



Australian Government

Defence Honours and Awards Appeals Tribunal

Seccombe and the Department of Defence re: Beal [2026] DHAAT 15 (3 August 2026)

File Number(s) 2025/043

Re **Mr Leon Scott Seccombe on behalf of
Ms Amy Elizabeth Mary Beal**
Applicant

And **The Department of Defence**
Respondent

Tribunal Commodore Vicki McConachie CSC RAN (Retd)

Hearing Date 13 July 2026

Attendances Ms Amy Elizabeth Mary Beal
Applicant
Mr Leon Scott Seccombe
For the Applicant

Ms Jo Callaghan, Assistant Director, Service and Campaign
Awards, Directorate of Honours and Awards, Defence
Mr Shane Donohoe, Current Service Manager, Directorate of
Honours and Awards, Defence

DECISION

On 3 August 2026, the Tribunal decided:

- (a) to affirm the decision that Ms Beal not be recommended for the Defence Long Service Medal; and
- (b) not to recommend to the Minister that the eligibility criteria for the Defence Long Service Medal be amended.

CATCHWORDS

DEFENCE AWARD – Defence Long Service Medal – eligibility criteria - qualifying service - period of at least 15 years – efficient service – requirements of Chief of Defence Force Determinations – definition of days served – recognition by way of National Medal

LEGISLATION

Defence Act 1903 – Part VIIC – Sections 110T, 110V(1), 110VB(2), 110VB(6)

Defence Regulation 2016, Regulation 36

Defence Long Service Medal Regulations 1998, Letters Patent, Commonwealth of Australia Gazette S352, dated 10 July 1998

Defence Long Service Medal Regulations 1998, Amendments of Letters Patent Commonwealth of Australia Gazette S160, of 30 March 2000

Defence Long Service Medal Regulations, Letters Patent and Amending Regulations, Commonwealth of Australia Gazette S2, dated 3 January 2002

Defence Long Service Medal Regulations Determination 2021 by the Chief of the Defence Force, 2021, dated 16 March 2021

National Medal Regulations 2011, Letters Patent and new Regulations dated 20 April 2011 and published in Commonwealth Gazette S113 of 1 July 2011. Creation of new Letters Patent and Regulations which revoke Letters Patent dated 18 June 1999 and 4 April 2000.

National Medal Regulations 2011, Amendment of Letters Patent signed 29 January 2020 and published in Commonwealth of Australia Gazette G00124 of 5 February 2020

Introduction

1. The Applicant, Mr Leon Scott Seccombe on behalf of Ms Amy Elizabeth Mary Beal, seeks review of a decision dated 19 September 2024 by the Department of Defence to refuse to recommend Ms Beal for the Defence Long Service Medal for her service in the Permanent Naval Force.

Decision under review

2. On 22 April 2024, Ms Beal submitted an online application to Defence for the Defence Long Service Medal (DLSM). On 13 August 2024, Ms Beal submitted an online application to Defence requesting an assessment for her eligibility for the National Medal, which she was subsequently issued. On 19 September 2024, in response to her first application for the Defence Long Service Medal, Defence wrote to Ms Beal to advise that:

based on the information currently available, I regret to advise that you may not have met the eligibility criteria for the award. Specifically, I cannot find evidence to show that you have completed 15 qualifying years of service.¹

3. On 21 January 2025, Defence emailed Mr Seccombe and Ms Beal stating:

Please note that members of the Permanent Forces qualify for the medal as long as they render service throughout a year, which is a period of twelve months from the date the member enlisted and any anniversary of that date. In your case that would be if “fully served from 19/10/2023 to 18/10/2024”. As you discharged on 23/04/2024 before your anniversary date that year does not qualify towards the DLSM.²

4. On 16 December 2025, Mr Seccombe made application to the Tribunal seeking review of the above decision.³

Tribunal jurisdiction

5. Pursuant to s110VB(2) of the *Defence Act 1903* the Tribunal has jurisdiction to review a reviewable decision if an application is properly made to the Tribunal. The term *reviewable decision* is defined in s110V(1) and includes a decision made by a person within the Department of Defence to refuse to recommend a person for a defence award in response to an application. Regulation 36 of the *Defence Regulation 2016* lists the defence awards that may be the subject of a reviewable decision. Included in the defence awards listed in Regulation 36 is the Defence Long Service Medal. Therefore, the Tribunal has jurisdiction to review decisions in relation to this award.

