NATIONAL NATIVE TITLE TRIBUNAL

Daisy Lungunan, John Watson & Others on behalf of the Nyikina & Mangala Native Title Claimants/Western Australia/AFMECO Mining and Exploration Pty Ltd **[2011] NNTTA 137, (20 July 2011)**

Application No: WO10/305

IN THE MATTER of the *Native Title Act* 1993 (Cth)

- and -

IN THE MATTER of an inquiry into expedited procedure objection application

Daisy Lungunan, John Watson & Others on behalf of the Nyikina & Mangala Native Title Claimants – (WC99/25) (Applicant, native title party)

- and -

The State of Western Australia (Government party)

- and -

AFMECO Mining and Exploration Pty Ltd (grantee party)

DETERMINATION THAT THE ACT IS NOT AN ACT ATTRACTING THE EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Tribunal: Helen Shurven, Member
Place: Perth
Date: 20 July 2011

Catchwords: Native title – future act – proposed grant of exploration licence – expedited procedure objection application – whether act is likely to interfere directly with the carrying on of community or social activities – whether act is likely to interfere with sites of particular significance – whether act is likely to cause major disturbance to land or waters – expedited procedure not attracted.

Legislation: *Native Title Act* 1993 (Cth), ss 29, 31, 109, 146(3), 151(2), 237
Mining Act 1978 (WA), ss 24, 26, 29, 63
Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (WA) ss 5, 17, 18

Cases:

Les Tullock and Others on behalf of the Tarlpa Native Title Claimants/Western Australia/Bushwin Pty Ltd [2011] NNTTA 22

Little and Others v Oriole Resources Pty Ltd (2005) 146 FCR 576; (2005) 225 ALR 202; [2005] FCAFC 243; [2006] ALMD 2977

Maitland Parker and Others on behalf of Martu Idja Banyjima/Western Australia/Derek Noel Ammon [2006] NNTTA 65

Nicholas Cooke & Others on behalf of the Innawonga People/Western Australia/Dioro Exploration NL [2008] NNTTA 108

Parker on behalf of the Martu Idja Banyjima People v State of Western Australia [2007] FCA 1027

Parker v Western Australia and Others (2008) 167 FCR 340; (2008) 245 ALR 436; (2008) 101 ALD 28; [2008] FCAFC 23; [2008] ALMD 5175

Walley and Others v Western Australia and Another (2002) 169 FLR 437; [2002] NNTTA 24

Wilma Freddie and Others on behalf of the Wiluna Native Title Claimants/Western Australia/Asia Investment Corporation Pty Ltd [2004] NNTTA 30

Representatives of the native title party: Ms Ania Maszkowski, Kimberley Land Council

Representatives of the Government party: Mr Domnhall McCloskey, State Solicitor's Office
Mr Greg Abbot, Department of Mines and Petroleum

Representative of the grantee party: Mr Greg Abbott, M & M Walter Consulting Tenement & Native Title Management

REASONS FOR DETERMINATION

[1] On 4 November 2009, the Government party gave notice under s 29 of the *Native Title Act* 1993 (Cth) ('the Act') of its intention to grant exploration licence E04/1940 ('the proposed licence') to AFMECO Mining and Exploration Pty Ltd ('the grantee party') and included in the notice a statement that it considered the grant attracted the expedited procedure (that is, one which can be done without the normal negotiations required by s 31 of the Act).

[2] The proposed licence, E04/1940, comprises an area of 326.44 square kilometres, located 20 kilometres south-east of Derby, in the Shire of Derby-West Kimberley. It is 48.83 per cent within the registered native title claim of the Nyikina and Mangala People (WC99/25 – registered from 28 September 1999). No other native title claims overlap the proposed licence area.

[3] On 4 March 2010, Daisy Lungunan & Others on behalf of the Nyikina and Mangala Native Title Claimants (WC99/25) ('the native title party') lodged an expedited procedure objection application with the Tribunal (WO10/305).

[4] In accordance with standard practice, the Tribunal gave directions to parties to provide contentions and documents for an inquiry to determine whether or not the expedited procedure is attracted. These directions allow a period, after the Act's s 29 notification date for the lodgement of objections, for parties to discuss the possibility of reaching an agreement which could lead to disposal of the objection by consent. Following a number of requests to vary the compliance dates, final directions made by the Hon C J Sumner on 21 December 2010 included that the Tribunal be provided with documents and contentions: of the Government party on or before 7 February 2011; of the native title party on or before 14 February 2011; and of the grantee party on or before 21 February 2011.

