

ENVIRONMENT PLAN

Beehive-1 Exploration Drilling

4-Relevant Person Consultation

WA-488-P

17 May 2024

Rev 6

4. Consultation

EOG is required to consult with relevant persons in preparation of this EP. As defined by NOPSEMA, consultation is a two-way process where information is shared between titleholders and relevant persons that provides an opportunity for relevant persons who may be affected by an offshore petroleum activity to raise concerns, seek information about how they will be affected and how the titleholder intends to manage the activity so that impacts and risks are ALARP and acceptable.

This chapter documents the process that was followed to undertake the consultations in accordance with OPGGS(E) along with a summary of the outcomes of that process. This chapter demonstrates that EOG has carried out consultation as required by applicable law and that the measures adopted because of the consultations are reasonable and appropriate. This chapter describes consultation undertaken by EOG between September 2021 and 15 February 2024 for the proposed activity, including a public comment period undertaken between 9 May and 8 June 2022 and again between 12 October and 13 November 2023 (EOG has allowed for a reasonable period of time, in this case up to 10 business days), to finalise compiling the EP, conduct final reviewed and finalise the EP for re-submission to NOPSEMA.

4.1. Relevant Persons Consultation – Background and Legislative Requirements

The Federal Court of Australia's appeal decision in December 2022 (*Santos NA Barossa Pty Ltd v Tipakalippa* [2022]) (the Decision), sets forth the requirements for consultation in accordance with OPGGS(E). At the time of the Decision, this EP was under assessment by NOPSEMA; following which, EOG revised its methodology to reflect the intent of the Decision. To guide the consultation process, EOG developed a Relevant Persons Consultation and Engagement Plan (RPCEP) (**Appendix 2**) that outlines EOG's revised consultation and engagement activities. The RPCEP lists the requirements for consultation in accordance with relevant NOPSEMA regulations, policies, guidance and information papers and was informed by the guiding principles of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2).

The consultation process was informed by the following regulations, policies and guidance:

- OPGGS(E):
    - Regulation 25 – defines 'Relevant Persons', requires that the titleholder must give each relevant person sufficient information and time to make an informed decision of the possible consequences of the activity on their functions, interests or activities.
    - Regulation 22(15) – requirement for ongoing consultation to be incorporated into the Implementation Strategy of the EP.
    - Regulation 24(b) – the EP must contain a summary and full text of stakeholder consultation.
- NOPSEMA policies, guidance, and information papers, including:
    - PL1347 - Environment plan assessment policy (January 2024).
    - GL1721 - Environment plan decision making (January 2024).
    - GL1887 - Consultation with Commonwealth agencies with responsibilities in the marine area (January 2024).
    - GL2086 - Consultation in the course of preparing an environment plan (May 2023).
    - GN1344 - Environment plan content requirements (January 2024).
    - GN1488 - Oil pollution risk management (July 2021).
    - GN1785 - Petroleum activities and Australian Marine Parks (January 2024).

- GN1847 - Responding to public comment on environment plans (January 2024).
- Brochure - Consultation on offshore petroleum environment plans: Information for the community (May 2023).

- Other relevant guidance, including:
  - Australian Fisheries Management Authority: Petroleum industry consultation with the commercial fishing industry (available at https://www.afma.gov.au/sustainability-environment/petroleum-industry-consultation).
  - Western Australian Department of Primary Industries and Region Development (DPIRD): Guidance statement for oil and gas industry consultation with the Department of Fisheries (July 2013).
  - Western Australian Department of Transport (DoT): Offshore Petroleum Industry Guidance Note – Marine Oil Pollution: Response and Consultation Arrangements (July 2020).
  - Petroleum activities and Australian Marine Parks (Guidance note - Petroleum Activities and Australian Marine Parks.pdf (nopsema.gov.au).
  - Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) Engaging with Traditional Owners Guidance (December 2020).
  - Interim Engaging with First Nations People and Communities on Assessments and Approvals Under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (DCCEEW 2023a).
  - Guidelines for working in the near and offshore environment to protect Underwater Cultural Heritage (DCCEEW 2023b).

4.2. Relevant Persons Consultation – Key Duties

EOG identified seven key legislative duties it must discharge in carrying out consultation with relevant persons in preparation of this EP. This chapter and EOG's RPCEP (Appendix 2) summarise these duties by describing what EOG committed to do and what EOG did to fulfil these commitments. References are made throughout this chapter to demonstrate these commitments were achieved.

The key legislative duties required of titleholders under the OPGGS(E) are to:

1. Consult with relevant persons (Regulation 25(1));
2. Provide sufficient information to relevant persons (Regulation 25(2));
3. Describe the relevant values and sensitivities of the environment that may be affected by the activity (Regulation 21(2)(b));
4. Allow a reasonable period for relevant persons to assess the sufficient information (Regulation 25(3));
5. Assess the merit of each objection or claim (Regulation 24(b)(ii));
6. Respond to each objection or claim (Regulation 24(b)(iii); and
7. Ensure consultation is ongoing if appropriate.

4.2.1. Duty 1: Consult with Relevant Persons

The OPGGS(E) create a distinction between the public and relevant persons (authorities, organisations, and persons), and require consultation with all relevant persons in the preparation of each EP. The OPGGS(E) further specify that relevant persons include people and organisations whose functions, interests, and activities may be affected by the petroleum activity. Titleholders are required to consult with relevant persons as defined by OPGGS(E). EOG undertook a comprehensive

multi-level approach to identify, invite and consult with relevant persons whose functions, interests, or activities may be affected by the proposed activities.

Regulation 25(1) of the OPGGS(E) defines a 'relevant person' as:

A. Each Commonwealth, State or NT agency or authority to which the activities to be carried out under the EP may be relevant;

B. If the EP relates to activities in the offshore area of a State-the Department of the responsible State Minister;

C. If the EP relates to activities in the Principal NT offshore area-the Department of the responsible NT Minister;

D. A person or organisation whose functions, interests or activities may be affected by the activities to be carried out under the EP; and

E. Any other person or organisation that the titleholder considers relevant.

Identification of potentially affected persons is the first step in being able to manage and address the concerns and issues of groups, organisations, or individuals who may impact or be impacted by the activity. When EOG prepares to undertake an EP, it seeks to proactively identify relevant persons and provide them opportunity to be consulted consistent with the regulated process and will continue identification activities throughout the activity.

EOG recognises that a community can be disaggregated, and that a member of a community may identify differently from the community at large. These methodologies are open-ended approaches that cast a broad net. The result is that a large pool is created from both general and targeted searches from which relevant persons can be located so that it is reasonable to conclude that all relevant persons have been identified.

EOG used the following methods to find relevant persons (authorities, organisations and persons) who may be affected:

- **Geographic searches -** geospatial focused and location-based search of maps and public GIS data to help form an understanding of the persons and organisations within the environment planning area.
- **Healthy Country Plans -** review of Aboriginal Corporation public Healthy Country Plans (HCP) to understand the values and sensitivities for those groups within the Work Plan area.
- **Government agencies and organisations -** relevant government agencies may have information about individuals and organisations that may be affected by the Work Plan
- **Review of EPs accepted and under assessment within the same region -** previous petroleum activities within a bioregion show who has previously engaged in consultation with petroleum titleholders. It is a broad search method with large coverage.
- **Online internet research -** a search for news articles and press releases about similar activities in the environment planning area and identify individuals and groups that were mentioned.
- **Notices in print media -** EOG utilised the NT News, The Australian, The West Australian, Koori Mail and The Kimberley Echo to provide notice of the activity and seek input and feedback.

- **Social media searches -** the use of social media to find relevant persons by following local groups and searching for pages, hashtags and key words related to the activity.
- **Dedicated activity-specific EOG website -** making activity information available to the public and allowing persons or organizations to self-identify.
- **Referrals from others -** asking relevant persons if they know of other relevant persons.
- **Self-identification -** through the outreach methods and actions listed above, EOG provides several avenues for relevant persons to self-identify and engage in the consultation process.

Once a relevant person was identified, under the OPGGS(E), EOG must tell any authority, person, or organisation that:

- They have been identified as a relevant person;
- The subsequent consultation effort is being undertaken as per the prescribed process; and
- EOG is obligated to expressly advise them of titleholder obligations for consultation.

In September 2021, EOG commenced consultation with relevant persons for the proposed activities described in this EP. This identified 62 relevant persons with whom EOG consulted. In July 2022, to continue to improve and enhance its consultation processes, EOG began to update its consultation methodology and identification of relevant persons. This process was informed by feedback from NOPSEMA as well as an understanding of evolving best practices, which in part emanated from the Santos NA Baross Pty Ltd v Tipakalippa [2022] FCAFC 193 decision (see Schedule C of the RPCEP at **Appendix 2** for EOG's summary of key implications from this case). This included re-evaluating the functions, interests and activities of those parties within the environment that may be affected (EMBA, see Section 5.1) and how they could be impacted by the proposed activity. After the revised approach, and at the time of this EP submission, 529 relevant persons have been identified and consulted, with one unique organisation (the Durduga Tree Point Aboriginal Association Incorporated, DTPAAI) being assessed as non-relevant.

Durduga Tree Point Aboriginal Association Incorporated

Multiple attempts to contact the DTPAAI have been made by EOG between August 2022 to date, with no response. The DTPAAI is a title holder in respect of Freehold Aboriginal Land (~242.5 ha) on behalf of the Tree Point (Durduga) Community. The land parcel hosts a small community consisting of fewer than ten dwellings that are intermittently occupied throughout the year. Attempts to contact this association were made as part of the consultation effort for this activity. EOG initially contacted the Northern Land Council (NLC) as part of their attempts to contact the DTPAAI, as the location of the land falls within the remit of the NLC. EOG approached the NLC because of their functions relating to Aboriginal land and sent multiple communications to the DTPAAI care of the NLC. In November 2023, the NLC notified EOG that they do not represent the DTPAAI – this development seems to be as a direct result of DTPAAI no longer being an active or functioning entity. EOG's further research efforts concludes that the DTPAAI is no longer functional.

