

POST-APPROVAL GUIDELINES (ANNUAL REVIEW)

Acknowledging that the Annual Review is not intended to be an exhaustive description of an operation, it is likely to be an entry point for assessing how well social/ecological cost is being managed relative to public benefit.

Data : in this complexly structured age of transparent management, regulation and internet delivery, the regulator should require easily followed links in the Annual Review to data supporting the document. Specifically,

- There should be links to all the current approvals; and
- for each section from 6 onwards there ought to be hardcopy request details or linkages to the relevant data as it exists and is approved by the regulator as being of a sufficient framework conforming to the “POST-APPROVAL GUIDELINE WEB-BASED REPORTING FRAMEWORK” for data monitoring of sufficient scope and quality for the operation. Design allowing data redaction for commercial competitive purposes should be allowed so long as it does not restrict access to data monitoring environmental measures;
- hardcopy request details or linkages to independent audit reports; and
- hardcopy request details or linkages to relevant financial reports.

Social & Community Benefit : proponents should be encouraged to measure and state their contribution to the public and social economy within the section entitled “Community” over the 12 month period by including suggested best practice provision of measures such as :-

- \$Royalties
- \$Non-skilled Employed labour
- \$Contracted labour / services
- #FTE Employed Trainees
- #FTE Community Education (Non-Employed Trainees)
- %FIFO workers

Carbon Emissions : It is possible there will one day be legally enforceable carbon emission targets so there should be a Greenhouse Carbon review summary based on #tonnes product.

PLANNING AGREEMENT GUIDELINES (FOR STATE SIGNIFICANT MINING PROJECTS)

With respect to Section 4 Region wide planning agreements : The mining industry seems to need coaching on how to be proactive as an industry turning *millstones* into *flywheels*.

These documents should explicitly suggest working with communities & councils on environments that were **poorly rehabilitated in the past**, particularly where circumstances did not result in a similar scale of replacement industries once mining moved on. Such regional areas often have long-lived large and growing economic, social and educational gaps that mean there is great opportunity for successful community building. Other regional communities that are going to be affected by new mining may be less hostile to mining if they see signage near attractive old mine sites efficiently reused by the public for healthy recreation saying “This public reserve was once mined by XXXX Co Ltd (since absorbed into ZZZZ Co) between the years XXXX and YYYY and now provides \$X of zzzz contribution to its community through passive tourism and xxx on top of the XX years of employment of over XX Australians” proudly extolling the social and ongoing economic benefits of environmentally responsible mining to the community.