[5] The Government party lodged its evidence and statement of contentions on 24 June 2010, with supporting documentation lodged by the Department of Mines and Petroleum on 16 June 2010.

[6] The native title party lodged a statement of contentions on 11 February 2011, together with a signed and sworn affidavit of Mr Harry Lennard, dated 1 February 2011.

[7] The grantee party lodged its contentions on 10 March 2011. I note the grantee party's contentions were lodged outside of the compliance date as set down by the Hon C J Sumner,

but I accept them as there does not appear to be any objection from other parties in relation to acceptance out of time, and the Tribunal is not bound by the rules of evidence (as per s109(3) of the Act).

[8] A listing hearing occurred on 24 February 2011 and following some communications between the Tribunal and all parties, by 29 March there was agreement that the matter could be determined 'on the papers' (that is without holding a hearing). I am satisfied that the objection can be adequately determined in this way (as per s 151(2) of the Act).

[9] On 26 May 2011, I was appointed by the Hon C J Sumner as the Member for the purpose of conducting the inquiry.

Legal principles

[10] Section 237 of the Act provides:

> **237 Act attracting the expedited procedure**
>
> A future act is an ***act attracting the expedited procedure*** if:
>
> (a) the act is not likely to interfere directly with the carrying on of the community or social activities of the persons who are the holders (disregarding any trust created under Division 6 of Part 2) of native title in relation to the land or waters concerned; and
>
> (b) the act is not likely to interfere with areas or sites of particular significance, in accordance with their traditions, to the persons who are the holders (disregarding any trust created under Division 6 of Part 2) of the native title in relation to the land or waters concerned; and
>
> (c) the act is not likely to involve major disturbance to any land or waters concerned or create rights whose exercise is likely to involve major disturbance to any land or waters concerned.

[11] In *Walley and Others v Western Australia and Another* (2002) 169 FLR 437; [2002] NNTTA 24 ('*Walley*'), Hon C J Sumner considered the applicable legal principles (at 439-449 [7]–[23]) and I adopt those findings for the purposes of this inquiry (s 146 of the Act).

[12] In relation to the nature of an exploration licence including conditions to be imposed, I adopt the Tribunal's findings in *Les Tullock and Others on behalf of the Tarlpa Native Title Claimants/Western Australia/Bushwin Pty Ltd* [2011] NNTTA 22 ('*Tarlpa'*) at [10]-[16].

[13] With respect to issues arising under s 237(b), I adopt the findings of the Tribunal in *Maitland Parker and Others on behalf of Martu Idja Banyjima/Western Australia/Derek Noel Ammon* [2006] NNTTA 65 ('*Maitland Parker*') at [31]–[38], [40]-[41]. In *Parker on behalf of the Martu Idja Banyjima People v State of Western Australia* [2007] FCA 1027, the

Federal Court (Siopis J) dismissed an appeal by the native title party from the Tribunal's decision in *Maitland Parker*. This decision was then appealed to the Full Federal Court and in separate judgments was dismissed on 7 March 2008 (*Parker v Western Australia and Others* (2008) 167 FCR 340; (2008) 245 ALR 436; (2008) 101 ALD 28; [2008] FCAFC 23; [2008] ALMD 5175).

[14] The task of the Tribunal in relation to s 237(c) is to undertake a predictive assessment as to the likelihood of major disturbance to land and waters or create rights which might entitle the grantee party to do so (see *Little Little and Others v Oriole Resources Pty Ltd* (2005) 146 FCR 576; (2005) 225 ALR 202; [2005] FCAFC 243; [2006] ALMD 2977 ('*Little*')). The correct approach to be taken to this limb of s 237 was outlined by the Full Court in *Little* at 588-589 where it held that the Tribunal was wrong to approach s 237(c) on the basis that major disturbance should be determined by reference to what could be done rather than what was likely to be done.

Evidence in Relation to the Proposed Act

[15] The Government party has provided the following documents: a statement of contentions; a tengraph plan with topographical detail, tenement boundaries, historical land tenure and Aboriginal communities within and in the vicinity of the proposed licence site; a report and plan from the Department of Indigenous Affairs ('DIA') Register; a copy of the tenement application; a copy of the proposed endorsements and conditions of grant; and a tengraph quick appraisal.

