

Assessment conclusions

Assessment ID [4937](#)

Duty holder: ConocoPhillips Australia Exploration Pty Ltd

Facility/Activity: Barossa Gas Export Pipeline Installation

Facility/Activity type: Petroleum Activity

Assessment type: Environment Plan (Development)


Conclusions

Submission number

1	Acceptance criteria	Team conclusion	Outcome
	Environment Plan is appropriate for nature and scale of activity	<p>The EP [has / has not] demonstrated that the environment plan is appropriate to the nature and scale of the activity because :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The activity [is / is not] clearly scoped and bounded (2) The environment that may be affected [is/is not] suitably understood (3) The requirements that apply [will / will not] be met (4) The impacts and risks [are / are not] suitably understood (5) - The analysis of how the activity and the environment interact [has / has not]. <p>(Requesting further Information)</p>	Unable to decide
	Environment Plan demonstrates that the impacts and risks will be reduced to ALARP	<p>The EP has not demonstrated that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be reduced to ALARP because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (3) The outcomes are not defensible in relation to the timing of the activity, in particular in relation to impacts to marine turtles. 	Disagree
	Environment Plan demonstrates that impacts and risks will be of an acceptable level	<p>The EP has not demonstrated that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be of an acceptable level because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) An acceptable level of has not been defined (6) The evaluation outcomes are not defensible particularly as it relates to impacts to marine turtles. 	Disagree
	Environment Plan provides for appropriate performance outcomes, standards and measurement criteria	<p>The EP [does / does not] provide for appropriate EPO's, EPS's and measurement criteria because they [are / are not] [insert EP refs / examples where appropriate]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) connected to the adopted control measures (2) connected to ALARP and acceptable levels (3) easily monitored for compliance purposes (4) compatible with each other and work <p>(Requesting further Information)</p>	Unable to decide

1	Environment Plan includes appropriate implementation strategy and monitoring, recording and reporting arrangements	The EP provides for an appropriate implementation strategy and monitoring, recording and reporting arrangements because it [does / does not] [insert EP refs / examples where appropriate]: (1) Meet the content requirements for the implementation strategy (2) Reflects reality (3) Is consistent with the rest of the EP (4) Is comprehensible to users (5) Include all aspects of the management system planning cycle by providing an EMS (6) Verify uncertainties in control measures (7) Manage errors, deviations and ineffective control measures (8) Comply with the Act and regulations and any other environmental legislation. (Requesting further Information)	Unable to decide
	Environment Plan demonstrates appropriate level of consultation	An EP has demonstrated the consultation process [has / has not] been followed and the measures adopted because of the consultations are appropriate because: (1) Relevant persons have been consulted with (2) Relevant persons' functions, interests and activities have been defined (3) Relevant persons have been provided sufficient information (4) A reasonable period for consultation has been provided (5) Objectives and claims have been resolved (as far as possible) (Requesting further Information)	Unable to decide
	Environment Plan complies with the Act and regulations	The EP complies with the Act and Regulations because: (1)The titleholder demonstrates compliance with s571(2) of the Act (2)The content requirements have been met (Requesting further Information)	Unable to decide
	Environment Plan does not involve the activity or part of the activity being undertaken in any part of a declared World Heritage property	The EP does not include an activity or part of an activity, other than arrangements for environmental monitoring or for responding to an emergency, being undertaken in any part of a declared World Heritage property because [insert EP refs / examples where appropriate]: (1) No activity will occur in a world heritage property (2) Environmental impacts and risks will be ALARP and of an acceptable level (3) Environmental monitoring and responding to an emergency	Agree

Commonwealth Environment Program	Result
World Heritage properties	Relevant requirements met
National Heritage places	Relevant requirements met
Ramsar wetlands	Relevant requirements met
Listed threatened species and communities	Relevant requirements not met
Listed migratory species	Relevant requirements met
Commonwealth marine area	Unable to decide

RoN decision	Decision reason	RoN
Opportunity to modify and resubmit	I agree with the conclusions of the assessment team. In addition, the following factors have been taken into account in making this decision: (1) Decision is within power and is fair (2) Decision is consistent with previous decisions for similar activities (3) Decision has considered relevant considerations (e.g. EPBC Act Programs; third party correspondence containing valid claims of relevance, all parts of the EP submission) (4) The decision excludes all irrelevant considerations (5) Decision is reasonable, well founded, merits based, and defensible (6) Decision is explained with direct reference to acceptance criteria with relevant evidence and reasoning.	

