



**COST RECOVERY IMPACT STATEMENT (CRIS)  
Minor Cost Recovery Arrangements  
including:**

**Building Control at Leased Federal Airports  
Environmental Protection at Leased Airports  
Coasting Trade Permits  
Airports Lease Administration  
Shipping and Aviation Statistics  
Australian Safety Transport Bureau  
Miscellaneous Consultancies**

<b>1</b>	<b>AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT COST RECOVERY POLICY AND GUIDELINES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1.	WHAT IS COST RECOVERY? .....	3
1.2.	WHY HAVE COST RECOVERY? .....	3
<b>2</b>	<b>PRINCIPLES THAT UNDERPIN COST RECOVERY ARRANGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	GENERAL PRINCIPLES RELATING TO ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY .....	4
2.2	DESIGN PRINCIPLES .....	5
2.3	OPERATIONAL PRINCIPLES .....	5
2.4	EFFICIENCY PRINCIPLES .....	5
2.5	OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES .....	6
<b>3</b>	<b>MINOR COST RECOVERY ARRANGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	BUILDING CONTROL AT LEASED FEDERAL AIRPORTS .....	6
3.1.1	<i>Description of activities</i> .....	6
3.1.2	<i>Cost recovery income and costs</i> .....	7
3.1.3	<i>Findings of the review</i> .....	7
3.2	ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AT LEASED FEDERAL AIRPORTS .....	8
3.2.1	<i>Description of activities</i> .....	8
3.2.2	<i>Cost recovery income and costs</i> .....	9
3.2.3	<i>Findings of the review</i> .....	9
3.3	AIRPORTS LEASE ADMINISTRATION .....	10
3.3.1	<i>Description of activities</i> .....	10
3.3.2	<i>Cost recovery income and costs</i> .....	11
3.3.3	<i>Findings of the review</i> .....	11
3.4	COASTING TRADE PERMITS (COASTAL SHIPPING) .....	11
3.4.1	<i>Description of activities</i> .....	11
3.4.2	<i>Cost recovery income and costs</i> .....	11
3.4.3	<i>Findings of the review</i> .....	12
3.4.4	<i>Change in arrangements</i> .....	13
3.5	SHIPPING AND AVIATION STATISTICS .....	13
3.5.1	<i>Description of activities</i> .....	13
3.5.2	<i>Cost recovery income and costs</i> .....	13
3.5.3	<i>Findings of the review</i> .....	13
3.6	AUSTRALIAN TRANSPORT SAFETY BUREAU .....	14
3.6.1	<i>Description of activities</i> .....	14
3.6.2	<i>Cost recovery income and costs</i> .....	15
3.6.3	<i>Findings of the review</i> .....	15
3.7	CONSULTANCIES AND ONE-OFF PROJECTS .....	16
3.7.1	<i>Description of activities</i> .....	16
3.7.2	<i>Cost recovery income and costs</i> .....	16
3.7.3	<i>Findings of the review</i> .....	16
<b>4</b>	<b>ANTICIPATED ALTERATIONS TO MINOR COST RECOVERY ARRANGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>FUTURE COST RECOVERY REVIEWS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>CERTIFICATION .....</b>	<b>17</b>

---

## 1 AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT COST RECOVERY POLICY AND GUIDELINES

In December 2002 the Australian Government (the Government) adopted a formal cost recovery policy to improve the consistency, transparency and accountability of cost recovery arrangements and promote the efficient allocation of resources. In order to apply the new policy the Government issued Cost Recovery Guidelines for Information Agencies and Cost Recovery Guidelines for Regulatory Agencies.

The Guidelines must be applied to review cost recovery activities either under:

- an agreed schedule of reviews announced by the Australian Government;
- whenever there is a change to the cost recovery arrangements; or
- where new cost recovery arrangements are to be introduced.

### 1.1. WHAT IS COST RECOVERY?

Cost recovery is the recovery of some or all of the costs of a particular activity. Government cost recovery charges fall into two broad categories:

- fees for goods and services; and
- cost recovery taxes (primarily levies, but also excises and customs duties).