[16] Government party documentation establishes the significant underlying land tenure of the proposed licence to be as follows:

- An Exploration Permit Application (PA67- 5/07-8 EP) at 100 per cent;
- A Geothermal Discrete Area Release (PA67- G09-146) at 100 per cent;
- An Indigenous Owned Lease (MOWANJUM- 3114/1008) at 52 per cent;
- Historical Leases (396/414, 396/412 and 396/450) at 21.9 per cent, 27.2 per cent and 2.9 per cent respectively;
- A Lease (295/109) at 11.5 per cent;
- A File Notation Area (7712) at 21.4 per cent;

- Five other File Notation Areas (7017, 7550, 7841, 8670, 8845) at 1 per cent each or less;
- A Stopping Place for Travellers and Stock Water (CR1484) at 0.5 per cent;
- A Common (CR1326) at 5.4 per cent;
- A Radio Station Site (CR41473) at less than 0.1 per cent;
- A Stock Route (CR12474) at 0.5 per cent;
- A Sand Quarry (CR46060) at less than 0.1 per cent;
- A Commonage, Travellers and Stock (CR1325) at 0.4 per cent;
- Five parcels of Vacant Crown Land, at between 0.1 per cent and 7 per cent;
- Two General Leases and a Pastoral Lease (MEDA) at between 0.6 per cent and 3.9 per cent;
- Five parcels of Private Land, at between 0.1 per cent and 2.0 per cent;
- The Derby Townsite Boundary at 14.1 per cent; and
- 20 parcels of Road Reserve, all at less than 0.1 per cent each.

The documentation also indicates seven tenements in the proposed licence area granted between 1965 and 1979, and which were all dead between 1966 and 1980, with five cancelled, one forfeited and one surrendered. I appreciate that not all of the land affected is within the 48.83 per cent overlap between the proposed licence and the native title party claim area. Further information from DMP indicates that the previous exploration, mining and/or pastoral activities appear to have occurred predominantly outside of the proposed licence/claim area overlap, with some activity within the bottom south west portion of the proposed licence/claim area overlap.

[17] A Tribunal geospatial map prepared on 11 April 2011 indicates one Aboriginal community, Mowanjum, within the proposed licence, but this community is not within the 48.83 per cent portion of the native title party claim/proposed licence overlap. There are also four communities approximately ten kilometres away from the north western boundary of the claim/proposed licence overlap area (Djimung Nguda; Budulah; Burrinunga and Karmulinunga).

[18] Department of Indigenous Affairs ('DIA') documentation provided by the Government party reveals three registered sites within the proposed licence E04/1940: Kunumudj (Ceremonial and Mythological - Site ID 12393); Munkayarra Pool (Ceremonial - Site ID 14086); and Mowanjum Mission (Repository/cache, Artefacts/Scatter - Site ID 14617). The Tribunal's geospatial map also indicates a number of sites approximately two to fifteen kilometres outside of the proposed licence boundary (such as Site ID: 1019, 1020, 12390, 12391 12392, 12394, 14029, 14089 17269, 17270, and 17272).

[19] Tribunal mapping indicates that of these sites, Munkayarra Pool (ID 14086) is the only one within the 48.83 per cent overlap area between the claim and the proposed licence.

[20] A draft tenement endorsement and conditions extract included in the Government party's documentation indicates the grant of the proposed licence intends to be subject to the standard four conditions imposed on the grant of all exploration licences in Western Australia (see *Tarlpa* at [11]) and eight further conditions:

