

Acceptance of Reindeer Wellhead Platform and Gas Supply Pipeline Operations and Cessation of Production Environment Plan

Document No: N-04750-FM2019 A1232310

Date: 04/07/2025

1. On 8 May 2025, I, [REDACTED], Director Decommissioning – Environment, delegate of the Chief Executive Officer of NOPSEMA decided, pursuant to s 33 of the *Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2023 (Environment Regulations)*, to accept the Reindeer Wellhead Platform and Gas Supply Pipeline Operations and Cessation of Production Environment Plan (Document No: 7715-650-EMP-0023, Revision 9) dated 24 April 2025 (EP), as I was reasonably satisfied that the EP met the criteria in s 34 of the Environment Regulations.
2. The EP was submitted by Santos WA Northwest Pty Ltd (Operator) and Santos Offshore Pty Ltd (ACN 009 140 854 and 005 475 589, respectively) (**titleholder**), to enable the titleholder to undertake the petroleum activity described in the EP, which involves activities associated with the Operations phase (infrastructure presence, operation of wellhead platform, wells and Devils Creek (DC) supply line, associated vessel-based activities), Cessation of Production phase (cleaning, flushing and preservation) and Inspection, Maintenance, Monitoring and Repair (**IMMR**) activities.
3. For the purposes of assessing the EP, I was assisted by an assessment team comprised of a lead assessor and four environmental specialists.
4. The reasons for my decision are set out below.
5. All references to a regulation (reg) are to the Environment Regulations unless otherwise stated.

Background

6. On 13 September 2024, the titleholder submitted the EP to NOPSEMA in accordance with the Environment Regulations.
7. On 20 September 2024, NOPSEMA published the EP on NOPSEMA's website in accordance with reg 28(1).
8. Between the 21 October 2024 and 27 February 2025, NOPSEMA made two requests for further information, pursuant to reg 32. The requests identified that further information on a number of the criteria in reg 34 was required. In response to these requests, the titleholder re-submitted the environment plan incorporating additional information in answer to these requests.
9. In addition to the requests detailed in [8] above, on 19 December 2024, NOPSEMA offered an opportunity to modify and resubmit the EP to the titleholder. The opportunity identified that the acceptance criteria had not been met. In response to this opportunity, the titleholder resubmitted the EP incorporating modifications pursuant to reg 33.
10. The EP that is the subject of this decision was received on 24 April 2025 (Document No. 7715-650-EMP-0023, Revision 9, dated 24 April 2025)
11. On 8 May 2025, I decided to accept the EP. I was reasonably satisfied that the EP met the criteria in reg 34. I explain my reasons in further detail below.

Materials

12. The materials considered in making this decision are set out in **Appendix A** and are referenced, where relevant, in the reasons below.

Decision overview

13. The issue before me was whether the EP should be accepted pursuant to reg 33. This required that I be reasonably satisfied that the EP meets the 'criteria for acceptance' in reg 34.
14. In accordance with regs 16 and 34, I must not accept an EP unless I am reasonably satisfied that the titleholder is compliant with subsection 571(2) of the *Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Act 2006 (OPGGGS Act)* in relation to the petroleum activity, and the compliance is in a form that is acceptable to me. On review of the titleholder's financial assurance declaration and confirmation forms, I was reasonably satisfied that the titleholder was compliant with s 571(2), and the financial assurance declaration and confirmation forms were acceptable. I therefore considered that the requirement in reg 16 was met.
15. I then considered the criteria in reg 34 and was reasonably satisfied that the EP met those criteria. I therefore accepted the EP. My reasons for this part of my decision are set out at [16] – [79] below.

Should the environment plan be accepted?

16. Under reg 33 of the Environment Regulations, in order to accept the EP, I had to be reasonably satisfied that the criteria in reg 34 were met. It was also open under reg 33 to accept the EP in part or with conditions, or to refuse the EP.
17. Regulation 32(4) requires that, when making my decision as to whether the EP should be accepted, I was required to consider the further information that the titleholders provided pursuant to the requests made by NOPSEMA. The information the titleholders provided in response to those requests was contained in the resubmitted versions of the EP (as set out at [8] – [10]) which resulted in the final version of the EP (Revision 9).
18. Against this background (and having considered the materials in Appendix C and D of the EP), I made the following findings against each criterion for acceptance of the EP in reg 34.

The EP is appropriate to the nature and scale of the activity: regulation 34(a)

19. I noted that Section 1.3 of the EP included a description of the scope and bounds of the activity. In particular, Section 2 of the EP provided details of the proposed location, spatial extent, timeframe, and duration of the proposed activities. These involve ongoing operations of the Reindeer wellhead platform (**WHP**) and Devil Creek pipeline, cessation of production (**CoP**) (preservation phase), and IMMR activities. The locations of relevant infrastructure and licence areas are presented in Table 2-1 and Figure 2-1 of the EP. The EP also described planned abandonment and decommissioning timelines for wells and subsea infrastructure in the Barrow Sub-basin (Section 2.13 of the EP) and assessment of potential re-use options (Section 2.12 of the EP). Section 2.12.3 of the EP identifies that decommissioning planning is being progressed in parallel with the assessment of re-use options, as a separate project. Information on project schedules, demonstrating that planning for decommissioning will be undertaken in parallel with the assessment of potential re-use options has been provided in Table 2-7, Table 2-8 and Figure 2-6 of the EP. Decommissioning is not part of the scope of this EP, but will be covered under a subsequent decommissioning EP (e.g. Table 2-8, Section 2.13.1 and Section 2.13.6 of the EP).

