

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Furnishings in Mural Hall

Question: A

A1. What changes have been made to the furnishings in the Mural Hall?

Answer

1 In 2005, 16 two-seater Brumby Leather lounges located in the Mural Hall were replaced.

2 The carpet within the Mural Hall and surrounding general circulation corridors was replaced in 2001.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Furnishings in Mural Hall

Question: A

A2. What were the reasons for the changes?

Answer

1 **Brumby Leather Lounges.** The Joint House Department Furniture Manager in 2003 evaluated the lounges as being in poor condition and recommended replacement due to:

- (a) the padding and leather upholstery being beyond service life; and
- (b) tears, deep scuffing and loss of colour to the leather.

2 **Carpet.** The carpet within the Mural Hall and surrounding general circulation corridors was replaced as it showed signs of wear and tear. The carpet was identified as being due for replacement as part of the Building Condition Index (**BCI**) assessment.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Furnishings in Mural Hall

Question: A

A3. Why weren't details of the Brumby Upholstered Lounge Replacement project provided in the answer to QoN 682?

Answer

1 QoN 682 (4) asked:

- (f) can details be provided of any original Parliament House items disposed of since 2000, including the reason for disposal, the value of the items and the manner of disposal; and
- (g) in relation to furniture, can details be provided of any items of furniture that have been replaced since the building opened in 1988....

2 The answers to this part of the QoN were prepared through a search of files held by DPS, and a reliance on corporate memory of available staff. Note that DPS generally only retains finance-related files for a period of seven years.

3 Details regarding the Brumby Lounge work were held on a file titled: *Brumby Upholstered Furniture Refurbishment Program*. Staff searching for records of replacement projects did not identify that file as relevant to furniture replacement activity and, hence, it was not examined.

4 At the time of answering QoN 682, individual recollection of the Brumby Lounge work was as a refurbishment project—as part of which the Brumby leather on the chairs would be replaced.

5 In addition to the Mural Hall lounges (detailed in response to QoN A1), there were other lounges included in the Brumby Leather Lounge replacement project that were located in the Cabinet Room entry, the House of Representatives Spouses Lounge and in the DPS Furniture Store.

6 The following are the responses in relation to the Question 682 (4) asked in 2011.

- (f) *Can details be provided of any original Parliament House items disposed of since 2000, including the reason for disposal, the value of the items and the manner of disposal?;*

7 A total of 23 Brumby chairs were disposed of on 29 May 2005, as part of the Brumby Leather Lounge Replacement project (including 16 from Mural Hall and 2 held as spares in store—see response to QoN A4). These were sold through Pickles Auctions for a total ex-GST net return to DPS of \$1,314.82 (after costs of \$721.53 were deducted).

- (g) *In relation to furniture, can details be provided of any items of furniture that have been replaced since the building opened in 1988...*

8 As part of the Brumby Leather Lounge Replacement project, 31 Brumby lounges were acquired in 2005 (1 x 3-seater; 21 x 2-seater; 9 x 1-seater), at a total cost of \$152,469.94 (ex-GST).

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Furnishings in Mural Hall

Question: A

A4. If any items from the Mural Hall have been sold or otherwise disposed of, please provide the committee with copies of the relevant Declaration of Surplus and Unserviceable Items Form and information on the method of disposal including the amount of revenue raised by any sale.

Answer

1 **Brumby Leather Lounges.** A copy is attached of the disposal form relating to the disposal of the Mural Hall Brumby Leather Lounges (**Attachment A**).

2 The lounges were disposed of in 2005 through Pickles Auctions, who were used at this time by DPS.

3 The disposal form lists 18 lounges—16 from the Mural Hall and two that had been in store. Available records indicate that the amount of revenue raised by the sale of these 18 two-seater lounges totalled \$1,027.29 ex-GST (after commission and administration charges of \$564.60 were deducted).

4 **Carpet.** A copy is attached of the disposal form relating to the disposal in 2001 of the Mural Hall carpet (**Attachment B**).

5 DPS finance records are generally kept for just seven years.

6 No records can be located to indicate the method of disposal of this carpet, nor are there any details of any revenue that might have been raised if sold.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: House of Representatives Chamber Enhancements

Question: B

B1. What changes have been made to the furnishings and/or fittings in the House of Representatives Chamber?

B2. What were the reasons for the changes?

Answer

1 DPS managed a project relating to a number of enhancements to the House of Representatives Chamber as a result of a request from the Department of the House of Representatives as its client. If there are detailed questions as to the basis of the request for enhancements, these should be directed to the Department of the House of Representatives.

2 The decision-making in relation to this project was primarily for the Department of the House of Representatives and, if there are detailed questions about the reasons for decisions that were taken, these will need to be addressed to the Department of the House of Representatives.

3 The following table lists the changes made and the reasons for them.

Item	change	reason for change
Speaker's Chair	New seat backrest and seat base installed.	To improve the ergonomic design and adjustability of the Speaker's Chair for multiple users.
Speaker's desk	Cavity added for IT infrastructure reticulation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ To provide access to the parliamentary computing network for occupants of the Speaker's Chair.▪ To integrate the technology hardware with the furniture in the Chamber, both for the Speaker and the Clerks at the Table.▪ To provide enhanced infrastructure services to occupants of the Speaker's Chair to enable the installation of the latest on-line applications, thus replacing existing paper based systems.
	Brass rail added to desktop to support computer monitors.	
Main Table —Clerk's seat —Deputy Clerk's seat	IT and power reticulation added to lower pigeon hole.	To integrate the technology hardware with the furniture in the Chamber, both for the Speaker and the Clerks at the Table.
Distinguished Visitors Galleries	Added to Government and Opposition sides. New chairs fabricated and installed.	To create a purpose designed distinguished visitor's gallery that better reflects the design and status of the House of Representatives Chamber.
Console tables (drinks tables at rear of Chamber)	Fabricated and installed.	To provide a table that is fit for purpose and constructed of appropriate materials.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: House of Representatives Chamber Enhancements

Question: B

B3. What consultations took place with the architects (Mr Giurgola, Mr Guida and Ms Berg) in relation to this project? Please provide the committee with any written material from/to the architects about this project.

