

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY: TASMAN TRANSCRIPTION

CLIENT: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY

EVENT: TARANAKI VTM APPLICATION CONFERENCE – DAY 1

SPEAKERS:

EPA PANEL: THE HON. KIT TOOGOOD, KC
DR HILKER GILES
DR LORETTA LOVELL
GAVIN KEMBLE
NATALIE HAMPSON

**TRANS-TASMAN
RESOURCES LTD:** ALAN EGGERS
PHIL MITCHELL
BILLY PRESTON
NICOLE

NGATI RUANUI: HAIMONA MARUERA
GRAHAM YOUNG
JUSTINE INNS

**TARANAKI OFFSHORE
PARTNERSHIP:** GIACOMO CALEFFI

**NEW ZEALAND
SUPERANNUATION:** JOHN REDWOOD

**CLIMATE JUSTICE
TARANAKI:** CATHERINE CHEUNG
LYNDON DEVANTIER
TUHI-AO BAILEY

**TARANAKI REGIONAL
COUNCIL:** FINBAR KIDDLE
THOMAS McELROY
GARY BEDFORD
BECKY SHANAHAN (PDP)

**WHANGANUI DISTRICT
COUNCIL:** SARAH HAGAN
DR NEIL LOFTUS (SANOFEX)
CLLR CHARLOTTE MELSER
DAVID GURNEY
TIM EASTON

**BEACH ENERGY
RESOURCES NZ LTD:** PAUL ROBERTS

TOTAL LENGTH OF AUDIO: 3.9 HOURS

TOTAL PAGES: 74

[Start of Recorded Material: 00:00]

K TOOGOOD: Mōrena. Good morning everybody. I'm the Chair of the Expert Panels appointed to determine that the standard application for the Taranaki VTM Project, submitted by Trans-Tasman Resources Limited under the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024. With me are the other members of the panel. On my far right, Dr Hilker Giles, Loretta Lovell, Gavin Kemble and Natalie Hampson. I'm going to ask them to introduce themselves in a moment. I will also ask the Applicants' representatives to introduce themselves and the members of our support team from the EPA just so that you know who's here and sharing this kaupapa with you.

Let me begin though by thanking Ngāti Ruanui and the other iwi and hapu groups for their warm welcome. It's very good of you to have us here in your rohe. It's important that we are here, but we're very grateful to you for welcoming us so warming. Ka mihi nui ki a koutou.

My background is in the law. I've been a lawyer for over 50 years, practising in Wellington and Auckland. I was a Judge on the High Court for about 10 and a half/11 years. Since my retirement, I've been doing mediations and other work, but I feel very privileged to be here. The members of the panel and I feel the weight of responsibility for making the decision in respect of this Application very keenly. We understand how important the Application and the decision are for all of you, for everyone who is here, so we take our responsibility very seriously.

We are in a sense learning as we go because this is a new process, so it was interesting that one of the speakers this morning talked about this being a wānanga. We are here to learn from you and we genuinely want your help to understand the things that you have told us in writing, and now we want to have kōrero and to hear kanoahi ki te kanoahi from you about the matters that are important to you. We have heard from the Applicant some time ago and we've read all the material that they too have presented.

Before I go any further, I'll ask if you wouldn't mind at the beginning just by saying briefly who you are please.

H GILES: Tēnā koutou katoa. Ko Hilker Giles tōku ingoa. Nō Tiamana ōku tipuna. Nō Kirikiriroa ahau. My background is marine science. I've worked in research.

I've worked at regional council now for quite a few years. I've been working in my own environmental consultancy. I echo [? 3:30] much here. I feel privileged to be here and to have the opportunity to listen to you all.

L LOVELL: Kia ora. Tēnā koutou katoa. Ko Whakapunga tōku maunga, ko Mohaka te awa, ko Takitimu te waka, ko Taihoa te marae. He tamāhine o Rongomaiwahine, Ngāti Kahungunu, Rakaipaaka me Whakatōhea. Ko Lori Tavala tōku more. Anā, ko tōku pāpā ko Temi Te Hapirangi Tanihana, rāua ko tōku māmā ko Maku-i-te-Rangi Maraki Aranui. And I say that with pride because they are my parents and they would have really appreciated the conversations and kōrero that we hear today. As a foundation, we speak of our mountain, our awa, and as sea people, we speak to our sea at home in Māhia. I am rightly honoured to be here today to listen, and as Kit says to understand your whakaaro, and we appreciate the opportunity to come to your rohe and to listen. So, kia ora tātou.

G KEMBLE: Good morning, my name's Gavin Kemble. I'm a planner, increasingly sitting on more and more hearings. I'm, as the Chairperson of those hearings, have a leaning towards coastal applications. In terms of where I'm based, I'm based in Tauranga. My mother's ancestors are from a couple of islands in the North Sea above Scotland, called the Shetlands, and my father has whakapapa back to Tūwharetoa in Taupo and Hinemaia.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry, we can't hear you in the back.

K TOOGOOD: We'll need to speak up. There are microphones, which we might need to use. I'm used to speaking in a courtroom in a nice loud voice, sternly, but some of the other members of the panel and some of the other speakers may not be so comfortable. So, it's really important. Thank you for letting us know that you couldn't hear. It's really important that you do hear what's being said, so we'll use the microphones if we need to. Kia ora.

N HAMPSON: Tēnā koutou katoa. Ko Penance [? 6:15] te maunga, ko Tanies te awa, ko Celtic te iwi, ko Jordi te hapū. Ko Natalie Hampson tōku ingoa. Kei Wānaka ahau e noho ana. He kaitohutohu ōhaoha ahau. Tēnā koutou katoa. My name's Natalie. I'm an economic consultant. I live down in Wanaka. I'm very privileged to be here to help understand economic effects. Thank you.

A EGGERS: Thank you. I'm Alan Eggers, Executive Chairman of TTR, and I would like to endorse Kit's comments. Thank you for a very warm welcome, Ngāti Ruanui. We do appreciate that and we appreciate you all taking the time to come and tell us about your concerns about the project. I can assure you we're here to listen. I'm a professional geologist, with many years' experience in mineral exploration and mine development around the world, mostly in Australia and of course of recent times here in New Zealand. I'm a Kiwi and have experience in corporate finance and mine development finance and funding for large public companies. I went through Victoria University. I do live in Australia most of the time these days, but I'm definitely a Kiwi. So, thank you everyone.

P MITCHELL: Tēnā koutou katoa. Ko Phil Mitchell tōku ingoa. I'm a resource management consultant advising TTR. Thank you.

NICOLE: Tēnā koutou katoa. Ko Nicole tōku ingoa. I am a lawyer as part of the TTR legal team. Thank you for your welcome.

B PRESTON: Morning, I'm Billy Preston. I've been a shipping agent for 40 years out of Port Taranaki in New Zealand, operating in seismic and offshore drilling, and I'm here to support TTR.

TUWHIONE [?]: Good morning. My name's Tuwhione [? 8:33]. I'm from EPA.

ELLIOTT: Kia ora. Ko Elliott Vana tōku ingoa. I'm from the EPA also here to support today's session as well.

K TOOGOOD: So, I'm sorry, Caro, I apologise.

C WRAIGHT: Mōrena everyone, my name's Carolyn Wraight. My role is to assist the panel.

TE MAURI APIATA: Kia ora tātou. Te Mauri Apiata tēnei he kaimahi nō te tari o Te Mana Rauhi Taiao i roto i te rōpū kaupapa kura taiao. Yeah, I work for the EPA within our Māori unit. Nō reira, Kia ora tātou.

K TOOGOOD: Since they're in place, we should ask the representatives of Ngāti Ruanui to introduce themselves also to everyone who's not aware who they are.

H MARUERA: Kia ora tātou. Haimona Maruera, he mokopuna o te takiwā nei o te maunga. My qualifications are marae boy, a iwi leader and hopefully a successful one

at that, that hail from Patia, born and bred, currently living in Palmerston North, five children, a beautiful wife. E mihi ana ki a koe.

G YOUNG: Mōrena everybody. Graham Young, Ngāti Ruanui. Raised in Hawera. 25 years' experience in the planning and resource management area, and look forward to the wānanga this morning.

J INNS: Tēnā rā tātou katoa. Ngāti Ruanui, ngā iwi ngā ōpu [10:20] katoa, tēnā rā tātou. My name's Justine Inns, a lawyer with a firm based in Nelson which is the other side of the windy place at the moment, which I was very conscious of in two attempts to land in Wellington yesterday. I've been privileged to support Ngāti Ruanui in this mahi for (what did we count?) 12 years and counting I think we're at, and very pleased to be with you today and just really welcome the sentiments about this being a sharing exercise of exchange and happy to support the team in doing that. Kai ora koutou.

K TOOGOOD: Kai ora koutou. So, we're meeting today in a conference, a hui, that we convened pursuant to a minute, which the panel issued on the 10th of October 2025 so that the panel might receive an in-person briefing from some of the 50 participants who responded to invitations to comment on the Application. In that minute, we described the purpose of the conference as being to familiarise the expert panel with the contents of the comments we have received about the substantive application, suggestions regarding the content and structure of proposed conditions, including management plans, a strategic plan and the drafting style. To refer us to key points of evidence, we have technical reports, assessments and other supporting information, and also to consider relevant legal tests and legal issues that are in contention.

We have invited those of you who have indicated a wish to speak to present high level overviews of your comments. I can't say to you that we have read everything that has been filed because there is so much of that material which we have to work our way through. So, this will be very helpful to us to give us that broad picture of the comments you have and, in many cases, of the concerns that you have about what is proposed. The expert panel will have opportunities to ask questions about the material you have provided and you'll have an opportunity not to give evidence or make submissions which haven't already been covered in your material but just to raise any

relevant matters particularly about procedure that you may wish to bring to our attention.

It's inevitable that reference will be made to your views on the merits of the Application. That's part of this process. We understand that, but I just want to emphasise and I know that you all understand this, that this is not a hearing conducted under Sections 57 and 58 of the Act as intended, that the briefing will inform procedural decisions that we will have to make in the future about which matters, if any, we think should be the subject of a hearing if we want to get into a more formal exchange of positions in here, evidence and submissions and so on.

The 13th of October, the Applicant filed its responses to the comments that you provide and others, and the representatives of the Applicant, who are here present and we're very grateful to them for taking the time to come, have already introduced themselves. Although we offered the Applicant an opportunity to speak at this hui, they have said that they believe that they have said everything that they want to say in response to the comments which have been filed, and we understand their position, but we have permitted them if there is any new material that comes out of the next three days of kōrero, we have given the Applicant an opportunity of five days to respond to anything new that they haven't covered in their written response. We don't anticipate there will be much, if any, new material but it's possible.

In that regard, I just want to mention one matter which is related to the Ngāti Ruanui comments. There has been an application by Ngāti Ruanui to make further submissions regarding an exhibit that was attached to Mr Maruera's affidavit, which was in the form of a, I think, a draft report or a report from Dr Vincent O'Malley, an eminent historian. We have been told by counsel that only part of that exhibit was filed electronically with the rest of the material, and they wish to submit the whole memorandum even though the time has expired for the filing of comments. They wish to put all of Dr. O'Malley's views before us as originally intended, so they have sought the panel's approval to do that.

In minute number seven that we issued, we held that the panel had a discretion to receive late filed information. We are satisfied that the material that Ngāti Ruanui seek to file was inadvertently omitted from the bundle of

documents which were filed within the time period allowed, so the panel's decision is that we will receive the full report authored by Dr O'Malley, and take it into account in our deliberations. I mention that now because we haven't issued a formal minute approving the receipt of that information but we will certainly do that, take that formal step which will be recorded in the proceedings.

Late yesterday, the panel issued a memorandum setting out its views about the conduct of this conference. I'm sorry that it came late but you will appreciate that the panel members and the EPA staff have had a lot to do to put this conference together. We have spent some time talking about, if you like, the rules by which we will conduct the hui. You will have seen those of you who have had a chance to read that memorandum that we emphasised the flexibility of the process but we do need to keep strict control over time unfortunately. I regret that the detailed information has come to you so late, but there's nothing in it that will cause you any alarm or discomfort and if there's anything about what we have said there that you think might cause any unfairness, please say so. We are more than happy to listen to what you have to say about that.

I just want to make a few points about the process procedure that we will follow. We have provided a schedule which allocates time to presenters attending the conference who wish to speak either in person or online. It was necessary for us to do that in order to ensure fairness to all of those who wish to speak within the limits of the three days we have available. You'll see allocated half hour time slots to each of the presenting participants. We'll be a little bit flexible about that. It will be helpful if you appreciate that you don't need to fill the whole 30 minutes. If you can tell us what you want us to hear in 20, there'll be a round of applause from the other panel members, but equally if you just need a few extra minutes to complete what you're saying, of course we'll be happy to accommodate that. We will take a fairly firm line, however, because it's the only way we can ensure fairness to everybody.

It's now a privilege to invite the representative of Ngāti Ruanui to address us in support of their comments. Kia ora.

H MARUERA: Tēnā koe. Otirā, tēnā tātou. Waerea te rangi e tū nei, waerea te papa e hora nei, waerea ngā kōrero o te ata nei kua huihui ai ki te kōmata o te kōreo kia

tau ki roto ki ngā manakitanga. Tēnā koutou katoa. Thank you. Thank you, Kit. I just want to declare that I'm no professional at this, so you're going to get the wānanga styles that I offered in the welcome, so e mihi ana ki a tātou. What I will be covering and sharing in a quick summary is whakapapa. Whakapapa ki a tātou. It doesn't come and go. It doesn't fly on a plane. It stays here and it lives within the mauri of our papa whenua of our haukāinga of our [inaudible 21:02]. Whakapapa cannot be demonstrated in words, but it can be lived through ancestral and generations of which I'm lucky and I know plenty more over here, my relations, are as lucky to know and learn of history and kōrero and wānanga of our seabed otirā our Tangaroa just like we have recently with our maunga, returning the status that he deserves always and will do.

So whakapapa, my affidavit talks about that. I'm not going to talk back over it and waste my five minutes on that, but I'm going to say is whakapapa kei roto i te ngākau, kei roto i te toto and it can never be watered down for a price, so e mihi ana ki a koe.

The next part I'm going to talk about is history. Before my time, our kaupapa was here. 700+ years whakapapa come, history come, kōrero come, wānanga come. As one that was lucky enough to receive and be around our elders, hearing stories, venturing at times through the spaces that are being talked about and being discussed by others who I asked, 'Have you been and touch the waters that we're talking about or the grounds that are deemed to be the best place to rape and pillage?' I don't think so.

When it comes through to our settlement that was initially given to us by our leaders before me between 1990 and 1995, and proudly for Ngāti Ruanui, and I know our fellow iwi will talk on theirs, in 2003 we were gifted and also offered an apology by the Crown. Now we carry that strongly to this time. It's not once, not twice, not three times that we've had an apology received in this rohe of us. So, we're reverting back to settlement e hoa mā. I'm asking what part of that do we not uphold in systems such as this or does it change as things as the world does?

I'd like to leave that there. Our technical arm on this side will tidy those wānanga up for us, but as a wānanga ki ngā kaiwhiriwhiri nei, I ask that you minimise the pricings or the dollar signs that may be ringing around in this

room and that you listen to the call of our people, the call of our whenua, the call of our moana for our generations that are coming after us. It'd be remiss if I to not stand and do what we do alongside our whanaunga and ask for that to be relooked at because it has done in the last three court cases that we've been successful. We ask for your expertise and these plethora of experts sitting in front of I and on our side here who know better. Who know better. Koinā tāku i waiho ki reira

Tikanga, well, that will go longer than 30 minutes Mr Kit, but if I could go to the CP mining impact and confiscation of Ngāti Ruanui, it's a modern day confiscation. It's a modern day taking of, raupatu. We had that in the 1800s. Now it's in my generation and my children, our mokopuna's generation, which we don't agree with. We have not said that we don't like it or yes we do, sorry, we don't like it, but there are ways we can work through things to ensure that everyone, all peoples, but mainly haukāinga are the centre of that discussion to ensure that we aren't creating spaces that creates another loophole so someone else can come up with something else.

