



Australian Government
Department of Industry
Science, Energy and Resources

National Radioactive Waste Management Program

Kimba Consultative Committee Kimba Economic Working Group

General Meeting Minutes

Wednesday 19 February 2020

General Meeting Details

Date: Wednesday 19 February

Time: 10:0am – 1:00pm

Venue: Kimba Office

Agenda

KCC Independent Convener: Allan Suter

KCC Deputy Convener: Dean Johnson

Time	Item	Lead
9:45am 10 mins	Refreshments available	
10:00am 5 mins	1. Acknowledgement of Country	Independent Convener
10:05am 15 mins	2. Housekeeping 2.1. Apologies 2.2. Minutes from the previous meeting 2.3. Actions from the previous meeting 2.4. Future meeting dates 2.5. Introduction to the day 2.6. Ministerial arrangements 2.7. Taskforce arrangements 2.8. Update on BDAC appeal Meeting Papers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes from previous meeting • Actions from previous meeting • Proposed future meeting schedule • Recent media releases • Communication and Engagement forecast 2020/2021 	Independent Convener & Sam Chard
10:20am 1 hrs	3. Site identification and next steps 3.1. Site identification 3.2. Site-Specific Legislation – what it means 3.3. Timings and next steps 3.4. Committee transition	Sam Chard
11.20am 45 mins	4. A new phase of engagement 4.1. Communication and engagement forecast 2020/2021 4.2. Piloting new engagement approaches for the RCC	Sam Chard & Catherine Russell
12:15pm 10 mins	Short lunch break	
12:25 pm 30 mins	5. Community Funding 5.1. Community Benefit Program update 5.2. Community Skills and Development Program	Sam Chard, AusIndustry

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Time	Item	Lead
	5.3. Workforce readiness ideas 5.4. Community Development Fund 5.5. Establishing an entity	
1:00pm	Meeting Close / Refreshments available	

Attendees

Kimba Consultative Committee

Allan Suter	Dean Johnson	Amy Wright
Heather Baldock	Kellie Hunt	Kerri Rayson
Meagan Jane Lienert	Patricia Beinke	Peta Willmott
Peter Woolford	Randall Cliff	Symon Allen
Toni Scott		

Kimba Economic Working Group (as observers)

David Schmidt	Charlie Milton	Christine Lehmann
Laura Fitzgerald	Debra Larwood	

Apologies

Jeff Koch	Jeff Baldock	Sally Inglis
-----------	--------------	--------------

Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources

Sam Chard, General Manager, Community Engagement, NRWMF Taskforce
 Catherine Russell, Manager, Community Engagement, NRWMF Taskforce
 Maree Barford, Kimba Community Liaison Officer, NRWMF Taskforce
 Tony Hobbs, AusIndustry
 Georgina Neuhaus. Secretariat, NRWMFT

Action Items Register

Date	Action Item Number	Detail
19/2/2020	KCC20200219/A01	Members to inform the Secretariat via radioactivewaste@industry.gov.au of any major conflicts with the proposed dates, within 7 days of the distribution of the minutes to members.
19/2/2020	KCC20200219/A02	The department undertook to keep members informed of developments of the BDAC appeal.
19/2/2020	KCC20200219/A03	The department to provide more information to the KCC regarding the Indigenous heritage suspected to be at the site (specifically, regarding songlines). Shane Holland to present at a future meeting on cultural heritage and songlines.
19/2/2020	KCC20200219/A04	The department to provide an explanation as to how submissions were identified as 'local' in the public submissions process.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

19/2/2020	KCC20200219/A05	The department to clarify and explain to the committee the wording of the amended act, as it pertains to “Commonwealth waste,” and any relevant explanation for this.
19/2/2020	KCC20200219/A06	The department to clarify with the Committee Secretariat the location of the Senate Inquiry, and to communicate this, and the terms of reference, to the Committee when known.
19/2/2020	KCC20200219/A07	Members to be provided with the Mentally Fit EP proposal for comment, particularly details of contacts at other mental health services already being provided in the community that they felt should engaged with before commencing work in Kimba.
19/2/2020	KCC20200219/A08	Members of the KEWG to meet and discuss their ongoing role, and to report back to the KCC and department on their proposal for this.
19/2/2020	KCC20200219/A09	The department to communicate concerns regarding the bituminisation of the road to the facility, and telecommunications along the road, to the Minister.
19/2/2020	KCC20200219/A10	The department to confirm whether the \$20m Community Fund will be increased by CPI by the time it is given to the community/entity.

