



Director
Direct line
Email
Our ref
Your ref

Emily Shoemark
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
81073 ES
AA1000694

Monday, 13 October 2025

Exemptions
ACCC
GPO Box 3131
Canberra ACT 2601
exemptions@acc.gov.au

Dear Commission

APPLICATION FOR AUTHORISATION AA1000694 - B-CYCLE 2.0

We refer to the Draft Determination issued by the ACCC in relation to Application AA1000694 issued on 28 August 2025, and the BSC's initial supporting submissions provided to the ACCC on 22 September 2025.

These further submissions responds to the additional Interested Party submissions which have now published on the Public Register.

1 General comments on the interest party submissions

- 1.1 The BSC wishes to publicly thank the organisations that made submissions for the general support for both the B-cycle Scheme and the Draft Determination.
- 1.2 In relation to the ongoing comments and concerns about the need for a national mandatory Scheme, BSC submits that:
 - (a) Currently, while BSC is involved in the consultation process for the NSW regulations, it is largely in the government's hands as to:
 - (i) When participation in battery stewardship will become mandatory in NSW
 - (ii) When other states will implement similar legislation to NSW, and how closely that legislation will mirror the *NSW Product Lifecycle Responsibility Act 2025*.
 - (iii) If there will ever be a single national solution rather than state- based regulation.

- (b) If authorisation is not granted as proposed by the Draft Determination, this will mean that B-cycle can only continue as the only battery stewardship scheme in Australia currently operating if the interim authorisation is not revoked. This will likely result in there being a period of time in which there is no battery stewardship scheme operating in Australia until mandatory stewardship is implemented in each state.

2 Responses to specific issues raised

- 2.1 Please find **overleaf** the BSC responses to specific issues and comments raised in the interest party submissions regarding the Draft Determination, which have been collated into common themes to assist the Commission.
- 2.2 In relation to the submissions made by an unidentified Interested Party,¹ those submissions make a number of assertions which are seemingly unsupported by evidence, which has not been provided with the submission. In particular, that submission asserts:
 - (a) there is existing commercial battery management by established commercial providers which manage batteries comprehensively, including procurement, testing, storage, transport, recycling, and disposal. These services are provided by established commercial providers, making the BSC scheme duplicative and unnecessary.
 - (b) The Scheme has not demonstrated significant benefits beyond button cell safety, and broader stewardship is already managed effectively under existing legal and commercial frameworks. Existing global frameworks (e.g., ISO standards) already govern battery stewardship effectively. The BSC scheme adds inefficiency and duplication, particularly in global supply chains.
 - (c) BSC undertakes conduct which creates a misleading perception that the Scheme is government-funded or regulator-operated.²
- 2.3 The anonymous nature of the submission makes this assertion difficult for BSC to respond to all aspects of the submission without knowing the identity nor scale of operations of the operations and transparency of the Interested Party. However, the BSC provide the following comment:
 - (a) The extensive consultation process undertaken both prior to the inception of the Scheme and in designing B-cycle 2.0 does not support the assertion that established commercial providers which manage batteries comprehensively, including procurement, testing, storage, transport, recycling, and disposal.
 - (b) The BSC does not agree that existing commercial battery management options are adequate. With the Collection Rate still under 20% it is evident that such arrangements are not solving the market failure. BSC is of the view that the current public detriment caused by button battery injuries and fires in the waste and recycling sector establishes the need for stewardship to facilitate accelerated outcomes.

¹ Submission by An interested Party 10/9/2025.

² As asserted by the submissions of An interested Party 10/9/2025.

- (c) The scheme has made significant progress which is evidenced by the increase in accessibility with now more than 5,700 Drop off Points and 94.8% of Australians within 15 minutes travel to a Drop off Point. BSC agrees that accelerated outcomes are needed but also notes that Collection Volume is increasing steadily and is credible when compared internationally (refer to page 30 of the [Positive Charge Report](#) FY 25).
- (d) There is no evidence to support the statement that existing global frameworks already govern battery stewardship effectively. If this were the case, BSC would expect to see 90+% Collection Rates (such as seen for lead acid batteries) and Australia would not be experiencing continued button battery injuries and escalating fires in the waste and recycling sector. Further, the battery stewardship schemes adopted across the world and in particular in Europe demonstrates that there exists no global framework to effectively govern battery stewardship without a stewardship scheme.
- (e) any reference to the ACCC or use of its logo by the BSC does not go any further than confirming that the ACCC has authorised the scheme, and the BSC strongly denies that it engages in any conduct which creates a misleading perception that the Scheme is government-funded or regulator-operated.

