



LandTasmania

Place Names Act

Stakeholder and Community Consultation Report

November 2017

Contents

.....	1
Contents	1
Background	2
About this document	2
Overview	3
Introduction	3
Consultation Process	3
Feedback.....	4
Submissions	4
Issue 1: Governance	5
Issue 2: Guidelines and standards.....	7
Issue 3: Ambiguity about ‘Place’	9
Issue 4: Assignment of names to public thoroughfares	11
Issue 5: Assignment, approval and consultation processes	13
Issue 6: Depiction and registration of place names.....	15
Issue 7: Enforcement in the use of official place names	16
Other Issues:.....	17
Conclusions and Next Steps.....	17
Appendix A: Submissions Received to the Issues Paper (September 2015).....	18
Appendix B: Submissions Received to the initial consultation report (July 2017).....	19

Background

PLACE NAMES are critically important reference points for all members of the community. From natural features, such as rivers and mountains, to cities, streets and reserves, place names are the most common way that people identify geographical locations. While the existence and use of place names may be taken for granted in everyday life, the importance of rigorous processes for assigning appropriate and authoritative names to natural and manmade features generally goes unnoticed.

Tasmania's current system for the official naming of places was established more than sixty years ago and embedded in provisions of the *Survey Co-ordination Act 1944* (the Act). While minor amendments have been made to the Act over the years, the legislative provisions that relate to place naming remain largely unchanged and no longer reflect technological advancement, different administrative arrangements or contemporary digital data management.

When a preliminary review of the Act was initiated several years ago, a key finding of the consultation process was that the legislative provisions for place naming – or nomenclature – were outmoded, confusing, complicated and inconsistent with modern administrative processes. The most critical ongoing demand is for consistent, accurate and up-to-date place names to assist Tasmania's emergency management organisations in the protection of life and property. At a more general level, there is significant demand for more efficient, streamlined naming processes, and data about the location and extent of places, for use across a diverse range of administrative and planning scenarios in both public and private sector organisations.

In response, the first step in the modernisation process was development of [Placenames Tasmania](#), the Tasmanian Government's online register of all official Tasmanian place names, which was publicly released in 2014. A significant function of *Placenames Tasmania* is the introduction of electronic submission and processing of new names proposed by Local Government Authorities and other proponents. Through this service, members of the public can also search online for place names; locate those places on a map and access information about the historical significance and origin of existing or superseded names.

The next step in the process is to modernise the legislation to clarify the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in the official naming process, further streamline the underpinning administrative processes and enhance opportunities for compliance with national standards. The *Survey Co-ordination Act 1944* is administered by the Minister for Primary Industries and Water. The Minister has endorsed development of proposed new place names legislation.

About this document

This document is the final summary of the extensive consultation process that has been undertaken, summarising the final feedback and comments. This has informed the Department's Preferred Position, included in this document, forming the basis of the drafting instructions to be developed for the proposed new Place Names Bill.

Overview

Introduction

A *Place Names Act Issues Paper* was developed to present a number of issues and proposals to help inform proposed new place names legislation. The issues were identified through community consultation and the *Paper* was distributed to interested organisations to comment, raise other issues and suggest potential solutions.

The *Stakeholder and Community Consultation Report and Preferred Position* was prepared to summarise the outcomes of the above consultation process and provide a preferred position. The *Report* was redistributed to stakeholder groups for information and an opportunity for final feedback prior to commencing the drafting of new legislation.

Consultation Process

The objective of the consultation process was to engage with key stakeholders and interested members of the broader Tasmanian community to assess community opinion, generate constructive feedback and foster support for the development of new place naming legislation.

The *Place Names Act Issues Paper*, together with a covering letter, was distributed on 29 September 2015 to a range of stakeholders that had been identified as either contributing to the place naming process, or having an interest in this process. Notices were also placed on both the Place Naming page on the DPIPWE web site, and the Tasmanian Government's Public Notices web page. Submissions were invited on the proposals outlined in the issues paper, together with support or otherwise for the options proposed. The closing date for submissions was 30 November 2015.

The Department received a number of considered responses to the issues paper (those submitting are listed in Appendix A), and consolidated those responses into the *Place Names Act Stakeholder and Community Consultation Report and Preferred Position*. This report, together with a covering letter, was released back to the stakeholder community for review and additional feedback on 28 July 2017, with a closing date for submissions of 1 September 2017. In preparing the report for release, draft proposed guidelines were developed which will accompany the legislation, and are referred to in the report. It became clear that stakeholders ought to have an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the intended treatment of guidelines as they are integral to how some aspects of the new legislation will be given effect. The *Tasmanian Place Naming Guidelines Draft* was also supplied to the stakeholder community for review and feedback on 28 July 2017.

