Environmental
Defenders Office

Submission to the inquiry into the *Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Amendment (Climate Trigger) Bill 2020*

21 May 2020

About EDO

EDO is a community legal centre specialising in public interest environmental law. We help people who want to protect the environment through law. Our reputation is built on:

Successful environmental outcomes using the law. With over 30 years' experience in environmental law, EDO has a proven track record in achieving positive environmental outcomes for the community.

Broad environmental expertise. EDO is the acknowledged expert when it comes to the law and how it applies to the environment. We help the community to solve environmental issues by providing legal and scientific advice, community legal education and proposals for better laws.

Independent and accessible services. As a non-government and not-for-profit legal centre, our services are provided without fear or favour. Anyone can contact us to get free initial legal advice about an environmental problem, with many of our services targeted at rural and regional communities.

Environmental Defenders Office is a legal centre dedicated to protecting the environment.

www.edo.org.au

Submitted to:

Committee Secretary
Senate Standing Committees on Environment and Communications
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Phone: +61 2 6277 3526
Fax: +61 2 6277 5818
ec.sen@aph.gov.au

For further information on this submission, please contact:

Rachel Walmsley
Director Policy and Law Reform (Sydney)
T: (02) 9262 6989
E: rachel.walmsley@edo.org.au

Environmental Defenders Office Ltd (**EDO**) has extensive experience across Australia in providing legal advice on how the *Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (**EPBC Act**) currently works and on how it could be reformed to more effectively clarify national leadership, strengthen and coordinate processes, and deliver environmental outcomes. We welcome the opportunity to provide input to this inquiry examining the issue of a climate trigger.

EDO has recently submitted a detailed submission to the statutory review of the EPBC Act.[1] That submission highlights that the EPBC Act is now 20 years old and is in need of extensive reform. It is complex, inefficient, and most importantly, it is not meeting its aim of protecting the environment and conserving biodiversity. It fails to address some of the most significant environmental challenges facing Australia, including climate change, land clearing and cumulative impacts. Its implementation has been undermined by resourcing issues. EDO recommends a new, clear national Environment Act be drafted to effectively address the major environmental challenges we face, and to reverse the declining environmental trends. **A key failure of the existing EPBC Act is the failure to effectively address climate change.**

Relevant analysis and recommendations in relation to effectively address climate change and the role of a climate trigger in national environment laws are included in this submission.

This inquiry, and the broader statutory review of the EPBC Act, provide an opportunity to re-write the law to better recognise our interdependence with the environment and the pathways necessary to ensure we deliver a healthy, thriving and resilient environment for future generations, by effectively addressing climate change.

This submission sets out:

- **The case for stronger climate change laws**
- **EDO recommendations for a greenhouse gas emissions trigger**
- **Specific comment on the provisions of the proposed Bill**
- **EDO recommendations for broader climate law reform.**

We would be happy to provide the committee with further detail on our recommendations for climate reform.

1. The case for stronger climate change law

Australia's climate has warmed by just over one degree Celsius (°C) since 1910 and average temperatures are projected to rise further.[2] Impacts that are the result of a changing climate are already occurring in Australia, including the warming and acidification of oceans, sea level rise, changes in rainfall patterns, and an increase in extreme weather events including fires, flooding and drought. And the impacts of climate change are not just environmental; there are significant implications across all sectors, including health, the economy and national security.[3]

In light of the unequivocal scientific evidence of the impacts of anthropogenic climate change, the international community agreed in late 2015 to keep the increase in global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels; and to pursue efforts to limit the increase to 1.5°C.

---

[1] Our full submission is available at: https://www.edo.org.au/publication/submission-10-year-review-epbc-act/

[2] See Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), *Climate change in Australia - Projections for Australia's NRM regions*, https://www.climatechangeinaustralia.gov.au/en/climate-projections/future-climate/regional-climate-change-explorer/clusters/

[3] The impacts of a warming climate on Australia are set out in more details in Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO, *State of the Climate 2018* (2018), www.bom.gov.au/state-of-the-climate.

Yet despite Australia's commitments on the international stage (that have attracted strong criticism as being inadequate[4]), and the fact that everyday Australian's are already suffering the impacts of climate change, Australia's national laws are woefully inadequate in requiring action to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the impacts of climate change.