20. Section 2 of the EP contained a thorough description of the activity components with the greatest potential to generate impacts and risks to the environment throughout the activity duration, and, appropriately, provides more detail on activity components with the greatest potential to generate impacts and risks to the environment.
21. I considered that Section 3, Appendix C and Appendix D of the EP contained a thorough description of the physical, biological and socio-economic environment, and provided details of relevant values and sensitivities that may be affected by the petroleum activity (including matters protected under Part 3 of the EPBC Act and social, economic and cultural features). I noted the description of the environment that may be affected by the activity (**EMBA**) includes areas that may be affected by potential emergency conditions in the event of an oil pollution incident which is appropriately conservatively defined through stochastic modelling of the worst-case spill scenarios. The EP delineated the following three EMBA's:
 - (a) The socio-economic EMBA, identifying the spatial extent at which impacts to socio-economic receptors may occur (Section 3.1.1 of the EP);
 - (b) The ecological EMBA identifying the spatial extent at which impacts to marine environmental (physical and biological) receptors may occur (Section 3.1.1 of the EP); and
 - (c) The planning area for scientific monitoring identifying the area within which scientific monitoring may be undertaken in the event of a spill (Section 3.1.2 of the EP).
22. I considered the level of detail included in the EP to be appropriately scaled to the nature of the impacts and risks. A greater level of detail is included in the EP on the EMBA by planned operations (Operational Area), compared with the broader environment that may be exposed to low levels of hydrocarbon (in the unlikely event of a worst-case hydrocarbon release). Specifically, the EP includes:
 - (a) A logical process that is applied to identify and describe the matters protected under Part 3 of the EPBC Act that may be present within the Operational Area and EMBA. The EP utilises relevant information to adequately inform and support the descriptions, such as information available on the Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment and Water (**DCCEEW**) website such as plans of management, threat abatement plans, threatened species recovery plans and marine bioregional plans (Section 3, Appendix B, Appendix C and Appendix D of the EP);
 - (b) A description of the key physical, biological, social, economic, and cultural features, values and sensitivities of the environment of the Commonwealth marine area. In particular, the EP appropriately identifies and describes the key physical, biological, social, economic, and cultural features, values and sensitivities of the environment that overlap with the EMBA. I considered that the EP utilises relevant references and information sources to adequately inform and support the descriptions, such as contemporary peer-reviewed scientific literature and other authoritative sources (Section 3, Appendix C and Appendix D of the EP); and
 - (c) A description of First Nations cultural features and heritage values of the EMBA (Section 3.2.8 and Appendix 3 of the EP). In particular, the EP describes:
 - (i) that operations and associated activities occur in both Commonwealth and State waters, hence the EMBA incorporates coastal and island shorelines and a seabed environment that is, and was previously, occupied by First Nations people;
 - (ii) consideration of both tangible and intangible aspects relating to First Nations cultural features was given and was supported by relevant and suitable information. For example,

the EP (Section 3.2.8.7 of the EP) includes details of cultural features of the environment relating to First Nations People's Heritage sites and values and potential for overlap with the Operational Area and/or monitoring EMBA;

- (iii) information on the cultural features of marine ecosystems including the broader concept of "sea country," and information on Indigenous archaeology in the offshore marine environment as relevant to the EMBA;
- (iv) consultation with relevant persons has built on the knowledge of cultural features of the environment available through published research in the area (Section 5.2.8 of the EP); and
- (v) I also noted that a sufficiently robust method, consistent with internationally recognised standard ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management - Guidelines, was applied in the EP for the identification and evaluation of the environmental impacts and risks of the petroleum activity (Section 5 of the EP). I considered that the detail and rigour applied to the impact and risk assessments (Sections 6 and 7 of the EP) is commensurate to the nature and scale of the environmental impacts and risks generated by the petroleum activity. Further, I was satisfied that information provided during relevant persons consultation with regard to impacts and risks to the environment had been appropriately considered, evaluated, and incorporated into the EP where it was relevant.

23. I considered that there was a clear demonstration in the EP that the evaluation of impacts and risks informed the selection of suitable control measures appropriate for the nature and scale of the activity to either reduce the consequence/severity or likelihood of environmental impacts and risks.
24. Based on the matters set out above, I was reasonably satisfied that the EP was appropriate for the nature and scale of the activity, meeting the requirements of reg 34(a).

The EP demonstrates that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be reduced to as low as reasonably practicable: regulation 34(b)

25. In determining whether the EP demonstrated that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be reduced to as low as reasonably practicable (**ALARP**), I considered the following:
 - (a) Section 5 of the EP describes the process applied to evaluate whether impacts and risks are reduced to ALARP. A clear, systematic, and reproducible process for the evaluation of all impacts and risks is outlined, which details the control measures to be implemented. The process included an evaluation of additional potential control measures and justifies why control measures are either adopted or rejected to demonstrate that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be reduced to ALARP. I was reasonably satisfied that the evaluation of the adoption of control measures is based on consideration of realistic and feasible controls that can reduce the environmental impact and risk;
 - (b) The titleholder applied the environmental risk assessment process (described in Section 5 of the EP) appropriately to reduce to ALARP the planned and unplanned aspects of the activity, in particular for higher order impacts and risks, and evaluated noise emissions (Section 6.1 of the EP), light emissions (Section 6.2 of the EP), atmospheric emissions (Section 6.3 of the EP), seabed and benthic habitat disturbance (Section 6.4 of the EP), physical presence (Section 6.5 of the EP), planned operational discharges (Section 6.6 of the EP), planned chemical and hydrocarbon discharges (Section 6.7 of the EP), treated seawater discharge (Section 6.8 of the EP), spill response operations (Section 6.9 of the EP), introduction of invasive marine species (Section 7.1 of the EP), marine fauna interaction (Section 7.2 of the EP), release of solid objects (Section 7.3

of the EP) and unplanned releases of hazardous liquids, hydrocarbons, treated seawater and nitrogen (Sections 7.4 to 7.10 of the EP). I accepted that the exploration of alternative, additional or improved control measures had been evidenced, and that the control measures adopted demonstrate that environmental impacts and risks from the activity will be reduced to ALARP;

