

DRAFT Social impact assessment guideline

June 2016

The Department of State Development

Copyright

This publication is protected by the *Copyright Act 1968*.

Licence



This work is licensed to the Department of State Development under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 3.0 Australia licence. To view a copy of this licence, visit: <http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/>

You are free to copy, communicate and adapt this publication, as long as you attribute it as follows:

© State of Queensland, Department of State Development, **June 2016**.



The Queensland Government is committed to providing accessible services to Queenslanders of all cultural and linguistic backgrounds. If you have difficulty understanding this publication and need a translator, please call the Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS National) on telephone 131 450 and ask them to contact the Queensland Department of State Development on (07) 3452 7100.

Disclaimer

While every care has been taken in preparing this publication, the State of Queensland accepts no responsibility for decisions or actions taken as a result of any data, information, statement or advice, expressed or implied, contained within. To the best of our knowledge, the content was correct at the time of publishing.

Copies of this publication are available on our website at www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au and further copies are available upon request to:

Department of State Development
PO Box 15517 City East, Queensland 4002.
100 George Street Brisbane Qld 4000 (Australia)

Phone: 13QGOV (137468)
Fax: 07 3220 6465
Email: info@dspd.qld.gov.au
Web: www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au

Insert Source number here

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Application of this guideline	1
1.2	Policy intent for resource projects	1
1.3	Who should use the guideline	2
2.	The EIS and SIA process	2
3.	Objectives and outcomes of a SIA	3
3.1	Social baseline	3
3.2	SIA requirements	4
3.2.1	Data sources and data collection	4
3.2.2	SIA cross agency reference groups	5
3.2.3	Impact and opportunity assessment	6
3.2.4	Impact management strategies	7
3.2.5	Identification of stakeholders and stakeholder engagement	8
3.3	Roles of Stakeholders	8
3.3.1	Project proponents	8
3.3.2	State agencies	9
3.3.3	Local governments	9
3.3.4	Non-government organisations	10
3.3.5	Landholders, residents, community and Indigenous groups	10
3.4	Management plans	10
3.4.1	Community and stakeholder engagement plan	11
3.4.2	Workforce management plan	12
3.4.3	Housing and accommodation plan	14
3.4.4	Local business and industry content (Procurement) plan	16
3.4.5	Health and community wellbeing plan	16
4.	Monitoring, review and compliance	17
4.1	Monitoring program	17
4.2	Reporting and review	18
4.3	Compliance activities	19

1. Introduction

1.1 Application of this guideline

This Social Impact Assessment (SIA) guideline applies to all projects subject to an environmental impact statement (EIS) under either the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971* (SDPWO Act) or the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (EP Act). An SIA must identify and assess a project's direct and cumulative social impacts. It must provide measures to avoid, mitigate and/or offset such impacts and manage any positive opportunities over a project lifecycle.

This guideline replaces the SIA guideline that was last updated in July 2013.

The introduction also needs to clarify that these guidelines relate to the requirements following the passage of the SSRC Act 2016 (presuming it passes, and noting AMMA's separate comments identifying areas where the draft SSRC Bill should be amended).

1.2 Policy intent for resource projects

Along with the proposed *Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities* (SSRC) Act, this guideline constitutes the Queensland Government's policy framework response to the recommendations of the 2015 Parliamentary inquiry into 'Fly in, fly out (FIFO) and other long distance commuting work practices in regional Queensland'¹.

The SSRC Act, which will apply to resource (mining and petroleum) projects only, will:

- prescribe the SIA process for new resource projects
- prevent the future use of 100% FIFO workforce arrangements near regional communities, and
- prohibit discrimination against locals during the recruitment of new workers.

Together, the SSRC Act and this SIA guideline also aim to:

- support resource communities to attract and retain workers and their families
- provide improved opportunities for local governments to participate in the project impact assessment process
- maximise opportunities for competitive and capable local businesses to access resource project supply chains
- ensure worker accommodation arrangements are well planned and any worker village accommodation is of a good standard
- protect resource worker health and well-being

¹ <https://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/documents/committees/IPNRC/2015/FIFO/02-gr-160317.pdf>

- provide sufficient flexibility to respond to the peaks and troughs in the resource sector, and
- minimise any consequential increases in costs to both proponents and governments in the assessment and operation of resource projects.