Minutes

Meeting opened 10:09am

The Independent Convenor (the Convenor) opened the meeting.

1. Acknowledgement of Country

The Independent Convenor provided an Acknowledgment of Country.

2. Housekeeping

The Convenor thanked members for attending, and acknowledged the presence of the Kimba Economic Working Group (KEWG). Members discussed the Observer Protocols and whether it was necessary for the KEWG to sign the Protocols. It was agreed that members of the KEWG should interact and participate in the meetings in the same way as members of the KCC, and therefore were not required to sign the Protocols form.

The Convenor asked members for consent for photographs to be taken, for use in internal departmental records, the website, or newsletters.

1.1 Apologies

Apologies were received from Jeff Baldock, Jeff Koch, and Kellie Hunt. These were noted by members.

1.2 Minutes from the previous meeting

Minutes were distributed out of session, and some changes were requested, which have now been made. Members agreed to the Minutes of the Previous Meeting in their current form.

1.3 Actions from the previous meeting

The Convenor invited Ms Chard to provide an update on the outstanding action items.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ms Chard discussed A02, noting that the department had not had any feedback on the Regional Consultative Committee (RCC), but also that there would be a more fulsome discussion regarding the RCC in this meeting.

Ms Chard acknowledged that the department had not yet published the handout from the previous meeting to members; she again noted that there would be more discussion regarding the Community Skills and Development Package in this meeting, including how information is publicised in the community. Similarly, there had not been information on different kinds of entities published; this was again an item for further discussion at this meeting.

1.4 Future meeting dates

A paper containing the proposed future meeting dates was circulated. Ms Chard noted that, later in the agenda, the department would discuss its engagement priorities over the next 12-18 months, what the future looks like, and what we need to collaborate on. The department would like to set up a forward-program of meeting dates, hoping this would provide more time for members to make arrangements to attend, but also to give more structure to this next period of consultation. Ms Chard noted that these dates do not need to be settled today, but that the department would be grateful for feedback on these proposed dates.

KCC20200219A01 Members to inform the Secretariat via radioactivewaste@industry.gov.au of any major conflicts with the proposed dates, within 7 days of the distribution of the minutes to members.

1.5 Introduction to the day

The Convenor invited Ms Chard to give an introduction to the day.

1.6 Ms Chard explained

Today's meeting would encompass: the site identification and that process; the site specific legislation; our consultation process going forward; our collaboration going forward; and, a discussion of how we have engaged, and how we might do that more effectively.

1.7 Ministerial arrangements

The Convenor invited Ms Chard to discuss the current Ministerial arrangements.

Ms Chard explained that former Minister Canavan had resigned as Minister for Resources and Northern Australia. The project briefly fell under the responsibility of Minister Littleproud, before the Hon Keith Pitt MP was sworn in as the Minister for Resources, Water and Northern Australia. Ms Chard noted that Minister Pitt is the Member for Hinkler, near Bundaberg in Queensland, and has previously served as the Assistant Minister to the Prime Minister and the Assistant Minister for Trade, Tourism, and Investment. There is also a connection with the Minister closer to home: the father of our Kimba Community Liaison Officer taught Minister Pitt at school. Minister Pitt has previously been actively engaged on nuclear energy issues, and had got across the radioactive waste management issues quickly. Ms Chard informed members that the Minister was hoping to make a visit to the community as soon as possible, though no details were confirmed yet.

The Convenor noted that he had worked with Minister Pitt previously also, and echoed Ms Chard's comments about the Ministers' thoughtful consideration of issues.

1.8 Taskforce Arrangements

The Convenor invited Ms Chard to discuss taskforce arrangements.