- (c) The evaluation of impacts and risks has informed the selection of suitable control measures to either reduce the consequence or likelihood of impacts and risks. The control measures described through Sections 6 and 7 of the EP (and summarised in Section 8.4 of the EP) are sufficiently detailed to demonstrate they will be effective in reducing to ALARP the impacts and risks for the duration of the activity. The level of detail in the evaluation is matched to the nature and scale of the potential impacts and risks. The EP provided a reasonable demonstration, which I agreed with, that there are no other practical control measures that could reasonably be taken to reduce impacts and risks any further;
- (d) The evaluation of the potential impacts from the activity to listed threatened and migratory species (including marine mammals, bird, fish and reptile species) (Matters of National Environmental Significance (**MNES**)) were considered to be reduced to as low as reasonably practicable; and
- (e) The EP adequately identified and evaluated the potential impacts and risks from the activity to cetaceans and other marine fauna, by being informed by the likelihood of species presence, distribution and behaviour within the EMBA. In particular:
 - (i) the evaluation of impacts and risks to threatened and migratory cetaceans and other marine fauna were supported by peer-reviewed literature and informed by applying suitable control measures, including those set out within the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulations 2000 (EPBC Regulations)* – ‘Part 8 Division 8.1 Interacting with cetaceans’, and implementation of further adaptive management controls;
 - (ii) the EP considered, evaluated, and detailed all reasonable control measures that could reduce impacts to threatened and migratory species, to ALARP (Section 7.2 of the EP); and
 - (iii) the EP provided reasons that were supported by evidence for why the adopted controls to manage underwater sound impacts, light emissions and marine fauna interactions, reduce the potential impacts to the point that any additional or alternative control measures are either not feasible, or their cost would be disproportionate to the benefit that would be achieved. Control measures (**CM**) adopted to reduce impacts and risks to ALARP include:
 - premobilisation review and planning of lighting on support vessels and the well head platform (**WHP**) is undertaken prior to IMMR activities (RE-CM-06);
 - ensuring all vessel operators comply with ‘EPBC Regulations 2000 – Part 8 Division 8.1 interacting with cetaceans’ in relation to distances to marine fauna (RE-CM-01);
 - maintaining critical equipment on vessels to ensure efficient operation (RE-CM-02);
 - implementing ‘Bird management plan for the offshore Reindeer Platform’ (EA-00-RI-10191) (RE-CM-03); and
 - implementation of the management controls in the Santos Invasive Marine Species Management Plan (IMSMP) (RE-CM-38).

26. Based on the above, I was reasonably satisfied that the EP demonstrated that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be reduced to ALARP and met the requirements of reg 34(b).

The EP demonstrates that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be of an acceptable level: regulation 34(c)

27. In determining that the EP demonstrated that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be of an acceptable level, I found that:
- (a) Section 5 of the EP describes a clear, systematic, and reproducible process for demonstrating how environmental impacts and risks will be of an acceptable level. Statements and conclusions made by the titleholder in the EP have been sufficiently supported with scientific literature where relevant. The process is commensurate with the nature and scale of the activity, with more effort and rigour applied to evaluations where identified impacts and risks were potentially likely to be more severe and/or where there is a higher degree of scientific uncertainty;
 - (b) The process undertaken by the titleholder to determine acceptable levels of impact and risk for the petroleum activity involved consideration of the 'Santos Environment, Health & Safety Policy and SMS requirements', legislative requirements, the principles of ecologically sustainable development (**ESD**) as defined under the EPBC Act, and relevant external context and information (such as feedback received by the titleholder during relevant persons consultation);
 - (c) I considered that the EP adequately demonstrates that the petroleum activity is not likely to have a significant impact on MNES protected under the EPBC Act, including World Heritage properties, National Heritage properties, Ramsar wetlands, listed threatened species and communities, listed migratory species and commonwealth marine areas;
 - (d) The EP has had regard to relevant policy documents, guidance, bioregional plans, wildlife conservation plans, management plans, instruments under the EPBC Act, conservation advice, marine bioregional plans, and other information on the DCCEE website. Assessment of the activity against relevant objectives of these documents is provided throughout Sections 6 and 7 of the EP;
 - (e) The EP demonstrates that the activity is not inconsistent with a recovery plan or a threat abatement plan for a listed threatened species or ecological community, a management plan or IUCN Reserve Management Principles in operation for an Australian Marine Park or a management plan for a Commonwealth Heritage Place. For example, the titleholder has demonstrated that marine fauna interactions from the petroleum activity will be managed in a manner that is not inconsistent with the Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia: 2017-2027 (Commonwealth of Australia, 2017); and
 - (f) The titleholder has identified and addressed areas of uncertainty in the impact and risk evaluations (Sections 6 of the EP). Predictions of environmental impact and risk are adequately conservative and supported by modelling and/or appropriate published information where applicable (e.g. underwater noise modelling (Section 6.1 of the EP), treated water discharge (Sections 6.8 and 7.9 of the EP), oil spill modelling (Sections 7.5, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the EP) and an unplanned release of nitrogen (Section 7.10 of the EP).
28. Predictions have been made regarding impacts and risks to the environment that are considered suitably conservative and result in the inclusion of appropriate controls given the nature of the planned aspects of the activity. For example, the environmental impact and risk assessments undertaken in Section 6 of the EP includes consideration of aspects common to the nature and scale of operations activities, such as physical presence, planned emissions (light, noise, atmospheric), and vessel and activity discharges.

29. The EP gives appropriate consideration to potential risks from unplanned aspects of the activity, such as unplanned interactions with marine fauna, introduction of invasive marine species (IMS), unplanned discharge of waste (hazardous and non-hazardous), accidental releases of hydrocarbons from vessel collisions, pipeline rupture and well loss of containment. Uncertainty has been addressed in the evaluation of oil pollution scenarios through the application of appropriately conservative stochastic modelling and appropriate justification of assumptions made. The evaluation of risks posed by such spill scenarios (e.g. subsea well and pipeline loss of containment and surface vessel loss of containment, evaluated in Sections 7.5 to 7.9 of the EP) includes consideration of potential impacts to the receptors outlined in the description of the environment (Section 4 and Appendix C of the EP) and informs the selection of appropriate spill response options.
30. In relation to impacts and risks to MNES, I considered that the EP demonstrates that the potential impacts (such as injury or significant behavioural disturbance) to threatened and migratory whales and turtles will be of an acceptable level because:
 - (a) Whilst the Operational Area overlaps a number of BIAs for threatened, protected or migratory marine fauna (Section 3.2.6 of the EP), the ongoing operational nature of the activity and short duration IMMR activities during operational and preservation stages, along with implementation of suitable controls to reduce potential impacts described in the EP demonstrated that the activity would not be inconsistent with the Wildlife Conservation Plan for Seabirds (Commonwealth of Australia 2020), Conservation Management Plan for the Blue Whale 2015–2025 (Commonwealth of Australia 2025), the Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia 2017–2027 (Commonwealth of Australia 2017) and the Approved Conservation Advice for *Rhincodon typus* (whale shark) (TSSC, 2015a);
 - (b) The EP uses relevant published and peer-reviewed sound transmission loss measurements and modelling undertaken by relevant experts to predict impacts and risks from underwater sound emissions to marine fauna, and in particular to blue whales, southern right whales, fin whales and marine turtles (Section 6.1.2 of the EP). This has been used to determine the potential spatial extents of different levels of impact and risk to marine fauna;
 - (c) The evaluation of the predicted level of impact derived from noise modelling was compared with other relevant literature to demonstrate that the environmental impacts of the activity will be managed to an acceptable level; and
 - (d) The EP describes a range of control measures to reduce underwater sound impacts to marine fauna to an acceptable level, including:
 - (i) procedure for interacting with marine fauna (RE-CM-01) ensuring all vessel operators comply with 'EPBC Regulations 2000 – Part 8 Division 8.1 interacting with cetaceans' in relation to distances to marine fauna;
 - (ii) vessel planned maintenance system (**PMS**) to maintain vessel dynamic positioning (**DP**), engines and machinery (RE-CM-02);
 - (iii) bird Management Plan for Reindeer Offshore Platform (EA-00-RI-10191) implemented (RE-CM-03); and
 - (iv) prestart Requirements (for survey equipment) (RE-CM-04).
31. With the implementation of the proposed management measures, I found the EP demonstrated that the petroleum activity will not result in unacceptable impacts to threatened, protected or migratory marine fauna and therefore will be managed to an acceptable level.

