

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

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

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

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY KYLE WELTEN ON BEHALF OF
OCEANA GOLD (NEW ZEALAND) LIMITED**

Iwi Engagement

Dated 1 September 2025

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

Introduction

1. My full name is Kyle Antony Francis Welten.
2. I hold a Bachelor of Geography, a Postgraduate Diploma in Teaching (Secondary), and a Postgraduate Diploma in Social Science, all from the University of Waikato.
3. Since August 2018, I have been employed by OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited (**OceanaGold**) as part of their External Affairs and Social Performance Team for the Waihi Operations. Since July 2024, I have held the position of External Affairs and Social Performance Manager. Throughout my employment with OceanaGold, I have been involved in, or otherwise directly managing, OceanaGold's engagement with tangata whenua on the Waihi North Project (**WNP**).
4. I have been asked by OceanaGold to provide a response to the comments made by about OceanaGold's engagement:
 - a. Ngāti Tara Tokanui / Ngāti Koi;
 - b. Ngāti Pū; and
 - c. Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki.
5. I have prepared this statement within the limited time available to me. Consequently, it is necessarily at a high level. I am able to provide a more fulsome response to the issues covered in this statement if the Panel requires further assistance from me.

Approach to engagement

6. In my time with OceanaGold, I endeavoured to ensure OceanaGold's engagement with iwi is built around respecting the traditions and cultures of

local iwi and hapū and recognising the unique relationship that Māori have with their ancestral land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. On-going engagement with iwi has been a part of the development of the WNP project. We have endeavoured to be open and transparent through our engagement.

7. This engagement has largely centred around first the supporting of iwi to prepare Cultural Values Assessments (**CVAs**) and / or Cultural Impact Assessments (**CIAs**) for WNP. These assessments have assisted in ensuring that Māori cultural values and interests, and the potential impacts on these, are well understood so that they are appropriately planned for and reflected in WNP, where practicable.¹
8. OceanaGold has always maintained, as have iwi, that only tangata whenua can describe their cultural interests and effects. Likewise, while a comprehensive suite of Western science-based effects assessments has been completed, along with associated proposed monitoring and management measures, it remains that only tangata whenua can determine how these align with te ao Māori and Mātauranga Māori.
9. Whilst CVAs and CIAs have now been completed by most mana whenua that expressed an intention to do so, OceanaGold has struggled to engage meaningfully on how these assessments can be appropriately reflected in WNP. This reflects the reality that tangata whenua have, at times, either declined to engage or remained non-committal when proposals have been put forward by OceanaGold, or have been unavailable to engage (often due to limited capacity or changes in personnel, all of which is understandable), or mandate issues about which individuals or groups have the capacity to represent their interests.
10. From OceanaGold's perspective, some iwi may view engagement as a proxy approval of the proposed activities, or fear that constructive

1 F.01. Waihi North project consultation summary.

engagement could result in their feedback being incorporated into the proposal in a way that facilitates its approval. OceanaGold also recognises that for many iwi, who often view modern mining through a historical lens, the default position is to fundamentally oppose mining.

11. That said, OceanaGold is grateful for the relationships it has developed with iwi, which for most groups have been characterised by respect and transparency, and OceanaGold maintains a genuine desire to reflect iwi concerns in the project and to respond to them meaningfully. Considering where engagement has progressed to, OceanaGold has proposed consent conditions that provide for ongoing engagement. Following a review of the comments received, OceanaGold propose further refinement of these consent conditions,² and it is hoped these changes will facilitate positive outcomes and enable the meaningful exercise of kaitiakitanga for those iwi that wish to participate.
12. For each tangata whenua group that has provided comment, OceanaGold has sought to identify the salient points and address them below. Several other comments concerned with technical issues (undoubtedly in some cases of equal importance to iwi) have also been made, many of which are largely technical in nature. These are addressed through the relevant expert assessments provided as part of the substantive application, or through the statements of evidence prepared in response to comments. Summary responses to these specific points are provided at paragraphs [60] – [119] of this statement of evidence, under the heading *specific technical concerns*.
13. This statement seeks to respond to the concerns of iwi as efficiently as possible. I believe a more fulsome response to these concerns is best achieved through direct engagement with tangata whenua. I intend to

2 Combined resource consent conditions C10, C17 (amended) and C18A (new) Waihi North Project substantive application

continue those conversations immediately as part of OceanaGold's broader, ongoing engagement with iwi and hapū.

Ngāti Tara Tokanui / Ngāti Koi (NTTNK)

14. An overview of the engagement undertaken with NTTNK is provided in section F.01 of the substantive application.³ Since 2020, this engagement has been extensive and wide-ranging, including: phone calls, emails, kanohi ki te kanohi hui (face to face meetings), wānanga (open discussion), site visits, the sharing of technical information, briefings from OceanaGold technical experts, and the provision of resourcing.
15. Even though NTTNK, on balance, supports the WNP, OceanaGold remains committed to working through the remaining concerns identified in NTTNK's comments.
16. From the comments received, OceanaGold has identified two key issues related to engagement with NTTNK:
 - a. The nature of the Partnership Agreement between OceanaGold and NTTNK, including how this aligns with a proposed Iwi Advisory Group (**IAG**), and whether that group provides adequate opportunity for NTTNK to exercise kaitiakitanga as mana whenua, distinct and separate from other iwi; and
 - b. A view that OceanaGold has not provided detailed or timely feedback on the findings of the NTTNK CIA.
17. A response to these two specific points is provided below. I note that NTTNK also raised a number of other detailed concerns and opportunities, many of which that are common across multiple commenters. These are addressed

3 See F.01. Waihi North project consultation summary.

at paragraphs [60]–[119], where I have compiled and responded to the broader comments received from all iwi, at a summary level.

Partnership agreement and the iwi advisory group

18. Central to the engagement with NTTNK on WNP has been the development and signing of a Partnership Agreement (**PA**). While the agreement remains confidential between NTTNK and OceanaGold, it broadly sets out how both parties have agreed to engage constructively with one another to support and uphold their respective interests. OceanaGold has established similar relationship agreements and Memoranda of Understanding with other iwi; some of which have been formally signed, while others remain under active negotiation.
19. The PA remains confidential, but at a high-level, it is as a relationship-based agreement that acknowledges NTTNK's cultural role and kaitiaki responsibilities, OGNZL's legal mining rights and constraints, and the benefits of mining. It also establishes a framework for regular meetings, information-sharing, and cooperation.
20. OceanaGold acknowledges NTTNK's request for further resourcing in support of helping them understand WNP. The PA does not currently, but could, include a prescribed schedule outlining how OceanaGold intends to resource NTTNK for the actual and reasonable costs of engaging expert consultants (as necessary and within a predefined scope) to provide advice on technical aspects of OceanaGold's operations and proposed projects. While OceanaGold has supported this throughout the engagement to-date, and will continue to do so, the OceanaGold is open to dialogue with NTTNK to formalise this arrangement.
21. OceanaGold remains committed to the PA and recognises NTTNK as mana whenua and kaitiaki. OceanaGold values the ongoing, transparent relationship shared between both parties. We also recognise however that other mana whenua have expressed interests in the proposed WNP area,

and OceanaGold is actively engaging with them as part of its commitment to transparent consultation. Navigating these overlapping interests has, at times, presented challenges, particularly where some groups have chosen not to engage due to the presence of other iwi, or where differing views have been expressed that require careful consideration and resolution.

22. The proposed IAG is mechanism which will provided for these groups to meet collectively on specific matters. It is not intended to be the sole means of engagement; but rather an opportunity to share ideas and help reach solutions. OceanaGold remains committed to engagement with iwi on an individual basis, as appropriate.
23. Although a version of the IAG exists under the existing Correnso and Martha Underground Consents, OceanaGold sees the WNP as an opportunity to refresh the function of the group, and is interested in feedback from iwi on how this group can better meet their needs. It should be noted that the existing group does not currently include all mana whenua who have expressed an interest in the WNP. At the most recent IAG meeting, OceanaGold proposed extending membership to include other iwi with interests in the WNP, namely Ngāti Pū and Ngaati Whanaunga. OceanaGold understands that it was agreed at this meeting that these groups should begin receiving invitations to attend future IAG hui. This further highlights the need for a 'refresh' of the current group structure and function.
24. OceanaGold remains open, however, to engaging through different mechanisms at NTTNK's preference. OceanaGold reiterates that the IAG represents only one avenue of engagement and does not diminish the importance of individual iwi interests, which OceanaGold remains committed to addressing through direct engagement.

Cultural impact assessment findings

25. NTTNK states that OceanaGold has not provided detailed and timely feedback on the findings of the CIA. OceanaGold undertook a process to collate the findings of the CIA into themes, as we have interpreted them, alongside our proposed responses, and presented these back to NTTNK for their consideration.⁴ I intend to ask NTTNK what we could have done better in this regard.
26. As part of this process, OceanaGold also drafted a set of proposed consent conditions intended to respond to NTTNK's concerns, where appropriate. These draft conditions were provided to NTTNK for feedback. The comments received through the Fast-track process are the first feedback on those conditions OceanaGold has received.
27. I provide a further response to the points raised by NTTNK at paragraphs [60] – [119], which compile and address the comments received from all iwi, at a summary level.

Ngāti Pū (NP)

28. An overview of engagement with NP up to the lodgement of the WNP Substantive Fast Track Application is provided in section F.01 of the application. It should be noted, however, that significant progress has been made between OceanaGold and NP since then, culminating in the delivery of a CIA for the WNP, submitted as their formal comment on the WNP.
29. From the comments received, OceanaGold has identified two key issues related to engagement with NP:
 - a. That OceanaGold consultation has not sufficiently provided for an understanding of NP's specific concerns, nor resulted in mātauranga Māori being adequately integrated into the design, management, and monitoring of the proposed project; and

4 F.01. *Waihi North project consultation summary*, section 16.12.

- b. That NP view modern mining through the historical lens of the activity, including how the Crown historically enabled it, and the lack of environmental controls that led to adverse effects on te taiao, iwi, hapū, and their customary practices and interests.
30. A response to these two specific points is provided below. I note that NP have also raised a number of other important and detailed concerns and opportunities that are common across multiple commenters. These are addressed at paragraphs [60] – [119], where I have compiled and responded to the broader comments received from all iwi, at a summary level.

Integration of Ngāti Pū concerns and mātauranga Māori

31. Since 2020, engagement with NP has been extensive, including: phone calls, emails, kanohi ki te kanohi hui (face to face meetings), wānanga (open discussions), site visits, briefings from OceanaGold’s technical experts, sharing of technical information, and provision of resourcing.
32. Central to this engagement has been OceanaGold’s desire to support, and NP’s commitment to complete, a CIA. Progress has been challenging over the years due to several factors, including the passing of NP kaumatua Ted Shaw, subsequent leadership transitions, the establishment of new relationships, and difficulties with NP’s chosen consultant, who ultimately ceased engagement without completing substantive work on the CIA. This was not through the fault of NP.
33. Ultimately, however, acknowledging the new leadership within NP and the positive relationships now established, OceanaGold has sought to respond appropriately in the time available to the CIA now provided.
34. As noted in the introduction to this response to iwi comments, I acknowledge the position of iwi that only they can speak to their own cultural values and how mātauranga Māori and te ao Māori should be integrated into the WNP.

With the NP CIA now available, OceanaGold is eager to move from identifying effects to establishing measures to further, or more appropriately, avoid or mitigate them. I consider the approaches proposed, including the Cultural Practices Plan, provide a solid starting point, and hope NP, along with other iwi and hapū, are receptive to co-designing the various elements of the plan for implementation.

35. Of note, however, is NP's view that all assessments and technical studies should have been informed and guided, at their inception, by a cultural lens. Unfortunately, the opportunity for this has now passed for this process. That said, there remains an opportunity to operationalise iwi views within the WNP, including refining the outcomes of OceanaGold-led assessments. This could include the preparation of bespoke tangata whenua-led studies, as necessary.

Historical context and cultural impacts of mining

36. Legacy issues feature prominently in the NP CIA and remain central when considering the WNP, as they do for most tangata whenua with interests in the WNP area. These issues relate not only to grievances arising from historical Māori-Crown relationships but also specifically to the legacy of past mining operations, which were marked by adverse impacts on both iwi and the environment.
37. Notwithstanding that OceanaGold operates in a modern context with strong environmental controls in place and a proven track record of responsible mining in New Zealand for over 30 years, it remains, from an iwi perspective, that OceanaGold inherits a responsibility to ensure these legacies are not repeated. To some extent, there is also an expectation to address and ameliorate past impacts, as far as practicable within the scope of the proposed project.
38. In essence, as I understand it, the main point is that NP clearly wish to see the WNP leave a positive overall legacy with a net benefit to their people,

rather than one that remains an ongoing cause of regret for multiple generations. I also acknowledge the stated emotional toll that engagement on the proposal has had for NP representatives, arising from their role as kaitiaki and the responsibility to ensure every effort is made to manage mining activity responsibly. In the case of NP (and indeed several other iwi), this responsibility has resulted in a preference to oppose the WNP in its entirety, as the ultimate means of avoiding any adverse effects.

