

[Redacted]

From: YourSAy [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 21 December 2022 3:29 PM
Subject: Anonymous User completed Propositions Survey

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Propositions Survey with the responses below.

What type of job do you do?

representative of an employee association (e.g. union)

Which industry or sector do you predominantly work in?

construction - civil

Please provide your name, contact phone number, email address and the organisation you represent. The reviewers may contact you to discuss your responses in more detail

[Redacted]

There are four Terms of Reference below. Each has multiple propositions and you can complete all or as many as you like.

Note, if you intend to respond to multiple ToRs select them before you start your response.

ToR A: CITB composition, administration, and operation
ToR D: Training plans

The Act should include Objects so that the Board's purpose and priority for the administration of the Fund is clearer. This should include that the Fund should be applied to addressing skills shortages, upskilling and entry level training as supported by data and evidence available to the Board.

Yes, supported

The Act should require the appointment of Board members to have a greater balance of employer and employee perspectives than is presently the case.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Prior to the changes of the Act by the previous Government the composition was appropriately balanced which gave overall good outcomes to the scheme. This was never challenged, and the subsequent changes were purely political and spiteful.

The expression of interest process for Board appointees should remain, but the Minister should not be compelled to utilise this if the Minister is satisfied that good reason exists not to.

Yes, supported

The Act should require the appointment of a Board member with extensive knowledge of training policy and the contemporary training landscape.

Yes, supported

The Act should require that the Minister ensure that through appointments to the Board, members collectively bring sufficient expertise in the building and construction industry, legal and financial skills. Consideration should also be given to promoting diversity in making appointments to the Board.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

And such appointments with the requisite skills should not be sole employer skills

The appointment of Deputy Members should be reserved only for members appointed due to a specific skill set.

No, not supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Deputy Members should be appointed to ensure a consistent quorum not just a specific skill set.

The ability for the Presiding Member to exercise a casting vote should remain.

Yes, supported

The provision for a majority Board decision should remain.

Yes, supported

The Act should confirm the principle that Board members' overriding fiduciary duty is to the Board and its objects under the Act.

Yes, supported

The Act should formalise a requirement to consult with Sector Committees during the preparation of the Training Plan.

Yes, supported

The appointment of an independent Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee should be facilitated by permitting the Minister to approve remuneration of the Chair of committees.

Yes, supported

The Act's position in relation to the use of public service employees should reflect that in the *South Australian Skills Act 2008* to enable more integrated and complementary connections between the Board and Government.

No, not supported

Government and the CITB should develop processes that facilitate information and market intelligence sharing in the formative stage of the development of a Training Plan.

Yes, supported

The annual planning cycle should be replaced by four-year rolling reviews of the overall strategic direction developed through the CITB's investment decisions, with capacity for annual adjustments and reallocation of funds.

Yes, supported

[Redacted]

From: YourSAy [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 11 January 2023 4:10 PM
[Redacted]
Subject: Anonymous User completed Propositions Survey

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Propositions Survey with the responses below.

What type of job do you do?

representative of an industry association

Which industry or sector do you predominantly work in?

education and training

Please provide your name, contact phone number, email address and the organisation you represent. The reviewers may contact you to discuss your responses in more detail

[Redacted]

There are four Terms of Reference below. Each has multiple propositions and you can complete all or as many as you like.

Note, if you intend to respond to multiple ToRs select them before you start your response.

- ToR A: CITB composition, administration, and operation
 - ToR C: Allocation of funds obtained through the levy
 - ToR D: Training plans
-

The Act should include Objects so that the Board's purpose and priority for the administration of the Fund is clearer. This should include that the Fund should be applied to addressing skills shortages, upskilling and entry level training as supported by data and evidence available to the Board.

Yes, supported

The Act should require the appointment of Board members to have a greater balance of employer and employee perspectives than is presently the case.

No comment

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

CITB is here support to the attraction, training and retaining of South Australian building and construction workers by providing leadership in training and skills development. The purpose is it not about industrial matters so employer/employee representation is irrelevant. It is more important that the board has the skills and knowledge to advise and provide direction to ensure that we have a sustainable and skilled construction industry.

The expression of interest process for Board appointees should remain, but the Minister should not be compelled to utilise this if the Minister is satisfied that good reason exists not to.

No comment

The Act should require the appointment of a Board member with extensive knowledge of training policy and the contemporary training landscape.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

This should also include knowledge of high school education, vocational education and higher education to be able advise on all pathways in careers in construction.

The Act should require that the Minister ensure that through appointments to the Board, members collectively bring sufficient expertise in the building and construction industry, legal and financial skills. Consideration should also be given to promoting diversity in making appointments to the Board.

Yes, supported

The appointment of Deputy Members should be reserved only for members appointed due to a specific skill set.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

I don't think Deputy Members are needed but if they were to remain, it would be to ensure that a specific skill set is maintained.

The ability for the Presiding Member to exercise a casting vote should remain.

Yes, supported

The provision for a majority Board decision should remain.

Yes, supported

The Act should confirm the principle that Board members' overriding fiduciary duty is to the Board and its objects under the Act.

Yes, supported

The Act should formalise a requirement to consult with Sector Committees during the preparation of the Training Plan.

Yes, supported

The appointment of an independent Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee should be facilitated by permitting the Minister to approve remuneration of the Chair of committees.

No comment

The Act's position in relation to the use of public service employees should reflect that in the *South Australian Skills Act 2008* to enable more integrated and complementary connections between the Board and Government.

