STATE DEVELOPMENT, NATURAL RESOURCES AND AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mr CG Whiting MP (Chair)
Mr DJ Batt MP
Mr JE Madden MP
Mr BA Mickelberg MP
Ms JC Pugh MP
Mr PT Weir MP

Staff present:

Dr J Dewar (Committee Secretary)
Mr M Gorringe (Assistant Committee Secretary)

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE LAND, EXPLOSIVES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2018

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, 5 MARCH 2018

Brisbane

MONDAY, 5 MARCH 2018

The committee met at 11.16 am.

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare open the public briefing for the inquiry into the Land, Explosives and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. Thank you for your attendance here today. My name is Chris Whiting; I am the member for Bancroft and the chair of the committee. The other committee members here with me today are: Mr Pat Weir, the deputy chair and member for Condamine; Mr David Batt, the member for Bundamba; Mr Jim Madden, the member for Ipswich West; Mr Brent Mickelberg, the member for Buderim; and Ms Jessica Pugh, the member for Mount Ommaney. The committee's proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of parliament. Witnesses should be guided by schedules 3 and 8 of the standing orders and note that their responsibility is to provide factual and technical background to government legislation and administration. Those here today should note that these proceedings are being broadcast to the web and transcribed by Hansard. Media may be present so you may also be filmed or photographed. Before we commence could you please switch off your mobile devices or put them on silent. When you are speaking, because we have a few people here today, just pull the microphone towards you so that can be picked up. I now welcome officers from the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy.

BARKER, Ms Mirranie, Manager, Land Policy, Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy

DANN, Ms Liz, Executive Director, Titles Registry, Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy

DJUKIC, Mr Robert, Acting Chief Operating Officer, Resources Safety and Health, Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy

ERICHSEN, Mr Noel, Chief Inspector of Explosives, Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy

HINRICHSEN, Mr Lyall, Executive Director, Land Policy, Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy

MACLEOD, Mr Ross, Director, Cape York Peninsula Tenure Resolution Program, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships

RUSLING, Ms Nicolette, Principal Policy Officer, Mineral and Energy Resources Policy, Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy

VIDAS, Ms Marie, Manager, Title Practices and Standards, Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy

Mr Hinrichsen: Good morning, committee chair and members. I would like to thank the committee for this invitation to provide this briefing on the Land, Explosives and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I would also like to particularly thank members of the public who made submissions to the committee on the bill.

The LEOLA bill of 2018 re-introduces, with some minor changes, a bill which lapsed with the dissolution of parliament last October. If it is useful for the committee, I have a table which summarises the key differences between the 2017 bill and the 2018 bill. If that is useful for the committee I would be happy to table that with your leave.

CHAIR: That should be fine. Thank you.

Mr Hinrichsen: Reflective of the number of officers we have here from the department and from the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, this is an omnibus bill which amends many acts that are administered by our department as well as the Department of

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. For the committee's benefit I would like to provide a brief overview of the key amendments within the bill covering various aspects of land, explosives, mining and gas management and administration.

First of all in relation to the Land Act, the bill amends the Land Act 1994 to provide a modern compliance framework. Similar to existing provisions in equivalent state legislation, these amendments will equip the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy with contemporary compliance powers and tools to stop inappropriate behaviour on state land for which the department has direct land management responsibilities. This includes improved powers to stop activities such as, for example, motorbikes or vehicles which are on state land causing either destruction or being a nuisance to neighbours. It will also enable authorised officers of the department to move people on in dangerous or potentially dangerous situations such as, for example, if there were to be a fuel reduction burn planned to be undertaken on that state land.

The department will be able to deal with inappropriate structures on state land, including those that pose a risk to public safety and health. For example, the department could require the removal of unsafe, poorly maintained or inappropriate structures on state land that are potentially a liability to the state and taxpayers. Examples of that might be unsafe rock walls or asbestos filled buildings which are posing a threat to the public who may be able to access, or in close vicinity of, those pieces of infrastructure. The department will have the power to undertake removal, and if it is not done by the tenure holder within a set time, the department could undertake that work and recover the costs of doing so. The compliance framework reflects modern drafting practice and aligns, to the extent appropriate, with other natural resource compliance frameworks.

