

 Record of Meeting	Meeting 4 7 June 2011 Perth 10.00am – 3.00 pm
---	--

ACTIONS FROM MEETING

ITEM 1

ACTION – Minutes from last meeting accepted.

ITEM 2

ACTION – The work of the Stewardship WG to continue in the AUA working group.

ITEM 3

ACTION – AUA and RET to coordinate out of session process for progressing the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Uranium Production Workshop.

ACTION – Agreed that the Regulation Working Group still has work to do and will continue.

ITEM 4

ACTION – ARPANSA to circulate the safety guide for the ANRDR

ACTION – Feedback would be sought from the SWG on how the proposal from Safe Work SA fits in with current codes regulating radiation exposure.

ACTION – A letter be sent from the Uranium Council to the National Mine Safety Framework addressing fact that this has come to our attention and expressing concerns.

ITEM 5

ACTION – support the work of ARPANSA for Stages 1 and 2 of the radiological protection of the non-human biota project. A Memorandum of Understanding between RET and ARPANSA signed in August 2011.

ACTION – Agreed that conducting an ERICA workshop should be pursued.

ACTION – proposal on ERICA workshop to be provided to RET to pursue funding options.

ITEM 6

ACTION – Transport WG to further consider the documents and finalise ready for appropriate distribution.

ACTION – The Transport WG to document State policies and practices for the transport of UOC through the Transport Strategy under development.

ITEM 7

ACTION – Indigenous Engagement WG to have additional meeting to discuss future of group, wind up group and determine new form to be taken into the future.

ITEM 9

ACTION – Chair to discuss with RET Secretariat and AUA the future of the UC.

ITEM 1 – Administration

The Chair opened the meeting and thanked the WA Dept of Mines and Petroleum for hosting the meeting. The Chair invited _____ to run through house keeping arrangements.

The Chair noted the apologies for the meeting.

Attendees

Uranium Associates, Paladin
Australian Uranium Association
Energy Resources of Australia Ltd
Paladin Energy Limited
BHP Billiton
Resources Division, Dept of Resources, Energy and Tourism (RET)
South Australian Department of Primary Industries and Resources
The Chamber of Minerals and Energy of WA
Minerals Council of Australia
WA Dept of Mines and Petroleum (DMP)
Minerals Council of Australia
NT Department of Resources
BHP Billiton
Mega Uranium
Energy and Minerals Australia Ltd
ARPANSA
Cameco
Paladin Energy Limited

Apologies

Chief Executive Officer, Energy Resources of Australia Ltd (represented by _____)
Queensland Resources Council
Paladin Energy Limited (represented by _____)
AMEC
Geoscience Australia
Resources Division, Dept of Resources, Energy and Tourism (RET) (represented by _____)
South Australian Department of Primary Industries and Resources (represented by _____)
The Chamber of Minerals and Energy of WA (represented by _____)
Northern Land Council
Mega Uranium
Cameco
Heathgate Resources

NT Department of Resources (represented by
BHP Billiton
Department of State Development, WA
Rio Tinto
SEWPaC

Secretariat

RET

The acceptance of the record of the meeting of 24 November 2010 was moved by
and accepted without amendment by the Uranium Council.

ACTION: Minutes from last meeting accepted.

Future of the UC

The Chair noted that this was an important meeting to think about the future direction of the UC. The important achievements of the UC over the past few years were noted. In addition to these achievements it was also noted that one of the real benefits of the UC is that it brings people together from not only industry but also state and Commonwealth Government. It was noted that some working groups are getting close to finalising their working plan and that it may be appropriate for some workstreams to cease and for the transition to delivery by the Australian Uranium Association (AUA).

RET advised that a review of the UC will be scheduled for the second half of financial year 2011-12 when current funding for UC projects expires. Further, that RET is interested in the perspectives as to whether and how the UC may continue past this point. It was noted that further funding would be required for additional projects. It was also noted that the expiry of current funding for the current UC projects may present a logical time to wind up the UC.

ITEM 2 – Stewardship

Chair of the Stewardship WG provided an overview of the work of the Stewardship WG. RET thanked RET for progressing the Stewardship Best Practice Guide for Uranium document. 1000 copies of the document have been printed by RET for distribution through the AUA, RET, and other Associations. Copies of the final Stewardship brochure, and the Leading Practice Stewardship Guide book produced by RET were distributed to all attendees. 500 copies of the brochure were available at the meeting to distribute to UC members. All members were encouraged to take copies for targeted distribution of the document. The brochure will also be made available on the AUA website and there will also likely be a link to it on the RET website.

Impact of the Fukushima Incident

discussed the impact of Fukushima on the uranium industry. A significant amount of assistance has been offered to Japan by industry. Several countries have announced a renewed commitment to nuclear, but also there are several reviews of nuclear underway, including in the European Union and the United States.

He noted there are a number of upcoming international meetings scheduled to discuss the impact and lessons of Fukushima: IAEA Nuclear Safety Conference 20-24 June Vienna; UN Ministerial Summit 22 September New York; World Association of Nuclear Operators (WANO) meeting October China; World Nuclear Association (WNA) Symposium September London.

Code of practice survey

Future work of the Stewardship working group

noted that he considers work of the group has largely come to a natural conclusion and the group can largely be wound up. He also considered that the work of the Stewardship working group could be taken over by the work of the AUA.

Following discussion it was agreed that the AUA would take the lead on stewardship issues. Further, that relationships between industry, government and others were important, and that there were possible further opportunities for work in this area.

ACTION: The work of the Stewardship WG to continue in the AUA working group.

Fukushima – Japan Nuclear Accident

from ARPANSA presented a power point on the current status of the Fukushima reactors.

The impact of Fukushima for industry and the UC going into the future was discussed. noted that AUA polling has indicated that although the public is worried by Fukushima the perspective of the uranium and nuclear industries has barely changed.

advised that RET will be very engaged in international activities related to nuclear safety. In particular to ensure the work that unfolds in response to Fukushima takes into account Australian interests. He further noted that Foreign Minister Rudd's op ed published on 2 May 2011 floated a number of policy areas that Australia could influence

ITEM 3 – Regulation

provided an update on progress of the *Review of Regulatory Efficiency in Uranium Mining* on behalf of the Chair, This report was based on the June 2011 progress report which was provided.

Regarding Recommendation 2, in May 2011 the Australian Government endorsed the recommendations of the Hawke's Review of the Woomera Prohibited Area (WPA), and committed to implementing the review's co-existence model: whereby Defence remains the primary user of the WPA, and industry is given certainty of access through a transparent regulatory process and defined access periods. It was advised that the WPA Coordination Office is now in place and is processing current applications for access. The Office will also be responsible for developing the legislation to underpin the regime. Further information is available at <http://www.finance.gov.au/property/lands-acquisition/access-commonwealth-land-mining-activities.html>

Regarding Recommendation 9, Principles of Engagement for Reporting (Stakeholder Consultation Guidelines), a document has been circulated which provides more detail to the principles. This has been circulated for a four week consultation period. Input on the principles back to the WG would be appreciated. It was noted that the document is currently based on the experiences of South Australian regulators and still requires feedback from producers and the Commonwealth.

IAEA Uranium Production Cycle Workshop

advised the UC that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has invited Australia to host a training meeting on the Uranium Production Cycle, in Darwin in March/April 2012. The purpose of this workshop is to provide training and information, and to discuss matters concerning uranium production cycle developments. The workshop is targeted at participants from developing countries. RET has produced a draft agenda for discussion, and is seeking agreement on potential speakers for this workshop from both government and industry. There was agreement from the UC that this would be a good thing for Australia to support and the AUA and ERA agreed to assist.

ACTION – AUA and RET to coordinate out of session process for progressing the IAEA workshop.

ACTION – Noted that the Regulation Working Group still has work to do and will continue.

ITEM 4 – Sustainability

Chair of the Sustainability WG provided an overview of the work of the Sustainability WG. noted that the bulk of the work has focussed on identifying those willing to offer courses based on the units of competency.

Currently it is only the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention (IFAP) who runs the courses as a registered training organisation, however several others including ANSTO, and a South African provider have indicated interest in

developing parts of the course for delivery in Australia. However at the university level there is less interest. Due the modest demand for Radiation Safety Officers there is unlikely to be room for more than one university provider. It was noted that this issue has been taken as far as it can be by the group and it is now up to the providers to develop courses and offer them. It was also noted that there may be some unintended consequences if particular courses were to become mandatory.

Regarding accreditation of the courses, there is currently no specification of the courses required for obtaining an RSO licence. This is currently done on the basis of assessment by the radiation regulatory agency. Industry indicates it is happy with this approach. The Radiation Health Committee (RHC) has indicated it would not accredit a course per se, but would be able to say it was developed by a Registered Training Authority (RTO) and then the course could be listed in the National Directory for Radiation Protection (NDRP) (although this could take a couple of years).

The importance of courses being recognised across jurisdictions was stressed. The value of approaching a person from the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations to participate in the WG was raised.

Australian National Radiation Dose Register (ANRDR)

presented on the progress of the ANRDR. The ANRDR has been approved by the RHC. On going funding for maintenance of the ANRDR has been secured. Regarding the inclusion of radiation doses for uranium workers in the Northern Territory doses, he advised that it is difficult to predict when the NT Government would resolve the administrative and legislative impediments to the provision of data to the ANRDR.

ACTION – ARPANSA to circulate the safety guide for the ANRDR

Workplace Health and Safety Laws

The national mine safety framework and workplace health and safety laws were raised by as an example of possible regulation creep.

It was noted that ionising radiation had been identified as a principle hazard and that Safe Work South Australia are developing a code of practice to address the management of radioactive materials in mining.

The stated objective of the Code is to provide guidance on the development of radiation management plans. Concern was raised by the group that this document

may duplicate existing radiation regulatory requirements and involve regulators without the appropriate background in radiation protection being involved in developing and implementing Codes of Practice. It was noted that there are already bodies in each state with the appropriate expertise and questions raised about who was going to regulate the Code.

Noted that as yet the document has not been approved by the National Mine Safety Framework, however a copy had been on limited circulation for feedback.

ACTION – Feedback will be sought from the SWG on how the proposal from Safe Work SA fits in with current Codes regulating radiation exposure.

ACTION – A letter be sent from the Uranium Council to the National Mine Safety Framework addressing fact that this has come to our attention and expressing concerns.

ITEM 5 – Environment Protection

ARPANSA provided an overview of the proposed Development of an Australian approach for assessing effects of ionising radiation on non-human biota. It was noted that the new proposal incorporates the earlier concerns of industry. [redacted] advised that he will formally respond to ARPANSA regarding cooperation in this area.

ACTION – The UC support the work of ARPANSA for Stages 1 and 2 of the radiological protection of the non-human biota project.

ERICA Radiation Workshop Environmental Proposal

[redacted] presented the proposal for conducting an ERICA workshop in Australia. It was noted that there is international consensus that the ERICA tool provides a practical framework for assessing absorbed dose rates for non-human biota. It was noted that this is an excellent opportunity to take advantage of the offer to run a couple of workshops on how to use the model. The UC supported the workshops proceeding on the basis that they would be largely self funding and that the course deliverer was still willing to come later this year to deliver courses. Possible timing for the workshop raised as around the Darwin workshop or the ARPS conference in Melbourne.