39. While it is not my particular area of expertise, I believe OceanaGold has prepared a comprehensive assessment of the environmental and social effects of the proposed project and proposed measures to avoid them where possible, or otherwise manage them, including in perpetuity. Opportunities have also been proposed for iwi to be involved in monitoring the effectiveness of these measures, such as through participation in the Annual Peer Review Process.
40. Further to this, unlike historical mining, bonds have been put in place at the Waihi site since before mining began again in the 1980s. As part of modern mining, closure plans for OceanaGold's mines are developed before any works start. This is also the case for the WNP. Annually updated, bonds form part of this process to ensure that approved rehabilitation plans can be carried out, even in the unlikely event OceanaGold is no longer around to carry out the mining activities. As part of the ongoing bond review process, each year, OceanaGold must engage an external technical expert to update the values for the bonds, which are then provided to Hauraki District Council, who undertake separate independent reviews to verify that the proposed.
41. When closure is achieved, ownership of the areas of land affected by mining will pass to a charitable trust called the Martha Trust, which is funded by the Capitalisation Bond. Members of the Martha Trust include regulatory bodies and iwi, with scope to include further representation (including that of more tangata whenua). Their responsibility will be to monitor and maintain that

land in a safe and stable condition in perpetuity, with sufficient funds bonded to resource this.

Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki (NPKH)

42. From the comments received, I have identified three key issues specific to NPKH:
- a. A view that NPKH have not been offered appropriate opportunity to engage with OceanaGold on the proposed project;
 - b. That OceanaGold, and the Act, fail to recognise NPKH as mana whenua, with interests in the Wharekirauponga area; and
 - c. That adverse effects from both existing mining activities and the proposed project are and will continue to be experienced at Mataora.
43. A response to these three specific points is provided below. I note that NPKH also raised a number of other detailed concerns and opportunities, many of which are common across multiple commenters. These are addressed at paragraphs [60] – [119], where I have compiled and responded to the broader comments received from all iwi, at a summary level.
44. I do not comment on the procedural and legal matters raised by NPKH which I understand will be addressed in legal submissions.

Engagement with NPKH

45. An overview of the engagement undertaken with NPKH is provided in Section F.01 of the substantive application.
46. Between November 2020 and December 2022, there were over 90 interactions and exchanges of information. A significant focus of this engagement was the preparation of a CIA for the proposed project, which

NPKH engaged Matapihi Limited to prepare on their behalf. As part of this process, OceanaGold provided access to relevant technical assessments, as well as the 2022 Assessment of Environmental Effects, as these became available.

47. The WNP, and associated effects assessments, remain substantively the same as those that were lodged as part of the 2022 resource consent application. The WNP Fast-track application is not a new project, nor are there significant new effects from those that were associated with the project that was advanced in the 2022 application.
48. In December 2022, NPKH informed OceanaGold of their decision to terminate their Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and advised that they would no longer proceed with the completion of a CIA. Instead, they indicated their intention to engage through the formal legal and approvals processes available to them.
49. NPKH representatives cited concerns about what they perceived as a lack of openness and transparency from OceanaGold regarding the WNP and its potential impacts as the basis for their decision. While OceanaGold does not consider that it has acted without transparency, it acknowledged and has respected the decision of NPKH to end the MoU and their choice to participate through formal engagement channels.
50. NPKH have attached a table to their formal comment, outlining their perspective of the engagement process.⁵ I provide my summary of the engagement between the two parties as Appendix A. While this account may not capture every interaction or exchange, it offers what I consider to be a more complete representation of OceanaGold's efforts to support the completion of the NPKH CIA.

5 Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki comments on Waihi North, at Appendix 2.

Issues around recognition of NPKH as having interests in the proposed project area

51. Several iwi have communicated to me and my colleagues that they hold interests in the proposed project area. Equal opportunities to engage have been offered to all of these groups, including early on to NPKH (as outlined above).
52. These overlapping interests have, at times, presented challenges; particularly in managing relationships with the various iwi, each of whom holds their own views on mana whenua status. NPKH have been included in some of these discussions between iwi and OceanaGold, and on occasion, there has been some reticence from other iwi to engage with OceanaGold, knowing that NPKH were also participating in the process.
53. I do not believe it is possible for OceanaGold to make judgements about mana whenua in the proposed project area. Instead, we have relied on the information available to us, such the Ministry for the Environment's section 18 report for the project, which does not identify NPKH as having interests within the project area. I note in passing that NPKH's Treaty Settlement Agreement in Principle, signed in July 2011, does not include the proposed project area as its areas of interest, but I do not have knowledge about whether that document represents NPKH's interests accurately.

NPKH's views on effects on the Mataora Block

54. In their comments, NPKH have raised concerns about adverse noise effects from current OceanaGold operations, and the proposed project, on the Mataora block. They state that noise is being funnelled toward their land, and this has not been properly assessed by previous expert assessments. A particular concern is the potential impact on a developing papakāinga at Mataora, with NPKH emphasising that noise pollution would undermine the wellbeing and harmony of this community.

55. All previously completed technical assessments into the effects of noise from elements of OceanaGold's operations have consistently demonstrated that it is extremely unlikely that any noise generated by OceanaGold's activities is, or will be, experienced at adverse levels at the Mataora block. The expert noise assessment undertaken by Marshall Day Acoustics for this application reaches the same conclusion. The modelled noise contours illustrate the predicted noise effects of the WNP and do not indicate any significant noise levels at Mataora; if any at all.⁶
56. NPKH have also raised concerns about the potential effects of the WNP on water, specifically in relation to the source of the Ohinemuri River, which they state originates in the hills at the western boundary of the Mataora block and will be impacted by the WNP.
57. A comprehensive suite of water management, groundwater and surface water assessments has been undertaken for the WNP.⁷ This suite of assessments considers the overall groundwater effects and how these may translate to surface environments. These assessments conclude that any potential dewatering effects associated with the proposed Wharekirauponga Underground Mine (**WUG**) are confined to the Wharekirauponga catchment, with only limited sections of stream having any likelihood of being affected at all. In the very unlikely event that these streams were affected, the predicted changes in flow are expected to be minimal, barely measurable, and not sufficient to cause any material effects on ecological values or stream.
58. Further detail regarding groundwater effects, in response to comments received, are included in Chris Simpson's corresponding statement of evidence.

6 B.56 *Assessment of noise effects*.

7 See Waihi North Project substantive application, Part B - Technical Reports, B.25 to B.34.

59. Geochemical analysis similarly concludes that the effects of WUG on the receiving water environment will be similar to, and treatable through, existing (extended) facilities for the current Waihi operations.⁸ I acknowledge that this position does not fully address the cultural effects of dewatering, including any potential impacts on mauri and wairua. I intend to continue working with iwi who choose to engage on the development of a mātauranga Māori-based monitoring programme, which is proposed as part of the conditioned Cultural Practices Plan. I believe this presents an opportunity to actively consider and seek to mitigate these cultural impacts as the WNP progresses.

Specific technical concerns

Gladstone Open Pit: Geotechnical Stability

60. I acknowledge the proximity of the proposed Gladstone Open Pit to Motukehu, and the historical and cultural connections NTTNK have to this Maunga. NTTNK have stated in their comments that the area is geologically complex, with weak rock and significant faulting, resulting in a risk of slope instability and landslides. They have stated that they have concerns that blasting, vibration, and excavation in this area could exacerbate fracturing and destabilise the area around Motukehu.
61. NTTNK request that the Gladstone Open Pit be developed in carefully staged phases, with ongoing geotechnical assessments before finalising slope designs. Slope angles must be conservative and based on real-time monitoring data, including movement sensors and piezometers, to prevent collapses and ensure long term stability.
62. A comprehensive technical assessment for Gladstone Open Pit has been completed by PSM and is included in the substantive application as the Geotechnical Pit Geotechnical Assessment.⁹ This assessment incorporates

8 B.15. *Wharekirauponga underground mine post-closure geochemistry modelling.*

9 B.12. *Gladstone Pit Geotechnical Assessment Part 1 and Part 2.*

the measures requested by NTTNK. The Ground Control Management Plan for Gladstone Open Pit recommended by PSM has now also been include as a proposed consent condition.

Gladstone Open Pit: Tailings Storage

63. NTTNK have noted concerns in their comments relating to long-term integrity of the Gladstone TSF, and the risk of seepage or contamination of groundwater, which could affect Motukehu and nearby water bodies, including the Ohinemuri river and Ruahorehore stream. In response to these concerns, NTTNK have requested that the prior to tailing deposition the pit be lined with geosynthetic liner and clay barrier to prevent seepage into groundwater, with ongoing monitoring post closure to ensure liner integrity.
64. A technical assessment for Gladstone TSF has been completed by GHD and is included in the substantive application as the Geotechnical Pit TSF Report.¹⁰ This assessment incorporates the measures requested by NTTNK.

Gladstone Open Pit: Footprint Constraint

65. NTTNK, in their comments, refer to a request for a commitment to constrain the footprint of the Gladstone Open Pit to its currently proposed boundaries. They indicated that such a commitment would offer some measure of comfort in the face of significant changes to the landscape and the associated impacts on the wairua and sociological connections of mana whenua to their whenua.
66. While it is theoretically possible that some future combination of circumstances could mean that OceanaGold may look at some form of pit expansion, at this point in time, OceanaGold has no plans to expand Gladstone Open pit beyond what is proposed as part of the current WNP

10 B.02. Gladstone Pit Tailing Storage Facility Design.

application. It should be noted that, for the purposes of the WNP, the pit would be limited to the extent of the pit shell as currently applied for and assessed. Should the WNP be approved, any future expansion of the pit would require be the subject of further engagement before any decisions would be made by OceanaGold to proceed to the next stage of applying for the necessary approvals. In addition, the intention is that the Gladstone Open Pit will become a tailings storage repository, making any future expansion of the pit an even more remote prospect as a future expansion proposal would need to overcome the technical and financial hurdles of digging out the deposited tailings and redepositing them somewhere else.

67. I also acknowledge the proximity of the proposed Gladstone Open Pit to Ngāti Koi Reserve (Motukehu), and the Ohinemuri River, as well as to OGNZL's existing Processing Plant. These features have been integral in informing the current pit design and would remain key constraints requiring careful consideration in the event that any future expansion is contemplated.

Wetlands

68. Iwi have raised concerns about the potential degradation of wetlands from land clearance, mining activities, and possible contaminant discharges. They emphasise the importance of restoration using indigenous species and specifically request the creation of buffer zones to protect wetlands. Wetlands are described in the comments received as the "kidneys of the land," reflecting their cultural and ecological significance. Iwi call for strong protection and management of wetlands.
69. They also disagree with the OceanaGold experts' conclusion that wetlands will not be affected by shallow groundwater drawdown, stating that the assessments conducted are insufficient to demonstrate wetlands will still meet the minimum technical criteria. Instead, they seek further information on wetland health, function, mauri, and cultural values, as well as clear mitigation measures to retain and enhance these values.

70. The potential effects on wetlands have been comprehensively assessed in the Wetland Hydrology Assessment Report¹¹ and Wetland Ecology Effect Assessment Report¹² of the substantive application. Further responses on this topic are provided in the statements of evidence in reply by Chris Simpson and Ian Boothroyd.
71. I acknowledge that these assessments do not fully address the mauri and cultural values associated with wetlands, nor the cultural effects of mining activities on them. My team and I intend to continue working with iwi who choose to engage on the development of a mātauranga Māori-based monitoring programme, which is now proposed as a condition of consent.

Dewatering effects

72. Iwi have raised concerns in their comments regarding how groundwater extraction and dewatering may alter surface water bodies. This includes an assertion from NTTNK that the Wharekirauponga area, including the neighbouring maunga of Ngapuketurua, is home to a network of warm springs that hold cultural and historical significance. According to NTTNK kōrero tuku iho these springs are recognised as healing waters and are believed to have served as important waypoints for travel and settlement.
73. NTTNK raise a concern that OceanaGold has only acknowledged the existence of a single spring in the area, and that this narrow recognition fails to reflect the broader network of geothermal features present in the area. The iwi emphasise the need for a comprehensive assessment and mapping of all warm springs in the region.
74. Further, iwi are concerned that dewatering to facilitate underground mining may result in the loss of surface streams, perceiving that the connections between deep, shallow, and surface waters are not fully understood and

11 B.45. *Wetland hydrological assessment* part 3.

12 B.46. *Wetland hydrological assessment* part 4.

that no contingencies are in place. In response, iwi request the implementation of a comprehensive groundwater management plan, including a piezometer network to monitor aquifer levels, detect changes in groundwater behaviour, and regularly assess and mitigate any impacts.

