

Response ID ANON-8EBD-41YN-F

Submitted to **Review of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972**

Submitted on **2018-05-29 12:15:33**

About You

Are you submitting a response as an individual, or on behalf of your organisation?

Organisation

Organisation details

What is the name of your organisation?

Organisation Name:

Geoscience Australia

Name of submitting officer and position.

Submitting officer and position:

Kriton Glenn

Do you have authorisation to make a submission on behalf of your organisation?

Yes

In which field is your business?

Government / Local Government

If "other" please specify your field of business:

Purpose of the Act

Question 1

No opinion

If not, what changes should be made?:

Does it need to capture a marine component? If so, this could be mentioned in the title.

Roles under the Act

Question 2

2 - who should be consulted?:

A living public register of the Aboriginal parties and their contact officers who are to be contacted for specific land access.

This register should be maintained by the WA Government.

It should include the up-to-date addresses of the organisations' web pages and associated contact lists.

Question 3

No opinion

How can the provision to appoint honorary wardens be improved?:

No comment

Question 4

No

Role and functions - Minister:

To assist all parties, a maintained, publicly accessible web-based register of the number of locations (not necessarily the exact locations) of heritage places and objects - linked directly to the public register of the Aboriginal contacts.

No

Role and functions - Registrar:

The requirement to 'Report Damage' is not clear

No opinion

Role and functions - Committee:

No opinion

Role and functions - DPLH:

What is Protected?

Question 5

No opinion

5. How can section 5 be improved?:

no comment

Question 6

No opinion

6. How can section 6 / Part VI be improved?:

no comment

Question 7

No

Additional comments:

A register of the occurrence of known sites should be publicly available via the web.

This register should be connected to the listing of the Traditional owners / custodians / contact officers of that land, so people know specifically who to contact regarding access and guidance.

Question 8

No opinion

8. what needs to be considered?:

No Comment

Protection and Enforcement

Question 9

9. Activities that should require consent or authorisation:

Activities that disturb and modify the ground

Question 10

10. Criteria to evaluate activities that may affect a site:

Activities that disturb and modify the ground surface.

Question 11

11. What is an impact in relation to sacred sites?:

No Comment

Question 12

12. consent / authorisation for proposals that will affect sites:

The identified and listed Aboriginal authorities / official representatives presented in the proposed register.

Question 13

No opinion

No opinion

13. How s18 can be improved?:

Question 14

No opinion

14. provisions for long-term protection of sites:

Question 15

No

15. How can enforcement provisions be improved?:

Consideration of the possibility that some offences, e.g. malicious intent could carry jail terms for company directors.

Question 16

No

16. How can penalties be improved?:

Move to penalty units and not specific dollar amounts that need to be updated regularly.

Amounts need to be sufficient so they act as an incentive to modify company 'behaviours', perhaps with fines applicable for each day's violation.

Site Assessment and Registration

Question 17

No opinion

17. Why shouldn't a defence be provided?:

Question 18

No opinion

18. What should the criteria be?:

Question 19

No opinion

19. Steps to report place or object:

No opinion

19. Steps to nominate a place or object:

No opinion

19. Steps to assess a place or object:

No opinion

19. Steps to enter a place or object on the Register:

No opinion

19. Steps to amend a place or object on Register:

No opinion

19. Steps to remove place or object from Register:

Other Parts of the Act

Question 20

20. What's missing from the Act?:

A requirement within the Act to report damage.

Question 21

No opinion

21. Sections to be removed from Act?:

Any other comments

Any other comments: