

Author name: Anonymous

Date of submission: Monday, 6 December 2021

Your submission for this review:

I would like to congratulate the progress on this initiative and thank the organisers for the opportunity to respond. I am concerned that the worked example introduces the contingency amount into the unit rate to be used by Councils and others. It would be expected that contingency items (like relocation of services, excavation of rock etc.) would have been dealt with by the developer and that subsequently council would not need to overcome those concerns during a future renewal. Thus the replacement value to council would not include that burden. I am concerned that the inclusion of contingency in the manner described embeds an expectation that contingency is ALWAYS expected to be spent as part of an infrastructure project, rather than being a provision for cost that may or may not be required. I am concerned that many of the examples, especially related to transport assets only provide a unit rate for the complete asset and not for the parts that are expected to be reported by Councils. For example, roads are reported by councils in parts that would typically be seal/base/formation/kerb and gutter/bulk earthworks and so on. This breakout is essential to enable financial treatment of those parts that have different useful life and thus different depreciation profiles. By not providing unit rates for these "parts", there is significant risk that different councils will establish different proportions for those parts, leading to a situation where modelling of anything different from the specific examples provided will provide different values. I am concerned that there are some asset types that are related where there is no cross reference in the report. Take for example 2.01 stormwater culverts, with no reference to 2.14 headwalls and vice versa. I am concerned that some descriptions in the report need further clarification. Take for example item 4.01 where the header talks about amenities blocks 400 sq m, while the detail talks of Nominal 100 sq m.