



Submission to the

Streamlining and Modernising the National Construction Code Consultation

Prepared by:

Building Products Industry Council

Rodger Hills - Executive Officer

PO BOX 3037

WESTON CREEK ACT 2611

Phone - 0438 740 240

Email - eo@bpic.asn.au

February 2026

Commentary

The **Building Products Industry Council (BPIC)** makes the following response to *the Streamlining and Modernising the National Construction Code* consultation.

1. Does the current ABCB governance model work? Why or why not? What should change, if anything?

The current ABCB governance model has strong foundations but is no longer functioning as effectively as intended. The Inter-Governmental Agreement (IGA) has become outdated and now contributes to blurred roles, duplicated structures, and unclear lines of authority. The introduction of additional bodies such as the Senior Officials Group and the Building Regulators Forum has created a crowded and ineffective governance environment without adding clear value, diluting accountability and slowing decision-making.

A core weakness is the lack of a structured, authoritative mechanism for industry input. Although the ABCB was originally conceived as a collaborative arrangement between governments and the industry it regulates, the current arrangements do not ensure that industry representatives are selected based on subject-matter expertise or chosen by industry itself. This has led to a disconnect between policy development and practical implementation realities, forcing industry to escalate issues directly to Ministers; a pathway that risks politicising technical decisions.

Furthermore the ABCB has suffered from underfunding for many years remained static at 2015 levels (\$8m annually) despite a ballooning in policy, project and consultation work over the intervening years to now, and an even greater annual workload expected to be undertaken in the years to 2030. The situation has only gotten worse with the exhaustion of the Special Reserve account the ABCB has been relying on to maintain staffing and resourcing levels.

For an industry that creates billions of dollars in revenue nationally and in each Jurisdiction, the low funding provided to the ABCB by all States and Territories is not commensurate with the importance of the ABCB, the NCC, and the economic value derived from both.

A modernised governance model should:

- Transition the current ABCB to a statutory body structure headed by an independent Commissioner (while not able to directly influence Jurisdictions, the body could nonetheless publicly report on performance benchmarks for regulatory activities in each State/Territory, especially NCC compliance enforcement).
- Update the IGA to clarify roles, responsibilities, and decision-making authority and especially reinforce the ABCB Board's role as the central body determining NCC technical content and all aspects of Code-related building performance covered by building policy.
- Scrap both the Senior Officials Group and the Building Regulators Forum.
- Ensure industry representation is based on expertise and selected by industry, not appointed by governments or Ministers.
- Ensure there is an equality of industry representation and government representation on the ABCB Board and in other forums associated with the development of the NCC.
- Significantly increase the level of funding contributed to the ABCB for building consultation capacity, code development capability, and fundamental research. Noting that State/Territory jurisdictions often have limited budgets allocated to them by their respective Treasuries, industry would expect the

Commonwealth to provide far more than the current 50/50 funding split (Federal vs. State/Territory) to achieve this.

These changes would restore the ABCB's original intent: a collaborative, expert-driven body capable of delivering nationally consistent, technically sound building regulation.

2. How effective is the current model at facilitating adequate stakeholder engagement? How could it be improved?

Stakeholder engagement (especially consultations and working groups) under the current model is inconsistent and often insufficient. While the ABCB consults widely, the mechanisms for incorporating industry expertise into decision-making are weak. Industry lacks a formal, reliable pathway to influence strategic and policy priorities, leading to frustration and too often, the need to pursue issues directly with Ministers. This dynamic undermines the quality of technical policy development and increases the risk of decisions being shaped by political pressures rather than evidence.