Also in relation to the Land Act, there are proposed amendments to enhance provisions which enable marine term leases to become rolling term leases where they provide support infrastructure to an island tourist facility on a rolling term or a perpetual lease.

In relation to amendments to the Land Title Act 1994, the bill makes important operational improvements which are aimed at making processes more streamlined and contemporary. It will facilitate the ongoing staged introduction of an electronic conveyancing system which is a quicker, more secure and accurate facility for dealing with land transactions. The second major amendment that is proposed in relation to titling legislation is to eliminate paper certificates of title. With the introduction of the electronic titles registry in 1994 paper certificates of title are no longer required, but they do still exist for approximately 12 per cent of properties. The legal effect of duplicate paper certificates of title will be removed by this bill, and that will take effect on 1 July 2019. That will give stakeholders adequate lead time to accommodate those changes. Paper certificates of title may still be retained by the holders after this date, but they would no longer be required by the registry before a land transaction could occur.

The bill also propose changes to the definition of a foreign person and a foreign corporation under the Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1988. Those changes are to align the definitions in that act with those that are already in the Duties Act 2001. Currently those two Queensland acts use slightly different definitions and descriptions of whom the provisions apply to, and that creates unnecessary complexity in conveyancing processes.

In relation to Indigenous land and housing, the bill contains amendments to the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 and the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991. It will provide Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander traditional owner groups with an option of nominating an existing corporation under the Corporations (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander) Act 2006 to be granted land outside of a determination area, thereby negating the need to establish and fund a new landholding entity where an otherwise suitable entity already exists. The bill includes requirements to ensure that the process of nominating an entity as a proposed trustee is consultative, open and transparent. The bill also provides for a flexible process for trustees and the state to agree on the sale price of social housing to enhance homeownership opportunities in Indigenous communities. This flexibility will allow the state and the trustee to respond to the unique circumstances in those discrete communities and recognise the existing interests in those properties.

The bill includes amendments to the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act 2007 to ensure that Aboriginal freehold land that is to be transferred as part of the Shelbourne Bay and Bromley land dealings is protected from future mining, mineral exploration or coal seam gas operations. Before that proposed transfer of land to Aboriginal ownership, Shelbourne Bay and Bromley had been subject to mining prohibitions under the Mineral Resources Act as restricted areas. As part of the tenure negotiations with the state, the traditional owners and Cape York Land Council have sought to continue this protection by including a specific clause in their Indigenous land use agreements. The clause asks the state to pursue legislative amendments to guarantee that no future mining, mineral

exploration or gas operations could occur on their freehold land. As a result, the proposed amendments will simply provide for the previous prohibitions over the entire Shelbourne Bay and Bromley properties to continue on the Aboriginal freehold land.

In relation to the Explosives Act, it is obviously very important that Queensland explosive legislation is up-to-date with contemporary safety and security standards and that it meets community expectations. To this end the bill amends the Explosives Act 1999 to introduce a driver's licence for the transportation of explosives; to require a security sensitive explosives plan to identify security risks and adopt processes to deal with these risks and for that plan to be reviewed annually; to streamline the administration by including processes around the application for, and transfer of, explosive licences, including a new provision that will clarify and prevent unnecessary additional regulation on mine sites; and improve the consistency of the safety regulated provisions to improve information provided to the explosives inspectorate around the notification and investigation of explosive incidents.

The bill provides that an applicant for a licence must satisfy a suitable person test to hold a security clearance. This test assesses a person's criminal and domestic violence history, and spent charges will be considered. This supports the Queensland government's *Not now, not ever* report by prohibiting persons who are the subject of a domestic violence order from holding an explosives licence. This will ensure that only persons who are suitable to have access to explosives do so.

The bill also contemporises explosive transportation requirements to improve the safety, security and efficiency of the transportation of explosives on the public road network. In the interests of public safety, amendments will link the Explosives Act with those in the Public Safety Preservation Act 1986 to enable the declaration of transport routes, areas or times as approved or prohibited for the transportation of explosives on public roads.

