

Minutes

Mining and Petroleum Competence Board

Details

Location: Room D
Ground Floor
3 Spring Street Sydney

Date/time: 23 May 2023
8.30 am

Chairperson: Joanne Muller, AM (Independent)

People present

1. **Chairperson:** Joanne Muller, AM (Independent)
2. **Member:** Ashley McLeod (NSW Minerals Council)
3. **Member:** Garvin Burns (Resources Regulator, Department of Regional NSW)
4. **Member:** Kylie Fahey (Independent)
5. **Member:** Stephen Barrett (Mining and Energy Union NSW)
6. **Delegate:** Lewis Stoll – delegate of Angela Hudson (Mining, Exploration and Geoscience, Department of Regional NSW)

Secretariat

1. Amanda Quin, Policy Officer (Mining, Exploration and Geoscience, Department of Regional NSW)

Observers

1. Anthony Margetts (Resources Regulator, Department of Regional NSW)
2. Andrew Palmer (Resources Regulator, Department of Regional NSW)
3. Dr Bruce Mowbray (DenStat Solutions - left after Paper 5)
4. Ron Cowdrey (Australian Workers Union)
5. Kurt Bridges (Cement Concrete & Aggregates Australia)
6. Craig Reed (NSW Minerals Council)

Apologies

1. **Member:** Angela Hudson (Mining, Exploration and Geoscience, Department of Regional NSW)
2. **Member:** Stephen Tranter (Mining and Energy Union NSW)

This Meeting:

| No. | Issue |
|-----|-------|
|-----|-------|

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country |
|---|---|

- The Chair opened the meeting at 8:30am.
- The Chair welcomed members and observers to the meeting and noted that Ms Angela Hudson had been appointed as a member since the last meeting and that Dr Peter Standish had ceased being a member.
- Mr McLeod advised that the NSW Minerals Council is in the process of determining a replacement nominee, given his term of appointment expires on 5 August 2023.

Outcomes

Members noted the following:

- Membership changes to the Board.

- Apologies, delegates and observers for this meeting.
- Mr McLeod’s upcoming appointment expiry.

Actions

- A. Secretariat to review whether quorum will be able to be met for the 8 August 2023 Board meeting.**

2 Declaration of interests

- The Chair requested declaration of any conflicts or interests.
- Ms Fahey advised that she was in the process of changing employment and would notify any change in conflicts or pecuniary interests in due course.
- Mr Cowdrey, observer declared that he holds the following positions:
 - AWU NSW Branch executive member
 - Receives income as Assistant Secretary AWU NSW Branch
 - AWU National executive member
 - AWU Silica Dust committee
 - AgriFood Board Director
 - Mine Safety Advisory Council (Observer).

Outcomes

No updates were requested to the member’s pecuniary interest register.

3 Acceptance of previous minutes and actions

No changes were requested to the minutes.

Outcomes

The Board endorsed the minutes of the last meeting.

4 Correspondence

- The Chair noted the letters which had been sent confirming the appointment of Ms Angela Hudson as a member.
- Mr Burns proposed that a letter of appreciation be sent to Dr Peter Standish to thank him for his service. Ms Fahey seconded this.

Outcomes

The Board resolved that a letter of appreciation be sent to Dr Peter Standish.

Actions

- B. Secretariat to send a letter of appreciation to Dr Peter Standish.**

5 Update on review of competency framework and blueprinting for certificates of competence

- Mr Burns introduced Dr Bruce Mowbray to discuss the review process, blueprinting and challenges. Dr Mowbray noted:
 - Previous framework was inconsistent and had overlapping areas