This list omits the importance of ensuring Queensland remains a globally competitive place for resource investment and employment.

The guidelines and the SSRC Bill cannot add to competitiveness (and in fact the point is to limit damage to Queensland's reputation as a place to do business), but such considerations do need to be noted (and taken into account) in how the government administers its responsibilities under the Bill and Guidelines.

1.3 Who should use the guideline

This guideline should be used by:

- proponents of major projects assessed under the *SDPWO Act* and the *EP Act* to inform the preparation of their SIA
- State agencies who have advisory and consultation roles in the assessment of a major project
- local governments who either have responsibilities for approvals related to the proposed project and/or are impacted by potential social impacts arising from the proposal
- non-government organisations that have responsibility for services that will be potentially impacted by the proposed project.

In addition to using the information in this guideline, project proponents must also consult the SIA Unit in the Office of the Coordinator-General (OCG) before and during the assessment process.

What does this final paragraph mean in practice? – Examples are recommended. What must project proponents do, and at what point? If this is regulation or a paraphrasing of regulation, it needs to be clearer.

2. The EIS and SIA process

Project proponents are required to complete an SIA to enable the Coordinator-General to assess the potential positive and negative social impacts of a project as part of the EIS process. The SIA also provides a collaborative mechanism for government agencies, affected stakeholders and the community to engage with the proponent.

The SIA is released for public comment as an integral component of the overall EIS. Along with submissions received on the draft EIS, the SIA informs both the EIS evaluation report, and any outcome-focused conditions imposed by the Coordinator-General (for non-resource projects) or stated by the Coordinator-General under the proposed SSRC Act.

3. Objectives and outcomes of a SIA

The desired outcome of SIA is influenced by the concept of establishing or maintaining a 'social licence to operate' with the community. This concept has been used in several industry sectors for some years. It generally describes the informal acceptance or agreement the local, regional, state or national community extends to a proponent for new development or the ongoing operation of an existing business.

The SIA should be based on the best data available, cover the full lifecycle of the project, and engage communities of interest in a meaningful way, recognising local knowledge, experience, customs and values.

3.1 Social baseline

The social baseline study should include impacts at the project site and, along the supply chains to where associated service activities are located. The geographic extent and scope of the assessment should be agreed with the SIA Unit of the OCG to ensure an appropriate baseline is established. The study should include:

- an identification of the stakeholders, including the communities of interest
- a social baseline study of the impacted communities of interest, for example:
 - community history, Indigenous communities, culture and key events that have shaped economic and social development, resilience and trends
 - key industries in the region and any historical considerations, pressures or vulnerabilities experienced by these industry sectors
- an overview of state government legislation and policies relevant to the SIA.

The baseline study also provides the basis upon which the proponent may describe the nil-project scenario.

Nonsensical that project proponents should be required to do an “overview” the Queensland government’s legislation and policies.

The government should know what it requires. If anything, guidance should be provided to the project proponent from government on these matters.

If such a requirement does form part of the guidelines, despite being nonsensical, unmerited and an undue burden on proponents, it needs some limitation on scope.

Just looking at the SSRC Bill, if a proponent has to overview applicable state government legislation, it would need to identify and presumably somehow summarise (?) at least four Acts, being the SSRC Act and the three Acts it calls up.

An example of the excessive and unnecessary burden this would create would be to even attempt to “overview” the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991, which would be a herculean task. If legal advice needed to be sought, this would be very costly.

3.2 SIA requirements

3.2.1 Data sources and data collection

Collecting the right data is one of the most important processes in undertaking a baseline study.

While published data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), the Queensland Government Statisticians Office (QGSO) or government agencies and local government should be used, the baseline study needs to be complemented by recent on the ground research. Desktop research is not sufficient to provide baseline data. The SIA report must identify any gaps in data.

Using multiple data sources will enhance the validity of the analysis. Qualitative data may be sourced from a range of stakeholder and community engagement activities, including:

- calling for written submissions from affected stakeholders
- documenting and addressing issues that are raised in public forums
- conducting surveys of residents and affected stakeholders.