Our national environmental laws do not explicitly require decision-makers to consider climate change impacts in environmental decision-making. At present, under the EPBC Act, assessment and conditions related to climate change can only be incidental to protecting listed matters of national environmental significance, such as threatened species or world heritage areas. The Environment Minister cannot definitively review or reject a proposal on the grounds that its greenhouse gas emissions are excessive or an unacceptable risk to the environment or the community.

There is no overarching national legal framework, such as a national Climate Change Act, that would ensure a whole-of-government approach for tackling climate change in Australia.

This inquiry into a climate trigger, and the broader statutory review of the EPBC Act currently underway, provide an opportunity to not only embed climate change considerations in our national environmental laws as recommended in this submission, but to recognise and recommend that for Australia to effectively mitigate and adapt to climate change an overarching whole-of-government approach is needed, including a new Climate Change Act.

---

2. EDO recommendations for a greenhouse gas emissions trigger

It is unacceptable that our national environment law does not effectively address the major threat to biodiversity that is climate change. There is ample evidence of the failures of the EPBC Act to do this, justifying the need for significant reforms.

The Bramble Cay melomys is the first Australian mammal to disappear as a direct result of climate change. Nominated as an endangered species by the Humane Society International (Australia) in 2006, its island home was increasingly inundated by sea level rise. A delayed response from state and federal agencies turned a species emergency into an extinction tragedy.[5] The bleaching of the Great Barrier Reef, a matter of national environmental significance in its own right and as a World Heritage area, is another key example of climate change repercussions having significant degrading impacts on our nationally important environmental values. There are many such examples from around Australia including the loss of Tasmania's giant east coast kelp forests, and the 2019 fires caused by unprecedented lightning strikes in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area which destroyed Gondwanan landscapes - both events linked to climate change.

Human-induced climate change has been listed as a key threatening process to biodiversity for nearly two decades. Yet the extinction of the melomys and the increasingly serious degradation of the Reef are both harbingers of biodiversity loss that Australia will increasingly face if our regulatory systems fail to respond more effectively to climate change.

Ideally, Australia would introduce legislation to place a price on greenhouse gas emissions and legislate targets for emissions reductions across all sectors and relevant decision-

---

[4] See for example, Climate Transparency, *Brown to Green Report 2019,* available at https://www.climate-transparency.org/g20-climate-performance/g20report2019

[5] Woinarski et al. 'The contribution of policy, law, management, research and advocacy failings to the recent extinctions of 3 Australian vertebrate species' (2016) *Conservation Biology*.

making frameworks, in a centralised legal framework. (The need for stand-alone climate legislation is noted below in part four of this submission). In the absence of specific climate legislation, national environmental legislation must address and properly regulate the impacts of climate change on biodiversity. This means systematically embedding greenhouse gas emission reduction and adaptation in environmental law, policy and decision-making frameworks.

The Climate Council states:

> *The inevitable conclusion from the commitment by the world's governments to protect humanity from climate change is that the vast bulk of fossil fuel reserves cannot be burned. To have just a 50:50 chance of preventing a 2°C rise in global temperature: 88% of global coal reserves, 52% of gas reserves and 35% of oil reserves are unburnable and must be left in the ground. Put simply, tackling climate change requires that most of the world's fossil fuels be left in the ground, unburned.*
> *…*
> *What does this mean for Australia? If all of Australia's coal resources were burned, it would consume two-thirds of the global carbon budget based on a 75% chance of meeting the 2°C warming limit. For Australia to play its role in preventing a 2°C rise in temperature requires over 90% of Australia's coal reserves to be left in the ground, unburned. Similarly, the development of new coal mines, particularly the Galilee Basin, is incompatible with tackling climate change. Instead, if developed, they could well become stranded assets in a world that is rapidly cutting carbon emissions.*[6]

At present, EPBC Act assessment and conditions related to climate change can only be incidental to protecting listed matters of national environmental significance, such as threatened species or World Heritage areas. The Environment Minister cannot definitively review or reject a proposal on the grounds that its greenhouse gas emissions are excessive or an unacceptable risk to the environment or the community.

Most sources of Australia's emissions require some form of development approval at the state or territory level (for example, land-clearing, mining, new power stations and major transport infrastructure). Yet state planning laws do not require decision-makers to meaningfully take into account a project's impacts on climate change.[7] States do not generally impose conditions to minimise climate impacts, plan for adaptation or set cumulative carbon budgets.[8] Climate change readiness, like biodiversity protection, needs national leadership.