Cost recovery is different from general taxation. Some levies or taxes are used to raise cost recovery revenues, but the direct link - or 'earmarking' - between the revenue and the funding of a specific activity distinguishes such cost recovery taxes from general taxation.

### 1.2. WHY HAVE COST RECOVERY?

Used appropriately, cost recovery can improve economic efficiency. Cost recovery may also have equity effects. It may improve equity by ensuring that those who use regulated products and those who request additional information bear the costs. For regulatory agencies these broad principles suggest that the price of regulated products should incorporate all of the costs of bringing them to market, including the administrative costs of regulation. For information agencies the principles disseminate between general information products produced for the Australian community and information products produced at the request of specific groups or individuals. The principles suggest the cost of the products should be assessed on a case by case basis, with regard to efficiency and cost effectiveness.

Regulatory and information agencies undertake a range of activities and produce a range of products; cost recovery may not be appropriate for some of these activities and products. Therefore, a mix of cost recovered and taxpayer funded activities would be expected for most regulatory and information agencies.

The guidelines require the following activities of regulatory activities to be assessed for cost recovery:

- registration and approvals;
- issuing exclusive rights and licenses;
- monitoring and compliance;
- information and education; and
- services to government that are integral to the regulatory activity.

## **2 PRINCIPLES THAT UNDERPIN COST RECOVERY ARRANGEMENTS**

The Cost Recovery Guidelines for Regulatory Agencies and the Cost Recovery Guidelines for Information Agencies require that cost recovery arrangements be assessed against cost recovery principles contained in the Guidelines. These principles can be broadly grouped into:

- general principles relating to economic efficiency
- design principles
- operational principles
- efficiency principles; and
- overarching principles

### **2.1 GENERAL PRINCIPLES RELATING TO ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY**

The general principles relating to economic efficiency support cost recovery as an important means of improving economic efficiency by:

- sending important pricing message to users or customers about the costs of resources involved;
- reducing the call on general taxation revenue and avoiding the high efficiency losses from higher taxation revenue;
- improving horizontal equity by ensuring that consumers or beneficiaries of products, pay for the costs; and
- improving agency performance through transparency of costs and increased cost consciousness in both the agency and users.



---

## 2.2 DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Design principles require that the cost recovery arrangements:

- do not cross-subsidise across user groups;
- do not allow automatic access to revenues from cost recovery activities;
- be subject to the same public administration principles that apply to all government activities; and
- involve a degree of industry consultation to help drive agency efficiency.

## 2.3 OPERATIONAL PRINCIPLES

Operational principles require that:

- all cost recovery arrangements should have clear legal authority (for regulatory agencies);
- cost recovery charges should be linked as closely as possible to the actual costs of activities or products;
- costs recovered should relate to specific activities, not the agency that provides them;
- targets should not be set for the level of costs recovered;
- over recovery is inappropriate;
- outputs or activities that have ‘public good’ characteristics may be taxpayer funded;
- costs recovered may exclude activities undertaken for government where they are not integral or directly related to the provision of regulatory activities; and
- partial cost recovery is generally not appropriate.

## 2.4 EFFICIENCY PRINCIPLES

A key principle is that cost recovery should be based on ‘the efficient costs’ of the activity and should avoid:

- regulatory creep, where additional regulation is imposed without adequate scrutiny;
- gold plating, where unnecessarily high standards or facilities are adopted or there is simply over-regulation; and
- cost padding, where costs are artificially inflated in the knowledge that all costs can be recovered.

## 2.5 OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES

Notwithstanding that the Report supports cost recovery for economic efficiency reasons, it does not support cost recovery, specifically where it:

- is not cost effective;
- is inconsistent with policy objectives; or
- would unduly stifle competition and industry innovation.

## 3 MINOR COST RECOVERY ARRANGEMENTS

A consolidated Cost Recovery Impact Statement has been completed for the minor cost recovery arrangements of DOTARS on the basis that the preparation of individual CRISs for each of these arrangements is not warranted.

DOTARS has identified its minor cost recovery arrangements as:

- Building Control at Leased Federal Airports
- Environmental Protection at Leased Airports
- Airports Lease Administration
- Coasting Trade Permits
- Shipping and Aviation Statistics
- Australian Safety Transport Bureau
- Miscellaneous.

