

8 August 2025

Jane Borthwick
Panel convener for the purpose of the Fast-track
Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA)

Tēnā koe Jane,

MINUTE OF THE PANEL CONVENER

Advising date for convener conference for Homestead Bay [FTAA-2506-1071] (31 July 2025)

Thank you for your minute dated 31 July 2025 regrading RCL Homestead Bay Limited's development proposal.

Otago Regional Council (**ORC**) can confirm that representatives Shay McDonald (Principal Consents Planner), Martina Courtier (Consents Planner), Jenny Ross (Team Leader Consents), and Alexandra King (Manager Consents/Manager Environmental Delivery Data & Systems) will be attending the convener's conference on **13 August 2025**.

ORC has met with both RCL Homestead Bay Limited (**the Applicant**) and Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) prior to responding to the minute.

Please see below ORC's response to the request in the minute referenced above regarding the two schedules: 'Participants' estimated timeframe' and 'Matters to consider when preparing for conference'.

ORC trust this information will assist the panel convener regarding the decisions under schedule 3 and section 79 of the FTAA.

Please advise if you need any further clarification on any matters raised in this response.

We look forward to working with you at the convener's conference.

Nāku iti noa, nā



Alexandra King
Manager Consents and Environmental Delivery Data & Systems

Matters to consider when preparing for conference

Approvals

[1] The number and range of approvals sought.

The Applicant seeks resource consent for the activities shown in Table 1 under the Regional Plan: Water for Otago (**RPW**), Regional Plan: Waste for Otago (**RPWaste**), Regional Plan: Air for Otago (**RPW**), and the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Regulations 2020 (**NES-F**). Table 1 includes commentary on each activity to assist the Convenor and future panel in the application of the relevant rules.

The overall activity status in respect of approvals required from Otago Regional Council is discretionary.

Table 1 Approvals Sought

Activity	Planning document, rule, activity status	Correct rule?	Notes
Section 14 water permit to take and use groundwater	RPW discretionary activity rule 12.2.4.1(i)	Yes	Allocation status (as surface water or groundwater) to be determined.
Section 14 water permit to divert water from upstream catchment (other side of SH6)	RPW discretionary activity rule 12.3.4.1	Yes	Diversion of 'upstream' (east of SH6) catchment flows including flood flows into the Northern and Southern Channels
Section 15 discharge permit to discharge human sewage to land where it may enter water	RPW discretionary activity rule 12.A.2.1	Yes	Multiple discharge locations are proposed.
Section 13 land use consent to place culverts in the beds of rivers	RPW restricted discretionary activity rule 13.2.2.1 NES-F discretionary regulation 71	Yes	Several culverts are proposed throughout the site. Clarification is required as to which (if any) can comply with the permitted activity regulation in the NES-F.
Section 13 land use consent to disturb the bed of a watercourse	RPW discretionary activity rule 13.5.3.1	Yes	Disturb the bed of the Northern Channel to increase flow capacity. Unclear if this rule is also to apply to the culvert installations.
Section 9 land use consent to drill land to install groundwater monitoring piezometers	RPW restricted discretionary activity rule 14.2.3.1	No	Based on the info provided it does not appear that consent is required for this activity and that RPW permitted activity rule 14.2.1.1 can be complied with.
Section 9 land use consent to erect defences against water	RPW discretionary activity rule 14.3.2.1	Yes	The proposed bunding along SH6 is a defence against water. However, the Northern and Southern Channels would also be defences against water as they appear to be specifically designed for flood hazard mitigation.
Section 9 land use consent and section 15 discharge permit to undertake residential earthworks and to discharge sediment to land in a manner that it may enter water	RPW restricted discretionary activity rule 14.5.2.1	Yes	This is dual provision rule requiring both a land use consent and discharge permit.
Section 15 discharge permit to discharge contaminants to air from land application of effluent	RPA discretionary activity rule 16.3.7.3	Yes	We consider that the land application infrastructure and the wastewater treatment plant need to be considered as one system for the purpose of this rule

			i.e. consent is also required for odour discharges from the wastewater treatment plant. Information has been provided to enable assessment of this activity.
Section 9 land use consent to disturb a contaminated site	RPWaste discretionary activity rule 5.6.1(1)	Yes	Additional sampling is recommended in some areas to delineate the areas of contamination
Section 9 land use consent to clear vegetation within and within 10 m of natural inland wetlands and to undertake earthworks within and within 10 and 100 m (resulting in drainage) of natural inland wetlands	NES-F restricted discretionary regulation 45C(1), (2), and (3)	Yes	Clarification is required as to whether parts (4) (diversion) or (5) (discharge) are applicable.

