatements
- procedures to be followed for monitoring and verifying key performance indicators (KPIs) including those specific to the provision of custodial services.

### **The Contract Management Branch had day-to-day oversight of WLG and G4S**

Daily management of the contract was performed by the Contract Management Branch (CMB) within the Department's Higher Courts Directorate of Court and Tribunal Services. The CMB also had responsibility for the strategic management of the contract through the provision of executive support and advice to a Management Board and a Management User Group.

In undertaking specific monitoring of the services provided under the Act, the CMB used information from a range of sources, including:

- reviewing data on custody hours, movements and incidents from the C3S
- self-reported information on incidents and operations from WLG and G4S
- reporting from various stakeholders on service provision
- audits conducted on various aspects of court security and custodial services, including officer training
- lessons learnt exercises undertaken with WLG on G4S's handling of various incidents
- direct observations made by the CMB and the CRAD.

### **A Management Board provided strategic direction**

The Management Board (the Board) met quarterly, providing strategic direction and governance for the delivery of all services under the PPP (DoJ, 2009, p. 32). The Board was chaired by the Director General of the Department, meeting with the Executive Director and Director of Courts and Tribunal Services, Departmental contract managers, and the General and Operational Managers of WLG.

### **A Management User Group reviewed service demand and provision**

The Management User Group (the User Group) met quarterly to review service demand and service quality issues. It also assessed feedback from stakeholders and service providers and provided a forum for building relationships between all parties. User Group meetings were chaired by the Chief Judge, and included the Department's Principal Registrar, the Executive Manager of the District Court, the Directors of Higher Courts and the CRAD. WLG and G4S management also attended.

## CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

---

### **By 2021 the Department had formalised a services review and audit plan**

Our 2018 Report recommended that the Department should develop a CBD Courts Contract Audit Plan and conduct regular audits of the service agreement (OICS, 2019, p. 10). In 2020 the Department formalised a comprehensive Services Review and Audit Plan, which defined service categories, specific service details, dates of receipt, schedules of review and completion status.

### **The Department had conducted an internal audit of the CBD Courts Contract management**

Our 2018 Report also identified risks from a heavy reliance on self-reporting by WLG (OICS, 2019, p. 11).

As part of its 2020/21 Internal Audit Plan, the Department had considered whether the CMB was effectively managing the CBD Courts Contract, and whether WLG was meeting its service level agreements. The audit found that, overall, WLG appeared to be well managed by the CMB, with:

- processes in place to verify and record invoices from WLG and approved variations
- the CMB mostly ensuring that WLG fulfilled the service agreement requirements for incident monitoring and complaints

The audit findings also suggested that the Department had become increasingly reliant on WLG self-reporting of issues and KPI indicators and identified processes to improve the management of the WLG contract, including:

- proactively monitoring identified areas of high-risk
- applying abatements as intended by the Service Agreement with a clear explanation
- implementing measures to enable verification of the accuracy and completeness of incidents/complaints data that was self-reported by WLG
- developing procedures to reconcile data from different reports for self-harm and use of force incidents involving PICs so that these critical incidents were all duly captured, and the Department was not exposed to further related incidents and reputational damage.

As part of our process of continual inspection we will assess whether the internal audit findings and other proposed changes lead to improvements in on-site monitoring of the CBD Court Contract.



## CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

---

### 3.3 CSCS CONTRACT GOVERNANCE

#### **A CSCS Contract Management Plan was in place**

In 2019 the Department established a formal CSCS Contract Management Plan (OICS, 2019, p. 13), setting out:

- the purpose of the Plan
- a summary of the contract
- contractor and pricing details
- contract variation and extension procedure
- governance and administration procedure
- reporting requirements

The Contract Management Plan was a detailed working document, with nine attachments setting out process guides, responsibility and accountability matrices, specified events and KPIs, complaints processes and a risk register.

#### **The Operational Compliance Branch monitored service delivery**

The Department's Operational Compliance Branch (the Branch) monitored custodial and security services to ensure that the service delivery requirements under the CSCS Contract were met. A team of 10 compliance officers observed and interacted with Ventia and Wilson officers, medical staff, and PICs. They also conducted compliance testing and examined operational systems. Any non-compliance was reported weekly to the Ventia management team, and to one or both of the Department's teams that managed the two contracts.

In 2019 the Branch had aimed to monitor courts, medical escorts and hospital sits a minimum of two days each week, but with staffing shortages, they had not always been able to conduct timely reviews of all aspects of the contractual obligations. In 2021 the Branch had increased its overall monitoring of the contractor's performance year-on-year by 20 per cent. FSH secure facility had a three-fold increase in monitoring visits.