EOG has determined that the DTPAAI is not a relevant person for this EP. This is because:

- The EMBA represents the area in which EOG has sought to identify relevant persons but is not conclusive of whether a group's functions, interests or activities (if any exist) would be affected. In this case, although the association exists 'on paper', EOG's research indicates that it is no longer functional. This is supported by the Tiwi Land Council (TLC) Annual Performance Statement 2022-23, which states that since the DTPAAI Senior Man passed away, the DTPAAI appears to be non-functioning, and it has failed to respond to letters or meeting invites issued

by the Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority or the TLC. It is reasonable to conclude that a non-functioning organisation does not, by definition, have functions, interests or activities that may be affected by the proposed activity. Otherwise, the mere registration of an organization (regardless of its status or whether it is inactive and non-functioning) could be used to stymie the consultation process indefinitely. That is, if it is automatically assumed that organisations that are demonstrated to be 'non-functioning' still have functions, interests and activities notwithstanding their 'non-functioning' status, the consultation process would come to a dead-end due to the organization being unable to participate and the purpose and utility of the regulations would be thwarted.

- Furthermore, EOG has cast a broad net based on the drilling spill EMBA (through Social Pinpoint, EOG's website, prominent boat ramp notices located near the DTPAAI lands, and a general media outreach) to allow for parties to self-identify if they wish to be considered a relevant person. To date, no representative of DTPAAI has contacted EOG regarding the proposed activity, which supports EOG's position that they are not a relevant person for this activity.
- Finally, consultation with the TLC (which has connections to the DTPAAI and this area as discussed in the TLC Corporate Plan 2022-2026) indicated that "there are no cultural impacts on the Tiwi Islands from EOG Resources Beehive project WA-488-P proposed operations because of their distance from the Tiwi Islands." This makes it reasonable to conclude that the DTPAAI would view its relevance in a similar manner if it still functioned.

Identifying Relevant Persons for Regulation 25(1)(a), (b) & (c)

Identifying the relevant persons in these categories is a reasonably straightforward exercise due to the publicly available information about Government departments, the consultation that has occurred by other titleholders in the past that is publicly available, and some specific guidance notes prepared by Government departments and agencies.

Each government agency or authority has been identified through online searches, expert advice, review of legislation, and review of previous EPs adjacent to the title area. NOPSEMA guideline GL1887 identifies the government agencies as a relevant person as they have responsibilities within the Commonwealth marine area. The full list of relevant authorities is included in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Relevant Persons under Regulation 25(1)(a), (b) & (c)

Relevant Authorities	Role and Relevancy
Regulation 25(1)(a) Each Commonwealth, State or NT agency or authority to which the activities to be carried out under the EP may be relevant	
Commonwealth	
Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA)	Administrator of submarine cable protection zones. Relevant when the activity may impact on subsea cables.
Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA)	Manager of fisheries in Commonwealth waters. Relevant when the activity has the potential to impact on fisheries resources in AFMA managed fisheries.
Australian Hydrographic Office (AHO)	Responsible for the publication and distribution of nautical charts and other information required for safe shipping and navigation in Australian waters. Relevant when the activity may impact operational requirements and where nautical products and other maritime safety information is required to be updated.

Relevant Authorities	Role and Relevancy
Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA)	Responsible for maritime safety. Relevant when the activity may impact on the safe navigation of commercial shipping and to determine shipping traffic in the activity area.
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF)	Responsible for managing biosecurity for incoming goods and conveyances. Relevant due to the potential for the transfer of marine pests between MODU, vessels and the mainland.
Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW)	Administers *the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act), the *Underwater Cultural Heritage Act 2018* and the *Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) Act 1981*. Relevant if underwater cultural heritage is directly or indirectly adversely affected by the activity.
Department of Defence (DoD)	Responsible for Australian defence activities. Relevant when the activity encroaches on known training areas and/or restricted airspace.
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)	Promotes and protects Australia's interests internationally. Manages relationships with countries neighbouring Australia's north, including Indonesia, Timor Leste and Papua New Guinea. Relevant when the activity may impact on waters outside Australia's maritime jurisdiction (such as an oil spill).
Director of National Parks (DNP)	Manages the AMP network. Relevant when activities undertaken outside an AMP may impact on the values within an AMP.
Maritime Border Command (MBC)	Key agency for border protection. Relevant when the activity may impact on border protection activities (e.g., vessel patrols).
National Native Title Tribunal (NNTT)	Responsible for administration of the *Native Title Act 1993*. Relevant when the activity may impact on Native Title. Maintains registers (and associated mapping) of native title determinations, prescribed bodies corporate, and registered native title claims.
WA	
WA Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA)	Manage State marine parks and reserves and protected marine fauna and flora. Relevant when activities undertaken outside a marine park may impact on the values within a marine park.
WA Department of Fisheries (DoF)	Managed West Australian commercial fisheries. Relevant when the activity has the potential to impact on fisheries resources in DPIRD.
WA Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH)	Protect Aboriginal heritage, assist with compliance with the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* and provide access to heritage information. Relevant if the activity results in impacts to Aboriginal heritage.
WA Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD)	Managed West Australian commercial fisheries. Relevant when the activity has the potential to impact on fisheries resources in DPIRD.
WA Department of Transport (DoT)	Manage oil pollution preparedness for response in WA state waters. Relevant if the activity results in impacts to a marine park.
Pilbara Ports Authority	Manage the Dampier Port under the *Port Authorities Act 1999 (WA).* Relevant if the activity results in impacts to port activities.
NT	

Relevant Authorities	Role and Relevancy
NT Department of Environment, Parks and Water Security (DEPWS)	Protect the environment and natural resources in the NT, including marine fauna management. Relevant when activities may impact on marine or coastal values.
NT Department of Transport (DoT)	Manage oil pollution preparedness and response in NT waters. Relevant if the activity results in impacts to the NT waters or coastlines.
NT Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)	Independent authority established under the *Northern Territory Environment Protection Authority Act 2012* to prevent and respond to pollution. Relevant if the activity results in pollution to NT waters or coastline.
Regulation 25(1)(b) The Department of the responsible State Minister	
WA Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DMIRS)	Manages offshore petroleum approvals in WA State waters. Relevant if the activity results in impacts to WA state waters.
Regulation 25(1)(c) The Department of the responsible NT Minister	
NT Department of Industry, Tourism and Trade (DITT) - Fisheries	Responsible for managing NT fisheries and aquatic ecosystems. Relevant when the activity has the potential to impact on fisheries resources in DITT managed fisheries.

Identifying Relevant Persons for Regulation 25(1)(d) and (e)

Subject-centred groups

Subject-centred grouping allows for tailoring identification, communication and engagement strategies. People and organisations grouped into subject-centred categories can allow the search for one member of a group to lead to the discovery of additional members of that group. The identification of persons or organisations within subject-centred groups necessarily evolved as engagement with these groups was carried out. In all cases each person contacted will be asked to identify other relevant persons and encouraged to share information about the petroleum activity and how to connect us with others in the subject-centred group.

Table 4.2 identifies the subject-centred groups used in the preparation of this EP and a summary of strategies used by EOG to reveal persons or organisations within the groups. A person could be associated with more than one of these groups while an organisation is more likely to associate with just one.

Table 4.2. Tailored consultation approaches conducted for subject-centred groups

Subject-centred group	Tailored strategy to identify relevant persons
Marine users	• EOG posted notices at ports, boat launches, and ramps to connect with a wide variety of marine users (Table 4.5).
Tourism operators	• Online searches for cruise operators, marine tours and recreational experiences such as marine mammal observations, diving, recreational fishing and thrill-seeking experiences. • Online searches for marine-based community or sporting events.
First Nations Peoples	The following activities were undertaken to identify First Nations Peoples: • Visited local government authority websites (shire or municipal council) that often include acknowledgement of Traditional Owners. • Searched state and territory government websites that include information

Subject-centred group	Tailored strategy to identify relevant persons

	about Traditional Owners in their jurisdictions, especially in the context of information about local offices.
	• Searched online for states' and territories' Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander consultative bodies.
	• Contacted land councils representing the local Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander communities.
	• Online searches for Native Title groups and corporations on the prescribed bodies corporate (PBC) website.
	• Registered searches on the National Native Title Tribunal (NNTT) website.
	• Geospatial searches by completing the forms on the NNTT website.
	Note: EOG categorises any person with Native Title claims of any standing (i.e., claim or determination) as a relevant person.
	Methods of identifying First Nations Peoples that may be relevant persons included:
	• Assessed the values and sensitivities of the EMBA.
	• Desktop research of any public Sea Country information within the EMBA of each specific activity.
	  ○ AMP management plans.
	  ○ Aboriginal group Healthy Country Plans.
	• Engaged with First Nations groups such as land councils and PBC to seek who they represent; how First Nations groups or individuals should be consulted as relevant persons; and if there are any groups or persons that EOG had not identified.
	• Provided information via written correspondence, information flyers, and the project-specific website, and continued to engage with additional relevant persons or organisations as they were identified.
	• Advertised in Aboriginal-owned publications, *Koori Mail* and *The Kimberley Echo* newspapers, to invite consultation with any person who may have a function, interest or activity that may be affected by the activity. Use of Aboriginal-owned publications allows for persons that have not yet been identified to self-identify as relevant.

Port users	• Contacted harbourmasters to enquire about frequent users. • Online searches for businesses located at wharves in regional ports.
Petroleum titleholders	• Queried the National Electronic Approvals Tracking System (NEATS) database to find titles and titleholders within the EMBA. • Queried the NOPSEMA EP database to find other titleholders with petroleum activities. • Subscribed to the NOPSEMA EP submissions pages for all activities within the EMBA.
Commercial fishers	• Requested data from the Commonwealth, WA and NT fishing authorities to understand historical fishing activity. • Visited local ports to find local fishers who operate in the region. • Contacted all state-licensed fishers. • Contacted all Commonwealth fishing license holders. • Queried and reviewed the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC) website, including the annual State of the Fisheries Report (www.fish.wa.gov.au).