Complexity

[2] *The level of complexity will have a bearing on the appropriate frame for decision making and may include:*

- (a) Legal Complexity: novel or difficult legal issues -*
 - (i) involve untested law or interpretation of statute;*
 - (ii) involve application for multiple approvals;*
 - (iii) interface with two or more statutes; and*
 - (iv) engage constitutional law and public law.*
- (b) Evidentiary Complexity: stemming from the volume, type, or technical nature of evidence -*
 - (i) include challenges like managing expert reports or dealing with conflicting factual or opinion evidence; and*
 - (ii) often involve technical or scientific analysis.*
- (c) Factual Complexity: arises from the volume and nature of evidence -*
 - (i) requires careful management of extensive information or reports, including expert opinion in specialised fields; and*
 - (ii) necessitates analysis if technical, scientific, or highly specialised subject matter are involved.*

Table 2, below, provides consideration of these specific matters.

Table 2 *Consideration of complexity*

Level of complexity	Specific provision	ORC comment
(a) Legal Complexity: novel or difficult legal issues	(i) involve untested law or interpretation of statute;	ORC do not consider that there is any legal complexity relating to untested law or interpretation of statute.
	(ii) involve application for multiple approvals;	Twelve approvals are required under sections 9, 13, 14, and 15 of the RMA for activities regulated by ORC. Additional approvals are required for matters regulated by QLDC, as well as approval under the Wildlife Act. The number of approvals required is considered to introduce a degree of complexity, although ORC notes that the types of approvals sought from ORC are common to other large-scale residential development projects in the area.
	(iii) interface with two or more statutes; and	Setting aside FTAA, the RMA is the primary statute for this proposal; however, approval is also required under the Wildlife Act.

		<p>ORC considers that the following statutory documents are of relevance to this proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 2) Resource Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 3) National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020 4) National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2024 5) Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Regulations 2020 6) Resource Management (Measuring and Reporting of Water Takes) Regulations 2010 and Amendment Regulations 2020 7) Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019 8) Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 9) Regional Plan: Water for Otago 10) Regional Plan: Waste for Otago 11) Regional Plan: Air for Otago
	(iv) engage constitutional law and public law.	<p>The activities have a discretionary activity status in respect of authorisations sought from ORC. As such, constitutional and public law is not anticipated to apply.</p>

(b) Evidentiary Complexity: stemming from the volume, type, or technical nature of evidence	(i) include challenges like managing expert reports or dealing with conflicting factual or opinion evidence; and (ii) often involve technical or scientific analysis.	The application contains an Assessment of Environmental Effects supported by 47 different appendices, which are technical in nature. Many of the appended technical reports refer to or rely on other technical reports, and many contain further appendices attached the main report.
(c) Factual Complexity: arises from the volume and nature of evidence -	(i) requires careful management of extensive information or reports, including expert opinion in specialised fields; and (ii) necessitates analysis if technical, scientific, or highly specialised subject matter are involved.	This level of information is not unexpected given the scale of the proposal; however, careful assessment (and adequate time) is required to ensure that all information is understood and that any inaccuracies, inconsistencies, or issues are identified and interrogated. ORC notes that the Applicant has helpfully provided the following two additional reports (which were not included in the substantive application) to aid in preliminary assessment of the application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odour Impact Assessment Report, prepared by Stantec, dated July 2025; and • Detailed Site Investigation, prepared by WSP, dated February 2025.

Issues

[3] Issues identified by the applicant and other participants:

(a) during consultation; and

(b) any disputed fact or opinion, or legal issue, that is or is likely to be of consequence to the determination of the application.

ORC has engaged SLR Consulting New Zealand (**SLR**) to undertake peer-reviews of the technical information provided in the application in relation to:

- Earthworks
- Contaminated land
- Wetland and aquatic ecology
- Groundwater and surface water quality, including stormwater management, particularly during the construction phase
- Groundwater quantity (review not yet complete)
- Wastewater discharges and management
- Air Quality
- Flooding hazard

Feedback on the application has also been provided by the ORC Transport Team and the ORC Compliance Team.