¹ Letter, Defence to Ms Beal dated 19 September 2024.

² Email Defence to Mr Seccombe and Ms Beal dated 21 January 2025.

³ Application for review, Mr Seccombe obo Beal, dated 16 December 2025.

Ms Beal's service

6. Ms Beal enlisted in the Permanent Naval Force on 19 October 2009, on an open-ended enlistment period and was discharged on 13 March 2024 as 'Military-Medically Unfit for Service'. Ms Beal served for 14 years, 4 months and 24 days.⁴

7. Ms Beal has been issued with the following awards for her service with the Royal Australian Navy.

- a. Australian Operational Service Medal – Greater Middle East Operation with numeral 2;
- b. National Emergency Medal with Clasp 'BUSHFIRES19-20';
- c. National Medal;
- d. Australian Defence Medal;
- e. Australia Day Medallion.⁵

Eligibility Criteria for the Defence Long Service Medal

Letters Patent and Regulations

8. The Defence Long Service Medal was instituted by Letters Patent issued on 26 May 1998 for the purpose of '*according recognition to persons who render long and efficient service as members of the Defence Force*'⁶ Regulations 3 and 5, as amended, made under the Letters Patent relevantly provide:

Award of the Medal

Regulation 3 The Medal may be awarded to a member, or former member, of the Defence Force (the member) who:

(a) has given:

(i) qualifying service for a period of at least 15 years or periods that, in total, amount to at least 15 years;

Qualifying service

Regulation 5 Service in the Defence Force is qualifying service if:

(a) where the service was given as a member of the Permanent Forces or the Reserve Forces – the Member:

(i) fulfilled the requirements specified in directions given by the Chief of the Defence Force; and

⁴ Defence Report to the Tribunal, 3 March 2026.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ *Defence Force Long Service Medal Letters Patent and Regulations, Commonwealth of Australia Gazette S352, of 10 July 1998.*

(ii) gave efficient service; or⁷

[...]

Amendments to the Regulations in 2000 inserted the following definition of efficient service into Regulation 2:

*‘efficient service means service determined to be efficient service by the Chief of the Defence Force’.*⁸

Defence Long Service Medal Chief of Defence Force Determinations

2021 Chief of Defence Force Determination

9. On 16 March 2021 the Chief of the Defence Force (CDF) issued a Determination relevant to Ms Beal’s case which stipulated that in order to qualify for the Defence Long Service Medal, the minimum period of annual qualifying service for all members of the ADF from 20 April 2000 would be 20 days.⁹

10. The 2021 Determination stipulates:

The following table specifies the minimum annual periods of service to be completed by a member for a year of qualifying service. The period of service may consist of one, or a combination, of the following:

- a. Days remunerated at Defence rates of salary or sessional fees.*
- b. Days on which the member is eligible for a Reserve service payment under Chapter 4 Part 9 Division 4 of the Defence Determination 2016/19, Conditions of service, as in force from time to time.*
- c. Days of approved voluntary unpaid Reserve service.*

2000 Chief of Defence Force Determination

11. On 13 April 2000, the Chief of Defence Force issued a Determination, which provided:

*‘...1b. On and after 20 April 2000 a member will undertake qualifying service for the purpose of the Defence Long Service Medal if the member undertakes a minimum of 20 days service per year **calculated at the anniversary of the enlistment or appointment of the member** [emphasis added].’*¹⁰

⁷ bid, as amended by *Defence Long Service Medal, Letters Patent and Amending Regulations, Commonwealth of Australia Gazette S160*, of 30 March 2000, and *Defence Long Service Medal Letters Patent and Amending Regulations, Commonwealth of Australia Gazette S2* of 3 January 2002. Folio 33

⁸ *Defence Long Service Medal, Letters Patent and Amending Regulations, Commonwealth of Australia Gazette S160*, of 30 March 2000.

⁹ *Defence Long Service Medal Regulations Determination 2021 by the Chief of the Defence Force, 2021*, dated 16 March 2021.

¹⁰ *Defence Long Service Medal Regulations, Directions by the Chief of the Defence Force dated 13 April 2000*.