Furthermore, comparatively recent additions to the NCC (e.g. Condensation and Water Vapour Management, and EV Charging Provisions) have lacked the first-principles research (rigorous, independent and appropriately commissioned scientific research) needed to underpin policy direction and technical regulation. This has led to two equally disastrous outcomes:

- (a) Individuals (within the ABCB and externally) with limited scientific credentials and technical research experience being over-represented in advisory and decision-making forums, leading to decisions based purely on opinion (or personal/industry agendas), as well as decisions that are disproportionate or inappropriate to the problem.
- (b) Multitudinous debates that collapse into acrimony between subject-matter experts with competing views and anecdotal experience, in the absence of definitive peer-reviewed evidence/research to break the deadlock.

Improvements should include:

- Establishing a structured, transparent consultation mechanism for industry to contribute at two levels: 1) – Policy Level (BMM) at the time any new national (or state/territory) policy is being considered and that would require a technical requirement in the NCC to be developed/amended, and; 2) Technical Standard Level where the technical feasibility of realising the policy intent is considered (this would need clear guidelines and management to prevent people trying to prosecute policy decisions they don't like during technical discussions).
- BPIC recommends that the current structure of ABCB consultation working groups be abandoned and that:
 - Sub-sectoral committees should be formed containing experts relevant to that sub-sector (from industry and government) and a narrow scope of responsibility.
 - Meeting minutes should be taken, including decisions and recommendations, and agreed and be available for review.
 - ABCB representatives should act as secretariat only and provide input to the meeting within specified guidelines, reviewed and agreed by BCC/PCC/Board from time to time.
 - These sub-sector committees should sense-check and/or validate any proposed third-party consultants before they are engaged and develop the briefs that direct consultant activity.
 - Where the evidence-base for building problems, and the circumstances under which they occur, is weak or non-existent, the ABCB should have access to a dedicated and substantial research fund, enabling it to conduct first-principles research that will inform further technical and policy discussion.

- Consider the creation of 'Regulatory Support Cells' in each State and Territory, hosted by the ABCB Office, local planning/building departments, and co-partnered with industry to run workshops, produce plain-English guidance, and troubleshoot local quirks in the NCC rollout. This would help fast-track training of certifiers, practitioners and builders to the new NCC.
- While BPIC acknowledges the need to reduce the workload on both the ABCB Office and the BCC/PCC, decisions about which PFCs are important and need to be prioritised, should be made either by the BCC/PCC or another formalised process, not unilaterally by the Office.
- Ensuring guidance material and explanatory content is co-developed with practitioners who understand practical implementation challenges.
- Creating a more collaborative environment where industry expertise is valued rather than perceived as a threat.

3. What is the best governance model to ensure independent and quality advice is provided to Ministers as the final decision makers of the NCC and related matters?

With respect, BPIC notes that until 2017, the final decision makers of the NCC and related matters was the ABCB Board. However a cohort of Building Ministers wishing to pursue an interventionist approach, redrafted the IGA to remove this perfectly acceptable situation that had worked for twenty years. They also created the Senior Officials Group and the Building Regulators Forum, which have proven to be disastrous as outlined in our response to Question 1.

Therefore a governance model that restores the ABCB Board as the final arbiter of all issues to do with the NCC is seen by industry as the preferred approach, with Building Ministers setting broad and long-term policy direction based on input from both government and industry representatives.

Several further enhancements would support this:

1. Independent Technical Review

An independent body (such as the International Building Quality Centre) could periodically review the NCC for complexity, duplication, inconsistency, and usability. This would provide Ministers with objective assessments free from jurisdictional or political pressures.

2. National Interpretative Service

A centralised, authoritative interpretation mechanism within the ABCB would reduce inconsistent interpretations across states and territories. This service would issue interpretations (e.g. *this* is what was intended and so *this* is what actually meets that intention) on high-volume or contentious topics, improving consistency and speeding up approvals.

3. Clearer Governance Through an Updated IGA

A revised IGA should:

- Restore the ABCB Board as the final approver of the technical content of the NCC.
- Clarify the BMM's role as setting broad and long-term policy direction only.
- Create a transparent and accountable forum of government and industry representatives to advise Building Ministers before policy directions are set.
- Clarify decision-making authority.
- Clarify how technical advice is escalated and validated.

