

Thursday 23 July 2026

Warwick Squire
CEO
Coexistence Queensland
warwick.squire@cqlld.org.au

Dear Warwick,

RE: Draft Discussion Paper – Navigating biosecurity arrangements on agricultural land in areas of energy and resource development, 30 June 2026.

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on Coexistence Queensland's draft biosecurity Discussion Paper.

Australian Energy Producers (AEP) sees biosecurity as a key coexistence issue, one that underpins the industry's social license to operate. We appreciate that our operations need to be visibly committed to delivering our share of local biosecurity responsibilities. Without this, industry risks eroding the trust it has built with rural and regional communities. Queensland's biosecurity risks are evolving, and landholders are increasingly grappling with the challenges of managing risks in an environment of multiple simultaneous land uses and three distinct regulatory systems.

Coexistence Queensland's draft Discussion Paper does a good job of describing multi-faceted regulation of biosecurity across different sectors. Given this regulatory complexity, it's unsurprising that some stakeholders are calling for more uniform regulation, but AEP believes an immediate regulatory response would be premature.

Biosecurity Queensland has been funded for 100 additional compliance officers. With these extra resources and a concerted focus on practical coexistence, AEP believes the existing comprehensive biosecurity regulatory system can be made to work more effectively. With detailed comments attached, we broadly support the direction of the paper's recommendations to improve the transparency and visibility of biosecurity measures. We welcome the development of education and support programs to support visibly better biosecurity outcomes.

We have focussed our feedback on the six discussion questions from the 2 July workshop with peak bodies in the attached table. AEP is happy to answer any questions that you may have about any of the points made in this submission, please contact Andrew Barger at abarger@energyproducers.au or on 0417 403 822.

Your sincerely,



Keld Knudsen

General Manager – States & Territories, and
Director – Queensland

Attachment One: Key industry messages on the draft Discussion Paper.

1. Queensland relies on a robust biosecurity system to protect animal, plant, human and environmental health. Queenslanders face a unique & growing set of biosecurity challenges, which demand continual vigilance at the State-wide, regional and local level.
2. Australian Energy Producers recognise biosecurity as a key coexistence issue that underpins our industry's social license; but biosecurity outcomes are a shared responsibility across all land uses. The balance of evidence suggests that Queensland's petroleum & gas industry is working hard to identify and minimise biosecurity risks from our operations.
3. We understand the concerns of several landholders and some peak agricultural bodies who fear they've identified gaps in Queensland's complex networks of biosecurity regulations, but we do not support their conclusions or their calls for immediate regulatory change.
4. The draft Discussion Paper starts an important policy discussion about whether Queensland's different regulatory systems treat our shared biosecurity risks with equivalent gravity. The paper's focus on the visibility of biosecurity measures to different stakeholders is also a practical contribution to a future policy debate.
5. The Discussion Paper makes it clear that Queensland's current systems of biosecurity regulation are complex, with different regulators applying different regulatory instruments across different land uses. The key challenge is improving the clarity and visibility of each these regulatory processes, when no single stakeholder is subject to all of them.

The Biosecurity Act is risk-based but it is difficult for stakeholders to be confident in the application of probabilistic concepts like 'reasonable and practical' when not all risk mitigation measures are visible to them.

6. It is important for Coexistence Queensland to clarify that resource companies have not received an exemption from biosecurity obligations, (Appendix 2 of the Discussion Paper will already be being quoted, out of context, to cause mischief). At a minimum, resource operators must comply with the General Biosecurity Obligation (GBO) under the Biosecurity Act and the biosecurity provisions contained within the Land Access Code. Reflecting the shared risk of biosecurity, current industry practice routinely goes well beyond that regulatory minimum.
7. Biosecurity outcomes are too important to be used as crude economic leverage for land access negotiations or as a stalking horse for activists to deliver a landholder veto over resource industry activities. Any future policy response should strengthen the shared responsibility for biosecurity outcomes rather than creating expectations that resource proponents act as the default risk manager for complex regional biosecurity issues.

