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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Infrastructure Planning and Management Committee (IPMC), a key body in the planning and approval of UTAS capital works, has identified the requirement for reform of the processes by which UTAS develops, assesses and prioritises proposals for capital infrastructure projects.

In order to deliver the procedural reform identified by the IPMC, Commercial Service and Development (CSD), in cooperation with Financial Services and Information Technology Services, has developed a suite of procedures and documentation designed to:

- ensure alignment of capital infrastructure development with key UTAS strategies and operational plans
- improve operational planning and delivery of capital projects
- increase support and guidance to capital projects proponents
- provide clear definition of capital works funding responsibilities
- identify which projects are to be referred for assessment
- streamline the processes for the development, submission and assessment of capital infrastructure proposals
- contain costs and promote more effective use of existing resources
- establish an annual reporting cycle to measure the effectiveness and promote improvement of the development and delivery of capital works projects.

1.2 The purpose of this document

This document is intended to provide information and support to staff of UTAS faculties, divisions and institutes who are involved in the planning and development of capital infrastructure projects.

As the entity with primary responsibility for service delivery at UTAS, it is incumbent upon CSD to exercise a client-focused approach in the planning and delivery of capital works. Feedback from the IPMC and anecdotal evidence suggests that many of the concerns most commonly raised by capital projects proponents at UTAS relate to lack of clarity and communication about the scope of works required to meet their needs, the costs involved and who is responsible for meeting those costs.

This document and the processes it describes seek to address these needs by:

- identifying key stakeholders
- establishing clear processes and requirements
- providing clear definitions for categories of works
- publishing criteria for the assessment of capital works proposals
- defining funding responsibilities
- simplifying client paperwork.

The new processes and associated documentation are intended to provide transparency, equity and assistance for all prospective capital works proponents and to foster a strategic and cost-effective university-wide approach to infrastructure development.

---
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2 Capital works proposal assessment process key stakeholders

2.1 Commercial Services and Development

Commercial Services and Development (CSD) is the UTAS entity responsible for the provision and management of physical facilities and infrastructure at UTAS. CSD is a section within the Division of the Chief Operating Officer (COO).

CSD employs a team of expert facilities and capital works planning and project management staff, who are available to assist in the planning of projects and the development of project proposals.

Faculties, institutes and divisions are strongly encouraged to engage with CSD at the earliest opportunity in the planning of infrastructure projects to discuss options and ensure that proposals will meet strategic and operational needs at both local and institutional levels. Ideally, CSD should be contacted at the conceptual stage of development, when a proposal is deemed by a dean, head of institute or head of division to be desirable and consistent with the faculty/institute/division strategic plan.

In the first instance, queries regarding the development of capital works projects should be directed to CSD.BuiltEnvironment@utas.edu.au.

2.2 Financial Services (Finance)

Financial Services is a section within the Division of Chief Operating Officer, with a charter to provide accurate and timely financial services to the University community, ensuring effective decision support, financial and management reporting, compliance with legislative requirements and internal control, and transaction processing.

When developing a capital works proposal, faculties, institutes and divisions should consult with their Finance Business Partner in the relevant Hub to ensure that financial aspects of the proposal (including expected benefits) are robust, prior to submission to the IPMC.

2.3 Information Technology Services (ITS)

Information Technology Services (ITS) is a section within the University’s Division of the Chief Operating Officer providing comprehensive IT services including UTAS Service Desk, ICT infrastructure (communications and systems), desktop support, enterprise business services and support, information and records management, as well as web and learning services.

When developing a capital works proposal, faculties, institutes and divisions should consult with their ITS Business Partner in the relevant Hub to ensure that all IT impacts of the proposal have been considered and preliminary cost estimates developed prior to submission to IPMC.

2.4 The Infrastructure, Planning and Management Committee (IPMC)

The IPMC is a sub-committee of the Senior Management Team (SMT). IPMC provides advice to the Vice-Chancellor on capital development priorities and funding.
From 2013, the IPMC will assess and prioritise all capital works project proposals, irrespective of funding source. Minor and medium capital works proposals will be endorsed by the IPMC for approval by the COO and Vice-Chancellor (depending on the level of funding sought), while major works proposals will be the subject of further scrutiny by the Built Environment and Infrastructure Committee and Finance Committee prior to submission to University Council for approval.