> '5 The licensee notifying the holder of any underlying pastoral or grazing lease by telephone or in person, or by registered post if contact cannot be made, prior to undertaking airborne geophysical surveys or any ground disturbing activities utilising equipment such as scrapers, graders, bulldozers, backhoes, drilling rigs; water carting equipment or other mechanised equipment.
>
> 6 The licensee or transferee, as the case may be, shall within thirty (30) days of receiving written notification of:-
>
> - the grant of the licence; or
> - registration of a transfer introducing a new licensee;
>
> advise, by registered post, the holder of any underlying pastoral or grazing lease details of the grant or transfer.
>
> 7 No excavation, excepting shafts, approaching closer to the Derby Highway, Highway verge or the road reserve than a distance equal to twice the depth of the excavation and mining on the Derby Highway or Highway verge being confined to below a depth of 30 metres from the natural surface.
>
> 8 The prior written consent of the Minister responsible for the Mining Act 1978 being obtained before commencing any exploration activities on Commonage and Travellers and Stock Reserve 1325, Stopping Place for Travellers and Stock Reserve 1484, Radio Station Site Reserve 41473, Sand Quarry Reserve 46060 and Derby Townsite.
>
> 9 No interference with the use of the Aerial Landing Ground and mining thereon being confined to below a depth of 15 metres from the natural surface.
>
> 10 No interference with the Geodetic Survey Stations DERBY 3, 55-67, 74-81, 78A, DBY 71 and 117-120 and mining within 15 metres thereof being confined to below a depth of 15 metres from the natural surface.
>
> 11 No interference with the transmission line or the installations in connection therewith, and the rights of ingress to and egress from the facility being at all times preserved to the owners thereof.

Consent to explore on Stock Route Reserve 12474 granted subject to:

12 No exploration activities being carried out on Stock Route Reserve 12474 which restrict the use of the reserve.'

The draft tenement endorsement and conditions extract also makes the following three endorsements (which differ from conditions in not making the licences liable to forfeiture of the proposed licence for their breach):

'1 The licensee's attention is drawn to the provisions of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 and any Regulations thereunder.

2 The licensee's attention is drawn to the Environmental Protection Act 1986 and the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004, which provides for the protection of all native vegetation from damage unless prior permission is obtained.

3 The land the subject of this licence may affect a heritage place located in the Derby Townsite, registered pursuant to the Heritage of WA Act 1990.

[21] Government contentions at (at para 5(d)) indicates that a further condition will be placed on the grant of the proposed licence:

'In respect of the area covered by the licence the Licensee, if so requested in writing by the Nyikina and Mangala People, the applicants in Federal Court application no. 6099 of 1998 (WC99/25), such request being sent by pre-paid post to reach the Licensee's address, M & M Walter consulting, PO Box 8197, Subiaco East WA 6008, not more than ninety days after the grant of this licence, shall within thirty days of the request execute in favour of the Nyikina and Mangala People such Regional Standard Heritage Agreement endorsed by peak industry groups as may be offered by the Kimberley Land Council.'

Evidence provided by the native title party

[22] The contentions of the native title party include the signed and sworn affidavit of Mr Harry Lennard. The affidavit of Mr Lennard is as follows:

'I, Harry Lennard of Karmulununga Community, Derby, in the State of Western Australia solemnly and sincerely declare and affirm THAT:

1. My name is Harry Lennard. I have three Aboriginal names, *Walawaregudung, Bundu Bundu* and *Nimarde*. I was born on 7 August 1951 at the old Native Hospital in Derby.

2. I have knowledge about the country where AFMECO Mining and Exploration Pty Ltd, the "**grantee party**", has applied for exploration licence number E04/1940, the "**exploration licence area**". I have been shown maps of the exploration licence area and I go to that area quite frequently. The map of the exploration licence area that I was shown is attached to this affidavit and marked "A".

3. I am a Warrwa man. John Watson, one of the senior people for the Nyikina and Mangala Native Title Determination Application (WAD 6099/98), has identified that I can speak for the exploration licence area. Warrwa people have a traditional connection to the exploration licence area.

INTERFERENCE WITH COMMUNITY OR SOCIAL LIFE

4. The exploration licence area is on both Nyikina Mangala and Warrwa country.

5. I visit the exploration licence area frequently, during the wet season and the winter. During the wet season we hunt for goanna, ducks, turkey and kangaroo. We still hunt in the winter time as well. I visit the exploration license [sic] area about once a fortnight.

6. I also visit the exploration licence area to go and see the old people. I go there with my kids on school holidays.

7. The country in and around the exploration licence area is spring and pindan country. That country is important to me and my family. We go camping and fishing there. We take our children and our grandchildren, like how the old people took us. Now we have vehicles so we can go further into the country than we used to go. We teach our children about country because we want to leave our children with something.

8. The old people had ownership of the land before native title. They are connected to it. They taught us where we can go and where we can't go and now we teach our children.