E te whānau, ehara i te mea he aha, engari ko tāku ki a tātou. Ngāti Ruanui speak with open heart. It's 15+ years of us going through this process. We thought the last space we were here would've tidied or cleaned up or got us some direction cos those people who we stand for and have been slowly not attending, once upon a time, this would've been full of our full of our pakeke. Once upon a time, we would have messaging of haere mai ki te kaupapa engari manakitia te manuhuri. Which is what we continue to do. Our messaging to the panel is please understand that this is a cultural push for us. It's definitely not financial, it's a cultural and it's a future focus for our people as we work as an iwi, as we work as a people, as we work as hapū, as we work as marae, to save what little we do have left.

We've been good kaitiaki. There's this word, kaitiakitanga that gets spoken about in all sorts of spaces. Kaitiakitanga is looking after from the start to the finish or from the land to the sea. It's not when things aren't rolling your way that you pull out of kaitiakitanga or kaupapa Māori or bring in resources who have never seen before at hui such as this. So, e mihi ana mō te wānanga, e mihi ana mō te wānanga. E ngā pou wānanga, e ngā pou tikanga, tēnā koutou. The people that make tikanga, that live tikanga, that whati tikanga kia ora ai te tikanga sit amongst the people today. It's not I. I'm just a voice

that drew the short straw to share our message of our Ruanuitanga, of our Uenukutanga [? 27:01], of our Marurutanga [? 27:02], of our Taranakitaga. What we ask for e te panel to our panel is that you take the energy to feel the warmth that we have. It's not ohara [? 27:10]. I suppose, the last one, there might've been a little excitement, but that comes when you're passionate, when you live in the back door of what could be and will not be hopefully a ground for people to come and do things.

No reira, ehara i te mea i takaroa i tāku kōrero. E mihi ana ki a koutou. Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou. Kia pēnei. Ripiripia!

KATOA: Āe, āe ā!

H MARUERA: Ripiripa!

KATOA: Āe, āe ā!

KATOA: Tuakina! Maraneitia [? 27:45] te upoko o te ringa rā kei tangata! Uehā, Uehā!

H MARUERA: He aha te take o te ringaringa?

KATOA: He kawakawa tuku ki raro ki a Hape rā, he koro, ki a whakapapa tau atu ki a mate! Uehā, Uehā!

H MARUERA: As we leave that part, parting kōrero he wānanga to all those who have passed before us. We stand here on their behalf to fight the fight. E mihi ana ki a koutou. Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou.

G YOUNG: Well, that's a hard job to follow, sir. As you'll see on the screen, I'll follow up with a little bit more information for you in terms of the material that we have submitted on behalf of Ngāti Ruanui.

I'd just like to turn briefly, sir, to the role of Ngāti Ruanui, just so that you're clear Ngāti Ruanui is the mandated voice of 16 hapu. Our settlement was given effect by the Ngāti Ruanui Claims Settlement Act in 2003, as our Chair has acknowledged. The Crown acknowledged our cultural, spiritual, historic and traditional association with our takiwa. This includes our entire coastline that now has a recognised statutory acknowledgement through our settlement. The rūnanga represents more than 12,000 registered descendants. It represents the interests and will of the 16 hapu, and we

always actively engage and consult with our descendants. Fulsome information is essential to enable Ngāti Ruanui to carry out its role. This is really important to us.

Turning briefly now, sir, to the interactions with TTR. I do not believe TTR has truly consulted with Ngāti Ruanui. The key obligations of TTR were to provide adequate information to enable an informed view of the proposal and have an open mind. These obligations have not been met over many years, and we've talked about the last 12 to 15 years. We've continued to ask for better information. Lack of information has resulted in us not preparing a cultural impact assessment. We could and still cannot validate technical information. TTR has defended an old and now rather outdated set of information since 2017. TTR has never had an open mind in which to explore any changes to their proposal, and the above effectively is fatal to any meaningful consultation that we tried and attempted to have. When you don't have information, you cannot be consulted.

Briefly turning to the effects of the TTR project, our fundamental concern is uncertainty, environmental and cultural impact. Our evidence shows and validated by others of a rich and valuable marine environment, effectively a coral environment, rich with longfin and short-fin eels, and as recently as the weekend, Ngāti Ruanui heard of the diverse and richness of our fishing grounds, which are unique to Ngāti Ruanui, and in fact unique to Aotearoa.

The area used for fishing supported by Application under Takutai Moana Act 2011 recognises our rights. The sediment plume impacts are significant on the coastal marine area, which is noted for regional significance and numerous reefs. Uncertainty of recovery of and cultural impact and physical and cultural impact is this essence of our objection to this Application.

Please note a technical report attached to my affidavit and please note paragraph 42 of my affidavit and the findings of the 2017 DMC. The findings of the 2017 DMC were used and quoted by the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court. Our kaitiakitanga has been confirmed.

The latest information provided by TTR does not include any new information. Our conclusion on the inadequacy of the information remains the same. Similarly, conditions have not changed, and provide no meaningful

solution to address uncertainty of impact. Nothing here protects our interests and nothing here protects the environment.

As the Chair has already spoken, our settlement provides a Crown acknowledgement of the many ways in which the Crown breached Tiriti. I refer you, sir and the panel, to paragraph 47 of my affidavit. Granting the TTR Application would make a mockery of our apology and would create a new issue for Ngāti Ruanui in terms of a breach of Tiriti.

I wish to now turn briefly to your request for further information through your minute nine. We do have hard copies here to hand out to you today, and we have a further publication which I will talk to shortly. Just briefly touching on minute nine, sir, and the areas that you've asked us to speak on. In terms of settlement and tikanga practise, Ngāti Ruanui's settlement provisions haven't always lived up to expectations; however, they have given a foot in the door in terms of a range of resources and management processes, including fishery management. Ngāti Ruanui kaitiakitanga in the moana has been exercised largely through our active engagement with oil and gas industry, as well as through participation in planning and consenting processes, particularly with the Taranaki Regional Council. Our kaitiakitanga was further exercised with the co-drafting exercise we entered with the then Minister of Environment. I take it through a National Government in creating the new EZ Act. We were instrumental in drafting that alongside the Government. We would say that the guardrails of that Act have held up right through the Supreme Court.

Ngāti Ruanui has well-developed environmental policies that have allowed us to comment on a number of resource management issues affecting the moana. Where new issues arise, we always engage with our hapu, our whānau, to develop an iwi position. We have extensive points of contact with the Taranaki Regional Council, with formal partnership arrangements, which were manifested in the development of the regional coastal plan, which has enabled us to have a wider number of reef systems recognised for the first time in the regional planning document.

Further, we have developed a whale strand policy with the Department of Conservation. We have an active partnership arrangement with private industry, such as Fonterra and the South Taranaki District Council, who

operate an ocean outfall - unfortunately, one of the last ocean outfalls in Aotearoa. We have operated that consent of the outfall through best practise initiatives and environmental improvement.

Further, we are in active participation with the Taranaki Regional Council in sampling the coastline in terms of that ocean outfall consent. We also have an active relationship with OMV, who operate the only DC oil well platform in New Zealand, recently completing a cultural impact assessment for them in terms of their reapplication. We have been involved with Government agencies in shaping regulation relating to renewable energy provisions, having been invited to do so. Again, the Kawanatanga has recognised our place in the rohe, moana and shared spaces. Sir, in our information, we identify our areas of our rohe, so I won't repeat those here. You can read those.

Existing Interests

In terms of MACA, Ngāti Ruanui has an undetermined application for customary marine title. This was moving to a hearing in early 2024 before the amendments to the MACA Act and the Crown Financial Assistance Programme, which created so much uncertainty that we agreed with other applicants on the South Taranaki coast to adjourn that hearing, but it is still active. The draft historical report, which you've agreed to accept in full now, was prepared for this Application and is attached to our Chair's affidavit.

Kaimoana Customary Fishing

Ngāti Ruanui operates a permitting system for kaimoana. Under the regulations, Ngāti Ruanui has been appointed kaitiaki for our rohe, moana, and the Minister of Fisheries has been notified of our kaitiaki. Our kaitiaki authorise and manage customary activities, enabling customary fishing and management traditions to continue. Regularly reporting on the amount of customary catch occurs to ensure sustainability measures. Evidence provided also includes a description of the kaitiaki [? 37:35] system operated collectively with Taranaki iwi. We have set out in our affidavit a list of reefs and fishing grounds. We believe all of these will potentially be affected by the sediment plume created by TTR, given its wide and unknown impact.

Te Tai Hauāuru Fisheries Forum

While Ngāti Ruanui's individuals have participated in the forum, over the years, Ngāti Ruanui maintains its own mana and voice on fishery issues. Our submission in 2016 rejects the report of the fisheries forum as a means to understand local indigenous knowledge. That's not to say that information provided won't be helpful to you; however, we have two principal concerns. Our concerns with the report that specified sites identified in it may not be completely accurate, mostly in respect that they don't provide a complete list of sites. In particular, we maintain there are sites in between Hawera and Pātea that will be affected but gain little attention in that report. The second concern is the conditions suggested in that report are wholly inadequate to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects of the proposed activity. This is understandable because the authors of that report only considered two sets of evidence in fact prepared by the experts commissioned by TTR. We have the benefit of much more evidence from a range of perspectives and so do you as a panel.

Effects and Uncertainty

In principle, we see mining of the seabed yet another confiscation. We're particularly concerned with the effects of the sediment plume and the way in which it will cause harm to taonga species and others. Effects of the marine mammals that frequent the South Taranaki Bight are another particular concern to Ngāti Ruanui, and you will hear a lot of information and you have a lot of information before you. These effects will be cumulative and we do not believe TTR has assessed them in any way that paints that full picture for you.

Our main concern in respect is that TTR has not undertaken proper baseline monitoring information and has had the opportunity to do so in the last 15 years. It doesn't propose to do so until after it's granted consent. This means that all of its assessments of effects are based on inadequate baseline information. It's really difficult for us to engage meaningfully on future monitoring when the foundations are as shaky as this.

In terms of commercial interface, Ngāti Ruanui actively participates in commercial users of the moana. We have an active partnership with oil and gas platform operators. We operate a formal kaitiakitanga forum with the

South Taranaki District Council and Fonterra in respect of their ocean outfall. We have active engagement with the renewable energy industry and in particular recently the offshore wind energy companies that have presented to us. They have presented best practise. We have a long history of active engagement with the oil and gas operators both onshore and offshore through the Crown minerals regime, including cultural observers who are part of seismic surveys when there was a lot of exploration occurring. Our partnership arrangements with the oil and gas sector culminated in the recognition by the Crown in the publishing of the best practise guidelines for engagement with Māori, and we have the pleasure of presenting this set of guidelines to you here this morning, sir. This was in fact endorsed by Strattera, so it outlines best practise that we believe was appropriate.

In terms of finally [? 41:34] served governance and conditions, as a matter of principle and without prejudice the only way in which the kaitiaki role would be meaningful would be if kaitiaki can call a halt to the project if it turns out to have the level of effects that it will and we believe it will do so, so we implore you not to approve this Application.

J INNS: Sir, you'll appreciate lawyers aren't very good at speaking while sitting, so I hope that I can project as well as the other speakers. Microphone? Tēnā koe. No. Yes.

E te kaiwhakawā. Sorry, training kicks in. We've just very briefly summarised the points raised in our legal submissions there. Before I speak to those, just a couple of points. Appreciate that you've addressed the matter of the report. Lawyers should not think they can do things without the support of their administrative crew, so I apologise to you for that, but thank you for that. Just two other preliminary matters. One is that there was a memorandum filed for my friends from KASM Greenpeace yesterday afternoon, which you may not have seen. Ngāti Ruanui wasn't actually a signatory to that memorandum, but that's just because I was circling Wellington and the whānau here were helping the staff to set up. That makes some suggestions for process matters, so taking by the faces, it hasn't made its way to your hands yet.

K TOOGOOD: No, I haven't seen it, but I'm not sure. Perhaps if I just ask Elliot, has that material come through to the EPA?

ELLIOTT: Yes.

K TOOGOOD: So, I expect just then that we will get it sometime during the day.

J INNS: Sure. I think it's just to say that we are broadly supportive of the suggestions made there. Some of my other friends can speak to that, but essentially there are proposals there for some very targeted focused expert caucusing on a short list of subjects and suggestions about matters that would bear at a hearing and how in fact we might use this process to agree a list of issues which those subsequent processes could deal with. So, just to say that Ngāti Ruanui is in support of that, despite having not been a signature.

K TOOGOOD: Thank you. Well, that is precisely the sort of thing that we want to hear in this hui. We want some help to make decisions about how we're going to continue the process, so thank you very much.

J INNS: Others can speak to that. I just wanted to raise that. The other point, just preliminary, in the Applicants' response, they've formulated some tables where they set out the comments by the various groups of commenters. I need to say that in respect of the Ngāti Ruanui comments, there are only two issues raised in that table, and that goes to consultation. I suspect that the saga of interactions between these parties, you've already heard enough about, and initial about conditions. The Applicants responded on those issues as they should. That summary though is in no way representative of what is in the Ngāti Ruanui comments, so I would just make that point.

The comments that Ngāti Ruanui made, that you've heard a summary of here in terms of the effects on the whakapapa on the mauri of the rohe moana and on those other important cultural values, as well as the community and the environment, the matters raised in their comments on those fronts have not been addressed by the Applicant.

Other than that, look, I'm going to speak to these points very briefly because you will have questions for more important people than me. Tikanga is at the top of our summary of legal issues. Tikanga, as our submissions say, is the first law of New Zealand. That's not coming from a screaming radical in the corner, that is actually the accepted view of the legal—

K TOOGOOD: The screaming radicals on the Supreme Court

[laughter].

J INNS: Some do appear to see them that way, but that's another conversation. That is just the orthodox legal view in New Zealand, so a statute that is all but silent on tikanga doesn't undo that fact. Coupled with that, in looking at the submissions in response the Applicants' filed, and I know I'm not here to make arguments, I'm simply summarising the point that they make is that, yes, but the purpose of the Act is to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and projects with significant regional and national benefit. That is the purpose, that is the criteria that you must give greatest weight to. The issues that we focus on in terms of tikanga, in terms of Tiriti, in terms of true settlements and the environmental bottom lines and concerns with uncertainty in the EZ legislation, none of those trump that greatest weight that must be given to the purpose. It's not my argument that they do.

My argument is twofold. One, we believe the evidence will show that there is not significant economic benefit here, and I'm not going to get out above my skis and try and summarise that for you. Others will be better qualified, but that doesn't stack up so that this project doesn't meet on that side of the scale as it were. The fact that the purpose of the Act must be given greater weight than other matters doesn't mean it trumps them, and the fact that some of those other matters to which consideration must be given by yourselves, some of them are environmental bottom lines in the underlying legislation. They are matters as important as tikanga and the Treaty. Those must be given considerable weight.

So, just to be clear, in the event that it appears we're talking past each other on that, understand the framework of the Act, but the framework of the Act is not that by virtue of being listed in the Act, you get consent. I think that's the shortest summary I can give of those long submissions, but I'm very happy to answer any other questions.

K TOOGOOD: Kia ora.

L LOVELL: Can somebody give me a mic? I'm always too quiet time. I get told this every time, so let's start with the way I mean to continue. I completely get it, Justine, I almost feel like I have to stand up. But, tēnā koutou, Ngāti Ruanui. E mihi ana mō ō koutou kōrero rangatira, me tō mātauranga kua tukuna mai ki a mātou i tēnei rā. Kia ora koutou.

I had a number of questions, but I have to admit that you've very helpfully gone through all the questions that we had in the RFI and answered them. So, you've saved a lot listening to my voice, but I guess to talk to Haimona and possibly to some of your whanaunga.

H MARUERA: Tēnā koe.