This would help ensure Ministers receive advice that is technically robust, nationally consistent, and free from fragmented jurisdictional influence.

4. What is the optimum cadence for making changes to the NCC and what is the best way of introducing changes to the NCC?

There is no perfect amendment cycle, but the evidence strongly supports retaining the three-year cycle as the most balanced option. International benchmarking shows that:

- A one-year cycle creates constant churn, leaving industry unable to absorb changes.
- A five-year cycle results in large, overwhelming updates that are difficult to implement.

The three-year cycle provides stability while allowing meaningful updates, but only if governments avoid overloading each cycle with major policy initiatives, as occurred with NCC 2022. Key improvements to the cadence and change process include:

- Limit out-of-cycle amendments strictly to urgent health and safety matters.
- Synchronise updates across Volumes 1 and 2 when changes affect both housing and commercial buildings.
- Assess the effectiveness of major changes before introducing new stringencies.
- Revisit RIS reports after implementation to confirm that projected costs and benefits were realised and that the original assumptions used in the RIS are still current and/or correct.
- Provide adequate transition periods so industry can adapt without disruption.

5. What should the role of the NCC be? Are there opportunities for the NCC to set minimum standards but provide pathways that effectively encourage the adoption of best practice?

The NCC's primary role is to set minimum necessary standards for safety, health, amenity, accessibility, and sustainability. However, the NCC can also act as an enabler of innovation and best practice, not merely a compliance instrument. Several opportunities exist:

1. Clarify the distinction between mandatory requirements and compliance pathways

Many users perceive the NCC as overly large and complex. Re-publishing a Mandatory Requirements Volume would make clear that only a small portion of the NCC is mandatory, while the remainder provides optional pathways.

2. Expand Deemed-to-Satisfy pathways for proven modern methods of construction (MMC)

MMC systems such as light-gauge steel, panelised walls, and volumetric modules are already delivering high-quality outcomes. DTS pathways would reduce approval delays and increase confidence.

3. Introduce voluntary innovation pathways

These would allow emerging technologies to be tested and refined before being considered for mandatory adoption.

4. Maintain the performance-based framework

The performance solution pathway remains essential for innovation, allowing new technologies to demonstrate compliance without waiting for prescriptive provisions.

5. Use the NCC to support national consistency in MMC oversight

The NCC can underpin national administrative arrangements for modular construction, reducing duplication and improving productivity.

6. What parts of the NCC could be improved to remove complexity, ambiguity or duplication?

Several areas of the NCC have become unnecessarily complex, ambiguous, or duplicative, creating barriers to compliance and increasing the risk of misinterpretation. The key issues include:

1. Performance Requirements introduced before supporting standards

New performance requirements — such as roof ventilation for condensation management — have been implemented before the relevant Australian Standards were updated. This has created fragmented and sometimes conflicting compliance pathways, forcing practitioners to assemble overly complex solutions to satisfy all requirements.

2. Inconsistent or unclear definitions

Multiple definitions for the same building element, and definitions that do not align with established terminology in Australian Standards or industry practice, have led to confusion and inconsistent application.

3. Competing design philosophies

The NCC now accommodates a wide range of design approaches (lightweight construction, high thermal mass, passive solar design, natural ventilation, Passivhaus principles), but without a clear framework for how these philosophies interact. This breadth has pushed the NCC toward a level of complexity that risks becoming unworkable.

4. Structural complexity and navigation challenges

The multi-volume structure and reliance on performance-based compliance make the NCC difficult for non-specialists to navigate. Simplifying the layout, numbering system, and language would significantly improve usability.

5. Overly complex provisions

Energy efficiency and liveable housing provisions are among the most complex in the Code, particularly due to their interactions with other sections (e.g., condensation, damp and weatherproofing). Attempts to align the NCC with NatHERS have further complicated matters.