32. I also found the EP provided an appropriate evaluation of impacts and risks specific for the nature and location of the activity and relevant environmental receptors. I considered that the evaluation is commensurate to the level of impact or risk presented and provides justifiable conclusions that impacts and risks will be managed to an acceptable level (Sections 6 and 7). The impact and risk evaluations demonstrate that acceptable levels will be met, and that the Environmental Performance Outcomes (EPO) can be achieved.
33. I considered that information provided during relevant persons consultation had been appropriately considered, evaluated, and incorporated into the EP where it was relevant. The titleholder has taken into account information gathered from the consultation process when demonstrating impacts and risks will be managed to an acceptable level.
34. Based on the above, I was reasonably satisfied that the EP demonstrated that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be of an acceptable level and meet the requirements of reg 34(c).

The EP provides for appropriate environmental performance outcomes, environmental performance standards, and measurement criteria: regulation 34(d)

35. Section 8.4 of the EP contains EPOs, environmental performance standards (EPS) and measurement criteria (MC) for impacts and risks of the petroleum activity (and I refer to [27] – [34] above for more detail on these).
36. The EP provides appropriate relevant EPOs, which I considered:
- (a) Unambiguous and addressed all the identified environmental impacts and risks for the activity;
 - (b) When read in conjunction with associated EPSs, establish measurable levels for management of environmental aspects of the activity;
 - (c) When read in conjunction with the relevant environmental impact/risk evaluation and adopted management measures, demonstrate that the environmental impacts and risks will be managed appropriately; and
 - (d) Are consistent with the principles of ESD and relevant requirements (such as plans of management, recovery plans, conservation advice and other guidance for matters protected under the EPBC Act), considering items (a) and (c) above).
37. I also noted that the EP provides appropriate EPSs that:
- (a) Contain clear and unambiguous statements of environmental performance. The statements of environmental performance describe how each of the adopted control measures will function and perform to effectively reduce environmental impacts and risks to an acceptable level; and
 - (b) Have clear MC that link to the EPSs and will provide a record that the EPSs have been met. The MC are suitable for verifying that the defined levels of environmental performance are being met, and for the purpose of monitoring compliance.
38. I considered that the EPOs, EPSs and MC are clearly linked and complementary of one another, as presented in Table 8-2 of the EP 'Control measures, environmental performance standards and measurement criteria for the proposed activity (environment plan)' (Section 8 of the EP).
39. Based on the above, I was reasonably satisfied that the EP provided for appropriate EPOs, EPSs and MC and met the requirements of reg 34(d).

The EP includes an appropriate implementation strategy and monitoring, recording and reporting arrangements: regulation 34(e)

40. Regulation 34(e) requires that I be satisfied that the EP includes an appropriate implementation strategy and appropriate monitoring, recording and reporting arrangements.
41. The implementation strategy contains a description of the environmental management system (EMS) for the activity. I noted that the implementation strategy outlined in Section 8 of the EP provides a range of systems, practices and processes (outlined in further detail below) which provide for all impacts and risks to continue to be managed to ALARP and acceptable levels for the duration of the activity, and therefore that this was appropriate.
42. I found that the management of change (**MOC**) process was adequately described in Section 8.11.2 of the EP and appropriate for the defined activity because the process describes that:
 - (a) An impact/risk assessment will be undertaken to ensure that impacts and risks from the change can be managed to be ALARP and of an acceptable level;
 - (b) Risk assessment outcomes will be reviewed as to whether a revision is required under reg 39(2); and
 - (c) Changes that do not trigger a requirement for a formal revision under reg 39(2) will be considered an 'internal update.'
43. I found that the implementation strategy to be appropriate as it includes measures to ensure that each employee or contractor working on, or in connection with, the activity is aware of their responsibilities in relation to the EP, including during emergencies or potential emergencies, and has the appropriate competencies and training. The key roles and responsibilities of personnel involved in the implementation, management and review of the EP are outlined in Section 8.5 and the roles and responsibilities for personnel involved in oil spill preparation and response are outlined in Section 5.2 of the Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (**OPEP**).
44. The OPEP is appropriate as it includes arrangements that are suitable, given the spill scenarios presented. Specifically, the OPEP:
 - (a) Details the oil pollution response control measures that will be used to reduce the impacts and risks of the activity to ALARP and an acceptable level, the arrangements for responding to and monitoring oil pollution to inform response activities, that response arrangements are consistent with the national system for oil pollution preparedness and response, the arrangements for updating and testing the oil pollution response arrangements and control measures, and provides for the monitoring of impacts to the environment from oil pollution and response activities; and
 - (b) Contains immediate (first strike plan) response measures that provides the oil pollution arrangements and control measures in an operational deployment context.
45. I found that appropriate implementation strategy monitoring, recording and reporting arrangements were described in Section 8.10 of the EP, which included routine internal and external reporting requirements and incident reporting arrangements. I found these Sections detailed that the information collected will:
 - (a) Be based on the control measures, EPOs and EPSs set out in the EP; and
 - (b) Include environmental emission and discharge reports that record volumes of planned and unplanned discharges to marine environment and atmosphere (Section 8.10.2 of the EP).