2.4 BSC refers the ACCC to the Application at [4.43] and [7.4] and Attachments 4 and 5, as well as its original application for authorisation in 2020 and the attachments to that application regarding:

- (a) the consultation process both prior to 2020 and throughout 2024;
- (b) the market failures identified by industry which support the need for a battery stewardship scheme in Australia; and
- (c) the identification by the Commonwealth government of the need for a battery stewardship scheme by way of identifying battery products on the Priority List, and by NSW by way of passing of the *NSW Product Lifecycle Responsibility Act 2025* and the commitment of the Victorian government to regulate on 7 October 2025.

2.5 In relation to comments made by Ecocycle relating to an alleged debt owed and serious confidentiality breaches, these are matters in direct dispute with the BSC and being dealt with through legal channels. To the extent appropriate, the BSC has addressed these issues in previous submissions.

BSC looks forward the final Determination and is available to assist the ACCC if required by way of meetings and/or further submissions.

Sincerely



EMILY SHOEMARK

Issue raised	BSC response
<u>Need for a mandatory scheme and legislative intervention</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The voluntary scheme discourages participation, limiting its effectiveness and risks market failure. Whilst the Scheme remains voluntary in nature, any fee increases will simply lead to lower industry participation and a greater number of free riders impacting both the financial viability of the Scheme and community access to it³ 2. Lessons from button battery safety legislation highlight the need for mandatory schemes to reduce harm. ⁴ 3. Non-participants in the scheme benefit from free recycling without bearing costs, leading to "free rider" issues. Levy-paying participants face competitive disadvantages, potentially leading to higher levies and reduced participation over time. The determination does not account for self-interest-driven competitor behaviour, which undermines collective efforts.⁵ 5. Support for immediate implementation of mandatory stewardship schemes, and National or federal intervention to ensure consistent requirements across states or alignment with state reforms (e.g., <i>NSW Product Lifecycle Responsibility Act</i>) ⁶ 6. Voluntary schemes like B-cycle reduce the impetus for mandatory government regulation, which is necessary for a comprehensive solution. Rejecting authorisation would prompt governments to regulate a mandatory stewardship scheme, addressing free riders and increasing public benefits. ⁷ 	<p>BSC agrees that mandatory participation in the Scheme is needed to achieve both the environmental and safety objectives of the Scheme. As explained at paragraph 1.2 above, the timing of implementation of mandatory stewardship schemes and federal intervention is outside of the control of BSC.</p> <p>BSC also agrees that the voluntary nature of the B-cycle Scheme is not sufficient to achieve both B-cycle's objectives. However, currently a voluntary scheme is the best solution which seeks to implement a national framework for battery stewardship.</p> <p>The significant time and consultation with industry in developing B-cycle 2.0 is designed to strengthen the current framework to address weaknesses. This will enable a strong basis on which mandatory participation can build on, when government regulation mandates participation.</p> <p>BSC is working closely with Government agencies to ensure that the B-cycle 2.0 authorisation will support the efficiency and outcomes of regulation.</p> <p>In relation to the submissions made at points 5 and 7, it is the BSC understanding from its consultations with the NSW government, other state Governments and the Commonwealth government that the timeline for mandatory stewardship is not impacted by the ACCC authorisation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Rather, the work done in the re-design of B-cycle 2.0 and the authorisation of the revised Scheme enables regulation of mandatory participation in battery stewardship to be implemented more quickly and efficiently.</p>

³ Powercell Submission 19/9/25; WMRR Submission 18/9/25

⁴ Powercell Submission 19/9/25

⁵ Powercell Submission 19/9/25

⁶ Powercell Submission 19/9/25; Duracell Submission 19/9/25; Airco Submission 18/9/25; Charged Battery Submission 18/9/25; Batteryhold Submission 18/9/25; Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25; Get Fire Training Submission 18/9/25

⁷ TEC submission 23/9/25;

