**Livestock SA Limited**
**ACN:** 681 162 667 **| ABN:** 53 681 162 667
PO Box 211, Goodwood SA 5034
Adelaide Showground, Leader Street, Wayville SA 5034
**P:** 08 8297 2299 | **E:** admin@livestocksa.com.au | **W:** livestocksa.com.au

# SUBMISSION

6 November 2026

Data Centre Legislation Team
Department of the Premier and Cabinet
GPO Box 2343
ADELAIDE SA 5001
Via email: DPC.DataCentreLegislation@sa.gov.au

Dear Data Centre Legislation Team

**Re: Submission to the proposed Data Centre Management Act**

Livestock SA is the peak industry organisation for South Australia's red meat and wool producers. Representing over 5,200 sheep producers, 2,700 beef cattle producers and several hundred goat producers across the state, we work to secure a strong and sustainable livestock industry. South Australia's $4.3 billion livestock industry is a key economic contributor to the state and supports 21,000 South Australian jobs across the red meat and wool industries.

Livestock SA welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission to the proposed Data Centre Management Act to inform development of the draft Bill. The framework has important implications for livestock production, resource security and regional communities.

Livestock SA supports responsible investment in data centres and artificial intelligence infrastructure that contributes to South Australia's economic development and delivers practical benefits for existing industries and regional communities. AI and AgTech offer opportunities to improve livestock productivity, innovation, biosecurity, sustainability, traceability and decision-making.

These opportunities must not come at the expense of agricultural production or the land, water, energy and infrastructure on which producers and regional communities depend. Benefits from AI adoption should complement, not replace, safeguards for existing users.

Livestock SA supports an enabling but precautionary framework: streamlined coordination must not lower assessment standards or guarantee approval for a project's ultimate capacity. Every data centre project should undergo proportionate screening of water and agricultural land impacts, with detailed assessment where material risks are identified. Assessment should also address supporting infrastructure, including where delivered by separate entities, and cumulative regional impacts.

Our recommendations seek to protect water security, electricity affordability and reliability, productive agricultural land and farming operations; allocate attributable infrastructure costs to proponents; and require verified capacity before each stage proceeds. They also seek early, meaningful consultation, public assessments and reporting, enforceable conditions and clear

transitional arrangements. The framework should identify who independently tests proponents' evidence, who enforces conditions and what happens when actual impacts depart from approved assumptions.

Proponents and governments should work with industry to support livestock producers' AI and AgTech adoption, alongside coordinated national and state action to manage adoption risks and protect farmers' control over their data.

**Summary of Recommendations**

1. Protect productive agricultural land by prioritising industrial precincts, brownfield sites and land of lower agricultural value, and minimising fragmentation and disruption of farming operations.
2. Require proponents to demonstrate that water demand will not materially reduce water availability, reliability or affordability for existing agricultural users or regional communities, including under drought conditions. Assess impacts against published baseline assumptions and credible drought, heatwave and peak-demand scenarios.
3. Apply water entitlement, allocation and compliance requirements at least as stringent as existing rules, with no new entitlement type or preferential access, and assess water quality and cumulative impacts on allocation reliability. Lawful water access should not, by itself, establish that a project's impacts are acceptable.
4. Support the proposed requirement that proponents bear infrastructure costs associated with data centre projects rather than passing them on to other electricity consumers.
5. Support the proposed requirement for each stage's electricity demand to be matched in scale and timing by sufficient additional generation and firming, with necessary network capacity in place before operation, without increasing prices or reducing reliability for existing users.
6. Support the proposed technical design and operating requirements to prevent undue risks to electricity-system security, reliability and stability.
7. Introduce an explicit cumulative impact assessment requirement covering the data centre and indirect impacts of supporting energy infrastructure, whether delivered by the proponent or a separate entity, as an additional safeguard beyond the discussion paper's proposed arrangements.
8. Require water and agricultural land assessments for every data-centre project regardless of capacity, including below-threshold facilities. Cover water demand, local and regional availability, existing users and drought conditions, alongside agricultural land and farming impacts; risk should determine assessment depth, not whether assessment occurs.
9. Assess the combined impacts of existing, approved and reasonably foreseeable regional developments on water, electricity networks, roads, workforce and agricultural land.
10. Approve each stage only when electricity, water, road and other service capacity is verified and existing conditions are met; initial approval must not guarantee ultimate capacity. Material changes to capacity, resource demand, cooling technology, water sources or supporting infrastructure should trigger proportionate reassessment.
11. Require public versions of water, energy and agricultural land assessments, with confidential information redacted where justified.
12. Where farming is affected, protect land, access and biosecurity and rehabilitate temporarily disturbed agricultural areas. Apply enforceable safeguards to early works and require risk-based financial assurance where significant restoration liabilities could arise.

