

STATE FORESTS 14, 22, 23, 39, 49 AND 65

Partial Revocation of Dedication — Motion

MR A.P. JACOB (Ocean Reef — Minister for Environment) [12.16 pm]: I move —

That the proposal for the partial revocation of state forests 14, 22, 23, 39, 49 and 65, laid on the table of the Legislative Assembly on Tuesday, 11 August 2015, by command of Her Excellency the Governor, be carried out.

This proposal relates to a land exchange and five separate road proposals that require partial excisions from state forests 14, 22, 23, 39, 49 and 65, totalling around 181 hectares. For ease of identification, the six areas have been numbered. One proposal relates to a land exchange with WA Bluemetal, the trading entity of Ransberg Pty Ltd; a second proposal relates to the construction of the Perth–Darwin national highway; and the remaining four proposals concern the widening and upgrades of existing roads by Main Roads Western Australia. All the road proposals will result in vegetation clearing. If the proposed land exchange with WA Bluemetal is approved, two areas of native bushland will be added to the lands managed by the Department of Parks and Wildlife and the net benefit to the state from this land exchange would be the addition of 327.7 hectares of bushland with significant conservation and recreation value.

Area 1 relates to the proposed excision of 1.9645 hectares from state forest 14, with this area being located about two kilometres south east of Dwellingup. Main Roads has requested the excision to facilitate the construction of a passing lane on the Pinjarra–Williams Road. Main Roads advises that this section of road receives a significant volume of traffic, particularly heavy vehicles associated with the operation of Boddington gold mine. To address traffic problems and improve road safety, Main Roads proposes to construct a passing lane. The new passing lane will ensure that the Pinjarra–Williams Road will be able to cope with the increasing volume of traffic and heavy vehicle movements associated with the operation of Boddington gold mine.

The excision and construction will result in clearing of native vegetation from state forest 14. The native vegetation affected by the proposal is identified as jarrah and marri forest with endemic understorey species. Main Roads has completed an environmental impact assessment and prepared an environmental management plan to address the environmental impacts of this proposal, as required by Main Roads’ environmental assessment and approval procedure. Main Roads is also addressing the necessary approvals for native vegetation and clearing, including acquiring a suitable offset with the Department of Environment Regulation.

Area 2 relates to the proposed excision of 83.9124 hectares from state forest 22. The area is located about six kilometres south east of Byford. WA Bluemetal owns and operates a granite quarry located west of state forest 22. The Department of Parks and Wildlife has supported the proposed excision of an 83.9124 hectare proportion of state forest 22 adjacent to the existing quarry. In exchange, WA Bluemetal would provide the state with two vegetative freehold properties. The first property is located south of Manjedal Brook. This property contains the upper reaches of Whitby Falls and was initially proposed to be quarried. Instead, the addition of this 48.6 hectare lot to the adjacent state forest 22 will ensure that Manjedal Brook and the downstream Whitby Falls can be managed for conservation and future recreational opportunities. The second lot is 363.1 hectares in the area and is adjacent to more of the national park. The area is known to contain Carnaby’s black cockatoo foraging and breeding habitat and is an important inclusion into this state’s conservation and reservation system. The land exchange will result in a net benefit to the state of an additional 327.7 hectares of bushland for conservation and recreation. WA Bluemetal will be required to undertake all the necessary environmental assessments and clearing permits for its proposed quarrying activities in line with the granting of its mining approval. It will also be required to comply with the necessary approvals required by the Department of Lands, which will complete the land exchange.

Area 3 relates to the proposed excision of 3.0775 hectares from state forest 23. This area is located about three kilometres west of Dwellingup. Main Roads has requested the excision to facilitate the widening of a portion of the Pinjarra–Williams Road between Dwellingup and Teesdale. This proposal, like area 1, seeks to address the significant volume of traffic, particularly heavy vehicle traffic associated with the operation of Boddington gold mine. Main Roads proposes to widen the road pavement, upgrade the road shoulder and improve the road geometry to improve safety and ensure that the Pinjarra–Williams Road is able to cope with the traffic volume associated with Boddington gold mine. The excision and road widening will result in the clearing of native vegetation. The native vegetation affected by this proposal was identified as wandoo and marri woodlands, with an endemic understory species. Main Roads has completed an environmental impact assessment and provided an environmental management plan to address the environmental effects of this proposal, as required by Main Roads environmental assessment and approval procedure. Main Roads is also addressing the necessary approvals for native vegetation clearing, including acquiring a suitable offset with the Department of Environment Regulation.