8. Any biosecurity compliance program should be risk-based, evidence-based and sector-neutral. Regulatory attention should be directed to demonstrated sources of biosecurity risks rather than predetermined land-use categories. The next draft of the Discussion Paper needs to explicitly consider whether the:
 - a. equivalent biosecurity risks arising from all other land uses are subject to comparable obligations and regulatory scrutiny;
 - b. resource industry's existing regulatory and contractual controls are already quietly delivering the biosecurity outcomes sought; and
 - c. existing regulatory requirements applying to the resources sector have been considered relative to all other land users.
9. A more comprehensive assessment of risk pathways, existing controls and regulatory outcomes across the broader landscape would provide a stronger foundation for future policy development. Redrafted recommendations in the Discussion Paper, supported by a documented and thorough assessment process across all major land uses would help maintain confidence that any future reforms are proportionate, targeted and focused on achieving improved biosecurity outcomes, rather than creating differing expectations for sectors managing comparable risks.
10. A single proponent or land use should not be expected to achieve biosecurity outcomes beyond those being achieved by existing regulatory systems and the wider community. The Discussion Paper should clearly distinguish between legislative requirements, accepted industry practice and industry-leading examples. This distinction is important to avoid unintended elevation of voluntary practices into perceived compliance obligations.

Attachment two: Industry feedback on draft biosecurity discussion paper.

Discussion questions	Feedback on the draft Discussion Paper	AEP's suggestions
1. "Are there any biosecurity issues you'd like to raise that weren't included in the draft Discussion Paper findings?"	Effective regional biosecurity outcomes require a landscape-level assessment of <i>all</i> significant pathways rather than a primary focus on resource development activities. It is important to clarify that resource companies have not received a wholesale exemption from biosecurity obligations. At a minimum, resource operators must comply with the General Biosecurity Obligation (GBO) under the <i>Biosecurity Act</i> and the biosecurity provisions contained within the Land Access Code. Industry biosecurity practices are generally founded on the principle of "<i>arrive clean, leave clean.</i>" This includes vehicle and machinery washdown requirements, which are mandated under the land access framework and are a proven mechanism for reducing the risk of spreading weeds, pests and pathogens. The legislative test is that parties must take reasonable and practical steps to prevent the spread of biosecurity matter. The emphasis on "<i>reasonable</i>" is important, as some property-specific biosecurity requirements can extend well-beyond what may be considered proportionate or practical. For example, some landholders have sought bespoke requirements such as issuing new boots to every person on every visit. In many cases, the same risk outcomes can be achieved through practical alternatives such as boot baths, disinfectant sprays, reduced number or controlled access points and hygiene protocols. A combination of these approaches has historically been successfully implemented. While there are baseline biosecurity requirements that apply across all properties, property-specific arrangements are generally	AEP felt there were several issues which weren't fully canvassed in the Discussion Paper. Our key questions include: 1. The issue of how to meet your general biosecurity obligation (GBO) by demonstrating "<i>all reasonable and practical steps</i>" to minimise each biosecurity risk remains subjective and open to challenge. How a project be confident their GBO has been seen to have been delivered? 2. Are there any mechanisms to have a landholder's Biosecurity Management Plan (BMP) reviewed if a company feels it is imposing requirements that are unreasonable or impractical? Or a BMP review mechanism if a company has alternative suggestions to deliver the same or better biosecurity outcomes? 3. Will the stakeholders that Coexistence Queensland consulted with directly (page 8) also have an opportunity to provide comments on the draft Discussion Paper? 4. The paper acknowledges that renewable energy developers operate under a different access framework and that commercial agreements are voluntarily negotiated between landholders and proponents. The paper does not examine whether varying contractual arrangements across sectors risks creating inconsistent biosecurity standards on the same property. A future biosecurity framework should seek consistency of outcome rather than creating more stringent expectations for

Discussion questions	Feedback on the draft Discussion Paper	AEP's suggestions
	best addressed through direct negotiation between the landholder and the company rather than through a broad, prescriptive legislative approach. Matters such as outbreak response, incident management, dispute resolution, monitoring, compliance and enforcement are tailored to individual property circumstances through the Conduct and Compensation Agreement (CCA) process. This is also a good way to address specific local concerns like economic weeds and engagement with neighbours. Additional regulation of the baseline requirements is unlikely to improve biosecurity outcomes and would increase the cost and complexity of operating in Queensland. The Discussion Paper could have set the context by explaining why it was largely focussed on petroleum and gas activities. Additional issues that could have been addressed include: • The value of a pre-agreed outbreak plan in the case of a reported biosecurity event so that everyone is clear on their responsibilities if they suspect there has been a breach. • How to deliver greater transparency of biosecurity measures (and be alerted to emerging local risks) for neighbouring properties and the local community • How to best recognise and engage with existing agricultural accreditation/certification systems. • How to best reconcile the list of <i>regulated</i> and <i>declared</i> pests (page 19). Is there a mechanism for better aligning the two lists? • The issue of dealing with economic weeds (page 35). What does leading practice look like in addressing this unregulated biosecurity risk? • Who carries the burden of proof under each of the three different regulatory systems?	one industry while different standards operate under separate and opaque commercial arrangements. Each of these key issues could usefully be addressed in the guideline mentioned in recommendation 2.