No comment

A minimum of 60% of the CITB fund allocations to training activity should be allocated between each sector of the building and construction industry in approximately the same proportions as has been contributed to the Fund by that sector. The remainder of training funds may be allocated for holistic or cross-sector programs such as sector attraction and cross-sector development.

Yes, supported

The CITB should allocate funding to administration activities such as research, data analysis, education and compliance.

No comment

Government and the CITB should develop processes that facilitate information and market intelligence sharing in the formative stage of the development of a Training Plan.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

It makes sense and always good to be transparent.

The annual planning cycle should be replaced by four-year rolling reviews of the overall strategic direction developed through the CITB's investment decisions, with capacity for annual adjustments and reallocation of funds.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

An annual training plan is very short. It is operational for 6 months before planning commences for the next FY. Most of the apprenticeship contracts in construction industry are 4 years. Schools programs are planned and delivered by calendar year and the ATP year impacts the ability to secure program funding for schools for a full year. I strongly agree with a 4 year plan with reviews each year.

Are there any other models for supporting industry training and workforce development outcomes that the reviewer recommends to assist the Construction Industry Training Board achieve its objectives?

I think there could be other ways that funds can be allocated for short courses. Eg, courses that are required by participants to maintain legislative or licensing requirements could be fully or almost fully funded. CITB has increased in spending in school programs and apprenticeship programs (ie direct funding to apprentices) but there is scope to include the jobseeker in the eligibility policy to attract new workers to the industry or workers looking to change industry. However, the fine line is to ensure that the funding is being used to benefit the construction industry, not other industries that do not pay into the fund.

[Redacted]

From: YourSAy [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 19 January 2023 11:18 AM
Subject: Anonymous User completed Propositions Survey

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Propositions Survey with the responses below.

What type of job do you do?

construction employer

Which industry or sector do you predominantly work in?

construction - residential

Please provide your name, contact phone number, email address and the organisation you represent. The reviewers may contact you to discuss your responses in more detail

[Redacted]

There are four Terms of Reference below. Each has multiple propositions and you can complete all or as many as you like.

Note, if you intend to respond to multiple ToRs select them before you start your response.

ToR A: CITB composition, administration, and operation

The Act should include Objects so that the Board’s purpose and priority for the administration of the Fund is clearer. This should include that the Fund should be applied to addressing skills shortages, upskilling and entry level training as supported by data and evidence available to the Board.

Yes, supported

The Act should require the appointment of Board members to have a greater balance of employer and employee perspectives than is presently the case.

Yes, supported

The expression of interest process for Board appointees should remain, but the Minister should not be compelled to utilise this if the Minister is satisfied that good reason exists not to.

Yes, supported

The Act should require the appointment of a Board member with extensive knowledge of training policy and the contemporary training landscape.

Yes, supported

The Act should require that the Minister ensure that through appointments to the Board, members collectively bring sufficient expertise in the building and construction industry, legal and financial skills. Consideration should also be given to promoting diversity in making appointments to the Board.

Yes, supported

The appointment of Deputy Members should be reserved only for members appointed due to a specific skill set.

Yes, supported

The ability for the Presiding Member to exercise a casting vote should remain.

Yes, supported

The provision for a majority Board decision should remain.

Yes, supported

The Act should confirm the principle that Board members' overriding fiduciary duty is to the Board and its objects under the Act.

Yes, supported

The Act should formalise a requirement to consult with Sector Committees during the preparation of the Training Plan.

Yes, supported

The appointment of an independent Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee should be facilitated by permitting the Minister to approve remuneration of the Chair of committees.

Yes, supported

The Act's position in relation to the use of public service employees should reflect that in the *South Australian Skills Act 2008* to enable more integrated and complementary connections between the Board and Government.

Yes, supported

Any other comments?

I do not believe the D2C program is as good as it used to be. The program is currently focused heavily on completing competencies within training packages and less on giving students experience in being WORK READY.

[Redacted]

From: YourSAy [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, 23 January 2023 1:04 PM
Subject: Anonymous User completed Propositions Survey

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Propositions Survey with the responses below.

What type of job do you do?

construction employer

Which industry or sector do you predominantly work in?

construction - residential

Please provide your name, contact phone number, email address and the organisation you represent. The reviewers may contact you to discuss your responses in more detail

[Redacted]

There are four Terms of Reference below. Each has multiple propositions and you can complete all or as many as you like.

Note, if you intend to respond to multiple ToRs select them before you start your response.

- ToR A: CITB composition, administration, and operation
- ToR C: Allocation of funds obtained through the levy
- ToR D: Training plans
- ToR B: Levy

The Act should include Objects so that the Board's purpose and priority for the administration of the Fund is clearer. This should include that the Fund should be applied to addressing skills shortages, upskilling and entry level training as supported by data and evidence available to the Board.

Yes, supported

The Act should require the appointment of Board members to have a greater balance of employer and employee perspectives than is presently the case.

Yes, supported

The expression of interest process for Board appointees should remain, but the Minister should not be compelled to utilise this if the Minister is satisfied that good reason exists not to.

No comment

The Act should require the appointment of a Board member with extensive knowledge of training policy and the contemporary training landscape.

Yes, supported

The Act should require that the Minister ensure that through appointments to the Board, members collectively bring sufficient expertise in the building and construction industry, legal and financial skills. Consideration should also be given to promoting diversity in making appointments to the Board.

Yes, supported

The appointment of Deputy Members should be reserved only for members appointed due to a specific skill set.