Subject-centred group	Tailored strategy to identify relevant persons
	• Engaged with the Western Australia Fishing Industry Council, Inc (WAFIC).
Recreational fishers	• Engaged with recreational fishing associations to advertise in newsletters/circulars or websites. • Requested contact details for license holders. • Requested to engage with advisory bodies or reference groups to establish the best approach to identify relevant persons.
Native Title Prescribed Bodies Corporate and Land Councils	• Sought contact details of land councils from the NNTT. • Online searches for Native Title PBC on the PBC website. • Cross-referenced PBC contact details with the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations.
Conservation groups	• Reviewed previously submitted EPs on the NOPSEMA website. • Online searches for conservation groups with interests in similar activities. • Online searches for new articles and current campaigns related to similar activities.
Fishing associations	• Identified target species within the EMBA through online research. • Requested contact details for license holders.
Other marine users	• Online searches for groups who use or have a connection to the marine environment.
Commercial shipping	• Contacted harbourmasters and shipping agents to enquire about frequent users. • Online searches for businesses located at wharves in regional ports.
Local councils	• Queried the WA and NT Electoral Commission and Government databases for councils, shires and cities. *Note:* NOPSEMA guideline GL1887 identifies the government agencies as a relevant person as they have responsibilities within the Commonwealth marine area.
Educational bodies	• Contacted the Department of Education to identify relevant institutions and research programs. • Contacted universities to identify any relevant research programs. *Note*: For this category, the exposure thresholds for monitoring potential impacts of the activity were used rather than the socio-economic thresholds, because this is more relevant to the likely activities of research institutions.
Commerce	• Online searches for news articles or press releases about marine-based businesses in the area.
Ports and harbours	• Reviewed automatic information system (AIS) data of vessel activities along the coast to establish frequented ports. • Reviewed the WA and NT boat ramp databases. • Contacted local councils, cities and shires for listing of local boat ramps and users.
Heritage groups	• Contacted WA and NT heritage organisations to identify relevant persons. • Queried the Australian Heritage Database. • Queried the Australasian Underwater Cultural Heritage Database.

The outcome of the approaches listed in Table 4.2 resulted in the complete list of relevant persons applicable to the proposed activity, presented in **Appendix 3** and **Appendix 4** (named individual fishing licence holders). In addition to the strategies listed in Table 4.2, the following strategies as stated in the RPCEP, were also considered but not undertaken because the databases or systems were not in place to accomplish these strategies:

- Request Tourism Australia and Tourism WA to query databases of local businesses along the coastline within the socio-economic risk EMBA; and
- Enquire with local Chambers of Commerce to identify marine-based tourism operators and local marine-based businesses in the region.

The subject-centred strategies used to search for relevant persons in Table 4.2 were primarily focused on persons within and proximate to the Beehive-1 drilling EP spill EMBA (see Section 5.1 for a description of the EMBA), which facilitated a broad capture of relevant persons. Furthermore, the communication strategies discussed in the following sections specifically targeted persons proximate to the activity (see also Section 5 of the RPCEP in **Appendix 2**).

International Persons

EOG has also considered the potential that relevant persons may exist in international waters. EOG has not been contacted directly by an international person who identified themselves as a relevant person. However, should international persons make themselves known to EOG as a relevant person for the purposes of this activity, EOG will make an assessment of this and if they are determined to be relevant, add them to the list of relevant persons.

It is possible that persons based in Indonesia would have an interest in fishing and aquaculture in the waters offshore from their coastlines. Nonetheless, at the low exposure concentration of 10 ppb used to define the outer extent of the spill EMBA for dissolved and entrained hydrocarbons (see Section 8.7.1) and which come close to Indonesia, there is not considered to be any exposure pathways resulting in ecological/toxicity impacts to fish or other receptors and therefore no effect on the functions, interest or activities of Indonesian coastal communities who may be undertaking fishing or aquaculture activities in coastal waters. As such, EOG considers that there is no potential for functions, interests or activities to be materially affected and therefore concludes that there are no internationally relevant persons applicable to this activity.

In addition, traditional Indonesian fishing effort is focused on shallow waters rather than the deep waters of the permit areas and EOG has engaged with individual fishers, fishing organisations and fishing regulatory bodies. In regard to Indonesian fishers, such persons are not accessible through a register as there is no requirement for traditional fishers to be licensed by either the Australian or Indonesian governments. There is no publicly available information to identify these individuals. As per the Santos Decision, the obligation to identify relevant persons for the purpose of consultation must be reasonably capable of discharge within a reasonable time and there is an evident need for all relevant persons to be ascertainable. The inability to identify traditional Indonesian fishers combined with EOG providing information via its website that is accessible globally (as described in further detail later in this section) is reasonable and workable.

Nonetheless, it is also reasonable and practicable to assume that the interests of traditional fishers are the same as those licenced commercial fishers operating in Australia that EOG has been able to contact. EOG has considered feedback from Australian commercial fishers and fishing associations in relation to potential impacts to fish communities.

Public Outreach

To complement the proactive and comprehensive searches for relevant persons via subject-centred groups, EOG also undertook a broader approach (both geographically and demographically) to raise public awareness, so persons not contacted as part of the tailored consultation could learn the details of the Beehive Project and self-identify as a relevant person. Each public outreach activity is listed in this section and fully described in the RPCEP (**Appendix 2**).

EOG Australia website

The EOG Australia website (https://www.eogresources.com/australia/) provides an overview of EOG Australia. In March 2022, a short summary (which remains available) of the proposed exploration drilling activity and activity map was posted, along with links to the project-specific online consultation hub, summary Fisheries Compensation Protocol, WA-488-P permit details, current geophysical, geotechnical and drilling EPs, and information flyers.

Establish a Dedicated Project-specific website

EOG launched a project-specific website (https://klarite.mysocialpinpoint.com.au/beehive) on 11 May 2023 as the central tool to convey information and updates about the proposed activity, potential environmental impacts and risks and control measures to mitigate them. The nature of the internet allows anyone in Australia and further extending to anyone in the world with internet access, to learn and choose to engage with the project in any manner they wish, thus removing geographic limitations for consultation. This platform provides opportunity for users to self-identify as a relevant person and request consultation with EOG. The website includes a feedback form and EOG contact information including telephone number, mailing address, and email address. The project-specific website will remain available throughout the EP assessment process and throughout the activity as the central place for updates on the activity.

A link to the project-specific website was included on the EOG Australia website. EOG project information, project map, QR code and link to the project-specific website were also included in public notices in print media (Table 4.3), and posted on notice boards at boat ramps, ports, local councils and other prominent community gathering sites within the EMBA, as listed in Table 4.5. This central tool allows users to review the project information at their own pace on their own schedule and ensures all relevant project information is made available anytime, anywhere.

The project-specific website invites the user to explore the following:

- *Consultation Information*
    - What are the consultation requirements? Provides information to all relevant persons so they can make an informed assessment of how their functions, interests and activities may be affected by the proposed activities.
    - What should I do if I want to be included in consultation? Provides a user-friendly, readily accessible means to register per activity as a relevant person.
    - What should I do if I don't want to be consulted? Provides a user friendly, readily accessible means to opt out of consultation per activity.
    - What happens if I don't respond to the information provided to me through the consultation process? Provides details on EOG's actions if party contacted by EOG does not respond.
- *Relevant Person Information*
    - What is a Relevant Person and how do I know if I am one? Describes what it means to be a relevant person and provide access to the Beehive Consultation Survey if user is unsure

if they are a relevant person.

- How do I advise EOG if I believe I am a Relevant Person? Provides the variety of ways available to register as a Relevant Person.
- What are my rights and obligations as a Relevant Person? Provides detail of the regulations regarding information shared during consultation.
- I think someone I know could be a Relevant Person, what should I do? Provides EOG contact information to share with others.

- *What is an Environment Plan?* Provides background information on the purpose of an EP.
  - Description of the activity.
  - Description of the existing environment.
  - Environmental impact and risk assessment.
  - Environmental management measures and commitments.
  - Environmental spill response measures contained within an OPEP.
  - Summary of the consultation record.
- *Interactive Project-specific Information*:
  - Beehive Geotechnical Assessment
    - EP status.
    - Activity summary.
    - Activity map.
    - Geotechnical assessment information.
    - Geotechnical assessment interactive map.
    - Current EP.
    - Information flyers.
  - Beehive-1 Exploration Drilling
    - EP status.
    - Activity summary.
    - Activity map.
    - Drilling activity information.
    - Drilling interactive map.
    - Current OPEP.
    - Information flyers.
- *Beehive Consultation Survey and Feedback*
  - Relevant Persons
    - Identify functions, interests, or activities that may be affected.
    - Activity-specific surveys.
    - Opt-in/Opt-out of consultation process.

- Confidentiality Statement.
- Provide feedback.

- General Public
  - Sign-up for project updates.
  - Confidentiality Statement.
  - Provide feedback.

Through the Beehive Consultation Survey, users are able to determine whether their activities, interests or functions have the potential to be affected by the project and the option to self-identify as a relevant person. The consultation survey provides relevant persons and the general public opportunity to provide feedback and comments, make suggestions for improvements, and sign up to receive project updates and information flyers. EOG's confidentiality policy is declared within the feedback form, with respondents having to elect whether their information be made public or removed from any documents made public, prior to submitting their information.

Public Notices in Print Media

Twelve advertisements were published in Australian national, regional and local newspapers, as listed in Table 4.3 (**Appendix 5**). The advertisements included a link/QR code for the project-specific website along with contact details (email address and phone number) for readers to provide EOG with comments on the proposed activity. In addition, seven newspaper advertisements, also listed in Table 4.3, were published in the weeks leading up to the Beehive Information Sessions (listed in Table 4.6) to notify the public of and provide details relating to the proposed project information sessions.

Table 4.3. Newspaper advertising of the proposed activity

Newspaper	Coverage	Publication date
Associated with EP submission to NOPSEMA for assessment		
The West Australian	Regional (WA)	3 December 2022
The Australian	National	3 December 2022
NT News	Regional (NT)	3 December 2022
NT News – Online	Regional (NT)	3 December 2022 - 1 January 2023
The Kimberley Echo	Local (WA)	8 December 2022
Koori Mail – Edition 791	National	14 December 2022
Associated with Beehive information sessions listed in Table 4.6		
The West Australian	Regional (WA)	13 May 2023
Koori Mail – Edition 801	National	17 May 2023
The Kimberley Echo	Local (WA)	18 May 2023
The Kimberley Echo	Local (WA)	25 May 2023
The West Australian	Regional (WA)	25 May 2023

Newspaper	Coverage	Publication date
Associated with EP submission to NOPSEMA for assessment		
Koori Mail – Edition 802	National	31 May 2023
The Kimberley Echo	Local (WA)	1 June 2023
Advertising for drilling EP feedback		
Koori Mail - Edition 803	National	14 June 2023
The Kimberley Echo	Local (WA)	15 June 2023
The West Australian	Regional (WA)	15 June 2023
NT News	Regional (NT)	29 June 2023
NT News - Online	Regional (NT)	29 June - 29 July 2023
The Australian	National	2 July 2023

Publication of Information Flyers

Information flyers have been produced periodically since 2021 to provide relevant persons and the general public specific information about the activity (Table 4.4, **Appendix 6**). Information flyers were used to introduce EOG and the Beehive project, provide descriptions of the geotechnical, geophysical and drilling processes, and to discuss the purpose of the EP relative to regulatory requirements. Tailored subject-centred flyers were created for relevant persons that requested more information or information in a different form.