6. Duplication and outdated DTS provisions

A strategic review of Performance Requirements and DTS Provisions is needed to identify redundancy, outdated content, and gaps. This includes reviewing the Energy Efficiency DTS Elemental Provisions to remove unnecessary requirements.

Overall, the NCC would benefit from a systematic simplification program focused on clarity, consistency, and alignment with contemporary standards and practices.

7. How can affordability and productivity implications be better considered in the NCC process (e.g., alternative approaches to presenting regulatory impact analysis)?

Affordability and productivity are influenced by the NCC, but the current processes do not consistently or transparently account for these impacts. However, several improvements would strengthen the NCC's contribution to housing productivity:

1. Recognise the cumulative impact of regulatory change

The NCC development process involves multiple proponents, evidence requirements, and consultation stages. While each change may be justified individually, the cumulative effect can significantly impact productivity and affordability.

2. Strengthen the ABCB's capacity

Reductions in the ABCB's capability and resources limit its ability to process amendments efficiently, review standards, and manage PFCs; all of which affect productivity.

3. Improve the role of DTS pathways

Volume builders rely heavily on DTS pathways. Expanding and refining these pathways, without compromising quality, would support productivity by reducing reliance on performance solutions.

4. Enhance regulatory impact analysis

RIS processes should explicitly consider housing productivity, provided a reliable and accepted method for calculating productivity impacts is developed. RIS assumptions should also be revisited after implementation to validate whether projected outcomes were achieved.

5. Avoid worst-case assumptions

The ABCB has increasingly applied worst-case scenarios across the NCC, even in low-risk areas. This approach inflates costs and complexity unnecessarily. A more proportionate, risk-based approach would reduce regulatory burden.

6. Reconsider the liveable housing provisions

These provisions are complex, interact with other parts of the Code, and can escalate costs. A voluntary standard (promoted as an optional add-on) could achieve policy objectives without imposing mandatory costs across the entire market. Specifically a review should be conducted of the current exemptions and whether more property types (and circumstances) should be exempt on technical grounds.

By embedding productivity considerations into the NCC development process, the Code can better balance safety and quality with affordability and efficiency.

8. Do you find it difficult or costly to comply with the NCC? If so, what would make it easier and more cost effective to comply without compromising building quality and safety?

Compliance with the NCC can be challenging for smaller practitioners and those unfamiliar with performance-based regulation. Key challenges include:

1. Navigation and structure

The multi-volume format and complex numbering system make the NCC difficult to navigate. Simplifying the structure and improving cross-referencing would reduce time and cost.

2. Performance Solutions

Users often struggle with interpreting performance requirements and developing performance solutions, especially when guidance is vague or requires referencing external standards behind paywalls.

3. Complexity of provisions

Energy efficiency, liveable housing, and condensation provisions are particularly complex due to their interactions with other parts of the Code.

4. Limited access to referenced standards

Many referenced standards must be purchased, creating cost barriers and limiting transparency.

5. Opportunities for improvement

- Integrate all functional requirements for a building element into a single section.
- Expand explanatory notes and guidance material.
- Improve recognition pathways for industry reference standards.
- Provide clearer, more consistent explanatory information for regulators and industry.
- Use diagrams more effectively to simplify concepts.

9. How do state and territory variations impact cost and productivity? Which of these variations have the greatest impact?

State and Territory variations significantly undermine the benefits of a national code. Their impacts include:

1. Increased cost and administrative burden

Variations, particularly those that depart from Performance Requirements, create inconsistency across jurisdictions. This leads to:

- Higher design and documentation costs
- Delays in approvals
- Increased risk of non-compliance due to practitioner confusion

2. Reduced productivity

Inconsistent requirements force builders and designers to customise solutions for each jurisdiction, reducing economies of scale and slowing project delivery.

3. Lack of transparency

Some variations are not clearly identified within the NCC, compounding confusion and increasing the risk of error.

