

## Comment – Civil Contractors Federation Queensland Limited

### Comment

We thank the Queensland Productivity Commission for the opportunity to further engage on the initial findings in the Interim Report.

We have responded in part to sections of requests for more information from the interim report.

We believe that further engagement through upcoming workshops will be of greater value to explore in more detail the issues raised.

28.08.2025

Queensland Productivity Commission

PO Box 12078

George St, Brisbane QLD 4003

## **OPPORTUNITIES TO IMPROVE PRODUCTIVITY OF THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY Interim report**

### **Civil Contractors Federation Queensland Limited**

The Civil Contractors Federation has branches in all states and territories and has around 1,800 contractor and associate members nationally.

Civil Contractors Federation Queensland Limited (CCF QLD) is the peak industry body representing the civil construction sector in Queensland. As a trusted advocate, CCF QLD supports civil contractors and associated businesses by providing leadership, resources, and a strong voice on critical issues impacting the industry. With a focus on workforce development, safety, sustainability, and innovation, CCF QLD is committed to driving the growth and success of industry participants and ensuring the civil construction industry continues to play a vital role in building Queensland's infrastructure and economy.

### **Submission Approach**

We thank the Queensland Productivity Commission for the opportunity to further engage on the initial findings in the Interim Report.

We have responded in part to sections of requests for more information from the interim report.

We believe that further engagement through upcoming workshops will be of greater value to explore in more detail the issues raised.

**The extent to which the Queensland Government's capital program is impacting or is likely to impact the construction industry's ability to deliver other projects (for example, private residential and non-residential projects), and whether there are opportunities to improve the selection and sequencing of future projects.**

The distinct segments of the industry are serviced by distinct players in the market. That is, contractors tend to gravitate to segments of the market where they have developed IP through

people, systems, relationships, prequalification etc., to engaged with a particular segment. As an example, the difference in building a road for the Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR) is fundamentally different to building a road for a Local Government Authority (LGA). The engineering and construction principles are the same, but the prequalification and compliance framework is very different. Those building subdivisions and undertaking other private or some LGA work rarely cross over to the DTMR space. The prequalification barriers for people and companies are too big to bridge so there is a preference to be all in or all out. However, there is a small part of the market which manages to cross over but their core activities will still be in one segment or the other. This will be replicated from other segments such as water, rail and renewables. Those who commit to a segment develop the people and systems to work in the segment. Often the overhead is higher and not easily reduced to take on segments that require a lower overhead.

Whilst the capital program is large the contractors will still largely stick to their segment of the market. Investment in plant, while capital intensive is not the main barrier. The pool of available labour whether blue or white collar will be too low to address. For the reasons above the flexibility of a portion of the workforce to transition between segments affects capacity as the segmental workload waxes and wanes over time.

Selection and programming of projects is a critical element in smoothing the industry as a whole and mitigating the intra boom bust cycles. It allows for labour rationalisation to a point but more importantly it gives contractors confidence to invest in people, plant and systems and retain and maintain them. But this is not the silver bullet.

**Arrangements or incentives that would help government improve its selection, prioritisation and staging of infrastructure. In particular:**

- Whether internal to government mechanisms can help improve decision making, and if so, what has been successful in the past or in other jurisdictions.
- If there is any evidence that independent advisory bodies, such as the former Building Queensland, compared to other processes, have improved infrastructure outcomes, and what design elements have proven most successful.
- Whether there are other effective and efficient mechanisms for improving the way government selects, prioritises, stages and contracts infrastructure projects.

Building Queensland is a good example. The problem was that the process was slow and lacked direction. The requirement to assess only on business cases that were positive limited infrastructure that was needed. A broader assessment criterion is needed to ensure the right projects are given the green light.

Building Queensland did not rank projects as to their importance or urgency. Rather gave a list for government to choose from. Whilst this is an improvement on politically driven projects, projects were promised outside of the Building Queensland model.

Ideally an independent assessment authority which is fast and ranks projects as to their importance and urgency would be beneficial.

