

# Tables and figures

Table 2.1: Responses by area of employment and education . . . . .	14
Table 2.2: Responses by degree of experience with CBA . . . . .	15
Table 2.3: Importance of issues associated with the use of CBAs. . .	16
Table 2.4: Responses regarding support for differing degrees of harmonisation . . . . .	17
Table 2.5: Application and usage of CBA studies . . . . .	21
Table 2.6: Support for greater harmonisation in CBA across agencies and jurisdictions. . . . .	22
Table 2.7: Principles and preferences for increased harmonisation . .	23
Table 2.8: Potential areas of greater harmonisation . . . . .	24
Figure 3.1: Simpson's paradox . . . . .	43
Table 3.1: Types of 'benefit transfer' methods for stated preference techniques . . . . .	47
Table 4.1: Implementation of synthetic project, using labour . . . .	103
Table 4.2: Synthetic project, assuming 'standing' is local only . . .	104
Table 5.1: Discounting with real and nominal values . . . . .	112
Table 5.2: Comparison of standard benefit-cost ratio (BCR) and net present value (NPV). . . . .	114
Table 5.3: Ranking of projects by NPV and profitability ratio (\$ thousands) . . . . .	116
Table 5.4: Using EAVs to compare projects with different time horizons . . . . .	118

Table 5.5: Present values of \$1 for selected years and discount rates . . . . .	119
Table 5.6: Adjusting for taxes levied (and subsidies provided) on inputs and outputs . . . . .	131
Table A2.1: Simplified goals-achievement matrix for a road-widening project . . . . .	155
Table A2.2: Selection of different attributes for the project . . . . .	156
Table A2.3: Different scoring scale used to assess the project . . . . .	156
Table A2.4: Different weights attached to each attribute . . . . .	157
Table A4.1: Discount rate used by transport agencies in selected OECD countries. . . . .	179
Table A4.2: Discount rates advocated by selected Australian and NZ government agencies . . . . .	180
Table A5.1: Current international valuation practice for carbon dioxide equivalent emissions . . . . .	190
Figure A6.1: Illustration of use of triangular distribution to represent estimated traffic volumes in a transport project evaluation . . . . .	198
Box A7.1: A simple example of the excess burden of taxation . . . . .	204
Table A7.1: Estimates of the marginal excess burden of taxation . . . . .	207
Table A7.2: Marginal excess burdens of Australian taxes (cents of consumer welfare per dollar of revenue). . . . .	210
Table A7.3: Marginal excess burden of state taxation in the presence of Commonwealth taxation and externalities, Australia . . . . .	211

This text is taken from *Social Cost-Benefit Analysis in Australia and New Zealand: The State of Current Practice and What Needs to be Done*, by Leo Dobes, Joanne Leung and George Argyrous, published 2016 by ANU Press, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.