DRAFT

Broad data categories may include:

Community history and culture including Indigenous history and culture	Income and cost of living
Population	Social infrastructure
Workforce participation, employment and diversity profile	Technology
Profile on non-resident workers	Community health and safety
Housing and accommodation – cost availability and range of housing options	Transport
Education and training	Socio-economic advantage, disadvantage and resilience
Business, industry and economy	Relevant information from the economic impact assessment
	Existing cumulative impact data

Data collected in the development of the social baseline study should be compared, aligned and analysed using best practice social science research methods.

3.2.2 SIA cross agency reference groups

The Office of the Coordinator-General will establish SIA cross-agency reference (CAR) groups for relevant regions when required to provide a collaborative approach to SIA. Membership of the CAR groups will include relevant state government agencies and local governments. To the extent that it is possible, the SIA CAR group meetings will be convened in the relevant region, but practical constraints may necessitate that some meetings will be held in Brisbane. When appropriate, a proponent **may** be invited to a CAR group meeting to discuss project details and proposed impact management strategies. Technical experts or other key stakeholders may also be invited to some meetings.

This needs to be clearer on what the role of the CAR is, and needs to be more transparent about how the process would work.

Need to be clearer than “may”.

If the CAR is going to make or inform determinations or look at impact management strategies, proponents need the opportunity to address each and every one of the CAR’s concerns prior to any decisions being made.

We also need clarity on whether these meetings will be minuted, public or closed, and how transparent the process is going to be.

Can proponents apply for FOI releases of the CAR deliberations and meetings with other persons (for example, the proponent may have a very different technical view than someone purporting to be a “technical expert” and should be able to contest material from such a source the CAR is seeking to rely on).

The frequency and agenda of each CAR group meeting will vary with project and regional circumstances. CAR groups will consider cumulative impacts of projects in the region.

This is unduly woolly on what the CAR does and how it fits into the process. Greater clarity and transparency to users is required.

3.2.3 Impact and opportunity assessment

The proponent's proposed approach and methodology for identifying and rating social impacts should be agreed within its organisation.

The process implemented by the proponent will need to be consistent with the community's capacity to participate.

This is unclear and potentially worrying. Towns with as few as 200 people may have little organised structure at all – resource proponents need to be able to navigate these requirements in such circumstances and not have projects unduly delayed.

There is also a radius issue. There could be numerous very different communities of 200 or more people within 100km of a proposed resource development, and it may be difficult to draw them all into a process.

Please see our separate comments on this scope matter in relation to the SSRC Bill.

An assessment of potential impacts and opportunities across each stage of the project lifecycle is to be informed by the social baseline study, as well as feedback from stakeholder engagement. The potential opportunities and impacts must be identified by considering the potential changes to the areas included in that study.

The following is quite unclear “The potential opportunities and impacts must be identified by considering the potential changes to the areas included in that study”. We ask that this be clarified in plainer English.

Additionally a “project lifecycle” refers to the entire cradle to grave of a project – where the purpose and scope of the SSRC Bill is “operational phase” only.

Recommendation: change “project lifecycle” to “operational phase”, which the phrase used in the SSRC Bill.

Proponents should use rating tools consistent with nationally or internationally recognised risk management standards. Upon request, the Office of the Coordinator General can provide an example of a risk impact and opportunity assessment.

Stakeholders and the community must be given the opportunity to comment on the rating of the impacts. In instances where stakeholders do not support the ratings, this should be stated and the reasons why explained and documented.

Even using international best practice risk (including ERM) management techniques, methodology and standards, it is imperative that professional judgement calls are able to be made by risk professionals, that assess and approve singular and overall risk ratings taking into account the probability and impact of the risk exposure.

Therefore, risks should be open to professional interpretation but not open for public rating consultation.

Recommendation:

Risk assessments continue to be made by professionals within proponent organisations/their contracted specialist advisers.

Risk management procedures and policies should be disclosed on a company's website (and made accessible to the public).

A list of the key risks that a company assesses should also be made public (similar reporting requirements under IFRS).

3.2.4 Impact management strategies

Once the social impacts and opportunities are identified, the proponent, in consultation and collaboration with stakeholders, must develop and document social impact management strategies. Such strategies must also be developed for expected cumulative impacts of projects within the region.

The SIA must clearly demonstrate that the established hierarchy of avoid, minimise, mitigate and offset impacts has been followed. Options to mitigate impacts must only be proposed where all reasonable project design, location, consultation and implementation measures have been explored to avoid social impacts or reduce them to an acceptable level.