L LOVELL: Maybe just some of just the lawyer in me understands (well sort of understands) the legislation and things like that. Can you talk to me about when you have rāhui, when you have things that have to be undertaken on the moana, how does that work?

H MARUERA: Kia ora tātou. As it is a wānanga, I'm going to ask one of our whānau, Hukutai [?: 49:31]. Whakautu tēnei patai.

HUKUTAI: Ka pai. Nah, I don't need that [laughter]. My mouth is big enough. Tēnā tātou. Your question again?

L LOVELL: I want to understand—

HUKUTAI About rāhui?

L LOVELL: —how it works in the moana space—

K TOOGOOD: In practise.

L LOVELL: —in the practise.

HUKUTAI: Okay, so depending on the rāhui, it might be a death, then we usually put karakia on the wahi where the aituā happened, and for a period of time, you can't go and gather kai 'til the rāhui had been looked in. At the moment, there's the rāhui on our coastline at the moment. That's for the taking of paua and kina for a certain period of time. I think it was for two years and I think they've extended that, just so that our stocks can grow back. I hope that answers your question.

L LOVELL: It does. Maybe more broadly, have you had to do so for fisheries?

[?: 50:53]: Yes.

L LOVELL: Don't worry, I've got a catch all question at the end. You can tell me what exactly [overspeaking] to answer.

[?? 51:09]: [overspeaking]. Ka pai.

L LOVELL: Just noting the conversation around OMV and oil and gas and things like that, just wanting to understand a little bit more in terms of how that has worked in terms of the relationship and how you engage with each other. I guess just I'll ask you the question a bit later in terms of whether that's within an arrangement, external from conditions or whether it's within conditions. Is there ability to just give us a bit more shade and light as it were on that?

G YOUNG: Most definitely. Most of those arrangements are actually carried out through negotiating conditions through the consenting regime. With OMV, we developed, over a long period of time, what we call our best practise operations. Along with conditions, we've also outlined how we want to work together, and by doing so, we adopted best practise. Part of that was reflected in this document, which I'll hand out to you shortly, in terms of how we go about respecting each other. As a result of that, we are the only iwi in the whole of Aotearoa to actually endorse a deep sea oil well and gas platform because of the best practise arrangement both through consent conditions at the time, and then when that was renewed through the EZ Act as well. We have an active partnership approach, which was the foundation to start with before we actually got to the consenting phase. That's how that approach has worked to the best advantage.

Similarly, we've done the same with Fonterra and the South Taranaki District Council in terms of the ocean outfall.

L LOVELL: You can stop me asking questions [? 53:00].

G YOUNG: No, no.

L LOVELL: I just [? 53:00] just have a habit of talking. I'd be interested in those guidelines and just in your comment in respect in terms of how those guidelines, were we of a mind to look at them, how that would fit within the framework of what we're thinking about.

K TOOGOOD: Are they included in your response to the RFA?

G YOUNG: Yes, they are sir.

K TOOGOOD: Kia ora.

L LOVELL: I know we're running out of time, so maybe I just—

K TOOGOOD: No, we've got a bit of time left. One of the advantages for Ngāti Ruanui being so short with the mihi whakatau is that they have a longer time to speak now [laughter].

L LOVELL: One of the questions we asked was around the Taranaki settlement, and of course, referred to the Ruanui settlement. Justine, I guess my question of you is as part of providing your comments, is there any again colour and shade you wanted to add in terms of your existing comments on that topic? I would be very interested to know given the Taranaki settlement in particular actually speaks to the EEZ which is the question we've raised in the [inaudible 54:35], but I acknowledge that equally the Ruanui settlement as well is within that framework. Before I have my catch all, is there anything else you want to say? Did you want to provide a bit more detail on Section 7, referencing your existing comments?

J INNS: Kia ora. The written submissions and comment go through those mechanisms that are in the Ruanui settlement in a bit of detail. I felt some personal angst in doing that, having been involved in the Ngāti Tahu settlement where a lot of those mechanisms largely were developed, and certainly no disrespect and Ngāti Ruanui wouldn't take it this way, but settlements of the late '90s and early 2000s don't look like settlements today. You wouldn't get the Hurunui River or a Taranaki Maunga settlement back then. So, the mechanisms in the settlement themselves are pretty dry, and as Graham's referred to, they've in some cases been hard work to actually implement. That's why we make the point in the submissions that a settlement is more than a shopping list of things that people must do, and we do look to the Crown's apology. Also, for those of us who are not so steeped in the local history, the recounting of the Ruanui history and particularly the history of raupatu, of persecution, of imprisonment that went on in this region, those are all part of the settlement. Those are all part of the commitment that the Crown made on behalf of all of us as New Zealanders to Ngāti Ruanui. I say, 'Coloured my personal experience'. That's how I look at a settlement. If you want me to show you the section that granting this application would breach—

L LOVELL: The commercial lawyer in me is tempted. I can tell that. You go.

- J INNS: I would say that a broader, more holistic view needs to be taken about what a settlement is. It's not a commercial contract, with respect. Kia ora.
- L LOVELL: Kia ora. And, yes, my final padel [? 56:53]. So, having had our questions, is there anything Ngāti Ruanui or your legal counsel would like to clarify or expand on and what are the key messages from your kōrero and comments that you most want the panel to take away?
- H MARUERA: Tēnā koe Marie. Hei whakakopani ngā kōrero i a tātou. As we've said, there might not be a lot of Ngāti Ruanui coming, but we speak on the coastline of our whanaunga iwi that sit here amongst us Ngāruahine Rangi, i a Raurukūtae [? 57:34], but could I just highlight some key fishing grounds, areas, reefs that connects us all to the kaupapa? Tātou o Rangatapu, Ohawe Tokotoko, Wahī, Wahokune, Tangārohe, Manawapou, Taumaha Manutahi Pipiri, Kaikura, Itikau, Kinipuru, Te Pou-a-Turi, Rangitauhi tae noa ki a tātou nei uri a Whenua-a-Kura [? 57:45]. Those are the spaces we're all here to protect. Those are our fishing grounds. Those are the grounds that our tupuna created, and it wasn't by compass and/or AI, other than ancestral intelligence that we know that these reefs, these fishing grounds are the grounds that we're trying to protect in this kōrero. Nō reira ehara i te mea i takaroa e ngā kōrero e te tiamana, tēnā koe, koutou ko te taumata, otinoa, koutou ko ngā manuhuri, tēnā koutou, ehara i te mea i takaroa. Is there anything? There may be some questions.
- K TOOGOOD: There may be questions from the other panel members, Haimona.
- H MARUERA: Kia ora.
- K TOOGOOD: Can I ask you though before I ask other panel members to speak? Thank you for that, for listing the fishing grounds. Is that list available within the material that you've—
- H MARUERA: It's in my affidavit two, number 50.
- K TOOGOOD: Thank you, and is there a map that would show us graphically where those grounds are, because it would be helpful to us not familiar with the area, with moana, to see where those fishing grounds are in relation to the consent area around the area which is the subject of the Application? If there isn't

one, would it be possible for you to provide one to us? We could issue an RFI asking for that further information.

H MARUERA: Sir, I'm going to get advice from the technicals, but my brain is saying, yeah, Ngāi Tahu, where's all your crayfish grounds? [laughter]. Anyway, that answer is, no, we haven't got one, but yes, we can and will seek to provide that.

G YOUNG: We can provide a general indication on location.

K TOOGOOD: Yes, I do understand that some things must remain secret.

H MARUERA: It's the names. The names is quite secret enough, but I think we need to get this across the road, so āwhina mai e hoa mā, tātou. [laughter].

K TOOGOOD: Kia ora. All right, Hilker, have you got any questions?

H GILES: Just a brief follow up on that, appreciate there's no need to be specific on what is contained in the fishing grounds. It would be helpful if possible if you could describe what particular concerns you would have about particular areas, whether that would be concerns around suspended sediments or changes to the immediate [? 1:00:39] structure. It can be very descriptive, it doesn't have to be very technical just for us to connect the activity with the values that you hold in those areas.

G YOUNG: The most significant and easy for us to say is the sediment plume and the impact that it would have on those reefs. If you look at the latest Regional Council Regional Coastal Plan, we've identified with the Regional Council a number of reef systems that were never shown before, so that is quite accurate. What it shows is there is a rich environment of reef structures that our people have used over thousands of years. That has to be taken into account.

The ability for those reefs to recover from being smothered by a sediment plume that will cover the lower part of the western coastline of the North Island is significant to us. We will have the biggest impact. You will see when they have had briefly up on the screen there, the impact of the sediment plume that was highlighted by the 2017 DNC. We've argued and tossed about so many models on what the impact will be, but each model comes out that there will be an impact. The ability to recover it is unknown. The whole

issue is uncertain. We're not prepared to take that risk and we don't believe you should take that risk either.

G KEMBLE: Mr Young, you referred verbally in your presentation to us about some information regarding habitat that was confirmed at the weekend just gone.

G YOUNG: Yes, so look, it's not something new to Ngāti Ruanui, but what made the point to us that we had a person that was intrinsically involved in fishing in front of the rūnanga, and that person described our fishing grounds as unique and important not only to us regionally but to Aotearoa. That really resonated with Ngāti Ruanui, really underlying what Ngāti Ruanui already knows in terms of the fishing stock, the fishing grounds and the importance of them to us, and not only to us probably to the commercial fisheries as well. That is really important for us to highlight to you.

I'm not an expert in fisheries. I don't intend to attempt to say that to you in an expert way, but that was knowledge based on a person out there fishing in both the commercial and in both a customary aspect. The uniqueness and the importance of that, I think was really underlined to Ngāti Ruanui again and reinforced what we already know.

K TOOGOOD: Gavin's question, I think, was what was that occasion? Was there some record of it? Are you able to provide some evidence that would help us understand that point?

H MARUERA: Yeah, kia ora. We had a, the Runanga, Te Runanga o Ngāti Ruanui had a directors' interview wiki, and in one of the interviews was a director for fisheries who shared this stuff. Wish we knew a long time ago, and it was probably our fault. That's where it was, so it is limited in Ngāti Ruanui.

K TOOGOOD: Would it be possible for you to provide that extract from the minutes because it's obviously an important point for you if we're (a) to take them into account; (b) to refer to it in our decision? We'd need to have some reference point.

H MARUERA: Yes.

G YOUNG: We can provide you with the extract of the minutes.

K TOOGOOD: Thank you.

NICOLE: I'm not sure who perhaps can answer this, but I'm keen to understand a bit more about the powers of rāhui and whether they can extend to other users of the coastal space.

H MARUERA: Ka pai. Good question. I'm going to ask one of our kaumatua/elders from our whānau.

[inaudible background chat][laughter]

[?? JOHN]: Ka pai. Tēnā mō tātou. Ko John Willco [? 1:5:04]. Yes, any of our rāhui that we place out there affects all of our community with Tangata Tiriti, Tangata Wīkītōria or Tangata Whenua. For example, I've got my cousin here. 51 years ago, her daddy was drowned out at sea, and some of the tupapa weren't recovered. We kept an ongoing rapu going on for quite a while, and then after that there, we then lifted it. That was obeyed by all of the Māori and all of our Pākehā fishers as well. Recently, we had another one last year. One person fell over the cliff down at Rangatapu [? 1:5:51]. We recovered that person the next day, but that was only a 24 hour one, and the fishing club next door, they acknowledged that there as well.

So, we've got a close relationship between tangata whenua here and by Tiriti, and some of our stricter adherence to Tangata Tiriti. Kia ora.

NICOLE: Thank you.

K TOOGOOD: Kia ora. All right, just thank you so much for that presentation. We're very grateful to you. This is a question as much I think to Elliot and the EPA, but the PowerPoints which you have helpfully provided us for summary, are they available to us?

G YOUNG: Yes, we have hard copies available to you today, and we can provide them electronically.

K TOOGOOD: All right, thank you.

Thank you very much for making your presentation in a timely way. That's helpful. We're due next to hear from Taranaki Offshore Partnership at 11, but we'll make use of the time now for the changeover.

G YOUNG: If I can just present you with the publication we talked about.

K TOOGOOD: Yes please. Yes, thank you, we'll receive that. Of course, this material will go on the website, and will of course be available to the Applicant also.

[inaudible background chat 1:7:40].

K TOOGOOD: Yes.

G YOUNG: That's the Application [?: 1:7:45].

K TOOGOOD: All right, Gavin Kemble has just made a point, which I think is helpful to future presenters. If you have material like this, so a hard copy of a PowerPoint, for example, it would be quite useful for the panel members to have that before you speak because that would enable us to make notes at the relevant parts of the document. This is not a criticism of Ngāti Ruanui, but for the future, if any of you want to present this type of material, if we could have it at the start, that would be very helpful to us. Thank you. Good point.

[no dialogue 1:8:25 – 1:8:43]

K TOOGOOD: During this break, can I also make this point? People should feel free to come and go at any time during the kōrero. If somebody is speaking, if you could do that in a way that avoids any unnecessary disruption or intrusion. If you can, just wait until we're changing speakers before you come and go, but please don't feel you are stuck here until excused. Just make yourself welcome or depart whenever it suits you.

[no dialogue 1:9:18 – 1:9:45]

K TOOGOOD: All right, thank you. Good morning, Mōrena. Would you like to introduce yourselves please to the panel.

G CALEFFI: Sure. Tēnā koutou. E mihi ana ki te maunga o Taranaki. Ka mihi ahau atu ki te mana whenua o tēnei wahi ki Ngāti Ranginui. Ko Giacomo Caleffi tōku ingoa. Ko Ngāti Tauwi te iwi. Nō Italy ahau. Thank you very much for having us. My name is Giacomo Caleffi, and I represent Taranaki Offshore Partnership here today. Thank you very much to the panel and thank you, Chair, for inviting us. It's a pleasure to be here and be able to present our views. I'm a structural engineer by background. My background is in design of offshore wind structures, but for the last four years, I've been working I guess in a commercial role in business development for the Taranaki

Offshore Partnership, effectively talking about offshore wind with pretty much everyone in New Zealand. That's what I've done. I'm joined today by John Redwood of New Zealand Superfund.

K TOOGOOD: I'm sorry I didn't catch your name.

G CALEFFI: Sorry.

K TOOGOOD: No, no, don't apologise.

J REDWOOD: Sorry, tēnā koutou katoa. John Redwood. Ko Te Mata maunga. Ko te Mangaroawhara [? 1:11:03] te moana. Nō Raratonga ahau. My name's John Redwood. I work for the guardians of New Zealand Superannuation. We're the fund manager of the New Zealand Superannuation Fund and we are partners with Copenhagen Offshore Partnership in exploring and assessing the feasibility of a potential one gigawatt wind farm in the South Taranaki Bight.

The superfund is an experienced institutional investor, but also has considerable experience in renewable energy investments. For reasons of scale, those are largely overseas, in particular in North America and in Europe, but we're very interested in the potential to bring some of our knowledge and capital, and obviously the experience and capital of Copenhagen Infrastructure Partners to benefit both the Taranaki rohe and the country as a whole. Thank you.

K TOOGOOD: Thank you.

G CALEFFI: Yes, thank you for the opportunity. We lodged an extensive submission. I would say we had the legal submission and also we had several experts putting together statements of evidence for us. I'm not a lawyer, but I'll try and do my best to represent the views from the legal team and also the ones of the experts. I'll try and cover. What we did is try to follow the request for the meeting, which was to present a high level view of our views. I'll start with the legal submission. Hopefully, you can see it there on the screen.

By way of summary, we think that the Applicants' proposal will result in significant adverse impacts on the South Taranaki Bight environment. These effects, as covered in the evidence that we have provided, includes impacts on the geotechnical characteristics of the seabed, effects on seabed

morphology, effects on waves and currents as well. Other submitters we know have addressed the other environmental effects as well, and we've been workshopping some of those over the last few months.

Importantly, we think that these effects will occur both within and outside the mining area proposed by TTR. They will persist long after the mining has concluded, so as a result of those adverse environmental impacts, we think that the proposal will prevent or constrain the use and development of the South Taranaki Bight, which includes New Zealand's premier site for offshore wind generation.

