



Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works

SIXTY-THIRD GENERAL REPORT

THE PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA
2000

The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia

Sixty-third General Report

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works

9 March 2000
Canberra

© Commonwealth of Australia 2000

ISBN 0 642 43000 4



Contents

THIRTY-THIRD COMMITTEE	1
Membership	1
Meetings	1
REFERENCES AND REPORTS	2
References re-referred	2
New references	2
Unreported references	3
OPERATIONS DURING 1999	4
Private meetings and briefings	4
Inspections	4
Length of inquiries	5
NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AUSTRALIA	6
First progress report	6
Second progress report	7
Changes to design	7
Expenditure and audit	7
Payment of subcontractors	8
Standards of finish	8
OVERSEAS WORKS	9
Statutory basis for inquiry	9
Project examined	9

EXPO pavilion, Hannover	10
Administration of property portfolio	10
Overseas travel by DoFA and former Overseas Property Group officials	11
MEDIUM WORKS.....	11
Need for notification.....	11
Department of Defence	11
MATTERS RAISED IN PREVIOUS GENERAL REPORT	12
Department of Transport and Regional Development.....	12
Cameron Offices.....	13
Redevelopment of Immigration Detention Centre, Villawood, NSW	15
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE CONFERENCE	16
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ACT	17
Statutory limit	17
Requests for exemption	17
Exemption of authorities by Regulation	17
Campbell Park Offices	19
SECRETARIAT	20
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	20
APPENDICES	
Appendix A—Meetings of the Committee 1999	A-1
Appendix B—Details of the Committee's reports presented during 1999	B-1
Appendix C—Acton Peninsula Alliance, External Envelope Design Considerations.....	C-1



1. Pursuant to section 16 of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works is required to report to the Parliament on its proceedings during the previous 12 months.

THIRTY-THIRD COMMITTEE

Membership

2. Members of the Thirty-third Committee were appointed by the House of Representatives and the Senate on 8 December 1998. They are:
 - Hon Judi Moylan MP—Chair;
 - Hon Janice Crosio MBE, MP—Vice-Chair;
 - Senator Paul Calvert;
 - Senator Alan Ferguson;
 - Mr John Forrest MP;
 - Mr Colin Hollis MP;
 - Mr Peter Lindsay MP;
 - Senator Shayne Murphy; and
 - Mr Bernie Ripoll MP.

Meetings

3. The Committee met on 50 occasions during the year to conduct public hearings and inspections and private meetings. Meetings were held at the following locations:
 - Canberra—26;
 - Sydney—6;
 - Darwin—6;

- Melbourne—4;
- Brisbane—3;
- Townsville—3;
- Lucas Heights—1; and
- Queenscliff—1.

4. Further details of the Committee's meetings are at Appendix A.

REFERENCES AND REPORTS

References re-referred

5. The Committee received 20 references during 1999. Of these, three were carried over from the previous Parliament. The references were:
- CSIRO Queensland Centre for Advanced Technologies Stage 2 development at Pinjarra Hills, Queensland;
 - CSIRO National Centre for Petroleum and Mineral Resources Research, Bentley, WA; and
 - Lavarack Barracks Redevelopment Stage 2, Townsville.
6. For these references, inspections were undertaken and evidence was collected by the previous Committee. The proposals were re-referred to the present Committee on 8 December 1998. The Committee exercised its discretion under section 24 of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969* to consider the evidence taken by the former Committee to be evidence taken by the present Committee and to prepare reports for the proposals on that basis. The reports, dated 11 February 1999, were tabled in both Houses on 17 February.

New references

7. The Committee received 17 new references during the year and reported on ten of them. They were:
- Australian Embassy, Berlin—Refurbishment of heritage buildings as a chancery and apartments;
 - Replacement nuclear research reactor, Lucas Heights, NSW;
 - RAAF Base Townsville Redevelopment, Stage 1, Townsville;
 - Redevelopment of Darwin Naval Base Project;
 - CSIRO Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, NSW—Joint Research Complex for CSIRO Molecular Science and Food Science Australia;

- CSIRO Division of Building Construction and Engineering Development Works at Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, NSW;
- CSIRO Clayton (Eastern Precinct) Development Works, Vic;
- Refurbishment of 4 Treasury Place, Melbourne;
- Staff Colleges Collocation Project, Weston Creek, ACT; and
- ANZAC Hall Extension, Australian War Memorial, Canberra.

Unreported references

8. At the end of the report period, the following seven references remained to be reported upon:
 - CSIRO / University of Queensland Joint Building Project, St Lucia, Queensland (referred 2 September);
 - Development of 90 apartments in Darwin (referred 2 September 1999);
 - Housing Development at Parap Grove, Darwin (referred 23 September 1999);
 - HMAS *Albatross* Stage 2 Redevelopment, Nowra, NSW (referred 11 October 1999);
 - Navy Ammunitioning Facility, Twofold Bay, NSW (referred 11 October 1999);
 - Proposed ABC Sydney Accommodation Project, Ultimo, NSW (referred 14 October 1999); and
 - Defence Science and Technology Organisation Rationalisation Project, Melbourne (referred 8 December 1999).
9. It should be noted that inspections and public hearings into three of the seven references had been held before the end of the year. Evidence collected at public hearings into the three references was unusually complex. This prompted the Committee to seek further information before commencing report preparation. The remaining four references were received late in the Parliamentary sittings. The Committee's inquiries into the majority were advertised and it was planned to conduct inspections and public hearings early in 2000.

OPERATIONS DURING 1999

10. The Committee's operations during 1999 comprised:

- 18 private meetings;
- 18 days of public hearings; and
- 14 inspections.

Private meetings and briefings

11. The Committee's private meetings are usually held in Canberra during Parliamentary sitting weeks. The meetings are convened to consider correspondence, plan the program of inspections and public hearings and consider draft reports. They also provide a forum in which Government officials provide briefings on matters raised in correspondence, follow-up from public hearings or on matters in which the Committee has an interest.

Inspections

12. Inspections during the year covered a range of facilities and properties in most States and Territories of the Commonwealth. Inspections are regarded by Committee members as essential to inquiries. They are usually preceded by an orientation briefing at which, using maps, aerial photographs and drawings, officials from sponsoring departments or agencies present a geographical and contextual overview of projects. Information provided at orientation briefings does not constitute formal evidence, although it often prompts Committee questioning at public hearings.
13. Inspections conducted varied in length during the year. In May, as an important part of its inquiry into the proposed construction of a replacement nuclear research reactor at Lucas Heights, Sydney, the Committee spent the best part of an entire morning inspecting facilities at Lucas Heights, including the High Flux Australian Reactor (HIFAR). In June, the Committee undertook an extensive inspection of RAAF Base Townsville as part of the inquiry into the proposed RAAF Base Townsville Redevelopment, Stage 1. The inspection included an examination of facilities completed for No 5 Aviation Regiment at the RAAF Base (see Committee's Fourth Report of 1996, Parliamentary Paper 391 / 1996). Similarly, in connection with two CSIRO proposals at North Ryde, the Committee undertook lengthy inspections of existing facilities and sites proposed for the construction of two new laboratory complexes. The Committee was able to observe scientific work being undertaken in the existing laboratories and to have informal discussions with leading CSIRO scientists.

14. During the inspection of No. 4 Treasury Place, Melbourne, the Committee's inspections revealed the relatively shallow watertable on the site and the existence of a number of heritage trees adjacent to the building. The Committee was able to obtain an undertaking from the Minister for Finance and Administration that these trees would not be removed as part of the refurbishment of the building. The existence of the shallow watertable prompted a number of questions from the Committee at the public hearing which were answered by technical experts to the Committee's satisfaction. These examples demonstrate the significant merit of the Committee's inspections.
15. It is the Committee's policy to invite State and Federal Members of Parliament in whose electorates proposed works are to be constructed to take part in the inspections. The Committee is pleased to report that on a number of occasions State and Federal Members availed themselves of the opportunity to join the Committee. The Committee will continue to actively encourage the implementation of this policy in future years.

Length of inquiries

16. Appendix B provides a chronology of the Committee's inquiries from the date of each reference to the date on which consequential expediency motions were moved by the relevant Minister.
17. In its Sixty-second General Report, which covered the Committee's activities during 1998, the Committee reported that it is rare for its formal public proceedings to extend beyond one or two days. This has been largely due to the quality of submissions and evidence presented by representatives of proponent departments and agencies and the general support of proposed works by State and local government and the wider community. During the year the Committee reported on three proposals of unusual complexity. All required extended hearings.
18. The Committee's inquiry into the proposed construction of a replacement nuclear research reactor was complex due to the volume of evidence collected and the development and establishment of a nuclear safety regime and nuclear waste disposal strategy in parallel with the Committee's inquiry.
19. The Committee's inquiry into the proposed Staff Colleges Collocation Project, Weston, ACT involved hearings spanning June to October. As well, the Committee inspected the existing staff college facilities at Weston Creek in Canberra and the historic Fort Queenscliff in Victoria. The Committee felt it necessary to investigate fully the basis of the need to collocate the Defence staff colleges in Canberra and to satisfy itself that adequate measures would be implemented to preserve the historic Fort Queenscliff precinct. This stance

was taken in large measure as a result of concerns raised with the Committee by the relevant local government authority and the local Federal Member of Parliament.

20. The Committee's inquiry into the proposed CSIRO / University of Queensland Joint Building Project, St Lucia, Queensland was lengthy due to the number of large number of submissions received by the Committee about the proposal. In view of the complexities raised by representatives of the local community at the first day of hearings, the Committee decided to reconvene the inquiry after the CSIRO had been given the opportunity to provide written responses.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AUSTRALIA

First progress report

21. The Committee's report on new facilities for the National Museum of Australia and the Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies requested that six monthly progress reports on the project be provided to the Committee. Uncertainties about the final cost of the facilities and the suitability of the project delivery method adopted led the Committee to request such reports.
22. The Committee received the first progress report in March. This covered the period from 1 July 1998 to 31 January 1999.
23. The turning of the first sod, by the Prime Minister, took place on 1 October 1998 although actual site works commenced two months later with the establishment of project site offices.
24. The National Capital Authority approved initial bulk earthworks in February 1999 and construction commenced on 15 February 1999. The project is expected to be completed on budget by 12 March 2001.
25. The project budget is \$151.9 million, comprising \$133 million for capital works and \$18.9 million for one-off establishment costs.
26. The project will be undertaken using the alliance method of project delivery. This was described to the Committee as a 'team approach, which provides substantial incentives for completion on time, within budget and to outstanding quality.' The progress report mentions that whilst the project was still at an early stage, the project delivery method was proving successful to date. Project alliancing has enabled contractors to provide advice early in the design process with some potential savings in building costs having been identified. The report mentions that design changes which had taken place since the Committee's report were relatively minor and will not add to costs.

Second progress report

27. The second report on progress was received in October and covers the period 1 February to 1 July.
28. The report included advice that:
 - the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Centre would not now be located, as originally planned, on Acton Peninsula; and
 - a total consolidated project budget of \$155.4 million had been prepared. This takes account of a carry over of \$0.5 million from 1996/97 expenditure associated with the project and the contribution of \$3 million provided by the ACT Government for the provision of infrastructure.
29. The Committee's report requested that the six monthly reports address a number of areas of concern identified by the Committee. These are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Changes to design

30. There have been no major design changes. The project was in the last stages of detailed documentation at the end of the report period.