ACTION – Agreed that conducting an ERICA workshop should be pursued.

ACTION – Proposal on ERICA workshop to be provided to RET to pursue funding options.

ITEM 6 – Transport

Chair of the Transport WG outlined the progress of the Transport WG. He noted that further progressing the Transport Strategy, the outline of which was presented to the UC at the last meeting for endorsement, and increasing and mainstreaming of access remained a priority for the next six months. [redacted] also advised that a new

Chair for the working group will be required when he retires from his current position at

There was discussion about the transport documents tabled (Attachments 6.1-6.5). It was noted that these must be made available to industry in an appropriate manner.

advised that he would be happy to make the documents available on the AUA website. The Chair noted that guidance documents are important. Discussion occurred about the technical nature of the documents and also the range of documents.

ACTION – TWG to further consider the documents and finalise for appropriate distribution.

ACTION – The TWG to document State policies and practices for the transport of UOC through the transport strategy under development.

International Steering Committee on Denial of Shipment

gave a brief overview of the 20-23 April meeting of the International Steering Committee on Denial of Shipment (ISC) at the IAEA in Vienna. She advised that she had been selected to be Second Deputy Chair of the ISC's management committee. She also noted that the ISC seems to be refocusing its interest from air access by radiopharmaceuticals back to greater interest in addressing issues in sea transport of nuclear materials, including UOC.

ITEM 7 – Indigenous Communication and Economic Development Theme

called into the meeting, representing Indigenous Communication and Economic Development WG. Chair of the provided an overview on the work of the group.

The development of fact sheets on the priority issues identified by the group for publication is well underway. The final text of these fact sheets is currently under development and is undergoing external review for two weeks. The eight fact sheets are designed as an introduction to each subject and complement the DVD that was completed.

It was noted that in terms of the original briefing the Working Group has probably completed the work program. It was noted the Land Councils involved considered there was value in having the forum and that there was value in continuing meetings of the group, however noting this benefit could also be attained under different arrangements or construction.

The issue was raised as to whether the work stream could be incorporated into the work programs of the AUA. noted that there had been hope to widen Indigenous participation in the AUA Indigenous Engagement Working Group and also increase engagement opportunities with Indigenous bodies.

ACTION – IEWG to have additional meeting to discuss the future of the group and determine new form to be taken into the future.

ITEM 8 – Government and Industry Update

Commonwealth Update

Brief discussion of Government work arising from Fukushima. noted that the International Nuclear Events Scale (INES) and transport regulations associated with radioactive contamination of cargo are both areas that require further consideration, as is improving international oversight for nuclear safety.

Regarding the review of the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC Act) advised that the review has not been released yet. A brief update on the progress of the new Energy White paper was also provided.

A revised National Energy Security Assessment (NESA), focusing on liquid fuels issues is currently underway and due for completion in August. The last NESA found that Australia is secure.

WA Update

West Australia

provided an update on the WA projects. Currently there are seven project proposals undergoing feasibility or formal assessment. The Yeelirrie draft submission date has been delayed. Noted that Minister Moore remains supportive of the uranium industry progressing.

NT Update

Mining Performance of the Northern Territory

provided an update on the NT. Currently the NT is working away at implementation of the dose register. Other big issues for the NT include environmental management and water management issues. Notable projects include Arafura, which will produce Uranium as a by product and the Biglyri deposit owned by Energy Metals/China Guangdong Nuclear Power Company (CGNPC).

SA Update

South Australia

provided an update from South Australia. He noted that a

decision on the Olympic Dam expansion is expected late this year. That Uranium One started hot commissioning of the Honeymoon ISR mine last week and should soon be producing. He noted that Four Mile was still subject to court action and after that the Mullaquana project is the next most advanced.

South Australia welcomes and strongly supports the outcomes of the Hawke Review on the WPA. Incident reporting procedures are under review and Mining Act Amendments are almost finalised, with Regulations commencing in July. Guidelines for a program for environment protection and rehabilitation for In-Situ Recovery (ISR) operations are being developed. The program will align the requirements with those for radiation protection. This is being done in preparation for new ISR projects in SA.

Industry

The Chair provided an industry perspective update and then opened the floor for contributions from the group. The Fukushima incident in Japan was discussed,

ITEM 9 – Other Business and Next Meeting

UC Future

There was a discussion of the future of the UC. It was noted that the UC has been a useful forum for bringing together government and industry and achieving outcomes but that it is unclear what the work program would be into the future if the group was continued. The possibility of having a facilitated seminar on how to refocus the group's activities and achieve better outcomes was raised. Following this discussion it was decided that this idea would need further consideration.

ACTION: Chair to discuss with Secretariat and AUA the future of the UC.

Next meeting:

Canberra, November 2011

 Record of Meeting	Meeting 5 12 December 2011 Canberra 10.00am – 3.00 pm
---	--

ACTIONS FROM MEETING

ITEM 1

ACTION – Minutes from last meeting accepted.

ITEM 2.3

ACTION: RET to incorporate proposed Uranium Production Workshop agenda changes into draft agenda for circulation. RET to inform members of proposed dates for workshop once confirmed with the IAEA.

ACTION: UC members to provide any additional comments on proposed agenda to Secretariat prior to next meeting for incorporation into final agenda.

ITEM 2.5

ACTION: TWG to devise strategic engagement plan, building on research completed so far, which addresses inter alia risk and perceptions of risk.

ACTION: TWG to develop a strategy for broad circulation of the transport working documents.

ITEM 2.6

ACTION: ERICA Workshop working group to finalise attendance for ERICA workshops by end of January 2012 to enable finalisation of workshop budget.

ITEM 2.7

ACTION: ARPANSA to consult with UC industry members and seek feedback on industry priorities in the development of ARPANSA's engagement strategy.

ITEM 3.1

ACTION: UC members to provide comment to the Secretariat by 19 December 2011 on the draft letter from the UC Chair to the NMSF Steering Committee Chair.

ACTION: Chair of UC to send letter to NMSF.

ITEM 3.2

ACTION: AUA to invite participation from members of the UC Regulation Working Group and develop terms of reference for the Best Practice Regulation project.

ITEM 3.3

ACTION: AUA to develop, in collaboration with the UC Secretariat, a small taskforce to progress the SCER report.

ITEM 3.4

ACTION: Secretariat to finalise fact sheets and provide to the Minister for release

ITEM 3.5

ACTION: UC Secretariat to develop, subject to Minister Ferguson's feedback, revised terms of reference for the UC for consideration at the next meeting of the UC.

1. Administration

The Chair opened the meeting at 10am, welcomed attendees and thanked RET for hosting the meeting. The Chair acknowledged the traditional owners of the region, the Ngunnawal people, and invited _____ to run through housekeeping arrangements.

The Chair noted the apologies for the meeting.

Attendees

Paladin Energy
Australian Uranium Association
Energy Resources of Australia
Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office
BHP Billiton
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (SEWPaC)
Geoscience Australia
Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism (RET)
Energy Resources of Australia
Paladin Energy
Western Australia Department of Mines and Petroleum
BHP Billiton
Heathgate Resources
Uranium One
Paulka Radiation
Heathgate Resources
Minerals Council of Australia
Queensland Resources Council
RET
Northern Land Council
ARPANSA
ARPANSA
Northern Territory Department of Resources
South Australia Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy

Apologies

South Australia Department of Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy
Northern Territory Department of Resources
Toro Energy
Mega Uranium
Western Australia Department of Mines and Petroleum
Cameco
Minerals Council of Australia

Secretariat

RET

The acceptance of the record of the meeting of 7 June 2011 was moved by
and accepted without amendment by the Uranium Council. All 15 items from
the previous meeting have been progressed.

ACTION: Minutes from last meeting accepted.

The Chair noted that the future of the Uranium Council (UC) was an important item
for discussion later in the day and suggested attendees consider their opinions in
preparation for this discussion.

2. Items for discussion

Item 2.1 Post Fukushima Market Update/Discussion

provided an overview of the impact of the Fukushima
incident on the global uranium market.

Item 2.2 Outcome of International Meetings: Lessons from Fukushima

outlined work done by the IAEA and UN on nuclear safety
since Fukushima, noting that while the work was largely contextual for the uranium
mining industry, it would be important for industry to consider implications. As a
designated member of the Board of Governors, Australia considers that actions
should be taken through existing IAEA mechanisms. RET is cognisant of the need to
consider the impact of any work done around nuclear safeguards and security on
uranium mining and Australian uranium production.

Item 2.3 IAEA Uranium Production Workshop 2012

provided an update on progress on the IAEA Uranium
Production Workshop. Due to IAEA delays, especially after Fukushima, it is now
expected that the workshop will be held in Darwin around October 2012.

The Chair noted that, as an important interface between government and industry, the Uranium Council may be an example of best practice communication in the uranium mining industry and could be showcased at the workshop.

It was suggested that the production aspect of uranium, especially regulatory systems, could be emphasised further and the agenda items on mining could be condensed. The workshop could also be used to engage states that are not currently exploring for uranium in Australia. The possibility of reducing the length of the workshop from the four days currently proposed was raised.

ACTION: RET to incorporate proposed agenda changes into draft agenda for circulation to UC. RET to inform members of proposed dates for workshop once confirmed with the IAEA.

ACTION: UC members to provide any additional comments on proposed agenda to Secretariat prior to next meeting for incorporation into final agenda.

Item 2.4 IAEA ISC on Denial of Shipment

_____ gave a brief overview of recent work done by the International Steering Committee on Denial of Shipment (ISC DOS), noting a renewed focus on sea transportation of uranium. The IAEA has set the target of reducing delays and denials of shipment of radioactive materials to an insignificant level by 2013.

Some progress has been made in this area, especially with North American ports and streamlining of vessel licensing in South African ports. Access to ports is a universal problem requiring a consistent regulatory approach – the requirement in both New Zealand and South Africa for exporters to apply for a permit for each shipment is a priority concern.

The importance of reporting incidences of delay and denial was noted, as concrete action cannot be taken on anecdotal evidence. A delay and denial database exists for this purpose.

_____ suggested that an engagement strategy to address public fears may also be required. _____ noted that a communication strategy was being developed, including an educational DVD, and that communication issues were an item that needed discussion at the next ISC meeting.

Item 2.5 Uranium Transport in Australia

_____ Chair of the Transport Working Group (TWG), outlined the progress of the TWG. Transport documents have been finalised and work on the transport strategy is being progressed, including working with various jurisdictions to understand current practices. This work is showing that transporting UOC (including shipment out of east and west coast ports in Australia) is not precluded legislatively from any jurisdiction, but there are different policies for different states. Engagement with policymakers needs to occur to align transport policy with legislation. _____ suggested the issue be raised with _____

Minister Ferguson and that there may be opportunity to increase state engagement. It was suggested that high level political engagement be encouraged through workshops with resource, transport and environment Departments in March/April 2012, and that the transport documents be published broadly to increase awareness. The need for companies to identify specific transport needs and to engage with ports was also raised, as the issue is primarily a commercial matter for ports.