4. Local government interventions

In some jurisdictions, local planning schemes impose requirements that exceed the NCC, further fragmenting the regulatory environment.

5. Cycle misalignment

A shorter amendment cycle previously reduced the likelihood of jurisdictions introducing variations out of impatience. Under the three-year cycle, variations have increased, particularly when jurisdictions seek urgent changes.

10. How could the NCC be improved to make it easier to understand and use?

Improving the NCC's usability requires addressing both navigation and comprehension challenges.

1. Simplify navigation

The new information architecture and improved search functionality have helped, but further simplification is needed. Re-ordering volumes so that Volume 1 covers Class 1 buildings and Volume 2 covers Class 2 buildings would improve intuitive navigation.

2. Target an appropriate reading level

Before NCC 2022, the Code required the equivalent of 33 years of education to understand. The target was reduced to a 13-year education level, but further refinement is needed. Expert analysis should determine the appropriate reading level for a diverse user base, noting that reading level does not necessarily equate to the education or intelligence level of users, and must also take into account English as a second language, competition from other sources for a user's attention, and the time-poor nature of modern readers. It should also be noted that according to the OECD, one in eight Australian adults are functionally illiterate, reading at an OECD Level 1 or below and this figure is potentially higher in the construction sector.

3. Improve language and structure

Clearer language, simplified numbering, and more consistent formatting would improve comprehension.

4. Expand explanatory content

Explanatory notes, handbooks, and diagrams are highly valued by users and should be expanded. These tools help translate technical requirements into practical understanding.

5. Produce a simplified guide for Ministers

A plain-language 'beginner's guide' to the NCC would help Ministers understand the Code's purpose, limitations, and the consequences of poor harmonisation. This would reduce the risk of politically driven decisions made without a full understanding of the NCC, that undermine technical integrity.

6. Leverage digital delivery

Most users now access the NCC online. Digital-first design (including better metadata, cross-linking, and AI-enabled navigation) will continue to improve usability.

11. How could the NCC better interact with regulations that sit outside the NCC (e.g. with international standards and Australian Standards referenced in the NCC)?

The NCC's effectiveness is heavily influenced by how well it integrates with external regulatory instruments, particularly Australian Standards and emerging international frameworks. Currently, this interaction is inconsistent and often creates barriers to compliance. Key opportunities for improvement include:

1. Seamless digital integration with Australian Standards

The new information architecture introduced in NCC 2022 provides a strong foundation for linking NCC clauses directly to referenced standards. Once paywall issues with Standards Australia are resolved, the NCC could support:

- Real-time cross-referencing
- Integrated navigation
- AI-enabled interpretation across both documents

2. Align definitions and terminology

Misalignment between NCC definitions and those used in Australian Standards or common industry practice creates confusion and inconsistent application. A systematic alignment process is needed to ensure terminology is consistent across all regulatory instruments.

3. Support for modern methods of construction (MMC)

Volumetric and panelised systems rely heavily on standards for components that cannot be inspected on-site. The NCC should:

- Recognise relevant industry reference standards
- Provide clear system certification/QA pathways for evidence of suitability, and building approval pathways (non-NCC) for closed-system manufacturing
- Ensure oversight processes are nationally consistent

4. Improve recognition pathways for industry standards

A more efficient mechanism for recognising industry-developed standards (e.g. NASH Standard – Steel Framed Construction in Bushfire Areas) would support innovation and reduce delays in adopting new technologies.

12. How do you access the NCC (e.g. on a device or via a printed copy)? Do you find it easy to locate and use? What would make it easier to use?

Most users now access the NCC online, following its transition to a free, digital platform in 2022. This has significantly improved accessibility, but several challenges remain.

What works well:

- The new information architecture has improved searchability and bookmarking.
- Online delivery means users typically only view the sections relevant to their work.
- Digital consumption reduces the need to navigate the full length of the Code.

