



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

**JOINT PARLIAMENTARY
COMMITTEE**

on

PUBLIC WORKS

**Reference: New facilities for the National Museum of Australia and the Australian
Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies**

CANBERRA

Monday, 8 December 1997

OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT

CANBERRA

WITNESSES

**ASHTON, Mr Stephen, Director, Ashton Raggatt McDougall Pty Ltd, Architects,
Level 11, 522 Flinders Lane, Melbourne, Victoria 3000 3**

**BERENTS, Mr Derek, TWCA Pty Ltd, Project Manager, Level 11, 121 Walker
Street, North Sydney, New South Wales 2060 3**

**CASEY, Ms Dawn, Department of Communications and the Arts, Executive Director,
Construction Coordination Task Force, 54 Marcus Clarke Street, Canberra City,
Australian Capital Territory 2601 3**

**JONAS, Dr Bill, AM, Director, National Museum of Australia, Lady Denman Drive,
Yarramundi, Australian Capital Territory 2600 3**

**KENIGER, Mr Michael, Head of Department of Architecture, University of
Queensland, Zelman Cowen Building, Brisbane, Queensland 4072 3**

**RATCLIFFE, Mr Michael, Chief Executive, National Capital Authority, 10-12
Brisbane Avenue, Barton, Australian Capital Territory 2600 88**

**SANTAMARIA, Ms Cathy, Deputy Secretary, Department of Communications and
the Arts, 54 Marcus Clarke Street, Canberra City, Australian Capital Territory 2601
3**

**SMITH, Mr Andrew, Senior Architect, National Capital Authority, 10-12 Brisbane
Avenue, Barton, Australian Capital Territory 2600 88**

**TAYLOR, Mr Russell, Principal, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait
Islander Studies, Acton House, Marcus Clarke Street, Acton, Australian Capital
Territory 2600 3**

**THOMSON, Mr Graham, Partner, Mallesons Stephen Jacques, Level 28, 525 Collins
Street, Melbourne, Victoria 3000 3**

**WILLIAMSON, Ms Gay, Director, Landscape Architecture, National Capital
Authority, 10-12 Brisbane Avenue, Barton, Australian Capital Territory 2600 88**

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

*New facilities for the National Museum of Australia and the Australian Institute of
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies*

CANBERRA

Monday, 8 December 1997

Present

Mr Tuckey (Chair)

Senator Calvert Mr Richard Evans

Senator Murphy Mr Forrest

Mr Hatton

Mr Hollis

The committee met at 2.05 p.m.

Mr Tuckey took the chair.

CHAIR—Welcome. I have some formal statements to make prior to commencing these proceedings. I declare open this public hearing into the proposed development of new facilities for the National Museum of Australia and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies at Acton in the Australian Capital Territory. This project was referred to the Public Works Committee for consideration and a report to parliament by the House of Representatives on 30 October 1997 at an indicative cost of \$133 million.

In accordance with subsection 17(3) of the Public Works Committee Act 1969:

- (3) In considering and reporting on a public work, the Committee shall have regard to—
- (a) the stated purpose of the work and its suitability for that purpose;
 - (b) the necessity for, or the advisability of, carrying out the work;
 - (c) the most effective use that can be made, in the carrying out of the work, of the moneys to be expended on the work;
 - (d) where the work purports to be of a revenue-producing character, the amount of revenue that it may reasonably be expected to produce; and
 - (e) the present and prospective public value of the work.

This morning the committee undertook an extensive inspection of the site at Acton, premises housing the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, the Museum's visitor centre and administration facility at Yarramundi Reach and the repositories at Mitchell. Today and tomorrow the committee will hear evidence from the Department of Communications and the Arts, the National Capital Authority, the ACT Government, Canberra Community Action on Acton, the Master Builders' Association of the ACT, National Film and Sound Archive, National Trust of Australia, Friends of the National Museum, Commonwealth Fire Board, ACROD and the Canberra Yacht Club.

[2.10 p.m.]

ASHTON, Mr Stephen, Director, Ashton Raggatt McDougall Pty Ltd, Architects, Level 11, 522 Flinders Lane, Melbourne, Victoria 3000

BERENTS, Mr Derek, TWCA Pty Ltd, Project Manager, Level 11, 121 Walker Street, North Sydney, New South Wales 2060

CASEY, Ms Dawn, Department of Communications and the Arts, Executive Director, Construction Coordination Task Force, 54 Marcus Clarke Street, Canberra City, Australian Capital Territory 2601

JONAS, Dr Bill, AM, Director, National Museum of Australia, Lady Denman Drive, Yarramundi, Australian Capital Territory 2600

KENIGER, Mr Michael, Head of Department of Architecture, University of Queensland, Zelman Cowen Building, Brisbane, Queensland 4072

SANTAMARIA, Ms Cathy, Deputy Secretary, Department of Communications and the Arts, 54 Marcus Clarke Street, Canberra City, Australian Capital Territory 2601

TAYLOR, Mr Russell, Principal, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Acton House, Marcus Clarke Street, Acton, Australian Capital Territory 2600

THOMSON, Mr Graham, Partner, Mallesons Stephen Jacques, Level 28, 525 Collins Street, Melbourne, Victoria 3000

CHAIR—The committee has received a submission from the Department of Communications and the Arts dated October 1997. Do you wish to propose any amendment to that submission?

Ms Santamaria—Yes. The amendments proposed have been circulated.

CHAIR—Thank you. It is proposed that the submission, as amended, be received, taken as read and incorporated in the transcript of evidence. Do members have any objections? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The document read as follows—

CHAIR—Would a representative of the Department of Communications and the Arts now read the summary statement to the committee, after which we will proceed to questions.

Ms Santamaria—Thank you, Mr Chairman. The proposal is to provide purpose built facilities for the National Museum of Australia, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, incorporating the development of Acton Peninsula for general community use. The ACT government also intends to construct the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Centre on Acton Peninsula in conjunction with the Commonwealth's project.

Subject to parliamentary approval of the proposal, it is intended that the facilities will open on 1 January 2001 as the flagship of the Commonwealth's contribution to the centenary of federation celebrations. The construction program is tight but, we believe, achievable.

The coalition's 1996 election policy statement *For art's sake—a fair go!* announced its commitment to establish a fully fledged national museum of Australia in Canberra. The museum was established with bipartisan political support as a statutory authority in 1980. It has not had a permanent home since that time but, through piecemeal arrangements in recent years, has developed exhibitions, based in part on its collections. The museum currently occupies a small visitor centre and administration facility at Yarramundi Reach and three collection repositories in north Canberra. The museum requires purpose built facilities to establish its identity as a national cultural institution and to fulfil its legislative charter.

The institute was founded in 1964 principally to promote Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander studies. The institute's leased premises are makeshift and inadequate. It is in urgent need of specialised environmentally controlled storage for the preservation of its collections of audiovisual material, books, journals, manuscripts and film which it holds in trust for indigenous Australians.

Collocation of the museum and the institute has always been intended and will benefit both organisations through shared access to collections and research data, shared infrastructure, cost savings from shared facilities and economies of scale throughout the various phases of the project, as well as increased visitor numbers.

In August 1996, a committee chaired by Mr Jim Service AM was established to advise the government on the most appropriate site, cost options and strategies for the development of new facilities for the museum and the institute. On 13 December 1996, the Prime Minister announced that he accepted the committee's recommendation to establish the facilities on Acton Peninsula, a significant site on the shores of Lake Burley Griffin.

In June 1997, the National Capital Authority released draft amendment 20 to the

National Capital Plan 'Acton Peninsula, a site of national significance'. The key changes proposed in the amendment include changing the land use category of the lower Acton Peninsular from 'open space—park' and 'community facility' to 'national capital use' and deleting reference to Yarramundi Reach as a site reserved for the museum. The latter does not preclude future development of museum facilities at Yarramundi Reach, or indeed, community use of the Acton facilities.

On 6 June 1997, the Prime Minister launched a two-stage international competition to select a design team for the project. On 29 October 1997, the Minister for Communications, the Information Economy and the Arts, Senator Richard Alston, announced as the winner of the competition Melbourne architects Ashton Raggatt McDougall Pty Ltd in association with Robert Peck von Hartel Trethowan. The winning team's preliminary design and model have been on display in Old Parliament House since the 15 November 1997.

The proposed development, the museum, will total a net area of 16,160 square metres. The main features of the new museum will include three major exhibition spaces, a digital theatre, a micro-gallery for on-line access to collections, research facilities, outdoor exhibitions and landscaping. The museum will combine the best contemporary exhibition techniques; new media technologies and live performances to become one of the leading museum and educational institutions within Australia. It will offer a range of experiences to appeal to visitors of all kind.

The institute will consist of six main functional areas including public entry, library and research facilities, the digital archive production team, the Aboriginal studies press and corporate services. The total net area of the institute will be 4,305 square metres.

I move now to the project cost. Overall, the government has agreed to \$151.9 million, excluding running costs for the project. In delivering the 1997 budget, the Treasurer announced a funding allocation of \$5 million in 1997-98 to commence design development and approvals. On 10 November 1997, the government agreed to funding for the project from the Federation Fund comprising \$128 million for building costs and \$18.9 million for one-off establishment costs. This sum does not include the bridge which is being proposed connecting Acton Peninsula to Lennox Park on the south shore of Lake Burley Griffin. The bridge is conceptual only and subject to further investigation and consultation. An additional \$2.5 million is the estimate to construct the bridge. The ACT government has committed \$3 million towards infrastructure cost.

Finally, as an overview, a new cultural precinct will be created on Acton Peninsula. The development will also see the museum and the institute take their place among the other national institutions located in Canberra including the Australian Parliament, the High Court of Australia, the National Library, the National Gallery, the National Film and Sound Archive, the Australian National University, the Australian War Memorial and the Australian National Botanic Gardens. The project will be a major boost for the Canberra

region creating up to 1,000 jobs, including 200 jobs during the design and documentation period, and around 700 on-site construction jobs through the opening of the museum on 1 January 2001.

CHAIR—Thank you for that overview of your submission. We will now move to questions and I turn to my vice-chairman, Mr Hollis.

Mr HOLLIS—In your opinion, has the best possible site has been selected?

Ms Santamaria—Yes I do. Over the years—and Dr Jonas this morning delved right back to the earliest expressions of desire for the museum—different sites have been examined, and Yarramundi Reach was identified by the 1975 Pigott committee as a preferred site. Those sites have been looked at on about half a dozen occasions since then, most recently last year. The reason the committee chose it and I, as a member of the committee but also as an individual, endorsed that is because the site is significant; it is within eyeshot, if that is the expression, of other national cultural institutions; and it creates, with the university and the National Film and Sound Archive, a cultural precinct itself on Acton Peninsula. I think it well meets the criteria for a national museum.

Mr HOLLIS—What do you think of it architecturally? Do you think it will add to the architectural splendour of Canberra or detract from it?

Ms Santamaria—I certainly do. I could now ask Michael Keniger his views, as the architectural adviser to the competition.

Mr Keniger—There is no question that the winning scheme will add to the list of national monument buildings that were just enunciated. It is important to say at the same time that it does that in quite a different way; it offers another alternative as to how a major national building should take shape on its landscape. It does that with particular cognisance of the time that we are living in.

In terms of the brief that it was asked to answer, the museum has a very clear brief about generating a new kind of museum and one which we have not yet seen in Australia. It is also a proposal which takes full account of the particular landscape and setting of the Acton Peninsula. It is certainly a fitting addition to Canberra's architecture.

Mr HOLLIS—You mentioned the concept of a new type of museum. I am not particularly promoting one site over another site, but I had always envisaged the museum going to Yarramundi Reach and I thought the attraction of that site was the very fact that the museum was a new concept and that it could expand. It seems to me, without being an expert on it, that we are putting a museum in a very confined space.

On the inspection this morning we were shown where this building was going to

go and where that building was going to go. The impression that I got, rightly or wrongly—and I guess it is for you people to prove to me that I got it wrong—was that after a few years we are going to see somewhat of a mishmash of styles crammed into one area. You have various architectural designs. It seemed to me that there was not a flowing design; there was a whole mishmash of architectural designs there, without a unifying theme behind it, crammed into a rather confined space of land.

Ms Santamaria—The fact of the matter is that our expectation is that there will be no need for any extension on Acton Peninsula for 30 years.

Mr HOLLIS—I have heard that before, though.

Ms Santamaria—The original concept of the museum was one that had sheep-shearing and a variety of elements like that, which are no longer intended for the museum. Like everything else, the concept of the museum is dynamic; and our expectation is that there is plenty of room on the site. As to the eclectic nature of the designs, which you referred to in the second part of your comment, I would like to ask one of the architects, Stephen Ashton, to deal with that question, if I may, Mr Chairman.

Mr HOLLIS—It is nothing personal, you know.

Mr Ashton—We will do our very best not to take it personally. There is a very long discussion one could have about the virtues or the pros and cons of an idea of uniformity as a method of integration, as opposed to eclecticism. Eclecticism means many things to many people. To us, eclecticism means that you draw your ideas from sources as wide as possible within both the national and international community of architectural design, and that you thereby seek to provide an architectural environment that is rich, complex and therefore ultimately satisfying to many more people over a much longer period of time. It is a deliberate strategy to avoid the idea of the architectural one-liner, where you go to a place, see just one idea, consume that one idea, go away and never come back.

That is exactly what we do not want to occur with the museum. We want people to feel that there are very many stories being told there, both within the exhibitions of the museum and in its architecture. Hopefully, they will find this layering of ideas intriguing, so that they will want to return on many occasions. We believe it is ultimately a strategy which will serve to make the facility last a long time in people's imaginations as a place of great interest and intrigue—rather than being a thing that you see once and then forget.

Senator CALVERT—I must say that my estimation of this project certainly increased when I found that Stephen's family came from Tasmania: obviously, they know what they are doing! What expertise did the committee that originally recommended the concept draw upon? What was the depth of that expertise?

Ms Santamaria—The committee had a great deal of expertise to draw on. The committee drew on expertise from eminent architects nominated by the Institute of Architects. They included Michael Keniger, who is at the table; John Davidson from Melbourne, who was the registrar of the competition and is another eminent architect; Professor Ken Taylor from the University of Canberra; and a number of architects, including Michael Ratcliffe, from the National Capital Authority. So there was quite a predominance of architectural advice.

Senator CALVERT—I suppose that the question has to be asked about the need for a national museum. I know it has been government policy with succeeding governments, but we do seem to have quite a few museums in Canberra, so what difference do you think this will make to the overall scene here? For instance, did you do any work on the usage of museums in Canberra and whether more people are visiting museums? I know that a lot of tourists visit Canberra and they always visit Parliament House, but I wonder how many of them visit the museums.

Ms Santamaria—Certainly the estimates are that museums are one of the cultural institutions which have increasing visitation. One of the ways that the delay in building the National Museum seems to have helped is that it has identified for the 2,000 other museums around the country a real linkage with the National Museum even though it has not had a substantial physical presence. There have been a series of linkages established. Dr Griffin, director of perhaps our oldest state museum in the country, the Australian Museum, said in his submission:

The National Museum of Australia has a unique charter and unique opportunity . . . More so than any other institution, the National Museum can explore key themes relating to Australia's national identity; what it is to be an Australian . . . the opportunity to be at the forefront of debate . . .

He said that there was the opportunity to use the new facilities as the forum for debate and exploration by communicating with the small museums around the country and by allowing them to participate in programs, not only through travelling exhibitions but also through the sorts of media facilities which are to be included in the National Museum.

I believe the National Museum is the missing link. As Stephen Weil said when he came to Australia earlier this year, 'What a National Museum can do these days is allow people to visit it and to see themselves as in a mirror.'

Senator CALVERT—I presume that the travelling exhibitions will still continue?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Senator CALVERT—Getting back to the competition that was held: I did note that the institute of architects labelled the design competition a 'Clayton's competition'. Is that the same institute of architects that wants to retain the ABS building in Belconnen?