75. A suite of comprehensive assessments of the effects of dewatering (as noted above, at paragraph [60]), including on springs, has been completed and is included in the substantive application. In addition, a Management Plan has been developed and included as part of the substantive application, which already incorporates the measures requested by iwi. Chris Simpson has previously presented these findings to both NP and NTTNK, and elaborates further on the topic in his statement of evidence.
76. Notwithstanding the outcomes of these assessments, OceanaGold acknowledges and respects the view that mining operations may affect the mauri and/or wairua of the springs, and of water more broadly. OceanaGold remains committed to maintaining ongoing dialogue with tangata whenua to explore how any such effects might be appropriately addressed or mitigated. OceanaGold is also committed to working collaboratively to develop a mātauranga-based monitoring programme, which would include the creation of cultural health indicators for water and the regular sharing of monitoring data with mana whenua.

Taonga species

Te Pua o te Rēinga / Te Pua o Marama

77. I am aware of iwi, particularly NTTNK, connection to Te Pua o te Rēinga / Te Pua o Marama (*Dactylanthus taylorii*) and their concerns regarding potential impacts from the WNP, including effects from air discharges.

78. The Boffa Miskell Terrestrial Ecology Values and Effects Assessment for the Wharekirauponga Underground Mine¹³ addresses the potential effects on this taonga. The assessment notes that there are no formal records of *Dactylanthus taylorii* in the Coromandel Ecological Region, and it was not detected during ecological surveys in the Wharekirauponga Catchment. However, Boffa Miskell has subsequently become aware of records of *Dactylanthus taylorii* in Papakai, >40 km north of Wharekirauponga. Nevertheless, an assessment of potential effects, including air quality impacts, concludes that the magnitude of effects on fauna and *Dactylanthus taylorii* is low.

Vegetation loss

79. Iwi raise concerns with the effects of vegetation loss proposed as part of the project. NPKH specifically cite the loss of planted and remnant indigenous vegetation and habitat within the pine plantation on Gladstone Hill as representing 5% of available local regenerating native vegetation in the Waihi Ecological District, and as a significant proportion of habitat, and dispute that this results in a low overall magnitude of effect.
80. OceanaGold's terrestrial ecologist concludes that, with the implementation of their recommendations, the proposed WNP can be undertaken in a manner that promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, delivering net positive outcomes for indigenous biodiversity. As detailed in the Terrestrial Ecology Impact Assessment,¹⁴ OceanaGold has fully adopted these recommendations, including measures to offset residual adverse effects from vegetation removal; nearly half of which comprises voluntary plantings established by the mine operator over time.¹⁵

13 B.37. Terrestrial ecology values and effects.

14 B.36. *Terrestrial ecological impact assessment*.

15 B.47. *Wharekirauponga underground mine: overall summary of ecology matters*.

Broadleaf and podocarp forests including tawa and karaka

81. NPKH express concern in their comments for the protection of broadleaf and podocarp species, including tawa and karaka (as sources of harvested fruit) and that mining activities are perceived as a potential threat to these culturally and ecologically significant resources.
82. As noted above at paragraph [80], OceanaGold's terrestrial ecologist concludes that, with the implementation of their recommendations, the proposed WNP can be undertaken in a manner that promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, delivering net positive outcomes for indigenous biodiversity.

Birdlife

83. NPKH raise concerns regarding how vegetation clearance, and mining activity may reduce the ability for birds to disperse across the landscape for food, shelter and breeding. Further to this, there are concerns raised as to whether OceanaGold has adequately assessed the noise effects on birds, and what potential impacts on birds' behaviour there may be; particularly for species which are threatened and require lack of disturbance to breed.
84. A response on this topic is provided in Katherine Muchna's statement of evidence in reply to comments. She states that vegetation clearance within Coromandel Forest Park is small in scale, and unlikely to impact food, shelter or nesting resources in the context of the wider forest. Drilling and helicopter activities will cause local "noisy environments" for birds, but are temporary and the post-drilling character of the forest with respect to noise will not be altered as a result of the WNP. These topics are discussed in more detail in Section 6.4.3 of the Boffa Miskell Terrestrial Ecology Values and Effects Assessment for the Wharekirauponga Underground Mine.¹⁶

Tuna and fish

85. Iwi have expressed concern that proposed tuna and fish salvage plans for stream realignments will not be adequately informed by tikanga and mātauranga Māori. OceanaGold has proposed, as a condition of consent, the development of a Cultural Practices Plan, which will include protocols for handling indigenous fauna and flora.

Kurī Peke (Archey's Frog) and Pepeketua (Hochstetter's Frog)

86. All iwi have expressed in their comments significant concerns regarding frogs, including the effects of dewatering, vibration, and the proposed salvage translocation approach. They note that protocols for translocation have not been adequately informed by tikanga and Mātauranga Māori. NP, in particular, are concerned that translocation sites may be of lower ecological quality than the existing habitat.
87. The topic of frogs has been considered in significant detail, with a comprehensive suite of assessments on potential effects and proposed management measures. Statements of evidence from the applicable experts discuss this topic in detail.

Pekapeka (Bats)

88. In their comments, NP identify bats as a taonga species and requests that their habitat be protected. They also acknowledge the project's proposal to retain bat roosting trees.
89. Bats are addressed in detail in the Boffa Miskell Terrestrial Ecology Values and Effects report.¹⁷ As set out in section 5.1.4, despite extensive surveys, no bats have been detected in the Wharekirauponga catchment. Regardless, potential effects on bats have still been assessed, and

17 B.37. Terrestrial ecology values and effects.

management measures specific to bats have been proposed and adopted by the project.

Lizards

90. All iwi have expressed in their comments significant concerns regarding lizards, including how the disturbance and relocation of indigenous fauna may impact this species.
91. Katherine Muchna, in her submission, responds to comments regarding lizards. She notes that two native species have been recorded in low numbers within the Wharekirauponga area during surveys, and none have been detected during previous site clearance. She further explains that the proposed release site will be subject to intensive pest control to maximise the likelihood of success, including the persistence and breeding of lizards at the site. Further to this, in his statement of evidence, Chris Wedding explains that his assessment concludes the populations of At-Risk moko skink and At-Risk copper skink are expected to expand as a result of the restoration actions proposed to offset the effects of the Waihi North Project.

Social and economic

92. Iwi that have provided comment state that their experience of mining in Waihi has, from a social and economic perspective, been overwhelmingly adverse, with persistent poverty and socio-economic disparities felt in the local area. They emphasise that meaningful economic, social, or cultural benefits have not flowed to tangata whenua, and that poor engagement and consultation have left them further marginalised by the impacts of mining projects.
93. OceanaGold has proposed consent conditions, including a Social Impact Management Plan and a Waihi Skills and Development Training Action Plan, as mechanisms for helping to help ensure that the WNP delivers tangible positive outcomes by supporting ongoing local employment.

Initiatives already underway include a driver licensing programme, career days, first aid training, scholarships, and apprenticeships. OceanaGold has committed, as required by the conditions, to ensuring tangata whenua are included in these initiatives, reporting on their effectiveness for Māori and iwi. OceanaGold is also committed to working with iwi on initiatives that support their wider social and economic aspirations through capacity building, development, and sponsorship, including sponsoring the inaugural Hauraki Māori Business Awards in 2025.

94. Further commentary on the social and economic effects is included in the WSP Social Impact Assessment, and Eaquad & Eaquad Limited Economic Effects report submitted with the application,¹⁸ as well as the respective statements in response to comments from Hilary Konigkramer and Shamubeel Eaquad.

Housing affordability and availability

95. Iwi have raised concerns in their comments about housing in Waihi, stating that limited supply and rising prices, potentially exacerbated by increased in-migration linked to the WNP, make it difficult for low to moderate income residents to secure affordable homes. They comment that many locals rely on an increasingly expensive rental market, contributing to housing insecurity and a shortage of affordable options, which impacts community stability and economic development.
96. This topic is addressed in detail in the WSP Social Impact Assessment for the Project,¹⁹ with additional measures proposed under the conditions to better understand the impacts and identify solutions, including Workforce Accommodation Assessments required to be completed and reported on prior to the commencement of various project stages. Ms Konigkramer

¹⁸ B.51. *Economic effects* and B.57. *Social impact assessment*.

¹⁹ B.57. *Social impact assessment*.

further addresses the topic in her statement of evidence in response to comments.

97. OceanaGold has already commenced several initiatives intended to a) reduce the WNP's accommodation demand (by endeavouring to hire from the existing local labour pool where possible; noting that there are several specialist roles which will likely need to be sourced from outside the local area), and b) increase the available accommodation to support the WNP.
98. These initiatives are summarised at a high-level below:
 - a. A commitment to ensure that agreements with project contractors include specifications to hire general labour from the local area wherever possible, and to maximise local workforce participation through training and skills development. Discussions with potential contractors on this matter have already begun.
 - b. The development of a Skills Development and Training Action Plan for the WNP, led by OceanaGold in collaboration with local secondary and tertiary education providers, industry training organisations, and other relevant groups, including iwi.
 - c. OceanaGold owned residential properties will continue to be available for rent to staff, contractors, and the public, helping to increase rental housing supply in Waihi. A review of OceanaGold's property portfolio is underway to optimise use, including assessing the potential for additional homes. An initial trial for increasing housing stock, involving the construction of two three-bedroom duplexes is planned for this, with construction expected to commence in Q4 this year (subject to the necessary approvals being obtained).

The Ōhinemuri River and its tributaries

99. Tangata whenua describe the Ōhinemuri River and its tributaries as vulnerable in their comments, with the mana and mauri of the river cited as significantly diminished. They attribute this degradation to historical and ongoing land uses, including mining, urban development, horticulture, and forestry, which have collectively altered the river's ability to sustain life and impacted the environmental, and cultural, landscape of the iwi.
100. The additional water associated with the WNP can be treated and discharged within the constraints of our existing resource consents. The volume and quality of water that can be discharged from our Wastewater Treatment Plant (**WTP**) is limited to an allowable discharge which is related to the flow in the river. OceanaGold is not seeking a change in these water discharge constraints under which we currently operate, other than an extended term.
101. Iwi however, (NPKH specifically) oppose extending the term of the water treatment discharge consent to align with the WNP's life of mine under the same conditions. They state that monitoring using macroinvertebrate community index (MCI) and quantitative macroinvertebrate community index (QMCI) biological indices around the WTP shows water and habitat quality remains poor to fair, both before and after the plant discharge was established, which from the perspective of iwi demonstrates that mitigation measures implemented to date address only the immediate effects of the current operation and do not actively seek to enhance or restore the wider environment.
102. As set out in sections 13.1.24 and 20.1.8 of the Freshwater Ecological Assessment²⁰, over some 30 years of monitoring there is no evidence of any adverse ecological effects resulting from the treated water discharge on the ecological values of the Ohinemuri River. Ian Boothroyd discusses this topic

in his statement of evidence, as well as provides an overview of the voluntary ecological enhancements that have been carried out by OGNZL (and antecedent companies).

Air Quality

103. Iwi express concern about the degradation of air quality caused by mining activity, as well as proposed vegetation clearance, and increased emissions from machinery. They highlight a perception that there is a lack of comprehensive monitoring of cumulative air discharge effects, and that there is a potential harm to wāhi tapu from corrosive contaminants.
104. The Waihi Operation has been effectively monitoring and managing inhalable gasses or particulates to meet strict air quality consent limits in the vicinity of Waihi operations since 1982.
105. A comprehensive set of Air Quality Assessments have been completed.²¹ If the WNP is approved, OceanaGold would monitor and manage air quality in accordance with the recommendations of this assessment through an Air Quality Management Plan, as is the process for our existing operations. There are a range of air quality management measures proposed to be implemented across the life of the WNP as necessary to meet the requirements of this plan.

Protection of cultural sites

106. I am aware that Waihi, Wharekirauponga, and the surrounding area, including the proposed project areas, may contain historical urupā, wāhi tapu, pā kāinga, and mahinga kai sites.
107. For NTTNK, I understand this is of particular significance in relation to the proposed Gladstone Open Pit. Clough and Associates have completed a comprehensive archaeological assessment of the proposed project sites of

21 Waihi North Project substantive application, B.21 - B.23.

the proposed project sites.²² The assessment did not identify any recorded sites of Māori origin within the project area, and previous surveys have likewise not identified any pre-European Māori sites within the project footprint. For the proposed Gladstone Open Pit area, Clough and Associates concluded that it is unlikely any such features, if they once existed, have survived within the project area due to historical land use and disturbance.

