

Impact Analysis Statement

Summary IAS

Details

Lead department	Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning
Name of the proposal	Amendments to Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026
Submission type	Summary Impact Analysis Statement
Title of related legislative or regulatory instrument	<i>Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014</i>
Date of issue	11 June 2026

What is the nature, size and scope of the problem? What are the objectives of Government action?

The Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (RPI(CA)OLA Bill) was introduced into Queensland Parliament on 25 March 2026.

The RPI(CA)OLA Bill proposes amendments to the *Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014* (MERC Act) to clarify and extend compensation arrangements for coal seam gas (CSG)-induced subsidence in the Condamine Alluvium CSG mapped area, including extending compensation liability to eligible landholders within a prescribed distance (5 kilometre) of a CSG resource authority. Following introduction of the Bill, stakeholder feedback and further Departmental analysis of the operation of the proposed provisions has identified two potential areas of ambiguity in the scope of the proposed subsidence compensation liability.

First, there is a risk that the current provisions could be interpreted as mutually exclusive, such that a landholder who is within the authorised area of, or access land, for one CSG resource authority – may be prevented from seeking compensation for CSG-induced subsidence impacts caused by another CSG resource authority within the prescribed 5-kilometre distance.

Second, the current provisions could allow subsidence compensation liability to arise in relation to a CSG resource authority located outside the Condamine Alluvium CSG mapped area where that authority is within five kilometres of impacted land inside the mapped area. This would extend the operation of the framework beyond the intended policy scope. The Condamine Alluvium CSG mapped area reflects the known CSG formations in the Condamine alluvium and covers the areas that may pose the greatest risk to the aquifer—consequently it is not considered necessary to extend the subsidence compensation liability to resource authorities outside the Condamine Alluvium CSG mapped area.

If not addressed, these provisions may create legal and operational uncertainty, increase the likelihood of disputes between landholders and petroleum resource authority holders, and potentially result in compensation liability applying more narrowly in some circumstances or more broadly in other circumstances, than intended.

Amendments to the RPI(CA)OLA Bill are required to clarify the intended operation of these provisions and ensure the provisions operate consistently with the original policy intent approved by Government.

What options were considered?

Option 1: Amend the MERC Act provisions in the Bill to clarify the scope of the subsidence compensation liability

Amend the MERC Act provisions in the Bill to: a. clarify that subsidence compensation liability may apply where affected land is within the authorised area of, or access land, for one CSG resource authority (on-tenure) and is also within the prescribed distance of another CSG resource authority (off-tenure); and b. clarify that subsidence compensation liability only applies where both the relevant CSG resource authority and the impacted land are within the Condamine Alluvium CSG mapped area. These amendments clarify the intended scope of the existing framework without changing the underlying policy intent.
Option 2: Retain the Bill as introduced
Under this option, no amendments would be made to the Bill as introduced. This may result in uncertainty regarding the interaction between on-tenure and off-tenure compensation pathways and may create the potential for compensation liability to arise in relation to CSG resource authorities outside the Condamine Alluvium CSG mapped area, which is unintended.
What are the impacts?
Option 1: Amend the MERC Act provisions in the Bill to clarify the scope of the subsidence compensation liability
Option 1 would: • improve legal clarity and certainty for landholders and petroleum resource authority holders regarding the intended scope of subsidence compensation liability; • reduce the risk of disputes regarding overlapping compensation eligibility; • ensure the framework operates consistently with the intended geographic scope of the Condamine Alluvium CSG mapped area; and • not materially alter the original policy intent, regulatory burden, or implementation arrangements approved through the RPI(CA)OLA Bill. The proposed amendments are technical and clarificatory in nature. The proposed amendments are not expected to result in significant additional compliance costs or regulatory burden for petroleum resource authority holders or affected landholders. By clarifying that the subsidence compensation framework only applies to CSG resource authorities within the Condamine Alluvium CSG mapped area, the amendments avoid unintended compensation exposure and associated compliance costs for petroleum resource authority holders operating outside the mapped area.
Option 2: Retain the Bill as introduced
Option 2 may: • create uncertainty regarding the operation of the compensation framework; • increase the risk of disputes regarding whether on-tenure and off-tenure compensation pathways are mutually exclusive; and • potentially extend compensation liability to CSG resource authorities outside the Condamine Alluvium CSG mapped area, contrary to the intended policy scope. This may create avoidable legal uncertainty for landholders, petroleum resource authority holders and decision-makers responsible for administering the framework.

Who was consulted?

The need for these amendments was identified following stakeholder feedback received after introduction of the RPI(CA)OLA Bill, including feedback from stakeholders through the Parliamentary Committee process and subsequent Departmental analysis of implementation scenarios.

Relevant Government agencies involved in delivery of the RPI(CA)OLA Bill have been consulted on the proposed amendments, including agencies represented on the existing Officer Working Group and Interdepartmental Committee established to support delivery of the reforms.

What is the recommended option and why?

The recommended option is Option 1: Amend the MERCP Act provisions in the Bill to clarify the scope of the subsidence compensation liability

Option 1 will clarify the intended operation of the subsidence compensation framework established through the RPI(CA)OLA Bill and ensure the provisions operate consistently with the original policy intent approved by Government.

The amendments are technical and clarificatory in nature, improve legal certainty for affected landholders and petroleum resource authority holders, reduce the risk of disputes, and ensure the framework operates only within the intended geographic and operational scope.

The amendments do not materially alter the substantive policy settings, regulatory impacts, implementation arrangements, or resource implications associated with the reforms previously introduced through the RPI(CA)OLA Bill.

Impact assessment

All proposals – complete:

	First full year	First 10 years**
Direct costs – Compliance costs*	Not estimated	Not estimated
Direct costs – Government costs	Not estimated	Not estimated

* The *direct costs calculator tool* (available at www.treasury.qld.gov.au/betterregulation) should be used to calculate direct costs of regulatory burden. If the proposal has no costs, report as zero. **Agency to note where a longer or different timeframe may be more appropriate.

Signed



.....
Graham Fraine
Director-General
Department of Natural Resources and Mines,
Manufacturing and Regional and Rural Development
Date: 11/06/2026



.....
Dale Last MP
Minister for Natural Resources and Mines
Minister for Manufacturing
Minister for Regional and Rural Development
Date: 11/06/2026