## **Queensland Government procurement policies.**

Procurement policies must be policy documents. They should avoid being prescriptive but set principles for agencies to deliver. Principles should be aimed at preventing barriers to entry, maximising industry participation, in particular local businesses and building sustainability for the future.

They must not duplicate process. Embedding requirements which are already effective under law is a waste of money, as suppliers who must comply then need to demonstrate during the procurement process how they will apply. This adds cost, adds a barrier to entry due to varying capability of demonstrating process and is not necessary. Performance and non-compliance can be monitored directly with appropriate regulators.

## **How the pre-qualification system impacts contractors, building consultants and subcontractors, and the extent to which it impacts the ability of small and medium subcontractors in regional areas to compete for government tenders, and what could be done to improve matters.**

A prequalification system, if implemented must be used. We are seeing that systems, such as expressions of interest (EOI), are being used in addition to prequalification systems to select contractors for tender. EOIs are often more expensive to prepare than the tender itself. Systems that select contractors for tender must recognise the cost burden of industry.

A prequalification system must not be too restrictive that it acts as a barrier to industry participation. Recognition and demonstration of company and people capability, capacity and performance, must include recognition of such, outside of the agencies own program of works.

A prequalification system must recognise development of contractors and progress them through the levels. Unfortunately, contractors get stuck on a level because the system precludes them from doing projects at a level above. As such, they cannot demonstrate performance and capability at the next level.

Prequalification Systems should not require contractors to provide the same information, such as management systems for approval, financial information and examples of previous work. This is all assessed at prequalification and on reassessment of prequalification level.

There needs to be more prescriptive measurement of performance and capability which is simple and objective. This gives transparency around maintaining and increasing prequalification levels. Presently the measurements for assessment are subjective and often unchallengeable.

Overcoming these issues will enhance and develop the capacity of the Queensland construction industry.

**Evidence that workplace and safety outcomes on Best Practice Industry Conditions (BPICs) sites are better than non-BPIC sites or that BPICs have led to industry-wide improvements in workplace health and safety.**

We have not seen any data that demonstrates the implementation of BPIC and improved safety on site. Data from public projects is somewhat transparent but not so for private projects. However, whistleblowers working on large private building projects, operating under BPIC and union Enterprise Agreements (EAs) have stated that the safety record is worse.

**Quantitative evidence on impacts, costs and benefits of BPICs.**

Attached is spread sheet EA Comparison Cooroy to Curra (C2C). This evaluated the EAs on Cooroy to Curra Section D1 with the BPIC rates established on Cooroy to Curra Section D2. Both projects ran concurrently with Section D2 lagging Section D1, by several months. Cooroy to Curra section D1 was not a BPIC project.

The highlighted sections show the payrates by the proponents, CPBs rates on Section D2 and the EAs of the joint venture contractors on Section D1.

On other projects which used a multiple envelope system. That is provide a price without BPIC and with BPIC the differences ranged between 17% and 30%.

The unrecognised cost on these projects at the time was, the disruption due to union interference, allowable delays, inflexibility of shifts and Rostered Days Off (RDOs) etc.

The requirement to jump up the supply chain meant that either the supply chain didn't engage with the project, or those who did had to increase their cost base to participate.

Examples of nonproductive actions observed from BPIC were:

- Fixed RDOs.
- Restrictions on flexibility of work force numbers.
- Inclement weather clauses that were over and above current WH&S Codes of Practice and abused in their interpretation. Days off in addition to RDOs.
- Excess meeting for example toolbox, safety, union etc reducing available hrs per day to work.
- Union approval of subcontractor. Only union aligned subcontractors approved and workforce levels maintained at peak levels regardless of actual requirement.
- Productivity schemes prohibited unless agreed with the union.
- Non-working union delegates.
- Dictating material supply regardless that conformity has been demonstrated.
- Union disruption through excess right of entry.

Contractors started to factor these delays into their based labour cost rates. These are then populated through the estimating software. Overall BPIC cost impacts were quickly identified.

**Options for improving workplace practices on large construction sites.**

Employers want a good environment and encourage it. It is in their best interest to provide practices which attract and retain people.

