

PUBLIC

**THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON FRIDAY
7 AUGUST 2026**

INQUIRY INTO THE MACQUARIE POINT STADIUM COSTINGS AND GOVERNANCE

Public Hearing: Inquiry into the Macquarie Point Stadium Costings and Governance

The Committee met at 11:39 am.

CHAIR - Thank you, Treasurer, or Minister, or everything.

Mr ABETZ - Minister, I think. Now you caught me as Treasurer.

CHAIR - Thank you for your appearance before the Public Accounts Committee into our ongoing scrutiny of the Macquarie Point development, the stadium, particularly. I'll invite you to provide some opening comments in a moment. If your two at the table could take the statutory declaration. I don't think I need to go through all the procedural information. I think we're fine, if that's okay with you. We're focusing initially, in the role as Treasurer as well as Minister, on the financial aspects of it, as well as the delivery aspects of it. Over to you, Treasurer, Minister.

Mr ABETZ - Thank you, Chair. On my left is the Secretary of Treasury, Gary Swain. On my right is Deputy Secretary Mat Healey, and I always forget his full title. Mat, help me out.

Mr HEALEY - Deputy Secretary, Strategy and Delivery.

Mr ABETZ - Strategy and Delivery.

Mr GARY SWAIN, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND FINANCE, and **Mr MATHEW HEALEY**, DEPUTY SECRETARY, STRATEGY AND DELIVERY, DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET, WERE CALLED, TOOK THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

Mr ABETZ - Thank you, Chair. Since the Committee's hearing in May [2026], the project has progressed from approvals and planning towards implementation, oversight and risk management. As Minister and Chair of the Cabinet Committee, my role is not to manage day-to-day delivery. That responsibility sits with the Macquarie Point Development Corporation and the relevant agencies. My role is to provide Ministerial oversight, monitor delivery against approved parameters, consider strategic risks and ensure Cabinet receives coordinated advice on major decisions.

The Cabinet Committee continues to meet regularly and has considered procurement funding, infrastructure dependencies, AFL¹ commitments and broader urban renewal outcomes.

¹ Australian Football League

Its recent focus has included financial investment decision pathways, governance and financing arrangements, precinct infrastructure and delivery risks across multiple projects and agencies.

Cabinet establishes the project scope, budget, schedule, governance arrangements and delivery objectives. Macquarie Point Development Corporation (MPDC) and its Board are responsible for delivering within those parameters. Government monitors performance and considers matters that may require changes to those parameters.

I remain at arm's length from the live requests for tender. Ministers should not be involved in the tender evaluation of procurement decisions, and I'm not. If procurement outcomes affect approved parameters, those matters will be considered through the established governance framework after the process concludes.

I've sought advice from the MPDC Chair on whether it would be appropriate to update the P90 cost estimate at this time and on the process from here as the two tenders are assessed through the first stage of the RFT.² As a courtesy to the Committee, I now table the Chair's response to me on those matters. That relates to the Vica Bayley motion in the House. If I may, I'll hand them to the Secretary to hand out.³

The Government remains focused on robust oversight, careful stewardship of public resources and evidence-based decision making. Our objective is to deliver both the stadium and the broader urban renewal of Macquarie Point, providing long-term benefits for Tasmania. I look forward to assisting the Committee and answering questions. Thanks, Chair.

CHAIR - In terms of the commitment to cap the cost, can you be really clear about what is in that and what isn't in it? What's included in the cost of the stadium and what's not?

Mr ABETZ - Are you able to assist in this, Deputy Secretary?

Mr HEALEY - I can provide some general information around the broader infrastructure - precinct infrastructure-related costs that I think you might be referring to, that certainly overlap with the project costs and some of the infrastructure costs that are critical not only to the broader operation of the precinct but of the operation of the stadium. There is additional funding within the MPDC to demolish the Goods Shed and the Red Shed, to decommission Evans Street substation and construct a new Hunter Street substation, to construct the north and south construction energy supply arrangements, to do ongoing site remediation and to invest in the north-eastern plaza within the precinct. They're costs that, with the exception of ongoing site remediation, the understanding of those costs is fairly well advanced, and we understand that they collectively - and this is probably detail that is for MPDC, but collectively there's about \$22 million worth of works in those works.

There is additional works that will be required for the activation of the precinct that Mac Point is still working their way through. They include the augmentation of stormwater down Evans Street, the reticulation of services internal to the precinct, site landscaping outside

² Request for Tender

³ See 'Letter from MPDC to Minister Abetz (Revised Stadium Costs) - 4 August 2026', https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0022/109642/Letter-from-Kim-Evans-Chair,-MPDC-to-Hon-Eric-Abetz-MP-Minister-for-Macquarie-Point-Urban-Renewal-with-respect-to-revised-Stadium-construction-costs-4-August-2026.pdf

of the footprint of the stadium, and then Brooker and Evans Street water augmentation, and the broader power supply from TasNetworks into the precinct.

We don't have confident estimates of the costs of those. I understand that Mac Point and the various utilities are still working their way through those. We do expect there will be additional costs associated with those, but they're costs that for the large part would be incurred for any development that you would need to have on that site.

I suppose, just in the interest of understanding some of the issues associated with the decisions for that site, there's ongoing discussions, for example, as to whether or not the Government wants to pursue, and TasPorts wants to pursue, the future electrification of the port, allowing cruise ships to plug in and turn their diesel engines off, which makes the port more attractive both as a cruise terminal and potentially as the gateway to Antarctica. They have implications for TasNetworks' decision in terms of the scale of infrastructure that they will direct into that precinct. So, they're the discussions that are going on at the moment. We're having some discussions with TasPorts and TasNetworks to make sure that our investment in infrastructure to Mac Point is creating the best possible future for that site. That's why there's some uncertainty around some of those figures.

CHAIR - All that Mat has mentioned is off or excluded from the price cap of the stadium? Is that correct, Minister?

Mr HEALEY - Yeah, they're not within the \$1.3 billion, how they're delivered. I mean, they are precinct costs. They're for the activation of the broader precinct.

CHAIR - If you weren't building a stadium with a very large roof, if you go back to the last master plan, there was a number of buildings that all have roofs, but not to that scale and extent that they collect so much water in, potentially, a short space of time because occasionally it rains in Hobart and sometimes it rains heavily, rather than just mizzles. So, you can have quite a large volume of water. As I understand it, this large volume of water, because of the nature of the roof size, will require significant upgrade to the stormwater. Why isn't that included in the stadium cost?

Mr HEALEY - That level of detail I probably haven't got. That might be a question for Macquarie Point in terms of their modelling for stormwater and what the plans would otherwise have been. I probably can't respond to that level of detail.

CHAIR - Minister, if you weren't building a stadium with a very large roof - it seems like it's a critical part of infrastructure to support the delivery of the stadium. If you weren't putting a roof on the stadium, yeah, you'd still have stormwater, you would still have some of the challenges, but a lot of it would be contained on the ground. The runoff from a solid roof is very different from the rain hitting the ground. I find it extraordinary, and this is what some of the people of Tasmania struggle with, that you have this piece of infrastructure that is a unique and entirely structural part of the stadium, but it's excluded from the cost of the stadium.

Mr HEALEY - We shouldn't forget that if you didn't have a stadium, you would have something else. And that may also -

CHAIR - Don't divert me off this.

PUBLIC

Mr HEALEY - Can I just say, though, that even the alternate proposal and, excuse me, I can't remember the name of the organisation that Roland Browne was representing, even in that proposal there was a very large number of residential properties, all of which would have had fixed roofs and all of which would be catching rain and needing to have that rain distributed as well.

CHAIR - But they wouldn't be covering the whole site like that. I think we need to acknowledge here, there is a piece of infrastructure that is part of the very design of the stadium. That was one of its big selling points. That's what the AFL said we had to have, okay -

Mr ABETZ - And indeed, the - yes.

CHAIR - So why isn't the cost that flows, pardon the pun, directly from that commitment that we made to the AFL not included in the cost?

Mr ABETZ - Well, as I understand, it was the Tasmanian Committee that was looking at a stadium or AFL team that suggested a roof, but that aside -

CHAIR - But it wasn't initially there either.

Mr ABETZ - that sort of specific question I think is best for the MPDC, because I'm not involved in that sort of specificity.

CHAIR - But as Treasurer, you have to find another bucket of money somewhere.

Ms THOMAS - Can I ask the question in a different way?

CHAIR - Yes.

Mr ABETZ - In due course, when it all comes together, we will be provided with a final figure.

CHAIR - Including all these other things needed to make the stadium possible to operate?

Mr ABETZ - There will, undoubtedly, be some other items, but as the Deputy Secretary said, the power supply to the precinct, that may well be to electrify the port for the benefit of TasPorts and cruise ships, so they can turn their engines off and have an electricity supply.

CHAIR - Yes, that's why I didn't focus on that because I can see there are other - I focused on the roof. That's an integral part of the stadium.

Mr ABETZ - Yes. As to the detail of the roof, I would divert to the MPDC that I understand will be appearing later.

Ms THOMAS - Thank you.

Mr SWAIN - I just want to make a couple of budget comments: as that work advances, additional costs will either have to be considered in the next Budget or the Budget thereafter, but probably the next Budget, either explicitly in terms of cost of risks and, as you know, risks

can be quantified or unquantified depending on your knowledge. Certainly, through my role in the Budget Committee and Oversight Committee, I'm anticipating that that information will have to be brought into the budget process, but just more from an infrastructure background comment, the question to MPDC, I don't know. The same amount of water is falling, so if it's falling on a roof versus falling on the ground, it still needs to be dealt with, so there's a technical question for a stormwater expert, which MPDC will know is how would you make - the water hasn't gone away just because it doesn't fall on the roof: it still would have to be dealt with on the site. That's infrastructure.

CHAIR - It might help the grass grow.

Mr SWAIN - Well, you would still have drainage. Going to Mat's example around the port, even if you have certainty about the stadium, unless you have certainty about all the other developments, the apportionment of that cost is still a complicated question, because you don't have a complete description of the other.

Ms THOMAS - On that, to follow up from the Chair's line of questioning: the Commonwealth funding that has been granted and the agreement with the Commonwealth overall is for the development of the Macquarie Point precinct, as I understand it. So, as Treasurer, do you have a schedule of all infrastructure that's required under that precinct plan, if you like, and the stadium and the \$1.13 billion with the agreement to cap the State's contribution to that \$1.13 billion at \$875 million, is one part of the Macquarie Point precinct development: but when we're talking about some of these other projects that will be required no matter what you're putting there, the housing component that's required under the Federation Funding Agreement,⁴ the port redevelopment, there are a lot of projects involved in the broader precinct development that the stadium funding from the Commonwealth has been wrapped up in.

So, do you as Treasurer have a schedule of all of the infrastructure that's required under this broader Federation Funding Agreement and anticipated costs and contributions from the Government on all of those things, because we keep hearing about components that are live because of the link to the stadium, but as has been acknowledged, they would perhaps be necessary for the port upgrade and other things as well? It would perhaps be helpful if those costs could be reported alongside the stadium costs, as part of the broader precinct development. Is that something you've considered, or would consider, Treasurer, as the bigger picture here?

Mr ABETZ - Look, can consider that and see what can be provided, just ensuring that we don't prejudice any quotes along the way: if we say, for whatever reason, that we think something might cost a certain amount, we don't necessarily want to put that too much in the public arena, because then the quotations that we get will undoubtedly match that which we've put in the public arena. Deputy Secretary, do you have anything further to add?

Mr HEALEY - Perhaps to add to what Gary mentioned before, these costs will need to be appropriated in the Budget. So, there needs to be transparency around those appropriations. I can tell you from our advice from the Oversight Committee, of the funding that has been provided to MPDC to date, there is still available somewhere in the order - and if you can give

⁴ See in general, 'Macquarie Point Federation Funding Agreement - Infrastructure (30 June 2026)', https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0011/110063/SIGNED-Macquarie-Point-Federation-Funding-Agreement-Infrastructure.pdf

me some latitude, ask for more specific information from Macquarie Point later - but we understand there's around \$30 to 35 million that they still have available in their own funds to continue to invest in the precinct and precinct infrastructure. That's not going to be enough, we know that: and I think Macquarie Point has been open that they're going to need some further supplementation and that will need to be included at least in the 2027-2028 Budget. Yes, they will have to be, and we will have to be open around what those costs are so that they can be appropriated.

Mr SWAIN - That's entirely right. Other than where a development is not sufficiently developed to be considered in the budget process, it will be a risk, and the Treasurer -

CHAIR - It won't appear as a risk for next year's Budget, because they will have quantified some of these costs.

Mr HEALEY - We hope so.

Mr ABETZ - I think that's right.

Mr SWAIN - What I'm saying: if it's a defined cost, it will be considered through the budget process. If it's not ready for that, it will be a risk, and then risks, as you know, how quantified or unquantified, generally we quantify them when we can and you will have to consider the commercial sensitivity of that, as the Treasurer articulates.

Ms THOMAS - So, the justification previously given on this Federation Funding Agreement, because there are communities still asking me questions about why the Government is allocating the \$240 million from the Federal Government to the stadium when it's for these other things as well, you know, and there's the broader precinct development and people are concerned about housing and how's the housing going to be delivered? Why is that stadium prioritised over the housing?

The answer provided in response to previous questions I've asked, is because the broader precinct plan has the stadium central to it: and so the Commonwealth has agreed that \$240 million goes to the stadium because it's a central part of the precinct plan, but there are these other elements and what I'm hearing, Treasurer, correct me if I'm wrong, is some of them aren't fully costed yet, but the Government is intent on delivering them. But are there any risks to that \$240 million actually being forthcoming, then, if it appears the State cannot deliver on the other milestones in the Federation Funding Agreement?

Mr ABETZ - The Deputy Secretary will correct me if I'm wrong, but as I understand it the milestones have been achieved and the funding is guaranteed.

Mr HEALEY - Through you, Treasurer, as you know, the original version of the Federation Funding Agreement had that we would agree milestones before the payments are to be made. The Federation Funding Agreement has been updated so that the first two years of funding is now available to the State and will be paid to the State based on the fact that the planning approval has been received and the budget has been provided for the stadium: and the remaining funds will just be agreed once the program from the contractor is known.

The only reason that that's to be worked through is the Commonwealth just wanted to be clear about what the milestones for the payment of the remainder of that funding is. It's not

because there's any uncertainty that the State will receive that funding: it's just the timing of the receipt of that funding. They don't - as they should, they want to make sure that they're not paying in advance of when the funding will be required for the construction of the stadium. You're absolutely right - the terms of the agreement required that there is housing on site and there absolutely will be. The master plan includes housing. They've gone quite a long way in developing a concept for around 100 apartments on the foreshore just in front of Regatta Point, and that will be activated once the stadium is built and that they can move to the broader precinct.

CHAIR - But it relies on the Macquarie Point selling land to fund that.

Mr HEALEY - There is the potential transaction of land, yes, sure.

CHAIR - Otherwise, how are they going to fund it, unless we give them more money?

Mr HEALEY - No, that's exactly right. But the early advice, because the Oversight Committee very early in the piece wanted to understand how this would work, and the advice was that the stadium needs to be built in order to realise the value of the land around the precinct. At the moment, it's an un-activated site, it's got land value of X, but once you have a stadium in there, and once you've activated the commercial areas around, then the value of that land goes up exponentially. Once you activate the TasPorts side and present the picture of an integrated, highly attractive precinct, then the value of the land goes up again. So, the return and the capital available to Mac Point to continue to invest in the infrastructure goes up as well.

CHAIR - Still speculative, though.

Mr HEALEY - It's uncertain, sure, because there's a lot of things that need to be done in that.

Mr ABETZ - But I think whilst it is speculative, that's a fair comment, it'd be fair to say that from experience in other areas, once you start developing the precinct and you've got some infrastructure down, then the land values around are considerably enhanced.

CHAIR - What do you base that on, Treasurer? That comment.

Mr ABETZ - Just, I would say, general experience, general knowledge. That is why I accepted at the beginning that it is speculative and time will tell. But I think the development of precincts around the place and way back in the day when I was Parliamentary Secretary for Defence and responsible for Defence land, and selling some of it was what developers had in mind and discussions with them as to how they roll out their developments. It's what makes it attractive to purchasers, as to how you plan it. So, look, general experience, do I have an academic paper that I can refer to? No. But does it remain speculative? Of course it does.

Mr WINTER - As part of getting the stadium approved through the Legislative Council, the Premier made a number of commitments to three MLCs. I just wanted to get an update on some of those.

The first was the State will limit its contribution to the stadium to the current \$875 million, costs above the total project cost of \$1.13 billion will be addressed through value-management, reducing scope not required in the CFDA minimum specifications, or requesting

PUBLIC

additional contributions from the Australian Government, AFL or Cricket Australia. Is that still the Government's position?

Mr ABETZ - Yeah, and any help you'd like to give to get more money from the Federal Government would be much appreciated. But do you have the details on that?

Mr WINTER - It's more for you, Treasurer, in terms of the Government's position. It was a written signed agreement - not agreement - signed letter tabled in the Legislative Council. So, the Government remains committed to capping Tasmanian taxpayers' spend to \$875 million, is that correct?

Mr ABETZ - On the current situation, that is our position. But when and if changes occur, then we will be needing to go back to the Parliament or to those members and indicate -

Mr WINTER - So, how would that process of going back to the Parliament actually work?

Mr ABETZ - Look, that remains and depends on what comes out at the very end of the process.

Mr WINTER - Is that a commitment that you would go back to the Parliament if there is a requirement for further Tasmanian taxpayer money than \$875 million?

Mr ABETZ - So, what we did say was we would go to the other funding partners to ascertain their appetite to provide further support.

Mr WINTER - But you're saying that the Government is committed to maintaining its Tasmanian taxpayer spend - \$875 million?

Mr ABETZ - Look, given the information that we had and have, that's the position. But should the situation change, then that is what an agile Government does: it looks at the circumstances.

Mr WINTER - It's not an agile Government: it's a written commitment tabled in the Legislative Council.

Mr ABETZ - That is what an agile Government does if circumstances change.

Mr WINTER - Just to go back to that question, is the proposal that if you do need to spend more than \$875 million, you would come back to the Parliament?

Mr ABETZ - We would definitely inform the Parliament and the public of that. But yeah, we are -

Mr WINTER - Inform them that -

Mr ABETZ - if I might say, Chair, in speculative territory here.

PUBLIC

Mr WINTER - I'm just trying to confirm that the position the Government took in December [2025], which is really clear, written, and tabled in the Parliament, is being adhered to. It sounds like you've moved position. You talked about being agile. What I'm trying to get to the bottom of is what's the mechanism for you to change position, if at all?

Mr ABETZ - We don't know what's going to come out at the end of the process. All I would be doing is speculating and that speculation would not be helpful for the process that we're currently in.

CHAIR - If the request-for-tender process completes, and it's clearly above the state of expectation, what will you and your Government do to try and get the approval of the people? The people and the Parliament made a decision based on a set of expectations and commitments. Going back to Dean's question, should - and I know it's speculative, but we've seen what happened in building major projects - costs don't go down. We've seen the fuel crisis have an impact, or the war in the Middle East have a significant impact on inputs and supply chains and all those things. It's unlikely to go down. What can we, as the people of Tasmania, be assured of if the price comes in above the cap that's been committed to by your Government?

Mr ABETZ - We are dealing to a large extent now in hypotheticals. If it is one dollar above, the chances are nobody -

CHAIR - Which it won't be.

Mr ABETZ - Chances are nobody would be concerned about that, as a result of which I suppose the issue is then if it is, how much will it be above? Will it be above? If so, how much? That will then be determined at the time as how we deal with it.

CHAIR - So, you won't make a commitment to stick to that cap. You'll find another way to make the money available to deliver it?

Mr ABETZ - We have to be exceptionally careful here. We are in a live procurement process, and I don't want to say anything that might prejudice that procurement process.

CHAIR - Do you remain committed, on behalf of the Government, to the cap that was agreed to and provided in good faith to members of the Legislative Council when that debate was on foot.

Mr ABETZ - It was provided in good faith. When certain events occur worldwide that might have an impact, then that's a matter for consideration if it's needed. Deputy Secretary, would you like to add?

Mr HEALEY - I just wanted to be specific about the commitments made and which was that the State will limit its contribution to the stadium to the current \$875 million. The cost above the total project cost of \$1.13 billion will be addressed through value-management, reducing scope not required in the CFDA minimum specifications or requesting additional contributions from the Australian Government, AFL, or Cricket Australia. Now, there is obviously a very active procurement process underway at the moment which will absolutely include negotiations with tenderers in terms of cost and scope and program and all of those things.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - The question is, I'll go back to the Treasurer, do you remain committed to that agreement that was made with the Legislative Council and the passage of that approval?

Ms THOMAS - That those are the things you will do if the tender comes back above budget.

Mr ABETZ - Those undertakings were given in good faith. We are a good-faith Government. We will seek to do what we can. First port of call is to talk to our co-funding partners to see if there's any room there, and then we will have a look at the scope of the project, as the Deputy Secretary said as to what may or may not be possible in relation to design.

Mr SWAIN - Just an obvious point: obviously, I can't speak for the Government in terms of how it will interface with the Parliament, but if those avenues have been exhausted and the Government were to want to push on, it would be reflected in next year's Budget. So, there are decisions for the Government leading up to that time, but to the extent the numbers were different, they would be in the Budget, which would come back to the Parliament, obviously.

CHAIR - That's the only way it can actually come back to Parliament, unless the Government takes a decision to bring it back to the Parliament separately. Is that right? The Budget's the Budget, but the Budget's at a point in time. Sometimes that may not be timely in terms of the commitments that the Government may seek to gain the approval of Parliament for. There's no other commitment to come back to Parliament sooner than that, should it be necessary? I understand the tender will be awarded sometime round October, hopefully. I'm sure Mr Swain agrees the Budget is quite some way off.

Mr SWAIN - I hope so.

Mr ABETZ - We are hoping so. We are hoping May [2027] next year.

CHAIR - That is still a long way off and it doesn't get the approval of Parliament till June [2027]. There's a big time difference there between when a price may come in that doesn't reflect the commitment made. And Mr Swain said you've been unable to secure additional funding from the other funders. It's a long time between that decision. Do you think the builder's just going to sit there and wait for the Budget?

Mr ABETZ - Certain decisions will need to be made. I don't want to speculate too much or, indeed, at all in relation to that whilst we've got a live procurement process which may include that which was in the letter dealing with the scope of the project, given funding limitations.

Mr EDMUNDS – That's what I was going to ask you about, Minister. Those two phrases, 'reduction in scope' and 'value management' - can we get a better understanding of what that means?

