SUSGGESTED COMMENTS TO BE PLACED IN THE ABCB COMMENTS BOX

“The reasons stated in the building complexity definition document do not adequately demonstrate the need for the definition. If the building complexity definition was based on a document and/or some research, then one would normally expect those documents to be added to the draft definition document to assist those reviewing the proposed definition.

To enable acceptance of a **future draft**, the ABCB should provide the following information:

1. Statement outlining possible uses of the definition (this information is needed
2. to understand the possible effect of the use of the definition on the design process and;
3. to evaluate the potential adverse effect the future use of the definition could have on architects’ Professional Indemnity Insurance);
4. Research and other information used to establish the definition;
5. The basis or justification for the establishing 10, 100 and 1000 as the dividing numbers for occupants and vulnerable occupants;
6. Clarification to confirm that disabled persons in other buildings (i.e., public buildings not listed in the definition) are not classified as vulnerable occupants. If they are vulnerable occupants, then a guide is needed to calculate a notional number of vulnerable occupants in those buildings;
7. Confirm that *Performance Solution* used to approve a minor construction error does not bring the whole building into the definition of an organisational building;
8. If after the design is completed and building approval given, the procurement arrangements for the project or project ownership may change. In that circumstances, can that project be exempted from the organisational requirements of the Building Complexity definition?

Detailed comments are provided in the attached file.”