As a general comment, the issues raised by SLR are not considered to represent critical flaws with the application that would be likely to render any aspect (relevant to ORC) of the proposal completely inappropriate in this location. Rather, the issues raised relate to:

1. the absence of various pieces of information that are likely to be required to enable a comprehensive assessment of the adverse effects of the proposal; and/or
2. additional details required to inform consent conditions capable of adequately monitoring and managing the adverse effects of the proposal.

All SLR reviewers as well as representatives from the ORC planning, compliance, and transport teams have attended a site visit. These visits were extremely informative and ORC thanks the Applicant for enabling these.

The review process has identified a number of issues that are likely to be of consequence to the determination of the application. In respect of matters regulated by ORC, we consider that the areas of greatest concern and warranting the most attention are:

- Construction phase effects, in particular erosion and sediment control.
- Management of the discharge of treated wastewater to land, in particular ensuring that adequate land area is available for this purpose.
- Protection of sensitive groundwater and surface water receptors.
- Loss of wetlands, including Critically Endangered Naturally Uncommon ephemeral wetlands.
- Confirmation that flood management infrastructure is appropriately designed.
- Drafting of robust and enforceable consent conditions.

A more detailed summary of the key issues identified in each area are summarised in Table 3. ORC is able to speak to these issues in greater detail at the meeting on 13 August, if required. Further, copies of the SLR memoranda and comments from the transport team are available if these would assist the Convenor in setting up a panel.

Table 3 Key issues identified by peer-reviewers to date

Subject matter	Key issues
Earthworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORC considers that best practice earthworks management is achieved via compliance with Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland Region Guideline Document 2016/005 (GD05). • The application as lodged contains insufficient information to have certainty that the potential environmental effects associated with the proposed earthworks activities will be appropriately managed in accordance with best practice erosion and sediment controls. • ORC's key concerns with earthworks are sediment runoff entering waterbodies and dust impacts. • Lake Wakatipu supports significant natural and cultural values and is considered to be a sensitive receptor.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staging of earthworks is proposed; however, there is insufficient detail provided in the application to determine whether the staging is appropriate and if the proposed erosion and sediment control measures are suitable. • The different soil types identified on site do not appear to have been considered during the selection of erosion and sediment controls. Glacial till soils in particular are highly erodible and require careful management. • Water quality testing and associated procedures should be captured in consent conditions. • The following management plans are considered necessary to ensure that earthworks effects are managed appropriately: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Environmental Management Plan, which should facilitate adaptive management (or a separate adaptive management plan) ○ Erosion and Sediment Control Plans (stage or area specific) ○ Chemical Treatment Management Plan • The proposed consent conditions provided as Appendix T do not capture all expected consent conditions for earthworks of this scale. • ORC is willing to work with the Applicant and QLDC to produce a robust set of consent conditions to assist the panel. • If not provided throughout the application process, final versions of all plans will require certification prior to commencement of works and sufficient time needs to be provided for this in conditions.
Contaminated land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six areas of potential contamination were identified by the applicant. • Investigations undertaken at the 'landfill area' are not considered sufficient to assess the risk to human health or the environment from the proposed development. Intrusive investigations of the potential landfill area including mechanical test pitting and further soil sampling should be completed to confirm that waste material (other than green waste) has not been deposited in this location. This could be completed as a condition of consent, prior to bulk earthworks. • Further soil sampling should be completed to characterise the extent of cadmium contamination in this fertiliser storage area. • A Contaminated Site Management Plan is recommended to manage contaminated soil in the fertiliser area, Homestead Bay Road sheep pens area, the air strip, and potentially the landfill area to ensure risks to human health and the environment are managed during the earthworks. • An updated Detailed Site Investigation should be provided which provides further investigation/assessment of the