ACTION: TWG to devise strategic engagement plan, building on research completed so far, which addresses inter alia risk and perceptions of risk.

The TWG-developed transport documents were circulated to the group and a discussion around the best way to distribute these, both internationally and domestically, followed. suggested that Austrade and the IAEA may be appropriate forums to assist with this distribution.

ACTION: Transport Working Group to develop a strategy for broad circulation of the transport working documents.

Item 2.6 ERICA Radiation Workshop Proposal

outlined current plans for the ERICA workshops in Australia. Two workshops are planned, one in Melbourne on 21-23 March 2012 and the second in Perth on 26-28 March 2012. ERICA is a free tool to assist with radiological environmental assessment and training materials are available online. However, due to the complex nature of the system and its European focus, will arrange the workshops to facilitate implementation of the ERICA tool specifically in the Australian context. Two of the ERICA software developers from the UK will present the workshops, which will be largely self funding and cost in the order of \$3,000 per participant. A small working group has been convened to organise the workshops.

The Chair asked if the AUA and Industry supported the ERICA workshops and he said they did.

ACTION: ERICA Workshop working group to finalise attendance for ERICA workshops by end of January 2012 to enable finalisation of workshop budget.

Item 2.7 ARPANSA: Industry Engagement

outlined the work currently being done by ARPANSA to align its activities with the needs of industry, with an emphasis on ARPANSA applying its expertise to the Australian uranium industry in an independent and relevant manner. ARPANSA is also seeking to play a greater role in providing clear information to the Australian public about radiation issues without making value judgments. It was suggested that ARPANSA could also play a bigger role in data interpretation.

ACTION: ARPANSA to consult with UC industry members and seek feedback on industry priorities in the development of ARPANSA's engagement strategy.

Item 2.8 Commonwealth and Industry Updates

Commonwealth Update

referred to **Agenda Paper 2.8.1**, the Regulation Review Progress Report December 2011, to update attendees on progress made.

noted that the first half of 2011 saw the Commonwealth take a defensive stance on uranium after Fukushima, with greater proactivity in the second half of 2011, especially in bilateral safeguards negotiations. Work on the Government response to the Hawke Review continues, as does work regarding access to the Woomera Prohibited area for mining. The Labor Party's policy platform change on India is significant and work on a bilateral safeguards agreement (BSA) will commence in 2012. It may be some years before this is concluded.

noted the work being done by SEWPaC in the Government response to the Hawke Review, notably in the areas of cost recovery and environmental offsets.

NT Update

advised that it is possible that the NT Radiation Protection Act will be amended in the third quarter of 2012 to enable dose data for NT uranium mining workers to be provided to the ANRDR.

noted that the NLC is planning to meet with ERA to discuss the Ranger mine closure criteria, and that closure criteria should be considered and formulated during mine planning stages. In response to a question from the Chair, noted that Traditional Owners had become more accepting of mining projects, and that uranium mining was on its way to being treated the same as other mining.

SA Update

provided an update from SA. He noted that the Olympic Dam environment approvals have been finalised, the indenture legislation was recently passed with bipartisan support and the final proclamation should be made by Christmas. noted that the SA government remains supportive of uranium projects in the state but is wary of possible duplication of legislation, especially with regards to the National Mine Safety Framework.

WA Update

noted that WA has seen an 81.8 per cent increase in uranium exploration expenditure and has a number of advanced projects, including Toro Energy's Wiluna project, likely to be Western Australia's first operating uranium mine. Cameco's Kintyre project is also progressing well. The DMP is due to receive a consultant's report on whether WA's current mining regulations are adequate for the uranium industry – the response is due in February 2012.

Code should be altered or appended to close these gaps, instead of a new Code being created.

The UC confirmed that the Australian uranium industry is unanimous in its view that the existing regulatory arrangements are more than adequate to address OH&S and that a new Code of Practice is not needed.

ACTION: UC members to provide comment to the Secretariat by 19 December 2011 on the draft letter from the UC Chair to the NMSF Steering Committee Chair.

ACTION: Chair of UC to send letter to NMSF.

Item 3.2 Research on Best Practice: Uranium Assessment and Approval Processes

noted that smooth regulatory processes are a key way that the Australian uranium mining industry can be supported, given that Government doesn't control factors such as the uranium price or global uranium demand. outlined the AUA's proposed research on best practice in uranium assessment and approval processes. The AUA plans to conduct case studies from AUA members, with a view to providing a report and recommendations to the next meeting of the UC.

It was suggested that the AUA consult with the MCA prior to commencing the project to ensure that it does not duplicate the scorecard exercise undertaken by the MCA in 2006.

ACTION: AUA to invite participation from members of the UC Regulation Working Group and develop terms of reference for the project.

Item 3.3 Development of Industry Report for SCER

outlined that Minister Ferguson has requested the UC develop a report on the Australian uranium industry for presentation at the Ministerial Standing Council on Energy and Resources (SCER). noted that this report can contribute to the uranium industry being 'normalised', a step towards the industry being treated on its merits. It was noted that the report should be straightforward and easily absorbable.

A small working group is to be established to oversee the work. It was also noted that the Chair of the UC may be the most appropriate person to present the work to the SCER.


ACTION: AUA to develop, through the UC Secretariat, a small taskforce to progress the SCER report.

Item 3.4 "Uranium Facts" Booklets and Folders

The Chair invited (ERA), Chair of the Indigenous Engagement Working Group (IEWG), to present the Uranium fact sheets to the UC. The print run for the fact sheets has currently been suspended due to the change in the policy platform regarding uranium sales to India at the ALP National Conference in early December 2011. noted the cooperation between Industry, Government

The Chair suggested that the next UC meeting be held in Adelaide on 12 June 2012 which is the day before the start of the AusIMM International Uranium conference. The Chair thanked participants for their attendance and the meeting was closed at 2.50pm.

Next meeting:
Adelaide, 12 June 2012

 Record of Meeting	Meeting 6 12 June 2012 Adelaide 2.30pm – 5.00 pm
---	---

ACTIONS FROM MEETING

ITEM 1

ACTION – Minutes from last meeting accepted.

ITEM 2.2

ACTION: RET to circulate outcomes/messages from IFNEC to the Uranium Council once received.

ITEM 2.3

ACTION: Transport Working Group to circulate draft of the Transport Strategy in November 2012.

ACTION: Note release of the *Guide to Safe Transport of UOC*.

ITEM 2.5

ACTION: Secretariat to circulate report on ERICA workshops to Uranium Council attendees once finalised.

ITEM 2.6

ACTION: Uranium Council members to provide feedback to ARPANSA on the possible expansion of the ANRDR to other industries.

ITEM 2.7

ACTION: to provide a draft of the *Uranium in Western Australia Handbook* to Uranium Council members, and members to provide their feedback.

ITEM 3.1

ACTION: Uranium Council meetings to be held on an annual basis in the future, where possible in line with the AusIMM International Uranium Conference.

ACTION: Members to submit feedback to the Secretariat on the Uranium Council Strategic Directions paper by 31 August 2012.

1. Administration

The Chair opened the meeting at 2.30pm, welcomed attendees and thanked the South Australian Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (DMITRE) for hosting. The Chair acknowledged the traditional owners of the region, the Kurna people, and ran through the housekeeping arrangements.

The Chair noted the apologies for the meeting.

Attendees

Paladin Energy
Australian Uranium Association (AUA)
Queensland Resources Council (QRC)
BHP Billiton (BHPB)
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office (ASNO)
Toro Energy
Rio Tinto
South Australia Department of Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (DMITRE)
Uranium One
Western Australia Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP)
BHP Billiton (BHPB)
Heathgate Resources
Uranium One
Heathgate Resources
Minerals Council of Australia (MCA)
Heathgate Resources
Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism (RET)
Northern Land Council (NLC)
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Northern Territory Department of Resources (NTDoR)
South Australia Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (DMITRE)

Apologies

Energy Resources of Australia (ERA)
Northern Territory Department of Resources (NTDoR)
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (SEWPaC)
Geoscience Australia (GA)
Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism (RET)
Paladin Energy
Mega Uranium
Paulka Radiation
Western Australia Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP)
Minerals Council of Australia (MCA)
Cameco
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Northern Territory Department of Resources (NTDoR)
Cameco
Cameco

The acceptance of the record of the meeting of 12 December 2011 was moved by the Chair and accepted without amendment by the Uranium Council. All 13 items from the previous meeting have been either completed or progressed.

ACTION: Minutes from last meeting accepted.

The Chair noted the significant progress made on a number of important projects since the last meeting in December 2011. The Chair encouraged attendees to share ideas and feedback on the performance of the Uranium Council and the future of the forum as part of Item 3.1, *Strategic Direction of the Uranium Council*.

2. Items for discussion/update

Item 2.1 Developments in the Australian Uranium Industry

noted the importance of the Uranium Council as a leading practice example of government-industry discussion, and provided an overview of developments in the Australian uranium industry.

In the AUA's view, uranium and nuclear issues are not salient ones for most Australians. There are benefits of uranium mining for Australians, including export revenue and job creation. Continued political leadership, increasing domestic familiarity with uranium, industry compliance with environmental regulations, and commitment to best practice in areas such as stewardship and Indigenous engagement has created a more positive public image of the industry.

outlined the changes over the past few years that have affected the industry, including the removal of the Australian Labor Party's three mines policy, a move towards merit-based assessment for new mines, removal of the ban on uranium exploration in NSW, and increased attention to nuclear power in the Australian Government's Energy White Paper. Work is continuing to improve assessment and approval processes for new uranium mines, and there is a need for the industry to work very hard to address the concerns of stakeholders.

Item 2.2 International Framework for Nuclear Energy Cooperation (IFNEC) Workshop May 2012

gave an overview of his attendance at the IFNEC Workshop in London in May 2012. Australia is a non-active participant in IFNEC. Discussion centred on the financing of nuclear power, as well as nuclear waste and the need for strong and transparent regulatory processes.

The workshop illustrated the extreme difficulty in sourcing finance for new reactors, particularly in Europe and 'mature' Western markets. An example was the UK, which

appears well-placed to begin new reactor construction, with an existing nuclear economy, a carbon tax, a good skill base, and government support - but has been unable to secure adequate finance to commence new nuclear builds.

ACTION: RET to circulate outcomes/messages from IFNEC to the Uranium Council once received.

Item 2.3 Uranium Transport Strategy

noted his forthcoming retirement, and introduced his replacement
noted her replacement at
would be .

The Uranium Council's Transport Working Group has made good progress on the Transport Strategy over the past year, which includes the publication of the *Guide to Safe Transport of Uranium Oxide Concentrate*, which was distributed to members. This publication will be available online, and will be disseminated both domestically and internationally to relevant stakeholders. The Transport Strategy's audit of state policies and practices for the transport of UOC is feeding into the first half of the document, and the second half will be based on investigating current and potential shipping routes. Shipping routes are presently limited,

The Strategy will make recommendations for industry and government to pursue, and address among other things negative perceptions of risk – particularly in the community and among carriers. In addition, opportunities for streamlining regulations both domestically and internationally will be investigated.
noted the timeline for the completion of the Strategy: It is expected a draft will be circulated in November 2012 for comment to the Uranium Council, and a final version completed towards the end of 2012.