Mr Keniger—I do not know the building but I assume it is the same institute. Although I did not read that article, I presume that you would be interested in the form of the competition. It is fair to say that the form the competition took was relatively unusual. Essentially it was a two-stage selection process. In the first stage the competitors were asked to submit one small sheet containing an outline of a design idea. The selection was literally on the basis of the ideas presented. The field of 76 included some eminent and distinguished international and national architects. The selection process was absolutely impeccable from that point on. Once a short list of five had been formulated, the second stage of the competition was run exactly the same way as any other selection competition. The five schemes submitted were all of a very high order.

Senator CALVERT—How many entries were received, and how many were overseas entries?

Mr Keniger—Because the first stage was anonymous I am not privy to the information as to where the entries came from. I am aware that 76 entries were received in the first instance and the short list was made from those entries. Ms Santamaria can answer the second part of your question.

Ms Santamaria—Seventy-six entrants were received, approximately 10 from overseas,.

Senator CALVERT—It is pleasing to see that locals won through.

Mr FORREST—Were all five on the short list Australian firms?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—Could you just give me an outline as to an expectation of the number of visitations? Is 350,000 per annum right? What sort of entry fee would they be paying if they were paying visitors?

Ms Santamaria—Do you mean entrance to the facilities?

Mr RICHARD EVANS—Yes.

Ms Santamaria—That has not been determined yet.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—When you say it is not determined, do you have a rough estimate as to what it might be? Is there going to be a ticket price?

Ms Santamaria—Again, that is yet to be determined.

CHAIR—I guess the question is: is there to be an entry charge?

Ms Santamaria—No. That is still to be determined.

CHAIR—So we have not decided whether there will be a charge, or if there is, what the charge will be.

Ms Santamaria—That is right.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—So what is this anticipated revenue of \$2.2 million over 12 months based upon if it is not based upon visitor entry fees?

Ms Santamaria—Amongst other things, it would be based on revenue from major exhibitions for which there is normally a charge. It would be based on merchandise and on the restaurant. Clearly, if it is determined to charge, that charge itself will contribute to that revenue.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—So it is an underestimate in the \$2.242 million if you have not got a ticket price on entry fee. Your anticipated revenue would be greater than the \$2.242 million that you are anticipating, so you are being conservative.

Ms Santamaria—I do not believe so. I am assuming that people will get to know the museum over a period of a few years and that revenue will adjust accordingly. And, of course, we would review estimates accordingly.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—In relation to visitations, your expectation is around 350,000 per annum. How does that compare with other state museum facilities?

Ms Santamaria—The comparisons are less with state institutions, but what we can do is to give you more accurate information on notice. What we have tended to do is look at national institutions based round Canberra.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—When you provide some information on notice could you give me some indication as to what the visitation rates are for other institutions?

Ms Santamaria—Certainly. There is no doubt that the National Gallery of Victoria's visitation has escalated since the entry fee was removed.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—Okay. I take your point. Why is Canberra the best location for a national museum?

Ms Santamaria—I believe that Canberra is the best location for the national museum because, as with Washington DC and a number of other capital cities, the concept of national is expressed through their capitals. For that reason, I think that the national museum, similarly, should be located in the capital city of the country.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—I will leave that to others to argue. Could you outline what your staffing will be once the project is complete? You mentioned that there are 1,000 people involved in the construction phase. What sort of staff numbers will there be once it is completed?

Ms Santamaria—Approximately 115.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—You have talked about building codes within your proposal for disability services. What other specific disability services will you have within the museum which will be able to provide services for disabled people, not only wheelchair access, but other disabilities?

Ms Santamaria—We are appointing an architect with specific expertise in the area of disability to give us advice. I will turn to Dr Jonas, as well.

Dr Jonas—We will also be talking very closely to ACROD. We are very conscious of the fact that the National Museum must cater for the nation, and for all Australians to be able to find themselves in it. We want it to be one of the most visitor-friendly cultural institutions in the country and we will be making whatever provision we can to ensure that disabled people can move around that particular museum as comfortably as they can anywhere else.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—Eighteen per cent of the Australian population has some sort of disability and not all of them are in wheelchairs. I would hate to think that a lot of your exhibitions would not be catering for blind, deaf and other disabilities.

Dr Jonas—We are certainly taking that into account and we are going much further than that. There are a group of people who, when suddenly exposed to conditions of lighting which are stronger than they have come out of, suffer badly. That is the latest one we are looking at, and we are looking at all those sorts of things.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—That is excellent. My final question is in relation to parking. You say you have about 320 car parks. Is that right?

Ms Santamaria—Yes, currently that is correct.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—Could you give me some outline of how you are going to be able to cope with the traffic in that area, plus pedestrian and bicycle traffic, as well? There is some contention regarding the bridge from the south side because there is pedestrian traffic from Civic which might be a bit of a problem. Could you give me a bit of an outline as to what your plans are in that regard? Are you improving access for car, bus and pedestrian traffic?

Ms Santamaria—Yes. It is not intended that all members of the staff of the

museum will be working at Acton. Probably close to 80 will be. I think that there might have been a feeling at this morning's site investigation that all the car park would be accommodated by the staff and that is not the case. Not all the staff have cars, and there will be storage for bicycles. We are about to commence discussions with ACTION buses for a much more frequent service between Civic and the museum itself. That whole issue of parking is currently being investigated. There will be further parking towards—

CHAIR—We might just take some instructions. That is the current parking there.

A map was then displayed.

Ms Casey—It comes down along there. But it would not be to develop it. We would have to work with the NCA and the ANU on it.

CHAIR—So your answer is that there is the potential to expand the amount of available parking anyway?

Ms Santamaria—That is my answer put much more succinctly.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—But what about the pedestrian traffic coming from the city et cetera? Are there facilities for pedestrians to get there at the moment? Are you planning to improve it? What is the general plan?

Ms Santamaria—There will be access by water, by foot and by bus.

CHAIR—There are a lot of major roads there as well. I guess that there could be a bit of danger. Are there plans by the local authorities and you to improve pedestrian access to it?

Ms Santamaria—There is already a bicycle path, which runs through Civic itself, to the site.

CHAIR—Does it go around the point at the moment?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Mr RICHARD EVANS—Is there a great need for pedestrian access across the lake?

Ms Santamaria—I guess that is one of the issues that will be examined when the concept of the bridge is looked at further.

CHAIR—In that regard, and considering its location, would that be the optimum place for pedestrian access? Would it be where people would tend to go prior to going to

the museum, or would they not?

Ms Santamaria—Lots of people have been quite excited about the concept. It is the optimum. It links Acton very closely with the parliament. It is a stone's throw from the parliament and the national institutions. You would cross the bridge and verge to your right to walk up to parliament. You would verge slightly to your left to cross to the library, the gallery and the science centre.

Mr HOLLIS—How many people do you think walk from there up to parliament? I have seen people jogging over it, but I have not seen people walking up to parliament. Do they use that precinct?

CHAIR—Do you mean tourists?

Mr HOLLIS—Yes. It seems to me that when tourists come to Canberra they go from one spot to another by car.

Ms Santamaria—Not all of them.

Mr HOLLIS—Others ride bikes or jog, but I have never seen anyone walk. You know Canberra better than I.

Ms Santamaria—I walk.

Mr HOLLIS—You might be the exception to the rule.

CHAIR—We are planning for a healthy lifestyle, Mr Hollis. Maybe we will take the buses away.

Senator CALVERT—We were told this morning that the footbridge is not part of the proposal.

Ms Santamaria—That is correct.

Senator CALVERT—But how come it is included in the project cost?

Ms Santamaria—It is not.

Senator CALVERT—It says here that it is. It says that the total cost also includes the proposed bridge.

Ms Santamaria—That was one of our amendments.

CHAIR—I was mainly concerned with there being, at some later date, a commit-

ment to it. If I remember rightly, if the costs are such, it might not come back to us. Anyway, that is the position.

Mr FORREST—Ms Santamaria and Dr Jonas were off to a good start with that paddle steamer ride this morning. It came from my part of the world. I return to the original question about the site. I want to be satisfied in my own mind that the process has been served. It is almost too late to reconsider Yarramundi Reach. You are talking about a site that is 90 hectares as against a site that is 80 hectares.

CHAIR—It is 80 hectares to 10.

Mr FORREST—There must, therefore, be some very justifiable reasons why this site is now considered the preferred option which you have not brought to the committee's attention. There must be overwhelming reasons why this is a better site. Could you just tell us what they are again. I know that it is a green site and there is extra capital and infrastructure costs and all that. However, in terms of embracing a really heritage image, you have 80 hectares. It could be surrounded by open land. This site, however, is constrained virtually by water all around its perimeter.

Ms Santamaria—Not all of the Yarramundi site can be built on. There are real environmental issues with quite a bit of it. There are legless lizards.

Mr FORREST—I will ask the question another way. Of that 80 or 90 hectares, the actual museum site would have probably been something similar to this site, such as 10. Is that an assumption I can make?

Ms Santamaria—Yes, I think you could. But these are not the only issues. You saw the site this morning. Look at where museums and other cultural institutions are being built in some cities of the world. It seems to me that we will not be arguing over hectares for a museum on Acton Peninsular. It is very spacious. It is within eyeshot of the other national institutions, which I think gives it an advantage over Yarramundi, extremely beautiful though Yarramundi is. It also has existing infrastructure. So it is off to a good start, given the period we have to develop it.

As I said earlier, our estimate is that there is no need to extend beyond what is being proposed at this point for another 30 years. Institutions are not looked at any longer as great holding places of materials. Objects and paintings that come into art museums are being looked at much more selectively these days with the intention of exhibiting just about everything that comes in. The Yarramundi site is beautiful. So are the other sites that were investigated, such as the Parliamentary Triangle. Acton Peninsular, in my view, but more importantly in the view of the advisory committee, is an excellent site.

Mr FORREST—How important was the infrastructure question, such as access and the ability to walk, given that it is eight kilometres away? What about road access,

sewerage and all the other infrastructure? Which was the most prominent reason in all of that for that site being chosen over Yarramundi?

Ms Santamaria—The infrastructure issue was not more prominent. Proximity to the national collections and other national institutions was important. So was the existence of the infrastructure. The identity of the site as a site of national significance, in the end, was the issue that led the committee to recommend it. Lots of people had nourished the idea of the previous site. Some still do. As people get to know the site, as they come across close to the university because they cannot get right onto the site, I think you will find that the feeling has changed.

Mr FORREST—That leads me to the services question, which is one that I have a reputation for always asking: the cost of such infrastructure services as water, sewerage, power and gas. There is very little information in the submission you have made about whether those systems are adequate or whether there is augmentation required, especially for fire servicing and other high-cost infrastructure items. Has that all been properly assessed? Will a positive statement be made that there is not going to be major cost requirement in upgrading major infrastructure services to that Acton site?

CHAIR—To add to that, has any upgrading that is required been included in the estimates before us today?

Ms Santamaria—Mr Chairman, I will ask Steve Ashton to answer that.

Mr Ashton—There are two issues raised. With regard to the capacity of the infrastructure on the site, it is really a very good site from that point of view, principally because we have already had a major building on it for many years, which was the hospital. The site is actually very well served with infrastructure already. It has one of the major sewer lines which service Canberra running directly underneath the site. It already has a substation on the site. It has two main electricity supplies independently feeding the site, which presumably was as a result of its hospital use.

There has been an assessment done on the capacity of all other infrastructure services: gas, water and so forth. The preliminary engineering advice is that all of that capacity is available and is adequate for the buildings that are proposed. There is no significant upgrading of infrastructure required at this point, because of the amount that already exists. There will be some alterations to the infrastructure to accommodate the new plan. At this stage, those alterations are costed into the budget.

Mr FORREST—Does that same comment apply to road access, or are there going to be upgrades to intersections, particularly further away from the site, so that it is more accessible and more prominent for strangers to Canberra? I find one spends a lot of time driving around in circles trying to find the right place. Will that all be included, and is that in the cost estimate?

Ms Santamaria—Yes, it is. We are proposing to do a traffic study shortly.

Mr FORREST—I read in your submission about the activities of the private sector being involved in the development. How is that likely to work: by sponsorship, or by direct capital assistance? How does private sector involvement operate in a venture like this?

Ms Santamaria—When private sector support for the concept of the museum was first investigated a few years ago, the previous government had talked about providing half the capital infrastructure money, the idea being that the rest would come from the private sector. It became very apparent, even without the study which was executed at that time, that the private sector was not interested in contributing to infrastructure. As with most other cultural institutions, once they are constructed and once they have got something to offer, whether it be a major exhibition or, with Questacon, a touring exhibition, that is when the private sector is prepared to come in to support blockbuster exhibitions and programs of various kinds.

Mr FORREST—I am fairly satisfied, Mr Chairman.

Mr HATTON—Firstly, Mr Taylor, I wish to ask you about the importance of the co-location of your facility, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, with the National Museum. I preface that by making a point about the great American museums, entry to which is free because they are national museums. But, in the Washington Smithsonian Institution, research is co-located with the museum and is a vital part of its function. Do you see your co-location with the National Museum as providing that essential research and intellectual basis to make this a really significant museum?

Mr Taylor—The answer clearly is yes. In the view of my council and my staff, the institute adds value to the project in its own right, because of the nature, the quality and the standing of the institute, in terms of its operational environment having a national and international focus and reputation. But we also believe that we add value because of the fact that, in terms of co-location, we become part of a larger project which includes, of course, the National Museum of Australia, as well as the ACT Cultural Centre.

We believe that there are ample opportunities within the future of the project and the establishment of the project where synergy can be achieved between the two agencies. I am referring to the National Museum and ourselves now, in terms of both improving certain activities of the National Museum of Australia and improving, and looking for opportunities for, the activities of the institute.

I mentioned this morning that we see there will be opportunity for the institute to undertake research that will be of value to the museum in terms of forward planning of its exhibitions. It is also a wonderful opportunity for the institute to showcase our research

and other activities, purely and simply because we are part of a wider, broader project.

We mentioned briefly this morning that, until recent times, the institute's public face has been low profile. By our co-location into the Acton project, all of a sudden we have a broader, higher profile, which I am confident will allow us to become involved in many more research activities of national significance. We certainly look forward to doing that in partnership with the National Museum of Australia. I hope I have answered your question.

Mr HATTON—Thank you, yes. I go now to a slightly broader question. I come back to the process through which not just the site was picked—I will come to that a bit later—but also the process in terms of the design. It is very interesting. Mr Keniger, you indicated that there was an unusual two-stage process to selecting this design. There was a first and second stage. Seventy-six people put in a piece of A1 paper at the first stage, and then five were selected out of the 76. I think I can accurately quote you as saying that 'the selection process was absolutely impeccable from that point on'. In stage 1, was it not 'impeccable'?

Mr Keniger—Yes, it certainly was. I chose the wrong word. What I meant was 'absolutely conventional'. Both stages were conducted in an impeccable way. I used the word 'unusual' in that, for instance, if my advice had been sought earlier or if the institute had perhaps given better advice earlier, a more accurate way of describing the process would have been as a two-stage selection process. The first stage, although a competition, was much more like an expression of interest stage, and that was what constituted 'unusual' in my mind. But that stage was conducted in accordance with competition rules. It was conducted anonymously. The issue of fees was quite separate from the issue of selection, and it was impeccably conducted.

The second stage was exactly the same as the second stage of a conventional competition where there was a short list prepared and the short-listed candidates were invited to conduct further design work. If anything, it was unusual in that it was probably better remunerated than are most second stages of most competitions.

Mr HATTON—I note that the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, previously named in despatches by Senator Calvert, had a number of objections to the process. They indicated that they thought:

Rushing the design process on a national museum which will serve the nation for 100 years or more is ill-advised.