All employers are striving to improve workplace practices, but through the lens of productivity. These initiatives need to be supported.

Contracts should reinforce the requirement for compliance with industrial relations laws and workplace health safety laws etc. and not dictate how they should be complied with. This will encourage innovation and competition, in delivering on these requirements which will always have a focus on worker wellbeing.

**Option for re-setting industry practices more broadly.**

The construction industry is facing a retention problem. In recent yet to published research 74% of people in the industry say it struggles to retain workers, and while wages and physical demands are major factors, 17% specifically call out workplace culture and poor management as a reason people leave.

The research highlights a gap between perception and reality. Almost half of the industry believes there is no real problem with culture, or that any issues will “fix themselves over time.” Yet a significant number say culture must be addressed. This divide makes change difficult. If part of the industry doesn’t see a problem, momentum for improvement is easily lost.

What does the research show

- While 89% of people would recommend construction as a career to a friend or family member, only 61% would recommend it to a woman or younger female relative.
- Employers are less supportive of action than employees — 67% of employers support doing more to retain workers compared with 81% of employees.
- Support for retention initiatives is strongest among women (90%) but drops among older men and those in regional areas.

**What needs to change.**

When asked how to fix retention, responses point to attitudes, not policy:

- 27% say more equal treatment of workers is needed.
- 24% say encouraging more people into the industry is critical.
- 23% point to reducing poor treatment.
- 20% say shifting negative attitudes is the key.

Practical solutions also resonate when shown clearly. 45% of the industry say they need more resources to improve workplace culture, and employers rank mentoring, networking, clear career

pathways, and flexibility as the most effective tools, showing that change must come from the bottom up, not through additional regulatory burden.

While governments are considering regulatory changes such as the proposed National Culture Standard, there are a number of significant risks that have not been fully explored including:

- Excessive compliance load – Adds around 300 pages of paperwork, a complex set of guidelines for SMEs without large compliance teams, that is yet to be fully understood by these businesses.
- Unbalanced impact – Tier 1s can absorb costs, while smaller firms risk being locked out of projects.
- No regional trials – Standard has not been tested in regional or remote contexts, raising doubts about practicality outside metro areas.
- No tendering trials – Unproven in procurement settings yet may be tied to government tenders.
- Poor consultation – Limited input from smaller contractors who will bear the heaviest burden.
- Risk of consolidation – Increases barriers for SMEs, pushing work toward a handful of large players.
- Red tape – Prioritises reporting over genuine cultural improvement.

One-size-fits-all regulatory approaches may be well intentioned, and we agree that steps must be taken to improve workplace culture across the construction sector. However, adding layers of red tape that maybe unfavourable to the majority of contractors, is not the solution.

We believe that national reform on culture, productivity, and sector-wide improvement should be guided by the National Construction Industry Forum (NCIF), the tripartite body established to bring employers, employees, and government together. The NCIF is the appropriate platform to achieve meaningful and balanced reform that lifts culture without undermining competition or creating barriers for the majority of contractors.

Top-down approaches driven by government, which impose significant new requirements on SMEs, threaten the oligopolies the civil construction sector. By setting rules that only the largest contractors can easily absorb, these reforms risk pushing smaller operators out of the market and concentrating work into fewer hands. This undermines competition, weakens resilience across the supply chain, and ultimately drives up costs for government and taxpayers.

Drive reform from the bottom up, not the top down – Ensure culture reform is shaped with input from contractors of all sizes, especially SMEs who make up the bulk of the industry, rather than imposing a one-size-fits-all model designed by and for a few large firms.

Embed reforms through the NCIF – Use the National Construction Industry Forum as the central platform for consultation and oversight, ensuring reforms are nationally consistent, balanced, and reflect the perspectives of employers, employees, and government.

Support transition and capability-building – Provide funding, templates, and practical tools to help SMEs implement cultural initiatives, alongside a phased rollout with pilot projects and review points before mandating full compliance.