In relation to gas safety, the bill makes clarifying operational improvements to the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004. These amendments improve regulatory certainty, consistency and efficiency for entities undertaking petroleum and gas activities and for government regulators. For example, the bill proposes that annual safety reports be replaced with online real-time notifications of safety-critical information about gas operating plants. The bill also proposes that operator safety obligations can be held either by an individual or a corporation. That is consistent with arrangements that apply in other Queensland workplaces.

The bill also provides a framework for abandoned operating plant to ensure that the state can authorise persons to remediate operating plant if it has been abandoned by a resource authority holder. This situation may occur where there has been a disclaimer of onerous property under the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth). A recent example of this is the Linc Energy site where the liquidators disclaimed all property, including resource tenures, environmental authorities and land related to its underground coal gasification activities. The proposed abandoned operating plant provisions are based on the existing abandoned mines framework which exists under the Mineral Resources Act 1989 and allows an authorised person to enter land to remediate any abandoned operating plant.

Minor changes have been made in the 2018 bill that better express the intended policy position for the amendments. The 2018 bill now includes specific provisions: firstly, to confirm that gas flares are not type B devices; and, secondly, to align the general safety obligation to keep risk to acceptable levels with the relevant obligations for the person under the act or the safety management system.

In relation to overlapping tenures, the amendments proposed address minor and technical issues identified in the overlapping tenure framework for coal and coal seam gas. In short, those amendments in the bill ensure that all disputes about matters that the legislation requires to be contained in a joint development plan can be referred to arbitration under the overlapping tenure framework, ensure the application of compensation for petroleum leases connecting infrastructure is consistent with industry's preferred position and apply the same restrictions that prevent a tender for a petroleum lease from being released over a coal or oil shale mining lease to also restrict a tender from being released over an area that is subject to an application for a coal or oil shale mining lease.

The bill also includes minor amendments to provide clarity and correct various errors and omissions in some of the aforementioned acts. In relation to the consultation that was undertaken, the proposed amendments were identified from customer and stakeholder feedback, as well as ongoing initiatives by the department to ensure operational effectiveness. I will not go into all the detail. Obviously across the breadth of the provisions of the bill there are a lot of stakeholders with an interest, but I refer the committee to the consultation section in the bill's explanatory notes for more information in relation to the specific consultation that was undertaken on the various aspects of the bill. With those not so brief words of introduction, I will happily offer ourselves to the committee to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIR: We will now proceed to questions. This bill refers to the registered native title body corporate issue. Where the registered native title body corporate does not hold native title but is granted land, how does this potentially impact on the rights and interests of those native title holders?

Mr MacLeod: The Shelburne Bay property mentioned before is a working example of where this issue came to the fore. There has been an exclusive native title determination on the Shelburne Bay property itself, and the Wuthathi Aboriginal Corporation hold that native title. There is a property immediately to the north, which is the existing Heathlands Resource Reserve, where negotiations are well advanced to transfer that land to Aboriginal ownership and joint management in a newly created national park—Cape York Peninsula Aboriginal land. The Wuthathi people are identified through anthropological evidence that satisfies the Native Title Act that the area immediately to the north of Shelburne Bay, that is part of this other dealing, is Wuthathi country. However, there has not been a finalised determination for that country.

For the transfer of those lands to go-ahead, which we hope will happen later this year, as the Act currently stands, the Wuthathi would have to set up a second corporation with the same people, the same office bearers and at considerable expense and inconvenience for a fledgling organisation that is not particularly well resourced. That would need to be done in order to hold this new land.

To satisfy the minister who administers the Aboriginal Land Act, a period of notification has to be gone through. The transfer of land has to be to the Aboriginal people particularly concerned with the land. The state relies on the anthropological evidence of the Cape York Land Council, in this instance, because they are the registered native title body for the area. They certify that the people who are going to potentially accept this land are the people particularly concerned with the land. The threshold of a native title test is still applied, but the Commonwealth controlled Native Title Act process has not yet run its course.

The intention of this amendment is to allow, under state legislation, to transfer land where it is clear that the proposed land-holding entity is the appropriate one, in the absence of a native title determination and avoid duplication and the creation of extra bureaucracy and expense for an organisation that is in effect a voluntary organisation that is holding the land in trust for the broader, in this case, Wuthathi people.