From what I can see, there was a five-month design process. How unusual or abnormal or how rushed is that?

Mr Keniger—The institute's concerns were not so much to do with the design

process for the competition but the design process beyond the competition. My reading of the competition process is that it was the right amount of time for the job that was asked to be done in order to select the architectural team, and that is proven by the outcome. There were five excellent submissions, and one, the winning scheme, is particularly so.

In terms of the ongoing design development, the institute was taking the view that more time in that process will be beneficial. There is no question that the more time that you have the more use you can make of it. But the reality of the project is that it has a very clear building procurement time frame. As a result of talking to the design team, I believe that the design team was satisfied that they had the time available to do the work according to time and budget. I hope that is a sufficient answer.

Mr HATTON—Yes. I have a rough recollection that there was some controversy about the initial appointment of members of the judicial panel and this resulted in the appointment of more members, one of whom I think was you. Could you give some background of this, either yourself or Ms Santamaria?

Ms Santamaria—The initial panel was the Construction Coordination Committee through which decisions are being made about the development of the facilities. There were not extra members added to it. It was always intended that there should be architectural advice available to it. What we did do, however, was to take the advice of the institute about appropriate architectural advisers. So the CCC, which is a five-member committee, serviced by a secretariat, acted as the jury, but they had lots of appropriate advice. They were not extended, however, in terms of decision making.

Mr HATTON—And you are entirely happy with the probity of the selection process?

Ms Santamaria—Totally.

Mr HATTON—Could you explain to me what the architects, the Melbourne firm of Ashton Raggatt McDougall, are doing in association with another firm? How does that work?

Ms Santamaria—I would like to ask Steve Ashton to answer that question.

Mr Ashton—It is quite a common arrangement in the architectural profession where firms come together for various reasons to carry out projects. In this case, we have come to an association with Robert Peck von Hartel Trethowan Pty Ltd, principally because of their presence and expertise in the Canberra market. The way that we will do that is we will establish a joint venture company which will be created solely for the purpose of carrying out the architectural commission for this project. That company will be managed by directors from each of our individual practices. It will acquire resources, both physical and human resources, as is necessary to carry out the project.

Mr FORREST—There is no proposal to link that to any building firm; it is purely professional architectural practice.

Mr Ashton—That is correct; it is purely an architectural practice matter.

Senator MURPHY—I would just like to ask a question in regard to the whole process that related to the selection of the final design team. You say that it was an international competition. What were the rules for the competition?

Ms Santamaria—The rules were contained in a series of briefs—design competition conditions.

Senator MURPHY—Were they based on international rules?

Ms Santamaria—They were certainly based on benchmarks like that. They were provided by the Royal Institute of Architects, the National Capital Authority and—

Senator MURPHY—Did they provide you with the rules for the conduct of your competition?

Ms Santamaria—What we had before us were copies of sets of rules, including some designed by the NCA and some designed by other governments, such as the ACT government in looking at the Kingston foreshore. There was plenty of advice to draw on in the construction of the design competition conditions, which we adapted, of course, to suit this particular competition.

Senator MURPHY—Because it was advertised as an international competition.

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—As I understand it, there are international competition rules that are set down by an organisation called UNESCO. Is that not true?

Ms Santamaria—I would like to take that on notice, Senator. Could I just add that what we were after was not a design, but a design team.

Senator MURPHY—Yes, I understand that. I am just really questioning the process that you went through to get your design team. If it was an international competition, as I understand, there was some criticism of the department with regard to the process that was used to select a design team.

Ms Santamaria—However, Senator, I think that criticism was related to other issues.

Senator MURPHY—Not as I understand it.

Ms Santamaria—What we have not done—

Senator MURPHY—With regard to the jury, as I understand it, from an international competition point of view—that is, in terms of getting an international design competition—that is what you said it was in your submission. It says there that you conducted an international design competition. At item 48, on page 9 of your submission, it says:

Preliminary design for the proposed facilities and associated site works has been developed through a two stage international design competition.

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—I just want to go back to a point you made. Did you say that the institute here provided you with the rules or at least some of the rules?

Ms Santamaria—No. What we sought from bodies was—

Senator MURPHY—I thought you said a second ago that the institute provided you with the rules.

Ms Santamaria—No. What we had was useful information from the institute, from the National Capital Authority and from other bodies. The fact that the jury itself was not composed—with the exception of one member, I think—of architects did not mean that the architectural advice that was provided was not of high quality. It was of absolutely superb quality and was influential in helping the committee, of which I was a member, look at particular design teams and the designs.

Senator MURPHY—I do not want to press the issue too much except that, if it was advertised as an international competition—and, as I understand it, there are international rules—I just wonder about the circumstances confronting international competitors that would submit to this at some cost. One would assume that they would expect the competition to have been conducted pursuant to international rules, when it apparently was not. Could I also ask you—

Ms Santamaria—However, about 10 international firms submitted entries.

Senator MURPHY—Yes, I understand that.

Mr HATTON—None of them got to the second stage.

Senator MURPHY—As Mr Hatton pointed out, none of them got to the second

stage. Nevertheless, that may not be a bad thing. At the start of your verbal submission, I understood you to talk about the funding for this proposal. Correct me if I am wrong, but I think you said there would be \$128 million from the Federation Fund. Could you read out the figures that you read out in your verbal submission?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—I think it was \$18.9 million, but I did not quite catch where you said that was coming from.

Ms Santamaria—Yes. What I said was that the government had agreed to \$151.9 million, excluding running costs. During the 1997-98 budget, the Treasurer announced a funding allocation of \$5 million and, on 10 November, the government agreed that funding for the project would come from the Federation Fund, comprising \$128 million for building costs and \$18.9 million for one-off establishment costs.

Senator MURPHY—So, in total, the money from the Federation Fund is about \$147 million; is that correct?

Ms Santamaria—That is correct.

Senator MURPHY—Can I go back to the issue of the design competition? When you came down to the final five, if you like, what was the brief for them? Am I to assume that the brief for the final five was contained in these two documents?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—Can I ask you, with regard to the costings that were provided, what was actually allocated for the task that was given to the design teams? What were they told?

Ms Santamaria—I would like to turn to Derek Berents from the project management team.

Mr Berents—Within that document there were budget costs allocated for each of the three facilities. I do not have the specific figures right in front of me, but I think it was \$47.9 million for the museum, \$10.5 million for the institute and an allocation of \$10 million for the landscaping component, which gave the architects an indication of the total moneys available for the construction of the project only.

Senator MURPHY—That is what they had to design?

Mr Berents—That is what they had to design for in terms of construction.

Senator MURPHY—Can I ask you this, Ms Santamaria: when you appeared before the estimates on 13 November, with regard to questions about the budget, there was no indication to any of the design teams that they could assume that there was more than \$68 million—which is what that totals up to? Were they required to actually keep to that budget?

Ms Santamaria—That is my understanding.

Senator MURPHY—Can I just remind you of what you said when you appeared before the estimates with regard to that matter? You were asked about the design teams keeping within the budget—and that is an important thing for this committee—and, when you were asked about the importance of it to the jury in making its decisions, you said it was considered by the jury to be vital. Is that still your position?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—What I would like to know then is this: with regard to the successful design team, did they meet the budget target?

Ms Santamaria—Yes. As I see it, it is regarded as vital. I understand that four of the five did not meet that target, but it was intended, as I think I said later in the estimates hearings, that there would be a number of months to refine the proposals before construction began. I am not quite sure into what detail I went, but I certainly made it clear that by the time the construction started these refinings would have taken place.

Senator MURPHY—The design teams were given a budget of \$68 million and, as you said, four out of the five came in above the \$68 million. As I understand the process, it was that some of these things could be pointed out to them and they may be asked to resubmit or refine their costings and come back and outline to the jury how they were able to achieve, if you like, the cost reductions. Is that how it worked?

CHAIR—Ms Santamaria, are you able to give us this advice, or should some other person be giving us this advice? Were you a member of that committee?

Ms Santamaria—I was a member of the committee.

CHAIR—So you are competent to give us advice as to what procedures took place?

Ms Santamaria—I believe so.

CHAIR—Fine.

Ms Santamaria—Certainly, on the day a series of questions were asked—

Senator MURPHY—Which day are you talking about?

Ms Santamaria—I am talking about the day when the jury made the decisions about the successful entry. That day was some time in October. I think it was about 23 October.

Senator MURPHY—It was on 25 October, I think.

Ms Santamaria—Sorry, the 25th.

Senator MURPHY—So you say that some questions were asked. It is important to us that we know that due process has been followed and that we know about the selection process and, in so far as taxpayers' dollars being expended are concerned, they are not going to blow out beyond all belief.

Ms Santamaria—Exactly.

Senator MURPHY—The reason I want to ask these questions is that I have a concern about that. Who was the person who was your quantity surveyor?

Ms Santamaria—Rory Pincott.

Senator MURPHY—Is he here?

Ms Santamaria—Our registrar, as I said earlier, was John Davidson, AM. He certainly looked into probity aspects of the competition throughout.

Senator MURPHY—I go back to the point you made about four out of the five coming in over budget. Is that right?

Ms Santamaria—I beg your pardon?

Senator MURPHY—Four out of the final five—

CHAIR—The short list.

Senator MURPHY—Four out of the five short-listed, when they put in their final submissions, were more than \$68 million. Is that what I understood you to say a minute ago?

Ms Santamaria—I did not speak in that detail. I said that four out of the five came in slightly over.

Senator MURPHY—Was Ashton Raggatt McDougall Pty Ltd one of those four?

Ms Santamaria—One of the four.

Senator MURPHY—Could you tell me how much over budget they were?

Ms Santamaria—I would need advice on that. I think I should take that one on notice.

Senator MURPHY—It is important, from the committee's point of view, in understanding the overall costs of this, given that the government has only approved \$151.9 million. If we have got a cost blow-out of somewhere in the vicinity of 30 per cent with regard to the design that has been proposed just for the buildings—

CHAIR—Are you prepared to give us a ballpark figure—you said that four out of the five were slightly over their target amount. Are you prepared to say to us it was one per cent, five per cent, 10 per cent or, as Senator Murphy has suggested, 30 per cent?

Ms Santamaria—Could I take a moment, please?

CHAIR—We will give you afternoon tea; how is that?

Ms Santamaria—That is very helpful, thank you.

Short adjournment

CHAIR—We will resume. I defer to Senator Murphy.

Senator MURPHY—I want to deal with the issue of costs, because it is an important issue. With regard to establishing the costs, I presume you had this process where Mr Pincott received—I guess that he was part of the committee, at the end of the day—submissions from the five teams. He would do an independent analysis of their costs. Is that right?

Ms Santamaria—That is correct. Each team had its costs consultant.

Senator MURPHY—That was their own?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—And the committee had Mr Pincott?

Ms Santamaria—We had Mr Pincott.

Senator MURPHY—Did Mr Pincott provide submissions to the jury about what he thought were the costs? Were there written submissions provided to the jury for their

consideration against the submissions from the teams?

Ms Santamaria—Mr Pincott's was available at the end of the process.

Senator MURPHY—A written one?

Ms Santamaria—I do not think it was written. It was available only at the end of the process. Before we continue—I am not attempting to divert at all from your issue—let me say that the jury were considering the capability of the teams.

Senator MURPHY—But you were considering the capability of teams within the guidelines set down in the brief. One of many was the cost. Another was the floor space. Is that right?

Ms Santamaria—That is correct.

Senator MURPHY—In the cost, there were components that had to be provided for. It is the cost that I want to deal with at the moment. As I understand your outline and Ms Casey's outline of the process before the estimates, all the teams had to comply with the guidelines. I hope that they would, because otherwise there would be little point in having them. That being the case, you employed the services of architects on the one hand to give you architectural advice and a quantity surveyor on the other to make sure that what you were being told by the teams in so far as the costs were concerned could at least be taken to be reasonably accurate. Did Mr Pincott—I think you said yes yesterday—provide the committee or jury with a written cost analysis of each of the submissions?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—Could you make those available to this committee, please.

Ms Santamaria—The fact is that they were estimates, as the convention for competition is like that. Designs at that stage were schematic. Four of the five came in within 10 per cent of the figure, which is the accepted tolerance for designs at that stage. As I said earlier, it is intended that the design, as it is developed, will be refined to meet that cost parameter. As I said in estimates and agreed again today, that is five per cent.

CHAIR—I do not want this to go on too far, simply because whilst I think you are quite correct in wishing to be assured that the price of construction under this design is going to be within the parameters set down by the government in terms of amounts of money, for us to demand all the working details of another committee is probably beyond our brief. So I think we are looking at an assurance that, whilst there may be some questions over, for instance, the fairness of the selection process, if one design team kept their particular design to that financial figure and their design lost competitiveness because of that, I think that is a question that we could address.

If, on the other hand, it was of a marginal nature and it was the view of this committee that that could be adjusted without any major loss of design integrity, then I think we should not pursue it too much further, simply because of the time available to us. I think what you need to do, Senator Murphy, is to get some assurances that, subsequent to the decision to select this particular design team, the budget can be met.

Senator MURPHY—Mr Chairman, I do not disagree with what you say, but as you know—and I know you totally agree and support this—we have a role to play in so far as ensuring that the costs are right is concerned. I do not want to see this committee's head or your head put on the chopping block for setting a budget blow-out of somewhere in the order of 30 per cent. That is what I am trying—

CHAIR—That is where we agree. But I think that is the assurance you need to get from the parties, not how they arrived at that because—

Senator MURPHY—I suppose what is critical in this is that there was an international competition run. If one team could submit a costing that was significantly above but then be given the opportunity—because that allowed them to be, say, more innovative—to be more generous with a range of things, are they then taken to task at some later point after they are appointed and told, 'Look, you've got to bring this back down to \$68 million worth'. All we see here, with the whistles and bells on, is that all of a sudden a lot of that disappears. I have some concern about that and that is what I am trying to ascertain. I ask Ms Santamaria, with regard to the 10 per cent as being the accepted figure: were all the teams told that they had a working range of 10 per cent?

Ms Santamaria—I would like to ask Stephen Ashton, as one of the teams, to make a comment.

Senator MURPHY—No, he may comment with respect to him and his company. I am asking you: were all the five teams told that they had a flexibility range of 10 per cent?

Ms Santamaria—No, they were not.

Senator MURPHY—Was Mr Ashton told?

Ms Santamaria—I do not believe so.

Senator MURPHY—So what was Mr Ashton going to tell me? Mr Chairman, with regard to Mr Pincott's submission to the jury, and he was the independent person who was given the various submissions from the teams, he was asked to cost them. That was to ensure that the costs were accurate. The reason why I am asking whether this committee could view both the final costings submitted by the teams and the cost analysis done by the independent quantity surveyor is very relevant. It is relevant in the sense that

if you have a budget set down in the criteria for \$68 million worth of buildings and you have a submission that comes in at \$68 million, or \$75 million, but the independent person costs it at much higher than that, then that is a cause for concern. It is something that we must consider.

That is why I asked to see that documentation because it will give us a final answer with regard to what we are going to get, how big a bang we are going to get for our buck. That is what is vitally important. That is the reason why I am pursuing that matter, Mr Chairman, because some of the evidence that was given to the Senate estimates committee with regard to that caused me concern.

If I can just go back to this question of the brief, this is the thing that all of the teams had to rely upon as their guide to what they were required to do. Also, in this brief it sets down a floor space requirement. Is that true?

Mr Berents—The brief gives an indication in terms of the room data sheets of the net requirements of various areas for the institute and the museum.

Senator MURPHY—Net requirements?

Mr Berents—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—How does one judge that? Is there a 10 per cent, 15 per cent, or 20 per cent flexibility up and down, or what?

Mr Berents—The net area is useable space; it is up to the—

Senator MURPHY—So that is a minimum, is it?

Mr Berents—That is the actual useable space that has to be provided.