	<p>landfill and fertiliser storage areas as well as a full investigation of the airstrip (not yet investigated) and associated activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consent conditions proposed in Appendix T are considered to be generally appropriate. • ORC is willing to work with the Applicant and QLDC to produce a robust set of consent conditions to assist the panel.
Wetland and aquatic ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No formal assessment of the ecological value of the identified natural inland wetlands is provided. Assessment of ecological value helps in assessing level of effect and ultimately the appropriate level of effects management. • Five natural inland wetlands will be permanently lost as a result of the proposed development. One will be retained. • The Ecological Effects Assessment is quite high-level and lacks detail on effects management. • The application does not appear to have applied the NPS-FM effects management hierarchy to the activities affected natural inland wetlands. This is required by the NES-F. • No formal offsetting or compensation is proposed. It is not clear if any such measures are required because of the inadequate assessment of wetland values and hence uncertainty about the adverse effects. • A Wetland Management Plan is proposed to ensure ongoing protection of Wetland 3. It would be helpful to view and assess a draft version of this plan. • Further information is required in respect of wetland values and effects. • The effects upon the aquatic ecological values of Lake Wakatipu do not appear to have been assessed. Lake Wakatipu is the ultimate surface water receptor and supports significant ecological values. This is considered a gap in the application. • Potential cumulative effects upon Lake Wakatipu of multiple large-scale residential developments does not appear to have been assessed. • ORC is willing to work with the Applicant and QLDC (if relevant) to produce a robust set of consent conditions to assist the panel.
Surface water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The greatest risk to surface water quality is during the construction phase. • Lake Wakatipu is described as having exceptionally good water quality, notably for its high water clarity and colour. • Total suspended solids and heavy metals are the key contaminants of concern. • Water quality monitoring during construction should focus on sediment treatment devices and ensuring that those devices are performing as expected. • Adaptive management during earthworks should require monitoring in the receiving environment if issues are

	<p>identified with sediment retention devices, and also require maintenance or other remedial/corrective action to avoid adverse effects on receiving waters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routine inspections, maintenance, and reporting on the operational-phase stormwater devices are recommended to ensure that operational discharges do not result in any effects listed in s107(1) of the RMA (and to comply with RPW permitted activity rules). • ORC notes that QLDC may have requirements for stormwater management from the finished development. • ORC is willing to work with the Applicant and QLDC (if relevant) to produce a robust set of consent conditions to assist the panel.
Groundwater quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The groundwater underlying the site is of excellent quality. Groundwater is therefore considered to have high sensitivity to changes in quality. This differs from the assessment provided in Appendix HH which does not consider the groundwater particularly sensitive. • ORC is willing to work with the Applicant and QLDC (if relevant) to produce a robust set of consent conditions to assist the panel.
Wastewater discharges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of the land treatment disposal is based on a non-deficit irrigation regime. This means that the hydraulic loading of wastewater to the soils will be greater than the losses from evapotranspiration, resulting in drainage below the root zone. • Rapidly draining water has limited nutrient uptake, so high potential to leach nutrients into groundwater. This system design is not unusual nor necessarily an issue, but warrants robust monitoring, and futureproofing of potential upgrades, to ensure long-term compliance with the design treatment criteria. • LTA Area 1, and part of LTA Area 2 (Blocks B & C) are located on sloping land along the northern boundary, adjacent to the Jacks Point development. These LTA are on sloping land that is currently grazed. There is concern that the significant increase in hydraulic loading on this sloping land could result in lateral flow, and surfacing of wastewater, particularly during winter months. The sloping land has small gully heads, and it is likely that water would drain to these lower areas and not recharge deeper groundwater. • French Drains are a feasible way to manage the hydraulic loading limitations of the sloping land; however, the need for secondary drainage does highlight the potential limitations of some of the soils and the high hydraulic loading. The performance of these areas needs to be closely monitored, and if the soils are found unable to deal with the hydraulic loading, the daily application rate may need to be reduced, and additional LTA areas found. • A key concern is ensuring that there is sufficient area