No comment

The ability for the Presiding Member to exercise a casting vote should remain.

Yes, supported

The provision for a majority Board decision should remain.

No comment

The Act should confirm the principle that Board members' overriding fiduciary duty is to the Board and its objects under the Act.

No comment

The Act should formalise a requirement to consult with Sector Committees during the preparation of the Training Plan.

Yes, supported

The appointment of an independent Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee should be facilitated by permitting the Minister to approve remuneration of the Chair of committees.

No comment

The Act's position in relation to the use of public service employees should reflect that in the *South Australian Skills Act 2008* to enable more integrated and complementary connections between the Board and Government.

No comment

If an item's cost would ordinarily be captured by the Act, the fact that it is associated with generation, supply or transmission of electricity should not exclude that item from calculation of the levy. (For example, construction work associated with the installation of wind turbines or solar panels would be leviable activity.) [See regulation 13(3) of the Regulations]

Yes, supported

If an activity would ordinarily be captured by Schedule 1 of the Act and the activity is maintenance or repair work carried out by a self-employed person or an employee for the benefit of his or her employer, where the principal business activity of the self-employed person or employer is not in the building and construction industry, this activity should not be excluded from building or construction work for the purposes of the Act. (For example, maintenance or repair work performed by employees of a council would be leviable activity – as is the case presently if such work is contracted out.) [See Schedule 1(2)(a) of the Act]

Yes, supported

If an activity would ordinarily be captured by Schedule 1 of the Act, the fact that it is associated with mining and petroleum activity should no longer automatically be grounds for exemption. Exemption should apply when associated with core resources operations or other specified activities. (For example, earthworks and building activity associated with the construction or maintenance of roads, tracks, or airstrips would be leviable activity. However, if WA's exemptions were mirrored, then work associated with resource exploration, unsealed haul road tracks etc. would continue to be excluded) [See Schedule 1(15) of the Act]

Yes, supported

The levy should be calculated by reference to employee data not by project value to enable a similar quantum of funds to be collected via a more streamlined process.

Yes, supported

If the levy is still to be calculated by project value, the definition of project owner should be changed so that the levy is payable by the landowner or head lessee rather than the current definition of project owner.

Yes, supported

The Civil sector should remain as part of the CITF Act scheme.

No comment

Planning for allocation of the Fund should be revised to better utilise available funds for the Civil sector, including in relation to attraction and retention initiatives; and short courses which equip Civil sector workers to work in other sectors when there is a downturn in civil construction activity.

Yes, supported

In the absence of an alternative method of calculation than project value, the 0.25% levy remains as an appropriate rate for the Board to fulfil its role and functions under the Act.

No comment

If the levy is based on project value, it should apply to a project's value excluding GST.

Yes, supported

If the levy remains calculated based on project value and exemptions are reduced resulting in an increase in revenue, the threshold of \$40,000 should be increased to reduce the administrative burden of payment and collection on low value projects.

Yes, supported

The levy threshold should be contained in the Regulations and reviewed periodically against CPI increases and other relevant data (such as expenditure from the Fund).

No comment

The CITB should increase the resources devoted to education and compliance.

Yes, supported

If the levy remains calculated according to project value, the South Australian Government should work with the CITB to identify reconciliation options for construction industry projects that are not captured by the usual planning approvals process.

Yes, supported

A minimum of 60% of the CITB fund allocations to training activity should be allocated between each sector of the building and construction industry in approximately the same proportions as has been contributed to the Fund by that sector. The remainder of training funds may be allocated for holistic or cross-sector programs such as sector attraction and cross-sector development.

Yes, supported

The CITB should allocate funding to administration activities such as research, data analysis, education and compliance.

No, not supported

Government and the CITB should develop processes that facilitate information and market intelligence sharing in the formative stage of the development of a Training Plan.

No comment

The annual planning cycle should be replaced by four-year rolling reviews of the overall strategic direction developed through the CITB's investment decisions, with capacity for annual adjustments and reallocation of funds.

Yes, supported

[Redacted]

From: YourSAy [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, 30 January 2023 9:17 AM
Subject: Anonymous User completed Propositions Survey

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Propositions Survey with the responses below.

What type of job do you do?

Other (please specify) - South Australian Industry Advocate

Which industry or sector do you predominantly work in?

construction - commercial

Please provide your name, contact phone number, email address and the organisation you represent. The reviewers may contact you to discuss your responses in more detail

[Redacted]

There are four Terms of Reference below. Each has multiple propositions and you can complete all or as many as you like.

Note, if you intend to respond to multiple ToRs select them before you start your response.

ToR C: Allocation of funds obtained through the levy

A minimum of 60% of the CITB fund allocations to training activity should be allocated between each sector of the building and construction industry in approximately the same proportions as has been contributed to the Fund by that sector. The remainder of training funds may be allocated for holistic or cross-sector programs such as sector attraction and cross-sector development.

Yes, supported

The CITB should allocate funding to administration activities such as research, data analysis, education and compliance.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

More needs to be done to promote the building and construction industry and to retain experienced staff such as construction supervisor and contract administrators.

Are there any other models for supporting industry training and workforce development outcomes that the reviewer recommends to assist the Construction Industry Training Board achieve its objectives?

More emphasis on market research including interviews with individuals to get their perception of the building and civil construction sectors. This information must be used when developing promotional activities

Any other comments?

