

CHAPTER SEVEN

MANAGEMENT CO-ORDINATION AND CONSULTATION

INTRODUCTION

1. The earlier chapters of this report have described how the Kakadu National Park region has abundant and diverse physical, biological and cultural resources, and is recognised as being of outstanding environmental importance, even on a world scale. In part because it is so rich in natural resources, the region has a recognised potential for several land-use objectives. These include the use of the region for mining, tourism, recreation, fishing and research activities; the conservation of its wildlife and the preservation of its diverse habitats and rich array of natural and cultural features, including sacred sites; and the need to maintain the choices for Aborigines about the way in which they live in the region.

2. The possibility of conflict between these management objectives means that the development of management policies and strategies is inevitably complex, requiring the resolution of difficult issues and the bringing together of competing interests. It is not just a question of accepting some activities and banning others, either completely or from certain places or at defined times. Even when activities can be geographically segregated, as by the banning of mining within the Park, their impact may be felt outside the area in which they are taking place. Moreover, many of the habitats in the region are said to be fragile and, while they may tolerate a certain level of one kind of activity, may suffer damage if the level or intensity of the same activity increases.

3. The problem is compounded by the number of groups having an interest in the area and wanting a say in its future. These include not only the Commonwealth and Northern Territory Governments and their agencies, but also the traditional land owners, all the residents of the region, conservation groups, and commercial interests such as the mining companies and the tourist operators.

4. The primary role in the management and control of the region is played by the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Director of which is responsible for the management of Kakadu National Park and for the preparation of the plan of management. Other Commonwealth bodies playing a role are the Office of the Supervising Scientist and the Kakadu Conservation Zone Advisory Committee (COZAC).

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

5. The Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service has been responsible for the administration of the Park since its proclamation in 1979. Management of the Park is according to a plan of management, the preparation of which requires extensive consultation. The National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act requires the Director to give notice of the preparation of a plan of management for the Park and invite interested persons to make submissions. Representations are also received after the draft plan has been published.

6. In preparing the second plan of management ANPWS received 26 representations in response to the original notice. It also consulted with committees such as the Kakadu Interest Group Advisory Committee (see below) and a Consultative Committee of traditional Aboriginal owners, as well as informally with other groups and individuals. Seminars on 'Tourism and Jabiru' and 'Tourism Development at Kakadu National Park' also provided opportunities for public discussion. Seventy four representations

were received after the draft plan was published and when the revised plan was submitted to the Minister for his consideration, these were also included.¹

7. Despite these procedures the Northern Territory Government felt that it had not been given a proper role in the development of the plan of management. The Committee was told that in 1984, well in advance of the time the first plan of management was to expire:

the Northern Territory Government provided a fairly comprehensive contribution to the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service about the deficiencies of the plan of management and what was needed. ... One of the most important points we made ... [is] that Kakadu is part of the Northern Territory and we have a vital and legitimate interest in what happens there ... we believed that the proper role for the Northern Territory authorities was meaningful participation and involvement in the development of the next plan of management, not just consultation in the sense of being forwarded a draft and asked to comment, which comment may or may not be taken into account, but actual participation in the process of determining what that plan of management should comprehend and how it should be developed. That request ... was denied totally. It was ignored and at no stages were we ever invited to do that.²

8. The Northern Territory Government was asked whether ANPWS had taken any notice of their representations; Mr Roodenrys, Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Chief Minister, replied that '[r]egrettably, we did not even get an acknowledgement of the submission. We cannot perceive any significant change in the plan, let alone any change we may have influenced'.³

9. Another group expressing dissatisfaction with the consultation mechanisms with ANPWS was the Darwin Tourist Promotion Association. The Association described consultation as

being 'badly lacking' and suggested that because the tourist industry is a large user of the Park 'it should have input into the management of the Park on a broad basis'. The Association took the view that this had not been allowed for at all in the plan of management.⁴

10. In contrast, the Northern Land Council believed that 'Aboriginal people have participated greatly in the plan of management and that the plan addresses issues of concern in relation to Aboriginal people - the need to protect areas, the impact of tourism and the wish of some Aboriginal people to be involved in management'.⁵ Jawoyn people had shown their satisfaction with the ANPWS management by indicating their preparedness to lease back to ANPWS the Gimbat/Goodparla areas should their land claim prove successful.⁶ They also indicated their desire to participate in the management of the area.