Answer

1 Copies of the following documents—relating to consultations with the Parliament House (**PH**) architects in relation to this project (WM-1738, House of Representatives Chamber Enhancement Project)—are provided in **Folder A**:

- (a) 12 January 2009—Request For Quotation (**RFQ**) released to market (including to Guida Moseley Brown Architects (**GMB**));
- (b) 19 January 2009—RFQ query from GMB;
- (c) 20 January 2009—RFQ clarification to all potential RFQ respondents;
- (d) 03 February 2009—RFQ response received from GMB;
- (e) 03 March 2009—RFQ debrief request from GMB;
- (f) 13 March 2009—RFQ debrief with GMB;
- (g) 21 April 2009—Letter from Mr Giurgola;
- (h) 13 May 2009—Letter to Mr Giurgola;
- (i) 01 June 2009—Letter and schematic design docs to Mr Giurgola, extending opportunity to meet;
- (j) 19 June 2009—Schematic design consultation meeting with Mr Giurgola, Mr Hal Guida and Ms Pamille Berg;
- (k) 01 July 2009—Draft minutes of schematic design consultation meeting with Mr Giurgola, Mr Guida and Ms Berg released to Mr Giurgola, Mr Guida and Ms Berg, requesting comments. Also distributed (for comment) was DPS's summary of questions the APH architect would like addressed;
- (l) 07 July 2009—email Ms Berg to DPS;
- (m) 14 July 2009—Correspondence from Ms Berg on minutes of consultation meeting;
- (n) 24 July 2009—Release of final minutes of consultation meeting to Mr Giurgola, Mr Guida and Ms Berg;
- (o) 04 Sep 2009—Moral Rights Notice to Mr Giurgola. Moral Rights Letter to Mr Giurgola;
- (p) 29 Sep 2009—Emails to/from Ms Berg;
- (q) 7 Oct 2009—Letter from Mr Giurgola; and
- (r) 15 Oct 2009—Letter to Mr Giurgola.

2 In addition, **Folder B** contains print-outs of emails (not previously filed), relating to PH architects consultations, which were extracted from the archived emails of a former DPS employee.

3 Finally, there are other documents relating to discussions with the architects that are contained amongst other papers in the following **DPS files**, which are also provided.

- 09/802 BUILDING & DESIGN MANAGEMENT - MAINTENANCE - HERITAGE MANAGEMENT - HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER
- 09/1320 BUILDING & DESIGN MANAGEMENT - PARLIAMENTARY DESIGN - HERITAGE MANAGEMENT 1 - WM 1738 - ENHANCEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER
- 09/1681 BUILDING & DESIGN MANAGEMENT - MAINTENANCE - HERITAGE MANAGEMENT - HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: House of Representatives Chamber Enhancements

Question: B

B4. Please provide all material in relation to the heritage matters considered in relation to this project.

Answer

1 A range of documents are provided that relate to consideration of heritage matters in relation to the House of Representatives Chamber Enhancements project.

- (a) Five lever-arch **folders (C to G)** contain printouts of electronic documents held by DPS:

C. HoR Chamber enhancements—heritage

D. HoR Chamber enhancements—OHS heritage

E. (1) HoR Chamber enhancements—design brief furnishings and/or fittings

F. (2) HoR Chamber enhancements—design brief furnishings and/or fittings

G. (3) HoR Chamber enhancements—design brief furnishings and/or fittings.

It has not been possible—within the timeframe for response to this question—to order the documents in these folders chronologically.

- (b) **DPS departmental files.**

09/452	BUILDING & DESIGN MANAGEMENT - PARLIAMENTARY DESIGN - WM 1738 ENHANCEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER
09/477	BUILDING & DESIGN MANAGEMENT - PARLIAMENTARY DESIGN - WM 1738 ENHANCEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER
09/802	BUILDING & DESIGN MANAGEMENT - MAINTENANCE - HERITAGE MANAGEMENT - HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER
09/1320	BUILDING & DESIGN MANAGEMENT - PARLIAMENTARY DESIGN - HERITAGE MANAGEMENT 1 - WM 1738 - ENHANCEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER
09/1321	BUILDING & DESIGN MANAGEMENT - PARLIAMENTARY DESIGN - HERITAGE MANAGEMENT 2 - WM 1738 - ENHANCEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER
09/1681	BUILDING & DESIGN MANAGEMENT - MAINTENANCE - HERITAGE MANAGEMENT - HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Bertoia chairs

Question: D

D1. Please provide all departmental files relating to the disposal of the Bertoia chairs.

Answer

1 There are no dedicated departmental files on the disposal of Bertoia chairs.

2 The attached documentation provided in relation to the disposal of the Bertoia chairs (**Attachments H to O**) has been taken from files relating to the project to replace the Bertoia chairs and from what Finance disposal files are still available (noting that DPS generally does not keep its finance-related files beyond seven years).

Att.	Disposal	No.	description	sold	destroyed
H	084/99-00	102	white courtyard chair		10-Mar-00
I	085/99-00	5	courtyard / outdoor chair		29-Mar-00
J	08/09-0002	197	Bertoia outdoor chairs		10-Jul-08
		42	Bertoia outdoor chairs	26-Sep-08	
K	08/09-0053	92	Bertoia outdoor chairs	17-Mar-09	
L	08/09-0072	13	Bertoia outdoor chairs	4-May-09	
M	09/10-0005	27	Bertoia outdoor chairs	23-Oct-09	
N	10/11-0039	49	Outdoor Bertoia dining chairs	22-Mar-11	
		19	Outdoor Bertoia lounge chairs		
O	10/11-0080	1	Bertioa outdoor chairs		13-Apr-11
		3	Bertioa outdoor chairs	27-Jun-11	

3 Further documents (**Attachments P to W**) were found in various departmental files and are provided as background information relating to the eventual decision to dispose of the Bertoia chairs and replace them with a more durable chair.

