

PERFORMANCE REPORT 2024–25

Quarter 4 | April – June 2025



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| About this report | 3 |
|--|-----|
| SDS performance measures | |
| | |
| SDS performance measure overview. | |
| SDS quarterly performance reporting | |
| Strategic plan performance measures | 9 |
| Strategic plan performance measure overview | .10 |
| Strategic plan quarterly performance reporting | .13 |
| Acronyms | .19 |

ABOUT THIS REPORT

This report provides an assessment of the Queensland Building and Construction Commission's (QBCC) achievements and progress based on the measures outlined in the:

- 2024–25 Service Delivery Statements (SDS) service standards
- Strategic Plan 2023–2027 (revised for 2024–25) performance measures.

While the 2024–25 Service Delivery Statements (SDS) service standards performance measures (SDS Measures) provide a quantitative analysis of performance, the Strategic Plan 2023–2027 (revised for 2024–25) performance measures (Strategic Plan Measures) capture a combination of qualitative and quantitative reporting information. Where relevant, some SDS Measures have been included to assess the QBCC's progress towards achieving its strategic objectives.

Both SDS Measures and Strategic Plan Measures align with the Ministerial Statement of Expectations received 9 September 2024. The QBCC publishes its quarterly performance report in support of the Minister's expectations.

Method

The information presented in the report is collated based on inputs from relevant divisions across the QBCC. The comparisons between quarterly actuals and their targets over a quarter period are grouped into three distinct performance status categories:

- 1. Target met Achieved or exceeded target
- 2. Slight variation from target Not achieved target but within tolerance of 5% variance or less
- 3. Target not met Not achieved target by more than 5% variance

Variations in performance relative to the target are categorised as either positive or negative. A positive variance reflects performance that exceeds the target, while a negative variance indicates performance that falls below the target.

In addition, year to date (YTD) status is used to inform performance trajectory towards the next quarter.

Acronyms are detailed in the Glossary at the end of the report.

SDS PERFORMANCE MEASURES



SDS Performance Measure Overview

| Category | Performance Measure | Accountable Officer |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Effectiveness measures | Perception of fairness in decision-making: percentage of survey respondents agree the final decision was fair | Chief Building Regulator |
| | Percentage of QBCC decisions set aside (within the financial year period) by the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal | Chief Legal Officer |
| | Percentage of licensees in category 4–7 who improved their financial position to meet minimum financial requirements to operate sustainably as a result of QBCC regulatory action | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Standards and Support |
| Efficiency measures | Cost of recovering \$1.00 of funds owed to creditors | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Standards and Support |
| | Cost to assess and finalise a new licence application made under the Queensland Building and Construction Act 1991, the Building Act 1975, and the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2018 | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Standards and Support |
| Other measures | Percentage of early dispute resolution cases finalised within 28 days | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Operations |
| | Average number of days to process licence applications | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Standards and Support |
| | Percentage of owner builder permits approved within 15 working days | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Standards and Support |
| | Percentage of adjudication applications referred to an adjudicator within 4 business days | Chief Integrity and Risk Officer |
| | Percentage of insurance claims for defective work assessed and response provided within 35 business days | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Operations |
| | Average processing time for an early dispute resolution case | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Operations |
| | Average approval time for defects claims less than \$20,000 | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Operations |
| | Percentage of internal review applicants contacted within 2 business days | Chief Integrity and Risk Officer |