2	Acceptance criteria	Team conclusion	Outcome
---	----------------------------	------------------------	----------------

2	Environment Plan is appropriate for nature and scale of activity	The EP has demonstrated that the environment plan is appropriate to the nature and scale of the activity because: (1) The activity is clearly scoped and bounded (2) The environment that may be affected is suitably understood (3) The requirements that apply will be met (4) The impacts and risks are suitably understood (5) The analysis of how the activity and the environment interact has been carried out appropriately	Agree
	Environment Plan demonstrates that the impacts and risks will be reduced to ALARP	The EP has demonstrated that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be reduced to ALARP because (1) The evaluation method is systematic (2) The evaluation method selected has been followed and applied thoroughly (3) The outcomes are defensible (4) ALARP is considered independently (5) Evaluation outcomes are reproducible;	Agree
	Environment Plan demonstrates that impacts and risks will be of an acceptable level	The EP has demonstrated that the environmental impacts and risks of the activity will be of an acceptable level because (1) An acceptable level of has been defined (2) Acceptable level has been considered independently (3) Action has been taken in the absence of scientific uncertainty (4) The evaluation method is systematic (5) The evaluation outcomes are defensible (6) The evaluation outcomes are reproducible	Agree
	Environment Plan provides for appropriate performance outcomes, standards and measurement criteria	The EP does provide for appropriate EPO's, EPS's and measurement criteria because they are (1) connected to the adopted control measures (2) connected to ALARP and acceptable levels (3) easily monitored for compliance purposes (4) compatible with each other and work	Agree
	Environment Plan includes appropriate implementation strategy and monitoring, recording and reporting arrangements	The EP provides for an appropriate implementation strategy and monitoring, recording and reporting arrangements because it (1) Meet the content requirements for the implementation strategy (2) Reflects reality (3) Is consistent with the rest of the EP (4) Is comprehensible to users (5) Include all aspects of the management system planning cycle by providing an EMS (6) Verify uncertainties in control measures (7) Manage errors, deviations and ineffective control measures (8) Comply with the Act and regulations and any other environmental legislation.	Agree
	Environment Plan demonstrates appropriate level of consultation	An EP has demonstrated the consultation process has been followed and the measures adopted because of the consultations are appropriate because: (1) Relevant persons have been consulted with (2) Relevant persons' functions, interests and activities have been defined (3) Relevant persons have been provided sufficient information (4) A reasonable period for consultation has been provided (5) Objectives and claims have been resolved (as far as possible)	Agree
	Environment Plan complies with the Act and regulations	The EP complies with the Act and Regulations because: (1)The titleholder demonstrates compliance with s571(2) of the Act (2)The content requirements have been met	Agree

2	Environment Plan does not involve the activity or part of the activity being undertaken in any part of a declared World Heritage property	The EP does not include an activity or part of an activity, other than arrangements for environmental monitoring or for responding to an emergency, being undertaken in any part of a declared World Heritage property	Agree
Commonwealth Environment Program		Result	
World Heritage properties		Relevant requirements met	
National Heritage places		Relevant requirements met	
Ramsar wetlands		Relevant requirements met	
Listed threatened species and communities		Relevant requirements met	
Listed migratory species		Relevant requirements met	
Commonwealth marine area		Relevant requirements met	
RoN decision	Decision reason		RoN
Accepted	<p>I agree with the conclusions of the assessment team.</p> <p>In addition, the following factors have been taken into account in making this decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Decision is within power and is fair (2) Decision is consistent with previous decisions for similar activities (3) Decision has considered relevant considerations (e.g. EPBC Act Programs; third party correspondence containing valid claims of relevance, all parts of the EP submission) (4) The decision excludes all irrelevant considerations (5) Decision is reasonable, well founded, merits based, and defensible (6) Decision is explained with direct reference to acceptance criteria with relevant evidence and reasoning. 		