Discussion questions	Feedback on the draft Discussion Paper	AEP's suggestions
	- Who determines “reasonable” in applying GBO tests. Is there support available for landholders in making this determination? - Clarify Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service’s role in practical biosecurity, both within Queensland’s protected estate and in neighbouring areas. - It is noteworthy that the paper remains silent on the applicability of its findings to public land, particularly road reserve areas, which are increasingly becoming a source of concern and/or disease outbreaks. - Some case studies of what happens in a biosecurity event might be useful to illustrate the serious threat to landholders. The quarantine area declared to control citrus cancer in Emerald in June 2004 saw 490,000 trees destroyed over 18 months. This event had a major regional economic impact. Non-agricultural stakeholders may be more familiar with the biosecurity measures around containing Hendra virus which has seen four people killed by the virus in Queensland. The Discussion Paper could call out the implications of such an event including close surveillance of contacts and lockdown of properties. - The paper acknowledges that Local Governments are required to have biosecurity plans and play a significant role in biosecurity management. However, there is limited analysis of the <i>effectiveness</i> of the performance of Local Governments on biosecurity. Road reserves, stock routes and other public corridors are recognised pathways for spread of invasive species. The Discussion Paper does not examine: - current weed prevalence on public corridors; - effectiveness of road reserve management programs; - resourcing challenges facing Local Governments; - historical changes in regional biosecurity controls;	

Discussion questions	Feedback on the draft Discussion Paper	AEP's suggestions
	– relative contribution of public infrastructure corridors to weed spread. • The Discussion Paper suggests that landholders lack support and resources when negotiating agreements. Queensland has one of the most extensive landholder support frameworks in Australia, including: – mandatory compensation negotiations; – recoverability of reasonable and necessary legal costs; – recoverability of other professional adviser costs; – access to alternative dispute resolution; – access to the Land Access Ombudsman; – Land Court processes; – Coexistence Queensland support services; – extensive published guidance material. Any assertion that landholders lack support should be carefully tested against evidence. The issue may be less about the availability of support and more about navigating complex biosecurity matters involving significant commercial interests.	
2. <i>Which recommendations do you support?</i>	We support the broad direction of each of the five recommendations, but we would have appreciated an opportunity to provide feedback on each. 1. Biosecurity Queensland develop a dedicated Guideline for biosecurity management associated with resource and renewable energy development on private land. The Guideline should explain the interaction of relevant legislation and provide practical direction on how parties can discharge and demonstrate compliance with their General Biosecurity Obligation.	As an example of how the recommendations could have been clarified, AEP has suggested some simplifications: 1. Biosecurity Queensland develop a practical guideline on how parties can demonstrate compliance with their General Biosecurity Obligation under a shared biosecurity responsibility. Further clarification of obligations may be beneficial; however, the existing requirements are already largely addressed through the Land Access Code, the MERCPC framework and the General Biosecurity Obligation. The focus should be on education and guidance.