Ms Chard explained to members that Jenni Philippa had moved to another section of the department, managing ICT services and support; a role that still played to her strengths of helping

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

people. Ms Chard passed on Ms Philippa's regards to the committee and the community, and her thanks for engaging with her on really emotive issues. She also passed on her sentiment that she would miss working in this space. Ms Chard explained that Ms Catherine Russell was now acting in Ms Philippa's role while a formal, permanent, recruitment process was completed.

The Convenor thanked Ms Philippa on behalf of the committee for her work and engagement with them.

1.9 Update on the BDAC appeal

The Convenor asked Ms Chard to provide the committee with an update on the BDAC appeal.

Ms Chard reported that the BDAC appeal will be heard by the Federal Court on 21 February 2020. It is anticipated this will be a one day hearing, but that there is unlikely to be a judgement made on that day. Ms Chard undertook to keep the committee informed of these developments.

KCC20200219/A02 The department undertook to keep members informed of developments of the BDAC appeal at future meetings.

Ms Chard explained the department's intent to continue to engage with BDAC and to develop a sound working relationship, regardless of the litigation. This has been challenging for the department to date because of BDAC's request that the department engage with them through their lawyers; this has made it hard to engage with them face-to-face (only two meetings have occurred with the Board in the last 2+ years). Further, the department has tried to organise workshops in the areas we are aware Barngarla members live, but these have been poorly attended. However, meetings for both the department and the Minister to meet with the board were scheduled over the coming weeks.

Ms Chard noted that, regardless of the legal action, the department considered it important to understand in detail what heritage exists at the nominated site, and to ensure it is managed appropriately. Ms Chard further noted that whilst there is no heritage listed at the site, BDAC was only registered in 2017, and it was an additional cost to register heritage at a site. The department is aware that there may be Songlines that run through the property, and whilst this should not impact on the site suitability, a thorough Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Survey will be conducted at the site. This, and archaeological studies, need to be completed as part of the environmental approval process. The department would prefer to do this work with the cooperation of BDAC.

Question: Can the department please explain the "Songlines" further?

Ms Chard explained that traditional stories and migration routes have paths through the landscapes, and whilst the department does not believe there are artefacts on the site, some parts of the landscape may need to be protected to protect the integrity of culture. Ms Chard suggested that Mr Shane Holland, Manager, Indigenous Engagement, NRWMT, could provide more information.

KCC20200219/A03 The department to provide more information to the KCC regarding the Indigenous heritage suspected to be at the site (specifically, regarding songlines). Shane Holland to present at a future meeting on cultural heritage and songlines.

Question: What happens to this process following the appeal?

Ms Chard explained that the department did not expect there to be any impact on the process as it stands, but that any decision would be a question for government to consider.

Question: What verification is there that the site is on Barngarla land? There is speculation that there are other traditional owners.

Ms Chard explained that the Gawler Ranges People have written to the department to state that they recognised BDAC as the appropriate Traditional Owner representative group for the department to engage with. However, native title at Napandee has been extinguished and there is no registered heritage at the site.

3. Site Identification and next steps

The Convenor invited Ms Chard to speak to the following issues.

1.10 Site identification

Ms Chard explained that the department had undertaken extensive assessments, drawing on the technical, heritage and community sentiment work over the last 2+ years, which was further considered by CSIRO, ARPANSA, ANSTO, the Department of the Environment, and others, before being considered by the former Minister to inform the site identification. While many of the underlying reports were already public, the department would be releasing further reports as part of its parliamentary inquiry submission. Ms Chard noted that there is a great deal of commercially or legally sensitive material in the documents, which needed review before the reports could be published.

Ms Chard explained that all three sites were found to be technically suitable to host the facility, but that the mitigations required on some sites were more complex than for others. Ms Chard demonstrated this with the example of flood risk at Wallerberdina, where there would have been a need to acquire additional land for all weather road access, with significant cost implications.

Ms Chard noted that the Wallerberdina site was by far the most complex and costly to manage. Similarly, there was insufficient community support at this site. As a result of there being insufficient community support, the then Minister announced he would no longer consider the site.

