

**Senate Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee**  
**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**  
**ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES 2015-16**

Finance Portfolio  
9 February 2016

**Department/Agency:** Department of Finance

**Outcome/Program:** 2/2.3

**Topic:** The Lodge – project manager contract

**Senator:** McAllister

**Question reference number:** F32

**Type of question:** Hansard Proof, F&PA Committee, Page 101, 9 February 2016

**Date set by the committee for the return of answer:** Friday, 1 April 2016

**Number of pages:** 1

**Question:**

**Senator McALLISTER:** In this instance was that person an external contractor?

**Ms Hall:** It was a firm, GHD— Gutteridge, Haskins and Davey. Then we have a couple of staff internal to the department who are contract managers, essentially. They manage those contracts for the delivery of the works.

**Senator McALLISTER:** Was the nature of the contract with GHD that any of their fee was at risk or associated with performance?

**Ms Hall:** I would have to take that on notice.

**Answer:**

The GHD contract fees were based on a fixed fee for approved scope and associated program for the works.

Failure to deliver the scope of services in accordance with the quality and program requirements would trigger ‘re-performance’ clauses under the contact.

Variations for additional works, not in the original contract, were based on the fixed schedule of rates agreed at the time of engagement.