Next steps for consultation

From the consultation process and taking into account feedback and submissions, this *Stakeholder and Community Consultation Report* has been drafted and Ministerial consent to begin drafting the new legislation will now be sought.

Once a functional draft Bill is prepared, stakeholders will again be issued that document to comment on its form and content.

The final version of the Bill will be circulated when it is introduced to Parliament.

Feedback

Submissions

Submissions received in relation to the consultation report are listed in Appendix B.

The submissions received from the first phase of consultation, acknowledged the need to develop new contemporary place naming legislation and were supportive of the proposed options. Further informal conversations with local government officers in relation to street naming issues in particular indicated unanimous support for improved processes for the timely and consistent finalisation of street names.

The submissions received from the subsequent consultation from the *Place Names Act Stakeholder and Community Consultation Report and Preferred Position* similarly supported the process, with most being fully supportive and some providing feedback to particular wording or outcomes. A large percentage of the feedback was in relation to the draft Guidelines.

DRAFT

Issue 1: Governance

Modernise the appointment and governance arrangements for the place naming process.

Final Department Preferred Position Issue 1

1.1 To dispense with a formally structured Nomenclature Board.

1.2 Provide for a Ministerially appointed panel of up to ten persons as members of a Place Names Advisory Panel composed of the Surveyor-General as chair; a senior officer from the Department with the primary responsibility for the State's spatial data and mapping, and with Ministerial appointed representatives from each of:

Local Government, Emergency Services, Parks and Wildlife Service, outdoor recreational groups; together with up to two other persons having knowledge, background and experience in heritage or historical matters; and orthography or linguistics; and up to two appointments from Aboriginal communities.

The suggested term for the Ministerial appointments is three years with opportunity for a further three year reappointment.

1.3 The panel will be convened by the chair on a needs basis, based on expertise required to address relevant naming proposals. This means that not all panel members shall be required for all decisions.

1.4 Provide for a Registrar of Place Names to be appointed by the Departmental Secretary to carry out the functions of registering the names of places and maintaining the Place Names Register

1.5 Place names (other than road and street names) to be assigned by the Minister upon advice and recommendation from the Surveyor-General.

Feedback

All submissions either endorsed or were supportive of this proposal.

A number of submissions suggested additional representatives on the Place Names Advisory Panel or alterations to the proposed composition of the Panel. Suggestions included:

- include a representative of the Department of State Growth to represent views of the State road authority;
- that numerous organisations involved in outdoor recreational pursuits have a legitimate interest in place naming, not just Bushwalking Tasmania;
- as the major public land management authority and a key stakeholder, Parks and Wildlife Service (PWS) should have input into naming features under its jurisdiction;
- need for the broader Aboriginal Communities to be represented, rather than only a Tasmanian Aboriginal Corporation (TAC) viewpoint in Aboriginal and heritage matters;

The Tasmanian Regional Aboriginal Communities Alliance (TRACA) outlined that they wished to be heavily consulted on place naming processes, and argued it was essential that an advisory body be established that has one representative each from the TAC and TRACA. They noted that it is important to ensure Aboriginal names are used along with Anglo names to recognize indigenous history and culture. TRACA requested that

local Aboriginal languages are used to name cities, towns suburbs or localities, habitations or other features of cultural significance.

Discussion

The preferred position has been updated to reflect feedback in relation to outdoor and recreation groups and PWS is recognised as the Public Land Management authority listed. The relatively small number of State Growth authority names considered by the Board currently is not seen as sufficient to justify inclusion on the Panel, but this may change in time. The preferred position has been updated to specify up to two representatives from Aboriginal communities, and further policy and procedures will be outlined in the reviewed Aboriginal and Dual Naming Policy when it is released, which should cover the other comments and feedback outlined.

DRAFT

Issue 2: Guidelines and standards

Introduce a requirement for the development and maintenance of published guidelines. Provide that these guidelines will be used for local conformity with national standards, rules and guidelines. Provide that these guidelines will be used to assess the suitability of place names and provide an authoritative basis for the potential rejection of unsuitable names.