Expenditure and audit

31. The project has a budget of \$155.4 million of which \$22.0 million had been spent to 31 July. An overrun of \$1.8 million occurred from costs associated with additional earthworks and design costs. The building works segment of the project has a contingency of \$1.7 million. The report assures the Committee that the cost overrun should be able to be met from the contingency. On this basis and taking into account other unused contingencies elsewhere in the budget, the project is currently on target for completion on budget.
32. An audit committee has been established for the project. It will be responsible for overseeing the development and implementation of a plan for compliance and performance audits for the project. The audit committee is chaired by an independent consultant. The Australian National Audit Office is also conducting an audit of the project.

Payment of subcontractors

33. The report states that all subcontractors have been paid within the time specified in the relevant agreements between building and services contractors and their subcontractors.

Standards of finish

34. The Committee's report on the project drew attention to the possibility that, as a result of cost-cutting measures, the standards of finish in the completed project may be less than those prescribed in the architectural brief. The Committee therefore recommended that the six monthly reports provide details of specified standards of finish and the standard of finish actually provided.
35. Details of external finishes are at Appendix C.
36. In relation to internal finishes, while details were being finalised, a decision has been taken to use applied floor finishes throughout the Museum in place of concrete screeds and timber access floors previously proposed. The report advised that reservations about the acoustic properties of polished concrete screed and timber floors were raised by the Museum during a review process undertaken during October-November 1998. This resulted in a detailed examination, which included advice from the exhibition designer, which led to the decision to use applied finishes which would provide:
- improved acoustics in mezzanine areas;
 - a softer walking service—especially compared with concrete floors;
 - improved maintenance; and
 - greater variety of finishes.
37. The decision to use applied finishes was not taken in order to reduce costs. To the contrary, the finishes now proposed would be more expensive and it is believed that it will provide a superior solution.

OVERSEAS WORKS

Statutory basis for inquiry

38. The Act was amended in 1981¹ to enable the Committee to examine overseas works such as Australian embassies, high commissions and accommodation for staff.

Project examined

39. The Committee received one reference involving the construction of an overseas project during the report period. This involved the refurbishment of buildings in Berlin to provide a chancery and apartments for the Australian Embassy. As in previous cases involving the construction of overseas projects, the Committee's task was made difficult due to the provisions of the Public Works Committee Act which do not allow the Committee to meet overseas and limit the Committee's inquiries to the consideration of plans, models and statements and to the taking of evidence in Australia. This departure from the Committee's conventional practice of undertaking site inspections was recognised in 1990 as a serious impediment to the Committee's operations.
40. The Committee's inquiry extended over two days of public hearings during which a number of matters, including the confidence of the cost estimate, cost recovery, the stability of the foundations and the appropriateness of collocating departmental officers with their workplace, were raised.
41. In November, the Vice-Chair reported to the Committee on an inspection, undertaken whilst in Berlin on Parliamentary business, of the properties to be refurbished. Mrs Crosio reported that the information obtained during the inspection would have assisted the Committee's deliberations greatly during its inquiry. The proposal examined by the Committee will involve the refurbishment of two major and contiguous heritage buildings located near the centre of Berlin. The properties are owned by the Commonwealth. Under German heritage requirements it is necessary for both buildings to be refurbished. The substantial amount of space excess to chancery requirements will be made available for staff apartments. Mrs Crosio reported that the inspection revealed the apartments will be of considerably greater size than could be perceived from plans submitted to the Committee. This highlights the disadvantages the Committee operates under when examining overseas works projects without being able to undertake site inspections.

¹ *Public Works Committee Amendment Act 1981* (No 20/1981), assented to and commenced 9 April 1981

EXPO pavilion, Hannover

42. In March, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade provided an outline of an overseas work for Australia's participation in Expo 2000 in Hannover (Germany). The Australian pavilion was envisaged as being constructed on a stand-alone site, which would involve the construction of a temporary pavilion that would be dismantled at the end of the Expo. The Committee was advised that, based on expert advice, construction, installation and decommissioning of the pavilion could cost around \$4.5 million.
43. The Expo is being held from 1 June to 31 October 2000. Organisers predict that up to 40 million people will visit the Expo. It will be the first World Exposition since Seville, Spain in 1992 and is set to be the largest exposition in history with 190 countries and international organisations participating. The Australian pavilion is expected to attract around 10 per cent of the visitors to the Expo.
44. In June, the Committee was advised that Caribiner International Pty Ltd, a Sydney-based company, had been appointed project developer. The Committee was also advised that the Commonwealth and Victorian Governments had provided core funding for the pavilion and additional funding from the South Australian and ACT Governments had become available. Additional funding accordingly increased the value of the project. DFAT advised the Committee that the project developer had undertaken to deliver the facility to a guaranteed maximum price of \$10 million and to obtain any additional funding from corporate sponsorship and revenue from retailing and catering operations.

Administration of property portfolio

45. The Committee was originally provided with a briefing on the administration of the portfolio on 15 December 1998. In February 1999, officers from the Department of Finance and Administration (DoFA) briefed the Committee on subsequent changes in the administration of the property portfolio and on overseas projects.
46. Since then, DoFA has amalgamated overseas property operations with its domestic responsibilities. The decision to amalgamate was intended to avoid duplication and to integrate computer systems, leading to improved efficiency without a reduction in staffing levels. The Committee asked DoFA to identify cost savings that will result from the amalgamation. DoFA was unable to be specific but envisaged that savings would accrue from greater efficiencies of scale. In relation to duplication, the Committee sought to establish if savings would occur in the cost of overseas travel by DoFA

officials to conduct inspections and attend to matters involving the lease, purchase and management of overseas properties.

Overseas travel by DoFA and former Overseas Property Group officials

47. At the briefing held in February, the Committee was provided with material requested at the December briefing. This included brief summaries of personnel involved in overseas travel since March 1998. The Committee noted that the reasons for one trip were to 'participate and present a paper at the International Network Meeting of Property Executives on operational and strategic property practices in Western countries in London between 8-20 May.'
48. DoFA advised that since taking over responsibilities for administering the overseas property estate, overseas travel is under continuous examination. Any proposal for overseas travel needs the approval of the Secretary of the Department. DoFA pointed out that there would be occasions when officers will be required to travel overseas. The Department manages \$1.2 billion worth of properties in 83 countries. During the financial year to December 1998, overseas travel costs had been kept to about \$140,000. The Committee is pleased to see that there has been a substantial reduction since DoFA has assumed responsibility for overseas property.

MEDIUM WORKS

Need for notification

49. Under the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, all public works estimated to cost more than \$6 million must be referred to the Committee.
50. Medium works, with an estimated cost of between \$2 million and \$6 million, may also be referred if the Committee believes an inquiry is necessary. This power has rarely been invoked.
51. To avoid a potential breach of the *Public Works Committee Act*, proponent departments have provided the Committee with details of their medium works program. It remains incumbent on departments to continue this practice well in advance of the calling of tenders for medium works.

Department of Defence

52. In February, the Committee was briefed by Defence officials on medium works included in the 1998/99 medium works program and medium works proposed for 1999/2000. Defence provided the Committee with briefing notes on 27 proposals in the 1998/99 program and 16 in the current program.

53. The total estimated cost of works in the 1998/99 program was \$108.224 million, while the cost of the 1999/2000 program was \$58.5 million. The Committee noted a number of projects whose estimated out turn cost came very close to the \$6 million statutory limit, some costing \$5.9 million. In June, the Committee requested additional information from Defence on the management of budgets close to the statutory limit. The following table details the Defence response.

Table 1: Distribution of Defence medium works projects, financial years 1998/99 to 1999/2000

Estimated Cost	Number of Projects
Under \$2 million	18
\$2–3 million	9
\$3–4 million	13
\$4–5 million	9
\$5–6 million	12

54. The Committee noted that of the projects estimated to cost over \$5 million, half were estimated at \$5.8–5.9 million. This gave rise to a concern that projects might be artificially capped and run over the \$6 million threshold during construction. Defence advised the Committee that projects estimated to come close to the statutory limit represent a management challenge and assured the Committee that every effort is made to maintain costs below the cost cap.
55. The Committee was also briefed by Defence officials on background to a number of works at RAAF Base Darwin, which were foreshadowed as forming part of the larger reference but now proposed as discrete elements. The Committee agreed with the works proceeding as medium works.

MATTERS RAISED IN PREVIOUS GENERAL REPORT

Department of Transport and Regional Development

56. In October 1998, the Committee was advised by the Department of Transport of a number of works, estimated to cost between \$2 million and \$6 million, to be undertaken as part of the Sydney Airport Noise Amelioration Program. The works were:
- Bexley Benevolent Society Aged Care Centre—a retirement village, including a specialist dementia unit, owned by the Benevolent Society of NSW—\$2.655 million;
 - Botany Public School—a primary school owned by the NSW Department of Education and Training—\$3.455 million;

- Daceyville Public School and Hibiscus Child Care Centre—a primary school and child care centre owned by the NSW Department of Education and Training—\$5.237 million;
 - Rockdale Public School—a primary school owned by the NSW Department of Education and Training—\$4.558 million;
 - St Joseph's Primary School and Church—a primary school and church owned by the Trustees of the Catholic Archdiocese of Sydney—\$4.394 million;
 - St Michaels Primary School and Church—a primary school and church owned by the Trustees of the Catholic Archdiocese of Sydney—\$4.117 million; and
 - St Michaels (Aged Care) Hostel—a retirement village, including a specialist dementia unit, owned by the Society of St Vincent de Paul—\$3.150 million.
57. The correspondence was considered by the incoming Committee which requested further information on the entire Sydney Airport Noise Amelioration Project.
58. In January 1999, the Department provided the Committee of details of public buildings where work commenced or was due to commence in the near future.
59. The extent of the program relating to public buildings can be summarised in the following table:

Table 2: Public buildings insulation—Buildings completed and to be completed, position at 14 January 1999

	To be completed	Completed
Schools and colleges	6	19
Preschool and child care centres	7	20
Health care	5	1
Churches	23	—

60. The Department also advised that in January 1999, there were 3,340 residential properties that required insulation and insulation had been completed on 2,550.

Cameron Offices

61. The central office of the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) has been accommodated in the Cameron Offices since the mid-1970s. In 1996, the

Government placed the Commonwealth Property Estate on the market. The Cameron Offices were considered as a problem building for sale purposes due to its overall condition and state of repair. From the ABS perspective, the building:

- is dysfunctional in design—the ABS occupies 43,000 square metres and needs only 28,000 square metres of office space;
- has had less than adequate maintenance over an extended period; and
- has significant occupational health and safety problems.

62. The Committee's Sixty-first General Report provided details of a proposal to refurbish the Cameron Offices in Belconnen, ACT. The proposed work was designed to bring the offices up to current occupational health and safety requirements as well as security guidelines and the estimated cost was \$6.25 million. At the time, the Committee was advised that the offices were scheduled to be demolished in three years. The Committee expressed concern about the justification of the cost of the proposed upgrading, given the plan for the building to be demolished.
63. In October 1998, the Committee was advised by DoFA that a review of the original scope of work had resulted in a reduction to the cost of the proposed work from \$6.25 million to \$4.15 million.
64. In December 1998, one of the first steps of the incoming Committee was to request the relevant authorities to provide a report on developments since October. The Committee was provided with a briefing paper on 29 January. The paper dealt with the refurbishment program and the Commonwealth's plans for the future of the building. Of note is that the project budget presented to the Committee in September / October 1997 was \$6.25 million and that the current works budget had been reduced to \$3.8 million. The reduction was achieved by focussing on essential occupational health and safety components requested by the Committee.
65. In relation to the future of the Cameron Offices, the Committee was advised by ABS that in early December 1997, the Minister for Finance and Administration announced that the Commonwealth would market test the refurbishment of adjacent Benjamin Offices, the demolition of the Cameron Offices and the provision of new or refurbished accommodation for the ABS in Belconnen.
66. On 7 December 1997, public expressions of interest were called for in the national press. Information packages were issued in early April to parties that registered. In December 1998, Call for Detailed Proposals (CDP) documentation was issued to all registrants.