13. Make approval obligations measurable, auditable and enforceable, covering maximum and staged water limits, approved sources and drought contingencies; electricity demand, additional generation, firming, network capacity and demand management; and responsibility for attributable network, utility and road costs.
14. Require monitoring, public reporting and consequences for non-compliance.
15. Require consultation from the earliest project-planning stages, beyond council notification, giving affected landholders, councils and, where broader impacts arise, agricultural organisations meaningful opportunities to influence proposals before key decisions are finalised and material early works commence. Publish issues raised, proposed responses and unresolved matters in a consultation report.
16. Clarify how new requirements apply to projects already approved, under construction or operating, with published compliance timelines and transitional safeguards for agricultural land, water security and existing users. Distinguish existing operations from unbuilt capacity and future expansion.
17. Support livestock producers' AI and AgTech adoption through industry partnerships with proponents and governments, research, on-farm trials, skills development and digital access.
18. Coordinate national and state government–industry action to manage adoption risks and protect farmers' control over their data, without replacing safeguards for agricultural production, land, water and energy.
19. Maintain substantive safeguards across government-sponsored, designated-project and accelerated approval pathways. Consult on the draft Bill and material regulations and standards, with core protections established in legislation rather than left entirely to guidance.

**Position statement**

Livestock SA supports data centre development that delivers shared benefits while protecting agricultural production and existing users. Support for investment is not support for preferential resource access, costs being transferred to existing users or reduced assessment standards. The framework should assess individual and cumulative impacts, make each stage conditional on verified capacity and compliance, and provide meaningful consultation, transparency and enforceable safeguards, including during the transition to new requirements. These protections should apply consistently across approval pathways and be supported by independent scrutiny, clear regulatory accountability and effective corrective powers. Agricultural AI and AgTech benefits should be actively supported, but must not substitute for these protections.

## Rationale for recommendations

### 1. Productive agricultural land and choosing suitable data centre locations

Data centre development is not solely a technology or industrial development issue. In regional South Australia it is also a land use and infrastructure issue. The relevant footprint includes the facility, access roads, water infrastructure, telecommunications links, renewable generation, storage, substations and transmission corridors.

Poorly located development can permanently remove productive land, fragment properties, constrain livestock movements, disrupt access, create new easements and increase biosecurity risk. Identifying suitable locations early, before substantial commercial commitments are made, should guide development and complement—not replace—individual project assessments. Affected farmers should be involved early in choosing suitable locations and have genuine opportunities to influence decisions before locations are finalised.

Livestock SA recommends a state spatial framework identifying locations suited to large data centres by reference to existing industrial land, energy and transmission capacity, sustainable water, telecommunications, transport, agricultural land capability, biosecurity constraints and cumulative regional development. Industrial precincts, brownfield sites and land of lower agricultural value should be prioritised wherever practicable.

Proponents should demonstrate that reasonable alternative sites and layouts have been considered, including options that reduce impacts from associated infrastructure. Assessment should follow a clear hierarchy of avoiding agricultural impacts, minimising unavoidable impacts and rehabilitating disturbed land where practicable. Land capability should be considered alongside the operational integrity of farming enterprises, including access, livestock movements and the effects of fragmentation.

**Recommendation**
**Protect productive agricultural land by prioritising industrial precincts, brownfield sites and land of lower agricultural value, and by minimising fragmentation and disruption of farming operations.**

### 2. Water security and existing users

Water security is a fundamental concern for South Australian livestock producers. A data centre's water demand will vary with its scale, cooling technology, source of supply and operating model. Closed-loop or water-efficient cooling may reduce demand, but construction and ongoing operations can still create material pressure on local supplies. Proponents should therefore demonstrate sustainability against local conditions rather than relying on efficiency measures alone.

Livestock SA supports the proposed requirement for proponents to demonstrate that water use is sustainable and efficient by providing information on demand, sources and suppliers, and to meet their own supply and infrastructure requirements to prevent adverse impacts on other users.

Water impacts should be assessed against supply in the affected area, not only statewide supply. Assessments should consider local and regional water availability, existing demand and impacts on the availability, reliability and affordability of water for agricultural users and regional communities, including under drought conditions. Demand that appears modest in aggregate can still be significant in a water constrained district or at times of peak demand.