### 3.1 BUILDING CONTROL AT LEASED FEDERAL AIRPORTS

#### 3.1.1 *Description of activities*

The activities that are subject to cost recovery are regulatory activities that relate to the provision of an Airport Building Controller (ABC) to each federally leased airport. Phase 1 airports (Melbourne, Brisbane and Adelaide) were leased in 1997 and the remaining federal airports were leased in 1998. The fundamental objective of the ABC is to implement the building approval system that facilitates ongoing building activity at the airport and to ensure that an appropriate standard of building work is achieved at the airport.

The legal authority for the recovery of ABCs costs is in the Airport Sale Agreements and the *Airports Act 1996* (the Act). Section 100 of the Act provides the head of power for the Government to levy fees in respect of applications for building approvals, while the Sale Agreements provided, for the first 5 years of the Airport Leases, for airport lessee companies (ALCs) to pay any costs of the ABCs which were not recovered from building

permit fees. There is no legislative/contractual basis for the recovery of DOTARS' costs associated with ABCs.

Following the expiry of the 5 year Sale Agreement authority to recover the full costs of the ABCs, Section 100 of the Act remained the only head of power for the recovery of ABCs' costs, and this was limited to applications for building approvals. The building permit fee structure was reviewed in 2002 and a decision made to revise the fees to more closely align them with local council building permit fees levied off-airport, for consistency with the Government's competitive neutrality principles.

The revenue drivers (number of applications) are different from the costs drivers (costs of the contractor which is a full time appointment). This means that cost recovery levels can vary significantly. For example, if the number of applications for building approval drops significantly in a particular financial year DOTARS costs are likely to exceed cost recovery revenues.

Cost recovery fees are designed to recover registration and approval activities and monitoring and compliance activities of the ABC.

### 3.1.2 Cost recovery income and costs

		2002-03 \$'000s	2003-04 \$'000s
Revenues from cost recovery activities		\$756	\$1,072
Less: Expenditure on cost recovery activities		\$1,241	\$973
<b>Total amount (under)/over recovered</b>		(\$485)	\$99

### 3.1.3 Findings of the review

#### 3.1.3.1 General principles relating to economic efficiency

The review found that the building control cost recovery arrangements comply with the general principles outlined in Section 2. The cost recovery arrangements are designed so that the proponents of building works on leased federal airport sites pays the cost of the regulating this activity, to the extent which is legally possible under Section 100 of the Airports Act..

#### 3.1.3.2 Design principles

The review found that the building control cost recovery arrangements comply with the design principles outlined in Section 2. There is no cross subsidisation between user groups as the individual who pays the fees gains the benefit. Revenue received from

building control fees is not available to DOTARS as revenues are credited to the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The involvement of industry groups to drive agency efficiency is not considered an issue as DOTARS' internal costs are not recovered, as explained under Section 3.1.1 of this CRIS.

#### *3.1.3.3 Operational principles*

Division 5 of the Airports Act 1996 and the Airport (Building Control) Regulations of 1997 provide the legal authority for the fee arrangements at all federally leased airports. The description of the cost recovery arrangements demonstrated compliance with the operational principles with the exception of under recovery of costs in some years.

The operational principles state that partial cost recovery is generally not appropriate. In this respect DOTARS internal costs are not recovered even though they could be considered integral to the regulatory activity. However, the government policy decision to align prices to those of adjoining local government precludes DOTARS recovering its internal costs. DOTARS considers that the removal of incentives/barriers to developments on leased airports compared to adjacent property takes higher priority than non-compliance with the cost recovery principles relating to partial cost recovery.

#### *3.1.3.4 Efficiency principles*

The review found no evidence of non-compliance with the efficiency principles. There is no evidence of regulatory creep, gold plating or cost padding in relation to the regulatory activities being provided.

#### *3.1.3.5 Overarching principles*

The cost recovery arrangements in place comply with the overarching principles. The arrangement is simple and cost effective. The arrangements do not stifle competition as the current fees charged for building applications are in-line with local council fees and charges and therefore do not provide incentives/barriers that may influence the location of proposed developments.