Area 4 relates to a proposal to upgrade the intersection of Vasse and South Western Highways. This area is located about 12 kilometres south of Manjimup. Main Roads is proposing to realign a portion of Vasse Highway and construct a turning lane from South Western Highway and construct a new rest area north of this intersection. The proposed upgrades require minor excisions from Sir James Mitchell National Park and state forest 39, which is a combined area of less than 0.4 hectares. The area required from state forest to facilitate this upgrade is 0.0825 hectares. The proposed excision and associated upgrades are anticipated to improve the safety of the intersection, particularly for vehicles turning right onto Vasse Highway. The proposed construction of a turning lane will remove the current practice in which some vehicles cut the corner when turning right into Vasse Highway. The excision and road widening will result in the clearing of native vegetation. The native vegetation affected by this proposal has been identified as karri and marri forest, with endemic understorey species. Main Roads is in the process of completing the necessary assessments to meet the requirements of the Environmental Protection Authority for environmental approvals and native vegetation clearing, and the Environmental Protection Authority will identify whether an offset for the proposed roadworks will be required.

Area 5 relates to a minor excision of 0.5356 hectares from state forest 49. This area is located about two kilometres south of Kirup. Main Roads is proposing to upgrade a portion of South Western Highway between Mullalyup and Kirup. The upgrades involve extending the northbound passing lane. Main Roads anticipates that the upgrades will allow for better separation of cars and trucks travelling north along South Western Highway. The excision and upgrades will result in the clearing of native vegetation. The native vegetation affected by this proposal was identified as jarrah and marri open forest, with endemic understorey species. Main Roads is in the process of completing the necessary assessments to meet the requirements of the Environmental Protection Authority for environmental approvals and native vegetation clearing, and the Environmental Protection Authority will identify whether an offset for the proposed roadworks will be required.

Area 6 relates to stage 1 of Perth–Darwin highway. The area in question is located between zero and nine kilometres west of Ellenbrook. Main Roads is proposing to construct stage 1 of the Perth–Darwin national highway, a new 37 kilometre road link between the intersection of the Reid and Tonkin Highways and the town of Muchea, north of Perth. The first stage of the Perth–Darwin national highway will join the existing Great Northern Highway at Muchea. Main Roads advises that the project is anticipated to improve freight capacity, efficiency and productivity, reduce heavy vehicle traffic from Great Northern Highway, and in turn improve the amenity for the community, tourists and road users, particularly those travelling through the Swan Valley. To facilitate the construction of the new road, Main Roads is seeking the excision of around 91.2018 hectares from state forest 65. An excision of about 7.6 hectares from two nature reserves has also been requested to facilitate the construction. The excision and road construction will affect the Gngangara pine plantation and some areas of native vegetation. Late last year the Forest Products Commission harvested the areas of pine plantation that were proposed for excision. Of the 91.2018 hectares proposed to be excised from state forest, 18.19 hectares is mature standing pine and 31.5 hectares is native vegetation, and the remaining 41.5 hectares is comprised of plantation regrowth, cleared areas and fallow land. Main Roads is addressing the environmental impacts of this project through the environmental approvals required under the Environmental Protection Act 1986, and also the commonwealth's Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. Offsets associated with the environmental impact and native vegetation clearing for the Perth–Darwin national highway will be assessed as a part of the environmental approvals process.

All six proposals have the support of the Forest Products Commission, the Department of Lands and the relevant local government authorities. They have also been endorsed by the Conservation Commission of Western Australia, the vesting body for state forests. The excisions from Sir James Mitchell National Park and two nature reserves in Ellenbrook are being progressed under the Land Administration Act 1997. I recommend this revocation proposal to the house and I ask members to support it.

MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells) [12.25 pm]: I am happy to speak to this motion on the partial revocation of state forests 14, 22, 23, 39, 49 and 65. Broadly speaking, these partial relocations relate, with one notable exception, to widening roads and making roads safer, which, of course, we on this side of the house support. When it is a matter of road safety, that is the priority. The explanations given by the minister give us some insight into the thought processes of Main Roads when looking at alternatives. I sometimes question, though, how well those alternatives are pursued. I will also raise the issue of the cost to the state for some of these road widenings. I will come to the actual number of revocations, but on a couple of occasions the minister said that this is because of Boddington gold mine. I wonder whether we should not in fact ensure that the people who are making money from the Boddington gold mine contribute to the cost of these road-widening operations.

