



Independent Technical Review

This guidance note outlines the DRFA requirements for undertaking an Independent Technical Review (ITR). It provides clarity on when an ITR is required, the circumstances in which it should be undertaken and submitted, and what the ITR must address to be compliant with the Disaster Recovery Funding Arrangements 2018 (DRFA).

Requirement to conduct an ITR

The purpose of an ITR is to provide the Commonwealth with enhanced oversight and assurance regarding claims made under the DRFA for specific types of essential public asset reconstruction works, as outlined in clause 4.3.2(d).

Under the DRFA, an ITR is required to be undertaken where a REPA project meets one of the following four circumstances:

- an estimated reconstruction cost (ERC) for a project is \$25 million or more; or
- where an alternative reconstruction solution is preferred but is more than 50% lower than the original ERC and to a value of between \$5 million and \$25 million; or
- where special circumstances were encountered that gave rise to a variance greater than 15% (and greater than \$1 million) from the original ERC; or
- the Commonwealth elects to have the ERC reviewed.

Notifying of the intention to undertake an ITR

It is recommended that the state informs NEMA as soon as it identifies that a REPA project may trigger an ITR. Each application and their triggers are described in Appendix A: Table 1. For Applications One, Two and Three, the state must notify the Commonwealth in writing within five business days of engaging the Technical Reviewer and provide the following information:

- the agency responsible for delivery of the essential public asset reconstruction works
- the reconstruction project subject to the ITR
- confirmation of the ITR type (i.e. Application One, Two or Three); and
- details of the Technical Reviewer undertaking the ITR.

States must complete the Intention to Undertake an ITR form (Annex 2) when notifying the Commonwealth of engagement of a Technical Reviewer.

Where the Commonwealth elects to have an ITR undertaken (Application Four), NEMA will notify the state within five business days of the Technical Reviewer being engaged. The state will then have 10 business days to consolidate the following documentation for sharing with the Technical Reviewer:

- damage assessment report and pre/post disaster evidence
- estimated reconstruction cost (detailed breakdown)
- preliminary design, scope documents, including alternative solutions (if applicable) etc; and
- demonstration of special circumstances (if applicable).

ITR Report

The state should review the draft ITR report to ensure it addresses the scope requirements of the relevant ITR application prior to submitting to NEMA. The state should also ensure any recommendations/findings raised in the ITR are addressed by the state prior to submission.



States are encouraged, where possible, to consult NEMA on the draft ITR report to ensure that any required changes or clarifications by the Technical Reviewer can be undertaken within the state's contract period, avoiding the need to reengage them.

Once the ITR is finalised, the report must be signed off by an engineer with the appropriate level of expertise and experience and include a statement regarding the Technical Reviewer's independence from the local government or state agency. The state is required to submit a copy of the report to NEMA in accordance with the timeframes outlined in Appendix A: Table 1.

ITR submission and acceptance

Upon submission of the final ITR report, NEMA will review it to confirm it meets the DRFA ITR requirements. As part of this review process, NEMA may request clarifications, additional information, or documentation from the state or amendments to the report to be made by the Technical Reviewer, if necessary.

While an ITR report does not need to be long it should be commensurate to the complexity of works and costs being claimed. The report must contain an analysis of the cost components of the ERC (or ERC adjustment), including construction, design and project management, contingency and cost escalation. It should also contain sufficient detail to clearly support the recommendations and conclusions made by the Technical Reviewer and how they developed these conclusions.

NEMA will formally communicate with the state regarding the acceptance of the ITR report and any adjustments that may need to be made to the established ERC value based on the ITR report conclusions and NEMA's determination of DRFA requirements being met.

Claiming costs of the ERC and ITR

Please ensure all documentation used by the Technical Reviewer to undertake the ITR is available to the Commonwealth. It is not required to be included in the report, unless listed in the table in Annex 2, but should be immediately available if requested as part of the Commonwealth's ITR assurance process.