Australia needs to urgently ramp up its efforts to meet the Paris Agreement with an economy-wide legal framework and carbon budget[9] that is consistent with limiting warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius (°C).

While this could be dealt with via standalone legislation, a new trigger (inserted into a new national Environment Act or the EPBC Act) would link Australia's carbon accounting and emissions reduction targets with impact assessment and development conditions.

---

[6] See: http://www.climatecouncil.org.au/uploads/a904b54ce67740c4b4ee2753134154b0.pdf piii-iv.
[7] See NSW *Planning for Climate Change* Report available at: https://www.edo.org.au/publication/climate-ready-planning-laws/
[8] Many states have recently set emissions reduction targets. Some have been legislated, and this is to be commended. However, state laws do not set systematic carbon budgets, nor do they cap or forecast cumulative emissions from developments they approve.
[9] For example, the Climate Change Authority (2012) recommended that Australia adopt a national emissions budget of 10.1 billion tonnes CO_2-e for the period 2013 to 2050.

A national trigger to oversee high greenhouse gas emitting projects has long been a major gap in the national environmental law. Previous ministers and several reviews have considered or recommended a greenhouse trigger under the EPBC Act.[10] However, uncertainty and polarisation of climate and energy policy remains problematic. It would also need to interact with any sector-specific laws and emissions reduction policies.[11]

EDO recommends that a trigger could have two limbs:

- At a **strategic level**, the EPBC Act would require decision-makers to consider climate change mitigation and adaptation opportunities in strategic assessments and bioregional planning processes.
- At the **project level**, a national Environmental Protection Authority (**EPA**)[12] would assess projects with major greenhouse footprints, reject unacceptable climate impacts, and apply conditions and limits on other assessable projects.

Clearly inappropriate activities which pose significant greenhouse gas emissions, including downstream 'scope 3' emissions resulting from the activity, should be prevented from being approved or applied for under the EPBC Act. The mechanisms currently used in the EPBC Act to prevent approval of nuclear installations and designated commercial fishing activities provide helpful examples of how clearly inappropriate greenhouse gas emitting activities could be prohibited under the EPBC Act.[13] These activities could include, for example, fossil fuelled power stations, thermal coal mines and gas extraction activities above a specified threshold.

Overall, in the absence of standalone Commonwealth climate legislation, a greenhouse trigger in environmental legislation would give the relevant decision-maker (for example, a new national EPA as recommended in our EPBC Act Review submission) strategic oversight of high-emissions proposals that are not sufficiently regulated by existing laws; and would ensure strategic plans under the EPBC Act are climate-ready.

We recommend:

- Add a greenhouse gas emission trigger that recognises **any development that produces over 100,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2-e) per year** (including downstream emissions) as a matter of national environmental significance.
- This should be supplemented by provision for all projects on a **designated development list** (including expansion of existing projects and significant land use change, including significant land clearing (if no separate land clearing trigger - see below) and motorway projects etc) to trigger the assessment provisions. This would ensure the trigger was more comprehensive in capturing diffuse emissions. A quantitative trigger is easier to apply and administer but might miss smaller but still significant projects, hence the need for a schedule list.
- For clarity, high emission projects should be prohibited or unable to be approved where they are in exceedance of Australia's carbon budget.

---

[10] When Environment Minister Robert Hill introduced the EPBC Bill in 1998, he noted his government's commitment to negotiate a greenhouse trigger once the Act was passed: Senate Hansard, *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Bill 1998* [1999], Second Reading Speech, 22 June 1999, at 5990. The Hawke Review proposed an interim greenhouse trigger until an economy-wide carbon price was in place, and a requirement for strategic-level mitigation (recommendation 10).

[11] For example, electricity, mining, forestry, the land sector and native vegetation clearing, livestock agriculture, vehicle emissions, major transport infrastructure, building efficiency and waste.

[12] A national EPA has been recommended in previous EDO law reform submissions and discussion papers.

[13] This power has been used in the EPBC Act for inappropriate commercial fishing activities (Ch5B) and certain nuclear installations (s140A).

- Best practice climate environmental impact assessment (**EIA**) must include mandatory consideration of scope 3 emissions in applying the trigger.
- We are also recommend a **call in power** – this could potentially capture projects that may have a significant climate impact that aren't necessarily covered by the threshold or the designated development schedule.

