

**UNDER** the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**Act**)

**IN THE MATTER** an application for approvals for the Waihi North  
Project (**WNP**) – a listed project described in  
Schedule 2 of the Act

**BY** **OCEANA GOLD (NEW ZEALAND) LIMITED**  
**Applicant**

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY HILARY KONIGKRAMER ON BEHALF  
OF OCEANA GOLD (NEW ZEALAND) LIMITED**

**Social Impact**

**Dated 1 September 2025**

---

**Counsel acting:**  
Stephen Christensen  
Project Barrister  
P 027 448 2325  
stephen@projectbarrister.nz

## **Introduction**

1. My full name is Hilary Jewell Konigkramer. My qualifications and experience, and my role in the Waihi North Project (**WNP**), are set out in my statement of evidence dated 3 March 2025 included in Part G of the substantive application document for the WNP.
2. I have been asked by OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited to provide a response to the specific matters contained in written comments on the WNP application from persons invited by the Panel to comment under section 53 of the Act about the following topics:
  - a. Potential social effects on business, education, training and employment;
  - b. Workforce accommodation and impact on housing;
  - c. Reporting requirements contained within amendments to conditions; and
  - d. Consideration of the impact on Whangamatā community.
3. I have prepared this statement within the limited time available to me. Consequently, it is necessarily at a high level. I am able to provide a more fulsome response to the issues covered in this statement if the Panel requires further assistance from me.

## **Business, education, training and employment**

4. Mr Robert Quigley, in his technical memorandum to the Hauraki District Council in response to the potential social effects of the WNP, states at paragraph 3.3 that the significant effects identified in respect of employment and training have not been reflected in the proposed conditions nor has the applicant proposed to provide for employment and training to respond to social effects identified. According to Mr Quigley, a strategic approach to the conditions relating to business activity, employment and training is

lacking. Proposed amendments have been made to the conditions with the aim of increasing the likelihood of achieving the uplift in positive effects.

5. In my view, the proposed amendments to conditions 93 – 99, which focus on the Waihi Skills Development and Training Action Plan requirement, detract from the intended outcomes that this plan seeks to achieve. The key shortfalls of the proposed amendments to condition 93-99 are noted below:
  - a. It is proposed that an Action Group, made up of a variety of stakeholders, is to determine how the requirements set out the conditions are to be met. It is my view that, whilst collaboration with key stakeholders is important, OceanaGold needs to retain responsibility for the conditions and led the development of the plan as they understand the specific skills and competencies required to create an employable workforce.
  - b. The objectives of the plan have been amended to focus on skills development and increased workforce participation in Waihi town, and not the local area as previously specified. The local area is clearly defined (i.e. 30km radius from Waihi town) and represents the local economic and employment catchment of the mine. Reducing the focus of the plan to Waihi town reduces the effectiveness of the initiative and limits the extent to which local workforce participation can be achieved within the local area. Iwi have highlighted the need for the project to generate meaningful benefits for tangata whenua in the local area, further emphasising the need for the plan to be targeted at improved social outcomes beyond the town of Waihi. I support the tangata whenua approach in this regard.
  - c. The objectives of the plan have been expanded to include supporting upskilling staff of local Waihi businesses and stimulating the local economy. This is in contrast with the intention of the plan which is to develop the skills required to respond specifically to the workforce requirements for the project.

- d. It is proposed that the plan include a detailed programme for skills development and training for the duration of the project (i.e. 18 years). I maintain that the detailed programme of activities required to respond to the skills shortages needs to be tailored to respond to the workforce requirements of a defined period based on the project stage.

### **Workforce accommodation and impact on housing**

- 6. Mr Robert Quigley states at paragraph 4.4 that it is probable that the high negative impact on housing is underestimated and that the potential effects and recommendations of the Social Impact Assessment (**SIA**) and Workforce Accommodation Assessment are not translated into the proposed conditions. Amendments have been proposed to the conditions to facilitate the mitigation of negative effects.
- 7. In my view the proposed amendments to conditions 100-103, which outline the requirements associated with the Workforce Accommodation Assessment, result in the unnecessary expansion of the scope of this assessment. The key shortfalls related to the proposed amendments to condition 100-103 are noted below:
  - a. The objectives of the Workforce Accommodation Assessment have been expanded to include reference to the requirement to assess actual and future effects on availability and capacity of housing and accommodation (condition 101(c)). This addition does not specify the area of the analysis or emphasise that the focus of assessment is on the project effects, rather than the assessment of the housing market in general.
  - b. The amendments to the proposed conditions include significant emphasis on road safety and traffic accidents. These health and safety considerations are covered by legislation and company and contractor health and safety policies and procedures. Whilst health and safety considerations inform the identification of acceptable

workforce accommodation options, the objectives need to remain focused on the analysis of accommodation supply in relation to workforce demand.

- c. The area of analysis has been expanded from a focus on the local area to the inclusion of Waihi township, a 30km radius and a 60-minute commute. This results in multiple levels of assessment which are onerous and not required. The local area (30km as defined) was chosen as the focus of analysis in the first instance i.e. if there is sufficient accommodation available in the local area there is no need to consider housing options in an expanded 60-minute commute area.

### **Reporting requirements contained within amendments to conditions**

8. Mr Robert Quigley highlights the requirement for appropriate reporting. Whilst the consolidation of social impact related reporting into the existing Social Impact Management Plan (**SIMP**) process is supported, it is recommended that in addition to the SIMP reporting, the effectiveness of the Waihi Skills Development and Training Plan and the Workforce Accommodation Assessment are to be reported on separately.
9. The multiple references to reporting, review, evaluation and certification requirements within the amended conditions, which in some cases are not consistent, are considered unnecessarily onerous and would result in duplication of reporting efforts on key social themes. Consolidated monitoring and reporting via the SIMP is preferred.

### **Consideration of the impact on Whangamatā community**

10. Ms Catherine Delahunty, representing the Coromandel Watchdog, states in her evidence that the Social Impact Assessment does not acknowledge the impact of the project on the Whangamatā community.

11. The SIA focussed primarily on the social impacts likely to be experienced in Waihi and the local area. Local is defined by a 30km radius from Waihi town centre, with Whangamatā located at the northern extent of this area. The assessment of social impacts relevant to the local area, therefore encompass Whangamatā.

**Dated:** 1 September 2025

---

Hilary Konigkramer