46. The EP implementation strategy also provides for auditing, review and management of non-conformances of the titleholder's environmental performance and the implementation strategy in Section 8.12 of the EP. In response to audit and inspection non-compliances, corrective actions will be implemented and tracked to completion as per the 'Assurance Procedure (SMS-LRG-0S03-PD-01)' and 'HSE toolbox' (Section 8.12 of the EP). I considered such processes appropriate as they would ensure prompt action and appropriate corrective measures were taken.
47. The EP appropriately provides for the implementation of ongoing consultation arrangements in Section 8.13 of the EP. I considered the ongoing consultation arrangements described in the EP, as required by reg 22(15), are appropriate. In particular, I noted that the titleholder has committed to:
 - (a) Provide agreed milestone activity notifications where requested;
 - (b) Provide for ongoing consultations with newly identified relevant persons;
 - (c) Provide for ongoing consultation with existing relevant persons, which includes relevant authorities of the Commonwealth and State;
 - (d) Consult in the event of an emergency; and
 - (e) Undertake routine external reporting requirements.
48. Based on the above, I was reasonably satisfied that the EP includes an appropriate implementation strategy and monitoring, recording and reporting arrangements and meets the requirements of reg 34(e).

The EP does not involve the activity, or part of the activity, other than arrangement for environmental monitoring or for responding to an emergency, being undertaken in any part of a declared World Heritage Property within the meaning of the EPBC Act: regulation 34(f)

49. I was satisfied that the EP clearly describes the boundaries of the petroleum activity (Section 2 of the EP) and demonstrates that no part of the activity will be undertaken in any part of a World Heritage Property within the meaning of the EPBC Act (Section 3.2.5.3 and Appendix D of the EP).
50. Based on the above, I was reasonably satisfied that the EP does not involve the activity, or part of the activity, other than arrangements for environmental monitoring or for responding to an emergency, being undertaken in any part or a declared World Heritage property and meets the requirements of reg 34(f).

The EP demonstrates that the titleholder has carried out the consultations required by Division 3, and the measures (if any) that are adopted because of the consultations are appropriate: regulation 34(g)

51. Regulation 34(g) has two components which an environment plan must demonstrate:
 - (a) First, that consultation has occurred in accordance with Division 3. Division 3 requires that the titleholder consult with each 'relevant person' as defined in reg 25(1), and imposes certain requirements for how that consultation is to occur (as specified in reg 25(2)-(4)); and
 - (b) Second, that the measures (if any) that the titleholder has adopted, or proposes to adopt, because of the consultations are appropriate.
52. In determining whether the consultation requirements set by reg 34(g) had been met, I had regard to the titleholder's consultation methodology in Section 4, Appendix F and the Sensitive Information Report part of the EP.

53. I found that Section 4 of the EP provided descriptions of the consultation process, and the rationale used to determine who was a relevant person and how to consult with relevant persons. These descriptions included the approach to providing a reasonable period of time to engage in the consultation process.
54. I found that the EP described a clear process for the identification and broad capture of relevant persons in accordance with reg 25(1). This is because:
- (a) The process provided for the identification of relevant persons within all the categories of relevant persons defined by reg 25 (1)(a)–(e). The relevant person identification methodology for a suitable range of categories was presented in Table 4-3 and Table 4-5 of the EP;
 - (b) The process (outlined in Section 4.5 of the EP) included reference to multiple sources of information, such as publicly available materials (e.g., in publicly available EPs submitted by other Titleholders that may be relevant to proposed activities to be managed under this EP, government agency websites and directories to understand agency roles, functions and responsibilities, management plans for marine parks, websites of conservation organisations), review of databases and registers (e.g., commercial fishing catch and effort data, public cultural heritage databases), and published guidance (e.g., NOPSEMA and government agency guidance on consultation expectations, Australian Fisheries Management Authority (**AFMA**) consultation guidance);
 - (c) The process included consideration of published guidance developed by relevant persons detailing their functions, interests, or activities as set out in reg 25(1)(d) and how and when they wish to be consulted on activities. For example, the titleholder referred to guidance published by Western Australian Fishing Industry Council (WAFIC) in relation to consultation with commercial fishing licence holders in WA-managed fisheries;
 - (d) The process provided for the terms, “functions,” “interests,” and “activities” for the purpose of identifying relevant persons under reg 25 to be interpreted and applied broadly by the titleholder in a manner consistent with the interpretation of those terms in NOPSEMA’s ‘Consultation in the course of preparing an environment plan guideline’ (N-04750-GL2086). A description of the functions, interests, or activities of those persons or organisations identified as relevant persons under reg 25 was included in Table 4-6 of the EP;
 - (e) The process (in Section 4.5.9, and Tables 4-7 and 4-8 of the EP) included details and evidence of the steps taken by the titleholder to create awareness of the activity and the consultation process and to encourage potentially relevant persons that the titleholder may not be aware of to make themselves known to the titleholder. The steps taken by the titleholder included advertising in state and relevant local newspapers and on state and local radio stations, and geotargeted social media campaigns;
 - (f) The process described how the titleholder made an assessment to determine whether an individual or organisation was or was not a relevant person for the purposes of reg 25(1)(d), having regard to each person’s stated functions, interests, and activities (Section 4.5.2 of the EP);
 - (g) The EP clearly identified who was a relevant person, and the category set out in reg 25 that the person fell within; and
 - (h) The process included additional details on how the titleholder’s process identified First Nations relevant persons, through engagement with First Nations representative organisations (Section 4.5.4 of the EP).

