

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Answers to Senate Estimates Questions on Notice**  
**Spillover Budget Estimates Hearing 25 November 2016**  
**Communications Portfolio**  
**NBN Co Limited**

**Question No: 159**

**NBN Co Limited**

**Hansard Ref: Page 5**

**Topic: Assumption FTTN - Corporate Plan**

**Senator Dastyari asked:**

**Senator DASTYARI:** Your latest corporate plan puts it at \$1,600.

**Mr Morrow:** No—the fibre to the node cost per premises—

**Mr Rue:** That is correct—without the doc leaks.

**Senator DASTYARI:** What was the assumption used for this document?

**Mr Rue:** I did not prepare it at the time, but it was not as low as \$600—I can tell you that. It was not triple the cost.

**Senator DASTYARI:** Do you remember what it was?

**Dr Switkowski:** No, I do not remember the assumption.

**Senator DASTYARI:** Can you take on notice what the assumption was. Mr Rue, we can talk about the exact amount, but your broad evidence is that that assumption figure did go up. You are saying it was not triple but you are not able to tell us what that assumption rise was with the information you have with you now—is that correct?

**Mr Morrow:** We can provide on notice the information you are looking for to bridge from what was assumed in that document to what is factual today.

**Senator DASTYARI:** Would there be any reason why that information could not be given to us on notice?

**Mr Morrow:** At the aggregate level, I would not see why not.

**Dr Switkowski:** I think we may have published a reconciliation.

**Answer:**

Please note that Mr Rue's response in the room as recorded in this question was actually "without duct lease" not "without doc leaks".

Please see the response to Question 31 of the Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearings October 2016.