The CITB could take the lead and put some resources into how the industry can develop sustainable costing practices. From my experience the client is almost always looking for least cost, head contractors often bid below cost to win the work and then extract the necessary margins from the subcontractors which means they have to cut corners. This practice ultimately effects the viability of the subcontractors and suppliers and gives the industry a poor commercial reputation.

[Redacted]

From: YourSAy [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, 30 January 2023 10:38 AM
Subject: Anonymous User completed Propositions Survey

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Propositions Survey with the responses below.

What type of job do you do?

Other (please specify) - Representative of a training organisation

Which industry or sector do you predominantly work in?

education and training

Please provide your name, contact phone number, email address and the organisation you represent. The reviewers may contact you to discuss your responses in more detail

[Redacted]

There are four Terms of Reference below. Each has multiple propositions and you can complete all or as many as you like.

Note, if you intend to respond to multiple ToRs select them before you start your response.

- ToR A: CITB composition, administration, and operation
- ToR B: Levy
- ToR C: Allocation of funds obtained through the levy
- ToR D: Training plans

The Act should include Objects so that the Board’s purpose and priority for the administration of the Fund is clearer. This should include that the Fund should be applied to addressing skills shortages, upskilling and entry level training as supported by data and evidence available to the Board.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

The case to provide additional clarity is compelling.

The Act should require the appointment of Board members to have a greater balance of employer and employee perspectives than is presently the case.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

This is a logical profile of representation.

The expression of interest process for Board appointees should remain, but the Minister should not be compelled to utilise this if the Minister is satisfied that good reason exists not to.

Yes, supported

The Act should require the appointment of a Board member with extensive knowledge of training policy and the contemporary training landscape.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Since Training is the core business consideration of the Board, having such representation seems appropriate.

The Act should require that the Minister ensure that through appointments to the Board, members collectively bring sufficient expertise in the building and construction industry, legal and financial skills. Consideration should also be given to promoting diversity in making appointments to the Board.

Yes, supported

The appointment of Deputy Members should be reserved only for members appointed due to a specific skill set.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

I can see times when supplementary skill sets may be valuable to the Board.

The ability for the Presiding Member to exercise a casting vote should remain.

Yes, supported

The provision for a majority Board decision should remain.

Yes, supported

The Act should confirm the principle that Board members' overriding fiduciary duty is to the Board and its objects under the Act.

Yes, supported

The Act should formalise a requirement to consult with Sector Committees during the preparation of the Training Plan.

Yes, supported

The appointment of an independent Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee should be facilitated by permitting the Minister to approve remuneration of the Chair of committees.

Yes, supported

The Act's position in relation to the use of public service employees should reflect that in the *South Australian Skills Act 2008* to enable more integrated and complementary connections between the Board and Government.

No, not supported

If an item's cost would ordinarily be captured by the Act, the fact that it is associated with generation, supply or transmission of electricity should not exclude that item from calculation of the levy. (For example, construction work associated with the installation of wind turbines or solar panels would be leviable activity.) [See regulation 13(3) of the Regulations]

Yes, supported

If an activity would ordinarily be captured by Schedule 1 of the Act and the activity is maintenance or repair work carried out by a self-employed person or an employee for the benefit of his or her employer, where the principal business activity of the self-employed person or employer is not in the building and construction industry, this activity should not be excluded from building or construction work for the purposes of the Act. (For example, maintenance or repair work performed by employees of a council would be leviable activity – as is the case presently if such work is contracted out.) [See Schedule 1(2)(a) of the Act]

No comment

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

I do not have sufficient information or insight to be able to make an informed choice

If an activity would ordinarily be captured by Schedule 1 of the Act, the fact that it is associated with mining and petroleum activity should no longer automatically be grounds for exemption. Exemption should apply when associated with core resources operations or other specified activities. (For example, earthworks and building activity associated with the construction or maintenance of roads, tracks, or airstrips would be leviable activity. However, if WA's exemptions were mirrored, then work associated with resource exploration, unsealed haul road tracks etc. would continue to be excluded) [See Schedule 1(15) of the Act]

Yes, supported

The levy should be calculated by reference to employee data not by project value to enable a similar quantum of funds to be collected via a more streamlined process.

No comment

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

I feel I do not enough insight to choose here.

If the levy is still to be calculated by project value, the definition of project owner should be changed so that the levy is payable by the landowner or head lessee rather than the current definition of project owner.

Yes, supported

The Civil sector should remain as part of the CITF Act scheme.

No comment

Planning for allocation of the Fund should be revised to better utilise available funds for the Civil sector, including in relation to attraction and retention initiatives; and short courses which equip Civil sector workers to work in other sectors when there is a downturn in civil construction activity.

Yes, supported

In the absence of an alternative method of calculation than project value, the 0.25% levy remains as an appropriate rate for the Board to fulfil its role and functions under the Act.

Yes, supported

If the levy is based on project value, it should apply to a project's value excluding GST.

Yes, supported

If the levy remains calculated based on project value and exemptions are reduced resulting in an increase in revenue, the threshold of \$40,000 should be increased to reduce the administrative burden of payment and collection on low value projects.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

\$40k seems too low and I can see how this would create clutter in the administrative space.

The levy threshold should be contained in the Regulations and reviewed periodically against CPI increases and other relevant data (such as expenditure from the Fund).

Yes, supported

The CITB should increase the resources devoted to education and compliance.

Yes, supported

If the levy remains calculated according to project value, the South Australian Government should work with the CITB to identify reconciliation options for construction industry projects that are not captured by the usual planning approvals process.