## 3.2 ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AT LEASED FEDERAL AIRPORTS

### *3.2.1 Description of activities*

The activities that are subject to cost recovery are regulatory activities that relate to the provision of an Airport Environment Officer (AEO) to each federally leased airport. Phase 1 airports (Melbourne, Brisbane and Adelaide) were leased in 1997 and the remaining federal airports were leased over the period 1998 to 2003. The fundamental objective of the AEO is to support better environmental outcomes at leased Federal

Airports by setting standards and imposing duties in relation to environmental pollution (dealing with air, water and soil quality and noise emissions) and authorising the monitoring and remediation of breaches in environmental standards. The AEO is the Australian Government representative who administers and enforces environmental regulations. The costs of the AEO are recovered directly by DOTARS from the Airport Lessee Company (ALC). This arrangement is outlined in the lease agreements held between the ALC and the Government. The costs recovered include monitoring, compliance and enforcement activities.

The costs of the AEO are fully recovered from the ALC however the departmental internal costs such as salaries of departmental staff that are involved in the administration of the AEO contract and other environmental regulation activities (approx 5.6 FTE) are not cost recovered – as explained in Section 3.2.3.3, there is no legal basis for the recovery of those costs and they are met from DOTARS’ budget.

### 3.2.2 Cost recovery income and costs

	2001-02 \$'000s	2002-03 \$'000s	2003-04 \$'000s
Revenues from cost recovery activities	\$1,672	\$1,574	\$1,432
Less: External expenditure (administered)	\$1,672	\$1,574	\$1,432
<b>Total amount (under)/over recovered</b>	0	0	0

### 3.2.3 Findings of the review

#### 3.2.3.1 General principles relating to economic efficiency

The review found that the AEO cost recovery arrangement complies with the general principles outlined in Section 2. The beneficiaries of the activities provided by the AEO are the ALC’s who pay the costs.

#### 3.2.3.2 Design principles

There is no cross subsidisation between user groups and DOTARS does not have automatic access to revenues from the cost recovery activities. No areas of non-compliance with the design principles were noted during the review.

#### 3.2.3.3 Operational principles

Part 6 of the Airports Act 1996 and the Airport (Environment Protection) Regulations of 1997 state that regulations and environment pollution standards may be imposed but do not provide legal authority to cost recover. Clause 12 of the Airport Leases provides the legal basis for the Government to recover the full costs of the AEOs, and these costs are

fully recovered. Clause 12 does not provide authority for the recovery of the departmental costs of environmental regulation.

#### *3.2.3.4 Efficiency principles*

The review found no evidence of non-compliance with the efficiency principles. There is no evidence of regulatory creep, gold plating or cost padding in relation to the regulatory activities being provided.

#### *3.2.3.5 Overarching principles*

There are no areas of non-compliance noted in relation to the overarching principles. The cost recovery arrangements are cost effective as the process for reimbursement of the AEO costs is simple and is outlined in the lease agreement with each ALC.

### 3.3 AIRPORTS LEASE ADMINISTRATION

#### *3.3.1 Description of activities*

The review of the airports lease administration function identified several major lease administration activities in relation to each federally leased airport, including:

- lease reviews
- Airport Environment Officer/ Airport Building Controller oversight
- development commitment obligations
- managing the AON insurance contract
- land tax assessment/ administration

There are currently no cost recovery arrangements in place for the recovery of the departmental or administrative costs of undertaking the lease administration function. Clause 11.2 of each airport lease stipulates that DOTARS is entitled to recover the reasonable costs of administering the lease. However, during the Phase 2 airport due diligence process, when bidders sought clarification of the meaning of Clause 11.2, the Australian Government's sale team provided the following clarifying statement in the January 1998 Report on Recent Developments (RORD): "these (lease administration) costs will not include the Commonwealth's ongoing administrative costs (ie salary costs of Australian Public Service employees and the related running costs of these officers)". Consistent with this undertaking, DOTARS recovers certain costs associated with lease administration, eg variations to Tripartite Deeds, but does not recover the lease administration costs identified as exempted in the January 1998 RORD.