Proposed impact mitigation measures should be relevant, reasonable, cost-effective, transparent, enforceable and focussed on outcomes rather than prescriptive processes. Such measures should also incorporate adaptive management to both:

We question the use of the word “enforceable” in this context as many of the likely measures relate to operational approaches and are not subject to direct enforcement.

The concept of “adaptive management” is also not defined or extrapolated upon – this requires clarity.

- address changes in the socio-economic environment that may occur during the construction and operation of the project, and

If the SSRC Bill is about “operational phase”, again, “construction” phase is erroneous and needs to be removed.

- amend mitigation measures where they are proven to be either insufficiently effective or having unintended negative consequences.

Measures to offset negative project impacts should be proposed only where other strategies are predicted to be inadequate. To the extent possible, offsets should:

- focus on the directly impacted communities
- be ‘like-for-like’
- be implemented prior to or at approximately the same time as the predicted impacts
- avoid proposals that are not related to the actual impact or will create unsustainable maintenance or operational costs over the longer term, and
- contribute to mitigation of cumulative impacts of projects in the region.

The impact mitigation strategies that are developed during the SIA need to be embedded across the proponent's business. This will include developing management systems and operating procedures to deliver the social outcomes.

We question any requirement that mitigation strategies be “embedded across the proponent’s business”.

A mitigation strategy appropriate to a remote region may have no relevance or justification for head office staff in Brisbane - let alone in another state or internationally.

Additionally, if an owner has two different sites with two similar SI issues but has different stakeholders / conditions, there may be different mitigation strategies required at each business. Therefore embedding SIA “across a proponent’s business” is impractical.

In addition to being impractical and misdirected, this is at odds with the concept that local concerns are met through bespoke measures as set out throughout the guidelines.

3.2.5 Identification of stakeholders and stakeholder engagement

A description of the key stakeholders affected by the project must be provided in the SIA. Stakeholders that should be considered include state agencies, local governments, non-government organisations, landholders and community/resident groups.

An outline of the role of each stakeholder group is provided below.

3.3 Roles of Stakeholders

The order of this is important – the NGOs should be last, after the landholders, residents etc

3.3.1 Project proponents

Project proponents are required to prepare an SIA that identifies the social impacts, especially those that are high risk over the project lifecycle. Mitigation measures must include commitments to:

- continuous improvement in SIAs through recognised best practice engage and collaborate with the local community, local and state governments and relevant stakeholders

Engagement and collaboration – some sort of subheading or break is needed here.

- upon request, present information to the Regional CAR Group
- prepare the management plans described in section 3.4
- implement, monitor, review and report on impact management plans.

3.3.2 State agencies

State agencies are required to:

- provide information and data for the social baseline assessment
- review the proponent's SIA
- assess potential impacts on state government services and make a submission to the Coordinator-General or Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (DEHP) delegate, as appropriate.

This is too passive and fails to properly identify the responsibilities of the government/ regulator.

The responsibilities of government should include, and in fact start with:

- **Providing information and other resources to support applicants / project proponents in making applications and successfully meeting the requirements of the SIA process.**

State agencies may also engage with proponents on strategies to mitigate impacts on state government services and participate, collaborate and negotiate with proponents as part of the Regional CAR Group process.

This might be assisted with some indicative examples. The industry would be concerned if the Guidelines assumed any cost shifting must apply from the State to the project proponent.

Where appropriate, state agencies may provide draft conditions relevant to their services for consideration by the Coordinator-General during the preparation of the EIS evaluation or assessment report.

What transparency will there be? Will the project proponent be heard by the agencies? – They should be.

3.3.3 Local governments

Local governments play an important role in reviewing project proposals and providing consistent data and information for the social baseline assessment. Relevant local governments may also:

- review the proponent's SIA and assess potential impacts on local government services and make a submission to the Coordinator-General or DEHP delegate, as appropriate

What transparency will there be? Will this submission be available to the project proponent?

Will it be subject to FOI application? Noting that proponents should not need to use such mechanisms to secure transparent access to material that will be used to determine their SIAs.

- attend Regional CAR Group meetings
- engage, collaborate and negotiate with proponents on strategies to mitigate potential impacts on local government services

- represent local community groups as appropriate.