We also suggest that land clearing activities, which make a significant contribution to Australia's greenhouse gas emissions, should be regulated for both their climate and biodiversity impacts, and this could be done by a separate, complimentary land clearing trigger. Our recommendations for a separate land clearing trigger are discussed in more detail below in part three of this submission, below.

In addition to a specific trigger, climate considerations need to be embedded in relevant plan-making processes and standard setting mechanisms under the EPBC Act, including:

- Bioregional plans – to assist adaptation planning including for developments in hazard zones (bushfire/floods), wildlife corridors and climate refugia. (This should be coordinated with states and territories);
- Strategic assessments - mandated consideration of both emissions reduction and adaptation planning;
- Recovery plans – as highlighted by the recent bushfires recovery actions may need to be reviewed and strengthened to recover species and build ecosystem resilience;
- Emergency listing provisions of species and ecological communities most at risk;
- Standard setting for air pollutants;
- In all relevant decisions to ensure the objects of the EPBC Act are operationalised; and
- National plans, standards and goals – this can and should be linked to setting carbon budgets.[14]

As stated in our submission to the EPBC Act review, ideally, we need a national Climate Change Act to ensure a whole-of-government response to climate change, but inserting climate change provisions and a trigger into the EPBC Act is an essential reform in the short term.

3. Specific comment on the provisions of the proposed Bill

In the context of the EDO recommendations for a greenhouse gas trigger we provide the following comments on the provisions of the proposed Bill.

The proposed Bill specifically amends the EPBC Act to introduce penalties for an individual or body corporate undertaking actions which involve mining operations, drilling exploration, land clearing or is specified in the regulations (emissions-intensive actions) if the action has, will have or is likely to have a significant impact on the environment. While EDO supports the intent of the Bill, we provide further comment in relation to the:

- **trigger threshold,**
- **scope,**
- **penalties, and**
- **additional requirements.**

[14] We note this could be done in stand-alone climate legislation as recently proposed by Hon Zali Steggall MP see: https://www.zalisteggall.com.au/climate_change_national_framework_for_adaptation_and_mitigation_bill_2020

Trigger threshold

We note that the definition of emissions intensive activities in the Bill does not set a threshold on levels of emissions from a project that would equate to a likely significant impact. As noted in our analysis above, many recommendations have been made for setting a threshold to capture the most significant project emitters, for example, any development that produces over 100,000 tonnes of CO2-e per year.

It would be impractical for all projects to be captured by the new trigger, so it is appropriate that thresholds be set and very clear guidelines be developed to define what a significant impact is.

As noted, while there is strong support for a trigger, opinion on what level to set a threshold has differed and we understand there is concern that setting an emissions threshold might exclude certain significant projects. It would be preferable to address the risk of certain projects avoiding assessment (ie, those just under the threshold) by enabling those projects that meet additional criteria to be captured by a call-in power or an addition schedule of designated development that identifies specific activities by type.

Scope

The Bill defines an action as emissions intensive if it:

- involves mining operations, or
- involves drilling explorations, or
- involves land clearing, or
- is specified in regulations.

This definition is very broad and would need to be clarified, including consideration of triggers discussed elsewhere in this submission. It is also unclear for example what individual activities would constitute a mining operation, and whether mining operations are intended to include gas extraction operations. Similarly, it is unclear whether drilling explorations are intended to be limited to those drilling activities targeting specific outcomes, such as exploration for fossil fuels.[15]

There are a number of high emissions activities that may be, but on the current wording, will not necessarily be, captured by regulation. This submission previously discussed the importance of considering the cumulative impact of projects such as motorways. Given the contribution that energy production makes to Australia’s greenhouse gas emissions, activities involving power generation would also be appropriately captured by the Bill. There would need to be clear and specific thresholds and guidance provided on when and how additional actions added by regulation would be assessed under the trigger.

Land clearing

We note the proposed Bill includes **land clearing** in the definition of emissions intensive actions. We certainly agree that land clearing makes a significant contribution to Australia’s greenhouse gas emissions and should be regulated accordingly. We therefore agree it is a relevant activity. However, it could also be addressed in a separate trigger that more specifically recognised the conservation value as well as the carbon storage value of vegetation.