CHAIR—Let me interpret. The reality is that net lettable area is net lettable area and everybody in the design business know what it is. So they are all coming in on exactly the same knowledge of what the brief is, irrespective of how they approached it. There is no flexibility, fundamentally, in net areas.

Senator MURPHY—So you would agree, Mr Chairman, they should not deliver less?

CHAIR—They would have to have a very good explanation for that.

Senator MURPHY—Okay. Ms Casey, with regard to what you said at the estimates in answer to a question from Senator Faulkner about the floor space, would you like to make any comment with regard to that?

Ms Casey—Do you want to remind me.

Senator MURPHY—Okay. I think you said that ARM did not meet the floor space that was required by the brief.

Ms Casey—I think I said they came in with less.

Senator MURPHY—With less floor space than was required by the brief. Is that right?

Ms Casey—That is right, but I would need to check that because we have yet to finalise—

Senator MURPHY—I am sorry, I just lost the place where I had that—

Ms Casey—the responses to Senate estimates and ensure that what we answer is accurate.

CHAIR—Senator Murphy, I think you have established the areas of your concern. But surely the questions you have got to ask relate to fairness. In other words, if some of the final five contestants were submitting proposals on a substantially more generous cost structure, then you would ask: did that disadvantage the party who met the cost structures? It appears that it might be the other way around because you are suggesting that there was even a smaller area promised. I guess the question therefore is: was the committee so convinced of the superiority of the design offered that they thought they were worthwhile situations; but, most importantly, is it a fact that you are now confident that the design as presented to this committee will meet those cost criteria?

Ms Santamaria—The answer is yes.

CHAIR—I think that is the extent to which we should pursue this matter. The issue of fairness has probably got to be dealt with back in the parliament. I am cognisant of that aspect. If that is the view of our witnesses at present—and there may be others who wish to contest that; I do not know at this stage—then I think we should try and move on, because I have a funny feeling we are going to be here all day otherwise and no further advanced. I am willing to let you ask another question, but I would then like to hear some new questions.

Senator MURPHY—Mr Chairman, thank you very much for that. Whilst there may be a question of fairness, and that is a very pertinent question, this design competition and the final appointment of the people involved a significant amount of money and the competitors went to a significant amount of cost—

CHAIR—I have raised the issue of fairness. I have raised the issue of whether we

are going to get value for money and got some answers. What I do not want to do, Senator Murphy, is just continue on having someone repeat that, because we should then have another session where we just get a record and we will all go home.

Senator MURPHY—I do not want to repeat it but—

CHAIR—I do not want to do that. I want to get the thing proceeding. I have tried to bring your points to a single question. I welcome you making another one, but please try and progress it. We are just going around in circles otherwise, making a point without getting anywhere.

Senator MURPHY—Mr Chairman, can I just say this: until such time as I am satisfied that what we are seeing in the plans there on the wall is accurately costed and is what will be delivered—

CHAIR—I have asked that question and the answer is yes. That is the point.

Senator MURPHY—I have not heard that question—

CHAIR—Well, I will ask it again. I asked the question: all things considered and at the point we are now at, putting aside the question of fairness in the process, is Ms Santamaria convinced that the project as presented to this committee today will meet those cost criteria on current day figures?

Ms Santamaria—Mr Chairman, I am.

CHAIR—So your answer is yes?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Mr HOLLIS—But how can you be so sure when you have said earlier that it was only a schematic thing? The whole detail is not there, yet you are under oath giving us an assurance that it will meet the guidelines. I have not seen one of these projects yet that has not blown out. But, even though it is in many respects in a conceptual stage, you are giving a guarantee under oath that all costs will be met.

Ms Santamaria—Yes, I am.

Mr HOLLIS—What will happen if it does not meet all the costs? If it is not within budget, what will you do?

Ms Santamaria—Could I tell you that the chairman of the National Museum, who is also the chairman of the Construction Coordination Committee and the jury, Mr Jim Service, has absolutely stated that the project will be met on time and on budget.

CHAIR—Taking Mr Hollis's point, that question is always asked in the context and that is why I used the words 'at present day costs'. We know that any project can be subject to escalation through inflation, industrial action or something of that nature. I guess there is the other question that we need to have answered at this time, because Senator Murphy raised the issue of the quantity surveyors. What I am trying to get to is some resolution of what I think is a legitimate line of questioning; I am not criticising that at all, I am just trying to get it resolved. On all the advice available to you, that is on the record presumably—and if it is not on the record, please tell us—is that the basis for your advice to us that it will meet budget?

Ms Santamaria—Yes, it is.

Senator MURPHY—That is nice for that to be said but different things were said at the estimates hearings, and that gives me cause for concern. I do not accept what we are being told. I want to satisfy myself, firstly, by having a look at the submissions that were put in by the five teams and, secondly, by having a look at Mr Pincott's quantity cost assessment of the respective bids. That will throw a lot of light on the whole question of cost. What is in? What is out? This guide here says that roads are in. Before the estimates hearings Ms Casey said that roads were out. I have no idea, at the moment, what is in, what is out, what is being paid for and how much. It is a responsibility of this committee to try to ascertain that. We are talking about a huge expenditure of taxpayers' money.

I have been on this committee a little while; Mr Hollis has been on it a lot longer. We had many debates with Australian Estate Management—when it existed—about the cost blow-outs that come before this committee. Ms Santamaria said that it was 10 per cent. I have a view that, right now, that design up there was costed well above 10 per cent. I suggest to you that it was as high as 30 per cent. I want to see what gets taken out for the 30 per cent. That is what I want to see. It is the responsibility of this committee to do that.

CHAIR—You have asked Ms Santamaria the question; she has given you an answer.

Senator MURPHY—No, she has not given me a sensible answer.

CHAIR—I am sorry about that. She has given you an answer. Whether you like it or believe it, she has given you an answer. I do not expect at this stage of the game that she will change that.

Senator MURPHY—She has not answered the question as to whether or not we can see those documents.

CHAIR—I am not sure that we have the right to see them.

Mr HOLLIS—With respect, Mr Chairman, we do have the right. As a parliamentary committee we can demand to see those documents.

CHAIR—I wanted to take that as a further step. That should be dealt with by way of further evidence. You cannot go on and on asking the same question and getting the same answer. If you want the documents, and we have the right to view them, then we should call the person who wrote them.

Senator MURPHY—Absolutely.

CHAIR—I am not objecting to that whatsoever. I am just telling you that you cannot go on and on.

Senator MURPHY—I do not want to go on and on.

CHAIR—Good. Let us agree on that.

Senator MURPHY—I am just trying to ascertain the differences in the answers and what really was costed in. There are two things: one on fairness and one on cost. They are the things that remain substantially unanswered and we have to get to the bottom of that. We have a responsibility to the parliament to do that.

CHAIR—Are there any other members of the present witness panel who were actively involved and who want to comment on those questions? I do not think it has to be someone who was a recipient. Are there any other persons present who want to advise this committee of the activities that occurred in that other jury committee? We do have some difficulties in terms of what they decided and what we decide.

Ms Santamaria—We could call on two witnesses: Professor Keniger and Rory Pincott.

CHAIR—Professor Keniger, would you like to address the committee on this issue?

Mr Keniger—I would like to speak more generally than just on the detail of the figures. I could compare the process, in terms of probity and fairness, with other competitions. The process adopted was exactly as Ms Santamaria spelt out. The review panel—the jury—examined each scheme. The chairman, Mr Service, had had a technical and a cost assessment prepared and they were available to the jury at the end of the review of each of the schemes. I was not a member of the voting panel, but my understanding of the process was that, at the end of the process, the five schemes were assessed on the design quality. The ranking of that was then set against a review of the other detail.

In terms of fairness, the five teams were treated equally and, in terms of compari-

son with other competitions, all five teams have reached a stage which you would expect at the end of the competition. The independent cost assessment does not agree with any one of the individual team's own assessment of their costs. Neither did it agree with the area assessment of any one team of their own area. That was the reason for having individual assessment and the reality produced by objective assessment was that four of the five teams were well within striking distance of the budget and were at an appropriate stage at the end of what is effectively a kind of sketch design, initial concept stage, that would enable the scheme to be developed to meet budget. In my opinion, four of the five teams could have done that without the loss of the quality of their scheme. I think that the cost consultant's advice is more or less exactly along those lines.

CHAIR—I will just comment at this stage because our secretary has drawn my attention to the fact that, as is the normal process in these inquiries, this particular group of witnesses are recalled at the end of all other evidence taken for the purpose of responding to other remarks. Mr Service, who is the chairman of the committee who was unavailable today, will then be present and I would suggest it might be in everybody's interest if Mr Pincott were invited to attend that briefing, too. Would you assure us that that could be done, to the best of his availability?

Ms Santamaria—Yes, absolutely, and I should tell you that Mr Pincott is sitting in the row behind us now.

CHAIR—Is he?

Ms Santamaria—So, if you would like to combine it with seeing Mr Service or—

CHAIR—I think so at this stage because I am concerned about the time and other witnesses to whom we have an obligation today. I think that matter could be best settled if both those parties were available to us tomorrow when we conclude our evidence. There may be other matters by then that they will be called on to address. Is that satisfactory to you, Senator Murphy?

Senator MURPHY—Mr Chairman, we might also see whether we can get the documentation that I was asking about.

CHAIR—If he is willing to bring that along we can deal with it. If it is to be dealt with in confidence we will have to consider how that would be done, remembering we will have opportunities to do that.

Senator MURPHY—Mr Chairman, can I just ask two more questions? Ms Santamaria, with regard to the \$68 million and the 10 per cent up or down, it is actually \$151.9 million, isn't it?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—It has always been talked of as \$133 million. But could you give the committee a cost breakdown in terms of the allocation of moneys to where. I know we have a very brief thing. I would like something a little different from that. If we have to have that in camera, that would be appreciated. We did receive a document which is just marked confidential. I assume it is from the department. I am not going to read any of the figures out, but I just would like something a little bit different from that because it just goes to orientation, all hours, public programs, administration, education. What I would like to know is: if it is \$68 million, what does that get in terms of that?

Ms Santamaria—So it is the actual construction that you are interested in?

Senator MURPHY—Yes, in terms of the fit out, where those moneys go to and what the remainder of the budget is intended for as well—out of the 68, what the remainder of the 151.9 is intended for. There was also a question with regard to infrastructure costs. I think it was indicated that roads, for instance, were not in; that that would come out of some infrastructure costs. Could the committee be told what that is and where it is coming from. I also ask Mr Keniger: what do you do nowadays?

Mr Keniger—What do I do?

Senator MURPHY—Yes.

Mr Keniger—I am the head of the School of Architectural Planning at the University of Queensland.

Senator MURPHY—Is that your only employment?

Mr Keniger—I act as adviser. I am on the design advisory panel for the Olympics; I am the chairman of the design advisory panel of the South Bank Corporation for the South Bank in Brisbane. I am not employed other than that.

Senator MURPHY—I understand it was indicated on the television monitor that you may have been working for ARM.

Mr Keniger—Oh! That was interesting!

Senator MURPHY—It was interesting to me, too.

Mr Keniger—I am not sure they would have me.

CHAIR—I want to try and move past this particular point. I think it has been well aired, and I did not want to interrupt, other than on the grounds that time is not exactly on our side. We now understand the information that will be brought to our attention tomorrow. I have a few questions that I would like addressed at this stage. We have

further submissions arising, particularly from the MBA here in Canberra. The plan clearly indicates that there are some discrete structures involved.

One of the questions I would consequently ask is this. Is it possible or practical in the interests of smaller building contractors—and I am not talking about someone who builds houses, but about people in that medium range of building construction—to call separate tenders for some of these buildings, so that there could be a more competitive environment provided by the smaller builders? In the end, this all comes down to the cost; but I am asking in practical terms. The answer might come from one of the witnesses with an architectural background.

Ms Santamaria—Chairman, I would like to call on Graham Thomson to deal with that question.

Mr Thomson—A number of options were considered for the most cost-effective way of delivering the project on time and within budget. As the committee will be well aware from previous experience, there are many contracting strategies that can be adopted to try to achieve those objectives. The MBA's submission deals with the concept of construction management and proposes it as the best way to deliver the project in order that the local trades and building community be given the best opportunity to maximise its involvement in the project.

The department has considered very many strategies for delivering the project and achieving those main objectives. It has formed the view that construction management is not the best way of delivering the project. There are a number of problems, as the committee is probably aware, associated with construction management as a project delivery vehicle. They include the fact that the works are let progressively as design develops, so the opportunity to introduce buildability into the design and maximise the building concepts—in particular, the mechanical and electrical services—at an early stage is not able to be achieved through construction management.

Where there are interfaces, the department takes responsibility for the interfaces, and that necessarily has a detriment. Usually, what flows from that are—I would say, as a partner of a law firm—the inevitable delay, prolongation and disruption claims. The department is concerned, of course, that whatever project delivery vehicle is adopted achieves a number of things. Firstly, the project has to be delivered by the due date. A project for the centenary that is not achieved by the centenary celebrations would be a rather embarrassing product. Secondly, maximum value must be delivered for the money, so that you get the best museum for the money that has been allocated in the budget. Thirdly, there is a desire to avoid disputation and inefficiencies at any stage of the project, including inefficiencies in terms of project management and also use of labour and trades on the project.

Taking all of those considerations into account, the department has decided that the

best project delivery strategy is a project alliance. Project alliancing is a fairly new contractual delivery strategy. It has been used around the world now, always by blue chip companies and always on major projects. The organisations that have adopted alliancing as a project delivery vehicle have been very mature companies with very widespread experience in all forms of project delivery vehicles.

The committee will be aware from the submission of some of the advantages of alliancing. The first is that it creates a single, integrated, high performance team for delivering the project, which avoids the usual man-marking associated with the construction industry. The second is that there is true sharing of risk and reward in the project, and all the usual grounds for extensions of time do not exist in relation to project alliances. Project alliances share the risk and reward on the true outcomes of the project and avoid the usual arguments and reasons put forward for non-performance. Project alliancing is all about performing. It denies access to the courts for things such as extension of time claims, prolongation claims and delay claims. They do not exist.

The department has decided that that is the most appropriate form of project delivery vehicle for this particular project. In relation to the opportunities that that provides for the building trades and the building industry in the ACT, assuming that that industry is efficient—and the department views that assumption as correct—in terms of the trade packages that are put together for delivery of aspects of the work under the umbrella of the alliance, project alliancing will certainly optimise what the department sees as the efficient parts of the building industry in the ACT being given every opportunity to be involved in the project. The converse of that is that the inefficient parts of the industry would not rise to the top.

CHAIR—While you have mentioned this alliance approach, considering that the architectural design team is already appointed—and, of course, you point out to us in the submission that, whilst this is a good idea, it is not a good idea if the architect cannot work with the builder—is it not the case that the horse has bolted on that? It strikes me that the proposition you put to us would be more appropriate if you had started on a design-and-construct premise: you would have gone out—and people would have come to you—as a team in the first instance, saying, ‘Here is our design and here is how much it is going to cost you, and we guarantee that price.’ You are now going to create an environment where the architects could be bullied into taking on a builder who says, ‘I can do it cheap, and you have got to live with me and you have got to share the risks.’ Is that a practical proposition?

Mr Thomson—It does not quite work like that. The—

CHAIR—It does, if you have already got an architect. The architect has been appointed. I can see where you are coming from if it is a design and construct proposition, but it is not.

Mr Thomson—There are always a number of possibilities with alliances. One is, as you suggest, that one goes into the marketplace and asks for a total alliance, with design and constructors coming together. The department's view, though, is that there are disadvantages associated with that. Primarily, when one is out looking for a design, the design is in essence for a 100-year building, and so the design is extraordinarily important. The design is a separate major issue.