Assessments should consider water quality as well as quantity, including whether large-scale cooling systems could change water temperature or other water characteristics in ways that affect downstream users.

Proponents should provide independently reviewable estimates of water demand during construction, start-up and ongoing operation. Their evidence should identify the proposed water source and supply, drought contingencies and potential impacts on existing users. Proponents should meet their own water supply and infrastructure costs, rather than transferring these costs to existing users.

Assessments should distinguish average annual demand from peak daily and seasonal demand, identify consumptive use and any return flows, and test credible drought, heatwave and supply-interruption scenarios. Published baseline assumptions should allow the regulator and affected communities to understand how project-attributable impacts have been assessed.

Livestock SA supports the concerns raised by the National Farmers' Federation (NFF) submission, *Getting It Right: Building AI Infrastructure That Works For Australia*, which identifies risks where data centre water demand intersects with fully allocated systems such as the Murray–Darling Basin. The NFF notes that, because the total consumptive pool cannot expand beyond established Sustainable Diversion Limits, additional demand from data centres may require water to be acquired from existing users, potentially increasing pressure on water markets, agricultural water users, food and fibre production and regional economies. The NFF therefore calls for cumulative impacts on water allocation reliability, affordability, accessibility and deliverability to be considered through planning and assessment processes.

Livestock SA supports the NFF's position that primary responsibility for water security, allocation and quality management should remain with state and territory governments, with national standards complementing rather than duplicating or displacing existing jurisdictional arrangements. Given the interconnected nature of the Murray–Darling Basin, national and state frameworks should be coordinated to address cross-border water impacts while retaining state and territory responsibility and avoiding duplication.

Livestock SA recommends that future standards under the Act require proponents, wherever practicable, to use fit-for-purpose alternative water sources, including wastewater, recycled, desalinated or harvested water, to reduce competition with supplies relied upon for existing productive uses. These sources should not be presumed impact-free: assessment should consider existing users, environmental requirements and associated energy and infrastructure impacts. Approval conditions should require actual water use to be reported against approved estimates.

Data centres should be subject to water access entitlement, allocation and compliance requirements that are no less stringent than those applying to other commercial water users, with no special or preferential treatment. Where their scale warrants, additional assessment and reporting requirements should apply, without reducing the reliability of existing entitlements. Livestock SA opposes any new water entitlement type for data centres, or any arrangement that gives preferential access to water or undermines the reliability of allocations and the property rights of existing entitlement holders.

Holding a water entitlement or securing a supply contract should be necessary where applicable, but should not, by itself, establish that a project's local and cumulative impacts are acceptable. Authorisations should include measurable limits, drought contingencies and review triggers where actual demand, supply conditions or impacts materially depart from approved assumptions.

**Recommendations**
**Require proponents to demonstrate that their water demand will not materially reduce the availability, reliability or affordability of water for existing agricultural users or regional communities, including under drought conditions. Assess impacts against published baseline assumptions and credible peak-demand and supply-stress scenarios.**

**Apply water entitlement, allocation and compliance requirements to data centres that are at least as stringent as existing rules, with no new entitlement type or preferential access, and assess water quality and cumulative impacts on allocation reliability. Lawful access should not substitute for assessment of acceptable impacts.**

## 3. Electricity affordability, reliability and infrastructure costs

Data centres can create very large, continuous electricity loads. This demand may help underwrite new generation, but the benefits will depend on whether sufficient generation, firming and network capacity are delivered in time and at the proponent's cost.

Livestock producers are already exposed to electricity costs and reliability risks across water pumping, irrigation, shearing, feedlots, intensive livestock systems, saleyards, cold storage and processing. The framework should ensure that existing agricultural, residential and business customers are not required to subsidise network augmentation or experience reduced reliability because of new data centre demand.

Livestock SA supports the proposed requirement that infrastructure costs associated with data centre projects are borne by proponents rather than passed on to other electricity consumers. Livestock SA also supports the proposed requirement that facilities' technical design and operations do not create undue risks to the security, reliability or stability of South Australia's electricity system.

Assessment should distinguish contractual access to electricity from the physical availability of sufficient additional generation, firming and network capacity when required. Evidence should address credible heatwave, peak-demand and supply-interruption scenarios, including circumstances in which electricity and cooling-water demand may be elevated at the same time.