11. The need for Aboriginal participation in the development of the plan of management is clearly recognised in the National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1975, which makes special provision for the Northern Land Council to be involved in the development of the plan of management. It is also recognised in the plan of management itself which states that:

Park management must be sensitive and responsive to the interests of the Aboriginal residents and recognise the importance of their traditional relationships with the land ... Park management must reflect the wishes of the traditional Aboriginal owners and be structured to allow maximum participation by Aboriginal people and to encourage them to take a leading role in management. Large areas of the Park are Aboriginal land ...⁷

12. A Consultative Committee of traditional Aboriginal owners was established to provide advice during the preparation of the plan and ongoing liaison takes place with the Gagudju Association. In addition, the senior traditional owners

permanently employed on the Park staff as cultural advisers also contribute to management matters.⁸ However, while these mechanisms are seen as useful, the Gagudju Association informed the Committee that:

[u]nder the Plan of Management the Director is only required to consult with Traditional Owners but we wish to have direct input in decisions on the management of the Park.⁹

13. While the process of preparing the plan of management is an important consultation mechanism, it is not the only one. The plan of management itself notes that local interest groups can provide valuable input into the administration of the Park and refers to the Kakadu Interest Groups Advisory Committee. Established in 1983 the Committee includes representatives of the following organisations:

Ranger Uranium Mines Pty. Ltd.
Gunbalanya Council Inc.
Gagudju Association Inc.
Jabiru Town Council
Northern Territory Museum of Arts and Sciences
Darwin Laboratories, CSIRO
Amateur Fishermen's Association of the
Northern Territory
Darwin Tourist Promotion Association
Northern Territory Association of Four Wheel
Drive Club Inc.
Australian Conservation Foundation.

Rotational membership is envisaged to enable other interest groups to participate at a later date.¹⁰

14. The first plan of management also provided for an 'Advisory Committee on policy matters' composed of representatives of the Northern Land Council and the Commonwealth and the Northern Territory Governments.¹¹ No mention of this Committee is made in the second plan of management.

15. The Northern Territory Government believed that neither of these Committees had been satisfactory. It commented that the status of the Kakadu Interest Groups Advisory Committee was 'obscure',¹² and that it meets rarely and 'has no discernible influence on Park administration'.¹³ The policy committee:

was given the dual task of advising on policy as well as the implementation of the decisions arising from the Review of Commonwealth Functions. The main points of the decisions referred to were that the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service (ANPWS), whilst maintaining its policy functions and control of essential Commonwealth interests in the Park, would scale down its general activities and delegate responsibility for operations to the Territory. This decision, however, has not been implemented.¹⁴

16. As well as its specific criticisms of these Committees, the Northern Territory Government also claimed that there had been a number of instances where plans with important ramifications for the Territory had been developed without consultation. It gave the outline plan for tourism development in the Park as the most recent instance of this.¹⁵ It is the 'strongly held view' of the Northern Territory Government 'that things are still left far too much on the basis of the discretion of one man, the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service'.¹⁶

17. The Committee has gained the clear impression that the consultative mechanisms used in the management of the Park can be improved. Meetings of the Kakadu Interest Groups Advisory Committee are convened by the ANPWS and there have been six since the Advisory Committee was formed in 1984. The contribution made by the Kakadu Interest Groups Advisory Committee seems to be minimal and a more formal structure seems necessary to ensure that the groups having a major interest in the area are able to participate, not just in the development of the plan of management, but in its implementation.