ACTION: Transport Working Group to circulate draft of the Transport Strategy in November 2012.

raised the issue of transport of UOC through Western Australia (WA). There is inconsistency in announcements by WA politicians – the industry is placed in a difficult position when there are competing messages. Simultaneously supporting uranium mining in WA but also opposing transport on the grounds of the perceived danger uranium poses is problematic. The Strategy should

consider educational aspects to assist a clear and consistent message is put forth by the industry and government, and should assist political leaders with high-level information on uranium transport. The Chair noted the work of the Uranium Council in this area, particularly the *Guide to Safe Transport of UOC* and *Indigenous Factsheets*, which address these issues. It is critical to ensure continued proactive engagement with local communities, similar to the work Toro Energy has been conducting in WA communities concerned by the Wiluna project.

noted that from ASNO's perspective, the transport security risks of UOC are very low, and Australia maintains a very robust regulatory system.

ACTION: Note release of the *Guide to Safe Transport of UOC*.

Item 2.4 Radiological Protection of Non-Human Biota Project

There is currently no consolidation of existing Australian data on concentration ratio to support non-human biota radiological assessments in the Australian uranium mining context.

The objective of the concentration ratio project is to collate existing data from current and prospective mine sites, both published and unpublished data, and identify data shortcomings (a gap analysis).

reported on ARPANSA's work on the project, funded under a Memorandum of Understanding with RET and endorsed by the Uranium Council at previous meetings. The project is on track for completion in September 2012.

noted his appreciation of the growing support by industry. The Chair raised concerns that whilst industry was mostly satisfied with the project, it may never get full support. As industry members on the Uranium Council had previously endorsed the project, it is important that they now work to make the project a success, including ensuring provision of relevant data to ARPANSA.

Item 2.5 ERICA Workshops: Report

Organisation of the ERICA workshops was an item discussed and subsequently endorsed at the last meeting of the Uranium Council.

provided a short report on the workshops, noting work in the organisation. The two workshops were fully subscribed by representatives from

government and industry and partially funded by RET and ARPANSA. noted a report on the workshops would soon be circulated to members of the Uranium Council.

ACTION: Secretariat to circulate report on ERICA workshops to Uranium Council attendees once finalised.

The tool highlights the potential for a risk, and would be used to design a monitoring program to determine whether a project posed a real radiation risk to the environment. It was noted that this tool could easily be applied to the Australian environment, regardless of type of climate, ie wet/dry/tropic/arid, and that the completion of ARPANSA's project on concentration ratios for non-human biota (Item 2.4) could be applied to the ERICA tool to increase the tool's relevance in an Australian context. In addition to practical skills gained in the use of the ERICA tool, participants were able to benefit from the networking opportunities at the workshops. It is hoped that these connections may continue, assisted by a forum to be set up through the Australasian Radiation Protection Society (ARPS) website. It was noted that the software tool is available for free, and it takes less than a week to do an assessment, the bulk of time being the gathering of data. The workshops were praised by several members for their ability to demystify non-human biota, and guide the use of ERICA as a speedy assessment tool.

The members of the Uranium Council extend their sincere thanks to [redacted] for her work on the ERICA Workshops.

Item 2.6 Australian National Radiation Dose Register: Update

[redacted] updated the Uranium Council on the status of the Australian National Radiation Dose Register (ANRDR), which is currently populated with the dose records of 24,000 workers over a time period of 11 years. In the next few months it is expected 100% of uranium mine workers will have their doses recorded. There have been some software issues with uploading data from Honeymoon, however these should be resolved by the end of June 2012.

The first ANRDR outreach workshop is to be held in Adelaide on 15 June 2012, aiming to increase communication between ARPANSA and the uranium mining industry. It is hoped that Radiation Safety Officers will become more involved in the project. [redacted] noted the engagement of a consultant by ARPANSA to assess how to expand the ANRDR to other industries, for example exploration and mineral sands. A report will be produced over the next six months.

At present data is only uploaded to the ANRDR annually. Industry members present suggested that this frequency is appropriate and will reduce the risk of duplication. The Chair and [redacted] congratulated ARPANSA on its work in getting the ANRDR up and running, and the imminent participation by the Northern Territory. The AUA has offered any assistance necessary in the ongoing work associated with the ANRDR.

noted the difficulty that was likely involved in expansion, with regard to ensuring functionality, and minimising excessive bureaucracy. There are challenges in terms of integrating different systems, and ensuring privacy issues are worked through.

ACTION: Uranium Council members to provide feedback to ARPANSA on the possible expansion of the ANRDR to other industries.

Item 2.7 Government and Industry Updates

Commonwealth Update

noted that the Uranium Council Indigenous Engagement Working Group's Factsheets *Uranium Facts* had been finalised by RET (Item 4.5) and were available for distribution, and thanked the Indigenous Engagement Working Group for their efforts.

The *Guide to Safe Transport of UOC* has also been finalised and was distributed to members at the meeting along with the factsheets. RET sincerely thanked on behalf of the Uranium Council significant contribution, and all those involved in the development of the publication. It was also noted that RET's secretariat work for the Uranium Council will continue, though budget constraints mean that RET can no longer fund large projects of the Council.

provided an update on the status of several Bilateral Safeguards Agreements (BSA). As of June 2012 administrative arrangements with Russia have been concluded, and ASNO and ROSATOM have agreed on facilities for processing Australian uranium. Virtually everything required is in place for exports to Russia to commence in the near future. The BSA with the United Arab Emirates is progressing well. There is no material update to provide on India, however it has been announced that the Government is in the process of preparing recommendations on a negotiating framework.

discussed outreach work being conducted around the world on Australia's regulatory system. A workshop held in Namibia discussed best practice on a range of uranium mining issues, including Australia's safeguards model as a template for countries seeking to develop a uranium mining industry. Japan is also running a workshop on uranium regulation in Mongolia, and ASNO has been invited to present on security and safeguards in September. The IAEA is also developing guidelines on security of UOC, as the international guidelines for natural uranium are not considered comprehensive enough. However, it should be noted that the audience for these guidelines is countries that do not have as robust requirements for UOC security as Australia.

Lastly, it was noted that [redacted] former Director General of ASNO had recently been awarded a Member of the Order of Australia.

South Australia Update

[redacted] noted a recent restructure of government agencies in South Australia that has brought the Resources area into the Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (DMITRE). The budget currently includes funding for advancing exploration activity in the Woomera Prohibited Area (WPA). The permit system is also being made available online, to increase accountability.

BHP Billiton has approved US\$1.2 billion in pre-commitment capital for the Olympic Dam expansion, and a feasibility study is near completion. The investment decision on the expansion is expected to go before the BHP Billiton Board by the end of 2012, consistent with the SA indenture agreement setting a deadline for decision in December 2012.

The Chair congratulated [redacted] on his recent award of a Public Service Medal for outstanding service to the growth and development of South Australia's mineral resources.

Northern Territory Update

[redacted] noted the Northern Territory will soon be fully participating in the ANRDR. Energy Resources of Australia have begun work on an exploration decline project that is expected to take two years to complete. Exploration activity in the Northern Territory is ongoing, with numerous interesting deposits being discovered. Currently there are 67 live exploration authorisations for uranium, out of over 300.

Western Australia Update

[redacted] noted that Toro Energy's Wiluna project is expected to become Western Australia's first uranium mine after approval had been received from WA EPA. An issue that has been receiving media coverage lately has been transport of uranium, and DMP has released another factsheet to assist understanding on this issue. A *Uranium in Western Australia Handbook* is being drafted by DMP, a draft of which is likely to be available in September/October 2012.

ACTION: [redacted] to provide a draft of the *Uranium in Western Australia Handbook* to Uranium Council members, and members to provide their feedback.

The Uranium Advisory Group has recently released a report with recommendations to maintain best practice in uranium mining regulation in Western Australia. The findings are focused on risk-based regulation, and DMP is in the process of responding to recommendations. A Memorandum of Understanding with the Radiological Council is being prepared to ensure streamlined processes, and radiation management plans are being placed online over the next month. This will enable progress tracking of plans, and help reinforce the commitment to the 30 day turnaround period. There are currently around 46 operators registered to explore for uranium in Western Australia.

The Chair congratulated Toro Energy's environmental approval, and also noted the attendance by NSW Government representatives at the Uranium Council meeting had been anticipated but were cancelled at the last minute. However, the Uranium Council is pleased that the NSW Minister for Resources and Energy Chris Hartcher would address the AusIMM International Uranium Conference on 14 June 2012.

Industry

The Chair opened the floor for contributions from industry representatives. The Chair noted the difficulties involved in raising money for new projects, given the ability to raise money in capital markets is 'almost gone'. There was a need to raise funds through long term users of the product.

noted the AUA has released a statement on radiation protection, and Indigenous economic engagement. The latter document was developed through the AUA's Indigenous Dialogue Group – the convenor of which is

3. Items for Decision

3.1 Uranium Council: Strategic Direction

The Chair noted the discussion on the strategic direction of the Uranium Council that took place at the previous meeting in December 2011. It was decided that revised terms of reference would be developed with an emphasis on uranium-specific issues. *Strategic Direction of the Uranium Council* outlines a proposed way forward for the Uranium Council, in light of achievements to date and the establishment of the AUA. A substantial number of changes in the industry have occurred over the past decade, and the Uranium Council has responded well by successfully addressing high level

issues through large projects. There has been consistent support from members that the Uranium Council should continue in some form.

The Chair opened the floor to discussion on the draft Strategic Directions paper, and moved that meetings be reduced to an annual basis. Where practical, meetings would fall in line with the AusIMM International Uranium Conference. This will ensure the work of the Uranium Council is targeted and relevant. This motion was carried.

ACTION: Uranium Council meetings to be held on an annual basis in the future, where possible in line with the AusIMM International Uranium Conference.

It is important to recognise the past achievements of the Uranium Industry Framework and the Uranium Council, and ensure future work does not duplicate work already completed. There is a desire not to duplicate the AUA's role, as the Council is not a lobby group. [redacted] noted the AUA supports the Strategic Directions paper, and that the Council has been very successful in addressing certain policies and issues.

Membership of the Uranium Council consists of both industry and relevant government agencies. [redacted] noted the combination of industry and government membership is unique, as the forum provides the opportunity to bring to the table issues from both sides. This allows for a good understanding between both parties to develop. [redacted] noted the membership of the Uranium Council lends credibility that is not achievable through other forums that include only industry or government. The variety of the Uranium Council's membership allows a diversity of views to be expressed. The broader industry is well represented through bodies such as the AUA, which includes smaller exploration interests. In future, the Uranium Council should retain a broad membership from government, industry and regulators, without over-representation from any one sector.

[redacted] raised the possibility of participation in the Uranium Council by a third-party, such as academia, to increase the level of confidence in the Uranium Council's impartiality. [redacted] noted that the Strategic Directions paper outlines a process rather than the content the Uranium Council should pursue, and industry must decide on the content to be addressed.