### 3.3.2 *Cost recovery income and costs*

DOTARS currently does not recover the costs associated with airports lease administration and therefore no cost recovery income is received. A costing exercise was undertaken to determine the reasonable costs of the resources required to administer the leases for the year ended 2003-04. Based upon this cost model, airport lease administration costs were estimated to be \$0.3 million.

### 3.3.3 *Findings of the review*

Not applicable as there are currently no cost recovery arrangements in place for the administration of leased federal airports to which the principles outlined in section 2 should apply. The RORD statement referred to in Section 3.3.1 would seriously undermine the Clause 11.2 contractual right to recover lease administration costs, and furthermore work undertaken by external consultants suggests there is some uncertainty on the cost effectiveness of a compliant cost recovery regime should it be introduced.

## 3.4 COASTING TRADE PERMITS (COASTAL SHIPPING)

### 3.4.1 *Description of activities*

The main objective of the Coasting Trade Permits (CTP) function is to facilitate shipping for Australian industry in coastal waters of Australia. The regulatory activities undertaken by the CTP function assist in the facilitation process through the issuing of licences and permits relating to the coasting trade. Licences and permits issued include:

- Licences – licensing of vessels to participate in Australia’s coastal trade irrespective of flag and crew nationality;
- Single Voyage Permits (SVPs) – issued for a single voyage between designated ports for the carriage of specific cargo;
- Continuing Voyage Permits (CVPs) – issued for a period of up to three months and enables a vessel to carry specified cargo between specified ports for that period; and
- Amendments – amendments made to the SVPs and CVPs, or to application already submitted for SVPs pr CVPs for which a permit has not yet been issued.

Fees are paid on application for an annual licence, SVP, CVP or and amendment in order to recover the costs of providing the regulatory activity. The level of cost recovery is dependent on the number of permits and licences issued each year.

### 3.4.2 *Cost recovery income and costs*

Revenue from the regulatory activities provided was \$0.3 million in 2003-04 and \$0.3 million in 2002-03 and \$0.2 million in 2001-02. The costs associated with the regulatory activity are not recorded separately from the costs of other activities

undertaken. Accordingly, the costs of providing the regulatory services were not able to be reliably determined. However, FTE numbers associated with the activity suggests that revenues and costs have approximately equalled over the 2002-03 and 2003-04 financial years. The costs recovered relate to registration and approval activities.

### *3.4.3 Findings of the review*

#### *3.4.3.1 General principles relating to economic efficiency*

Consumers of the regulatory activity are the vessel owners, charterer master or agent who lodges an application for a licence or a permit. These consumers are the beneficiaries of the regulatory activity provided by DOTARS and it is in accordance with the general principles that they pay the costs.

#### *3.4.3.2 Design principles*

The CTP cost recovery arrangement complies with the design principles outlined in section 2. The review found there to be no cross subsidisation between user groups in relation to the CTP cost recovery arrangement. The review also found that the payment of fees and charges are paid into DOTARS' bank account and are transferred to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. A bank reconciliation is performed each month to ensure all revenues received have been transferred into the CRF. DOTARS does not have access to these funds.

#### *3.4.3.3 Operational principles*

There were no areas of non-compliance with the operational principles noted during the review. Part VI of the Navigation Act 1912 and Regulation 25 of the Navigation (Coasting Trade) Regulation of 1937 provide the legal authority for the cost recovery arrangements.

#### *3.4.3.4 Efficiency principles*

The review found no evidence of non-compliance with the efficiency principles. There is no evidence of regulatory creep, gold plating or cost padding in relation to the regulatory activities being provided.

#### *3.4.3.5 Overarching principles*

The review found that the CTP cost recovery arrangement complies with the overarching principles outlined in Section 2. The user pays fee structure ensures that the cost recovery arrangements are simple and cost effective. The cost recovery arrangements do not stifle competition as the current fees are not excessively high and therefore do not preclude new entrants from entering the market. In 2000, CVP fees were significantly reduced in order to help open up the Australian Coasting Trade to overseas vessel operators.

#### 3.4.4 *Change in arrangements*

As from 1 July 2004 the processing activities relating to licences was transferred to the Office of Transport Security Operations Centre. This transfer may result in changes to activities undertaken and therefore cost levels. Compliance with the operational principles (in particular the proximity of revenues and costs) will be re-reviewed after a full twelve months of operations has been completed.