67. The successful development would be constructed on National land and the requirement for consultation provided for under national lands legislation will need to be adhered to. ABS has revised its accommodation requirements and now needs:
- office accommodation—28,000 square metres;
 - basement storage—2,000 square metres; and
 - carparking—2,100 square metres.
68. This is 10,000 square metres less than the space currently occupied in the Cameron Offices.
69. Cost estimates, provided by ABS consultants for the fitout amount to \$19.659 million plus \$7.550 million for information technology.
70. At the time, the ABS envisaged that the fitout works would be referred to the Committee by October 1999. However, should a developer put forward a proposal that includes a fitout option, with costs met as a component of rent, the work would not need to be referred to the Committee.
71. The Committee was briefed by officers from the ABS on 25 March.
72. In July, the ABS advised the Committee that it intended to enter into an Agreement for Lease for the proposed new building funded by the private sector. This agreement provides for an integrated fitout to be undertaken by the developer as part of the construction program. The ABS will hire the greater part of the fitout, with ownership resting with a financier.

Redevelopment of Immigration Detention Centre, Villawood, NSW

73. In June 1998, officers from the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA) briefed the Committee on the proposed development of Villawood Detention Centre (Sydney). Officials from the department foreshadowed the possibility that a motion declaring the work to be 'urgent' may be moved in the House of Representatives by the relevant Minister. The Committee expressed its unanimous opposition to this possible course of action to the officials.
74. During the year, the Committee was advised by DIMA of progress in finalising plans under which the project would be fully financed, built, owned and controlled by the private sector. Under this arrangement the Commonwealth would pay a private service provider for the accommodation and related services. Under this arrangement, the work would not need to be referred to the Committee.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE CONFERENCE

75. The eighth annual conference of Parliamentary Public Works Committees was held at Parliament House, Hobart, on 13–14 September. The Committee was represented at the conference by the Chair (Ms Moylan), Mr Hollis and members of the secretariat. Representatives of the following Parliamentary committees also attended the conference:
- Tasmania—Standing Committee on Public Works;
 - New South Wales—Standing Committee on Public Works;
 - Queensland—Committee on Public Works;
 - South Australia—Standing Committee on Public Works;
 - Australian Capital Territory—Standing Committee on Urban Services; and
 - Western Australia—Standing Committee on Ecologically Sustainable Development.
76. The conference was chaired by the Hon. Don Wing MLC, Chairman of the Tasmanian public works committee and was organised by the committee's secretariat. The conference was opened by the Hon. Michael Field, Premier of Tasmania from 1989–1992.
77. As in previous years, proceedings commenced with representatives of each committee reporting on activities since the previous conference, held in Sydney in July 1998. The Chair of the ACT Committee on Urban Services presented a paper on the committee's examination of the Territory's draft public works program. The conference also discussed approaches to public hearings and meetings. Invited speakers presented papers on the Tasmanian Metal Fabrication Training Facility and the management of heritage assets.
78. Part of the conference involved inspections of the following facilities and buildings which served as case studies of the funding and provision of public works in Hobart:
- Centre for the Arts, Hobart—a former jam factory, now used as workshops and studios for young Tasmanian artists;
 - Temple House—a refurbished heritage building now used as a training facility for the Tasmanian police force;
 - Government House;
 - The Antarctic and Southern Ocean Centre;
 - The College of Aluminium Training; and

- International Catamarans (INCAT)—employer of personnel undergoing training at the college.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ACT

Statutory limit

79. The question of amending the Public Works Committee Act to raise the statutory limit for referral of works, currently \$6 million, has been under consideration by the Committee for a number of years. At this stage, the Committee does not believe there are adequate grounds for raising the limit.

Requests for exemption

80. In July, the Committee received a request from the Department of Defence for a proposed F-111 cold proof load test facility at RAAF Base Amberley to be exempted from Committee scrutiny. Defence officials briefed the Committee on the project during August. The Committee advised the officials that it was not in a position to grant the dispensation requested.
81. Also in August, the Committee received two letters from the Defence Housing Authority (DHA) seeking the 'urgent' consideration of two housing development projects in Darwin, namely:
- Carey Street development—requesting approval in principle for DHA to proceed to enter into contracts for the design and construction; and
 - Parap Grove development—requesting approval in principle for DHA to enter into a house and land contract for 50 houses.
82. The Committee considered the requests and advised DHA that it was not in a position to grant the approval in principle sought; normal statutory processes would need to be followed. The proposals were subsequently referred to the Committee on 2 and 23 September. Advertisements calling for submissions appeared in the Darwin press on 18 and 29 September and public hearings were held on 28–29 October.

Exemption of authorities by Regulation

83. The Committee's Sixty-second General Report drew attention to correspondence received from the Minister for Finance and Administration which foreshadowed a Government proposal to exempt a number of airport corporations from the purview of the Public Works Committee Act.
84. Subsection 6A(3) of the Act provides that:

Where the Governor-General is satisfied that an authority of the Commonwealth is engaging in trading or other activities, or is

providing services in competition with another body or bodies, or with persons, the Governor-General may make regulations declaring that this Act does not apply to that authority.

85. The corporations in question were:

- Sydney Airports Corporation Limited;
- Bankstown Airport Limited;
- Camden Airport Limited;
- Hoxton Park Airport Limited; and
- Essendon Airport Limited.

86. Each corporation operates the relevant airport under a lease from the Commonwealth. All entities are incorporated companies in which the Commonwealth holds 100 per cent of the shares. As airport lessees, the companies are subject to the provisions of the *Airports Act 1996*.

87. Receipt of the correspondence coincided with the dissolution of the House of Representatives. The 39th Parliament met for the first time on 10 November 1998. The Regulations, made pursuant to the provisions of subsection 6A(3) of the Public Works Committee Act, were tabled in the House of Representatives and the Senate on 23 November 1998. The regulations commence on gazettal following a period of 15 Parliamentary sitting days.

88. The current Committee considered the correspondence at its first private meeting on 10 December 1998 and expressed concern about the peremptory manner in which the amending regulations were handled. Past practice has been for sponsoring agencies to brief the Committee about the need for amending regulations before they are tabled. Indeed, on one occasion the relevant Minister briefed the Committee about the need to exempt a number of authorities from the provisions of the Act.

89. The Committee believes the time imperative in this case did not outweigh the wide-ranging ramifications of the proposed amendments. The Committee noted the Minister's assertion that the ministerial approval regime, under the Airports Act, provides for a public consultation process. The Committee requested a briefing on these processes from representatives of the corporations.

90. Officers of the Department of Transport and Regional Development briefed the Committee on 9 February 1999. On the following day, the House of Representatives debated a motion moved by Mr Hollis, a longstanding member of the Committee, for the disallowance of the Regulations. Debate on the motion lasted for more than an hour. Although the motion was defeated,

the substance of the debate highlighted concern regarding the incremental erosion of the Committee's powers. This includes the Committee's ability to examine public officials about the provision of services requiring infrastructure costing many millions of dollars in capital investment and recurrent expenditure.

Campbell Park Offices

91. In March, the Committee received a request from the Department of Defence to have a proposed fitout of the Campbell Park Offices (Canberra) declared a 'repetitive work'. The Committee agreed to the request after being briefed on the project and undertaking an inspection of the office complex.
92. Defence leases the offices from DoFA at an annual cost of \$7.2 million and requires a fitout to provide 2,100 workpoints to current standards for staff to be accommodated there.
93. Campbell Park Offices are located in a natural bush setting on the eastern slopes of Mount Ainslie. They comprise four reinforced concrete wings of eight storeys connected by nodes containing building services. The buildings have 36,000 square metres of net lettable space. They were completed progressively between 1974 and 1977 and have not been upgraded since then. Defence advised the Committee that a condition report on the building structure, fitout and services showed:
 - the structure to be in good condition;
 - chillers, boilers and cooling towers are approaching the end of their economic lives;
 - airconditioning ducts and risers to be in good condition;
 - lifts require new controls;
 - a small amount of asbestos in lifts, fire doors and ducting; and
 - carpets need replacement.
94. Defence considered the extent of work required and believed that a complete refurbishment of the office complex was not warranted. In short, the four buildings require minor work to upgrade finishes and to make minor improvements to airconditioning and electrical services. Higher levels of work will be required in the service nodes. The extent of the work was described by Defence as minimalist, involving the removal of all partitioning, furniture and carpet as well as rectification of airconditioning, electrical and occupational health and safety problems. The proposed fitout will provide a modern open plan and information technology environment similar to that provided in the Russell Redevelopment.

95. Defence advised the Committee that major plant can be upgraded by the building owner over the next five years as part of a planned maintenance program.
96. The total cost of the refurbishment was assessed by Defence to be \$30 million, comprising:
- building owner work—lifts, toilets, stairwells and entrance—\$4.0 million;
 - client building work—strip out the existing fitout, rectify airconditioning, electrical and occupational health and safety problems and the installation of cabling and the provision of new carpet—\$15 million; and
 - client fitout to provide workstations, furniture and storage to meet current work practices and occupational health and safety standards.
97. Defence proposes to add the work to the Russell project. This would enable Defence to obtain maximum time and cost benefits from early commencement and the use of an established team to apply lessons learned from the Russell Redevelopment.

SECRETARIAT

98. At the end of 1999, the Public Works Committee Secretariat comprised:

Secretary	Mr Bjarne Nordin
Assistant Secretaries	Mr Michael Ross and Mr Michael Fetter
Administrative Officer	Mrs Angela Nagy

99. During the year, the following inquiry secretaries and support staff also assisted the Committee: Ms Maria Grainger, Ms Shelley McInnis and Mrs June Murphy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

100. The Committee records its appreciation to Parliamentary staff and other agencies involved in supporting the Committee's operations during the year, in particular:
- Department of the House of Representatives staff:
 - ⇒ Bills and Papers Office
 - ⇒ Table Office
 - ⇒ House of Representatives Printing Service;

- Department of the Senate staff—Table Office;
- CanPrint Communications Pty Ltd;
- Office of the Minister for Defence;
- Parliamentary Reporting staff (Hansard);
- Sound and Vision Office; and
- Parliamentary Library—Information and Research Service:
 - ⇒ Economics, Commerce and Industrial Relations
 - ⇒ Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade
 - ⇒ Law
 - ⇒ Science, Technology, Environment and Resources
 - ⇒ Statistics.

Hon. Judi Moylan MP
Chair

9 March 2000

The briefing adjourned with officials undertaking to provide written answers to questions taken on notice. A further briefing was held on 11 March for which DoFA provided extensive documentation relating to executives of the former Overseas Property Group. In summary, this revealed that during 1996/97 the three executives travelled overseas on 11 occasions. One officer visited:

Bangkok, Manila, Kuala Lumpur between 25 August and 7 September to 'attend facilities managers conference in Kuala Lumpur and conduct executive inspections of owned and leased properties and discussions with embassy personnel on property matters;

Shanghai, Hong Kong, Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City, Phnom Penh, Bangkok, Vientiane and Guangzhou between 5 November and 25 November. The purpose of the visits was 'Executive strategy visit and inspection of owned and leased properties and hold discussions with Embassy officials on strategic property issues'; and

Mexico City, Miami, Caracas, Barbados, Sao Paulo, Brasilia, Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Washington, New York between 16 March and 24 April. The purpose of these visits was described as 'Executive inspection of posts in North and South America assessing the strategic property requirements in those locations'.

