
In general terms, the UDIA supports the **legislative framework that establishes the Construction Industry Training Board (Board) and the levy it collects to fund appropriate skills-based training for the building and construction industry to improve the capacity of skilled labour within the sector.**

We also note the focus and attention on attracting senior school students to a career in construction through the **doorways2construction** program and fully support the continuation of this program in addressing workforce development.

While training needs are important, the UDIA believes that in the depth of a housing crisis and amidst continually rising building costs, the levy rate should not be increased and in broad terms the funds already collected are adequate.

In relation to more specific questions related to the operation of the CITB, the UDIA as a representative body of the broader development sector shares many common members with other industry peak bodies including the Master Builders Association, Housing Industry Association and Civil Contractors Federation. In broad terms, we note their intention to respond to many if not all of the specific questions raised. Notwithstanding this, please see the following in relation to some specific matters that the UDIA believes should be considered.

Further to the commentary above, the UDIA notes there are several questions posed regarding the composition and skills of the CITB related to construction, including legal, financial and training expertise. We believe that these are critically important, however the UDIA also believes that a critical function of the CITB is to both forecast and plan for broader development trends that will impact skill requirements. This contrasts with responding to shortages after they occur. We strongly support a broad consideration of data and wider engagement instead of what appears to be such a strong emphasis on consulting sector committees.

The UDIA strongly rejects any idea or notion that a landholder or head lessee should be subject to the levy. Landholders and head lessees are already subject to punitive taxes such as stamp duty and land tax, and further, most of them do not operate in the business of construction where the direct benefit of training through the expenditure of the levy is realised. If the landholder or head lessee engages a firm to complete construction work, the building contractor will already factor the levy into commercial arrangements.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We hope the above is of assistance.

Yours sincerely,



Daniel Palumbo
PRESIDENT