

Thank you for your letter dated 9 May 2022 regarding 'Peer Review of CSV draft Protocols for Managing Cladding Risk – Phase 1 Report'. Please see our response below.

Comment 1

CSV welcomes the reviewer's comment that the overall project aims are clear and reasonable.

Comment 2

CSV welcomes the reviewer's comment on PMCR's scope to the Elevated Risk group and the focus on a "practical and proportionate" approach. CSV acknowledges the reviewer's note that they did not comment on the definition of risk categories. These categories are set by the Ministerial Guide 15 (MG-15) later after the review was conducted.

Comment 3

CSV acknowledges the reviewer's comment on the literature review, which recommends a more detailed discussion on the ALARP and the Bowtie approach. The notion of tolerable risk is not addressed in the review since the risk tolerance is set by the government (i.e. MG-15). The review of the Bowtie approach was not included in the initial literature review of the document. It has been extended with the set of PMCR documents published on CSV website at a later date.

Comment 4

CSV acknowledges the reviewer's comment on the tolerable risks and the estimation. As mentioned previously, the tolerable risk is defined in MG-15 which is a legal document published at a later date than this review. The document that was sent to review is to present the overall methodology for future work on estimation which was developed after the review. CSV acknowledges the interchangeable use of "acceptance" and "tolerance", which has been considered in the development of the PMCR document set following this review.

Comment 5

CSV acknowledges the reviewer's note of not commenting on the cladding risk premium approach since this is a development not part of this review.

Comment 6

CSV welcomes the reviewer's comment on the approach of the CP and SB buildings. The approach proposed by CSV is similar to what the reviewer described in comment 6. CSV has incorporated this comment into the development of the PMCR document set which was published on the website.

Comment 7

CSV welcomes the reviewer's comment regarding the Bowtie approach and the note on risk estimation. Further work by CSV as evident in the Supporting documents as part of PMCR document set provides more details on the risk estimation.

Comment 8

CSV welcomes the reviewer's comment on the appropriateness of the proposed 15 interventions. Following this review, we have conducted further work into different ESMs and develop those interventions in more details. We also agree with the reviewer that some interventions such as creating a new exit may be required. In fact, this is an intervention which has been used in the Victorian setting through our program delivery.

Comment 9

CSV welcomes the reviewer's comment on the Bayesian network for risk estimation. The document was reviewed at the early stage where the Bayesian network was not fully developed for cladding fire risk. As the work progressed with the informed acceptance criteria set in MG-15, the risk estimation and quantification are detailed in Supporting document 4. Using this systematic approach, the subjective nature of assessment conducted by different people is minimised.

Comment 10

CSV welcomes the reviewer's positive comment of the PMCR work.