CHAIR: There is concern about precedent with this. Does it set a precedent? Is it possible that the native title holders may have an objection to which corporate body the administration goes to?

Mr MacLeod: We do not believe it sets a precedent that cannot be managed. As I mentioned, the Aboriginal Land Act provisions require the minister administering that act—and in the case of Cape York it is the Deputy Premier and Treasurer because she has delegated those elements of the act as they relate to the tenure program on Cape York; otherwise it is the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy statewide—to advertise and to take submissions. Ultimately, all of these dealings are formalised through an Indigenous land use agreement under the Native Title Act which is then certified by the relevant land council, which is the representative body, and then registered by the Native Title Tribunal.

There are checks and balances throughout that process to make sure that it is open and transparent. Anybody who asserts an interest or a native title interest in the land has an opportunity to come forward and make submissions. Ultimately, it has to be signed off by the Native Title Tribunal, which would settle any dispute that might arise as to who are the appropriate people for that particular country.

Mr WEIR: It is hard to know where to start on this. I will refer to the chair's question about precedents. You are talking about the altering of an ILUA. Does that not set a precedent for other ILUAs around the state because you know how complicated they are to amend?

Mr MacLeod: We are not altering an existing ILUA. I will stick with the example that I used, if that is okay, rather than complicate matters. In the case of the Wuthathi people and the Shelburne Bay determination, there has been a determination in the Federal Court. They have exclusive native title rights for those areas and there is a registered Indigenous land use agreement with the Native Title Tribunal.

The artificial boundary that used to surround that pastoral property still exists to the north where the Wuthathi assert native title, but the federal native title process has not yet run its full course. We are not proposing to amend the existing ILUA. We will enter into a fresh Indigenous land use agreement to formalise the transfer under state law to grant Aboriginal Land Act freehold to the corporation that already holds the Aboriginal freehold land at the south that has been authorised through an Indigenous land use agreement. It is complicated, and I apologise for that, but that is the nature of the beast that we are dealing with.

Mr MADDEN: Probably an area that is not on top of the list to ask questions about, is the petroleum and gas act. I find the provision about abandoned decommissioned machinery very interesting. My question has three aspects to it. How do we define abandoned operating plant? Who has the responsibility to manage that plant in law? Who bears the costs of the remediation work required for that equipment?

Mr Hinrichsen: They are all very good questions, member for Ipswich West. I will try to deal with them in component parts. The Linc Energy matter is the ground zero for this. We never in the past had a disclaimer of a resource development of this scale and obviously one with some significant clean-up costs.

I think in the committee room adjacent to this one there is a briefing on another bill that is before the parliament in relation to ensuring that there is adequate financial assurances in place to deal with resource activities generally. With Linc Energy—and obviously there are matters before the courts where the state is seeking to minimise the impact on the Queensland taxpayer—there is certainly significant public expense associated with dealing with the aftermath of that disclaimed site. The current legislation was presenting deficiencies in dealing with the reality of Linc Energy having their liquidators disclaim that site. The legislation effectively supposes that the new operator will continue to operate a production facility as opposed to decommissioning and mitigating any impacts associated with the previous activities.

The Mineral Resources Act does it much better in terms of the framework which allows a regulator to get access to a site, to control the site and to do what is required to secure a site from a safety perspective first and foremost, but equally in terms of working with the environmental regulator to minimise and mitigate any adverse impacts in relation to the condition in which that site has been left. Basically, the proposal is to align the Mineral Resources Act with those in the petroleum and gas act so it is seamless.

Underground coal gasification is an interesting process in itself. It is basically regulated under the Mineral Resources Act as a mining tenure, if you like. Once the coal resource is turned into a gas the petroleum and gas framework kicks in. The regulator was having those two regulatory frameworks apply and there were significant differences in the two. This is to bring it all into a consistent framework. Certainly those broader issues of the liabilities and how the state minimises impact and making sure that those who are accountable are held responsible is certainly something that has been the subject of significant legislative reform over the last couple of years as well and is ongoing.

Mr MADDEN: Are these provisions meant to only apply to resource industries?