**What government could do to create conditions that encourage greater competition for large construction projects, including to encourage growth of existing Tier 2 construction firms.**

The number of companies who can build mega projects are limited. The majority are multinationals exporting a fee overseas on the projects of approximately 5% before profit.

The size and complexity of these projects require procurement strategies which reduce the proponents to a select few through expressions of interest and using either an Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) or Early Tender Involvement (ETI.) The procurement process isolates the rest of the market from participating. The process requires the contractor to work with the agency to develop a design and tender. These contractors are the only contractors who price the works.

Whilst this process will identify risks and opportunities and embed innovation into the project it has some draw backs. The process is expensive and requires reimbursement of tender costs to enable participation in the procurement process. The final budgeted costs are only recognised at the end of the process.

Sometimes the delivery mechanism is a form of cost reimbursable or fix price. Often the full scope or risk of the project is not recognised at tender time and additional funding is required through the project.

The transport capital works program 2024 to 2028 had approximately 75% of it planned and underway projects over \$100M. This was being done by multinational contractors and a selection of Australian and Queensland contractors in joint ventures. The feedback is the joint venture proponents are delivering good quality and value work.

Projects need to be broken down to smaller packages where smaller contractors can either deliver in joint ventures or in their own right. The planning, design, procurement and delivery should be done collaboratively. When the planning and design is facilitated by the agency with early market engagement. The positives are:

- Early market engagement that is designed to identify risks, improve constructability and take advantage of innovation, will make tenders clearer and more contractors will be able to provide accurate pricing.
- The project is at a size that can be understood by a contractor during the tender period.
- The project can be delivered under a construct only contract which all the market can participate.
- Smaller contractors can joint venture to deliver large projects.



The selection of contractors should then be based on value for money, defined as the right price to deliver the project rather than the cheapest. The process allows an encouraging platform for a larger portion of the market to participate and increased competition.

**The key barriers to increased adoption of digital technologies, such as Building Information Modelling (BIM), and the policies or practices that would allow the opportunities for digital technologies to be fully leveraged.**

BIM is used in various forms in the delivery and data capture in the private sector far better than in the public sector.

The main barrier is, government agencies are trying to overcomplicate its implementation. They need to focus on the real information that is available and the actual data that needs to be captured. The agency then needs to develop a specification and not overthink whether industry can deliver. Industry has the capability to engage with BIM, but a clear and consistent requirement is needed.

There is also a reluctance for agencies to be liable for the data they provide digitally. If the data is not accurate or the contractor or supply chain is unable to rely upon it, then they will avoid BIM and work with non-digital sources.

For a contractor if all digital information, including the design is available and can be relied upon, the speed, cost and accuracy is improved and there is another opportunity to identify constructability and other issues prior to works commencing.

**The benefits and costs of collaborative contracting arrangements, and the key barriers to greater adoption of collaborative contracting (including early contractor engagement).**

With respect to collaborative contracting, risk allocation and contracts, we refer to the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads which has the best collaborative contracting model in Australia. It has been in development for about 5 years and is in evolving stages of maturity. The trials and benefits are well documented. The process has been designed to reduce barriers as much as possible and to maximise industry participation whilst addressing issues such as risk, innovation, constructability and value for money.

**The extent to which there are likely to be benefits from greater bundling of projects, and the extent to which this might prevent competition by preventing smaller firms from tendering for work.**

We refer to our previous comments. Bundling projects will exclude a large portion of the industry. Most of the industry are principal contractors in their own right and have built systems and people to operate as such. They do not want to become subcontractors.

## **The pros and cons of replacing prescriptive specifications with more performance-based specifications.**

There is a place for both. For standard projects standard specifications are suitable. The standardisation however needs to be across jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction has their own standard specifications which in turn means all of Queensland does not have a standard. This is very costly due to the constant knowledge uplift each time a company changes jurisdiction. Familiarity brings efficiencies. Working across jurisdictions does not develop familiarity. Some contractors for this reason stick to a limited number of jurisdictions. This restricts portability of firms and reduces competition.