*South Australia's Net Zero Strategy 2024–2030*[1] recognises that "Changes in one sector can directly or indirectly impact others" and commits agencies to engaging stakeholders to understand and manage impacts and share benefits across regions and communities. Livestock SA considers this cross-sector approach supports assessing the combined effects of data centres and supporting energy infrastructure on agricultural land and farming operations.

Growing land-use pressures on agricultural land pose risks to food and fibre production and security. Cumulative assessment should therefore consider both the data centre and the indirect impacts of supporting energy infrastructure, including generation, batteries, substations, transmission lines and easements across agricultural land. This infrastructure should remain within the scope of assessment even where it is delivered by a separate entity, so that its combined effects on agricultural land and farming operations are considered together rather than in isolation across separate projects.

Proponents should disclose the supporting infrastructure on which their project relies. Assessment should be coordinated across relevant approval processes, with enforceable obligations allocated to

[1] Located at: SA-Net-Zero-Strategy-WEB.pdf

the entity responsible for the relevant works or activity. This should avoid both gaps in accountability and duplicative assessment.

**Recommendations**
**Support the proposed requirement that infrastructure costs associated with data centre projects must be borne by proponents, not passed on to other electricity consumers.**

**Support the proposed requirement for each stage's electricity demand to be matched in scale and timing by sufficient additional generation and firming, with necessary network capacity in place before that stage becomes operational, without increasing prices or reducing reliability for existing users.**

**Support the proposed technical design and operating requirements to prevent undue risks to electricity-system security, reliability and stability.**

**Introduce an explicit cumulative impact assessment requirement as an additional safeguard beyond the discussion paper's proposed arrangements. Assessment should cover the data centre and the indirect impacts of supporting energy infrastructure regardless of whether that infrastructure is delivered by the data centre proponent or a separate entity.**

### 4. Risk-based thresholds and cumulative impacts

Regardless of any capacity (scale) threshold adopted for the broader regulatory framework, water and agricultural land assessments should be required for all data centre projects, including every facility below that threshold. Assessments should consider water demand, local and regional water availability and impacts on existing users, including under drought conditions, as well as effects on productive agricultural land and farming operations. Risk should determine the depth of assessment, not whether these impacts are assessed.

The depth of water assessment should be proportionate to proposed demand, local water stress and potential impacts on existing users, including cumulative pressures. Agricultural land assessment should be proportionate to land capability, potential loss or fragmentation of productive land, disruption to farming operations and the combined effects of supporting infrastructure and regional development.

Assessment should also consider the combined impacts of existing, approved and reasonably foreseeable developments within a region. A single project may be manageable, while a cluster of facilities drawing on the same water source, electricity network, roads, workforce or agricultural landscape may not be.

Threshold rules should aggregate functionally connected facilities and development stages to prevent avoidance through project splitting. Government should also maintain an up-to-date picture of approved and proposed regional demand so cumulative assessment does not depend solely on information available to individual proponents.

**Recommendations**
**Require water and agricultural land assessments for all data centre projects regardless of capacity, including every below-threshold facility. Assess water demand, local and regional availability and impacts on existing users, including under drought conditions, alongside impacts on productive agricultural land and farming operations. Risk should determine the depth of each assessment, not whether assessment is required.**

**Require assessment of the combined impacts of existing, approved and reasonably foreseeable developments within a region, including their shared demands on water, electricity networks, roads, workforce and agricultural land.**

### 5. Staged approvals, transparency and compliance

Livestock SA supports staged approvals where they allow development to expand in line with verified infrastructure capacity. However, an initial approval should not create an automatic expectation that a facility may reach its ultimate proposed capacity.

Progression to each stage should be conditional on the proponent demonstrating that the required electricity generation, firming, network infrastructure, water supply, roads and other services have been secured and that existing conditions have been met.

Material increases in capacity or resource demand, changes in cooling technology or water sources, and significant changes to supporting infrastructure should trigger proportionate reassessment. Renewed consultation should be required where the changes may materially affect landholders, existing users or regional communities.

Assessments concerning water availability, energy demand and agricultural land impacts should be transparent and publicly available where commercial confidentiality does not genuinely require otherwise. Approval conditions should be measurable, auditable and enforceable.

