

**Legislative Council
Hansard
Tuesday 14 April 2026**

The President, **Mr Farrell**, took the Chair at 11 a.m., acknowledged the Traditional People and read Prayers.

MOTION

Proposed Macquarie Point Stadium Project Costs and Impacts

[3.30 p.m.]

Ms WEBB (Nelson) - Mr President, I rise to speak on this motion. Surprisingly, it doesn't look like many people are going to rise to speak on it, which is quite puzzling to me. The key role we have here in this House of review is one of scrutinising the government of the day in the decisions that have been made, particularly around the spending of public money. This project, as we're all well aware, was one of fairly high sensitivity, fairly high public engagement, fairly high public contention, and I recall as the order went through this place, time after time, statements of the need to provide intensive scrutiny as the project went forward, and support for the project being contingent, in fact, on that occurring.

We have more than enough examples in recent times in this state of government projects that have gone somewhat astray, potentially through a lack of scrutiny that was effectively applied at the right times during a process. Certainly, the one that springs to mind is to do with berthing in the Devonport area for our new ferries. Somehow, because of things going astray within the government, within the relevant GBEs, but also within the appropriate scrutiny of this parliament, we landed in a position of a project really going quite pear-shaped and having consequences: financial, social and in community confidence in government.

I don't think any of us here would expect to undermine community confidence in governance, in government, in the ability of this place to do its job for scrutiny, by us shying away from an opportunity to do that effectively with the right information in front of us. It's really interesting to me to see this motion, and I thank the member for Hobart for bringing it. I believe it's quite a straightforward proposition.

When I look to it and I consider, okay, we have a piece of correspondence that was tabled in this place on 4 December by the leader for government business that makes a statement about the existence of a P90 assessment, and I believe there's an immediate question then: did it exist at that time and what was its scope? Did it meet the standard that would be expected of a P90 assessment? That's a relevant question for us in this place. When the motion here asks us to note that correspondence and the statement about the P90 in that correspondence, that's a fairly straightforward proposition for us to note that.

It also asks that this Chamber expresses concerns. These are not unreasonable things to express concern about, as the member for Hobart went through in some detail, but I will just remind myself, given that industry requirements for a valid P90 - and this is across Australia and international practice - would require for that to be done to a standard that's acceptable; there to be a finalised scope for the project; a settled design; no major unresolved design decisions; no pending negotiations with key stakeholders; no uncosted functional requirements.

It would require that there were known quantities, so that we must have defined structural elements; materials; engineering systems; mechanical and electrical systems; site preparation

requirements; enabling works; utilities and power upgrades; and that they would all be known quantities. That there would be identified risks in a complete risk register, including design risks; construction risks; geotechnical risks; supply chain risks; labour availability risks; inflation risks; stakeholder-driven scope changes as a risk. That we would also see the P90 presenting quantified contingencies and having those taken into account: for each risk there must be quantified, assigned a probability, assigned a cost impact, and incorporated into a Monte Carlo simulation. It's been very interesting to learn a lot from this motion in engaging with the content of it and learning a bit more about what's expected for a P90. I certainly wasn't aware of it to this degree before.

It also would require there be stable design inputs. The following things must be final: the roof design; the acoustic engineering; the pitch and turf systems; the seating bowl geometry; the structural loads; the mechanical systems; and compliance with sporting code requirements. That requires that there would be completed engineering studies for acoustic modelling; wind loading; roof engineering; utilities and power assessments.

I didn't hear the government dispute this, but I am quite prepared to be told that some of these things aren't necessary to produce a valid, to-standard P90 assessment. If that's the case, I didn't hear the government say it. I also didn't hear the government clearly say that they had a full assessment that would meet that standard at the time that letter was written, which they certainly implied in the letter. I think it's absolutely reasonable that we may have concern to express, which is a mild thing to do about these things: firstly, that the claims in the letter and the P90 assessment are not supported by available evidence, are incomplete or maybe not technically possible.

Given the list of things I just read out, which I can absolutely assure you, and every member here would honestly know, on 4 December last year were not things that could be claimed to be finalised and in place and known. Who knows when that letter was written, but on 4 December last year, when it was tabled, we could not meet a P90 that required all those things I just referred to. It was a mild thing to say we may express concern about that. We're also asked to express our concern that an industry-standard P90 requires finalised scope, known quantities, identified risks and quantified contingencies. Yes, it does.

If anyone wants to get up and say it doesn't, I'm interested to hear and to see the evidence of it; and concern that the project conditions may not be met, resulting in penalty payments and overall cost increases. I think that's always an overarching concern that we would have to some extent. All of those things that the motion asks us to express concern about are valid. There's nothing particularly condemnatory about them. They're more observational than anything else, to be honest. In fact, they're asking us to be honest with ourselves, with this place and with the Tasmanian community.