### **The Commission is seeking stakeholder views and evidence on:**

- the underlying drivers, incidence and scale of issues in the training and apprenticeship system as they affect the construction industry
- further case studies where strategies to improve training and apprenticeship outcomes have been effective
- the design of an appropriate process to drive reform
- any other issues or considerations that should be identified in the recommendation

The Commission is aware of the newly instituted Strategic Dialogue Series of the Department of Trade, Employment and Training and is seeking feedback on whether this model alone will deliver the identified objectives or what other activities would be needed to support reform.

### **Request Energy Queensland (EQ) to remove the requirement for EQ's EBA rates of pay and allowances to be applied to contestable works (which apply to employees of contractors and subcontractors) when EQ negotiate their next EBA in 2028.**

The previous EQ EA 2020 required contractors doing core works to jump to the EQ EA. This was done under Schedule 8. The definition of Core Works in Schedule 8 and now Schedule 9 are the same except the following clause has been added in relation to contestable works.

Schedule 9 at 1.8(b) states:

*A similar management approach will be taken in relation to the standards specified for developers and others involved in either extensions of the current network, major projects or asset enhancements in accordance with relevant legislation or Energy Queensland policy in place at the time. In addition, subdivisions work, public lighting work and major customer work that will become part of the Energy Queensland network assets will be subject to developers and others involved meeting all requirements as an accredited service provider including maintaining a rating under that framework. This includes rates of pay and allowances; and quality and safety of work standards that will become part of the Energy Queensland network assets which will be managed under the accredited service provider framework.*

This clause is a twofold requirement. The first is that contractors doing core works need to be accredited under EQ and the second is they must jump up their wages and allowances to the EQ

EA. It should be noted that this applies not only to residential and industrial subdivisions but also to lighting on new infrastructure such as roads and bridges.

Further subclauses require union officials to do joint audits. Whilst unions have protected and prescribed powers under the Fair Work Act 2009 to inspect records this is an overreach of union powers. The scope of the audits is not defined and should be removed.

### **Jump Up Requirement**

As a principal, governments should avoid entering into enterprise agreements which require the supply chain to jump up their wages and allowances to those specified in those enterprise agreements. The original principle of enterprise bargaining was productivity-based bargaining at enterprise level. It was recognised that businesses could negotiate pay and conditions directly with their employees, with or without union involvement, to increase flexibility and link productivity improvements with wages. It is those enterprises that are closest to the part of the industry they work in and they, with their employees are best to achieve these goals. This was done with safeguards.

Whilst jump up clauses are not prohibited; they do go against the original principle of enterprise bargaining. An organisation such as EQ is not close enough to segments of the industry that contractors, who are providing core works services on their behalf to decide what wage rates and conditions are appropriate. Doing so is driving down productivity and in turn increasing costs.

Contractors doing core work activities are not dedicating 100% of their business activities to core works activities. As an example, on a typical subdivision, civil contractor labourers would install the civil segments of core works activities such as concrete pit construction, under road conduits etc. and do other civil works such as pavement construction, stormwater installation, earthworks etc. They now require, for the portion of core works, be paid at the EQ EA rates.

As an example, the EQ rate for workers to install conduits is \$64.01/hr. The equivalent civil rate varies but at its highest based on BPIC rates is approximately \$40/hr. The average rate is lower and varies with location and company. This creates a difficult industrial relations issue to manage within civil companies. A solution is to pay their workers the EQ rate for all works on the subdivision or exclude them from the core works and subcontract specialists who pay the EQ rates.

**The following case studies are from two subdivisions in Queensland.**

#### **Case study 1**

- Service conduits civil rates. \$209,839.50
- Extra Over for EQ Rates: \$51,970.00
- Increase 30%

#### **Case study 2**

- Service conduits civil rates. \$2,182,565.00

- Extra Over for EQ Rates: \$326,929.00
- Increase 10%
- This is equating to an additional \$8000.00 to \$10,000.00 per block of land extra.

## **EQ Accreditation**

There is not an argument that contractors doing works on electrical assets should not be accredited. The issue is the extension of accreditation to non-electrical components of the works, civil works.