SDS Quarterly Performance Reporting

| | | | | FY | 2024– | 25 | | |
|---|--|---------------------|--------|--------|----------|--------|----------------------------|---|
| | Previous Quarter Q4 Quarterly Q4 YTD Comment | Comment | | | | | | |
| Performance Measures | Q3 Quarterly Actual | Q3 YTD Actual | Target | | | Status | Quarterly and Year to Date | |
| Effectiveness Measures | | | | | | | | |
| Perception of fairness in decision-making: percentage of survey respondents agree the final decision was fair | 63.3% | 65.1% | 65.0% | 61.1% | X | -6.0% | 0 | The target has not been met by more than 5% variance in Q4. However, the overall year-to-date performance was within 5% of the target. |
| Percentage of QBCC decisions set aside (within the financial year period) by the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal | 35.0% | 10.9% | 7.0% | 5.2% | √ | 25.7% | × | This measure should be interpreted based on the YTD actual (9.4%) which did not meet the target by more than 5% variance. Due to procedural differences between the QBCC and QCAT. |
| Percentage of licensees in category 4–7 who improved their financial position to meet minimum financial requirements to operate sustainably as a result of QBCC regulatory action | 92.0% | 88.0% | 80.0% | 96.0% | √ | 20.0% | √ | Target met. Due to the delivery of proactive engagement to support licensees meet minimum financial requirements. |
| Efficiency Measures | | | | | | | | |
| Cost of recovering \$1.00 of funds owed to creditors | \$0.92 | \$0.72 | \$0.55 | \$0.80 | × | -45.5% | × | The target has not been met by more than 5% variance. A slight improvement in performance compared to Q3, from \$0.92 to \$0.80. Due to a decrease in the value of amounts returned to creditors. |

Status Symbols

- ✓= Target met (achieved or exceeded target)
- O= Slight variation from target (5% variance or less)
- x = Target not met (more than 5% variance)

| | D | | | FY | 2024- | -25 | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|---------|
| | Previous Quarter | Previous Quarter | | | Q4 Quarterly | | | Q4 YTD | Comment |
| Performance Measures | Q3 Quarterly Actual | Q3 YTD Actual | Target | Actual | Status | Variance (compared to target) | Status | Quarterly and Year to Date | |
| Efficiency Measures (continued) | | | | | | | | | |
| Cost to assess and finalise a new licence application made under the Queensland Building and Construction Act 1991, the Building Act 1975, and the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2018 | \$1,110.39 | \$1,448.97 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,531.56 | 0 | -2.1% | ✓ | The target has not been met in Q4, but the variance is less than 5%. The overall year-to-date performance achieved target. | |
| Other Measures | | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of early dispute resolution cases finalised within 28 days | 95.0% | 92.0% | 80.0% | 86.0% | √ | 7.5% | √ | Target met. Due to the reduction in the number of cases requiring complex investigation. | |
| Average number of days to process licence applications | 34.0 | 31.0 | 30.0 | 31.0 | 0 | -3.3% | 0 | The target has not been met, but the variance is less than 5%. A slight improvement in performance compared to Q3, from 34 days to 31 days. | |
| Percentage of owner builder permits approved within 15 working days | 91.0% | 93.0% | 90.0% | 84.0% | × | -6.7% | √ | The target has not been met by more than 5% variance in Q4, but the overall year-to-date performance achieved target. A decline in performance compared to Q3, from 91% to 84%. Due to resourcing challenges. | |

Status Symbols

✓= Target met (achieved or exceeded target)

○= Slight variation from target (5% variance or less)

×= Target not met (more than 5% variance)

| | Durania de C | | | FY | 2024- | -25 | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------|---------|--------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|
| | Previous C | Q4 Quarterly Q4 YTD | Comment | | | | | |
| Performance Measures | Q3 Quarterly Actual | Q3 YTD Actual | Target | Actual | Status | Variance (compared to target) | Status | Quarterly and Year to Date |
| Other Measures (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of adjudication applications referred to an adjudicator within 4 business days* | 98.7% | 98.6% | 100.0% | 100.0% | √ | 0.0% | × | The target was met in Q4, but overall year-to-date performance of this goal post measure did not. |
| Percentage of insurance claims for defective work assessed and response provided within 35 business days | 98.0% | 98.0% | 50.0%** | 97.0% | √ | 94.0% | ✓ | Target met. Due to the introduction of the Claims Management Improvement Project. |
| Average processing time for an early dispute resolution case | 12.0 | 13.0 | 28.0 | 15.0 | √ | 46.4% | ✓ | Target met. Due to the reduction in the number of cases requiring complex investigation. |
| Average approval time for defects claims less than \$20,000 | 13.0 | 18.0 | 35.0** | 17.0 | √ | 51.4% | ✓ | Target met. Due to the introduction of the Claims Management Improvement Project. |
| Percentage of internal review applicants contacted within 2 business days | 99.7% | 99.5% | 95.0% | 96.5% | √ | 1.6% | ✓ | Target met. Due to additional resources. |