Mr ABETZ - Well, no, because once again, it's speculation. If it is one dollar out, for example, the reduction in the scope for one dollar will mean a lot, lot less than if it is some substantially higher figure. And I'm not going to speculate as to what a lower or higher figure might be. We have to wait and see.

Mr EDMUNDS - I've got some questions which are more relevant to the MPDC about local content and the like. Is that something that's under consideration in terms of a change of scope - that something can be resourced from outside of Tasmania might be looked at if these cost considerations come in?

Mr ABETZ - I think you've heard me say many a time never say never. But it's one of those situations that we have stressed the first time I met with - well, the only time, in fact, that I've met with the two consortia that are interested in and have now moved forward, that local content was a big consideration for the Government. We wouldn't proceed to prejudice that but all these things, you've got to make assessments at the time. But our front of mind is as much Tasmanian content as possible.

Ms THOMAS - I haven't yet read the letter you've tabled, so it may well be covered in here. I know you said you've requested advice from the MPDC Chair as to an updated P90 cost estimate. Given changes in the global landscape, interest rate movements, construction inflation, labour shortages, all of these sort of things, have you requested the MPDC to seek an updated cost estimate, a quantity-surveyed assessment? Or have you asked Treasury to model any of the impact of any of those changes?

Mr ABETZ - We have quantity surveyors working on the project as we speak. I don't know if you can give specifics, Deputy Secretary.

Mr HEALEY - I can't give specifics because it's an active tender process. But can I just, perhaps, draw attention to the fact that our quantity surveyors at the moment will be, over the coming months, testing and analysing not just theoretical estimates, but the actual tender prices provided by contractors. We've probably moved beyond the point in which we get them focusing on theoretical estimates of what a project could cost because they can now focus on what's being offered to us in terms of prices from contractors. That's the real price. Anything else, the P90s, anything that they might do pre-tender, that's just our best guess of what the price should be. A contracted price offer is far more valuable to us than any estimate could be.

Ms THOMAS - So, Treasurer, you haven't specifically asked for an updated cost? You are waiting for the tender process to play out to see what the tender price comes back at and still relying on the P90 estimate that was provided last year?

Mr ABETZ - That, in general terms, is our approach, yes.

Ms THOMAS - Has Treasury undertaken any scenario modelling for delays to completion or looked at what the financial implications would be if the stadium were delivered one or two or three years late?

Mr SWAIN - Not specifically because, again, there's a lot of different scenarios we could model. Just going back to your former question, if I could, we would take the same position at this point. What you need to see is - so, the P90 is typically a tool that a funder will use to make a decision about whether they want to proceed with a project. The P90 just means that there's a 90 per cent probability that the project is expected to come in at or below the cost. But you really don't know until you're in the market, so we would be saying the same thing as Mat articulated: that at this point you need to see what the market's telling you.

In terms of the scenario question, we're working on the funding mechanisms on the assumption that the current project parameters are what's been approved and that's what we'll apply, and would only move away from that position if the Government made a decision to do so.

The mechanics of the financing arrangements don't actually depend on the dollars. They're agreements and mechanisms between parties. But we are preparing them on the assumption that the project parameters will be met and we will be guided by the Government if we were to end up in a different scenario.

Mr HEALEY - Can I also point out that within the P90, there is an escalation calculation in there, so how much is construction going to cost us towards the end of the build, which is going to be more than what it costs us at the start of the build, given inflation over time. There are really clear assumptions in there. Macquarie Point do know if it was delayed by another year or another two years, absolutely the cost will continue to increase. Hence the reason that there'll be a lot of focus in the tender on making sure we've got a really clear and achievable program so that we're confident with the pricing of the project.

Ms THOMAS - As Treasurer, have you sought a consolidated estimate of the total cost to Tasmanian taxpayers of securing and maintaining the AFL licence, including the stadium, the high-performance training centre, the Devils' operating grants, transport infrastructure, utilities, some of the other things we've talked about, financing costs and all of the associated Government commitments?

Mr ABETZ - I have not sought that full picture. There is, of course, as we have talked about earlier, like the power supply to the stadium, are we going to take all that as a stadium cost or are we going to say that that's part for TasPorts as well for the cruise liners. Some people are arguing, at least in my Chamber, that the northern access road should be lumped in with the stadium. We say no, because that was part of the Hobart City Deal and is needed for an active port. Even if the stadium doesn't go ahead, that northern access road would be built in any event. It's one of those things as to what you include or don't include that ultimately determines the full costing.

Ms THOMAS - Do you think that would be a worthwhile exercise to do, excluding perhaps some of those projects that would be required anyway for the Macquarie Point redevelopment? Looking at what the cost of the AFL licence is, if you include the stadium at \$1.13 billion, the grants to the Devils, the high-performance centre and any other Devils costs?

Mr ABETZ - Well, yeah. There are some costs, clearly, but then we have to also look at the benefits as well that will flow. And so -

CHAIR - Which you can't quantify. If you're going to make a comparison, you need to understand what the cost is beyond the cost-benefit assessment there. You actually need to understand what the cost is if you're going to assess the benefit.

Mr ABETZ - Yeah.

PUBLIC

Mr SWAIN - I mean, known costs are in the Budget for T&A⁵ for the stadium for the northern access road. There are risks identified in the Budget for some other elements, which as I've said, we will quantify where we can. I think, Chair, you're on the money, the more complicated part is the benefits. And the benefits, absolutely, in terms of what comes out of the new facilities, but also some of the costs of achieving the benefits. Some of that, I think, will still continue to evolve through the budget process. So, what we know is in the Budget.

CHAIR - We might wrap it up there. The Treasurer has other commitments. I don't think we have anything on notice. Thank you for your time today.

Mr ABETZ - Thank you.

The witnesses withdrew.

The Committee suspended from 12:20 pm to 1:03 pm.

⁵ Training and Administration Centre

PUBLIC

Macquarie Point Development Corporation

CHAIR - Thanks, Kim and Anne, for appearing before the Public Accounts Committee in the ongoing inquiry and scrutiny of the Macquarie Point development with the stadium.

I'll invite you both to do the statutory declaration. I understand, Kim, you will make some opening comments and then Anne's got a presentation. I think you understand the formal procedure, so I won't go through that.

Mr KIM EVANS, CHAIR, and **Ms ANNE BEACH**, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, MACQUARIE POINT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, WERE CALLED, TOOK THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thanks.

Mr EVANS - Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Committee, for the opportunity to talk to you this afternoon. I've just got a few brief opening remarks, but we've got a more substantive progress report as to what's taken place over the last three months since we last appeared, and Anne will run through that in a few moments. But it is fair to say it's been an extraordinarily busy three months and we've made some major advances and hit some big milestones in the lead-up to today.

The most significant of those is that the Request for Tender Stage 1 for the stadium contractor closed this week, with submissions received from the two tenderers participating in the request for tender arising out of the expression of interest.

In the lead-up to that milestone, it's been an extraordinarily busy time, as I've indicated, as we've maintained a strong focus on procurement and probity. But the teams - and we've got some great people helping us - have been particularly focused on holding workshops with the two tenderers to ensure everyone is fully informed in terms of the development of those Stage 1 tenders.

Another significant milestone has been the start of site preparation works. Most significantly, the archaeological investigation is being delivered by Hazell Bros, a local contractor, in the lead-up to early works.

Also, a significant focus has always been on maintaining and meeting the State Policies and Projects Order conditions for early works. That's really important, to ensure that we're ready to do early works in preparation for the main contractor. Those preparations have included the completion of dilapidation surveys and the preparation, and it's well progressed - the development of the construction environmental management plans.

So, we've made a lot of progress, but we can walk through for the Committee, if you like, a presentation now from Anne. We can go as quickly or as slowly as you want. Feel free to interrupt if you've got questions along the way.

CHAIR - Yeah, we will.

Ms BEACH - Chair, I have hard copies, if that's useful for the Committee, to table.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms BEACH - I think there's a spare for the library. Okay, thank you. So, as we've done in the last couple of updates, we just wanted to give an update of work that we're doing and activities that we're working on, an update on costs and also a snapshot that we table each hearing. We're focusing on mid-May [2026] since we last attended, through to July [2026], and as the Chair said, we have commenced site preparatory works.

So, at this stage, it's relatively - it's moving at a slower pace than what we'll move up to as we get closer to October [2026] and move into Stage 1, but these preparatory works are a chance to work through archaeological investigations, and we are doing some remediation of a couple of level 3 spots on the site. In this period we can move up to 11,000 cubic metres of material from the site, and that increases as we move into Stage 1.

The Committee might be aware, but we refer to level 1, level 2 and level 3 - that just refers to the level of contaminants that's set out in a contamination information bulletin that the EPA puts together, but I can send a copy to the Committee, if that would be useful.⁶

CHAIR - I think it would be. We haven't got that, have we?

Ms BEACH - We haven't tabled it, and I can certainly send it.

CHAIR - Yeah. I mean, that is a matter of interest around the contaminated soils and how it's assessed.

Ms BEACH - The site preparatory works of this phase is guided by our site environmental management plan. In December [2025], during the Order debate, we did table in Legislative Council the version as at, I think it was 5 December [2025], of the site environmental management plan (SEMP). We have updated it. It's now - the latest version is from May [2026], and that was to make sure it covered everything we needed for these works. The site environmental management plan is published on our website, but I can also provide that to the Committee - the latest version, if that would be useful. It does need to be prepared to the satisfaction of the director of the EPA⁷ before we can start works. For the preparatory works, that's the only thing we actually require.

Just on the screen there, there's a few other things that were, I guess, best practice that we made sure we had in place. One is an unanticipated discovery plan: so that mapped out the management of Aboriginal material, if identified, that's unanticipated. That's standard for projects. We made sure we had that in place. There's also a statement of historical archaeological potential. What that's essentially saying is what we'd expect to find, based on the work we've done on the site before, and similarly a method statement that's around how we manage that material.

In the order, we are required to advise the EPA 14 days before we commence work. That refers to the main stages, so we technically weren't required, but obviously it's good practice to make sure we did that in advance of commencing works.

⁶ See in general, 'EPA Tas - Info Bulletin 105 - Classification of Contaminated Soils (Tabled 7 August 2026)', https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0025/109645/Information-Bulletin-105-Classification-of-Contaminated-Soils-IB105-V3_2018-Tabled-7-August-2026.pdf

⁷ Environment Protection Authority Tasmania

CHAIR - Can you just confirm whether or not the anticipated discovery plan has been prepared to the satisfaction of the Minister?

Ms BEACH - It has, yes, and it's also published on our website.

CHAIR - So, any of the work that you've done to date, there's been no discovery of any artefacts or anything?

Ms BEACH - The area is a combination of high and low sensitivity, so we've actually investigated some of this area before. So, it wouldn't be unusual to identify material on the - sorry, if I go back a couple of slides - you can see there some of the old foundations from the old roundhouse that used to be on the site, and just closer to us there's also from the King's Yard, that was from 1824. So, we do expect to find material - both Aboriginal and European - as we're working through this. It is partially original land and also reclaimed land.

CHAIR - But the question I asked was: has there been anything unanticipated discovered?

Ms BEACH - Yes, we have identified some shell midden material.

CHAIR - Right. What part of the site is that in?

Ms BEACH - We're only working on the western side of the site, so the foundations here, that's as far as we've excavated so far.

CHAIR - What do you do when you find Aboriginal material?

Ms BEACH - The development of the unanticipated discovery plan, the consultant engaged with Aboriginal organisations around how that would work. We also work with Aboriginal Heritage Tas, so they've been notified that we've identified material and we seek their guidance on what happens next.

CHAIR - So, where's that at?

Ms BEACH - That's a live discussion, so we've notified Aboriginal Heritage Tas.

CHAIR - So, you don't do anymore right there until you've got some resolution from Aboriginal Heritage?

Ms BEACH - That's right. We flag the site and don't do any further work in that space.

CHAIR - And is there a timeline for that? Like, is there a requirement that they get back to you in a certain time or is it when they get back to you?

Ms BEACH - No, there's not a statutory timeline, but they are usually pretty prompt, so we'd expect to be discussing it in the next few days.

CHAIR - Okay.

Ms BEACH - So, the site environmental management plan is the tool that we've used up to this point to manage activity on the site. It sets out environmental controls and has covered all of our remediation work up to this point. We do update that as we progress.

One of the examples of - if anyone's walking past the site - of something visible that's a control, is there is bunding. So, there's like a berm that goes all the way around the site that's currently being excavated to avoid any runoff if there's rain, and avoid any runoff going outside of the site. We have those in place. We also, noting that the SEMP needs to be to the satisfaction of the director of the EPA, we do have site visits from the EPA. They have been on site since we've commenced work and there haven't been any issues identified.

One of the other things we've set up is some noise and vibration monitoring. We've got these monitors that are dotted around the site in close proximity. This again is not actually required in the order or in the site environmental management plan, but it is good practice. We've put those in place now. They'll be there for the balance of the development.

There's eight locations where we have noise monitors. If they are triggered - so the triggers are set based on our construction noise and environmental management plan - it does have this functionality where it will take an image and take an audio snippet, so it allows us to investigate if there's any triggers. We can also use that as a tool if there's any complaints or similar, so we can check what happened exactly at that time and get that data.

CHAIR - Where are the eight locations?

Ms BEACH - There's one on the Federation Concert Hall, another on the corner of our site, in the south-west corner, closest to the Federation Concert Hall. We do have one over the road, I think near Henry Jones, one at MACq 01. There's another a bit further down the Brooker Highway. We also have one in, I think, Glebe, and on the eastern shore.

CHAIR - They're obviously set to different sensitivities - the one on the eastern shore. Sound does travel across water much more freely than across land.

Ms BEACH - Yeah. It does just give us good baseline data as well. Having that now helps us manage those.

CHAIR - There's none relatively close to the port?

Ms BEACH - No.

CHAIR - The MACq 01 one's probably the closest, is it?

Ms BEACH - No. TasWater and TasPorts also have the same system. They have locations set up around the port and the surrounding area, and also for the work TasWater is doing in the north-east of the site as well, so there is an extended network in addition to our monitors.

We've also been doing dilapidation surveys. These are required once we get into the main works, but we have commenced those at this point. The surveys are done within 100 metres of the site - is the area that we've set out. There are a number of surveys we need to do. It does include things like buildings but also structures. It might be a bit hard to see [in the slide], but

the red with the number eight near it there is the Hobart Rivulet. That's quite an old structure, so we look at those as well. Any reports that we compile through those will be provided to the relevant landowner or operator of that space. We've had excellent engagement and really helpful to us to progress those. They're well advanced but we are still working through that list.

The dilapidation reports that come out of this - they're essentially a condition report, a visual and written summary, need to be approved by the secretary of Building Tasmania, but it has to be in consultation with TasPorts and the Hobart City Council. We've already sent through some sample reports just to make sure what we're putting together is meeting their expectations as we go through that program.

CHAIR - That's all at Mac Point's expense, not the property owners'?

Ms BEACH - Yep, that's part of the project expense.

A few updates around how we're going around that. The focus of our engagement and communication has been around working through the dilapidation surveys. We obviously need permission and to engage with landowners for us to do that. Similarly, some of the noise equipment is mounted outside of our site and on private locations, so having their permission has been really helpful. Our nearest neighbours we engage with pretty regularly. We've let them know about upcoming work so we can answer any questions. We have also - there's a little snippet there, but on our Works and Events page, which is macpoint.com/whats happening. We have a snapshot of all the activities that are currently happening, so the dilapidation surveys, the archaeological investigations and notes on the monitoring that I mentioned, the environmental monitoring.

We've also been engaging on the construction environmental management plan. Under the order, we're required to have a construction environmental management plan for each stage of the works. We also have on our website a monthly update under the Stadium tab that gives a snapshot of the key activities since January through to July [2026].

CHAIR - The sound and vibration mitigation work that was going to be done to support the TSO - is that Macquarie Point's responsibility to do? Or is that funded separately and it's their responsibility to get it done before you start?

Ms BEACH - That's a grant the TSO have received through Building Tasmania to do that work. I think it's \$4.45 million. They're protective works. They're looking to use that for the structure. I think the intent is for that to start early next year.

CHAIR - I guess that's a matter for them as to how long it will take to complete it. But you won't be starting any major works like drilling and blasting, or anything like that, or whatever you might need to do that's quite noisy and creates a lot of vibration until - when are you expecting that to start?

Ms BEACH - The activity we're doing at the moment is excavation. There was a need to break up some of the asphalt and similar, but that wasn't hugely noisy. We'll have the pack-down of the Goods Shed and the Red Shed, as you flagged. The actual physical, I guess, coming out of the ground works and more substantive works will be probably mid next year. So that gives a bit of a similar timeline for that delivery.

PUBLIC

In terms of works happening, the next phase is gearing up the excavation into bulk excavation, which forms stage 1 of the staging plan. I gave a brief overview of the staging plan last time we appeared before the Committee. Stage 1 is bulk excavation, so that's ramping up the excavation work. In the preparatory works, we can take 11,000 cubic metres off site. Across the bulk excavation, there will be around 100,000, including that. So, it's bringing the site down to about 2.4 relative level, which is about the height of Evans Street.

There are a number of things we do need to have in place before this starts, I guess, the more substantive work in Stage 1. Just in that blue box there [on screen], there's the unanticipated discovery plan that needs to be accepted by the Minister, which is complete. That's a plan that goes for the balance of the works. We also need to do a Statement of historical archaeological potential, particularly for that area. That is being progressed. And we need to finish the dilapidation surveys that I mentioned, and they need to have been accepted and approved.

There's also an impact assessment we need to do on road reserves for each stage. We've completed that for Stage 1. That went through the Secretary of Building Tasmania, in consultation with Hobart City Council. And then the main tool, I guess, is the construction environmental management plan. They're required to be prepared for each stage. Part of that is there will often be a different contractor doing those different works.

We are required to consult on the construction environmental management plan with specified parties that are set out in the order, so the TSO, UTAS, Baha'i Centre, Hobart City Council, Federal Group, RSL and TasPorts. We're actively doing that at the moment, and nearly at the end of those initial consultations. Particularly, they are focusing on noise and vibration in terms of impact on surrounding areas. We do have a third-party acoustic engineer who reviews all of that before it is finalised. Then it's submitted to the Secretary for approval, in consultation with the director of the EPA.

CHAIR - Where does the dust come into this? If excavation is during the summer, it is likely to create some dust. You mentioned dust. I thought you said the eight monitors detect dust levels as well?

Ms BEACH - Yes.

CHAIR - You're not mentioning that here.

Ms BEACH - They're already in place, so they'll stay in place. The site environmental management plan is our tool for monitoring for management and the requirements of dust. For example, if it's a windy or particularly hot day where there's a higher risk of dust, essentially the soil that's stored on site needs to be watered. There'll be water tanks and we're quite experienced at doing that. In terms of dust, this is exactly the same but at a larger scale, so it'll be set out in the construction environmental management plan, building on the existing practices we have in the site environmental management plan.

CHAIR - So, you get water trucks in to do that, I presume?

Ms BEACH - Yeah. The other thing with dust is the actual movement of the material. When the material's loaded into trucks, they have to be covered before they leave site to protect for dust movement.

PUBLIC

Just briefly, I mentioned the construction environmental management plan. Just as a quick reminder on that - I think I touched on this briefly last time, the overarching construction environmental management plan has 16 sub-plans. For example, noise and vibration is one of those. There are other things like air quality, traffic, groundwater, waste, heritage. There's 16 of those. What they do, by setting out this structure, because there will be a number of construction environmental management plans as we go through the project, it allows for there to be consistency. We're setting out these as the framework and the requirements that we expect to see, and then the contractor works through and produces documents that provide the evidence of those requirements. We've developed this structure working with the EPA because they will need to work through a lot of this detail to make sure it's a useful form.

Each of the sub-plans set out what are the objectives, the obligations, what is the relevant information and project information and what is the statutory requirements that need to be addressed in a nice, succinct way; and then the supporting documents need to set out, for each of the requirements, what is the measure, who's responsible and what will be the evidence of compliance, so we have a consistent framework.

CHAIR - The two preferred tenderers have had access to this level of detail, because how can they quote if they don't know what their requirements are?

Ms BEACH - Yes, we have talked to them about the CMP. Their requirements are actually set out in the order of what it needs to include. That information is available to them. We're working through this as a standard framework, particularly with the stage 1 and 2 contractors because it is more hefty than what you'd normally need to do. It's not a document and requirements they'd be familiar with. We've been sharing how that's going and our approach to doing that.

CHAIR - Do they know the standards have been set?

Ms BEACH - They know the structure of the CMP and what's required and the sub-plan structure. Yes.

CHAIR - We're not going to get to a point where there's - EPA say, well, actually, we've found this, you've found this potential contaminate, potential problem from an environmental point of view; what does that mean for the contractor if it requires a new plan or a new requirement to meet?

Ms BEACH - The CMP is pretty comprehensive. For example, one of the sub-plans is on contaminated land, and we've been managing contamination on site for a decade. The site environmental management plan that is existing provides a good basis for that. That has been developed and accepted by the director of the EPA. So, there's existing practices for those things, and the EPA will be doing site visits and checking that we are complying with all those requirements. The sub-plan actually sets out what's required, and notifications as they go through that process.

CHAIR - If something new is discovered that hadn't been contemplated, or you've found that a particular area of the land was going to be really difficult to build without going deeper or whatever, I'm not the engineer here, but it could require a rethink of the standards that have been set: could that potentially result in a variation to the contract?

Ms BEACH - In terms of the contract, so there should be contingencies provided for that. So, we've mapped out geotechnical information, contamination information, the nature and the distance to the bedrock. There's quite a comprehensive set of information there. It is a fixed-price contract. Unless there's a change in scope, if there's a challenge there, then it really does need to be considered in terms of their contingency as they've worked through their risk. One of the things we will work through as we do the contract negotiations is a risk matrix that makes it clear who's responsible for what. If it is something -

CHAIR - That's not done yet?

Ms BEACH - We have one that has informed the tender process, where we set out the risk matrix. It was part of the documentation. We will go through that as part of the contract negotiations. If we were - if there was a risk that sat with us, then that would be a matter for us; if it's a risk that sits with a contractor, then it's their risk.

CHAIR - I don't believe you provided a copy of that to the Committee. Are you able to provide a copy of that risk matrix?

Ms BEACH - I'd need to take that on notice. I think we'd need to take probity advice.

CHAIR - Very risky. Okay. Sorry, Anne.

Mr EVANS - Bearing in mind it's still under negotiation too, as part of the tender process.

CHAIR - It gives us an idea of what the risk is that we are taking on as a State.