Issue raised	BSC response
<p>7. ACCC should delay providing any further authorisation until such time as the interaction of the NSW Act with the Scheme is determined to ensure we have a mandatory scheme for battery and battery powered products. The time for voluntary measures has passed, and all levers of government, including the ACCC, must align to enable mandatory stewardship of increasingly problematic batteries and related products.⁸</p> <p>8. Support for initiatives to make producer responsibility mandatory, recognising the challenges faced by voluntary schemes.⁹</p> <p>9. The Scheme risks becoming a de facto compulsory scheme through state government requirements and retailer mandates. The scheme risks becoming compulsory through government or retailer mandates, raising concerns about third-line forcing.¹⁰</p>	<p>BSC also confirms that it does not have the power to mandate participation in the Scheme, and the ACCC authorisation is not compulsory. However, the BSC and the majority of its members agree regulation is necessary for to avoid the anti-competitive behaviour of free riders and ensure the public detriment caused by batteries and battery related products is reversed. If the Scheme is accepted as a Scheme under the <i>NSW Product Lifecycle Responsibility Act 2025</i>, then it could be that this legislation and any regulation sitting under the Act does compel participants to join B-cycle or another authorised Scheme under that legislative framework.</p>
<p>Scope of Battery Products falling under the Scheme</p>	
<p>1. Supermarkets, the primary collection points, lack the capacity to handle SEEEB effectively. Authorisation should be limited to portable and removable batteries and vapes. The current collection model is unsuitable for small electrical and electronic equipment with embedded batteries (SEEEB).¹¹</p> <p>2. Expanding the scheme to include SEEEB may delay government regulation, perpetuating inefficiencies.¹²</p>	<p>1. BSC recognises that supermarkets will not be the appropriate collection channel for all Battery Products including SEEEB. The timing of introduction of regulation which would be a precursor for the introduction of new channels for SEEEB allows time to plan, engage with partners and deploy new collection channels appropriate for different product categories.</p> <p>2. Expanding the scheme to include SEEEB is dependent on regulation, so the inclusion will not cause delay in regulation. Instead, it will ensure more rapid expansion once regulation is introduced as planning and consultation can occur in parallel.</p>

⁸ WMRR Submission 18/9/25

⁹ ABRI Submission 18/9/25

¹⁰ An interested Party Submission 10/9/25

¹¹ TEC submission 2/10/25

¹² TEC submission 2/10/25

Issue raised	BSC response
<p>3. Recommendation to focus on portable batteries (5 kg and under) before expanding to embedded and larger storage batteries. Suggests second-life applications are more suitable for larger batteries, not those under 5 kg.¹³</p> <p>4. Early planning to include large energy storage systems, EV batteries, and other embedded batteries in the Scheme will ensure industry readiness, public safety, and avoids future stockpiling risks.¹⁴</p> <p>5. Concerns as to whether BSC has the capability and expertise in overseeing stewardship of products with embedded batteries. Existing schemes, such as the National Television and Computer Recycling Scheme, are highlighted as more competent in managing such products.¹⁵</p> <p>6. The Draft Determination does not adequately consider the broader Australian and global battery markets. Key market sectors overlooked include:¹⁶</p> <p>(a) Parallel imports of household batteries.</p> <p>(b) Industrial end-user imports (e.g., batteries used in security, hygiene, and building maintenance).</p> <p>(c) Specialty batteries (e.g., medical, mining, and defence applications).</p> <p>(d) Modular batteries for home energy and EV/Hybrid batteries.</p>	<p>3. As noted above, the BSC does not intend to expand SEEEB categories until regulation is introduced. Following introduction of the regulation, it is expected that there will be transition time for SEEEB to allow time to plan and consult to ensure funding model, collection channels, and behaviour change models are fit for purpose.</p> <p>4. As stated in the submissions 22/9/25 BSC would welcome the opportunity to engage in planning for large energy storage systems, EV batteries etc to ensure industry readiness, public safety, and avoid stockpiling risks.</p> <p>5. Within the BSC staff and Board, the BSC has extensive experience in battery stewardship and e-waste stewardship. As an example, the CEO has specialised in e-waste stewardship in the US, Canada and South Korea for more than 10 years, and is happy to engage with CESA and any other interested party directly to discuss the credentials and expertise within the BSC. In addition, BSC can engage consultants and recruit additional staff with expertise in this area to ensure capacity and capability is in place as this category is introduced.</p> <p>6. (a) – (c) BSC considers these sectors are included but would welcome further clarity in the Determination to confirm this understanding and is happy to engage directly with the BSC.</p> <p>6 (d) BSC would welcome the inclusion of these batteries noting inclusion would be linked to industry consultation and engagement to further define the market failure, mitigation action, and the funding model related to these sectors.</p>

¹³ Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25

¹⁴ Duracell Submission 19/9/25; Airco Submission 18/9/25; Batteryhold Submission 18/9/25; Get Fire Training Submission 18/9/25; Makita Submission 18/9/25; OPEA Submission 18/9/25

