

Response ID ANON-8EBD-41P7-F

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

Submitted on **2018-05-08 14:48:29**

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:

Mid West Development Commission

Name of submitting officer and position.

Submitting officer and position:

Anne Finlay - Project Manager Infrastructure & Business Development

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

If not, what changes should be made?:

Ideally the Act would also set out to 'protect' these places and objects in situ.

Roles under the Act

Question 2

2 - who should be consulted?:

The traditional land owners should be consulted on what and how places and objects of importance to them should be protected and preserved in situ.

Question 3

No opinion

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

Question 4

No opinion

Role and functions - Minister:

No opinion

Role and functions - Registrar:

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?:

Question 6

No opinion

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

Question 7

No opinion

Additional comments:

Question 8

Yes

8. what needs to be considered?:

Protection and Enforcement

Question 9

9. Activities that should require consent or authorisation:

Mining activities

Question 10

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

Regulations and guidelines should be developed (through extensive consultation with Traditional Owners) as an adjunct to the Act, to ensure the Act is effectively administered and enforced.

Question 11

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

As per Q10

Question 12

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

As per Q.10

Question 13

No opinion

13. How s18 can be improved?:

Question 14

14. provisions for long-term protection of sites:

As per Q.10

Question 15

No opinion

15. How can enforcement provisions be improved?:

Question 16

No opinion

16. How can penalties be improved?:

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?:

As per Q.10

Question 19

No opinion

19. Steps to report place or object:

19. Steps to nominate a place or object:

As per Q.10

19. Steps to assess a place or object:

As per Q.10

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

As per Q.10

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

As per Q.10

19. Steps to remove place or object from Register:

As per Q.10

Other Parts of the Act

Question 20

No opinion

20. What's missing from the Act?:

Question 21

No opinion

21. Sections to be removed from Act?:

Any other comments

Any other comments: