

species conservation, whichever is the sooner.

The Act has also resulted in significant amendments to the EP&A.

Under the EP&A, an FIS is required where "there is likely to be a significant effect on the environment or protected fauna" by a proposed development which requires consent under Part IV or is an activity under Part V.

In regard to Part IV, section 77 of the EP&A now requires an FIS to accompany any development application where there is likely to be a significant effect on the environment of protected fauna. This would appear to be primarily the decision of the consent authority and in practice one would expect there will be consultation between a developer and the consent authority. The consent authority is also required to take into consideration, when determining a development application, whether there is likely to be a significant effect on the environment of protected fauna.

In regard to Part V activities, a separate FIS is not required where an environmental impact statement addresses the matters which are required to be addressed in an FIS.

The amendments to the EP&A, which require an FIS, do not affect consents granted before the commencement of the Act or any Part V activity which was commenced before the Act.

The amendments to the EP&A are repealed on 1 December 1992 or when provision is made by another Act for environmental assessment and protection for endangered and protected species.

On 28 February 1992 the revised list of Endangered Fauna referred to in Schedule 12 of the NPWA was gazetted.

Andrew Poulos
Solicitor, Clayton Utz
Sydney

DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Conservation Movement Supports Delaying Tactics on MFP

The Conservation Council of SA has backed the Opposition in its plans to delay debate on the Government's MFP Development Bill.

Council President, Professor David Shearman, says that it is entirely appropriate that the Bill be shelved until the Environmental Impact Statement is available, and all comments about the EIS have been duly received, considered and responded to. Furthermore, no money should be spent before these processes have been completed.

"The Government's process of having the Bill debated before the many problem aspects of the site have been addressed is putting the cart before the horse."

"With the Government having stated its intention to proceed with the MFP anyway, it is not surprising that the Government is moving this way. However, it does turn the forthcoming EIS process into a sham. The clear message to anyone considering a response to the EIS would be not to bother as the Government will have made it a fait accompli."

"This move by the Opposition will allow the EIS to be given the proper consideration it deserves."
"The Conservation movement believes that the Gillman site is unsuitable and welcomes Opposition policy to spread technological developments to regional centres and suburbs of Adelaide.