Yes, supported

A minimum of 60% of the CITB fund allocations to training activity should be allocated between each sector of the building and construction industry in approximately the same proportions as has been contributed to the Fund by that sector. The remainder of training funds may be allocated for holistic or cross-sector programs such as sector attraction and cross-sector development.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

This appears to be a better compromise, allowing new cross-sector initiatives to be identified and funded.

The CITB should allocate funding to administration activities such as research, data analysis, education and compliance.

Yes, supported

Government and the CITB should develop processes that facilitate information and market intelligence sharing in the formative stage of the development of a Training Plan.

Yes, supported

The annual planning cycle should be replaced by four-year rolling reviews of the overall strategic direction developed through the CITB's investment decisions, with capacity for annual adjustments and reallocation of funds.

Yes, supported

[Redacted]

From: YourSAy [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 1 February 2023 11:32 AM
Subject: Anonymous User completed Propositions Survey

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Propositions Survey with the responses below.

What type of job do you do?

representative of an industry association

Which industry or sector do you predominantly work in?

Other (please specify) - Representation of the landscaping industry in South Australia, from design, to construct, to maintenance and the industry suppliers who support our member businesses.

Please provide your name, contact phone number, email address and the organisation you represent. The reviewers may contact you to discuss your responses in more detail

[Redacted]

There are four Terms of Reference below. Each has multiple propositions and you can complete all or as many as you like.

Note, if you intend to respond to multiple ToRs select them before you start your response.

- ToR A: CITB composition, administration, and operation
- ToR B: Levy
- ToR C: Allocation of funds obtained through the levy
- ToR D: Training plans

The Act should include Objects so that the Board's purpose and priority for the administration of the Fund is clearer. This should include that the Fund should be applied to addressing skills shortages, upskilling and entry level training as supported by data and evidence available to the Board.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Good governance practice and will focus the Board on addressing important issues such as skills shortages.

The Act should require the appointment of Board members to have a greater balance of employer and employee perspectives than is presently the case.

No comment

The expression of interest process for Board appointees should remain, but the Minister should not be compelled to utilise this if the Minister is satisfied that good reason exists not to.

No comment

The Act should require the appointment of a Board member with extensive knowledge of training policy and the contemporary training landscape.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Having a representative of the education/training industry will better prepare the Board “to act as a principal adviser to the Minister and the Minister for Employment, Education and Training of the Commonwealth on any matter relating to training in the building and construction industry”.

The Act should require that the Minister ensure that through appointments to the Board, members collectively bring sufficient expertise in the building and construction industry, legal and financial skills. Consideration should also be given to promoting diversity in making appointments to the Board.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Good governance practice.

The appointment of Deputy Members should be reserved only for members appointed due to a specific skill set.

No, not supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Opening the opportunity for deputy members to be appointed for all Board positions improves exposure of the Board process to industry, and allows for training opportunities for the next generation of representatives.

The ability for the Presiding Member to exercise a casting vote should remain.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Good governance practice.

The provision for a majority Board decision should remain.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Good governance practice.

The Act should confirm the principle that Board members' overriding fiduciary duty is to the Board and its objects under the Act.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Confirming this position in the Act reduces the perception (real or imagined) of political bias.

The Act should formalise a requirement to consult with Sector Committees during the preparation of the Training Plan.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Sector committee membership is representative of all industry sectors, unlike the make-up of the Board. As such, a requirement to engage with the sector committees in the preparation of the Training Plan should be formalised to ensure that all industry sectors have an opportunity to be heard and/or advocate for representation in the training plan.

The appointment of an independent Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee should be facilitated by permitting the Minister to approve remuneration of the Chair of committees.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Good governance practice that will allow for the attraction of a qualified Finance and Audit Chair to oversee the collection, management and use of the CITF.

The Act's position in relation to the use of public service employees should reflect that in the *South Australian Skills Act 2008* to enable more integrated and complementary connections between the Board and Government.

No comment

If an item's cost would ordinarily be captured by the Act, the fact that it is associated with generation, supply or transmission of electricity should not exclude that item from calculation of the levy. (For example, construction work associated with the installation of wind turbines or solar panels would be leviable activity.) [See regulation 13(3) of the Regulations]

No comment

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Not the MLSAs area of expertise.

If an activity would ordinarily be captured by Schedule 1 of the Act and the activity is maintenance or repair work carried out by a self-employed person or an employee for the benefit of his or her employer, where the principal business activity of the self-employed person or employer is not in the building and construction industry, this activity should not be excluded from building or construction work for the purposes of the Act. (For example, maintenance or repair work performed by employees of a council would be leviable activity – as is the case presently if such work is contracted out.) [See Schedule 1(2)(a) of the Act]

No comment

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Not the MLSAs area of expertise.

If an activity would ordinarily be captured by Schedule 1 of the Act, the fact that it is associated with mining and petroleum activity should no longer automatically be grounds for exemption. Exemption should apply when

associated with core resources operations or other specified activities. (For example, earthworks and building activity associated with the construction or maintenance of roads, tracks, or airstrips would be leviable activity. However, if WA's exemptions were mirrored, then work associated with resource exploration, unsealed haul road tracks etc. would continue to be excluded) [See Schedule 1(15) of the Act]

No comment

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Not the MLSAs area of expertise.

The levy should be calculated by reference to employee data not by project value to enable a similar quantum of funds to be collected via a more streamlined process.