The word ‘days’ is not further defined in the Determination. The 2021 Chief of Defence Force Determination expressly revoked a previous Chief of Defence Force Determination dated 6 February 2013.¹¹

Eligibility criteria for the National Medal

Letters Patent and Regulations

12. The National Medal was created in 1975 for the purpose of according recognition to persons who render long service in certain occupations. The eligibility criteria for the National Medal is currently governed by the National Medal Letters Patent and Regulations signed by the Governor-General on 20 April 2011. The National Medal Letters Patent and Regulations were published in the Commonwealth of Australia Gazette S133 on 1 July 2011.

Mr Seccombe’s application to the Tribunal on behalf of Ms Beal

13. In his application to the Tribunal, Mr Seccombe did not provide a statement of reasons for his application. Following on from a telephone call from the Tribunal Executive Officer to Mr Seccombe to request reasons for the application, Mr Seccombe forwarded to the Tribunal an email dated 6 January 2026 from Ms Beal. This email included a description of the trail of events from Ms Beal’s initial application to Defence on 22 April 2024 until 19 December 2025.¹²

14. Ms Beal stated:

I served 20 days in my 15th year – anniversary date of enlistment was 19 October and I served until my medical discharge on 13 March 2024. I’ve attached the spreadsheet that H&A kept sending me, which clearly shows I served the 20 required days IAW the Defence Long Service Medal Determination document: “For service in the Permanent Naval Force (PNF), the annual obligation is 365 days prior to 20 April 2000 and 20 days from 20 April 2000 onwards.” My service is post April 2000, so 20 the days should apply to me.^{13 14}

Defence report

15. In its report Defence stated that in response to the application for review:

Defence reviewed the original decision from September 2024 and re-assessed Ms Beal’s eligibility for the Defence Long Service Medal.¹⁵ The re-assessment was endorsed by the Assistant Director, Service Assessments and Awards, and supported the original decision to not recommend Ms Beal for the Defence Long Service Medal.

¹¹ Defence Long Service Medal Regulations Determination 2021 by the Chief of the Defence Force, 2021, dated 16 March 2021.

¹² Email, Ms Beal to Mr Seccombe dated 19 December 2025.

¹³ Ibid

¹⁴ Email, Defence to Ms Beal dated 19 September 2024.

¹⁵ Defence Tribunal assessment working paper.

16. On 8 July 2025, in response to Ms Beal's second application, Defence wrote to her via email,¹⁶ advising that:

I am pleased to advise that we are progressing on your entitlement for the NM in conjunction with your CFS service as a BRIGADE FIREFIGHTER.

17. Following the initial advice regarding her National Medal entitlement Defence sent a subsequent email to Ms Beal,¹⁷ stating:

We wish to inform you that your application has been successful and now processed, this will be dispatched shortly.

18. On 27 January 2026, Defence contacted Mr Seccombe by phone to discuss Ms Beal's case and explain the basis for the decision. Defence advised that as Ms Beal's Australian Defence Force service had already been counted towards the National Medal, it could not be also used towards the Defence Long Service Medal.

19. Defence submitted that Mr Seccombe acknowledged the advice and indicated that he would discuss it with Ms Beal, who subsequently maintained her position that the Tribunal's review should proceed.

20. Defence also stated:

that Ms Beal's claim for the Defence Long Service Medal is based on her having rendered more than 20 days service in her final enlistment year. Defence does not dispute the days served. However, Ms Beal commenced her 15th year of service on 19 October 2023, and was medically discharged on 13 March 2024, prior to the anniversary date of 18 October 2024.

...

The decision to not recommend Ms Beal for the Defence Long Service Medal is based on the fact that she did not complete the required minimum 15 years of qualifying service. Defence acknowledges she was medically discharged, however, the Defence Long Service Medal Regulations do not provide for the award to be granted on compassionate grounds.

Additionally when Ms Beal applied to have her Defence service counted towards the National Medal, she relinquished her eligibility for the Defence Long Service Medal. As that service has now been applied to the National Medal, any future Defence service would contribute only to Clasps to the National Medal.

The re-assessment confirmed that Ms Beal rendered 14 years, 4 months and 24 days of service with the Royal Australian Navy and was discharged as Military Medically Unfit for Service. Accordingly, she did not complete the minimum requirement of 15 years service.

21. Defence recommended that the Tribunal affirm the decision to not recommend Ms Beal for the Defence Long Service Medal.