We were concerned, however, to find that the Branch had not visited any regional court custody centres during the two years before this inspection (DoJ, 2020b, p. 5) (DoJ, 2021b, p. 5). We had previously recommended that the Department improve regional facility monitoring (OICS, 2019, p. 7). The Department had not supported that recommendation. In the course of the inspection we were told that the CRAD's oversight of regional court custody centres compensated for the Branch's lack of visits to those sites.

#### **A Contract Manager had day-to-day oversight of the CSCS Contract**

At the operational level, the Contract was overseen and monitored by the Prisoner Transport and Custodial Services Management Contract Branch. A Contract Manager led a team of four staff. The Contract Manager had the authority to action everything in the

## CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

---

CSCS Contract except contract variations. The Contract Management Plan provided an overall contract management structure and identified the core processes for contract compliance.

### **The CSCS Contract Management Board had high-level oversight**

The CSCS Contract Management Board met quarterly, chaired by the Department's Deputy Commissioner Operational Support. Board members included the Department's Directors of Higher Courts and CRAD, and an Assistant Commissioner from WAPF. Ventia also attended Board meetings.

The objectives of the Board were to:

- examine and resolve strategic issues that affected the Contract
- ensure compliance requirements were met
- facilitate improvements in the performance of the Contract
- review the ongoing relevance of aspects of the Contract
- provide a forum for co-ordination of relevant budget processes
- ensure that planning priorities informed the budget process.

### **The CSCS Contract Management Group assessed Ventia's performance**

Contractual performance and service delivery was assessed and managed by monthly contract management meetings between the Contract Manager, the Contractor Representative and other departmental and Ventia representatives. This included reviewing specified events, KPIs, performance improvements notices and other contract management oversight mechanisms. It also provided a forum to discuss operational matters affecting the CSCS Contract movement and court related services.

# Chapter 4

## ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY

---

### 4.1 ASSESSMENT OF WLG'S PERFORMANCE

#### Positive performance by WLG

The Department's latest CBD Courts Contract Annual Report (CBD Annual Report) summarised WLG's performance positively (DoJ, 2021a, pp. 4, 5). There were no major service delivery failures that impacted on court operations. The Department's stakeholders continued to be satisfied with the level of service provided by WLG and its sub-contractor G4S. The Director General of the Department noted that the PPP between WLG and the state had been operating for 13 years, and the high level of security and custodial services at the CBD Courts had been achieved with the help of that very positive and longstanding working relationship (DoJ, 2021a, p. 4).

#### The CBD Courts were busier than ever, and G4S's resources were stretched

The CBD Annual Report noted some court security shortfalls, where the large number of concurrent and long-running co-accused trials stretched G4S's resources. Despite that, total abatements on the WLG court security and custodial services contract for the period were just over \$11,650, a reduction of 33 per cent on the previous year, and 78 per cent less than in 2018–2019 (DoJ, 2019; DoJ, 2020a; DoJ, 2021a). That ongoing abatement relief took account of mitigating factors when service delivery by the contractor fell short. Over the period WLG was abated less than 0.1 per cent of the total annual contract cost.

#### The CBD Annual Report identified benchmarking as a challenge

Benchmarking, the repricing of services, sets the expected usage of courts under the terms of the contract. During 2021 WLG and the Department had been working through the third five-yearly benchmarking process. At the previous five-year benchmark dates in 2012 and 2017, court and PIC volumes at both sites had been rising. WLG had asked for an increase in the agreed number of courtrooms operating, which would have raised the cost to the state. In both instances the WLG request for an increase had been denied.

The WLG submission to the 2022 benchmark negotiation included recognition for the higher court custody volumes. In February 2022 we were informed the Department had given WLG conditional approval of their Benchmarking Services and had acknowledged increased court custody volumes. WLG reported that the State had been very reasonable and anticipated that the contract would continue to run smoothly.

### 4.2 OICS ASSESSMENT OF WLG'S PERFORMANCE

#### WLG and the Department delivered infrastructure improvements

Since the last inspection WLG had worked with the Department's Courts Technology Group (CTG) on a \$12 million upgrade to information technology at the DCB and CLC. WLG had funded the upgrades, and the state had adjusted the service payment. WLG took on the design and completion risks. The upgrade was delivered on time and below budget. The WLG and CTG technicians collaborated effectively, sharing knowledge. We were told that without the upgrade, the Department's response to the COVID-19 pandemic (COVID)

## ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY

would have been severely impacted. As it was, the Judiciary were able to continue limited function in the central courts with video links across the state.

### G4S staffing had not kept up with court volumes, and staff attitudes were mixed

G4S employed 113 staff – 35 per cent were female, 90 per cent were permanent, and over 50 per cent worked full-time. G4S targeted employees with a customer service background, rather than security experience. Members of the Judiciary told us that G4S staff interactions with PICs were not confrontational, and court security staff were protective of judges, magistrates and court staff.