55. I considered that the nature of the activity, the environment, and the possible impacts and risks of the activity were appropriately taken into account by the titleholder in determining whether the activity may be relevant to authorities and Departments under regulation 25(a), (b) and (c), or determining whose functions, interests, and activities may be affected under regulation 25(d). This is because the titleholder considered:
- (a) The nature and scale of the activity and the possible impacts and risks of the activity when determining who to consult with; and
 - (b) All the known environmental values and sensitivities in the EMBA by the planned and unplanned impacts and risks of the activity when determining relevant persons (Table 4-4, Section 4.5 of the EP).
56. I considered the content of Section 4 and Appendix F and the Sensitive Information Report part of the EP and found that the titleholder's approach to the provision of sufficient information allowed the relevant persons to assess the possible consequences of the activity on their functions, interests, or activities. I formed this view because:
- (a) The titleholder sufficiently informed relevant persons of the purpose of consultation, including advising relevant persons of the titleholder's obligations for consultation. This included sharing the reasons for the consultation and providing a link to NOPSEMA's 'Consultation on offshore petroleum environment plans' Brochure as part of the consultation;
 - (b) the titleholder provided relevant persons with sufficient information relating to the possible consequences of the activity on their functions, interests, or activities and considered views of relevant persons as to what constitutes sufficient information and provided further information where required including detailed information sheets; and
 - (c) The titleholder informed relevant persons that they may request that particular information provided during consultation not be published. Information subject to such a request was not published, in accordance with reg 25(4). The titleholder consistently provided these notifications through the information sheets, in specific written correspondence, and at meetings.
57. The titleholder addressed all responses from relevant persons at the date of EP submission to NOPSEMA. The manner in which the titleholder addressed responses was summarised in the EP for all relevant persons (Table 4-9). For the most part, this involved the titleholder preparing and sending written correspondences (letters or email) to the relevant persons addressing their response(s). In some cases, records were provided indicating that a phone call had been returned or a meeting organised and held. Records of any written responses were also included in the Sensitive Information Report.
58. Given the period of time afforded by the titleholder for consultation and the evidence of engagements with relevant persons, including multiple opportunities for the relevant persons to provide information to the titleholder, I accepted that a reasonable period for the consultation was given.
59. I found that information gathered through the consultation process was appropriately incorporated into the EP and effectively informed the identification of environmental values and sensitivities to ensure impacts and risks are reduced to ALARP and acceptable levels. This is because the information provided by relevant persons throughout the consultation process assisted the titleholder to ascertain, understand, and address all of the environmental impacts and risks that might arise from its proposed activity. For example, Santos considered the concerns raised by WAFIC with respect to potential cumulative impacts of treated water on water quality (see [77]) in:
- (a) Section 6.8 of the EP (treated seawater discharge);

- (b) listed control measures (e.g. RE-CM-32, RE-CM-34, RE-CM-36 and RE-CM-55);
 - (c) Section 2.9.3.1 of the EP (environmental monitoring activities); and
 - (d) Section 2.9.6 of the EP (marine growth removal).
60. I considered that the titleholder's assessment of the merit of, and all responses to, objections and claims were reasonable and supported, and the measures adopted because of the consultation were appropriate. This is because:
- (a) The titleholder's assessment and its responses made cross-references to records where applicable. Where claims or objections regarding the adverse impact of the activity were raised, relevant to the activity to which the EP relates, the titleholder considered the claims against the content of the EP to ensure relevant management measures were included. The consultation progressed to resolve objections and claims made by relevant persons as far as reasonably practicable;
 - (b) In some cases, the titleholder's assessment of the merits of objections and claims resulted in the adoption of control measures to demonstrate that impacts and risks will be reduced to ALARP and acceptable levels. For example, anti-collision measures were evaluated, as identified through consultation with AMSA, and were included in the EP (Table 7-15 of the EP);
 - (c) The EP (Section 4, Table 4-9 of the EP) contained an assessment of the merits of any objection or claim raised during relevant persons consultation. The titleholder identified claims and objections raised by relevant persons and assessed the merit of each objection or claim about the adverse impact of the activity described in the EP. The assessment of merit subsequently informed the titleholder's response or proposed response to the relevant person's objection or claim. The report contains a statement of the titleholder's response, or proposed response, if any, to each objection or claim. Where there was a claim or objection identified, the titleholder provided a response which I considered adequate to each objection or claim that has been raised;
 - (d) Objections and claims were made by the Wilderness Society relating to the activity and future plans for the Reindeer facilities and Pipeline. Where concerns were raised - specifically in relation to the preservation phase of the Reindeer facilities and regarding assessing potential repurposing options for the pipeline - the titleholder provided further details including noting that planning for decommissioning is being undertaken in parallel with assessments of repurposing options, and that the activities outlined in the EP are a precursor to a future decommissioning EP which will be submitted at a later date;
 - (e) The Wilderness Society also requested information on planning for decommissioning. The titleholder provided responses to these relevant persons with information such as that presented in Section 2.13 of the EP that describes the planning for permanently abandoning wells, completion of technical and scientific studies, ongoing maintenance of property to enable decommissioning and the required approvals for the decommissioning phase, and a schedule for decommissioning and repurposing options; and
 - (f) I consider that the responses to the decommissioning claims and objections were appropriate, as the titleholder acknowledged these concerns and their response was that decommissioning planning was being undertaken in parallel (and in a separate project) from potential re-use options, and that decommissioning activities will be considered under a decommissioning environment plan. My reasons relating to s572 of the OPGGS Act are set out at [68] below.

61. The EP described a clear process for the identification and broad capture of First Nations relevant persons in accordance with reg 25(1). This is because:
 - (a) The titleholder's methodology, as identified in the EP, was consistent with the purpose and intention behind reg 25, NOPSEMA's guideline on Consultation in the course of preparing an environment plan (12 May 2023);
 - (b) the titleholder applied Federal Court authority on the interpretation of this provision (*Santos NA Barossa Pty Ltd v Tipakalippa* [2022] FCAFC 193; (2022) FCA 1121), namely, to ensure that the titleholder had 'ascertained, understood and addressed all the environmental impacts and risks that might arise from its proposed activity';
 - (c) The process for relevant person identification provided for the capture of First Nations representative groups within or adjacent to the EMBA; and
 - (d) The process enabled relevant persons to self-identify as relevant persons in response to widely distributed public notices in national and local newspapers, targeted regional advertising, and community engagement opportunities (Section 4.5.3, Tables 4-7 and 4-8 of the EP).
62. In reviewing the consultation summary report (Section 4 of the EP) and records provided in the Sensitive Information Report ('consultation records'), I found that:
 - (a) The consultation process considered the established and ongoing operational presence of the titleholder, and previous consultation undertaken for this and other activities in the region;
 - (b) An iterative, targeted, repeated, and reasonable effort was made to engage with specific persons or groups of relevant persons in order to elicit a response and engage with the process; and
 - (c) Section 4.6 and Appendix F of the EP provided the titleholder's assessment of the merit of, and all responses to, objections and claims. There were no outstanding specific objections or concerns regarding the proposed activity, that had not been reasonably responded to, addressed or incorporated into the EP as a result of the consultation process.
63. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, I was reasonably satisfied that consultation as per the requirements of reg 34(g) was satisfied.
64. Further, I noted the ongoing consultation commitment in the EP (Section 8.13). I considered this was an appropriate measure which would ensure that any future feedback, objections, or claims which may arise from relevant persons would be assessed and reported.
65. Overall, I was reasonably satisfied that the EP meets the requirements of reg 34(g).