¹⁶ Email, Defence to Ms Beal, 8 July 2025.

¹⁷ Email, Defence to Ms Beal.

Mr Seccombe's comments on the Defence report

22. Mr Seccombe was provided with a copy of the Defence report via email on 4 March 2026. On 24 March 2026, Mr Seccombe responded via email, enclosing a Statutory Declaration by Ms Beal dated 20 March 2026 and a copy of a spreadsheet listing Ms Beal's years of service.¹⁸

23. In her Statutory Declaration dated 20 March 2026, Ms Beal detailed her correspondence to Defence in relation to her eligibility for the Defence Long Service Medal and the National Medal, however the Tribunal observed that Ms Beal also referred to the Defence Force Service Awards Regulations, which do not apply to this review, due to her time of service. Ms Beal further stated that on 26 August 2025, she received her 'National Service Medal' presumably (the National Medal) and stated that:

Whilst I am proud to wear my National Service Medal, it does not equate to the Defence Long Service Medal to me. I would hand my National Service Medal back in less than a heartbeat if Defence Honours and Awards changed their decision and approved awarding me it. Still to this day, I cannot find any formal documentation or regulations that show why I was deemed ineligible. The mental strain the fight to be awarded the Defence Long Service Medal almost got too much, and I reached out to a friend, Mr Seccombe for advice and support.

Tribunal hearing

Applicant

24. Mr Seccombe, representing Ms Beal, put to the Tribunal that this matter was an example of arbitrary rules and regulations being applied in relation to awards with no consideration for Ms Beal's service or mental health. Mr Seccombe highlighted that Ms Beal's affidavit showed that she had served 20 days as required by the Regulations and Determination and was therefore entitled to the award of the Defence Long Service Medal. He noted that her affidavit set out how important the award of the Defence Long Service Medal was to her as it represents her service. He further noted the affect this matter was having on her health and that she would happily return the National Medal if she could receive the Defence Long Service Medal.

24. Mr Seccombe stressed that Ms Beal cared deeply about being awarded the Defence Long Service Medal. He emphasised the devastating affect Defence's decision not to recommend Ms Beal for the award of the Defence Long Service Medal has had on Ms Beal's mental health. He pointed to her having met the criteria of 20 days within her final year of service and submitted that she was therefore entitled to the award of the Defence Long Service Medal. He further submitted that there was a lack of acknowledgment of how these decisions affect veterans and that if Ms Beal had been advised she needed to remain in service longer she may have done so.

¹⁸ Email from Mr Seccombe to Tribunal dated 24 March 2026.

25. Mr Seccombe submitted that Ms Beal had met the requirements for the Defence Long Service Medal and that in any event, there should be some discretion to award it as the current structure disregards the effect on the member and their perspective.

Defence

26. Defence thanked Mr Seccombe for his passionate support for veterans.

27. Defence noted that it was bound by the legal instruments that govern various awards and that the instruments governing the Defence Long Service Medal require that a member give qualifying service for 15 years or periods that amount to 15 years. Defence submitted that it approaches assessment for the award by first examining whether a person has the required amount of service and that it then assesses what qualifying service is for the award. Defence noted that in April 2000 the Chief of Defence Force released a Direction that the days be calculated at the anniversary of a person's appointment to the Australian Defence Force. The Chief of Defence Force later made a Determination that required personnel undertake 20 days of remunerated service in each 12-month period. Before that Determination there were differences between permanent members and reserve members.

28. Defence submitted that Ms Beal had served for a total of 14 years 4 months and 24 days. It noted that if she had reached her fifteenth anniversary of her enlistment or appointment then she would have met her 15 years of qualifying service. Defence did not dispute that she had served her 20 days during her fifteenth year of service.

29. Defence then addressed Ms Beal's affidavit. Defence acknowledged that Ms Beal served with honour and integrity. It expressed gratitude for her service and sympathy for her medical situation. Defence submitted that, unfortunately, the legal instruments governing the award of the Defence Long Service Medal do not make any differentiation as to why someone has had to leave the service.

30. Finally, Defence acknowledged that Ms Beal feels there is a 'hole in her story' without the Defence Long Service Medal. Defence noted that Ms Beal's medals tell a story of contribution through service on ADF operations and national emergency, more broadly than Defence service alone.