- The review process is now in blueprinting phase to ensure that the examination papers cover relevant aspects regarding competency.
- Ms Fahey commented that the framework looks clear regarding structure and levels. Ms Fahey raised concerns regarding the next link (i.e., what are the mandatory questions and levels and how do exams and maintenance of competence link together against the framework).
 - Dr Mowbray replied that these issues were touched on in the blueprinting. Different levels of functions need different competencies. While there had been some discussion about categorising competencies into essential and desirable, this is not the preferred framing.
 - Mr Palmer clarified that essentials are assessed in every exam, plus additionally a range of desirables are also assessed as part of the exam cycle. Every competency is examined over 3 years.
 - When asked by the Chair, Dr Mowbray confirmed that there would be questions at some level in every exam paper on safety management system and statutory functions and on incident reporting requirements.
 - The Chair sought further clarification as to whether all main domains are covered off in every exam, perhaps with the level of detail changing. Mr Burns and Dr Mowbray both confirmed this was correct.
- Mr McLeod raised a concern that the examiners may not accept the new blueprinting process. He cited feedback that the examiners felt it was too prescriptive and it may cause them to retire as examiners. Mr McLeod asked whether there could be a middle ground, as previously the approach was too subjective, but with the blueprinting perhaps it was too prescriptive.
 - Mr Burns reiterated the importance of ensuring a repeatable and consistent approach across all the panels. The previous approach lacked transparency and allowed too much scope for variance. The review is trying to find that middle ground. Mr Burns acknowledged that some examiners would find the change challenging and there may be some resistance. Mr Burns noted that there are different approaches and some participants in Dr Mowbray’s program have commented that it takes away their latitude, but equally they also say that they want a model to work to. There is nothing in the model that is insupportable.
 - Mr McLeod commented it is not just existing examiners, he is also concerned the new framework may put off potential new examiners.
 - Mr Burns replied that the Regulator is getting some more applicants, and while it may be harder to get new examiners, the new process is a positive change. The change will be publicised, and those concerns can be overcome.
 - Dr Mowbray said in terms of consultation, each person in the program has received a draft to review and there was virtually no feedback.
 - Mr Palmer advised he had canvassed feedback from three recent examiner candidates that responded that it would have been helpful to have such a clear framework when they were examined. He noted each piece is tied to a legislative responsibility.
 - The Chair said the discussion indicates that there is some work to be done in socialising the changes and bringing the examiners along the journey. This will require communication. She asked Mr Burns what the Regulator is doing around messaging and socialising the changes.

- Mr Burns advised that the Regulator is holding workshops, three conferences before the end of year, and will publish a mine safety news article. There will be plenty of opportunities to communicate the changes before the exams next year. This new approach is simpler without losing impact. Mr Burns is confident that examiners will embrace the changes.
- Dr Mowbray advised that the majority of examiners in the program that saw the changes as an imposition are now engaging with them. He said where they did not see themselves in the competency, they have now engaged and questioned and in the blueprinting a key issue will be not to impose an extra load on them.
- Mr Burns reiterated that the framework is still in draft form. In the past the examiners used to just set a paper, whereas the template mapping and blueprinting approach should make examination easier.
- Mr Barrett said it is a brilliant paper compared to what we have had in the past. However, he said it is not clear whether section 3.3 on page 6 (risk management, high risk activities and work) is a reference to the legislative requirements or a reference to a high risk piece of work. The Chair seconded this. Overall, it is an improvement on the ad hoc approach to exams from the past. He said he sits on the oral examiner panel for deputies. He acknowledged oral examiners may feel tied into reading from a script that lacks flexibility. However, he also acknowledged concerns about individual variances and subjectivity. Mr Barrett said once examiners understand the new framework, they will embrace it. He said he would be surprised if we lose examiners because of the new framework.
- Mr Burns emphasised that the discussion is about the framework, not the exam process. The framework is trying to achieve consistency. The blueprinting process has exposed the subjectivity and unworkability of elements of the current approach. The new framework focusses on the essentials. The examiners will still get to write the exam and pick the topics and make the recommendation.
- With respect to stakeholder engagement and understanding, Mr Burns explained that Covid restrictions affected the original plan to include face-to-face consultations during the initial blueprinting process. However, the project is at the point of requesting the board to endorse the framework, with the view that the blueprinting process will address the communications issue.
- Ms Fahey gave feedback on the framework's structure and flow (e.g., there was too much jumping around between the responsibility and the levels of wording, managing and implementing).
 - Mr Burns encouraged all members to review the paper and provide feedback to the secretariat within the next two weeks. Mr Burns explained that implementation is not likely to occur until the first round of exams next year. He said all convenors are in the working group – so all panels have had a say. It is important to publish the framework well before the end of this year, so it can be used next year.
 - Mr Burns advised that section 3.3 would be changed to reference high risk work.
- The Chair asked for a proposed communication strategy summary for the changes to be presented at the next meeting.

Outcomes

The Board conditionally endorsed the framework, agreeing that board members may submit further feedback to the Secretariat for consideration by the Resources Regulator within a period of two weeks.

Actions

- C. Board members to submit further feedback on the blueprinting process to the Secretariat within two weeks after the meeting.
- D. The Resources Regulator is to provide a summary of the proposed industry and stakeholders communication strategy for the blueprinting process for the next meeting.
- E. Domain Focus Area 3.3 in the revised competency framework paper is to be amended to high risk work.

6 Evaluation of the Practising Certificate Maintenance of Competence Scheme – Draft Public Discussion Paper

- Mr McLeod commented that the proposed evaluation was both practical and timely, given the recent audit. The feedback would be useful and there may be potential for simplification of the maintenance of competence process. He noted that the Resources Regulator had been active in facilitating forums regarding competency and to attain knowledge through information sharing.
- Mr Burns noted that:
 - The intent of the paper is targeted. Mr Burns raised concern about the mapping across jurisdictions. It downplays the previous five-year attempt to map across jurisdictions, which has not proceeded further, as there is a limit to the extent that the jurisdictions are able to be aligned.
 - Workload with documenting maintenance of competency is an issue which has been reported. Some people have concerns regarding the stringency of record keepings and maintenance of competency requirements.
 - A further issue is that under the current framework, it is possible that a person could potentially not undertake any maintenance of competence in their last 12 months and instead apply for a new certificate, rather than seek a renewal of their existing certificate at the end of the five year period. Some people have let their certificate lapse or forgotten to renew, so they applied for a new one instead – and this is a problem.
 - Additionally, there is a potential problem for retirees. There is no option to surrender a certificate.
- The Chair noted that for health professionals – the practitioner initially signs a statutory declaration confirming that they have completed their professional education requirements and there is a potential audit.
- Ms Fahey generally agreed with the paper but is concerned about the detail complexity of question 5. She was concerned that some of the nuances may be lost and believes that some respondents might not respond as fully as they otherwise would have. She suggested dividing question 5 into separate questions.
- Mr Burns emphasised that the paper is a draft and he is seeking conditional endorsement from the Board, with opportunity for further feedback as to structure of questions and things that have been missed.
- Mr Bridges asked whether consideration would be given as to credits for MOC for people who fill positions on and off, versus someone permanently in the role. He felt that actually doing the role, should be worth some hours toward MOC.
 - Mr Barrett disagreed, stating that people need to learn and modernise and be up to date, even if working in the role.

- Mr Burns said that this was a decision for the Board to take.
- Mr Barrett noted that there was some confusion surrounding MOC. He said some staff think it should be up to the company to organise MOC but in fact staff need to realise it is their own responsibility. Also, there was confusion about the private provider app. Mr Barrett said when people raised that with him, he would advise them that if the private app was difficult, don't use it, just write it down and keep a logbook if need be. Mr Barrett said people also often talk about the subgroups, so why not just have three groups. Steve said some people's feedback may be focused on private apps, rather than the actual MOC framework and that could be a problem.
- The Chair said that the Board may need to look at these questions.
- Mr Burns said he would prefer people to have a free hand to respond on submissions as they see fit. Mr Burns said will take all feedback into consideration.
- Mr Reed said that it is easier doing the logbook if you are working in the role. It is easier to overlook recording in your logbook if you are not working fulltime.

Outcomes

The Board conditionally endorsed the draft discussion paper for the Evaluation of the Practising Certificate Maintenance of Competence Scheme, agreeing that Board members may submit further feedback to the Secretariat for consideration by the Resources Regulator within a period of two weeks after the meeting.

Actions

- F. **Board members to submit further feedback on the draft discussion paper for Evaluation of the Practising Certificate Maintenance of Competence Scheme to the Secretariat within two weeks.**