Mr Hinrichsen: Specifically, yes, to operating plant under the petroleum and gas act. The definition of operating plant can be very small. It can be say a single well or it could be a processing plant for underground coal gasification. As occurred in this place, it could be compressor stations—all manner of infrastructure that somebody needs to ultimately take responsibility for its remediation to secure it, make it safe and facilitate its decommissioning.

Mr BATT: In relation to the security, safety and transportation of explosives, you mentioned earlier in your briefing that a person who has an explosives licence would have that licence taken away if they have a domestic violence order against them. Could you go through that process? How is that going to work? Is the licence just going to be suspended whilst the DVO is there or is it taken away completely and they have to renew it?

Mr Hinrichsen: It might be useful if I refer to the chief inspector for explosives Noel Erichsen to go through the specifics and give you a response.

Mr Erichsen: The application of a DVO will result in the automatic suspension of an explosives individual licence. Currently, it is for the duration of the DVO and it would come off. We differ a little bit to some other acts and also other jurisdictions in that regard. The application of a DVO is determined by a magistrate based on the full information that he has available. The lifting of that DVO is also done by a magistrate based on the full knowledge of the situation. As a chief inspector, we do not have access to that information, so we will be relying on the courts to make an appropriate decision.

Ms PUGH: My question goes to the dangerous buildings on state property. Say the site in question was a school with asbestos in the buildings and the school site has been unused for a long period. Under this legislation, how would the department go about having the buildings decommissioned or demolished? What would trigger the department to do so? Would it be things such as excessive trespassing from the public or would the existence of asbestos alone in the buildings be sufficient?

Mr Hinrichsen: I guess in the scenario of, say, a state-run school it is administered by the Department of Education. Obviously they have a very rigorous program in asbestos management strategies. I guess the provisions are more about state land where there might be a third party lessee and where that lessee is not executing their workplace health and safety responsibilities, particularly in relation to, say, securing a site and preventing inappropriate access. As you say, it might be that there is excessive trespass onto a site where there are known hazards and the government, ultimately as the owner of that land, has a duty of care for safety. This would give a mechanism by which directions could be given to the lessee, to the tenure holder, to either secure the site or otherwise render it safe. In some situations that might include the demolition and remediation of a site. Certainly there is a significant focus on health and safety.

There are also potential liability issues to do with the end of the life of a lease where, when that land returns as, say, unallocated state land, the state then would inherit any liability associated with any dangerous infrastructure or anything that was causing environmental damage on that site. There are mechanisms in the bill to ensure that, prior to the surrender of the lease, any of those potential liabilities are addressed by the current lessee before the return of that land to the state.

Mr MICKELBERG: My question relates to the proposed legislation and the Aboriginal Land Act 1991. Could the minister conceivably grant land to a registered native title body corporate where native title has not yet been established in an instance other than the example that you used in your earlier answer?

Mr MacLeod: Yes, that is the case. I merely used that example because it is a fairly clear-cut example of where there is duplication and onerous reporting, et cetera. Certainly the act applies statewide, so there is the potential for the relevant minister to grant land. As I mentioned before, however, the process under the Aboriginal Land Act is very transparent and open, with a lot of opportunity for people with an interest or a claimed interest or a native title interest in the land to come forward. It is not possible for land to be transferred to an existing prescribed body corporate that has already met all of the obligations under the Native Title Act and the Aboriginal Corporations Act. Under this provision, the processes are such that you could not grant land to that body without it being public knowledge and calling for submissions and certification by the relevant land council representative body and, ultimately, being registered by the National Native Title Tribunal. There are checks and balances throughout the process that mitigate the risk of transferring land to a body that would not be appropriate. That is the way that risk is mitigated, through the transparent process and the registration process through the Native Title Act.

Mr MICKELBERG: Specifically, I would like to understand if the minister could grant land to a registered native title body in instances such as, say, a leasehold property is owned by an entity other than the state where native title has not yet been established in law?

Mr MacLeod: I would like to take that one on notice, if I could. I am not a lawyer with native title expertise. I do not feel confident that I could give you an answer on that without consulting a lawyer with appropriate knowledge.

Mr MICKELBERG: I am happy with that, if you are, Mr Chair.

CHAIR: Thank you. The member for Ipswich West has another question.