---

[15] We note that ‘mining operations’ is defined broadly in section 355(2) of the EPBC Act.

In our submission to the EPBC Act review, EDO recommended a stand-alone new trigger be legislated for ***Significant land clearing***.

As consistently noted by EDO, the EPBC Act is currently ineffective at addressing the most significant threats to biodiversity including habitat loss through vegetation clearing, along with the release of significant carbon emissions. Accordingly, EDO recommends that the EPBC Act should adopt a trigger to regulate significant clearing of native vegetation (**land clearing trigger**). Land clearing that meets certain thresholds should be a controlled action that requires federal assessment and approval. Sensitive areas such as High Conservation Value (**HCV**) vegetation should be off-limits to clearing other than for clearly identified conservation and emergency management purposes.

There is currently no specific trigger in the EPBC Act to regulate the serious impacts of land clearing and degradation, including deforestation. Land clearing can only be referred to the Commonwealth if the clearing action is likely to have a significant impact on a listed matter of national environmental significance - for example, an internationally protected wetland, or mapped habitat of nationally threatened species. The carbon emissions of land clearing are not currently grounds for referral.

Land clearing is mainly regulated by the states and territories, with limited effectiveness or strategic oversight. High levels of clearing are still lawful or unregulated, and illegal clearing continues with limited resourcing for enforcement at state or federal level. In recent years state laws have been weakened, putting national biodiversity, water and soil health at risk, and making it more expensive and difficult to achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets. The following case study evidences problems with Northern Territory native vegetation laws, including the sheer scale of clearing permitted at the state and territory level.

Case study: Land clearing at Maryfield Station, Northern Territory

In a landmark ruling, the Northern Territory Supreme Court revoked a permit to clear more than 20,000 hectares of native vegetation at Maryfield Station, southeast of Katherine, NT. North Star Pastoral had been granted a permit to clear 20,431 hectares in 2017 for planting pasture and grazing stock. This was the single largest land clearing permit ever to be issued in the Northern Territory, and was granted without the proponent being required to undertake an environmental impact assessment under the NT's environmental laws. The estimated greenhouse gas emissions from this permit would have been 2-3 million tonnes, about 18.5% of the Northern Territory's entire annual emissions.

In a legal first in the NT, the Environment Centre Northern Territory (ECNT), represented by the EDO, challenged the permit to allow the clearing, including on climate change grounds, and was successful in having the permit declared invalid.

The proponent has subsequently applied for, and received approval to clear 5,000 ha at Maryfield Station (again, without any proper environmental impact assessment), and the NT's legislation contains no mechanism to prevent the 'stacking' of further land clearing permits nor to properly consider the cumulative impacts of land clearing.

It is extraordinary that clearing of this scale was not referred to the Commonwealth and did not trigger the EPBC Act.

A comprehensive federal land clearing trigger would ensure that Commonwealth efforts to preserve national biodiversity, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and achieve landscape-scale conservation are not undermined by a constantly changing patchwork of state land clearing laws and policies.

A new land clearing trigger should include three elements, based on *scale*, *sensitivity* or *high conservation value*. Any of these would constitute significant land-clearing that requires Commonwealth assessment, approval to proceed, or outright prohibition:

- ***Scale:*** proposals to clear 100 hectares or more of native vegetation in any *two year period* (designed to record and regulate cumulative impacts);
- ***Sensitivity***: a schedule of *regulated* activities, regardless of the scale of clearing proposed (e.g. low-level clearing in over-cleared catchments); and
- ***Protected area prohibitions:*** a scheduled list of *prohibited* activities[16] in nationally protected areas (for example – clearing, modification or degradation of native vegetation that is known or critical habitat for endangered species or ecological communities; High Conservation Value vegetation, Key Biodiversity Areas and other Ecosystems of National Importance; national heritage places and Ramsar wetlands).[17]

Land clearing with significant implications on the climate would be captured under the 'scale' trigger.

Under such a trigger it would be an offence to undertake significant land-clearing without Commonwealth approval, and an aggravated offence to undertake prohibited clearing. Applications would be assessed against scientific guidelines, requirements in bioregional plans, recovery plans and other relevant strategies, taking account of local data and any assessments and approvals conducted at state or territory level.

EDO has developed a draft of how a native vegetation clearing trigger could be inserted in the current framework, and would be happy to provide further detail to the Committee.