Regarding the Kimba sites, it was found that the Lyndhurst property would be marginally more complex and costly to manage due to the natural hazard risk and access requirements. Furthermore, the Napandee site recorded 100% of direct neighbouring properties supported the Napandee site nomination; this figure was lower at Lyndhurst.

A lot of work was done to assess community sentiment. There was a high participation rate in the community ballot, and a demonstration of 61.6% support. There was a high neighbour participation rate also.

Ms Chard noted that the department received over 3,500 submissions received since the commencement of the process. The vast majority of these were pro forma submissions, from websites with simple form, or postcard campaigns coordinated by anti-nuclear groups from outside Kimba, as opposed to 'bespoke' submissions written by individuals or organisations.

The department analysed the issues raised in both supportive and opposed submissions. In supportive submissions, it was clear that there was a lot of confidence in the safety of the facility; in the opposing submissions, there were three key issues: the impact on Aboriginal cultural heritage, agricultural concerns, and criticism of the site selection process, particularly the ability for a landowner to nominate a site.

Question: How were 'neighbours' defined?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ms Chard explained that neighbours within 5km of the property were surveyed, and that those that shared a boundary with the 160 hectare property were considered 'direct' neighbours.

Question: In the business surveys, you say 85% responded. Was this 85% of eligible businesses?

Ms Chard confirmed this was 85% of eligible businesses, with the terms of eligibility having been agreed with the KEWG.

Question: Regarding local submissions, there was some debate over what was deemed "local". Are the submissions from the local area taken in to account, beyond the smaller zone of Kimba town?

Ms Chard explained that local submissions were defined as submissions received from within the Local Government Area of the District Council of Kimba.

Whilst about 2,500 were pro-forma, of the remaining 500+, there were a high number that were local, but there were also international submissions; all were taken in to account. Ms Chard undertook to provide to members, out-of-session, how the local submissions were broken down in the figures.

Ms Chard explained that all the submissions were very carefully read through by the Minister.

Question: Why is the participation figure 2,879, when there were 3,500 submissions?

Ms Chard explained that the department received multiple submissions from some individuals; the 2,879 figure is number of unique individuals participating.

Question: Are these the submissions received in this round, or over the full 5 years of this process?

Ms Chard confirmed that these were submissions received since August 2018, when this process was opened. It ran for 499 days.

Ms Chard took the opportunity to note that the department also received some petitions, such as a local petition that contained 26 signatures, and other surveys/ballots such as the BDAC members' ballot. Ms Chard noted that all surveys and petitions received were taken in to account by the Minister.

Ms Chard explained some aspects of the BDAC ballot/survey. The department had offered to fund this, but this offer was not taken up. BDAC engaged the Australian Electoral Company to conduct their ballot, which had a low participation rate, of around 40%. Of that 40%, 100% were opposed.

KCC20200219/A04 The department to provide an explanation as to how submissions were identified as 'local' in the public submissions process.

Question: You mentioned you had offered some information sessions to the BDAC Membership prior to the vote; can you explain this more? Supplementary: had the members seen any information, prior to voting in their ballot?

Ms Chard explained that the department has had 67 interactions with BDAC and their lawyers. The department has provided BDAC with factsheets they have asked them to distribute; they have met with the board twice; and have attempted to host information sessions. The department had attempted to target sessions where concentrations of BDAC members lived, but still had a low attendance rate. It is the department's intention to continue to engage; we are hoping to negotiate and come to an agreement on how we can work together going forward. The government has committed \$3m to support Barngarla economic development.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Members noted that they wanted to continue to engage with the community also. Ms Chard noted that when she meets with BDAC in a few weeks, she hopes to discuss with them whether they might like to become involved in the KCC. Ms Chard further noted that, when it is established, BDAC will be invited to become a part of the RCC, but there was also a discussion happening as to whether a specific working group for BDAC members should be set up. The Convenor noted that, in his local area, there was an Indigenous population of around 25%, and it took 12 years to gain their trust and support. This will take hard work and a dedicated process. Ms Chard noted that, at the Wallerberdina site, while there was strong support from the local Indigenous population, the broader Adnyamathanha Traditional Lands Association (ATLA) group were opposed. In contracts to engagement with the Barngarla, the department was confident that ATLA members were well informed about the project.