Approval conditions should address the following matters, where relevant to the project's impacts:

- Maximum and staged water consumption, approved water sources and drought contingencies.
- Electricity demand, additional generation and firming, network capacity and demand-management obligations.
- Responsibility for attributable network, utility and road costs.
- Protection of surrounding agricultural land, maintenance of farm access and rehabilitation of temporarily disturbed agricultural areas.
- Farm biosecurity and weed hygiene, controls on vehicle and machinery movements, and protection of fencing, gates and livestock movements where farming operations are affected.
- Monitoring, public reporting and consequences for non-compliance.
- Review triggers and corrective measures where actual demand, supply conditions or impacts materially depart from approved assumptions.
- Incident notification and accessible arrangements for receiving, investigating and responding to complaints.

A public register should identify authorisations, material conditions, approved stages and compliance outcomes, subject to justified confidentiality protections. Regulators should have proportionate powers to require corrective action, restrict progression to further stages, vary conditions and, where warranted, suspend operations.

**Recommendations**
**Approve each stage only when electricity, water, road and other service capacity is verified and existing conditions are met. Initial approval must not guarantee ultimate capacity. Require proportionate reassessment of material changes and renewed consultation where impacts may materially change.**

**Require public versions of water, energy and agricultural land assessments, with confidential information redacted where justified.**

**Where farming is affected, protect land, access and biosecurity and rehabilitate temporarily disturbed agricultural areas.**

**Make the following approval obligations measurable, auditable and enforceable: maximum and staged water limits, approved sources and drought contingencies; electricity demand, additional generation, firming, network capacity and demand management; and responsibility for attributable network, utility and road costs.**

**Require monitoring, public reporting and consequences for non-compliance, supported by clear regulatory responsibilities, independent technical scrutiny, review triggers, corrective-action powers and an accessible complaints pathway.**

## 6. Consultation with landholders, councils and agricultural organisations

Livestock SA acknowledges the planning arrangements already introduced through amendments to the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017*. Amendments made on 11 September 2025 enabled State-sponsored data centres to be assessed as Crown development under section 131 of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* and designated the State Commission Assessment Panel as the relevant authority for data centre applications under the general scheme[2].

Further amendments made on 13 August 2026 permit specified preparatory works with State-agency authorisation and require notification to the relevant council before works commence[3].

As an additional safeguard, Livestock SA recommends consultation with affected landholders and councils from the earliest stages of project planning, while meaningful opportunities to influence the proposal remain. Consultation should not be confined to predetermined matters or delayed until key decisions have effectively been settled. Their practical knowledge of farming operations, local roads, water constraints, drainage, weeds, livestock movements, access and rehabilitation should inform assessment and mitigation.

Livestock SA seeks a requirement that material early works not commence until these parties have had a meaningful opportunity to identify impacts and mitigation requirements, beyond the existing council notification obligation.

Early works authorisations should include enforceable requirements for drainage, erosion control, topsoil protection, farm access, fencing and biosecurity. They should also require rehabilitation if the project is refused, abandoned or materially altered. Risk-based financial assurance should secure restoration obligations where significant agricultural disturbance could otherwise leave landholders or taxpayers exposed.

Relevant agricultural organisations should also be consulted where a project may have broader implications for productive land, regional water, energy reliability, transport or biosecurity.

[2] Located at: PlanSA: Recent regulation changes

[3] Located at: Regulation changes to provide for Data Centre early works | PlanSA

Reported community concerns about current regional proposals, including Tungkillo[4][5] (noting the news articles indicate that no formal proposal had been lodged with state planning authorities on 31 October 2026) and Bundey[6], demonstrate the importance of early engagement and clear, project-specific information. Public reporting identifies concerns about water demand, agricultural land, electricity supply, noise, lighting and the adequacy of consultation. These concerns warrant transparent assessment and a documented response explaining how material issues will be addressed or why particular measures are not adopted. Livestock SA considers that proponents should address these concerns while meaningful opportunities to influence proposals remain.

**Recommendation**
**Require consultation from the earliest stages of project planning, beyond council notification, giving affected landholders, councils and, where broader impacts arise, agricultural organisations meaningful opportunities to influence the proposal before key decisions are finalised and material early works commence. Publish issues raised, proposed responses and unresolved matters in a consultation report.**

**Apply enforceable agricultural protection and rehabilitation conditions to early works, supported by risk-based financial assurance where significant restoration liabilities could arise.**

## 7. Consistent safeguards across approval pathways

Streamlined coordination should improve the quality and timeliness of decisions, not remove substantive protections or create an assumption that a government supported project must proceed.

Government sponsorship, designated project status or an accelerated approval pathway should not displace substantive protections for agricultural land, water security, biosecurity or affected landholders. Government should explain how these protections, consultation requirements and enforceable conditions will be maintained across each available approval pathway, including where special project facilitation powers are exercised.