What we do not want to do is lose the competitiveness of actually then selecting the best consortia of builders and mechanical and electrical services people actually to give effect to that design. If the department had gone out into the marketplace and asked for designers to come with a builder and mechanical and electrical services contractor, it would be to the detriment of the Commonwealth, in that you do not get the ability actually to match the best project delivery provider, in terms of builder and services, with the best design. Thus the department's view was that it was best actually to select the best design and then go competitively in the marketplace to get the alliance consortia. An important point that you make, Mr Chairman, and one that is absolutely valid, is that it is, of course, important that the architects work with the selected builder and it is not foisted upon the architects.

CHAIR—You are talking about time. You are suggesting that the next stage should be to go to a process of what we might call tender, at the end of which the architect might say, 'I couldn't work with that mob in a fit.' Where are we then? We are back to square one. As I say, it is my personal view that the horse has bolted as far as that particular concept is concerned. If you have a desire to finish this thing on time, that risk cannot be tolerated.

Mr Thomson—The risk is dealt with. In the selection process, the architect is an integral member of the selection process and, in accordance with the principles of alliancing, the architects—

CHAIR—How do we get the cheapest price?

Mr Thomson—There might be a misconception. Alliancing is not a lump sum contract. Alliancing is agreeing to—

CHAIR—That is not answering my argument as to how we get the cheapest price; that is telling me that it could be any price.

Mr Thomson—I am trying to think of the best way to formulate the answer without getting into too much detail at the first pass. Alliancing is about selecting the best, most efficient project delivery team. The assumption of alliancing is that one gets the best team and takes away the adversarial nature of delivering projects, so that all the focus and attention goes onto delivery, onto achieving the project objectives—and, as I said at the outset, not looking for reasons not to achieve them. The risk reward all hinges upon

achieving the project objectives. But that must produce the lowest cost for delivering the project because that is where the contractor maximises the returns. It is important to pick the most efficient team to deliver the project objectives.

The process has been gone through a couple of times now with the state government in New South Wales and it has been through the Independent Commission Against Corruption. Probity orders, internal and external, have been involved in the process to ensure that precisely those concerns have been addressed. The department has taken on board all learning from both private and government entities to ensure that the maximum bang for buck is achieved in this project.

CHAIR—Anyway, considering that may or may not be the view held by this committee and, looking again at the plan, you might advise me. On the plan to the left, there is a building. Is that the building that might be constructed by the ACT government or is that building included—this building that is completely discrete and separated from the others? Is this part of our current inquiry or is that the one that has been—

Ms Casey—Yes, it is part of it.

CHAIR—In other words, there is no interface of a physical nature with that building and the other buildings. What is the practical reason that could not be let to separate tender?

Mr Ashton—Quite apart from the advantages of alliancing with respect to the time frame that Graham mentioned, the practical reasons revolve around the nitty-gritty issues of having two or three different head contractors on one site. It is actually really asking for trouble.

CHAIR—Is that more chain wire, so we fence them separately?

Mr Ashton—It is rather more complex than that, because we have a common road system and we have a common set of underground services and infrastructure. We are planning to service all of those buildings with common infrastructure. To have three hard money contractors on the one site, I can tell you from direct experience, is really asking for trouble. It revolves around an endless series of disputes—such as who has damaged what bit of curb, who is using whose power, who caused whose industrial dispute. It is a recipe for a nightmare on the site. I think there are some very strong practical reasons why that would not be a good way to procure this project.

CHAIR—Let me put a question to you. We go into Collins Street or we go into St Georges Terrace and there are three separate contractors building three high-rise buildings within metres of each other: why don't they have that problem?

Mr Ashton—They do have that problem. We are trying to avoid that problem and

we have an opportunity to avoid it. It is usually very difficult on those sorts of sites.

CHAIR—I have some other questions, probably to you, Mr Ashton. In our recent inquiries and inspections for the Australian National Maritime Museum they drew our attention to the great problems confronting museums in terms of dust. In terms of your design concepts, are there any special measures being taken to pressurise buildings, as such? The terminology ‘dusty old museum’ is one we all understand. This is of interest to me.

Mr Ashton—Yes, Mr Chairman. There are a number of issues wrapped up in that question. We have paid, and we are paying, particular attention to the environmental conditions within the museum. Principally, we are controlling the environmental air quality—which is what dust tends to mean in those sorts of questions—through a series of graded zones where the level of control of the environment is increasing as you move through the museum until you get to the most sensitive parts. By the time you get to the most sensitive parts—areas such as the permanent exhibition—you are inside a space which is totally sealed to the outside. It has a skin within it which is separate from the external skin of the building, with a very high level of environmental control, including filtration, and a very high level of insulation. We have also been paying particular attention to the selection of such things as surface finishes, so that the materials in those spaces do not give off things such as particles or gases, and so forth. We are very much aware of that issue and we are addressing it in the detailed design.

CHAIR—Normally, fire protection is something that tends to be addressed to people. You are looking at some very valuable and, in fact, in some cases irreplaceable items. How much confidence can the committee have that fire prevention arrangements will include attention to the protecting of the asset as much as the protecting of the people? For instance, if there are valuable books, do we squirt water on them to put the fire out, or are there other alternatives?

Mr Ashton—There is a very detailed brief with regard to the various kinds of fire protection that are required within the building. These range from simple design measures, which are things such as escape distances, corridor widths, and so on, which are about getting people out, and that remains the No. 1 priority. However, a very close second priority is the protection of the valuable objects. There are a range of systems in there which, depending on their particular application, range from dry sprinkler systems which have no water in the pipes until such time as it is required, to systems involving fire suppressing gases which require no water at all. And there is also attention paid to the routing of any hydraulic services with respect to areas containing sensitive objects. We believe that we have probably got that one covered to the greatest extent that is practicable.

CHAIR—I am glad that that matter has been considered in the circumstances. The advice received is that, these being typically steel framed structures, quite a substantial

amount of work will be done off-site. Are there any special comments that you wish to make about that in terms of positioning the type of structures that you might bring in? Is it more just a case of the manufacture of trusses and such things, or do you actually see some unitising and relocation?

Mr Ashton—At this stage it is probably a little early to get specific in the area of unitisation, which may well apply to facade design when it is finalised. We certainly see some opportunities there. It is true to say that in our practice we are moving to take more advantage of what can be achieved through the fact that you can now provide very accurate descriptions of what is exactly required to fabricators via computer information.

The use of the steel structural system is driven by a number of factors, not the least of which is the desire to achieve a large clear-span space in the exhibition areas so that there are no columns for maximum flexibility of exhibition design. It is also related to the desire to be able to erect a weatherproof envelope of the building as quickly as possible within the overall construction program so that we can commence work on the internal fit-out works as early as possible. So that is driven by a programming issue as much as anything else.

CHAIR—Fine. On our physical inspection this morning, an issue arose regarding when you view the buildings as you see them—and considering that the focus of your gazing is to Lake Burley Griffin—that, in fact, as you sight it there in the second from the right, the administrative building has clear views of Lake Burley Griffin but the restaurant and some of the other display areas, which are really your major architectural statement, are hidden behind a series of pine trees and poplars, none of which could by any means be considered indigenous. I have already expressed a view, to be honest, that I think it is quite inappropriate that such trees be there in terms of the finished architectural product and, secondly, that they are not indigenous and it would be better if we had a design replacement of those trees with indigenous trees. Some of my fellow committee members may hold a different view on that as time goes by, so I am asking you the question. Would you see any problems with removal and replacement with more indigenous species in that area, but more particularly aimed not at having just a desert in front of those buildings, but so that there is a better view to the lake and from the lake?

Mr Ashton—Mr Chairman, we are very much aware of the issue that you raised on the site inspection this morning. Our view on that to date—and I must stress that we are still to do a detailed landscape plan—is that it is desirable that we enjoy views both from and back to the hall and the restaurant and cafe area from parts across the lake. We need to actually carry out a detailed investigation of that area to make final decisions. My estimation at the moment is that we will probably end up in a process where we are doing a little bit of a number of things.

First of all, advice from my landscape architect colleagues is that the nature of those trees in that area is such that they can take substantial thinning and pruning and still

remain healthy and active, so there may be some trees which we nominate for that kind of treatment. There may be some trees which are just downright in the way, so therefore we might look at actually thinning out the numbers of trees if that proves to be a problem. Underneath all of that, as we all know, trees do not live forever, so we need to have a longer term plan for bringing on the landscaping in that area over time.

CHAIR—Have you a preference for indigenous trees there?

Mr Ashton—No, we are not ideologically pure on that question. We believe that Canberra's landscape is, particularly around the edge, a mixture of types. We think that the maintenance of a mixture is acceptable in a design sense, but we do believe that the precise nature of the planting in that area needs careful consideration to address the issue you have raised.

CHAIR—Did you notice, when we drove around and sailed around, that the poplars are already growing out of the retaining wall around the lake?

Mr Ashton—We did notice that.

CHAIR—There is a message.

Mr Ashton—We are very concerned about the aggressive nature of the poplar root system vis-a-vis walls and buildings.

CHAIR—And sewer pipes. Thank you. I am nearly at the end of my questions, and I understand Mr Hatton has a couple more. I would just put on notice, coming back to the alliance approach, et cetera, that SOCOG have broken up their contracts out at Homebush, haven't they? 'Yes' or 'No' will do to that. I understand that there are a number of contractors out there.

Mr Thomson—There are big packages. Things like the multi-use arena are a package and the stadium is a package. They are large chunks of work, and each one is significant in its own right. One of SOCOG's concerns was not to let too much work to one contractor because it would just be physically impossible. They are very large projects in their own right.

CHAIR—Yes, I am aware of that. Could I move to other parties—I think it might be to Dr Jonas—for a comment that you may be able to put on the record—it does not have a lot more weight than that—but for other reasons. From my involvement in another entertainment industry, we are quite surprised at the actual statistics related to the attendance at museums. Are you able to advise the committee where public attendance at museums rates in terms of other sporting and cultural events?

Dr Jonas—Quite highly.

CHAIR—I think I could suggest to you that you might want to come back to us tomorrow and tell us that you are at the top. We racing people get quite put out about it, but I can tell you that we lead football. So you might be surprised. It is an interesting figure. I cannot go on the record, but you might choose to do so in terms of the reason that we should be spending all this money.

I have a final general question. As we left the property, the ANU buildings—which I understand will be your approach, your roadways—by my observation look pretty decrepit. Have you any comment as to what the future should be for those buildings in terms of what it means? Are they to be screened or are they to be upgraded? I think we have to put another question to you there in that, in correspondence with us, the university has expressed some concerns about traffic flows through the campus, so there seem to be two questions to be asked in that regard. Would you be prepared to comment on them?

Ms Santamaria—Those buildings which you found pretty decrepit are close to the hearts and minds of many people, either working at the university or even visiting there from time to time. One of the buildings is used by the UNESCO group. A number of them are also listed in I think the local register.

CHAIR—It must be the same architects that think the Cameron Offices have got some architectural appeal.

Ms Santamaria—They are more charming than the Cameron Offices, Mr Chairman.

CHAIR—I must get inside one and be convinced.

Ms Santamaria—But I will check. A number of them are listed in heritage registers. What I need to do is ascertain which buildings and which register. I think the ANU in its submission did express some concern about traffic. As we mentioned earlier, we are about to start a traffic study. The university also, I think, expressed its disappointment with our submission for not referring to the proximity of the Acton facilities to the university itself. So it seems that there are a couple of messages there. But we will certainly take up the issue of the buildings. The traffic study we are hoping will give us some very good answers in terms of access.

CHAIR—Just considering that there is quite a bit of synergy between universities and museums, particularly in the research area and particularly maybe in the space that might be protected or better available in terms of a museum, to what extent has that been given consideration? I get the message from the ANU that they feel that they probably have not been consulted as much as is appropriate in terms of where this whole thing is heading and, once the buildings are finished, I guess, or even in terms of that process, where they could be involved in a cooperative way.

Ms Santamaria—I think there are lots of opportunities. I think the humanities research centre is engaged in much activity which has linkages with museum activity. I think that we will take up those opportunities. I spoke to the vice-chancellor last Thursday about that particular issue.

CHAIR—Thank you. Dr Jonas.

Dr Jonas—We are having ongoing talks with the ANU on a range of issues, including buildings and grounds, catering facilities and academic links. At our last meeting, council discussed the possibility of working closely with the academy of the humanities. We are really very interested in pursuing research cooperation, because the one thing that this museum will be based on is research. We have started as many talks as possible in the name of being good neighbours with the ANU.

CHAIR—You might also like to put on the record something which arose from our inquiries with the maritime museum and which, if I may, I will refer to as the changing culture that exists in the museums these days. Historically, they were a place of stuffed animals, and we know that is no longer the case. Do you want to put something on the record relative to how this place will operate internally and why it will be different from past and even from more recent museum developments?

Dr Jonas—Yes, I would like to do that and thank you for the opportunity. Unlike many other museums such as those museums that you have alluded to, the National Museum of Australia is a social history museum. It is not a museum which is based on large collections and the desire to show those collections and to disseminate information through the display of those collections in some sort of classificatory or taxonomic way like the natural museum histories of the past.

What we are interested in and what we are charged with doing is telling the wonderful story of Australia. We are telling that through three themes; the social history of the last 200 or so years; indigenous peoples' history and cultures, and people's relationship with the environment. We want to tell that story by integrating those three themes and using whatever methods are at our disposal to best tell those stories, remembering that, as a museum, objects and collections of objects are still our primary way of telling those stories. We are going to tell those stories and make them accessible to as many of Australia's population as we can through exhibits of objects, using all of the various forms of technology which are now at our disposal. We were talking just over afternoon tea about how many of us knew about the Internet 25 years ago when this museum was being envisaged. How many of us knew about the Internet five years ago, yet we are all on the Internet today. We are going to be a museum for the 21st century, telling the story of Australia in the best way that we can.

CHAIR—Thank you very much. Finally—my colleagues are probably wondering when I am going to finish but this is only evidence of how many questions they forgot to

ask—I want to go to Russell Taylor to ask about the involvement of Aboriginal research in two areas. I thought you might want to explain to us particularly how, in terms of your research institute, you will be able to involve the public. As I have expressed to you in our inspections, we are talking about a museum and the public perceive that as somewhere they can go—in particular, how what might otherwise be an overcrowded situation will be addressed. You might also—and I think it is reasonable that you do—comment on the economic benefits that you expect Aboriginal people to achieve from this, as compared with the other ways that governments spend money in that regard.

Mr Taylor—Thank you, Mr Chairman. In answer to your first point, I think I mentioned in an earlier answer that the institute really has had a low profile and a limited or restricted interface with the public. There is absolutely no doubt that the new development on Acton will allow the institute to do several things that it does now in a much better and more effective way. The main thing is making the information and knowledge that we hold in the institute much more accessible to the public. In the interests of brevity I will say that we are looking for new premises to do that in the development and we are looking also for a systemic answer as well. In conjunction with our planning to move into the new Acton premises, we are also looking at the acquisition of systems that will allow us to make far more information available in a much more user-friendly way.

You had, in terms of our visit this morning, a very brief experience in terms of limited space, limited use of technology and limited use of staff. Acton represents a wonderful opportunity to address some of the restrictions that are placed on us at the moment, particularly as we are going from operating premises, in which we are only the tenant and have limited ability to change to our needs, to a purpose built building which will, apart from allowing more space, be ergonomically and economically more efficient in terms of public access, comfort and use, and staff being able to manage our collections much more effectively and in a much more user-friendly way.

If there is one strength in the decisions associated with the project, from the institute's point of view, that is the main benefit and the main reason why we are very keen to be involved in co-location. It really affects all aspects of the institute's operations, but it will manifest itself in the strongest way in the orientation and entrance points of the institute and obviously in the operations of our library, which will be the front window for the public to come into the institute and have access to our resources.