P	15-Dec-93	JHD File Note	re proposed rejuvenation of Bertoia chairs
Q	25-Jan-94	JHD Minute	detailing attempts to refurbish Bertoia chairs
R	27-Jan-94	JHD Minute	re life expectancy of refurbished chairs
S	29-May-06	DPS Minute	Submission to DPS Finance Committee to approve replacement of Bertoia chairs via open tender procurement (includes photos T, U and V below)
T	3-May-06	photo	piles of damaged Bertoia chairs
U	3-May-06	photo	close-ups of damaged legs of Bertoia chairs
V	3-May-06	photo	details of Bertoia chairs—for resale and broken
W	8-Dec-06	DPS email	re Finance Committee approval to replace chairs (noting poor to average condition)

4 All documents discovered in the time available to meet the deadline for response to this question have been provided.

5 There may be further documentation, relating to the disposal of the Bertoia chairs, which has not yet been discovered. Further searches of what historic files might still exist would include retrieving files from the National Archives of Australia (**NAA**). Retrieval of some six JHD files has already been requested.

6 Further information relating to Bertoia chair disposal will be provided if it comes to light in searches of files currently held by the NAA.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Retention of original fittings

Question: E

E1. Since 1995, what off-site storage facilities have been leased by DPS?

Answer

1 Available records have provided the information below on off-site storage facilities arranged by the Joint House Department (**JHD**) and then DPS.

General furniture and building spares items	
prior to 1995 to Jan 2003	JHD leased space at 200–214 Gilmore Road Queanbeyan.
Jan 2003 to Jan 2008	Facility at 200–214 Gilmore Road Queanbeyan operated by 1 st Fleet Warehousing and Distribution (2,125 m ²). 1 st Fleet provided JHD and then DPS with warehouse management services.
January 2008	DPS transferred material from Queanbeyan facility to 1 st Fleet Warehousing and Distribution at Dairy Flat Road, Fyshwick. Space is provided as required. At 1 April 2012, DPS had 120 m ³ of furniture storage space and 130 m ² of pallet racking, containing 96 pallets of material.
Artworks	
1988–1991	Fyshwick Art Store Repository
1991—Nov 1998	Kingston Repository (AGPS Building) (JHD had fitted out AGPS Building for art storage at a cost of approximately \$300,000.) The Commonwealth owned the AGPS Building until Sept 1998, when it was handed over to the ACT Government. Soon after that, it was condemned—necessitating the re-location of the artworks.
Nov 1998 to Mar 2001	Hume Repository (NGA Storage Facility)
Mar 2001 to present	Artwork Store, basement of Parliament House

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Retention of original fittings

Question: E

E2. Since 1995, how many stock takes of items in the off-sites storage facilities been undertaken?

Answer

1 DPS undertakes an annual stocktake program in accordance with internal procedures. The stocktake is undertaken on assets recorded in the DPS asset register, as well as inventory stocktakes for The Parliament Shop. Items that do not meet the DPS asset threshold for reporting on the asset register are not included in the annual stocktake program.

2 Many of the items held at off-site storage facilities have not been categorised as assets on the asset register.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Retention of original fittings

Question: E

E3. Could you provide details of the sale of any assets (other than IT equipment) which have previously been stored off-site, including any building spares retained from 1988 eg door hinges, ceiling tiles, flooring timber?

Answer

1 The examples referred to in the question are not recorded as assets on the DPS asset register and no financial records have been found indicating that these types of items have been sold.

2 A search of available files has indicated a number of assets relating to kitchen equipment and Members' Guests Dining Room furniture and some leather lounges (all of which appear to have been stored at Queanbeyan) were disposed of in 1993.

3 The list of kitchen equipment is difficult to ascertain; but it included items such as juicing machines, steamers, Hobart slicers, stainless steel trolleys, mobile soak sinks, cooking ranges, mobile tables etc.

4 Furniture from the Members' Guests Dining Room included tables and chairs. Attached is a copy of the disposal notice that has been located. No information is available on the proceeds received from the sale.

5 Based on available records and corporate knowledge, the following table provides details of the sale of assets (excluding IT equipment) that were previously stored off-site at Queanbeyan. This information does not include items that were not recorded on the DPS asset register. Typically, disposal records do not include details of item location prior to disposal.

Year	Description	Proceeds (ex-GST)
2007-08	GRIDDLE WALDORF MHPL33/G	\$0.91
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$37.27
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$42.73
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$34.55
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$67.27
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$37.27
2007-08	MOBILE BAR WAITER STATION	\$45.45
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$33.64
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$49.09
2007-08	MOBILE BAR WAITER STATION	\$15.45
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$46.36
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$37.27
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$47.27
2007-08	WAITER STATION MOBILE	\$70.00
2007-08	BARBEQUE LUKE	\$91.82
2007-08	CABINET SECURITY B CLASS CHUBB SAFE	\$272.73
2007-08	SAFE CHUBB BLUE	\$272.73
2007-08	TABLE DINING TYPE D	\$7.27
2007-08	LOUNGE 2 SEAT	\$65.45
2007-08	LOUNGE 2 SEAT	\$9.09

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Retention of original fittings

Question: E

E4. Have any assets previously sold been repurchased or attempts been made to repurchase them?

Answer

Stockpot

1 In January 2006, five stockpots from Parliament House kitchens were decommissioned and authorised for disposal. However, one of these stockpots needed to be retained as evidence in a liability claim (relating to an incident in August 2004). This stockpot was disposed of (due to an ID verification error) with four other stockpots (for a total sale price of \$409).

2 Once this error was discovered, the stockpot bowl was discovered at a local scrap metal merchant and repurchased (for \$90); however, some of the operating components had already been destroyed.

Cargo trailers

3 In July 2007, 14 Cargo trailers were purchased to replace existing trailers being used in the Loading Dock. The existing 14 trailers were traded in as part of this new purchase and a trade-in value of \$100 (ex-GST) was received for each trailer.