7 Additional qualifications for metalliferous underground mining engineering manager

- Mr Burns indicated his position is not aligned with the examiner's proposal that the Masters of Mining Engineering qualification be accepted. In his opinion there is too much variance with the content of masters' degrees.
- Mr Barrett was against the examiner's proposal to remove the Advanced Diploma of Metalliferous Mining (RII60120). He said if that were to occur, it would eliminate the opportunity for workers to advance from the workshop floor. Mr Barrett said any concerns about demonstration of competency regarding ventilation could be dealt with via the examination process or perhaps by requiring additional qualifications regarding ventilation, if the diploma is not covering those.
- Mr Reed sought clarification as to whether the examiner is suggesting that candidates for examination are unprepared. Mr Barrett replied that he thinks the examiner is saying that. However, although ventilation is technically listed as non-core in the Diploma –it is nevertheless a compulsory elective and is therefore always undertaken as part of the Diploma.
- Mr Cowdrey said in the paper there is a point made about ground control, where the examination panel state that they did mapping which said a component was missing
 - Mr Palmer said he has undertaken further mapping work and his mapping had a different result, effectively saying that ground control is in the Diploma.
- Mr Burns said historically, panel recommendations only went to the MPCB Board if the Resources Regulator supported the recommendation. That is no longer the case as there is to be open communication between the examiner panels and the MPCB on these issues. Accordingly, the MPCB Board will now receive the proposal and the Board will

make the decision. In this case, this panel has had a view. This examiner thinks you should only have a degree in mining engineering, however the Resources Regulator thinks that may be problematic. However, it is now for the Board to decide.

- Ms Fahey felt that the qualifications would be too narrow if the Diploma was removed. If the candidates for examination are not passing exams, it is not this course's fault. She has reviewed the AQF framework, and believes the course is not the reason for those failures.
- Mr Barrett asked Mr Palmer whether he had discussed the mapping discrepancies with the examiner.
- Mr Palmer advised that he had and the examiner maintains there are principle hazards not covered.
- Mr Palmer suggested that perhaps, similar to Under Ground supervisor qualifications, that there could be a review of the candidates' qualifications, regarding which electives would be best suited to passing the examination.
- The Chair felt that might be a reasonable compromise.
 - Ms Fahey observed that mandating a unit does not make you competent and she is of the opinion that the course as set is sufficient. There is no need for additional units or for the Board to take on the role of educator. If there is a bias as between degree over diploma that needs to be addressed with that individual.
- Mr Barrett noted that if there are key units that are not compulsory in a Diploma, then people may pick the easier units.
- Mr Burns replied to Mr Barrett, that in this instance, in this course, both ground control and ventilation are required so if they complete the course, then they are undertaking the required units.
- Mr Burns observed that the panel has identified the issue that the candidates for examination have inadequate knowledge, the panel's proposed solution is to remove the Diploma as an eligible qualification. Mr Burns again noted that the Resources Regulator's views do not align with the panel's proposal.
- Mr Reed asked whether the Diploma was a robust course. Mr Palmer said that this down to the RTO.
- Mr Bridges noted it's the function of examiner to assess. He does not support removing the Diploma. He wants people with different knowledge and experiences and backgrounds to be able to work their way up. Diversity makes the industry better.
- Mr Reed sought further clarification as to why the Regulator was not supporting the addition of the Master of Mining Engineering.
- Mr Burns advised that while a masters does provide good underpinning knowledge, there is no consistency in the course syllabus for the Masters degree. For example, it could be undertaken by way of thesis. The syllabus regularly changes and mapping it is not practical, as the universities are not working to the AQF framework.

Outcomes

In relation to the pre-requisite qualifications for the Mining Engineering Manager Underground mines other than coal certificate of competence:

- The Board declined to remove the Advanced Diploma of Metalliferous Mining (RII60120) as an accepted pre-requisite
- The Board declined to accept the Masters of Mining Engineering as a pre-requisite.

8 Additional qualifications for electrical engineering certificates of competence

- Mr Burnes observed that both the examiner panel and the Resources Regulator recommend further analysis and research.
- Mr Burns noted that there is a push to expand the electrical engineering to include non-core, e.g., computer science and it is arguable that the certificate of competence exam could deal with that. However, it is also important not to lose the fundamentals. The risk on the site is about power, high voltage electricity.
- Mr Burns felt that there are issues to be flagged and the Regulator's position is not yet firm, however the Board will need to consider whether broadening the acceptable qualifications to the extent proposed by the panel, for the sake of commonality between electrical and mechanical engineer is appropriate, given the real risks associated with power.
- The Chair felt that the Board requires further information.
- Mr McLeod agreed and stated that information was required and not just feedback.
- Mr Barrett said regarding both this paper and the previous paper – he has been approached by people who have completed an Advanced Diploma of Automation and some the topics covered may meet the requirements. He suggested that perhaps the subjects need to be looked at individually.
- Mr Burns replied that none of the topics offer power as a stream. It is covered in the core, but it is not a stream. He said for example, with computer science, you will not do anything with high voltage.
- Mr Barrett replied he had only looked at one, automation, but you also need five years' experience underground before you sit an examination.
- Mr Burns replied that the same argument was mounted for mechanical – e.g., aircraft engineering and they did open it up and not one applicant has applied relying on aircraft engineering.
- Mr Barrett asked how was it approved for mechanical? Mr Palmer replied it aligns with Engineers Australia.
- Mr Barrett agreed that more work was required before a decision is able to be made.