We think that TTR has significantly overstated the economic benefits of their proposal and we think that TTR has failed to account for the proposal's significant adverse economic costs, including the opportunity cost of closing down options for offshore wind projects such as ours. We think that they've failed to also account for other implications for achieving, for example, New Zealand's climate change goals, energy security and impacts on offshore wind development as I mentioned.

We also think that TTR has not presented the best development based available information in their Application. The Application contains uncertain and inadequate information, particularly in relation to the economic benefits of the proposal and effects of the proposal on the environment, meaning that a number of matters relevant to the panel's decision making tests are unknown or difficult to assess.

Our position, as set out in the legal submission, is that the adverse impacts of the proposal are sufficiently significant to be out of proportion with and outweigh the benefits of the proposal. So, our proposal is that the panel should exercise its discretion to decline the Application.

TTR's legal submissions, in response to our own legal submission, we don't think they address the substance of Taranaki Offshore Partnership's submission and they effectively say that the issues that we raised cannot be disregarded. Accordingly, all of the issues that are raised in our legal submission, they all remain in contention. By way of example, TTR incorrectly states that the panel can disregard impacts on the environment. That's paragraph 157. The environmental impacts covered in our evidence

are relevant regardless of whether offshore wind generation is developed or not.

I will move onto the next slide. Here, we talk a little bit about the Taranaki Offshore Partnership and the project that we are looking at. As John has mentioned, Taranaki Offshore Partnership is a 50/50 joint venture of Copenhagen Infrastructure Partners, a renewable energy investment fund from Denmark, and the New Zealand Superfund. We were formed in 2022 specifically to investigate and pursue the feasibility of offshore wind farms in New Zealand.

We believe that offshore wind will be a cornerstone of the energy security for New Zealand in the future. Right now, we all know that we are grappling with the energy crisis and the high cost of electricity is front of mind for many New Zealanders, so projects like this that have large scale and long-term horizons are essential in the future of New Zealand's energy mix.

Offshore wind is recognised by government as integral to their electrify New Zealand strategy and it has been front of mind for, I would say, both the current government and opposition. We've been working closely with MBIE for the last few years on the development of the Offshore Renewable Energy Bill, which is the regulatory environment that has been set up to enable development of offshore winds. We're saying South Taranaki Bight is by far the best location for establishing offshore wind and it has the two main ingredients that we look for - high wind speeds, but especially shallow water. There's not many other areas around the country that have that combination. As a matter of fact, the only other one would be Waikato, but it's a very different environment. South Taranaki has wind speeds that are almost 20% higher than Waikato. From a point of view of excellence of resource, we know that South Taranaki is if offshore wind happens, it will start here.

Our proposed offshore wind project comprises one gigawatt, which means 1,000 megawatts wind farm, which would entail 70 wind turbines roughly. The exact shape and extent of the site that we will require will be determined later in the feasibility studies. We're not at the point where we can pinpoint exactly what polygon we would need in the sea. It is expected that the wind farm will extend over an area of around 250 square kilometres. That will be the amount of area that is needed for the turbines.

Over the last four years, we've conducted several feasibility activities, including some of the main ones would be we deployed a floating lidar, which is effectively a buoy that measures wind speeds all the way up to 300m above water level. That allows us to get a data set of the wind profiles. That work and the deployment was consented as a permitted activity with the EPA, and another one that we also lodged as a permitted activity under the EPA was the deployment of three underwater microphones for detection of marine mammals. They have been out there for a year now, and the idea was to do a first pilot study to understand how marine mammals use the South Taranaki Bight. As we heard loud and clear very early in our feasibility studies, that was one of the things that was of concern, especially for mana whenua and mana moana.

We did technical assessments of Port Taranaki and Patea to understand what the capabilities there would be to support offshore wind development. We've done extensive industry capability mapping to understand the job opportunities that offshore wind could bring and how they could support the transition of oil and gas workers, for example, in the region to offshore wind. We've done several environmental technical studies to understand the baseline of the South Taranaki environment.

My conclusion as expert for this part of evidence from a point of view of an offshore wind developer is that this proposal entails unique risks and creates a level of uncertainty that will negatively affect investor sentiment, the investment case, and ultimately the prospect of any future offshore wind development in the area.

I will move to the next slide where we're looking at evidence from Dr McComb of Ocean Numerical. This regards seabed morphology and the impact on that from proposal. We have it on there. Dr McComb says that the main impact on seabed morphology will be the creation of pits and mounds of unconsolidated material on the seabed. Dr McComb suggests that in his view these will be significant in size and effectively permanent as in they will not remediate within a short timescale. Dr McComb supports the view that the modelling of these impacts was flawed and that mounds created by the mining will be much larger than estimated.

The migration of these pits that will be created by the seabed mining operations has not really been addressed extensively, but we think that because of that uncertainty, it would be very difficult to understand how these effects would expand outside of the mining area. Another thing that Dr McComb has suggested is that these changes to seabed morphology have the potential to affect the wave patterns significantly and create localised navigational hazards, and current speeds as well.

In general, I guess the summary of Dr McComb's view is that the seabed morphology impact will be enduring, so they will not remediate as fast as has been suggested by the proponent. There has been a response from TTR on these points, but the response then from Dr McComb again is that there is a remaining disagreement on, for example, using the correct size of sediment, grain size, density and bed forms that informs how these mounds will create and migrate, and in general, that there is a high level of uncertainty in the estimates of timescales for remediation. Again, we highlight the word uncertainty that has been used by Ngāti Ruanui as well.

Moving onto our views on geotechnical impacts and impacts on offshore wind development, so Mr Regan King of Tonkin and Taylor has prepared his views on geotechnical impacts of the seabed mining operations. The main things that we expect the proposal to affect are reducing the geotechnical strength in the area that will be mined and the density of the upper layers of the seabed. There will be an increased risk of settlement if other structures get installed in the same area. There will be an increased risk of seabed liquefaction during seismic events. That hasn't been addressed really. Effectively, every existing mapping of the surface that we have at the moment that is available for understanding what the seabed formations are like, it will make them obsolete and it will require remapping of very much the whole area. So Mr King's view is that all those impacts will have direct implications for future users of the seabed, not just for offshore wind but for other activities that might need that kind of interaction with the seabed.

My colleague, Mr Perry, based in Australia, he's one of our technical directors for development of offshore wind. His statement of evidence focuses on what the impacts on offshore wind activities itself would be from having seabed mining in the same area. Mr Perry broke it down in the various phases of development of an offshore wind farm, starting with the planning, which is

effectively the phase that we're in now, where we try and understand all the physical characteristics of the area alongside the commercial opportunity and the investment opportunity. This is effectively the phase where the word uncertainty becomes a big deal. It's one of the things that can actually lead to make it difficult to reach final investment decision if we have too many uncertainties left unclear, I would say.

Mr Perry highlighted how it's required to have a detailed understanding of seabed conditions to progress offshore wind, the design of especially offshore wind foundations, so the components that sit on the seabed. And then he moves onto also looking at what would the interaction likely be during the construction and then the operation of the wind farm. There, we have uncertainties around just the marine traffic, how that would be managed and what the impacts on our design would be.

It's worth saying there's no examples anywhere in the world of offshore wind and seabed mining coexisting next to each other in the same area, whereas there are many examples of offshore wind coexisting quite well with other activities, like for example, shipping or fishing and petroleum as well. The fact that we don't really have an example of offshore wind and seabed mining coexisting means that our hands are tied in terms of having to assume many worst case scenarios, let's say for the development of our project.

Mr Perry concludes that in his view, all these challenges and uncertainties are effectively so significant that it's unlikely that a developer of offshore wind would pursue or be able to finance an offshore wind project. These projects rely heavily on large consortium banks funding or providing debt in the later stages of the project. A big part of the due diligence will be to effectively show what the risks are and how the risks have been managed. Having all this level of uncertainty early on makes it very difficult to push forward with the development of an offshore wind project.

My last slide here is a summary of the economic evidence put forward for us by Mr Fraser Colgrave of Insights Economics. The main points from Mr Colgrave were that the input-output model that was used by TTR in the latest NZIER report is insufficient for a large first of its kind capital intensive proposal, with material supply side constraints and high delivery risk. TTR's response to our comments accepted that the input-output methodology has

limitation, but hasn't really addressed them. It's Mr Colgrave's view that TTR has overstated economic benefits in a number of fields. One is the induced effects that they consider inflate the proposal's likely economic benefit, omitting those induced effects, and in Mr Colgrave's view reduces the proposal's estimated economic impacts on GDP unemployment by between 22% and 29%. NZIER's response to our comment does not address this issue.

Mr Colgrave also thinks the proposal's deliverability risk is very high and NZIER's response again does not address this issue. Unreliable inputs and assumptions is something else that Mr Colgrave has raised and also the assumptions around the labour market being excessively optimistic in Mr Colgrave's view. He says in a region with thin existing capacity, displacement of other activity and wage pressure are likely, but there hasn't been further explanation on this from NZIER in response.

Mr Colgrave also flags how TTR has understated economic costs, mainly because of the potential opportunity costs that he believes could be material. He makes the case for offshore wind, and he says that on a like for like basis, a one gigawatt offshore wind farm is likely to generate comparable or greater GDP and direct employment as the proposal, along with substantial emissions reduction and enduring enabling infrastructure provisions.

Another point where economic costs have been understated is in NZIER's response. It does consider economic costs in terms of impact on tourism and fishing, but not on other industries, and also it's worth saying the impact on tourism were looked at for the year 2020, which we all know was not a representative year for tourism due to the COVID lockdown.

The conclusions from Mr Colgrave are effectively that the analysis from NZIER of the purported economic benefits is not reliable and that NZIER has materially overstated the economic benefits of the proposal and understated the costs.

That's all I have. Again, a high level overview of our experts' views, but very happy to take any questions. If there's something that we can't quite address because it would be more better left to the experts, we would welcome the opportunity to follow up with written answers.

K TOOGOOD: Thank you. I understand the points you make about the potential impact on your proposals and your project of granting the Application in a very general way. I do understand you talk about the difficulties of coexistence and the types of consequence of granting the Application that you foresee for your project. I haven't read the legal submissions that you filed, but I'm sure they'll be helpful, but can you just tell me do they address this question of whether or not your interests represent an existing interest within the terms of the legislation or are you framing your point in a different way in terms of the consequences for you of granting the Application?

G CALEFFI: This is where I'll tread carefully, not being a lawyer, but there are comments around we understand to the extent of the law what an existing interest could be. Our lawyers have made the point that because of the amount of work that we've done on feasibility and the presence that we've had in the region, there are grounds to consider our interests as existing.

K TOOGOOD: You do mount an argument, but you do cover within that framework of an existing [overspeaking]?

G CALEFFI: I believe so, and yes, it is covered in the legal submission.

K TOOGOOD: All right, thank you.

G CALEFFI: Thank you.

K TOOGOOD: Other panel members, have you—

[no dialogue 1:31:10 – 1:31:41]

L LOVELL: Just on the issue of existing interests, you mentioned the two existing consents that you have. Can we get copies of those consents?

G CALEFFI: Yep.

L LOVELL: Thank you.

K TOOGOOD: Can you just summarise those for us? What are they?

G CALEFFI: Those were two. I'm not sure, Alison, our environmental planner might help. I'm not sure whether consent is the right word, but both activities, the

underwater microphones and the floating lidar were considered permitted activities by the EPA. Is it right to call it a consent?

A LANE: It's a permitted activity under the Exclusive Economic Act and Economic Zone Continental Shelf [overspeaking].

K TOOGOOD: Can you come forward please, because we are recording the kōrero?

G CALEFFI: Of course.

K TOOGOOD: If you could perhaps take the microphone from Giacomo and just explain what you're talking about.

A LANE: Thank you. Kia ora koutou. Ko Alison Lane tōku ingoa. So, under the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf Act, there are certain activities that are classified as permitted activities, therefore not needing consent, providing you meet very specific criteria in terms of doing an assessment of impacts, having extensive consultation with mana whenua and providing notifications and details to the EPA. Both of the activities that Giacomo referred to are permitted activities, and all of those permitted activity criteria were adhered to, including very extensive consultation with iwi even prior to those required notification periods. Does that help, sir?

K TOOGOOD: Yes, that does help, and if you can provide some information if it's not already provided about that, that would be helpful.

G CALEFFI: Absolutely.

L LOVELL: Including any authorisation or confirmation from the EPA.

G CALEFFI: Sure. Okay, we can do that.

K TOOGOOD: I'll just make an observation here, but I'm not sure whether we ask informally for this additional information, whether we should crystallise that into a formal RFI. We'll take some advice about that and we may in fact have to issue requests for information just to give that some status within the terms of the process that we're following here.

G CALEFFI: Sure.

K TOOGOOD: We'll get some guidance from EPA on that. Well thinking aloud, it seems to me that if we want to be specific about the information we're seeking, we should probably record our request in some way. I think what you can take from it is that we're heralding that we are likely to issue an RFI more formally, which frames the question if you like, so you know exactly what it is we're looking for.

G CALEFFI: Sounds good. Okay, thank you.

K TOOGOOD: Any other questions from the panel? All right, well, thank you very much.

G CALEFFI: Thank you.

K TOOGOOD: We've saved ourselves eight minutes. Would the next group, Climate Justice Taranaki, like come to forward, set themselves up and let us know when you are ready to start?

[no dialogue/background chat 1:35:20 – 1:37:43]

CLIMATE
JUSTICE
TARANAKI:

Waea, waea, waea ki te urutapu nui o Tāne. Tāne te waiora, Tāne te pūkenga, Tāne te wānanga, Tāne te whakaputa nei ki te whai ao, ki te ao mārama. Ko tātou tēnei e noho matara nei. Mauri ora ki a tātou. Ko tātou tēnei wānangananga, ēnei kōrero, tēnei ngāngara, me kī. Nō reira, kia kaha, kia māia. Ko mātou tēnei o Climate Justice Taranaki e mihi ana ki Aotea waka. Ko Turi tēnei, ko Rongorongo, me tana kete ngā taonga o Hawaiki, te oneone i hongia e Turi, te whenua momona, he moana ātaahua nei rā aku mihi. Te mihi o te rōpū nei ki a koutou o Aotea waka, karanga mai! Kua tae mai ki te tautoko i a koutou i tēnei wā. Kia kaha. Ko tātou tēnei, ā, ngā kupu kōrero o te ata nei, te ātea mana mōhau, te whenua tōmuri, te tangata tōmua. Nō reira, ko tēnei whakatupuranga, ā, ko te moana tōmuri. Nō reira, kia kaha. Ko tātou tēnei, kia ora mai tātou. Ka huri au ki a koutou, ngā kaiwhakawā. Mai i ngā moutere o Shetland, mai i Chamonix, otirā, ki te tērā waka o Takitimu, ki ngā maunga Tūwharetoa, ki te auahi nui o Wānaka. Tēnei aku mihi kia koutou. Kia ora mai tātou. We are Climate Justice Taranaki. We've been here before as well to support our friends and comrades and relations of Ngāti Ruanui, Ngāruahine, Ngārauhui here in the south. We're a community group started in 2010. We've engaged in numerous of these EPA hearings, including TTR as well as various other EEZ matters pertaining to

oil and gas exploration. We're mostly based in coastal Taranaki. My role is to introduce our group quickly and then leave it to our experts to talk about it.

We've got Dr Lyndon DeVantier. He's got a PhD from the University of Queensland. He's a coral ecologist. We got Catherine Cheung [? 1:39:39]. She's a researcher with Climate Justice Taranaki. She's worked for the UN development programme around marine issues. She's an exec member of ECO, the Environment and Conservation Network of Aotearoa. And Tuhi-Ao Bailey, current Chair of the Parihaka Papakāinga Trust and iwi rep on the Policy and Planning Committee at the TRC, also iwi rep on the sustainability working party at the NPDC. That's our background as a group. We're based in the community. We've been working on these issues for many years.