108. The absence of identified cultural sites in archaeological surveys does not necessarily mean such sites are not present, or that the area lacks cultural significance. As a precautionary measure, OceanaGold has proposed conditions of consent that require all earthworks be carried out in accordance with an Accidental Discovery Protocol, which OceanaGold remains open to refining in collaboration with mana whenua.
109. In addition, OceanaGold is open to making provision for cultural monitoring to help safeguard against the accidental discovery of kōiwi or cultural artefacts. This may include direct observation of earthworks by mana whenua representatives. OceanaGold proposes that protocols for cultural supervision of earthworks be developed as part of the proposed Cultural Practices Plan, including clearly defined circumstances where a cultural monitor may be required to oversee works, over and above the application of the Accidental Discovery Protocol.
110. Further to this, OceanaGold is committed to working with mana whenua to explore additional mechanisms for acknowledging their cultural connections to the broader project area. This may include providing support for oral history projects led by tangata whenua, or collaborating on the development and implementation of cultural interpretation related to the project area and its significance. These initiatives could be progressed through the Iwi Advisory Group, or through direct engagement with individual if preferred.

Integration of Mātauranga and Cultural Values

111. Each of the iwi that provided comments have stated that, at present, the technical assessments, and the application more broadly, lack the integration of mātauranga Māori and cultural values. Only iwi themselves can determine how the project may affect their respective interests and mātauranga, and assess how these values can be appropriately incorporated into the proposed project.
112. OceanaGold has proposed the development of a mātauranga Māori monitoring programme as part of the conditioned Cultural Practices Plan. It is envisaged that this programme would include the development of cultural health indicators, for example, for water, and outline how these indicators would integrate with the extensive Western science-based monitoring already planned for the project. The programme would also describe how iwi might be resourced to undertake monitoring directly or to advise OceanaGold representatives on how to do so accurately, potentially through designated kaitiaki roles.
113. Additionally, the programme could include traditional approaches for managing or reducing adverse effects, as well as identify opportunities to enhance te taiao more broadly. OceanaGold has recently sought to initiate engagement with several iwi on the drafting of this programme.
114. I consider the development of a mātauranga Māori monitoring programme to be an important component of the WNP, and one that goes some way toward addressing concerns raised by iwi, particularly around their ability to exercise kaitiakitanga. However, for it to be effective, it requires active iwi participation in both its design and implementation. OceanaGold remains committed to resourcing iwi to enable their involvement in this process.
115. In light of the emphasis from iwi in their comments on the importance of the integration of mātauranga Māori into the proposed project, OceanaGold

proposes to refine a number of the cultural conditions to reflect this. This is described more in paragraphs [120] - [127]

Potential Water Contamination and Changes to Water Chemistry

116. All tangata whenua groups who made comments have raised concerns about the risk of leachate and acid mine drainage contaminating ground and surface waters, potentially introducing harmful metals and chemicals, including cyanide, into waterways. These risks are seen as not only causing detrimental effects to te taiao, but also as compromising the mauri of the water. Tangata whenua emphasise that even if physical effects are not evident, the very knowledge of mining activity can lead to doubt and second guessing about the cleanliness of water for drinking, swimming, and other uses. NPKH go as far as requesting that where any seepage is predicted to occur into waterways, regardless of how minor, it be completely avoided so that no seepage occur.
117. OceanaGold takes the importance of protecting the mauri of water seriously, and I understand the view expressed that even the perception of risk can affect tangata whenua trust in the safety of wai for drinking, swimming, and other uses.
118. To that end, OceanaGold has undertaken comprehensive assessments on this matter, including the Waihi North Project Geochemical Assessment prepared by AECOM, and the Geochemical Assessment for the Wharekirauponga Underground Mine by GHD.²³ These assessments confirm that the risks of acid mine drainage and cyanide contamination can be effectively avoided or managed, through proposed mitigation and management practices, which have been adopted. These practices are informed by extensive monitoring results, and more than thirty years of successful application at Waihi.

23 B.14. *Geochemistry of tailings and overburden, treatment and mitigation*. B.15. *Geochemical Assessment Wharekirauponga Underground Mine*.

119. Ongoing monitoring of rock material will allow refinement of lime amendment rates, as outlined and presented in the report, and will form part of operational practice throughout the life of the WNP. In addition, OGNZL is committed to sharing monitoring results transparently with iwi, to help build confidence and ensure concerns are addressed in an open and ongoing way.

Refinement of proposed cultural consent conditions

120. In considering how the WNP may respond to and accommodate cultural concerns, a distinction can be made between managing the direct effects of the WNP, such as avoiding, remedying, or mitigating impacts, and facilitating broader outcomes that are beneficial to iwi but not necessarily tied to the mining activity itself. Examples include assisting iwi to research and consolidate oral histories related to the project area, or supporting their wider aspirations through resourcing or sponsorship opportunities.
121. With respect to direct project effects, these have been addressed through the proposed conditions of consent, all of which were shared in draft with iwi engaging with OceanaGold prior to lodgement. Matters not directly related to the management of project effects may be more appropriately addressed through agreements and commitments made outside the formal approvals framework.
122. For the measures proposed as consent conditions, following a review of the comments received, OceanaGold proposes refining them to be broader and more prescriptive in order to better reflect the feedback provided.
123. As the proposed conditions stand now, and as they relate to Tangata Whenua, they include the following:

A requirement that, within two months of the establishment of an Iwi Advisory Group (a separate condition), OceanaGold invite the group

to facilitate the preparation of a Cultural Practices Plan. The purpose of the Cultural Practices Plan is to enable tangata whenua to express their tikanga and fulfil their role as kaitiaki in relation to the WNP. The plan is required to include, but is not limited to:

- i. Protocols for karakia
- ii. Cultural monitoring protocol(s)
- iii. Accidental discovery protocol(s)
- iv. Protocol(s) for handling indigenous fauna and flora
- v. Protocol(s) for managing light and noise during culturally significant times

124. OceanaGold now proposes to elaborate further on the Cultural Practices plan, ensuring that it is centred around three things:

- a. Describing how OceanaGold employees and contactors can be respectful of cultural values when undertaking their work;
- b. Providing for, and describing the appropriate times for which, cultural oversight, or traditional practices, are required when undertaking works; and
- c. Detailing how specific works can be undertaken in alignment with tikanga, including, for example:
 - i. Protocols for karakia
 - ii. Accidental discovery protocol(s)
 - iii. Protocol(s) for handling indigenous fauna and flora
 - iv. Protocol(s) for managing light and noise during culturally significant times

125. OceanaGold also proposes a new condition, further elaborating on the Cultural Monitoring Protocol(s) previously proposed as part of the Cultural Practices Plan. This standalone condition would require that the Iwi Advisory Group be invited and resourced to develop, in conjunction with OceanaGold, a Mātauranga Māori Monitoring Programme, which must include, for example:
- a. The development of cultural health indicators and associated performance metrics for waterways and wetlands.
 - b. The development of cultural health indicators and associated performance metrics for other ecosystems and/or culturally significant sites, as deemed necessary by the Iwi Advisory Group.
 - c. A plan describing the monitoring regime for these indicators, which is agreed between the OceanaGold and the Iwi Advisory Group and includes the frequency of monitoring and how it integrates with the broader environmental monitoring programme for the project.
 - d. How OceanaGold intends to provide resourcing to support the development of the programme and the associated ongoing monitoring, which may include, for example, the provision of a dedicated kaitiaki role/s.
126. Further proposed changes to the broader suite of conditions, as they relate to tangata whenua, include the requirement to appoint a person with knowledge of, and expertise in, Mātauranga Māori to the Expert Groundwater Panel (condition UG.32 of the proposed Waikato Regional Council Consent Conditions).

127. The above proposed changes are incorporated into the updated suite of conditions provided as part of OceanaGold's response to the comments received.

Dated: 1 September 2025

Kyle Welten

Appendix A: Record of Engagement with Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki

Date	Subject	Summary
November 2020	Meeting request	Meeting request sent to Baz Howie, which was forward on to John Tamihere. Requesting a meeting to discuss a proposed plan to expand the Martha Open Pit, and tunnel under the Forest Park to Wharekirauponga. Meeting agreed for 5 November, in OGNZL Waihi offices.
November 2020	Consultation	<p>Meeting held, led by the OGEASP Manager, and attended by Baz Howie and John Tamihere. The OG EASP Supervisor was also present. Key points of discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An overview of both Project Quattro (including the proposed expansion to the MOP) and the Wharekirauponga Tunnel Project (including the extension of land application) was provided. - Ngāti Porou Ki Hauraki said they need time to review these projects in more detail and have asked to receive the technical studies once they become available. OceanaGold committed to providing these when they are ready. John Tamihere agreed to email the OG Company Liaison Officer with an appropriate contact and method for sharing technical studies as they become available. - Ngāti Porou Ki Hauraki advised OceanaGold they will receive ownership of the land that Waihi Central School currently occupy as part of their Treaty settlement, and that the Ministry of Education would then lease it back off them. - Ngāti Porou Ki Hauraki stated that they were not interested in being part of the existing iwi advisory group. - John explained that Ngāti Porou Ki Hauraki's stance on mining is that they would not stand in the way of anything that is beneficial to the Waihi community, however, they are still careful to protect their own interests - An offer to conduct a Cultural Impact Assessment was put forward by OceanaGold Waihi but this was declined by Ngāti Porou Ki Hauraki – They explained that they are satisfied at this stage with having the opportunity to review technical studies and make comment.
NOTE: Between November 2020 and June 2021 a Memorandum of Understanding between OGNZL and Ngāti Porou Ki Hauraki was negotiated and signed. Detailed records of this engagement were not recorded.		
March 2021	Wharekirauponga Mining Permit Extension	<p>Email sent by the GM of Waihi Operations, to John Tamihere, providing details regarding an application by OGNZL to extend the Wharekirauponga Mining Permit Area. Matt and John had meet to discuss this in detail the week prior.</p> <p>John responded, and acknowledged that the letter was</p>

Date	Subject	Summary
		<p>consistent with the conversation had the week prior, and also noted that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki are not interested in commercial details relating to the project, but rather any potential impacts of the project on eco systems.</p> <p>Matt responded and acknowledged this position, and committed to sharing effects assessments studies, related to any future mining activities, once they were complete. Matt also noted that he looked forward to working together, and learning more about the Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki worldview.</p>
June 2021	Waihi North Project	<p>Email sent by the OG EVP & Chief Development Officer, to John Tamihere, providing details of a change in the structure of OceanaGold's proposed projects. Which involved the redundancy of Project Quattro, and the move toward intentions to apply for approvals to develop an underground mine at Wharekirauponga and construct the related infrastructure to support this, which the company has called the Waihi North Project. The OG EVP & Chief Development Officer also advised that the company may choose to progress a potential Martha Open Pit Expansion, but would do so separately. Project Overview Documents were shared as attachments, which provided more in-depth details on the proposals. The OG EVP & Chief Development Officer and John had met to discuss this change the week prior.</p>
August 2021	Waihi North Project & CIA	<p>The OG Company Liaison Officer sent an email to Baz Howie and John Tamihere, requesting a meeting to discuss the Waihi North Project, as well as the potential for Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki to complete a Cultural Impact Assessment. John Tamihere replied, and asked if in the first instance, OceanaGold could provide an example Cultural Impact Assessment framework, or examples of previous similar work. An example of a Cultural Impact Assessment framework was shared with John Tamihere in response. The OG Company Liaison Officer also explained that the decision as to whether or not Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki wished to undertake an assessment was with them, but OceanaGold wished to meet with them to discuss this in more detail.</p>
August 2021	Cultural Impact Assessment	<p>The OG Company Liaison Officer sent an email to Baz Howie and John Tamihere, following up on the request to meet and discuss the Waihi North Project, and the completion of a Cultural Impact Assessment by Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki. John Tamihere replied, stating that they had located a person to prepare a draft report, but were awaiting their terms of reference and proposed fees, of which he would share once they were received.</p>