Status Symbols

^{*} Goal post measure that treats any variation from the 100 per cent target as not meeting target
** Correction from published 2024–25 SDS. Retain the 2023–24 SDS target for reporting over FY2024–25

^{✓=} Target met (achieved or exceeded target)
○= Slight variation from target (5% variance or less)

x = Target not met (more than 5% variance)

STRATEGIC PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES



Strategic Plan Performance Measure Overview

| Strategic Objective | Performance Measure | Accountable Officer |
|---|--|---|
| Objective 1 Support a strong, safe and | Qualitative statement: outcomes of proactive inspection programs | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Operations |
| sustainable industry through responsive regulatory activity to reduce risk and harm | Surveyed statutory councils and industry advisory bodies indicate a perception of effectiveness of engagement | Office of the Company Secretary |
| readed new and mann | Percentage of licensees in category 4–7 who improved their financial position to meet minimum financial requirements to operate sustainably as a result of QBCC regulatory action* | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Standards and Support |
| Objective 2 Improve the customer | Percentage of licence applications determined within timeframes – per category/type | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Standards and Support |
| experience through the provision of information, advice and decisions that are | Surveyed customers indicate that our tools and information provided have assisted them to comply with requirements | Chief Customer and Strategy Officer |
| practical, clearly communicated, transparent | Percentage of interactive forms available to be fully completed online | Chief Digital and Information Officer |
| and timely | Overall customer satisfaction | Chief Customer and Strategy Officer |
| | Percentage of internal review decisions made within the required period | Chief Integrity and Risk Officer |
| | Percentage of peer reviews which agree with the original recommendation to grant/suspend/cancel a licence | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Standards and Support |
| | Percentage of QBCC decisions set aside (within the financial year period) by the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal* | Chief Legal Officer |
| | Perception of fairness in decision-making: percentage of survey respondents agree the final decision was fair* | Chief Building Regulator |

^{*}This strategic plan measure is also an SDS performance measure

| Strategic Objective | Performance Measure | Accountable Officer |
|---|---|---|
| Objective 3 Educate and inform customers | Qualitative statement: Customers and stakeholders satisfaction with engagement mechanisms | Executive Director Regulatory Practice and Engagement |
| and stakeholders to support continuous quality | Percentage of attendees agreeing that the events / materials have improved their knowledge / understanding of the topic | Executive Director Regulatory Practice and Engagement |
| improvement | Qualitative statement: Percentage of licensees found to be compliant with audit obligations following QBCC education and engagement | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Operations |
| Objective 4 Be a sustainable and digitally | Qualitative statement: application of relevant Queensland Government Enterprise Architecture elements | Chief Digital and Information Officer |
| enabled organisation | General Fund expenditure is within tolerance | Chief Financial Officer |
| | Insurance Fund expenditure (excl. claims and related) is within tolerance | Chief Financial Officer |
| | Average cost to assess and finalise a Queensland Home Warranty Scheme claim | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Operations |
| | Cost to assess and finalise a new licence application made under the <i>Queensland Building and Construction Act</i> 1991, the <i>Building Act</i> 1975, and the <i>Plumbing and Drainage Act</i> 2018* | Assistant Commissioner Regulatory Standards and Support |
| | Percentage of staff self-reporting comfort in their digital capability and tools as required by their current work processes | Chief Digital and Information Officer |
| | Qualitative statement: activities conducted that have a positive financial, environmental and social impact | Chief Legal Officer |
| Objective 5 Be an organisation that | Percentage of staff indicating satisfaction with their supervisor's support for their professional development through learning and development opportunities | Chief Human Resource Officer |
| supports, values and empowers our people | Percentage of staff satisfied with the quality of engagement with their leaders during one-on-one performance and development discussions | Chief Human Resource Officer |