The year in which the state claims the ERC is outlined in Appendix A: Table 1. States can also claim the cost of undertaking an ITR, where it's required, as an eligible measure under the DRFA. The cost of the ITR should be claimed in the financial year in which the ITR report was signed off by the Technical Reviewer. This may not be the same financial year in which an ERC was established, or an adjusted ERC is claimed.

NEMA will activate a specific sub-measure within the CRM portal for states to claim ITR costs, upon notification of the state's intention to undertake an ITR. Where an ITR has commenced or been undertaken but has not been claimed as of 1 July 2025, NEMA will provide advice on where to claim the ITR costs.

Reporting ERC adjustments (Application Two & Three) in quarterly reporting

The trigger for either Application Two or Three for a REPA project occurs after the state has established an ERC. Therefore, states should continue to report the original ERC for these projects in the quarterly estimates and REPA Report, reflecting any proposed adjustment to the ERC as an omission in the certification letter for quarterly estimates and as a comment against the REPA project in the REPA report.

As part of the Commonwealth's acceptance of the ITR report, NEMA will advise the state on reporting any adjustment to the original ERC in its formal correspondence.



Appendix A: ITR Requirements

Type	Trigger	Scope of ITR	ITR undertaken	ITR report submitted	ERC claimed
One	The estimated reconstruction cost for the project is \$25 million or more.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review and evaluate the accuracy of the ERC to provide the same pre-disaster function to the community as it did before the eligible disaster, and identify if pre-disaster function reconstruction is either cost-prohibitive or impractical. 	After ERC is established	Upon completion of report. No later than submission of state's claim pack for the year the ERC is claimed.	In the FY in which the ERC is established.
Two	Where an alternative reconstruction solution is preferred and there is a variance between the original ERC and the preferred reconstruction solution that is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> more than 50% lower than the original ERC, and between \$5 million and \$25 million. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review and evaluate the accuracy of the ERC of pre-disaster function reconstruction, review and evaluate the accuracy of the estimated reconstruction cost of an alternative solution, and review and evaluate the rationale for the alternative reconstruction solution of the essential public asset. 	After original ERC established and preferred alternative solution agreed	As soon as practical following completion of the ITR.	After Commonwealth acceptance of ITR report. If adjusted, ERC claimed in the FY the original ERC was established.
Three	Where special circumstances* are encountered which give rise to a variance in the estimated reconstruction cost for the project that is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> greater than 15 per cent of the estimated reconstruction cost of the original project, and greater than \$1 million. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review and evaluate the accuracy of the ERC of pre-disaster function reconstruction, review and evaluate the accuracy of the amended estimated reconstruction cost, review and evaluate the amended reconstruction cost is directly attributable to the special circumstances, and identify if pre-disaster function reconstruction is now cost-prohibitive or impractical. 	Once special circumstances are identified**	As soon as practical following completion of the ITR.	After Commonwealth acceptance of ITR report. Adjusted ERC claimed in the FY the original ERC was established.
Four	The Commonwealth, on receiving the estimated reconstruction cost for a project from a state within its financial year claim, elects to have it reviewed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> review and evaluate the accuracy of the ERC of pre-disaster function reconstruction of a project. 	N/A	N/A	As notified by the Commonwealth.

* Eligible special circumstances are defined by the DRFA in Table 1 of Schedule B.

** A state has 24 months from the end of the financial year in which the relevant eligible disaster occurred to claim an adjusted ERC due to special circumstances.



Appendix B: ITR scenario examples

- 1. The state establishes an ERC for a REPA project on 31 December 2024 (2024-25 Program of Works year) for a total of \$35 million, triggering ITR Application One. The state engages an engineering firm in January 2025, with the ITR report being signed off by the Technical Reviewer on 28 February 2025 (2024-25 financial year). The final ITR report is submitted to NEMA in April 2025.**

The state must inform NEMA, using the Intention to Undertake an ITR form within 5 business days of the Technical Reviewer being engaged (i.e. January 2025). Based on this information NEMA will open a special measure in the CRM portal to enable the costs of undertaking the ITR to be claimed. The special measure is called 4.3.2 d) *Cost of an Independent Technical Review*.