4 In January 2008, the Projects Branch required four trailers for mobile storage for contractors working in the building. Four of the previously traded-in trailers were repurchased at a cost of \$350 each (ex-GST). These trailers had been refurbished and repainted.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Retention of original fittings

Question: E

E5.How does DPS assess the level of building spares to be retained for future use during the buildings anticipated 200 year life span?

Answer

1 The requirement for building spares is generally determined based upon the failure rate of items or when components have long lead times for delivery. For example, door hinges, lock hardware, push plates etc are replenished when stocks have reached a certain minimum level. Minimum stock levels are different for each component and are monitored by the respective trade group. It is the responsibility for the trade group to ensure there are sufficient stock levels to cover emergencies and routine maintenance activities.

2 For components that are manufactured and not off-the-shelf items, the level of spares will vary. In the majority of cases it will depend upon what is an economical manufacture run, eg brass hinges are purchased in 1,000 lots.

3 For items of plant and equipment, a quantity of critical spares (again, depending on factors such as failure rates and long lead times) are held on site, such as fan belts, light fittings, various electrical components, electric motors and pumps.

4 As manufacturers vary their product lines, and the majority of plant and equipment is superseded with new more efficient models, it is not sensible to maintain large holdings of particular items. In addition, many items deteriorate to a point of not being usable. For example, a number of original troffer light fixtures held in storage as spares have been disposed of, as they had deteriorated (eg rust damage) and were no longer suitable for use.

5 Although the building is designed with a 200-year life, there will be components over the life of the building that will have to be modified or replaced with alternative units due to changes in legislation and Australian Standards. An example of this is the phasing out of incandescent globes.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Retention of original fittings

Question: E

E6. How does DPS assess the 'heritage' value of items such as building spares when it appears that they do not fall within the definition of 'cultural and heritage items' in the Finance Ministers Orders (see DPS submission, p. 9) but are integral to the maintenance of the building as close as possible to its original condition? Are these items to be included in the database of assets that will be developed as a result of the Tonkin review?

Answer

1 In 2011, following the Review of asset disposal policies and practices, DPS identified a need to improve the identification of assets—in particular moveable and semi moveable assets—that did not already form part of the Parliament House Art Collection but are considered to have cultural heritage value.

2 A preliminary survey to identify these moveable and semi-moveable items was undertaken from June to August 2011—the results of this survey formed the basis of a new heritage database. Items have been added to this heritage database as recently as March 2012.

3 The initiative to improve the heritage management of moveable heritage has three main stages:

Stage 1—the identification of items with potential heritage value and the cataloguing/recording of these items in a heritage asset database;

Stage 2—the undertaking of individual detailed heritage assessments that include recommendations for appropriate treatment and maintenance/preservation activity; development of a heritage asset tracking system; and

Stage 3—the continuous monitoring and identification of new items and ongoing long-term management.

4 As part of Stage 1, the exercise to identify and record items of moveable heritage significance used the *Significance Methodology*¹ as the basis for assessment. The following provides a summary of the methodology.

(a) There are four primary criteria and four comparative criteria for assessing significance. Note that one or more criteria may apply and be interrelated. It is not necessary to find evidence of all criteria to justify significance. An item or collection may be highly significant even if it is relevant to one primary criterion only. The comparative criteria interact with the primary criteria to modify or clarify the degree of significance.

(b) **Primary criteria.** Four primary criteria are used for assessing significance:

¹ Significance Methodology is an extract from
<http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/publications/significance2-0/>

- (i) historic significance;
 - (ii) artistic or aesthetic significance;
 - (iii) scientific or research significance (research potential); and
 - (iv) social or spiritual significance (demonstrated contemporary attachment between the item or collection and a group or community).
- (c) **Comparative criteria.** Four comparative criteria, listed below, are used to evaluate the **degree** of significance. They interact with the primary criteria and may increase or decrease significance.
- (i) Provenance (who created, made, owned or used the item or collection?).
 - (ii) Rarity or representativeness.
 - (iii) Condition or completeness.
 - (iv) Interpretive capacity (does it help to interpret aspects of its place or context).
 - (v) Identified items were then evaluated using the below categories to give the item an indicative grading.
- (d) *Highly significant* (HS)—includes items which clearly satisfy a number of the *Significance methodology* criteria, and also appear very likely to satisfy the requirements for classification as heritage and cultural assets.
- (e) *Significant* (S)—includes items that satisfy some significance criteria and would benefit from more rigorous control and management. These items are likely to be of slightly lesser intrinsic/financial value, but are important for their information content, or in assisting to understand, interpret and preserve the history of the building.
- (f) *Items of interest* (IoI)—includes items that may be significant, but require more detailed assessment or investigation. This category particularly applies to group listings, where it is possible that not all items within a group will be of equal importance (some may be duplicates), or items where we do not have appropriate expertise to make a judgement about significance (eg some technology items).
- (g) *Flagging for future attention* (FF)—includes items that may not have any great heritage significance now, but will probably accrue value with the passage of time, eg 'spares' of original building fabric/materials/fittings, where DPS currently holds many multiples of an item, but in future there may be only a few original examples surviving.

5 In order to finalise Stage 1, a number of the tasks have been completed, including the following.

- (a) The preliminary identification and collation of a list of items or groups of items, eg groups of photographs, or architectural drawings—that have been flagged as having potential heritage value.
- (b) Agreeing the following definition for cultural heritage items and assets in Parliament House to assist in the identification of items.

The cultural heritage items for Parliament House comprise ...

- *items which are a symbol of the functions of Parliament House as a ceremonial place of national importance;*
 - *items which have a role in telling the story of the development and operation of Parliament House as a workplace for the Australian Parliament;*
 - *artworks and documents within the Parliament House Art Collection;*
 - *items which have been specifically designed for Parliament House; and*
 - *items which have permanent Parliament House markings.*
- (c) This definition recognises that cultural heritage items have the capacity or potential to demonstrate, symbolise, or contribute to our understanding of the history of Parliament, and the story of Parliament House.
- (d) A heritage item asset class has been developed in DPS's asset management database, SAP. SAP will be used as the database to record and monitor cultural heritage items not already recorded within other databases (Art Services Collection, Furniture database and Library database).