On the question of economic benefit, I think there are a number of issues. I guess it will enable us to work smarter rather than harder. It will enable us in the institute to use public funding that we have available at the moment much more economically. It will enable us to pursue an expanded range of research activities as well, from an economic point of view. I know that Mr Evans raised the question of revenue. There is no question that the institute's location in Acton will enable us to maximise opportunities for revenue in terms of the sale of our books, CDs and other products that we produce. You saw the *Encyclopedia of Aboriginal Australia* as well as the maps that we produce. We believe

that our involvement in the Acton project, because of the national focus and the visitations, really represents an opportunity for us to reduce our reliance on the public purse.

Also, through the systems that I talked about and, as Dr Jonas mentioned, the use of Internet and the World Wide Web, we intend to ensure that Acton is an opportunity for us to become far more accessible to the general public and certainly to indigenous communities which also use that technology and want to embrace a closer relationship with the institute, the museum and the cultural centre. Generally, in terms of economic benefits, I guess they are specific in terms of being cheaper and having more ease of access for indigenous communities in terms of our information and the use of that information. They are broad in the sense that it will enable the institute to become more efficient and effective in the use of the public funding that we enjoy at the moment.

CHAIR—Thank you.

Mr HATTON—In real estate they say there are three factors: position, position, position. This is a great position, stuck right in the middle of Lake Burley Griffin. Given its central position, is this the jewel in the crown for the department of communications and the arts? Given the location of the National Museum here, could that be seen as the jewel in the crown of the department?

Ms Santamaria—I would like to see it become that. The fact of the matter is, as you know, most of our national institutions are around the lake shore. We do feel a sense of family with all the institutions and, without wishing to sound tawdry, an affection for each of them. I certainly think the design has the capacity to achieve that status, but there are a number of jewels in the crown.

Mr HATTON—The committee certainly moved very quickly once the Acton land was available and the land swap had been done with the ACT government to choose this site and overthrow Yarramundi Reach. Is it the location factors, and the factors underlying that which you have just mentioned, which really helped to overthrow Yarramundi Reach? Is it the fact that it is so central and it is where the other national institutions are?

Ms Santamaria—It was certainly a significant factor—it certainly was. It was not, indeed, the first time that the Acton facility had been looked at. As recently as 1994, I think, that site was being looked at for the National Museum.

Mr HATTON—We have had a comment from Mr Thomson that this is a 100-year building, and you have given some remarks previously indicating that expansion would not be a problem—certainly in the next 30 years. My guess is that this is a major and significant national building and we should be looking at a 100-year time frame in regard to the adequacy of the site.

Given that lots of other national museums are on very small sites, the constraints

seem to be built in here in terms of any future expansion. You indicated there did not seem to be any for 30 years but for 30 years plus, given that we do not have a resolution of the car parking issue for the staff—we do not really know what is going to happen with that—and the department has not worked out yet whether they are going to charge people to go into the place and we have not had a road study yet in relation to it, how much forward thinking beyond 30 years, if you had to expand, as you may well have to, have you done?

If I could ask you that question first, Ms Santamaria, and then I would like to continue that question with Dr Jonas in terms of the conjunction between this and the rest of the collection. Where are you going to store everything? Also, what is the possible future for Yarramundi Reach?

Ms Santamaria—Can I invite Steve Ashton to comment on part of your question?

Mr HATTON—Certainly.

Mr Ashton—There are a couple of issues I could comment on there. Firstly, with regard to the road study that you mentioned, there was a traffic study done as part of the overall site selection process so that when this site was selected there was some understanding of its capacity with regard to roads vis-a-vis the other sites, although I was not directly involved with that. I just mention that for your information.

With regard to expansion on the site, we have given some thought to how physical expansion could take place on the site, notwithstanding the fact that it is seen as unlikely within that 30-year time frame but understanding that, hopefully, this will be there for much longer.

Mr HATTON—That was a proposition with the Old Parliament House too, that it was unlikely it would need to expand.

Mr Ashton—It is a good lesson, I am sure. Just to give some perspective of the size of the site, firstly, whilst in one sense the site can be described as constrained, it is about 12 hectares. The footprints of the buildings that are on it, in broad terms, are around 24,000 square metres, which is only about 20 per cent of the site. One should not despair too much about the capacity of the site in terms of expansion in the general sense. There is really quite a lot of unbuilt site.

Secondly, we have specifically examined the museum because that is the facility that the department feels is most likely to have a major expansion requirement. Without too much difficulty, we can see ways that several thousand square metres can be added to the exhibition space—indeed, it could be more, if that were required—and that is getting on for a 60 to 70 per cent increase in the exhibition space. There are other, more radical, options as well which we have considered. So we are reasonably comfortable at this stage

that there are a number of possibilities, and we have looked at them far enough to know that they actually can be done. We have considered items such as, within the overall museum planning, siting functional groups within that plan in such a way that we do not have to move the expensive bits later on to do the expansion, wherever that is possible. It is certainly a question we are mindful of in the design.

Mr HATTON—Just before I throw in a bit of a curly one that will be grist to the mill with regard to this, I would like to ask Ms Santamaria a question. In relation to Yarramundi Reach, in previous evidence you indicated that, out of the 80 or so hectares there, there would probably only be about 10 hectares that would be useable.

Ms Santamaria—I did not indicate that.

Mr HATTON—But you indicated that there would not be very much that would be really very useable?

Ms Santamaria—No, I do not believe I said that either. I did say that there were problems with part of the site. You could certainly quantify that element of the site that has the endangered species on it.

Mr HATTON—Given that there has been a lot of investigation of that site previously from those environmental viewpoints, do you have any idea of how much of that is useable or not?

Ms Santamaria—For some reason, two-thirds sticks in my mind, but I could be quite wrong so I would rather take that on notice.

Mr HATTON—Dr Jonas, I will throw in some material that will directly bear on where this questioning is going and will allow you, I think, probably to rebut. It goes back to the questions of what the nature of the museum is, what was the nature conceived previously and how that could fit into Yarramundi Reach. What is the nature of this museum and is it in fact constrained by this site in terms of what was originally seen? Has the facility here had to be developed in a particular way and the philosophy changed in order to meet space requirements?

Given that the only really cheap way you could do this is a virtual museum, which is something that lots of people are doing in the future, this is a fairly hard-hitting comment in regard to the report from Emeritus Professor D.J. Mulvaney, who was on the committee of inquiry on museums, who was also on the interim committee of the National Museum and is a former chair of the council of AIATSIS. This is his argument:

. . . space available on the peninsula, and also in the exhibition space is totally inadequate to the Museum envisaged since the 1975 report. It may constitute a fine amusement park, but this concept presents a great case for retaining Yarramundi Reach for future expansion, including major nationally significant buildings, and equipment, which requires relocation and preservation. . . .

Compared with the areas for exhibition (internal galleries) in recent national museums an area of 5,300m sq is quite inadequate.

You might like to respond to that as well as to the general points that I put forward.

Dr Jonas—In relation to the expansion question, most museums expand because they need more space for their collections. We are a museum which is not so much collections based as ideas based. We do have space for collections out at Mitchell. Any museum at any one time only displays about three per cent of its collections. We will certainly be doing that.

I think, because I was not around 25 years ago and ideas have changed a lot in the last 25 years in terms of museological practice, there was an idea to recreate large parts of Australia on a large area of land in which to tell the Australian story. We know that you do not need to do that. We do not need to build another old Canberra at Yarramundi Reach to tell the story of Australia. We do not need to build another Old Sydney Town on Yarramundi Reach to tell the story of Australia.

Eleven hectares is actually a very large museum. Most museum directors that I know all around the world would kill for the opportunity to have 11 hectares on a peninsula like this one. It is very large. It is, in fact, the equivalent of four Sydney Opera Houses and surrounds. There is an enormous amount you can do there. And what is more, there is an enormous amount that you can do these days using modern technology. And to suggest that the use of modern technology is turning us into either just a theme park or a virtual reality museum is to totally miss the point of what we are doing.

The committee saw this morning just the surface of the collections that we have. You really saw only a little bit of that and we do have quite magnificent collections to display. But, as I have said before, in order to tell the story properly so that as many Australians as possible can see, hear and enjoy the story, we are going to be using as much as we can of modern technology. That is not turning us into a virtual museum, but rather it is integrating our collections with the best ways we have got of presenting them. I think that we have got an opportunity to build an absolutely magnificent museum on a very large site. We do not need more space than that at the moment. By the way, the actual exhibition space is 7,800 square metres, not the smaller 5,000 version.

I think you asked, then, about future expansion to Yarramundi. I have not really got much comment on that. I think that this site is quite adequate. I certainly think that this site is adequate for 30 years and beyond. As I said, one of the main reasons that museums want to expand is that their collections grow so much. There are other ways that you can deal with the increased demand for people to see what you have got. One way is turning over the temporary exhibitions, as they were called this morning. They are called temporary because they are not in the same category as the permanent ones—they do not last as long. If we want to call them rotating exhibitions, we can. One way is to rotate

them more quickly.

Another way—and I have a lot of faith in this without actually being able to say how it might be done but—I would have thought is that 30 years down the track the technology that is going to be available to us to augment the collections and to change our exhibitions over very rapidly is something that at this stage we cannot even imagine. I suggest, with all due respect, that Professor Mulvaney is 25 years behind the time in the comments that he is making.

Mr HATTON—You have got a lot of storage areas in the collection—we saw only a fraction of those. Over time you will, in fact, add to those. Will you retain those storage areas? You are not trying to move all of those onto this site, are you?

Dr Jonas—No.

Mr HATTON—You will move a part of those.

Dr Jonas—That is right.

Mr HATTON—But those storage areas will need to be retained?

Dr Jonas—That is right. The bulk of the collections will stay off-site.

Mr HATTON—And it will be extended some time. Might I suggest that one of the key aspects of this would be to extend the virtual museum to the rest of Australia for all of those people who cannot get to Canberra and never will be able to get to Canberra? Apart from the travelling exhibitions, they could see the collection on the Internet because the capability of our accessing that will be within most people's reach in the next few years.

Dr Jonas—That is very much part of our planning, and this particular design takes that into account. It has always been one of my dreams that little kids in Yuendumu who, like most non-Aboriginal kids are computer literate before they are print literate these days, can have a museum experience on the Internet. This is one way that we are going to be able to do it.

Mr HATTON—Thank you, Dr Jonas.

Senator CALVERT—I just want to reiterate that I was quite shocked to see the conditions under which you have to do your research. I think that it is important that that important work is relocated. In relation to the rotating or temporary exhibition gallery, you say in your submission that it will host blockbuster exhibitions. What sort of expertise has the museum had in staging blockbuster exhibitions?

Dr Jonas—We have not had any expertise because we have not had anywhere to put them. What we have had a lot of expertise in is either developing our own exhibitions and then touring them around the country—and some of those have been extremely popular—or brokering other exhibitions which have been developed by other museums and toured around the country. We have not had any expertise yet in the blockbusters, the really big ones.

Ms Santamaria has just reminded me that there is lots of expertise we could call on. For example, the former chairman of the museum, Dr Bob Edwards, has brought the current Rembrandt exhibition to Australia and he has had lots of experience in that regard. We were talking to him about other issues as recently as last Friday.

Senator CALVERT—Also in your submission there is some talk about sponsorship. Did you have private sponsorship in mind when you talked about the digital theatre? Could you tell me a bit about that?

Dr Jonas—We have not gone very far down the sponsorship road yet, as Ms Santamaria said before. Approaching people for sponsorship is not really very successful until you have something to offer them as well. We now have a marketing manager and we are currently working on ways that we might begin to approach potential sponsors. There will be more of that as the profile of the National Museum is lifted, especially once the building gets under way. Beyond that I really cannot say any more, except that on a recent overseas study tour we saw that the national museum at Edinburgh had been approaching large corporations, the equivalent of our Telstra and so on, in the area of information technology, which is where the digital theatre would fit in. Certainly, we would be keeping all of those things in mind.

Senator CALVERT—Sponsorship is used in some of the rotating exhibitions, of course.

CHAIR—You are going to find that when you are producing blockbusters is the time when people are going to want to associate themselves with displays.

Senator CALVERT—I was interested in looking at the report by the advisory committee. You had 130-odd individual submissions regarding the museum. Were they all supportive or were there some that were not supportive?

Ms Santamaria—Of the museum or the site?

Senator CALVERT—In this particular document you have a list of all the people who made individual submissions. I was curious to know whether they were supportive.

Ms Santamaria—They were certainly all supportive of the museum.

Senator CALVERT—The large majority were?

Ms Santamaria—Yes, they were.

Senator CALVERT—Getting back to Mr Thomson, he was talking about the project alliance delivery mechanism over a period of time. We have had different approaches mentioned. Is there much difference between the turnkey approach and the project alliance approach?

Mr Thomson—Yes, there is a large difference. In a turnkey contract one tries to bundle everything together and leave it to the other party. The department would be standing to one side. A turnkey contract involves the designer and the like. The department does not want that approach in this case because it is a long-term project, it is a national monument. Through the course of developing the project the department will have a strong input from the design point of view. Therefore, that argues strongly against the turnkey approach.

The other problem with a turnkey approach is that you would have to say, ‘We have now fixed the design. We have to put a lump sum price on this and we will hold you to the lump sum price.’ We are just not in a position to do that at the moment.

Turnkey is not a desirable strategy in the time frame that is available, or for the product that we are trying to deliver. Turnkey is more suitable for an office block or for a power station and that sort of thing where you are quite comfortable that you know your performance criteria and you can bundle it up in a contract document. You do not want to have any involvement over the course of the job so you just leave it to the consortia to produce the product for you.

Senator CALVERT—So the project alliance method is a bit more like the process that was used in this place we are sitting in now—Parliament House. Would that be right?

Mr Thomson—No.

Senator MURPHY—If that is the case, it might save us an—

Senator CALVERT—Do you intend to use the value management process that is used in large construction projects at all?

Mr Thomson—It comes in very strongly. One of the biggest advantages of alliances is that you get the entire team together very early and that includes, in particular, mechanical and electrical services. There is a huge contribution for the builder and the mechanical and electrical services people to make in the conceptual design stage to improve the value of the building in terms of buildability and the like. To introduce those people at this stage of the project and carry out design optimisation workshops and studies

is going to produce true value engineering results. The risk reward structure encourages that because it rewards all the participants for the value that they produce.

In terms of the project from the department's point of view, it is not so much a matter of cutting costs as such as reinvesting those savings back into the project. To use a fairly tacky term, it is the sort of bang for buck approach that the department is looking for. They want to get the best possible product for the amount of money that is available.

Senator CALVERT—Would you have a constant review process going on?

Mr Thomson—That is right. It starts with setting stretch objectives, but it is really looking for breakthrough performance and that is what alliancing is about. It is an approach to produce results that everyone else in the industry talks about—continual improvement and the like. Alliancing is different from that; it actually looks for breakthrough performance so it targets a different objective. It is a real stretch target that alliancing sets out to achieve.

Mr FORREST—Concerning that arrangement, who is it that is actually supervising the Commonwealth's interests?

Mr Thomson—The Commonwealth is an active participant in the alliance. Alliancing is about the parties adopting a best for project approach. When you come to an area such as quality assurance, the parties say, 'What is the best quality assurance we want in this project; who is best to actually carry out the quality assurance?' The department may have a member of that quality assurance team and the contractors may—you may decide that, as a group, you want to go out and pick an individual out in the marketplace who is excellent at quality assurance and bring him into the team.

In terms of the department's overall interests, the department has its project manager in the team itself. The project manager is looking at the department's overall interests. But what is being avoided in an alliance is the man marking so you do not have an inspector watching an inspector. You avoid that situation.

Mr FORREST—I will put it to you another way. Let us say there is a monumental geological disaster we were unaware of and it is realised that millions of dollars have to be used to compensate for that and that then results in some other feature of the total plan having to be cut back. Who makes that decision if it occurs?