The information flyers provided a description of the relevant persons consultation process, an invitation to consult with EOG, a QR code for the project-specific website, and contact details. The flyers were emailed to relevant persons, accessible through the project-specific website and the EOG Australia website, and appended to written correspondence as necessary.

Table 4.4. Beehive-1 information flyers

Flyer	Date	Focus
1	15 September 2021	Geophysical and geotechnical investigations
2	1 December 2021	Update on geophysical and geotechnical investigations
3	28 February 2022	Drilling program
4	11 May 2022	Updates on geophysical and geotechnical investigations and drilling program
5	27 June 2022	Updates on drilling program and geotechnical investigations and EP status
6	May 2023	Updates on drilling program and geotechnical investigations, EP status and introduction to the project-specific website

Public Notices at Prominent Locations

Public notices were developed to span a broader and more general audience that might otherwise not receive or have access to notifications provided by email, in print media or on internet platforms.

During February and June 2023, public notices were distributed in high-traffic areas throughout the EMBA on notice boards, boat ramps, ports, local councils and other prominent community gathering sites, listed in Table 4.5.

Public notices specifically tailored for relevant subject-centred groups and individual persons were created and displayed in specific areas frequented by subject-centred relevant persons (e.g., fishers, tourism operators) within the EMBA. The primary purpose of the public notices was to inform the general public of the activity and invite consultation with relevant persons. Public notices provided the project-specific website QR code so that the public could access information about the activity, determine if they are a relevant person, and contact EOG.

Table 4.5. Public Notice Posting Locations

Town	Location	Posting Date
Ardyaloon	One Arm Point Boat Ramp	19 February 2023 & 8 June 2023 (Updated)
Broome	Town Beach Boat Ramp	18 February 2023 & 9 June 2023 (Updated)
	Gantheaume Beach Boat Ramp	18 February 2023 & 9 June 2023 (Updated)
	Entrance Point Boat Ramp	18 February 2023 & 9 June 2023 (Updated)
Kununurra	IGA Supermarket	16 February 2023 & 12 June 2023 (Updated)
	Coles Supermarket	16 February 2023 & 12 June 2023 (Updated)
	Shire of Wyndham / East Kimberley Service Centre	16 February 2023 & 12 June 2023 (Updated)
	Red Sun Sports and Casual Gear	12 June 2023
Darwin	Dinah Beach Cruising Yacht Club	13 – 16 February 2023 & 16 – 17 June 2023 (Updated)
	Best Foods Frances Bay Village	13 – 16 February 2023 & 16 – 17 June 2023 (Updated)
	Frances Bay Village Marina	13 – 16 February 2023 & 16 – 17 June 2023 (Updated)
	Cullen Bay Marina	13 – 16 February 2023 & 16 – 17 June 2023 (Updated)
	Darwin Trailer Boat Club	13 – 16 February 2023 & 16 – 17 June 2023 (Updated)
	Craigs Fishing Tackle Shop	13 – 16 February 2023 & 16 – 17 June 2023 (Updated)
	Anaconda Darwin	13 – 16 February 2023 & 16 – 17 June 2023 (Updated)
	Fishing & Outdoor World Darwin	13 – 16 February 2023 & 16 – 17 June 2023 (Updated)
	BCF Darwin	13 – 16 February 2023
	BCF Palmerston	13 – 16 February 2023
	Compleat Camping & Angler Darwin	13 – 16 February 2023
Dundee Beach	The Lodge of Dundee	15 February 2023 & 18 June 2023 (Update)
Wagait Beach	Wagait Beach Supermarket	15 February 2023 & 18 June 2023 (Update)

Access to self-identify as a relevant person

The project-specific website (https://klarite.mysocialpinpoint.com.au/beehive) was specifically designed to convey information about the proposed activity, and enable users no matter their location to determine whether they are a relevant person. Through the Beehive Consultation Survey, users are able to determine whether their activities, interests or functions have the potential to be affected by the project and thereby self-identify as a relevant person. The consultation survey also directs relevant persons to either request to consult with EOG or opt out of the consultation process. Relevant persons can also sign up for updates and information flyers, or specifically request to be excluded from all correspondence. EOG's confidentiality policy is declared within the consultation survey, with respondents having to elect whether their information be made public or removed from any documents made public, prior to submitting their information. The below information can be found on the website main page along with a link to the Beehive Consultation Survey.

Relevant Person Information – per Public Outreach section above.

- Beehive Consultation Survey and Feedback - per Public Outreach section above.

For those who do not have access to the internet or otherwise do not interact online, EOG contact information (telephone numbers and mailing address) was provided in advertisements in print media, public notices, and information flyers.

Request relevant persons identify other relevant persons

To amass as great an assemblage of relevant persons as possible, each person contacted was encouraged to share information about the project and thereby identify other relevant persons. This request was included in written correspondence, made during in-person meetings and project information sessions, and included on the project-specific website. In addition, the Beehive Consultation Survey on the project-specific website specifically includes the following instructional dialogue:

Relevant Person Information

- "*I think someone I know could be a Relevant Person, what should I do?*" — Please share this website with them and encourage them to contact us.

The Beehive Consultation Survey and Feedback form also explains that EOG is "*seeking to engage with any other person to improve our environmental management of this activity*".

Consultation

This section describes how EOG has consulted with relevant persons.

Invite co-design of the consultation process for each relevant person

Utilising the methods previously outlined, relevant persons were invited to engage with EOG in co-design of the consultation process to ensure that the consultation process was adapted to the nature of the relevant person and their interests. Written correspondence was the primary means used to conduct formal consultation between EOG and relevant persons. Phone calls were used to follow up on initial correspondence to ensure receipt of initial email correspondence. In-person meetings and information sessions were also conducted to request input and invite co-design of the consultation process.

EOG utilised land councils and registered PBCs to facilitate consultation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander relevant persons. EOG has engaged with the Tiwi Land Council (TLC), Kimberley Land Council (KLC) and Northern Land Council (NLC). These land councils have provided feedback to EOG on identifying and consulting with Traditional Owners and in some cases have assisted in co-designing

appropriate strategies and plans for engagement.

During consultation, KLC engaged in the co-design of consultation with their organisation. The KLC advised EOG to directly contact the Aboriginal stakeholders within the KLC boundaries. KLC also recommended, and EOG did utilise, the services of KRED Enterprises to undertake project information sessions (see "Face-to-face meetings").

Customised communication appropriate to relevant persons

A variety of communication methods were employed respective of the preferred methods requested by the different subject-centered groups. Written correspondence is the primary means used to conduct consultation between EOG and relevant persons. If a relevant person requested more information, or the information in a different form, subject-specific flyers were created to tailor the information to the relevant person that made the request. This includes information provided to the TLC, Balanggarra Aboriginal Corporation (BAC) and Tuna Australia. In-person information sessions were held for Native Title holders, Aboriginal land holders and Traditional Owners, as this was expressed as a preferred form of communication. The full list of communication methods is described below. Communication records are included as 'sensitive information' (in accordance with OPGGS(E) Regulation 26(8)) in **Appendix 7**.

Written Correspondence

Written correspondence is the primary means used to conduct consultation and is tailored specifically to communicate appropriately with relevant persons. It has been used to initiate (or continue) consultation with authorities, organisations and subject-centred groups. Written correspondence was used to provide notifications on project milestones and availability of activity-specific online information, and to request input and invite co-design of the consultation process. Written correspondence has also been used to respond to enquiries and to request any remaining feedback that had not been previously addressed.

Phone Calls and Virtual Meetings

The EOG consultation team utilised phone calls and virtual meetings to maintain rapport and continue consultation with relevant persons, to confirm receipt of correspondence and offer opportunity to ask questions and clarify information provided through written correspondence and other media. All relevant persons were encouraged to provide feedback and present their concerns regarding the project.

Information Sessions

In addition to the distribution of EP-specific information (emails, letters, QR code to project-specific website, etc.), consultation specifically undertaken during the development of this EP included several in-person information sessions, as listed in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 Beehive-1 information sessions

Location	Date	Number of attendees
Derby	6 June 2023	0
Broome	7 June 2023	2
Ardyaloon	8 June 2023	2
Kununurra	12 June 2023	0

Location	Date	Number of attendees
Kalumburu	13 June 2023	12
Wyndham	14 June 2023	0

Requested Information Sessions

EOG recognises that some consultation activities may be inappropriate to carry out if it is contrary to group norms, cultural traditions, or without support of representative bodies. Therefore, if requested by a relevant person who is a representative body, project information sessions beyond those listed in Table 4.6were made available. Such information sessions were tailored to the requesting representative body and might include face-to-face in-person meetings with specific agendas, or open forums at strategic locations proximate to the activity for community members to meet with the EOG consultation team and discuss concerns.

Face-to-face Meetings

EOG attended in-person meetings, beginning with a meeting with the BAC on 1 August 2022 in Perth, followed by a BAC board meeting in Kununurra on 7 September 2022.

Meetings with the TLC (27 February 2023), KLC (1 March 2023) and NLC (8 March 2023) were conducted to further facilitate consultation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander relevant persons. With respect to Native Title holders, Aboriginal land holders and Traditional Owners, information was prepared to communicate details of the project and potential impacts and risks, including possible effects on Native Title and traditional country, as well as resources integral to culture and customs.

