


Request for Costing an Election Commitment

Name of election commitment:	ADJR Reform					
Person and party requesting costing:	Meredith Hunter, ACT Greens Parliamentary Leader					
Date of public release of election commitment, including source:	14 September 2012 http://act.greens.org.au/content/greens-make-open-government-reality-act					
Summary of election commitment:	To amend the standing requirements in the <i>Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act</i> to implement the recommendations of the Australian Law Reform Commission Report 'Beyond the door-keeper: Standing to sue for Public Remedies'.					
Intention of election commitment:	To ensure that there is not an artificial barrier to the enforcement of public remedies and that public decision makers can have the legality of their decisions challenged.					
Signature of person requesting costing:						
Date of request for costing:	5/10/12					
What are the key assumptions that have been made in the election commitment?						
<p>Note: that where the request to cost an election commitment differs from the public announcement, the costing will be on the basis of information provided in the costing request.</p> <p>Note: it will be up to the professional judgment of the Director-General as to whether these assumptions are adopted in the costing of the election commitment.</p>						
Where relevant, is the funding for the policy to be demand driven or a capped amount?						
N/A						
Will third parties, for instance the Commonwealth or other State/Territories, have a role in funding or delivering the election commitment?						
No.						
Will funding/the cost require indexation?						
N/A.						
What are the estimated revenue and operating costs each year (if available) and what are the capital requirements for this election commitment and estimated costs each year (if available)?						
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Total
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Revenue ^(a)						
Expenses ^(a)						
Capital						

(a) A negative number indicates a decrease in revenue or an increase in expenses.

What is the likely take up?

N/A

Any other assumptions?

- The legislative change will involve no additional cost to the budget. There is no evidence that removing the standing limitations leads to any significant increase in litigation. This issue is discussed extensively in the ALRC report.

<i>Administration of the election commitment</i>
How will the election commitment be administered?
Who will administer the election commitment? JACS.
Has an allowance been made for expenses necessary to support the implementation of this election commitment? – If no, will the government agency be expected to absorb expenses associated with this election commitment? – If yes, please specify the key assumptions. No.
What is the intended implementation date of the election commitment? From the start of the 2013-14 financial year.
Are there transitional arrangements associated with election commitment implementation? N/A.
Are there any other assumptions that need to be considered? No.
When is the election commitment expected to be fully operational? <i>Please provide further details i.e. start and end dates, the level of commitment during each period etc?</i> From the start of the 2013-14 financial year.
Will the election commitment cease and if so when? N/A.