Date	Subject	Summary
August 2021	Application from Oceana Gold NZ Ltd	John Tamihere forwarded the OG EVP & Chief Development Officer an email from the Hauraki DOC Community Ranger that advised him that the Hauraki District Council had received an application from OGNZL for a Licence to Occupy road reserve at Wharekirauponga (as potential Vent Shaft Locations) and that the Department had been asked to review and provide feedback on the draft licence. The email from DOC to John also suggested that if he had any feedback on this proposal, then he was encouraged to contact HDC as soon as possible.
September 2021	Oceana Gold Licence to Occupy	John Tamihere forwarded the OG EVP & Chief Development Officer his email in response to the Hauraki DOC Community Ranger. In summary, the email states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed project area is adjacent to Mataora, which is 1140ha of Māori Freehold land. - Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki have recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding with OceanaGold, and are in the process of preparing a Cultural Impact Assessment. - That Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki do not oppose the Licence to Occupy application to Hauraki District Council.
September 2021	Licence to Occupy	Email sent by the OG EVP & Chief Development Officer, to John Tamihere thanking him for sharing his response on the Licence to Occupy Application, and requesting that John ensure the GM of Waihi Operations and the OG EASP Manager were included on all future correspondences as well.
October 2021	Site visit invite	The OG Company Liaison Officer sent an email to Baz Howie and John Tamihere advising them that OceanaGold were planning to host DOC for an underground mine tour on the 21st of October, and extended an invite for Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki to attend as well.
October 2021	Change in OG Leadership Roles	The OG EVP & Chief Development Officer phoned John Tamihere to advise him that he was stepping away from his position at OGNZL and that moving forward, the primary engagement contact would be the GM for Waihi Operations. This was followed up with an email to John reaffirming this.
October 2021	Site Visit Presentation	The OG Company Liaison Officer sent an email to Baz Howie and John Tamihere providing them copies of the presentations given at the recent DOC/Iwi visit that they chose not to attend. Included in these was the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site visit agenda (Welcome, Presentations, Inductions, Underground Tour with Lunch Underground, Debrief). - A copy of a presentations covering: The history of

Date	Subject	Summary
		mining in Waihi, A snapshot of the Waihi Operation (people, production and expenditure), an Overview of the Martha Underground Mine, the Proposed Waihi North Project, TSFs and Water Treatment, and the Reefton Closure Project.
November 2021	CIA	<p>The GM of Waihi Operations sent an email to Baz Howie and John Tamihere, asking if they needed any further assistance with preparing a scope for their Cultural Impact Assessment. The GM also advised that the business was targeting a consent lodgement for next year, and that OceanaGold is happy to provide further support and resourcing to progress the Cultural Impact Assessment ahead of that time if necessary.</p> <p>In the same email, the GM of Waihi Operations advised that the OG EASP Manager had recently left the business and that an OG Sustainability Manager had been appointed to lead the development of the consent application, and ongoing cultural, social and environmental performance. The GM of Waihi Operations requested a meeting to make the formal introductions to the OG Sustainability Manager.</p>
November 2021	Cultural Impact Assessment	<p>John Tamihere emailed the GM of Waihi Operations a scope and proposed costings to have consultants Matapihi prepare a Waihi North Project Cultural Impact Assessment for Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki. He apologised for the delay in getting this sent through for consideration, and introduced Matapihi who would be leading the work.</p> <p>On the 6th of December, the GM of Waihi Operations responded acknowledging receipt of the proposal, and confirming acceptance of it. The GM requested the opportunity to meet with John and Matapihi to work through next steps, he advised that the OG EASP Supervisor would send through a Teams meeting request.</p>
December 2021	Meeting request	The OG EASP Supervisor sent a Teams Meeting link to John Tamihere and Matapihi for the 13th of December, to meet and discuss the Cultural Impact Assessment Proposal.

Date	Subject	Summary
December 2021	Cultural Impact Assessment Hui	<p>The GM of Waihi Operations, the OG Sustainability Manager, the OG EASP Supervisor and the OG Company Liaison Officer, met with John Tamihere, to discuss next steps for progressing the Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki CIA. Key points discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GM advised that the Company had reviewed the proposal, and accepted the scope of what was proposed. He stated that the OG Sustainability Manager and the OG EASP Supervisor would be responsible for facilitating the completion of that specific piece of work moving forward. - The OG Sustainability Manager explained that technical assessments for the proposed project were still yet to be completed, and lodgement would not likely be until sometime next year. He stated that the Company was very keen to understand and account for Māori cultural values, interests and associations with the project area and the potential impacts of the proposed activities on these, so the Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) was a really important piece of work. - It was discussed that to get Matapihi started, it would make sense to formalise the proposal through the signing of a Short Form Consulting Agreement, and that the OG EASP Supervisor could arrange for that to be prepared. John was asked if this was best set up with Ngati Porou ki Hauraki, or Matapihi directly. John advised he would need to go away and come back to OceanaGold to confirm. - John explained to the group that that Ngati Porou ki Hauraki would be supportive of the social and economic contributions that mining brings to the District. And that once OceanaGold provide their "roll out plan" he can come together with the Runanga and agree on next steps. - The OG EASP Supervisor presented a slide on possible approvals timeframes for the project, noting that the Cultural Impact Assessment Proposal that was sent through did not include any defined timeframes, but ultimately the company would like to have a Cultural Impact Assessment in hand before April next year. - The OG Sustainability Manager asked John if those timeframes seemed reasonable? And suggested that if possible, Ngati Porou ki Hauraki might be open to providing support for the lodgement of the application, with the caveat that the CIA was progressing in parallel. - John advised that given the positive professional relationship that was evolving those suggestions all sounded reasonable, but ultimately he would need to consult with the Runanga before he could confirm.

Date	Subject	Summary
December 2021	Follow up	John Tamihere emailed the GM of Waihi Operations to thank him for their earlier conversation and to confirm that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki accepts the lodgement of a resource consent application while the CIA progresses. He also noted that he would be in touch shortly to confirm the appropriate invoicing mechanisms for Matapihi's work.
December 2021	Consultation follow up	<p>The GM of Waihi Operations responded to John Tamihere's email, thanked him for his time, and advised that OceanaGold would send a summary of the information discussed in the recent meeting through to him in the coming day.</p> <p>John Tamihere responded, confirming that the Matapihi would invoice OceanaGold directly for their supporting the completion of a CIA.</p>
December 2021	Meeting minutes	The OG Sustainability Manager, sent John an email summarising the key points from the hui on 13 December, including the proposed timeline. The OG Sustainability Manager also requested a letter or formal email response from John confirming again Ngati Porou ki Hauraki's acceptance of the lodgement of the Waihi North Project, whilst the CIA continued to process .
January 2022	Consulting Agreement	The OG EASP Supervisor sent Matapihi and John Tamihere a copy of a Short Form Consulting Agreement for consideration and signing.
January 2022	Site visit invite & overview of project	<p>Matapihi emailed the OG EASP Supervisor confirming receipt of the Short Form Consulting Agreement. They also requested access to the resource consent application lodged with Council and to undertake a site visit as soon as possible.</p> <p>The OG EASP Supervisor responded, advising that OceanaGold had not yet lodged the application, as the company was still completing several technical assessments. He provided a Project Overview document summarising the project, along with a link to a Truescape video animation describing the key elements of the proposal. He added that the company would be happy to facilitate a site visit and that the OG Company Liaison Officer would contact them to confirm a suitable time and date.</p>
January 2022	Site visit invite	The OG Company Liaison Officer emailed Matapihi asking if there were any specific dates in the near future that might work for their site visit. She also requested that if Matapihi had any specific areas of interest, to let her know so these can be incorporated in the visit's agenda.
January 2022	Site visit	Matapihi responded to the OG Company Liaison Officer's email, stating that Friday the 21st, or Monday the 24th would work best for them. They advised that their interests on the day related to understanding any

Date	Subject	Summary
		changes to existing consents, and the key aspects of the project that require new consents, and the planned mitigations associated with these. Matapihi advised that an underground visit probably wasn't necessary, but someone on hand to explain the general site and existing operations would be helpful.
January 2022	Site visit invite	The OG Company Liaison Officer emailed Matapihi and advised that Monday the 24th was worked from the OceanaGold end for a site visit, and asked them to confirm when they might be able to arrive in Waihi so that an agenda can be finalised. She also asked whether Matapihi wanted to visit Wharekirauponga, which would require a moderate level of fitness, or if a general helicopter flyover was sufficient.
January 2022	Site visit invite	<p>Matapihi responded to The OG Company Liaison Officer's email, indicating a preference for an early start due to needing to return to Gisborne in the afternoon. They also requested access to the full resource consent application documents for the project, including the Assessment of Environmental Effects, noting that the information previously provided by the OG EASP Supervisor was too high-level for Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki to rely on for their own assessment of effects.</p> <p>The OG Company Liaison Officer responded, confirming that an early start would be fine and asked Matapihi to provide estimated arrival and departure times so she could finalise the agenda. She noted that the OG EASP Supervisor was hoping to give a detailed presentation on the project and said she would speak with him regarding the sharing of any available effects assessments.</p>
January 2022	Site visit invite	<p>The OG Company Liaison Officer emailed Matapihi a draft site visit agenda, and asked them to let her know if the proposed timings worked.</p> <p>Matapihi responded, requesting that the site visit be deferred to the following Monday (31 January). Stating that that they preferred to have access to the Assessment of Environmental Effects beforehand, so they could consider the information during the site visit.</p>
January 2022	Consent application status	<p>The OG EASP Supervisor phoned Matapihi. Key points from their discussion are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matapihi had understood from John Tamihere that the application for approvals had already been lodged. The OG EASP Supervisor clarified that the company is still in the process of completing technical assessments and drafting the Assessment of Environmental Effects, and that the application has not yet been submitted. - Matapihi acknowledged that they had believed the

Date	Subject	Summary
		<p>project was at a more advanced stage. She expressed a preference to defer the site visit until the AEE and supporting technical assessments have been finalised and are ready for submission to Council. After which, they would like the opportunity to review these documents prior to visiting the site to 'ground truth' the findings.</p> <p>- The OG EASP Supervisor committed to sharing the PowerPoint presentation he had planned to present during the site visit, as a starting point. He also offered to provide access to any of available effects assessments, noting that they would be in draft, subject to approval from the OG Sustainability Manager.</p>
January 2022	Biodiversity project at Wharekirauponga	<p>The OG Company Liaison Officer emailed John Tamihere, as well as representatives from other Hauraki iwi groups engaging with the company, providing an introduction to OceanaGold's commitment under the Waihi North Project to achieve and sustain an environmental net gain throughout the life of the project, aiming to leave the immediate area in an ecologically improved state.</p> <p>Attached to the email was a document outlining preliminary details of a proposed Biodiversity Project at Wharekirauponga, developed in response to this commitment. The OG Company Liaison Officer noted that the proposal is conceptual at this stage, as OceanaGold recognises the role of iwi as kaitiaki and wishes to co-design the project with iwi input.</p> <p>She invited recipients to review the document and let her know when they were ready to meet and discuss it further. She also welcomed suggestions for an appropriate facilitator to support those discussions.</p>
January 2022	Presentation & Technical reports	<p>The OG EASP Supervisor emailed Matapihi, providing them a copy of the presentation he had intended to walk through during the postponed site visit. The PowerPoint included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An overview of OceanaGold, its involvement in New Zealand mining, and the Waihi Operation - Details of the existing operations in the Waihi area (Martha Open Pit, Correnso, Martha Underground, Favona, Trio) - A broad overview of the Waihi North Project, covering the underground mine (including proposed access tunnels, ventilation raises, and Willows Road surface infrastructure), Gladstone Open Pit, Northern Rock Stack, and Tailings Storage Facility 3 - A summary of the current status of draft effects assessments, noting that approximately nine reports were available for review, with around 20 still under

Date	Subject	Summary
		<p>development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A detailed summary of the predicted effects at each project area, and the mitigation measures proposed by OceanaGold. <p>In the same email, the OG EASP Supervisor explained that he had created a Box.com folder as a central location for Matapihi to access the completed reports. He advised that they would receive a system notification granting access shortly, and that one of the folders includes a table of contents outlining which reports are available, and which are still being drafted. He reiterated that all reports are currently in draft form as the company continues to review and finalise them in parallel to their review.</p>
February 2022	Biodiversity Project	<p>The OG Company Liaison Officer emailed John Tamihere and asked if he had found time to review the Biodiversity Project consultation document, and to query whether Ngāti Porou ki Haruaki would like to meet to discuss the proposal further.</p> <p>John Tamihere responded, stating that the Biodiversity Project consultation document references the fact that other specific technical reports are being prepared for the project. He requested that these are listed out, together with the authors that are preparing them, and that these be made available to him.</p>
February 2022	Consent Application Documents	<p>The OG Sustainability Manager emailed John Tamihere in response to his request for access to the full suite of technical assessments for the project. In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The OG Sustainability Manager explained that the OG EASP Supervisor had recently spoken with Matapihi to clarify a misunderstanding that the consent application had already been lodged. He reiterated that no application has been submitted for the project and apologised if this was not made clear during his last conversation with John. - He noted that a Box folder had been established to provide Matapihi with access to draft reports as they become available. The folder now contains 12 draft reports available for review, with the remaining assessments still being finalised. - The OG Sustainability Manager also offered clarification on the proposed Biodiversity Project, stating that as part of the broader Waihi North Project, OceanaGold is seeking to establish a long-term biodiversity initiative that goes beyond the mitigation required for unavoidable environmental effects identified in the draft technical reports. He explained that the OG Company Liaison Officer's recent email was intended to provide an overview of the concept