18. The Park plan of management notes that the National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1975 provides for the establishment of a Board, subject to the agreement of the Minister and the Northern Land Council, and that a Board would include representatives of the traditional Aboriginal owners and take on agreed management responsibilities for some of the processes identified in the plan.¹⁷ The Jawoyn people have indicated that if their Stage 3 land claim is successful and they lease back the land to ANPWS, they would prefer an administrative arrangement involving a Board of Management with an Aboriginal majority.¹⁸ The Gagudju Association 'is keen to see the establishment of the Board as soon as possible'.¹⁹ Support for a Board of Management also comes from the Darwin Tourist Promotion Association, which sees the Board as including 'user groups and suitable interested persons',²⁰ and from the Northern Territory Government which believes that:

the opportunity exists for the Board to be a vehicle for accommodating the interest of government and industry as well as of traditional Aboriginal owners.²¹

The Committee strongly supports the establishment of a Board of Management for the Park. The Board should have a majority of traditional owners but include representation from a broad range of interest groups including the Northern Territory Government. The Board should be responsible, among other things, for the development of the next plan of management and could, if necessary, have special advisory bodies with clearly established composition, functions and responsibilities reporting to it. One such advisory body might, for example, be responsible for the development of the tourist strategy mentioned in the recommendation associated with paragraph 91 of Chapter Two of this report.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that, as a matter of urgency, a Board be created to manage Kakadu National Park.

19. While a Board would go some way to solving some of the problems identified by the Committee it might not be sufficient in itself, without other administrative changes. One matter drawn to the attention of the Committee by the Gagudju Association was that almost no delegation to Park staff exists for the expenditure of money and that all matters have to be referred to Canberra for decision. This is said to cause delays which frustrate both local staff and traditional owners.²² This is clearly an unsatisfactory situation and the Committee believes that ANPWS should review the level of its financial delegations in order to ensure that day to day management of the Park is not being hindered by unnecessary bureaucratic delay.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that when a Board of Management is established for Kakadu National Park there be a review of administrative practices, and particularly of financial delegations, to ensure that the management of the Park can be accomplished in an efficient and effective manner

OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISING SCIENTIST

Uranium Mining

20. The Office of the Supervising Scientist for the Alligator Rivers Region was established under the Environment Protection (Alligator Rivers Region) Act 1978 to protect the environment in the Alligator Rivers Region from the effect of uranium mining. Kakadu National Park lies entirely in the region, of which it comprises almost two thirds the total area.

21. The Office oversees and assists in the development of environment protection arrangements relating to uranium mining operations in the Region. It also advises the Government on the adequacy of environment protection measures and carries out specific, mission-oriented research. However, the Supervising Scientist has no powers to license or regulate the mining operations, and has no powers to enforce compliance with requirements and conditions. This is because:

[f]ollowing the passage of the Northern Territory (Self-Government) Act in 1978 (in which the Commonwealth retained ownership of prescribed substances, including uranium) an agreement between the two governments - and the subsequent introduction of the NT Uranium Mining (Environment Control) Act incorporating the Commonwealth's Environmental Requirements - provided for uranium mining operations in the Alligator Rivers Region to be regulated as far as possible under the laws of the Northern Territory. Working arrangements between the Northern Territory and the Supervising Scientist were endorsed by both Governments in 1979.²³

22. Under the arrangements agreed between the two Governments, the Northern Territory supervising authorities are responsible for day to day regulation of the uranium mining and milling activities. Moreover:

the Supervising Scientist does not monitor the activities of the mining companies to demonstrate that the mining companies are complying with the law. The mining companies themselves are required to do that. The Supervising Scientist does not verify the monitoring that is carried out by the companies to ensure that the monitoring is acceptable ... That verification activity is carried out by the supervising authority which exists in the Northern Territory Government, essentially the Department of Mines and Energy.²⁴

23. The Supervising Scientist has supervisory, co-ordination and research roles in the protection of the environment from the effects of uranium mining in the Region, but no regulatory role. The working arrangements require that there must be adequate consultation between the Northern Territory authorities and the Office of the Supervising Scientist before any authorisation is issued. However, the Northern Territory may issue an authorisation even if the Supervising Scientist disagrees with it.²⁵ If a disagreement were to exist between the Supervising Scientist and the Northern Territory Authorities, the Supervising Scientist would report his concerns to his Minister who would, if he wished, report the matter to the action Minister in the Commonwealth. The action minister 'if he felt strongly about it, would take the matter up with his counterpart in the Northern Territory'.²⁶ There has never been an occasion when the Northern Territory authorities have recommended that something be done which the Supervising Scientist felt necessary to report to his Minister. Nevertheless, it seems to the Committee that the regulatory framework is complex, and could lead to confusion.