^{*}This strategic plan measure is also an SDS performance measure

| Strategic Objective | Performance Measure | Accountable Officer |
|---|---|---|
| Objective 5 (continued) Be an organisation that | Percentage of staff being able to identify how their work contributes to the strategic plan | Chief Human Resource Officer |
| supports, values and empowers our people | Percentage of internal Regulatory Academy participants indicating uplift in regulatory maturity | Executive Director Regulatory Practice and Engagement |
| | Staff engagement score | Chief Human Resource Officer |
| | Percentage of staff who identify that the organisation has a positive impact on the lives of the people of Queensland | Chief Human Resource Officer |

Strategic Plan Quarterly Performance Reporting

| | Previous Quarter | | | FY | /2024– | 25 | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|
| | Previous C | Quarter | Q4 Quarterly | | terly | Q4 YTD | Comment | |
| Performance Measures | Q3 Quarterly Actual | Q3 YTD Actual | Target | Actual | Status | Variance (compared to target) | Status | Quarterly and Year to Date |
| Strategic Objective 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Surveyed statutory councils and industry advisory bodies indicate a perception of effectiveness of engagement | 58.3% | 58.3% | 70.0% | 90.0% | √ | 28.6% | ✓ | Target met. The four industry forums hosted in FY2024–25 are effective methods to engage with the industry. |
| Percentage of licensees in category 4–7 who improved their financial position to meet minimum financial requirements to operate sustainably as a result of QBCC regulatory action* | 92.0% | 88.0% | 80.0% | 96.0% | √ | 20.0% | ✓ | Target met. Due to the delivery of proactive engagement to support licensees meet minimum financial requirements. |
| Qualitative statement: outcomes of proactive inspection programs | - | - | 30/06/2025 | | 24–25, | | | proactive site inspections, identifying 556 non-compliant sites. seed by approximately 91%, dropping from 534 in Q1 to just 48 in Q4. |
| Strategic Objective 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of licence applications determined within timeframes – per category/type | 65.0% | 70.0% | 90.0% | 66.0% | × | -26.7% | × | The target has not been met by more than 5% variance. A slight improvement in performance compared to Q3, from 65% to 66%. Due to longer time required to verify experience and qualifications. |

^{*} SDS measure

Status Symbols

^{✓=} Target met (achieved or exceeded target)

O= Slight variation from target (5% variance or less)

x = Target not met (more than 5% variance)

| | Davidson Occasion | | | FY | ′2024 – | 25 | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------|--------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|
| | Previous C | Previous Quarter | | Q4 | Quar | terly | Q4 YTD | Comment |
| Performance Measures | Q3 Quarterly Actual | Q3 YTD Actual | Target | Actual | Status | Variance (compared to target) | Status | Quarterly and Year to Date |
| Strategic Objective 2 (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Surveyed customers indicate that our tools and information provided have assisted them to comply with requirements | 31.0%* | 31.0%* | 32.5% | 34.9% | √ | 7.4% | ✓ | Annual measure. Target met. Due to initiatives delivered to assist customers including redesigned licence application forms and website usability improvements. |
| Percentage of interactive forms available to be fully completed online | 25.0%** | 25.0%** | 50.0% | 31.7% | × | -36.6% | × | Six-monthly measure. The target has not been met by more than 5% variance. A slight improvement in performance compared to Q3, from 25% to 31.7%. Due to the re-prioritisation of work to support the remaining forms to be digitised. |
| Overall customer satisfaction | 35.0%* | 35.0%* | 37.0% | 37.7% | √ | 1.9% | ✓ | Annual measure. Target met. Due to Customer Experience Strategy implementation. Due to improvements to customer-facing products and services including redesigned licence application forms, reduced building inspection wait times, the implementation of the Claims Management Improvement Project, and the introduction of the Mediation and Conciliation Pilot Service. |
| Percentage of internal review decisions made within the required period | 97.6% | 96.7% | 80.0% | 99.6% | √ | 24.6% | √ | Target met. Due to an additional resource. |
| Percentage of peer reviews which agree with the original recommendation to grant/suspend/cancel a licence | 88.0% | 91.0% | 95.0% | 94.0% | 0 | -1.1% | 0 | The target has not been met, but the variance is less than 5%. A slight improvement in performance compared to Q3, from 88% to 94%. Due to an increased focus on reviewing higher risk decisions. |