9. There are no Traditional Owners living on the exploration licence area any more. They were kicked off by the pastoral lessees but we go back to visit frequently.

10. There is a lot of native wildlife in and around the exploration licence area. There are goanna, turkey, emu, kangaroo and ducks. We also get boab nuts for carving from the exploration licence area, and bush fruits like koongkuberry and bush orange.

INTERFERENCE WITH SITES OF PARTICULAR SIGNIFICANCE

11. There are very significant places in the area of the exploration licence area.

12. There is a rock formation which runs from near Ashley Street to the cemetery. There is an old Dreaming story that runs through there.

13. There are also ceremonial grounds inside and around the exploration licence area; we still visit those areas today. For example, in the exploration licence area, near to Munkayarra Pool there are old law grounds. These law grounds were used by Traditional Owners before colonisation.

14. There are also ceremonial grounds called *Mardja*, which means shade. We need to protect these areas.

15. There are many secret spots in the exploration licence area. When we were kids we were not allowed to go to the secret spots. Even today I can't go there. It belongs to certain people; it is their property and their Dreaming. The old people said that something will happen if you go there.

16. The water areas inside and around the exploration licence area including the *Jumu* are very important to the Traditional Owners. We need to protect these areas. Water is very important to us.

17. That country in and around the exploration licence area is spring country and pindan country. That country is important to me and my family. We teach our children about country because we want to leave our children with something.

MAJOR DISTURBANCE TO LAND OR WATER

18. I am aware of the activities which the grantee party could perform under the terms of the exploration licence, if granted. They haven't spoken to people to do the exploration out there. They want to go out there without talking to us first. All mining companies have to come and talk to us first. They can't go destroying places.

19. In the old days, strangers asked permission before they went on country. Now people don't know the process. We need to pull people up sometimes. The native title process is a new ball game in a *guidya*, white man sense. The mining company should be familiar with this process and with cultural awareness.

20. Strangers who go on to the country and who don't ask permission are trespassing. They need to come and talk to us first.

21. If we don't know what they are doing on our country and digging holes and cutting lines it will be no good. There will be erosion and damage to the country. We want to look after country and for them to tell us what they are after.

> 22. There are many significant places on the exploration area and waterholes and animals which are important to us. We would like the mining companies to come and talk to us before they go there. There are many special places that you cannot touch. You can go there if you are a Traditional Owners [sic]. But strangers cannot go there without our permission.'

Mr Lennard's evidence has been presented by the native title representative body for the Nyikina and Mangala claim. Mr Lennard attests that one of the senior people for the Nyikina and Mangala native title determination application, Mr John Watson, has identified that he can speak for the exploration licence area, and while there is no evidence from Mr Watson, I accept that Mr Lennard has the necessary authority to speak for country on behalf of the native title party.

Community or social activities (s 237(a))

[23] In relation to determining s 237(a), I adopt the following findings from *Tarlpa*:

- History and interpretation of s 237(a) as amended (at [57]-[64]).
- The Tribunal's approach to the interpretation of s 237(a) as amended (at [75]). The Hon C J Sumner has made it clear (at [66]) that 'the law as applied by the Tribunal since the 1998 amendments does now require there to be evidence of direct interference with the community or social activities of the native title party which are of a physical and not purely spiritual nature for the expedited procedure not to be attracted'.
- The definitions of 'interfere directly' and 'carrying on' as applied to s 237(a) (at [105]-[109]).
- Must the community or social activities take place on the proposed licence area? (at [85]-[86]).

The Government party relies on relevant aspects of its regulatory regime under the *Mining Act* 1978 (WA), including ss 24, 26, 29 and 63, as well as ss 5, 17 and 18 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act* 1972 (WA) ('AHA'), to contend, among other things, that there is not likely to be direct interference with the carrying on of community or social activities by the native title parties regarding the area of land concerned.

[24] In relation to community and social activities at the proposed licence area, Mr Lennard states that he lives at the Karmulununga [sic] Community (which is approximately 10 kilometres north west of the proposed licence/claim area overlap), and he states that he

visits the proposed licence area frequently, 'about once a fortnight' (at 5). He states that traditional owners visit frequently (at 9), and engage in activities including:

- hunting (for goanna, ducks, turkey, kangaroo) of which there is 'a lot ... in and around the exploration licence area'(at 5, 10);
- camping (at 7);
- fishing (at 7);
- taking children and grandchildren to the area for teaching purposes (at 6-8, 17);
- taking boab nuts for carving (at 10);
- taking bush fruits (such as koongkuberry and bush orange) (at 10); and
- protecting ceremonial grounds and water areas (at 13-14, 16, 22).