6 Building spares that have been identified as meeting the criteria set out in the *Significance Methodology* and Parliament House's definition for cultural heritage items have been include in the database of heritage assets. Examples of these are:

- (a) lighting fittings specifically designed and manufactured for APH;
- (b) monumental door hardware (spares);
- (c) terracotta roof tiles (Senate and House of Representatives Chamber roofs);
- (d) glass ashtrays for bronze entry stands;
- (e) Chamber fabric—specifically design and manufactured for the spaces;
- (f) hand woven fabrics both in situ and on rolls;
- (g) glass Lift Indicators

7 As items and objects including original building spares continue to be identified or become rare, they will be added into the SAP database as heritage assets. Once classed as a Parliament House heritage assets, these items will then attract the protection and management appropriate for heritage items including (if appropriate) disposal in accordance with guidelines for disposal of heritage items.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Retention of original fittings

Question: E

E7. What processes are in place to assess new building parts which must be purchased when no original spares are available, eg does DPS maintain a list of original suppliers and seek to have the items remade to the original specifications?

Answer

1 DPS's Building Information (**BI**) section is the repository for the original 'Design', 'For Construction' and 'As Constructed' technical information, such as drawings, specifications, Operation and Maintenance Manuals and samples, etc as handed over by the Parliament House Construction Authority (**PHCA**).

2 Construction works since the opening of Parliament House are documented and the resulting technical information is incorporated within the collection maintained by BI.

3 DPS has a large number of the original suppliers contact details. This information is available from various information sources such as Equipment Manuals, and the original PHCA Contract Specifications and drawings. Part of this information also includes details on the original contractor, suppliers and manufacturers.

4 When new building parts or components are required to be purchased due to no original spares being available, the original details are obtained from BI.

5 When the information cannot be found on a particular component, BI has on occasion re-documented components in the form of drawings and short specifications. These drawings and specifications are then used to remanufacture the item to match as close as possible to the original.

6 Whenever possible, the item is purchased from the original manufacturer or supplier. If they are no longer in business or the item is no longer available, an approach to market is conducted for alternative suppliers.

7 For superseded off-the-shelf items, alternative quality products are identified and an appropriate replacement item is selected and agreed by the relevant maintenance staff and the Heritage and Design Integrity Officer. For example, we are currently investigating a suitable door closer for Fire Doors within the building, as the original door closers are no longer manufactured.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Retention of original fittings

Question: E

E8. In the answer to QoN 682, it is indicated that AllBids has been used to dispose of assets. Could you provide a list of all assets sold through AllBids.

Answer

1 ALLBIDS.COM.AU PTY LTD (**Allbids**) has been used to dispose of assets since 2008–09. Some 2,155 assets have been sold through Allbids since that time. A summary of the type of assets sold is provided in the table below.

Allbids Asset Sale Summary

Asset Grouping	Asset Type	Number of Assets —Financial Year				Total No. of Assets Sold
		2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	
Electronic Media Monitoring	Audio Recorder Cassette			5		5
	Audio/Visual Mixer			1		1
	Cassette Player			1		1
	CD Duplicator			1		1
	Dubbing Machine		1			1
	DVD			1		1
IT Equipment	Generator				1	1
	Barcode Reader	4				4
	Keyboard & Monitor			1		1
	Laptop	3	62	29	4	98
	Monitor	48	96	458	40	642
	PC	165	439	324	145	1073
	Printer	23	25	14	16	78
	Scanner	2	1			3
	Sender			1		1
	Server		13	59	9	81
	Storage Tape or Disk		4	2		6
	Tape Drive			2		2
	UPS			5		5
Office Machines and Furniture	Fax	2	4	3	1	10
	Workstations Fitout		19			19
	Mixer		5			5
	PDA		4	5	2	11
	Photocopier		18	10	1	29
	Stentura Machine		5			5
	Television			3	7	10
	Trolley		1			1
	Vacuum Sweeper			1		1
Plant & Equipment	VCR		1	2		3
	Billiard Table			2		2
	Camera	1			1	2
	Camera Lens				4	4
	Cooking Equipment		13	8	7	28
	Diamond Drill			1		1
	Edge Bander	1				1
	Electric Pallet			1		1
	Mower			1		1
	Pool Cleaner			1		1
	Projector		1	7		8
	Refrigerator				2	2
	Salamander			1		1
	Splicer				1	1
Security Equip.	Switcher				1	1
	Whiteboard		1			1
	CCTV			1		1
	Total	249	713	951	242	2155

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Retention of original fittings

Question: E

E9. Since 2000, has DPS used any auction houses other than AllBids to sell assets? Is so, please provide the details and a list of all assets (other than IT equipment) sold.

Answer

1 DPS has reviewed detailed sales and disposal records going back to 2004–05. Two auction houses were used between 2004–05 and 2008–09 to dispose of assets (excluding IT equipment): Dominion/DOLA and Pickles.

2 Dominion/DOLA is the same organisation that is now known as AllBids—the change of name occurring during 2008–09. In this response, DPS is providing information separately on the asset sales through Dominion/DOLA—as assets being disposed of by an auction house other than AllBids—because, prior to 2008–09, the financial records reflect a name other than Allbids.

3 A total of 260 assets have been disposed with total net proceeds of by sale of \$20,426.46 being received by DPS. **Table A** below shows the number of assets sold with each respective auction house.

4 **Table B** shows the type of assets disposed.

5 Comprehensive disposal records prior to 2004–05—for the former three parliamentary departments: Joint House Department (**JHD**), the Department of the Parliamentary Reporting Staff (**DPRS**) and the Department of the Parliamentary Library (**DPL**)—are not available, due to the financial records' normal retention period of seven years.