^{*} Q4 FY2023-24 Actual and YTD

^{**} Q2 FY2024–25 Actual and YTD

Status Symbols

✓= Target met (achieved or exceeded target)

○= Slight variation from target (5% variance or less)

×= Target not met (more than 5% variance)

| | D | | | FY | 2024– | 25 | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------|---------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|
| | Previous Quarter Q4 Quarterly | terly | Q4 YTD | Comment | | | | |
| Performance Measures | Q3 Quarterly Actual | Q3 YTD Actual | Target | Actual | Status | Variance (compared to target) | Status | Quarterly and Year to Date |
| Strategic Objective 2 (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of QBCC decisions set aside (within the financial year period) by the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal* | 35.0% | 10.9% | 7.0% | 5.2% | √ | 25.7% | × | This measure should be interpreted based on the YTD actual (9.4%) which did not meet the target by more than 5% variance. Due to procedural differences between the QBCC and QCAT. |
| Perception of fairness in decision-making: percentage of survey respondents agree the final decision was fair* | 63.3% | 65.1% | 65.0% | 61.1% | × | -6.0% | 0 | The target has not been met by more than 5% variance in Q4. However, the overall year-to-date performance was within 5% of the target. A decline in performance compared to Q3, from 63.3% to 61.1%. |
| Strategic Objective 3 | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of attendees agreeing that the events / materials have improved their knowledge / understanding of the topic | 79.5%** | 79.5%** | 75.0% | 84.0% | √ | 12.0% | √ | Target met. Due to delivered Non-Conforming Building Product (NCBP) topic that was important to the audience type. |

^{*} SDS measure

^{**} Q2 FY2024–25 Actual and YTD

Status Symbols

✓ = Target met (achieved or exceeded target)

○ = Slight variation from target (5% variance or less)

× = Target not met (more than 5% variance)

| | D | | | FY | 2024– | 25 | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------|------------|--|--------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 5 | Previous Q | | | Q4 Quarterly | | | Q4 YTD | Comment |
| Performance Measures | Q3 Quarterly Actual | Q3 YTD Actual | Target | Actual | Status | Variance (compared to target) | Status | Quarterly and Year to Date |
| Strategic Objective 3 (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Qualitative statement: Customers and stakeholders satisfaction with engagement mechanisms | - | - | 30/06/2025 | QualitatiIn Q4, fe | | received from | 18% of the 25 | 56 attendees to the NCBP webinar for Engineers reflected a satisfaction rating of 83%. |
| Qualitative statement: Percentage of licensees found to be compliant with audit obligations following QBCC education and engagement | - | - | 30/06/2025 | Qualitative. In Q4, the QBCC undertook 952 proactive audits and 80 education and engagement activities, identifying 127 non-compliant sites that had been rectified without further regulatory action required. | | | | |
| Strategic Objective 4 | | | | | | | | |
| General Fund expenditure is within tolerance | -7.2% | -7.8% | +/- 5.0% | 7.5% | × | 2.5% | ✓ | The target has not been met in Q4. However, the overall year-to-date performance achieved target. A significant variation in performance compared to Q3, from -7.2% to 7.5%. Due to the timing of expenditure of key projects. |
| Insurance Fund expenditure (excl. claims and related) is within tolerance | -58.4% | -39.2% | +/- 5.0% | -41.9% | X | -36.9% | × | The target has not been met by more than 5% variance. An improvement in performance compared to Q3, from -58.4% to -41.9%. Due to delays in the implementing some initiatives. |

Status Symbols

✓= Target met (achieved or exceeded target)

○= Slight variation from target (5% variance or less)