¹⁵ CESA Submission 18/9/25

¹⁶ Powercell Submission 19/9/25

Issue raised	BSC response
Levy conduct and Scheme funding	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insufficient clarity, transparency and oversight on how the eco-modulated levies are determined for different types of batteries and products with embedded batteries.¹⁷ 2. The levy is passed on to consumers, increasing retail prices for battery-operated goods. 3. Equivalent Battery Unit (EBU) Calculations¹⁸ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The current proposal includes plastic casings and circuitry in EBU calculations, which was excluded in the original application. This change results in levies being based on total product weight rather than just battery cells, which CESA argues is outside the scope of the BSC. (b) insufficient Equivalent Battery Unit (EBU) rate in Australia (AUD 0.04, proposed increase to AUD 0.053) compared to Europe (AUD 0.20).¹⁹ 4. Recommends a simpler levy structure and immediate adjustment of rebate rates to ensure financial stability for collectors, sorters, and processors.²⁰ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process for calculating levies is documented in the B-cycle 2.0 Scheme Design which includes a consultation process to ensure stakeholders are aware of the costs associated with different battery types. 2. The passing on of the levy to consumers is important for transparency and is appropriate as a more responsible cost structure than consumers paying for irresponsible management of batteries which results in increasing injuries, damage to waste and recycling infrastructure and remediation. 3. As detailed in the previous submission of the BSC: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) B-cycle 2.0 takes a different approach to levy calculations which means that each product category is responsible for the sustainability investments and collection costs associated with that product. This means that casings must be included as they contribute to the cost of recycling that particular product. However, as confirmed in the BSC submissions of 22 July 2025, this change has been delayed. (b) BSC agrees that the current EBU levy rate is inappropriate, which is why the Levy Conduct has be re-designed in B-cycle 2.0. 4. The Scheme imposes a levy to enable the true cost of responsible end of life management is included in the cost of the product. In reality, this cost is already being met by the consumer through increased rates and taxes needed in incident response and replacement of infrastructure. BSC has deferred moving quickly to a fully eco-modulated levy until regulation is introduced, instead implementing a two-tiered levy which will allow more costly batteries to be accommodated.

¹⁷ CESA Submission 18/9/25

¹⁸ CESA Submission 18/9/25

¹⁹ Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25

²⁰ Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25

Issue raised	BSC response
<p>5. Disputes the claim that free-riders are the primary cause of financial challenges, attributing issues to underfunding and low EBU rates.²¹</p> <p>6. BSC's forecasted revenue increases rely on the assumption that the scheme will be mandated by the government, which is speculative. The ACCC should not base its decision on such uncertain assumptions.²²</p> <p>7. The scheme imposes a levy akin to a tax, adding costs without delivering additional benefits. The levy disadvantages compliant Australian businesses while offshore importers avoid costs. It creates a competitive disadvantage for local businesses, potentially forcing them out of the market. Retailer-mandated reverse logistics schemes are already in place and effective, making the BSC levy a form of double charging.²³</p> <p>8. The levy increases costs, discouraging the adoption of electrification technologies such as e-mobility solutions and light electric vehicles.²⁴</p>	<p>5. Free riding is the biggest challenge facing the Scheme as it increases levy rates in a voluntary environment, which means increasing likelihood of losing members which further undermines the Scheme.</p> <p>6. BSC's forecast revenue is prepared for both regulated and unregulated environments. BSC does not assume regulation, but also believes it important to prepare for regulation.</p> <p>7. BSC agrees that it is important for offshore importers to be included in the Scheme and has been a strong advocate for regulation to engage online sales. BSC also advocates for alignment with Europe where the new regulation requires products to be registered prior to sale. While some Retailers do use reverse logistics, it is clear from the low recovery rates that this is not common practice. BSC works closely with the accredited Retailers and Recyclers to understand costs and ensure that it is not duplicating existing activity but supporting responsible end of life recovery of Battery Products, utilising existing activities where possible.</p> <p>8. The BSC is unsure of the basis of the assertion in point 8 by An Interested Party and is not aware of any data or research which indicate that the Levy Conduct discourages the adoption of electrification technologies.</p>
Rebate Conduct	
<p>1. Suggest adjustments to rebate structures to address logistical complexities and costs, and ensure equitable access to battery collection and recycling services in regional and remote areas.²⁵</p>	<p>1. The BSC is committed to improving regional access and equity and to this end has designed rebates to increase funding for regional and remote areas. As the Scheme moves forward it is envisaged that funding and other mechanisms can be employed to improve access in a cost-effective manner. This may be done by employing reverse logistics and working with other product stewardship schemes to leverage economies of scale.</p>