The EP complies with the OPGGS Act, the Environment Regulations and any other regulations made under the OPGGS Act: regulation 34(h)

66. In determining whether the EP complies with the OPGGS Act, the Environment Regulations and any other regulations made under the OPGGS Act, as required by reg 34(h) I found that, among other things, the EP:
 - (a) Clearly delineates information in the EP as being relevant to either Commonwealth or Western Australia state waters given the cross-jurisdictional overlap of the activity;
 - (b) Is consistent with the 'Objects' of the Environment Regulations, including the principles of ESD;
 - (c) Includes an EP summary (Section 1.1) as required by reg 35(7); and

- (d) Commits to complying with the requirements in regs 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53 and 54 regarding various notifications and reporting to NOPSEMA.
67. I accepted that consultation with relevant persons has informed the titleholder in its obligations under section 280 of the OPGGS Act which require that the proposed petroleum activity will not interfere with navigation, fishing, conservation of resources of the sea and seabed, other offshore electricity infrastructure and petroleum activities, and the enjoyment of native title rights and interests (within the meaning of the *Native Title Act 1993*) to a greater extent than is necessary for the reasonable exercise of the titleholder's rights and obligations.
68. I considered that the EP complies with s572 of the OPGGS Act because:
- (a) The activities described in the EP are operations, cessation of production (preservation) and associated IMMR activities (Sections 2.4, 2.5, 2.9 and 2.10 of the EP). The IMMR activities are being undertaken to ensure that all structures, equipment and other property in the title area will be maintained in good condition and repair and can be removed when no longer in use, consistent with section 572(2) and (3) of the OPGGS Act;
 - (b) The EP defines the obligations of the titleholder specific to the duties and requirements of titleholders under Section 572 of the OPGGS Act and addresses relevant NOPSEMA guidance material regarding decommissioning (Section 2.13.1 of the EP);
 - (c) The EP includes a plan for decommissioning, including a set of objectives, a range of technical and environmental studies (Section 2.13 of the EP), regulatory submissions and a schedule for decommissioning (Table 2-8 and Figure 2-6 of the EP). The titleholder has indicated that the proposed schedule ensures that the decommissioning activities can be undertaken in a safe and environmentally responsible manner;
 - (d) Section 572(3) of the OPGGS Act states that "A titleholder must remove from the title area all structures that are, and all equipment and other property that is, neither used nor to be used in connection with the operations." The EP indicates that the titleholder is assessing re-purposing options for the property. The EP also indicates that decommissioning planning as required by s572(3) is being progressed in parallel as a distinct project;
 - (e) The EP included appropriate planning to continue to comply with s 572(3) of the OPGGS Act for the activities covered by this EP. Assessment against Section 572(3) will also be a relevant consideration for future EP submissions, such as the decommissioning EP committed to in this EP; and
 - (f) The report on consultation in the EP provides an adequate assessment of the merits of the objections relating to decommissioning activities and timelines (section 4.6 and Sensitive Information Report).
69. The information provided in the accepted EP was not directly consistent with NOPSEMA guidance on timeframes for removal (e.g. in the NOPSEMA Decommissioning Compliance Strategy 2024-2029 (A927433, v0 November 2023)). However, the assessment of the EP against the requirements of s572(3) included consideration of the IMMR activities, pre-decommissioning studies and that planning for decommissioning was being undertaken in parallel to any decision on potential re-use, rather than after. I also took into account the titleholders commitment to submitting a decommissioning EP, safe and environmentally responsible execution of the proposed work packages, and commitments on timeframes for decommissioning provided in the EP.

70. Having regard to the matters set out at [68] – [69], I was satisfied that the EP demonstrated compliance with the titleholder's obligations under section 572 of the OPGGS Act.
71. Based on the above, I was reasonably satisfied that the EP complies with the OPGGS Act, the regulations made under the OPGGS Act and meets the requirements of reg 34(h).

Other considerations

The Program: protected matters under Part 3 of the EPBC Act

72. The Program endorsed under section 146 of the EPBC Act outlines the environmental management authorisation process for offshore petroleum and greenhouse gas activities administered by NOPSEMA and requires NOPSEMA to comply with Program responsibilities and commitments.
73. In implementing the Program, NOPSEMA conducts assessments of EPs against the requirements of the Program, which includes meeting the acceptance criteria and content requirements under the Environment Regulations. Specific Program commitments relating to protected matters under Part 3 of the EPBC Act are outlined in Table 2 of the Program report and must be applied during decision making with respect to offshore projects and activities.
74. I considered matters protected under Part 3 of the EPBC Act, including listed threatened and migratory species and the Commonwealth marine area, and was reasonably satisfied that the activity under the EP met the requirements of the Program on the basis that:
 - (a) The activity will not result in unacceptable impacts on listed threatened species and is not inconsistent with relevant recovery plans and threat abatement plans for listed threatened species. For example, I found the activity is not inconsistent with the Wildlife Conservation Plan for Seabirds (Commonwealth of Australia 2020), Conservation Management Plan for the Blue Whale 2015–2025 (Commonwealth of Australia 2025), and the Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia 2017–2027 (Commonwealth of Australia 2017) and the Approved Conservation Advice for *Rhincodon typus* (whale shark) (TSSC, 2015a). I considered these documents when determining the acceptability of the EP where impacts to listed threatened species may arise. Also see my reasons above [27] – [34];
 - (b) There are CM in place to ensure that impacts to the environment of the Commonwealth marine area will not result in unacceptable impacts, having regard to relevant policy documents, gazettal instruments, bioregional plans, wildlife conservation plans, plans of management and EPBC Act guidance documents on the DCCEE website. For example, I found the titleholder had regard to the 'Wildlife Conservation Plan for Seabirds (Commonwealth of Australia 2020)' when evaluating impacts and adopting controls in the EP (e.g. RE-CM-61: 'Passive bird deterrent in place on WHP'). Also see my reasons above [27] – [34]; and
 - (c) There are CMs in place to ensure that the petroleum activity will not result in unacceptable impacts to a migratory species or an area of important habitat for a migratory species, having regard to relevant policy documents, wildlife conservation plans and guidelines on the DCCEE website. For example, I found the EP requires for all project vessels to comply with the 'EPBC Regulations – Part 8 Division 8.1 interacting with cetaceans' in relation to 'procedure for interacting with marine fauna' (RE-CM-01). See my reasons above [27] – [34].