If we go to slide two, Lyndon, to give an overview of where we're coming from, and our experts will speak to this, we're saying that the claimed regional and national benefits are overstated by the Applicants and far outweigh the environmental and social costs. Secondly, the project would increase risks on a global scale, particularly when it comes to threatened species. Finally, we will be discussing the cumulative effects in the South Taranaki Bight. Nō rēira. Ēnei āku mihi ki a koutou. Ko Ollis [? 1:40:43] tēnei, kia ora mai tātou. ka hoatu te microphone ki a wai?

C CHEUNG: Kia ora Ollis [? 1:40:50]. Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa. Nō Hainan ōku tipuna. Ko Hong Kong tōku moutere, engari e noho ana au me tōku whānau kei Ōkato i te taha o te awa Hangatahua. Ko Cheung [? 1:41:11] Catherine tōku ingoa. I just want to say I consider myself a sea person too, growing up in Hong Kong, a little island. I longed to be in the ocean from an early age. As soon as I have saved up enough money, I got myself onto a scuba course and I went away diving in lots of tropical islands, coral reefs. I spent about 10 years working, counting marine fish, coral reef fish with colleagues with environmental organisations. I wasn't going to mention the UN because I'm not an expert for this area here, but I do have a marine background, and I love the ocean is what I'm trying to say. While we as a group, we don't have commercial interests, but we have very strong interests for a thriving marine ecosystem and moana, an ocean that would keep sustaining us and whānau.

Okay, so I am not an economist and I'm sure that I have read somewhere, we have read some of the expert statements from KASM and from Forest and Bird economists' analysis, so I'm not going to try and rephrase them. They are very, very clear and very strong that the economic benefits both at regional and national levels are overstated while the cost themselves are understated or not really understood.

We've heard earlier already from Ngāti Ruanui that there is so much that we simply can't put a dollar sign on - the cultural values, the connection to the ocean, those very special fishing grounds. There is of course environmental economics you can, if you really want to put figures, monetary values, but really at the heart of the issue, we feel they are not touchable. Also, in my earlier career and even throughout now as a volunteer, I have seen so much losses, so much losses in the ocean, mana whenua, and I feel quite sad. We would like to really continue to try and protect what is left that are still valuable, that are still treasured by the people here.

Okay, so I'd like to just say a few things about the risks that seem to be not mentioned very much by other submitters, and being a group based in Taranaki, the energy capital of Aotearoa, we have had interactions with the industry a fair bit. We have witnessed oil spills and dangerous incidents that I should just say between 2010 and 2017, in a written submission, there have been eight dangerous incidents that occurred on just the Māori platform now owned by OMV. Three of those incidents are oil spills. One of those oil spills actually reached the Kapiti Coast. The other four dangerous incidents, one of them required a shutdown of the platform. I forgot for how long and apparently there was a crack in the infrastructure. The cause of it was not really clear. It was a pretty wild storm out there, but there could also be seismic activities then, but there was never a clear answer to what caused that other than it was pretty dangerous and dire.

We feel that we've been very lucky with all these industrial activities offshore that we haven't had something worse. Of course, these things all come with dollar values. How much are those things? If something goes wrong, how much is it going to go on and cost the Crown, the taxpayers and the people who live here? We fear that the current regulations are weakening the protection on Aotearoa and the Crown, and for companies who may not be

the most competent or able, will they be able to do the cleanup if something bad happens?

Accidents do happen. There's human error and we know that there is a well in the Kupe field, a KS2 well, that's been leaking since 2018. We've been trying. Hapu and ourselves have been trying to get to the bottom of it. Why and how is there nothing done to it? Why are they not made to just patch it or whatever they can do? Close it. We were just told, 'It's just a few bubbles'. But, is that true and why is there nothing done? We are worried that if something bad happens, it's just do our regulators have the capacity to deal with it and make sure that it is all safe?

On the economic side, I would touch on again is that globally many steel makers are already shifting to using scrap metal and electric arc furnace, including New Zealand Steel and Pacific Steel who are already going away from using iron ore that are freshly mined and going for this new technology. So, why are we mining for more iron? There's currently a glut, I've heard, of iron. Is it how economically viable?

And then there are companies, the big companies, BMW Group, Samsung, dare I say Google, who are already saying that they will not buy materials that are mined from the seabed. This vanadium or whatever else that ends up being extracted by this project, where are they going? How firm is this economic argument? We don't know.

I'll pass it on to Dr Lyndon DeVantier who will cover the cumulative effects detail.

L DEVANTIER: Thank you. Thank you, Catherine. I'd just like to start off by saying that I live in Ōkato. I've been here for about 15 years, but I've visited New Zealand before making the move from Australia many times in my life prior to that. I feel quite strongly that this is my home. I'll just start off by acknowledging that.

We have concerns regarding cumulative effects. We've had them for a long while, so we'd like to definitely bring your attention to that in terms of the EZ Act. You can see there on the screen what it's actually saying, but the main point is that there was a contention from the legal department, the legal people, that they were saying that we'd mentioned decades. We were

actually meaning a future effect, and I think that's an important consideration for this panel because there seems to be a sense that we have a steady state and we're adding one more thing to a steady state in the ocean, but the ocean is changing really fast. So, it's not a steady state out there, and that's why we highlighted the future effect aspect of your considerations.

In that respect, this is from the IPCC, but I think most people in this room are aware of these issues. We really do have a crisis in our oceans and to maintain the food security, we shouldn't be really, really thinking not to add more disturbances to an area that's incredibly important for the people here. So, very briefly, warming is unabated. The oceans are continuing to acidify, losing oxygen. Nutrient cycles are perturbed. There are observed changes in the biogeography, and unfortunately our seas here are no exception to that. In fact, the latest report that came out just very recently from MFE highlighted the fact that our waters here are warming at about a third more rapidly than the global average. That is illustrated here. This is actually old news now. This was done back in 2017, this image, but the situation has not improved. Since 2023, the world's oceans have heated dramatically, so this is an indication of how things were.

It's no longer even like that, the extent of heat waves, the intensity of heat waves are getting rapidly more severe. That has obviously significant flow on effects, including drastic reductions in krill. Krill obviously are one of the basis of the food chains for marine mammals, which are incredibly important off this coastline. Indeed the Taranaki Bight and the waters offshore from here is the global hotspot, along with an area off the coast of Argentina, that there are more species recorded from this little part of the world in terms of the marine mammal fauna than anywhere else on earth. These are taonga species to the mana whenua here, and we feel an obligation that these should be carefully considered in this proposal.

K TOOGOOD: Kia ora.

L DEVANTIER: This is just to highlight what's going on and this is from the new report by MFE and Stats New Zealand. Our little area is heating, and it's also losing primary productivity. That's predicted to continue. That is not good news.

Synergisms, again, these are difficult to quantify, but there have been a number of studies done. The study above at the top of this slide is not dealing

with this particular area, but the points I think are relevant. Ocean acidification will decrease sound absorption at low frequencies, enhancing long range sound propagation. At the same time, temperature changes can modify the sound speed profile, leading to the creation or disappearance of sound ducts in which sound can propagate over large distances. The importance of this is that the animals that are living offshore here, and we know that we had unfortunately 12 sperm whales wash ashore dead several years ago now, so there are large numbers of animals that are being affected. The cause of their death was not clear, but in the months prior, there had been a major seismic survey off this coast and we suspect that that could have been one of the causes. We're not sure, but in terms of this particular study, the expert caucusing from 2024 pointed out that without information on the intensity and frequency range of the noise from mining, it is not possible to determine the likely impacts on marine mammals, including physical and behavioural effects and fish species both vocalise and are sensitive to underwater noise. Now I expect that you'll hear much more on those aspects from the experts, from the various groups.

On the benthos, there was virtually nothing known other than within the mana whenua and within a dive club that worked out from Patea, back when this hearing was conducted back in 2013 and then 2017. It was considered to be, by the proponent, as far as I can gather a marine desert. The project reef team knew that there was a beautiful reef there and the mana whenua also knew that there was significant grounds there, but it wasn't well understood how important this area was and how unique it was.

Before we get to that, I've jumped ahead. I wanted to make a point that, and I think this is a disagreement that I have, and I'm not speaking here as an expert, but my experience in the marine realm is that many species have very narrow tolerances to physiochemical, the conditions that they live in. I certainly see that with coral reefs where a degree change in temperature, an increase in light or a decrease in light causes dramatic effects. The issue here is that if we're changing things and things are already changing, how much change are these communities, these marine ecosystems going to be able to cope with?

Now the proponents' team think that they're very robust. That was the impression and that our concerns could be set aside with the language that

was used. Well, I wish I was as sanguine in this respect. I don't think that that's necessarily the case, and like most people here, I think I'm most concerned with the plume because the reductions in plume, the plume modelling that was done by Pinkerton back in 2017 showed under worst case scenario that the reduction in light would be almost half. Now even if macroalgae can use heterotrophic feeding, which is absorption of nutrients from the water, that's an unknown to the degree that that will support them through these kinds of events

So, I think that there's a lot more uncertainty in respect of that, particularly given that nobody even knew what was really there until quite recently. Thankfully the Regional Council employed Morrison et al from NIWA to go out and look. They turned up an incredible array of marine hard grounds. They're not in my consideration [inaudible 1:57:09] reefs, but there's beautiful areas that have been documented with video cameras. You can see some of that footage, of the importance of those and they're discovering new species, new records for these areas, and noted that the subtitle's common with many more awaiting discovery.

We're still quite uncertain as to the actual amount that's out there, but it does clearly play an important role in fisheries. They're providing important nursery habitat, and one of the conclusions from the NIWA report was that these are worthy of careful management by the Regional Council and other governance entities. So, the associated fish assemblies are abundant. That's a really important consideration for the local people here.

In terms of our international obligations, New Zealand has committed to looking after these taonga species to people here. We've said that we will maintain viable populations of species in their natural surroundings. We've also said that we would rehabilitate and restore degraded ecosystems and promote the recovery of threatened species. Those are important commitments that we have made, and we are not at present doing as good a job on this as we could. I think that if we do decide to allow this project, then we're actually again stepping in the wrong direction.

I'll hand this over to Tuhi-Ao Bailey. Oh, sorry to Catherine.

C CHEUNG: Okay, so we have this international commitment and I think that there have been some steps in conservation. Say, the West Coast North Island marine

mammal sanctuary, this blue strip, but unfortunately if we look closely at what's allowed was not allowed as the protection within this area is very small. These two maps, you could see that the line along the coast as the 12 nautical miles boundary, also the boundary of the marine mammal sanctuary, and on the left-hand side, we all recognise the blue plot just outside the 12 nautical miles. That's the mining license that TTR owns, within which there is that 65 kilometres square, but it's much bigger than that. Their interest is much bigger than the 65 square kilometres, especially if you include the exploration permit, which is 635 square kilometres, which is actually inside the marine mammal sanctuary.

And then just last week we learnt that there is now a petroleum exploration permit that's been granted to another Australian company now under this open market protocol, that there's going to be three months of period where other companies can put in bids to compete with them. That's the purple area that is inshore from Kupe and inshore from the current TTR mining permit.

The purpose of these diagrams is to show how heavily used it is already, the coastal waters of South Taranaki, and how much pressure and stressors are being put on species, whether it is benthic species or whales, coral rock, penguin and seabirds. Everything, to us, feels like they're under attack, and we can't just say we'll only look at the 65 square kilometres because this is the context that we are working within. This is what the species have to deal with, and they don't see that 12 nautical miles. We know the impacts themselves, the plume are not going to stay within the project area. There's going to be transboundary effects from the projects into other places, so we just have to look beyond what we are told to look at on paper.

T BAILEY: Tēnā tātou. Tēnā koe Aotea waka. Ko Taranaki te maunga. Ko Ngāti Mutunga, ko te Ātiawa, ko Taranaki ōku iwi ki te taha o tōku papa. He hononga ōku ki Maniapoto ki Ngāti Ruanui. I'm an ecologist. I'm a mother and I'm one of the founding members of our group, Climate Justice Taranaki. I'm also the Chair at Parihaka Papakāinga, so I'm combining my comments today with our one from Parihaka, as we didn't have the capacity to speak today formally.

Our comment from Parihaka, we're a Papakāinga that was a refuge and the political voice for about 50 hapu and iwi from around the country back in the

1800s, and we maintain that role still in fighting for what's right. Our people were pushed inland by the colonial forces and the land around us was taken, but our hapu, our people, are sea people and you can see the evidence in the Tauranga waka and Tauranga eka [? 2:3:03] all around our coast and the million [? 2:3:03] heaps which are full of shells and bones from the sea. Our sacred raukura feather from Parihaka is the feather of the toroa, which flew into the park, which was about 3km inland when there was a storm at sea. As you know, there lots of storms here. The toroa was also fed to our people who were in prisons in the jails in the south by Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Waewae. So, our people are sea people.

We also have other birds that fly inshore. I found a kawau in our food box [? 2:3:41] the other day next to our river. We've had whales washed ashore just in the last five years – two different types of whales. We have seals, sea leopards, kororā. I found a baby takapū the other day from White Island that had washed up ashore over here. We also witnessed a mass [? 2:4:03] seabird die off just a few years ago when we had the marine heat waves come through and toxic algae blooms.

Also, our people, they didn't just fish from the coast; they used to head out to sea. Our aunties and uncle slept [? 2:4:22] for about 10 days at a time. We can't do that anymore because we don't have the financial basis to have those boats anymore, but our people are still fishing from the shore or they go on someone else's boat.

What I'm getting to is that when we had healthy forests and streams, we had a constant nutrient exchange between the sea and the whenua of sediment going up to sea and fish and birds and seaweed being brought into the land to feed our mana and feed our people. We're not separate from the sea, and our iwi are not separate from each other.

The effects on taiao are also not separate to each other, and also our tūpuna maunga is not separate from the sea. The seabed is our tūpuna maunga.

So, how Parihaka has tried to help with the situation is we called on our eight iwi to stand together to support our iwi in the south in opposing this Application. For the first time in quite a while, our iwi did that collectively. We stand together with Aotearoa.

We've also been waiting on our MACA hearings on the Takutai Moana claims. The Government has not been genuine in proceeding fast with these and now they're changing the rules again there. So, we seek the highest form of protection for protected customary rights of our ocean and the taiao, which will allow us to deny commercial activities to threaten our ways of life.

We've also, in the meantime, been enacting rāhui as you heard earlier, so we have a rāhui for the Taranaki area in the north. This has been in place for almost six years now and currently sits under Section 86A of the Fisheries Act as a temporary fisheries closure. This is to reduce the amount of take that we've had, not just from local fisheries, but busloads of people from around the country to come and take kaimoana. This is supported by our local recreational fishing club who also spoke of times back in the seismic surveys in the 1960s, where there was a massive fish die offs. They remember following the survey boats filling their boats with fish that were dead. They said the sea out there has never recovered since then. The surfers also supported this as they've seen the effects of sedimentation effluent discharge from the dairy industry, and also we support it on the grounds of the climate impacts of forcing fish and marine life to move around and change their territories, toxic algal blooms, rising storms and sea level rise.

We see the cumulative the effects of the Crown land theft, the dairy export industry, forestry, fishing and mining. These extractive activities are void of tikanga that ground into a balanced, respectful form of economy that does not take more than it gives back. We do not support any further extraction from our environment. We have crossed many environmental tipping points that can no longer be ignored if we want a liveable planet. This company continues to [inaudible 2:7:45], which leads to genocide. Please turn down the Application.

CLIMATE
JUSTICE
TARANAKI:

Kia ora tātou. Koinei ngā kōrero whakamutunga. That concludes our ... as the tamariki out there are starting to gather with their haki, that concludes our kōrero engari ka hoki ngā whakaaro ki tēnei kōreo ki tēnei taki tūā ko Tāwhirimātea ko tēnei taki tūā mai Waitira ki te tahua. From the 17th of March 1860, the beginning of the war, all the way to the invasion of Parihaka in 1881, this is the context. This is the foundation here in Taranaki. When you

look towards this maunga, you might see a beautiful maunga on a beautiful day, but you also see acres and acres of confiscated lands. In our view, this is a continuation of that colonial process.