²¹ Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25

²² CESA Submission 18/9/25

²³ An interested Party Submission 10/9/25

²⁴ An interested Party Submission 10/9/25

Issue raised	BSC response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Suggests explicit recognition of second-life opportunities, including incentives for repair, refurbishment, and repurposing, aligning with circular economy principles. ²⁶ 3. Insufficient transparency and oversight of the eco-modulated levy and rebate system. 4. Recommends a simpler levy structure and immediate adjustment of rebate rates to ensure financial stability for collectors, sorters, and processors. ²⁷ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The B-cycle 2.0 Scheme design is intended to allow for recognition of Repair, Refurbishment, and Repurposing. The Eco-modulated processing rebates includes a circularity outcomes assessment to incentivise improved circularity outcomes. This will become increasingly important depending on the product involved and will be linked to adherence to appropriate safety and quality standards. BSC would expect to consult with industry as this process evolves over the coming years. 3. The original Application and supporting documentation, as well as the BSC’s previous submissions during the ACCC’s consultation process, demonstrates that the process and method of calculating each of the proposed eco-modulated levies is fully transparent. The Annual review process also ensures oversight of the levies and rebates set each year both through consultation with Participants of the proposed new rebates and levies for a year as well as needing BSC board approval. 4. BSC is committed to increasing rebates as soon as funding allows, but is currently navigating a downturn in imports which is impacting revenue and an increase in collections which increases costs. In October 2025, BSC is increasing levies by 30% for alkaline, NiMH and Carbon Zinc batteries and 40 % for all other batteries. This is a significant increase which is challenging for importers in the current economic climate. Raising the rate of the levy requires time for consultation and additional time for the funding to land on BSCs accounts.
Authorisation period	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If authorisation is granted, it should be limited to 2–3 years to facilitate a transition to mandatory regulation and noting past challenges, and 	<p>The BSC refers to the previous submission made to the ACCC in relation to the authorisation period, and the relevant sections of the Draft Determination which address these issues.</p>

²⁵ Duracell Submission 19/9/25; Airco Submission 18/9/25; Batteryhold Submission 18/9/25; Fire Training Submission 18/9/25; Charged Battery Submission 18/9/25; Makita Submission 18/9/25; OPEA Submission 18/9/25

²⁶ Airco Submission 18/9/25; Charged Battery Submission 18/9/25; Batteryhold Submission 18/9/25; Get Fire Training Submission 18/9/25; Makita Submission 18/9/25; OPEA Submission 18/9/25

²⁷ Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25

Issue raised	BSC response
<p>so the considerable progress made by governments to implement a mandatory framework is not undermined.²⁸</p> <p>2. A three-year review window to determine whether the BSC Scheme should become the endorsed mandatory national scheme.²⁹</p> <p>3. A shorter authorisation period with stricter conditions, enhanced transparency, and effective safeguards is recommended to address potential detriments and better serve the public interest.³⁰</p>	<p>The BSC maintains the 5 years authorisation period is appropriate noting the changing regulatory landscape and the importance of providing as much certainty as possible to the recycling sector to support investment decisions.</p>
<u>BSC Governance</u>	
<p>1. A skills-based board and organisation are essential to handle the legal, regulatory, and financial complexities of the scheme.³¹</p> <p>2. Clear Rule-Making Process - Transparent processes for changing scheme rules are necessary. Consideration of consumer impacts and potential compensation for sunk investments is required.³²</p> <p>3. Independent mechanisms for appeals and conciliation should be established.³³</p> <p>4. Independent auditing to address conflicts of interest, particularly as competitors sit on the BSC board.³⁴</p> <p>5. Calls for clear governance protocols, including circumstances requiring director resignation due to conflicts of interest.³⁵</p>	<p>1. The BSC Governance and Nomination Committee is responsible for ensuring that the Board has the appropriate mix of skills and expertise to handle the legal, regulatory and financial complexities of the Scheme. The Board skills matrix included in Schedule 1 illustrates the skills base of the Board.</p> <p>2. BSC has an established process for changing the Protocols. The recent change to the Protocols to extend rebate payment terms provides an example of the process used which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) preparation of proposed draft change; (b) provision of the proposed amendment to effected participants for consultation purposes with a clear schedule for response; (c) review of feedback, and finalise proposed amendments accordingly (d) publishing of the updated Protocols on the B-cycle website. <p>3. This is already provided for in the Constitution (see articles 16-19) as approved by special majority of members and relevant governance policies.</p>