No, not supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Utilising employee data rather than project value may achieve the objective of streamlining the collection process by (1) providing consistency on enforcement of the levy as mandatory (refer proposition 25), (2) making payment and reporting more easily integrated into regular payroll/ administrative business systems bringing them into a regular, time based interval, (3) removing the need for operational staff to retain responsibility for levy compliance during a peak period in their workflow (project mobilisation), and (3) removing inconsistency between processes for projects as "project owner" vs not as "project owner" - which is a very common mix in the Landscape Industry. But, it would also significantly increase the proportion of the levy that MLSA Members are tasked with administering. As such, the MLSAs concerns are (1) some enterprises will be required to administer the levy for the first time. Many Landscape businesses will rarely or never procure work under a structure that would render them "project owners". This creates a new burden regarding these organisations, many of whom are small, owner operators. (2) This places the collection of the levy towards the upstream end of the supply chain where it is more likely to be absorbed by construction businesses along the way. This is counter to the intent of the act that the landowner/ end user bare this cost. (3) At best, take time for the levy to be integrated into overhead recovery strategies of business resulting in an unintended financial burden (against the intent of the Act). The approach of utilising employee data rather than project value, would place significant pressure on construction enterprises generally, given the current construction industry climate broadly. Implementation of this approach would further burden enterprises who are already experiencing a higher-than-average escalation in costs to project inputs, skills and labor shortages and other significant supply chain challenges.

If the levy is still to be calculated by project value, the definition of project owner should be changed so that the levy is payable by the landowner or head lessee rather than the current definition of project owner.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Subject to how proposition 25 is utilised, this would be optimal from the perspective of ensuring the levy is funded as intended by the Act. This would be easily implemented under the current system heavily utilising the planning system to identify leviable activities.

The Civil sector should remain as part of the CITF Act scheme.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Notably, the MLSA participates as part of the Civil Sector Sub-Committee. As such, the inclusion of the Civil sector is the only direct representation available to the Landscaping industry in South Australia. Further, the Landscape industry shares a high degree of crossover and similarity with the Civil industry, as outlined in the discussion paper (page 22). The MLSA would like to note that whilst we support the retention of the Civil sector as part of the CITF Act scheme, this position is subject to how the following propositions are implemented: 19, 26, 28 and 29.

Planning for allocation of the Fund should be revised to better utilise available funds for the Civil sector, including in relation to attraction and retention initiatives; and short courses which equip Civil sector workers to work in other sectors when there is a downturn in civil construction activity.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Understandably, the MLSA agrees with this proposition, however would also advocate for an increased focus on addressing the skills shortage present in the Landscaping industry. Landscape Construction is an ideal industry to provide alternative opportunities to Civil workers. Further, given the similarities between both sectors, specific training focuses that leverage the overlapping skills and knowledge utilised in both sectors could be a highly efficient use of the CITF. The MLSA are open to providing more specificity on this topic to the CITB in future.

In the absence of an alternative method of calculation than project value, the 0.25% levy remains as an appropriate rate for the Board to fulfil its role and functions under the Act.

No comment

If the levy is based on project value, it should apply to a project's value excluding GST.

No comment

If the levy remains calculated based on project value and exemptions are reduced resulting in an increase in revenue, the threshold of \$40,000 should be increased to reduce the administrative burden of payment and collection on low value projects.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

The administration required to collect the levy should not exceed the funds attached by the levy calculation. As such, the MLSA would advocate for an increased threshold in these circumstances to ensure efficient resource allocation.

The levy threshold should be contained in the Regulations and reviewed periodically against CPI increases and other relevant data (such as expenditure from the Fund).

No comment

The CITB should increase the resources devoted to education and compliance.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

The MLSA advocates that the CITB increase resources devoted to education and compliance, in line with the ability of these additional resources to generate additional funds. The MLSA continues to consider its own efforts in assisting our membership in their understanding of their obligations under the Act, and additional CITB resources to this end would be hugely valuable. The MLSAs primary motivation is to alleviate unintended breaches that could pose a legal risk to our Members, and agrees that improved factsheets on building and construction activities that are leviable, simpler forms and better linkages with PlanSA would significantly contribute to improving compliance and the user experience and outcomes.

If the levy remains calculated according to project value, the South Australian Government should work with the CITB to identify reconciliation options for construction industry projects that are not captured by the usual planning approvals process.

No, not supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

The Issues Paper presents case studies and opportunities to utilise existing mechanisms to aid reconciliation of leviable activities. It is also evident that it is uncertain an ideal existing mechanism(s) exists. On this basis, the MLSA believe that it is highly probable that aligning the definition of leviable activities with definitions of activities that trigger planning approvals is the most efficient strategy. This could be more robustly investigated using a data-driven

methodology, but at the very least, it is an existing view referenced in the Issues Paper with regard to the “honor system”.

A minimum of 60% of the CITB fund allocations to training activity should be allocated between each sector of the building and construction industry in approximately the same proportions as has been contributed to the Fund by that sector. The remainder of training funds may be allocated for holistic or cross-sector programs such as sector attraction and cross-sector development.

No, not supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

The MLSA advocates for the allocation of funds based on need, evaluated via an objective measure such as skill shortage. Limiting the allocation of funds based on the proportion of contribution limits the CITBs ability to have a meaningful impact on ‘smaller’ or niche industries. Further, investment in these industries up-front, rather than only when they are contributing’ will allow for the growth of contribution in the long-term. More robust planning, as per proposition 29, would better inform allocation of funds and potentially require more flexibility than is currently allowable. Further, we believe that holistic cross-sector programs should remain to be prioritised. The mobility of workers between sectors should also be considered, along with emerging building technologies as opportunities for cross-sector development/ widely applicable skills.