Essentially, the debate this afternoon is about the environmental impacts of these partial revocations. It is clear that one partial revocation is quite substantial, and it is not about a road widening. I refer to the partial revocation that relates to the area in state forest 22. That is the one in which we are doing a deal with WA Bluemetal. WA Bluemetal already has a quarry operating in the area where it wants to extend its activities. It proposes

a reasonable offer. It suggests that the quarry project is something that it really urgently and keenly wants to pursue. Obviously there is a demand for blue metal. I am not sure how much blue metal there is in the Perth outer-metropolitan area. Is it possible that there is an abundance of blue metal on already cleared land that we could have directed the company towards thereby avoiding the need to destroy a substantial area? It is 83 hectares of native vegetation that is going to be destroyed. It seems that we did not pursue that. Instead we have just gone down the route of accepting the proposal by WA Bluemetal for a number of offsets. This is what I really want to get to. The minister has heard me talk on this point before. It is all very well for us to accept offsets for these sorts of partial revocations. However, my concern is that we do not have a comprehensive register of all the offset proposals that are going on in the state. I have tackled the minister on numerous occasions about offsets relating to part IV of the Environmental Protection Act, environmental impact assessments for which we do have an offset register. That is a document and a publicly available register that gives us some idea of the standards that are being set for environmental offsets.

As an example, there is no global recording for a whole host of offsets. For a number of reasons, I think this is a very serious problem, but I would particularly like to highlight two reasons. It is a problem because it means that people cannot consult the offsets register and check that land put up as an offset is not double counted. We cannot be sure about its long-term protection and viability. We cannot be sure what it relates to. The one I am really concerned about is the double counting issue. The other aspect is that we do not know the standard for offsets. We need a publicly available register so that people can see where we are setting the standard. Why should some proponents put forward a very weak offset and have it accepted when somebody else has a very high standard of offset? Why would we allow that potential situation? Instead, we need this public register.

I refer to a document that was prepared in January 2006 by the Environmental Protection Authority. As far as I am aware, this document still has currency. The government will say it has since released its own document on environmental offsets, but the government's document, which I think came out in September 2012, does not have the same sort of discussion and academic rigour as this EPA document. It is important that we look at some of the content in this EPA document. The number one point is that it states there must be no net loss of environmental values. When the minister was talking about the partial revocation from state forest 22, I heard him say that in fact there is a net benefit to the state. What offset will the WA Bluemetal proposal bring to state forest 22? The minister outlined that part of it is an acquisition of land—some 363 hectares, I think the minister said. I have been advised that it is more like 327 hectares, next to Moore River National Park. On the surface of it, I think this is a very good acquisition of land. I welcome the acquisition of this land, this addition to Moore River National Park. It is very sensible. I have looked at that land through Google Earth. The minister said it was all fully vegetated, but it struck me—this might be of great environmental significance—that a lake is in the middle of the land. It could be a salt lake or some form of sandfire flat that has high ecological significance. I am not sure; that has not been explained to us. It has been left to members to do their own research on these matters, which is not always easy.

However, I am prepared to accept that that area is a useful, significant acquisition and of value to the state. But in saying that it is a net benefit to the state, we must be clear about what we mean. Although it has been said that it is a net benefit to the state, an increase of conservation land will not be achieved from this. Yes, we will add land to the conservation estate, but will we increase the amount of native vegetation in Western Australia? No; we will have a net loss of native vegetation when clearing for the blue metal quarry goes ahead. We have to be clear about that. When there is a net loss of something, we have to say it. In claiming that it is a net benefit, the minister is suggesting that the change in tenure makes it a significant achievement. I think that is questionable. The minister has said that these offset agreements going ahead will be a net benefit to the state, but I think that is questionable. The fact is that that land is there. I assume it is of high conservation significance. I am not sure who the current landholder is, but they would perhaps have been quite happy to keep it in its present condition, which, by definition is one of high conservation significance. I am unclear why we are trying to pretend there is a net benefit to the state with this excision. It is something we have to sort out.

This is where we get back to the issue of the offsets register. That offsets register would provide a high degree of transparency. The public would be able to consult it, see what is being offered and check the relativities of proposals. Some companies will put up proposals for major works and for rehabilitating tracts of land and will also be adding them to the conservation estate. I think it would then be possible to claim a net gain of native vegetation cover over the state. But to say that it is a net benefit because we have added land to the conservation estate is not a genuine achievement. It is just shifting things around, and that is something we have to expose.