6 When DPS was established in 2004, it adopted the SAP financial and maintenance system used by JHD. In preparation for this response, DPS reviewed the JHD electronic asset records from 1999–2000 to 2003–04 and identified 68 assets (excluding IT equipment) that were disposed through auction houses during this period, with net proceeds of sale of \$7,826.14 being received. It was not possible to identify which auction houses were used. **Table C** shows the type of assets disposed. Detailed system records for DPL and DPRS are not readily available.

Table A—Assets sold by Dominion/DOLA and Pickles

Year	Dominion/DOLA		Pickles	
	Number of Assets	Net Proceeds \$	Number of Assets	Net Proceeds \$
2004-05	99	989.75	0	0.00
2005-06	0	0.00	34	4,380.99
2006-07	0	0.00	73	1,777.55
2007-08	31	3,004.20	7	583.59
2008-09	16	9,690.38	0	0
Total	146	13,684.33	114	6,742.13

Table B—Dominion/DOLA and Pickles Assets Sale Summary

Asset Grouping	Asset Type	Number of Assets (excluding IT equipment)—Financial Year					Total Number of Assets Disposed
		2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	
Broadcast	Speakers				1		1
Electronic Media Monitoring	Analyser			1			1
	Audio Base Station					1	1
	Audio Cartridge			1			1
	Audio Measurement Set			1			1
	Audio Mixer			1			1
	Audio Recorder					1	1
	Cassette Player		6	6			12
	CD Player			1			1
	Character Gen		1				1
	Dat Recorder			3			3
	DVD Recorder			1			1
	Noise Meter			1			1
	Oscilloscope		1				1
	Projector		2		3	2	7
	Sound Meter					1	1
	VCR			25	1		26
Office Machines and Furniture	Cabinet - Metal				2		2
	Coin Counter			1			1
	Dining Table			4	1		5
	Fax	2	8	6		3	19
	Franking Machine			1			1
	Lounge				1		1
	Microfiche		1	1			2
	Mobile Bar Waiter Stn				13		13
	Mobile Buffet				2		2
	Mobile Flame Liquid Commdr		2				2
	Mobile Phone	82					82
	PDA	3	2	5	3	1	14
	Radio		1			2	3
	Receiver UHF			1			1
	Scales Postage			1			1
	Storage Unit				1		1
	Tape Recorder			1			1
	Television	1	6	5	1		13
	Vacuum Cleaner				1		1
Plant & Equipment	Camera			2	1		3
	Cooking Equipment				2		2
	Cutter Mitre			1			1
	Cutter/Grinder				1		1
	Digital Camera		1				1
	Dock Leveler					1	1
	Fitness Equipment		1				1
	Forklift		1				1
	Generator			1			1
	Hoist			1			1
	Mixer		1				1
	Platform Jack					1	1
	Pressure Cleaner				1		1
	Refrigerator				1	1	2
	Safe				2		2
	Saw			1			1
Security Equipment	CCTV					2	2
	Metal Detector	11					11
	Grand Total	99	34	73	38	16	260

Table C—JHD Asset Sales through Auction Houses 1999-2000 to 2003-04

Asset Grouping	Asset Type	Number of Assets (excl. IT equipment)—Financial Year					
		1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	Total No. of Assets Disposed
Office Machines and Furniture	Cabinet				1		1
	Copier	1	1		1		3
	Fax	1			2		3
	Microfiche		2		4		6
	Projector					1	1
	Radio		18			1	19
	Waiter Station		8				8
Plant & Equipment	Air Cond	5	1				6
	Electronic Device	2		5	3		10
	Garden Equipment	1	1				2
	Kitchen Equipment		2				2
	Motorcycle			1			1
	Plant & Equipment		1	1	1		3
	Pump	1					1
	Steam Cleaner		1				1
	Welder			1			1
	Grand Total	11	35	8	12	2	68

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Building maintenance

Question: F

F1. Could you provide a brief explanation of the basis of the Building Condition Index (BCI); Landscape Condition Index (LCI); a Design Integrity Index (DII) and Engineering Systems Index (ESI).

Answer

1 **Building Condition Index (BCI)** is a measure of the current condition of the building fabric of Parliament House, expressed as a percentage of the original condition (target 90%).

2 **Landscape Condition Index (LCI)** is a measure of the current condition of the landscape surrounding Parliament House, expressed as a percentage of the total possible condition (target 90%).

3 **Design Integrity Index (DII)** is a measure of the current condition of Parliament House and the precincts expressed as a percentage of the original built form. In particular it measures the extent to which change within Parliament House and the precincts impacts upon the original design intent.

4 **Engineering Systems Condition Index (ESCI)** is a measure of the current operation and condition of the engineering systems in Parliament House against the expected decline of those systems through their life cycles (target 90%).

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Building maintenance

Question: F

F2. How were these indices developed, in particular were outside consultants used in assessing the validity of the indices?

Answer

1 The Building Condition Index (**BCI**) was developed in 1993 by the Joint House Department using the expertise of a consulting facilities management organisation, Advance FM, and in-house maintenance staff. At this time, the Engineering Services Condition index (**ESCI**) was part of the **BCI**.

2 In 2000, the building fabric and engineering components were separated. The **ESCI** was created to give greater focus on the condition of the engineering systems. Again, this was developed using the expertise of Advance FM and in-house maintenance staff.

3 The Landscape Condition Index (**LCI**) was developed in 2000 primarily by in-house Landscape Services staff, and was based on the concept and methodology of the **BCI**. Advance FM provided assistance in the development of the **LCI** and provided training to staff in the scoring methodology.

4 The current Design Integrity Index (**DII**) was commissioned by the Joint House Department and developed by consultants, Advance FM Pty Ltd in 2001. Advance FM, using the *Design Integrity and Management of Change Guidelines* (1990/rev1995) as a reference document, divided the building and surrounds into eight separate zones based on the significance of the space. It then established a scoring system, weighted by importance, for each applicable design element (up to 33 elements), for each space.