The CITB should allocate funding to administration activities such as research, data analysis, education and compliance.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

The MLSA supports the allocation of funding to administrative activities such as research, data analysis, education and compliance to the extent that this allocation is valuable in determining the best allocation of resources for training. Further, this approach supports the development of long-term training plans by furnishing sufficient information and data research to create and review effective plans.

Government and the CITB should develop processes that facilitate information and market intelligence sharing in the formative stage of the development of a Training Plan.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Coupled with proposition 27, this would be valuable to best target the use of the CITF. The MLSA are open to further participation on this matter to provide perspectives and data from MLSA Members. Developing a process that

facilitates information and market intelligence sharing in the formative stage of the development of a Training Plan, will increase transparency with industry.

The annual planning cycle should be replaced by four-year rolling reviews of the overall strategic direction developed through the CITB's investment decisions, with capacity for annual adjustments and reallocation of funds.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

This proposition represents a more robust planning strategy than the current 12-month format and would address the issues regarding the current planning strategies' misalignment with the needs of larger, years-long projects. The MLSA believes that a four-year rolling review would allow for both short and long-term training considerations based on industry needs and market intel (data). This approach will assist industry to improve workforce shortages in the short term and skill upgrading in the long term.

Are there any other models for supporting industry training and workforce development outcomes that the reviewer recommends to assist the Construction Industry Training Board achieve its objectives?

Providing operational/grant funding to Industry Bodies such as the MLSA to offer industry specific attraction, retention, and training opportunities. Wherever possible, the MLSA advocates for the inclusion of input from industry professionals as part of any training packages.

Any other comments?

In closing, the MLSA would like to highlight the key opportunities of this review from the landscaping industry of South Australia's perspective. Whilst they are focused on the collection of the Levy, this does not reflect the MLSA interest in all of the areas of review presented. It simply reflects the area of review that is most impactful on MLSA Members, and if improved, would contribute to the efficient collection of the CITF for the benefit of the industry. (1) We strongly support taking the collection of the CITB levy out of the remit of contractors altogether. From our interest base, making payment of the levy the responsibility of the landowner/ head tenant will streamline the collection of funds (especially if coupled with the process of paying planning approval fees), whilst reducing the administrative burden on construction professionals. (2) If sticking with a project by project-based collection strategy, we advocate for the alignment of the leviable activities with the prompts for collection. The historically used 'prompts' for payment of the levy should be aligned to what attracts the levy. This would make compliance clearer and easier for all. (3) We strongly object to the proposition for the levy to be calculated by reference to employee data not by project value. This proposition will increase the administrative and financial burden on landscaping businesses, despite the intent for the levy to be "added to the bill". (4) We advocate for the consideration and representation of the landscaping industry in the CITBs future plans. As identified, there is significant similarity and crossover with the civil and landscaping industries, and we look forward to working together to benefit the whole South Australian construction sector.

[Redacted]

From: YourSay [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 1 February 2023 3:22 PM
[Redacted]
Subject: Anonymous User completed Propositions Survey

Anonymous User just submitted the survey Propositions Survey with the responses below.

What type of job do you do?

representative of an industry association

Which industry or sector do you predominantly work in?

Other (please specify) - MEA's membership sector work would be fairly evenly split between residential and commercial.

Please provide your name, contact phone number, email address and the organisation you represent. The reviewers may contact you to discuss your responses in more detail

[Redacted]

There are four Terms of Reference below. Each has multiple propositions and you can complete all or as many as you like.

Note, if you intend to respond to multiple ToRs select them before you start your response.

- ToR A: CITB composition, administration, and operation
- ToR B: Levy
- ToR C: Allocation of funds obtained through the levy
- ToR D: Training plans

The Act should include Objects so that the Board's purpose and priority for the administration of the Fund is clearer. This should include that the Fund should be applied to addressing skills shortages, upskilling and entry level training as supported by data and evidence available to the Board.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Intelligence on skills shortages is vital to ensure that monies are being directed to the most appropriate use, upskilling in the form of courses for new technologies and CPD programs are strongly supported by MEA.

The Act should require the appointment of Board members to have a greater balance of employer and employee perspectives than is presently the case.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

MEA believe that feedback and industry intelligence from representative employee and employer organisations that are broadly representative of different facets of the sector is the most transparent and effective way for boards such as the CITF to operate and reflects best practice in other comparable jurisdictions.

The expression of interest process for Board appointees should remain, but the Minister should not be compelled to utilise this if the Minister is satisfied that good reason exists not to.

No, not supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

MEA believe that a transparent process of appointment is best to ensure the confidence of industry and is best practice.

The Act should require the appointment of a Board member with extensive knowledge of training policy and the contemporary training landscape.

Yes, supported

The Act should require that the Minister ensure that through appointments to the Board, members collectively bring sufficient expertise in the building and construction industry, legal and financial skills. Consideration should also be given to promoting diversity in making appointments to the Board.

No, not supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

For important public policy considerations, competence and experience should be the primary governance principle for board appointments.

The appointment of Deputy Members should be reserved only for members appointed due to a specific skill set.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

Perhpas consideration should be given that the board positions for employer and employee organisations could be allocated to the organisation, and subject to approval by the minister, could be changed in the event of the incapacity of an organisations representative. This would remove the need for deputies for "General" members.

