



Document reviewed		
Title of the draft being reviewed:	Guidelines on tools and techniques for hazard identification and risk assessment	
Contact information		
Surname:	Playle	
Given Name:	Ben	
Government (if applicable):	Commonwealth of Australia	
Organization (if applicable):	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	
Country:	Australia	
E-mail:	ben.playle@dfat.gov.au	
General Comments		
<p>Australia confirms its position, as previously stated that these Guidelines can only be approved as part of a package, together with the Draft Exploitation Regulations (Regulations) and other Standards and Guidelines. We note also that to the extent these Guidelines refer to other Guidelines which are yet to be developed, it is appropriate to have a further opportunity to comment on this Guideline in the light of the other Guidelines once they have been prepared.</p>		
<p>Australia reiterates comments made to the draft Regulations and considers that any proposed amendments to the Regulations should also be reflected in the Guidelines.</p>		
<p>These Guidelines should include a statement to the effect that where the Guidelines seemingly conflict with the Regulations, including its annexes, or any Standards, the Regulations or Standards will prevail.</p>		
<p>The “section” references throughout the Guideline do not correspond with the formatting of the Guideline and its headings and it is difficult to follow the cross-references. Please align references with the formatting of the Guideline E.g “Section III.B, paragraph 20” etc.</p>		
<p>To the extent the Guideline indicates that certain risk assessment tools or methodologies are preferred over others and the LTC may reject a proposal on this basis, Australia considers that this should be elevated into a Standard (including in relation to hazard identification and risk assessment levels).</p>		
<p>Terms defined in the schedule to the Regulations should be consistently used and capitalised throughout the Guidelines.</p>		
<p>Support the document’s focus on strong environmental regulation.</p>		
Specific Comments		
Page	Line	Comment
2	75	Please replace “Section 1” with “Section I”
2	79	Please replace “Section 2” with “Section II”
2	83	Please replace “Section 3” with “Section III”
2	88	Please replace “Section 4” with “Section IV”
2	91	Please replace “Section 5” with “Section V”

5	Table Row 1 Column 3	Please insert “and in accordance with the Mining Workplan at Annex II(a) of the Exploitation Regulations”
5	Table Row 2 Column 3	Please insert “and as set out in Annexes IV, V, VI, VII”
5	Table Row 3 Column 2	Please insert “-The review and updating of previous risk assessments as required for an EMMP under Regulation 51(c) and Regulation 52(2), an ERCP under Regulation 53(1)(a), and a Plan of Work under Regulation 58(1)(aa), (d), (f), (g)”
8	286- 289	This sentence indicates that in certain circumstances certain risk analyses methodologies would not be sufficient to establish that all hazards have been identified. If failure to use HAZOP or a similar methodology by a Contractor could lead to the refusal of an exploitation contract, then this should be elevated into a Standard.
17	611	The risk assessment and management review processes are built into the requirements to update the ECRP, the Plan of Work, the EMMP and its associated performance assessments. Further, Australia reiterates its position that the ECRP should be tested and annually updated and as such, would be subject to the same risk assessment and management processes. Given these updates and assessments are mandatory, Australia considers that these are obligations that should be elevated into a Standard.
18	627	Please replace “should” with “must”, as this reflects obligations under the Regulations.
18	653	Please replace “should” with “must”, as this reflects obligations under the Regulations.
19	702	Please replace “should” with “must”, as this reflects obligations under the Regulations.