Mr Thomson—As to the final quality of the product, the department makes the decision. How you deal with a particular problem is a collective decision, so that the way forward is agreed collectively, but the decision of what you want at the end of the day has to reside with the department because it is your money that is being spent. It is Commonwealth money that is being spent and you have to ensure that what you get at the end of the day is what you want. The setting of the goals is by the department; the way of getting

there is agreed between the parties.

CHAIR—Right. Senator Murphy.

Senator MURPHY—With regard to the questions that were raised by the MBA, there is one question in particular. You say in your response that you decided, ‘Look, the construction coordination committee and the department decided to try project alliancing.’ MBA raised the question: on what basis do you do that and what is the evidence around the place that suggests that that is the best option?

Mr Thomson—It is very fair to say that alliancing is a new project delivery strategy. In Australia there have been, I think, 10 full project alliances. There has been no litigation anywhere in the world on an alliance to date. Alliances have produced some really extraordinary results on a number of the projects that have been carried out and the experience in Australia has been very good.

It is true to say that an alliance has not been adopted on a building project before, but the principles that underlie alliances started in the oil and gas industry, and have moved into the resources and computer industries. They are in the building industry and are even heading into litigation to run litigation by alliances now.

Senator MURPHY—With regard to this project, you have got a timetable and a cost that has got a 10 per cent variable in it. How do you deal with some of the problems—even like the ones Mr Forrest asked about—which can occur? I think the MBA highlighted some problems of the past—done, yes, under different circumstances, but if it comes down to the construction of it, it would not be the first time. Let us assume that problems may occur under a project alliancing system. How do you deal with those?

Mr Thomson—Correct me if I am not picking on the sort of issue that you are talking about, but a good example is Wandoo alliance, which was a project alliance carried out in Western Australia. There was a casting base and a bund wall failed—a geotechnical problem—and it flooded. The alliance participants speak about the strength of the alliance in those circumstances. That would have stopped the project ordinarily for two or three months because no-one would have been prepared to spend a large amount of money until responsibility had been resolved for the issue.

In an alliance with the risk award structure, a problem like that affects both parties. Everyone suffers pain in that situation, so the issue is: how do we get out and fix it? There is no blame associated with it so one person cannot take the other to court. The pain is being shared on the basis of the pre-agreed risk award structure. The goal posts are not shifted. The obligation to finish on time remains the same; there is no such thing as an extension of time for latent conditions. It is a true project objective, so the issue for the parties is really twofold: firstly, how do we get over the immediate problem and, secondly, are there any lessons to be learnt so that we do not make that problem again in the future?

Senator MURPHY—With regard to the risk reward process: does it work the same way when you get confronted with potential cost blow-outs?

Mr Thomson—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—This is a new project. It is more likely to occur on some—

Mr Thomson—The parties share in the cost overruns and also in the cost underruns. The cost overruns are usually capped at a level where the contractor does not make any profit and gets no overhead contribution to the works at all. So it suffers a loss depending on how you count the numbers—

Senator MURPHY—And that is all agreed before?

Mr Thomson—That is right.

Senator MURPHY—Concerning Australian content, I note that you say ‘where possible’ in response to the question that was raised about not setting a specific reference or measure in terms of Australian content. That worries me somewhat. I would prefer ‘to the maximum extent’.

Mr Thomson—I speak, generally, on the industry approach as just a project person. Someone else on the panel might care to comment on specifics for—

Senator MURPHY—I guess my concern is that I have seen this ‘where possible’ thing before. When this committee has raised questions in the past about some relevant issue arising, the answer is that you were not aware of it. It gets fobbed off to that degree. It is more important in constructing a national museum that to the maximum extent possible we use Australian.

Ms Santamaria—Yes, absolutely. I would like to ask Ms Casey to speak to that point.

Ms Casey—Yes. We should have used the words that you have just espoused because that is what we mean: to the maximum extent. There may be however a couple of areas in relation to the digital theatre where we may need to use equipment from electrosonics. That is the only area where there may be a possibility. Throughout the rest of the museum we are envisaging that it will be all Australian.

Senator MURPHY—We might have to rectify it to say ‘to the maximum extent’.

Ms Casey—Okay.

Senator MURPHY—I would like to ask a question which relates to the stuff I

asked earlier, but would be helpful for tomorrow. It goes to this question of \$133 million versus \$151.9 million.

Ms Casey—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—In everything that has been prefaced, and even in the estimates process, everybody talks about \$133 million. As I understand, the department have approval to draw down \$133 million. Where did the other money come from? How did that get into the equation, because the budget estimates and the budget documents would indicate that at best—

Ms Santamaria—The \$133 million is the construction cost and the other \$18.875 million is the exhibition fit-out. That is specialised exhibition fit-out for the building. There will clearly be more exhibition fit-out to suit particular exhibitions when they come in, but the \$18 million is to cover that specialised fit-out.

Senator MURPHY—When we were talking about this before I thought you said \$128 million, plus \$18.9 million, I think. I am just trying to understand these figures. I thought you said earlier when you read out from your verbal submission—

Ms Santamaria—I did. But \$5 million came from the budget this year.

Senator MURPHY—So that is how you get your \$5 million?

Ms Santamaria—Yes.

Senator MURPHY—I see. That is all right.

CHAIR—Thank you. We can call the initial evidence of these witnesses concluded at this stage. I thank all members of the committee for their questions, which have given us an excellent record. We are hoping to continue for a while, if other witnesses will accommodate us, because we are well behind our schedule—but to good purpose. We will have a short break and then move on to the National Capital Authority.

Short adjournment

[5.28 p.m.]

RATCLIFFE, Mr Michael, Chief Executive, National Capital Authority, 10-12 Brisbane Avenue, Barton, Australian Capital Territory 2600

SMITH, Mr Andrew, Senior Architect, National Capital Authority, 10-12 Brisbane Avenue, Barton, Australian Capital Territory 2600

WILLIAMSON, Ms Gay, Director, Landscape Architecture, National Capital Authority, 10-12 Brisbane Avenue, Barton, Australian Capital Territory 2600

CHAIR—The committee has received a submission from the National Capital Authority dated 28 November 1997. Do you wish to propose any amendments?

Mr Ratcliffe—No, Mr Chairman, other than a brief introductory remark.

CHAIR—It is proposed that the submission and the response by the Department of Communications and the Arts be received, taken as read and incorporated in the transcript of evidence. Do members of the committee have any objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The document read as follows—

CHAIR—I invite you to make a short statement in support of your submission before we proceed to questions.

Mr Ratcliffe—The National Capital Authority is responsible for the national aspects of the national capital; therefore both the Acton Peninsula and the National Museum project come within the authority's purview. The authority is the manager of the land at Acton Peninsula upon which the National Museum and the AIATSIS facilities are proposed to be constructed. The authority will have ongoing management responsibilities for the public realm areas of the peninsula, post-construction, and following resolution of the management interfaces and agreements with the facility operators. The authority is also responsible for approval of the works under the provisions of the Commonwealth's Australian Capital Territory Planning and Land Management Act.

Overall, the authority supports the development of the museum and the AIATSIS facilities as significant contributors to the role and functioning of the national capital. The building concepts are consistent with the planning principles for the site, and queries which may be raised by the authority are capable of being redressed in the design development and works approval phases. The status of the design resolution is not atypical of major projects at this stage of their planning. Some of those more particular items are outlined in the authority's submission. I would be pleased to respond to questions on other matters of detail.

CHAIR—Thank you. I now refer to my colleagues for any questions they might have.

Mr FORREST—I noticed your last comment about the nature of the buildings. If you look at the model that is currently before us the most prominent building is the restaurant area. The museum appears less relegated in scale, which is not consistent with the computer images we were shown. What status does this model in front of us have, or should we disregard it?

Mr Ratcliffe—I would regard the model as no more than a block model, a basic indication of the massing of the main building elements. The drawings are probably more illustrative, but even then I would regard that as no more than an architectural concept. It would still have to go through a design development or a refinement phase. Indeed, there are minor matters that the authority would wish to see resolved further, such as car parking, and there are other matters that need to be addressed, such as minor points of facade presentation and perennial questions like which trees are to be kept or removed and so on.

Mr FORREST—Will that include aspects relating to traffic management, car parking and all the infrastructure questions in the broad? Do you currently have any concerns about any one of those?

Mr Ratcliffe—In terms of basic capacity, the major utilities are in place and can readily provide the services to the site or be easily augmented to meet the basic need. Internal site distribution of major services will be incorporated into part of the project. On the car parking question, the car park layout is an issue for further design resolution. The numbers of car parks are certainly in line with the brief. The brief, in turn, is tied back to a study that looked at the satisfaction of a 95 percentile of a demand profile that was built up in the formulation of that brief.

With regard to access to the site, the intention is that public transport services will be enhanced to the site. So, again, that facilitates better movement to the site. The authority is also in the process of issuing new licences for boat operators, including a water taxi licence, so that accessibility between the parliamentary zone, the national triangle area and the Acton Peninsula should be enhanced as the museum evolves.

Mr FORREST—All of these things obviously involve extra costs. Let us say that the traffic study reveals there have to be major intersection changes further upstream. Who is going to pay for that?

Mr Ratcliffe—A figure of \$3 million has been identified as a contribution from the ACT government. That will contribute towards some of those things.

Mr FORREST—That will not pay for one roundabout, though.

Mr Ratcliffe—That is if major upgrading is required. In basic traffic functioning terms it should not need major traffic enhancement. There is going to be some need for changes to make the routes more visible, but that is in the realm of signage and so on.

Senator MURPHY—With the traffic movements along the road there, the main highway, which is providing on and off access to that peninsula, what is the assessment on the traffic movement now and the need for upgrade, say, in 10 years time?

Mr Ratcliffe—I cannot quote those figures. There was a piece of preliminary work done as part of the site selection process. I will call on Mr Smith.

Mr Smith—During the site selection process, the traffic study that was undertaken indicated that the only significant additional load on Parkes Way—which I believe is the road you are talking about, the major highway—occurred during the peak time and was related to staff of the museum arriving at work. The road is under-utilised during the major visitation periods for general tourists to Canberra. So, at this stage, it is not envisaged that there would be any additional demand on that road that would require it to be upgraded.

Senator MURPHY—What was the assessment of people per vehicle numbers?

Mr Smith—I would have to take that on notice. I cannot recall the precise population per vehicle number.

Senator MURPHY—This is so that you can identify the vehicle movements. You would have done that though, wouldn't you?

Mr Smith—That was all done and has been recorded in the site selection report. But, as I said, the study indicated that there would be no need to upgrade Parkes Way as a result of construction of the museum on Acton Peninsula.

CHAIR—We will return to Mr Forrest, because he had the call.

Mr FORREST—That is okay; the senator has pursued the question I had. To get back to that \$3 million, what is the equivalent amount of infrastructure investment for the Yarramundi Reach site in terms of all of those things, being a green site. Is it 10 times?

Mr Ratcliffe—There was a calculation of that nature done. For the exact figure I might have to take advice, but it was in the order of \$15 million to \$19 million.

Mr Smith—There has been a lot of debate about the precise costs of infrastructure upgrade to Yarramundi Reach, vis-a-vis the other sites. The basic problem is that Yarramundi Reach is not serviced by infrastructure sufficient to cater for a facility of this size. My memory tells me that the Acton Peninsula was the lowest or second lowest site to upgrade the infrastructure, and that was related to just relocating infrastructure that was already on the site. That was in the order of about \$700,000, though I would have to refer to other documents to check that. I think Yarramundi was into the millions.

Mr FORREST—Perhaps this should be taken on notice. I am looking for orders of magnitude, rather than just saying it is the cheapest site.

Mr Ratcliffe—Sure. I could say confidently that the upgrading of the Yarramundi site was orders of magnitude greater than the other candidate sites—a factor of many times. I cannot give you the exact figure—and, as Mr Smith has suggested, there is some debate about what would be included and what would be considered part of an urban program—but figures well in excess of \$12 million, I recall, and possibly up near \$20 million.

CHAIR—You could confirm those to us in due course, resulting from those inquiries?

Mr Ratcliffe—Yes.

Mr Smith—Mr Chair, I have the figures in front of me now.

Mr FORREST—Are they in the documents? I went looking and I could not find them.

Mr Smith—They are in this document.

Mr Ratcliffe—That being the report of the site selection committee.

Mr Smith—On page 92 of the site selection—

Mr FORREST—There you go; it has all been submitted to us.

Mr Smith—You will see here on option 1 for the development, it says:

Providing services to Yarramundi Reach is \$5,510,000, services to Acton Peninsula \$740,000.

Senator MURPHY—That is made up of all of the things that are mentioned in the above, is it?

Mr Smith—Roads, sewer, electricity and other infrastructure.

Senator MURPHY—In terms of the road, where would that actually run to and from?

Mr Smith—On Acton Peninsula?

Senator MURPHY—Yes.

Mr Smith—Further, within the report, there is an allowance for the creation of the roundabout and there is re-use of the existing roads.

Senator MURPHY—Could you point me to that?

CHAIR—Page 92.

Senator MURPHY—I know. The question I am asking is in terms of Acton peninsula: what does it buy? Where does the road begin and end?

CHAIR—This is a proposition that compared the sites, isn't it?

Mr Ratcliffe—Yes.

CHAIR—It may not have that degree of detail.

Senator MURPHY—I understood Mr Smith to say that it did.

Mr Smith—I might take a step back and explain the process. One of the aspects of the site selection was literally comparing the full sites with a standard building design and then determining what infrastructure one would need to service that design on each site. There were drawings prepared by the National Capital Authority and presented to the committee which demonstrated how each site would be developed, and the infrastructure required to support each of those developments was then costed. Those costs were then presented to the committee and are presented in this report.

Mr Ratcliffe—The assessment was done by independent engineering consultants.

Senator MURPHY—What I want to know is: in so far as the costings that you did are concerned, how do they then interrelate with the costings that were required to be put forward for the construction, say, of cycleways, walkways and roads that went to the construction coordination committee's brief, of which you are a member. It says in here the roads. I want to know how much road was expected in the \$68 million and how much road is in the whatever amount of money it is for Acton Peninsula. On the backside of page 49 there is sort of a shaded line drawn in there that looks as if it is an access road off Parkes Way, or somewhere thereabouts. Can you explain that diagram to me?

Mr Ratcliffe—Sorry, could you just help with the page you are referring to?

Senator MURPHY—Turn over page 49. There is a diagram on there.

Mr Ratcliffe—The drawing you are alluding to is a drawing about landscape treatments. Let us use your document as a reference. Your queries about the road—Langton Crescent—is that the one referred to?

Senator MURPHY—No. Mr Smith, I understood, said that, with regard to the costings on page 92, services include road of some description. I just want to know from where to where.

Mr Smith—The drawing that you perhaps should be referring to is over the page. It is incorrectly titled, I just realised, 'site capacity'. That actually shows you the base plan that was used for costing purposes. I would have to refer to our previous documentation to actually establish what road was costed in that. I cannot tell you the precise length of road, or the upgrading of road that was required at this stage.

Senator MURPHY—I assume that this area of land from Parkes Way is the area that the design teams dealt with. There was a requirement in the design brief to cover some roadworks, walkways, et cetera. I just want to know this: does the costing in this document cover roadworks from Parkes Way to wherever? And how far in there? Does it cover it to the museum door or to where?

CHAIR—I thought previous evidence to that effect was that that type of off-site

works was included in the estimate. I will stand corrected, but I understood that was what we were told.

Mr Smith—Yes, it has been costed. There are no new roads proposed. The money that was allowed for is intended to resurface part of Langton Crescent and then construction of any new roads that are required on the site to service the new design.

Mr Ratcliffe—Mr Chairman, I perhaps could cut to the quick on it. The roundabout is included in the costing that has been submitted as part of the project figures.