Mr EVANS - If we could take that on notice as to whether or not we can give you a list of frameworks and an outline.

CHAIR - Of who cops the financial burden, particularly: that's what I'm interested in.

Mr EVANS - If we took it on notice, but if we did provide it, we would need to do it in confidence, I would have thought.

Ms BEACH - Or we will need to seek advice and come back to the Chair.

CHAIR - That's all right. You can make that request when you provide it.

Ms BEACH - Stage 2 works set out in the approved staging plan is the pack down of the Goods Shed. The requirements here are substantially the same, so I won't waste the Committee's time going through that. Probably the one just to note is this does need a heritage conservation management plan because it is a heritage structure, and that needs to be prepared to the satisfaction of Heritage Tasmania, and that's currently in progress.

The main construction: this is a little example of the summary of the work that's been done so far. We're currently at the end of Stage 1 of the request-for-tender process and, as the Chair noted in his opening comments, we have received two submissions through the request for tender process Stage 1 which we're currently assessing.

In terms of what happens next, just to give some context: there is a substantial process to go through around how we assess those bids. That includes a number of things: one is we have identified subject matter experts, and what they do is we farm out bits of the bids for them to provide advice on. For example, subject matter experts include: independent financial capability assessment; financial modelling; work, health and safety; design management; economic and social benefits; and the ones you'd expect, like a quantity surveyor to help with assessment of costs and similar, and they prepare subject matter expert reports which are provided to the Evaluation Committee to assist them in assessing the criteria.

There are four quantitative - sorry, three qualitative - quantitative - qualitative criteria and one around price. They will inform their assessment of those elements as we go through that process. It is a two-tiered assessment process. You normally have an Evaluation Committee: we have an Evaluation Committee and a Tender Review Committee, which is the same as we did in the EOI process and then that -

CHAIR - Presumably, it's a different membership on that Committee?

Ms BEACH - I can't comment.

CHAIR - Or is it one Committee checking the same people's work?

Ms BEACH - Sorry, yes, the two Committees are different memberships. One does the

-

Mr EVANS - One is tenders and one is -

CHAIR - Financial.

Ms BEACH - It's a broader review.

Mr EVANS - It's a broader review.

Ms BEACH - There's a recommendation effectively formed by the Evaluation Committee and then the Tender Review Committee reviews that, and can also ask questions but also has access to the same material; and then that also goes through the normal procurement review before a recommendation is made to the Board. So, that process will happen over the balance of this month and into September [2026] as we go through those governance - and that will lead to management, so me, making a recommendation to the Board informed by those expert advisers and subject matter experts and the findings of those Committees around moving into Stage 2 of the request for tender.

In the procurement strategy, we've mapped an intent to take one party into Stage 2, but we do reserve the right to take two, pending the advice of those Evaluation Committees. The difference between Stage 1 and Stage 2, stage 1 is, I guess, the substantive submission, the kind of hefty data. That includes methodology, team, experience of the organisation and the team, financial capability and price, but it is a target price we then undertake that informs the assessment. The final stage is where the final bid price, I guess, is locked in. That also includes opportunity for further engagement with the local sector and to lock in those elements which was something both parties - well, when we did market sounding, all parties highlighted as a

PUBLIC

really good benefit and an important part of the process to avoid and minimise variations later in the process.

CHAIR - So, Anne, we had the Treasurer, or Minister for Macquarie Point Urban Renewal in earlier, and I'd have to check exactly what he said on *Hansard*, which I can't do right now, obviously, but he sort of suggested that there would be a contract awarded in October [2026]: this is not what this says. This says you're going into the Stage 2 for the request for tender process continuing, and then a contract awarded in December 2026. Can you clarify this end of the process for us?

Ms BEACH - Yes.

Mr EVANS - Rather than a contract awarded, I think he said Stage 1 of the tender would be complete in October.

Ms BEACH - Yes. So, we then make -

Mr EVANS - Then it moves into stage 2, which is the detailed contract negotiations which will conclude by -

CHAIR - December [2026].

Ms BEACH - Yes, so we will have a contract in place. We're working to have that in place in December [2026].

CHAIR - Obviously, you're watching, so you will take your own -

Ms THOMAS - I think he was talking about advice on the cost too, so you would provide advice on the cost?

Ms BEACH - As part of going into Stage 2, we would need to inform the Cabinet Committee of any risk to the project parameters that have been set, so time, scope, cost, and seek consent before we go into the next stage if there's any risks there.

Ms THOMAS - Would that be a decision of Government, then, as to whether that was publicly announced, or would that be the Board's intention at the MPDC?

Ms BEACH - We will advise the Minister and the Committee of Cabinet of where we are at that point, and if there are risks, and then I think it's how much certainty there is in that. So, in Stage 2, there's also some clarifications and that is when we set the fixed price, but we'll have an indication if we need to work through broader funding or if there's any risk there, but also if we're looking at any scope changes as well. So, if there are any value management opportunities, or it made sense to look at the scope and broaden that based on the capability that the tenderers could offer.

Ms THOMAS - So you would provide advice to Government on value-management or scope change, should the price come back being above the \$1.13 billion current estimate budget?

PUBLIC

Ms BEACH - Yes. We'd outline the risk to those parameters that have been set for us to achieve.

Mr EVANS - We're operating within project parameters established by the Government, which are absolutely consistent with all of the commitments that have been made. As we work through the process, the extent to which we can operate within those, we will, but if we need to go outside, we would need to go back and talk to Government.

CHAIR - So can I just clarify then, as the Treasurer reminded us, we're talking hypotheticals now -

Mr EVANS - And we are talking hypotheticals.

CHAIR - We are. But if the cost was higher, acknowledging all the cost pressures on many things at the minute, whose decision is it to proceed with the project even if the cost is higher?

Ms BEACH - We would have to seek endorsement to proceed. We can only operate within the project parameters that we have.

Mr EVANS - We've been set goalposts within which we've got to operate.

Mr WINTER - Is that \$875 million?

Ms BEACH - That's the \$1.13 billion for the full project delivery.

Mr EVANS - Timeframe -

Ms BEACH - And scope as well

Mr EVANS - And scope.

CHAIR - That process would be, I presume, you report to the Minister and the Oversight Committee, and Cabinet. They can make a decision without any other recourse to Parliament.

Mr EVANS - That's a matter for the Government.

CHAIR - We tried to get the Minister to explain how that would work, but he was a bit elusive on that.

Mr EDMUNDS - On that theme, one of the things they talked about was value management and the reduction in scope. They spoke about that, but there wasn't much detail about that. What does that mean for you guys, I suppose, is my question.

Ms BEACH - Yes, so that's an important question. There's value management and then there's scope management.

Mr EDMUNDS - Maybe we'll do one and then the other.

PUBLIC

Ms BEACH - Value management would be things that the tenderer or tenderers have identified to get the same outcome but at a lower cost. An example of one of those that we identified before going to tender - so we also found value management as we were refining the design and the cost - was as the design advanced we found the amount of steel that was expected in the roof reduced. Similarly, having a raker - so the steel that supports the concrete seating plats - whether they're single or double, when we tested that we actually found a saving. So, there's no actual change to the experience or the scope of the delivery, but it's just looking at, are there more efficient ways to achieve the same thing, if that makes sense.

Scope is more if we make changes that impact on the offerings, how it's delivered or the actual product. There's lots of different elements that could be in there, that we also have to consider. To provide a compliant tier 2 facility, there are guidelines that AFL, cricket, sporting codes will have, and there are things that have been factored in thinking about Stadiums Tasmania's capacity as the operator to generate revenue. There are the core things like the field, the seats and making sure you've got access to toilets and those things. But a lot of the functionality we've looked at is actually the other elements: so the function rooms, the restaurants, the bars, some retail. They are important in terms of, not necessarily the stadium, its operation for those big events, but its day-to-day operation. If we were looking at: are there opportunities or should we look at the scope, we'd have to consider it in terms of what are the implications for any changes in scope. Does that answer your question?

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes, I might come back a bit later with some other questions around the same outcome-lower cost, but I won't interrupt the flow of the presentation.

CHAIR - This information, though, will be what you're providing going into October to the Government and to the Oversight Committee?

Ms BEACH - Yes. So, to make a recommendation to Board we would need to engage the Oversight Committee and Committee of Cabinet to be able to make that recommendation to Board so they could make a decision.

CHAIR - In terms of the construction, I think before you identified somewhere you didn't need quite as much steel in the roof, you could use one rather than two steel supports in the seats, things like that. I mean, if I was building a house, I would do that upfront, too, because it's a different scale project altogether, but I'm only one person. Have you done, in this process, everything you can to take unnecessary costs out of the project already?

Ms BEACH - Yes, heaps. We have a spreadsheet that's incredibly long. That is all of the value management we've explored and some of those we have had to go, 'Is this value management or is it scope?' We've had to work through those types of processes and there are a lot of savings we found, like the breaker example.

Through the tender process, though, noting that these entities have delivered these types of facilities before, it's an opportunity to go, 'Is there anything else?' We have talked to them about the value management we've already done to also avoid them wasting time.

CHAIR - So, the value management you've done, the scope work, if you like, that has informed the \$1.1 billion price tag?

Ms BEACH - Yes.

CHAIR - So, there's not a lot of fat left in it then, you'd suggest?

Ms BEACH - We've had a fair crack at it. As I said, there's a reason we get to 70 per cent design and no further - that is as far as we can go without giving them an opportunity to find out if there are any more of those we could consider and what specific construction methods will they use to achieve the design.

So, not very exciting, but important. A big part of the work we've been doing is working through compliance with the conditions in the order, of which there are quite a few. So, in the reporting period, the approvals that we had in terms of documentation - and these are on our website - is the confirmations or our determination around what preparatory works are in scope in keeping with the order - the staging plan that approved what constitutes Stage 1 and Stage 2. So, that's the bulk excavation and the Goods Shed. For each stage, we need to do an impact assessment on road reserves. That's been approved for Stage 1 and it's currently under review for Stage 2.

The site environmental management plan, as I mentioned, was provided to the EPA and confirmed that it was to the Director's satisfaction and the unanticipated discovery plan, as I also noted. We have been pretty busy in terms of - with each of the regulators, we do keep them up to date with the work that we're doing so we can catch any questions as we're going through the process. We have also met with the design quality integrity review panel in the reporting period, and that's working through with our design team an overview of the plans that are in the order. So, their role is to inform, provide advice and feedback in finalising the plans, and that the design as approved, the integrity of that, is maintained. We've just been investing working with that panel to make sure they've had an opportunity to ask questions, and we've provided an overview of the design as it is, and then we can work through anything that might change in a more targeted way.

We've been busy preparing all the different documentation and a key one is the CEMP, as I mentioned, and we've started consultation or have consulted with all the parties required in the order which has been given.

CHAIR - Before you go to the next bit, you've got approvals for the impact assessment on road reserves in Stage 1, which is where you're actually removing a fair bit of material from the site during that period, as well as relocation or packing down the Goods Shed.

Ms BEACH - That's Stage 2.

CHAIR - Oh.

Ms BEACH - Stage 1 is the excavation, Stage 2 is the Goods Shed.

CHAIR - Then, you're taking submissions on the impact of road reserves in Stage 2?

Ms BEACH - We've submitted it to the Secretary of Building Tasmania who's - to seek approval and they are required to consult with Hobart City Council in doing that. So, we've also issued it at officer level so they can have time to review it.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - In that piece of work, does that piece contemplate traffic management around the site when you've got trucks coming and going, you might have cranes coming in, perhaps not quite at this stage - well, you might for the Goods Shed - but it might not be a manual handling task, I wouldn't think, pulling that down.

Ms BEACH - The impact assessment is more looking at the road reserve in the area and the impact on that and any sort of structural challenges.

CHAIR - So where do you look at the traffic management during construction?

Ms BEACH - In the construction environmental management plan - there's a specific sub-plan on traffic management.

CHAIR - During the construction?

Ms BEACH - Yes, and there'll be one of those for each stage. There'll be one for the excavation, one for the Goods Shed, Red Shed pack down, and then Stage 3 is the main construction - there'll be a separate one for that.

CHAIR - That's ticked off by the Secretary of Building Tasmania?

Ms BEACH - Yes, in consultation with the Director of the EPA.

So, that was the update on activity. As we've previously done, I'll give an overview of costs. The budget of \$1.13 billion, as we've talked about, is an all-inclusive budget. It includes the design work, resourcing, commissioning, escalations and the physical construction. So, this is the elements we've provided at the last two hearings outlining cost, so I just wanted to flag those. There's been \$1.02 million since we last reported to the Committee: so it was previously \$44.81 million. The main costs have been in project management and resourcing. They're sort of negligible changes in the other areas.

The last thing was just, as we've done previously, we've committed to provide a snapshot, so, I guess a short version of this, of activity, so I do have that, Chair, separately for tabling, if that's a useful resource. This just outlines the things that I've already mentioned: our engagement, procurement activity, key activity, and on the second page, the meetings we've had with regulators and a tracking of the budget against spend.

So, I can table those. Thank you.

CHAIR - If you were watching this morning, you would have seen me asking questions about the roof and the stormwater matter. What work has been done on the stormwater requirements? Acknowledging with anything on the site there will be stormwater requirements, but this is a very large roof, and if you added up all the roofs of potential properties you could put on there, it probably wouldn't be as big on the actual site.

Ms BEACH - Yep. In terms of actual work, the design work has included both identifying the existing capacity, so we do already have some stormwater outlets onsite, and looking at what would be needed for the total precinct, so that includes the stadium and the catchments of the other developments that will be the final solution onsite. That is in -

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Does that include the housing as well as the hotels or just the hotel, or whatever it is, on the port side?

Ms BEACH - In terms of stormwater, it would be a separate connection into Regatta Point, so it would be more the site on this side of the Cenotaph. So, that includes the commercial development - so there's around 17,000 square metres of development space on the eastern side. There's also runoff we need to manage. Once the site's fully developed it will be capped, so you have an asphalt, sort of concrete base, so that increases the catchment as well. So, they've been considered in us identifying the full load of what's required for the precinct.

CHAIR - In that, it seems that there's kind of likely to be a need for significant upgrade to the stormwater. I want to hear from engineers that know how these things work. So, what's the plan there?

Ms BEACH - The work that's been done has looked at what is the additional capacity to manage stormwater through the existing outlets. We will need an additional stormwater, I guess, connection point that leaves from the site, and we're looking to do that in the south-east.

CHAIR - Being?

Ms BEACH - Sorry, Evans Street side.

CHAIR - So, putting it out into Evans Street or?

Ms BEACH - No, under Evans Street.

CHAIR - So, it'll go out into the harbour?

Ms BEACH - Yeah.

CHAIR - Into the - well, what's that? Constitution Dock out there?

Ms BEACH - Yep.

CHAIR - Right. And what sort of volumes are we talking about going out that way?

Ms BEACH - I would need to take that on notice, Chair, to get the volumes.

CHAIR - And that's not included as part of the costs of the stadium? It's additional work?

Ms BEACH - No.

CHAIR - So, why is that? Because of the large roof, arguably some of the commercial properties there that'll obviously have roofs, too, but if we were going with the previous plan where it was a lot of open space, there would be less of a need to upgrade, certainly to this extent. So, why isn't this being included as part of the cost of the stadium? Because if you didn't build the big roof, you probably might not need it - or not to this extent.

PUBLIC

Ms BEACH - The precinct services, I guess, are scaled based on what is required on the site. So, because this is considered whole-of-precinct infrastructure, it has been considered as part of the broader delivery of the site and the cost to provide precinct services.

CHAIR - But you can't build the stadium with the roof without this upgrade.

Ms BEACH - No, but we're also not building it solely for the stadium. It will provide stormwater catchment and management for the whole site. So, I guess it's a line of, at what point do we bring in scope the services to develop the rest of the precinct and load those onto the stadium as a cost? And because this had a broader benefit, we considered it a precinct service.

CHAIR - Bec asked the Treasurer earlier about the cost of all the components making it up. This is not your job: it's really the Government's job, because part of it's to do with the costs associated with the AFL agreement - the stadium's one part of that. Where do you expect to see these sorts of costs, including a portion, or the whole lot, of the energy requirements upgrade? Where will that be reported and publicly visible in terms of the cost of delivering this stadium?

Ms BEACH - Yes. So, it's all managed, I guess, as costs for us. So, we have to track costs in our reporting, in our annual report, and through the budget process -

CHAIR - Including the cost of the new stormwater and the energy upgrade?

Ms BEACH - We have existing funding that we can deliver precinct services to a point. There is the whole precinct to deliver. To the extent we need additional funding, we have to seek that, and that is reported.

CHAIR - What I'm asking you, though: will it be easy for someone who's interested in the total cost of this build to be able to see, well, here's what was attributed to the stadium, which is the walls, the roof, the seats, the ground, the hospitality, things inside. And where will be the costs attributed to the stadium associated with the energy infrastructure, the stormwater infrastructure, the water and sewerage infrastructure - all the things that you can't operate a stadium without?

Ms BEACH - We will report and capture the stadium project and precinct services. We would probably be in a better position, I think, to articulate that once we go through the tender process and we're working through the bids that we've received. There are elements of the precinct services that are part of the stadium scope because it makes sense for the delivery of those to be within that footprint. There are a lot of elements that are important to have in place but benefit the border precinct, such as power supply, stormwater, water upgrades. I guess there isn't an external, public, sort of 'this is this portion and this is that portion', but I think as the development and the delivery of the precinct advances, that's something that we could certainly look to do.

CHAIR - Notionally, reasonably accurate final costs will be the cost of the stadium and the precinct works. Is that what you're saying? Just to be really clear, because the Government claim they're being - and you, too, for that matter - are saying that you're being really fully open and transparent about the cost, but a lot of people don't see it that way. I don't see it that way when there are things being attributed to different buckets that make it harder to track.

PUBLIC

Ms BEACH - There are number of works that we were already progressing that we need to do to get the site ready for development that we would consider site preparation and those elements we would consider part of the precinct. Similarly, we've had to remove a lot of redundant infrastructure, and including services on the site. We need to install those to enable the site to be developed. In developing -

CHAIR - Macquarie Point's been on this task for years, before you came, I might add. Anyway.

Ms BEACH - The task has been more focused on remediation -

Mr EVANS - Macquarie Point's been on what, sorry?

CHAIR - On a path of getting a site ready for development for years. Dealing with contaminated soils, removing redundant infrastructure, yeah? For years. With lots of money being thrown at it.

Mr EVANS - It's essential to have a development-ready site.

CHAIR - Correct.

Ms BEACH - We have a summary of the remediation that has been done on our website, including the materials found, and also some comparisons to other sites that have required remediation that have taken a similar period and, in some instances, ours has been faster. In terms of the actual infrastructure, it has to be informed on what we want to deliver on site. So, we can only deliver that to match what's in the precinct plan.

CHAIR - Which comes back to the decision to deliver a stadium onsite requires these things to happen, but they're not included in the cost.

Ms BEACH - Yes, and we would outline that those services will be required. We just develop those need to be informed based on what we're developing.

Mr WINTER - I've heard this for quite a while now. I mean, Mr Evans, you were around I think, when the hospital was built. Were the ancillary services like headworks for water and power, were they included in the final cost for what the hospital cost?

CHAIR - The Royal rebuild?

Mr WINTER - The Royal rebuild. Did you see the -

Mr EVANS - I was around when the hospital redevelopment was going on, but I can't say I'm privy to all of the details of how it was project managed.

Mr WINTER - My point is that Governments - and I've watched this Government now for nearly 13 years - when you talk about the cost of a project, you don't, for example, a subdivision, you don't build a subdivision and say, well, this is what it cost but we're excluding the cost of roads and water and power because we could have built anything there and those costs would have been associated. It seems like you've gone through and completely

PUBLIC

recreated how you cost projects specifically so that you can exclude some costs from the stadium: is that fair?

Mr EVANS - I think the example that the Treasurer gave this morning around the northern access road is a good one. A lot of people claim it should be part of -

CHAIR - I deliberately haven't mentioned that, because that was talked about beforehand. Let's not do that. Let's talk about the things we have talked about.

Mr EVANS - The same principle applies that, pre-stadium, there are a whole range of infrastructure requirements and costs that would need to have been met in order to develop the site.

Mr WINTER - And you would have included those costs in the final cost for whatever it was you were building: and yet here, you seem to be trying to pretend they're not real costs. I just feel like everyone can see the reality, and Ruth has made this argument now, not just you, but others, and it's a perfectly logical argument.

Mr EVANS - As the CEO also explained, a lot of these real costs and solutions will be explored with the main contractor as part of the tender evaluation, and we don't know how that's going to land yet. We will get more clarity over the course of the next month or so as we work our way through the tender process.

Ms THOMAS - Is it fair to say that through all this stadium debate - and this has been an issue for the Government since they started talking about it - was that this all started about the redevelopment of Macquarie Point. Then all of a sudden on the front page of the *Mercury* one day was the stadium. So, we stopped talking about the redevelopment of Macquarie Point and we started talking about the stadium and so, then, the narrative is focused on that: whereas the Federation Funding Agreement, the focus of the MPDC, as I see it, is the redevelopment of Macquarie Point as a precinct, but that has just got totally almost lost in all the debate and controversy around the stadium. Would it be fair to say when it comes to the cost of the stadium, within the development of the Macquarie Point precinct, what is included is what has been costed in the P90 assessment?

Ms BEACH - That's right. The corporation's core role is to prepare the site for development. We would look at making sure that you can provide relevant end capacity of water, storm water, sewer, internal services, power; they're all part of getting the site ready for development, which is why we group them in that way. We will get to a point where we can articulate the full cost of those items. They will be available once we get there, but it is a broader role that we have to deliver the precinct, and so, we haven't changed the way we do that because we're also responsible for doing the stadium.

CHAIR - I will go back to that question I asked: will there be somewhere transparently reported the full cost, including the bits that you would have had to do for it, whatever it was, because some of those had already been spent over the last 10, 15 years, whatever how long it has been? At a point in time when the decision was made to build a stadium rather than the other master plan that was agreed to, that that's when the cost - the things that needed to change, like a significant expansion to the stormwater, a significant upgrade to the energy requirements, that's when we should be counting it from.

PUBLIC

Ms BEACH - We will get to a point where we can articulate the precinct infrastructure services that need to be in place to support the stadium. So, we're effectively bringing them forward or getting them to a capacity at that point, and which of those are, I guess, majority use for the stadium and which are partial for the precinct, and which is to service both.

CHAIR - Okay.

Ms BEACH - But all of these items link back to there is some benefit to the precinct because that is our primary purpose. It would be inappropriate for us to look solely at how do we get the stadium sorted and not think about the broader need of the precinct.