What could be improved:

1. Keep pace with user expectations for digital tools

- Users increasingly expect advanced functionality such as:
- Intelligent search
- Cross-referencing
- Personalised navigation
- AI-assisted interpretation

These capabilities were intentionally left to the private sector, but the potential has not yet been fully realised.

2. Improve comprehension tools

Diagrams, explanatory notes, and handbooks are highly valued and should be expanded. These tools help users understand complex provisions without needing to interpret dense technical language.

3. Support the transition from analogue to digital

The shift to a digital NCC disenfranchised some long-standing practitioners. Continued investment in training, guidance, and intuitive design will help bridge this gap.

13. How could the NCC better incentivise innovative ways of building? Does the performance solution pathway adequately promote innovation and new approaches or are there other approaches to more effectively encourage these outcomes?

The NCC's performance-based structure is inherently supportive of innovation, but several enhancements would strengthen its ability to encourage new building methods and technologies.

1. Create a Performance Solution Verification/Collation service within the ABCB

It was always intended that the Performance Requirements of the NCC would lead to a library of acceptable Performance Solutions, which could eventually be used as the basis for the drafting of DtS requirements. However, because Performance Solutions are currently undertaken by private builders and contractors, these solutions remain commercial-in-confidence and unavailable to others in the industry. However, if the ABCB was to provide a Performance Solution Verification service, these solutions could be made public and the concept of a library realised, whilst at the same time recovering costs, and adding technical capacity to the ABCB that has been lost over several years.

If 'validation' proved to impose too great a risk profile for the ABCB, at the very least, it should become a 'collation' service that receives all Performance Solutions that are developed, collates and registers them, then makes them publicly available. A 'validation' and/or a 'collation' service would significantly and immediately improve the productivity of the sector and reduce industry costs by:

- Eliminating the repeated development of Performance Solutions for the same or similar technical issues.
- Providing open access to established Performance Solutions for common or low-risk technical issues.
- Developing Deemed-to-Satisfy pathways that consolidate the multitude of Performance Solutions for the same or similar building elements.

2. Expand DTS pathways for proven MMC systems

Modern methods of construction, including light-gauge steel framing, panelised walls, and volumetric modules, are already delivering high-quality outcomes. Developing DTS pathways for these systems would:

- Reduce approval delays
- Increase regulatory certainty
- Encourage broader adoption

3. Introduce voluntary innovation pathways

A structured pathway allowing new technologies to be tested under controlled conditions before becoming mandatory would:

- Reduce risk for innovators
- Provide regulators with evidence
- Accelerate the adoption of best practice

4. Strengthen national consistency

Innovation is hindered when jurisdictions apply different performance criteria or administrative processes. A single national framework for MMC oversight (including plan review, inspection, and compliance) would reduce duplication and improve productivity.

5. Improve regulator capability

Clear guidance and education for regulators, certifiers, and practitioners would build confidence in assessing innovative systems, reducing reliance on conservative interpretations.

6. Maintain the performance solution pathway

Performance solutions remain essential for innovation. However, they must be supported by:

- Clearer performance metrics
- Quantified performance requirements
- Nationally consistent interpretation

14. How could the NCC better support diverse types of housing (e.g., medium density, commercial retrofits)?

The NCC's ability to support diverse housing types is constrained by complexity, misalignment between volumes, and provisions that interact in unintended ways.

1. Address complexity in key provisions

Energy efficiency and liveable housing provisions are among the most complex in the NCC. Their interactions with condensation, damp, and weatherproofing requirements create challenges for designers and regulators, particularly in medium-density and retrofit contexts.

2. Improve alignment between Volumes 1 and 2

There are inconsistencies between the volumes, such as:

- Fire safety provisions
- Lists of materials deemed suitable for non-combustible construction

3. Consider voluntary pathways for certain provisions

Liveable housing provisions could be offered as a voluntary standard, allowing consumers to opt in without imposing mandatory costs across all housing types.