24. Dr R. J. Wasson is of a similar opinion and told the Committee that in his view:

somebody has to cut through what I perceive to be a regulatory nightmare that has developed around Ranger ... I would think that a lot of the problems Ranger has faced has to do with regulations cutting across one another and not knowing who is the final authority. I would think that if the Office of the Supervising Scientist could, after due consideration, be given that responsibility it would be an excellent way of cutting through a lot of these problems. I would not necessarily think that OSS has all of the expertise it would need to do that because it would need to have expertise in mining ... It has virtually no engineering expertise. It has no mining engineering expertise to my knowledge.²⁷

25. Possible duplication and overlap in the activities of the Office of the Supervising Scientist (OSS) and the Northern Territory supervising authorities was considered when the OSS was established. Mr Fry, the Supervising Scientist, informed the Committee that considerable effort went into defining their respective roles and that a review conducted by OSS and the Northern Territory Co-ordinator-General in March 1982, and subsequent reviews, concluded that:

[g]iven the legislated functions of the Supervising Scientist and the existing institutional arrangements, the extent of any real duplication and overlap is believed to be minimal and necessary.²⁸

26. Even if duplication between the Northern Territory and Commonwealth authorities is slight, the regulatory environment is complex. The Supervising Scientist told the Committee that his role 'with no direct regulatory component or powers of enforcement' is not easy to perform and that the 'assignment of a direct regulatory role, and associated powers to the Supervising Scientist' would remove some of the perceived inefficiencies and 'possibly much debate'. Mr Fry cautioned, however, such a move would be opposed by the Northern Territory Government, which sees the presence of a Commonwealth supervising agency 'as a derogation from self-government and a reflection upon its credibility and competence'. He also pointed out that:

the questionable appropriateness and potential conflict of interests inherent in an environmental protection body like OSS directly regulating mining operations would present its own difficulties, including possible credibility problems and additional costs associated with resource provision to establish (replicate) a regulatory infrastructure just for the Alligator Rivers Region.²⁹

27. The Committee believes that a prerequisite of any regulatory framework will be the need to ensure effective liaison between Ranger and the Office of the Supervising Scientist. It is a matter of some concern therefore that problems appear to exist in this area and that the information flow between the two organisations needs to be improved. Ranger told the Committee that it 'has made every effort to co-operate with the authorities and has established a very effective reporting system with the NT Department of Mines and Energy'.³⁰ However, the 'overseeing, co-ordinating and reporting responsibilities of the Office of the Supervising Scientist have been of concern to Ranger for some time'.³¹ In contrast, Mr Fry informed the Committee that:

[r]elations with Ranger have deteriorated significantly in recent times due, I believe, to a concerted campaign by Energy Resources of Australia to discredit the Office and have it abolished. The immediate cause of this is the raising of the levy on uranium exports from the Region ... I am increasingly concerned at the reluctance of Ranger to provide detailed information ... Ranger's growing reluctance to co-operate and keep OSS informed is making it difficult for me to co-ordinate activities and indeed to avoid the very duplication of effort and inefficiencies ERA and Ranger complain about.³²

28. Quite apart from the complexity of the regulatory framework and problems of liaison with Ranger, other criticisms have been made of the Office of the Supervising Scientist. Ranger, for example, stated that '[d]uplication of responsibilities, personnel and reports flowing to and from a Sydney Office have inevitably resulted in gross inefficiencies'.³³ The Committee is aware that the division of Office of the Supervising Scientist responsibilities between Sydney and the Northern Territory is a cause of concern to several groups. These concerns relate not just to the possible duplication of effort, but also to the fact that decision making is located away from the mining operations themselves. Mr Fry

informed the Committee that there is 'virtually no duplication of the work being performed at Jabiru'.³⁴ He also told the Committee that the principal decision-making staff of the Office of the Supervising Scientist, except for the Director of the Alligator Rivers Region Research Institute, are all located in Sydney. The group is required to consult or advise a wide group of individuals and organisations variously located in the Northern Territory, Canberra, Sydney and Melbourne. For this reason he said 'it is obvious that no one operating location is ideal for all purposes'.³⁵