CHAIR - No, not suggesting that. Yes. I just want to understand.

Mr EVANS - Going to another comment Ms Thomas made: we haven't forgotten about the broader precinct. We've developed the precinct plan, now the master plan; and we're advanced with the development of a precinct development strategy in parallel. Yes, the priority is on the stadium just at the moment because of the timeframes, but we've got a mind to broader precinct development that we're seeking to achieve. We've got a vision for the precinct, of which the stadium is one little bit.

Ms THOMAS - Yes. And a big bit -

CHAIR - It's not one little bit: it's one rather large bit.

Ms THOMAS - Just to be clear: I wasn't for a second suggesting that the MPDC has forgotten about the border precinct. What I was saying is that has been lost in the broader community and media narrative. So, I'm not suggesting that the MPDC has forgotten about that: but the focus of the community and of the media has been on the stadium, when the Federation Funding Agreement clearly outlines that these other things need to be delivered as well, and the focus, I know, of the MPDC is on the broader precinct.

Mr EVANS - The master plan is really clear that we have got to do the broader precinct development, and stages how we will deliver that. We're operating consistent with that staging plan within the master plan.

Ms BEACH - Our principle, I guess, objectives in the act are around delivering the precinct.

CHAIR - Have you finished the presentation you want to give, Anne? I'll go to you, Bec.

Ms THOMAS - Thank you. We talked last hearing about the tender process and specifically around the MPDC's due diligence in relation to the tenderers: can you just be clear about what due diligence the MPDC undertook on Webuild before shortlisting them as a participant in the process?

Ms BEACH - The expression-of-interest process was designed to identify and assess parties that had the financial, strategic and experience, the capability to deliver the projects; the assessment was informed, similarly to what I outlined for the tender, with subject matter experts and with a two-tier evaluation panel. So, we had experts to advise all of that process and the assessment was principally on the information that was submitted.

Ms THOMAS - I know you tabled a letter from Webuild in the previous hearing, and that letter stated that Webuild had acted transparently at all times, and has proactively notified relevant regulatory authorities of any allegations; but what steps did the MPDC take to verify that statement before proceeding, and before providing that letter to the Committee? Did the MPDC independently satisfy itself that those representations made by Webuild were accurate and, if so, how?

Ms BEACH - So, as I noted, there are subject matter experts that consider both the information submitted and information reasonably publicly available: that informed their reports and assessment, that informed the Evaluation Committee and the recommendation that was then made for the parties that we nominated to go into the tender stage. At an expression-of-interest stage we wouldn't be undertaking detailed investigations: there is a reasonable check of what information is publicly available to assess the information provided.

Ms THOMAS - So did those independent experts conduct any searches of Australian court proceedings, industrial relations, litigation, work, health and safety prosecutions, or ASIC or other regulatory enforcement actions, or did MPDC undertake any of that, I guess, due diligence at that stage?

Ms BEACH - The assessment considered, by those experts, what is information reasonably available. We didn't contact every jurisdiction and look through the detailed elements that they were currently considering, for example. That's not really an appropriate consideration of an expression of interest. We looked at what information was provided, what was publicly available, and sought expert advice on, is this a reasonableness and understanding of those entities and their history?

CHAIR - When was that process undertaken? What dates was that undertaken?

Ms BEACH - Expression of interest, I think, opened on 10 January [2026] and closed on 11 February [2026].

CHAIR - 2020 -

Mr EVANS - 2026.

Ms BEACH - This year.

Ms THOMAS - Among those independent experts and advisers, was the probity adviser involved in looking into Webuild?

Ms BEACH - The probity adviser, their role is to make sure we follow the process set out and follow reasonable process. They're party to all meetings. It's important the probity adviser is present for those.

Ms THOMAS - Was the probity adviser aware of the New South Wales proceedings, and the timing of those proceedings, and the public reporting around Webuild?

Ms BEACH - The probity adviser would look at the process that we followed, and did we go in accordance with that: it's not the role of the probity adviser to go out and do additional searches of information.

Ms THOMAS - Has the probity adviser provided a written report on the procurement process to date?

Ms BEACH - Yes. Probity advisers for all procurements provide a review, a report of the process; that's attached to the evaluation report and was one of the things that we needed to provide to the Board to make a recommendation.

Mr WINTER – We've got into this quite a bit during the last hearing, particularly around the tender process, and there are a number of layers of governance around here. In particular, the last hearing, you listed out the amount of governance which is quite substantial, but it still seems strange to me that given the allegations made against Webuild, there doesn't appear to be any willingness or even ability to exclude them from the process, if that's what MPDC wanted. If MPDC chose to, could it choose to exclude Webuild from this process at this point?

Ms BEACH - We're ultimately responsible. There is a lot of governance around these processes and we do have expert advisers, but we're ultimately responsible for the process.

For the key assessment points throughout the EOI and then when the submissions are made, which we're now at, during the tender assessment process, it's a more fulsome assessment: we consider the information that's provided and as said on the tender documentation, we have the right to undertake investigations that we see appropriate and to inform the assessments.

What I would say on these matters is: we haven't had anything identified that would change the assessment of having compliant bids. We have sought advice and we're working through these, but the key assessment point for us to look at what we've received and what we need to consider and the delivery requirements is now as we're working through the tender assessment process and we have expert advisers to help us do that. I haven't been in a position where I felt I've needed to say to our governance or to our Board that we need to review the decision.

Mr WINTER - In that May [2026] hearing, you confirmed that Webuild have been shortlisted for Stage 1 of the RFT, but then given that the New South Wales Government then referred Webuild to the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC), the New South Wales Police and the ATO on 8 May [2026] following the Kimber Inquiry, can you confirm the exact date the MPDC became aware of the specific referrals?

Ms BEACH - I note the matters are charges: they're untested at the court and the advice we have received is that the bids remain compliant. There hasn't been a need for us to review the decision to further the compliant bids that were selected to enter into the tender process.

Mr WINTER - There have been findings made by the Kimber Inquiry, correct?

Ms BEACH - That doesn't relate to the declaration that was required. That is a separate investigation. It doesn't contravene the requirements that will need to be declared in the EOI.

PUBLIC

Mr WINTER - So, the Kimber Inquiry hasn't been made public but the findings have. Has MPDC sought or obtained the final Kimber Inquiry report?

Ms BEACH - No, as I said, it's not - we've considered matters that are publicly available, that is not publicly available, but, as I noted, we can undertake investigations as part of the tender assessment process.

I would note that this is important for us to do for any party. If we looked at any T1 or other construction firm, there will be points in time where they've had safety industrial relations and other matters.

What's important for us is to understand how they manage those. Do they have the system so that we can make sure for any party that we contract, if there were to be any issues or we had concerns of potential issues, we have the right mechanisms to make sure that appropriate people are undertaking the work, and safety systems are in place.

Mr WINTER - It's a really simple question. Did Webuild declare the Kimber Inquiry in their EOI response on the 11 February [2026]?

Ms BEACH - I can't comment on specific elements that are and aren't in a confidential inquiry, but I can say that would not be required to be declared.

Mr WINTER - I don't understand how that could be true and I think this goes a little bit to what we talked about last time, but in EOI Volume 2, schedule QEC3, Part AV -

Ms BEACH - That's very specific.

Mr WINTER - and what I know about you, Ms Beach, is you're very, very diligent and, oh my God, if you find that you'll be, you're very, very good, but when I read that, it seems to me they were required to declare this.

CHAIR - Can I just add something to that?

Mr WINTER - Sure.

CHAIR - There are also public court documents from October 2024 and then court appearances in 2025, so they're public. It's not like there was no public visibility of the matters that were being raised against Webuild.

Ms BEACH - Chair, I think -

Mr WINTER - In part A5, it says 'any other claims and disputes' which you did find. Of course, you did. You're very good, as I said. Any other claims and disputes which are on foot and subject to litigation, arbitration or determination by an independent expert which is Kimber. So, can you explain to me why they weren't required to disclose their participation in the Kimber Inquiry?

Ms BEACH - I can. The reference here to a determination by an independent expert, which we've sought advice on to make sure we're clear, is you have to read the whole clause as a whole and not as individual. So, the reference to independent expert needs to be read in the

PUBLIC

context of litigation and dispute. It's not just a random investigation that someone has been commissioned to do: it has to relate to the litigation, arbitration -

CHAIR - What about court appearances, then? They're not random.

Ms BEACH - They're allegations, so the matters need to be tested at court.

Mr WINTER - But it says claims and disputes -

CHAIR - Yeah, claims and potential -

Mr WINTER - are on foot.

CHAIR - So if court documents clearly revealed that there were matters on foot - they hadn't been determined, you're absolutely right. They're in court now, or recently - I don't know whether it's completed its process or not. But it says - it doesn't say they have to have been determined. It says, could this be a flag, effectively.

Mr WINTER - And it also doesn't discount them. It just says they should disclose anything, and they haven't disclosed it, which is why I can't understand the rationale or argument that they weren't required to when clearly they were.

Ms BEACH - As I said, you have to read the whole clause. So, any other claims and disputes which are on foot 'and' subject to litigation, arbitration and determination by an independent expert and those matters don't apply.

CHAIR - How does the fact that they are now in court facing charges that are serious enough to be in court -

Mr WINTER - Very serious.

CHAIR - and subject to not insignificant penalty, how does that impact the process now moving forward?

Ms BEACH - As I noted, we have the ability to undertake investigations and we need to assess the bids based on the criteria as they are set out. So, we would consider that in terms of their capacity to deliver this project. We do have Work Health and Safety advisers, industrial relations advisers, as part of the assessment, and we would need to look at, when we're assessing these, what is our view and our ability for each of the parties to meet all of those obligations. We would also be thinking about the contract negotiations around what we would require in a contract to have confidence that the project will be delivered safely, on time and on the agreed budget.

CHAIR - What sort of measures would do that? If they were found guilty, that would be one line in the sand, I guess, but maybe it's not. I don't know. At what point - we've only got two people in the race here. I know there is a live procurement process going on at the minute which makes it all awkward, but this has all been very public now because it is playing out in a court.

PUBLIC

Ms BEACH - We would seek the advice of the subject matter experts to inform the assessment, and it would depend entirely on the nature of if there were findings, what are they, what were involved, was it an individual party, was it a system fault? What is the challenge that actually needs to be managed? As I said, if we looked at the history of any of the firms, we're likely to find instances where they've had to make changes due to things happening.

CHAIR - So, do you - I mean, I don't know this - when the court proceedings are due to wind up, if they haven't, and when - I mean, I don't know how efficiently the court operates in New South Wales, but are you going to get a finding from the court with recommendations for changing practice or whatever it might be before you go through the process where you make a determination about who you take forward into the next part?

Ms BEACH - We would seek advice: what are the matters being considered, what mechanisms might we need to make sure we protect a safe delivered project.

CHAIR - Advice from whom?

Ms BEACH - Our subject matter experts that are informing the assessment.

CHAIR - Who are the subject matter experts in this?

Ms BEACH - I can't tell you who they are, but I can certainly give you a list of the subject matter experts that are involved in terms of the - if that's helpful, I can do that now or I can provide a list to the Committee.

CHAIR - I'm happy for you to provide a list to the Committee. What are you providing, though, and is it a list of all the subject matter experts or the subject matter experts in this area?

Ms BEACH - We've identified subject matter experts in our evaluation plan that are currently assessing the bids received that will inform the assessment against the evaluation criteria.

CHAIR - So, we'll have that, yes?

Ms BEACH - That will inform -

CHAIR - I'm sure there's other subject matter experts who get to assess other parts of the process.

Ms BEACH - Yes, there's lots.

Mr EVANS - There's 15 or 16 of them.

CHAIR - So, if you could provide that to us, that'd be great.

Ms BEACH - The list? Yep.

Ms THOMAS - Have MPDC received written expert or legal advice on this matter, that continually appears to be contentious, specifically?

Ms BEACH - In terms of an investigation, we would do that as part of the assessment. In terms of compliance, we've had advisers throughout the process and we've continued to consult with them.

Ms THOMAS - But since becoming aware of the further media reporting and the further action in relation to Webuild, has this been discussed at Board level? Has MPDC sought specific legal or expert advice? Given this, this and this is going on, how does our tender process stand up, not just at that initial EOI stage but following that, given the matters that have evolved? Has there been further advice sought?

Ms BEACH - We've continued to engage with our advisers throughout our process and nothing has been brought to my attention that would require us to review the decision around the compliance of the bids.

I would also note some of this is legal and compliance, and some is just important for our understanding as we do the assessment against the criteria and in forming the contracts. For example, work health and safety arrangements in each jurisdiction are different. To meet the work health and safety requirements here, there is Tasmanian legislation and Commonwealth legislation that applies around industrial relations. Matters that relate to work health and safety in other jurisdictions legally don't apply here. That's not to say we wouldn't consider how those systems and processes might be important for us to think about in terms of the safe delivery of our project.

Mr WINTER - You'd be familiar with an *Australian* article on 30 June [2026] which outlines concerns raised through the New South Wales Industrial Relations Court where it alleged that the lives of two workers on the Snowy 2.0 project were put at risk by continuing to operate a broken drilling machine. It points out in the article that MPDC put out a statement that publicly stated that the charges against Webuild:

have only just been outlined and could not have been declared at the time of the EOI assessment.

But then the article points out that, in fact, these charges were detailed in October 2024 and subject to several publicly listed court appearances in 2025. What is your response to that? And again, a similar question as before: do you accept that this should have been disclosed during the EOI process?

Ms BEACH - As I said, this hasn't triggered a change or review of our assessment in terms of compliance. Industrial relations are Commonwealth. They are different to work health and safety, and the declarations that were made around work health and safety.

Mr WINTER - How are they different?

Ms BEACH - I made a comment to the best of my knowledge. I noted that, as I said of the EOI process, we considered matters that were publicly available. We didn't go to every jurisdiction of every court and inquire in those. It's not a reasonable thing to do at EOI stage.

Mr WINTER - This isn't a question on you. It's on them and their disclosure. They didn't disclose these matters, and they were aware of them. They've been aware of them for a long time. Do you accept that they should have disclosed them in the EOI process?

Ms BEACH - No. Our understanding is they weren't required to be disclosed.

Mr WINTER - When I read the tender document, quite rightly it's asking for transparency from the respondents about matters that are on foot, matters that are being investigated. And yet here we have a respondent that has failed to do so. I don't understand how this isn't being dealt with, particularly when it concerns things like worker safety. There's allegations around the treatment of a \$10 million contract or invoice that wasn't able to be traced back. So, there's financial concerns, worker safety concerns. How is it you've got this process that is so layered - huge layers of probity, and yet we have a situation like this where we're just flagging them through.

Ms BEACH - As I noted, the matters noted in the *Australian* article are industrial relations, not work health and safety. The conduct of a subcontractor was the other thing you noted. These don't trigger a non-compliance in terms of the questions that were asked.

It does, however, as I said, we do need to think about the assessment that we need to do at pace. We're going to be working really quickly - and the team are at the moment, to try and make sure we get clarity for all parties, including the community so we can enter into Stage 2 and have a contract in place by the end of the year, which is why we put together a suite of subject matter experts to make sure the assessment of the tender and information we have available, and our ability at this stage to do more detailed investigations, inform our assessment.

Mr WINTER - Mr Evans, you tabled on 26 May [2026] correspondence from Webuild to this Committee asserting that:

Webuild had acted transparently at all times and proactively notified relevant regulatory authorities.

In light of *The Australian's* findings regarding multiple undisclosed SafeWork NSW prosecutions and the Sydney Airport inquiries, does the MPDC still stand by your statement, or was the Committee misled relating to the tenderer's disclosure record?

Mr EVANS - As the CEO has explained, we took legal and probity advice at the time in terms of the compliance of the EOI with what was disclosed. That indicated that there wasn't a case to be made to disqualify or reconsider the Webuild expression of interest. It was compliant. We got advice, both legal and probity, to verify that. But now into a different part of the process, through the tender, we will obviously, through the subject matter experts, do a lot deeper dive into a whole range of matters relating to the tenders, including these sorts of matters. And we will have -

CHAIR - Where's the point where your preferred tenderer is disqualified? What would disqualify them under this sort of framework? You said you've taken advice. You've got legal advice, you've got probity advice. Where is the line?

Ms BEACH - We'll be undertaking an assessment that includes a compliance check as well as assessments against the evaluation criteria as part of the tender assessment.

CHAIR - Does this assessment process require them to have a pretty squeaky clean health and safety, and worker safety record?

PUBLIC

Ms BEACH - It requires declaration, and we have the ability to investigate.

Mr EDMUNDS - So, that assessment is essentially ahead of Stage 2?

Ms BEACH - That's the work to happen now.

Mr EVANS - That's to happen under this current assessment.

CHAIR - If you found financial mismanagement - you might or some other body who's investigating matters could.

Mr EVANS - As you'd expect, we would do a lot of due diligence of both tenderer parties through this next phase in the lead-up to a decision about who to take forward.

Ms BEACH - That would inform the scoring. For each of the criteria, there needs to be, informed by subject matter expert reports, the performance against each of those criteria are assessed. If someone performed poorly, you can imagine that would impact on -

Mr EVANS - As the CEO has explained, we've relevant subject matter experts and then we've got a two-tiered evaluation process, with the right experts involved in both those tiers, before it comes forward to Government and to the Board.

CHAIR - When you provide the subject matter expert information to us, will it give us the name and the skills of the person or people?

Ms BEACH - No, we can't. It's the same as Committee members. We can't disclose them. We would be able to at the end of the process, I believe. But -

CHAIR - You said you were going to provide -

Ms BEACH - I'll provide a list of all the subject matter experts in terms of -

Mr EVANS - The subject. But we won't give you the details of who's on each subject matter expert team.

Ms THOMAS - If the Committee wanted to ask questions of the probity adviser, are you able to provide their details?

Ms BEACH - Yes.

Ms THOMAS - Thank you.

Mr WINTER - I was just going to ask about public transport. There's been a big discussion, particularly this week, around light rail. We asked last time about this. I guess this is another example of something that should be included in the cost of stadium, but I think you're going to tell me it's not. Has the Corporation commissioned or received modelling of event day transport demand generated by the stadium's potential for 23,000 or up to 30,000 people for concerts? If so, can you take us through it all or provide it?

Ms BEACH - I can, to a point, off the top of my head, but I can certainly provide some further information. As part of the Project of State Significance submission, we did need to do quite a bit of modelling. There was a first pass that supported the precinct plan that was around what modes would be supported and targets to try and achieve those. And then with the Project of State Significance, we did both origins, so where are people coming from, modelling. That was informed in part by Tasmanian Cricket and Devil's membership, de-identified to get a feel where some of those for those example events would come from. And then we also considered the actual impact on traffic and in different mode scenarios. So, if we had a certain percentage of people in cars and on buses and walking, what would that look like? And then if we up the cars, what does that look like, to try and identify at what point do you hit congestions that are probably a level of delay that we wouldn't want to see. So, that modelling is submitted in what the PoSS process is a ... report. We could probably pull an excerpt out for the Committee.

Mr WINTER - We can probably find it if it's in there.

Ms BEACH - I can certainly send a link to that and provide copies. In addition to that, we have done some further testing around - percentages are useful, but the actual movement of people is really important when we look at how people move, particularly after a main event. So, the arrival, too, can be staggered, but often people will leave at the same time unless their team's rubbish and it's three-quarter time, they might leave early. You get that flush.

CHAIR - You wouldn't have left the Roos match last night. Just saying.

Ms BEACH - So, we've done what's called dynamic pedestrian flow modelling to look at if people are in this seat and they want to get to that part of the city, or they're going to a car park or they're going to a bus, how does that actual movement work? That's more important for our design and landscaping rather than transport as much, because we need to make sure we're identifying are there any pinch points and how can we design those out so we get a good flow of people. The other probably related part is the bus services.

Mr WINTER - Exactly what I was going to ask. Rapid buses, right?

Ms BEACH - So, the event day bus - one of the assumptions is that normal services would apply. So, you would have the normal bus service that would be in place that day. We're working on the basis of the rapid bus being in place to then look at the loads that would be required as a surge for the event day.

Mr WINTER - So, you're expecting the rapid buses to be in place for game one?

Ms BEACH - 2031.

Mr WINTER - I haven't asked that question yet. We're still on track for 2031?

Ms BEACH - Yes.

Mr WINTER - So, you're expecting the buses to be available, the rapid bus transport plan, to be active on day one for match one.

Ms BEACH - That was the base model. If that wasn't the case, we'd obviously have to adjust the management of buses.

Mr WINTER - What sort of discussions are underway with State Growth at the moment about - because this is really important, obviously, for the city. What are the discussions at the moment about how that would actually work?

Ms BEACH - So, the bus services that were considered in the transport plan were particularly servicing park-and-rides. There are some identified routes that would get the best and most efficient movement of people and their capacity to circle back. In the northern access road designs that I think are now submitted with council, that State Roads and Building Tasmania are progressing, the part of that that comes on to our site and will form part of that road includes bus bays. There are eight bus bays. We've also allowed in our landscaping the space to extend that if we were wanting to add some additional bus bays, particularly for accessibility. So, that helps with moving people through quickly and having those stops as close as possible for loading people.

So, I think the work that's just being stress-tested is: how often would we need to look at an expansion, or ever, onto our site, and how quickly can we move people. So, it's not so much a case of - the impact on bus availability and how quickly you get people in and out is how quickly can you flush the site through. So, you have to make assumptions around what are called headways - how quickly can you fill a bus and then it leave and another bus come in. And the sort of model we've looked at is ideally you want to have the full site, looking at other stadia, around 45 minutes to an hour. What we're stress-testing is to make sure the eight bays are sufficient to do that, or would we need to think about a more ongoing operational overlay.

Mr WINTER - There was a technical note about the northern access road and bus plaza filed on behalf of MPDC during the TPC hearings into the stadium in July [2025] last year, and it said that the northern access road and event bus plaza sit outside of the scope of the integrated assessment PoSS. What assessment, if any, has been carried out about the impact of the road on the broader area so far and, if it hasn't, what is the process for that?

Ms BEACH - It's going through a standard process as a DA, but the design has been considering a number of parties, so one is TasPorts. It's a key access to the port, which has really important grade implications when you're moving, like, a B-double or larger structures, so you can't have sudden changes. That's been a key factor, and supporting prioritisation to the port. Also, TasWater, they will have a pump facility, a sewer pump facility there, that will pump sewage out to Selfs Point for our pipeline, so because of different levels, they'll need to make sure they can access that station and -

Mr WINTER - What about the rail alignment? Does that get considered as part of the DA?