1.11 Site-Specific legislation – what it means

The Convenor invited Ms Chard to discuss the Site Specific Legislation.

Ms Chard explained to the committee that legislative amendments were introduced to the Parliament last week; she noted that last year, the department had flagged with the committee that this might occur. Initially, it was envisaged that these amendments would enshrine the community fund. Ms Chard noted the 2012 Act was drafted when the government was considering sites in the Northern Territory, which were subsequently withdrawn by the Northern Land Council. As such, there are numerous references to the National Capital Contribution Fund, which was envisaged as a state/territory fund. The Kimba community was strongly opposed to a fund being managed by the state government, with a preference for it to be community-managed. Therefore, these amendments repeal the National Capital Contribution Fund and replace it with the Community Fund.

Another key aspect of this legislation is it specifies the site in the legislation. This gives the Parliament a say in identifying the site. The site is specified by coordinates, and also contains provisions to potentially acquire more land within the nomination envelope, to support other issues that may be identified in the next stage of technical assessments, if required; and provision to acquire land for secondary all weather road access, consistent with the current Act. Ms Chard noted that the additional land provision did not allow for the government to acquire land for any purpose not related to this facility and its current terms. The department does not envisage needing to acquire more land; this provision is there as a fail-safe. Ms Chard noted that there would need to be additional community consultation if any additional acquisition was necessary.

Question: Regarding all-weather road access, the former Minister made a determination that the road to the site would be upgraded to bitumen. Is this still the case?

Ms Chard noted that she could not see a situation in which the road would not be upgraded. Ms Chard further noted that assurances made by the former Minister were being passed to the current Minister. Now a site has been identified, and we know the site is suitable, the department is now able to develop a detailed design, with much more technical work studies, which will involve much more planning around issues like road access.

Question: A member noted it was good to see the legislation change, the monetary value specified, and the funding being directed to the community being enshrined. The member sought clarification: has the wording “Commonwealth waste” been removed?

Ms Chard explained that the changes to the definitions in the act more clearly specify the type of waste that can be stored, and that is consistent with the definition in the *Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Act 1998*. The amendments also make a clear link to Australia’s

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

obligations under the Joint Convention on the safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management. While the wording 'waste generated, controlled or possessed by the Commonwealth' is proposed to be removed by the Object of the Act, replacing it with the definition of 'controlled material' does not change, but more clearly defines the type or origin of waste that will be managed at the facility.

KCC20200219/A05 The department to clarify and explain to the committee the wording of the amended act, as it pertains to "Commonwealth waste," and any relevant explanation for this.

Question: What happens to the legislation if ARPANSA says this facility cannot take Intermediate Level Waste?

Ms Chard explained that every aspect of the facility was being designed to meet ARPANSA regulations. Ms Chard noted that the government is making a significant investment in this project, and if it were not to meet the regulations, we would have to go back to the drawing board, which would not be a satisfactory outcome. The department does not envisage a future in which ARPANSA does not give the facility the appropriate approvals, as all work will be completed against their guidelines and requirements. ARPANSA has already been involved in the process and agrees that the sites have been demonstrated to all theoretically be technically suitable, though it should be noted that they will not give formal agreement of this until their approval process has been completed. The department is aware of media reports speculating that we could go through this whole process, to then end up not being licenced. We are confident this will not happen.

Regarding the Community Fund, Ms Chard explained to members that this will become available once the facility obtains its operating licence and the Community Fund entity is established.

Question: Does this relate to the \$20m, or the \$8m, amounts?

Ms Chard clarified that the government had committed to make the \$8m fund available once the site is acquired.

Ms Chard took this opportunity to talk the committee through the expected timeline. If the legislation passes through the Parliamentary committee process as expected, the site could be acquired in June. This will be followed by a discussion, as happened with the CBP funding, about how the funding is rolled out.

Question: This process has already been through one Senate Inquiry; what is the difference with this one?