Penalties

The Bill proposes both civil penalties (5000 penalty units for an individual and 50,000 penalty units for a corporations) and criminal penalties (7 years imprisonment or 420 penalty units or both) for taking an action that will or is likely to significantly impact the environment without an appropriate approval or exemption under the Act. These penalties appear to be consistent with the rest of the EPBC Act.

In both situations, the onus is on the defendant to prove a valid approval or exemption for the activity. EDO supports this proposal.

Additional requirements

We note that the Bill as drafted does not embed climate change considerations into relevant plan-making processes and standard setting mechanisms under the Act, which is the second arm of our recommended climate trigger (discussed above). We recommend that clauses could be added to the Bill to require this.

[16] Limited exemptions would allow for environmental conservation and emergency management works.
[17] This would be consistent with any red lights or prohibitions identified in the proposed Ecosystems of National Importance trigger, as recommended by EDO in our submission to the 10 year statutory review of the EPBC Act.

4. EDO recommendations for broader climate law reform

Given the significant limitations of the current EPBC Act to effectively address key threats, while adding a climate trigger would be a definite improvement, there is still an urgent need for broader climate law reform in Australia. Current Australian laws are inadequate in meeting our responsibility in curbing dangerous climate change and to provide for necessary adaptation measures.

Urgent, whole-of-government law reform is needed, including a new national Climate Change Act, and embedding requirements to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to climate change impacts across all portfolios of Government, including Commonwealth environmental laws.

In addition to the climate related recommendations for a new or amended Environment Act outlined above, EDO recommends that the development of a new national Climate Change Act.

Australia should implement a whole-of-government approach to climate change by enacting a new national Climate Change Act that addresses both climate change mitigation and adaptation in a clear and coordinated way.[18] A new national Climate Change Act would include the elements set out below.

Objects: set a clear overarching objective to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and make decisions consistent with limiting the increase in global warming to no more than 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. The objects should also refer to planning for a rapid and just transition away from fossil fuel production.

Targets: set legislative short-term and long-term emissions reduction target, with mechanisms to require review and non-regressive improvements to targets against best available science.[19]

Independent expert advice: formalise a skills-based independent statutory *Climate Change Advisory Council* to advise the Government and the Parliament on the best available science for climate mitigation, and assess and report on progress in relation to meeting targets and implementing adaptation plans, and require decision makers to not act inconsistently with this advice.

Duties: create an enforceable duty on Ministers and relevant decision-makers to make decisions consistent with relevant climate change legislative objects and targets when exercising prescribed functions under Commonwealth legislation.

Risk assessment: adopt a process for a national climate risk assessment, and require specific policies and initiatives for sectors identified as high risk from climate change impacts (e.g. housing, infrastructure, agriculture, energy, insurance).

Adaptation Plans: require a national Adaptation Plan to be made, published, and periodically reviewed by the Climate Change Advisory Council; sectoral and regional adaptation plans could also be made consistent with the national adaptation plan.

---

[18] The recently proposed by private members Bill (*Climate Change (National Framework for Adaptation and Mitigation) Bill 2020*) by the Hon. Zali Steggall MP, provides an example of a possible national Climate Change Act see: https://www.zalisteggall.com.au/climate_change_bill_2020_business_overview

[19] Alternatively, impose duties on Government Ministers to set periodic and long-term emissions reduction targets and carbon budgets, based on expert advice consistent with internationally agreed climate goals, best available science, and the principles of ecologically sustainable development. It is noted that the Commonwealth has already set legislated renewable energy targets, see section 40 of the *Renewable Energy (Electricity) Act 2000.*

***Monitoring progress*:** Develop national indicators, including for emissions reduction in line with set targets, adaptation planning and climate-readiness of legislation; and annually report against those indicators.

***Governance*:** Allocate Ministerial responsibility specifically for climate change[20], and stand-alone government Climate Change division that administers an overarching Climate Change Act (assisted by advice from the Climate Change Advisory Council) and supports interagency collaboration on emissions reduction and adaptation.

The EDO would be happy to provide the Committee with further detail on these recommendations. Please contact rachel.walmsley@edo.org.au.

---

[20] We would recommend that Ministerial responsibility should encompass emissions reduction and climate adaptation and be responsible for coordinating a whole-of-Government response to climate change and administration of a new Climate Change Act.