Ms BEACH - The scope doesn't consider rail, no. There is an extensive amount of work that's informed looking at that rail corridor and the condition of it and there needing to be substantial remediation and potential land reclamation to enable that corridor to be activated. This is focusing on the current requirements, which are for road access.

Mr WINTER - The very last one, because I'm sure others have similar but related.

The sewage treatment plant -

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Before we go onto that -

Mr WINTER - Sure, transport.

CHAIR - I wouldn't presume it'd be your job to deal with the bits that lead to the plaza area on Macquarie Point site, but there's going to be a whole heap of work that needs to be done to create those corridors in. The northern access road's one, but for potentially other transport moving people in and out of the ground, so the majority of that falls outside of MPDC's responsibilities, so how are you coordinating that to make sure that you might get your six or eight bus bays there but there are only five buses available?

Ms BEACH - I think this is the value of having the Oversight Committee. They're looking at and making sure we're talking to each other across agencies about what is the whole solution and we're not doing this in isolation. There is work underway at the moment to look at the capacity in terms of there are a number of operators, they all have different numbers of buses, and looking at different scenarios around how many of those would be reasonably available on an event day - looking at sort of a Friday or Saturday.

Mr EVANS - Of course, Stadiums Tasmania are part of those discussions as the eventual owner and operator of the site.

CHAIR - Who's leading that body of work? Is that now Building Tasmania.

Ms BEACH - To test, I guess, the requirements and to make sure the space in the northern access road works, but it is, I guess, a shared responsibility.

CHAIR - That's only one small part. That's the end of it or the start of it, depending on whether you're coming or going.

I don't know if there's still a plan to use the rail corridor for these rapid buses. Is there? Is that still part of the plan?

Ms BEACH - Rapid buses are separate. This is event buses on top of those, but my understanding of the rapid bus is that it goes to New Town in that sort of space where it can be effectively activated as a first stage and the second stage is more challenging, so being able to activate that through to New Town through that rapid bus service gives it a dedicated space.

Mr EVANS - But that's a Building Tas responsibility.

CHAIR - So, they're in the room while this has been discussed about how many buses, surge capacity, all that sort of stuff?

Ms BEACH - I think it's an active piece of work around looking at some of the things that are being considered are using the bus fleet to support on those event days when they're not in use and that being an opportunity as part of the renewal of that program of fleet for those to be *Disability Discrimination Act* (DDA) compliant, for example, and some of those benefits. So, looking at the availability and the amount of people we can move through that bus bay will be a factor of the buses that are available and how quickly we move people through and the number of bays. We are looking at that at the moment in more detail.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - But Building Tasmania is in charge of sorting out that other end of it out there, beyond the site. Yeah?

Ms BEACH - I'm not entirely sure what you mean by the 'other end'.

CHAIR - Well, making sure that it works.

Ms THOMAS - Like the northern corridor, you mean?

CHAIR - Not just the northern corridor. There'll need to be buses coming from the south, won't there?

Ms BEACH - There are event day bus services. The routes for those have primarily looked at park-and-rides that are either in place or in progress, so it's not looking to create new specific infrastructure. For buses that might come from the north and the north-west, they're classed separately as 'coaches', and outside of that more immediate event day bus service.

CHAIR - Who's dealing with that plan?

Ms BEACH - We've modelled traffic impacts in terms of the number of people on buses and the extent of delay that it would need to be managed and found that worst case on a Friday afternoon where you have multiple users and pressures on the road network, that it would be similar to the experience on a Monday or Friday coming into the city. In terms of the fleet availability, that work is underway, which Building Tasmania is working through.

Mr EVANS - From our perspective, what we needed to be confident of is that there is a solution. And our modelling would show that there is a multitude of different solutions -

CHAIR - But you're not in charge of delivering them but you do need to connect.

Ms BEACH - Yes, and -

Mr EVANS - But the actual delivery of those solutions needs to be worked through with the relevant parties with responsibility, including Building Tasmania, including the venue operator, Stadiums Tasmania, and others.

CHAIR - That's what I'm asking: is that going on?

Ms BEACH - Yes, it's an active piece of work.

Mr EDMUNDS - I've got a couple of lines, but I might go to the shortest one first about waste. It's been a bit topical and you talked about how there's three categories. Is there only three? Because that's something I've seen some conjecture about. So, I'm interested in how many classifications there are and the process for how each of those is dealt with.

Ms BEACH - Yeah, so there is a - I do have a hard copy here, Chair, I can give you one of and then provide others to the Committee. The EPA information bulletin 105 is the classification and management of contaminated soil for disposal. So, that's not specific to us; that's the framework in which they undertake their assessment and there are three levels. They're sort of described as - I guess it gets progressively higher as you go through the levels.

PUBLIC

It's a little bit of an academic description in the table, so I won't read that out - but it does have a supporting table that outlines essentially thresholds for a whole range of contaminants that would tick you into one level or the other.

The way that we determine that is through sampling. At the moment on site, you would see some stockpiling and so they're being sampled. The results of those are then worked through the EPA - we determine or confirm. We generally have done query sampling and are relatively confident we know where there's sort of pockets of higher levels and lower levels and then it can then be removed from the site. But it does need to be confirmed what the level is before it can leave site. And it is covered -

Mr EDMUNDS - So, you have like a grid on the site where, like, that's where the level 1 is, that's where level 2, after you've done the sampling?

Ms BEACH - Yes.

Mr EDMUNDS - Or is that more of an evolving thing?

Ms BEACH - Yes, to all those things. I guess the bulk excavation that we're planning, we've done in-situ sampling, so trying to get a picture across the site so that can inform a faster move. The material at the moment is removed and then sampled. We do a combination of both, depending on the risk in the context.

Mr EDMUNDS - Is it the level 1 and 2 is reasonably easy to dispose of, I suppose? Is it just 3 that's the challenge, is that right?

Ms BEACH - They do need to be licensed facilities, but level 3 is where there is only one licensed facility, which is Copping.

Mr EDMUNDS - And that's Copping. So, level 1 and 2 could go to Mornington or - at the Hobart I saw something about Hobart -

Mr EVANS - Sorry, Chair, I should declare I'm Chair of Southern Waste Solutions and a director on Copping.

Ms BEACH - Don't ask him any questions.

Mr EDMUNDS - I won't ask you anything.

Mr EVANS - I just excuse myself from all discussions at Macquarie Point end and at Southern Waste end.

CHAIR - Thanks, Kim.

Ms BEACH - To your question, at level 2 they do still need to be licensed by the EPA to take that material: McRobies Gully is one of those licensed entities.

Mr EDMUNDS - Just can you outline if any, or how, if any health risks are identified in that process and how they're mitigated? This is to just deal with speculation that I've seen where people are talking about going to places like Copping. How is it sort of encapsulated, I suppose?

Ms BEACH - When it's transported from our site, it does need to be covered. As I know, the material is sampled or it's been informed by sampling before it leaves the site. More importantly, I guess, is we have monitors that help us understand and obviously spotters. So, as the investigations are happening at the moment for the archaeological investigations, we have an architect, an Aboriginal Heritage officer and a spotter. So, if there's any signs of materials or any issues with gas, that would be an immediate stop and we have mitigations for those in our site environmental management plan and that's always part of every induction coming onto our site to an understanding of how they need to be managed. By the time the material leaves the site, it is covered, so that risk is low.

I'd just note, if we found something specific like asbestos, there's obviously specific protocols for the management of those things separately from the removal of material.

Mr EDMUNDS - Understood. Thank you.

Ms THOMAS - I think we covered off on this last time as well, but I'll ask again because things change and time has passed. But in terms of the cost risks, has MPDC updated its assessment of risks arising from inflation and labour shortages and fuel prices and supply chain and major competing projects since the last hearing and, if it has, have the contingency assumptions or the total budget been affected by the further analysis? I know the Treasurer this morning did table a letter that's been prepared by you, Mr Evans, as Board Chair, in response to a motion that was passed in the House of Assembly recently. What can you tell us about whether MPDC has concerns around the costs increasing and whether you've done any analysis on that?

Ms BEACH - Our project budget and our estimate remain at \$1.13 billion. We have just received tenders and we will be assessing those and working through if there's any cost considerations we need to go through there. We do monthly risk reviews or monitoring on all of our projects. They're not necessarily for a financial impact. They're more looking at risks that we need to manage. We do have quantity surveyors as one of our subject matter experts and they will be advising on and assisting with things such as the costs, as you mentioned, and also a reasonableness and a test of the scope of things that have been considered in quantifying those costs. We haven't prepared another cost estimate for that purpose, but we will be receiving quantity surveyor advice during the assessment to make sure it is an informed assessment. I think, because of the complexity of this and the number of things to consider in pricing, we need to have quantity surveyor advice and we know we're comparing apples with apples. And if we're not, how do we adjust for that and work through what additional expenses there might be.

Ms THOMAS - So the letter from the MPDC Chair to the Treasurer or Minister for Macquarie Point Urban Renewal does say that:

The MPDC has obtained advice from our legal and probity advisers and consulted with Department of Treasury and Finance to assess the procurement implications of releasing a revised estimate during the current tender process. Providing a cost estimate at this stage risks adversely affecting Tasmania's ability to achieve the best outcome from the procurement process, as set out below.

PUBLIC

And the letter goes on to outline the probity, confidentiality and value for money risks of tabling a cost estimate. That talks about providing or tabling a cost estimate, but has MPDC a revised cost estimate or have you just got the costs that have come in through the tender process.

Ms BEACH - Yes. So, the reason the correspondence from the Chair referenced that is because the motion specifically asked us to develop one for the 11th of August [2026]. We haven't developed a cost estimate, as such, to replace the one we have. We are certainly seeking and working through cost considerations from our quantity surveyor. But that's why it referred to the tabling, because the motion specifically requested us to, if we didn't have one, to prepare one.

Ms THOMAS - So you don't have one to provide.

Ms BEACH - I'm not sure what advice has been provided by our quantity surveyors as part of the assessment process. So, I wouldn't want to say there's no cost information, but we haven't sought a revised cost estimate, and we didn't intend to prior to the assessment. Part of the letter was sort of suggesting: for us to do that, outside of our processes in addition for the purpose of public release, would be unhelpful. If we have a challenge around cost, the obligation on us is to advise Government of that so they can consider how they would like to manage that. If there's instruction for us to manage down, or if the consideration of there are benefits in looking at a revised budget, we're not - it's all hypothetical - but, particularly, at this stage, releasing further information could impact probity. It's unhelpful when we want to keep cost pressure on our tenderers and it's unlikely to be particularly accurate. When we have real numbers, we'll share them.

Ms THOMAS - Thank you.

Mr EDMUNDS - You talked about the economic and social benefits statement and you talked about scoring before and, I think, it's 30 per cent. I'm interested, within that 30 per cent, how much weight sits on materials sourced from Tasmania as distinct from labour and training?

Ms BEACH - I do have the documentation here and it would take me a minute to find it. I'm happy to provide some advice if that's useful, rather than the Committee waiting for me to rifle through paper.

Mr EDMUNDS - I could probably put some of this stuff in - because I have quite a few questions on it and we're at 2.45 p.m., so I can send it through if you like.

Ms BEACH - There is a returnable - I recall from the EOI seeking probity advice around the appropriateness of providing returnables and we were able to provide that for the EOI, for that one, for the economic and social benefits. So, I would need to seek some advice, but I can certainly come back with some further -

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay. Yes. That's fine.

Ms BEACH - Here's one we prepared earlier: 15 per cent.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes. Cool.

Ms BEACH - So, that's specific to the goods and services used in the contract.

PUBLIC

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay. Is there any minimum percentage or dollar value of the Tasmanian-sourced materials the tenderer must commit to?

Ms BEACH - I don't think we specify minimums, but this is 30 per cent of their assessment, and -

Mr EVANS - So, they're motivated to maximise that number.

Ms BEACH - I think also, frankly, without relying on the local market, I'm not sure they could deliver this project. So, it's in their interest on multiple fronts to maximise that as much as possible. We do have the industry capability network, where we've encouraged local suppliers to use those to make sure, if tenderers aren't going to people directly, there's opportunity to make sure they put their hand up, and that will continue into Stage 2.

Mr EVANS - We had an industry briefing day with, what, 250 registrations?

Ms BEACH - 200, I think.

CHAIR - Is there a Tasmanian industry participation plan? Do you actually have a plan for that, like to set expectations about the percentage of Tasmanian employees and that sort of thing?

Ms BEACH - They're usually a returnable as part of the -

CHAIR - Sorry?

Ms BEACH - They're usually a returnable: part of our assessment is receiving that advice from tenderers.

CHAIR - So you are seeking that?

Ms BEACH - I believe so. I think that the economic and social benefits request we've put in are more comprehensive than the usual TIPP (Tasmanian Industry Participation Plan), but they will need to articulate that.

CHAIR - Do you have an expectation of what percentages you will set, because I've looked at one with another GBE, acknowledging you're not a GBE, but it was a pretty low bar.

Ms BEACH - The overall assessment is 30 per cent. What makes that up is when we're looking through that - sorry, 100 per cent total to inform the 30 per cent is: 25 per cent is demonstrating how you will maximise Tasmanian job opportunities; the question that was just asked around is 15 per cent - is focused on where the goods and services are being sourced from; 20 per cent opportunity for small to medium enterprise involvement; and 20 per cent for skills and training; and 10 per cent for -

CHAIR - Does that mean employing people with skills or training, or training people?

Ms BEACH - A combination of both. When we speak to people like Master Builders and CCF, some of the legacy opportunities here they talk about are opportunities for people to

PUBLIC

come in and experience and do micro qualifications as well as those sort of longer-term apprenticeships and similar. So, the training element is a really important part, which is why we've weighed it at 20 per cent. There's also 10 per cent broader social and economic, and 10 per cent local initiative solutions.

CHAIR - Local?

Ms BEACH - Local initiatives. So, what opportunities is there for industry engagement and development.

Mr EDMUNDS - You said was it 250 local businesses had registered, was that -

Ms BEACH - 200.

Mr EDMUNDS - 200, sorry. Is it reported when their engagement with the tender is at stage 2? Is that when they will disclose that, or do you get that feedback already, or how is it -

Ms BEACH - There isn't - it's really important we provide the opportunities and the quadrants for information, but don't -

Mr EDMUNDS - Insert yourself into it.

Ms BEACH - insert ourselves in there. So, we don't know specifically which parties they will have engaged with, but I guess it's up to the tenderers to put their best foot forward; but there are lots of different models to do that, so, for example, the Tasmanian industry is quite broad, but it might not necessarily be particularly deep. They might look at going, well, they should consider opportunities like - or could consider opportunities like if we have the capability to do a portion of comms and electrical work, and then using a broader capability from an interstate party, making sure that there's - some of the opportunities could be things like them delivering together rather than just going with a mainland provider, for example. That has not only the benefit of using the local capability that's here, but it also provides a development opportunity for the industry. So, in regions such as ours, those types of models have been applied in other instances, and while I haven't seen the bids, they may be some of the initiatives that they could consider.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes. The comments I asked about earlier and also Minister Abetz talked about, was the reduction in scope and value management, et cetera, and obviously this cost pressure is the big pressure point for all of us involved in this, basically: with regards to material - so when we get to Stage 2 and something has gone through, is it possible that perhaps something that has been factored in, like Tasmanian materials, into the build could then be removed as a cost? Are there any safeguards to protect the sort of Tasmanian element to this, which is why we had so many people out the front of this building calling for this project, that that is sort of quarantined from being something that's seen as a reduction in scope or value management?

Ms BEACH - We would be looking at any value-management initiatives that they may have identified in their bids to the extent that they would impact on - we need to consider what is the impact of those on the evaluation criteria. One of the evaluation criteria is the local participation. So, if there are things being popped up going - one value management might be

to not have a local provider in this scope of the package of works, you could imagine that would adversely assess our assessment of their performance against the local participation.

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay, but what if we get to a point, after Stage 2, what safeguards are there around that?

Ms BEACH - That would come down to how we develop a contract and our expectations.

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay. So that's -

Ms BEACH - Yes. There are things in construction and similar contracts of where there are particular - so, we assess on not just what they'll deliver, but how and who. So, if there's a key person identified and we contract that in, that is our expectation, that that party does that work. To the extent there are key parties and persons identified, that would be our expectation. There are mechanisms in the contract for us to approve subcontractors, so we'll have a line of sight to those types of things.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes. What sort of protections, or what's your commentary, perhaps, on - like with the *Spirits* for instance, we saw some of the local procurement was iPads that were bought here, I think, and things like that: how are you assessing that the local materials as well as the workforce is actually legit Tasmanian stuff, like, the wood in the roof and things like that?

Ms BEACH - We have stated an expectation that the timber, particularly in the roof, will be locally sourced. It may be that it requires structural lamination, that some or all of that could be done off-island, but it does need to be sourced here. We've highlighted the importance of those. We will be contracting them based on the program that we receive and that includes identification of where they need to appoint subcontractors; we have the ability to approve those or flag concerns with subcontractors within the contract. They would be some of the protections, and it is something they'll need to be reporting on throughout the project.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes. Cool.

Ms BEACH - That includes not just materials but also people; one of the things we've heard from industry is we want to be looking at a capability uplift in our existing industry, not just in the Tier 1. So, where packages of work are awarded to a local firm, it means they can put on additional apprentices and jobs. That has a longer-term benefit than just the Tier 1, and we want to see reporting on both, because that has the longer-term benefit.

CHAIR - That's in the TIPP - the reporting requirements?

Ms BEACH - I can't tell you exactly where it is: I'm not sure if the TIPP is in this, or if there is an equivalent. I think it might be a more complex assessment. I would need to check.

Mr WINTER - On the timber roof, a lot of people are quite excited about this. Have you identified - you talked about potentially coming from within the State - have you identified whether local businesses can produce what you need?

Ms BEACH - There is some capacity to do lamination on-island. We have tested quite a bit the volume and the types of timber. One of the things we've explored in sort of the design phase - I'd just caveat this: we'd have to look at what's finally contracted - but it's looking at things like *Eucalyptus nitens*, so, getting a higher benefit for that product and being able to mill that locally.

Mr WINTER - That's our plantation eucalypt?

Ms BEACH - Yes, it's a much higher use, and in looking at the, I think it's the GL -

CHAIR - It has to be mostly pruned and thinned, doesn't it? Or are you talking about -

Ms BEACH - In looking at the size of those timber beams, we have allowed for the strength of consideration for that type of timber. It's been one of the design factors: but I think you were specifically referring to lamination and the structural -

Mr WINTER - Well, the structural timber in the roof.

Ms BEACH - There is capacity to do some of that on-island. It would just be a case of the volume and the size that is required. There has been, I think, some thinking through that. I'm not sure that - we need a lot, fast, when it gets to that stage and that may require some off-island processing.

Mr WINTER - The work you did with Cricket Tasmania and Australia around the shadowing: that hasn't impacted on the potential use for wood in the design?

Ms BEACH - No, we've maintained as a base-model timber. That could be an example of value management. We would have to - I don't know this, but if one of the parties were to propose that, we would have to look at what are the knock-on impacts of something like that, that the base design that we're looking at remains with a 20-metre steel grid and 5-metre timber secondaries.

Mr WINTER - Thank you.

CHAIR - Just on that: if I'm right, I imagine these beams are fairly big, the timber ones. Having been to another site recently where they had beams about 30 centimetres by 30 centimetres, they had to be done in Victoria. You talked about using cross-laminated timbers: where are we doing that in Tasmania that could do this?

Ms BEACH - There is a firm on the north -

Mr WINTER - North-west?

Ms BEACH - Yes. I'd have to check.

CHAIR - Doing that size of cross-laminated timber, in that volume?

Ms BEACH - I think the challenge is that size and volume, as I was saying. There is some capacity on-island, I think, to meet those needs. It is likely that it will need to be done interstate, but with Tasmanian timber.

CHAIR - I am interested to see how that goes then. In the corporate suites and things like that, there was an expectation there'd be timber panelling and that sort of thing?

Ms BEACH - Yes. There's a whole suite of different grades of timber and different offerings. You're exactly right in the corporate suites; there's the cabinetry and finishings, there's also feature bars with opportunities for reclaimed and all different suite of timber across the spectrum.

CHAIR - Who are you engaging? It's up to the contractor, I suppose, to engage with those various parties. There are plenty of those in Tasmania.

Ms BEACH - Yes, and that's where the industry capability network is really valuable for some of those to be identified and that those discussions, I would anticipate, will continue into Stage 2 to lock in that local supply of some of those products.

Mr WINTER - I'm not sure if this is you or potentially State Growth: maybe I should know the answer to this already. Is the TasWater work to relocate the sewerage, is that finished or still under construction?

Ms BEACH - No, it's still underway. The pump station is under construction and the pipeline out to Selfs Point, and the Selfs Point, I guess, enhancement, is, I think, progressing well. I think it's close in, but then the last stage is actually the removal of the existing wastewater treatment plant, because that material, in the nicest way possible, needs to be safely taken to Selfs Point when it can then be decommissioned, so that's in progress.

Mr WINTER - The last project cost I could find was \$314 million of which the State was paying \$225 [million]: is that coming from the Macquarie Point Development Corporation or elsewhere?

Ms BEACH - For the relocation of the wastewater treatment plant?

Mr WINTER - Yes, for the project.

Ms BEACH - No.

Mr WINTER - It's coming from, presumably, State Growth or somewhere else.

Ms BEACH - There's a deed with Treasury between Treasury and State Growth.

Mr WINTER - Straight from Treasury. TasWater is delivering it. They're paying -

Ms BEACH - Yes.

Mr WINTER - Okay. I can ask elsewhere about that.

Ms BEACH - That's been in place a little while. I think it is published, the deed.

Mr WINTER - Okay. I will look into that. Thank you.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Are there any other questions? There are a few things we'll write to you about after today that you've agreed to take on notice and some documents to provide. Is there anything you want to provide to us now before we finish?

Ms BEACH - I have a copy of that land contamination EPA bulletin if you'd like a copy of it?

CHAIR - Great, Thanks.

Mr WINTER - Sure. I was just going to ask, Chair, in the couple of minutes we have left: is there any update on the progress you've made with TASCORP around servicing your debt that you're likely to take on?

Ms BEACH - We are engaging with TASCORP. We will need to submit a credit submission. The teams are engaging. We engage directly with TASCORP and also with Treasury on at least, I think, a fortnightly basis with regular check-ins. We have submitted an initial package of information to provide an overview of the project and some other frameworks for things like project parameters and the governance and, similar to TASCORP, which I believe they provided to their Board, so they know what's coming and they have an understanding of the development.

Mr WINTER - Do you have a timeline in mind in terms of when you'd have a finalised agreement around that?