The ability for the Presiding Member to exercise a casting vote should remain.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

It is common governance practice.

The provision for a majority Board decision should remain.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

MEA support this is principle, however this is on the proviso that the board appointment process is open and transparent, as laid in our response to Q9, and not solely at the discretion of the monoster of the day/

The Act should confirm the principle that Board members' overriding fiduciary duty is to the Board and its objects under the Act.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

With the obvious acknowledgement that if the board members representing other organisations and stakeholders, have a conflict of duty, they must disclose this as early as possible and refrain from voting on an issue that presents a conflict if the conflict cannot be managed to the satisfaction of the Chair.

The Act should formalise a requirement to consult with Sector Committees during the preparation of the Training Plan.

Yes, supported

The appointment of an independent Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee should be facilitated by permitting the Minister to approve remuneration of the Chair of committees.

Yes, supported

The Act's position in relation to the use of public service employees should reflect that in the *South Australian Skills Act 2008* to enable more integrated and complementary connections between the Board and Government.

Yes, supported

If an item's cost would ordinarily be captured by the Act, the fact that it is associated with generation, supply or transmission of electricity should not exclude that item from calculation of the levy. (For example, construction work associated with the installation of wind turbines or solar panels would be leviable activity.) [See regulation 13(3) of the Regulations]

Yes, supported

If an activity would ordinarily be captured by Schedule 1 of the Act and the activity is maintenance or repair work carried out by a self-employed person or an employee for the benefit of his or her employer, where the principal business activity of the self-employed person or employer is not in the building and construction industry, this activity should not be excluded from building or construction work for the purposes of the Act. (For example, maintenance or repair work performed by employees of a council would be leviable activity – as is the case presently if such work is contracted out.) [See Schedule 1(2)(a) of the Act]

No comment

If an activity would ordinarily be captured by Schedule 1 of the Act, the fact that it is associated with mining and petroleum activity should no longer automatically be grounds for exemption. Exemption should apply when associated with core resources operations or other specified activities. (For example, earthworks and building activity associated with the construction or maintenance of roads, tracks, or airstrips would be leviable activity. However, if WA's exemptions were mirrored, then work associated with resource exploration, unsealed haul road tracks etc. would continue to be excluded) [See Schedule 1(15) of the Act]

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

The resources sector benefits from the pool of trades trained predominantly within the construction sector, so it seems appropriate that they should contribute to a training levy.

The levy should be calculated by reference to employee data not by project value to enable a similar quantum of funds to be collected via a more streamlined process.

Yes, supported

If the levy is still to be calculated by project value, the definition of project owner should be changed so that the levy is payable by the landowner or head lessee rather than the current definition of project owner.

Yes, supported

The Civil sector should remain as part of the CITF Act scheme.

Yes, supported

Planning for allocation of the Fund should be revised to better utilise available funds for the Civil sector, including in relation to attraction and retention initiatives; and short courses which equip Civil sector workers to work in other sectors when there is a downturn in civil construction activity.

Yes, supported

In the absence of an alternative method of calculation than project value, the 0.25% levy remains as an appropriate rate for the Board to fulfil its role and functions under the Act.

Yes, supported

If the levy is based on project value, it should apply to a project's value excluding GST.

Yes, supported

If the levy remains calculated based on project value and exemptions are reduced resulting in an increase in revenue, the threshold of \$40,000 should be increased to reduce the administrative burden of payment and collection on low value projects.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

\$40000 is a very low value for a construction project, this threshold should be raised in consultation with industry and a review of project values.

The levy threshold should be contained in the Regulations and reviewed periodically against CPI increases and other relevant data (such as expenditure from the Fund).

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

No Answer

The CITB should increase the resources devoted to education and compliance.

Yes, supported

If you would like to tell us the reason for your response, please do so

MEA believe that consideration should be given to the levy supporting a CPD scheme for occupational licenses in SA which would go a long way to addressing education and compliance issues.

If the levy remains calculated according to project value, the South Australian Government should work with the CITB to identify reconciliation options for construction industry projects that are not captured by the usual planning approvals process.

Yes, supported

A minimum of 60% of the CITB fund allocations to training activity should be allocated between each sector of the building and construction industry in approximately the same proportions as has been contributed to the Fund by that sector. The remainder of training funds may be allocated for holistic or cross-sector programs such as sector attraction and cross-sector development.

Yes, supported

The CITB should allocate funding to administration activities such as research, data analysis, education and compliance.

Yes, supported

Government and the CITB should develop processes that facilitate information and market intelligence sharing in the formative stage of the development of a Training Plan.

Yes, supported

The annual planning cycle should be replaced by four-year rolling reviews of the overall strategic direction developed through the CITB's investment decisions, with capacity for annual adjustments and reallocation of funds.

Yes, supported

Are there any other models for supporting industry training and workforce development outcomes that the reviewer recommends to assist the Construction Industry Training Board achieve its objectives?

The Qld scheme that combines portable long service, work health and safety, and a construction skills intelligence body (CSQ) of .575% has merit, it reduces compliance costs for business and administration costs for government and has a broad base. Consideration should also be given to the Design Building Professionals levy (DBP) in NSW which helps fund an auditing and inspection regime for licence holders.

Any other comments?

If there is to be an expanded representation of employer representatives as outlined in Q7 and in the consultation paper, or there are vacancies on the industry representation allocations, MEA would have interest in supplying a suitably qualified candidate for the CITB.