The motion then goes on to ask that the Legislative Council calls on the Tasmanian Government to make publicly available and lay upon the table of the Council the document it refers to as the P90, and any materials supporting the P90 as described in the letter, by 5 May this year. I heard the honourable member for Hobart state, in her contribution on this motion that she's brought, that it would be entirely acceptable to meet this motion if the government were to say those things can't be put into the public domain in full.

I heard her say that it would be acceptable to put the bits that could be partially into the public domain, and to potentially provide to members of this place on a confidential basis a briefing or access to see the others. That's an entirely reasonable way to approach this request in the motion. The government has gotten up here and stated that it can't put these things in the

public domain because the project is in an active procurement phase and it's a commercial risk to put things into the public domain that might be part of this material: fine. Don't put it into the public domain, then. Meet that requirement in the motion by providing access to us as the people voted into this place to provide scrutiny of government on behalf of the Tasmanian community who all stood here and promised to do that in relation to this project.

There is literally no reason whatsoever to deny the request of this place. It's a reasonable, responsible request to see this material, in confidence if necessary: absolutely zero reason to deny this Chamber the opportunity to do that. It's actually offensive to this Chamber to not do that, if this Chamber puts the request. It is, however, a matter of this Chamber putting the request.

So, I'd be surprised today, very surprised, if there isn't majority support in this Chamber to make that request because it is an entirely reasonable and responsible request. When we get further down the track with this project, should anything go astray, should things begin going in a direction that the public, Tasmanian public become concerned about, and they turn to this parliament and ask us, on our behalf, how did you hold the government to account on this project? How did you apply urgent scrutiny as it progressed? If they were to look to this debate today on this motion, and see that this Chamber, failed to support this motion, the Tasmanian people would be well within their rights to see us as derelict in our duty, in fact. We are the House of review. We are not dominated by the government of the day. We're perfectly placed to be able to do a responsible, reasonable job. Scrutinising on behalf of the Tasmanian people. This motion assists us to do that. To neglect to take this opportunity presented by the motion would be just that, neglect. Dereliction of duty.

Now, I'm very pleased that the government has outlined the ways in which it's undertaking other commitments made in the letter here. Great. I'm very pleased to hear those things are being put in place, or have been put in place and are continuing to play out. I'm particularly pleased that the Public Accounts Committee is doing regular oversight of this project as it goes along. Excellent. None of that absolves us here, as a Chamber and as members, from doing our job of scrutiny, too.

Now, we haven't heard from the Public Accounts Committee member about whether they've looked at this P90. I don't know, maybe they have. I also haven't had the opportunity to go and look at the records of the scrutiny that the PAC has applied to the project so far. I don't know their intention going forward. This may well be something that PAC wishes to look at in detail, but again, even if PAC were to do that or have done it, it still doesn't mean this Chamber, as a broad Chamber of members, couldn't and shouldn't do that, too.

There's literally no reason, to not support this motion. In terms of it being a reasonable call for scrutiny, it's asking for responsible information about this incredibly consequential project. It is what the Tasmanian people would expect of us. The government has no basis on which to deny us, at the very least, confidential access to this information. There's likely to be a swathe of it that could be made public as well. There's likely to be, but if there are elements that can't be, we can certainly be provided with them on a confidential basis.

I would hate to think that this Chamber would be seen today to not support this motion, when we all stood here and promised to do this very thing not a handful of months ago when the order went through this place with the support of this Chamber.

I certainly will be supporting this motion. If it needs to be given effect to slightly different wording of the motion, for example in point 3, rather than all made being made public, if elements could be made public, and other elements be provided confidentially - the member

for Hobart has made it very clear that that's an acceptable proposal going forward. That's what I've heard anyway. I would support that too. I put it out right now the government is absolutely available to do that, without any commercial in confidence risks because we accept confidential information. The government has provided us with confidential information on other occasions to do with other projects and nobody here abused that. Nobody here leaked about that or abused it, but we were then able to better fulfil our role of scrutiny - particularly as the House of review.

The only reasons a government would refuse to provide this information is either because it didn't exist at the time that letter was written and it will be horrendously embarrassing and damning if that comes to light, or that they don't have faith and confidence in the material that's associated with it and are scared of the criticism. Quite frankly, that's not good enough. That is just not good enough. An executive government is responsible for its decisions, it's responsible for the way it undertakes its governance work around projects, and it should be scrutinised. It should have to answer questions on it. It should have to front up and provide information at least to the people who are doing the scrutiny on behalf of the Tasmanian people here in this place.

On that, I thank the member for Hobart for bringing this motion. It's great to see somebody putting the actual role of this place to work for us to exercise on behalf of the Tasmanian people our responsibilities on this project and I certainly hope that with this place supporting this motion, we then will have the opportunity to fully do that.