Ms BEACH - That'll be a live conversation with TASCORP. We will need to make an initial, I guess, submission in advance of finalising the contracts. They have time to assess, and then in terms of execution - the loan documentation and the contract would essentially be done at the same time because they point to each other. So, it would need to be ready to execute at the end of the year.

Mr EVANS - And we need that, in terms of signing a construction contract. So, it's all coming towards the end of the year.

Mr WINTER - Okay. So we're likely to have that agreement with TASCORP by December this year, ready to execute along with the -

Ms BEACH - Yes, so a master loan.

Mr EVANS - But I think it's fair to say we've had really constructive engagement with both TASCORP and Treasury.

CHAIR - Treasury are paying the interest bill.

Mr WINTER - Well, Treasury are paying them so they can pay the interest bill, is that right?

CHAIR - That's the thing.

Mr WINTER - Is that it?

PUBLIC

CHAIR - That's what's in the Budget.

Ms BEACH - Yes. We have an interest borrowing support payment as part of our operating grant forecast. I would just note while we've had really constructive engagement, TASCORP obviously has its own Board and they need to make their own decision.

Mr WINTER - So the Budget has got, in 2026-27, 6.5, then 2027-28, 8.5, and then -

CHAIR - Million?

Mr WINTER - Then getting up to 2029-30, a bit over 30 million, P and S, and that's the debt servicing.

Ms BEACH - Yes, so 8.5 of that is operating costs and the rest is interest support.

Mr WINTER - So you take on the debt. Treasury gives you a bucket of money every year for you to service the debt; is that correct?

Ms BEACH - Yes. So once we are past the point of expending the equity that's set out, that model highlights when we'd be needing to then borrow funds.

Mr WINTER - Okay, thank you.

CHAIR - We'll wrap it up. Thanks for your time today.

The witnesses withdrew.

The Committee suspended from 3:00 pm. to 3:15 pm.

PUBLIC

Department of Premier and Cabinet and Department of State Growth

CHAIR - Thanks Kath and Shane and your assistees in appearing before the PAC ongoing inquiry into the delivery of the stadium, particularly from the stadium part of the Macquarie Point Development Corporation, from your perspective. I don't think I need to remind you how Committees work but I will ask you all to take the statutory declaration if you wouldn't mind, then invite you to make some opening comments if you wish, Kath.

Ms KATHRINE MORGAN-WICKS, SECRETARY, **Mr MATHEW HEALEY**, DEPUTY SECRETARY STRATEGY AND DELIVERY, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH, **Mr SHANE GREGORY**, ACTING SECRETARY, and **Mr ANDREW JOHNSON**, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH, WERE CALLED, TOOK THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Thank you, Chair, and thank you to Committee members for the opportunity to appear before you today. At the Committee's previous hearing in May [2026], much of the discussion focused on governance arrangements, project approval pathways, budget development, and the establishment of the frameworks that would support the delivery of the Macquarie Point Urban Renewal program. Since that time, and no doubt as you've heard in a lot of detail today, the project has progressed significantly. From the perspective of the Macquarie Point Urban Renewal Oversight Committee, the most significant change is that we've now moved beyond preparation and into active implementation, oversight and decision support.

Today, I'd like to briefly outline three areas where the position has materially changed since the Committee last received evidence.

First, implementation of the State policies and projects Macquarie Point Precinct Order 2025 has moved from establishing governance arrangements to supporting active statutory decision-making.

Second, the stadium procurement process has progressed from commencement of the request-for-tender phase to evaluation, planning, due diligence and preparation for future final investment decision processes.

Third, the project has continued to transition from planning towards delivery with preparatory works now underway on site and financing assurance, stakeholder and governance arrangements continuing to mature.

In terms of the role of the Oversight Committee: before speaking to those developments, it is important to explain the role of the Oversight Committee. The Committee was established to provide whole-of-Government strategic oversight and policy advice to Government on the delivery of the urban renewal program and associated commitments under the club funding and development agreement. The Committee itself does not deliver the projects and it does not undertake regulatory decision-making, rather its role is to maintain visibility of delivery across multiple projects and agencies, to provide assurance and advice to Government, to monitor performance against Cabinet-approved project parameters, to coordinate the consideration of risks and dependencies, and to escalate issues where Government consideration may be required.

A key focus of the Committee is ensuring Government maintains visibility of whether projects remain capable of being delivered within scope, within budget, within schedule, governance and quality parameters that have previously been approved by Cabinet. Where risks emerge that may have implications for those parameters, the Committee provides advice regarding mitigation options and, where appropriate, escalation pathways.

In relation to order implementation: at the previous hearing, implementation arrangements for the parliamentary order were largely focused on establishing governance, consultation and probity mechanisms. Since then, implementation has moved into an active decision-making phase. A number of decisions and determinations have now been made under the order, including decisions relating to preparatory works, staging arrangements, impacts on road reserves and the establishment of the Design, Quality and Integrity Review Panel. The Oversight Committee has received regular updates regarding implementation of the order and has considered reports from the independent probity adviser relating to decisions made under that framework. Those reports did not identify any outstanding probity concerns regarding the administrative decision-making processes that were followed.

The Committee has also overseen the development of additional assurance arrangements, including conflict-of-interest management processes and ongoing monitoring of commitments made during the parliamentary approval process.

If I could just talk about procurement risk and the final investment decision: the second major area of focus has been procurement and preparation for the future investment decisions. At the Committee's previous hearing, procurement had recently entered the request-for-tender phase. Since then, that process has continued to mature, with interactive tender workshops undertaken, ongoing engagement with proponents by MPDC, and increasing focus on evaluation, due diligence, and future decision-making requirements.

The Oversight Committee itself has recently devoted significant attention to the pathway towards final investment decision. Members will appreciate that final investment decision is not a single decision: it is rather a coordinated series of decisions, approvals, financing arrangements, due diligence activities and Government decision-making processes that must come together before a construction contract can be executed. The Committee has therefore been focused on ensuring that Government will have access to comprehensive advice and assurance regarding procurement outcomes, financing arrangements, project risks, delivery readiness and alignment with approved project parameters as the project approaches these future decision points. Ensuring these arrangements are robust remains one of the Committee's key priorities.

In terms of delivery progress, third area of change is that the project has continued to transition from planning towards delivery, and most visibly, preparatory works commenced in late July [2026] at Macquarie Point, representing an important milestone for the project and broader urban renewal program. These have included preparatory earthworks, site preparation activities and associated investigations that are required ahead of major construction. Alongside that delivery process, governance arrangements have also continued to mature.

The Oversight Committee continues to meet monthly and has maintained - or in fact, more than monthly - and has maintained oversight across the multipurpose stadium, northern access road, precinct planning activities, the training and administration facility, and associated commitments under the AFL agreements. Recent discussions have included project parameters

for additional projects outside of the stadium, funding and financing arrangements, precinct infrastructure requirements, operating model development, stakeholder agreements and long-term delivery dependencies. The Committee has also continued to receive reporting from delivery agencies, independent advisers and relevant stakeholders to support a coordinated, whole-of-Government view of delivery progress and emerging risks. While there is still significant work that is ahead, I'm very pleased in terms of the progress that has been made since I last reported through to the Committee in May [2026]. I welcome questions.

CHAIR - I have a few, but I'm sure others do, too. I'd just like to start initially with the risks: how you're assessing, measuring, managing the risks and thus reporting back through your process. Do you have a risk matrix that you've delivered and can you provide that to the Committee?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I'll probably start and open and then ask Mr Healey to also comment. This is probably also the differentiation between MPDC, as the actual delivery agent responsible, who are reporting in relation to their particular project risk together with, for example, Building Tasmania, who was responsible for the northern access road, for example, who will maintain risk registers for their particular programs. They are reporting then up at a - we received, from a whole-of-Government perspective, if there is an escalation in relation to any risks that's been identified in those particular projects, but more of a risk is actually matured into an actual issue that requires escalation and consideration by the Committee, but I might ask -

Mr HEALEY - Yes, that's exactly right. So, when we receive reports from each of the projects we do ask to hear from the risks that they've identified. I know certainly for the stadium, which is the one that we've been focused most on most recently, they do have quite an extensive risk register and they report routinely on those most significant risks through to the Oversight Committee. As part of the standard report, there is a section which looks at the risks and the Oversight Committee talks about those risks quite regularly.

In terms of risks across the program, they're the issues that the Oversight Committee chooses to focus most intently on and provide advice directly to the Cabinet Committee on. So, it's more in managing the agenda is how we really identify the oversight risks.

CHAIR - Obviously, one of the risks that you talked about, Kath, is the financial risks associated with it. We know that there's a live procurement process going on at the minute and there's - not to speculate too much, but I just think that there's pressures everywhere, and the global situation isn't helping that either. We did ask the Minister, when he was here, about this. In terms of the contract price, it was significantly higher than what's been committed to under the agreement - it saw the passage through our House. As I understand from the Minister, the Committee will provide advice to the Cabinet sub-Committee on this. So, how do you assess that and is there a point - and I know that you haven't got the Secretary of Treasury here: he was here earlier - but is there a red line here or what?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Chair, I'd probably comment just first from general experience in terms of chairing: but usually a project delivery, usually you're able to get in there and you've got your hands right on the information and you're responsible for the delivery of a particular project - if it's an IT system or if it's the build of K Block at the Royal, et cetera - where you are - and I'd say any major project would have budget and achievement of budget: but once even a construction contract is struck, the value of variations, the decision-making around the

application of contingencies, for example, or allowing something to be improved, variation for contingency, that is squarely probably one of the major things that's being managed in terms of a Steering Committee in itself.

We're not the MPDC Board, who ultimately will be able to make that decision in relation to the final price that's presented and whether that price delivers the scope and whether it delivers the scope within the approved parameters for timeline as well for the stadium: but as the Oversight Committee, we'll receive that advice once the evaluation has occurred appropriately under the procurement and we will be, I suppose - or not the first, because Evaluation Committees will be asking all of the questions and interrogating and reviewing - but at Oversight Committee level, we'll then be that next stage to ask those questions once a procurement recommendation has been reached: but in terms of that, we are all actively working to monitor.

We've had quite a deep dive recently in one of our Oversight Committees in relation to, for example, precinct costs, and I think these were discussed earlier today, and whether items are already being approved in terms of application of contingency or not, whether there is design maturity or pricing that can be applied to each of those items. There are live and active conversations, for example, in relation with TasNetworks that I've attended a meeting and had a conversation together with, for example TasPorts, in relation to the energy needs for the entire precinct: but it has to reach a point of maturity in which it can then be brought in and considered for the application of contingency.

CHAIR - In terms of your experience and informed us it was to be a fixed-price contract, that doesn't mind that the price is fixed, there can be variations, that sort of thing: what a level of risk do you think is tolerable in the degree to which variations - I mean, anyone that builds a house and decides to move a door by an inch will find out that's where the cost really starts. We agree a price, but that's not necessarily the price. What role does the Oversight Committee have in all of that?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - The Oversight Committee, in terms of receiving advice from each of the delivery agents, and we'll apply this same type of laser focus to stadium, as we do to northern access road, as we've interrogated in terms of risk and price in relation to the T&A facility, for example.

CHAIR - Which has blown out quite a bit.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I'm a very conservative person because - and maybe it's my Treasury background as well, in terms of trying to make sure that we are as detailed as possible in the contractual arrangements, and we have legal experts that are engaged to ensure that the Crown's interests are protected in terms of variations and the potential for variations which will occur on any standard construction project.

In terms of the actual - looking across the design, the undertaking of the P90 assessment, for example - which I know there have been many discussions about, and the value of a P90 - looking across in terms of context in the environment in which we're now going to build this stadium as time is moving along and the importance, for example, of ensuring that there was a level of escalation contingency approved, that has been the role of the Oversight Committee, to question - to make sure that all of the aspects of design were included. At one stage, you will know that, for example, the fit-out for food and beverage, for example, was not

included in initial projection of the price or estimate of the price. The Oversight Committee said, no, we want to see all of the elements -

CHAIR - So did most of the people of Tasmania, I will add - but anyway.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - But we wanted to make sure that we're all comparing apples with apples: that we have all of the elements of the design actually included and that we're able to assess those through the P90. Is everyone perfect in its application of everything at all times? We all know that that's not the case in all projects, but we are alive to the risks and we'll examine, as each item comes up, or if there's a turn in world events, for example, what we're seeing this year, which has been up and down in fuel pricing, up and down in terms of access to particular types of product that might be required for a construction. That's what the Oversight Committee will continue to ask questions and make sure that Government receives advice about.

Mr HEALEY - Can I perhaps also, just to add to that, it's probably relevant to know that at the end of the RFT process, there will be an independent gateway review that's done, that's facilitated through Building Tas, that will assess the health of the project and its readiness to go into signing that contract. So, there will be an independent assurance mechanism that looks at the contingencies and the health of the contingencies and whether the contingencies are appropriate, having regard to the risks of the project. So, multiple people will be looking at the readiness of this project, ready to sign a contract.

CHAIR - And all those things, the contingencies, et cetera, need to come in within the price cap that's been agreed?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I was just going to, before Mr Healey comments, the Oversight Committee's - and just as a reminder, probably more for the public also watching - is that the Oversight Committee is responsible for tracking each of the 58 commitments that we've recorded, not just from a written perspective of a letter from the Premier, but we've also gone through the *Hansard* of when the order went through in terms of commitments that were made on the floor.

CHAIR - Have you got an updated list of progress against those commitments, and maybe you could speak to that?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I've got one that I've scribbled -

Mr HEALEY - I do. It's as at 30 June [2026], because that's the last time that the Oversight Committee considered. But yes, we do.

Ms THOMAS - Is that the one that's already been provided to the Committee out of session? So, last month we asked for a copy of that to be - of the update tracker - the commitment tracker was provided and has been published on our website. It was on page 12 of the letter that you sent in response to the questions on notice.

CHAIR - Is that the most recent one?

Mr HEALEY - It may have been slightly updated -

PUBLIC

Ms THOMAS - That was at May 2026.

Mr HEALEY - This one will be as at June [2026].

Ms THOMAS - Okay, so that's -

CHAIR - If you could provide that. I mean, I don't know that there'd be a whole heap that would've changed.

Mr HEALEY - Probably not. I just wouldn't mind having a look at the two and just making sure that it's clear what's been updated between the two.

CHAIR - Maybe if you could take this on notice to provide this to the Committee and where there have been changes or updates, you could highlight those in the June so we don't have to read through everything to try and find the changes.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes, we can do that, too.

Mr HEALEY - Yes.

CHAIR - Is that being done monthly? Or how often?

Mr HEALEY - We provide an update to every Oversight Committee. So, if an Oversight Committee is meeting monthly, they'll get a monthly update. If they have a shorter time period, we'll quickly update it and provide it, so every meeting they receive an update.

Ms THOMAS - At least monthly, then?

Mr HEALEY - Yes.

Ms THOMAS - We did ask for this at the last hearing, and I recall that you were happy for it to be provided, but you wanted to have a look over it last time before providing it. So, I guess this is something that we will likely ask for an update on each quarterly hearing we have. So, is it possible next time to come prepared and able to table that?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes, of course, we can do that.

Ms THOMAS - Rather than having to wait for it to be provided following?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes. I think just the complication was having recently provided one in relation to a question on notice. So, we were just going to check to see if they were different, but we will make sure that we bring that next time.

CHAIR - In the House or here?

Mr HEALEY - I think it was for here.

Ms THOMAS - Here. It had only recently been provided, but it was dated May [2026].

Mr HEALEY - Just adding, if I can, Ruth, to your question: we talk about the project parameters a lot, but it probably can't be underestimated just how important it is that we have that document, because it does provide that separation between what MPDC is authorised to do by Government in terms of delivering a project within those parameters and to the policy decision-making of Government, which the Oversight Committee supports. So, as we move to a final contract, it may be that there are risks that Macquarie Point express generally to the Oversight Committee about being able to deliver within the project parameters, but at some point, if the project cannot be delivered within those parameters, including the cap at \$1.13 billion, then they will have to come to Government to ask for those project parameters to be changed before they're authorised to sign a contract with a contract tender. So, that's the separation between the statutory responsibilities of the Board and the policy decision-making responsibilities of Government that constrains the activities of the Board. It makes for a very clear set of accountabilities and responsibilities and the Oversight's role is to provide advice to Government on whether it should agree to changes to those parameters.

CHAIR - Some of the commitments made during the course of the debate were not the responsibility of MPDC. One of them that's been ignored is the adequate funding of the Auditor-General. So, who's responsibility is it to fix that, aside from the Treasurer?

Mr HEALEY - It is a responsibility of Treasury in terms of management of the budget process. So, Treasury obviously sits on the Oversight Committee and the Secretary reports into the Oversight Committee and they report on progress with the delivery of those commitments through to the other side.

CHAIR - So, is that commitment on the list you've got?

Ms THOMAS - Yes, it is.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I believe it is.

Mr HEALEY - Yes.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - And we would require -

CHAIR - And what does it say in your latest update about that one, for example?

Mr HEALEY - The commitment was to review the level of resourcing for the Audit Office in the lead up to the 2026-27 Budget and ensure that funding over the Forward Estimates supports at least six performance audits per program. Advice from Treasury is that that was considered as part of the 2026-27 Budget process.

CHAIR - But not delivered.

Mr HEALEY - I think they're - I mean, that's the advice from Treasury. I'm assuming that they're saying that the level of resourcing was reviewed. The appropriateness of the outcome of that review is obviously something that people have a different view on.

CHAIR - So, this is the way we're going to see all those commitments treated? It's not very encouraging, I can say, for the people who sought these commitments and did it in good faith, because the expectation was from Mr Harriss at the time - because I know, I discussed

PUBLIC

this with him - that the Audit Office would be funded adequately to deliver six performance audits. We've got evidence on the record in Budget Estimates from the Auditor-General clearly stating that is not the case. There was a suggestion made that top-up funding will be provided: that's not how you fund the office appropriately. It concerns me that we're twisting the intent - well, not you - someone is twisting the intent of that particular agreement, just one, that doesn't relate to MPDC or the project itself.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - But with all respect, Chair, that's a matter that's been allocated to Treasury in terms of in their relationship with the Auditor-General. So, that is a Treasury responsibility. We're receiving that update as an Oversight Committee. We're not attempting to twist the wording, et cetera.

CHAIR - No, I'm not suggesting you're attempting to twist: it's the person who's responsible for delivering it.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - And in terms of - there will be views of the Auditor-General, for example, as to the reasonable cost of performance audits, noting that depending on the subject matter of a performance audit or whether he's outsourcing a performance audit or requiring expertise -

CHAIR - He doesn't outsource performance audits: that's the whole point. Anyway, we're not getting bogged down in the Auditor-General's business, but I'm just making the point that this is one of the commitments that doesn't seem to be being honoured in the intent, but I know the Treasurer's not here and neither is the Secretary at the minute.

Ms THOMAS - On the commitment tracker, while we're on that topic, and as I say, it is published on the Public Accounts Committee webpage in the letter that you've provided in response to the last hearing: there was a commitment that was overdue in progress in relation to the stadium Steering Committee, commitment 3: so has that now been finalised with the stadium steering Committee terms of reference being finalised?

Mr HEALEY - That is now complete. In the June [2026] report that you'll get, it still says it's overdue, but it's been more recently complete. I am now Chairing that Steering Committee and there's been delays simply because the Chair of the Steering Committee was to go to Shane and then because of the changes of arrangements that wasn't appropriate, so we needed to determine who was the most appropriate Chair. I think Shane has engaged with the AFL and the Commonwealth and confirmed that they're comfortable that I Chair the Steering Committee.

Ms THOMAS - Right. Okay. Sorry, to go back a step: we talked before about the reports being monthly to the Committee and that we received the May report, but it is now 7 August, so would there now be a July report that had been tabled to a July Committee meeting, because you keep mentioning that we'll get the June report? So, are they monthly?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - We're happy to take this away and provide an updated - because we're actually due to have a Committee meeting -

Mr HEALEY - Next Friday.

PUBLIC

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Next Friday: so, perhaps if we can provide the absolutely up-to-date commitment tracker to the Committee.

Mr HEALEY - Just to avoid confusion, the July meeting was early July, so by the time we get the updates from agencies, it's the update from 30 June that goes to the early July meeting. So, if we had the August meeting, which is next week, it would probably be to 30 July.

Ms THOMAS - Thank you. That makes sense. The gateway reviews are another commitment - commitments 10 and 11 refer to the gateway review. So, has gateway review 4 yet commenced?

Mr HEALEY - Gateway review 4 is the gateway that's done at the end of the RFT.

Ms THOMAS - Oh, sorry.

Mr HEALEY - So, that is absolutely a commitment and that will be done.

Ms THOMAS - Okay. Commitment 20 refers to a public reporting dashboard and the last update said by June 2026 the Government expected delivery reporting to be published online. So, has an online reporting dashboard now been established?

Mr HEALEY - I might have to take that on notice. I know Macquarie Point were working on some information that they were going to make public regularly. To be honest, I probably haven't checked in on that one for a little while. So, we can make sure that there is an update on that in the report that we provide to the Committee.

Ms THOMAS - Okay, because it does also say that regulator reporting will be published on the State Growth website: tas.gov stadium website will be updated with a link to each of the reporting sites. Is that something that has occurred?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - While Mr Gregory is speaking to Andrew, I regularly checked the Building Tas update in the main to make sure that you're sending me things for consideration, but yes, I mean I've been able to access and can see in terms of decisions and reports that are made under the order are published, and I've checked as recently as this morning in my preparation for Committee.

Ms THOMAS - Right. Okay. I think the thing we discussed last hearing was the difficulty for the public and actually understanding all the moving parts of this and having one place to go to understand the steps in this process and project and where things are at in terms of the order and the actual delivery, and then these commitments as well. Like, there's a lot of things going on and a lot of governance and oversight, rightly so for a project of this scale and cost, but it's just there's no sort of centralised place for people to go to find information. I know even things that we've asked in previous hearings, people don't know where to find them and don't know that we've asked them or discussed them, because there's not sort of one central place to find information about this.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - So, we're happy to - I think that's a very fair comment. It is a very complex program of works; there are a lot of moving parts. I think in terms of the order itself, there's only been two or three determinations that have been made and they've been published on the Building Tasmania website, but perhaps if we take that away and think

about - because a lot of material goes up on the Macquarie Point website, stuff on Building Tas - in terms of a dashboard, if we can look to see if there is a central view so that it can be easy, a little bit like, for example, our Keeping Children Safe website that we put together in terms of the commission of inquiry where you could track all in one place.

Ms THOMAS - And the hundreds of conditions that exist: here's a table of conditions, here's the ones that have been met.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes. You don't mind if we take that away and consider that to make sure that we have an update on that?

