

Response ID ANON-8EBD-41ZQ-K

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

Submitted on **2018-03-15 11:45:27**

About You

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

Individual

Individual details

Are you of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent?

No

What is your name?

Optional:

Do you give permission for your name to be published with your feedback?

No

Purpose of the Act

Question 1

Yes

If not, what changes should be made?:

Roles under the Act

Question 2

2 - who should be consulted?:

They need to be registered with DAA

Question 3

No opinion

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

Question 4

Yes

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

Yes

5. How can section 5 be improved?:

Question 6

No opinion

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

Question 7

Yes

Additional comments:

Question 8

Yes

8. what needs to be considered?:

Protection and Enforcement

Question 9

No opinion

9. Activities that should require consent or authorisation:

Question 10

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

Development approval by DLPH

Question 11

No opinion

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

Question 12

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

DLPH approval

Question 13

Effective

No opinion

13. How s18 can be improved?:

Question 14

No opinion

14. provisions for long-term protection of sites:

Question 15

Yes

15. How can enforcement provisions be improved?:

Question 16

Yes

16. How can penalties be improved?:

Site Assessment and Registration

Question 17

No

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

All sites should be registered if they are to be protected.

Question 18

No opinion

18. What should the criteria be?:

Question 19

19. Steps to report place or object:

DLPH to advise on sites to prospective developments

19. Steps to nominate a place or object:

Full ethnographic and archeological report

19. Steps to assess a place or object:

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

Advertisement in newspaper

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

All registered sites should be reviewed every 5 years

19. Steps to remove place or object from Register:

Application to the APMC and DPLH

Other Parts of the Act

Question 20

No opinion

20. What's missing from the Act?:

Question 21

21. Sections to be removed from Act?:

Any other comments

Any other comments:

Penalties should only be financial with ability to rehabilitate if possible to the satisfaction of the Registrar and/or Minister.