Final Department Preferred Position Issue 2

- 2.1 New legislation will refer to published guidelines to ensure conformance and consistency with national rules and guidelines for the naming of places.
- 2.2 These guidelines will be endorsed by the Minister following development by the Department. The guidelines will be developed through consultation with key stakeholders and conform to national protocols.
- 2.3 The guidelines will set out the principles, practices and processes to be followed in selecting, assigning, altering or discontinuing the name of a place.
- 2.4 The guidelines will set out the responsibilities of naming authorities prior to the name of a place being selected, assigned, altered or discontinued including the requirements for consultation.
- 2.5 The processes and rules for Aboriginal and Dual Naming will continue to be documented through a separate Government policy.
- 2.6 The guidelines shall be reviewed periodically as required.

Feedback

All submissions generally supported the proposed approach.

One submission questioned the equity of the preferred position if it was to defer part of the decision making to the Aboriginal and Dual Naming Policy, believing that one Aboriginal representative group was providing the direction for place naming that was not equitable to the rest of place naming. The submission also noted that consultation with key stakeholders needs to be broadened with proposed names to appear in all regional dailies and on social media.

The TRACA submission made note of the Intergovernmental Committee on Surveying and Mapping's (ICSM) Principles for the Consistent Use of Place Names document developed by the Permanent Committee on Place Names (PCPN) and in particular the Principles for the Use and Recording of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Place Names as the national standards that apply to Australia. The principles include recognition of Aboriginal people's rights to consultation and participation when it comes to official naming processes. TRACA indicated the Nomenclature Authority should examine these principles and work with Aboriginal communities as to how they are implemented in Tasmania, with emphasis on local Aboriginal groups.

The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in its submission noted that it is not clear whether the guidelines are intended to have the status of mandatory, enforceable rules; the draft legislation needs to clarify this.

Discussion

The preferred position has been updated to reflect feedback and note the review of the guidelines. The feedback on recognition of national standards and Aboriginal and Dual naming will be dealt with in a separate review of policy and procedures in the review of the Aboriginal and Dual Naming Policy, which should cover the other feedback outlined. The ICSM Principles for the Consistent Use of Place Names has been the basis from which the Draft Tasmanian Place Naming Guidelines have been developed.

DRAFT

Issue 3: Ambiguity about ‘Place’

Allow for an unambiguous definition of ‘place’ that acknowledges all natural and man-made features represented in contemporary digital mapping. Provide an unambiguous interpretation of what constitutes ‘place’ in relation to legislative responsibility for the assignment and/or management of place names in Tasmania. Distinguish between the authority to assign names to places under *Place Names* legislation and the assignment of names to ‘other’ places authorised under separate legislation or by other organisations. Be subordinate to (outranked by) other legislation or regulation that allocates specific place names, such as local government areas or electoral districts. Provide the Minister with discretionary power to facilitate the assignment of names to ‘other’ places of significant cultural or public interest not covered under any other legislation

Final Department Preferred Position Issue 3

- 3.1 New legislation will clearly define “place” in relation to legislative responsibility for assignment and management of naming.
- 3.2 New legislation will also be specific in excluding those names that are assigned under other existing legislation, together with those features not intended to be included under new place naming legislation e.g. buildings.
- 3.3 A Place will include:
 - A geographic feature (whether or not covered by water); and
 - A city, town, locality or suburb, habitation or other feature of community or cultural significance; and
 - A highway, road, street, lane or thoroughfare that is open to or used by the public; and
 - A park, recreation or sporting ground, walking or bike track that is open to or used by the public; and
 - Any other place that is, or is likely to be, of public, cultural or historical interest.
- 3.4 A Place will not include:
 - An electoral district or division; or
 - A local government area or ward; or
 - A building or similar structure; or
 - A place that is given or may be given a name under any other Act.

Feedback

All submissions supported the stated intention of Issue 3 of the new legislation.

Launceston City Council (LCC) noted in their submission that in current legislation a ‘place’ does not include a street in a city or town, allowing council to approve a street name and advise the Nomenclature Board. A robust consultation and evaluation system is already in place prior to formal council approval. Council do not wish to see extra additional steps introduced for road and street naming. LCC also believe it seemed logical that naming of Council owned parks, recreation or sporting grounds, walking or bike tracks that are public should be the function of local council.

TRACA's submission noted the Minister could have discretionary powers on the proviso that the relevant advisory committee has been gone through and that it has been publicly noted in the papers. Careful consideration would be required where Aboriginal clans/groups have close boundaries.

Discussion

No change to the preferred position has been deemed necessary. LCC's queries are sufficiently covered in the discussion for 'Issue 4: Assignment of names to public thoroughfares' and TRACA's advice is noted and will be referenced in the guidelines.