3.3.4 Non-government organisations

Non-government organisation may be requested by the proponent or Regional CAR Group to provide information and data for the social baseline assessment. These organisations may also:

- review the proponent's SIA and assess potential impacts on **the** non-government services **they provide in the local area to be impacted on by the proposed development** and make a submission to the Coordinator-General or DEHP delegate, as appropriate
- engage with proponents on strategies to mitigate potential impacts on non-government services.

This needs precision. It should be qualified to only deal into this process existing NGOs that are providing social and community services in the region, and not activist bodies that may be organised to oppose a project (which are technically NGOs on some readings of that concept).

Examples may assist in understanding which non-government groups need to be engaged with.

Activist NGOs opposing development should not be dealt into the process through this identification of stakeholders.

Again, this is the last group and should come under existing 3.3.5.

3.3.5 Landholders, residents, community and Indigenous groups

Individuals, the community and Indigenous groups have the opportunity to:

- review the proponent's SIA and assessment of impacts during the EIS public consultation period and make a submission to the Coordinator-General or DEHP delegate, as appropriate
- engage with proponents on strategies to mitigate these impacts.

3.4 Management plans

As prescribed by the proposed SSRC Act, the SIA for each resource project must provide plans for the following:

- community and stakeholder engagement
- workforce management
- housing and accommodation
- local business and industry content
- health and community wellbeing.

For non-resource projects, provision of these five plans in the SIA is recommended.

While a summary of the requirements for these plans is provided below, proponents should also seek direction from the SIA Unit in OCG, early in the process to agree the content of the plans.

What does early in the process mean?

It needs to be more exact on who must do what when, or at least provide a clearer indication of what the regulator will expect to see happen and what point.

While this guideline generally sets out the SIA process, individual project circumstances necessitate that the actual SIA requirements for a project are specified in the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the EIS.

The Coordinator-General may require that any of the plans be updated prior to construction if more than two years have elapsed between the EIS evaluation report and the commencement of construction, or if there have been **significant changes to the economic and social environment**. This will ensure the SIA mitigation and management strategies remain current.

“Significant changes to the economic and social environment” is very subjective.

What will this mean in practice and how would a project proponent navigate such a requirement? If the regulator thinks this is an issue or likelihood, they need to be the ones making contact with the project proponent and asking them to respond.

3.4.1 Community and stakeholder engagement plan

The proponent is required to develop a community and stakeholder engagement plan. This plan should support open and transparent dialogue with stakeholders. It requires identifying and working with **all** potentially affected individuals and groups from the start of the planning and design stages of the project. It includes affected local and state government agencies and local and regional communities.

A requirement to identify and work with all potentially affected individuals and groups is unrealistic and inherently unsuited to the purpose being pursued here.

The requirement should instead be that the project proponent took reasonable steps to identify and then work with “potentially affected individuals and groups”.

In no circumstances should the proponent of a project in Queensland be obliged to work with a group or groups based, or substantially operating outside the state of Queensland.

An appropriate range of stakeholder and community engagement techniques, (for example different approaches for literacy levels and cultural differences) should be demonstrated.

The plan needs to incorporate an inclusive and continuous process between the proponent and the communities of interest that identifies **social opportunities** and **impacts** that are directly related to the project. The community and stakeholder plan should include:

What is a “social opportunity”? This seems like imprecise jargon and likely to mislead, or lead to very different interpretations by those seeking to comply with the Guidelines.

This might more usefully be expressed as:

“The plan should provide for an inclusive and continuous process of dialogue and engagement between the proponent and community stakeholders.”

The application of “impacts” is also unclear, requires clarification. Which impacts, and impacts on what? Again this requires greater precision.

- a program for the proponent to communicate to stakeholders the:
 - project details
 - expected **social impacts and opportunities**
 - mitigation and management strategies identified

Note: comments re social impacts and opportunities, directly above, and earlier responses on “mitigation and management strategies”.

- the process for ongoing consultation, liaison and negotiation in relation to the implementation of agreed mitigation and management strategies during the lifecycle of the project

Operational phase not “lifecycle of the project”.

- actions to promote an active and ongoing role for stakeholders throughout the project lifecycle

Operational phase not “lifecycle of the project”.

- responses from communities of interest about the mitigation of impacts and the transparent integration of these responses in the project’s SIA

Cumbersome, ineffective, impractical recommendation.