2.4.1 Terms of reference
The IPMC’s functions, as established in its terms of reference, are:

- overseeing the strategy, policy and planning of the capital infrastructure lifecycle and monitoring their implementation
- reviewing proposals for major expenditure against the Capital Management Plan (CMP), paying particular attention to the campus master plans, Asset Management Plan, ICT Strategic Plan and other relevant strategic plans and policies
- recommending proposals for new build, refurbishment, disposal or demolition of buildings to ensure the adequate provision of functional space that is fit for purpose
- ensuring that capital infrastructure provision, maintenance and use trend towards sector best practice in accordance with agreed targets and benchmarks
- reviewing proposals for major infrastructure or plant and equipment such as IT hardware or software or research facilities and equipment
- providing recommendations to SMT.

2.4.2 Membership and support
The IPMC is comprised of:

- Chief Operating Officer (Chair)
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)&Provost
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students & Education)
- Executive Director Strategic Projects
- two deans, each appointed for a two-year term, on alternating years
- Executive Director, CSD
- Chief Information Officer
- Chief Financial Officer.

Secretariat support for the committee is provided by the Office of the Chief Operating Officer (COO).

2.5 The Built Environment and Infrastructure Committee (BEIC)
The BEIC is a committee of UTAS’ governing authority, the University Council.

BEIC endorsement is required for all major capital works projects. Under the new capital works assessment process, major capital works proposals prioritised and approved by IPMC will be forwarded to BEIC for endorsement. A proposal endorsed by the BEIC will

---
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subsequently be forwarded to the Finance Committee for its endorsement and finally to University Council for approval.

2.5.1 Terms of reference

The BEIC’s terms of reference are as follows:

- The committee will focus on strategy and high-level policy.
- The committee is responsible for considering, reviewing and advising Council on the development, approval and implementation of:
  - campus framework plans
  - priorities for major capital works
  - the strategic asset management plan, including information technology support infrastructure
  - the preventative maintenance program
  - buildings and grounds plans
  - design standards for building works and landscaping
  - policies in respect of the built environment and sustainability.

2.5.2 Membership and support

The BEIC membership is comprised of:

- Chair
- Chair of Academic Senate (or nominee)
- three other members appointed by Council
- Secretary.

Attendees are:

- Vice-Chancellor
- Provost
- Chief Operating Officer
- Executive Director Strategy
- Executive Director CSD.

Secretariat support for the committee is provided by the Office of the General Counsel and the University Secretary.

2.6 The Finance Committee (FC)

The FC is also a committee of the University Council. Works proposals with an estimated cost exceeding the financial delegation of the Vice-Chancellor (major works) require the endorsement of the FC prior to submission for approval by Council.

2.6.1 Membership and support

The FC is comprised of:

- Chair
- Vice-Chancellor (ex officio)
- Chair of Academic Senate (or nominee)(ex officio)
- Chair of Audit and Risk Committee
• two members appointed by Council
• Secretary.

Attendees are:
• Provost
• COO
• Director Financial Services.

Secretariat support for the committee is provided by the Office of the General Counsel and the University Secretary.

2.6.2 Terms of reference
The FC’s terms of reference are:
• to provide a strategic assessment and review of the University’s financial position
• to monitor the financial performance and activities of the University and to make recommendations to Council on financial matters as appropriate
• to review the University’s triennial budget and report to Council on its financial implications
• to review budgets of boards, centres and other Council-controlled entities operating outside the triennial budget
• to recommend to Council University investment policy and to review that policy and oversee the investment of University funds
• to review levels of fees and charges imposed by the University and report to Council as appropriate
• to act as a source of advice and consultation for the Vice-Chancellor on financial matters
• to review the University’s fiscal plan and report to Council on its implications.

2.7 University Council
Council is the University’s chief governing body, with statutory responsibility for strategic direction, academic and general reputation, financial viability and standards of conduct and probity.

The functions and powers of the University Council are established under the University of Tasmania Act 1992 (Tasmania). Broadly, Council is required to act in all matters concerning the University in the way it considers will best advance the University’s interests and is empowered to do all things necessary or convenient to be done for or in connection with the performance of its function as the University’s governing authority, including:

• appointing persons to positions of authority
• allocating University funds and resources.

In the context of capital works, Council is the approval authority for all major works (i.e. those for which the estimated cost exceeds the financial delegation of the Vice-Chancellor).

2.7.1 Membership and support
The membership of the University Council is as follows:
• Chancellor (Chair) (ex officio)
• Vice-Chancellor *(ex officio)*
• Chair of Academic Senate *(ex officio)*
• two members appointed by the Tasmanian Minister for Education
• five members appointed by Council
• one member elected by Academic staff
• one member elected by Professional staff
• one student appointed by Council
• Secretary.