### 3.5 SHIPPING AND AVIATION STATISTICS

#### 3.5.1 *Description of activities*

The activities that are subject to cost recovery are information activities. The Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics (BTRE) provides international cargo, coastal shipping, airfare indices and other aviation statistics to interested parties such as merchant banks, tourism consultants and travel agents upon request. The information products are incremental products and form a minor part of the overall activities undertaken by BTRE.

Costs are recovered on a fee for service basis. Fees are quoted at 50c per item plus estimated labour costs. Fees charged for airfare indices are calculated at \$75 per index plus estimated labour costs. The fee calculation methodology complies with the cost recovery guidelines for incremental information products.

#### 3.5.2 *Cost recovery income and costs*

Revenue from the sale of shipping and aviation statistics was \$0.03 million in 2003-04, \$0.01 million in 2002-03 and \$0.01 million in 2001-02. The majority of costs recovered are the incremental costs of FTE effort to provide the information product. The incremental costs (other than labour) associated with the database are not able to be reliably separated from the 'basic product set'.

#### 3.5.3 *Findings of the review*

##### 3.5.3.1 *General principles relating to economic efficiency*

The review found that the shipping and aviation statistics cost recovery arrangement complies with the general principles outlined in Section 2. The fee for service arrangement ensures the consumers/beneficiaries of the products pay for the costs of providing these products. The fee for service arrangement was introduced in order to eliminate vexatious demand for the incremental information products which is in accordance with the general principles of cost recovery

#### 3.5.3.2 *Design principles*

The user pays arrangement which is based upon a standard costing template ensures that there is no cross subsidisation between user groups. In principle, the cost recovery arrangement does not fully comply with the design principles as the revenue from the sale of shipping data and airfare indices can be automatically accessed by DOTARS. However, given the small amounts of revenues recovered the ability to automatically access revenues (compared to requiring an annual appropriation to access funds) is considered appropriate on efficiency grounds.

#### 3.5.3.3 *Operational principles*

The cost recovery arrangements fully comply with the operational principles. No legal authority is required for fees charged for the incremental products provided. The majority of costs recovered relate to FTE effort required to produce the incremental information product. These costs are calculated in a robust manner which means there is a close nexus between revenues and costs.

#### 3.5.3.4 *Efficiency principles*

The cost recovery arrangement fully complies with the efficiency principles outlined in Section 2. There has been no artificial inflation of costs in providing the information products as fees are based on a standard rate plus a reasonable estimate of staff time.

#### 3.5.3.5 *Overarching principles*

No exceptions were noted during the review in relation to the overarching principles. The fee for service arrangement is simple and cost effective. Consumers of the information products are billed in accordance with contracts entered into and have 30 days to pay. Given the small amounts of revenue generated from the provision of these information products and the recovery of FTE effort in prices it is not considered to be cost effective to introduce systems and procedures to more accurately price the incremental database costs.

### 3.6 AUSTRALIAN TRANSPORT SAFETY BUREAU

#### 3.6.1 *Description of activities*

There are two information activities that are provided by the Australian Transport Safety Bureau (ATSB) which are subject to cost recovery:

- provision of a human factors training course – the human factors course is designed to increase the awareness of the human factors that can cause accidents/incidents to occur and is primarily aimed at internal staff as part of the DOTARS safety officers' training requirements. It is also available to external participants which represent approximately half of the participants and contribute approximately \$0.02 million

towards the costs of providing external experts to assist in running the courses. It is normally run twice a year; and

- sale of safety videos and CDs – these videos promote overall road safety in Australia and are sold to the general public for \$20 with applicable bulk discounts. The ATSB has been selling safety videos for over five years.

### *3.6.2 Cost recovery income and costs*

Revenue from the sale of videos/CDs was \$0.04 million in 2003-04 and \$0.02 million in 2002-03. The human factors course generated \$0.05 million in 2003-04 and \$0.02 million in 2002-03. In relation to safety videos/CDs, DOTARS internal costs associated with the provision of the information products by ATSB are not separately recorded from other departmental expenses. However, DOTARS is of the view that revenues and costs approximate. External costs associated with the provision of each product are fully recovered through the current cost recovery arrangements.