[redacted] noted ARPANSA's continuing interest in the Uranium Council as an observer, and [redacted] noted that ARPANSA's next meeting of the Radiation Health and Safety Advisory Council would focus on uranium mining. This

highlights the continuing opportunity for the Uranium Council to be proactive in providing input to other forums.

The Chair agreed that there are many issues to pursue, and work to be undertaken. There is significant work that the Uranium Council still has ahead of it. To ensure high level awareness of the issues affecting the industry, a paper on the Australian uranium industry will be presented to the Standing Council on Energy and Resources (SCER) in December 2012 (Item 4.1).

reiterated RET's budget situation, that funding for uranium activities has ceased, except for the Secretariat function. Despite this reduction, the Commonwealth remains committed to ensuring the Uranium Council serves as a useful forum in which to address the issues affecting the industry, and also that the industry must remain the driver behind the Uranium Council as a forum to alleviate the impediments to an internationally competitive Australian uranium industry. Attendees are encouraged to submit feedback on the Directions paper to the Secretariat. This includes the process by which the Uranium Council should function, and the emerging issues that are causing concern in the industry.

ACTION: Members to submit feedback to the Secretariat on the Uranium Council Strategic Directions paper by 31 August 2012.

4. Items for Noting

The Chair noted that members had seen the following items in advance, and no discussion occurred. All were noted.

Item 4.1 Industry Report for SCER: Progress

The progress of the Uranium Council's industry report for the Standing Council on Energy and Resources (SCER) was noted. This document will be presented at the December 2012 meeting of SCER.

Item 4.2 AUA Research on Best Practice: Uranium Assessment and Approvals

The Uranium Council noted the research being undertaken by the AUA in the area of best practice uranium mine assessment and approval processes.

Item 4.3 Ionising Radiation and Mine Safety

The Uranium Council noted the decision by the National Mine Safety Framework (NMSF) Steering Group to accept advice that ionising radiation does not meet the definition of a Principal Mining Hazard, and that the Code of Practice on Naturally Occurring Radioactive Minerals in Mining is not required

Item 4.4 IAEA Uranium Production Workshop

The Uranium Council noted that Australia has agreed to host the International Atomic Energy Agency's Training Meeting on Effective Regulatory and Environmental Management of Uranium Production in Darwin over the week, 13-17 August 2012.

Item 4.5 Uranium Fact Sheets

The publication and release of the Indigenous Engagement Working Group's *Uranium Facts* factsheets was noted. These were distributed at the meeting. Further copies are available from the Secretariat.

5. Other Business and Next Meeting

The Chair opened the floor to any other issues for discussion.

thanked DMITRE, particularly
for hosting the meeting.

The Chair noted the next Uranium Council meeting will likely be held in Darwin at a date to coincide with the AusIMM International Uranium Conference. The meeting was closed at 5.30pm.

Next meeting:

Darwin – June 2013

 Record of Meeting	Meeting 7 13 June 2013 Darwin 8.30am – 11.30 am
---	--

ACTIONS FROM MEETING

ACTION 1: UC agreed to the AUA canvassing the establishment of a Risk Communication Working Group.

ACTION 2: Members to provide figures and anecdotal evidence demonstrating commercial impacts of transport restrictions, for incorporation into the Transport Strategy.

ACTION 3: Transport Strategy endorsed by the Uranium Council, and will be submitted to SCER for consideration in December 2013 (minor amendments will be made by the secretariat to incorporate commercial impacts).

ACTION 4: UC agreed to reconvene Regulation Working Group. AUA to canvass industry for an appropriate Chair.

ACTION 5: Industry led paper to be drafted outlining environmental regulation challenges faced by the industry.

ACTION 6: AUA Radiation Protection Working Group to take the lead on any radiation-related submission to SCER.

1. Administration

The Chair opened the meeting at 8.30 am, welcomed attendees and thanked the Northern Territory Department of Mines and Energy (DME) for hosting. The Chair acknowledged the traditional owners of the land, the Larrakia people. The significance of the inaugural attendance by Queensland and New South Wales Government representatives was acknowledged as a significant step forward for the Uranium Council (UC).

welcomed members to the Northern Territory and ran through housekeeping arrangements.

Attendees

Paladin Energy
Australian Uranium Association (AUA)
Energy Resources of Australia (ERA)
Western Australia Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP)
Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM)
South Australia Department of Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (DMITRE)

Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM)
New South Wales Department of Trade and Investment, Regional Infrastructure and Services (DTIRIS)
Northern Land Council (NLC)
Paladin Energy
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA) Supervising Scientist Division (SSD) of the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities.
Queensland Resources Council (QRC)
BHP Billiton (BHPB)
Uranium One
Northern Territory Department of Mines and Energy (DME)
Northern Land Council (NLC)
Cameco
Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism (RET)
Heathgate Resources
Northern Territory Department of Mines and Energy (DME)
Minerals Council of Australia (MCA)

Apologies

Energy Resources of Australia (ERA)
Toro Energy
Geoscience Australia (GA)
Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism (RET)
Toro Energy
South Australia Department of Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (DMITRE)
Northern Land Council (NLC)
Heathgate Resources
Western Australia Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) Supervising Scientist Division (SSD)
Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism (RET)

The record of the previous meeting on 12 June 2012 in Adelaide was accepted without amendment. All previous actions from the last meeting have either been completed or are in progress.

The Chair outlined that the meeting would focus on potential submissions by the UC to the Ministerial-level Council of Australian Governments (COAG) Standing Council on Energy and Resources (SCER).

2. Items for Discussion/Decision

Item 2.1 Report on outcomes of the Standing Council on Energy and Resources

The Chair outlined the report submitted to SCER in December 2012 by the UC, which noted three challenges facing the industry: (i) environmental regulation, (ii) transport restrictions, and (iii) radiation protection. The Chair presented the report in person and noted that the only issue Ministers were not immediately receptive to was amendment of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). The response was positive with regard to progressing work on radiation and transport issues, and environmental regulation more broadly.

acknowledged former Minister Ferguson's support for the uranium industry and his efforts in placing uranium on the SCER's agenda. It is important to use this opportunity to address industry challenges.

noted that the benefit of the UC is the industry-government collaboration, and that it is important to focus directly on the outcomes the industry wants when reporting to SCER.

Item 2.2 Transport

The UC's Transport Working Group has developed a Uranium Transport Strategy outlining the challenges faced by the industry, and presenting a suite of recommendations to address impediments to the transport of uranium domestically and internationally. gave an outline of the Strategy, noting that success is dependent on effort from both government and industry.

A key recommendation of the Strategy proposes the development of a Risk Communication Strategy to address the concerns of the public with regard to uranium transport. noted it is important for this to be developed or endorsed by an impartial body to ensure its acceptance by the public. ARPANSA advised it would be unable to develop such a document, however may be able to provide endorsement. State regulators (such as EPAs or radiological protection agencies) were also of this view. It is important for any Risk Communication Strategy to be developed and reviewed by experts that are independent from uranium mining. Public acceptance will be difficult to achieve when there is a real or perceived influence from the industry.

It was agreed that the AUA should canvass government and industry interest in establishing a Risk Communication Working Group.

ACTION 1: UC agreed to the AUA canvassing the establishment of a Risk Communication Working Group.

It was also noted that there needs to be ongoing discussion regarding domestic and international port access. Port access needs to be driven by commercial needs.

Whilst it was agreed not to identify key ports

It was noted that a deficiency of the Strategy is the lack of data covering the commercial risks associated with the high costs of transport restrictions. It is important to highlight the commercial aspects of this issue. For example,

ACTION 2: Members to provide figures and anecdotal evidence demonstrating commercial impacts of transport restrictions, for incorporation into the Transport Strategy.

noted that the NSW Government's position on uranium transport within the state is not clear. However, the Strategy is designed to be broad and will not specifically target jurisdictions. further noted that restrictions on uranium transport are purely politically-driven, and hence this document will generate discussion, with a view to returning to SCER at a later time with more specific actions.

It was agreed that the Strategy provided a good overview of the transport challenges facing the industry. Subject to the secretariat making some minor amendments to the recommendations, the Strategy was endorsed by the UC.

ACTION 3: Transport Strategy endorsed by the Uranium Council, and will be submitted to SCER for consideration in December 2013 (minor amendments will be made by the secretariat to incorporate commercial impacts).

noted that it is important the Strategy provides a first pass of the issues for high-level consideration by Ministers. Subject to reactions by Ministers and jurisdictions at the officials level, there is an opportunity to return to SCER with more specific recommendations and actions at a later date.

Item 2.3 Environmental Regulation

gave an outline of the main challenges facing the industry with regard to environmental regulation. Duplication and delay, and the nuclear trigger in the EPBC Act remain problematic issues. The AUA is undertaking research on the extent of regulatory duplication faced by the industry.

It was agreed that an industry paper be developed for SCER outlining these challenges in detail, with the AUA leading its development. The target would be the mid-2014 meeting of SCER (this will require a paper to be developed by around March 2014). It is important to address specific examples of regulatory burden, in order to present an evidence-based case for reform. Companies agreed to provide case studies of their regulatory experience for inclusion in the paper.

The paper should propose what is 'best practice', as opposed to criticism of the current regulatory system. It was generally agreed by the jurisdictions that they would support a paper of this nature, however it should be primarily industry-driven. The UC's Regulation Working Group has been inactive, and should be reconvened in order to progress this work.

ACTION 4: Members agreed to reconvene Regulation Working Group. AUA to canvass industry for an appropriate Chair.

ACTION 5: Industry led paper to be drafted outlining environmental regulation challenges faced by the industry.

Item 2.4 Radiation

gave a brief overview of developments in the international radiation protection framework, and Australia's national uniformity program. ICRP 103 was published in 2007, and was used in the development of the new International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Basic Safety Standards published in 2011. ARPANSA's Radiation Health Committee is developing its Radiation Protection Series documents to put the changes into practice. ICRP has largely moved from a process-based protection approach to one based on exposure situation. ICRP 108 (Protection of the Environment) was published in 2008.

The reporting of data collated through the Australian National Radiation Dose Register (ANRDR) was raised. Average dose rates will be reported in the Annual Report, however there are still problems with comparisons of data, such as being able to determine the effect of the use of PPE. noted that the application of the ANRDR should be extended to all industries affected by radiation issues. Further, there is still a strong preference from industry that data is left as meta data for research purposes. It was noted that the Honeymoon mine is still unable to upload data due to compatibility issues.

Despite the need to progress work on radiation issues with the SCER, it was agreed that no Radiation Working Group be established. The AUA's Radiation Protection Working Group could fill this role, given the expert nature of the work required. noted that the AUA would progress a paper on how authorities could

contribute to countering unscientific claims regarding radiation and uranium mining more broadly.

A radiation protection-related submission to SCER will occur sometime in the future, with transport and environmental regulation remaining priorities.

ACTION 6: AUA Radiation Protection Working Group to take the lead on any radiation-related submission to SCER.