- details of the meetings set up for communities, including:
- outcomes agreed through the implementation of management and mitigation strategies.

3.4.2 Workforce management plan

The intrusion of the guidelines and legislation into employment carries new and novel propositions unknown to our employment law.

Putting to one side the validity and justification for this approach, it needs to be expressed/executed as tightly and clearly as possible, and to clarify as clearly as possible what is required of the project proponent.

The existing draft is not sufficiently precise and falls short of appropriately supporting compliance. It is repetitious and unclear in many areas. More work is required on the wording executing policy (without AMMA at this point contesting the policy, which we continue to do).

Even imposes that the industry does not support need to be executed clearly and effectively, and we are very willing to assist this process.

AMMA would be pleased to work with the government on the wording of these requirements to identify and minimise ambiguity.

In the meantime:

- **We have included some comments and corrections below.**
- **We have included at the end of this reply document a clearer redraft of subsection 3.4.2. Note, we are not conceding that this should be regulated, but trying to improve on the clarity and drafting if this is to be regulated.**

A Workforce management plan is required that addresses:

- the size, nature and location of the project workforce for construction and operational phases, including the projected proportion of workers who will use FIFO, bus-in, bus-out and drive in, drive out arrangements

Need to delete “construction”.

Needs the qualification of “projected” in the initial line too, as follows:

“the projected size, nature and location of the project’s operational workforce, including the projected proportion of workers who will use FIFO, bus-in, bus-out and drive in, drive out arrangements”

- **workforce demand**- the estimated composition of proposed workforce by occupation, project stage and duration
- ~~labour supply analysis for the relevant region(s) including~~

planning and policies for recruiting workers that address the recruitment of:

- **Indigenous Australians**
 - **Women**
 - **People with disability**
 - **Trainees/apprentices and**
 - **Employees from areas with high unemployment**
- in order of priority, a commitment and strategies for recruiting and training personnel from:
 - local and regional communities
 - recruitment to the regional community
 - recruitment from priority areas, such as areas of high unemployment and socio-economic disadvantage
 - recruitment from other areas of Queensland

The industry recognises what the government is attempting here, and understands the political and policy rationale being pursued.

This said, the industry unambiguously and with no apology stands and will continue to stand by its commitment to diversity, in particular to the employment of women and Indigenous Australians.

If the pool of qualified local and regional community is predominated by white males, the industry will not allow them to dominate hiring to the exclusion of opportunities for women and Indigenous Australians.

We are confident that this is not the intended effect of the workforce management plans, but this needs to be clarified in the drafting and is a priority concern raised by the guidelines as drafted. As indicated, we have attempted a redraft at the end of this document.

Finally and on a different issue, we ask the CG to look into whether it is permissible under the Commonwealth Constitution to insist on employment from Queensland. We suspect this may be at odds with the free trade provisions which may preclude a state law from requiring employment discrimination against persons from another state.

- the plan must include details of all operational employees whether employed directly, by contractors or by other recruitment arrangements
- roster arrangements for local, regional and FIFO operational workers
- training and development strategies and initiatives for the recruitment of local and regional workers to build better local and regional skills capacity
- targets and performance indicators in relation to:
 - local, regional and FIFO recruitment strategies and initiatives
 - training and development strategies and initiatives including vulnerable groups, women, people with a disability and Indigenous people
- employee assistance programs to support the physical and mental health and well-being **of employees**, including a description of the range of services to be provided.

3.4.3 Housing and accommodation plan

A Housing and accommodation plan is required that demonstrates and includes:

- clear understanding of impacts and detailed mitigation strategies for accommodating local, regional and FIFO construction and operational project workforces

The reference to mitigation is misapplied here, and this is poorly expressed. This would be better in the positive.

“Strategies for accommodating local, regional and FIFO operational project workforce”.

Note however that in the communities the SSRC Act is designed to assist, the rationale for acting is that existing residents (paying their mortgages or rent) are qualified and work ready. In such cases there is no need for a strategy to house local employees in particular, as they are seeking employment on the basis that they can commute.

- a review of available accommodation in local and regional housing markets over the construction and operational phases of the project

Again, operational phase only.

- projected population increases attributable to the project

- analysis of the impact of the demand for housing from the project workers and their households, and related housing affordability
- type and location of proposed accommodation for workers and projected **impacts** of this accommodation during **construction** and operational phases

Again, operational phase only.