At the time of our interview, the G4S General Manager described activity at both CBD courthouses as particularly busy, and service provision needed to be flexible. For example, COVID-related changes had required that lists start earlier to stagger PIC and public movement into and through the CBD courts. New state government initiatives to help offenders avoid court had seen an increase in pre-hearing service provision. WLG had kept the Department informed as those difficulties arose, and G4S had stepped up to manage the necessary changes.

Perhaps understandably this may have impacted on staff attitudes as evidenced in our staff surveys. We compared the results of our 2021 pre-inspection survey of G4S staff with the results from the previous inspection survey, and some of the 36 question categories stood out. We found a noticeable deterioration in staff opinions in several areas set out in the table below. We suspect those changes may have been driven by increased court volumes and general wear-and-tear on the facilities.

**Table 1: G4S staff response to the questions regarding aspects of their job, effectiveness of G4S procedures and features of their court custody centre**

G4S Court Custody Staff Survey: negative findings						
	Very poor/Poor		Satisfactory/Good		Excellent	
	2021	2018	2021	2018	2021	2018
work conditions	16%	9%	65%	83%	13%	4%
staff numbers	56%	42%	40%	53%	0%	2%
number and mix of cells	22%	2%	57%	71%	8%	9%
safety and amenity of cells	17%	9%	64%	69%	8%	9%
perimeter security and monitoring	13%	4%	61%	64%	13%	13%
support from management	38%	33%	42%	58%	8%	8%

## ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY

There were also some positive changes identified in staff attitudes in several areas as set out in the table below.

**Table 2: G4S staff response to questions regarding aspects of their job, effectiveness of G4S procedures and features of their court custody centre**

G4S Court Custody Staff Survey: positive findings						
	Very poor/Poor		Satisfactory/Good		Excellent	
	2021	2018	2021	2018	2021	2018
pay rates	3%	24%	82%	69%	10%	17%
training	23%	34%	62%	56%	8%	9%
relationships with colleagues	7%	15%	82%	64%	7%	18%
secure supervision of PICS	8%	6%	71%	71%	13%	11%
managing PIC medical needs	8%	20%	67%	51%	13%	11%
managing at-risk issues	10%	20%	69%	60%	16%	4%

### G4S staff interacted professionally and respectfully with PICS

We observed hand-overs at the DCB sally port were more efficient since Ventia had introduced their mobile ePEMS tablets. All PIC information was still entered by G4S staff onto the C3S electronic records database.

PIC movements between the DCB sally port and the custody hall were well-staffed, secure and respectful. We were told that G4S had introduced a procedure to calm distressed PICS based on an ethos of empathy and support.

## 4.3 ASSESSMENT OF VENTIA'S PERFORMANCE

### The Department's CSCS Annual Report found evidence of innovation

Unlike the CBD Annual Report, the latest Court Security and Custodial Services Contract Annual Report (CSCS Annual Report) did not begin with a foreword by the Director General of the Department, or an Executive Summary (DoJ, 2021b).

The 2020–2021 CSCS Annual Report opened with an explanation of the Department's contract management procedure, which had included a 20 per cent increase in operational compliance visits to metropolitan CSCS sites.

The Department and Ventia agreed on two contract variations during the period. Additional resources were required for services related to circuit criminal jury trials for 12 months, and court security was negotiated for Supreme Court hearings at Busselton Court in October and November 2020.

Regarding innovation, the CSCS Annual Report noted that Ventia had introduced a secure mobile tablet to record PIC details on ePEMS. Because the tablets were updated regularly by company transport and custody staff, they gave contract management, receiving

## ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY

---

facilities, prisons and other contractors access to ePEMS records in near-live time. Ventia had also progressed a comprehensive review of its Operating Manual and had met the contractual requirement to provide certificated training to its Care and Security Managers (CSMs) and custodial officers.

### Performance failures and abatements rose during 2020–2021

The contract applied an abatement regime for service delivery failures in two categories: specified events and KPIs. Fixed abatement amounts were provided for specified events referred to in the contract, and payments were reduced based on the total performance assessment points the contractor accumulated for failing to meet KPIs. The contract also included a Specified Event Multiplication Factor which provided for increased penalties for repeated occurrences of the same specified event.

The CSCS Annual Report had two performance measure dashboards attached. They listed the number of failure incident points recorded against delivery on specified events, and against satisfying KPI measures. Regarding specified events, compared with the previous period, Ventia recorded two significant changes:

- a 75 per cent decrease in *failure to provide a service – court unable to proceed*
- an 80 per cent increase in *failure to provide a service – PIC unscheduled hospital sit more than one hour late*.