In 1997/98, two executives embarked on 12 overseas visits costing in total \$117,781. One officer resigned shortly thereafter.

Travel by non-executive officers amounted to the following number of visits and costs:

1996/97*	1997/98**	1998/99***
40	41	19
\$317,248	\$351,135	\$175,000

101. DoFA also provided the Committee with details of medium and minor works projects carried out on overseas properties in financial years 1996/97, 1997/98 and 1998/99. The total cost of these works, undertaken over a period of three financial years, was more than \$50 million. DoFA also provided details of expenditure on repairs and maintenance during 1997/98, which involved more than \$11.0 million.



Appendix A—Meetings of the Committee 1999

* denotes Sectional (sub) Committees

Date	Location	Purpose
9 February	Canberra	Private meeting
11 February	Canberra	Private meeting
18 February	Canberra	Private meeting
11 March	Canberra	Private meeting
25 March	Canberra	Private meeting
29 March	Canberra	Inspection
5 May	Lucas Heights	Inspection
5 May	Sydney	Public Hearing
6 May	Sydney	Public Hearing
10 May	Canberra	Public Hearing
13 May	Canberra	Public Hearing
14 May	Canberra	Public Hearing
18 May	Sydney	Public Hearing*
		Inspection*
3 June	Canberra	Private meeting
10 June	Canberra	Private meeting
11 June	Canberra	Inspection*
		Public Hearing*
16 June	Townsville	Inspection
		Public Hearing
17 June	Townsville	Inspection
24 June	Canberra	Private meeting
29 June	Canberra	Private meeting
6 July	Darwin	Inspection
		Public Hearing
8 July	Melbourne	Public Hearing*
		Inspection*

Date	Location	Purpose
12 August	Canberra	Private meeting
16 August	Melbourne	Public Hearing
		Inspection
17 August	Queenscliff	Inspection
18 August	Sydney	Inspection*
		Public Hearing
26 August	Canberra	Private meeting
2 September	Canberra	Private meeting
23 September	Canberra	Private meeting
30 September	Canberra	Private meeting
14 October	Canberra	Private meeting
21 October	Canberra	Private meeting
27 October	Brisbane	Public Hearing
		Inspection*
28 October	Darwin	Public Hearing
		Inspection
29 October	Darwin	Public Hearing
29 October	Darwin	Public Hearing
19 November	Brisbane	Public Hearing*
22 November	Canberra	Public Hearing
		Inspection
25 November	Canberra	Private meeting
9 December	Canberra	Private meeting



Appendix B—Details of the Committee's reports presented during 1999

	Page
CSIRO Queensland Centre for Advanced Technologies Stage 2 development at Pinjarra Hills, Queensland	B-2
CSIRO National Centre for Petroleum and Mineral Resources Research, Bentley, WA	B-5
Lavarack Barracks Redevelopment Stage 2, Townsville	B-8
Australian Embassy, Berlin—Refurbishment of heritage buildings as a chancery and apartments	B-11
Replacement nuclear research reactor, Lucas Heights, NSW	B-14
RAAF Base Townsville Redevelopment, Stage 1, Townsville	B-19
Redevelopment of Darwin Naval Base Project	B-22
CSIRO Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, NSW—Joint Research Complex for CSIRO Molecular Science and Food Science Australia	B-25
CSIRO Division of Building Construction and Engineering Development Works at Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, NSW	B-28
CSIRO Clayton (Eastern Precinct) Development Works, Vic.	B-31
Refurbishment of 4 Treasury Place, Melbourne	B-34
Staff Colleges Collocation Project, Weston Creek, ACT	B-38
ANZAC Hall Extension, Australian War Memorial, Canberra	B-41

CSIRO Queensland Centre for Advanced Technologies Stage 2 Development, Pinjarra Hills, QLD

Referred	8 April 1998—reference lapsed with dissolution of House of Representatives and prorogation of the Senate on 31 August 1998. Re-referred 8 December 1998
Public hearing held	15 June 1998
Report dated	11 February 1999
Report presented	17 February 1999
Motion for expediency passed	17 February 1999
Report number	1 / 99
Proposed expenditure	\$22.3 million
Expenditure recommended	as above
Parliamentary Paper	34 / 1999

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The mining and energy sectors are important to the Queensland and national economies.
2. The need to expand and diversify research and development in mining, energy and related manufacturing industries resulted in the CSIRO and the Queensland Government entering into an agreement, in 1990, to establish the Queensland Centre for Advanced Technologies at Pinjarra Hills, Brisbane.
3. Originally designed to cater for research and development projects involving 130 staff, research activities at QCAT have grown at a rapid rate and existing facilities will be inadequate to support planned increases in research personnel and projects.
4. There is therefore a need to provide additional facilities at QCAT to house and support these planned increases in personnel and research projects.
5. Master planning studies of the site, undertaken by the CSIRO, have identified areas suitable for further expansion well into the next century.
6. The extent of the proposed works will provide for the planned expansion of research and development projects and provide capabilities expected to stimulate their further expansion.

7. The Committee recommends the construction of the CSIRO Queensland Centre for Advanced Technologies Stage 2, Pinjarra Hills, Queensland, at an estimated out turn cost of \$22.3 million.

Minister's response

Mr SLIPPER¹ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(5.01 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: CSIRO Queensland Centre for Advanced Technologies stage 2 development, Pinjarra Hills, Queensland.

As we have heard, the Queensland Centre for Advanced Technologies, located at Pinjarra Hills, Queensland, was established by an agreement between the Queensland government and the CSIRO with the objective of developing a world centre of excellence to expand and diversify research and development in the mining, energy and related manufacturing industries in the state and the country as a whole. The centre aims to bring together resources from the state government, universities, kindred CSIRO divisions and Queensland and Australia wide minerals, energy and manufacturing industries in collaborative activities.

Currently, the occupancy across the whole complex greatly exceeds the original planned complement and has led to an acute shortage of space and a demand for additional facilities. New initiatives and increased interest from commercial collaborators will further exacerbate the accommodation problems in the foreseeable future. In order to redress these accommodation problems, the CSIRO proposes a building development program which will significantly expand the existing facilities and in addition permit rationalisation of some of the existing resources.

The proposed development comprises a research building housing lightly serviced laboratories, offices and open work areas; a technology transfer building providing office style accommodation for a number of independent rental suites; a number of new industrial type buildings; expansion of the existing library and canteen facilities; minor alterations to existing buildings to suit change of function; site works, including new roads, car parking, environmental rehabilitation and extension and modifications to site services; and relocation and modification of the existing sewage treatment plant.

1 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 17 February 1999, p. 3036.

The estimated turnout cost is \$22.3 million. It is anticipated that construction will commence in early 1999 and be completed by mid-2000. The Public Works Committee, in its report tabled today, as we have heard, recommended that this project proceed. The CSIRO agrees with the committee's recommendations, and I am very happy to commend the motion to the House.

CSIRO National Centre for Petroleum and Mineral Resources Research, Bentley, WA

Referred	29 June 1998—reference lapsed with dissolution of House of Representatives and prorogation of the Senate on 31 August 1998. Re-referred 8 December 1998
Public hearing held	26 August 1998
Report dated	11 February 1999
Report presented	17 February 1999
Motion for expediency passed	17 February 1999
Report number	2 / 99
Proposed expenditure	\$31.8 million
Expenditure recommended	as above
Parliamentary Paper	35 / 1999

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. CSIRO, or its predecessor organisations, has had a presence in Western Australia spanning more than 80 years and employs more than 400 staff at six locations.
2. The mining, oil and gas industries are the mainstay of the Western Australian economy.
3. Both the CSIRO Division of Exploration and Mining and the Division of Petroleum Research have established research teams and formed alliances with other research and development partners to undertake projects associated with mining, oil and gas industries in Western Australia and nationally.
4. CSIRO and the Western Australian Government have identified the need to increase substantially the State's research capability to support the sustained development of resource industries in an era of heightened international competitiveness.
5. CSIRO and the Western Australian Government entered into an agreement in 1997 to establish a National Centre for Petroleum and Mineral Resources Research in Perth.

6. Independent economic and financial analysis has demonstrated that returns to the community and resource companies from investment in research and technology transfer can be significant and are highly influential in the creation of new investment and employment.
7. Collocation of the Division of Exploration and Mining and the Division of Petroleum Resources will deliver cost savings and will maximise research effort in support of both oil and mining industry sectors.
8. The extent of the proposed work can be justified as providing modern facilities designed to enable CSIRO Divisions and alliance partners to undertake research into minerals and petroleum research at increased levels and will overcome current unsatisfactory conditions.
9. The proposed site, adjacent to Curtin University of Technology and within Technology Park, Bentley will provide the capability to foster collaborative research between the university and private sector research and development organisations.
10. A Master Plan for the site makes provision for further expansion of facilities and staff.
11. The Committee recommends the construction of the proposed CSIRO National Centre for Petroleum and Mineral Research, Bentley, WA, at an estimated out turn cost of \$31.8 million.

Minister's response

Mr SLIPPER² (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(5.04 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: CSIRO National Centre for Petroleum and Mineral Resources Research, Bentley, WA.

The National Centre for Petroleum and Mineral Resources Research is being established by the Western Australian government and the CSIRO to substantially increase Western Australia's technological capacity and its capability to support the sustained development of its resource industries. Located at Technology Park, Bentley, the national centre will provide a focal point for research excellence and collaboration among the CSIRO, cooperative research centres, university

2 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 17 February 1999, p. 3036.

researchers, government agencies, resource companies and associated technology suppliers and providers.

The national centre will provide a unique opportunity to bring together world-class scientific and engineering research groups to work closely with the petroleum and minerals industries. Collaborative research will embrace a wide range of activities aimed not only at providing solutions to current industry issues but also at providing the research leadership necessary to redress the key research needs and research issues of these industries now and in the decades ahead. The concentration of capability and expertise at the national centre will also provide a major incentive for leading edge companies and organisations to locate their operations in Western Australia, further enhancing the prospects for research collaboration and technology transfer and the delivery of innovative research solutions, services and products to the petroleum and minerals industries.

The centre represents a marriage of the leading edge research in minerals and petroleum exploration and production within the industry sector. The proposed development will include laboratories and research facilities, process bays, support and stores areas, staff amenities and public facilities, and associated site works, roadworks, car parking, engineering and communications services and landscaping.

The estimated turnout cost is \$31.8 million. It is anticipated that construction will commence in early to mid-1999 and will be completed by late 2000. The Public Works Committee, in its report tabled today, recommended that this project proceed. The CSIRO agrees with the committee's recommendations, and I am pleased to commend the motion to the House.