The ERC should be reported and claimed in the 2024-25 Program of Works year and submitted as part of the state's 2024-25 claim, as per normal claim submission timeframes (i.e. March 2026). The ERC value claimed must align with the value accepted by NEMA in its review of the ITR report.

The costs related to undertaking the ITR must be claimed in the 2024-25 claim, in line with the financial year the report was signed by the Technical Reviewer, against the special measure 4.3.2 d) *Cost of an Independent Technical Review*.

- 2. The state establishes an ERC for a REPA project on 31 May 2025 (2024-25 Program of Works year) for a total of \$50 million, triggering ITR Application One. The state engages an engineering firm in June 2025, with the ITR report being signed off by the Technical Reviewer on 15 August 2025 (2025-26 financial year). The final ITR report is submitted to NEMA in September 2025.**

The state must inform NEMA, using the Intention to Undertake an ITR form within 5 business days of the Technical Reviewer being engaged (i.e. June 2025). Based on this information NEMA will open a special measure in the CRM portal to enable the costs of undertaking the ITR to be claimed. The special measure is called 4.3.2 d) *Cost of an Independent Technical Review*.

The ERC should be reported and claimed in the 2024-25 Program of Works year and submitted as part of the state's 2024-25 claim, as per normal claim submission timeframes (i.e. March 2026). The ERC value claimed must align with the value accepted by NEMA in its review of the ITR report.

The costs related to undertaking the ITR must be claimed in the 2025-26 claim, in line with the financial year the report was signed by the Technical Reviewer, against the special measure 4.3.2 d) *Cost of an Independent Technical Review*.

- 3. The state establishes an ERC for a REPA project on 31 December 2024 (2024-25 Program of Works year) for a total of \$15 million and claims the ERC in the state's 2024-25 claim. During the project's reconstruction the asset owner identifies indigenous artefacts previously unidentified that result in the need to change the design and scope of works (identified in April 2026), triggering ITR Application Three. The estimated costs related to the project scope change, due to the indigenous discovery, results in an upward variation of the ERC up to \$45 million.**

The state engages an engineering firm in May 2026, with the ITR report being signed off by the Technical Reviewer on 29 June 2026 (2025-26 financial year). The final ITR report is submitted to NEMA in July 2026.

The state must inform NEMA, using the Intention to Undertake an ITR form within 5 business days of the Technical Reviewer being engaged. In this scenario, the asset was originally damaged in an event in the 2023-24 financial year (with the original ERC developed within the standard ATL i.e. 2024-25). The state identified the special circumstances before 30 June 2026, within the allowable time limit to vary an ERC (refer Schedule B, clause 4.5), and the variance is more than 15% and over \$1 million, triggering an ITR (Application Three).



The revised ERC costs estimates should be reported and claimed as an adjustment to the 2024-25 Program of Works year and submitted as a supplementary 2024-25 claim, at the same time the state is due to submit its next DRFA claim (i.e. March each year, unless otherwise agree with NEMA). The adjusted ERC value claimed must align with the value accepted by NEMA in its review of the ITR report.

The costs related to undertaking the ITR must be claimed in the 2025-26 claim, in line with the financial year the report was signed by the Technical Reviewer, against the special measure 4.3.2 d) *Cost of an Independent Technical Review*.



Appendix C: Better practice for ITR reports

Advice on how to structure and what should be included in ITR reports is outlined below. Following this better practice advice will assist in the timely acceptance of ITR reports.

Structure: Ensure there are clear sections in the report. The minimum requirement for each section of the report is outlined in below table.