The KPI dashboard showed a total failure incident point increase of 225 per cent during 2021, which included:

- *Failure to manage the health and security of a PIC*, up from 0 to 12 points
- *Contractor tests duress alarm at courthouse monthly*, up from 0 to 30 points
- *Transport fleet maintained in good condition*, up from 2 to 14 points
- *Low level incidents reported within specified time*, up from 5 to 16 points
- *PIC delivered to court by time on warrant*, up from 14 to 63 points
- *Except for late courts each PIC back to prison by 5pm*, up sharply from 40 to 438 points.

The CSCS Annual Reports showed a minimal year-on-year increase in the cost of the contract to the state, with custody movement services over the period coming in at \$29 million and court custody services at \$24.6 million. Abatements over the period, however, had increased by 64 per cent on the previous year, to \$1.3 million (DoJ, 2020b; DoJ, 2021b). Ventia suffered an abatement rate of 5.3 per cent of the cost of the court custody services aspect of the CSCS Contract. That contrasted strongly with WLG's abatement rate of 0.1 per cent of the cost of the CBD Courts contract.

## ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY

### 4.4 OICS ASSESSMENT OF VENTIA'S PERFORMANCE

#### We were told that some courts were under-staffed

In taking on the CSCS Contract, Ventia had retained some BRS management and staff, and took over management of secure transport vehicles across the state. Our inspection team visited the 17 sites where Ventia had a presence. In discussion with Ventia staff, a recurring theme raised was that custody centres, particularly in the regions, were under-staffed.

Comparing the results of our survey of Ventia staff in 2021 with the previous inspection survey results, we found clear changes in some of the 36 question categories. Ventia staff expressed dissatisfaction with: staff numbers; subsidies and allowances; head office support; short-notice changes; and managing at-risk issues.

**Table 3: Ventia staff response to questions regarding aspects of their job, effectiveness of Ventia procedures and features of their court custody centre**

Ventia Court Custody Staff Survey: negative findings						
	Very poor/Poor		Satisfactory/Good		Excellent	
	2021	2018	2021	2018	2021	2018
staff numbers	74%	49%	22%	46%	2%	6%
management support	58%	36%	28%	45%	8%	10%
short-notice changes	38%	24%	49%	55%	8%	7%
managing at-risk issues	22%	11%	58%	61%	14%	14%

Conversely, staff approved of: relationships with colleagues; relationships with prisons; general custodial management; management of Aboriginal, female and juvenile PICs; and the capacity to securely supervise PICs.

**Table 4: Ventia staff response to questions regarding aspects of their job, effectiveness of Ventia procedures and features of their court custody centre**

Ventia Court Custody Staff Survey: positive findings						
	Very poor/Poor		Satisfactory/Good		Excellent	
	2021	2018	2021	2018	2021	2018
relationships with colleagues	4%	8%	67%	56%	26%	30%
relationships with prisons	6%	4%	59%	62%	25%	19%
general custodial management	13%	15%	70%	59%	12%	8%
management of Aboriginal PICs	5%	7%	73%	68%	17%	12%
management of female PICs	6%	9%	73%	66%	15%	11%
management of juvenile PICs	10%	8%	70%	64%	12%	12%
secure supervision of PICs	9%	5%	68%	63%	19%	19%

## ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY

---

Ventia management agreed that some sites had experienced staffing pressure. The company had continued the BRS practice of allocating enough staff to cover anticipated court security and custody services for weekly lists at each site, but as margins were kept close, surges had created stress. PIC transport for unscheduled hospital sits and compassionate leave came at very short notice and routinely drew staff away from court custody and security. The 155 per cent increase in movements to funerals over the period also stretched capacity. Moving staff between court custody sites to compensate was complex and expensive, particularly in the regions.

### **Ventia's revised Courthouse Briefing Templates will support continuous improvement**

Ventia had revised its CSCS Courthouse Briefing Templates (CBT) for all sites with a court custody centre. The CBTs were extensions of the Ventia Standard Operating Procedures. They provided detail of site-specific processes and idiosyncrasies at each location. The revised CBTs have established clear benchmarks for infrastructure and procedure against which changes to overall service provision will be measured. This innovation will support continuous improvement.

### **As the contract review date approached, abatements increased, but negotiations stalled**

Ventia management drew our attention to the Specified Event Multiplication Factor (the SEMF) in the CSCS Contract. The SEMF was applied when an event of the same type occurred on multiple occasions within a rolling six-month period. Third, fourth and fifth occurrences attracted increments in the abatement of 1.5, 2 and 3 times respectively.