Lavarack Barracks Redevelopment Stage 2, Townsville

Referred	29 June 1999—reference lapsed with dissolution of the House of representatives and prorogation of the Senate on 31 August 1998. Re-referred 8 December 1998
Public hearing held	26 August 1998
Report dated	11 February 1999
Report presented	17 February 1999
Motion for expediency passed	17 February 1999
Report number	3 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$139.3 million
Expenditure recommended	as above
Parliamentary Paper	36 / 1999

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Provision of new airconditioned living-in accommodation should improve living standards for on-base personnel and should lift the morale of personnel.
2. There is a need for new messes, on a scale commensurate with requirements identified in Department of Defence planning studies, to be provided at Lavarack Barracks adjacent to the sites proposed for new living-in accommodation.
3. There are concerns about the appropriateness of the cook-chill method of food preparation based on its untested nature in the Australian Defence Force.
4. The Department of Defence should report back to the Committee on the operation of the cook-chill process after it has been fully tested at Lavarack Barracks, before its wider implementation within the Australian Defence Force.
5. Operational integrity, communications management and message security should be improved by the provision of the new Communications Centre.
6. Provision of new facilities for 3BASB's Transport Squadron should enable its activities to be consolidated in modern facilities, with a consequential improvement in Unit management and performance. In addition, overall

- management of 3BASB should improve with the collocation of its Transport Squadron with the rest of the Battalion.
7. The provision of the Eastern Deployment and Assembly Area would allow assembly of deployment equipment at a single location and avoid road congestion which occurs under present arrangements.
 8. The Eastern Deployment and Assembly Area could also provide a large hard standing area suitable for a parade ground or as a helicopter landing area.
 9. Provision of a new heavy vehicle east-west trunk road linking the three zones would enable heavy traffic to be kept away from residential areas, improve traffic flow with consequential savings in running costs and improve safety and security.
 10. Installation of waste collection facilities and the provision of the new Common Wash Facility should improve environmental management on the Barracks.
 11. The Committee recommends the construction of Lavarack Barracks Redevelopment Stage 2, Townsville, at an estimated out turn cost of \$139.3 million.

Minister's response

Mr SLIPPER³ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(5.07 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: Lavarack Barracks redevelopment stage 2, Townsville, Queensland.

The Department of Defence proposes to redevelop Lavarack Barracks. The works now proposed are needed to overcome acute accommodation inadequacies, to improve efficiency and operational effectiveness, and to provide a sound infrastructure framework on which further development of the barracks can proceed.

The works are in nine main components, consisting of accommodation and messing, operational and logistical support, and infrastructure development facilities. The main components comprise new living-in accommodation for 1,112

3 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 17 February 1999, p. 3037.

officers, senior non-commissioned officers and other ranks; associated mess complexes and a central food preparation facility. The estimated turn-out cost of the proposal is \$139.3 million. Subject to parliamentary approval, construction will commence in September 1999 with the objective of completion by December 2001.

The report of the Public Works Committee, as we have heard a moment ago, has recommended that this project proceed. Defence accepts and will implement the recommendations of the committee. I commend this motion to the House.

Australian Embassy, Berlin—Refurbishment of heritage buildings as a chancery and apartments

Referred	17 February 1999
Public hearing held	10 and 13 May (Canberra)
Report dated	24 June 1999
Report presented	30 June 1999
Motion for expediency passed	30 June 1999
Report number	4 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$43.57 million
Expenditure recommended	\$37.277 million
Parliamentary Paper	148 / 1999

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. In future inquiries the Committee must be provided, as a matter of course, with more detailed cost breakdowns of proposed expenditure.
2. There is a demonstrated need for the Australian chancery in Bonn to relocate to Berlin, in line with the relocation of the German seat of government, due to take effect in mid to late 1999.
3. Whilst recognising that the location of the new chancery is suitable, the Committee notes the age and condition of the existing buildings and, as a result, the restrictions it places on the design and the refurbishment.
4. The Committee recommends that, in circumstances where departments are paying rent to the Department of Finance and Administration for accommodation, actual comparisons between the rent charged by the Department of Finance and Administration and the rent charged for similar buildings on the private rental market should be made available.
5. The Committee recommends that the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade develop a set of guidelines on the standard of overseas accommodation.
6. These guidelines should include consideration of the appropriateness of collocation of departmental officers with their workplace, taking into account staff attitudes on this matter.
7. The guidelines should be developed in consultation with all relevant parties.

8. The Committee approves the renovation and refurbishment of the Wallstrasse 76-79 and Märkisches Ufer 8 buildings to provide a new Australian chancery in Berlin at an estimated turnout cost of \$A37.277 million at May 1999 prices.

Minister's response

Mr SLIPPER⁴ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(8.06 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: Australian Embassy Berlin—
Refurbishment of heritage building as a chancery and apartments.

As part of the process of the reunification of Germany, the seat of the German government is relocating from Bonn to Berlin. Relocation has already commenced and is programmed to be completed in 1999. In 1995 the former Australian government purchased two adjoining heritage buildings in the Mitte district of Berlin. This area is the historic centre of Berlin. The decision to purchase and refurbish these buildings was intended in part to be Australia's contribution to the rebuilding of Berlin. Both buildings are heritage listed and have certain heritage characteristics which must be managed in the refurbishment program. The Wallstrasse building will provide six stories of office accommodation for the embassy and two apartments. The Markisches Ufer building will provide four apartments. Car parking will be provided in the basement to serve both buildings.

The Public Works Committee, in tabling its report, recommended that this project proceed. However, the committee recommended also that in future inquiries it must be provided with more detailed cost breakdowns of the proposed expenditure. The Department of Finance and Administration will meet this requirement with future submissions. During the committee's inquiry into the Berlin project additional details were provided in line with the committee's request. The committee recommended that actual comparisons between the rent charged by the Department of Finance and Administration and the rent charged for similar buildings on the private rental market should also be made available. Future submissions to the committee will include the necessary comparisons. In its inquiry into the Berlin project the committee was satisfied with the additional information provided by the department in this regard.

4 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 30 June 1999, p. 8000.

The committee also recommended that the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade develop a set of guidelines on the standard of overseas accommodation, that those guidelines include consideration of the appropriateness of collocation of departmental officers with their workplace, taking into account staff attitudes on this matter, and that relevant parties should be consulted. Existing guidelines for accommodation were reviewed by the then Department of Administrative Services in 1997 in consultation with the relevant agencies. In addition, a consultants' report was commissioned in 1996 to survey staff attitudes to overseas accommodation, including the appropriateness of collocation of residential and office accommodation. This report was based on a survey of all overseas staff from all relevant agencies. The existing accommodation guidelines and the consultants' report continue to be used in the design and acquisition of residential accommodation.

In their final recommendation, the committee approved the provision of a new chancery at an outturn cost of \$37.277 million at May 1999 prices. This motion is moved on the basis that the committee recommends the renovation and refurbishment to provide a new Australian chancery and apartments at an estimated outturn cost of \$37.277 million at May 1999 prices. Subject to parliamentary approval, it is expected that the project would be completed in the latter half of the year 2001. I commend the motion to the House.

Replacement nuclear research reactor, Lucas Heights, NSW

Referred	17 February 1999
Public hearing held	5-6 May (Sydney), 14 May (Canberra)
Report dated	12 August 1999
Report presented	25 August 1999
Motion for expediency passed	26 August 1999
Report number	5 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$286.4 million
Expenditure recommended	as above
Parliamentary Paper	171 / 1999

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. HIFAR is obsolete and will need to be permanently decommissioned in 2005.
2. The estimated cost of refurbishing HIFAR to comply with safety requirements alone would be half of the cost of providing a new research reactor. This would not provide an enhancement of its research and operational capabilities which are considered by the scientific community to be limited. Such limitations have led to a reduction in national research and development opportunities.
3. A need exists to replace HIFAR with a modern research reactor. The new national research reactor must be operational some time before HIFAR is decommissioned.
4. The need for the replacement of HIFAR arises as a consequence of national interest considerations, research and development requirements and the need to sustain the local production of radiopharmaceuticals.
5. There has been substantial investment in infrastructure at Lucas Heights Science and Technology Centre.
6. Construction of a replacement research reactor at a greenfields site and decommissioning of HIFAR would require the provision of much of the infrastructure which already exists at Lucas Heights.
7. The comparative costs of locating the replacement research reactor at Lucas Heights or a greenfields site favour the former by a considerable margin.

8. On financial grounds there is merit in locating the replacement research reactor at Lucas Heights, subject to the suitability of the site on operational and public safety grounds.
9. The capabilities of the proposed research reactor and auxiliary facilities result from study and assessment by representatives of potential users and provide scope for later enhancement.
10. During the licensing, construction and commissioning phases ANSTO should provide the Committee with six-monthly reports on progress.
11. The storage of radioactive waste at Lucas Heights is of major concern to the local community.
12. When moving the expediency motion for the work to proceed, the Minister should provide a guarantee to the House that all recommendations in the Environment Assessment Report will be implemented. This guarantee should include existing commitments and new commitments listed in Appendix A of the Environment Assessment Report.
13. Provided all recommendations and commitments contained in the Environment Assessment Report are implemented during construction and commissioning and for the expected life of the research reactor, the Committee believes, based on the evidence, that all known risks have been identified and their impact on public safety will be as low as technically possible.
14. Removal of all radioactive waste from Lucas Heights for disposal or storage at a National Repository must be a high priority and is dependent on the timely provision of the Repository and Store.
15. In its quarterly and annual reports to Parliament, the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency should report on the implementation of all recommendations in the Environment Assessment Report falling within its direct responsibility.
16. In future, in its Annual Report to Parliament ANSTO should report on compliance and implementation of all recommendations in the Environment Assessment Report, including the commitments listed in Appendix A of the report.
17. As a matter of urgency, the Minister for Health and ARPANSA should appoint members to positions on committees identified in the Act.
18. There is an urgent need for an agreement on the Community Right to Know Charter. Steps toward its development identified in the Environment Assessment Report should be undertaken as soon as possible to enable the public to be better informed about the further development of the project.

19. The estimated cost is based on international precedents and national construction. There will be no scope for design variations during construction which could lead to cost increases.
20. A high level management structure will be established to oversight the project with representation from key departments—including the Department of Finance and Administration.
21. The Committee recommends provision of the reactor should not be at the expense of other Government science funding.
22. The Committee recommends the construction of a replacement research reactor at Lucas Heights at an estimated cost of \$286.4 million at 1997 prices.

Minister's Response

Mr SLIPPER⁵ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(4.40 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: Construction of replacement nuclear research reactor, Lucas Heights, NSW.

The Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation intends to construct and operate a replacement research reactor at the Lucas Heights Science and Technology Centre. The new facility will replace the high flux Australian reactor, HIFAR, which is nearing the end of its operational life and is to be closed at the end of the year 2005. The replacement reactor will be a modern, multipurpose reactor with the performance and facilities necessary to maintain and enhance Australia's nuclear science and technology capacities and their application. It is expected to come into operation in the year 2005.

In 1997 it was estimated that the facility would cost \$286.4 million. This figure was reviewed and endorsed by the Department of Finance and Administration. The replacement research reactor will meet the specific objectives of (a) ensuring Australia has a reliable supply of radio pharmaceuticals to maintain and enhance health care benefits provided to the community; (b) providing a neutron beam research facility that will not only meet Australia's own scientific and industrial research needs but also be a research centre of excellence; (c) providing research and research training facilities and programs to enhance the educational

5 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 26 August 1999, p. 9250.

opportunities available to Australia's scientists and engineers; (d) providing industrial isotopes and facilities for neutron activation analysis, irradiation of materials and neutron radiography to support agriculture and industry; and (e) maintaining Australia's nuclear technical expertise in order to provide sound advice to government on nuclear policy issues of strategic national interest.

Leading scientific, technological and medical associations have publicly expressed their support for replacing HIFAR. They include the Australian Academy of Science, the Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering, the Federation of Australian Scientific and Technological Societies, the Institution of Engineers Australia, the Australian Medical Association, the Australian and New Zealand Society of Nuclear Medicine and the Australian and New Zealand Association of Physicians in Nuclear Medicine.