EOG aimed to fully understand who needed to be consulted with regarding the Beehive project, who the land councils represented and what if any on-the-ground consultation was required. EOG utilised the list of questions below as a guide to facilitate understanding what additional consultation efforts were needed:

- Who do you represent (or do not represent)?
- What is the nature and capacity in which this representation exists? Traditions, culture, legal, etc.
- What does your framework for consultation with your constituents look like?
- Do you find community meetings a beneficial means of providing information to your constituents?
- Do you or your constituents find the ability to view detailed information and provide comments on a project-specific website helpful?
- What can EOG provide you/your organisation that would be helpful in your undertaking of consultation on EOG's activity?
- Are you aware of anyone else we should consult with?
- Can you tell us about your traditions, values, sensitivities, etc. and how they may be affected by our activities? Can you provide us any written material that would be helpful as we elevate your concerns?
- Can you describe your connection to Sea Country, and how our activities may impact them?
- Are there any topics we failed to raise or questions we didn't ask that you would like to discuss?

EOG has made specific efforts to engage with First Nations peoples, as presented in Section 3.4.3 of the RPCEP (**Appendix 2**), to inform EOG about cultural features within and proximate to the Beehive-1 drilling EMBA. In fulfilling these objectives, EOG has:

(1) Engaged with the First Nations groups such as land councils and PBCs to seek who they represent, how First Nations groups or individuals should be consulted as relevant persons, and if there are any groups or persons which EOG had not identified;

(2) Provided information via written correspondence, subject-centred information flyers, and the project-specific website, and consistently engaged with additional relevant persons or organisations as they were identified;

(3) Advertised in *Koori Mail* and in *The Kimberley Echo*, regional print media serving Aboriginal people and communities in Northern Australia; and

(4) Held six project information sessions across the Kimberley region (see Table 4.6).

Determination of Representation of the Land Councils

Both the TLC and the NLC expressed a preference that EOG's consultation activities be conducted through these land councils, as representatives for their constituents. In contrast, the KLC saw the organisation as a relevant person in its own right but advised EOG to directly contact the Aboriginal peoples within the KLC boundaries. KLC recommended that EOG use the services of KRED Enterprises (KRED) if they elected to undertake project information sessions.

KRED is an Aboriginal-owned and operated organisation with an established presence in the Kimberley region that provides a wide range of services in the area. These services include consultation planning and facilitation by Aboriginal people, with Aboriginal people in mind.

As a result of these discussions, the decision was made by EOG to conduct project information sessions across the Kimberley region. EOG engaged KRED to leverage their well-established Kimberley network to provide support and guidance in planning the information sessions, confirm the suggested locations for meetings and secure suitable venues based on their familiarity with local communities. In addition, KRED sent follow-up emails on behalf of EOG containing the media-published project information session notice to the affected PBC and community Chief Executive Officers for the Ardyaloon and Kalumburu communities. This project information session notice was first published in the *Koori Mail*, *The Kimberley Echo* and *The West Australian*. In doing so, KRED provided communications from an organisation familiar to other members of the Kimberley region.

As listed in Table 4.6, six information sessions were held across the Kimberley region. To facilitate accessibility for participants, the following materials were made available during the sessions:

- Information flyer #6 (see Table 4.6);
- A map of the project location;
- NOPSEMA brochure "*Consultation on offshore petroleum environment plans: Information for the community*";
- Business cards with EOG contact information and a QR code linking to the project-specific website;
- Where wi-fi accessible or phone service allowed, a tablet with access to project-specific website; and
- Attendance registers—including provisions for attendees to choose: individual or organisational representation, their attendance to be treated as sensitive information, requests for further information.

Confidentiality and sensitive information

As stated in Section 5.6 of the RPCEP (**Appendix 2**), EOG has communicated the legislative requirements around sensitive information. Throughout the consultation process and in all communications, EOG has reminded relevant persons of their right to request that any information provided during the consultation not be made publicly available. While that information must still be included in the EP submitted to NOPSEMA as "*sensitive information*", it would be excluded from the information published on NOPSEMA's website. This declaration has been included in public notices, information flyers, written correspondence, and in the Beehive Consultation Survey and Feedback form on the project-specific website.

On the main page of the project-specific website, it reads:

> "*As a Relevant Person, you may request that information you provide during the consultation not be made publicly available. That information must still be included in the EPs submitted to NOPSEMA as sensitive information but will be excluded from information published on NOPSEMA's website*".

Furthermore, EOG's confidentiality policy was declared within the Beehive Consultation Survey and Feedback form, with respondents having to elect whether their information be made public or removed from any documents made public, prior to submitting their information. The statement of confidentiality also noted that information would be included in the EP submitted to NOPSEMA as "*sensitive information"* but excluded from information made publicly available on NOPSEMA's website.

As a specific example of the confidentiality notice provided by EOG in its communications, information flyer #6 (May 2023) provided the following confidentiality statement:

> *Note: you may request that information you provide during the consultation not be made publicly available. That information must still be included in the environment plan submitted to NOPSEMA as sensitive information but will be excluded from information published on NOPSEMA's website. * The Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Environment) Regulations 2009 (including the definitions, sections 9(8), and 11A(4)) indicate that, if requested, information that you or your organisation provides, along with personal information, will be considered "sensitive information". Environment plans published by NOPSEMA on its website do not include any information deemed as sensitive.*

Protocol for unresponsive relevant persons

All attempts to contact relevant persons after the mail out of information flyers were recorded in EOG's consultation management system. If after multiple attempts to contact relevant persons, no response had been received, the following actions were employed to ensure compliance with EOG's requirement to consult with relevant persons on the proposed activity:

- Multiple phone calls, written correspondence and emails;
- Follow-up after 20 business days (4 weeks) from issue of initial consultation materials;
- Final follow-up prior to the resubmission of the EP; and
- Use of other broader consultation methods, including newspaper advertising and information flyers.

All of the above strategies were implemented to contact relevant persons multiple times.

4.2.2. Duty 2: Provide Sufficient Information

In accordance with OPGGS(E) Regulation 25(2), titleholders must provide sufficient information to each relevant person during the consultation process. To achieve this, EOG committed to the process as outlined in the RPCEP and implemented the information and outreach actions summarised below.

Tailor information to relevant persons functions, interests, activities

Project-specific website

The project-specific website includes the Beehive Consultation Survey and Feedback form, which clearly defines "functions", "interests" and "activities" to enable potentially relevant persons to accurately self-identify as a relevant person. The interactive map enables users to determine whether their functions, interests or activities have potential to be affected by the project. Through the survey, users can specify their interests relative to the project and to identify those aspects of the project for which they desire more information or information in a specific manner.

The consultation survey provides relevant persons and the public with an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed activity, make suggestions for improvements, and sign up to receive project updates and information flyers. The project-specific website allows relevant persons to review the information at their own pace on their own schedule and ensures that all current project information is made available anytime, anywhere.

The website includes interactive self-guided links as listed in Section 4.2.1 so that individuals can access specific information relevant to their unique functions, interests and activities.

EOG's confidentiality policy is declared within the feedback form, with respondents having to elect whether their information be made public or removed from any documents made public, prior to submitting their information.

Information flyers

In recognition of the needs and particular interests of specific relevant persons and groups, tailored subject-centred flyers were created for relevant persons that requested more information or information in a different form.

4.2.3. Duty 3: Describe the Environment that may be Affected by the Activity

In accordance with OPGGS(E) Regulation 21(2)(b), titleholders are expected to use consultation with relevant persons to improve the description of the environment that may be affected by the activity and increase predictive certainty of the impact assessment. To discharge this duty, EOG committed to the processes as outlined in the RPCEP. The following is a summary of how EOG completed each commitment.

Engage relevant persons

Relevant persons were invited to communicate information about their environment and sensitivities through the project-specific website, phone calls, and written correspondence, as described in Section 4.2.1. Furthermore, EOG made specific efforts to engage with First Nations peoples to inform EOG about cultural features of the EMBA. EOG has engaged with land councils and PBCs, provided information via written correspondence, specific subject-centred information flyers and consistently engaged with additional relevant persons or organisations as they were identified.

Publicise the EMBA / Invite feedback

EOG has published the description of the environment in the following locations that have been available to relevant persons throughout consultation: the project-specific website, Beehive-1 drilling interactive map and comment portal, information flyers #3, #5 and #6, email correspondence, and relevant persons-specific requested information packets. Additionally, this EP was published on NOPSEMA's website with an invitation for public comment, for 30 days from 9 May 2022 until midnight on 8 June 2022 and again between 12 October and 13 November 2023. EOG advertised the EP's publication in national, regional and local print media (see Table 4.3).

Online interactive access to project maps and communications

EOG developed the project-specific website, launched 11 May 2023, as the central tool to convey information about the proposed activity, potential environmental risks and controls in place. The website's interactive map allows users to view the proposed drilling activity in context with other spatial features—depicting the Beehive-1 well location, AMPs and state marine parks, and the EMBA. The interactive map allows users to place comments directly on the map to share feedback regarding the activity with EOG. This feature enables precise and easy communication of location-based environmental values and sensitivities.

The website also provides a comment form, an email address, mailing address and telephone number for alternative methods of contact. As of 15 May 2024, the following user statistics for the drilling part of the website are:

- 1,829 total visits;
- 464 unique users;
- 343 document downloads;
- 2 consultation survey responses; and
- 0 comments posted to the interactive drilling map.

Additionally, throughout the relevant persons consultation process other forms of communication, telephone numbers, a mailing address, and email addresses have been shared with relevant persons. Relevant persons could contact the EOG team directly and share location-based information.

4.2.4. Duty 4: Reasonable Period for Relevant Persons to Assess the Sufficient Information

As required by OPGGS(E) Regulation 25(3), consultation must allow a reasonable period for relevant persons to review the proposed activities. The consultation period, described in **Appendix 2**, states that consultation with relevant persons during the development of an EP will generally run for 30 calendar days (four weeks).