4. Strengthen DTS pathways

Clear, consistent DTS pathways are essential for volume builders and for supporting diverse housing forms.

15. Are there barriers to introducing new building products and methods? What are they and how could the NCC be improved to support their uptake by the construction industry?

BPIC notes that the barriers to introducing new building products and methods are similar to those failures within the building regulatory system with regards to products, which were identified by the Building Confidence Report (BCR) commissioned by Building Ministers and published in 2018. Despite the clear pathway forward detailed in the National Building Product Assurance Framework (developed in response to Recommendation 21 of the BCR and endorsed by Building Ministers), successive iterations of the Senior Officials Group, the Building Regulators Forum, and the BMM have failed to implement these much-needed improvements.

Also there are specific barriers for the modern methods of construction (MMC) sector and non-traditional systems.

1. Implement the National Building Product Assurance Framework and all derivative work undertaken by industry in the absence of any regulatory progress.

- Implement the National Building Product Assurance Framework in full.
- Abandon the ill-conceived and unworkable Building Product Register concept considered by the BMM.
- Prioritise a **Proposal for Change to the NCC A5 (Evidence of Suitability) Provisions** (proposed by the National Building Products Coalition) which seeks to increase the rigour of the current A5 provisions, and which has languished in the ABCB office since July 2023. Specifically, the proposal is to modify NCC – A5G1, A5G2 and A5G3 Documentation of Design and Construction provisions to align with the recommendations in Element 1 of the National Building Product Assurance Framework as one of the outcomes of the Building Confidence Report. The proposal recommends the NCC Evidence of Suitability provisions be reviewed to:
 - Set a minimum and standardised format for compliance information regardless of the compliance pathway chosen, and
 - Increase the rigour of the evidence required to demonstrate compliance, and instruct which pathway is appropriate in which circumstance.
- ABCB to adopt or endorse various industry guides developed by the National Building Products Coalition (e.g. Good Practice Conformity Guide, and Traceability & Digitisation Guide) as adjuncts to the National Building Product Assurance Framework.

2. Fix inflexibility in interpreting existing provisions

Some innovative systems have been forced into compliance pathways that do not reflect their characteristics. For example, insulated sandwich panel (ISP) roofs were initially required to create artificial roof spaces for ventilation, despite not having roof cavities. This resulted in unnecessary cost and delay until the NCC was updated.

3. Create new tailored DTS pathways

Without DTS pathways, innovative systems must rely on performance solutions, which are:

- Time-consuming
- Costly
- Subject to inconsistent interpretation

4. Provide nationally consistent oversight

MMC systems often involve closed-system manufacturing where components cannot be inspected on-site. This requires:

- Clear administrative arrangements
- Nationally consistent evidence-of-suitability requirements
- Streamlined plan review and inspection processes

4. Speed up the recognition of new standards

Industry reference standards are not always recognised efficiently, delaying the adoption of new technologies.

5. Other opportunities for improvement

- Develop DTS pathways for proven MMC systems.
- Introduce voluntary innovation pathways.
- Provide clearer guidance for regulators and certifiers.

The Role of BPIC

BPIC is a national peak body representing Australia's leading building products industries and related services in:

Steel	Gypsum Board	Concrete	Insulation
Timber Products	Roof Tiles	Windows & Glass	Cement
Clay Bricks	Concrete Masonry	Reinforcing Steel	Insulated Panels

Building product suppliers directly employ 243,300 people and a further 796,500 indirectly. About 262,000 firms make up the sector and manufacturing, fabrication and installation activity accounts for \$67.3 billion in economic activity.

Conclusion

BPIC believes that a properly functioning ABCB, Building Ministers Meeting, Inter-Governmental Agreement, and National Construction Code are fundamental to an effective national building regulatory framework that will drive improved productivity in the building industry and deliver on the Albanese Government's housing policy objectives.