CHAIR—The roundabout is included in the \$150 million.

Mr Ratcliffe—The roundabout is included.

Mr FORREST—Now that I have had a chance to digest the table you directed me to, I am not quite sure in table 6 on page 92 which of options 1, 2 and 3 we are referring to in terms of the final project. I misinterpreted what you said, Mr Ratcliffe, about the \$3 million. Really, that is the contribution from the ACT government but in reality the differences in costs are \$23 million as against \$13 million in infrastructure costs. That money is coming from somewhere, and the Yarramundi Reach site has only twice the amount of infrastructure costs as the Acton Peninsula.

Mr HATTON—It is a matter of arithmetic. I am not sure what it proves.

Mr Ratcliffe—Yes. Clearly, the choice of site was made on more factors than simply the infrastructure costing, and that would be a question you would need to direct to the committee that came to that decision.

Mr FORREST—It is a question that I am pursuing with them. Of greater prominence in terms of selecting the site have been factors other than the infrastructure.

Mr Ratcliffe—How they weighted particular factors, as I say, would be in the committee's mind, but certainly infrastructure was one of the factors that led them to the conclusion.

Mr FORREST—I am satisfied that it is only a factor of two.

CHAIR—That completes your questions?

Mr FORREST—I am satisfied.

Senator CALVERT—I would like to know where the Uluru line comes into it. Is it a proposed railway line or what is it?

Mr Ratcliffe—Again, it is a question the architects would best address. My simple understanding is that it is a symbolic line that has the same geographic orientation as Uluru. It derives from perhaps the broader planning of Canberra that has its fascination with street lines that go out to the capital cities. This is another orientating device that has a symbolic value in the museum.

Senator CALVERT—Have you had any comment, adverse or otherwise, about the contemporary design of the Acton Peninsula project being in an area where we have more of a traditional heritage type operation? Have any concerns been raised with the National Capital Authority about that?

Mr Ratcliffe—No. By far and away most of the comments that have been reported in the press or spoken in informal discussions have been positive and supportive of the design. There is a professional debate, certainly, about what is good architecture and what is appropriate but most commentary has been quite supportive. As to how it fits with a typical Canberra building—if there is such a thing—or the typical parliamentary zone architecture, it consciously sets out to be something of a counterpoint to that more formal and monumental style within the national triangle. The peninsula is a different land form that lends itself to a different architectural treatment.

Senator CALVERT—Making a statement like the opera house in Circular Quay, I suppose—an older area with a modern type building.

Mr Ratcliffe—This was one of the points of discussion in the assessment of the schemes—whether Acton is the Bennelong Point of Canberra and the architectural solution should be quite a strong statement on the end of the peninsula or, conversely, whether the brief for the building should be for a more relaxed style, lower key, predominantly single storey that sat more within the tree line of the site. It was that latter view that prevailed.

Senator CALVERT—Do you have any comment about the footbridge, further down the track?

Mr Ratcliffe—The footbridge has enjoyed a bit of public comment. The authority does not support a footbridge at this stage. A footbridge would require an amendment to the national capital plan and that would involve public and statutory processes to allow it. There is some scepticism that the bridge can be built for the budgeted figure. The bottom line is, I think, that it is not considered part of the project at this time.

Senator MURPHY—Mr Ratcliffe, you are a member of the CCC. Were you present at the time of the selection of the five finalists?

Mr Ratcliffe—No.

Senator MURPHY—Do you have architectural qualifications?

Mr Ratcliffe—Yes, I am a registered architect.

Senator MURPHY—Were you the only one on the committee who had those qualifications?

Mr Ratcliffe—I believe I was the only one with architectural qualifications.

CHAIR—Where did the professor fit in?

Mr Ratcliffe—He was a professional adviser to the process. A further architect was a registrar, and there were other people with architectural qualifications in advisory capacities.

Senator MURPHY—Were they present at the selection of the final five?

Mr Ratcliffe—Those individuals were present, yes.

Senator MURPHY—At the selection of the final five?

Mr Ratcliffe—I am aware that the architectural adviser, Mr Keniger, was present at the selection of the final five. There were at least four other qualified architects present in advisory capacities, including the registrar of the competition—a senior architectural figure in the profession—Mr Davidson, another consultant advising architect and qualified staff of the authority, who were architects.

Senator MURPHY—Are you aware of the accepted international guidelines for the conduct of international competitions?

Mr Ratcliffe—Reasonably, yes.

Senator MURPHY—Did you offer any advice?

Mr Ratcliffe—The authority did give advice on the conduct of the competition, yes.

Senator MURPHY—What was that advice?

Mr Ratcliffe—The advice was drawn from an examination not only of the international perspective but also of recent architectural competitions within Australia, standard conditions of the institute of architects, the experience the authority has in running competitions and the experience of predecessor organisations in building some of the other national institutions in Canberra. The advice was an amalgam of those perspectives.

Senator MURPHY—Were they the Australian institute guidelines?

Mr Ratcliffe—The Royal Australian Institute of Architects have some guidelines on architectural competitions as well.

Senator MURPHY—If they were setting up an international competition, would they specifically use a particular set of guidelines?

Mr Ratcliffe—It is likely that they would wish to see their own guidelines used, yes.

Senator MURPHY—Are you aware of what they are?

Mr Ratcliffe—In general terms, yes.

Senator MURPHY—In so far as the criticism has been made with regard to the UNESCO guidelines, did you offer any advice with regard to the UNESCO guidelines?

Mr Ratcliffe—Not the UNESCO guidelines per se. My understanding is that they were first formulated in the 1950s and that there is a body of experience in running competitions that is more recent than those original guidelines.

Senator MURPHY—So you never made any reference to those?

Mr Ratcliffe—As I say, the advice that was proffered was from a combination of guidelines and experience drawn from all quarters, but also considering the circumstances of the project, particularly the time available. The milestones and critical times that were set for the running of the competition—the opening date that was required—moderated any pure process that might have aligned with a particular institute's guidelines.

Mr HATTON—Mr Ratcliffe, could I just direct you to your draft amendment 20 and the geotechnical information which is at page 25. You indicate there, based on geotechnical examination of the site, that there are constraints to construction on the peninsula. I will quickly summarise them. There are difficult excavation and founding conditions on the east side, deep soils on the west side of the site and higher ground water levels on the west side, on the site within likely basement excavation depths. How significant are those construction constraints and how probable is it that we could get substantial cost overruns or that we would need higher contingencies based on that geotechnical information, given the nature of the buildings that it is proposed to put there?

Mr Ratcliffe—As with all building projects, geotech is something that cannot be completely known until the geotechnical program has been undertaken. But the preliminary results, and certainly the experience from excavations associated with the previous buildings, give some profiling and reasonable confidence about what can be found there. It

is a tricky site but it is far from the worst building site in Australia. Indeed, it is relatively good compared to some of the other sites, say around the Yarra in Melbourne or some of the areas in Sydney—for instance, particular sites in Sydney around the Homebush area.

There was a preliminary geotechnical assessment during the site assessment study. This is where Acton was picked out of the four-horse race, as it were. And there was a cost penalty derived out of that that could be applied, that gave a general indication of what could be expected. More detailed geotechnical contingencies have been built into the current budget figures for the project.

CHAIR—Could I just ask you to comment in regard to the previous buildings which seem to be fairly standard brick infill on a concrete construction compared to these buildings which will be more steel frame and steel clad. On a scale of one to 10, my own judgment would be that this style of building would be less affected by geotechnic conditions than the old buildings. Would that be your judgment?

Mr Ratcliffe—Simple steel frame construction is usually a very simple construction technique. It does tend to tie back to the geotechnical conditions that vary over the site. The previous building—a large, heavy hospital building—had a raft type of slab construction. The footing design for these buildings has not emerged yet, but they are typically more simple than buildings of that more massive scale. As a gross generality, the answer is yes.

CHAIR—Yes, I understand that, but just comparing one to the other.

Mr Ratcliffe—Sure.

CHAIR—So if the other survived it—

Mr Ratcliffe—I do not think there is any problem with the bearing strength of the site as an ability to hold up these buildings, no.

Mr HATTON—In terms of your general experience at the National Capital Authority in Canberra, what is your view in terms of the wind problems that we will have, with it whipping down off the mountains and running through on to what is a very exposed site? What problems could we expect, given the nature of the design and the materials, in terms of corrosion and other such difficulties, over time?

Mr Ratcliffe—The prevailing wind in this part of the world is generally from the south-west through the north-west. In fact, it is a fairly fluky wind situation because it comes from the other side of Black Mountain and then tends to swirl around below it. The assessment of the design showed that there was a reasonably good attempt to control the wind effects. With regard to building layout, certainly the building massing across the bottom of the displayed plans shows that there are building elements that would break the

long fetch that goes out to the north-west, and the tree planting and substantial number of trees that already exist should further reduce wind impacts on the western side. Wind within the courtyard area, which is sunk a further level below, should not be a problem.

The other positive aspect of this scheme is that the major outdoor activity areas are located on the north, which has a good solar orientation and again is well away from the prevailing winds. With regard to wind, per se, in the use of the site this project is reasonably accommodating of the prevailing wind situation. On the question of corrosion and so on, you do not tend to have the same problems as, say, a coastal situation, because the air here is a lot lighter. It would be the normal exposure situation that you would find anywhere in from the coast. The biggest issue in Canberra is in fact a thermal gradient problem, from freezing weather through to quite hot summers and so on. That often shows up in the way stone and jointing and so on have to be dealt with.

Mr HATTON—One last question. Given the geotechnical information, in relation to what is proposed here on the site, if there were later additions, do you see any major problems in terms of the siting of those? Is there adequate space left for any additions 30 years on?

Mr Ratcliffe—There is reasonable space for additions. You can see broadly from the plan that most of the building element is at the eastern end of the peninsula. Most of the area between the eastern end and back to where the university buildings start is fairly much open spaces: open-lot car parking and so on. I could imagine that, in the decades ahead, if there was a requirement for additional building elements on that site, they could be sympathetically incorporated.

Mr HATTON—Thanks, Mr Ratcliffe.

CHAIR—Briefly, in terms of the demands on energy and other aspects that such a large building could create without adequate insulation, has your authority taken a special interest in that regard?

Mr Ratcliffe—One of the guidelines in amendment 20 that set up the development parameters for the site made a particular point of looking for energy efficiency, particularly passive energy and thermal design, that should be promoted in this. When it comes to the detailed assessment of that efficiency, that will be done more through the quality assurance and design processes than through an approval process.

CHAIR—Finally, from my point of view, you would have heard me ask earlier about some of the flora there. The trees, of course, are rather typical of the early development of Canberra but seem to have no relationship whatsoever to a national museum. Are you prepared to express a view on how they should be treated?

Mr Ratcliffe—Yes. There has been quite an extensive analysis of the vegetation

on the site. Some of it is indigenous and predates the settlement of Canberra. Other vegetation has been introduced since Canberra became the capital. That tends to include a lot of exotic trees that are now at a very mature stage. There has been a botanical assessment almost tree by tree. Some of the trees are in good shape and others probably should be removed as they are nearing the end of their lifespan.

Some of the trees have heritage significance because of their age, planting patterns and the buildings they related to in times past. Others could be removed to make way for the quite exciting building project. It would take a tree by tree assessment. The authority would take a balanced view that some of the vegetation should stay so that the site is not too naked through its early years—really a transitional building and redevelopment of the site. There are particular trees that the Heritage Commission has identified and listed as trees that should be kept because of their significance in their own right. There are other clumps of trees that could be removed or better managed around buildings.

CHAIR—We did not have any lynchings or anything like that to give them special significance—not in Canberra, surely?

Mr Ratcliffe—Not that I am aware of.

Mr FORREST—Has the authority been given any perspectives that relate to the other side of the lake? Looking at ground level across to the building, there is an impression of major intrusion on a prominent peninsula. Was the authority presented with any perspectives from ground level looking, say, from the bridge or from the park opposite?

Mr Ratcliffe—Yes. These drawings in the bottom right elevations give some sense of the contour line of the proposed buildings as they would sit on the site. Again, they are drawn without the benefit of trees, so you do not get a real sense of scale. An analysis of the site ahead of the design competition tried to look at what would comfortably fit. Buildings within the generalised tree line, which is about 16 metres, were thought to be quite acceptable.

Mr FORREST—Those two bottom elevations are views from where?

Mr Ratcliffe—That would be, say, standing on the opposite shore. Perhaps I could refer to the second drawing in, on the top, where the suggested footbridge ends over in Lennox Gardens—at about the point where you had the head of your pencil. If you were standing there and looking back at the peninsula, that would be the perspective presented to you—the bottom one, that is.

Mr FORREST—Has that profile been publicised properly? Is the general public aware that that is the nature of the intrusion?

Mr Ratcliffe—Yes, some of these plans have been exposed—how widely I could

not say exactly. I would also go back to the point that these plans are still somewhat misleading because a significant stand of trees that is proposed to be kept would moderate the presentation of that facade from its long view. Indeed, I am aware that some of the poplars going around to the left have been the subject of submissions by others, and we would take the view that some of the trees further around should remain too so that it will be a total composition that has some trees.

The elevations which are on a slightly smaller scale immediately above that drawing start to show something of the composition with the trees in place. Again, the trees are very schematic. In reality, as you will have seen this morning, the current vegetation is quite heavy through there. That is becoming one of the issues: how many of those trees are to be removed and how much the buildings might predominate.

Senator CALVERT—What is the point of the signage if you cannot see it—symbolic, is it?

CHAIR—Like the sign for the Museum of Australia.

Mr FORREST—On a point of clarification: are the first two elevations closer than the two elevations on the other diagram? The larger sized elevations would obviously be from the lake somewhere; really, the perspective is the ‘2’ on the upper drawing.

Mr Ratcliffe—Yes. In fact, it is probably not even fair to call them ‘perspective’. They are elevations, so they are very flat. One is simply on a larger scale than the other.

CHAIR—To intervene for a moment, we cannot put too much on those drawings. We have to rely on the evidence that it is of a satisfactory nature in the view of those that have looked at it over time.

Mr FORREST—Yes, or capable of finessing to be so.

CHAIR—Yes.

Mr HATTON—Is there a particular recommendation from the heritage people in regard to the poplars?

Mr Ratcliffe—There are particular trees that the Heritage Commission has identified and earmarked, yes.

CHAIR—The question is whether that included any of those poplars?

Mr Ratcliffe—In relation to the poplars, no.

CHAIR—They were not used to make the first matches or something for Red-

heads?

Mr Ratcliffe—The vegetation has been through a couple of iterations of examination. The first pass by the Heritage Commission looked at it very much through heritage values, and they identified a set of trees. There has been a second, more detailed, botanical evaluation which has suggested that some of those poplars should be of heritage value, but they are not listed as such at this date.

Mr HATTON—I do not think we have seen anything about legless lizards on this site.

CHAIR—Do not mention it! We might have to start all over again, and we have been here all day. We need to finish.

Senator MURPHY—Mr Ratcliffe, were you present at any of the briefing sessions for the five finalists?

Mr Ratcliffe—I was present for the judging of the winning successful scheme.

CHAIR—The final pass.

Senator MURPHY—But you were not present at the briefing on 27 August?

Mr Ratcliffe—I am not sure. I would have to reflect.

Senator MURPHY—There were briefing sessions. It refers to ‘the timetable for the briefing sessions held on 27 August’. Were there any other briefing sessions that you were aware of?

Mr Ratcliffe—No; I had a delegate at that meeting on my behalf.

Senator MURPHY—Who was that?

Mr Ratcliffe—Mr Rohan Dixon. He was assisted by Mr Andrew Smith, who is present today.

CHAIR—Thank you very much. That concludes our questioning. Thank you for your attendance. We apologise to the ACT government witnesses. We will see you first thing in the morning.

Committee adjourned at 6.13 p.m.