



ACT Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions

14 July 2025

ACT Remuneration Tribunal
PO Box 964, Civic Square
ACT 2608

Via email only: remtrib@act.gov.au

Dear Ms Lambert AM,

ACT RENUMERATION TRIBUNAL 2025 SPRING SITTING

Thank you for your invitation to make a submission and providing me with a short extension to facilitate my response.

The purpose of this submission is to draw several relevant matters to the Tribunal's attention, including an increase in salary of my role's counterpart at the federal level, and to highlight the unique breadth of the ACT role, which may result in the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) role falling behind its counterparts, and becoming uncompetitive. Noting the pressures on my budget, I however make no specific request for increase in remuneration on this occasion, outside of an increase reflective of the consumer price index (CPI).

Last year, the Federal Government increased the salary for the DPP (Cth) to \$735,580.¹ This represented an increase just shy of 25%.² On 1 July 2025, this was increased to \$753,240.³ Prior to 2021, the salary was broadly consistent with the salary for the DPP (ACT).⁴ Steady increases over recent years, and a marked increase last year, without commensurate increases

¹ [Remuneration Tribunal \(Remuneration and Allowances for Holders of Full-time Public Office\) Determination 2024](#)

² From \$592,250 in 2023: [Remuneration Tribunal \(Remuneration and Allowances for Holders of Full-time Public Office\) Determination \(No. 2\) 2023](#)

³ [FTOH - RT Principal Determination 2025.pdf](#)

⁴ [FTO 2021 - Compilation no. 4.pdf](#)

in this jurisdiction has allowed the DPP (ACT) role to fall significantly behind the salary for its federal counterpart.

It is also relevant to note that resident Supreme Court judges within the ACT are linked to the remuneration, allowances and entitlements of their federal counterparts by virtue of s 37U of the Supreme Court Act 1933 (ACT), yet the ACT DPP salary is no longer commensurate with its federal counterpart.

I also note the ACT role has less favourable conditions outside of salary, such as a lower entitlement to annual leave and no pension allowance, unlike many other jurisdictions.

In addition, the scope of the DPP (ACT) role is broader in nature than any other DPP role in Australia. This is due to the ACT adopting a 'one prosecution' agency model, meaning I have oversight for all criminal prosecutions within the Territory, unlike my counterparts across Australia, who take over serious crimes, with the Police Commissioner of the relevant states or territories responsible for prosecuting the other criminal matters before the Courts through their police prosecution service. It is noteworthy that family violence matters are most often prosecuted in the lower courts, and by police prosecutors in other jurisdictions. In the ACT, I am responsible for prosecution for all family violence matters.

The breadth of the ACT role is reflected in the number of matters finalised each by my office, compared to other jurisdictions. In the 2024 -25 financial year, my office finalised over had 5,321 matters.

As flagged at the outset of this submission, my office is regrettably operating under considerable budgetary restraints. I am conscious that any increase to my salary, unless accounted for in the budget to my office, will add to this pressure. For this reason, whilst I consider it necessary to draw the above to the Tribunal's attention, I do not make a specific request for an increase in salary outside of an increase consistent with CPI.

Yours faithfully,



Victoria Engel SC

Director of Public Prosecutions (ACT)