Date	Subject	Summary
		and to initiate further discussion to gauge interest in progressing the initiative collaboratively with iwi and other stakeholders. - The OG Sustainability Manager advised John to not hesitate to contact him he have any questions, or wish to discuss anything further
February 2022	Consulting Agreement	The OG EASP Supervisor sent an email to Matapihi, asking if they had yet reviewed the Short Form Consulting Agreement. He advised them to not hesitate to contact him if they required clarity on anything.
February 2022	Follow up / Frog distribution surveys	The OG Sustainability Manager emailed John Tamihere to ask if he had any questions regarding his recent email. In the same email, the OG Sustainability Manager advised that as part of the broader studies for the project, the company was continuing frog distribution surveys. He noted that OceanaGold would soon be applying to the Department of Conservation to renew the wildlife permit for this work, as the current permit was due to expire. The OG Sustainability Manager invited John to get in touch if he wished to discuss the matter further.
February 2022	Follow up / Technical Reports	The OG Sustainability Manager rang John Tamihere to follow up on his email dated 3 Feb. In summary: - In relation to the technical documents and effects assessments, John advised that he would like to also received summaries, so that he and others did not need to read through the full documents. - John advised he is also happy to meet discuss the Biodiversity Net Gain Project, and that he know appreciated the distinction between this and the effects mitigation for the project. - John acknowledged the wildlife permit renewal, stating that it is important to understand the ecology at Wharekirauponga, and if the permit facilitates that then it would have his support.
March 2022	Consulting Agreement	Matapihi emailed the OG EASP Supervisor a copy of the signed Short Form Consulting Agreement. She asked if there were any newly available reports, that these be uploaded to the Box File ASAP. She also requested access to a draft AEE, if one was available.
March 2022	Consulting Agreement	The OG EASP Supervisor emailed Matapihi, acknowledging receipt of the Short Form Consulting Agreement, and providing a fully signed copy for their records. He also acknowledged that there were reports still being drafted, that had not yet been uploaded to Box, and committed to chasing up a status update on these and coming back to them.

Date	Subject	Summary
March 2022	Draft assessments	<p>The OG EASP Supervisor emailed Matapihi asking them to complete a Vendor form, so that Matapihi could now be set up in the OceanaGold system for the paying of invoices. The OG EASP Supervisor also stated that the following reports, had now also been uploaded to the Box File for their review: Water Management Studies, Blasting and Vibration Assessment, Assessment of Groundwater Effects (Tunnel Elements), Air Discharge Assessment (Wharekirauponga Elements), Air Discharge Assessment (Waihi Elements), Landscape, Natural Character and Visual Effects Assessment, Assessment of Noise Effects, and the Erosion and Sediment Control Assessment.</p> <p>Additionally, he advised that the following reports were still in draft stage, with completion and availability for review anticipated toward the end of March or early April: Geotechnical Assessment (Underground Mine and Tunnel Elements, Groundwater Assessment (Underground Mine), Ecological Assessment (Volumes 1 and 2), Recreation and Tourism Assessment, and the Social Impact Assessment</p> <p>In the same email, the OG EASP Supervisor also explained that OceanaGold had engaged Mitchell Daysh as expert planning consultants to support the preparation of the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE). And that as the AEE will require input from all completed technical assessments, it is expected to be drafted at a later stage, once the relevant technical work has been finalised.</p> <p>Finally, the OG EASP Supervisor asked Matapihi if they would be available for a regular formal catch-up on a fortnightly basis, and requested confirmation as to whether Thursday afternoons would be suitable.</p>
March 2022	Meeting request	<p>The OG Sustainability Manager, emailed John Tamihere requesting a meeting to provide him with an update on OceanaGold Waihi activities.</p>
March 2022	Draft assessments	<p>Matapihi emailed the OG EASP Supervisor and acknowledged the reports recently added to Box. Matapihi advised that the day proposed for a regular catch-up didn't work from their end, and asked if these could be rescheduled to a Friday.</p> <p>Matapihi also asked if there were any records of pre-lodgement engagement between OceanaGold and the council, and if these could also be provided to them.</p>

Date	Subject	Summary
March 2022	MMZ, Draft Consultation Letter	<p>The OG Sustainability Manager had a phone conversation with John Tamihere to discuss the company's proposed changes to the Martha Mineral Zone. During the call, The OG Sustainability Manager explained that any future expansion of the Martha Pit would first require a change to the area as defined in the District Plan. He clarified that such a change would not permit any physical mining to commence, it would simply increase the boundary of the zone, and change some of the provisions associated with this zone.</p> <p>The OG Sustainability Manager also spoke with John regarding a letter of support for the lodgement of the Waihi North Project, while Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki continued to finalise their WNP Cultural Impact Assessment. John requested that the information be provided in and, along with an example of the support letter being sought.</p> <p>Following the call, the OG Sustainability Manager sent an email to John containing the requested information and a sample letter of support.</p>
March 2022	Exploration permits	<p>The OG Company Liaison Officer emailed Baz Howie and John Tamihere to inform them of changes the company intends to make to its exploration programme. She advised that OceanaGold plans to surrender three Exploration Permits from its regional portfolio: Glamorgan (EP 40813), White Bluffs (EP 51041), and Ohui (EP 51630). A map was included with the email to show the location of these permits. It was noted that each of these permits is due to expire within the next one to two years, and at this time, the company cannot justify the continued expenditure required to extend their duration or to progress them to Mining Permit status. As a result, the company has made the decision to voluntarily surrender the permits early and return them to the Crown. Donna explained that, should NZPAM choose to tender these areas in the future under the Newly Available Acreage process, OceanaGold may consider reapplying. However, for now, the company's primary focus remains on advancing the Waihi North Project.</p>
March 2022	Waihi North Project	<p>The OG Sustainability Manager received an email from Danielle Vaoga, which included a letter signed by John Tamihere on behalf of Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki. The letter expressed support for the lodgement and public notification of the Waihi North Project consent application, subject to the condition that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's position on the proposal remains reserved until the completion of their Cultural Impact Assessment. The letter also clearly stated that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's support for the lodgement and notification of the application does not derogate from,</p>

Date	Subject	Summary
		or otherwise affect, any legal or customary rights held by Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki.
April 2022	Martha Mineral Zone Plan Change Application Lodgement	The OG Sustainability Manager rang John Tamihere and discussed with him that the company was now in the process of lodging a private plan change request to expand the Martha Mineral Zone, as defined in the Hauraki District Plan. He explained that the proposed rezoning involves only OGNZL-owned land and would not permit any physical mining, but simply enable the possibility of applying for future consents to be applied for. John stated he was not opposed to the lodgement, noting the Martha Pit is an existing feature and the plan change alone would not create physical impacts. The OG Sustainability Manager emphasised that any mining would still require a full resource consent process, and committed to engaging with Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki prior to lodging any such application, especially to address potential effects
April	Biodiversity Project Workshop	The OG Company Liaison Officer sent an email to Baz Howie and John Tamihere, referencing the preliminary information previously shared regarding a proposed biodiversity project in the Wharekirauponga area. She explained that, in order to progress this conceptual initiative, the company would like to further discuss the proposal and explore how iwi may wish to be involved. She stated that to facilitate this, the company is proposing a workshop with iwi representatives, to be held on 28 April. And the session would be facilitated by Lou Sanson (former Director-General of the Department of Conservation). Donna noted that the workshop is intended to be held kano ki kano, with provisions made for those who prefer to join virtually. She requested that Baz and John confirm their attendance, specifying whether they plan to attend in person or via video conference, and to advise on the number of attendees and any dietary requirements.
April 2022	Biodiversity Project Workshop Teams Invite	The OG Company Liaison Officer sent a Teams invite to Baz Howie and John Tamihere for the proposed Biodiversity Project Hui. This meeting invite was accepted.
April 2022	Additional WNP Draft Reports	The OG EASP Supervisor emailed Matapihi to advise that the following draft Waihi North Project reports had now been uploaded to Box: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recreation and Tourism Assessment - Geotechnical Assessment – Underground Mine and Tunnels - WNP Ecological Assessments – Volumes 1 and 2 - Groundwater Assessment He also noted that the previously referenced Mine Vent Air Discharge Assessment is now included as an appendix to the Wharekirauponga Underground Mine Air Discharge Assessment. The OG EASP Supervisor stated that the Social Impact Assessment,

Date	Subject	Summary
		Groundwater Assessment for the Wharekirauponga Underground Mine, and the Vibration Assessment are still being drafted. And he would advise once these are available. In relation to pre-application conversations with Council, the OG EASP Supervisor confirmed he doesn't have any specific records but advised that Council is reviewing the same assessments that have been provided to Matapihi. He offered to look into any specific queries regarding OceanaGold's conversations with Council if needed, and asked Matapihi specifically what they were wanting to know. He also provided his phone number and welcomed Matapihi to contact him directly if they had any questions about the project.
April 2022	Biodiversity Project Hui	Biodiversity Project Hui held. John Tamihere attended.
May 2022	WNP AEE	Matapihi emailed to thank the OG EASP Supervisor for the updated reports that were recently added to the Box folder. However, noted that the most critical document for their work is the draft Assessment of Environmental Effects; particularly the assessment of effects against planning provisions, which they stated is central to the development of the Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA). Matapihi mentioned that they were making good progress on the report, with the caveat that there are still some gaps due to pending information. They also advised that an invoice should be expected shortly. Additionally, Matapihi requested further information on the Biodiversity Net Gain Project, specifically background context and any reports that have been prepared to date.
May 2022	WNP AEE	<p>John Tamihere emailed the OG EASP Supervisor requesting that all relevant project documentation be provided to the consultant appointed by Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki. Alternatively, resourcing must be made available to allow them to obtain independent third-party expertise. He also raised several other matters as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki is increasingly concerned about the limited time remaining to complete their Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA). - Without a completed CIA, Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki is not in a position to either support or oppose any applications made by OceanaGold. - The Memorandum of Understanding between Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki and OceanaGold is at risk, due to what is perceived as a failure to uphold principles of good faith. - The Department of Conservation, Waikato Regional Council, and Thames-Coromandel District Council have been informed that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki is still preparing its CIA and therefore remains agnostic on

Date	Subject	Summary
		<p>any OceanaGold applications until that process is concluded.</p> <p>The OG EASP Supervisor responded, apologising for the delay in providing the Assessment of Environmental Effects. He explained that OGNZL had engaged planning consultants Mitchell Daysh to prepare the AEE, and that it was not yet completed at the time of writing. He committed to sharing a draft as soon as it becomes available.</p> <p>Additionally, the OG EASP Supervisor attached the consultation document for the proposed Waihi North Biodiversity Project, which had previously been shared with John. He clarified that the document outlines preliminary (conceptual) details regarding a biodiversity initiative at Wharekirauponga. He emphasised that iwi involvement is important to OceanaGold in designing this project, and that the concept remains open to collaborative refinement.</p>
May 2022	Meeting request / CIA	<p>The OG EASP Supervisor sent Matapihi a Microsoft Teams invitation for a recurring fortnightly meeting. The purpose of the meeting series is to discuss the progress of the Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki Cultural Impact Assessment and to regular check in on, and identify, any additional information or support that may be required to complete it.</p>
May 2022	Fortnightly meeting update	<p>The first recurring fortnightly meeting between the OG EASP Supervisor and Matapihi was held to support the completion of the Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki Cultural Impact Assessment. Key discussion points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued interest from Matapihi in the WNP AEE - To which the OG EASP Supervisor advised that the WNP AEE had not yet been fully drafted. - He committed to following up with Matapihi as soon as a draft becomes available. - The OG EASP Supervisor also agreed to reconfirm with planning consultants Mitchell Daysh an estimated delivery timeframe for the AEE. - Matapihi also requested a schedule of estimated timeframes more broadly, in terms of what the company was working toward
May 2022	Waihi North Biodiversity Project Hui Notes	<p>On behalf of Lou Sanson, the OG Company Liaison Officer sent the meeting notes from the Biodiversity Project Hui held on 28 April to John Tamihere. Within the same email, several potential dates were proposed for the next hui, with Pedlars Motel in Paeroa suggested as the meeting location. Recipients were asked to confirm which of the proposed dates and whether the suggested location would be suitable for their attendance.</p>