The primary beneficiaries of the human factors training course are internal staff. Accordingly, the contributions by external participants are used to defray external costs that would have been incurred by DOTARS in any case and should not therefore be regarded as a cost recovery activity.

### *3.6.3 Findings of the review*

#### *3.6.3.1 General principles relating to economic efficiency*

The fee for service/user pays arrangement ensures the beneficiaries of the products pay for the costs of providing them.

#### *3.6.3.2 Design principles*

External parties who attend the human factors course are charged a fee of \$2,000 which is used to recover the third party costs of running the training course. DOTARS does not charge for internal ATSB investigation staff participants. This is somewhat offset by the fact that the ATSB does not recover its internal departmental costs.

The external costs of courses are not based on participant numbers but on the number of courses provided. Although it could be argued that some cross subsidisation occurs because of these arrangements, the external costs of providing the course would remain largely unchanged even if no internal staff attended. As the primary beneficiaries of the course are internal staff the contributions from external parties should be regarded as a reimbursement of external costs rather than a cost recovery arrangement.

No other exceptions were noted in relation to the design principles during the review.

### *3.6.3.3 Operational principles*

The human factors course is not considered to be a cost recovery arrangement as the primary audience is internal staff. Revenues generated from external participants are in the nature of a contribution to costs.

Costs recovered in relation to the safety videos/CDs are also not linked to activities or actual costs as the \$20 flat fee is based on historical costs and have not been revised since sales commenced. However, DOTARS considers that the prices charged recover costs and reflect an appropriate balance between recovering costs and providing community access to important safety information.

Fees and costs of the safety videos/CDs are scheduled for review during this financial year.

### *3.6.3.4 Efficiency principles*

The review found that the cost recovery arrangements comply with the efficiency principles of the cost recovery guidelines.

### *3.6.3.5 Overarching principles*

The review found that the cost recovery arrangements comply with the overarching principles. The cost recovery arrangements are consistent with the policy objectives of the ATSB which is to improve and promote safety within Australia's transport systems. The arrangements are also simple and cost effective.

## 3.7 CONSULTANCIES AND ONE-OFF PROJECTS

### *3.7.1 Description of activities*

Consultancies relate to one-off projects undertaken by DOTARS for a third party and vary significantly. The number of consultancies undertaken each year is small and a very minor component of DOTARS' overall cost recovery operations.

### *3.7.2 Cost recovery income and costs*

Income and costs vary significantly between consultancies but are based on an effort and an hourly rate calculation and recovery of direct costs where they have been incurred.

### *3.7.3 Findings of the review*

As the pricing of consultancies and one-off projects is based on hourly rates and recovery of direct costs the cost recovery arrangements would comply with the design and operational principles.

---

#### **4 ANTICIPATED ALTERATIONS TO MINOR COST RECOVERY ARRANGEMENTS**

DOTARS does not intend to alter any of the current arrangements for minor cost recovery activities.

#### **5 FUTURE COST RECOVERY REVIEWS**

The Finance Guidelines require that cost recovery arrangements be reviewed on a regular basis but at intervals no later than 5 years and all minor cost recovery arrangements are scheduled for review in five years. However, the Coasting Trade Permits activity has recently been transferred to a new organisational unit which may impact the cost profile. Accordingly it is scheduled for review after a full twelve months of operations ie. during the 2005-06 financial year. Fees relating to the sale of safety videos (part of the cost recovery arrangements of the Australian Safety Transport Bureau) are being reviewed in the current financial year.

#### **6 CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS**

The combined total of DOTARS minor cost recovery activities is not considered to be significant and therefore no pro-active and direct consultation with stakeholders is being contemplated other than to publish this document on DOTARS' web site. If stakeholders wish to provide comments on this CRIS they can be made in writing to Mr Simon A. Ash, Chief Financial Officer, GPO Box 695, Canberra ACT 2601

#### **7 CERTIFICATION**

This cost recovery impact statement was certified by the Secretary of DOTARS on 10 May 2005.