ANSTO undertook a full environmental impact statement for the project in accordance with the provisions of the Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act 1974. After considering the environmental impact statement, the Minister for the Environment and Heritage announced on 30 March 1999 that there are no environmental reasons—including on health, safety, hazard or risk grounds—to prevent construction of the replacement reactor at Lucas Heights. The minister made 29 recommendations to ensure that the reactor is built and operated in accordance with best international practice. In response, the Minister for Industry, Science and Resources on 3 May 1999 accepted all 29 recommendations. ANSTO is now implementing appropriate plans to give effect to these recommendations.

The reactor proposal was referred to the Public Works Committee on 17 February 1999. The committee has now tabled its report. I note the conclusion of the committee that a need exists to replace the high flux Australian reactor with a modern research reactor and that the new national research reactor must be operational some time before HIFAR is decommissioned. I also note the conclusion of the committee that the comparable costs of locating the replacement research reactor at Lucas Heights or a greenfield site favour the former by a considerable margin.

There is one matter in the report which, on behalf of the government, I would like to clarify. The committee has concluded that a high level management structure will be established to oversight the project with representation from key departments. In fact, while a committee with that type of structure will certainly be established, its charter will be to oversee the tender selection process. The government would also like to place on record the contribution and the involvement of the honourable member for the area, Mrs Vale. The government also welcomes the committee's unanimous recommendation that the project should proceed.

In its report the committee made a number of recommendations. In response I can say that the government accepts those recommendations and will implement them as follows. ANSTO will provide the committee with six-monthly reports on progress during the design, construction and commissioning phases of the replacement reactor. All the recommendations in the environment assessment report will be implemented, including the commitments listed in appendix A of the report. The establishment of national repository and storage facilities for the various classes of Australia's radioactive waste is a high priority for the government. Once these facilities are established, all radioactive waste will be removed from Lucas Heights in a staged process for disposal or storage of them.

In its quarterly and annual reports to parliament, the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency will report on the implementation of all recommendations in the environment assessment report falling within its direct responsibility. In its annual report to parliament, ANSTO will provide a summary assessment of compliance and implementation of recommendations in the environment assessment report, including comments listed in appendix A of the report. ANSTO will provide these reports from 1999-2000 until all the recommendations have been addressed. All appointments to positions on committees identified in the ARPANS Act 1998 will be completed as soon as possible.

ANSTO will endeavour to finalise a community right to know charter in consultation with the Sutherland Shire Council and other local community groups before 30 March 2000. The funds for the construction of the reactor will not be found at the expense of other government science funding, and I am particularly pleased to assure the parliament of this. I thank the committee for its report and commend the motion to the House.

RAAF Base Townsville Redevelopment Stage 1, Townsville

Referred	30 March 1999
Public hearing held	16 June 1999
Report dated	2 September
Report presented	22 September 1999
Motion for expediency passed	30 September 1999
Report number	6 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$70.1 million plus \$16.96 million for capital equipment funded element
Expenditure recommended	\$87.05 million
Parliamentary Paper	189 / 1999

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The continued usage and improvement of RAAF Base Townsville as part of Australia's northern air defence is appropriate.
2. The provision of an improved Ordnance Loading Apron Complex is necessary to ensure that military aircraft can be armed with explosive ordnance safely and efficiently and that disruptions to the operations of general aviation and commuter aircraft are minimised.
3. A Quick Reaction Alert Facility (QRAF) will enhance the effectiveness of fighter aircraft by retaining them on alert for long periods and providing runway access.
4. Due to the replacement of the Caribou aircraft with Light Tactical Aircraft, there is a need for additional space to accommodate the aircraft and increased personnel numbers. A Light Tactical Aircraft flight simulator facility is also necessary.
5. A new consolidated vehicle and battery maintenance facility is needed and should overcome the deficiencies of the existing maintenance facilities and therefore improve performance and efficiency.
6. A new perimeter road is necessary to provide a safe all-weather route for boundary access to the Base by emergency vehicles, security patrols and vehicles transporting explosive ordnance.

7. Fuel Farm 1 is a potential hazard to the Base and the surrounding area, and attracts unnecessary maintenance overheads. Its closure is therefore appropriate.
8. The Department of Defence has undertaken adequate consultative processes in relation to the Borrow Pits. The replacement habitat should provide a suitable alternative habitat for the flora and fauna which currently resides in the Borrow Pits.
9. The Committee recommends that the development of the Borrow Pit replacement habitat continue to involve consultation between the Department of Defence and the relevant authorities and interest groups, to ensure that a suitable replacement habitat is provided.
10. The Committee is satisfied that the Department of Defence appears to have undertaken sufficient consultation with the relevant authorities and interest groups in the consideration of environmental and heritage issues associated with the redevelopment.
11. The Committee recommends the construction of RAAF BASE Townsville Redevelopment Stage 1, at an out turn cost of \$87.05 million.

Minister's Response

Mr SLIPPER⁶ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(1.41 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work, which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to parliament: RAAF Base Townsville Redevelopment Stage 1.

The Royal Australian Air Force base at Townsville forms part of a chain of military airfields stretching across northern Australia to Learmonth in the west. Together with the RAAF Scherger, Townsville provides for the air defence of northern Queensland and its approaches, as well as providing an air head for military air transport operations and a base for fighter strike, maritime and army aviation operations.

In many cases, the facilities need to be upgraded or replaced if the full operational and support capabilities assigned to the base are to be efficiently achieved and maintained and occupational health and safety standards met. Accordingly, a

⁶ Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 30 September 1999, p. 11078.

staged redevelopment of RAAF Townsville is proposed. The main components of stage 1 comprise: 10 fighter strike ordnance loading aprons, four maritime patrol ordnance loading aprons, an operational and technical support facility, the consolidation of vehicle and equipment maintenance functions, facilities for the Caribou replacement aircraft, and upgrade of base engineering services.

The estimated out-turn cost of the proposal is \$70.1 million with a further \$16.9 million identified for the capital equipment funded element. Subject to parliamentary approval, the project would be committed in December this year, with the aim of having it completed by December 2001.

In its report, the Joint Standing Committee on Public Works recommended that this project proceed. The Department of Defence accepts the recommendations of the committee and I commend the motion to the House.

Redevelopment of Darwin Naval Base Project

Referred	31 March 1999
Public hearing held	6 July 1999
Report dated	2 September
Report presented	22 September 1999
Motion for expediency passed	30 September 1999
Report number	7 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$12.4 million
Expenditure recommended	as above
Parliamentary Paper	190 / 1999

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. A new wharf and improvements to the existing wharf at Darwin Naval Base are necessary to overcome the administrative and occupational health and safety problems resulting from the existing berthing facilities at the Base.
2. Realignment of the boat ramp is appropriate to alleviate safety concerns for landing craft using the ramp.
3. The provision of three additional hardstands is necessary to allow additional craft to be removed from the water for maintenance and safety reasons.
4. Additional fuel storage and reconditioning facilities are needed to facilitate removal from the water of the increased number of vessels to be ported at Darwin Naval Base.
5. An undercover stores receipt and dispatch area will result in a working environment which complies with occupational health and safety principles.
6. The relocation of 36 Water Transport Troop to the main Base complex should result in the logical integration of common supply, stores, maintenance and administrative functions.
7. The Committee is satisfied that environmental and heritage concerns have been adequately addressed by the Department of Defence.

8. The Department of Defence should continue to consult with Darwin City Council and local residents in relation to alleviating excessive traffic noise related to the operations of the Base.
9. The Department of Defence, in consultation with Darwin City Council and local residents, should consider existing guidelines governing the level of noise permitted from construction activities, and particularly those carried out outside normal working hours and on weekends. Ability to comply with these guidelines should form part of the tender documentation prepared by prospective contractors.
10. The Committee is satisfied that the Department of Defence undertakes suitable safety precautions and measures in relation to the transportation of ordnance.
11. The Committee recommends the redevelopment of Darwin Naval Base at an out turn cost of \$12.4 million.

Minister's response

Mr SLIPPER⁷ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(1.36 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: Redevelopment of the Darwin naval base project Northern Territory.

The Department of Defence proposes to redevelop Darwin naval base to overcome the inadequacy of present facilities affecting current operations and to cater for a planned increase in the number of minor war vessels to be home ported in Darwin.

The base is an element of the Larrakeyah barracks and its initial development was completed in 1982. It was designed to support six Fremantle class patrol boats to be home ported in Darwin and to support other naval operational and exercise activities in northern waters. Since 1982 the tempo of operational activities in the north has increased as has the intensity of unilateral and bilateral exercises. Four army landing craft and naval heavy landing craft and additional harbour support

7 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 30 September 1999, p. 11077.

craft have been relocated to Darwin, placing an unacceptable strain on the existing support facilities.

In order to support the increases in activity and the additional craft, works were undertaken in 1992 to expand the dry berth tiedown area. Furthermore, in 1993 works were undertaken to supplement administrative and workshop facilities. The Royal Australian Navy intends to increase further the number of minor war vessels to be home-ported in Darwin. An additional four patrol boats and another heavy landing craft will relocate to Darwin on completion of the proposed works. The predominant elements of work will be, one, the extension of the existing wharf to cater for landing craft; two, the construction of a new wharf to support patrol boats and visiting minor war vessels; three, extension of the dry land storage area to facilitate repair activities and to increase the capacity of the base to protect craft in the event of a cyclone; four, increased fuel treatment and storage facilities to cater for both home-ported and visiting vessels; and, five, inadequacies in officers' areas and stores areas will also be addressed.

The estimated out-turn cost of the project is \$12.4 million. Subject to parliamentary approval, the project would be committed in October 1999 with the objective of completing the work by June in the year 2001. In its report, the Joint Standing Committee on Public Works has recommended that this project proceed. The Department of Defence accepts the recommendations of the committee, and I commend the motion to the House.

CSIRO Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, NSW—Joint Research Complex for CSIRO Molecular Science and Food Science Australia

Referred	30 March 1999
Public hearing held	11 May 1999
Report dated	23 September 1999
Report presented	30 September 1999
Motion for expediency passed	25 November 1999
Report number	8 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$49 million
Expenditure recommended	as above
Parliamentary Paper	201 / 1999

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, contains the largest aggregation of CSIRO research activities in New South Wales. Long term planning envisages development of the corporate park, within CSIRO precincts, to provide modern research facilities.
2. Land surplus to CSIRO requirements has been developed and infrastructure and site services have been upgraded or replaced for sale to private sector companies. Further rationalisation and consolidation of CSIRO facilities is planned.
3. Food Science Australia and the Division of Molecular Science undertake wide-ranging strategic and applied research for industries which play a vital role in the continued economic growth of Australia.
4. Both Divisions are located at North Ryde in facilities which are inadequate and cannot be adapted to contemporary and future research requirements. North Ryde is regarded as an ideal location for both organisations which are required to interact with companies and universities located in the Sydney area.
5. A need therefore exists for the provision of modern research facilities for Food Science Australia and the Division of Molecular Science at the North Ryde site. Both Divisions would benefit from collocation.
6. The proposed joint research complex will provide both Divisions with much needed modern research laboratories and ancillary facilities. The

extent of the complex can be justified being necessary to meet current and future requirements. CSIRO staff were involved in some detailed planning of the proposed joint complex.