5 Reference documents that are used to inform the way the design integrity of Parliament House is managed include the Architects Design Intent for Parliament House, Canberra 2004 (*The Central Reference Document*), the original Joint House Standing Committee on the New Parliament House briefs, and Interim Architectural design reports.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Building maintenance

Question: F

F3.How are the targets set and by whom?

Answer

1 Advance FM and in-house maintenance staff originally set the targets as part of the development of the **BCI**, **ESCI**, **LCI** and **DII**.

2 The benchmark of 90% of original condition was considered at the time as appropriate for nationally significant facilities. Since the development of these indices, a number of other prominent Australian facilities (such as the Sydney Opera House and the Victorian Arts Centre) have adopted this methodology.

3 The targets are intended to measure the performance of building condition over time.

4 The targets now form part of the key performance indicators set as part of the DPS Portfolio Budget Statements, which are provided to the Parliament annually.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Building maintenance

Question: F

F4.How are the components of the indices measured and who takes the measurements?

Answer

Building Condition Index (BCI)

1 The **BCI** score is a result of the ongoing Building Condition Monitoring program, which focuses on the building finishes and fixtures.

2 Parliament House is divided into eight zones:

- Chambers
- Public/North Zone
- Ministerial/South Zone
- Senate
- House of Representatives
- Back of House (departmental offices, kitchens, basement areas etc)
- Plant rooms
- External

3 DPS's maintenance management system (**SAP**) produces a work order to inspect all of the building over a 12-month period—with the exception of high-profile areas such as the seven special suites², public areas, entrances etc, which are programmed six monthly. There are approximately 770 locations.

4 The DPS Building Fabric Long Term Planner conducts the inspections using the Building Condition Monitoring inspection spreadsheet to rate each individual element of a particular location. The spreadsheet was developed as part of the BCI methodology.

5 The overall score for a location is generated by the spreadsheet and the score entered into SAP.

6 The **BCI** score is drawn from the information entered into SAP.

Landscape Condition Index (LCI)

7 The **LCI** score is a result of inspections/assessment of the landscape conducted by in-house gardening staff each October.

8 The Parliament House landscape is divided into eight areas:

- Native peripheral gardens
- Senate Courtyards
- House of Representatives Courtyards

² President of the Senate's Suite; Speaker of the House of Representatives' Suite; Prime Minister's Suite; Cabinet Suite; Leader of the Opposition's Suite; Senate Chamber and House of Representatives Chamber.

- Ministerial
- Eastern Formal Gardens
- Western Formal Gardens
- Ramps
- Front Area.

9 The team that assesses the landscape is comprised of:

- Assistant Director, Landscape Services (DPS)
- Landscape Manager and
- the three Gardeners in Charge (leading hands).

10 The team walk the eight areas taking individual notes on the condition of the various elements, eg hard surfaces, turf etc.

11 On completion of the walk around, the team discusses their individual rating and agree an overall rating.

12 The Assistant Director enters the agreed score of each area into a spreadsheet that was developed as part of the LCI methodology to produce the yearly LCI score.

Design Integrity Index (DII)

13 The procedure to calculate the annual **DII** is to:

- inspect, review and collect data for all changes made at APH over a financial year;
- analyse the data and provide a score for each change, measuring the extent to which key design integrity principles have been integrated into the new work;
- tabulate the individual area scores and tally all scores to achieve a global score that is defined as the **DII**; and
- make observations regarding trends or anomalies. These observations are used to assist with future decision-making regarding physical change at APH.

14 Calculating the value of the annual **DII** is a substantial task. From 2000–01 to 2004–05, the annual **DII** was calculated by Advance FM.

15 Since 2005, the measurements have been taken by the **DII** team. The team is established each year and includes the DPS Heritage and Design Integrity Officer (lead officer), two additional DPS members (past participants have included Director Art Services, Director Building and Security Projects, Building Fabric Planner) and an independent expert. For the last two years, Mr Gowrie Waterhouse, Convener—Interdisciplinary Studies, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra—has been engaged to provide an independent measure of the integration of all new works.

16 A rigorous program of inspections is established, followed by the physical inspection by the **DII** team of all areas. In each space, in each zone, the components of language, symbolism, design order, change and overall impression are examined and given a score from one to five by each team member. Individual scores are then used to determine a team score. This score is then expressed as a percentage of the total possible score.

17 Annual inspections are planned to ensure that all spaces where projects work has been undertaken are physically inspected however, given the enormity of the task, areas such as Senators and Members Suites, DPS staff offices, courtyards and basement spaces are inspected on a randomly selected sample.

18 Every five years, a full building assessment is conducted, which necessitates access to, and scoring of, all areas. The next full assessment of all eight **DII** zones is due to take place in 2013–14.

Engineering Systems Condition Index (ESCI)

19 **ESCI** score is a result of data and reports collected over the course of the year.

20 The engineering systems within the building have been broken down into 30 elements, such as Boilers, Cooling Tower, Water Features and Lights.

21 Each element over the course of the year has a number of reports and/or readings that are conducted. The majority of these reports and readings are by external contractors or industry specialist. Some examples are:

- (a) annual air quality tests;
- (b) weekly inspection and dip slide testing for bacteria count in Air Handling Units;
- (c) monthly fire system testing reports;
- (d) monthly microbiological laboratory testing on water quality for pool and spa.

22 In June each year, all of the required reports and data are collated by DPS Long Term Planners. This information is then referred to an external consulting engineer to review the data and provide a report and score for each system element. The score of each system element is entered into a spreadsheet that was developed as part of the **ESCI** methodology to produce the yearly **ESCI** score.

Performance Information Collection Procedures

23 The attached DPS Performance Information Collection Procedures provides further details on the process of how and who measures the **BCI**, **ESCI** and **LCI**.

- (a) DPS Performance Information Collection Procedure: Building condition Index (BCI) (**Attachment X**);
- (b) DPS Performance Information Collection Procedure: Engineering Systems Index (ESCI) (**Attachment Y**);
- (c) DPS Performance Information Collection Procedure: Landscape Condition Index (LCI) (**Attachment Z**).

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Building maintenance

Question: F

F5. When was the last time that the basis of the indices was reviewed?

