

Morning,

1. Do you support the proposed option of clarifying obligations to manage psychosocial hazards?

Yes, the clarification is necessary as the current obligation does not specifically mention psychological hazards. The obligation will assist in the allocation of resources.

2. Which part of the proposed option do you support and why?

The two key proposed options- "clearer definitions in the context of psychological health", and "reporting obligations", both of the elements ensure the psychological impact of the mining impact rosters, FIFO and work pressures are risk assessed and provided additional consideration when investigating incidents or in the employment process.

3. Which part of the proposed option do you not support and why?

Nil.

4. If you do not support the proposed option, is there an alternate option which you do support?

N/A

5. Within the proposed option, do you support clarify reporting obligations for incidents relating to psychosocial hazards and psychological injuries?

Yes, the clarification of physical and psychological health will assist in the identification but must be supported by a mental health professional assessment.

6. Do you have any other feedback or comments about the proposed option?

The psychological health impact of mining personnel extends beyond the workers/employees. The family and support network of each employee could be taken into consideration when assessing the hazards of the mining operation. Availability to mental health professionals via EAP or other mental health professionals should be mandatory requirement and form part of the company general induction process.