7. The proposed location and height of the joint research centre combine to create a strong architectural statement whose immediate impact will be tempered by the setback from Delhi Road and tree plantings.
8. The Committee recommends that the profile and heights of exhaust stacks should be re-examined to reduce their visual impact.
9. CSIRO consulted widely with State and local government planning authorities in order to meet planning requirements.
10. CSIRO has implemented extensive initiatives to minimise the environmental impact of the development of the corporate park site. These measures include extensive stormwater management and the provision of a substantial portion of land as a flora and fauna reserve.
11. The Committee recommends the construction of the Joint Research Complex for CSIRO Molecular Science and Food Science Australia at Riverside Corporate park, North Ryde at an estimated cost of \$49 million at March 1999 prices.

Minister's response

Mr SLIPPER⁸ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(1.46 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: CSIRO Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, NSW—Joint Research Complex for CSIRO Molecular Science and Food Science Australia.

Mr Deputy Speaker, CSIRO proposes to construct a new joint complex for its Division of Molecular Science and Food Science Australia at Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, New South Wales. The proposed works are a further stage in the major redevelopment of the CSIRO site at North Ryde into a high technology business park, Riverside Corporate Park. It will incorporate both CSIRO research and development facilities and compatible private industry technology developments. The new complex will replace predominantly old and substandard

8 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 25 November 1999, p. 9452.

existing facilities at North Ryde that are now inadequate for conducting modern scientific research.

This project will establish and consolidate new replacement research facilities for Food Science Australia, a joint venture between CSIRO and Australian Food Industry Science Centre, and the Division of Molecular Science within a central CSIRO precinct at Riverside Corporate Park.

The new facilities will provide accommodation for some 220 Food Science Australia / Division of Molecular Science staff, plus long term visitors and students. It will also provide amenities, support services and infrastructure which will be shared among all CSIRO divisions within the central precinct of Riverside Corporate Park.

The new research facilities will consist of modern laboratories, laboratory special suites, support areas and laboratory offices, industrial scale process bays, as well as accommodation for the management and administration staff.

The joint facilities to be shared among all CSIRO divisions on the site include a library, canteen, a 140-seat auditorium and a central reception area, as well as common stores for both hazardous and non-hazardous goods and general consumables. Associated infrastructure, including fully networked computing capabilities, a comprehensive access control security system and building maintenance system, will be included in the project.

Associated site works will include roads, car parking, site engineering services and landscaping. Substandard temporary and redundant existing buildings located on the site of the new complex will be demolished.

The project has a budget of \$49 million. Subject to parliamentary approval, tenders are expected to be called early in the year 2000, with completion of construction in late 2001.

The Public Works Committee in its report has recommended that this project proceed. CSIRO agrees with the recommendations of the committee. On behalf of the government I would like to thank the committee for its support and I commend the motion to the House.

CSIRO Division of Building Construction and Engineering Development works at Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, NSW

Referred	30 June 1999
Public hearing held	18 August 1999
Report dated	23 September 1999
Report presented	30 September 1999
Motion for expediency passed	25 November 1999
Report number	9 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$10 million
Expenditure recommended	as above
Parliamentary Paper	202 / 1999

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The Committee concludes that there are sound logistic and economic reasons for the consolidation of the CSIRO Construction Building and Engineering facilities in the Southern Precinct of Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde.
2. The Committee is satisfied that the CSIRO's development proposals take appropriate account of the environment and that the various conservation measures outlined to the Committee will minimise adverse environmental impacts.
3. The Committee recommends that the CSIRO allocate sufficient resources to the supervision of development works and management of the environmental aspects of the project to ensure effective and thorough implementation of promised conservation measures.
4. The Committee recommends that the CSIRO investigate alternative paving materials to reduce run-off at the proposed development site and incorporate results of this research into the comprehensive environmental management plan for this project.
5. The Committee recommends that the CSIRO ensure that local resident groups have the opportunity to contribute to and / or comment on the comprehensive environmental management plan currently being prepared for this project.

6. The Committee recommends the construction of the CSIRO Division of Building Construction and Engineering Development Works at Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, NSW, at a cost of \$10 million at June 1999 prices.

Minister's Response

Mr SLIPPER⁹ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(1.50 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: CSIRO Division of Building Construction and Engineering Development Works at Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, NSW.

CSIRO proposes to construct new facilities for its Division of Building Construction and Engineering at Riverside Corporate Park, North Ryde, New South Wales. The proposed works will replace predominantly old and substandard facilities with new state of the art accommodation for the division's construction materials laboratory and fire technology complex. These new facilities will be consolidated with other recently constructed facilities within a discrete divisional precinct at Riverside Corporate Park. These works are a further stage in the major redevelopment of Riverside Corporate Park as a high technology business park. It will include both CSIRO research and development facilities and compatible private industry occupants.

The proposed facilities will accommodate the construction materials laboratory, which will house groups undertaking research and testing of concrete masonry materials, and the fire technology complex, which will conduct fire-related research activities, including the behaviour of structures and materials subjected to fire, and advanced fire protection technologies. The new facilities will replace accommodation on one site scheduled for sale and fire research structures erected on another site in the early 1950s. The existing facilities are inadequate for current activities and substandard in terms of structure and materials. The existing structures are constructed from materials containing asbestos and will be demolished. The land will be decontaminated in preparation for future use by CSIRO.

The project has a budget of \$10 million. Subject to parliamentary approval, tenders are to be called in early 2000 with completion scheduled for mid-2001. The Public

9 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 25 November 1999, p. 9452.

Works Committee in its report recommends that this project proceed. CSIRO agrees with the recommendations of the committee. I would like again to thank the committee for its support and I commend the motion to the house.

CSIRO Clayton (Eastern Precinct) Development Works, Vic

Referred	12 May 1999
Public hearing held	8 July 1999
Report dated	30 September 1999
Report presented	13 October 1999
Motion for expediency passed	25 November 1999
Report number	10 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$28 million
Expenditure recommended	as above
Parliamentary Paper	208 / 1999

Conclusions and recommendations

1. Since 1961 substantial investments have been made by the Commonwealth in the construction of five major CSIRO research laboratory complexes on a 15 hectare site at Clayton, Victoria.
2. The site now houses the largest concentration of CSIRO scientific expertise in Victoria. It is the centre of CSIRO research into minerals, forest products, molecular and polymer science, manufacturing science and technology and mathematical and information science.
3. A number of elements of research Divisions, in particular Manufacturing Science and Technology and Petroleum Resources remain at other centres within the Melbourne metropolitan area in properties owned or leased by CSIRO.
4. Capacity remains at the Clayton site for further collocation and rationalisation of research activities. This rationalisation would result in reduced overheads and realise proceeds from property sales for investment in new and upgraded research facilities at Clayton. It would also facilitate interaction between research groups and between Divisions, cooperative research centres and staff and post-graduate students from Monash University.
5. In property terms, sites at Preston and Syndal and leased premises at Carlton and Clayton could be vacated and staff relocated to Clayton.
6. A need therefore exists to provide additional research facilities at the Clayton site for more than 370 CSIRO staff.

7. The need for stainless steel downpipes proposed for the refurbished David Rivett Building should be reviewed.
8. CSIRO should develop a master plan for the further development of the site which will avoid costly removal of existing facilities and infrastructure.
9. The scope of the proposed development includes refurbished and new accommodation at a standard commensurate with modern research requirements and on a scale consistent with the number of staff to be employed. There is capacity for expansion. The scope of the project can be justified as making adaptive reuse of refurbished buildings with new construction reflecting contemporary generic research facilities already provided at other sites.
10. The Committee recommends the construction of the CSIRO Clayton (Eastern Precinct) Development Works at an estimated cost of \$28 million at May 1999 prices.

Minister's response

Mr SLIPPER¹⁰ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(1.53 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: CSIRO Clayton (Eastern Precinct) Development Works, Victoria.

CSIRO proposes to consolidate the Victorian activities of its divisions of Manufacturing Science and Technology, Mathematical and Information Sciences, Information Technology Services and Petroleum Resources at its Clayton site in Victoria. The project will enable CSIRO to vacate sites at Preston and Syndal, freeing up these sites for sale. It will also relocate staff and resources from leased premises at Carlton and Clayton into accommodation at the Clayton site, which is owned by CSIRO and is located adjacent to the campus of Monash University. The Clayton site is one of the largest sites of CSIRO and is occupied by more than 700 staff. It is the major Victorian site of the organisation and the centre for CSIRO research into minerals, forest products, molecular and polymer science, manufacturing science and technology, and mathematical and information sciences.

10 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 25 November 1999, p. 9453.

The development will provide approximately 7,000 square metres gross floor area of new building accommodation. This is in addition to another 7,000 square metres of refurbishment in the 35-year-old outdated and substandard David Rivett laboratories. This will provide accommodation for over 370 staff. The work will provide laboratories, offices, process and technical bays, research support facilities and staff amenities. The project has a budget of \$28 million. Subject to parliamentary approval, construction is expected to commence in mid-2000 with completion scheduled for early 2002. The Public Works Committee in its report recommends that this project proceed. CSIRO agrees with the recommendations of the committee. I would like to thank the committee for its support and I commend the motion to the house.

Refurbishment of 4 Treasury Place, Melbourne

Referred	21 June 1999
Public hearing held	16 August
Report dated	14 October 1999
Report presented	20 October 1999
Motion for expediency passed	21 October 1999
Report number	11 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$15.8 million
Expenditure recommended	\$17.8 million
Parliamentary Paper	213 / 1999

Conclusions and recommendations

1. The first building constructed for the Commonwealth is No 4 Treasury Place, located in Melbourne's historic Treasury Reserve precinct and is closely associated with the early history of Federation.
2. In the past, the building housed the office of the Prime Minister, Cabinet and the Commonwealth Treasury. Today, the building houses the Melbourne offices of the Prime Minister, Cabinet, the Governor-General, former Prime Ministers and Governors-General, Melbourne-based Ministers and visiting Ministers.
3. It is listed on the Register of the National Estate and must be preserved for future generations.
4. Whilst the building appears structurally sound, there is a need to refurbish the interior and exterior.
5. Internally, the building's finishes and services are showing signs of disrepair and have reached the end of their economic lives.
6. Externally, the building requires extensive restoration and the removal of extensions and roof repairs.
7. The proposed internal and external works are extensive and can be justified to preserve the building and to provide office accommodation of a suitable standard.
8. The building certifiers have confirmed that emergency egress from the basement will be the subject of a dispensation from the Building Code of

Australia. Emergency evacuation of basement occupants should be accorded the highest priority. The suitability of the basement as a public resource or interpretation centre should be investigated further. The views of the Melbourne Metropolitan Fire Brigades should be sought before final plans are developed for the basement.

9. The scope and design of building services and systems are appropriate for the operation of the building subject to basement emergency evacuation requirements being satisfactorily addressed.
10. The Committee recognises the sensitive nature of heritage issues raised by the Australian Heritage Commission and requests continuing advice and information about ongoing discussions between the Department of Finance and Administration and the Commission to ensure that all options are properly explored to maintain the heritage aspects of the building.
11. The Committee recommends the refurbishment of No 4 Treasury Place, Melbourne, at an estimated cost of \$17.8 million.

Minister's response

Mr SLIPPER¹¹ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(5.04 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: Refurbishment of 4 Treasury Place, Melbourne.