Ms THOMAS - Yes, sure. Thank you, I appreciate that.

Mr GREGORY - Chair, on the Building Tas major projects page, there is a specific section for Macquarie Point precinct approved plans and documents. So, all plans and documents that require approval under the order, when they're approved, they are posted there with a link to the documents.

CHAIR - You do have to go - I think Bec's point was you have to go there, you have to go to EPA, you have to go many places.

Mr WINTER - In terms of where we're at with the whole project, firstly, just to get an understanding, I think we talked about this last time, but you've obviously got oversight of the stadium project, we talk about that a lot, but you mentioned the T&A, having general oversight. Can you explain to the Committee what the Oversight Committee's role is in relation to those associated projects?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes, I can, Mr Winter. So, in terms of - and the T&A, being a key milestone and requirement under the CFDA agreement - under the terms of reference for the Oversight Committee, we are responsible also for the CFDA agreement and making sure that each of the milestones are met, or if a milestone is in jeopardy that we are looking at that being renegotiated, for example, with -

Mr WINTER - That's why I asked, yes. I'm looking at it, I've got it in front of me at the moment, the CFDA, but of course mine's redacted, just the publicly-available one. So, there's - and I'm going through my recollection on some of this - the high-performance centre was to be proved quite a long time ago and start construction quite - correct me if I'm wrong, but there's already some breaches of the agreement. Has the agreement been renegotiated at all? Or is it just sort of agreed that some of the milestones aren't going to be met?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I will go to Mr Gregory, only because he has also negotiated the agreed variations to the CFDA. So, there are no breaches of the CFDA to my knowledge, as Chair of the Oversight Committee, but we obviously closely monitor the obligations under the agreement, the milestone dates and noting that those dates have moved, but we've negotiated variations of the CFDA to encompass that. I think if, Mr Gregory, you can speak to the T&A facility.

Mr GREGORY - I think you've covered that very well. Part of the process with the T&A has been a negotiation around, rather than the State delivering the T&A, the club is delivering the T&A. That obviously impacts some of the obligations under the CFDA, the

PUBLIC

obligations on the Crown, in effect, fall away because we're not actually doing the delivery: but aside from those things, which are no longer relevant given the change in delivery model, all the other requirements are still there. None of that's changed. It's just a recognition that the date has needed to move. So, there've been a number of amendments to move the dates to reflect the change.

Mr WINTER - Are you able to provide - you might be able to do it now, but even if it's on notice - the Committee with a list of the variations and what's changed in the agreement?

Mr GREGORY - Certainly. I think we might have provided that before. I know we've compiled a list for another reason -

Mr WINTER - We're having this trouble today where we've all sat across each other in different Committees and sometimes we think we've been in this Committee, we've been in other ones.

Mr GREGORY - Correct. I know we have compiled that list for another purpose. It might have been a question on notice coming out of Estimates, I can't quite remember.

Mr WINTER - We're confused over here.

Mr GREGORY - But certainly we would be able to provide that. We'd be able to get that reply.

Mr WINTER - So, there's the T&A facility, for example, what are the other - are there any other major variations that have been made?

Mr GREGORY - No. No, that's it. It's really about moving some dates around the T&A facility. There was an adjustment to some dates around the planning approval for the stadium, obviously given the move away from, I guess, what we might call a normal planning process into the refined POSS process, so that obviously impacted on some dates; but the only amendments have really been dates. There have been some amendments that relate to the make-up and function of the Steering Committee. Again, the prescribed make-up and operation of the Steering Committee and project control group for the high-performance centre were changed to reflect a different delivery model. We just, in fact, streamlined the governance around the high-performance centre because there was quite an overlap between the project control group and the and steer co and we also tightened the membership of the Steering Committee and put some adjustments in place.

Mr WINTER - With the high-performance centre, there's obviously been a high cost escalation, I think \$45 million, top of my head, from I think it was 70 to start with, to 115 might be right. Now that the club is delivering the infrastructure, who pays for any cost escalations that might occur during the construction?

Mr GREGORY - This is quite a complex bit you're tapping into. I will speak cautiously because the tender - the contract hasn't been awarded. There's a preferred contractor and their contract is about to be awarded for the high-performance centre.

Mr WINTER - There's a brand on the side of the fence at the moment. I thought it might have been them.

Mr GREGORY - Well, you look at a little bit surprised. There's been a contract awarded for the Oval 3 in earthworks.

Mr WINTER - Oh, that's Batchelor?

Mr GREGORY - Batchelor, yes.

Mr WINTER - Sure. But that's not the entire project?

Mr GREGORY - No. So, I will speak cautiously about the pricing and escalation and contingency because the final bit of negotiating the contract hasn't been done. If the Committee would like to go into that in any more detail, Chair, I would request we go in camera.

Mr WINTER - I'm happy to just keep it at high level. I'm just trying to - particularly given this was sort of uncovered during, I think it was a hearing at a different - maybe a House of Assembly hearing - but what wasn't really answered by the Minister at the time was about what happens if, given the club's going to deliver it, projects go over budget all the time, so who actually pays if it does go over budget?

Mr GREGORY - The simple, short answer to who pays if it goes over is, under the CFDA, that obligation still rests with the State. I would qualify that by saying that the cost estimate is very, very robust and it has appropriate contingencies and market allowance. There was a high level of value management applied to it. I was heavily involved: I actually chaired the Steering Committee. I have a very high level of confidence that it won't go over budget. I wouldn't go into the details of why I have that level of confidence without going in camera.

Mr WINTER - Sure. What were the advantages of having - or what were the reasons why the club's taken over the development of the T&A rather than State Growth - sorry, Building Tasmania?

Mr GREGORY - I think the key advantages to it are there are some advantages to the State in terms of there are some time requirements that are now in control of the club, rather than being an obligation on the State. The club has to be thinking about when it starts training, where it starts training. That's all better managed if it's delivering the facility and knows when it's in and out. It's just simpler to do it that way. Interconnectivity between projects is also the reason why the club is actually delivering Council's Oval 3 work as well for sort of overall risk management. So, there is an advantage in that. Also, with the club running the project and delivering the project, the facility will be theirs. They are able to work with the contractor in terms of early access to some parts of the facility and so on, which becomes more problematic if they're just occupying the facility and we're running a project, that becomes a bit more challenging.

CHAIR - Just on that, though, isn't there generally issues with you can't occupy a building without an occupancy permit?

Mr GREGORY - The way the building is designed, there may be components of it that they can access earlier. For example, there's an indoor training facility that they may be able to occupy independently of other components being complete. So, there may be an ability to get an occupancy permit for a component of it.

PUBLIC

Mr WINTER - One of your performance trackers is - number 16 is the high-performance centre spend cap at \$105 million. Are you going to maintain that spend cap at \$105 million?

Mr GREGORY - Of State funding? Yes.

CHAIR - Just on that, on the high-performance centre or T&A, whatever we're calling it these days: in the renegotiation of dates, has there been any financial penalty imposed on the State or the club?

Mr GREGORY - No.

Mr WINTER - I was just going to go some of these commitment trackers where they're overdue or in progress, but unless anyone else had anything else before we -

CHAIR - Can I just ask before you go down there, we were talking about this with MPDC, obviously they've got their role to deliver, within their sort of footprint, the stadium and some infrastructure around that. Obviously the bus mall is part of the - I think it's part of the northern transport corridor. Yeah? So, they don't have to deliver that: Building Tasmania does. So, what coordination is occurring with not just getting the number of buses, the routes, the scheduling and that sort of thing, who's in charge of that and the public safety part of it? The police are putting together a plan, but how is that all being integrated, because it all needs to work together, obviously?

Mr GREGORY - So, for clarity, the northern access road is a project being delivered by Building Tasmania. Under the order, the operational plan for the stadium, that obligation rests with the proponent and the operator, and that obligation extends beyond the immediate precinct. So, when they are working out their event date plans, they have to consider impacts beyond the immediate.

CHAIR - So, they have to organise the buses?

Mr GREGORY - Well, they need to work through the modelling and understand what sort of transport, how much they need, when they need it and the buses and where it will go from. That obligation rests very clearly with them under the order. Obviously bus contracts are - the majority of the buses in the State are buses contracted by Building Tasmania through the passenger transport team. Logically, Stadiums Tas will be working with, and are working with, the passenger transport team to coordinate all of that and understand it.

CHAIR - What role does the Oversight Committee have in making sure that people are talking together and there's this integration of the system at large to make sure it will work on the day?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - The Oversight Committee Chair has a significant role and, really, that was the whole reason for the genesis of the Committee, was that there were concerns raised that departments or entities were working in silos and proceeding or running ahead at a pace and making decisions that weren't fully communicated or understood, and we weren't getting a whole-of-Government perspective. So, the Oversight Committee has been running since late 2024 to try and pull together and ensure and, if at times, I have to pull in heads of entities - which is why they all attend, or a lot of them attend, the Oversight Committee to try

PUBLIC

and make sure that we have a full understanding, that we are communicating, we are making sure that all relevant information is being shared. That for me - if the Oversight Committee is working properly, we are getting on top of those risks and issues as they occur.

CHAIR - So, is that - sorry.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Sorry, I was just going to say: this is actually a live issue at the moment, in relation to making sure that the transport arm of Building Tasmania is not taking a batten-down, siloed approach and that it is working together with Macquarie Point Development Corporation to ensure that the order condition is met.

Mr HEALEY - Can I just add to that: this is a very good example exactly of the role of the Oversight Committee. DPAC did chair a meeting which included State Growth, Macquarie Point and Stadiums Tas, where we opened the meeting by putting aside roles and responsibilities and said, 'Right, this is the outcome that we need to get; how do we get there?' Then at the end, we sort of reassigned roles and responsibilities. So, State Growth is doing a bit of work that, technically, if you wanted to be strict about it, probably should be done through Stadiums Tas, but they've recognised that no, we've got a bit of capability here. So, we'll all work together and get a really clear plan that ensures that the design of the northern access road is right, but also ensures that we're doing the early work based on the early modelling that Macquarie Point has done in terms of access and egress, further work that has been done out of Shane's area in terms of how does that feed into the design of the northern access road and then the work that needs to be done in the near future by Stadiums Tas to start to pull together an event-management plan. So, everyone has got overlapping work. We have brought them all together; they are now working all together on making sure that the plans are responsible and workable.

CHAIR - Do all heads of agency, like all Committee secretaries - sorry, Departmental Secretaries, attend these meetings?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - No, Chair. But as Chair, I'm able to request the attendance of another secretary required. So, if it was, for example, a public safety risk or issue that required further work, design or mitigation, I would be having a conversation, for example, with Commissioner Adams in relation to that: but that is what we're trying to achieve as a coordinating point, to bring in the right expertise across the service or the entity that's responsible.

CHAIR - So, then, how do you deal with the issues such as - a lot of the buses are actually school buses that are under the school bus part of whatever department it's going to be now and whatever it's going to be called - who would know? But anyway -

Mr GREGORY - Building Tasmania.

CHAIR - Yes, it will come under there. Then you've also got the coaches, which I know don't seem to be large in number, but if people are going to catch a bus from the north or the north west, they're not going to get a Metro bus from down here or even a school bus. I know in Perth, they bring in buses from all around the regions on game day, particularly when the two teams are playing the week or something, and Freo are playing.

Mr GREGORY - So, for clarity, it's Building Tasmania, and the transport division -

CHAIR - That won't change?

Mr GREGORY - No, and there's a passenger transport branch that manages all school bus contracts. The general transport buses -

CHAIR - General access as well?

Mr GREGORY - General access bus contracts. Obviously, they have those buses contracted, they have interactions with the operators, they know when they're available and when they're not available, so they have a piece of work to do there. Independent coaches, they won't obviously run through that system, but collectively between Stadiums Tasmania and MPDC and that team that's managing the buses, they'll need to consider what the requirements are in terms of how many buses, when they'll flow through, and they'll be thinking about, well, where do the coaches go? Where do they drop off? That's all part of the event day planning.

CHAIR - Whose job is it, then, to look at - A lot of people from the north-west won't want to use a coach, they'll want to drive down from the north. Last weekend, the weekend before, when the footy was on in Launceston, we were driving in the opposite direction, and it was pretty much wall-to-wall cars all the way. So, most people they drive, they don't like to catch a coach, so whose job is managing that?

Mr GREGORY - Again, I have met last week with MPDC and Stadiums Tasmania as the regulator, making it very clear from my perspective and how I interpret the order, and that obligation rests with the proponent and the operator. They obviously have access to the department directly - not through me, but directly to the Deputy Secretary of Transport - to have all those conversations around how people are going to move around, because their responsibility goes beyond the stadium precinct itself. They'll be talking about that and looking at where the park-and-ride opportunities are and how that needs to operate, because that will all have to be coordinated.

CHAIR - It will, and you need to understand that north-west, if you can't park right outside the shop, we don't go in.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - We appreciate that fact, too.

CHAIR - Yes, it's a bit of a cultural thing.

Mr GREGORY - That's also in Hobart.

CHAIR - Oh, is it? I thought it was just the north-west coast that was like that.

Mr WINTER - Good opportunity: one of the questions on here for you, Mr Gregory, was around your conflict of interest. You've just sort of outlined how you're managing it. I think, last time, we might've talked a little bit about how you're going to manage the components about your obligations under the Project of State Significance order as a regulator, as well as being the Acting Secretary. Is that written down somewhere? Is it in a document? How are you managing that?

Mr GREGORY - Yes, there are processes we've put in place to manage that, because obviously there's potential for a conflict, so we have recognised that. There is a function that's been created in the Office of the Secretary to deal with paperwork and approvals associated with the order. That is all stored in the document management system, content manager, and that has security on it that means that team and I get to see it. And under that software package, if you don't have access and you do a search, it returns a 'no' response on the search. Then, similarly, where Stadiums Tasmania or MPDC need to interact, for example, with our transport team, or any of our environmental teams, or any of our other planning teams, we've written to both Ms Beach and Mr Avery and saying - well, Mr Limkin wrote to them and said: 'You can come and get advice, but you go directly to these people.' That's filed away, and the security on that is done in a way that I actually don't get to see those things, so we've created that separation.

Mr WINTER - Is this written in a policy or a procedure or something that we would be able to get?

Mr JOHNSON - Yes, there's like an office procedure document that was -

Mr WINTER - Is that something we'd be able to get?

Mr GREGORY - There's a probity plan.

Mr WINTER - A probity plan? If you're able to provide the Committee with something that summarises that, we'd really appreciate it. Sounds like it's in hand. That's great.

CHAIR - The probity plan to manage conflicts of interest, is that what we were -

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - So, we have a probity adviser who I understand is appearing - or is here, behind me.

CHAIR - That's right. Listening to everything you're saying.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Watching every move.

Mr WINTER - Might ask him some questions about that.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes, who is also checking compliance and conflicts of interest that are identified in the execution of approvals for the order.

CHAIR - If there's a document, though, that you can provide the Committee - well, that outlines how that is being managed, that would be really helpful.

Mr GREGORY - Yes. There are some documents, including the letters that have been written out to the proponent and the operator outlining the requirements.

Ms THOMAS - In terms of the procurement process, I understand that's a matter for Macquarie Point Development Corporation, but has the Oversight Committee raised any concerns about the procurement process and particularly the involvement of Webuild? Has the Committee sought any advice from this or sought assurance from MPDC, or even the State Growth appointed probity adviser, regarding the current procurement process?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Thank you, Ms Thomas, for that question. In terms of procurement, you've obviously rightly identified that we're not running the actual procurement process. We receive updates, though, in relation to the stages of procurement, and as they're moving through we've seen obviously what are the released documents for each stage of the procurement and the conditions in those documents.

In terms of the questions surrounding Webuild that have been raised and the media reporting - yes, that has been raised at Oversight Committee, and noting the assurance that Macquarie Point Development Corporation provided through to the Minister. As Oversight Committee Chair, I have also written to the Chair of Macquarie Point Development Corporation more recently noting continued reporting, and to ensure that they have considered that information that is publicly available and whether that's changed their position in relation to the complaints that have been raised. And I've received that assurance in writing back from the Chair of Macquarie Point Development Corporation.

CHAIR - So, in that communication back to you, what assurance did you get?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I asked the question, and I'm happy to share the correspondence with the Committee, in question, so raising the matters that I've read obviously as a Committee Chair, an interested person, or have been raised with me, in relation to reporting in *The Australian*, for example. I've written to seek assurance that, is there any information that is now being reported in the public realm that changes the position of the Chair or the Board's consideration of the EOI response and its own compliance.

CHAIR - Are you able to provide copies of that correspondence today, to us now?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Do I have a copy?

Mr HEALEY - I'm not sure if we've got enough copies.

CHAIR - I only need one.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes, I'm happy to provide a copy of those letters and the response that I've received.

CHAIR - And they're not being received in camera?

Ms THOMAS - In confidence. They can be published?

CHAIR - Just to be clear.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes.

Mr WINTER - They are in confidence?

CHAIR - No, they're not.

Ms THOMAS - No, they're not. We can publish them on the Public Accounts Committee webpage.

CHAIR - We can redact the signatures et cetera.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I think I've just publicly commented that I signed it and sent a letter.

CHAIR - If you're worried about potential information on it, though, there's nothing personal there that -

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I do not believe so, no.

Ms THOMAS - Thank you for that information. Has the Oversight Committee reported any procurement risks or any other risks to Cabinet or the Cabinet Committee since the last time we met in May [2026]?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I think at each Cabinet Committee we would talk about the active discussion in relation to risks on conduct of the procurement and tender and stage, certainly in relation to time line. So, concern that the procurement is actively, you know, managed and that there's no slippage, for example, with responses and the evaluation because of the active and ongoing concern as to escalation in price due to time. I'm just trying to think, in terms of other risks that would be discussed. I don't think there's any particular one, other than probably the issues that we've already discussed with Committee - sorry, I should add, in relation to updates on precinct infrastructure and trying to get to a maturity of design of the precinct infrastructure and costing for that precinct infrastructure.

Ms THOMAS - You mean the precinct services?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Sewerage, the reticulation service, energy solution, et cetera, which I think have been previously discussed.

CHAIR - You will be maintaining some oversight over those costs, and will there be a reporting process to you about the costs that aren't now being apportioned to the stadium, but a part of the precinct?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes, Chair. I would expect any changes in solution for precinct infrastructure, in particular the costing or the approach, would be escalated through to the Committee and -

CHAIR - Would you get reports on the design, like the new stormwater, new energy infrastructure, those sorts of things, and the cost? I'm just trying to understand what you're going to get.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - At the moment, the Oversight Committee is also concerned from a whole-of-Government perspective that decisions are not made purely for a solution that only benefits the stadium, and I'm not suggesting the MPDC are trying to do that, because they are also responsible for the precinct, but the Government is responsible for TasPorts and the operation of the ports. There could be nothing worse. It's a little bit like building your own house and then saying, well, actually now I need to dig up part of that house because I'm going to run another major piece of infrastructure under it.

We don't want to see that additional cost to Government if we're not completely thinking about the entire precinct, and to be honest, what's going to be required, for not just the next decade, but the next 20 to 30 to 40 years in that area. So, those are the discussions that the Oversight Committee, for example, called in TasPorts, TasNetworks, TasWater, together with MPDC, to have a conversation to make sure that they are thinking about future-proofing and the whole-of-Government solution that would be required; but it's not yet at a stage where they can say, 'Well here is the design exactly for that, and here is the number that's attached to it', noting that we have to have a solution, though, for day one operation at the stadium - that's included in the construction contract.

Ms THOMAS - Do you have a timeframe for when that's expected, then?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - There are elements of it that I know are being actively considered and quoted on as part of the two responses to the tender. There will be other items, for example TasWater that's currently doing the Selfs Point work and relocation, who are going away with their own contractors and working out the best method. I know there's a bit of conjecture about exactly where on the site they would be looking to do their pipelines or what part of Evans Street, for example, and what the impact on Evans Street would be, so they're going away and actively doing that design and engagement work to come back.

CHAIR - Could I just clarify one point you made, Kath? I believe you said, in terms of the request-for-tender process now and working with the two preferred tenderers, some of the works that may provide the broader community benefit could, will be delivered by that contractor?

Mr HEALEY -Maybe.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Potentially.

Mr HEALEY - It's an option. If I can be more specific: the reticulation of services within the footprint of the stadium is an optional thing. We could do it separately for the entire precinct or we could ask the lead contractor to do it, depending on the benefits of both. Also, the landscaping of the area outside of the footprint of the stadium, that is an optional quote as well. There might be benefits in getting their contractor to do broader landscaping works; there may not be. It might be better to get somebody else to do it because it's more aligned with infrastructure well outside of the footprint of the stadium and you're better doing one line all the way through, but -

CHAIR - If the person or company that wins the contract delivers some of this infrastructure, is it still going to be separated out of the cost, or is it going to be included in the cost of delivery of the stadium?

Mr HEALEY - That'll be a challenge in communicating what the contract actually represents once the Government announces the contract; and it may be that here's a contract, here's the price for the delivery of the project and the stadium, and here's a separate price for the contractor to also contribute towards the broader precinct infrastructure, so that'll need to be clearly communicated.

PUBLIC

Ms THOMAS - Have there been any matters requiring Ministerial intervention? Like in terms of the Oversight Committee, has the Oversight Committee had to recommend any Ministerial intervention on any matters?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - No, not to my knowledge. Obviously, the Minister has the power under the act to issue instructions or directions to Macquarie Point Development Corporation. To my knowledge, I don't think there's been any variation to the current published directions that the Minister has provided, or need to, that's been identified to my knowledge.

Mr HEALEY - Not interventions, but over the period of the last couple of years, the Oversight Committee has led processes to, for example, assure itself about the constructability of the roof and get separate advice around those sorts of risks to make sure that we weren't just relying on the advice from the RPDC, but we were getting independent assurance into there. So, there's been a few things where the Oversight Committee has -

CHAIR - Not the RPDC, it's not called that anymore, is it?

Mr HEALEY - No, planning commission, TPC.

CHAIR - Tas Planning Commission, TPC. That's going back in history, quite a while.

Mr HEALEY - Well before then, but the Oversight Committee has acted to provide assurance to Government independently of Mac Point on occasions where they've considered that those risks really need to be clearly articulated.

CHAIR - One last one, because we're going to run out of time.

Mr WINTER - Again, I know we don't have a lot of time, but some of the overdue and in progress ones: so, it looks like 53 is the cricket centre of excellence, I think. Tasmanian Government provides in-kind support for planning and regulatory approvals for the centre of excellence - I assume it's the cricket centre of excellence - DPAC and State Growth meeting with Cricket Tasmania to discuss requirements. It was due on 31 January [2026]: it's overdue and in progress. What's the update on that?