Outcomes

In relation to the pre-requisite qualifications for Electrical Engineering Manager Underground coal mines and Electrical Engineer for Coal mines the Board requests the Regulator undertake further analysis and prepare a further paper regarding this issue, in particular clear mapping is required to establish whether there is an appropriate equivalency.

Actions

- G. Secretariat to include Update on Additional qualifications for electrical engineering certificates of competence as an agenda item for meeting on 8 August 2023**
- H. Resources Regulator to undertake further analysis and prepare a further paper (including mapping of equivalency) in respect of the proposed additional pre-requisite qualifications for Electrical Engineering Manager Underground coal mines and Electrical Engineer for Coal mines.**

9 Five-year report on number of certificate holders and pass/fail rate

- Mr Palmer advised that numbers for mechanical engineers remain low. Low numbers coming in, low numbers going out.
- Mr Palmer noted the recommended continuing use of online written exams.

Outcomes

The Board noted the contents of the report.

10 Update on Automatic Mutual Recognition

Mr Palmer advised that an extension for the exemption on automatic mutual recognition had been sought, to allow for concerns regarding maintenance of competence to be addressed.

Outcomes

The Board noted the update.

11 Prerequisites and written examination details - Deputy of underground coal mines

Mr Palmer requested that the Board formalise the acceptance of the units of competency as noted in this paper.

Outcomes

The Board endorsed the following units of competence as satisfying the Deputy pre-requisites for emergency response and preparedness:

- RIIERR501E Implement underground coal mine emergency preparedness and response systems; and
- The superseded units RIIERR501D & RIIERR501A Implement underground coal mine emergency preparedness and response systems or other equivalent superseded unit number.

12 Risk Register

- The Chair referred to the Treasury paper and asked the Board to consider the need for a risk register.
- The Secretariat noted that the attached Guideline indicates that risk strategies need to be identified but does not specifically state that the identification of strategies must be in the form of a risk register.
- Mr Burns felt that considering a risk strategy would involve a risk register. He proposed that a risk register be prepared which identified risks and ranked risk priorities.
- Ms Fahey agreed with Mr Burns.
- The Chair also agreed and proposed that additional time be allocated at the November meeting to develop a risk register.

Outcomes

- The Board resolved to develop a risk register within the next two meetings.
- The Board requested Secretariat assistance to provide a short guide/template for risk register.

Actions

- I. Secretariat to include development of risk register on agenda for meeting on 14 November 2023
- J. Secretariat to prepare a short guide/template to be used by the Board when developing the risk register.

13 MPCB work plan and communication plan

- Mr Palmer observed that the work plan and communications plan should be considered as part of or after developing the new Strategic Plan.
- Mr Palmer advised that the Secretariat is to take the lead on commencing preparation of the annual report.

Outcomes

- The Board noted the status of projects identified in the Board's work plan to support the Strategic Plan to 2023.
- The Board noted the status of actions identified in the MPCB Communication Plan.
- The Board resolved to develop a new work plan and communication plan.

Actions

- K. Secretariat to commence preparation of annual report
- L. Secretariat to include development of a new work plan and communication plan on the Agenda for the August 2023 meeting.

14 Appointment of examiners

The Chair called for comment from the Board, otherwise for the examiners to be appointed as noted in the paper. No comments were made.

Outcomes

The Board approved the appointment of the following examiners:

- Open cut examiner: Jade Charnock and Bradley Donoghoe
- Mechanical engineer: Alison Pepper
- Mining engineering manager: Justin Peterkin.

15 Quarterly report on certification outcomes

Mr Palmer advised the event proposed for 14 June as noted in Attachment C has been postponed to 21 June 2023 to communicate the event more widely.

Outcomes

- The Board noted the certification outcomes for January to March 2023
- The Board noted the report on activities completed for February to April 2023
- The Board noted the report on planned activities for May to July 2023.