Secretariat support for Council is provided by the Office of the General Counsel and the University Secretary.

3 The capital works submission and approval process

From 2013, UTAS will implement a revised process for the submission and approval of capital works projects. Irrespective of estimated cost or funding source, all works proposals are to be developed in consultation with CSD’s Built Environment and Development Unit. The process for assessment of works will differ slightly depending upon the category of capital work proposed, with category (minor, medium or major) to be determined by estimated project cost.

All minor capital works projects are to be funded locally from the budget allocation of the proponent faculty/institute/division. In recognition of the fact the size of annual operating budgets varies greatly between entities, the maximum limit for self-funding of minor capital works by faculties/institutes/divisions will be determined according to annual budget allocation as outlined in the table below.

*Table I – Maximum $ limit for self-funding of minor capital works*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Annual budget&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt; ($ million)</th>
<th>Maximum self-funding limit for minor capital works ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4–10</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10–25</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;25</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For works with an estimated cost exceeding the amounts shown above, proponent faculties/institutes/divisions will be eligible to submit a case for funding through the CMP.

The process by which all capital works proposals will be assessed and prioritised is outlined in Table II.

*Table II – Approval process by category of work*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of work</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Fund source</th>
<th>Funding approval</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<sup>4</sup> Operating and corporate expenditure allocation
| Minor          | Band 1 ≤ $50,000  
|               | Band 2 ≤ $100,000  
|               | Band 3 ≤ $200,000  
|               | Band 4 ≤ $250,000  |
| Local budget allocation | Dean/Head of Institute/Head of Division and COO |
|                | • Monitored by CSD  
|                | • Regularly updated summary list/table to IPMC  
|                | • Detailed report to IPMC by exception only  
|                | • One or two completed minor projects selected randomly for inclusion in annual report (to IPMC and BEIC) as part of cyclical review process. |

| Medium        | > maximum self-funding amount as determined by budget allocation < financial delegation of Vice-Chancellor |
| Central or local | IPMC and COO/VC |
|                | • Regular progress summary report of all medium projects to IPMC (with detailed report to IPMC by exception only)  
|                | • One or two completed medium projects selected randomly for inclusion in annual report (to IPMC and BEIC) as part of cyclical review process. |

| Major         | > financial delegation of the Vice-Chancellor |
| Central or local | IPMC, BEIC and Finance Committee, UTAS Council |
|                | • Regular progress report on each major project to IPMC, BEIC and Finance Committee  
|                | • Progress report on each major project included in annual report (to IPMC and BEIC) as part of cyclical review process. |
3.1 Works to be referred

It is intended that all capital works, irrespective of funding source, be developed with the involvement of CSD facilities, built environment and finance personnel, and be submitted for assessment according to the process outlined in Table I.

This requirement is consistent with the Policy on the Approval of Works to University Buildings and Site Infrastructure (2002), which applies to all UTAS building work regardless of scope or funding sources and which states that:

‘Any works to University buildings or site infrastructure that have been undertaken by a faculty, division, school or section without approval may be removed or modified in cases where the work has compliance, safety, aesthetic or nuisance issues. All costs associated with the rectification of unapproved works will be charged to the responsible faculty, division, school or section.’

Referral of all works projects is required in order to:

• ensure that UTAS’ built environment and infrastructure develops in alignment with its key strategies (including Open to Talent, the Learning and Teaching Plan, the Research and Research Training Management Plan, campus master plans and the Strategic Asset Management Framework) as well as fulfilling the objectives of individual faculty/institute/division plans
• enable equitable and transparent assessment of all proposals against established criteria
• streamline delivery of prioritised projects
• maximise the use of resources and create operational synergies by taking a ‘whole-of-University’ approach to infrastructure planning and development.

It is intended that the inclusion of externally funded works in the assessment process will encourage UTAS faculties/institutes/divisions to consult with CSD in the development of funding grant applications with a capital infrastructure component.

Early involvement of CSD expert staff in the development of internal and external infrastructure funding bids can strengthen proposals by demonstrating alignment with broader property/asset management planning objectives and UTAS strategic planning goals, and through the provision of robust project cost estimates and ongoing lifecycle maintenance costs for completed facilities.

3.2 Funding responsibilities

Under the Policy on the Approval of Works to University Buildings and Site Infrastructure (2002) funding responsibility for ‘minor capital works’ lies with the proponent budget centre. In practice, however, this principle has not been strictly observed. Since 2002, an increasing range of capital project cost items have become the subject of negotiation.