Introduction:

- Generally includes details of Technical Reviewer; scope of ITR; evidence relied upon (evidence may be short summary with an annex); and overview of the project (i.e. description of asset and damage sustained).
- The scope of the ITR report should be clearly articulated in the report and aligned to the DRFA requirements (refer DRFA Schedule B, clauses 2.2, 3.2, 4.2 and 5.2).
- The ITR report should list the name and qualifications of the individual(s) undertaking and signing off on the ITR report. If this information is not provided in the report, it will be requested by NEMA.
- Describe the asset(s) pre-disaster function and condition. Describe the damage sustained during the eligible disaster. Photographic or other accepted forms of evidence should be included as an annex or appendix.
- The ITR report should summarise the evidence the Technical Reviewer relied upon to undertake the review. Evidence can be attached as an annex or appendix if required. The report should indicate if a site visit was undertaken and when.
- It is recommended the Technical Reviewer makes a statement summarising the adequacy of the evidence available to demonstrate pre-disaster condition, damage evidence and the link to an eligible event.

Scope of works:

- This section will provide an analysis of the scope of proposed works and whether these meet DRFA requirements (i.e. restore asset to pre-disaster function).
- The Technical Reviewer should provide an analysis of the scope of the proposed treatments and determine their appropriateness in rectifying damage incurred to the asset(s) due to the eligible event and restoring the asset(s) to pre-disaster function.
- Any proposed findings or recommendations to change scope or treatment(s) should be identified and if the ERC was adjusted (if required). This may include any design recommendations or ineligible components, such as betterment.
- Where a change to the scope of proposed treatments is recommended, and these changes impact the ERC, the ITR report should discuss this in detail in the Scope of Works, Estimated Reconstructions Costs Review, as well as the Recommendations and Conclusions sections.
- *For Application Two only:* the Technical Reviewer must provide an evaluation of the rationale and appropriateness of the alternative reconstruction solution identified and meeting DRFA requirements (i.e. restoring pre-disaster function).
- *For Application Three only:* the Technical Reviewer must provide an overview of the identified special circumstances. This should include a determination of the eligibility (as per the DRFA) and the direct attribution of special circumstances to an adjustment to the original ERC.



Estimated Reconstruction Cost Review

- The ITR report should contain a detailed analysis of the cost components of the ERC (or ERC adjustment), including construction, design and project management, contingency and cost escalation. Costs should be assessed against national guidance material and with DRFA requirements. The review of the estimated costs must reflect the ERC that has or will be claimed by the state. This should include any state-held contingency or any other eligible costs not included in any agreement with the asset owner.
- The Technical Reviewer should include a description of the methodology used to assess the costs. It should also include a description of the methodology used in the original cost build up.
- A cost comparison must be provided and analysis included on the different components of the ERC (i.e. construction, design and project management, contingency and cost escalation). While the analysis may be at a component level, the comparison should include a detailed cost breakdown. This may be included in an annex or appendix.
- Any identified variances between the state's ERC and the Technical Reviewer estimated costs must be identified and addressed, either as being within reasonable thresholds or requiring an adjustment.
- The Technical Reviewer must specifically provide an analysis of the calculation of contingency and cost escalation. This must include a determination as to whether these costs have been calculated in line with DRFA (and DITRDCSA) requirements. Alignment with state-prescribed requirements but not DRFA or National requirements is not acceptable.
- Any identified changes to the scope or proposed treatments that have an impact on the estimated costs must be reflected in the cost review.
- A detailed cost breakdown should be provided along with the Technical Reviewer's comparison costs in an excel format (as an annex or appendix) in addition to what is included in the main report.

Recommendations and conclusions:

- This section is to provide recommendations to ensure compliance with the DRFA requirements of the relevant ITR type. The Technical Reviewer's recommendations must, at a minimum, address the DRFA requirements of the relevant ITR type (refer Schedule B, clauses 2.7, 3.7, 4.7 or 5.6).
- For example, for Application One:
 - There is a clear recommendation that the proposed scope of reconstruction works, and associated costs are consistent with reconstructing the asset to its pre-disaster function.
 - Any adjustment to the scope and proposed treatments to align to pre-disaster function eligibility must be reflected here (e.g. such as removing components considered betterment) and any implications for the estimated cost addressed.
 - Confirm that the estimated reconstruction cost established by the state is not cost prohibitive, or that an adjustment to the estimated reconstruction cost is recommended.
 - Make a clear conclusion on the methodology used to calculate contingency and cost escalation and whether these costs are compliant with National guidance.
 - When making a recommendation statement on the estimated costs or cost adjusted, please clearly reflect the values in the statement.