Us as environmentalists, we can place our environmental views with a social justice lens that this project has no benefit for our communities. It's not wanted by our communities, it's rejected by the community, by the hapū, by the councils, and etc, so we encourage you to make the right decision. Kia kaha, kia maia, kia manawanui. Tēnā koutou. Kia ora mai tātou.

K TOOGOOD: Kia ora. I'll just ask the panel members if they have any questions.

C WRAIGHT: Kia ora. I've read your evidence. It was very helpful, thank you. I haven't had a chance to read TTR's response, and I just wondered if you could give me some key highlights as to how you feel about that response.

L DEVANTIER: Yeah, one of the points that TTR made was that our comments were in regard to cumulative effects and we'd mentioned looking ahead several decades. They said that that was ... well, I'm not exactly sure of the wording, but we read it as being that it was out of scope. But the EZ Act actually, as we had on one of the slides, Section 6 mentions future effects, so we think it is in scope and that was one of the considerations. TTR referred us to mostly to Dr McDermott's evidence, and Dr McDermott, in our view, we don't agree with what she said. She basically dismissed everything, our concerns and the concerns of many others, and said that that could be set aside. We do not agree that they can be set aside. There are significant lacks of information. Well, I'm expecting that the experts will counter Dr McDermott's arguments quite stringently. Those were the main criticisms I think that came from TTR in respect of our evidence.

C CHEUNG: Yeah, I think the other one that stood out, the comments from the company is that we pointed out earlier that the oil spill is in dangerous incidents that have occurred in more than a decade just by one company. TTR's response was listing half a dozen regulations and protocols and say, 'We'll be all right'. But the fact that this is a new industry, a very complicated one, they have four vessels and two crawlers [? 2:11:28] under the sea. There are so many opportunities for error and for dangerous things to happen in the wild seas and the moana is probably ready to blow.

Anyway, you don't need to consider that, but I'm just listing the number of regulations that they have to follow doesn't mean that it is safe. What are they doing to avoid any accidents or minimise?

L DEVANTIER: Just quickly, one of the things that we hadn't read Copal [? 2:12:05] et al (that was our error) in raising an issue in regard to carbon dioxide release, and from the eight cause [? 2:12:14] that TTR had commissioned, they found low levels of organic carbon. So, they dismissed that aspect, but we also raised the question about noxious or toxic chemicals from the deeper seabed. I think a subsequent report by Copal in 2017 ... or Vocal [? 2:12:31, I'm sorry. I think it's Vocal, the name. Apologies. Pointed out that there could be elevated levels of ... I think it was chromium, nickel and one other chemical that could be released.

I'm not sure how that's been handled, but other parts of the South Taranaki Bight do have more elevated levels of carbon in the sediments, but it appears that the cause [? 2:12:57] that were taken had low levels of organic carbon, so we take that point.

T BAILEY: Just to answer your question, so this was discussed before, but just to summarise that TTR was saying they shouldn't have to consider cost benefit, effects on the economy, but then they say we have to consider net effects. It's the same thing, it's just a weird argument.

K TOOGOOD: Well, that is perfectly timed. It's now midday.

L LOVELL: I just have a couple.

K TOOGOOD: I'm sorry.

L LOVELL: Sorry.

K TOOGOOD: Loretta is just going to spoil it for us [laughter] by wanting to ask some questions [laughter].

L LOVELL: A couple of quick questions. Sorry, I'm [inaudible 2:13:39] to lunch. Just on that rāhui point and the one you were mentioning, you mentioned it's been there for six years under ... was it 86A of the Fisheries Act?

T BAILEY: 186.

- L LOVELL: 186? Is it possible to get a bit of information on where that rāhui is and how that has operated?
- T BAILEY: Yes, it extends across the whole coast of Taranaki iwi rohe. I think it's from Taungatara to Ngā Motu.
- L LOVELL: I'm assuming that under the Act that there'll be a map somewhere or something like that.
- T BAILEY: Yeah, so it had two years of rāhui, then it had two years of the fisheries closure, and then it had an extended two years. That finishes in December this year.
- L LOVELL: Okay, are there any other examples you could give us of that sort of formalised process that rāhui.
- T BAILEY: My understanding is there was similar rāhui up in the Tauranga area after the oil spill.
- K TOOGOOD: Is that recorded somewhere for us to [inaudible 2:15:10]?
- T BAILEY: It should be online. I'm not sure.
- K TOOGOOD: It should be online?
- T BAILEY: Yeah, this is under the Fisheries Act, so there'll be plenty of documents.
- K TOOGOOD: All right.
- C CHEUNG: We submitted for it. We submitted in support when it went to the Fisheries Act. We submitted in support.
- L DEVANTIER: In relation to the Taranaki coastal rāhui and fisheries closure, if Te Kahui o Taranaki is presenting, are they presenting? Te Kahui would be the one to speak more to it as the iwi did, has supported the hapu to implement that fisheries [overspeaking].
- K TOOGOOD: Yes, they are, Te Kahui.
- L DEVANTIER: That'd be a good question for Te Kahui o Taranaki.
- K TOOGOOD: They're presenting tomorrow morning.

L LOVELL: [several inaudible words 2:15:48].

K TOOGOOD: Kia ora.

L DEVANTIER: Ka pai.

L LOVELL: And just one final point, you mentioned losing primary productivity. What did you mean by that?

L DEVANTIER: Well, that's a measure. It's usually measured using chlorophyll in the water column, so the predictions that have been done just recently by MFE are that primary productivity off our coast is going to decline in future. It's probably related to obviously changes in temperature and changes in oxygen that will affect primary productivity, which obviously has significant cascading effects on everything else that's relying on that as it's a very foundation of food webs.

L LOVELL: Thank you.

K TOOGOOD: Well, a talk of food. We've had a great deal of food for thought this morning, but not food for the puku. So, we'll take a break for an hour, and resume at one o'clock with a presentation from Taranaki Regional Council and again, our thanks to those presenters who have helped us this morning, kia ora. [overspeaking].

L DEVANTIER: Tēnā koutou.

[off topic background chat/singing].

[Break for lunch]

[End of Recorded Material: 2:17:21]

[Start of Recorded Material: 00:00]

[group background chat 00:00 – 2:10].

K TOOGOOD: Just before we resume, I just want to refer to an issue that has been raised by Beach Energy Resources for Kupe people about some commercially sensitive information that they have provided and want to provide this afternoon. In responding to that, the Applicant also wants to respect that and they have its own commercially sensitive information that it wants us to receive, but we'll have to make a decision about whether we should allow

that to happen and just how we'll do it. What we will do after we've heard from Seafood New Zealand later, after afternoon tea, we'll take a break and the panel will meet representatives of Kupe and the Applicant downstairs and we'll have a conversation about how we will deal with those commercially sensitive issues. And then once we've made that decision and we'll make whatever announcements are appropriate, we'll then hear Beach Energy Resources' submissions, which will be the final ones for the day. I just wanted you to understand what's happening and how we'll handle that and I'll explain that more fully later on. Thank you. All right, kia ora.

F KIDDLE: Kia ora. Ko Finbar Kiddle taku ingoa. I'm the Strategy Lead at the Taranaki Regional Council. We have a few short talking points, but keen to leave the most of this time for question, commenting and discussion.

So, as I said, I'm the Strategy Lead, and I've led the co-ordination of our input this fast track process so far. I'm a planner by training, but have moved up to TRC just over two and a half years ago. Before that, I was at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, where I worked on Pacific Ocean issues, including seabed mining in the Pacific Islands across a range of matters.

Before continuing, I'll just pass this to my colleagues to allow them to introduce themselves.

T McELROY: Kia ora, my name's Thomas McElroy. I'm the Manager for the Science and Technology Group at Taranaki Regional Council. I had input into this process by co-ordinating with PDP, who I think we will throw to introduce shortly, but I've worked at Taranaki Regional Council for a number of years in different roles, so now involved here to help co-ordinate the comment.

G BEDFORD: Kia ora, my name's Gary Bedford, recently retired as the Director for the Environmental Sciences Division of the Council, now continuing on a senior retired basis as a science advisor to the Council.

F KIDDLE: Cool, and now I'll just ask Becky for you to introduce yourself please.

B SHANAHAN: I was hoping you would point to me cos I can't see any of you [? 5:14][laughter]. Kia ora, I'm Becky Shanahan. I'm a Coastal Psychologist based at PDP, an environmental consultancy. My background is largely in marine ecology, and worked a bit in the regional sector, with designing

different monitoring programmes, but also reviewing the effects of various coastal activities on the environment.

K TOOGOOD: Tēnā koe, thank you.

F KIDDLE: Okay, thank you. Well, we'll take our written comments as read and I'll just highlight some key points throughout, and just to front foot, we have gone through the response evidence provided by the Applicant. For the most part, we think most of the questions we've raised in our written comments still stand. There are a few ones where there's been some good changes, like around the koiwi [? 6:04] requirement, and we can speak more to that if needed here, but we're very also happy to provide some response in writing if that would be useful, but we'll take your direction on that.

Overall in terms of economics, Council considers the project would likely have a significant gross economic benefit on the region. That's especially when viewed in light of the challenging economic conditions that the region is currently in, but at this stage we think we cannot comment about the net economic benefit due to those information deficiencies in the Application, and we understand there's been much comment in the evidence around gross versus net and all that as well.

On the economic effects, we'd like to thank the Applicant for the additional clarity they've provided around the expected job numbers and where those might fall, and we note their objection to the idea of a consent condition that would require locating the head office in Taranaki. We do acknowledge the need for proper business planning with regards to that, but we do know having the office located in Taranaki does represent a key regional economic benefit and commitment to the region that we would like to have full confidence in if possible.

Overall, and noting the likely significant gross economic benefit, we still think that the adverse effects being sufficiently significant to be out of proportion to the regional and national benefits cannot be ruled out at this stage. A significant reason for this judgment is the uncertainty associated with the plumes impact on reef ecosystems due to gaps in the assessment regarding reef locations and corresponding effects and the broader effects on seabirds and marine mammals in light of the knowledge gaps in both of those areas. The newly proposed consent conditions to address risks to any rocky reefs

within 3km of the mine are a positive step, but they still represent a consent condition that defers the identification and management of adverse effects until after the consent has been granted. This is similar to consent conditions 9 and 10 regarding marine mammals and seabirds that require no adverse effects, a matter that you would ideally have confidence in before granting a consent.

Within the time constraints of the fast track process, we think there are opportunities for further consideration and clarity on effects regarding benthic ecology and primary productivity and particularly, and you would've picked this up in our written comment, we are particularly interested in the rocky reef associated macro algae for some of those important reefs out there. This is where, across these matters, we think there is information that is yet to be properly considered; however, addressing uncertainties regarding marine mammals and seabirds is likely to prove more difficult. Efforts, of course, still need to be made throughout this process, but if the expert panel considers there is not sufficient information to reach a robust view on the extent of adverse effects, we think assumptions might be necessary to make progress on deliberations in terms of what a realistic worst case might be in terms of effects on those species.

In considering these environmental effects, we think bottom line type policies and causes still matter. We agree they lose their red line type impact under the Fast Track Approvals Act, but we think they still function as a useful flag for the ecosystems, species and values that have been identified as needing additional protection and therefore warrant close consideration.

Beyond the environmental effects I've already talked about, we've also highlighted a range of other matters for consideration in our written comment. We think these are all important, but for the purposes of today, I'll be selective. These are the lack of assurance that appropriate assistance, towage, rescue, salvage and oil spill capacity exists and is readily accessible to the Applicant to deal with a major incident out there. Deficiencies, gaps and inconsistencies regarding information on air emissions and oil spill modelling, potentially requiring a commitment to using low sulphur fuels, noting the lack of consideration of acidification impacts of the air discharges, financial security mechanisms, including the inadequacy of the proposed \$500 million in public liability insurance, ensuring the Applicant is required to

undertake post-extraction recovery activities if needed, and considering whether that five year monitoring period is sufficient for those purposes and consideration of a protocol for if a rāhui is declared in the adjacency CMA. In this, we want to note that our thinking there is not intended to provide a right of veto on the operations but is more about being a good neighbour to the community if such a rāhui was declared.

Regarding alignment with our RMA planning documents, we're not able to make a judgment on this time due to the information issues we've talked about; however, we have detailed in our written comment the policies we think will be most pertinent to the Application. These are particularly those with regards to Project Reef and north and south traps, which is scheduled in our plan, key indigenous taxa, the identified significant seabird area identified in our coastal plan and the West Coast North Island Marine Mammal Sanctuary, which we think is captured as another marine management regime in the NZCPS policy that you need to think about.

Finally, and while admittedly not so much in that matter regarding the Application, we want to emphasise that if the Application is granted, we would like to work closely with the EPA on monitoring and enforcement of the activity. This is an area we have considerable experience and expect our presence in the region would be beneficial to those processes.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak. We're happy to answer any and all questions and look forward to continuing to engage in this process however Council can be an assistance. Thank you.

K TOOGOOD: All right. Hilker? No questions? [inaudible 12:08].

H GILES: Maybe start down that end is my thinking.

K TOOGOOD: Okay, Natalie?

N HAMPSON: Yes, a general comment. Your comments have helpfully provided recommendations in terms of information we might like to seek, and I haven't had a chance to read thoroughly TTR's response to your comments. Is there any particular points in there that you'd like to draw our attention to that haven't been addressed?

F KIDDLE: We think the comments with regards to reefs, benthic ecologies, marine mammals and seabirds are all still live, and that what the Applicant has provided has not significantly elucidated those matters in any great regard, but I'll particularly look to you, Becky, if you've got any comments on that with regards to the environmental effects.

B SHANAHAN: Yeah, I'll just flag that just as the nature of the process to date, a lot of that information is piecemeal in various places. It may be here and it may be there, but it's not actually been considered in a holistic way just because it's not really been possible, but in terms of the effects that we're highlighting for the sediment plume, there's acknowledgement that the reefs exist and that they've been mapped in some places in the region that could be impacted, but we actually have a technical assessment of the sediment plume impacts and the dynamics on the optical properties that could impact the macro algae and these high biodiversity spots just hasn't really been conducted in a way that allows us to say, 'Okay, yeah, we see, we understand what these impacts are'. It's difficult for us to really be able to assess that at the moment.

N HAMPSON: Okay, thank you.

K TOOGOOD: No, and I don't either and I don't want you to think that because we have a few questions now, we're not seriously interested in what you say. I think putting anything else to one side, the Regional Council and the Whanganui District Council, the local authority's view is going to be helpful to the panel because in the sense you are in a neutral position, so you are trying to assist us as a neutral advisor if you like. We're very grateful to the approach that you've taken in that regard. Partly the fact that we don't have many questions is a reflection on the clarity of your presentation, and we're grateful to you for that, but also of course, as we dive more deeply into your paper and the other material that's presented, we have the opportunity to ask further questions later. So, thank you for your time, and of course Loretta has something else that she wants to raise.

L LOVELL: I'll go to the microphone. You should start down that end and just not come to me until last.

K TOOGOOD: I'm sorry [laughter].

L LOVELL: Kia ora. One clarification I wanted, the Ngāti Ruanui witnesses noted an observation that there were some new identified reefs in terms of some work that they had done with Taranaki Regional Council. Does that ring a bell?

F KIDDLE: Yes.

L LOVELL: Would you be able to provide information, more detail of that? We could do it through an RFI, but it might be helpful to provide that information in terms of [overspeaking].

K TOOGOOD: Give us a general indication as to what that might involve.

F KIDDLE: Yeah, we'd be happy to. There's the sites that are scheduled in our coastal plan in terms of Project Reef and the traps. I imagine the other matter is that report, yeah? Do you want to speak to that and maybe Becky?