Date	Subject	Summary
May 2022	Waihi North Biodiversity Project Hui	The OG Company Liaison Officer followed up with John Tamihere and Matapihi regarding a preferred date for the next Waihi North Biodiversity Project Hui. She suggested Tuesday, 21 June for the hui. The OG Company Liaison Officer followed also noted that Lou Sanson had proposed a site visit, suggesting that Tuesday, 2 August could be a suitable date for this. John Tamihere responded via email confirming that both dates worked for him, and he has pencilled them into his diary. The OG Company Liaison Officer advised she would send out a formal Microsoft Teams invitation once she has received confirmation from the other iwi representatives.
May 2022	Waihi North Biodiversity Project Hui Invite	The OG Company Liaison Officer sent John Tamihere and Matapihi a Teams meeting invite for the 21 June Biodiversity Project Hui.
May 2022	Waihi North Biodiversity Project Hui / Apologies for planned hui	Matapihi emailed the OG EASP Supervisor and the OG Company Liaison Officer to: - Thank them for the invitation to the upcoming Biodiversity Project hui. - Advise that they were unavailable for the regular catch-up meeting scheduled for today, and requested that it be deferred to next week. - Request an update on the schedule of estimated timeframes discussed at the last hui, with particular interest in the planned lodgement date. The OG EASP Supervisor acknowledged the change in date for the regular catch-up. He advised that he is currently working on compiling a schedule of estimated timeframes, but noted that its completion is dependent on input from other teams within the business, and he is awaiting their feedback. The OG EASP Supervisor also provided an update on the AEE, indicating that he expects it to be available for review toward the end of June, subject to: - Timely delivery by external consultants, and - Completion of the internal review process.
June 2022	Waihi North Project Lodgement Timeline	The OG EASP Supervisor emailed Matapihi, providing her with a copy of the GaNTTNK chart he had walked through in their recent hui. As requested, he also included copies of the existing consent conditions for the company's current operations, along with the Iwi Advisory Group's Guiding Principles dated October 2014. In addition, the OG EASP Supervisor advised that OceanaGold's primary contact at Hauraki District Council is Leigh Robcke and shared his contact details. He also have his apologies for the next scheduled catch-up, as he would be out of the office that day. Matapihi responded by thanking the OG EASP Supervisor for the information and confirming that they were happy to postpone the next hui.

Date	Subject	Summary
June 2022	Site Visit	OceanaGold Representatives attended a site visit at Mataora Bay. Lead by, and at the request of Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki.
June 2022	Waihi North Biodiversity Project Hui Apologies	John Tamihere emailed the OG Company Liaison Officer, to convey Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's apologies for not being able to attend the upcoming Waihi North Biodiversity Project hui. He also requested copies of the notes from the hui. Donna responded by thanking John and confirming that she would share the notes after the workshop
June 2022	WNP AEE	Matapihi sent an email to the OG Company Liaison Officer following up on the expected availability of the AEE for review (the OG EASP Supervisor had previously indicated it would likely be ready toward the end of June). Matapihi also mentioned that they had recently submitted an invoice that had not yet been paid and asked the OG EASP Supervisor to follow up on the matter for them. The OG EASP Supervisor responded by providing a link to the AEE and the full suite of Technical Assessments, explaining that these had only just now become available. He requested that the information in the attachment be treated as confidential and used solely for the purpose of completing the Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki CIA work. The OG EASP Supervisor also advised that he would follow up on the status of the invoice and encouraged Matapihi to reach out to him if they had any questions or needed clarification regarding anything in the attached materials.
July 2022	WNP AEE / MMZ Plan Change	Matapihi sent an email to The OG EASP Supervisor thanking him for sharing the AEE and the suite of application documents. In their message, they also raised a query regarding the Martha Mineral Zone Plan Change, which was referenced in the AEE (as a separate process/project included for completeness). Matapihi asked whether Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki had been made aware of this plan change, acknowledging that it may have been discussed in other forums. Additionally, they reiterated that their invoice remains unpaid and requested that this matter be followed up.
July 2022	MMZ Plan Change	John Tamihere emailed Matapihi, copying in the OG EASP Supervisor and the OG Company Liaison Officer, stating that he had never discussed, nor received any information from, OceanaGold regarding the proposed plan change. He advised Matapihi to discontinue any further engagement with the company and to resend her invoice directly to Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki, who would process the payment.
July 2022	Memorandum of Understanding	John Tamihere emailed the OG EASP Supervisor and the OG Sustainability Manager, referencing several commitments outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding between Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki and OGNZL. The commitments referenced included the

Date	Subject	Summary
		<p>honest sharing of information and the obligation for each party to keep the other informed of actions relevant to their respective interests. John expressed his disappointment at learning about a private plan change being led by OGNZL through reading of it in the WNP AEE, noting that this was contrary to the commitments outlined in the MoU. He requested a kanohi ki te kanohi meeting to establish and agree on shared high-level outcomes and next steps. John suggested that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's consultants prepare an agenda in advance of the meeting and proposed that it take place within two weeks. He also requested an urgent phone call from the OG Sustainability Manager and reiterated that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's consultant, Matapihi, had still not been paid.</p>
July 2022	MMZ plan change follow up	<p>The OG Sustainability Manager emailed John Tamihere noting that he had attempted to call him several times the previous day without success. In the email, the OG Sustainability Manager attached information regarding the proposed plan change that had been shared on 28 March 2022. He also referenced their phone conversation on 4 April, during which, as the OG Sustainability Manager understood it, John Tamihere had expressed no objection to the Plan Change, given that the open pit already existed, the plan change would not approve any additional physical mining, and the primary concern was any potential impact on Central School. The OG Sustainability Manager reiterated that, prior to any expansion, a full resource consent process would be required; one that could only begin if the Plan Change was approved. He assured John that the company would fully engage with Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki before lodging any resource consent application, with particular attention to potential impacts on their interests in Waihi. The OG Sustainability Manager also mentioned that he had informed John of the company's intention to lodge the Plan Change back in April, and understood there were no objections at that time. The OG Sustainability Manager also acknowledged the existing Memorandum of Understanding and affirmed that the company had never intended to act contrary to the commitments outlined within it.</p>
July 2022	Meeting / MMZ Plan Change	<p>The OG EASP Supervisor, emailed Matapihi to remind them of their upcoming catch-up scheduled for Friday. He acknowledged that discussions regarding the Plan Change had been taking place between John Tamihere and the OG Sustainability Manager in the background. The OG EASP Supervisor also noted that the link to the Assessment of Environmental Effects and the supporting Technical Assessments had become inactive, and he provided an updated link for</p>

Date	Subject	Summary
		access. In response, Matapihi confirmed their availability for the Friday hui and requested access to any written documentation related to the Plan Change in advance of the meeting.
July 2022	MMZ	The OG EASP Supervisor emailed Matapihi copies of the documentation related to the proposed MMZ Plan Change.
July 2022	CIA / MMZ	<p>John Tamihere emailed the OG EASP Supervisor, expressing his disappointment upon learning that a private plan change application had been lodged in April 2022, while the substance of the application was only recently provided to his consultant. He stated that this lack of timely communication does not reflect good faith dealings as required under the MOU. John also emphasised that all engagement between OceanaGold, Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki, and their chosen consultant is without prejudice and confidential, noting Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's concern that OceanaGold may not trust them to act professionally. He stated that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki does not view the Waihi North Project and the MMZ Plan Change as separate or siloed initiatives, but rather as components of a single project footprint. He reinforced his view that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki is the only iwi materially and consistently affected by OceanaGold's activities, and this should be acknowledged in all future applications by OGNZL, with mitigation strategies to be developed through their nominated Cultural Impact Assessment consultant. However, he noted that this consultant is currently unable to complete the CIA due to outstanding information yet to be provided by OGNZL. And as such, until full disclosure of this information occurs, Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki intends to inform all relevant regulators of their opposition to all OceanaGold applications. He also made it clear that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki is not controlled or influenced by any other iwi or external pressure groups, including anti-mining organisations. Finally, John indicated his intention to meet with the OG Sustainability Manager in Auckland on 1 August and expressed the expectation that by that time, Matapihi will be in a position to deliver a CIA report, which will remain confidential between Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki and OceanaGold. The OG EASP Supervisor acknowledged receipt of the email, stating that Matapihi has all relevant and available project information. Nevertheless, he mentioned that he would explore any perceived outstanding information with her during their regular catch-up on Friday.</p>

Date	Subject	Summary
July 2022	WNP / MMZ	<p>Matapihi emailed the OG EASP Supervisor, providing a summary of her understanding of the discussion during their recent catch-up, as follows:</p> <p>Plan Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matapihi requested copies of the Section 92 requests and any responses related to the Plan Change, as they become available. - There was a discussion about Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's interest in the Waihi Central School site and the potential opportunity to purchase it following Treaty settlement. - Discussion regarding cultural mitigations associated with Pukewa, with a request for the OG EASP Supervisor to share the draft Cultural Balance Plan currently being prepared by Ngāti Hako (as required under existing consent conditions). - It was noted that a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) may be required from Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki as part of the Plan Change process. <p>Wharekirauponga:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matapihi raised questions regarding the Social Impact Assessment, particularly the analysis of Māori demographics and the broader benefits to Māori. She expressed the view that a standalone SIA should have been developed specifically for Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki. - The OG EASP Supervisor committed to further investigate and analyse how many individuals affiliated with Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki are currently employed by OGNZL. - There was discussion around the Department of Conservation's obligations to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. - The topic of profit sharing from mining activities was raised. In her email, Matapihi notes that the OG EASP Supervisor had directed her to the Department of Conservation (DOC) regarding this matter; however, this is not accurate. The actual discussion centred on the fact that gold and silver were explicitly excluded from Treaty settlement redress. - They also discussed the diversion of streams on the farm. Matapihi indicated they intended to assess this against the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM), and confirmed that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's primary concern is the impact on groundwater. - Matapihi requested information on the water take allocations being sought as part of the application. <p>Timeframes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matapihi indicated they were working toward a 1 August delivery date; however, they clarified that this is likely to be for Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki

Date	Subject	Summary
		<p>recommendations only.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They advised that they would keep the OG EASP Supervisor updated regarding when the information can be shared with OceanaGold.
July 2022	WNP / MMZ / CIA	<p>The OG EASP Supervisor responded to Matapihi's email, seeking clarification on whether or not Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki wished to complete a Cultural Impact Assessment in relation to the proposed plan change. He noted that the proposed change to the Martha Mineral Zone does not in itself permit any new mining activity to occur, and that any future mining or expansion of the Martha Pit would require OceanaGold to apply for separate resource consents. The OG EASP Supervisor requested that Matapihi confirm whether Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki does wish to complete a CIA, and if so, whether they would prefer to undertake it now or at the point when approvals are sought for any physical mining activities. He added that OceanaGold is happy to proceed in whichever way Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki considers appropriate and offered for Matapihi to meet with OGNZL's planning consultant to discuss the application in further detail, should that be helpful. The OG EASP Supervisor also acknowledged the request to review the Cultural Balance Plan but noted that the document is still in draft and continues to be developed by Ngāti Hako. He directed Matapihi to the relevant consent conditions that reference the plan and outline its intended purpose. However, he advised that he is not in a position to share the draft until it has been finalised by Ngāti Hako. He also acknowledged the request for an analysis of Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki employment with OceanaGold and advised that someone is currently reviewing OGNZL's annual demographic staff survey; This data is being triangulated with relevant information from Te Whata and compared against the estimated job numbers for the project, and he'd been in touch once that work had been complete.</p>
August 2022	OceanaGold Employee Demographics	<p>The OG EASP Supervisor sent Matapihi an email summarising the number of existing OceanaGold staff and contractors who are Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki, together with a very high-level overview of the workforce requirements for the project (noting that a more fulsome overview of this is included in the SIA, which has been share with Matapihi previously). Details are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current Workforce: OceanaGold employs approximately 350 individuals. - Māori Representation: The most recent staff survey (2020) indicates that 16% of employees identify as Māori, which is slightly below the local area average of 17.9%.