From 2013, the principle of defining and publishing clear funding responsibilities for capital works projects will be reinstated. This is consistent with recent changes to the UTAS budget model, which seeks to devolve more funding responsibility to individual budget centres.

Self-funded items will include:

• all minor capital works (i.e. capital projects with an estimated cost within the budget-based self-funding limits outlined in tables I and II)
- all loose furniture and equipment (chattels) except where these are specifically included (for example, under a funding grant or special purpose allocation)
- all specialist equipment (i.e. locally managed and maintained specialist research equipment, including vessels and machinery) unless specifically included as above.

3.3 Key dates and activities

The following calendar-based submission, approval and review process is intended to:

- simplify the submission process for works proponents
- enable better planning and management of project delivery by CSD
- ensure the involvement of CSD expert staff in project development at the earliest opportunity
- address problems relating to the referral to the IPMC of ‘unexpected’ works proposals
- ensure transparency, consistency and objectivity in the assessment process
- maximise alignment of effort and resource expenditure with strategic objectives
- dovetail with the UTAS Planning and Budget Cycle Timeframe devised by the offices of the COO and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor.

An outline of the process timeline is provided at Table III.
### Table II – Capital works proposal submission and assessment timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February–March</td>
<td>Capital works plan annual report for previous calendar year submitted to IPMC and BEIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April–May</td>
<td>Faculties, institutes and divisions liaise with CSD regarding capital works proposals to develop robust project scope and costing (concurrent with development of faculty/institute/division plan – due for submission on 31 May).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| June           | • All completed capital works proposals submitted to CSD using capital works project proposal template  
• CSD assesses and prioritises minor works proposals against selection criteria, provides draft minor capital works prioritisation list to Executive Director CSD for endorsement and to the COO for approval. Copy of list provided to IPMC for information  
• Approved minor capital works notified to proponents and CSD. CSD develops delivery schedule for approved minor capital works projects  
• All medium and major capital works proposals submitted to IPMC for assessment and prioritisation against selection criteria (with CSD assistance).  
• Proposals will be ranked according to priority and assigned to one of the three following lists:  
  o endorsed and CMP-funded  
  o endorsed but not CMP-funded  
  o not endorsed.  
• Faculties/institutes/divisions to be notified of outcome of IPMC decision and provided with a copy of the three ranking lists                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| June–July      | Proponents whose proposals have been endorsed, but not allocated CMP funding to decide whether they will self-fund their proposal through the UTAS budget round                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| September–October | Faculties/institutes/divisions to advise CSD of any medium and major capital works projects previously designated as ‘endorsed, but not CMP-funded’ by IPMC, for which funding has been obtained subsequently through UTAS budget process  
• List of previously endorsed and prioritised medium and major capital works projects, for which funding has been obtained subsequently through the UTAS budget process, submitted to IPMC for information  
• All endorsed and prioritised major capital works proposals submitted to BEIC for endorsement  
• All endorsed and prioritised major capital works proposals submitted to Finance Committee (FC) for endorsement  
• Prioritised major capital works proposals endorsed by BEIC and FC submitted to University Council for approval  
• Proponents of self-funded major capital works notified of outcome of IPMC and BEIC/FC/Council deliberations  
• CSD develops delivery schedule for approved medium and major works projects.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| November       | IPMC identifies selected completed minor and medium capital works projects for inclusion in capital works plan annual report. (NB – the report will include a progress report on each major project).                                                                                                                                                                           |
It should be noted that proposals will be valid for a single annual submission round only. Should a proponent wish to have their project reconsidered in a subsequent year, the proposal must be resubmitted for assessment and prioritisation against all new proposals.

4 The capital works project proposal template

A standard capital works project proposal template has been created to facilitate both the development and assessment of capital works proposals.

The template is comprised of three sections, only the first of which is to be completed by the project proponent. The remaining sections will be completed relevant CSD and Financial Services staff.

While the template contains detailed instruction as to the specific requirements under each section, it is recommended that proponents liaise with CSD before attempting to draft a proposal. The template is designed to ensure involvement of all stakeholders in the proposal development process and to encourage communication between them.

5 Assessment and prioritisation of works

Capital works proposals will be assessed and prioritised by CSD and the IPMC against a consistent set of criteria, which have been drafted to reflect key strategic and operational requirements for capital infrastructure development.

The criteria are designed to ensure:

- alignment of proposals with UTAS’ strategic and operational plans
- that the proposed works will deliver stated functional requirements
- that the proposed works will comply with all relevant legislative and code requirements
- that the proposal represents the optimal use of funds and resources
- that all built environment implications have been considered
- that the proposed works will deliver tangible operational benefits.