We were told that although the SEMF had been used since the contract began, the provision had been applied more frequently since the beginning of the fifth year of the contract and had contributed to the 64 per cent increase in abatements.

The CSCS contract was due for renewal or re-tendering in March 2022. The Department can elect to extend the contract for a further period for up to five years, commencing on the initial expiry date. If so, it is required to give Ventia six months' notice before the initial expiry date.

The contract does allow for the Department to offer Ventia an informal further period of not more than 12 months. Notice directing an informal further period should be given by the Department no later than three months before the initial expiry date. We were informed that the Department formally advised Ventia on 21 December 2021 that the 12-month extension option was being exercised. On 3 March 2022, three weeks before the expiration of the initial contract, the Department sent Ventia the executed 12-month Deed of Variation and extension of the CSCS Contract. Both parties expect to use the 12-month extension to negotiate adjustments to the initial contract and some additional service options for a second five-year term.



## ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY

---

Leaving the decision so late to formally extend the contract for five years or offer a further period of 12 months had placed Ventia management in a difficult commercial position. For example, the lease period on their Canning Vale premises was falling due, and difficulties retaining senior staff in the face of such uncertainty presented risks. The CSCS Contract is a significant investment by the state and should be managed better.

### **Recommendation 1**

When re-tendering the CSCS Contract, the Department must adhere to the detail of that process.

# Chapter 5

## SITE INSPECTIONS

---

In the course of our inspection, team members visited both CBD courts, where G4S managed PICs under contract with WLG. We also inspected all 17 courthouses and the FSH secure facility where Ventia had a presence.

### 5.1 BUILT INFRASTRUCTURE

#### Facilities varied widely across the state

WLG and G4S managed PICs at the CBD Courts complex. The custody centre at the CLC (opened in 1980) was cramped, with nine cells clustered around a small control room. It struggled to cope with high throughput to 31 courts on six levels. In contrast, the DCB custody centre (2008) was an excellent example of modern design and durable finish, with 26 cells servicing 24 courts on seven levels.

Six of the 10 metropolitan sites where Ventia had responsibility were mixed-use courthouses. Court custody facilities at Mandurah (1980), Midland (1986) and Joondalup (1993) were worn, but some structural and surface repairs were evident. Even Rockingham (2000) and Fremantle (2001) were showing their age. Armadale (1986) was cramped, crowded, and generally in poor condition, but a new Armadale Courthouse and Police complex is expected to open in 2023.

Ventia managed four other metropolitan facilities. The two specialist sites in Northbridge where Ventia provided court security were typical of the era of their construction. The Children's Court (1992) had small cells, tight corridors and cramped staff facilities. By contrast, the WAPF-managed custody centre at the Northbridge Watch House (2013) showed purposeful design giving excellent workflow and had sufficient capacity to manage PICs brought nightly from police stations across the metropolitan area.

At the Old Supreme Court building (1903) maintenance to combat rising damp was ongoing, and cell layout was antiquated. Again, by contrast, the secure facility at the FSH (2015) was spacious, and purpose-built to a very high standard, giving PICs access to in-patient and out-patient medical services.

We visited eight of the regional courts covered by the CSCS Contract. Built infrastructure at Broome (1921) was mixed. The courthouse was heritage-listed, but court custody was in modern transportable, 'donga-style' buildings. Bunbury (1985) and Geraldton (1989) had old-style custody areas, but cells were clean. South Hedland (1999) did not have a court custody centre as such. Ventia provided court security and delivered PICs from police custody to court holding cells, which were showing wear. Albany (2005) was a prescribed lock-up, with Ventia managing the police lock-up while court sat. The six cells were in good condition.

Kalgoorlie (2013), Kununurra (2014) and Carnarvon (2015) reflected the design ethos of the Northbridge Watch House. Modern and architecturally striking, they dominated their streetscapes. Kalgoorlie was an elegant re-fit of the nineteenth-century gold-rush government administrative centre. As at Albany, Ventia took over the Kalgoorlie Police lock-up while court was in session. The custody centre was freshly painted, and minor but

## SITE INSPECTIONS

---

ongoing structural issues were managed. Kununurra and Carnarvon suffered from some complex design features that were not suited to the climate and difficult to keep functional, but cells were clean and comfortable when air conditioning was working.

### 5.2 SECURITY

#### **Security had improved at most sites, but some Ventia staff expressed concern**

We were pleased to find upgraded security technology at six of the metropolitan court custody centres. Digital closed-circuit television (CCTV) had improved control room monitor resolution, moving those sites towards the already high standards of the DCB, the CLC, the Northbridge Watch House and the FSH secure facility. At five sites the number of cells with camera coverage had increased, but still only one of the six Children's Court cells was remotely monitored. Security technology at Joondalup and the old Supreme Court had not improved.