Traditionally, for contributed assets component of core works, civil contractors would install conduits and pits prior to the installation of the cables. Prior to connection an audit and compliance check would be done prior to energising, at the time the asset was handed over to Energex or Ergon. These are traditional civil works where the workforce is trained and skilled in installing. Similar works include installing NBN conduits, conduits for water services and gas services. Concrete pits are constructed for a range of assets such as storm water and communications. Safety and non-conformance risk is low. Efficiencies were gained in that the civil contractor could program their road works seamlessly with the same crew without additional red tape.

The requirement adds a layer of cost in addition to the wages and allowances of the EQ EA requirement, due to the contractor applying and maintaining accreditation and if they do not get accredited, they need to engage an accredited subcontractor. There are not enough accredited subcontractors to meet demand. This is adding costs of delay waiting for accredited subcontractors and increase pricing due to their short supply.

For example, the current Energy Queensland Accredited Provider – Reinforced Concrete Pit Construction list, comprises four providers all located in SEQ. There are no accredited pit builders in North Queensland.

There are three options in relation to this issue:

1. Legal opinion should be sought to the interpretation and application of the EQ EA requirement as it is added under the heading, *1.8 Contract Compliance and Supervision*. The reading of Clause 1.8(b) seems to contradict the definition of Core Works under Clause 1.6. It also seems to focus on supervision and compliance, specifically developers and others. (*Others* are not defined).
2. A deletion of EQ EA clauses 1.8 in its entirety be sought.
3. Future EAs should not include any jump up requirements

## **Revise the definition of contestable works, so that sub-contractors are no longer covered by the EQ EBA.**

Following the previous section core works is defined outside the EQ EA. Attached is the *Core Works Activities v1*. This definition was prior to the amendments that aligned with the 2024 EQ EA. There

is a *Core Works Activities* v2. Not attached but we believe it has been amended to reflect the intent of the EQ EA.

The definition of Core Works in these documents differ from the definition in the EQ EA.

Whilst amending an operational EQ EA is possible it is very difficult to do so.

As the definition of Core Works and its application outside the EQ EA is inconsistent with the EQ EA it is far easier to amend the external definition to exclude contestable assets.

This could be done immediately without any contravention of industrial laws.

In addition, the term *Others* could be defined outside the EQ EA to clarify that it excludes contractors doing contestable works.

## **Other Productivity Challenges**

Energex and Ergon are insisting that accredited service providers must hold a Queensland Building and Construction Commission (QBCC) Concreting Licence for doing civil works in road reserves.

Works in, on or under road reserves or public utility easements do not require a person to hold QBCC licence. This has been upheld in the Queensland Courts.

Schedule 1AA s.14 of the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Regulation 2003 states that work on, in or under a road is excluded from needing a QBCC licence. This has been upheld by the courts.

Although a requirement to hold a QBCC licence can be requested for any work it is not necessary and adds costs to the project. These costs are associated with the additional layer of administration to hold a QBCC licence and it restricts the number of available resources to do these works. The restriction lowers competition and adds time delays waiting for resources to become available.

## **Conclusion**

Whilst there have been many think tanks to address the issue of declining productivity the initiatives suggested from these think tanks either address part of the issue, are incorrect in their findings, or create solutions which through their application produce another layer of productivity reducing red tape.

To increase productivity in the building and construction industry it is important to recognise the discrete elements of the industry and the barriers to and the changes that can be made which to enhancing productivity.

The project life cycle exists from project conception, planning, design procurement, construction and maintenance. Each step has its own set of efficiency issues and if improved can contribute to significant productivity improvements.

Not one issue is any more important as another, although some are easier to address, rather it is the combination of the overall improvements which will deliver long lasting improvement.

Recommendations of this enquiry, if implemented, must be periodically reviewed for impact and amended if required to ensure the objectives are achieved.