Explanation/guidance is required on what the “impacts” could potential be... environmental, economic? Again, the Guidelines need to better guide those being asked to comply with them.

- analysis of the projected workforce mix (e.g. FIFO, new and locally based operation workforce and workers who are sourced locally)
- current and projected rental and purchase costs
- current and projected rental vacancy rates
- impact of current and projected rental costs on low and moderate income workers in industries other than the resource industry
- subject to the housing market analysis above, the proportion of the operational workforce that **is proposed to** be located in local towns
- strategies for the provision of accommodation for workers and their families who wish to live locally and the level of assistance that will be provided by the proponent.

Why would a PP need to pay anything to accommodate someone locally unless there was a rental shortage or price spike as occurred in the Pilbara.

The PP should in most cases pay wages to the employee and the employee then pays their rent or mortgage, as is the case for head office staff and the rest of the company’s employees.

Only in exceptional circumstances should any rent allowance be required – and if there is a shortage of rental accommodation in an area an allowance is potentially going to do more damage to the local community than a village based strategy. A home owner may make more money pulling their family out of the community and cashing in an artificially inflated rent, which would be a perverse incentive and outcome.

This needs to be clearer – are you saying an employer must give incoming, not already resident employees a choice of living locally, and must subsidise them doing so?

The pros and cons of this will differ town by town, case by case, but it is not hard to see it having very negative impacts on the existing community. And for the already resident employees they already own or rent.

When outlining plans for worker accommodation villages, project proponents must include:

- details of the projected size, design, location and duration of **construction and** operational villages

Again, operational phase only.

- details of any existing accommodation camps operated by the proponent, total bed capacity and current vacancy rate

Relevance - unsure what the point is. Why is it relevant that a project proponent disclose the detail of the bed capacity and vacancy rate of existing accommodation camps elsewhere?

As it reads, it sounds like it is expected that the project proponent for a Queensland mine has to disclose the number of beds available at one their mine sites (for example) in Saskatchewan, or thousands of kilometres away in a different part of Queensland or another state.

- consultation, negotiation and agreement with local government and/or state government on current status of approval process for proposed accommodation camps
- a strategy for provision of recreation, infrastructure and health and social services in the accommodation camps.

3.4.4 Local business and industry content (Procurement) plan

The *Queensland Resources Council Code of Practice for Local Content* (2013), is widely used as a basis for procurement plans across the resources sector.

The plan should include:

- an assessment of the current local community and regional supplier capacity and capability
- any proposed programs and policies to be implemented to build local and regional capacity and capability
- procurement strategies and initiatives to be implemented for local and nearby regional suppliers

The plan should also apply to contractors and sub-contractors engaged to undertake operational activities on behalf of the project owner.

3.4.5 Health and community wellbeing plan

A health and community wellbeing plan is required that details:

- forecast impacts on access and demand for health and medical services provided by hospitals, general practitioners and community health centres
- strategies for how these health services will be maintained for the community

Is this implying the project proponent will be required to pay to subsidise additional services? Be clearer about what you expect of project proponents.

- any community concerns about potential health and safety impacts resulting from the project and any mitigation strategies to be implemented, including for road safety

Is there a temporal issue here? Won't the community concerns only come to light after the proposals are made and become public, and wont the concerns only be reasonable or able to be engaged with once facts are released (opposed to supposition and fear based on partial information).

Also the "any" is a bit tough given some concerns may be exaggerated or baseless, or some only from individuals and not the community.

Perhaps this could be better expressed as:

“Concerns that have been formally communicated to the project proponent from members of the local community regarding potential health and safety impacts arising from the project, and the project proponent’s response. Particular regard should be had to any concerns for road safety resulting from the project”

- **the level of** on-site health services to be provided for workers
- **any** workforce codes of conduct, or comparable guidelines to manage worker behaviour in impacted communities

This isn’t particularly arduous, however there are limits to any employer’s capacity to direct employee behaviour when they are not rostered on to work.

- emergency response arrangements and **mitigation** strategies agreed with emergency service providers, for incidents both on and off the mine site

“mitigation” is not the right concept here; it is about agreed arrangements or strategies.