In the regions, CCTV and monitors had been upgraded at Albany and Bunbury, but Geraldton and South Hedland still suffered poor camera coverage. Although Carnarvon and Kununurra had good digital CCTV, individual cameras often failed, repairs were slow, and power outages frequently interrupted on-site electronics and even cut communication with Perth.

Sally ports at Mandurah, Midland and Broome were too small for some Ventia PIC transport vehicles, presenting risk while unloading PICs. Also at Broome, the sally port door malfunctioned, and walking PICs through the court grounds and up the steps to Court One was an ongoing problem. All sites had walk-through metal detectors for court visitors, but most regional courts did not have x-ray bag scanners.

Our pre-inspection surveys had flagged possible under-staffing, and discussion with Ventia officers during our site visits reinforced those concerns. Six of the 10 metropolitan and three of the eight regional staff groups complained about chronic under-staffing. Some said that local staff absences were not covered, and skeleton staffing could not adequately cope with multiple courts operating, or the frequent demands for unscheduled PIC transport.

Courts across the state will continue to experience fluctuations in the number of matters listed. Under-staffing puts court staff, defendants and the public at increased risk. The Department and Ventia must manage surges in demand to minimise those risks. Flexibility of court custody staff numbers should be a part of any CSCS Contract extension.

Only with serviceable custodial infrastructure, contemporary security technology and adequate staffing can court users be guaranteed safety. As we travelled the state to inform this inspection, it was the lack of consistency across those three areas that stood out. It is the Department's responsibility to bring all court custody centres up to the same high standards.

## SITE INSPECTIONS

---

---

### **Recommendation 2**

The Department should undertake a review of infrastructure and security at all court custody facilities across the state to ensure a consistent high standard and level of service.

# Appendix 1

## PHOTOGRAPHS

---



***Photo 1: Supreme Court Building: commissioned 1903***



***Photo 2: Armadale Courthouse: commissioned 1986***

## PHOTOGRAPHS

---



***Photo 3: Geraldton Courthouse: commissioned 1989, built 1898***



***Photo 4: Perth Children's Court: commissioned 1992***

## PHOTOGRAPHS

---



***Photo 5: Joondalup Courthouse: commissioned 1993***



***Photo 6: Fremantle Courthouse: commissioned 2001***

## PHOTOGRAPHS

---



***Photo 7: Central Law Court: renovated 2005, built 1980***



***Photo 8: District Court Building: commissioned 2008***



## PHOTOGRAPHS

---



***Photo 9: Kalgoorlie Courthouse: commissioned 2013, built 1899***



***Photo 10: Kununurra Courthouse: commissioned 2014***

## PHOTOGRAPHS

---



*Photo 11: Carnarvon Courthouse: commissioned 2015*



*Photo 12: Armadale Courthouse and Police Complex: expected completion 2023*

# Appendix 2

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- DoJ. (2009). *CBD Courts Project Services Agreement Contract Management Plan*. Perth: Department of Justice.
- DoJ. (2019). *CBD Courts Project Contract Annual Report 2018/19*. Perth: Department of Justice.
- DoJ. (2020a). *CBD Courts Project Contract Annual Report 2019/20*. Perth: Department of Justice.
- DoJ. (2020b). *Court Security and Custodial Services Contract Annual Report 2019/20*. Perth: Department of Justice.
- DoJ. (2021a). *CBD Courts Project Contract Annual Report 2020/21*. Perth: Department of Justice.
- DoJ. (2021b). *Court Security and Custodial Services Contract Annual Report 2020/21*. Perth: Department of Justice.
- OICS. (2015). *Western Australia's rapidly increasing remand population*. Perth: Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services.
- OICS. (2019). *2018 Inspection of Court Custody Centres and Fiona Stanley Hospital Secure Facility*. Perth: Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services.

# Appendix 3

## ABBREVIATIONS

---

---

BRS	Broadspectrum Australia Pty Ltd
C3S	Custodial Services Support System, the Department's data management system
CBD	Central Business District
CBT	Courthouse Briefing Templates
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
CLC	Central Law Courts
COVID	COVID-19 pandemic
CRAD	Court Risk Assessment Directorate
CSCS	Court Security and Custodial Services
CMB	Contract Management Branch
CSM	Care and Security Manager, Ventia on-site manager
CTG	Court Technology Group
DCB	District Court Building
DoJ	Department of Justice
ePEMS	electronic Prisoner Escort Management System, Ventia's data management system
FSH	Fiona Stanley Hospital
G4S	G4S Custodial Services Pty Ltd
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
PIC	Person in custody
PPP	Public Private Partnership
SEMF	Specified Event Multiplication Factor
WAPF	Western Australian Police Force
WLG	Western Liberty Group