Discussion questions	Feedback on the draft Discussion Paper	AEP's suggestions
	2. Coexistence Queensland and Biosecurity Queensland develop enhanced information resources, education materials and support services focused on negotiating, implementing and managing biosecurity arrangements. These resources should include agreement-making guidance, compliance and enforcement information, dispute resolution pathways and outbreak response planning.	2. Coexistence Queensland and Biosecurity Queensland develop resources and practical support services focused on negotiating, implementing and managing biosecurity arrangements. Improved information and educational resources could assist both landholders and industry. The relevant obligations and negotiation mechanisms already exist through the Land Access Framework, CCAs and associated guidance materials.
	3. Coexistence Queensland, industry peak bodies and Biosecurity Queensland collaborate to document and promote leading practice case studies and develop guidance addressing specific scenarios, including biosecurity management on organic farming enterprises.	3. (a) Coexistence Queensland, industry peak bodies and Biosecurity Queensland promote leading practice. (b) Biosecurity Queensland develop scenario guidance on biosecurity management including organic farming. Sharing practical examples of successful biosecurity management is likely to deliver more value than additional regulation and will assist in driving continuous improvement across the sector.
	4. Biosecurity Queensland expand and tailor "Biosecurity in the Boardroom" programs for the resources and renewable energy sectors to strengthen corporate awareness, governance and leadership on biosecurity issues.	4. Biosecurity Queensland expand QFF's Biosecurity in the Boardroom program (presumably after securing QFF's blessings).
	5. Biosecurity Queensland implement a proactive audit and inspection program focused on biosecurity obligations associated with resource and energy development to strengthen regulatory confidence, improve transparency and support continuous improvement across sectors.	5. Biosecurity Queensland implement a proactive inspection program across all sectors, not with a view to compliance action, but rather to improve performance; with the results informing the leading practice work in #3 Recommendation 5 currently proposes an audit and inspection program specifically focused on energy and resource

Discussion questions	Feedback on the draft Discussion Paper	AEP's suggestions
		development. The draft paper does not establish that energy and resource development represents the highest or predominant source of regional biosecurity risk. Nor does it compare the relative biosecurity performance of: – landholders; – Local Governments; – agricultural contractors; – transport operators; – utility providers; – renewable energy developments; and – Parks & Wildlife Services. Any future compliance program should be risk-based, evidence-based and sector-neutral. Regulatory attention should be directed to demonstrated sources of risk rather than predetermined land-use categories.
3. <i>Are there any recommendations you don't support?</i>	While we broadly support each of the recommendations: Recommendation one could have been made clearer if talked about not just <i>how</i> GBO compliance was demonstrated but also to <i>who</i> it was demonstrated. We think that recommendation one and two could also have encompassed a biosecurity extension service, see our response to Q5 (below). We would hope that the audits in recommendation five can be delivered in a manner which is educational rather than punitive. Ideally the audits would draw on the leading practice guideline to highlight how to deliver best-in-class compliance. The paper acknowledges that determination of causation is one of the most challenging aspects of biosecurity management.	The issue of the landholder having to police biosecurity compliance across complex regulatory systems is not really addressed in the consultation paper and landholder groups may well have expected this concern to be addressed. Landholders are right, biosecurity is a <i>shared responsibility</i>, but this principle isn't consistently reflected throughout the Discussion Paper's recommendations and analysis. Many of the paper's recommendations focus on increasing expectations of resource proponents through enhanced compliance programs, monitoring, auditing, documentation and assurance activities. However, there is little discussion regarding: • how the biosecurity performance of landholders will be evaluated;

Discussion questions	Feedback on the draft Discussion Paper	AEP's suggestions
	However, the recommendations do not fully address the practical limitations associated with proving introduction or spread of weeds, pests or pathogens. Many biosecurity risks spread through multiple pathways including: – vehicle movements; – machinery; – livestock movements; – wildlife and feral animals; – water; – flood events; – wind dispersal; – neighbouring properties; – public road reserves; – stock routes; and – third-party contractors. It is often difficult to definitively establish <i>when</i> introduction occurred, by <i>whom</i> it occurred, and through <i>which</i> pathway(s). AEP is concerned that some aspects of the paper place significant emphasis on enhanced monitoring, record keeping and compliance obligations for resource proponents without considering what equivalent information may be required from landholders and other parties. Without a balanced evidentiary framework there is a risk that resource proponents become responsible for disproving allegations while other significant pathways remain undocumented.	• how Local Government compliance with biosecurity obligations will be assessed; • how biosecurity risks arising from public road reserves, stock routes, national parks, easements or public infrastructure will be managed; • how renewable energy developers and associated contractors will be held accountable; • what records landholders should maintain to support causation assessments; and • whether agricultural contractors should be subject to equivalent evidentiary expectations. Any future policy response should strengthen the <i>shared responsibility</i> model rather than creating expectations that resource proponents act as the default risk manager for complex regional biosecurity issues.
4. <i>Are there any further recommendations that would add value?</i>	It would have been useful to address the issue of managing the difference between the regulated biosecurity pests that are the focus of a landholder's BMP and the declared pests & weeds that are conditioned under standard conduct and compensation agreement (page 19).	Simple regulatory maps or diagrams of the different systems of biosecurity coverage would be a useful addition to the report, which could then be reused in fact sheets and other education and awareness-raising materials.