- **Forecast** impacts on community services and facilities, including child care, family, domestic violence, youth and disability support, community and sporting organisations

Express consistently with the first dot point, the requirement should be based on what a project proponent can reasonably forecast or foresee. Should be “Reasonably foreseeable impacts on.....”

- how impacted community services and facilities will be maintained for the community

Is this implying the project proponent will be required to pay to subsidise additional services? Be clearer about what you expect of project proponents.

- scope, frequency and scale of any community development programs to be implemented and outcomes to be achieved

Re-express:

“The planned scope, frequency and scale of any community development programs to be implemented and the outcomes sought”

- consultation, monitoring and mitigation strategies in relation to potential community health impacts in relation to air quality, noise and water.

4. Monitoring, review and compliance

4.1 Monitoring program

The proponent will monitor the progress and effectiveness of mitigation strategies and ensure stakeholder input is considered as part of the ongoing implementation process.

Monitoring must:

- track the progress and assess the effectiveness of mitigation and management strategies
- capture information with which to advise communities and government on progress and achievements
- facilitate engagement, consultation and collaboration with stakeholders

The key components of a monitoring program are:

- a list of identified impacts and issues
- targets and outcomes sought
- how management of the impact will be monitored and reported

This could be clearer:

“how the listed impacts and issues will be monitored and managed”

- the party responsible for the implementation of each monitoring strategy

This could be clearer:

“Who is responsible for monitoring and reporting”

- timing and frequency of monitoring
- key performance indicators that are informative, relevant, measurable, simple to report and easily understood.

~~This guideline emphasises the value of establishing or maintaining a social licence to operate with the community. Such programs have been used widely in the resource industry for some years.~~

This would work better without the additional paragraph. Its superfluous and could confuse in this location – keep this concept in the introduction only.

4.2 Reporting and review

The frequency of reporting will depend on the individual circumstances of each project. It will be determined by the SIA Unit of the OCG in consultation with the proponent and specified in the EIS Evaluation/Assessment Report.

Prior to construction, the reporting regime may be amended if more than two years have elapsed between the evaluation report and the commencement of construction, or if there have been significant changes to the economic and social environment.

Annual reports are usually required for a period of five years after construction starts. Thereafter, reporting will be at much longer intervals (e.g. each ten years) or at key operational changes (e.g. a large quantum increase in production; or at decommissioning).

An assessment of the progress and outcomes against the Coordinator-General conditions, mitigation strategies and proponent’s commitments will be undertaken for each of the five plans described in section 3.4.

The Coordinator-General will review these reports in consultation with state agencies, local government and relevant stakeholders and may make recommendations or give directions to the proponent if any further action is necessary.

4.3 Compliance activities

The Coordinator-General's enforcement powers are described in Part 7A of the SDPWO Act. Further information is available in the *Strategic Compliance Plan* on the Department of State Development website².

Compliance requirements, which are usually described in the EIS evaluation report, may include:

- a third party audit certifying the proponent's compliance with relevant conditions
- review by the Coordinator-General of annual reports or management plans, providing direction to the proponent on any corrective actions that may be required
- reporting by the proponent on any non-compliance with conditions and subsequent measures taken to correct such non-compliance and minimise the probability of reoccurrence.

The OCG SIA Unit may also undertake further auditing of the project's activities as a result of the findings of a report or as part of a targeted audit program.

² <http://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/compliance-monitoring-and-enforcement/>

Workforce management plan (Redrafted)

The proponent is required to develop a Workforce Management Plan.

The Workforce Management Plan should include/address:

- the size and location of the projected employed operational workforce, including the projected proportion of employees who will use FIFO, bus-in, bus-out and drive in, drive out arrangements.
- the projected composition of the project's employed operational workforce by occupation, along with the anticipated duration of employment.
- a strategy for recruiting, and where appropriate training, employees:
 - From diverse backgrounds, including in particular Indigenous Australians and women
 - From local and regional communities
 - Recruited to reside in the regional community
 - Recruited from areas of high unemployment and socio-economic disadvantage
 - Recruited from other areas of Queensland
- apprenticeship and traineeship strategies.
- employee assistance programs to support the physical and mental health and well-being of employees, including a description of the range of services to be provided.

The Coordinator-General

PO Box 15517

tel 13 QGOV (13 74 68)

fax +61 7 3452 7486

info@dsg.qld.gov.au

www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au