# Appendix 4

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE

---



Government of Western Australia  
Department of Justice  
Corrective Services

## **Response to OICS Draft Report:**

**2021 Inspection of Court Custody Centres  
and Fiona Stanley Hospital Secure Facility**

**June 2022**

Version 1.0

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE

---

---

Response to OICS Draft Report:  
2021 Inspection of Court Custody Centres and Fiona Stanley Hospital Secure Facility

**Contents**

Response Overview ..... 3  
Response to Recommendations ..... 6  
Appendix A: Inaccuracies and Comments..... 7

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE

---

---

Response to OICS Draft Report:  
2021 Inspection of Court Custody Centres and Fiona Stanley Hospital Secure Facility

---

### Response Overview

#### Introduction

On 23 October 2020, the Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services (OICS) announced the commencement of the inspection of court custody centres and the Fiona Stanley Hospital secure facility.

As per the standard process, the Department of Justice (the Department) facilitated the provision of a wide range of documentation and access to systems, policies, processes, facilities including staff, prisoners and contractors upon OICS' request for the purpose of the inspection.

On 5 May 2022, the Department received the draft inspection report from OICS for review and comment. The draft report has highlighted key findings and made two recommendations. The Department has reviewed the draft report and provides further context, comments, and responses to the recommendations as below.

Appendix A contains comments linked to sections in the report for the Inspector's attention and consideration when finalising the report.

#### Review Comments

The Department notes the positive findings made in the report in relation to the Department's management of the CBD Courts Contract and the CS&CS Contract. Both contracts are clearly defined, and robust governance arrangements are in place, including multiple oversight mechanisms established to monitor service delivery and compliance with both contracts.

Following recommendations made by OICS in the 2018 CS&CS Inspection, the Department made several improvements in relation to contract management and service delivery under both contracts. This included the development of a Contract Management Plan that complies with government requirements, Service Review and Audit Plan to ensure regular audits are conducted against specific services, a data validation and invoicing processes for accuracy in payments, increased compliance monitoring and regular oversight through contract management boards.

The \$12 million information technology upgrades at the District Court Building and Central Law Courts have enabled the Department to continue certain court functions remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic with video links across the state.

In addition to the upgrades at the CBD court complexes, further upgrades to address security system vulnerabilities commenced in 2020 at various court complexes in WA, including Bunbury, Busselton, Fremantle, South Hedland, Karratha, Mandurah, Midland, and the Perth Children's Court. These upgrades, with an investment of \$2.74 million, includes new technologies for CCTV, access control, duress alarms, intruder detection, and integration of whole of site security systems.

Court volumes in the CBD complexes had increased since the last inspection. Staffing profile remained relatively stable at 90% permanently employed. Staff were found to be flexible in how they operated within the court, noting the significant changes to operations as a result of COVID-19 and other Government initiatives introduced to help offenders avoid court through an increase to pre-hearing service provisions. Where offenders did attend the courts, staff and contractor interactions with them were noted as being professional and respectful.

---

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE

---

---

Response to OICS Draft Report:  
2021 Inspection of Court Custody Centres and Fiona Stanley Hospital Secure Facility

---

As acknowledged in the report, the Department has oversight mechanisms to ensure service delivery requirements under both contracts are met and is continuously seeking to improve the oversight of these contracts.

Although the two contracts have separate oversight arrangements, namely by the Department's Operational Compliance Branch (OCB) and the Court Risk Assessment Directorate (CRAD), the two areas work in collaboration to close gaps and complement each other by focusing on the areas identified as having the greater risks. The two teams have been agile and flexible in deploying resourcing based on risk and need.

As per the Department's response to the 2018 inspection, compliance reviews at regional prisons are undertaken biennially which include regional court locations. The biennial frequency is based on a risk-based allocation of resources to undertake on-site compliance testing.

Compliance reviews in the regions on a biennial basis has continued, noting there have been gaps recently due to resourcing challenges caused by the impacts of COVID. The gaps however are compensated by the operations of the CRAD who evaluates potential threats to the secure operations of all courts and the development of mitigation strategies. The CRAD's oversight of regional court custody centres also compliments compliance reviews and attendance at those sites.

Regular independent audits of various aspects of the contracts are also conducted by the Department's internal audit function.

In addition, the contract management teams hold regular meetings with various stakeholders and the service providers to ensure all parties are aware of issues affecting service provision.

A comprehensive abatement regime also exists under both contracts for failure of the contractors to deliver the required services in accordance with specifications of the contract.