All relevant persons consulted for this activity have had a significant amount of time (far greater than 30 days) to assess the information provided by EOG and make comment, claims and objections, as noted by the following drilling-specific timeline of consultation:

- 28 February 2022 – issue Information Flyer #3 to 62 relevant persons;
- 9 May 2022 - this EP was published on NOPSEMA's website, with an invitation for public comment. The 30-day public exhibition of the EP closed at midnight 8 June 2022;
- 12 May 2022 - EOG placed advertisements with *NT News*, *The Australian*, and *The West Australian* newspapers, advising of the EP's publication and inviting public comments;

- July 2022 - EOG updated its methodology and identification of relevant persons, resulting in a total of 530 relevant persons;
- 21 September 2022 – Mail-out Information Flyers #1-5 to fishing license holders and newly identified potentially relevant persons;
- 28 October 2022 – Mail-out campaign to follow up on 21 September 2022 communications;
- 3 December 2022 to 29 July 2023 - EOG placed 12 separate public notices in print media (see Table 4.3);
- 11 May 2023 - EOG launched its project-specific website, as discussed in Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.3;
- 29 May 2023 – Email and letter campaign to issue Information Flyer #6 to provide updated project details and further request potential relevant persons to engage with EOG regarding the activity;
- 13 February 2023 to 18 June 2023 - Public Notices (see Table 4.5)with project information and map, QR code and link to the project-specific website were posted on notice boards, boat ramps, ports, local councils and prominent community gathering sites throughout the EMBA;
- 5 July 2023 – Email, telephone and letter campaign to follow up on May 2023 communications;
- 31 July 2023 – Mail-out campaign to follow up on communications to date and seek feedback for the EP;
- 10 August 2023 – Email campaign to follow up on communications to date and seek feedback for the EP;
- 18 August 2023 – Telephone campaign to follow up on communications to date and seek feedback for the EP;
- 25 October 2023 – Mail out campaign issued to stakeholders of the recent re-submission of the Geotechnical Assessment and Beehive-1 Exploration Drilling EPs with an invitation to review the activities and seeking any further feedback;
- 14 November 2023 – Email campaign issued to notify stakeholders of the recent resubmission of the Geotechnical Assessment and Beehive-1 Exploration Drilling EPs with an invitation to review the activities and seeking any further feedback;
- 24 November 2023 – Mail out campaign issued to follow up on communications to date and providing stakeholders with opportunity for feedback prior to the updated EP resubmission date. This included the statement that EOG believes a reasonable opportunity to consult has been provided and that legislative obligations have been met; and
- 27 November 2023 – Email campaign issued to follow up on communications to date and providing stakeholders with opportunity for feedback prior to the updated EP resubmission date. This included the statement that EOG believes a reasonable opportunity to consult has been provided and that legislative obligations have been met.

Appendix 8 provides a complete summary of consultations undertaken with dates of consultation indicating length of time each relevant person had sufficient information. **Appendix 8a** supplements

Appendix 8 by providing the names of those within the summary, and is submitted to NOPSEMA separately to this EP (as sensitive information).

4.2.5. Duty 5: Assessment of Merit of Objections and Claims

As required by OPGGS(E) Regulation 24(b)(ii), titleholders are obligated to assess objections or claims from relevant persons and provide a response to each relevant person about each objection or claim. Titleholders are also required to adopt appropriate measures as a result of the consultations with relevant persons. This section provides a summary of how EOG fulfilled this duty.

EOG recognises and respects each relevant person's need to be identified and included in the fulfillment of the consultation processes and therefore followed a stringent process to assess the merit of objections and claims from relevant persons to ensure that their concerns were recognised and fully addressed. Written correspondence was used to respond to enquiries and to request any remaining feedback that had not been previously addressed.

The EOG consultation team followed a standard protocol to assess the merit of claims and objections to the EP and provide feedback to all relevant persons with regards to enquiries, objections or claims. All objections and claims were recorded in EOG's consultation management system and assessed based on the following criteria:

- Relevance to environmental management of the activity;
- Relevance to the persons' functions, interests, and activities; and
- Whether the objection or claim can be resolved through the adoption of additional control measures, an activity design variation, or through changes to the Implementation Strategy for the EP.

For objections or claims found to have merit, EOG incorporated measures that avoid, manage or mitigate the objection or claim into this EP. For objections and claims found to not have merit with regards to the criteria, the claim was recorded and reasons documented. In all instances, each claim or objection was recorded and the relevant person responded to via written correspondence providing an explanation of EOG's assessment of merit and a request for additional feedback in an effort to uncover any remaining objections or claims. Additional claims were again considered relative to the merit criteria and the process repeated until the relevant person's claim or objection had been satisfactorily considered.

Despite best efforts to resolve all objections and claims, EOG understands that relevant persons may not agree with its assessment of merit regarding their objection or claim. Such circumstances do not preclude EOG's submittal of this EP to NOPSEMA for assessment.

Appendix 8 provides a complete list of consultation undertaken with relevant persons, inclusive of an assessment of merits of objections or claims. Full records of all correspondence with relevant persons are provided in **Appendix 7** (Sensitive Matters Report), which is submitted to NOPSEMA separately to this EP.

Table 4.7provides a summary of the objections and claims raised by relevant persons during the consultation process, as assessment of merit of each objection or claim and how EOG has addressed this. Note that because consultation with relevant persons for the drilling campaign and the geotechnical program occurred simultaneously (from early 2023), some issues may relate to one or the other activity, but in most circumstances such differentiation was not made by the relevant person. As such, the issues outlined in Table 4.7 are the same as those presented in the equivalent table of the Beehive-1 geotechnical EP.

Table 4.7. Summary of relevant person objections and claims

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
Prior to first public exhibition of the EP (prior to 9 May 2022)				
Drill cuttings and muds	NT DITT – Fisheries (Demersal fishery)	The DITT expressed concerns over the cumulative effects of smothering of benthic fauna from drill cuttings and muds (during the geotechnical survey phase) and the possible flow-on effect this could have on biota and higher trophic organisms including fish stocks that straddle the WA/NT border.	These concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DITT and therefore have merit.	EOG discussed the results of the impact assessment for this hazard with the relevant person and where this information could be found in the publicly available PDSA EP (link). The relevant person stated he was satisfied with the outcome of the discussion. See records in Appendix 8 and Appendix 9.
Consultation reach	NT DITT – Fisheries (Demersal fishery)	The DITT stated that it was important to engage with the NTSC to elicit concerns relevant to NT commercial fisheries.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DITT and therefore has merit.	EOG agrees with this and advised the DITT that consultation with the NTSC was taking place. See records in Appendix 8 and Appendix 9.
Impacts on the effects of seismic sound sources on fish	NT DITT – Fisheries	The DITT raised concerns with regard to the impact of seismic sound sources on fish, including impacts to audio organs, larval survival and other varying spatial and temporal impacts. They requested that any seismic surveying is not undertaken during the warmer months of the year, which coincides with tropical fish spawning seasons.	These concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DITT and therefore have merit.	Issues relating to seismic surveying relate to the VSP program, which will only take place for about 4 hours and is assessed in Section 7.5. The residual impact consequence is assessed as 'negligible.'
Voracity of impact assessment	NT DITT – Fisheries	The DITT requested that the EIA be robust and should align with ERA processes rather than the ALARP process and that the risk assessment be reviewed by a third party.	These concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DITT and therefore have merit.	The structure and content of the EP meets the requirements of the OPGGS€, which embodies best practice EIA methods. A full impact and risk assessment is included in Chapters 7, 8 and 9 of this EP, which includes an assessment of the ALARP concept, as required by the OPGGS(E).

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
Impacts to commercial prawn fishing	Northern Prawn Fishing Industry Association (NPFIA)	The NPFIA stated that although there is low fishing effort and catch in the activity area, there is historically a higher fishing catch and effort and EOG should not underestimate the potential impacts to fishing productivity and disruption.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the NPFIA and therefore has merit.	Fishing effort in the activity area is mapped in Section 5.7.1 of this EP for the last three years and show an area of 'low' fishing intensity immediately adjacent to the activity area. Section 7.2 of this EP provides an assessment of displacement for commercial fisheries, which is assessed as 'negligible.'
		Opposition to any activity taking place during the fishing season of 1st August to 1st December each year.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the NPFIA and therefore has merit.	EOG will aim to avoid undertaking the activity during this window, but if that is not possible (for logistical, technical or other reasons), EOG will work closely with the NPFIA to minimise impacts to fishing operations. The assessment of proposed control measures in Section 8.4.5 describes why a firm commitment to this request is not possible.
		Concern about short- and long-term impacts to productivity of the fishery, including larvae, from sound-generating equipment.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the NPFIA and therefore has merit.	Sound-generating impacts from drilling activity will be minimal. The impact assessment for this is presented in Section 7.5 of this EP and is assessed to have a residual consequence rating of 'negligible.'
		The fishery will seek compensation from EOG if there are any impacts to it from disruption, displacement or loss of fishery productivity.	This claim is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the NPFIA and therefore has merit.	EOG does not anticipate there will be a loss of fishery productivity resulting from drilling given that a very small exclusion zone during the activity (a 500-m radius around the MODU) will be in place. Nevertheless, EOG has prepared a Fisheries Compensation Procedure to deal with this concern, has provided a copy of the procedure to the NPFIA and included the procedure as an environmental performance standard in Section 7.2.5 so that impacted fishers can make a claim for loss.