Ms Chard explained that the different inquiries have different terms of reference, however, what the inquiry actually looks like can vary on the day. This inquiry will be specific to the legislation, whereas the previous inquiry was examining the site selection process. Ms Chard encouraged members to participate in the process, and to encourage the community to do so also.

Question: Will the inquiry be held in Kimba, as the last one was?

Ms Chard believed it would take place in Canberra, however, she undertook to confirm with the Committee Secretariat and confirm with the members. Ms Chard explained that these sorts of 'Legislation' inquiries are very routine, and therefore usually occur in Canberra, however, neither the date nor terms of reference had been released yet, so we will wait for that clarification.

KCC20200219/A06 The department to clarify with the Committee Secretariat the location of the Senate Inquiry, and to communicate this, and the terms of reference, to the Committee when known.

Question: The current legislation required the site decision to be gazetted within 7 days; this has not occurred. Could you please explain?

Ms Chard clarified that the Minister decided to specify the site in legislation rather than make a determination under the current legislation (the NRWM Act).

1.12 Committee transition

Ms Chard explained that, as previously discussed with members, a Regional Consultative Committee would be stood up, but confirmed that this does not happen until the site is acquired. Ms Chard also offered that if members felt they no longer wished to remain a member of either the KCC or KEWG, they were welcome to resign from their committee, by emailing radioactivewaste@industry.gov.au.

4. A new phase of engagement

1.13 Communication and engagement forecast 2020-2021

Ms Chard explained that now a site had been identified, and we move into the next phase of site-specific design development and regulatory approvals, there were more opportunities to engage, and invited Ms Russell to talk the committee through the department's plans for the next phase of engagement.

Members were provided with a handout outlining future engagement topics and timing, and were encouraged to advise of any additional activities they would like added to the schedule.

The department noted it had received numerous requests for mental health support in the community, particularly the need for an independent 'third-party service' which wasn't managed by a local community group, to enable people of all viewpoints and concerns to feel more comfortable seeking assistance required. The department has been engaging with Mentally Fit EP, to ascertain if their services are suitable.

Question: Will mental health services be offered to the whole community?

Ms Chard confirmed that these services would be independent to the taskforce and open to anyone in the community. The department understands the services provided could include both individual counselling services and larger, workshop-style sessions.

Members noted that we should be careful not to overlap with services already provided in the community. Ms Chard acknowledged this, but did stress that the goal was to provide as much support as possible to as broad a range of the community as necessary. Ms Chard did reassure members that Mentally Fit EP had indicated that they were able to work with current programs in the area.

Members agreed that there should be as many resources on the ground as possible, even if there was a double up in services. Ms Chard suggested that the Mentally Fit EP proposal would be circulated to the KCC for comment, and asked members to advise the department if they were aware of services that Mentally Fit EP should engage with.

KCC20200219/A07 Members to be provided with the Mentally Fit EP proposal for comment, particularly details of contacts at other mental health services already being provided in the community that they felt should engaged with before commencing work in Kimba.

Question: Where does the KEWG fit in to the future consultation process?

Ms Chard stated that the department was open to suggestions from the committees. Ms Chard noted that the RCC will replace the KCC, but it would be good to understand if members wanted the KEWG to continue to exist separately, or did they want to see the RCC perform the function of the KEWG also. Ms Chard noted that the members of the RCC would be appointed by the Minister, but a working group is a departmental consultative mechanism. As we discuss and settle the terms of reference for the RCC, the continuing role for the KEWG might become clearer. However, while the KCC exists, so will the KEWG.

The Convenor suggested that the KEWG could meet and discuss, and provide feedback on what their preference is.

KCC20200219/A08 Members of the KEWG to meet and discuss their ongoing role, and to report back to the KCC and department on their proposal for this.

Question: At the last meeting (workshop), we discussed the concept of “region”. Would the RCC involve specific skillsets out of this town, or wider region, or would it be strictly local?

Ms Chard again acknowledged that this discussion would be part of the RCC consultation that we need to have. There is no definition of “region” in the legislative amendments. Ms Chard acknowledged that it might be useful to have a broader definition in order to account for aspects such as transport routes.