Date	Subject	Summary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Iwi Affiliation: The staff survey includes an option for iwi affiliation. In the latest survey, no staff or contractors identified as Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki. The OG EASP Supervisor noted that the staff survey may not accurately represent iwi affiliations as participation is voluntary and the iwi affiliation field is optional. However, it provides an indicative baseline. - Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki Data: According to Te Whata (https://tewhata.io/), there are approximately 2,076 individuals affiliated with Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki, 64.5% of whom are of working age. - Workforce Requirements for WNP: The total direct workforce needed to support the WNP averages 292 over a 17-year period. The Social Impact Assessment for the Project estimates that about 87% of this workforce will consist of general labour, skilled operators, and trades, while the remaining 13% will be supervisory, technician, professional, and managerial staff.
August 2022	Meeting postponement	Matapihi emailed the OG EASP Supervisor informing him that they couldn't attend the meeting today and requested to postpone it until next Friday. The OG EASP Supervisor responded acknowledging the postponement but asked if Matapihi could meet earlier in the week, suggesting Tuesday or Wednesday.
August 2022	CIA	<p>A regular catch-up meeting was held between The OG EASP Supervisor and Matapihi to discuss the Waihi North Project CIA. Matapihi advised that they were still reviewing the AEE and supporting technical assessments but is on track to deliver some recommendations for John to consider. The OG EASP Supervisor inquired about the potential for a CIA for the proposed changes to the Martha Mineral Zone through the private plan change request. Matapihi mentioned that they had yet to receive further direction from John on this matter. The OG EASP Supervisor advised that, in light of recent conversations, he was conscious of taking a no-surprises approach and maintaining transparency regarding other applications and activities; and provided a brief update, via PPT, on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applications to undertake Minimum Impact Activities in Exploration Permit 51771 (Waihi North) - The seeking of Research & Collection Permits for Continued Archie's Frog Distribution Surveys - Increased WNP Groundwater Monitoring, including the installation of additional piezometers
August 2022	Meeting PPT	The OG EASP Supervisor emailed Matapihi a copy of the PPT presentation he went through with her at their recent meeting.
August 2022	CIA	A regular catch-up meeting was scheduled between The OG EASP Supervisor and Matapihi to discuss the WNP CIA. Matapihi did not attend.

Date	Subject	Summary
August 2022	MMZ CIA	The OG EASP Supervisor mailed Matapihi, noting her absence from their scheduled catch-up meeting. He attached the Martha Mineral Zone Plan Change application and inquired if Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki was still interested in completing a CIA for this proposal. He also sought clarity on the likely scope of this assessment. Additionally, the OG EASP Supervisor reminded Matapihi of the other smaller applications they had recently discussed (Minimum Impact Activities, Frog Research, and Additional Groundwater Monitoring) and asked if they had any comments on those. The OG EASP Supervisor advised that he was largely free the following week, if Matapihi wanted to meet to discuss anything.
August 2022	Follow Up	The OG EASP Supervisor sent Matapihi an email, following up on the note he sent on the 19th. Matapihi responded, apologising for missing the previous meeting and suggesting a catch-up on Tuesday next week. The OG EASP Supervisor agreed and sent a meeting invite to Tuesday.
August 2022	CIA / MMZ	Meeting scheduled between The OG EASP Supervisor and Matapihi. Matapihi did not attend.
August 2022	Additional Drill Rigs (Wharekiraupong a Exploration) / Waihi North Project	The OG EASP Supervisor phoned Matapihi to follow up on his recent emails. Matapihi mentioned that they were still awaiting direction regarding the MMZ Plan Change CIA. The OG EASP Supervisor explained that since their last catch-up, the company had decided to seek approval for an additional rig at Wharekirauponga. Also that both HDC and WRC had issued RFIs for the proposed Waihi North Project. Matapihi requested the application for the additional rig, as well as access to the RFIs. The OG EASP Supervisor followed up the phone call with an email to Matapihi, providing them with a link to the RFIs. He also informed Matapihi that the drill application was being drafted and that he would share it once complete. Matapihi responded, acknowledging receipt of the RFI link and advising that they planned to review the Research & Collection Permits for continued Archie's Frog Distribution Surveys that evening.
September 2022	Research & Collection Permits (Frog Surveys)	The OG EASP Supervisor emailed Matapihi, and asked if they had found time to review the Research & Collection Permits for Continued Archie's Frog Distribution Surveys. He mentioned that the company was still holding the draft, awaiting submission. He also advised that the application for the additional drill rig/s was still being prepared, and he would share it once complete. Matapihi responded that they would like to see provision for the funding of a full-time role for Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki to participate in the frog surveys and the collation of findings. They also mentioned that they would be discussing this with John Tamihere to identify a suitable candidate from the iwi for this role.

Date	Subject	Summary
September 2022	Additional Drill Rigs / Frog Research Permit	The OG EASP Supervisor emailed Matapihi, thanking them for their recent email, and stating that the frog research permit application would be lodged shortly. He explained that due to the sporadic nature of the frog research, which is weather-dependent and conducted at night, as well as the necessity for the research team to be suitably trained, it would be challenging to employ someone full-time for the project. He advised that once the permit is received, the work plan for the research will be finalised, at which point, he stated that there may be opportunities for additional survey members. The OG EASP Supervisor assured Matapihi that any such opportunities would be communicated to both Matapihi and John, so they could be shared with Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki more broadly. Additionally, the OG EASP Supervisor attached a draft application to DOC to vary the existing AA to allow for additional drill rigs to operate concurrently in the Wharekirauponga Forest Park, shared in confidence. The existing AA was also attached. The OG EASP Supervisor reminded Matapihi of their recent discussion about this application. Lastly, he reminded them of their planned catch up on Friday.
September 2022	CIA	The OG EASP Supervisor and Matapihi met to discuss progress on the WNP RFI responses and the Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki Cultural Impact Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matapihi inquired about the timing of OceanaGold's formal response and requested a copy. The OG EASP Supervisor confirmed the company is working through the RFIs and aims to provide formal responses to the majority by December. - Matapihi noted they were still reviewing the CIA and expected to share a draft with John Tamihere shortly. they mentioned that several points require clarification and that they will compile and send these through for the company's consideration and response. - The OG EASP Supervisor also reaffirmed OGNZL's commitment to progressing the CIA and to engaging in meaningful dialogue with Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki to address any issues collaboratively.
September 2022	Apologies for Meeting	Matapihi emailed the OG EASP Supervisor and gave their apologies for the upcoming meeting and proposed postponing it to the following Friday. She also noted that they were still awaiting payment of a recent invoice. The OG EASP Supervisor responded confirming he would send through a new meeting request for next week. He advised that, to his understanding, the invoice had been passed on to the OGNZL accounts team for processing but that he would follow up to get an ETA on payment. He also mentioned that the OG Sustainability Manager was keen to connect with John, and asked Matapihi to pass

Date	Subject	Summary
		on a message for him to give the OG Sustainability Manager a call if he had time.
October 2022	Biodiversity Project / CIA	John Tamihere sent an email to Lou Sanson (Independent Facilitator for the Development of the Biodiversity Project) and the OG Company Liaison Officer, affirming that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki has consistently asserted its position as the iwi most materially affected by OceanaGold's proposed project. He expressed concern over what he viewed as a divide-and-rule approach, that was being reflected in OceanaGold's current engagement process. John urged the company to prioritise the provision of the necessary information required to complete Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's Cultural Assessment, rather than pursuing a consultation approach that, in his view, presumes a uniformity of interests among iwi groups and contributes to division. He emphasised that Lou Sanson should be fully aware of these dynamics. Finally, he noted that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's patience was wearing thin and conveyed the iwi's confidence in its ability to assert its rights through both legal and political avenues, if required.
October 2022	CIA meeting postponement	Matapihi emailed the OG EASP Supervisor stating that, following the email for John Tamihere to Lou Sanson, they felt it better to postpone the hui planned for the 4th of October.
October 2022	CIA meeting postponement	The OG EASP Supervisor emailed Matapihi, explaining that his preference was still to meet as planned. The OG EASP Supervisor requested that Matapihi provide more detail on the information they were waiting for to complete the Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki CIA. He noted that last time they spoke, he explained that they were still working through the RFIs from Council, and this remains the case. He suggested it would be helpful if Matapihi could write up what further information they require, so he could get this pulled together and sent to her urgently. Finally, he explained that OceanaGold's standard payment terms are payment on the 20th of the month following the month an invoice is submitted (as stipulated in her Short Form Consulting Agreement), so they could expect payment of the invoice they'd recently followed up with him then.
October 2022	CIA / MoU	John Tamihere emailed the OG EASP Supervisor as a follow-up to a recent phone conversation between himself and the OG Sustainability Manager (not the OG EASP Supervisor, as incorrectly referenced in the email). In his message, John expressed concern over what he described as a lack of good faith and transparency from OceanaGold. He stated that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki had been unable to complete their Cultural Impact Assessment due to outstanding information requirements, detailed in a schedule

Date	Subject	Summary
		<p>attached to the email. Specifically, he noted OceanaGold's failure to disclose the potential economic benefits of the project, as well as predicted social impacts, effects on water tables, springs and streams, and the absence of detail regarding "post-consent actions". John noted his perception of silence on biodiversity matters from OceanaGold, calling it unacceptable. He emphasised that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki had particular concerns stemming from the scale and proximity of their interests to the project, along with their distinct cultural and Treaty of Waitangi rights. He also referenced the Biodiversity Project which OceanaGold had engaged Lou Sanson to facilitate its development and co-design with iwi, describing it as an effort to mask iwi-specific rights within a collective framework. Lastly he stated, that given that these concerns had been raised previously without resolution, Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki had no choice but to formally terminate their Memorandum of Understanding with OceanaGold.</p>
October 2022	CIA / Mou	<p>The OG EASP Supervisor emailed John Tamihere (Matapihi cc'd) to acknowledge receipt of the table outlining the information Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki considers outstanding and necessary to complete their CIA. He also acknowledged Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's decision to no longer proceed under the MoU. And despite this OceanaGold remained commitment to understanding and addressing Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's cultural values and concerns in relation to the Waihi North Project. He confirmed that all completed technical assessments had been shared with Matapihi and that regular meetings continued to be offered to provide clarification. The OG EASP Supervisor noted that OceanaGold had not attempted to characterise Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's cultural values or assess potential impacts on these, as the purpose and scope of the CIA was to inform this understanding. In response to the information requested, he attached a document identifying where relevant information could be found within the existing technical reports. However, he explained that in some cases, further specificity from Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki was required before OceanaGold could provide a complete response. He also advised that some of the requested information aligns with council/s RFIs, and that responses to these are in progress with expert input, aiming for completion in December 2022. Regarding the Biodiversity Net Gain Project, the OG EASP Supervisor reiterated that it is a separate, voluntary initiative beyond what is required for project effects mitigation. He stressed that OceanaGold hopes to have the project co-designed with iwi, and that it is not intended to replace or conflict with the CIA process or engagement on Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki's specific</p>

Date	Subject	Summary
		concerns. The OG EASP Supervisor concluded by restating OceanaGold's willingness to facilitate a site visit with Matapihi, which had previously been proposed but had not yet occurred.
October 2022	CIA Meeting	Meeting scheduled between the OG EASP Supervisor and Matapihi. Matapihi did not attend.
October 2022	CIA Meeting	Meeting scheduled between the OG EASP Supervisor and Matapihi. Matapihi did not attend.
November 2022	Invoice	Matapihi emailed the OG EASP Supervisor, stating that their recent invoice remained unpaid and that they were awaiting further direction from John Tamihere as a result. The OG EASP Supervisor replied, noting that he had been assured the issue was resolved, but it was clear that wasn't the case. He informed her that he had arranged for accounts to process a special payment run that day and asked her to contact him if they hadn't received the payment by the following afternoon.
November 2022	WNP RFI / MMZ Plan Change Update	<p>The OG EASP Supervisor sent an email to Matapihi following up on his earlier message to John Tamihere on 13 October, which included a table outlining where the information that had been requested could be found. In his email, he provided a general update as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That work on the proposed Waihi North Project was continuing, with efforts currently focused on formulating responses to the RFIs received from both HDC and WRC. He noted that OceanaGold hoped to have these responses ready before the end of the year and will share them with Matapihi for review at the same time they were shared with Council/s. - That the application to change the Martha Mineral Zone as it was defined in the District Plan was also continuing to progress through Council processes. He noted that in their last conversation, Matapihi had indicated they were awaiting further direction from John Tamihere regarding how Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki wished to proceed with the development of a CIA for the Plan Change. He explained it would be helpful to receive an update on where those discussions currently stand. He also advised that there will likely be

Date	Subject	Summary
		an opportunity for Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki to make a submission once the application is publicly notified.
December 2022	MOU	John Tamihere sent an email to the OG EASP Supervisor formally advising that Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki had resolved to terminate their Memorandum of Understanding with OceanaGold. He explained that the decision was made at a recent hui, which accounted for the delay in providing formal notification. He stated that, due to a lack of direct engagement, moving forward Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki would instead seek to protect their interests through the legal and political avenues available to them and that this position would be communicated to the offices of the relevant Ministers and other stakeholders prior to Christmas. John also emphasised that no other iwi speaks on behalf of Ngāti Porou ki Hauraki and his view that they are the only iwi who will be constantly and materially affected by OceanaGold's operations.