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
Impacts to threatened species	NPFIA	Concern about impacts to threatened species, such as turtles, sawfish and sea snakes, with a request that EOG ensures the EP addresses potential impacts to these species.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the NPFIA and therefore has merit.	Chapter 5 of this EP describes all threatened species and conservation values in the impacts EMBA, while Appendix 11 does likewise for the spill EMBA. The impact and risk assessments for these species is presented in Chapter 7 of the EP, with the residual impact consequences and risk rankings for all hazards assessed as 'negligible'.
Impact to DoD activities	DoD	The DoD claims that offshore infrastructure may impact military flying training areas and that there may be safety risks to air navigation due to the risk of collision with low-flying aircraft below 500 feet (152 m). Unexploded ordnance (UXO) may be present on and in the sea floor within the North Australia Exercise Area (NAXA).	These concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DoD and therefore have merit.	EOG has identified and mapped the NAXA and restricted airspace, which is included in Section 5.7.8 of the EP. Although not yet contracted, the highest point of the MODU derrick will be about 90 m above the sea surface. This, the bulk of the MODU, its location in the NTM and direct communications from EOG to all relevant persons ahead of drilling means the MODU should not present a risk to low flying aircraft. An assessment for the risk of interference with other marine users is presented in Section 7.2. Notification requirements are included in Section 10.7.2 of the EP per DoD's request.
Interference with commercial fishing and vessels	WAFIC	WAFIC requested that no recreational fishing takes place from any vessel associated with the activity, that vessels divert around commercial fishing activity and remain clear of underwater fishing gear. They also requested that all vessel crew are trained about potential interactions with commercial fishers.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of WAFIC and therefore has merit.	An assessment of the risks of interference with other marine users is provided in Section 8.4 of the EP and concludes that the residual risk rating is 'negligible.' An environmental performance standard (has been included in Section 8.4.5 that prohibits fishing from the MODU and support vessels. Section 10.4.2 of the EP provides a commitment to undertake an induction of all vessel crew, which will include key

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
				commitments such as avoiding interactions with commercial fishing vessels.
Potential for oil spill impacts	WA DoT	The WA DoT stated that they must be consulted if there is a risk of a hydrocarbon spill entering WA state waters.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DoT and therefore has merit.	EOG committed to providing the DoT with a copy of the OPEP with each submission to NOPSEMA in line with the DoT's guidance for the preparation of OPEPs, which EOG has done. See records in Appendix 8 and Appendix 9.
	WAFIC	WAFIC wants assurance that if a hydrocarbon spill occurs, baseline scientific data on the marine environment will be collected, that a desktop emergency training exercise includes commercial fishing interests, that there is support to the commercial fishing industry with regards to traceability of fish products to manage tainting risks, there is an OSMP in place and there is a commitment to financial adjustment to the commercial fishing industry.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of WAFIC and therefore has merit.	EOG has incorporated these requirements in the EP, OPEP and OSMBIP.
	Project Sea Dragon	The project representative expressed concern for water quality and impacts on an aquaculture water intake at Forsyth Creek in the event of a hydrocarbon spill.	These concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of Project Sea Dragon and therefore have merit.	EOG has incorporated water quality monitoring requirements into the OSMBIP. The creek is nominated as a priority protection area in the OSMBIP.
	BAC	The BAC expressed concern for damage to Country, including important coastal cultural sites as well as a number of tourism endeavours run by the Balanggarra people, in the event of an oil spill and a spill response.	These concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the BAC and therefore have merit.	The risk assessment for spill response at the shoreline factors in the need to consult with Traditional Owners (see Sections 9.5.6 and 9.6.6).

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
Consultation with regards to Sea Country	DNP	The DNP stated that Aboriginal groups have responsibilities for managing the JBG AMP and should be consulted.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DNP and therefore has merit.	EOG has consulted with Aboriginal groups with interests in management of the JBG AMP. See records in Appendix 8 and Appendix 9.
Submission in response to first public exhibition of this EP (after 8 June 2022)				
Provision of DIMT resourcing to the WA DoT	WA DoT	In response to EOG seeking feedback on the draft Beehive-1 drilling EP in August 2022, the DoT queried EOG's initial arrangements to provide less than the 11 DIMT personnel to meet its expectations as set out in the DoT's Offshore Petroleum Industry Guidance Note Marine Oil Pollution: Response and Consultation Arrangements.	The concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DoT and therefore have merit.	In the second half of 2022, EOG revised the OPEP substantially in response to NOPSEMA's initial assessment and the DoT's concerns. The OPEP revision included new appendices demonstrating the capability of the DIMT and operational teams (based on an analysis by AMOSC). The revised OPEP (Rev 3) was submitted to the DoT in mid-December 2022 for additional review, along with a tabulated response to the DoT's comments. In this revision, EOG nominated that they could provide 11 DIMT roles to the DOT between days three and eight after the spill.
		In January 2023, the DoT provided an additional list of comments to EOG about the revised OPEP.	The concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DoT and therefore have merit.	In February 2023, EOG met with the DoT in person to discuss their concerns and form a plan to address these in a revised OPEP. Throughout 2023, EOG worked on refining the OPEP to address DoT's concerns as well as the comments from NOPSEMA's assessment. In October 2023, EOG re-submitted the OPEP to the DoT for their review, along with an update to the tabulated response provided in December 2022, which indicated where changes had been made in response to DoT's comments. Noting that EOG would have limited staff in-country during the activity, EOG nominated two

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
				staff as part of the DIMT, with additional personnel to be sourced from LPM and AMOSC.
		In December 2023, the DoT raised one additional concern relating to the suitability of using external personnel (non-EOG staff) in the DIMT Deputy Planning Officer and Deputy Logistics Officer roles. The DoT stated that their preference is that these roles are sourced internally as they need to have an intimate knowledge of EOG's processes and plans and the ability to make financial decisions on EOG's behalf.	The concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DoT and therefore have merit.	EOG re-submitted the EP and OPEP to NOPSEMA for assessment in February 2024 after its additional public exhibition phase (to factor in the change of timing to the activity). While EOG factored in DoT's concerns regarding number of personnel in the DIMT, non-EOG personnel were still retained in the DIMT Deputy Planning Officer and Deputy Logistics Officer roles because EOG determined that LPM and AMOSC have the suitable expertise and manpower to fulfil these roles. As part of NOPSEMA's assessment of the EP and OPEP in February and March 2024, it was noted that this issue had not been closed out with the DoT. As part of continuing consultation, in early May 2024 EOG provided additional information to the DoT about the reasoning for having non-EOG personnel in the DIMT Deputy Planning Officer and Deputy Logistics Officer roles, in addition to clarity around the commitments and control measures that have been added to the OPEP to remedy any concerns. The DoT was satisfied with this, which is included in Section 3.1 of Appendix A to the OPEP.
Impacts of an oil spill to marine parks	CCWA	The CCWA expressed concerns about hydrocarbon spill impacts to marine parks, specifically the Joseph Bonaparte Gulf AMP, North Kimberley Marine Park, Ord River Floodplain, King Shoals Sanctuary	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the CCWA and therefore has merit.	EOG revised Appendix 11 of this EP (existing environment of the spill EMBA) to provide more detail about these areas, along with updating the oil spill risk assessment (Section 8.7) where necessary. The proposed control

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
		Zone and Cape Domett Special Protection Zone.		measures for a LoWC were reviewed and found to be ALARP and acceptable. Appendix 14 was added, providing more information on the probability of contact to protected areas in the event of a LoWC, and an assessment of consistency of oil spill response activities with the relevant management plans. See Section 4.2.7 for more details.
Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions	CCWA	The submitter expressed concern about Scope 3 GHG emissions.	Although this concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the CCWA, it has no merit for this activity because scope 3 GHG emissions are not relevant for an exploration well, as it will not be producing hydrocarbons for combustible use by EOG or any third parties.	EOG responded to the relevant person that scope 3 GHG emissions are not relevant for the assessment of the activity. Nevertheless, the EIA (Section 7.4) was reviewed and updated with additional information about scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions, outlining why Scope 3 emissions are not relevant to this activity. Scope 3 emissions cannot be calculated because a) they will not be generated for this activity and b) because in the event of a commercial discovery, the volume and quality of the hydrocarbons is currently unknown. The impacts are assessed to be ALARP and acceptable.
Consultation with a wider range of relevant persons was required	CCWA	The submitter claimed that EOG inappropriately applied the IAP2 consultation criteria by removing some key components, thus reducing its responsibilities to meaningfully consult with stakeholders.	This claim has no merit because EOG did not claim it applied the IAP2 consultation criteria in full. EOG's review of the consultation methodology indicated that it was consistent with the IAP2 core values. Nevertheless, as a result of the Decision (see Section 4.1), EOG reviewed its approach to consultation.	In response to this comment and the Decision (see Section 4.1), EOG reviewed its approach to consultation. This approach is described in this chapter. This resulted in consultation with a much larger number of Traditional Owner representatives and commercial fishing companies.

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
EOG's response to CCWA's comments is available in its titleholder report, available on the NOPSEMA website here.				
Subsequent to the identification of additional relevant persons and prior to second public exhibition of the EP (between 8 June 2022 and 10 October 2023)				
Sensitive receptors	WA DBCA	The DBCA noted the many marine parks, islands and coastal reserves in the spill EMBA that may be impacted in the event of a large hydrocarbon spill. They asked that the necessary baseline values of these areas be understood. If baseline data is not available, they requested that EOG establish what baseline information is available in order to be available to undertake Before-After, Control-Impact (BACI) studies in the event of a large spill.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DBCA and therefore has merit.	Chapter 5 of this EP describes all conservation values in the impacts EMBA, and Appendix 11 of this EP describes all conservation values in the impacts EMBA. Appendix C of the OPEP outlines the scientific monitoring arrangements that will be implemented in the event of a LoWC.
		The DBCA also suggested using the *National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds* as a best-practice industry standard for managing potential impacts of light pollution on marine fauna.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the DBCA and therefore has merit.	The light pollution guidelines were already referenced in the EIA in Section 7.3 of this EP.
	Individuals at information sessions at Kalumburu and Broome	A number of individuals raised general concerns regarding the impacts of Beehive-1 exploration on marine receptors including fishing areas (for oysters, scallops, fish, crabs, sting rays), turtles, whales, dugongs, and species of cultural significance such as turtles and dugong.	These concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of these individuals and therefore have merit.	All species of conservation and cultural significance are described in Chapter 5 and Appendix 11 of this EP, augmented with information about cultural relevance where information was available. Impacts are assessed in Chapter 7 and risks are assessed in Chapters 8 and 9.
	CSIRO	Concerns were raised about the impacts to post-larval and juvenile redleg banana prawns, including their migration, as a result of turbidity in the water column	These concerns are relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the CSIRO and therefore have merit.	EOG responded to the CSIRO noting that Section 7.6 of the Beehive-1 Drilling EP presents the EIA for the discharge of drilling cuttings and muds, with the impact to the