T McELROY: Yeah, I'm assuming what we're referring to here in terms of the newly identified reefs would be those recently surveyed or mapped, surveyed and reported within Morrison et al 2022 technical report. There was a lot of reference to that report within the technical comment we provided, but I can provide a brief bit of background in terms of that process if that would be helpful.

K TOOGOOD: Well, there's plenty of time. Well, we'll want the report, but do you want to give us a short introduction? We've got plenty of time. That would be helpful.

T McELROY: Sure, so that particular report documents the findings from two surveys that were carried out over two consecutive summers. The first survey was effectively a targeted bathymetric or sea floor survey, which was carried out by NIWA and was informed by some local knowledge from underwater club members, fishers and divers around some other rocky reef locations that hadn't been perhaps formally mapped and recognised today. That first survey went about essentially mapping the sea floor and looking for those features.

The following summer, there was another survey that was directed by the findings of the first survey. The second survey involved towing underwater cameras essentially, ground truth and get imagery of what was down there where these features had been recognised. All in all, there was a large number of sites or new rocky reefs that hadn't been formally documented to

date that were identified. A subset of those were able to be visited in that second survey with the towed camera to ground truth and provide a bit of information regarding the biological communities associated with those reefs, but if we look back to that first survey, there was actually much more of a larger area of seabed that was mapped. It wasn't able to be fully explored with the ground truthing methods, so some analysis of that sea floor data suggests that there are some quite extensive linear reef bridge reef features and mosaics of small patcheries scattered around in that area that we just haven't been able to go back and do the formal biological surveys of yet, but that's all documented in the Morrison et al report and we make reference to that with PDP's technical comment.

F KIDDLE: So, yes, we're more than happy to provide that report. It was also provided to our Council, so there's a covering memo that we can also provide which provides a bit of a summary of the key points of what is quite a long technical report, so we can send that through too as well.

L LOVELL: And just one more question. In your comment, you recommended setting conditions for cultural protocols, including [inaudible 19:18] and accidental discovery. Just noting from your experience as Council, how do you envisage in comparative examples but probably that are being implemented or monitored in practise?

F KIDDLE: That's a good question. Gary?

G BEDFORD: I was here this morning and I note that Ngāti Ruanui spoke quite eloquently and knowledgeably about the use of rāhui, so anything I say now should be moderated by anything which they've already presented. In terms of making this proposal in our commentary, it was a matter of respecting that the mining does not take place in a void. It's taking place within the context of social and cultural understandings in a local community, and we believed that this was a way of acknowledging that connection with Taranaki.

In terms of thinking through what a rāhui protocol might look like for the company, we were conscious that there might be rāhui opposed for a number of reasons, so the response might vary depending upon what was appropriate in each case. My recollection is that for example, a rāhui was declared when we had shellfish paralytic neurotoxins being detected and shellfish around the northern coastline in particular intruding into the southern

bight as well. Something like that, the rāhui is for the protection against shellfish gathering and subsequent poisoning, an operation that's 20km or 30km offshore may not need to respond to that in any way, but on the other hand, something such as a drowning in the South Taranaki bight or a fatality on board one of the vessels, a response that's appropriate might be more significant in terms of perhaps pausing mining operations or something like that.

The emphasis here is that a protocol should be developed as a signal from the company that they're taking seriously their context. It might not be fully prescriptive, but we believe it's appropriate that a condition be imposed, requiring at least the development of the protocol and to reflect where this activity is occurring. It was that kind of thinking that we had.

The company has made a response. We think that the response offered by the company is perhaps raising objections which are not necessarily truly determinative in terms of whether that protocol should be developed. We think there's room for the company to do something that respects the local community.

K TOOGOOD: Thank you, Loretta. That was very helpful.

L LOVELL: You're welcome.

K TOOGOOD: All right, thank you very much for your presentation. We really appreciate it and we'll look forward to receiving that further information and any other that we might seek later on. Kia ora.

F KIDDLE: Thank you very much.

K TOOGOOD: All right, Whanganui District Council next, so set yourselves up and we'll look forward to hearing from you.

[no dialogue 23:00 – 24:00].

WHANGANUI
DISTRICT
COUNCIL:

10 minutes early, and we've got someone presenting online.

[no dialogue 24:05 – 24:30].

WHANGANUI
DISTRICT
COUNCIL:

Neil will be able to join in in two minutes.

K TOOGOOD: Okay, we'll wait.

[no dialogue/off topic background chat 24:35 – 25:05].

S HAGAN: Tēnā koutou katoa, and thank you for the opportunity to appear before the panel here today. My name is Sarah Hagan. I'm the Chief Executive Officer of Whanganui District Council. With us shortly online will be Dr Neil Loftus of Sanofex Limited, who prepared the financial model assessment that supports our submission. Also supporting me here today from my right is Councillor Charlotte Mesler, Strategy and Policy Manager from Whanganui District Council, David Gurney, Tim Easton, who is our Team Leader of our Economic Development Unit, Whanganui and Partners, and sitting over in the background, Policy Planner, Leanne Huruwai [? 25:45].

Our comments focus mainly on the economic implications of the project with reference to key environmental and social concerns relevant to the Whanganui district. We do stand alongside neighbouring councils and iwi authorities in calling for a cautious and evidence-based approach. In summary, our position is that Whanganui District Council considers that the information provided by the Applicant is insufficient to enable the panel to weigh environmental effects against the claimed economic benefits.

Independent analysis by Sanofex Limited shows that the Applicant's economic assumptions are overstated, meaning the headline GDP and employment figures cannot be relied upon. Even on those optimistic estimates, the benefits to Whanganui are minimal, while the risks and uncertainties, economic environment and social are substantial. Taken together, these information gaps mean the panel does not have a sound evidential basis to conclude that the project would deliver genuine regional or national benefit.

Economic Assessment Summary

The Applicant's economic case relies heavily on modelling that used its own unverified data. Sanofex's independent review indicate that revenue, production and price assumptions are unrealistically high. We normalise to

market conditions. The project appears marginal at best, raising doubts about its long-term commercial viability. If the project is not profitable, then the anticipated fiscal benefits such as tax revenue and royalties will not materialise. Moreover, the proposal involves no domestic processing or value added manufacturing. It is an extract and export model, where a high value refining and skilled employment would occur offshore. That structure provides little enduring benefit to New Zealand and does not advance national goals for developing value added export industries.

For Whanganui specifically, the claimed benefits are vague and unsubstantiated. There is no clear evidence of local investment, port utilisation or employment opportunities. Most activity would occur in South Taranaki and New Plymouth, meaning the economic benefit to our district would be negligible.

Finally, the proposal carries a significant opportunity cost. Seabed mining in the Taranaki Bight could preclude offshore wind development for decades, undermining regional investment and renewable energy and closing off higher value, longer term opportunities that align with national climate goals.

To touch on the environmental and social considerations, the sediment bloom remains the most significant environmental concern for Whanganui. The Supreme Court previously identified major information gaps that have still not been addressed. Expert advice from Taranaki Regional Council highlights continuing uncertainty about the extent, duration and ecological impact of this.

Given those uncertainties, we support the regional council's recommendation that the panel adopt a precautionary approach and base its judgment on a plausible worst case scenario for environmental effects. We also share the concerns of iwi authorities that engagement has been limited and inadequate, raising concerns about whether the Applicant has met its consultation obligations and whether kaitiakitanga would be properly respected if the project proceeds.

From a social perspective, the Applicant relies on an outdated 2013 report that omits Whanganui's coastline as a major access point for fishers and divers. Local evidence shows high levels of recreational activity that are not

reflected in the assessment. The result is a material underestimation of social and recreational impacts.

Just a couple of additional comments. Whanganui District Council has not had any significant consultation with TTR. Engagement from TTR took place in December last year only after the Council publicly debated our position on the Application by means of an e-mail from the company. I note that the response from TTR to the comment from New Plymouth District Council states that the project's geotechnical and environmental monitoring facility will be based in the Port of Whanganui. It refers to condition 85. There has been no consultation or any engagement whatsoever with our port company, which is a CCO 100% owned by Whanganui District Council.

In their comment, the Whanganui Port Company filed in support of the Council's comment, stated that the port is currently undertaking a substantial port redevelopment, and we would further suggest that it would be a good and sensible time for TTR to enter into active consultation with the Council and the Port of Whanganui, but there has been none to date.

So, our recommendation is that Whanganui District Council respectfully recommends that the panel (1) re-evaluate the project's claimed economic benefits through experts caucusing using realistic market-based assumptions, (2) base its environmental assessment on a precautionary worst case scenario where information remains incomplete, (3) consider the alternative high value uses of the Taranaki Bight, such as offshore wind as permitted under Section 22(6) of the Fast Tracks Approval Act, and (4) if the consent is granted, require a significant environmental bond in trialling liability provisions to protect the public from future environmental and financial risks.

In conclusion, the economic case is overstated, the environmental information remains incomplete and the opportunity costs for our region are considerable. Whanganui District Council therefore urges the panel to exercise caution, to seek independent verification of the Applicant's claims, and if the uncertainties cannot be resolved, to decline or heavily condition the consent.

Whanganui district Council is aware that the Applicants have responded to technical aspects in the Sanofex report. I will pass to Dr Neil Loftus to

comment on that response. Nga mihi nui, and thank you for the opportunity to present our views. We are happy to answer any questions after Neil's had his few moments. Thank you, Neil.

N LOFTUS: Thank you, and thank you for that, Sarah. I can't see you on my screen, so thank you again. Thank you to the panel for hearing me today. I come before you today to bring you my testimony, which in my professional opinion is the truth of the matter.

The Sanofex report as submitted reviews the financial model of the TTR project. The report is authored by myself, Dr Neil Loftus, as Chairman of the Sanofex Group, with over 17 years of experience at board and executive level in the offshore mineral exploration field. Dr Loftus has joint degrees in medicine and surgery, and is both a general practitioner and specialist in obstetrics and gynaecology. He left the field of medicine and moved to New Zealand in 2009, when he founded Ironsands Offshore Mining Limited and Pacific Offshore Mining Limited. This too commercialised, I understand, deposits in the offshore and mineral state of New Zealand. Dr Loftus has experience in cross-commodity business environments, in project development, government relations, international financing and promotion, [inaudible 33:41] or trading and an exceptional track record of delivering value in complex businesses. His operational insights and determined approach to deliver on cost and efficiency gains are career highlights. He's also highly adept at business development, at problem solving through innovation and has a passion for delivering safety and cost control as embedded business values. Dr Loftus is not a geologist or a metallurgist or engineer, and when stepping outside of his expertise, has included references in his report from competent persons as defined by posit.

Sanofex no longer holds acting permits offshore in New Zealand and is not a competitor to TTR, but does bring a wealth of relevant business experience delivered here in this report. The main findings, as noted in the summary of the main findings section of the report cover the main areas. Firstly are Seacat New Zealand as the author of the TTR PFS (or pre-feasibility study). We first questioned whether they are truly independent of TTR. Well, they are former executives and high level management of TTR. Tim Crossley, a partner in Seacat Proprietary Limited, the Australian parents of Seacat New Zealand, is a former chairman and CEO of TTR. Tim holds a bachelor of

applied science degree. He, like me, is not an engineer, a geologist or a metallurgist. He is a businessman with relevant expertise.

Now, Seacat claim their code of professional conduct provides them the necessary distance to assess the project without bias, and they are professionally and commercially independent of TTR. Also, they claim that past affiliation with TTR has a depth of knowledge. We have disputed this; however, their professional colleagues who have not worked for TTR would also be competent persons according to the definition of posit. They too would be fully capable to assess the project without any relationship bias. To draw an analogy, if your mother writes your school report, you can expect a grade A. This does not call into question, of course, the disparity ability. In other words, the professionalism, but it does outline the inherent bias of the close relationships.

We believe a more impartial reviewer would not allow several aspects of the TTR PFS to pass. These include incorrect fair market pricing. This is the price expected for purchases of law by arms' length providers. In correctly applying the iron ore pricing mechanism or see revenue from iron sand sales down 30%, not 13% compared to the quoted indexed standard that TTR reference. The iron content is 56%-57%, not 58%. 58% is called low graded iron and is 12%-20% less than 62% iron in price. We expect a further reduction of 3%-6% for this reduction below 58%.

Adjustments for impurities, a process called normalisation in the market, have not been included. In particular, illumina, which is present in the TTR product, will result in a further 2%-3% reduction in price. Antitania, a further 10%-15% reduction in price. There are other impurities, such as silicon and phosphorus, and these may also reduce the price, but we have not reduced our model price based on these additional values.

We should also mention adjustment for moisture content. A dry metric tonne is the percentage of iron by weight contained in a tonne of ore, excluding any moisture at all. We have used TTR's quoted 4.9 million dry tonnes per annum for our modelling basis. TTR are targeting 10% moisture in their product specification. This is the specification that the purchase of ore are seeking. They are selling 5.4 million wet tonnes per annum by specifications. They are facing revenue on dry tonnes, CFR, which includes the freight costs from

the port of origin to the port of destination. They will pay freight on wet tonnes, although the buyer will include the freight price based on the dry tonnage. This needs to be adjusted in the model.

We believe freight costs are also higher, approximately US\$16, not US\$10 per tonne on average. As an example, you might prepare a journey from Hawera or Wellington to Auckland. This requires more fuel, more time and more wages. It is 60% further from Taranaki to China than North Australia to China, and this merits a 1.6 times increase in freight costs and a further 10% to adjust for the moisture content. Can we suggest that independent quotes would confer fair market pricing and wouldn't be too difficult to obtain?

We should also consider process losses which are not included it and will be about 20% with further losses from poor weather, servicing time and ramp up of operations over the first three units. Overall, we see output around 2-3 million tonnes per annum in year one, 3-4 million tonnes per annum in year two and 4-5 million tonnes per annum on a dry basis from year three forward. This reduces revenue both in the short and long term. Break it down further and losses on uplift from the seabed by the seabed crawler will be about 8%-10%. Losses in the run of mine process on the IMV will be about 10%. Losses in the wrap up process, the full operational output, will be as indicated – year one 2-3 million tonnes per annum overall, year two 3-4 million tonnes per annum overall and year three, 4-5 million tonnes per annum overall.

Good weather operations, which we have personal experience of on this particular coastline, are not as high as 70%-80% as quoted by TTR. Our experience is with such a high intensity coastline, a high energy coastline, 50%-60% good weather operational uptime can be expected, and on top of that, you must account for servicing downtime.

With respect to interest rates and capital used to assess the wage adjusted cost of capital in the model, debt servicing will be least 7% per annum, not 3%, and no plan is outlined to raise significant equity capital, which will be a minimum of [inaudible/background coughing]. Both of these reduce net profits.

Lastly, vanadium revenue is included on a hearsay basis. TTR vanadium revenue is based on 50% of full market value amounting to US\$113 million per annum on the balance sheet, and also baked into the valuation of the

company. This doesn't include operational and capital servicing expenditure and third parties, which TTR say they will be using also have these costs. TTR's production tonnage is large indeed, and requires a new plant to be built specifically for the purpose of extracting the vanadium. There are no redundant plants capable of processing this volume. Typically, this will cost US\$350-US\$400 million in total. On average, vanadium net profits are typically 10% of revenue, and it is the net profit that will be shared, not the revenue stream, ie 5%, not 50% of revenue. Furthermore, the share of the net profit should be based on the risk capital percentage division of the net profits within the joint venture. To illustrate, if the plant operator risks 90% of the net profit at risk capital, then TTR will receive 10% of the net profit or 1% of the revenue. This is a long way from the \$113 million quoted. Let's say TTR are likely to receive US\$5-US\$10 million per annum, not \$113 million per annum.

We recommend an offtake agreement or a contract is required for this speculative market revenue if it is to be added to the TTR financial model at all. Otherwise, it should be removed. Overall, fair market royalties are about NZ\$7 million per annum, with tax losses around NZ\$10 million per annum averaged over the first 10 years of the project. This is of course the time when debt is being paid down. Things will undoubtedly improve after the debt is paid off and there is much more free cash flowing, but the company has to survive through that debt payment process. We calculate the break-even cut off price of the project sits at an equivalence of US\$85 for dry metric tonne, CFR equivalent for the 62% iron finds as indexed by TTR.