Question: Can you please clarify the role of the RCC as it pertains to the community fund?

Ms Chard confirmed that there would be a separate entity to administer the community fund, but that it could work on the recommendations of the RCC; these sorts of issues should be kept in mind when considering the RCC.

1.14 Piloting new engagement approaches for the RCC

Ms Russell noted that to-date, engagement had been face-to-face. While the office remains here, and there will continue to be regular visits from the department, workshops and other activities, there was an opportunity to undertake some copnsultation online. An online approach could also assist with hearing the views of a broader group.

There are many examples of online engagement platforms, and we would like to trial one with the committee for our consultation on the RCC. These platforms have advantages over, for example, email, because they are more user friendly, messages and ideas don’t get lost, those kinds of issues become streamlined. Ms Russell discussed an example in the presentation, for the RCC, with the six consultation questions posed.

Ms Russell confirmed for members that the plan was to pilot this type of engagement with just the KCC and KEWG initially, but that this technology could be expanded to consult with the wider community on other issues, if that was something members assessed that they wanted to do. By doing a pilot, we can then meet and make assessments of what did and did not work for these issues.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Regarding the online engagement platform, the Convenor noted that opening this system up to the general public could be fraught; we have all seen these sorts of issues on social media, for example. The Convenor expressed a belief that the committees were broadly representative and could accurately reflect community views.

Ms Russell explained that having clear guidelines, and strict moderation of the forums from their inception was important. Ms Russell clarified for the committee that the intention was to begin this consultation with just the committees, but that there was the option to open up specific items to a broader base, if that was something the committees or department deemed necessary or useful on a particular issue.

The convenor called a lunch break.

Meeting suspended 12:20pm

Meeting resumed 12:50pm

At the resumption of the meeting, the Convenor noted that, during a lunchtime discussion, it was made clear that the commitment to bituminise the road to the facility was expected to be honoured, and that mobile phone coverage should be improved. Ms Chard undertook to ensure that was communicated to the Minister.

KCC20200219/A09 The department to communicate concerns regarding the bituminisation of the road to the facility, and telecommunications along the road, to the Minister.

5. Community funding

1.15 Community Benefit Program Update

Ms Chard provided a further update on the different funding mechanisms. Ms Chard explained some of the timeframes, and noted that the timelines displayed to members at this stage were theoretical, aspirational, and ambitious. Ms Chard noted that the regulatory processes are untested in Australia, but that ARPANSA and the Department of the Environment are very involved in the process.

Question: We were expecting the CBP process to open in March; is that still the case?

Ms Chard noted that the CBP process had been delayed by the change in Minister, and March was ambitious at this stage.

Regarding the Indigenous component of the Community Development Program, this timeline was very ambiguous at this stage, as it will be subject to negotiation with BDAC. The department looks forward to engaging with them in order to progress the planning; there is a requirement to develop a process and a plan. As with CBP, this is not just a payment, there will be an expectation of agreed outcomes.

Ms Chard noted that there will likely be an overlap in the \$2m CBP and the commencement of the \$8m CSDP, and that this was important for members and the community to keep in mind when considering projects and assessing applications.

Question: Where are the guidelines for the CSDP at in their process?

Ms Chard explained that the guidelines were a topic for discussion with this group, but that they would also need to be signed off by the Minister for Finance. However, this package is specifically designed to support community skills development in the lead up to construction and operation of the facility. Ms Chard encouraged members to think back to the construction workshop and issues raised at that, and to think about the CSDP in terms of business planning.

1.16 Community Skills and Development Program

Ms Chard explained that the purpose of the CSDP is designed to assist the community to realise the benefits of the construction and operation of the facility. Ideas for it could include forums, plans, clinics, and training. Ms Chard encouraged members to think about what workforce readiness actually looks like, and that they should be considering these issues soon.

Comment: This is something the KEWG could provide valuable input to, for example, building on their experience and expertise in pulling together the last forum.

Question: Regarding the legislation, does it cover issues such as the CSDP being \$8m over four years, and would it be increased by CPI?

Ms Chard confirmed that the \$8m would not be increased by CPI.