				Cooroy to Curra Section D2	Cooroy to Curra Section D2	Cooroy to Curra Section D2	Cooroy to Curra Section D2	Other Market Non BPIC EAs									
	Award	BPIC	SWC	CPB( BPIC)	Beilby	BMD	Q Birt	JF Hull	Acciona	FH	Mcllwain	Albem	John Holland	Average	Diff Award	Diff BPIC	Diff BPIC
CW0						24.2					25.27						
CW1 (New Entrant)	22.53		32.14	35.14		26		30.08	29.86	27.14	26.76	29.65	29.35	29.56889	7.038889		
CW2	23	37.24		37.15		26.44			31.74	27.14	27.51	31.5	31.19	30.38143	7.381429	-6.858571	-23%
CW3	23.67	38.07		37.96		27.5		31.03	32.5	29.33	28.25	32.27	31.94	31.3475	7.6775	-6.7225	-21%
CW4	24.42	39.72	34	39.56	31.96	28.19		32.24	33.75	29.33	29.73	33.51	33.17	32.544	8.124	-7.176	-22%
CW5	25.16	41.38		41.17	33.91	28.63	33.5	35.24	33.75	31.59	31.22	34.91	34.56	33.848	8.688	-7.532	-22%
CW6	25.83	43.34	38.51	43.08	35.44	31.94	35		37.47	33.24	32.71	36.66	36.28	36.033	10.203	-7.307	-20%
CW7	26.57	45.51	40.3	45.19	36.83	33.03	36.5		39.27	35.11	34.19		38.02	37.60444	11.03444	-7.905556	-21%
CW8	27.22	47.58	41.9	47.2	38	37.08	38.5		39.27	37.74	35.68			39.42125	12.20125	-8.15875	-21%
TRAVEL	17.88	36.05	40	40	25	23		35	35	38.63	30	37	35	33.863	15.983	-2.187	-6%
Income Protection	N	Y	Y	Y		N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y				
Redundancy Fund	N	Y	N	Y		N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y				
36 hr week	N	Y	N	Y		N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y				
Union Agreement	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y				





# **Energex Core Work Activities**

for Contestable Works

16 November 2020



# Energex Core Work Activities (for Contestable Works)

---

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction .....	1
2.	Core work activities .....	1
3.	Contact Us .....	7

# Energex Core Work Activities (for Contestable Works)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This information sheet outlines the Core Work activities that are associated with Contestable Works projects.

Energex made changes to the Service Provider Work Category Quality Assurance (WCQA) Rating Terms & Conditions in 2018 introducing requirements directly related to rates of pay associated with "Core Works". The changes were communicated with all Contestable Works Accredited Service Providers and it was a requirement to comply from 19 March 2018. More information can be found on the Energex website in the Standard Work Procedures.

## 2. CORE WORK ACTIVITIES

Activity / Task / Purpose	Core Work	Effective
<b>Commissioning &amp; Switching</b>		
Writing switching sheets	Yes	19 Mar 2018
Entering sheets in AMS	Yes	
Undertake switching sheet items (Low Voltage) - from start to finish of sheet	Yes	
Commissioning activity	Yes	
Physical connection to the existing network	Yes	
Physically connecting or disconnecting a new or existing cable to or from the existing network	Yes	
Any work that is undertaking while signed on to an Access Permit	Yes	
Any work that is undertaking while signed on to a De-energisation Permit	Yes	

## Energex Core Work Activities (for Contestable Works)

Overhead		
Changing the construction on an existing distribution pole	Yes	19 Mar 2018
Move existing construction on an existing distribution pole	Yes	
a) Standing a new distribution pole underneath existing mains	Yes	
a) Boring / holding the distribution pole (new or existing)	Yes	
a) Dressing the distribution pole	Yes	
b) Replacing an existing distribution pole (same hole or adjacent)	Yes	
b) Boring hole for a replacement distribution pole	Yes	
b) Dressing a pole for a replacement distribution pole	Yes	
Recover an existing distribution pole	Yes	
Installation/construction of a new distribution pole to augment, relocate or replace the existing network	Yes	
Stringing new overhead conductors to augment, relocate or replace the existing network	Yes	
Installation/construction of a new distribution pole not associated with augmentation, relocation or replacement of the existing network	No	
Stringing new overhead conductors to not associated with augmentation, relocation or replacement of the existing network	No	
Distribution pole inspections	Yes	
Holding the pole while excavating close	Yes	
Reconductoring	Yes	
Additional overhead mains (e.g. 2 phase to three phase open wire)	Yes	