Discussion questions	Feedback on the draft Discussion Paper	AEP's suggestions
	As an example, the vexed question of lovegrass raises important questions regarding proportionality and practicality. The Discussion Paper notes that lovegrass is not currently listed under the Biosecurity Regulation and is not covered under declared pest provisions of the Land Access Code. Queensland Government guidance notes African & other Lovegrass varieties occur along roadsides, railway corridors and other disturbed areas and may be spread through a range of pathways including machinery, vehicles, roadside slashing and livestock. For species that are already broadly distributed throughout a landscape, policy responses should clearly distinguish between: – preventing introduction; – preventing spread; – regional management; – local management; and – eradication. Part of the general biosecurity obligation (GBO) and definition of a biosecurity event includes a consideration of potential impacts on human health (page 9). Given the unrelenting focus on workplace health and safety (WHS) in energy & resources, the Discussion Paper could have considered how existing industry WHS systems could be deployed to also demonstrate operational compliance with the GBO. Some mapping or diagrams of the biosecurity protections that exist across the three different regulatory systems would have been useful to illustrate that while resources and energy projects might be regulated differently to the landholder that these other	The paper highlights concern with the compliance with biosecurity obligations by resource proponents but gives limited attention to compliance with biosecurity obligations by landholders. The <i>Biosecurity Act</i> establishes obligations for <i>all</i> parties. This includes obligations on landholders to manage biosecurity risks under <i>their</i> control. The paper could be strengthened by recognising that biosecurity outcomes are influenced not only by the activities of proponents but also by: – weed management practices undertaken by landholders; – local management of invasive species; – livestock introduction practices; – fencing and containment; – contractor management; – compliance with property biosecurity arrangements; and – broader landscape management. A more balanced assessment would recognise that poor biosecurity outcomes can arise from failures by a range of parties and are not necessarily associated with resource development activities. The ongoing struggle to successfully manage Queensland's tick-line and the manner in which Privacy Act concerns are reported to have inhibited recent public notification processes is a recent example of where existing agricultural biosecurity processes have been demonstrated to have practical shortcomings.

Discussion questions	Feedback on the draft Discussion Paper	AEP's suggestions
	regulatory systems can deliver the same standard of protection alongside a landholder's BMP. A single proponent should not reasonably be expected to achieve outcomes beyond those being achieved by the broader regulatory system and wider community.	
5. <i>Recommendation 2 suggests the development of information and support services for landholders and companies managing biosecurity arrangements. In your view, what type of information and support services are most needed?</i>	As noted above, an extension service would be an excellent addition to increasing the sophistication of biosecurity planning. The Biosecurity Queensland audits could also be a useful mechanism for landholders or companies to assure themselves that they are reasonably managing their shared GBO responsibilities without fear of compliance action. In the context of landholders dealing with multiple easements, multiple access points and multiple contractors, it might be useful to consider a establishing a mediation service (perhaps under the LAO) so if any of the parties has a concern with the reasonableness or practicality of any other party's biosecurity performance, there's a non-litigious avenue to getting an independent holistic view on the differences of opinion. We note that Biosecurity Queensland is around half-way to filling their roster of 100 new biosecurity officers, and we'd expect that once a full contingent has been onboarded that these new resources will provide a palpable increase in information and support for landholders and companies managing biosecurity arrangements on the ground.	The paper should avoid creating an expectation that resource companies are responsible for disproving causation. Biosecurity disputes should continue to be assessed based on evidence and facts, recognising that causation is often complex and may involve numerous contributing factors. Any future framework should preserve established principles of evidence and accountability rather than creating implied presumptions regarding responsibility. Before additional compliance obligations, audit programs or regulatory responses are developed, consideration should be given to collecting and publishing evidence regarding the frequency, causes and pathways associated with confirmed biosecurity incidents across all sectors. Policy responses should be informed by demonstrated risk rather than stakeholder perception. The document should consider proportionality and cost-effectiveness when recommending additional assurance, monitoring and compliance measures. Regulatory responses should be calibrated to the demonstrated level of risk and should avoid creating requirements whose compliance costs exceed likely biosecurity benefits. Effective biosecurity management relies upon accurate information. Consideration should be given to encouraging both landholders and proponents to disclose known biosecurity risks,