	<p>available for land application once the development is complete. If issues arise with the land disposal system once development is complete, there are few options available to manage adverse effects if there are no additional areas to dispose of wastewater.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consent conditions will be critical to ensuring that the wastewater discharges are appropriately monitored and that there are robust and enforceable mechanisms in place to manage adverse effects that stray beyond the anticipated envelope of effects. • ORC is willing to work with the Applicant and QLDC (if relevant) to produce a robust set of consent conditions to assist the panel.
Air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key areas of concern are dust generated by earthworks and odour from the wastewater treatment plant. • There is very little detail on the proposed dust sources to fully investigate potential air quality issues that might be experienced by the project. However, in the experience of SLR, the types of issues expected to be experienced can be managed with well-written and executed management plans. • Dust should be managed in accordance with the MfE Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Dust and should be subject to a Dust Management Plan, which may be a standalone plan or part of an EMP. • The Odour Impact Assessment generally captures the risk associated with odour from the proposed wastewater treatment plant. However, an odour management plan should be produced, and an odour audit should be undertaken soon after commencement of operation of the wastewater treatment plant. • ORC is willing to work with the Applicant and QLDC (if relevant) to produce a robust set of consent conditions to assist the panel.
Flooding hazard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The natural hazard posed by flooding was addressed across two components: the hazard posed by flooding from outside of the subdivision (runoff from the Remarkables hills to the east of the development); and the hazard posed by flooding within the subdivision (stormwater runoff into the diversion channels from within the subdivision and from the northern catchments discharging into the Northern Channel). • The first was addressed by GeoSolve. Their report was relatively thorough and well referenced with clear assumptions and justification for decisions. The latter was address by Stantec. The report lacked detail to assess whether key components of the flood hazard had been considered. • It is recommended that a consent condition be developed requiring a Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) is

	<p>submitted to the consenting authority for engineering approval. The SMP must demonstrate that there will be no adverse effects from flooding, erosion, land instability, sedimentation or property damage of any other person's property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Stantec report has not provided any details of their hydrological calculations, therefore it is unknown whether the infrastructure design appropriately provides Defence Against Water. Similarly, it is not possible to comment on whether culverts have been sized to convey peak flows accordingly. This should be adequately addressed in submission of a SMP for approval. • The SMP should also confirm the existing culvert beneath Homestead Bay Road is able to adequately convey peak flows. • Based on the limited information presented in the Stantec report, it is recommended that proposed consent conditions referring to numerical values relating to the design of stormwater infrastructure are removed, as these dimensions and flows may be insufficient. Alternative wording should be developed and should include blockage and freeboard allowances. • There has been no assessment of whether peak velocities may cause erosion of stream banks. This is particularly relevant to the Southern Gully which will receive increased flow. The application refers to rock placement to form check dams and armouring along the gully floor, however, no specifics are provided. There is a dwelling perched near the edge of the bank on the southern side of this gully which may be at risk if erosion of the toe of the bank were to occur. • It is noted that in an overdesign event, State Highway 6 may become inundated as the proposed finished ground level of the bund is higher than the ground level of the highway. • The application has not provided detail of how flood volumes have been calculated, so it is unclear whether the detention basins are sized appropriately. • ORC is willing to work with the Applicant and QLDC (if relevant) to produce a robust set of consent conditions to assist the panel.
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Otago Regional Public Transport Plan 2025-2035 land use policy states ORC's commitment to collaborate with territorial authorities to support developments whose urban form enables viable frequent public transport service provision. ORC policy also states we will not provide public transport services sufficient to enable well-functioning urban environments where a development's urban form does not make it affordable to do so. While parts of the proposed development support viable frequent public transport provision, the high proportion of single-use residential urban form (57% of total dwellings) may not.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Transport Analysis Summary (Appendix GG) outlines the necessity of building transport-oriented development in Southern Corridor to maintain a functioning transport network, identifying that the construction of the currently zoned and consented dwellings alone will cause the Kawarau Falls Bridge to be 30% overcapacity. • Public and active transport integration: ORC note the pedestrian and cycle network's high level of connectivity and expect them to be well integrated with the public transport network. • Park and ride: ORC request further investigation into park and ride infrastructure as the most efficient use of the high value land adjacent to public transport nodes. Noting its inclusion in the Queenstown Lakes Spatial Plan we recommend this investigation be undertaken as a collaborative process between ORC, QLDC and RCL. • ORC transport team would like to see greater demonstration that the proposed transport infrastructure upgrades funded by RCL are staged in a way that maintains a functioning transport network. Do the proposed development triggers align well with the forecasted demand on SH6? • ORC transport team recommend staging the commercial development earlier than currently stated in the Subdivision Staging Plan (Appendix Z) to enable Southern Corridor residents to complete more trips within the corridor. The need for businesses to have adequate customer bases must be balanced with the need to reduce trips on SH6 and the wider Queenstown transport network. • ORC is willing to work with the applicant and QLDC on transport-related matters.
--	---

The findings of these peer-reviews have been shared with the Applicant. The Applicant has indicated a willingness to continue engaging with ORC (and QLDC) on matters raised in peer-reviews to achieve efficient resolution of these matters, where possible. The Applicant has further advised that in some cases they already have or are willing to obtain information that could partly or fully resolve some of these matters. In this regard, ORC seeks advice from the Convenor and/or future panel about how or if the Fast Track Approvals Act provides for such engagement and potential resolution of identified issues.