DRAFT

Issue 4: Assignment of names to public thoroughfares

Provide clarity for the authorised and responsible naming of all thoroughfares, including privately developed streets, roads, tracks, etc. Allocate responsibility for the naming of public thoroughfares (including those that will be publicly managed and/or have addressed dwellings) to the authority with relevant road management responsibility, in accordance with established guidelines. Provide the Minister with discretionary power to overrule or intervene in the assignment of an unsuitable or non-compliant place name.

Final Department Preferred Position Issue 4

- 4.1 New legislation will provide for the relevant road authority to have responsibility for naming of all trafficable public thoroughfares (roads and streets) excluding walking tracks.
- 4.2 New legislation will require all trafficable thoroughfares public or private that are named to be named in accordance with the principles and processes in published guidelines.
- 4.3 New legislation will provide for Local Government to have the responsibility for naming private thoroughfares, including aged care facilities and gated communities where there are residences addressed or capable of being addressed to privately maintained roads.
- 4.4 Providing such road names conform to the guidelines, receipt of advice of the road name from the road naming authority, or in the case of private thoroughfares from Local Government, will cause those names to be recorded as approved names in the Place Names Register.
- 4.5 New legislation will provide for any road or street name which does not comply with the Guidelines to be referred to the Advisory Panel by the Registrar of Place Names.

Feedback

The majority of submissions were supportive of the preferred position.

LCC's submission noted that they did not agree with the issues identified in the current legislation from the *Stakeholder and Community Consultation Report and Preferred Position* for Issue 4. Council also noted that they were against any additional steps to road naming being added to the current process and saw the requirement to refer names to the Minister or delegate for approval as counterproductive.

The Tasmanian Planning Commission (TPC) submission noted that it was unclear if the Department's preferred position 4.1 in relation to 'trafficable public thoroughfares (roads and streets)' includes public thoroughfares limited to foot traffic only, such as walkways, footways, alleys and arcades. It is noted that a road, highway or street is defined variously in separate legislation, including the Roads and Jetties Act 1935, Traffic Act 1925, Highways Act 1951 and Local Government (Highways) Act 1982, and may include items not normally associated with these terms. For example, a 'highway' may include mall [section 3 of Local Government (Highways) Act 1982], a 'public street' may include a footpath or public place [section 3 of Traffic Act 1925], and a 'road' may include a bicycle path, vehicular ferry or boat ramp [section 3 of the Roads and jetties Act 1935]. It is considered that the new legislation should clarify that public thoroughfares restricted to foot traffic (walkways, footways, alleys, malls and arcades) are the responsibility of local government and provide for an appropriate definition.

TRACA believe there should be dispensation in the guidelines on a percentage of new suburbs to be Aboriginal named, and that local Aboriginal groups are able to provide street names and that the local road authority should work closely with these groups. TRACA also wish to be involved in the naming process for walking tracks. TRACA wishes to ensure the assigning of new Aboriginal names remains subject to the control of the Aboriginal community, but recognises there are many Aboriginal communities.

DHHS in its submission questions why road or street name proposals will not be routinely advertised in the same manner as other types of place names. DHHS suggests that all proposals should be advertised for at least 6 weeks, unless there are pressing reasons not to. DHHS would like to have regular email updates on forthcoming place name proposals.

Discussion

In respect to LCC's feedback, the proposed new legislation will not introduce new steps for the council in respect to road and street naming. As outlined in position 4.4 these are not required to be referred to the Minister as long as naming conforms to the guidelines. In respect to the TPC feedback, it is envisaged that considerations in respect to the definition of 'trafficable public thoroughfares' can be catered for sufficiently in the guidelines to accompany the legislation.

As previously mentioned, the review of the Aboriginal and Dual Naming policy should sufficiently cover the TRACA provided feedback points, along with the intended Aboriginal community membership of the Place Names Advisory Panel. In respect to the DHHS comments, the road authorities conduct thorough consultation processes prior to submission of a road and street name, the Department's preferred position is that road and street naming continue to reside with the road authorities, provided the guidelines which incorporate standards are complied with. The registrar of place names will have oversight of road and street naming proposals and will have authority to refer non-complying names to the panel for resolution.