Further, it is intended that publication of the criteria will complement the associated processes and documents to assist in the development of proposals and create a ‘level playing field’ for works proponents.
Appendix A – Definitions

Types of works

Capital works

Capital works are works undertaken to create a new asset or space, or to change the use, function or layout of an existing asset or space.

Capital works may include:

- provision of new building infrastructure
- provision of site infrastructure associated with and integral to a building, such as a new electrical sub-station, new lift, new water main, new landscaping, etc
- renovation of an existing building or space.

All capital works projects must align with the UTAS Strategic Plan and support the implementation of other relevant planning instruments (such as the campus master plans and the Strategic Asset Management Framework).

For administrative purposes, a capital works projects at UTAS will fall into one of the following categories:

- **Minor capital work** – a capital works project for which the estimated cost is equal to or less than the maximum limit for self-funding of works by the proponent faculty/institute/division, according to the latter’s band ranking as established by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Annual budget ($m)</th>
<th>Maximum self-funding limit for minor capital works ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4–10</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10–25</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;25</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Medium capital work** – a capital works project for which the estimated cost exceeds the maximum limit for self-funding of works by the proponent faculty/institute/division, but which is less than the financial delegation of the Vice-Chancellor.

- **Major capital work** – a capital works project for which the estimated cost exceeds the financial delegation of the Vice-Chancellor.

Renovation

Renovation projects are capital works projects intended to change the use, function or layout of a built asset or space. Renovation does not include refurbishment, repairs and/or maintenance of an asset or space with no accompanying change of use or function.

---
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Refurbishment

Refurbishment works are works undertaken to improve the condition and/or functionality of a built asset or space, but which do not change the use, function or layout of the asset/space. Refurbishment may include repainting, recarpeting and installation of new fit-out items (such as benches, cupboards, etc).

Unless undertaken as part of the centralised maintenance/upgrade program, refurbishment works are to be funded by the proponent faculty/institute/division. Refurbishment works are initiated by submitting a ‘Job Request’ to the CSD Service Centre.

Repairs and maintenance

Maintenance works include all actions necessary for retaining an item or asset in, or restoring it to, its original condition.

Major types of maintenance are:

- corrective, which comprises:
  - planned repairs;
  - reactive ‘fix-on-fail’
- preventative, comprising:
  - lifecycle efficiency maintenance (scheduled tasks undertaken to extend the life of an asset and to ensure that it operates at its maximum efficiency)
  - statutory (scheduled maintenance that must be undertaken to ensure compliance with relevant legislation and codes).

Maintenance works for base-building infrastructure are centrally funded, except in the case of non-fair wear and tear or deliberate damage. Where an asset has been damaged as a result of vandalism or negligence, the perpetrator will be responsible for costs.

Faculties/Institutes/Divisions initiate self-funded maintenance works by submitting a ‘Job Request’ to the CSD Service Centre.
Funding definitions

Order of cost
The order of cost estimate is an indication of the likely cost of a project based on information available at the initial proposal.

Indicative cost estimate
Also called a ‘ball-park estimate’, an indicative cost estimate has a ±30% order of accuracy. Developed at the project identification and assessment stage, it is used to determine if funds are likely to be available and whether to proceed with the proposal.

Brief stage cost
The briefing stage cost estimate is prepared using the project brief developed for the selection of the principal consultant for the project. It is based on known building costs from similar projects, with external costs indicated separately.

Budget estimate or outline proposal cost
This is the estimated cost of the project and has a ±20% order of accuracy. It is based on the results of the project feasibility study, including a more detailed scope of the works required and delivery option plans. The budget estimate is used to determine whether the project should proceed, and if and how it could be funded.

Estimate or sketch design cost
The estimate or sketch design cost estimate has a ±10% order of accuracy and is produced during the design development or schematic design phase of the project. The estimate is based on drawings of project delivery options, which are then assessed to determine which option will be pursued.

Tender estimate or tender document cost plan
The tender estimate or tender document cost plan estimate is based on the documentation prepared for distribution to businesses wishing to submit tenders for delivery of the project.

Tender price
The tender price is the price received from tenderers for a capital works project. It is the cost that the market has determined is applicable to the project at the time tenders were called. The tender price is based on detailed plans, drawings and specifications.

Quote/quotation
A quote or quotation is cost estimate provided by a contractor for a small project. It is based on a limited scope of works and specifications.