3. Items for Update

Item 2.7 Government and Industry Updates

The Chair noted the downturn in sentiment and prices affecting the industry, reiterating that there is still a need to address industry challenges in order to be ready to meet increasing demand in the future. The long-term fundamentals underpinning the industry remain strong. Although there is a lack of funds available to progress initiatives, SCER represents a good opportunity to pursue some issues.

Western Australia Update

There have been efforts to streamline the relationships between regulators in WA, including establishing an MOU between DMP and the Radiological Council to better work through issues and strengthen the regulatory system.

Northern Territory Update

noted the recent referral by ERA of the Ranger 3 Deeps project for Territory and Federal environmental consideration, and that there has also been a notable decrease in activity by exploration juniors in the NT. The newly established NT Environment Protection Authority is continuing to build its relationship with the NT Department of Health.

South Australia Update

noted that the Four Mile project is expected to progress later in 2013, There has also been a mining MOU signed between the SA and NSW Governments concerning cross-border resources issues.

Queensland Update

The Queensland Government's response to the Uranium Implementation Committee's report is expected before the end of 2013. It is anticipated that it will be generally supportive of the recommendations of the report. The Mary Kathleen tender process is being developed, and initial drilling has commenced to determine

the resource. It is expected to be prospective for rare earths, with uranium as a potential by-product.

NSW Update

NSW Government assessment of the expressions of interest for uranium exploration licenses is expected to be completed shortly. The assessment panel consists of various agencies, including Geoscience Australia. Successful applicants will be invited to apply for a license.

Commonwealth Update

Negotiations are ongoing with the Indian Government regarding a Nuclear Cooperation Agreement, a necessary requirement in order for sales of uranium to begin. The first round of negotiations in March in New Delhi were positive.

The Joint Standing Committee on Treaties is also currently considering a Nuclear Cooperation Agreement with the United Arab Emirates.

It was also noted that [redacted] has replaced [redacted] as the Acting Manager of the Uranium Industry Section at RET.

Northern Land Council update

[redacted] noted that a delegation of Traditional Owners and NLC representatives had recently visited the El Cabril radioactive waste repository site operated by Spanish company ENRESA.

Industry update

[redacted] noted that the Four Mile mine is in the final stages of approval.

[redacted] noted the appointment [redacted] and the ongoing work to identify alternate options for the Olympic Dam expansion.

3. Other Business and Next Meeting

No further issues were raised, and the Chair once again thanked NT DME for hosting the meeting, and noted his appreciation of the attendance of the Council's newest members.

The next meeting will be held in June 2014 to coincide with the next AusIMM International Uranium Conference (tentatively scheduled for Perth). The meeting was closed at 11.30 am.

ACTIONS FROM MEETING

ACTION 1: as the newly appointed Chair, to reconstitute the Transport Working Group to consider how best to address the issues discussed, including greater access to ports.

ACTION 2: Reconstitute the Regulation Working Group to prepare an evidence-based paper on environmental regulation issues for industry.

ACTION 4: Support the expansion of the Australian National Radiation Dose Register to other industries, including the mineral sands industry.

Follow up on data that can be shared to quantify risk for input to communications strategy. Consider feeding back through MCA consultations with regulators.

ACTION 5: UC continues to meet in person on an annual basis, in conjunction with the AusIMM Conference. A teleconference will be held within approximately six months of each face-to-face meeting.

Reconstituted Regulation and Transport Working Groups to meet as required before the next UC meeting in six months.

Agenda Item 1: Administration

The Chair opened the meeting at 10.05 am, welcomed attendees, including new members and those phoning in, and thanked the WA Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) for hosting. The Chair acknowledged the Traditional Owners of the land on which the meeting was being held, the Noongar people.

representing welcomed members to DMP and ran through safety and housekeeping arrangements.

Attendees

Paladin Energy
Geoscience Australia (GA)
Australian Safeguards & Non-Proliferation Office (ASNO)
Western Australia Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP)
New South Wales Department of Trade and Investment, Regional Infrastructure and Services (DTIRIS)
BHP Billiton (BHPB)
Cameco
Western Australia Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP)
Department of Industry (DoI)
Northern Territory Department of Mines and Energy (DME)
South Australia Department of Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (DMITRE)
Heathgate Resources
Minerals Council of Australia (MCA)

By Phone

Energy Resources of Australia (ERA)
Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM)
Queensland Resources Council (QRC)
Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM)
Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM)

Apologies

NT Department of Mines and Energy (DME)
Queensland Resources Council (QRC)
Australian Radiation Protection & Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Toro Energy
Energy Resources of Australia
South Australia Department of Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (DMITRE)
Office of the Supervising Scientist (OSS)
Energy Resources of Australia (ERA)
Energy Resources of Australia (ERA)
Office of the Supervising Scientist (OSS)

Secretariat

Department of Industry
Department of Industry

The record of the previous meeting of 12 June 2013 in Darwin was accepted without objection. The Chair noted all actions from the previous meeting have either been completed or are in progress.

(DoI) noted:

- the Secretariat had agreed with AUA not to progress the establishment of a Risk Communication Working Group;
- members had provided notes on transport issues and input and coordination was acknowledged; and

- there is more to be done on an industry lead discussion/paper on environmental regulation challenges facing the industry.

The Chair outlined that a discussion was needed on how to maintain the momentum of the UC during the current down market situation, noting that this is a good time to maintain commitment whilst people have more time to do so.

Agenda Item 2: Items for Discussion/Decision

Item 2.1 Transport

The Chair noted that access to ports and international restrictions on transport movements remained an area of concern for operators. Since the last meeting, the Standing Council on Energy and Resources, now the COAG Energy Council, had effectively endorsed UC's Uranium Transport Strategy.

referred to Attachment 2.1.2, which outlined the recommendations in the Uranium Transport Strategy, and briefly ran through their status:

1. Information and communication strategy – considered incomplete and queried whether it is something that UC still wishes to pursue;
2. Harmonisation – for discussion later in the meeting, including Queensland's strong interest;
3. Paper to SCER – invited to provide an update later in the meeting;
4. International transit – for discussion later in the meeting;
5. International engagement – for discussion later in the meeting;

noted that while there appears to be no regulatory restrictions to exporting UOC via domestic ports, gaining approval at state government levels may be difficult. invited to speak on the outcomes of the SCER meeting which took place on 13 December 2013.

thanked all parties for their input leading up to the SCER meeting. He relayed that SA Minister, and NT Minister, had been very supportive.

The Chair noted that ten years ago the discussion about transport would have been different due to the number of routes on offer and the lack of new mines on the horizon to create the required demand. The Chair challenged the group to identify

what it was that needed to be done to address these issues and to commit to progressing those things.

commented that the situation was satisfactory at present with only 3-4 producers. The Chair added that with more producers there would be less flexibility in terms of available slots on carriers.

posed the question of whether the key matter was (access to) ports or (availability of) routes. Consultations with domestic ports over the previous two years concluded that there were no regulatory impediments to shipping UOC via those ports. Rather, other government restrictions (most likely political) prevented the practice. The ports appeared willing and prepared to ship UOC.

The Chair pointed out that ports would at some point be questioning the benefit for them, given that uranium shipments would provide minimal business compared to other products. One of the real problems for producers was that product was in transit for up to 3-4 months, meaning capital was sedentary and not converted to cash. The Chair proposed that, as a group, the momentum needs to continue to address these matters.

spoke of the difficulty in his jurisdiction (NSW) of selling the message politically that port access was important for the industry when at present, there is no exploration activity in NSW. Without production, it would be difficult to convince the government of the need for uranium shipments via NSW ports.

proposed that, as SCER ministers have been exposed to and expressed an interest in UC's work, it may be best to pursue a business case approach.

acknowledged that the communication aspects were vital to ensure readiness for exploration activity (in NSW's case) in light of the experience with coal seam gas activity.

A general discussion took place covering:

- progress/change to WA policy of exports;
- whether to target high volume ports or whether the route to port was the real issue;
- messaging from presentations at the AusIMM Conference;
- risk management analysis in respect of distances to port (e.g. far North Queensland to Adelaide); and

In light of these issues, it was suggested that a Working Group be reconvened on transport. The Chair and [redacted] supported the idea. The Chair suggested Queensland be invited to participate and that the group would need to prioritise tasks.

The Chair brought the transport discussion to a close by suggesting the group needed to think about the composition of a re-convened working group and perhaps bringing the shipping lines and ports into the discussion as required.

[redacted] said that Queensland was keen to be involved now that it was 'open for business' for uranium mining and the need to address transport. She mentioned community interest (in uranium mining) in the North West of Queensland, including some negative sentiment, but that the government was supportive.

In regard to follow-up actions stemming from the SCER meeting in late 2013, [redacted] explained that the (now) COAG Energy Council agenda was quite large and uranium would not be a regular item. However, where the UC wants something considered, DoI can request that the Minister for Industry consider putting it forward.

[redacted] departed for the airport and in doing so expressed his support for getting the Working Group(s) restarted, noting he had information to contribute.

<p>ACTION 1: [redacted] as the newly appointed Chair, to reconstitute the Transport Working Group to consider how best to address the issues discussed, including greater access to ports.</p>

Item 2.2a Environmental Regulation

spoke about the one stop shop concept and the difficulty of previous attempts to have the nuclear trigger removed from the EPBC Act – which had proven too difficult. A better approach might be to document the precise issues for the industry and how the trigger has been applied relative to other forms of mining proposals, rather than simply seek its removal.

The Chair noted the importance of any such approach for WA as projects progress. The key is getting the regulatory process reduced to a fewer number of levels of consultation and process.

told the meeting that had agreed to Chair and reform the Regulation Working Group (RWG) to prepare an evidence-based paper on environmental regulation issues for industry.

The Chair welcomed this new approach and advised that the UC is well placed to participate and assist where possible. He also noted the potential financial savings to both government and industry if the matters could be addressed.

commented on how the new processes could be used to reduce project approval times (e.g. from two years to one year) and highlighted the need to be clear what the UC wants the new RWG to do.

suggested the RWG could look at what the process will look like when bilaterals for both assessment and approval are in place (assuming this will be the case).

suggested looking at the Productivity Commission report on exploration as it identifies some key issues.

ACTION 2: Reconstitute the Regulation Working Group to prepare an evidence-based paper on environmental regulation issues for industry.
--

Item 2.2b Aquatic Toxicology

gave an update on the first stage of the aquatic toxicology testing by Golder and Associates:

- Information will be sent to UC members for review;
- The Stage 1 report will be finalise by 30 June 2014; and
- The report will find that UOC is soluble in water.

questioned whether Stage 2 of the project, which requires substantial further testing, was relevant and valuable, and if so, questioned how it could be funded.

On the latter point, suggested involving Supervising Scientist Division.

The Chair suggested that the group receive the report, review it and where appropriate, get peers to provide comment (several members suggested that colleagues within their organisations would be qualified to provide input), and then consider what knowledge the work would provide to the industry.

On the costings for Stage 2, commented that the petroleum industry had testing done at Curtin University for considerably less than what had been indicated for some tests in Attachment 2.2.1.

Item 2.3 Radiation

There followed a general discussion about the Dose Register and its relevance and value to workers, such as whether they are able to access their own data.

suggested a communication link to the public about the relative safety margins and other activities from a safety perspective.