Annex and Appendix:

- An annex is not mandatory. However, it can be utilised to enhance and support statements made within the ITR report. It may include a list of evidence relied upon by the Technical Reviewer (if not covered in main report) and a detailed breakdown cost comparison.



Recommended Sections & Subsections for ITR Report	
Cover sheet	
Executive summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ITR adjusted costs• ITR recommendations
Front or end matter	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Document / version control• List of acronyms• List of documents received (this should include any eligibility or other advice relevant to the project)• Technical Reviewer report• List of reviewer qualifications and experience
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scope of the ITR (application type)• Process undertaken by Independent Technical Reviewer• Project background• Summary of scope of the project• Pre- and post-disaster evidence• Summary of funding requests or other project reviews (if applicable)• Summary of site visits and ITR process
Scope of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analysis of the proposed treatments• Assessment of proposed works against pre-disaster function• Alternative solution (if Application Two)• Special circumstances (if Application Three)
Estimated reconstruction cost review	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overview methodology to assess the established ERC• Summary of construction costs (direct construction costs)• Summary of base estimate (client costs, including design and project management)• Contingency costs• Cost escalation• Summary of total eligible estimated reconstruction costs• ITR adjusted costs, if relevant
Recommendations and conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lists of recommendations• Conclusion
Annexes and appendices	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All working papers or recalculation relied upon as part of the ITR should be included as an Annex or Appendix.
Attachments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Original cost estimate• ITR adjusted cost estimate, if relevant• Cover letter• Any special circumstances reports, letters etc (e.g. conservation management plan, geotechnical reports)



Annex 1: ITR Process Checklist

Initiating an ITR		
	Item	Guidance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Is it an essential public asset as defined by the DRFA (DRFA Guideline 1) and will be claimed under Category B <i>Reconstruction of Essential Public Assets</i> (clause 4.3.2 d).	<i>This should align with state specific controls in the DRFA Management System</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Identify which conditions apply to the established ERC: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The established ERC value is over \$25 million (or likely to be) (Application One).• An alternative reconstruction solution has been chosen that is more than 50% lower than the ERC and of a value between \$5 million and \$25 million (Application Two).• One or more special circumstances were encountered during reconstruction works that has given rise to a variance greater than 15% (and greater than \$1 million) from the original established ERC (Application Three).	<i>An ITR may be triggered at the point in which:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>the ERC has been established (Application One) or</i>• <i>after the ERC is established and before or after works have commenced (Application Two) or</i>• <i>after reconstruction works have commenced (Application Three)</i>• <i>at any stage following the establishment of the ERC (Application Four).</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Determine the scope of the ITR.	<i>Is the scope for the ITR in line with the DRFA requirements?</i> <i>Include the deliverables relevant for the specific ITR Application for the Technical Reviewer in your request for quote.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Undertake procurement to engage a suitably qualified Technical Reviewer.	<i>The Technical Reviewer must:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>be a suitably qualified professional with the appropriate level of expertise and experience</i>• <i>demonstrate ability to resource the required services</i>• <i>be able to provide independent, without conflict, advice</i>• <i>be independent of the delivery agent.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Complete and submit the Intention to Undertake an ITR form	<i>This form should be submitted to NEMA within five business days after appointment of the Technical Reviewer.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ask NEMA to review your Request for Quote to ensure compliance with DRFA requirements (optional)	<i>If the state chooses to include additional scope that is beyond the scope outlined in the DRFA (Schedule B) this will need to be approved by NEMA where additional costs may be incurred.</i>