I want to look a little further at the EPA's 2006 "Position Statement No. 9". One of the points highlighted in the document is on page 25, and states —

It may be necessary to establish a repository of offset commitments to avoid double counting and to provide the basis of auditing success and compliance.

I think that is a very important point. We must have transparency around these issues. Essentially, these offsets are deals that have been cut between bureaucrats on the one hand and the legal teams or professional negotiators for companies such as WA Bluemetal on the other hand. I can guess who will win in those sorts of arrangements. The only protection for us as the people of Western Australia is absolute transparency around the nature of these deals. That is when we need a public register that contains all these offsets. We cannot have a register that includes just one category of offset; it has to be a comprehensive register that contains absolutely everything that is deemed an environmental offset. That is absolutely essential.

I want to turn to some of the principles that the EPA has established. As I say, its document is an excellent study of what offsets can and cannot achieve. It set the way for us. Unfortunately, the government came out with its own environmental offsets document of, I think, about four pages. It was a satisfactory document for the purpose of indicating to proponents some of the broad principles but it did not get into the level of detail that is absolutely essential when talking about things such as offsets, which in many cases will be worth millions of dollars. It is the way a company can make palatable something that might otherwise be objected to by the state. When I think about this excision of land from state forest 22, which the minister has told us is essentially jarrah-marri vegetation—I know some land nearby was acquired that will protect the head waters of Whitby Falls, and that is valuable—I note that with this land at Moore River, we are talking about a very different vegetation type. It might be argued that, in fact, this vegetation type is severely underrepresented in the conservation estate and therefore its value is greater than the value of the somewhat well-represented jarrah-marri vegetation we will lose with the WA Bluemetal proposal. I think that needs to be assessed properly and transparently and we need to look at the principles the EPA said should be considered when these projects are under consideration.

I will run through some of those principles —

Environmental offsets should only be considered after all other reasonable attempts to mitigate adverse impacts have been exhausted.

I would include another one there: “Proper consideration has been given to alternatives”, which I mentioned earlier. My knowledge is that blue metal is a fairly abundant material; there is loads of the stuff around. We do not have to go to state forests to get access to blue metal. It can be found on already cleared land within reasonable proximity to Perth and the sorts of construction projects the blue metal might be required for.

I know there is discussion around the preparation of documents known as basic raw materials documents, and that, of course, is under consideration in the strategic assessment work that is going on. We keenly await some word on when the strategic assessment document will be made available to us.

I will continue with the principles that the Environmental Protection Authority set. It also stated —

An environmental offsets package should consider direct offsets and contributing offsets, ...

It also goes into some detail on what that involves.

I think the next one is absolutely critical to the state forest 22 situation. The document reads —

Environmental offsets should ideally be ‘like for like or better’

That is why I say it is quite possible that on this occasion there is a case to say that the land that will be acquired and added to the conservation estate is something that has become more precious. Because we have destroyed so much of it, these remaining patches might be desperately needed additions to the conservation estate, so that is of some value.

The EPA raises a further point that —

Positive environmental offset ratios should apply where risk of failure is apparent.

An increase in the actual area of native vegetation cover is needed, not just an addition to the conservation estate.

A further point is that —

Environmental offsets must entail a robust and consistent assessment process.

I do not think we have had that in this case at all. I think we have it to some extent with the EPA formal assessment offset considerations, because that is a whole formal assessment process that can and should expose the offsets being offered.

A further point is that —

Environmental offsets must meet all statutory requirements.

I take it as given that that is the case with the excision for WA Bluemetal.

Another point is that —

Environmental offsets must be clearly defined, ... transparent, ... and enforceable.

I have a real concern because I do not know whether in 10 years someone will be able to say, “Yes, WA Bluemetal got that approval for that extension, but there is the land that was added to the conservation estate as a result of that.” As to public recording, yes, it will be in *Hansard*, but we do not have a document such as a consolidated environmental offsets register, and we desperately need one.

A further point is that —

Environmental offsets must ensure a long lasting benefit.

That is a fairly self-explanatory suggestion, I think.

I will quote from the EPA’s “Position Statement No. 9” on the issue of net loss. The EPA states —

While environmental offsets can offer a sustainable approach to environmental protection, the concept is not without its limitations. Long-term studies of environmental offset schemes overseas have shown that implementing offset projects without sufficient data, research, information, available resources, regulation and commitment will only result in a *net loss* of environmental assets and values—the opposite desired effect of environmental offsets ...