Mr HEALEY - So, this is probably an example of where we're trying to be really transparent around whether or not -

Mr WINTER - It's not often I see things - everything's on track when I read the Government documents, usually, Mr Healey.

Mr HEALEY - And this one, to be frank, we could probably quite easily say it's on track. We are working with Cricket. They don't need our in-kind support just yet. They've got contractors working on designs and the like. They said, 'Well, we probably don't need it now, but we might need it in a little while'.

Mr WINTER - This is the design for Seven Mile Beach, is it?

Mr HEALEY - Yes, and it's the same in here, there's 'include Cricket Tasmania and Cricket Australia into the governance groups'. We're actively working with them alongside of the governance and the oversight, so there's probably not a need for them to be into the

PUBLIC

oversight governance at the moment, but we're still reporting it as overdue because we haven't delivered on that commitment, but we're actively working with them, they're really comfortable with the progress that we're making. It's a really positive piece of work.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - And it's been a piece where the Oversight Committee has been called into this, and I suppose that is our role, if stakeholders are coming forward also and identifying that they're not being heard, for example, by Macquarie Point who may be very, very busy running a thousand workshops on detailed design, et cetera, that we're able to meet with them and hear their concerns. Obviously, from a Cricket perspective, I don't think I'm putting words in the mouth of the CEO of Cricket Tasmania: they've seen this very much as an AFL nearly dominant design approach, the CFDA, et cetera, and I think Cricket have been trying to catch up, noting that their contribution to the stadium is also going to be significant and, particularly, if you hear the evidence of Stadiums Tas in relation to cricket fixturing and F&B (food and beverage) contract potential, as a revenue item for Stadiums Tas.

We want to make sure that the design requirements of Cricket are heard and represented, and that all stakeholders that are going to be part of multipurpose stadium have that opportunity. We've offered them the assistance in terms of the in-kind support, noting that sometimes they are quite thin on the ground, depending at what aspect of the season they're at, or where in the world they are as well in terms of their current program.

CHAIR - We might wrap it up there then, thanks. We'll have you back at another time. I think we have scheduled the next date.

Mr GREGORY - November 6. While we're tabling documents, we'll just take the opportunity to table the letters that Mr Limkin wrote to Stadiums Tas and MPDC about the interactions with the department.

CHAIR - That would be great. Yes. Thanks for that. Thank you. All right. Thanks very much. Are they in public, those ones?

Mr WINTER - Oh, that's in relation to conflict of interest stuff.

Mr GREGORY - It's in relation to when they need to interact or seek advice, rather than coming to the secretary, going to the relevant deputy secretary.

CHAIR - Thank you.

The witnesses withdrew.

The Committee suspended from 4:24 pm. to 4:32 pm.

PUBLIC

Independent Probity Adviser

CHAIR - Well, thank you very much for appearing again before the Committee, Andrew, and we appreciate you coming and giving some insights into your role as a probity adviser. As you know, everything you say is covered by parliamentary privilege while you're before the Committee. If there's anything of a confidential nature you wish to share, please make that request. Otherwise, it is all public.

Mr HARRIS - I understand.

CHAIR - Would you mind taking the statutory declaration, then I understand you have a presentation to go through.

Mr HARRIS - Opening Statement as well.

CHAIR - Opening Statement? Yes, sure. Okay, that's fine.

Mr ANDREW HARRIS, INDEPENDENT PROBITY ADVISER, WAS CALLED, TOOK THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

Mr HARRIS - Thank you, Chair. Our team expresses our ongoing appreciation for the opportunity to attend these hearings and to report to the Committee on matters relating to the independent probity adviser role under the stadium order. We understand the importance of parliamentary Oversight and confirm their willingness to assist the Committee with its ongoing invigilation of the implementation of the order. In the period since the 12 May [2026] hearing, we have prepared probity and assurance reports on five matters under the order. We understand that the Committee has received copies of four of these reports from the Office of the Secretary of Building Tasmania.

Our engagement with regulators and our participation in project governance has not identified any material non-compliance with the provisions of the order, nor have we been made aware of any substantive probity matters to date relating to the order.

We seek to maintain regular engagement with the agencies involved in the order, to reinforce the need for transparency, timeliness and fairness in decision-making and to promote the awareness and declaration of conflicts of interest for those officials participating in the observance of conditions under the order.

Individual officials, agencies and regulators have continued to acknowledge our independence and legitimacy in conducting our work. Our role is respected at the Oversight Committee and through the office of the secretary of Building Tas. Our team has established constructive relationships with regulators and the proponent of the Macquarie Point Development Corporation. We remain confident that we are able to work with agencies and regulators to observe whether decisions are compliant with the order and to reduce the potential suboptimal or compromised decision-making.

At the 12 May [2026] hearing, we anticipated an intensification of activity under the order, notably through the approvals for the construction environment management plans for Stages 1 and 2 and related and concurrent activities. We have prepared a short overview of our action since 12 May and the possible forward agenda to which I just referred. I'd be pleased to

PUBLIC

present that now for the Committee's information: alternatively, happy to respond immediately to any matters the Committee may be of a mind to raise. Thank you.

CHAIR - Just one thing I think, and you've basically said in your opening statement, Andrew, but has there been any difficulty experienced by you or your team in accessing information or documents you've needed to do your job?

Mr HARRIS - No, nothing of any substance. No, there was a lot of documents moving around, but we've been able to access things in a timely manner and ensure our advice coincides with the timeframes for decision-making. I'm comfortable in that respect. We're copied into correspondence occasionally where it doesn't relate to a condition, so we're very pleased with the level of interaction we receive.

CHAIR - To confirm that you had no vision, oversight or part of the decision for Macquarie Point Development Corporation to work with two preferred tenders, one being Webuild, and we heard from our previous witnesses how they had some concern about the publicly-available information regarding Webuild and their court actions in New South Wales: were you asked to consider that at all or have any oversight of that?

Mr HARRIS - We've had no discussions on that front at all within the State Government.

CHAIR - Is that something that you would have thought you may have been, or is it outside the scope in your view?

Mr HARRIS - No, it is outside the scope of our role, and I wouldn't presume to offer commentary on that decision.

CHAIR - Sure.

Mr HARRIS - I know what the public knows. I've had no insight into documentation or arrangements or briefings or anything of that nature, nor has our team, so we would be very hesitant to make any comment on that.

CHAIR - That's fine. I just wanted to clarify that not being part of your consideration.

Mr HARRIS - No.

CHAIR - Okay. We'll go to your presentation.

Mr HARRIS - Thank you very much. Thanks to Simon for driving. Please don't be alarmed by the 17 slides here, that'd be cruel and unusual at this time of the day. I'll just do half a dozen of them and maybe we can pick up dialogue as we go. Please stop me if need be.

Just to confirm that I represent a team of three senior assurance and probity advisers along with Steve Richardson, Kevin Davey: both men are very pivotal to the breadth of the work we undertake and the amount of work we have to produce. So, I just wanted to make that point that it's not just me. If I use DSG (Department of State Growth) and BT (Building Tasmania) interchangeably, please forgive me.

Mr WINTER - So do we.

CHAIR - Yes, I know.

Mr HARRIS - Yes, the MOG (machinery of Government) changes come in and, it's got that - thank you. In terms of standard practice is to declare conflicts of interest, and we have none that we need to report to you, perceived, actual or anticipated, and we will continue to monitor that in relation to us as a team, and our close associates and families, and we will advise you out of session if we run into something that cuts across the project like that. In the spirit of transparency, I'm still the probity adviser on the Treasury complex repurposing project, which is at RFT stage, and Steve has just completed - since we last spoke - successfully led two reviews of some major projects in this State, the TT-Line Terminal 3 project, and the new youth justice facility, so he led those. Steve is currently advising the New Zealand Government on aspects of its infrastructure and insurance programs. Kevin Davey has been working on major project reviews interstate, but we have nothing else local here which can cut across this project and bring doubt to anybody's mind about our independence. Thank you, Simon. Thank you for listening to that.

In terms of actions arising from 12 May, Chair, you wrote to me on the 26 May, I believe. Thank you for that correspondence. In that you sought two documents from us: one was our advice on the A9 Design Quality and Integrity Review panel, the establishment of that panel by the then-secretary, and the second was a conflict-of-interest management plan. Now, we've been able to give you the copy of our advice on the A9 panel. I think that went through, Simon, so I think you have that.

In terms of the second document, the conflict-of-interest management plan, that remains under development, subject to incorporation of commentary from regulators under the order. So, we have been working on this for several months. It's been to the Oversight Committee, and it has gone to all regulators under the order for their views. I understand there's been some recent commentary received from one of the regulators which BT is now considering. They may then refer it back to us to incorporate those comments, and then it goes back to the acting secretary of BT for approval. So, that didn't come up in the previous hearing, but there is a conflict management plan which will be in place hopefully shortly. I've been unable to forward you a copy of it because I just don't have an approved version.

CHAIR - So, one would have expected this might have been finalised a little bit earlier. I'm not saying you held it up, I'm just saying that I would have thought it might have been finalised a bit earlier. It's pretty critical.

Mr HARRIS - We provided a first draft fairly early on in our tenure, in this role, and it has been subject to, as I indicated, consultation at Oversight Committee and regulator level, and it's coming through that process now. In the absence of it, we've been implementing most of the actions in it anyway, particularly in terms of engagement with regulators, and checking on their conflicts of interest, viewing their registers. So, implementing the spirit of it. What didn't come up in the last hearing is that one of the whole sections in the plan is about the dual role of the acting secretary of BT. So, it's specifically to that position. What the order has done to provide these other obligations on him in the context of his business-as-usual activities, and we recommend some controls and strategies around that, and we've been implementing those softly, I assume, from the term -

CHAIR - But they will be enshrined, if you like, in the management plan once it's signed off?

Mr HARRIS - Yes, exactly right. So, we will get you that document as soon as we can.

CHAIR - So, assuming that's done in the not-too-distant future, and we're probably not going to see you for three months again, would you be able to send us a copy in the - as soon as it's signed off?

Mr HARRIS - Yes, as soon as I can. Yes, that's right, that was always my intention.

CHAIR - Great, thank you.

Mr HARRIS - We're about to finalise it, and then some late comments, as I indicated, came in and in the spirit of consultation inclusion. As soon as I can get it, Chair, I'll forward it to you. Thank you, Simon.

At the 12 May [2026] hearing, there was some discussion regarding the distinction between our role and the role of the MPDC probity adviser, and I just thought I'd put a simple graphic up on the screen which highlights that. We're in the teal box of the left-hand bottom side of the screen. Our focus is the stadium order. That's a fairly prescribed role for us, and our reporting accountability lines are to you as a Committee, and to the Oversight Committee, standard reporting, and to BT on a contractual basis.

CHAIR - So, from your experience as a probity adviser, would you expect the Macquarie Point probity adviser to have looked at the compliance of both - I understand there was more than two, but there was the tenderers who expressed an interest, to make sure they comply with Treasurer's Instructions and other procurement guidelines?

Mr HARRIS - I'd expect them to enforce whatever arrangements have been put in place to guide that procurement. I haven't had insight into that documentation, so I can't comment -

CHAIR - No, that's fine. That would be a role in that position though, to look at those matters, yes?

Mr HARRIS - Yes, I'd expect so. The probity advisers there report upwards - for the MPDC report up through the corporation, and they have an audit and risk Committee, I understand, and a Board-level consideration of those matters: but they do then proceed through the MPDC to the Oversight Committee. So, there is a shared accountability and reporting measure in the middle through the Oversight Committee, but as you can see from this very simplistic graphic, there's no interaction levels of probity, and I haven't seen documentation or had any engagement with probity advisers from the corporation. I just thought I'd clarify that after the last meeting.

In terms of where we've been since we last saw you, we have prepared formal advice or reports on five conditions under the order. I've listed those on the left-hand column of the slide. I believe you have the first four, and not our paper on the unanticipated discovery plan approval by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. I don't believe you have that one yet, but that should be with you shortly. We didn't identify anything of concern in that process. Because you have the documentation, I don't want to dwell on some of the detail of those, but the first two, B11M and B2 had some sequencing considerations and some twists in terms of how to secure approvals, those sort of things, which we provided advice on as we went through. The B11M in particular is a tripartite decision for the Minister of Housing and Planning, the Director of

the EPA and the Acting Secretary of then-DSG. So, some complexities and how we ensure that everyone has the same information to make determinations, any technical advice is shared amongst them, and how the Acting Secretary for DSG could brief or submit information to get a determination out of a Minister given it was within that same portfolio, so some of the twists like that we work closely with the office of the secretary to ensure independence in decision-making and an absence of influence.

In terms of other matters that we've been working on, we regularly engage with the regulators, particularly those who have most relevance to the stadium order in this current phase, and we've been getting really good responses from them, and whenever we meet with those, we engage with them on any risks they're seeing, any process problems they may be having, any resourcing problems that prevent them from considering documentation appropriately, and any conflict of interest concerns they may have; and we have a good, open relationship to be able to either view their registers or to discuss with them about the need to maintain awareness and updated conflict of interest registers.

A good example of our work there has been with Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania where we worked on iterative versions of their process plans for how they will handle their obligations under the order. Under the two schedules they have, between Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania and Heritage Tasmania, over 22 conditions which they need to comply with. So, we saw versions in June and July of how they proposed to handle the order before it went to their secretary for sign-off. A part of that process was the sign-off by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on the unanticipated discovery plan. So, we're very comfortable with how they're handling that for that component of the order, and they also shared with us this week their updated conflict of interest register, which is good. They've got a good awareness in DNRET (Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania) about that.

We have provided guidance on a conflict of interest (COI) declaration for an appointee to the design, quality and integrity review panel arising from the activities of the person's host company, and that was declared in early June in an abundance of caution and with some management controls proposed. We considered the controls, suggested to BT some tightening or some additional controls, and we believe it's at the lower end of risk for probity and for the activities of the panel. I checked in with the person involved a week or so ago and there's been no movement on that one, so it's just something we'll monitor. We have a central conflict of interest register, so we will build up these as they go.

We've also provided advice on the operationalisation of the A9 panel, the design quality and integrity review panel, as the project proceeds. We had a meeting with the Chair of the panel, the secretariat for the panel and the office of the secretary of BT to look at expectations under the order, how the panel is understanding its role, governance and reporting; and that meeting went well. We're comfortable in that space as well.

Ms THOMAS - Are you able to provide any more detail on that? You said it's a low level of risk, but are you able to elaborate any more on what specifically it was?

Mr HARRIS - Probably not in public. I'd probably prefer and am happy to talk about it in camera, but I wouldn't talk about a conflict of interest without revealing information.

Ms THOMAS - Sure.

Mr HARRIS - It's tricky, that one, confidentiality, those concerns.

Ms THOMAS - Sure.

Mr HARRIS - We've also provided a discussion paper for BT on where there may be sensitive information in documents that have been published under A3/A4 of the order, on what grounds could material be redacted and how that process would take place - sensitive information which shouldn't be in the hands of a bad actor, for example: something about the design of a stadium which gave them insight into security shouldn't be published. We've produced that paper. It's early days, just a discussion paper for one or two agencies for publication obligations. I should stress that does mean that redaction, from our perspective, would be the last resort. The spirit is to publish and have strong reasons for redacting, where at all.

CHAIR - From your perspective, they have to demonstrate to you the need to redact rather than you drag out of them why it shouldn't be redacted?

Mr HARRIS - Yes, that's right.

CHAIR - Or the other way, it should be redacted.

Mr HARRIS - There'd be some mechanism for that. Also, because of the organisation publishing a document might not realise what's sensitive either, so there should be consultation to be able to determine what may be considered to be sensitive. It's hard to put the horse back into the stable, I think, once you've published it.

CHAIR - You can't unsee what you've seen.

Mr HARRIS - Yes, that's right.

In terms of governance, we continue to report to the Oversight Committee, written reports at every meeting; we've had three since we last met you and another one for next Friday's meeting, and we have a weekly meeting with the office of the secretary of Building Tasmania, which is a good clearing house. I should say that that meeting also is a way of monitoring any conflicts of interest for the secretary, in practice. We look at case-by-case considerations where there's a matter before the secretary to see what processes we can put in place around him to protect from perceptions of conflict of interest.

I mentioned at the last meeting that we were approaching an intensification period of activity which potentially posed risks in terms of compressed decision-making, compromised decision-making, resourcing constraints -

CHAIR - For you or for the various departments, or both?

Mr HARRIS - For the regulators and the secretary himself. I thought we'd take the liberty of trying to show this more graphically. I should stress that this is our interpretation of the July tabular schedule provided by the MPDC, so it's our interpretation. It's illustrative, it's indicative, and it's not to commit anybody to a schedule; it's really to illustrate our point. This program is subject to change and volatility and while these are headline activities I've listed on the screen that need to take place for the staging of works, underneath those headline things,

PUBLIC

I think the MPDC States there are 40 to 50 sub-actions which can influence timing as we go, so, we're not so much interested as a group, as a team, in terms of, is it on this Wednesday that something is submitted; it's more in a period of time, what could be in front of up to eight or nine regulators and the secretary and the Head of the State Service at one time, so this is an illustration of that, with the green teal shapes there showing some substantial documents that may be approaching us over the next month or so.

The gold stars under the grey blobs represent decisions made to date, and you heard earlier in one of the sessions around the complexity of the construction environment management plans, so there's two of those. Happy to report that the MPDC has started consultation on those documents and preparing regulators for them with exposure documents and standardised material. They've also started engagement with the third-party groups under A6 of the order, which is a mandatory consideration for the CMPs, and they're very well aware of the need to bring people along on the journey and we talk to the MPDC every fortnight so we're comfortable that's achievable, if this is the scenario that happens, but there is a lot of work to do in a short space of time. We'll also work with the regulators to ensure that they don't feel under pressure, they're resourced accordingly, they're not going to make decisions just to get something off the desk.

CHAIR - What have you - I mean, there is and it was alluded to by previous witnesses that there's a lot of things about to all, sort of, start being decision points, if you like. So, if a regulator said to you, look, we're just really pressed for time, you know, like I've mentioned, like, EPA, for example, we have an environmental disaster somewhere and their resources are dragged to deal with that, as they should be: then what avenues are there for them there to, you know - because I know that the Oversight Committee don't want hold-ups, and they're watching that very closely. So, what do you think about that?

Mr HARRIS - Well, I would have to refer back to the order to see what consultation was prescribed for a certain document, what periods were prescribed, but I'm sure there's capability there for consultation between the authorising parties and the submitting parties to be flexible in terms of consultation. All these agencies have BAU (business as usual) they're grappling with the same time, and they're not resourced with extra staff to handle this work, so I have some sympathy for them, but for now, the spirit is there to achieve the time periods for each document, but it's still a risk and we'll still look to monitor them.

There are also notifications under the order for the commencement of works, for example for stages under B1, 2, I think it is, and G3. So, these aren't strictly decisions, for example, for the secretary, these are notifications - and we have one to date for the start of preparatory works, and we will fill up this slide as the stadium proceeds. This is the notification from the MPDC to the EPA saying 'we intend to start'. Here's the site environment management plan that's been produced and reviewed, I assume, by an accredited person with appropriate authorisation, we intend to start, and it's just a notification, it's not a decision, and that was turned around by the EPA within the timeframe allowing prep works to start. We checked in with the EPA after that notification to see if they were comfortable with the process and whether they had encountered any COIs and they were good. They were comfortable with how it had gone through. So, that was a successful project, successful process.

The remaining slides I have start to get into detail around decisions of the material you already have in front of you, and I suppose this is a probably a way of reporting to you. Even if we don't address it now, I'm happy to continue, I'm happy to respond to questions.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - I think it's probably easier if you go through each of them, because those are, I mean, this is obviously -

Mr WINTER - We've only got five minutes left.

CHAIR - Have we? Just see how we go, because these are - unless anyone has a particular question at the moment, because this is around the works that should've been going on now.

Ms THOMAS - Perhaps if we just take a moment to read them, rather than making Andrew keep talking.

Mr WINTER - Well, you'll provide these to us?

Mr HARRIS - I think you've already got them, early July [2026]. Yes. You've got our written reports for these, Mr Winter, and this is just a summary of what's already in those reports.

Mr WINTER - Great.

CHAIR - Do you want to keep going through them, Simon?

[proceeding through slideshow]

Mr HARRIS - And this one you haven't seen.

CHAIR - Yes.

Mr HARRIS - This is one of the - I think it's the only determination by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs under the order, that she's seen the unanticipated discovery plan and makes an approval to her satisfaction. So, the plan has to be to her satisfaction based on advice from the entity administering the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975*; that was a process I referred to earlier with the process plans and DNRET. There was extensive dialogue between Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania and the MPDC on draft versions of the plan over several months, and then they were happy with the final version, I think -

CHAIR - So it has been finalised now?

Mr HARRIS - Yes, that one's gone, and there's a letter from the Minister on 10 July [2026] to the MPDC confirming her satisfaction with the plan.

CHAIR - We asked about some of the early works that have been going on, whether it had any unanticipated discoveries, and they had: they found some shell midden areas in a part of the site. So, they asked them about that process there with what do you do with that? They wait, they notify Aboriginal Heritage and then wait for a response. So, there's no timeline. Essentially during that period the expectation is that no further work is undertaken at that spot, or -

Mr HARRIS - Yes, I think that it becomes a prescribed process once there is a discovery, and it's for skeletal and non-skeletal remains, so there's different processes depending on the

PUBLIC

nature of the remains or the heritage find relative to the plan. I don't know much more than that, so I'd probably struggle to answer any further questions as it goes down.

CHAIR - No, sure, that's fine. That was shells as opposed to any human remains?

Mr HARRIS - Yes, that's right. You can imagine the process that comes in when there's skeletal remains - you know, fingers crossed that it doesn't happen. That's all right, I'm happy to respond to any questions. I'm not stuck to time, if -

CHAIR - I think it's really helpful -

Mr WINTER - One minute to go, Chair.

CHAIR - Yes, to get an update from you, so that from your perspective things are going appropriately. If you can send us through the conflict of interest management plan when that's available, that'll be really helpful.

Mr HARRIS - I will, yes.

CHAIR - Is there anything you wish to add after that?

Mr HARRIS - No, just to thank you for your for your time and for your questions, and if you need anything out of session, in between the periods, please advise.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms THOMAS - Thank you for your ongoing oversight.

CHAIR - Yes, thank you, it's really helpful. It certainly helps us as we don't have the expertise to delve into the areas that you do. So, that's really helpful.

Mr HARRIS - No, thank you.

The witness withdrew.

The Committee adjourned at 4:59 pm.