Panel membership

[4] Consider:

- (a) the knowledge, skills and expertise required to decide the application under clause 7(1) of Schedule 3
- (b) whether there are factors that warrant the appointment of more than four panel members, such as:
 - (i) the circumstances unique to a particular district or region; or
 - (ii) the number of applications that have to be considered in that particular district or region; or

- (iii) the nature and scale of the application under consideration; or*
- (iv) matters unique to any relevant iwi participation legislation.*

The key knowledge, skills, and expertise that ORC expects to be beneficial to be included within the panel are legal and RMA knowledge and understanding/experience in the drafting of consent conditions. While the scale of the proposal is significant, ORC considers that the type of approvals sought are common to other residential developments within the Queenstown Lakes District and within the wider Otago Region.

ORC requests that when consent conditions are drafted that consideration is given to the need for these consent conditions to be enforced by multiple authorities. To the extent practicable, it should be clear which consent conditions are of relevance to which authority. To this end, ORC is most willing to be involved in consent condition drafting and review, and signals that we intend to provide a comprehensive suite of consent conditions in our comments to be provided under sections 53 and 54 of the Fast Track Approvals Act.

Tikanga

[5] Iwi authorities and Treaty settlement entities are invited to advise:

- (a) whether tikanga is relevant to any aspect of the applications for approval.*
- (b) how the panel might receive assistance on those matters.*
- (c) the time required to adequately respond.*

ORC will take direction from the panel and relevant iwi authorities and Treaty settlement entities regarding tikanga.

Procedural requirements

[6] Consider and prepare to indicate:

- (a) willingness to engage directly with the panel as necessary to advance progress of the application efficiently (briefings, meetings, conferencing).*
- (b) likelihood of any form of hearing process being required and, if so, time that should be allowed for such process in the time frame allocated by the panel convener. Forms of hearing include:*
 - (i) Disputed fact or opinion or*
 - (ii) Selected topics or issues which the panel seeks clarification (whether disputed or not).*
 - (i) Proposed conditions.*
 - (ii) Legal issues.*

ORC is willing to engage with and assist the panel as necessary to advance progress of the application. ORC and relevant experts from SLR are willing to engage in any briefings, meetings, conferences, or hearings as deemed necessary by the panel or as requested by any participant.

Anything else?

[7] Is there any other information needed to decide time frames or panel composition?

ORC advises that the evidence planner who will be responsible for preparing the s53/54 comments has a resource consent hearing 10-12 September and respectfully requests that any deadline relevant to ORC is not set for those dates.

Participants' estimated timeframe

Timeframes are suggested below (highlighted yellow) where those timeframes appear to be relevant to ORC's role in this process. ORC is willing to further discuss timeframes in the meeting on 13 August if it would be of assistance the Convenor.

Task	Working days (W/D)	Date:
Panel commencement	N/A	XXX 2025 (nominal)
Invite comment from relevant parties	10 W/D later	XXX 2025
Comments close (s 53 & s 54)	20 W/D later	XXX 2025
Comments close for applicants (s 55)	5 W/D later	XXX 2025
Any other procedural step and evaluation	20 W/D later	XXX 2025
Draft decision is to approve		
Draft conditions to participants (s 70)	XXX W/D later	XXX 2025
Participant comments on draft conditions (s 70(2))	XXX W/D later	XXX 2025
Applicant response to participants on conditions (s 70(4))	5 W/D later	XXX 2025
Draft decision to Ministers (s 72)	XXX W/D	XXX 2025
Response from Ministers (s 72)	10 W/D later	XXX 2025
Applicant response to Ministers (allow)	XXX W/D later	XXX 2025 (approx.)
Evaluate	10 W/D later	XXX 2025 (approx.)
Any other procedural step and evaluation	10 W/D later	XXX 2025 (approx.)
Decision release	XXX W/D later	XXX 2025