Issue 5: Assignment, approval and consultation processes

Provide the Minister with discretionary power to vary the consultation and approval processes for potentially contentious place names or the naming of prominent features. Provide for the description of place name categories suitable for public consultation, reflected in the proposed guidelines. Provide for the assignment of non-contentious names to man-made features without the requirement for reference group/advisory committee consideration or public gazettal. Mandate that the process to assign names to natural features is subject to reference group/advisory committee consideration and public gazettal. Provide for community consultation processes to occur prior to the formal assignment and gazettal of those names perceived as likely to generate strong community interest and/or debate. Provide that the assignment status of a place name is deemed to be final at the point of gazettal.

Final Department Preferred Position Issue 5

- 5.1 New legislation will provide for flexibility in the consultation and approval process and timeframes to provide for community input in place name proposals.
- 5.2 New legislation will provide for effective community consultation processes for naming proposals.
- 5.3 New legislation will provide for flexibility to correct minor errors, remove and replace names where there is no change to community use or expectations of a name or extent of a name.
- 5.4 New legislation will facilitate the formalisation or recording of pre-existing names of non-geographic features which have been assigned by other organisations and accepted by the community e.g. council parks and walking tracks, and significant infrastructure features e.g. bridges.
- 5.5 New legislation will provide that the assignment status of a place name (other than road and street names) is deemed to be final at the point of gazettal.
- 5.6 New legislation will provide for public exhibition and notice, as well as the opportunity for the community to object to a proposed place name.

Feedback

Submissions were supportive of the preferred position.

TPC in its submission considered that public exhibition and notice of proposed place names is a fundamental requirement to ensure public participation and acceptance. In view of this, it considered that the new legislation should include provisions for public exhibition, provide for a minimum exhibition period of 28 days, with flexibility to extend in the case of contentious or significant matters, and specify the form of notice. The Department's preferred position 5.5 is endorsed by TPC, and outlined that there should be no objection period following gazettal, although it is noted that decisions on place names may still be challenged under common law unless specifically provided for in legislation. It is submitted that the new legislation should limit appeals to the Supreme Court to matters of law only, such as jurisdictional issues and administrative law, including natural justice or procedural fairness. TPC noted that the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* contains a similar provision adopted for planning decisions and also contains a suitable model for public exhibition and submissions.

TRACA would like to see the current Aboriginal and Dual Naming Policy reviewed and reference the directions of the ICSM Principles for the Consistent Use of Place Names. They request that the consultation processes be clearly defined and have minimum standards. TRACA would like to see the Minister have discretionary powers in reviewing and replacing offensive names and utilise new Aboriginal names to turn around the negative history. TRACA requests an advisory committee relating to Aboriginal place naming be established.

DHHS question how far the guidelines will reflect the mandatory requirements of the proposed legislation, such as the right to object to a place name proposal. The recommendation is to preserve such rights in statute rather than purely guidelines.

Discussion

The preferred position has been updated to reflect feedback from TPC and DHHS in relation to public exhibition and notice and objection opportunities. As previously mentioned, the review of the Aboriginal and Dual Naming policy should cover the TRACA provided feedback points along with the intended Aboriginal community membership of the Place Names Advisory Panel. The Nomenclature Board has recommended to the Department that a process of reviewing and replacing offensive names commences.

DRAFT

Issue 6: Depiction and registration of place names

Acknowledge *Placenames Tasmania* as the official register and single, authoritative ‘point of truth’ for Tasmanian place names. Provide that spatial depiction of the location and extent of a place is linked to all place names held within the register, regardless of the original naming authority.

Final Department Preferred Position Issue 6

- 6.1 *Placenames Tasmania* will be the single authoritative register for all Tasmanian place names.
- 6.2 *Placenames Tasmania* will provide public access for Tasmanian place names and extents, together with any other background information that may be deemed appropriate.
- 6.3 *Placenames Tasmania* will record all names assigned through the formal place naming process together with other place names assigned through other legislation.
- 6.4 *Placenames Tasmania* will have a discretionary capacity to record other names not required to be assigned under the proposed new legislation.

Feedback

All submissions received were supportive of the preferred position.

TPC noted in its submission that the report does not make clear how decisions on place names made by other agencies will be recorded in *Placenames Tasmania*. It is assumed that the new legislation will impose a requirement on local government and other agencies to notify *Placenames Tasmania* when place names are assigned by other legislation. TPC also notes that if there is public interest in a place name, it is considered that the proposed place name should be required to be assigned under the new legislation.

Discussion

The preferred position has been amended to remove the reference to ‘the public interest’, but has retained discretion for the registrar to record other names not required to be assigned under the proposed legislation. The TPC feedback on the issue of requirement to notify is noted. The considered position of the Department is that this cannot be accommodated by this legislation.