Mr MADDEN: My question relates to the Explosives Act and the Explosives Regulation. Can you outline to the committee the need for nationally consistent explosives regulations and laws and, also, how this bill will harmonise with national laws?

Mr Erichsen: That is an excellent question regarding how we achieve national harmonisation. We have been working for the past two years with a study group at the national level to try to achieve that. We had determined that there would be four policy areas that we would address. Queensland has always adopted the stance of, if we can achieve national harmonisation and it is an improvement to safety and security, then we would move forward; if it does not improve security and safety, we would not be going along the national route. Consequently, the amendments we have put into this particular act have picked up on some things that other jurisdictions do quite well and that we feel should be introduced, such as the explosive security card that has not been in place in Queensland, but has been in place in other states for the period.

The other matters are around licence types that would support people being able to move across states and that is one of the policy agreement areas that we are working towards. There is probably a long way to go on that and it is very difficult in that national forum to get every state to agree. However, we are moving forward. We believe there will be improvements as a result of this act, which we hope will show other states how they might adopt new legislation in that area.

Mr MADDEN: In relation to the signage on vehicles carrying explosives, Mr Erichsen, is that uniform throughout Australia?

Mr Erichsen: It is uniform throughout Australia. There are a couple of minor exceptions. Each jurisdiction calls up the Australian explosives code version 3 and that lays down the requirements for particular signage on the vehicles. Some states may have some additional requirements to that particular code.

Mr WEIR: Following on from the question of the member for Ipswich West, what do you actually deem to be an explosive? What quantity of explosive comes under different transport and handling laws? I might be on a farm and buy a little tin of gun powder, go home and reload some bullets. How does all this work?

Mr Erichsen: Assuming you have a weapons licence, obviously you are entitled to have all of those ingredients that you are talking about. There is no impost on that particular use of propellant powders if you load your own ammunition associated with security. There is adequate security in place to handle those, as they stand.

Mr WEIR: What quantity would trigger this legislation?

Mr Erichsen: We have a definition in the act around products that are security-sensitive explosives. For instance, in the case of propellant powders we regard that as a security-sensitive explosive because it could be adapted for misuse or a criminal or terrorist activity. Therefore, there are stricter controls around those particular types of items. There are exemptions in various parts of the act, in the schedules, that allow people who have a legitimate need, such as a weapons licence or a shotfirer licence, to go about their business without excessive burden.

CHAIR: I have a question regarding the contemporary compliance powers under the Land Act 1994. Obviously, the Queensland Law Society raised some issues regarding the amendments in relation to entry powers by officers. Can you outline what those concerns are and the safeguards to make sure that we balance the concerns that have been raised?

Mr Hinrichsen: The Queensland Law Society, indeed, raised those issues in their submission. Mr Chair, you will see we have provided a response to that to the committee last Friday.

CHAIR: It is probably important we outline those, as well.

Mr Hinrichsen: Obviously, from our perspective it is about getting a balance between the private interests of a landholder and the interests of the public. We have modified powers of entry that are about those circumstances with an authorised officer. Obviously, an authorised officer is a person with training and with an appropriate level of delegation from within our department. It is not all employees. They are specifically authorised people to perform functions under the specific legislation who in particular circumstances where they believe, say, an offence was being committed would be able to access the land. The provisions that we have put in place do limit those entry powers, clearly. They are modelled on existing provisions in other legislation. We think we have a fair balance between the interests of the lessee and that broader public interest when it comes to enforcing the provisions of the Land Act.

Mr BATT: I have a quick question on the gas safety legislation. In relation to the new process for appointing persons to approve gas devices, how will that impact on people already approved? Will people who already have authority need to reply to get that approval?

Mr Djukic: People who are already approved will be taken care of under transitional arrangements. I think it is a case of when their approval comes due again. Those provisions will become relevant when the person has to reapply for their relevant authority approval.

CHAIR: There being no further questions, I will close this briefing. We have one question on notice. Obviously, that will go to DATSIP. The answer should be provided by 10 am on Thursday, 8 March. Thank you for attending at today's briefing on the Land, Explosives and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Thanks to the Hansard reporters. A transcript of the proceedings will be available on the committee's parliamentary website in due course. I declare the briefing closed.

The committee adjourned at 11.58 am.