The government has approved the provision of \$17.8 million to undertake the refurbishment of the Commonwealth offices at 4 Treasury Place, Melbourne, subject to the normal Public Works Committee processes. 4 Treasury Place was constructed in two stages between 1911 and 1913 as the first purpose-built federal building. It is a six-level building comprising a total building area of 6,364 square metres but, more importantly, it is a building rich in character and a fine example of the architecture near the time of our Federation. 4 Treasury Place is of national significance because of its close association with the history of the Commonwealth of Australia, and is of continued importance today as the Melbourne offices of His Excellency the Governor-General, the Prime Minister, cabinet, Melbourne based ministers, visiting ministers and also two former governors-general.

11 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 21 October 1999, p. 12184.

It is located on the eastern edge of Melbourne's central business district within the Treasury Reserve and adjacent to a number of state government owned buildings of similar age, character and historical significance. Having regard to the building's significance and its place within the historic Treasury Reserve precinct, the Commonwealth will be retaining ownership and use of this building. As is appropriate, it will also be continuing the historic tradition of the building's primary use, which is the provision of parliamentary offices. As such, the building will continue to be leased by the ministerial and parliamentary services group of the Department of Finance and Administration, the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet and the Office of the Governor-General.

It is also proposed to accommodate within the building, with consequent rental savings, some non-government senators and members who are currently located in private sector leased premises elsewhere in Melbourne. The proposed refurbishment works include repair of the render work and application of new finishes, demolition of the non-original fourth floor additions, restoration of the slate roofs, replacement of all building services and refurbishment of amenities throughout the building. The proposed works will restore and protect this valuable heritage asset while providing the building tenants with an efficient and safe working environment with reduced building operational costs.

The level of disruption associated with the proposed building works unfortunately necessitates the relocation of tenants to temporary accommodation at Casselden Place for the duration of the refurbishment works. These works are expected to take about 14 months, and the official opening of the refurbished building will form an important part of the Centenary of Federation celebrations in the city of Melbourne early in the year 2001.

The suitability of the basement as a public resource and interpretation centre is under investigation and, in the event that the space is used for such a purpose, the associated fire safety requirements, including emergency evacuation requirements, under the Building Code of Australia will be fully complied with. The Melbourne Fire Brigade has provided comment on the fire safety provisions within the building, and that information is being taken into account in the finalisation of the refurbishment design.

The Department of Finance and Administration has been involved in extensive and constructive discussions with the Australian Heritage Commission to ensure that the heritage values of the building are protected to the maximum extent practicable. The department will shortly be in a position to further advise the committee on this matter. I am particularly pleased to advise that the stand of pine trees at the eastern end of the building and the canary palm on the northern side of the building will be retained.

As my colleague the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the honourable member for Pearce, noted yesterday when presenting the Public Works Committee report to this chamber, the recommendations in the report have been unanimously endorsed by the committee. On behalf of the government, I would like to thank the committee for its support and I commend the motion to the House.

Staff Colleges Collocation Project, Weston Creek, ACT

Referred	30 March 1999
Public/ Private hearings held	11 June (Canberra), 17 August (Queenscliff—inspection), 2 and 30 September and 21 October (all Canberra)
Report dated	25 November
Report presented	6 December 1999
Motion for expediency passed	8 December 1999
Report number	12 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$28 million
Expenditure recommended	as above
Parliamentary Paper	380 / 1999

Conclusions and recommendations

1. The three services currently conduct middle level officer training at individual staff colleges located in Sydney, Canberra and at Queenscliff. Collocation of the colleges would achieve financial and manpower savings and reinforce an emerging joint culture in the Australian Defence Force.
2. An education model has been developed for collocated staff colleges which covers common, single service and joint education. Implementation of the new education model will require additional educational and support facilities.
3. Existing Air Force and Navy staff colleges are unsuitable for further development due to property ownership and site constraints.
4. There is a need to provide new facilities to house students and staff of the Australian Command and Staff course which is due to commence in 2001.
5. A site at Weston Creek, occupied by the Australian Defence College, has the capacity for expansion. Further development of the Queenscliff site is constrained by heritage issues and distance from other educational supports.
6. Comparative operational costs between Weston Creek and Queenscliff favour the former. In addition, non-quantifiable benefits such as posting stability strongly favour the Weston Creek site.

7. Although the property has been offered to the State of Victoria, the Committee has strong concerns about the future use of the Fort Queenscliff property when the Army college is collocated in Canberra.
8. During negotiations concerning the transfer documents with the State of Victoria, the Commonwealth should insist on the inclusion of caveats and covenants in the documents to preserve the heritage value of the property similar to those which applied to former lighthouse stations.
9. The nature and extent of the education complex are based on predetermined student numbers and staff and the format of the Staff College course.
10. Support areas such as administration, kitchen and dining facilities take into account the number of staff and the remoteness of the site from commercial outlets.
11. Principles and standards adopted for the design reflect contemporary practices adopted by Defence for similar development proposals.
12. The Committee recommends the construction of the Staff Colleges Collocation Project, Weston Creek, ACT at an estimated out turn cost of \$28 million.

Minister's response

Mr SLIPPER¹² (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(5.47 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: Staff Colleges collocation project, Weston Creek, ACT.

The single services currently conduct middle level officer training in their individual staff colleges. Collocation of the three colleges onto one site was most recently proposed in the context of the Defence Reform Program. The service colleges are presently located at Queenscliff in Victoria, Balmoral in Sydney and Fairbairn in the ACT—for the Army, the Royal Australian Navy and the Royal Australian Air Force, respectively.

The Department of Defence proposes to collocate the three existing staff service colleges and the Defence Public Service management course in new facilities to be

12 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 8 December 1999, p. 9750.

constructed at Weston Creek in the Australian Capital Territory. These facilities will sit adjacent to the existing Australian Defence College.

The works now proposed are needed to improve efficiency in the delivery of middle level officer training and thereby realise savings in operating costs and reinforce an emerging Australian Defence Force joint culture. The works are in three main components consisting of:

- . the main college building of up to three levels to accommodate educational and administrative facilities;
- . supporting works, involving a replacement catering facility and upgraded library and gymnasium; and
- . the augmentation of existing site infrastructure, roadways, parking facilities and landscaping.

The estimated outturn cost of the project is \$28 million. Subject to parliamentary approval, construction will commence in December this year—that is, this month—with the objective of having it completed in February 2001.

In its report the committee has recommended that this project proceed. The Department of Defence agrees with the recommendations of the committee. I thank the committee, and I commend the motion to the House.

ANZAC Hall Extension, Australian War Memorial, Canberra

Referred	19 October 1999
Public hearing held	22 November
Report dated	25 November
Report presented	6 December 1999
Motion for expediency passed	8 December 1999
Report number	13 / 1999
Proposed expenditure	\$11.9 million
Expenditure recommended	as above
Parliamentary Paper	381 / 1999

Conclusions and recommendations

1. The Committee is satisfied with advice tendered by the National Capital Authority that the current carpark trees do not have preservation significance and are not Heritage listed.
2. The Committee recommends that the initial 251 carspaces to the west and the later 104 carspaces to the east (including 10 disabled carspaces near the main entrance) be sealed and available before ANZAC Hall is opened. The additional bus parking spaces should also be available before ANZAC Hall opens.
3. The Committee is satisfied that the proposed Colorbond roof meets the requirements of the brief but is aware of concerns about its quality as expressed by the National Capital Authority and the Australian Heritage Commission.
4. At an estimated further cost to the project of approximately \$2 million, the Committee does not believe that a copper or zinc roof represents value for money. The Committee therefore recommends that this issue be resolved satisfactorily between the Australian War Memorial and the National Capital Authority prior to the commencement of work.
5. The Committee notes that the Australian War Memorial is in the process of engaging a consultant to advise and assist on issues relating to people with disabilities in the design process for ANZAC Hall. The Committee also recognises that the Australian War Memorial has improved access to the Memorial considerably over the last few years and intends to continue to

ensure that the needs of people with disabilities are met within the usual budget constraints.

6. The Committee recommends the construction of ANZAC Hall at the rear of the Australian War Memorial, Campbell, ACT, at a cost of \$11.9 million at October 1999 prices.

Minister's response

Mr SLIPPER¹³ (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration)(5.39 p.m.)—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: Anzac Hall extension, Australian War Memorial, Canberra.

The Australian War Memorial proposes to build a modern, flexible exhibition hall of 3,000 square metres to showcase its world-class collection of large technology objects. It is planned that Anzac Hall will utilise the technique 'object theatre' to interpret and display its many wartime relics. An example of these relics includes the Japanese midget submarine which, when finally displayed, will be suspended as if caught in antisubmarine nets—as it was in Sydney Harbour in 1942. Another example, once its conservation work is completed, is the Lancaster Bomber G for George, which will appear as if in a bombing raid with a German fighter poised menacingly above it.

Four years ago the Australian War Memorial began an exciting and challenging major program to revitalise its galleries, which had become dated. The galleries were not communicating as well as they might and were not using modern display techniques, particularly multimedia. In its summary statement to the Public Works Committee, the War Memorial turned to its founder, Charles Bean, and his original vision for the institution. He once said:

We are out to make our war museum, our war gallery and our war library, if possible, not merely fine museums for Australia, but the finest that the world contains.

As I stated when referring this matter to the Public Works Committee, the first stage of revitalising the galleries and facilities in the main building is now complete. It should be noted that there has been an increase of over 30 per cent in attendance since the reopening of the galleries by the Prime Minister in March this

13 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representatives, 8 December 1999, p. 9749.

year. It became strikingly apparent during the renewal program that the public had strong expectations of seeing many of the large major icons of the collection when they visited. Unfortunately, most of these are in a repository in the outer Canberra suburb of Mitchell with limited public access.

This stage of the Anzac Memorial Hall development will go a long way towards satisfying further the strong public demand for such displays of our nation's proud heritage. The building design of Anzac Hall comprises two major elements: a wall which rests 20 metres behind the main building and acts as a backdrop to the iconic form of the main building, and a large, slightly curved, metal roof which fans out from the centre point of the dome and sits behind the wall. The wall conceals some of the bulk of the building which is dug into the ground so that it cannot be seen from Anzac Parade. The roof sits lower and into the landscape so that it does not dominate the view from Mount Ainslie.

A simple glass link will join the historic, main War Memorial building to the clean and striking architecture of Anzac Hall. The site of Anzac Hall is the current car park facility for staff and visitors. A new car park will be constructed on the western side of the Administration Building, and all associated road, pedestrian access and other external works will need to be completed before the existing car park is closed. This new area will provide 256 spaces. An additional 109 spaces, including 10 disabled parking spaces, can be accommodated in the future on the eastern side of the building. The Australian War Memorial is very confident that all of the 109 additional car park spaces designated for the eastern side of the site can be constructed prior to the building opening in April 2001. It is seeking tenders, which will include sealing of all car parks. The Anzac Hall project has a budget of \$11.9 million funded from the Federation Fund. Subject to parliamentary approval, tenders are expected to be called early next year, with work scheduled for completion by 30 March 2001. It is planned that the building will be officially opened on Anzac Day 2001.

The Public Works Committee in its report has recommended that this project proceed. The memorial enjoys a close and cooperative working partnership with the National Capital Authority and the Australian Heritage Commission. It is sure that its architects will provide design solutions which will meet the issues that these agencies raised on the appropriateness of the designated roofing materials. The memorial is engaging a disabled access consultant to advise on the internal and external design of Anzac Hall and its associated works. The memorial will continue its program of ensuring that its facilities enable visitors with disabilities to enjoy their visit and participate in the full experiences offered by the memorial. In closing, I would thank the committee for its support. I commend the motion to the House.



**Appendix C—Acton Peninsula Alliance, External
Envelope Design Considerations**