²⁸ TEC submission 2/10/25; Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25; WMRR Submission 18/9/25

²⁹ Powercell Submission 19/9/25; Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25

³⁰ CESA Submission 18/9/25

³¹ ABRI Submission 18/9/25; Livium t/a Envirostream Submission 18/9/25

³² ABRI Submission 18/9/25; Livium t/a Envirostream Submission 18/9/25

³³ ABRI Submission 18/9/25; Livium t/a Envirostream Submission 18/9/25

³⁴ Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25

³⁵ Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25

Issue raised	BSC response
	<p>4. BSC has a clear Conflict of Interest Policy [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Any data or information relating to a specific Participant, including any audit reports, are not shared with the Board members who are elected as a representative of industry. BSC maintains that it is critical to conduct some auditing activities itself and/or witness to audits. This understanding is essential for managing the Scheme to ensure outcomes are being achieved and to delivering on transparency commitments provided to the ACCC, the community and BSC stakeholders. Information collected during audits is also essential for modelling future rebates and levies, which is undertaken internally by appropriately qualified BSC staff members and the data informing the calculations is not presented to the Board.</p> <p>5. BSC is diligent in its management of Conflict of Interest and its governance policies and procedures in this regard. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>
Authorisation condition - Targets and reporting	
<p>1. Community Access Targets: Clearly stated targets and plans for achieving them are needed.³⁶</p> <p>2. Reports should evaluate how program implementation meets targets. Include information on domestic processing.³⁷</p>	<p>1. BSC has always had a clear goal to divert 100% of batteries from landfill. Each year we have reported publicly our performance towards this goal, and will improve this reporting as required by the condition regarding targets and reporting in the Draft Determination.</p> <p>2. As a result of [REDACTED] the Draft Determination reporting condition, BSC is developing KPIs for the coming year which will be published in annual reports, the first of which will be published in December 2025.</p>
Authorisation condition – Scheme review	

³⁶ ABRI Submission 18/9/25; Livium t/a Envirostream Submission 18/9/25

³⁷ ABRI Submission 18/9/25; Livium t/a Envirostream Submission 18/9/25

Issue raised	BSC response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual Financial and Performance Reviews - Independent and published reviews are critical. Battery Stewardship Council should release annual financial reports and the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) audit for transparency.³⁸ 2. Independent and published financial and performance reviews of the Scheme and its administration must be published more frequently, i.e. no more than every 2 years. A scheme review in 2028, as proposed by the ACCC, is deemed insufficient given the rapid changes in the battery market. Annual reporting and independent review by 2029 are deemed inadequate for ensuring timely accountability.³⁹ 3. Calls for a full audit of the BSC to commence by early 2026 and conclude by June 2026.⁴⁰ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Under the requirements of the <i>Corporations Act 2001</i> and the Australian Charities and Not-for-Profit Commission, the BSC is required to appoint an independent auditor to undertake annual financial audits. The reports are presented to members at the AGM each year and are published on the ACNC website. The requirements of the DCCEEW auditing processes and the publication of any reporting is a matter for DCCEEW. 2. In accordance with the BSC's submissions of 22 September 2025, BSC agrees to the condition for the independent review after 3 years to enable the changes to the Scheme to be implemented and for the impacts of the NSW regulation to become better known.
Authorisation condition – Button battery safety	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Button Batteries Awareness Campaign - Supports public awareness but stresses the need for a strong operational foundation first. Recommends prompt disposal of button batteries at designated collection points to mitigate safety risks.⁴¹ 2. Battery safety risks (e.g., fire, environmental, and button battery hazards) are fragmented in the determination. Comprehensive cradle-to-grave legislation is needed to address these risks effectively.⁴² 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BSC agrees that the Button Battery Safety Awareness campaign is important and that such campaigns focus on prompt disposal at designated collection points to mitigate the risks. 2. Battery safety risks are integrated into the design of B-cycle 2.0, but also acknowledges the important role of the ACCC in addressing product safety. BSC does see a potential future role in supporting improved product safety but this would only occur in consultation with participants and government. BSC agrees that regulation of product safety from cradle to grave is important

³⁸ ABRI Submission 18/9/25; Livium t/a Envirostream Submission 18/9/25

³⁹ ABRI Submission 18/9/25; Livium t/a Envirostream Submission 18/9/25; WMRR Submission 18/9/25

⁴⁰ Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25

⁴¹ Ecocycle Submission 18/9/25

⁴² Powercell Submission 19/9/25