We conclude the excess revenue claimed by TTR is mainly based on not meeting fair market pricing (in other words, low value products), not realistically ramping up commercial operations, not accounting for process losses when producing concentrates, underestimating freight charges, both in days of hire of the vessel and in wet tonnage transportation, underestimating debt interest repayments and overestimating vanadium revenue if it exists at all.

To summarise, the information provided by TTR regarding iron sand and vanadium revenue is uncertain and inadequate, and does not provide the panel with the best available information. In our opinion, there is inadequate

information to determine the economic validity of the project and the economic benefits may not outweigh the adverse environmental effects.

The outputs of the NZIER economic model are correct based on the proposed capital and New Zealand based operational expenditure, which is a relatively fixed quality but are not sustainable with revenue based on fair market values. We believe this is an inherent flaw of the choice of model used in the NZIER economic model.

We believe fair market corrections to the iron sand revenue and the removal or drastic reduction of the vanadium revenue creates a sufficiently significant adverse impact out of proportion to regional or national benefits. All of this begs the question, does the project comply with the purpose of the FTA Act? Thank you for your time.

K TOOGOOD: Kia ora, thank you.

N LOFTUS: I'm happy to take any questions?

K TOOGOOD: Any follow up for the presenters?

L LOVELL: No.

S HAGAN: No, I think we can just take any questions that you may have—

K TOOGOOD: Thank you

S HAGAN: —after that very, very technical description of an even more detailed report.

K TOOGOOD: No, but it's helpful to have high level.

N HAMPSON: All eyes on me for questions. There's actually a lot to unpick there and I perhaps keep my powder dry. I think there's going to be a lot of thought going into RFIs related to economic effects and particularly based on some of those findings. I did have a couple of other questions. I'd like to understand a little bit more about Whanganui Port and the activities that TTR have indicated may occur there and why that may not be possible. Any consents required, that sort of thing?

S HAGAN: I think the key thing about the port is that there hasn't been any discussion with the port around what may or may not happen there. Right now, we've

got a \$55 million redevelopment project underway at the port to (1) strengthen and improve the existing infrastructure there and to expand it. From Council's perspective and the port company's perspective, it would be the opportune time for those discussions, so that we could future proof if that's what we needed to do or that was the direction of travel, but we haven't had those discussions, so there hasn't been anything. There's reference that there'll be environmental and something else skill there.

C MELSER: Geotechnical.

S HAGAN: Yeah, and we haven't had those discussions either through Council or the port directors.

C MELSER: On top of that, we discovered that in their statement they will be having this geotechnical servicing base at the Whanganui Port through looking at the New Plymouth District Council's response to the comment, so that's the kind of lack of engagement that has been. It was only through skimming over their responses to the comments that I picked that up.

N HAMPSON: Is it possible that anything, obviously your project at the moment's creating capacity which might support additional vessels and activities wanting to base themselves at the port, but if they needed some sort of an amendment to the project you have in mind or underway, is that the sort of thing that would require new consents or any other approvals typically or not?

C MELSER: It's hard to say without knowing what their requirements are.

D GURNEY: I think based on the information that we know for the requirement for TTR to use the port, we wouldn't be able to say, but in terms of servicing vessels into the South Taranaki Bight, the port should be able to accommodate that based on the current plans.

The contrast to the port plan or the port project's been underway for a number of years now. It's well known and widely distributed that the ports under development and quite a lot of interest from commercial companies to use the port, and if TTR were looking at it as part of a future plan for use in the South Taranaki Bight, we would've expected to have an earlier conversation than today.

- G KEMBLE: On that, if they haven't had a conversation with you but they may/were to use report should consents be granted, if further modifications are required to the port, who would pay for that?
- T EASTON: That's a very good question. From an economic perspective, if there's an opportunity to use the port, there would be a discussion around what that would look like. If it's significant and there is a significant economic benefit that would be realised to Whanganui, then there'd be a discussion around how that's funded. There's certainly no plans or budget or anything in the foreseeable future to further develop the port past what we've already got.
- G KEMBLE: If they were to come to you and there was a commercial conversation, there would be opportunities for the port company to recover those costs either in a lease or in some sort of capital contribution.
- T EASTON: Definitely that would be the expectation.
- G KEMBLE: Thank you.
- K TOOGOOD: All right, thank you. Loretta?
- L LOVELL: No [laughter].
- K TOOGOOD: All right, and I have none. Thank you very much. However, that has been very helpful, and as Natalie has said, we anticipate that there will be quite a lot of work that will be necessary in this area of economic benefit. A number of the commenters have referred to the issue and obviously it's a central feature of the consideration that we have to take under the legislation. We're grateful to your helpful contribution in that regard. Thank you.
- S HAGAN: Thank you very much, and if there are any questions that come up in the future, once you've had a good chance to look through the report, we really welcome them.
- K TOOGOOD: Yes, well, thank you very much. That is entirely possible.
- T EASTON: We also have copies of the comment that we've made if you wanted to refer back to what we've talked about.
- K TOOGOOD: Thank you. Yes, we'd appreciate that. Thank you for your help. Thank you very much.

All right, so the next presenters are Ngā Motu Marine Reserve Society.

NICOLE: No, they're going on the Thursday.

L LOVELL: They're on Thursday.

K TOOGOOD: I have them down for two o'clock. I may have an out of date—

ELLIOTT: Yeah, I think this is an older version.

K TOOGOOD: Ah, it is, okay.

NICOLE: There's afternoon tea and then Beach.

ELLIOTT: Give me second.

K TOOGOOD: We'll just find out what's supposed to be happening now.

[administrative background chat].

K TOOGOOD: Okay, I've been looking at an out of date version of the schedule, so we're about to have afternoon tea. We'll take afternoon tea now. We will have our conversation with Beach Resources and the Applicant, and resume just as soon as we can after that, but not before. I would say not before 2:30. I think that would be about right. So, you can assume that we won't start again until 2:30 at the earliest. All right, thank you

[off topic background chat 55:35 – 1:00:40].

K TOOGOOD: Okay, I'm going to need to take my laptop downstairs.

ELLIOTT: Sure.

N HAMPSON: Are we going downstairs?

K TOOGOOD: Yeah, we're just going to discuss this issue of confidentiality. I'm not on top of that, so I'm going to have to get them to explain it to me.

N HAMPSON: Yeah.

[off topic background chat 1:1:05 – 1:21:25].

[conference resumes 1:21:25]

K TOOGOOD: All right, tihei mauri ora. The he arrangement is that there is nothing that's likely to be discussed by the Beach representatives in their presentation which is regarded as confidential. If any of the panel members asks a question, the answer to which may need to be kept confidential, we'll reserve the question for an RFI. We'll get that information and then we'll decide how that should be dealt with in terms of publicising it for the website. All right, kia ora.

P ROBERTS: Tēnā koutou katoa. Ko Paul Roberts tōku ingoa. I'm the Production Manager for Kupe Gas Production Facilities, presenting on behalf of Beach Energy. Adam Wood is here with us, and Adam is the Lead Environmental and Community Liaison Advisor for Beach here in New Zealand.

Beach Energy's position on the Taranaki VTM project is documented in our letter to the expert panel dated 3 October '25. Please, I'd just like to note that we've only just a few minutes ago read the response from TTR to that. I think most of our things are covered in the response today, but we are reinforcing what's in the letter. That's what we're trying to do today.

To summarise, Beach Energy's position is to state this project will present increased costs and risk to the Kupe gas production, offshore assets and operations. The best outcome for Beach Energy is for this project not to proceed; however, we are cautiously prepared to work with TTRL to safely operate in close proximity if a marine consent is granted under the Fast Track Approvals Act.

Now caution is based on the fact that Beach Energy took over as operator of the Kupe Mining license and the Kupe production facilities on behalf of the Kupe JVs in 2018, having purchased the assets and the operation from Lattice Energy, part of Origin Energy. Something that I need to make very clear here is that Beach Energy is a different company to Origin Energy. We have a different board, different executives, different management team, and most importantly, a different tolerance to risk. Beach Energy was not party to the negotiation of the risk management agreement agreed in 2017 between TTRL and Origin Energy, which is referred to in the substantive Application for the Taranaki VTM project.

Things have changed since 2017, including acceptable risk tolerances and expectations from regulators and stakeholders, such as iwi and the general

public, including on matters such as safety and environmental management. Our caution is heightened by a total lack of consultation or communication by the Applicant with Beach Energy with regards its substantive Application. It is eight years since the risk management agreement was signed and seven years since Beach Energy's become operator of Kupe on behalf of the JVs.

Beach Energy has expected that TTR would've consulted with it prior to submitting its substantive Application to update its understanding of the Kupe joint venture, the current joint venture operations, the status of Kupe assets, development opportunities, and most importantly to formulate a current assessment of risk incorporating Beach Energy's level of risk tolerance. This absence of engagement is unacceptable to Beach Energy given the increased risks to its operation posed by the Taranaki VTM project.

Moving forward, in the letter to the expert panel, dated 3rd of October, Beach Energy sets out conditions it requests are included in the marine consent if it is to be granted. These include, as a minimum, the conditions set out in the risk management agreement already included draft in the substantive Application. That's the agreement that was agreed between Origin Energy and TTRL and some new conditions reflecting Beach Energy's level of risk tolerance.

New conditions include updated and improved insurances and financial assurances, funding of the Beach Energy lead revision to the Kupe wellhead platform safety case required due to the increased risk exposure in accordance with the Health and Safety at Work, Petroleum And Exploration Regulations 2016. This would require, amongst other things, a new joint risk assessment to assess the risks of the joint venture and to identify required preventative and mitigating controls and the development of management plans listed in the risk mitigation agreement prior to this revision. Funding and develop the implementation of new preventing and mitigating controls should be funded by TTR and the development of exclusion zones around all Kupe license infrastructure, including wells that have been plugged and abandoned, especially KS4.

I'm just going to move on to some notes that I made after having read the response from TTRL to our letter. I can't give a full response cos we've only had a few minutes to look at it, but want to reinforce the point that Beach

Energy is not Origin Energy. We are a totally separate company. We inherited the risk mitigation agreement; however, as I've stated, we are leaning in. That is a good basis risk to move forward on; however, we do have additional conditions required based on the different risk tolerance that Beach Energy has compared to Origin Energy.

With regards to the safety case stuff, we operate in a high consequence, low likelihood environment/business. We are required by law to operate with risk managed so far as reasonably practical. An identified major accident event in our Kupe wellhead platform safety case is a vessel collision. TRL's operation, in close proximity to our platform, does increase the likelihood of the collision, and we have a legal requirement to review and consider. This will cost. We should not have to pay for this. What we would be doing is following (and only following) well-defined processes developed by WorkSafe. That's their expectations, that we meet those.

Just in item four on the response, we just noticed a comment around the mining license being 15km away. I can't remember the exact words from the Kupe mining license, and clearly that is not the case. We're only 30km off the coast, but the mining operation is very, very adjacent. The license area is very adjacent.

K TOOGOOD: What does that mean, Paul, in terms of, 'Very adjacent'?

P ROBERTS: Oh, it's just an incorrect statement.

K TOOGOOD: No, but what do you say is the correct distance? When you say, 'Very adjacent', can you tell us what that is?

P ROBERTS: We'd have to go measure it, but it's immediately south of our operating infrastructure. To be confirmed, I thought it was approximately a kilometre at the closest point.

K TOOGOOD: Okay, so I was trying to understand what you meant.

P ROBERTS: Yeah.

K TOOGOOD: Okay.

P ROBERTS: We've also put a thing around exclusions zones around all Kupe license infrastructure. KS4 is a plugged and abandoned well that was plugged in and abandoned immediately after drilling back in the '80s. At that time, the way the industry works, once it's plugged and abandoned and the Crown accepts that's been done properly, that well is handed back to the Crown. That well is within the mining license. It's cut off at 2m below the motor line [? 1:30:45]. It's not our asset, but I guess we are linked. It's Kupe South 4 well. We are linked to it. If there was damage done to it, we reputationally could be harmed by that.

K TOOGOOD: Well, can I ask you this, and I'm sorry to interrupt you?

P ROBERTS: No problem.

K TOOGOOD: Just while you're making this point and while it's in my mind, that seems to represent a potential hazard.

P ROBERTS: Yes.

K TOOGOOD: Do you know whether TTR are aware of that potential hazard or that hazard?

P ROBERTS: No, I don't know for sure, but I would expect. It's certainly on many publicly available drawings.

K TOOGOOD: To me, that suggests there may need to be a condition related to the existence of that hazard. We might need some more information about it.

P ROBERTS: Yeah, as I say, it's not ours, but we're aware of it, aware of its presence.

K TOOGOOD: No, I realise that. My follow up question is where would we get that best available information about that potential hazard?

P ROBERTS: Beach Energy would be happy to work with any party to resolve that.

K TOOGOOD: Okay, right, well, let's flag that for further consideration.

P ROBERTS: Yeah.

K TOOGOOD: Thank you.

P ROBERTS: I'm sure TTR don't want to run into it or cause damage to it either.

So, just to wind up, Beach Energy welcomes and encourages engagement from TTR about its Application to identify the extent to which mitigants can be established and implemented to reduce risks to the Kupe operation posed by the potential VTM project operations and to allow each of those operations to safely operate and proceed in close proximity should a marine consent be granted. Thank you. That's all I've got.

K TOOGOOD: Adam, do you wish to add anything?

A WOOD: No, all covered there, thank you.

K TOOGOOD: Thank you. Hilker, is there anything you want to ask?

H GILES: Not at the moment.

K TOOGOOD: Okay, do you want me to come to you last [laughter]?

L LOVELL: On that basis.

K TOOGOOD: Natalie?

N HAMPSON: None at the moment.

G KEMBLE: I don't have anything.

K TOOGOOD: No, I don't have any, so maybe Loretta?

L LOVELL: No, I'm [inaudible 1:33:17]. No, I don't think so. Thank you though.

K TOOGOOD: We're grateful to you. I mean your position is clear not only from the written material but from that helpful summary, Paul, so we are grateful to you for your assistance and contribution. I'm just trying to think of how we might accommodate you in terms of anything additional you might want to say in response to the information provided by TTR. What I'd suggest we do is in terms of a process is could you let EPA know through Elliott whether there's anything you want to add and in general terms the nature of that, and then we'll take that on board and we'll probably issue a request for information, which is the best way to enable you to give us some further information? We'll follow that.

P ROBERTS: What timeframe would you like?

K TOOGOOD: ASAP. I won't make a direction, but if you could do that within the next five working days at the outside, then we'll process it and issue an RFI to cover that off. Thank you very much.

All right, kia ora, Haimona. Are you able to close for us?

H MARUERA: I'm going to ask my elder over that side of the room to close.

K TOOGOOD: Kia ora.

NGATI RUANUI

ELDER: Tēnā tātou. Tuatahi, e mihi atu ki a koutou, te poari me ngā kaiwhakawa, mō koutou mahi today, o koutou pukenga hoki. Nō reira, kei te mihi atu ki runga ki a koutou katoa. E mihi atu ki a koe, whaea, i rongō au ki ngā kōrero i puta mai koe, ngā pātai ki ētahi o mātou. Pai tēnā ki taua whakarongo. Nō reira, ki a koutou hoki, kua tae mai nei, kua pauniatia te rā nei. Tēnā koutou katoa. Nō reira ka whakakapi i tō tātou hui. Unhia, unhia, unhia ki te urutapu nui o Tāne, kia watea, kia māmā te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua, ki te ara taka tū koiara e Rongōā, whakaeria ki runga, kia watea, kia watea. Ae rā, kua watea. Haunea, paemaria. Kia ora tātou.

K TOOGOOD: Kia ora. Thank you everybody for your work today. It's been great mahi. We've really appreciated it. We'll look forward to seeing at least some of you tomorrow.

[End of Recorded Material: 1:36:10]