To further maximise operational compliance effectiveness, the Department has established an Operational Compliance Tasking Committee involving stakeholders that have operational and strategic objectives that can be supported by a focused compliance function. The aim of the Committee is to drive operational performance through effective use of resources, reduced cross-functional barriers and to achieve better service deliver outcomes.

The Department acknowledges that whilst the majority of prisoner movements are able to be facilitated without issues by the contractor, Ventia, there are known challenges in facilitating unscheduled hospital sits and, on occasion, the clearance of Police lockups. These challenges are largely limited to regional and remote locations and is often as a result of resourcing and operational priorities, infrequent flight schedules, or local conditions such as accommodation availability or weather restrictions. The Department will continue to work with the contractor to provide support and mitigate risks as required.

As noted by OICS, the 2020-2021 CS&CS Annual Report KPI dashboard shows the contractor had incurred 12 total failure incident points against KPI sub-category "Provide PIC food water medication". The Department has since identified this to be a coding error and should have been reported under sub-category "Failure to manage the health and security of a PIC". This error will be corrected in the upcoming 2021-2022 CS&CS Annual Report.

---



## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESPONSE

---

---

Response to OICS Draft Report:  
2021 Inspection of Court Custody Centres and Fiona Stanley Hospital Secure Facility

The Department will continue to monitor and assess the performance of both contracts in a continual effort to identify and make contract management and service delivery improvements where necessary.

Response to OICS Draft Report:  
2021 Inspection of Court Custody Centres and Fiona Stanley Hospital Secure Facility

---

## Response to Recommendations

### 1 When re-tendering the CS&CS Contract, the Department must adhere to the detail of that process.

**Level of Acceptance:** Noted  
**Responsible Division:** Corrective Services  
**Responsible Directorate:** Operational Support  
**Proposed Completion Date:** N/A

#### Response:

The Department seeks to meet all of its obligations under the CS&CS Contract, including notices regarding contract extensions. The 12 month extension exercised included a number of contract variations which were subject to internal and external negotiations and agreement.

While the Department will strive to conduct renewals or extension to contracts within the required timeframe, however, the delays in this instance were unavoidable as it was prudent for the Department to ensure the contract variations were subject to a robust assessment and review process.

### 2 The Department should undertake a review of infrastructure and security at all court custody facilities across the state to ensure a consistent high standard level of service.

**Level of Acceptance:** Supported – Current Practice / Project  
**Responsible Division:** Court and Tribunal Services  
**Responsible Directorate:** Court Risk Assessment Directorate  
**Proposed Completion Date:** Completed

#### Response:

Security risk management within court complexes is conducted in accordance with the Courts Security Framework, which adopts a comprehensive, intelligence-led security risk management model. Under the Framework, bi-annual critical assessments are conducted at all court complexes which identify security and infrastructure improvements, resulting in the development of a focused treatment plan.

The retrofitting of complexes against contemporary standards is both complex and expensive. Treatment plans are implemented subject to funding and in collaboration with critical stakeholders such as WA Police and specialist units of Corrective Services.

Infrastructure designs at court complexes throughout Western Australia are guided by the Courts Standard Architectural Design Brief. Under the Brief, the design and integration of security fit outs and technologies are underpinned by the Courts Physical Security and Technical Specifications. Construction of all new court complexes or major upgrades to existing complexes must comply with the Brief.

---

# Appendix 5

## INSPECTION TEAM

---

Eamon Ryan	Inspector of Custodial Services
Darian Ferguson	Deputy Inspector of Custodial Services
Stephanie McFarlane	Principal Inspections and Research Officer
Lauren Netto	Principal Inspections and Research Officer
Kieran Artelaris	Inspections and Research Officer
Jim Bryden	Inspections and Research Officer
Cliff Holdom	Inspections and Research Officer
Charlie Staples	Inspections and Research Officer
Aaron Hardwick	Inspections and Research Officer (seconded)
Catie Parsons	Inspections and Research Officer (seconded)

# Appendix 6

## KEY DATES

---

---

Formal notification of announced inspection	23 October 2020
Start of on-site phase	8 December 2020
Completion of on-site phase	31 August 2021
Draft report sent to the Judiciary, the Department of Justice, Western Liberty Group, G4S and Ventia	5 May 2022
Responses received from the Judiciary, Western Liberty Group, G4S and Ventia	20–26 May 2022
Response received from the Department of Justice	1 July 2022
Declaration of prepared preport	27 July 2022

*Inspection of prisons, court custody centres, prescribed lock-ups,  
juvenile detention centres, and review of custodial services in Western Australia*



OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR  
OF CUSTODIAL SERVICES

Level 5, Albert Facey House  
469 Wellington Street  
Perth, Western Australia 6000  
Telephone: +61 8 6551 4200

[www.oics.wa.gov.au](http://www.oics.wa.gov.au)