Undertaking the ITR		
	Item	Guidance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide the Technical Reviewer with all necessary supporting information relating to the ERC and REPA project.	<p><i>This may include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>pre- and post-disaster evidence</i> <i>damage assessment reports</i> <i>design and scope documents</i> <i>any technical assessments undertaken (e.g. Geotech)</i> <i>detailed cost breakdown of the ERC</i> <i>eligibility advice received from the Commonwealth (if relevant)</i> <i>the DRFA and associated guidance materials</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Facilitate site visit for Technical Reviewer (optional)	<i>This is not mandatory but is strongly encouraged.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Facilitate discussion with key stakeholders involved in the reconstruction works.	<p><i>This should include any local and or state representatives involved in the reconstruction project and development of the ERC.</i></p> <p><i>This may also include meetings to discuss any preliminary findings or queries from the Technical Reviewer to enable the ITR report to have clear recommendations and conclusions related to the ITR report requirements.</i></p>
Finalising and submitting the ITR		
	Item	Guidance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ensure the final ITR report includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> cover sheet analysis – the report must include an analysis of the evidence provided in support of the estimate(s) findings – the report must include discussion in respect of the evidence provided and how it supports the estimate(s), and recommendations. 	<p><i>The final ITR report must be signed off by an engineer with the appropriate level of expertise and experience and include a statement in respect of the Technical Reviewer's independence.</i></p> <p><i>The state should use the cover sheet template (DRFA, Schedule B, Appendix A). Refer Appendix C on better practice for ITR reports.</i></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Submit to NEMA with cover letter outlining key decisions (optional) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> How Technical Reviewer recommendations have been addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> Will the estimate be updated in line with the review? <input type="checkbox"/> Has the scope changed (address any concerns the reviewer raised e.g. betterment or alternative solutions)? 	<p><i>A cover letter for the submitted ITR is not mandatory. However, where there is additional information to convey to NEMA it is recommended to summarise this via the cover letter.</i></p> <p><i>For example, where the Technical Reviewer has not agreed with the state's scope and or costs for the reconstruction works as reflected in the ERC.</i></p>



Annex 2: Notification Form

Intention to undertake an Independent Technical Review form

This form has been designed to assist the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) assess requirements to undertake an Independent Technical Review (ITR) under the Disaster Recovery Funding Arrangements (DRFA).

This form should be used:

This form should be used for any project being claimed under 4.3.2 d) *reconstruction of essential public assets* (REPA) which triggers an ITR, including:

- when the established estimated reconstruction cost (ERC) for a project to repair or reconstruct an essential public asset is \$25 million or more (**Application One**); or
- where an alternative reconstruction solution is preferred but is more than 50% lower than the original estimated reconstruction cost (ERC) and to a value of between \$5 million and \$25 million (**Application Two**); or
- when special circumstances were encountered that gave rise to a variance greater than 15% (and greater than \$1 million) from the original ERC (**Application Three**).

How to complete:

Throughout the form, red text brackets denote where state input is required: **^example^**. Please delete all red text once you have entered the relevant data.

- States are encouraged to complete Parts 1 and 2 as soon as the state is aware of any project that is confirmed or likely to be \$25 million or more, including prior to the Technical Reviewer being engaged. This will enable NEMA to engage and provide any support, as required.
- Within five (5) business days of engagement of the Technical Reviewer, the state **must** complete all parts of this form (including reviewing Part 1 and 2 if previously provided) and submit to NEMA for review.

Forms should be submitted to recovery@nema.gov.au. Requests for advice about completing this form, or any other related enquiries, should be directed to recovery@nema.gov.au or through your state liaison officer.

PART 1 – APPLICATION INFORMATION	
Date of application	^dd/mm/yyyy^
Eligible disaster details	Event name: ^name of event ^ Event date: ^date or approximate ranges when the event occurred^ AGRN: ^Australian Government Reference Number^
Lodging state	^name of the state submitting the eligibility form^
Lodging agency	^primary agency for disaster recovery matters^
Authorising state officer	^name, position and contact details^



[complete Part 2 if the ITR triggered is Application One]

