

SUBMISSION

Public consultation on the prohibition on the use of engineered stone

Instructions

To complete this online submission:

- Download and save this submission document to your computer.
- Use the saved version to enter your responses under each question below. These questions are from the [public consultation on the prohibition on the use of engineered stone](#).
- Once you have completed your submission, save it and upload it using the upload your submission link on the [Engage submission form](#).

Submissions will be accepted until **11.59 pm on 2 April 2023**.

Additional documentation

Up to three additional documents can also be uploaded when you submit your response. Relevant documents to upload could include cover letters or reports with data and evidence supporting your views.

Help

If you are experiencing difficulties making your submission online, please contact us at occhygiene@swa.gov.au.

Respondents may choose how their submission is published on the Safe Work Australia website by choosing from the following options:

- submission published
- submission published anonymously
- submission not published

For further information on the publication of submissions on Engage, please refer to the [Safe Work Australia Privacy Policy](#) and the [Engagement HQ privacy policy](#).

Please note the following are unlikely to be published:

- submissions containing defamatory material, and
- submissions containing views or information identifying parties involved in hearings or inquests which are currently in progress.

Your details

(Please leave blank if you wish to remain anonymous)

1. Name or organisation

Corestone

2. Email used to log into Engage

[REDACTED]

Consultation questions

1. Do you support a prohibition on the use of engineered stone? Please support your response with reasons and evidence.

No to a blanket prohibition, there is no alternative with the same qualities and price point.

2. If yes, do you support a prohibition on the use of all engineered stone irrespective of its crystalline silica content? Please support your response with reasons and evidence.

NA

3. If no, do you support a prohibition of engineered stone that contains more than certain percentage of crystalline silica? If yes, at what percentage of crystalline silica should a prohibition be set? Please support your response with reasons and evidence.

Yes, we as an organisation have used lower-silica alternatives to traditional engineered stone many times and find it as good to work with and comparable in terms of cost, application and durability as traditional engineered stone. Given natural stones can be up to 50% silica (to my knowledge), it seems reasonable that engineered stones with greater than 50% silica content be phased out.

4. How many businesses work with engineered stone only?

For these businesses, please provide where possible:

- a) the number of sole traders and small businesses (1-20 employees), medium businesses (21-200 employees), large businesses (>200 employees)
- b) the number of workers in these businesses, by business size
- c) the average annual revenue, by business size
- d) the proportion of business activity with engineered stone containing 40% or more crystalline silica content, by business size
- e) the proportion of business activity with engineered stone containing less than 40% crystalline silica content, by business size.

Please use the table below to enter this information.

Business type	Description	Sole traders and small business	Medium business	Large business
Business working with engineered stone only	Number of businesses			
	Number of people employed			
	total annual revenue (approximate, rounded to nearest \$10,000)			
	Proportion of business activity involving ES with $\geq 40\%$ silica			
	Proportion of business activity involving ES with $<40\%$ silica			

Click or tap to enter text.

5. How many businesses work with both engineered stone and non-engineered stone products?

For these businesses, please provide where possible:

- the number of sole traders and small businesses (1-20 employees), medium businesses (21-200 employees), large businesses (>200 employees)
- the number of workers in these businesses, by business size
- the average annual revenue, by business size
- the proportion of their business activity with non-engineered stone products, by business size
- the proportion of their business activity with engineered stone containing 40% or more crystalline silica content, by business size
- the proportion of their business activity with engineered stone containing less than 40% crystalline silica content.

Please use the table below to enter this information.

Business type	Description	Sole traders and small business	Medium business	Large business
Business working with both engineered stone and non-engineered stone products	Number of businesses	1		
	Number of people employed	5		
	Average yearly revenue (approximate, rounded to nearest \$1000)	1,500,000		
	Proportion of business activity involving ES with $\geq 40\%$ silica	80%		
	Proportion of business activity involving ES with $<40\%$ silica	5%		
	Proportion of business activity involving non-engineered stone products	15%		

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Do you have any data or information on the risks to workers from the other non-crystalline silica elements of engineered stone? Are these risks increased in engineered stone of less than 40% crystalline silica content?

No evidence has been presented to me that there is any difference in non-crystalline silica risk between the 2

7. In relation to Option 3, do you have:
- any information on the additional benefits of a licensing scheme over the enhanced regulation agreed by WHS ministers (Option 5a) that would already apply to engineered stone products containing less than 40% crystalline silica content?
 - feedback on the implementation of concurrent licensing schemes for both prohibited engineered stone and non-prohibited engineered stone?

We are in Victoria and are licensed by worksafe to work with engineered stone. It has significantly benefited our education on the matter, housekeeping and general manufacturing process. We highly support national licensing be rolled out in a similar manner to Victoria's licensing process (12 month grace period to establish correct systems) to purchase any engineered materials (including porcelain) with any silica content at all, as well as natural stones containing silica.

8. Are the assumptions and scenarios described for Option 6 in the Decision RIS accurate and appropriate? If not, why? Please provide additional information to support the impact analysis.

Seem appropriate at face value

9. Are there any other options or issues you think should be considered for a prohibition on the use of engineered stone?

nil

10. Should there be a transitional period for a prohibition on engineered stone? If so, should it apply to all options and how long should it be?

Yes, 12 months to phase out products with greater than 50% silica, the same time frame to introduce and implement a licensing system

11. Do you have any evidence or data on the number of cases of the other silica-related diseases (such as lung cancer, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, kidney disease, autoimmune disease) attributed to exposure to crystalline silica from engineered stone?

no

12. Do you have any additional evidence or information on the impacts of silicosis or silica-related diseases?

For example, the direct impacts on the affected worker from the disease, the impacts on the mental health of affected workers and their families, the healthcare costs to the affected worker, loss of income for affected workers and their families, the costs to the health, workers' compensation and social support systems.

no