[25] In *Wilma Freddie and Others on behalf of the Wiluna Native Title Claimants/Western Australia/Asia Investment Corporation Pty Ltd* [2004] NNTTA 30 ('*Wilma Freddie*'), affidavit evidence on behalf of a native title party indicated access to a proposed tenement was regular, but the evidence provided only general information on the present activities of the claim group. The Tribunal found (at [11] and [13]) the requisite level of interference with social and community activities was unlikely in that matter as there was little specific evidence of the activities carried out over the area. In the current matter, Mr Lennard's evidence is specific in that himself and traditional owners access the area frequently, he and his family attends fortnightly, and he lives in a community very near the proposed licence/claim overlap area. He has also outlined, in some specificity, the types of social and community activities that are undertaken, and that they involve a number of generations, including children and grandchildren.

[26] The size of the proposed licence is 326.44 square kilometres and the area of the Nyikina and Mangala claim is approximately 27252.72 square kilometres. The size of the overlap between the claim and the proposed licence is 48.83 per cent of the proposed licence area. Consistent with previous Tribunal decisions such as *Nicholas Cooke & Others on behalf of the Innawonga People/Western Australia/Dioro Exploration NL* [2008] NNTTA 108, I find that the size of the proposed licence area in the context of the much larger native title claim, particularly as the overlap to the claim is 48.83 per cent, makes it less likely that

the proposed exploration activity will interfere with the native title party's community or social activities.

[27] Grantee Party contentions indicate that they do not intend to exclude any community activities on the proposed licence area 'unless during a particular activity it is considered temporarily unsafe for the conduct of community activities', and if it should be unsafe they 'will consult with the Community to relieve apprehensions' (at 1). The Grantee Party indicates a willingness to enter into an Alternative Heritage Agreement (at 4, 6). They also contend there has been 'extensive previous mining activity' over the proposed licence area (at 5) but have not provided any detail or annexures in support of this. They have included a proposed work program and a proposal for rehabilitation (at 3.3).

[28] Hon C J Sumner in *Tarlpa* (at [121]) makes the point that 'The Tribunal has determined that the existence of mining or pastoral activities that did, or currently do, affect the native title holders' community or social activities may be taken into account when assessing whether the grant of an exploration licence is not likely to directly affect those activities for the purposes of s 237(a) (*Walley* at [12]).' In the present matter, previous exploration or mining activities appear to be limited to the south west portion of the overlap between the proposed licence and the claim area, or, in any event, have been limited in their nature and extent.

[29] I appreciate that the grantee party does not intend to interfere with the social and community activities of the native title party. Taking all of the evidence into account, and in particular, given that Mr Lennard has provided his evidence in the form of a sworn affidavit, that he lives close to the proposed licence, that he has provided some specificity of who attends at the licence area and the activities which are conducted there, and that limited previous mining or exploration activity appears to have taken place in the overlap between the proposed licence and the claim area, I am of the opinion that this is a case where the normal negotiations mandated by the Act should take place to avoid the likelihood of interference with social and community activities of the native title party. On that basis, I find that there is a real chance or risk that exploration activity is likely to directly interfere with the community or social activities of the native title party in a substantial or more than trivial way.

Sites of particular significance (s 237(b))

[30] As the evidence in relation to s 237(a) of the Act supports a determination that the expedited procedure is not attracted in relation to E04/1940, it is not necessary to consider whether interference with areas or sites of particular significance to the native title party is likely to occur.

Major disturbance to land and waters (s 237(c))

[31] As the evidence in relation to s 237(a) of the Act supports a determination that the expedited procedure is not attracted in relation to E04/1940, it is not necessary to consider whether major disturbance to land and waters is likely to occur.

Determination

[32] The determination of the Tribunal is that the grant of exploration licence E04/1940 to AFMECO Mining and Exploration Pty Ltd is not an act attracting the expedited procedure.

Helen Shurven
Member
20 July 2011