Answer

1 The basis of the **BCI**, **ESCI** and **LCI** have been reviewed and altered over the years. Please refer to QoN F6 for details.

2 Prior to handing over the annual calculation to DPS, Advance FM undertook the most recent review of the **DII** in 2004–05, for which there were four main objectives:

- (a) to review the new structure of the **DII**;
- (b) to audit the **DII** data;
- (c) to analyse the data; and
- (d) to make observations.

Question on Notice: Senate F&PA Committee

Question date: 26 March 2012

Response due: 26 April 2012

Topic: Building maintenance

Question: F

F6. Since 2000, have any reviews of the building condition been undertaken by external experts? If so, when and what was the outcome?

Answer

Building Condition Index (BCI)

1 The **BCI** was reviewed in 2005 by Advance FM with four objectives:

- (a) Conduct 100% audit of the 2004–05 in-house **BCI**.
- (b) Report on the \$ Maintenance per m².
- (c) Analyse the data.
- (d) Make observations.

2 The 100% audit of the **BCI** and analysis of the data confirmed a **BCI** score of 89% for 2004–05. There were no recommended changes to the methodology.

3 Maintenance costs per m² for 2004–05 were below 1% of Capital Replacement Value (**CRV**), which is a benchmark used by many building management organisations (for example, Queensland State Government). With a CRV of \$1.8 billion, the 1% benchmark equates to \$18 million pa or \$72.00 per m². The maintenance costs for 2004–05 were \$47.76 per m².

4 The report also noted the level of maintenance funding for 2004–05 would not sustain a **BCI** of 90% over time and was not keeping pace with the CPI.

5 There were six observations identifying areas within the building where the building condition was falling. Some of these concerns were addressed. The remainder of the concerns are being monitored, as they have no immediate impact, but may in the longer term.

6 In 2010, ARUP was engaged to review maintenance services activity. ARUP noted that maintenance management and staff cared deeply about the custodianship of Australian Parliament House and were fearful that cost-cutting/outsourcing may impair the long-term sustainability of the asset, leading to higher costs in future years.

Engineering Services Condition Index (ESCI)

7 The **ESCI** was reviewed in 2005 and again in 2009 by Advance FM.

8 In 2005, Advance FM engaged Rusden Consulting to assist with the **ESCI** review and provide technical engineering advice. The review had the following four objectives.

- (a) Review the **ESCI** structure.
- (b) Audit the data collected by DPS.
- (c) Analyse the data.
- (d) Make observations.

9 The review of the structure confirmed recent changes DPS had made strengthened the **ESCI** structure and was totally consistent with the 100-year asset replacement plan and the SAP Plant Maintenance module.

10 The audit of data and analysis of the data confirmed an **ESCI** score of 90% for 2004–05. There were no recommended changes to the methodology. The report stated they found the engineering systems to be in good to very good operational order and maintained at appropriately high standards

11 There were three observations. The first endorsed the minor changes to the **ESCI** structure; the second noted that plant rooms were being used as store rooms; and the third highlighted that the ageing engineering systems will require greater levels of maintenance to continue performing at high levels.

12 The **ESCI** review in 2009 was conducted by Advance FM with the following five objectives.

- (a) Review the current **ESCI** methodology.
- (b) Identify the needs of potential **ESCI** users.
- (c) Review the methodologies used by other organisations.
- (d) Review changes proposed by the DPS Electrical Engineer.
- (e) Make observations and recommendations.

13 The review noted the following findings.

- (a) The original **ESCI** methodology was changed since the last review (2005) to save the cost of doing plant inspections.
- (b) Maintenance trade staff support the **ESCI** concept, but do not agree with the current **ESCI** methodology.
- (c) Maintenance trade staff would like to see the **ESCI** return to being a working tool similar to the **BCI** (capable of identifying current condition and generating action lists).
- (d) Maintenance trade staff would like the **ESCI** integrated into SAP and the asset renewal plans.
- (e) There are around 1,000 Australasian facilities using the original Parliament House **ESCI** methodology. It is vital that Parliament House do not move too far from the original **ESCI** methodology for benchmarking purposes.
- (f) Whilst Maintenance Services are willing to take control of the **ESCI**, they will need a person dedicated to managing and analysing the **ESCI** data.
- (g) The changes suggested by the Electrical Engineer should be implemented over a 5 year period.

14 There were also nine recommendations which, if adopted, would have resulted in the original **ESCI** being restored and would have had an implication on maintenance resources.

15 None of the recommendations have been implemented to date. No documentary evidence can be found to confirm why the recommended changes were not implemented.

Landscape Condition Index (LCI)

16 The **LCI** was reviewed in 2001 and again in 2005 by Advance FM.

17 The **LCI** review in 2001 had the follow four objectives.

- (a) Measure the **LCI**.
- (b) Review the proposed **LCI** structure.
- (c) Audit and analyse the data.
- (d) Make observations.

18 The reported noted the following.

- (a) The **LCI** score was 90%.
- (b) The **LCI** is soundly based upon the **BCI** and did not recommend any changes to the methodology or structure.
- (c) Advance FM audited the data and found it to be accurate.

19 There were seven observations five of which were adopted and implemented. Two observations were not agreed by Landscape Services.

20 The **LCI** review in 2005 had the following four objectives.

- (a) Audit the **LCI**.
- (b) Report on the cost per m².
- (c) Analyse the data.
- (d) Make observations.

21 The audit and data analysis of the **LCI** confirmed a score of 85% and noted the impact the drought has had on the landscape.

22 The overall landscape cost for 2004–05 was \$7.95 per m².

23 There were three recommendations from the report, all of which were accepted and have been implemented.

Design Integrity Index (DII)

24 From 2000–01 to 2004–05, the DII was calculated annually by Advance FM. In 2005, this task was undertaken internally, as described in response to QoN F4. Below are the DII results in the years assessed by Advance FM.

2000–01	95%
2001–02	92%
2002–03	90%
2003–04	90%
2004–05	91%