29. Mr Fry provided to the Committee a detailed analysis of the costs of relocating the Sydney Office to the Northern Territory, examining a number of possible options. In addition to providing information on the costs involved, the paper provided information on the non-financial costs and benefits of possible relocation options.³⁶ The conclusion of the paper is that the costs of relocating the Sydney office to the most practicable Northern Territory location mix (Jabiru/Darwin) would be between \$2.8 million and \$4 million as a one-off cost and between \$106 000 and \$161 000 in additional operating costs. The paper also shows that:

no appreciable staff savings or operational advantages would accrue from such a relocation which raises other factors likely to impair the Office's efficiency and credibility over and beyond any relocation transition period.³⁷

30. It is clear to the Committee that serious difficulties exist with respect to the existing arrangements for regulating and supervising uranium mining activities in the Kakadu National Park region. In particular, it appears that there have been breakdowns in effective communication between the parties involved. Although, on the evidence available to it, the

Committee is not able to establish a firm perspective on the detailed causes of this situation, it regards the location of decision making officers of the Office of the Supervising Scientist in Sydney as a contributing factor.

31. The Committee is aware that proposals have been made to locate the Office of the Supervising Scientist at the Northern Territory University College, so that its work could form part of a School of Nuclear Sciences. This is seen as a means of strengthening the University College.

32. If such a proposal were accepted it would clearly result in very significant changes in the structure, functions, operations and relationships of the Office and the Committee has not yet had an opportunity to identify these or assess their significance. It is apparent, however, that the location of the Office of the Supervising Scientist in a school of nuclear science would have implications for its responsibilities in relation to the mining of minerals other than uranium.

33. The Committee is strongly of the view that action is necessary to ensure that the national environmental safeguards for uranium mining in the Park region are being met. This requires a strengthening of the Office of the Supervising Scientist and will require a review of the administrative agreements between the Northern Territory and Commonwealth Governments. Moreover, changes in the Office are inevitable given the greater responsibilities that flow from the possibility that exploration and mining activity in the Conservation Zone might increase. The necessary strengthening of the Office will be difficult to achieve while uncertainty exists about possible changes to its organisational location and the extension of its role way beyond its present functions. For this reason the Committee believes consideration should be given to the future role of the Office of the Supervising Scientist. This should examine recent proposals for changes to its status and location,

take into account the increased responsibilities of the Office resulting from mineral activity in the Conservation Zone and pay particular attention to the need to ensure effective communication between the Office and the mining companies operating in its area of responsibility. In this respect the Committee questions the efficiency and desirability of continuing to maintain the Sydney office of the OSS.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the Government:

- (i) urgently consider locating all operations of the OSS in the Northern Territory; and
- (ii) carefully examine increased responsibilities for the OSS and its strengthening as appropriate, to take account of the issues discussed in the preceding paragraphs.

Co-ordinating Committee for the Alligator Rivers Region

34. The Supervising Scientist chairs the Co-ordinating Committee for the Alligator Rivers Region, which was established by the Environment Protection (Alligator Rivers Region) Act 1978. The purpose of this Committee is to facilitate the co-ordination of the work of the various parties involved in protecting the environment of the Alligator Rivers Region from the effects of uranium mining in the region.³⁸ In particular:

the Committee provides a forum and a mechanism whereby members might communicate, consult, consider and reach understanding and agreements on the protection of the environment. The Committee is empowered to provide advice and recommendations to the Supervising Scientist.³⁹

35. The Director of the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service is a member of the Co-ordinating Committee. Other members include a representative of the Northern Land Council, representatives of relevant Commonwealth Government departments and a representative of the Northern Territory Government. The mining industry is also represented. In recent years Committee membership has been broadened to include a representative of the Northern Territory uranium mine-site unions and a member drawn from the environmentalist and anti-uranium movement.⁴⁰ The Committee believes that when a Board of Management is established for Kakadu National Park, the Chairman of the Board should also become a member of the Co-ordinating Committee.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that when a Board of Management is established for Kakadu National Park, the Chairman of the Board should take up a position on the Co-ordinating Committee for the Alligator Rivers Region, in addition to that occupied by the Director of ANPWS.