## Energex Core Work Activities (for Contestable Works)

Cables		
Pulling a cable into an existing transformer or low voltage pillar	Yes	19 Mar 2018
Installing, removing or replacing an existing cable up an existing pole	Yes	
Reticulate underground cable in new conduit, to assets not yet gifted	No	
Removing an existing cable	Yes	
Jointing onto an existing HV underground cable.	Yes	
Terminating a new HV cable into an existing Padmount Transformer or Ring Main Unit	Yes	
Terminating and connecting new LV cable into an existing LV pillar	Yes	
Preparing a new cable for termination onto existing assets	Yes	
Preparing a new cable for termination onto assets not yet gifted (pillar terminations)	No	
(c) Underground cable relocation	-	
(c) Installation of the new conduit route	Yes	
(c) Recovery of cable from an existing conduit	Yes	
(c) Installation of cable to new conduit route	Yes	

## Energex Core Work Activities (for Contestable Works)

Civil		
Install new conduits alongside existing conduits	Yes	19 Mar 2018
Install concrete cable pit over existing conduits	Yes	
Install new bank of conduits	No	
Install concrete cable pit and conduits (green field)	No	
Preparing a PMT or Ring Main Unit site	No	
Supervising the installation of conduits	No	
install new pillars over new conduits	No	
Underground		
Install new pillars over existing cable and conduits	Yes	19 Mar 2018
Relocate PMT / RMU	Yes	
Recover PMT / RMU	Yes	
Install PMT / RMU on greenfield site	No	
Improving the earthing at an existing site (pole, pillar, PMT or other)	Yes	
Remove existing pillar lids	No	

## Energex Core Work Activities (for Contestable Works)

Earthing		
Converting existing earthing from separate to common	Yes	19 Mar 2018
Installing earths on existing assets	Yes	
Modify / replace earthing	Yes	
Earthing new assets not gifted	No	
Supervising, Scoping, Observing		
Opening existing PMT doors and reading labels/MDI's for planning purposes only (not relating to physical work or switching)	No	19 Mar 2018
Opening existing PMT doors and reading labels/MDI's for scoping purposes only (relating to physical work or switching)	Yes	
Supervising, Coordinating non-core work activities	No	
Auditing/inspecting works for the purposes of a Final Product Audit	No	
Traffic control (work on existing assets)	No	
Traffic control (work on new assets not gifted)	No	
Safety observer (observing work on existing assets)	Yes	
Safety observer (observing work on new assets not gifted)	No	

## Energex Core Work Activities (for Contestable Works)

Public Lighting		
Changing an existing luminaire, bracket or SL pole	Yes	19 Mar 2018
Installing a street light on an existing distribution pole	Yes	
Recovering and existing street light	Yes	
Installing a new street lighting column	No	
Pulling a cable through an existing conduit	Yes	
Assembling a street light	No	
Driving		
Driving in between switching items	Yes	19 Mar 2018
Driving to and from a switching job (full day works on core work)	Yes	
Driving from a switching job to another non core worksite	No	
Driving to and from site where the employee will be undertaking core work on the day	Yes	

## Energex Core Work Activities (for Contestable Works)

---

### 3. CONTACT US

**To report loss of supply:**

13 62 62

**For electricity emergencies:**

13 19 62

**For general enquiries:**

[energex.com.au](http://energex.com.au)

[custserve@energex.com.au](mailto:custserve@energex.com.au)

13 12 53 (8am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)

Telephone interpreter service 13 14 50



Follow us on [twitter.com/energex](https://twitter.com/energex)



Like us on [facebook.com/energex](https://facebook.com/energex)

© Energex Limited 2015

® Energex and Energex Positive Energy are registered trademarks of  
Energex Limited

Energex Limited ABN 40 078 849 055

GPO Box 1461, Brisbane QLD 4001