1.17 Community Development Fund

Question: Could you please provide more information regarding the \$20m fund (Community Development Fund)?

Ms Chard confirmed that this would be a one-off payment of \$20m from government, and that it would then be up to the entity to invest it, in order to get additional resources from it. Ms Chard undertook to confirm if the \$20m would be increased by CPI, noting it would not be given to the community for a few years hence.

KCC20200219/A10 The department to confirm whether the \$20m CDP fund will be increased by CPI by the time it is given to the community/entity.

Question: When the former Minister was in the community with Mr Rowan Ramsey MP, the committee asked if it would be possible to access the \$20m fund prior to construction to commencing. There are members of the community who are elderly, may have voted in favour of the project, and should be able to see the benefits of it.

Ms Chard strongly encouraged members to look at the other funding available through the other programs, which will have totalled \$10m over four years. There are opportunities in that to deliver projects to benefit these members of the community. Ms Chard stressed that the \$20m amount would be a one-off payment, when the facility is operational. Ms Chard suggested that submissions could be made to the Parliamentary Inquiry, but that she would be surprised if the timing of this amount would be changed.

1.18 Establishing an entity

Question: Regarding the RCC and the entity administering the fund, is there a potential that the RCC could also be the entity administering the fund, or do they have to be different groups?

Ms Chard did not recommend that a committee should administer a fund, and that it was best left to a board or trust with clear governance structures, which fell under ASIC's laws. How the board

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

members are nominated or chosen, however, was still a topic for discussion as part of RCC consultation. Ms Chard suggested that workshops should be run with consultants to get a diversity of views on the different options available for the entity. Broadly, the RCC should be well-placed to provide recommendations to the entity, but the two groups would be very distinct, with different skillsets. Similarly, Ms Chard noted the longevity of the RCC through several phases of the project, and continuing in perpetuity.

Members acknowledged that this was a one-off payment, that should not all be spent as soon as it is received. Ms Chard noted that the Commonwealth will cease to have involvement in the administration of the fund, once given to the community.

Mr Tony Hobbs confirmed that AusIndustry would not continue to be involved. Members asked if AusIndustry could be invited to be involved, e.g. as a member on the board. Mr Hobbs and Ms Chard noted that the costs and implications of a situation such as this had not been considered, however, a member of the government could be invited to be a representative on the board. It is the department's view that expertise will need to be from the private sector.

Members noted that it is envisaged that this facility will have a 100-year+ lifespan, and that this fund is designed to support the community throughout that time. As such, it needs to be wisely invested, with only the profits used on an annual basis.

Ms Russell provided an update on the CBP, following the workshop in December when members looked at project types. A summary was sent out of session in December (Secretariat note: this was also resent the day after the meeting 20/2/2020, at the request of members).

Question: In the last assessment of projects, we were given insufficient time to consider the projects presented to us. Has this been rectified for the new round?

Ms Russell explained that the intention was to meet while the process was open, but when it came time for the committee to assess the applications, that yes, they should have access to a package of applications for longer. However, we may require members to sign a confidentiality agreement in order to do this.

Question: How will it be advertised, when the process opens?

Ms Russell confirmed that there was a plan to advertise, and noted that there were great time pressures around the last round, which we hope will not be the case in this round.

Question: The KEWG were not involved in the process last time; will this change for this round?

Ms Russell confirmed this was an item for the committees to discuss and agree.

Members discussed the ongoing nature of the KCC and KEWG, and the continuing involvement of both committees in the ongoing processes.

Ms Russell confirmed that the committees do not have a decision making role in the assessment process, but they do make a recommendation to government.

The Convenor called for any more questions.

Members thanked the department for the workshop in December

The Convenor noted that it was important that the KEWG continued to have an ongoing role, but that he would seek advice on that.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Question: Will the RCC members be paid by the government or the community?

Ms Chard confirmed that members of the RCC would be paid in the same way as members of the KCC, as they will be members of a statutory body. The community entity would be managed out of the \$20m fund.

The Convenor thanked members for their participation, and the taskforce for their attendance, and drew the meeting to a close.

Meeting closed 1:40pm