I think the EPA makes a very important point there that is based on a considerable amount of its own research and research from others, looking at overseas examples. We are not at all unique in wanting a good, workable offsets policy, but even as far back as 2006, we were well aware that there was potential for offset systems to fail us. That is what makes the EPA’s work so valuable; it has set what should be the parameters for a detailed consideration of any offset proposal.

The Environmental Protection Authority’s “Position Statement No. 9” continues —

This has been shown to be especially true for offsets related to natural ecosystems, especially wetlands and complex vegetation types. Therefore it is imperative to ensure that offset-related policies, programs and projects are robustly coordinated, monitored, managed, evaluated and enforced to ensure the environmental offset contributes to successful, long-term environmental outcomes.

That is what gives me serious doubts about the offset proposal before us, especially for the land that will protect the headwaters of Whitby Falls. I am really concerned that that will not be something that people will be able to closely monitor, and the same goes for the additional land that will go into Moore River National Park. These additions, of course, would necessitate some mention in the management plan for Moore River National Park. The status of the management plan for Moore River National Park escapes my knowledge, but I will try to get that researched as we head into our next discussion today that will touch on the issue of management plans. I am very concerned about the slow delivery of management plans, the poor turnaround time and the inability to review them and produce contemporary documents that reflect the conservation objectives of the land, not just the tourism aspects. We will come to that in further detail as we move on to discussion about amendments to the Conservation and Land Management Act.

The other excisions in this series strike me as reasonable. They, as I have said before, provide for Main Roads Western Australia to make our roads safer, and, of course, that is the priority. I note that Main Roads has committed to develop its own offsets. I do not think the minister made any mention in his speech a little while ago of the actual offsets that Main Roads will be involved in. He did, though, mention that the widening of these roads, especially the Pinjarra–Williams Road, were for the benefit of those travelling to the Boddington goldmine. I say again that I think we have to look at that. When we have particular mining projects causing us to upgrade roads, I think we have to look at the potential for the mine operator to be involved in the overall cost of some of these projects. There, again, it could be around the acquisition of land for an offset proposal. That would mean that already we would assume that a company with ownership of the Boddington goldmine would be involved in some substantial offsetting of its work—its clearing footprint—and it would not be too hard for it to add onto that an area that reflects the loss that we are having because of the widening of roads that make access to the mine easier.

I note the situation of Sir James Mitchell National Park with the Vasse Highway–South Western Highway intersection. The area is of particular vegetation types that I think are under-represented. We have a fairly heavy amount of loss in those vegetation types, and they should, again, be properly offset.

I look to the acquisitions relating to the Perth–Darwin highway. I gather an offset will be determined to offset the loss of native vegetation for 37 kilometres of road construction. That is a good thing, and I noted the minister’s comments that of the area that will be destroyed about 19 hectares is pine plantation or former pine plantation, about 30 hectares is native vegetation, and about 41 hectares is, as he described it, regrowth and fallow land. I think he was suggesting that there was pine regrowth as well as native vegetation regrowth. That is the nature of the land that will be acquired for the road construction works, but there is a project to offset the overall amount of land being lost, principally from state forest 65. I am happy to support the partial revocations but I want to emphasise my concern about the process we are using to determine the offsets applied to these projects.

It is absolutely urgent that we have a comprehensive offsets register that can be applied to all these projects and that there is some consistency and transparency around these offsets.

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [12.50 pm]: Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this particular instrument, Mr Speaker. I am not even sure how to describe it. Is it a notice of motion or is it a —

Ms S.F. McGurk: It is a motion.

Mr R.H. COOK: It is a motion—excellent. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak on this motion, Mr Speaker. I note from the comments by the member for Gosnells that we will support this motion, and it is sensible to do so. I want to pick up on a couple of very telling points the member for Gosnells made about the net benefit of the offsets. One observation the member for Gosnells made is that offsets are created for these sorts of revocations or when a parcel of bushland is utilised for some other purpose. We always assume that that is done with the best of intentions and we are trading like for like. As a member of Parliament representing an outer metropolitan electorate, I know that these issues are very much at the forefront of the minds of a lot of people as new suburbs develop, not necessarily on old farming land as one would expect in a place such as Baldivis, but in areas that to the untrained eye look like high-value bushland. I want to talk about a few of the experiences I have had in my electorate to date and how we come to these places.