36. The Co-ordinating Committee receives periodic reports from the Northern Territory supervising authorities on their surveillance of environmental monitoring in the region and from ANPWS and the Office of the Supervising Scientist on their monitoring and research programs. In addition, the mining companies are required to report immediately all infringements and unusual events to the Northern Territory Department of Mines and Energy, and simultaneously to the Office of the Supervising Scientist. The regulatory and administrative arrangements relating to the notification and reporting procedures for unplanned events at the uranium mines in the region have been revised from time to time and were last considered by the Co-ordinating Committee in June 1987. Ranger Uranium Mines commented on their own very effective reporting system with the

NT Department of Mines and Energy and said that the 'Co-ordinating Committee for the Alligator Rivers Region has for years unsuccessfully attempted to establish an agreed reporting system'.⁴¹

37. The Supervising Scientist informed the Committee that he is increasingly concerned at the reluctance of Ranger to provide detailed information to the Co-ordinating Committee. He suggested that, because of the broadening of membership referred to above, the mining companies are now 'less willing to try to make the Committee work'.⁴² One factor in the reluctance to table information is that Committee proceedings are not confidential, members being asked only to accede to a voluntary code of conduct. This question of information flow is one that we have recommended be taken up in the review of the role of the Office of the Supervising Scientist recommended earlier in this chapter.

38. Another area of disagreement among members of the Co-ordinating Committee has been the extent to which it can discuss worker health and safety. The Minister agreed to union representation on the basis that it provided a means of ensuring that worker health and safety was given due consideration in the control of mining operations.⁴³ The Committee endorses that approach.

39. While problems appear to exist with the Co-ordinating Committee we support the view of the Supervising Scientist that:

[g]iven the multiplicity of agencies involved in the environment protection arrangement in the Alligator Rivers Region there is strong argument for the continuation of the Co-ordinating Committee as it provides the only formal mechanism for round-table discussions and information exchange on the environmental effects of uranium mining operations in the Region. This need would still exist if the regulatory role were given to the OSS.⁴⁴

Conservation Zone

40. In 1987 the Environment Protection (Alligator Rivers Region) Act was amended to confer on the Supervising Scientist responsibilities associated with general (non-uranium) mining activities in part of the Region declared as a Conservation Zone. The responsibilities of the Supervising Scientist in the Conservation Zone are purely supervisory and research. There is no regulatory role and, in contrast to the role of the Supervising Scientist in relation to uranium mining, there is no co-ordination role. The co-ordination role for the Conservation Zone is taken by the Conservation Zone Advisory Committee.

41. The costs of running the Office of the Supervising Scientist have been partially offset by an export duty on uranium concentrate produced from the Alligator Rivers Region. This duty was increased from 80¢ to \$1.02 per kilogram as from 15 September 1987, and it recovers approximately 75 per cent of the annual cost of the uranium-related monitoring and research activities of the Office of the Supervising Scientist.⁴⁵ This partial cost recovery is based on the recognition that some of the work carried out by the Office has value outside the immediate region. The Committee supports this mechanism of funding and believes that the additional resources that will be required if the Office of the Supervising Scientist is to play an effective role in the Conservation Zone should be funded by mining companies active in the Conservation Zone, whether in exploration or mining. The Supervising Scientist is already establishing field and accommodation facilities near Coronation Hill in order to provide sufficient oversight of the BHP Joint Venture operations as is necessary to advise the Minister on the adequacy of the environment protection measures applying in the Zone. As exploration activities increase and should mining begin, it may be necessary for an OSS office to be located continuously in the Zone.⁴⁶

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that a levy be placed on all exploration and mining activity in the Conservation Zone in order to maintain an overall cost-recovery similar to present levels for the costs associated with the additional responsibilities given to the Office of the Supervising Scientist as a result of the declaration of the Conservation Zone.

CONSERVATION ZONE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

42. The Government has decided that Management of the Conservation Zone should be guided by an Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of the Ministers for Primary Industries and Energy and the Arts, Sport, the Environment, Tourism and Territories (including the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service) with other interests being co-opted as required. As a result the Kakadu Conservation Zone Advisory Committee (COZAC) was established in April 1987 to advise Ministers on management of the Conservation Zone, including the conduct of the exploration and resource assessment program, and to oversee the day-to-day administration of the exploration scheme.