16 Resources Regulator Quarterly Safety Report

Mr Burns advised that:

- in future these safety reports will not include any references to incidents occurring in other jurisdictions, as such information is in the public domain. This will result in the report being more squarely focussed on NSW rather than external content.
- there has been an upward surge in instances of fires in mobile plant and vehicle incidents in open-cut mines, however, there is usually some variability in quarter on quarter regarding these items. Likewise certain issues will experience seasonal variability and there may be variability associated with shutdowns. Dust monitoring is undertaken in campaigns and cycles and therefore there may be periodic increases associated with the cyclic regime of the testing.
- a fatality occurred approximately two weeks ago in the Opal sector associated with a winding shaft, which is not noted in this paper. The investigation report has not yet been released, as the investigation is still ongoing. There will be more details on this matter at the next meeting.

Outcomes

The Board noted the Quarterly Safety Report and expressed sadness at the news of the fatality in the Opal Sector.

Actions

M. Further information on the recent fatality in the Opal sector to be provided at the 8 August 2023 MPCB meeting.

17 Quarterly report on shot firing assessment activity

Mr Burns advised that there was no assessment activity to report.

Outcomes

The Board noted that there was no activity to report regarding shot firing assessment activity for the January 2023 to March 2023 quarter.

18 2023 meeting dates and venues

- The MEU NSW offered its Clarence Street, Sydney premises for the November meeting. The Board gratefully accepted this offer.
- Persons who are not attending the 8 August 2023 MPCB meeting:
 - Mr McLeod’s term ends prior to the next meeting, accordingly the May meeting will be his last meeting.
 - Mr Burns is unable to attend the August meeting.
 - Mr Barrett is unable to attend – however, if Mr Steve Luck is available, he will attend as a delegate in his place.
- The Secretariat advised that Mr Stephen Tranter had previously indicated that he might not be able to attend the August meeting, but that he was not yet certain.

Outcomes

The venue for the Board meeting on 14 November 2023 is to be the MEU NSW head-office at Level 12, 215 Clarence Street, Sydney.

Actions

- N. Secretariat to liaise with MEU NSW to book 14 November 2023 meeting at Level 12, 215 Clarence Street, Sydney
- O. Secretariat to check whether Mr Tranter is able to attend the 8 August 2023 meeting.

19 Additional business

Nil.

The Chair closed the meeting at 10.32 am.

Summary of Actions

- A. Secretariat to review whether quorum will be able to be met for the 8 August 2023 meeting.
- B. Secretariat to send a letter of appreciation to Peter Standish.
- C. Board members to submit further feedback on the blueprinting process to the Secretariat within two weeks after the meeting.
- D. The Resources Regulator is to provide a summary of the proposed industry and stakeholders communication strategy for the blueprinting process for the next meeting.
- E. Domain Focus Area 3.3 in the revised competency framework paper (see Paper 5 – Blueprinting) is to be amended to high risk work.
- F. Board members to submit further feedback on the draft discussion paper for Evaluation of the Practising Certificate Maintenance of Competence Scheme to the Secretariat within two weeks.
- G. Secretariat to include Update on Additional qualifications for electrical engineering certificates of competence as an agenda item for meeting on 8 August 2023.
- H. Resources Regulator to undertake further analysis and prepare a further paper (including mapping of equivalency) in respect of the proposed additional pre-requisite qualifications for Electrical Engineering Manager Underground coal mines and Electrical Engineer for Coal mines.
- I. Secretariat to include development of risk register on agenda for meeting on 14 November 2023.
- J. Secretariat to prepare a short guide/template to be used by the Board when developing the risk register.
- K. Secretariat to commence preparation of annual report.
- L. Secretariat to include development of a new work plan and communication plan on the Agenda for the August 2023 meeting.
- M. Further information on the recent fatality in the Opal sector to be provided at the 8 August 2023 MPCB meeting.
- N. Secretariat to liaise with MEU NSW to book 14 November 2023 meeting at Level 12, 215 Clarence Street, Sydney.
- O. Secretariat to check whether Mr Tranter is able to attend the 8 August 2023 meeting.

Approval

| Name/position | Signature/approval | Date |
|--|--------------------|------|
| Joanne Muller, AM Independent Chair | | |

Comment:

[insert any comments from approver]