Tribunal

31. The Tribunal acknowledged Ms Beal's service.

32. The Tribunal noted that the rules governing the award of the Defence Long Service Medal are contained in Letters Patent signed by Queen Elizabeth II and then Prime Minister Mr John Howard. They are not something the Tribunal can change. In contrast to the regulations governing the Australian Defence Medal, there is no provision for award of the Defence Long Service Medal where a member's service has been curtailed by reasons such as medical discharge.

33. The Tribunal noted that it has previously exercised its power to make a recommendation to the Minister that he consider introducing such a provision into the Defence Long Service Medal framework. Such a provision might allow consideration

of special circumstances like those of Ms Beal. However the Minister has considered these recommendations and decided that such a provision is not appropriate in the Defence Long Service Medal framework.

34. The Tribunal explained that the Regulations attached to the Letters Patent state at Regulation 3 the Medal may be awarded to a member, or former member who has given *qualifying service* for a period of at least 15 years or periods that, in total, amount to at least 15 years. Further, Regulation 5 states *qualifying service* is service in the Defence Force, given as a member of the Permanent Forces or the Reserve Forces, which fulfils the requirements specified in directions given by the Chief of the Defence Force. The member also has to give efficient service.

35. The Tribunal noted this means that to be recommended for the award of the Defence Long Service Medal the member has to have served for 15 years and during each of those 15 years have completed the requisite qualifying service being both 20 days and efficient service.

36. Ms Beal did provide 20 days qualifying service in each of the years she served but she did not serve for 15 years. There is no discretion for the Tribunal to say that while she did not complete 15 years, that was because Defence injured her and therefore she should be treated as having served 15 years. The Tribunal noted that this does not detract from the valuable service provided by Ms Beal.

37. The Tribunal noted for completeness that it did not have jurisdiction in relation to the National Medal.

Tribunal consideration

Length of Service

38. In determining Ms Beal's eligibility for the Defence Long Service Medal the Tribunal was required to apply the criteria in the *Defence Long Service Medal Regulations* as amended on 5 December 2001. Sub regulation 3(1) of the regulations provides that the medal may be awarded to a former member of the Defence Force who has given *qualifying service for a period of at least 15 years or periods that in total, amount to at least 15 years*. Service in the Defence Force is *qualifying service* where it fulfils the requirements specified in directions given by the Chief of the Defence Force and is efficient service. The requirement for *qualifying service* specified in the Chief of the Defence Force *Defence Long Service Medal Determination 2021* of 16 March 2021 is that the minimum annual period of service to be completed for a year of qualifying service is *20 days remunerated at Defence rates of salary...*

39. For Ms Beal to be eligible to be awarded the Defence Long Service Medal, she must have, in the first instance, served for 15 years from the date of enlistment **and**, where it can be shown that this requirement had been met, also have provided at least 20 days qualifying service in each of those 15 years. The Regulations and the Determination do not provide for any exceptions to be made to these criteria.

‘Efficient service’

40. In relation to the separate criteria of ‘efficient service’ set out in the regulations, the Tribunal endorses the following observations which were highlighted in the Tribunal decision in *Clarke and the Department of Defence* [2022] DHAAT 06 (27 May 2022).

‘Regulation 5(a)(ii) provides that service can only be qualifying service if during that time the member gave efficient service, defined as service determined to be efficient service by the Chief of the Defence Force. It is an essential separate criterion, in addition to meeting the number of qualifying years of service.

There does not appear to be any current operative Determination by the CDF of efficient service, the 6 February 2013 Determination having been revoked by the 2021 CDF Determination,³³ and the previous 13 April 2000 Determination only referring to service prior to 20 April 2000 as efficient service.

The various CDF Determinations sets out minimum annual periods of service to be completed for a year of qualifying service. They make no mention of what amounts to efficient service.

Defence appears to assume that if a member serves for the requisite number of qualifying years, that member has given efficient service. This is a conflation of two discrete criteria. It is inconsistent with the Regulations which require a separate assessment of efficient service in accordance with a Determination by the CDF.’

41. In Ms Beal’s matter, Defence does not dispute that she gave efficient service during her service. Noting that the length of her service was the determining factor in the decision as to whether she was eligible for the Defence Long Service Medal, the Tribunal did not consider this matter further.