×= Target not met (more than 5% variance)

| Performance Measures | Previous Quarter | | FY2024–25 | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------|------------|---|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | Q4 Quarterly | | | Q4 YTD | Comment | |
| | Q3 Quarterly Actual | Q3 YTD Actual | Target | Actual | Status | Variance (compared to target) | Status | Quarterly and Year to Date | |
| Strategic Objective 4 (continued) | | | | | | | | | |
| Average cost to assess and finalise a Queensland Home Warranty Scheme claim | \$9,564.02 | \$8,291.48 | \$6,137.00 | \$11,674.79 | × | -90.2% | × | The target has not been met by more than 5% variance. A decline in performance compared to Q3, from \$9,564.02 to \$11,674.79. Due to the timing of costs associated with funding key improvement initiatives. | |
| Cost to assess and finalise a new licence application made under the Queensland Building and Construction Act 1991, the Building Act 1975, and the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2018* | \$1,110.39 | \$1,448.97 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,531.56 | 0 | -2.1% | ✓ | The target has not been met in Q4, but the variance is less than 5%. The overall year-to-date performance achieved target. A decline in performance compared to Q3, from \$1,110.39 to \$1,531.56. Due to improvement initiatives focussed on reducing backlogs. | |
| Percentage of staff self-reporting comfort in their digital capability and tools as required by their current work processes | 73.0% | 73.0% | 60.0% | - | - | - | - | This is an annual measure not reported in Q4 FY2024–25. | |
| Qualitative statement: application of relevant Queensland Government Enterprise Architecture elements | - | - | 30/06/2025 | Qualitative. Compliance with the Queensland Government Information Security Policy (IS18) was achieved in September 2024 to reduce cyber security risks across the organisation. | | | | | |
| Qualitative statement: activities conducted that have a positive financial, environmental and social impact | NEW | NEW | 30/06/2025 | Qualitative. In FY2024–25, the QBCC introduced a container recycling and coffee cup recycling schemes at the Brisbane office. The QBCC also donated its surplus office furniture to another government entity. | | | | | |

^{*} SDS measure

Status Symbols

✓= Target met (achieved or exceeded target)

○= Slight variation from target (5% variance or less)

×= Target not met (more than 5% variance)

| Performance Measures | Previous Quarter | | | FY | 2024- | -25 | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------|--------|--------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|---|
| | | | | Q4 Quarterly | | | Q4 YTD | Comment |
| | Q3 Quarterly Actual | Q3 YTD Actual | Target | Actual | Status | Variance (compared to target) | Status | Quarterly and Year to Date |
| Strategic Objective 5 | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of staff indicating satisfaction with their supervisor's support for their professional development through learning and development opportunities | 48.0%* | 48.0%* | 45.0% | - | - | - | - | This is an annual measure not reported in Q4 FY2024–25. |
| Percentage of staff satisfied with the quality of engagement with their leaders during one-on-one performance and development discussions | 48.0%* | 48.0%* | 45.0% | - | - | - | - | This is an annual measure not reported in Q4 FY2024–25. |
| Percentage of staff being able to identify how their work contributes to the strategic plan | 83.0%* | 83.0%* | 83.1% | - | - | - | - | This is an annual measure not reported in Q4 FY2024–25. |
| Percentage of internal Regulatory Academy participants indicating uplift in regulatory maturity | 52.0%* | 52.0%* | 50.0% | - | - | - | - | This is an annual measure not reported in Q4 FY2024–25. |
| Staff engagement score | 46.0%* | 46.0%* | 50.0% | - | - | - | - | This is an annual measure not reported in Q4 FY2024–25. |
| Percentage of staff who identify that the organisation has a positive impact on the lives of the people of Queensland | 66.0%* | 66.0%* | 65.0% | - | - | - | - | This is an annual measure not reported in Q4 FY2024–25. |

^{*} Q2 FY2024-25 Actual and YTD

Status Symbols

✓= Target met (achieved or exceeded target)

○= Slight variation from target (5% variance or less)

×= Target not met (more than 5% variance)

Acronyms

| IAC | Industry Advisory Committee | | | | |
|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| STC | Services Trades Council | | | | |
| FTE | Full Time Equivalent | | | | |
| HWI | Home Warranty Insurance | | | | |
| KPI | Key Performance Indicator | | | | |
| QCAT | Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal | | | | |
| SES | Senior Executive Service | | | | |
| so | Senior Officer | | | | |
| FY | Financial Year | | | | |
| SDS | Service Delivery Statements | | | | |
| YTD | Year to Date | | | | |

For more information

Visit **qbcc.qld.gov.au** or call us on **139 333**.