On the matter of extending the Dose Register to include other sectors, the Chair suggested a greater critical mass of people and sectors included would be beneficial for the uranium industry. added that supported extending the Dose Register to the mineral sands industry.

ACTION 4: Support the expansion of the Australian National Radiation Dose Register to other industries, including the mineral sands industry.

Follow up on data that can be shared to quantify risk for input to communications strategy. Consider feeding back through MCA consultations with regulators.

Agenda Item 4: Items for Discussion (continued)

Item 4.1 Industry Outlook

spoke of the merger of AUA into the MCA, a process that commenced mid-2013. A largely seamless transition had taken place, as with the Australian Coal Association also merging into MCA and the advocacy role of the former AUA would continue. Key areas of activity included the political processes of “new” states, Queensland and NSW and community perceptions around industry image (i.e. social

licence to operate). In line with the Chairs earlier comments, now is the time to consolidate these matters while industry activity is reduced due to market conditions.

Item 4.2 Future of the UC

The Chair lead a general discussion about whether the UC should continue. Since moving to the annual format, interest appears to have waned. However, there was a consensus that UC continue, along with a suggestion that annual meetings be held with a teleconference(s) in-between (i.e. six-monthly meetings). More regular meetings are intended to make each working group more accountable for action/progress.

ACTION 5: UC continues to meet in person on an annual basis, in conjunction with the AusIMM Conference. A teleconference will be held within approximately six months of each face-to-face meeting.

Reconstituted Regulation and Transport Working Groups to meet as required before the next UC meeting in six months.

Agenda Item 5: Items for Update

Item 5.1 Government & Industry Update

Not discussed due to time constraints.

Agenda Item 6: Other Business and Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held in June 2015 to coincide with the next AusIMM International Uranium Conference (tentatively scheduled for Adelaide). The meeting was closed at 12.50 pm.

ACTIONS FROM MEETING

ACTION 1: Prepare a UC submission to the South Australia Royal Commission into the Nuclear Fuel Cycle. UC Secretariat to pull together an outline of UC achievements as a starting point for limited member distribution initially, followed by broader circulation and development across the UC.

ACTION 2: UC Secretariat to confirm closing dates for submissions to the South Australian Royal Commission into the Nuclear Fuel Cycle and circulate with the outline.

ACTION 3: Members to provide questions on the One Stop Shop initiative to the UC Secretariat for response by the Department of the Environment.

Agenda Item 1: Administration

1.1 Welcome and Apologies

The Chair opened the meeting at 9:00am by welcoming attendees and those phoning in. The South Australia (SA) Department of State Development was thanked for hosting the meeting. The Chair acknowledged the Kurna People as the Traditional Owners of the land on which the meeting was held.

1.2 Accept record of last meeting

The Uranium Council (UC) minutes from the previous meeting of 12 June 2014 in Perth were accepted without objection. The Chair noted that progression of action items arising from the previous meeting will be discussed throughout the meeting.

Attendees

Paladin Energy
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Geoscience Australia (GA)
Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office (ASNO)
NT Department of Mines and Energy (DME)
WA Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP)
SA Department of State Development (DSD)
SA Department of State Development (DSD)
NSW Dept of Trade and Investment, Regional Infrastructure and Services (DTIRIS)
Mineral Council of Australia (MCA)
Association of Mining and Exploration Companies (AMEC)
BHP Billiton
BHP Billiton
BHP Billiton
Heathgate Resources
Heathgate Resources
Cameco
Paladin Energy
Department of Industry and Science (DoIS)

By Phone

Queensland Resources Council (QRC)

Apologies

Geoscience Australia (GA)
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office (ASNO)
Office of the Supervising Scientist (OSS)
Office of the Supervising Scientist (OSS)
NT Department of Mines and Energy (DME)
NT Department of Mines and Energy (DME)
WA Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP)
Uranium One

Secretariat

Department of Industry and Science
Department of Industry and Science

Agenda Item 2: Items for Discussion/Decision

2.1 Status of the Uranium Sector

The Chair noted that there is no new investment and the current price is not sustainable, but hopefully the industry would see a change with the emergence of projects in Western Australia (WA). The Chair also noted that it was disappointing to see Queensland (QLD) take a step back and ban uranium mining in the state. [redacted] from the Queensland Resources Council noted that the change of government created uncertainty with uranium mining, although exploration is still permitted. [redacted] further explained that the ban will likely be delivered via a policy decision, rather than via a legislative amendment.

2.2 SA Royal Commission into the Nuclear Fuel Cycle

The Chair introduced [redacted] to talk about the Royal Commission.

[redacted] provided a broad overview of the Royal Commission and outlined the 'forensic approach' the Commission will take, digging right down to view all of the available evidence to inform a position that will withstand public scrutiny. Issues papers are currently out for discussion, with a closing date of:

- 24 July – for submissions on only issues papers 1 and 4;
- 3 August – for submissions on only issues papers 2 and 3; and
- 3 August – for consolidated submissions on all issues papers.

[redacted] noted that the Royal Commission presents a wonderful opportunity internationally and queried how the UC can communicate this. The Chair noted that the UC has been addressing issues such as transport, training and regulatory duplication – which may be of interest to the Royal Commission. [redacted] added that rebuilding skills relevant to the nuclear sector is a key issue, along with the reduction of red tape and the EPBC Act process.

[redacted] from the [redacted] noted that the MCA will be making a submission on issue paper 1 and will use the opportunity to raise issues such as over-regulation and duplication that impact on competitiveness.

There was also general conversation surrounding the usefulness of the Royal Commission as a platform to address incorrect public perceptions, such as radiation concerns. The Royal Commission's credibility can go a long way to alleviate many of those concerns. It can also shed light on perceptions across the board to inform both industry and the public.

posed the question: what is Australia's uranium strategy – what would 'good' look like? The UC can use this opportunity to give the Royal Commission a framework for what a robust uranium industry could look like in Australia.

The Chair noted that the focus of a UC submission should be on uranium processing and shipping to reflect the UC's Terms of Reference, and not the downstream processing and power generation aspects.

raised the legal prohibitions that currently restrict the establishment of a complete nuclear fuel cycle in Australia and noted that, due to government representation on the UC, the content of any submission by the UC would need to be consistent with state/territory and Commonwealth legislative and policy positions. This position was supported by

proposed that the UC make a broad submission that covers the issues discussed over the years, with individual submissions from members going deeper if necessary. added that the UC agenda is clear and the submission can be based on the group's history of achievements. The Chair agreed that UC should stick to its foundations and avoid nuclear directly.

The Chair agreed that a suitable approach would be to provide a presentation to the Royal Commission, followed by a formal written submission. offered to facilitate the presentation.

reiterated that UC's approach should discuss industry constraints and focus on the work of the UC to date such as the dose register, transport strategy, and avoid the policy space.

It was agreed that the UC Secretariat would pull together information outlining the UC and its achievements for use in a submission. The concept of "what good looks like" was a unanimously agreed approach.

ACTION 1: Prepare a UC submission to the South Australia Royal Commission into the Nuclear Fuel Cycle. UC Secretariat to pull together an outline of UC achievements as a starting point for limited member distribution initially, followed by broader circulation and development across the UC.

ACTION 2: UC Secretariat to confirm closing dates for submissions to the South Australian Royal Commission into the Nuclear Fuel Cycle and circulate with the outline.

Transport Working Group (TWG)

Chair of the TWG, provided an update on the TWG's activities. The TWG met three times with a focus on developing the business case. Limited resources continued to be a barrier as a nominee to carry out the work is still required.

It was agreed that the TWG will not continue the business case development at this point, but will await the outcome of the Royal Commission and then reassess the need for work in that space.

The Chair brought discussions on transport to a close.

Regulation Working Group (RWG)

noted that while the RWG has not met, there is progress occurring externally and there is little the RWG can add at this stage. General comments were made by members noting that the environmental bilateral assessment process assigned responsibility to the states and that this can cause limitations. from the NT noted that the NT bilateral was in progress.

A general discussion took place regarding:

- the environmental bilateral assessment and approvals process;
- the positive impact bilateral approvals will have;
- the need for federal legislation changes around the nuclear trigger;
- the Commonwealth's approach to approve and add conditions under the bilateral approach; and
- the need for regulation to be cut and duplicative processes removed, particularly with the EPBC Act.

suggested that there may be benefit inviting the Department of the Environment (DoE) to the next UC meeting to provide a presentation to assist industry understanding of the One Stop Shop (OSS) initiative. In the interim, offered to relay any questions members have on the OSS to DoE.

ACTION 3: Members to provide questions on the One Stop Shop initiative to the UC Secretariat for response by the Department of the Environment.

Agenda Item 4: Items Update

4.1 Government & Industry Update

The Chair invited updates from each state/territory, followed by Commonwealth agencies.

South Australia

- SA is in the process of developing a state-based multiple land use policy framework to cover all aspects, such as land use conflict and increasing transparency and consistency in the decision making process.
- The PACE Frontiers program continues, with the PACE Discovery Drilling 2015 initiative currently seeking proposals from industry to undertake collaborative exploration drilling projects.
- The Mining Industry Participation Office is encouraging investment and assisting industry in developing capacity and capability.
- The Mining and Petroleum Services Centre of Excellence is working well with strong projects emerging.

Western Australia

- Three project proposals are underway:
 - Wiluna Uranium Expansion Project: Toro Energy;
 - Kintyre and Yeelirrie Uranium Projects: Cameco/Mitsubishi; and
 - Mulga Rock Uranium Project: VIMY Resources.
- Noted Paladin's Manyingee Field Leach Trial proposal.
- WA is an active, emerging district with production ramping up.

Northern Territory

- Exploration is ongoing in the NT.
- Tailings and pit filling remediation work at Ranger is ongoing.
- Brief update was provided on Jabiluka, Nabarlek and Rum Jungle remediation.

New South Wales

- Since the ban on uranium exploration was lifted, six companies were invited to apply for an exploration license following a two year Expression of Interest process. Three applications for tenements in the Broken Hill region were received and are currently under assessment.
- The strategy was to be on the "front foot" with community engagement resulting in minimal negative response by the community. This potentially indicates a shift in opinions with the reduction of negative interest during consultations.
- Engagement occurred with local community groups, field consultants and local government, with factsheets available on the website.

Commonwealth

- Radioactive waste activates:
 - Specific nominations cannot be discussed, however results were encouraging.
 - Criteria was published and an Independent Advisory Panel is helping to assess which applications are acceptable under the Act and if they meet technical requirements.
 - A list will then be prepared for the Minister's consideration followed by a 60 day community consultation process to address any concerns.
 - A short list of sites is intended to be announced in late July, with a preferred site identified prior to the election next year.
 - EPBC and ARPANSA approvals then ensue and a tender process to assist the next stage with design and costings.
 - Best practice is being followed, but modelling is still being determined through community engagement and based on a small volume of low level waste as the focus, as opposed to overseas examples of high level waste with revenue opportunities.
 - General discussion about the type of facility (above/underground) with all options being kept on the table.
 - Pending difficulties in balancing the science vs emotive issues during the consultation process were noted.
- Growth Centre design was discussed and the opportunity for the UC to contribute to the Oil, Gas and Energy Resources proposal.
- Exploration Development Incentive:
 - Commonwealth election commitment. The Department of Industry and Science worked with Treasury and AMEC to pull it together, with applications closing in September 2015.
 - The Australian Taxation Office has developed information for applicants and guidance material will be updated soon.

Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office

- The Australia-India Nuclear Cooperation Agreement is progressing through the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties. A report to the Australian Government is expected in early July once hearings are completed. Administrative arrangements continue to be developed.
- The United Arab Emirates administrative arrangements are under negotiation and expected to be finalised soon.
- No further developments to report on regarding the Australia-China agreement at this point.

Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency

- Radiation guides are being reviewed.
- The dose register has 33 000 people registered in the database, across all mines. Those figures include anyone who is identified as a uranium worker, using all the records available over the industry's life span.
- Work is being done to incorporate the mineral sands industry into the dose register.
- ARPANSA has been asked to assist the International Atomic Energy Agency to develop standards for the mining industry.

The Chair invited any comments or updates from industry and brought this item to a close.

Agenda Item 5: Other Business and Next Meeting

5.1 India Nuclear Energy Summit 2015

gave a brief overview of the upcoming India Nuclear Energy Summit 2015. The RET Counsellor to India was contacted by summit organisers, showing interest in an Australian industry delegation attending in October.

The Chair noted that the next UC meeting will be held in conjunction with AusIMM 2016, with the capacity to meet out-of-session regarding action item 4 once discussions were finalised.

The meeting was closed at 12:30pm.

ACTIONS FROM MEETING

ACTION 1: Convene a Working Group to consider what options exist for the Uranium Council to pursue with respect to engaging in the next phase of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission. The Working Group will report back to all members with a proposal for consideration out of session.

Agenda Item 1: Administration

1.1 Welcome and Apologies

The Chair opened the 10th Uranium Council (UC) meeting at 2:00pm by welcoming attendees and those phoning in. The South Australia (SA) Department of State Development (DSD) was thanked for hosting the meeting. The Chair acknowledged the Kurna People as the Traditional Owners of the land on which the meeting was held.

1.2 Accept record of last meeting

The UC minutes from the previous meeting of 11 June 2015 in Adelaide were accepted without objection.

1.3 Action items from last meeting

The Chair noted action items arising from the previous meeting had progressed, with the UC successfully submitting its submission to the SA Royal Commission into the Nuclear Fuel Cycle and the delivery of a presentation at the 2015 COAG meeting. No further progress to report on the Aquatic Toxicology Project or the Working Groups.

Agenda Item 2: Items for Discussion/Decision

2.1 SA Royal Commission into the Nuclear Fuel Cycle

provided a comprehensive summary of the 12 recommendations in the Royal Commission's Final Report as they relate to each of the four themes. It was noted that significant findings existed across all categories. In response to the final report, the SA Premier established a taskforce to take forward the body of work required. A community engagement process will help inform the SA Government's response to the Final Report. The intention is to provide a response by the end of 2016.

The Chair opened up the floor for discussions around what the UC can do to feed into those recommendations, in particular, noting the storage and disposal concept being an interesting one to follow.

is supportive of the proposal as it provides economic development opportunities for the resources sector. also noted that it will be important for Commonwealth agencies to participate in the debate and for jurisdictions to progress the work through ongoing engagement. International partnerships with minerals exploration and resource value chains will be important to understand the nuclear fuel cycle through international benchmarks.

The Chair questioned what DSD thinks the UC can do in this space; where can the UC fit in? Discussions took place around what the UC was capable of providing in-line with its membership and the constraints that exist. In particular, regulatory reform and nuclear trigger actions were raised. noted that regulatory reform has been a long-term battle for the industry and other states across Australia can build on SA's example.

noted that industry has been raising these issues for a long time. From the MCA's perspective, a good streamlined process is needed that doesn't inhibit the uranium industry. SA is a leading example across Australia. agreed that obvious duplication of the approvals process needs to be resolved. added that current arrangements provide for two separate sets of environmental terms and conditions between the states and Commonwealth which is impacting operators.

The Chair concurred that streamlining issues have been ongoing for some time and the UC shouldn't pass on this opportunity to contribute, particularly given the UC's previous body of work. noted the importance of community education to any proposed reform in this area.

Members discussed the potential for a UC briefing for an incoming Minister covering the Commonwealth legislative implications should SA pursue expanded involvement in the nuclear fuel cycle (i.e. what changes would be required). It was noted by that, based on government membership within the UC, a national perspective would need to be put forward as opposed to a federal one.

The creation of a small, off-line group was suggested to consider what opportunities exist for the UC to pursue. The focus should remain within extraction and milling operations, in-line with the UC's purpose.

ACTION 1: Convene a Working Group to consider what options exist for the Uranium Council to pursue with respect to engaging in the next phase of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission. The Working Group will report back to all members with a proposal for consideration out of session.

2.2 National Energy Resources of Australia Presentation

provided a presentation (**Attachment A**) on NERA's body of work and the Oil, Gas and Energy Resources Growth Centre. provided an overview of her background within the nuclear energy space and the work she has been involved in with respect to social licence and regulatory reform. Key points during presentation included:

- NERA was announced in 2014 and tasked to commercialise research across the oil, gas and coal sectors: challenging sectors with decreasing commodity prices and productivity, high cost areas to do business which creates a decrease in social license to operate.
- NERA's approach is to conceptualise by identifying opportunities, collaborate through industry engagement, and commercialise designs and implement programs. Many small regulatory projects have commenced.
- To date, NERA's focus has been within the oil, gas and coal sectors. However, engagement with the uranium sector is ramping up, with the UC meeting being NERA's first direct interaction with the uranium industry. Regulatory reform issues raised by members in earlier discussions align with NERA's work program. NERA is equipped to assist in this space and there is potential for it to co-fund activities with industry.
- The current energy market and mix is disruptive. It is important to ensure the energy mix is sustainable going forward.
- Room for reform within the current regulatory regime. Australia is falling behind and rates poorly on overall competitiveness: great at research, but not great at articulating it through partnerships etc.
- Community engagement suggests a lack of transparency is a major area of concern. While public education is useful to breaking down barriers, it should not be the default action. More than just education is needed: transparency is key.

asked about NERA's funding arrangements. advised that NERA has four years' of base funding provided by the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science. After this time, NERA will be self-funded, leveraged by industry.

asked if NERA was working within the renewable energy space. advised that the renewable energy sector is out of scope as other avenues for renewables already exist. Engagement has occurred in this area, however a firm answer is not yet available.

Agenda Item 4: Items for Update

4.1 Government & Industry Update

noted that Japanese reactor restarts are the current price drivers. However, once inventory levels reduce, the long-term prospects are positive.

noted that it will be interesting to see how the pro-nuclear debate will develop in the US in the coming years, with pressure from low gas prices and no low-emissions credits.

South Australia

- Facilitating further work program approvals at Four Mile; progressing towards full production.
- Boss Resources is also progressing towards full production.

Western Australia

- Four major projects at various stages of development:
 - Wiluna
 - Yeelirrie
 - Mulga Rock
 - Kintyre
- For those projects awaiting approvals, recommendations by the Environmental Protection Authority are expected in the coming months and decisions by government expected by the end of the year.
- Three emerging projects:
 - Bennet Well
 - Manyingee
 - Oobagooma
- WA has agreed to consider permits for small-scale ISR exploration activities, to test feasibility.
- Uranium projects on track and assessments progressing. In parallel, anti-nuclear groups expected to increase their activities.
- The Supreme Court's decision to invalidate the EPA's approval to construct Roe 8 highway extension in 2015 has resulted in other approvals being treated with caution. The decision was based on legal rather than environmental grounds. While not uranium specific, legal perspective is now being closely considered in this context.

Northern Territory

- Minimal exploration activities occurring at present.
- South Alligator containment continues to perform well.
- Rum Jungle Phase 2 planning being finalised this month and additional funding received for further detailed design for Stage 3 of the rehabilitation project and maintenance works at Rum Jungle Creek South.
- NT state election planned for August 2016.
- ERA continues to process stockpiles and carry out progressive rehabilitation activities in consultation with regulatory partners.
- Ranger 3 Deeps Project will remain in care and maintenance, subject to any further board decisions.

New South Wales

- Uranium exploration has been allowed since 2012, however a ban on uranium mining remains in force for the state.
- Six Expressions of Interest (EoI) were approved to apply for an exploration license. Only one approved EoI was lodged, however it was later withdrawn.
- No current exploration license applications exist and there is no indication when there will be in the future.

Commonwealth

- Australia recently became the 14th member to join the Generation IV International Forum.
- Radioactive Waste activities:
 - Minister announced one site for community consultation.
 - No decision has been made yet. Consultations will continue.
 - \$2 million local community package announced to assist with activities that will increase the value of the region.
- SA Royal Commission:
 - Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet is driving Commonwealth engagement and will work side by side with SA to address the recommendations.

Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office

- Nuclear Cooperation Agreements signed for India and the United Arab Emirates in November 2015, and the Ukraine in March 2016. Joint Standing Committee on Treaties review has been suspended during the caretaker period.

Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency

- Several radiological documents consolidated into once comprehensive document.
- Code of practice review to align with IAEA to meet Australian requirements.
- Recent Mongolian delegation showed a lot of interest in the Radiation Dose Register.

During the updates, discussions around mine closure and an operator's ability to fully fund the cost of rehabilitation took place; one project can hurt the entire industry. Further discussion on what many of the closure requirements actually mean would be beneficial for industry and the broader community to inform a better understanding. Key concerns raised during the consultation process are predominantly related to how a site will be closed.

noted that WA has moved away from bonds and has instead implemented a mine rehabilitation fund for industry contribution. WA's view is that the bond system is not efficient and other jurisdictions should consider this approach also.

noted that NSW previously looked at a mine rehabilitation fund however, as activities are dominated by coal, the approach would not work.

Agenda Item 5: Other Business and Next Meeting

5.1 Future of the Uranium Council

It was agreed that [redacted] will be the new UC Chair. [redacted] will chair both the MCA Uranium Forum and the UC for the foreseeable future.

The Commonwealth, on behalf of all members, thanked [redacted] for his decade long and effective chairing of the UC, noting that the UC has achieved much in that period. Members wished [redacted] well in his new endeavours.

The next meeting will align with AusIMM if possible, however a firm date will be agreed at a later time.

The meeting was closed at 5:30pm.

In Attendance

Uranium Associates
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)
Geoscience Australia (GA)
Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office (ASNO)
NT Department of Mines and Energy (DME)
WA Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP)
SA Department of State Development (DSD)
National Energy Resources Australia (NERA)
Department of Industry, Innovation and Science (DIIS)
Mineral Council of Australia (MCA)
Toro Energy
Energy Resources of Australia
BHP Billiton
BHP Billiton
BHP Billiton
Heathgate Resources
Heathgate Resources
Cameco
Boss Resources

By Phone

NSW Department of Industry
Boss Resources

Secretariat

Department of Industry, Innovation and Science
Department of Industry, Innovation and Science