The interaction between the proposed Act and existing planning, water, electricity and environmental requirements should be clear. Coordinated assessment should avoid duplication while ensuring that no material impact falls between regulatory responsibilities.

**Recommendations**
**Maintain substantive safeguards across government-sponsored, designated-project and accelerated approval pathways, and explain how those safeguards will operate where special project-facilitation powers are exercised.**

**Consult on the draft Bill and material regulations and standards, with core protections established in legislation rather than left entirely to guidance.**

## 8. Transitional provisions

[4] Located at: Adelaide Hills AI data centre protest draws opposition and crossbench support - ABC News

[5] Located at: Mid Murray residents concerned proposed hyper-scale data centre infringes on dark sky reserve - ABC News

[6] Located at: Locals fear one of the largest data centres proposed for Asia Pacific will use water from 'stressed' River Murray - ABC News

Livestock SA notes that the discussion paper proposes transitional provisions without grandfathering. The legislation should clearly explain how new requirements will apply to projects already approved, under construction or operating, with published compliance timelines and safeguards for agricultural land, water security and existing users during the transition. Proponents should demonstrate how their projects will meet the new requirements, and government should clarify how emerging impacts will be managed while projects progress before those requirements commence.

Transitional arrangements should distinguish between existing operations, approved but unbuilt capacity and future expansion. They should not allow approval of an ultimate development envelope to exempt later stages from demonstrating resource availability, infrastructure readiness and compliance with applicable safeguards.

**Recommendation**
**Clarify how new requirements apply to projects already approved, under construction or operating, with published compliance timelines and transitional safeguards for agricultural land, water security and existing users. Distinguish existing operations from unbuilt capacity and future expansion.**

## 9. Livestock productivity benefits from AI

Livestock SA supports the opportunities AI and AgTech present for increased livestock productivity, innovation, biosecurity, sustainability and improved decision-making.

In its August 2023 submission to the Select Committee on Artificial Intelligence, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA)[7] estimated that greater adoption of AgTech could generate up to $2.6 billion per year in additional South Australian agricultural gross value of production.

PIRSA identified potential benefits including more efficient use of inputs, improved traceability, better forecasting of pest and disease outbreaks and improved product quality. It also highlighted support for the commercialisation of virtual fencing for livestock, illustrating practical opportunities for producers.

Realising these benefits requires barriers and risks to be addressed. PIRSA identified barriers including capital costs, unclear returns on investment, poor connectivity and insufficient training and support. It also identified risks relating to cybersecurity, agricultural data access and use, technology interoperability and reliability, workforce change and the safety of automated systems.

Livestock SA recommends that national and state governments work with agricultural industry organisations, producers, researchers and technology providers to manage these issues through coordinated policy, practical guidance, skills development and adoption support. This collaboration should protect farmers' control over their data, support safe, fit-for-purpose technologies and keep regulatory arrangements responsive to technological change.

Principle 4 of the Data Centre Management Act discussion paper, "Deliver benefits for all South Australians", provides a basis for ensuring agriculture shares in the benefits of data centre investment. Livestock SA recommends that proponents and governments work with agricultural organisations and producers to support AI and AgTech adoption through research partnerships, on-

[7] Located at: parliament.sa.gov.au/Search/Result?type=committee&id=430

farm trials and access to appropriate digital services, alongside the skills and adoption support outlined above.

Support for AI growth must not come at the expense of agricultural production: these benefits should complement, not substitute for, safeguards for agricultural land, water and energy.

**Recommendations**
**Support livestock producers' AI and AgTech adoption through industry partnerships with proponents and governments, research, on-farm trials, skills development and digital access.**

**Coordinate national and state government–industry action to manage adoption risks and protect farmers' control over their data, without replacing safeguards for agricultural production, land, water and energy.**

Taken together, these recommendations seek a framework that enables responsible data centre investment while protecting agricultural production and existing users. Clear assessment requirements, verified capacity for each stage, meaningful consultation and enforceable conditions should apply alongside transparent transitional arrangements. Independent scrutiny, clear regulatory accountability and effective corrective powers are necessary to turn these commitments into practical protections.

Collaboration between proponents, governments and industry should deliver practical AI and AgTech benefits for livestock producers without substituting those benefits for safeguards for land, water, energy and farming operations.

Please contact the Livestock SA office on (08) 8297 2299 or via email at admin@livestocksa.com.au if you would like to discuss this submission further.

Yours sincerely

Travis Tobin
Chief Executive Officer