Tribunal findings

42. The Tribunal found that Ms Beal enlisted in the Royal Australian Navy on 19 October 2009 and served continuously until 13 March 2024 when she was discharged as Military-Medically Unfit for Service. Accordingly, she served for 14 years 4 months and 24 days. In each of the years during which she served she provided at least 20 days service remunerated at defence rates of salary.

43. Ms Beal provided 20 days qualifying service in each of 15 years. She did not however serve in the Australian Defence Force for 15 years because she was discharged on the basis of a medical condition that was service-related before she had completed 15 years of service.

44. This means that Ms Beal is not eligible for the award of the Defence Long Service Medal. This ineligibility for the Defence Long Service Medal does not detract in any way from the valued and respected service given by Ms Beal to the Australian Defence Force, including operational service in the Middle East.

Consideration of whether to make a recommendation to the Minister

45. Mr Seccombe submitted that Ms Beal's service in the Australian Defence Force was ended prematurely by her being discharged due to a service-related medical condition. Having concluded that Ms Beal did not meet the current eligibility criteria for the Defence Long Service Medal, the Tribunal considered whether it was appropriate for it make a recommendation to the Minister in respect of Ms Beal's circumstances.

46. In this regard the Tribunal noted that in the matter of:

- a) *Jackson and the Department of Defence* [2021] DHAAT 14 the Tribunal decided to affirm the Defence decision that Mr Jackson was not eligible for award of the Defence Long Service Medal but also decided to recommend to the Minister, under section 110VB(3) of the *Defence Act 1903*, that he should review whether an exception should be made to the Regulations and Determinations to waive the requirement for 15 years of qualifying service where a member is discharged due to an accepted service-related medical condition; and
- b) *Clarke and the Department of Defence* [2022] DHAAT 6 the Tribunal decided to affirm the Defence decision that Mr Clarke was not eligible for award of the Defence Long Service Medal but expressed the view that the Minister should be made aware of that case which bore strong similarities to the *Jackson* case.

47. In the *Jackson* case the applicant had served at least 20 days in each of 14 years but no days in the fifteenth year before he was discharged due to a service-related medical condition. In the *Clarke* case the applicant had served at least 20 days in each of 15 years, but was not enlisted for the entirety of the fifteenth year before he was discharged due to a service-related medical condition. As noted above, Ms Beal served at least 20 days in each of 15 years, but did not serve for the entirety of the fifteenth year before she was discharged due to a service-related medical condition and so her situation was comparable to that of Mr Clarke.

48. In preparing of this statement of Reasons for Decision, because of that similarity the Tribunal considered whether it was appropriate to include the same recommendation to the Minister as it had made in the *Jackson* case. The Tribunal noted, however, that on 7 May 2024 the Minister wrote to the Chair of the Tribunal in reference to the *Jackson* and *Clarke* cases. In that letter the Minister stated that:

I have decided not to recommend amendments to the DLSM Regulations which would allow the medal to be awarded to members who have not provided 15 years of eligible remunerated service in the Australian Defence Force.

The singular intention of the DLSM is to recognise long service. I consider it appropriate to establish and maintain a minimum time period for members to be considered efficient for the award of the DLSM in order to set a reasonable standard and retain a degree of esteem for the award.

49. As the circumstances of Ms Beal were closely aligned to those of Mr Jackson and Mr Clarke, the Tribunal concluded that this decision of the Minister was applicable to Ms Beal. It decided not to make any further recommendation as there was nothing to

differentiate Ms Beal's situation from the matters on which the Minister had already expressed his firm view.

50. In reaching that conclusion the Tribunal noted that:

- a) its recommendation in the *Jackson* case, and inferentially in the *Clarke* case, was simply that the Minister should give consideration to making an exemption from the 15-year requirement where a member was discharged because of a service-related medical condition;
- b) the Tribunal's recommendation did not suggest what conclusion the Minister should reach as a result of that consideration;
- c) the Minister has clearly given the recommended consideration to the issue; and
- d) the Tribunal has no role in its review jurisdiction to seek to assess the conclusion reached by the Minister.

Tribunal decision

51. For the reasons set out above, the Tribunal decided:

- a) to affirm the decision that Ms Amy Elizabeth Mary Beal not be recommended for the Defence Long Service Medal; and
- b) not to recommend to the Minister that the eligibility criteria for the Defence Long Service Medal be amended.