Discussion questions	Feedback on the draft Discussion Paper	AEP's suggestions
		known infestations and relevant management activities so that biosecurity arrangements are based on complete information available to all parties. The Discussion Paper should clearly distinguish between legislative requirements, accepted industry practice and industry-leading examples. This distinction is important to avoid unintended elevation of voluntary practices into perceived compliance obligations.
6. <i>Are there any Leading Practice examples you're aware of that weren't captured in the draft Discussion Paper (Appendix 4)?</i>	QREC's guideline has a number of great examples of best practice and case studies that could have been included. It was surprising that there were no mining examples of best practice – particularly around rehabilitation and offsets.	Some further leading examples of beyond compliance and leading practice suggested by AEP members include: • Activities are undertaken in accordance with the Risk Minimisation Requirements of the DAF Queensland Biosecurity Manual (Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, 2019). • All vehicles/equipment carrying organic materials must have a valid biosecurity hygiene declaration for that load. • Weed, pest, and biosecurity management plan for compliance with obligations under the Biosecurity Act 2014 (Qld), including weed identification and management • Implement clean on entry procedures for vehicles and machinery & utilise vehicle wash down facilities to enable inspection and cleaning of vehicles prior to entry.

Attachment three: Parallel regulatory frameworks for biosecurity in Queensland

Regulators	Potential land uses				
	Agriculture	Resource tenures	Renewables – land use planning system	Easements & State lands	Protected Estate
Biosecurity Act	General Biosecurity Obligation – Section 23: Reasonable and practical steps to prevent and minimise biosecurity risks (page 10). Biosecurity risks to agriculture, the environment, human health and the economy (page 9).				
Biosecurity Queensland	All livestock producers – regulated biosecurity entities, (page 10). - Biosecurity Management Plan (BMP), (page 11). - Code of Practice (page 11) - Regulated weeds, pest and diseases (page 10).	BMP and regulated weeds can be included in the conduct & compensation agreement.	Access bound by BMP and regulated weeds, but accommodation can be negotiated with the landholder.	?	?
Local Governments	Regional Biosecurity Plans (page 10) - Invasive plants & priority species - Codes of practice and guidelines (page 11) - n/a	Regional Biosecurity Plans (page 10). - Invasive plants & priority species - Heed to codes of practice and guidelines (page 11) - n/a	Regional Biosecurity Plans - Invasive plants & priority species - Heed to codes of practice and guidelines (page 11) - Ecological Assessment Report (EAR), (page 13).	? ? ?	? ? ?
DETSI – EP Act	n/a n/a n/a	Environmental Authority – Environmental Values (page 16) - Invasive species, (page 16) - Weed management, (page 17)	Environmental Authority – Environmental Values, (page 16) - Invasive species (page 16) - Weed management (page 17)	? ? ?	? ? ?
Department of Resources – MERC Act.	n/a ? n/a	Land Access Code, (page 15) Declared pests, (page 15) Conduct and Compensation Agreements, (page 15)	n/a ? n/a	n/a ? n/a	n/a ? n/a
Land Access Ombudsman	n/a	Mediation & appeal processes (page 17).	n/a	?	n/a

Note: Based on the information in the Discussion Paper, appendix 2 page 28, could have presented a more nuanced summary of Queensland's biosecurity obligations for both mandatory requirements (above) and guidance materials (on the following page).

Guidance frameworks for biosecurity in Queensland.

	Agriculture	Resource tenures	Renewables – land use planning system
Frameworks that are not mandatory			
Property biosecurity plan (cropping) , (page 11)	X	Unless in CCA.	Unless by agreement.
Economic weeds , (page 35)	X	Unless in CCA.	Unless by agreement.
Biosecurity codes of practice , (pages 11, 24)	X	Unless in CCA.	Unless by agreement.
Certification – organic, Livestock Production Assurance (LPA) , (pages 10, 21)	X	Unless in CCA.	Unless by agreement.
Baseline weed assessment , (page 26)	X	Unless in CCA.	Unless by agreement.
Biosecurity guidelines , (page 11)	X	Unless in CCA.	Unless by agreement.
Visibility for neighbours? (page 7)	X	CCA not usually public.	Agreements are often confidential.
QREC guideline , (page 13)	X	n/a	QREC guideline
Lovegrass species , (page 19)	Not yet a regulated or a declared pest.		