



## PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICE

NSW Parliament • Parliament House, Macquarie Street Sydney 2000

### Election Costing Request Form

Details of request	
Party:	Australian Labor Party (NSW Branch)
Name of Policy:	<i>A Better Way</i> – additional funding
Date of request:	26 March 2015

Description of policy	
Summary of policy (please attach copies of relevant policy documents):	Direct \$438.1 million of new savings to increase funding allocated to support the rollout of <i>A Better Way</i> (separately costed) – bringing the allocation to \$2.2 billion over the four years to 2017-18.
What is the purpose or intention of the policy?	Roll-out Labor’s plan to deliver the state’s infrastructure priorities – without privatising our electricity network.
Has the policy been publicly released yet?	

Your estimated costing of the policy <sup>1</sup>						
	2014/15 \$'000	2015/16 \$'000	2016/17 \$'000	2017/18 \$'000	4 Yr Total \$'000	Other years <sup>2</sup> \$'000
Impact on General Government Sector (GGS) net operating result <sup>3</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-
Impact on GGS capital expenditure <sup>4</sup>	-	146,026	146,026	146,026	438,079	-
If different from above, impact on total State Sector net financial liabilities <sup>5</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-

<sup>1</sup> Amounts should be expressed in nominal dollars. GGS - General Government Sector.

<sup>2</sup> Please provide information on other years if spending occurs outside the forward estimate years and will be required to cost the policy.

<sup>3</sup> Negative for a saving that reduces expenditure

<sup>4</sup> Negative for a reduction in capital expenditure.

<sup>5</sup> Only required if proposal is outside GGS. Negative for a reduction in net financial liabilities.

<b>Key assumptions made in the policy</b>	
Does the policy relate to a previous announcement? If yes, which announcement?	Yes – \$1,722 million of funding to support the rollout of <i>A Better Way</i> was published by the Parliamentary Budget Office as part of its Budget Impact Statement on the Australian Labor Party (NSW Branch).
What assumptions have been made in deriving the financial impacts in your estimated costing? <i>(See checklist)</i>	<p>Allocate an additional \$146.026 million in each of 2015-16 to 2017-18 to support the rollout of <i>A Better Way</i>.</p> <p>Accordingly, the capital funding allocated to support the delivery of <i>A Better Way</i> is as follows:</p> <p>2014-15: \$116.302 million  2015-16: \$387.997 million  2016-17: \$916.936 million  2017-18: \$737.659 million  Total: \$2,158.895 million.</p>
Is there a range for the costing or any sensitivity analysis that you have undertaken?	No.
Are there associated savings, offsets or expenses? If yes, please provide details.	The policy reallocates \$438.1 million out of the \$519.1 million of savings taken up since the publication of the Budget Impact Statement.

<b>Administration of policy</b>	
Intended date of implementation:	Consistent with previously costed policy.
Intended duration of policy:	..
Who will administer the policy (e.g. Government entity, non-government organisation, etc.)?	..
Are there any specific administrative arrangements for the policy that need to be taken into account?	..
Are there transitional arrangements associated with policy implementation?	..

<b>If the policy is mainly a capital costs<sup>6</sup> commitment</b>	
Type of work, size and capacity:	To be finalised with completion of planning and business cases.
Proposed start and completion date of work:	Consistent with previously costed policy.
Intended construction schedule/cashflow:	..
Offsetting expenditure savings:	..
Associated asset sell off (if any):	..
On-going maintenance, depreciation and operational expenses:	..
Third party funding involvement:	..

---

<sup>6</sup> Capital costs differ from expenditure in that only depreciation will be included in the impact on operating balance. The capital cost of the asset to be acquired will however be included in net financial liabilities.