PART 2 – DETAILS OF PROPOSED RECONSTRUCTION WORKS (APPLICATION ONE)	
Project number / reference	<i>^Note: this should be the same reference as reported in the REPA Report.^</i>
Asset owner	<i>^This should be the entity that owns (or operates) and maintains the asset^</i>
Program of Works (PoW)	<i>^PoW year in which the project’s ERC was established ^</i>
Is the <u>project</u> a single asset or multiple assets reconstruction?	<p><i>^Please specify if the project constitutes a single asset reconstruction or a group of related assets (see DRFA 1.1 Definitions)</i></p> <p><i>If the project constitutes a group of related assets, please outline</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• how many assets/works constitute the project;</i> <i>• average value of the works/activities and highest valued activity;</i> <i>• brief description of the treatments and how these assets are related.^</i>
Details of the reconstruction project	<p><i>^Briefly outline the proposed reconstruction works, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• where applicable, unique project identifier (consistent with state project numbers provided through REPA reporting)</i> <i>• description and location of asset (or assets, if the project is a group of related assets)</i> <i>• name of eligible undertaking</i> <i>• proposed treatment(s)</i> <i>• works already undertaken</i>
Betterment funding	<i>^Please specify if the proposed works include enhancements to pre-disaster function, utilising either Category D Betterment funding or from another source^</i>



[complete Part 3 if the ITR triggered is Application Two or Three]

PART 3 – DETAILS OF PROPOSED RECONSTRUCTION WORKS (APPLICATION TWO or THREE)	
Project number / reference	<i>^Note: this should be the same reference as reported in the REPA Report.^</i>
Program of Works (PoW)	<i>^PoW year in which the project's original ERC was established ^</i>
Has the <u>original established ERC</u> been claimed?	<i>^Please confirm if the original established ERC has been claimed and reimbursed by the Commonwealth^</i>
Estimated ERC <u>following variation</u>	<i>^Please include the <u>revised</u> estimated cost of reconstruction (ERC) for the project relating to either:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>• the preferred alternative reconstruction solution; or</i><i>• the revised estimated reconstruction costs resulting in a variance from the original ERC due to special circumstances.</i> <i>Note that this should include all eligible costs, where relevant, including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>• construction</i><i>• design and project management</i><i>• contingency</i><i>• cost escalation^</i>
Details of proposed alternative reconstruction solution <i>(Application Two only)</i>	<i>^Briefly outline the original proposed scope of works used to establish the original ERC and how the proposed alternative reconstruction solution varies from this^</i>
Special circumstances resulting in cost variance <i>(Application Three only)</i>	<i>^Briefly outline the special circumstances that have occurred and have resulted in the variance from the original ERC (defined by the DRFA in Table 1 of Schedule B)^</i>
Betterment funding	<i>^Please specify if the proposed works include enhancements to pre-disaster function, utilising either Category D Betterment funding or from another source^</i>



PART 3 – DETAILS AND SCOPE OF PROPOSED INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW

Independent Technical Reviewer(s)	<i>^Please provide details of the Independent Technical Reviewer(s) who have been engaged for this ITR^</i>
Proposed scope of ITR	<i>^Please provide an outline of the proposed scope and potential timing of the ITR</i> <i>As per Schedule B of the DRFA, the Technical Reviewer will:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>review and evaluate the accuracy of the estimated reconstruction cost to provide the same pre-disaster function as it did pre-disaster (Application One, Two and Three),</i>• <i>identify if pre-disaster function reconstruction is either cost-prohibitive or impractical (Application One)</i>• <i>review and evaluate the accuracy of the estimated reconstruction cost of an alternative solution for reconstruction (Application Two)</i>• <i>review and evaluate the rationale for the alternative reconstruction project solution for reconstruction of the essential public asset (Application Two)</i>• <i>review and evaluate the accuracy of the amended estimated reconstruction cost (Application Three)</i>• <i>review and evaluate the amended reconstruction project cost is directly attributable to the special circumstances (Application Three)</i>• <i>identify if pre-disaster function reconstruction is now cost-prohibitive or impractical (Application Three)</i> <i>Note: Any scope additional to the requirements under the DRFA (below) will be considered by NEMA as to appropriateness of cost-sharing. ^</i>

PART 4 – FURTHER INFORMATION

Any further relevant information	<i>^Please include any other relevant information supporting this submission^</i>
---	---