43. The Committee

- . provides advice to Ministers to resolve any apparent conflict between conservation objectives and the effective conduct of the exploration and resource assessment program;
- . advises on the substance of regulations to be applied under the National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act;
- . advises the Director of National Parks and Wildlife on management policy in the Conservation Zone;

- . establishes conditions to ensure that exploration is conducted in an effective manner consistent with sound conservation practices; and
- . oversees the day-to-day administration of the exploration scheme and related monitoring by the Northern Territory Department of Mines and Energy.

44. Membership of COZAC consists of one representative from each of the Department of Primary Industries and Energy and the Department of the Arts, Sport, the Environment, Tourism and Territories and the Director of ANPWS or his representative. Other Commonwealth departments or agencies which will be invited to participate where matters of relevance to them are discussed include the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, the Department of Administrative Services, the Bureau of Mineral Resources, and the Office of the Supervising Scientist.

45. The Northern Territory Government will be invited to nominate representatives to attend all or part of meetings as relevant, recognising that attendance would not be appropriate when specific advice is being prepared for Commonwealth Ministers.

46. The Committee believes that, when the Board of Management for the Park is established, COZAC should advise the Chairman of the Board of Management on management policy in the Conservation Zone, rather than the Director of ANPWS.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that when a Board of Management is established for Kakadu National Park the terms of reference of the Conservation Zone Advisory Committee should be changed so that the Committee provides advice to the Board of Management.

J R Black
Chairman

1. Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service (ANPWS) 1986. Kakadu National Park Plan of Management, p. 2
2. Evidence pp. 1249-1251
3. Evidence p. 2621
4. Evidence p. 2313
5. Evidence pp. 1012-13
6. Evidence p. 1005
7. ANPWS 1986 op cit p. 10
8. ANPWS 1986 op cit p. 12
9. Letter from Mr M Alderson of the Gagudju Association to Secretary of the Committee dated 9 February 1988
10. ANPWS op cit p. 92
11. ANPWS 1980 Kakadu National Park Plan of Management p. 331
12. Evidence p. 1186
13. Evidence p. 2458
14. Evidence p. 1186
15. Evidence p. 1187
16. Evidence p. 2622
17. ANPWS 1986 op cit p. 12
18. Evidence p. 1005
19. Letter from Mr M Alderson op cit
20. Evidence p. 2312
21. Evidence p. 2452
22. Letter from Mr M Alderson op cit
23. Evidence p. 648
24. Evidence p. 654
25. Evidence p. 684
26. Evidence p. 669
27. Evidence p. 1508
28. Office of the Supervising Scientist (OSS) 29 April 1988. Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist to Concerns Raised About its Operations with the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts. p. 3
29. OSS 29 April 1988. Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist to Concerns Raised About its Operations with the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts. p. 2
30. Letter from Dr T Gardner, Ranger Uranium Mines Pty Ltd, to Committee Chairman, dated 24 February 1988, p. 2
31. ibid p. 2
32. OSS 29 April 1988 Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist to Concerns Raised About its Operations with the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts p. 6
33. Letter from Dr T Gardner, Ranger Uranium Mines Pty Ltd, to Committee Chairman, dated 24 February 1988, p. 2
34. OSS 29 April 1988 Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist to Concerns Raised About its Operations with the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts op. cit. p. 4
35. OSS 29 April 1988 Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist to Concerns Raised About its Operations with the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts op. cit. p. 4
36. OSS 29 April 1988. Staffing, Present Costs, Travel and Costs of Relocation

37. OSS 29 May 1988. Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist op. cit. p.5.
38. Supervising Scientist for the Alligator Rivers Region Annual Report 1986-87 p. 69
39. ibid p. 69
40. OSS 29 April 1988. Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist to Concerns Raised About its Operations with the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts p. 8.
41. Letter from Dr T Gardner op. cit. p. 2
42. OSS 29 April 1988. Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist to Concerns Raised About its Operations with the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts. p. 7
43. OSS 29 April 1988. Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist to Concerns Raised About its Operations with the Senate Standing committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts p. 7
44. OSS 29 April 1988. Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist to Concerns Raised About its Operations with the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts p. 9
45. House of Representatives, Hansard, 17 February 1988 p. 141
46. OSS 29 April 1988. Response by the Office of the Supervising Scientist to Concerns Raised About its Operations with the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts. p. 6.