The Program: Cumulative environmental impacts

75. In the context of the Program, cumulative impacts refers to the direct and indirect impacts of a number of different petroleum activity actions that may influence the natural environment or other users within

a locality or region which, when considered together, have a greater impact on the offshore marine environment than each action or influence considered individually.

76. In the context of NOSPEMA's Decision Making Guidelines for offshore petroleum activities, cumulative environmental impacts are successive, additive, or synergistic impacts of collectively significant activities or projects with material impacts on the environment that have the potential to accumulate over temporal and spatial scales.
77. I considered the potential for cumulative environmental impacts to the Commonwealth marine area as required by the Program, noting the titleholder had evaluated some potential for cumulative impacts in the EP. Specifically, Section 6.8.3 of the EP (Cumulative impacts (Treated water)), evaluates the potential cumulative effect on water quality of the discharge of treated water from the WHP, discharge from vessels in the operational area, and discharge from IMMR activities. Based on information provided in the EP, I did not consider that these impacts to the environment would be unacceptable.
78. After considering the information presented in the EP, I was reasonably satisfied that, due to the nature and scale of the activity, the potential cumulative impact factors, the receptors at risk, the relative distance to other oil and gas activities and adopted controls, cumulative impacts of the activity were of an acceptable level.

Conclusion

79. For the reasons set out above, I was reasonably satisfied that the EP met the criteria for acceptance set out in reg 34. Being also satisfied that the titleholder was compliant with s 571(1) (and reg 16), I accepted the EP.

Signed



Director Decommissioning Environment

4 July 2025

Appendix A: Key materials considered in making the decision

80. In making this decision, I considered the documents making up the EP submission in accordance with legislative requirements and NOPSEMA policy and procedure. The material that I had regard to in making this decision included, but was not limited to:
- (a) The EP comprising:
- Reindeer Wellhead Platform and Gas Supply Pipeline Operations and Cessation of Production Environment Plan (Document number 7715-650-EMP-0023, Revision 9, dated 24 April 2025)
 - Devil Creek Pipeline and Reindeer Well Head Platform Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (Document number EA-14-RI-10001.02, Revision 15, dated 8 April 2025)
 - Operational and Scientific Monitoring Bridging Implementation Plan: North West Shelf (Document number 7715-650-ERP-0002, Revision 2, dated 9 April 2025)
 - Sensitive Information Report - document to support consultation - Reindeer Wellhead Platform and Gas Supply Pipeline Operations and Cessation of Production Environment Plan (Revision 3, dated September 2024)
81. The legislative framework relevant to EP assessments, including:
- (a) the OPGGS Act
- (b) the Environment Regulations and
- (c) the EPBC Act Program¹
82. Policies and Guidelines:
- (a) NOPSEMA Assessment policy (N-04000-PL0050)
- (b) NOPSEMA Environment plan assessment policy (N-04750-PL1347)
- (c) NOPSEMA Environment plan decision making guidelines (N-04750-GL1721)
- (d) NOPSEMA Consultation in the course of preparing an Environment Plan guideline (N-04750-GL2086)
- (e) NOPSEMA Section 572 Maintenance and removal of property regulatory policy (N-00500-PL1903)
- (f) NOSPEMA Section 270 Consent to surrender title regulatory policy (N-00500-PL1959)
- (g) NOPSEMA Petroleum activity guidance note (N-04750-GN1343)
- (h) Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment and Water (DCCEEW), Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 – Matters of National Environmental Significance, EPBC Act Policy Statement (2013)
- (i) Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities' (DSEWPaC) 'Indirect consequences' of an action: Section 572E of the EPBC Act (2013).
83. Guidance:

¹ <https://www.environment.gov.au/protection/assessments/strategic/offshore-petroleum-greenhouse-gas>

- (a) NOPSEMA Environment plan content requirements guidance note (N-04750-GN1344)
- (b) NOPSEMA Petroleum activities and Australian marine parks guidance note (N-04750-GN1785)
- (c) NOPSEMA Oil pollution risk management guidance note (N-04750-GN1488) and
- (d) Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources, Offshore Petroleum Decommissioning Guideline (2018).

84. Procedures:

- (a) NOPSEMA Environment plan assessment standard operating procedure (N-04750-SOP1369).

85. Other relevant documents and records:

- (a) Relevant published, peer-reviewed scientific literature, including the scientific literature cited in the EP and relevant national/international standards such as the Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for fresh and marine water quality (ANZG, 2018).
- (b) EPBC Referral, Decommissioning of the Minerva Pipeline in Victorian State Waters, Victoria (EPBC 2024/09879)
- (c) Relevant policies, plans of management, recovery plans, conservation advice and other guidance for matters protected under the EPBC Act, including:
 - (i) Commonwealth of Australia, Threat Abatement Plan for the Impacts of Marine Debris on the Vertebrate Wildlife of Australia's Coasts and Oceans (2018)
 - (ii) Commonwealth of Australia, Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia 2017–2027 (2017)
 - (iii) Commonwealth of Australia, Conservation Management Plan for the Blue Whale 2015–2025 (2015)
 - (iv) Commonwealth of Australia, National Recovery Plan for the Southern Right Whale *Eubalaena australis* (2024)
 - (v) Offshore Petroleum Decommissioning (Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources, 2022)
 - (vi) National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife, including marine turtles, seabirds and migratory shorebirds (DoEE, 2020).

86. Relevant legislative requirements that apply to the activity and are relevant to the environmental management of the activity; and

87. Relevant Federal Court of Australia authority.