Issue 7: Enforcement in the use of official place names

Provide for the application of penalties for the intentional misuse of official place names.

Final Department Preferred Position Issue 7

- 7.1 New legislation may provide for the application of penalties for the intentional misuse of official place names.
- 7.2 New legislation may outline penalties to be applied, responsible parties for enforcement and when the intentional misuse of official place names should be enforced.
- 7.3 New legislation will enable the Chair of the Advisory Panel to refer matters to the Director of Consumer Affairs.

Feedback

The majority of submissions were supportive of the preferred position, although a number requested more detail on the power of the legislation, penalties and its desire to enforce the rules. It was noted that it was unclear who will be responsible for enforcement under the new legislation and how far this would stretch. Feedback included whether there should be provision for an 'on the spot' penalty, noting that such a provision would simplify enforcement and avoid unnecessary court appearances.

Discussion

The preferred position has been updated to reflect feedback and this issue will be further reviewed once the initial draft of the legislation is developed. The *Surveyors Act 2002* provides for referral to the Director of Consumer Affairs in relation to investigation of complaints and determination of sanctions, which may provide guidance to the new legislation.

Other Issues:

Through the first phase of stakeholder consultation it was suggested by the TAC that Place Names Advisory Panel members undergo Aboriginal cultural competency courses or sessions as part of the induction process. The Department endorsed the suggestion, with the notion that it could be accommodated in administrative arrangements rather than in the Act or guidelines.

A submission to the final consultation strongly opposed this suggestion. With previous experience in one of these courses the proponent believed that it would unfairly skew the position and view of panel members. The same submission also called on the current Aboriginal and Dual Naming Policy to be fundamentally altered to ensure the new Place Names Act is able to cater for the majority non-Indigenous population as well as the non-TAC indigenous groups.

Conclusions and Next Steps

The recent consultation has been undertaken to test the Department's views on the proposals developed through the previous stakeholder consultation process over a number of years. The proposals were developed to resolve the identified issues and provide for a more effective process in the timely approval of place names to meet community and emergency service requirements.

There have been clear indications from stakeholders, ever since a preliminary review of the *Survey Coordination Act 1944* was conducted in 2006, that current naming processes defined in that Act no longer effectively supported contemporary management of geospatial information and the feedback through the consultation process has confirmed this.

The support for the development of new legislation has been unanimous throughout the consultation process. There is substantially uniform support from the stakeholder community for developing new legislation to manage the place naming process.

This summary document contains the Department's final considered views and Ministerial consent to begin drafting the new legislation will now be sought. Drafting instructions will now be prepared for the Office of Parliamentary Counsel that will draft the proposed legislation. Once a suitable draft is available, the stakeholder community will be further consulted.

Appendix A: Submissions Received to the Issues Paper (September 2015)

The *Place Names Act Issues Paper* was distributed to 48 organisations within Tasmania covering all those organisations and groups that have had an interest or role in the place naming process. In addition this paper was also distributed to other State and Territory place naming bodies.

Feedback was received from the following organisations:
Secretary, Department of State Growth
Secretary, Department of Police & Emergency Management
Secretary, Department of Health & Human Services
General Manager Parks and Wildlife Service
Chief Information Officer Hydro Tasmania
General Manager, Circular Head Council
General Manager, Kentish Council
General Manager, Latrobe Council
General Manager, West Tamar Council
CEO, Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre (Now Corporation)
Secretary, Hobart Walking Club
Secretary, Bushwalking Tasmania
Secretary, New Zealand Geographic Board Ngā Pou Taunaha o Aotearoa, Office of the Surveyor-General
Spatial Data Coordinator, Department of Natural Resources and Mines, QLD

Appendix B: Submissions Received to the initial consultation report (July 2017)

The *Place Names Act Stakeholder and Community Consultation Report and Preferred Position and Tasmanian Place Naming Guidelines Draft* were distributed to 48 organisations within Tasmania covering all those organisations and groups that have had an interest or role in the place naming process. In addition these documents was also distributed to other State and Territory place naming bodies.

Feedback was received from the following organisations:
Secretary, Department of State Growth
Secretary, Department of Health & Human Services
General Manager, Parks and Wildlife Service
Deputy Commissioner of Police
Devonport City Council
Launceston City Council
Meander Valley Council
Southern Midlands Council
Co-chairs, Tasmanian Regional Aboriginal Communities Alliance
Secretary, Bushwalking Tasmania
Secretary, North West Walking Club
Planning Advisor, Tasmanian Planning Commission
Board Member, Nomenclature Board of Tasmania