First I will talk about the widening of Gilmore Avenue in Kwinana. Gilmore Avenue was a dual carriageway to a certain point and then a single-lane road down to Dixon Avenue. It was a bottleneck and it was a dangerous and very dark, winding piece of road. Unfortunately, a young 16-year-old girl was killed in a car crash on that stretch of road. When the government moved to extend the dual carriageway through to Dixon Avenue, the realignment of that road needed to be addressed. On either side of this road was Bush Forever land as well as a conservation area, and therefore some of that Bush Forever status needed to be revoked. I was very pleased to support that revocation because there was a clear public interest in that road being developed, albeit it meant the loss of a very small but obviously valuable piece of bushland. I should note that the Greens in the other place moved to disallow the revocation of that patch of Bush Forever site. In doing so, the Greens stuck to its guns and principles on these things but there was a very clear and present public interest in the widening of that road going ahead. For me, the decision to support the revocation of that particular part of land was clear.

I am also drawn to the various mining tenements in my electorate. It may come as a surprise to some members that as a metropolitan member of Parliament, I have mining tenements in my electorate, but I actually have many sand mining tenements in my electorate. Much of that sand is needed for either mineral processing or landfill for land development in some suburbs. Residents in my electorate see bushland around them being developed and ploughed for other uses, which comes with an enhanced level of anxiety about the loss of that bushland. I am reminded in particular of an old rifle range in Banksia Avenue in the south of my electorate that has some valuable banksia woodland on it, albeit surrounded by what is considered to be a significant level of lead contamination from the old shells that litter that patch of land.

However, it is considered by the community to be valuable bushland and it is valued by black cockatoos that use that site for feeding. When the proposal comes to develop that land, in this case for a sand mine, the issue of offsets comes into play. We are assured by the authorities that offsets are indeed taking place with this sand mine but we do not know whether it is like for like. We do not know whether the offset for this sand mine is another feeding habitat for black cockatoos and has been set aside in perpetuity to preserve important feeding grounds. We do not know whether it is bushland of equally high ecological value or whether, in the public interest, it will add to our overall repository of conservation areas.

The member for Gosnells' contribution around having a register of offsets is a very good idea because we need much more transparency about these types of processes. Members of the public will otherwise struggle to decide whether an offset or, in general terms, the nature of an offset is continuing to maintain the high conservation values of our state. I am sure some members of the public are reassured by the assurances made by government departments or ministers of the Crown. However, the public will increasingly want greater transparency around this process. They will want to see for themselves that we are preserving our conservation estate and doing like-for-like swaps and that the offsets are in the public interest. It is important that we take heed of the comments made by the member for Gosnells and look at ways to reform this process. As the member for Gosnells said, we support this motion, albeit reluctantly, because none of us wants to see our conservation estate slowly eaten away. However, in future we must maintain greater transparency of this process and ensure that the information that people access about it is easily understood so we can all make a decision about the value of these processes.

MR A.P. JACOB (Ocean Reef — Minister for Environment) [12.58 pm] — in reply: I will quickly address a couple of questions from the member for Gosnells, because we are now moving on to other bills. The offset register currently applies under parts 4 and 5 of the act, so it picks up on those matters that would go through the

Department of Environment Regulation. Admittedly, it will apply to all those matters that are decided upon from now on. I have asked the department to progressively add historical offsets into that register as well, but it starts at a point in time. The focus is on the offsets that apply from now and the department will progressively work back through the historical offsets and put them on the register.

Mr C.J. Tallentire: In the future, will the Moore River offset, about 300 hectares, be on this register?

Mr A.P. JACOB: I expect that it will be because it will still need to go through to DER for a clearing permit as well.

Mr C.J. Tallentire: It is not a part 4 or part 5 assessment is it?

Mr A.P. JACOB: No, not at this stage, but it will have to go for a part 4 or part 5 requirement after the revocation—that is just an excision around the revocation. I take the point about Department of Parks and Wildlife excision offsets because they do happen from time to time. The offset register will be a good central collection point and I will take that comment away and look into that for the future.

Irrespective of that, I expect that this one will require a clearing permit anyway. This offset will probably end up popping up on the register through that means. Since coming into office, this government has developed offset guidelines. We now have a formal offset policy to give some parameters, which the member for Gosnells is aware of. Just to flag for the member, the government is also working on offset metrics, which I know other states in the commonwealth use, again to give a much clearer framework and rules set around which offsets would be applied.

Question put and passed.

Request for Council's Concurrence

On motion by **Mr A.P. Jacob (Minister for Environment)**, resolved —

That the Legislative Council be acquainted accordingly and requested to agree to a similar resolution.