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
		(from drill cuttings and muds discharges) and underwater sound. The potential impacts to sawfish (*Pristis* spp) and their habitats were also raised as a concern. ** Note that these concerns were raised by letter and via the project social pinpoint website.*		Northern Prawn Fishery determined to be 'negligible'. The matrix-type design of the jack-up rig legs allows for water to flow through the legs, meaning there will be negligible impact on prawn movements. There is minimal underwater sound generated by jack-up drill rigs, even while drilling (EP Section 7.5). If VSP is undertaken, the area expected to be affected by sound greater than 160 dB (sound levels greater than that affecting the behaviour of marine invertebrates such as prawns) is less than 500 m from the sound source. With regards to noise impacts, potential impacts to marine mammals and crustaceans are assessed in Section 7.5 and have been assessed as 'negligible'. *Pristis* spp (sawfish) are described and have their habitats mapped in Section 5.4.4 of the EP, with impacts and risks to fish addressed in Chapters 7 and 8.
Impacts to tuna fisheries	Tuna Australia	Tuna Australia provided a Position Statement to EOG asking for information in a written succinct manner including estimated boundaries for extent of planned activity impacts as well as activities within the operational area.	This concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of Tuna Australia and therefore has merit.	EOG created a fact sheet tailored for Tuna Australia, which provided detailed information about the location of tuna fisheries in relation to the project area and potential risk, as well as demonstrating that the EP has control measures in place to reduce these risks to ALARP.
		Tuna Australia provided a Service Agreement, mandating an hourly fee be paid with a minimum hour commitment, in order for consultation to proceed.	NOPSEMA's brochure GL2086 *Consultation in the course of preparing an environment plan* (May 2023) indicates that there is no requirement in law for titleholders to pay relevant	EOG explained to Tuna Australia that it had consulted with the individual Southern Bluefin Tuna and Western Tuna and Billfish fishery license holders and peak representative bodies (the fishing zones for those fisheries overlap

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
			persons' costs associated with consultation. There is therefore no merit to this claim.	the spill EMBA). EOG also noted that the ABARES fishing data indicates there is no recent fishing effort near the activity area for any tuna fisheries. At the time of this EP submission, EOG has not received any further response from Tuna Australia. See Section 4.2.7 for more details.
		Tuna Australia made a number of claims about the adequacy of EOG's consultation with tuna fishers.	An assessment found that EOG's consultation with tuna fishers has met the legislated requirements and is in accordance with EOG's RPCEP (Appendix 2).	No further measures adapted. See Section 4.2.7 for more details.
Engagement process	Bardi & Jawi Niimidiman Aboriginal Corporation (BJNAC)	The BJNAC emailed EOG their draft Resourcing Protocol Agreement seeking to enter into an executed agreement with EOG prior to fully engaging with EOG. The BJNAC stated that the draft Resourcing Protocol Agreement had been prepared to align with the findings in the Court in the Santos decision around the requirements for consultation. The draft agreement seeks an explicit consent right for the BJNAC in respect of EOG's activity.	The consent requirement included in the draft Resourcing Protocol Agreement does not align with legislative requirements or NOPSEMA's published guidance. Based on Section 280 of the OPGGS Act 2006, EOG assesses that there is no merit to the consent right being sought by the BJNAC. See Section 4.2.7 for more details.	EOG has sought an opportunity to hold a discussion with the BJNAC to better understand the contents of the rights being sought by them in the proposed Resourcing Protocol Agreement. At the time of EP submission, no discussions have taken place.
Impacts to commercial fisheries	WAFIC	WAFIC provided input to EOG's fisheries compensation protocol.	This input related to WAFIC's functions and interests and therefore has merit.	EOG took WAFIC's feedback into account when finalising the fisheries compensation protocol (a summary of the protocol is provided in Appendix 9).
Potential for oil spill impacts	Project Sea Dragon	As per the 'Prior to first public exhibition' part of this table. The only difference being that the relevant person advised that water pumping from	As per the 'Prior to first public exhibition' part of this table.	As per the 'Prior to first public exhibition' part of this table.

Theme	Relevant persons	Objections and claims raised by relevant person	Assessment of merit of objections and claims	Measures adopted by EOG in response to objections and claims
		Forsyth Creek is scheduled to commence in 2024.		
Spill response	Individual at information session in Broome	The relevant person stated that the Indigenous Salt Water Advisory Group (ISWAG) may be able to assist in the event of responding to a spill event.	This claim may assist in the event of a spill event and therefore has merit.	The ISWAG is contactable via the Kimberley Land Council (Land and Sea Unit). Their contact details have been included in an update to the spill notifications section of this EP (Section 10.7.2).
In response to second public exhibition of the EP (after 10 October 2023)				
There was one submission in response to the second public exhibition of this EP. This was from the CCWA, which repeated the claims made in their submission to the first public exhibition of the EP. As such, these are not repeated here. See the 'Submissions in response to first public exhibition of this EP (after 8 June 2022)' part of this table. One additional point was made in their submission, which is detailed below.				
Sensitive receptors	CCWA	The CCWA asked that the location of the proposal be changed to avoid severe impacts to highly valued and biologically marine parks and receptors, including coral reefs, seagrass communities, mangroves, migratory birds, sea turtles, dugongs, Australian snubfin dolphins and diverse finfish communities.	Although this concern is relevant to the functions, interests and activities of the CCWA, it has no merit for this activity. This is because the reservoir is where it is – its location is fixed below the seabed and therefore the activity location cannot be changed. CCWA claims that impacts from the activity will be severe, whereas as outlined in Table 7.1, none of the residual impacts are rated higher than 'negligible' and as outlined in Table 8.1, none of the residual impacts are rated higher than 'medium.' As such, this claim has no merit.	No additional measures can be adopted in response to this claim.
EOG's response to CCWA's comments is available in its titleholder report, available on the NOPSEMA website with this EP (weblink unavailable at the time of EP submission).				

4.2.6. Duty 6: Titleholder Responsiveness

As required by OPGGS(E) Regulation 24(b)(iii), titleholders must respond to each relevant person's objections or claims. The EOG consultation team manages all website content, in-person meetings and activities, written correspondence and phone calls to ensure that the consultation process is adequate and appropriate to targeted relevant persons, and that every claim and objection receives a response.

Feedback is handled via written correspondence and telephone contact. Written correspondence has been used to respond to enquiries and to request any remaining feedback that had not been previously addressed. Phone calls are used to maintain rapport and continue formal consultation with relevant persons, to confirm receipt of correspondence and offer the opportunity to ask questions and clarify information provided through written correspondence and other media.

Appendix 8 provides a complete list of consultation undertaken with relevant persons and demonstrates that EOG has responded to all questions, objections and claims.

4.2.7. Duty 7: Consultation Shall Be Ongoing

Based on the fact that EOG has executed in its entirety the methodology set forth in its RPCEP and fulfilled its requirements for the purposes of compliance with the OPGGS(E), relevant persons consultation has been fulfilled. However, titleholders are obligated to maintain ongoing consultation. Therefore, until the EP has been accepted by NOPSEMA and the project is completed, relevant persons can provide feedback to EOG. This section summarises how EOG is fulfilling this duty.

Ongoing Consultation Matters

EOG remains in ongoing consultation with multiple relevant persons. As summarised below and further described in Appendix 7 (Sensitive Matters Report), the ongoing consultation matters continue with the Nyul Nyul PBC, the NPFI, Tuna Australia, and the Bardi and Jawi Niimidiman Aboriginal Corporation (BJNAC).

Nyul Nyul PBC

EOG emailed the Nyul Nyul PBC on 23 May 2023, 6 July 2023, 9 August 2023, 13 November 2023, and 24 November 2023 through both the Kimberley Land Council and the nominated Nyul Nyul contact person.

On 28 November 2023, the Nyul Nyul contact person responded by email thanking EOG for the correspondence as per email updates and apologising for the delayed response. They indicated that the Nyul Nyul PBC Board would like EOG to have the opportunity to present and share information early in 2024 and engage in personal consultation.

EOG replied on 29 November 2023 acknowledging the correspondence and noting the fact that the Nyul Nyul PBC Board does not have any general or specific feedback in respect of the proposed activities at this time. EOG welcomed the opportunity to present the Beehive project to the Nyul Nyul PBC Board and inquired as to whether there is flexibility to present virtually, as the most expedient and efficient way to proceed. EOG also specifically noted that, given the length of time that the project information has been made available and that no concerns have been identified at this time, a meeting in 2024 would be a part of continuing consultation and would not impact the resubmission of EOG's EPs to NOPSEMA, inviting any feedback from Nyul Nyul PBC to be provided prior to 11 December 2023.

At the time of this EP submission, EOG has not received further correspondence from the Nyul Nyul PBC.

Northern Prawn Fishing Industry (NPFI)

On 18 September 2021, EOG sent an email introducing the Beehive-1 drilling and geotechnical phases. In response, on 28 September 2021 the NPFI emailed EOG requesting additional information, which was provided by EOG via email on 28 September 2021. EOG sent a follow-up email on 27 October 2021 to request feedback. On 9 November 2021, EOG emailed NPFI to provide an update and request feedback on earlier correspondence. On 10 November 2021, the NPFI emailed EOG with a summary of concerns, to which EOG emailed a response on 12 November 2021 specifically addressing the NPFI's concerns.

On 24 May 2023 EOG emailed the NPFI to provide an update on the Beehive-1 project; on 19 June EOG emailed NPFI to follow up on the 24 May email. On 20 June 2023 the NPFI responded and on 20 June 2023 EOG replied to confirm receipt of NPFI's email. On 3 August 2023 the NPFI emailed EOG reiterating their concerns as stated in their November 2021 correspondence. EOG responded that day confirming receipt of their email and again on 24 August 2023 with a detailed reply to each of NPFI's concerns. On 24 August 2023, EOG received an automated reply informing that the NPFI contact was unavailable and indicating 11 September as the earliest possible date of response. On 12 September 2023, EOG emailed the NPFI with an updated timeline on the EP submittal and a request for assistance regarding specific items that the NPFI had identified in previous correspondence. On 26 October 2023, EOG emailed the NPFI advising that the EP had been submitted to NOPSEMA. On 24 November 2023, EOG emailed the NPFI to request feedback.

On 3 December 2023, the NPFI emailed EOG reiterating their previous concerns. EOG replied on 6 December 2023 advising that their records will be updated accordingly.

At the time of this EP submission, EOG has not received further response from the NPFI.

Tuna Australia

Tuna Australia emailed EOG on 25 May and 28 May 2023, providing a Position Statement and a copy of Tuna Australia's form of Service Agreement.

Tuna Australia's Position Statement asked for "information in a written succinct manner including estimated boundaries for extent of planned activity impacts (i.e., artificial light, noise, discharges, etc.) as well as activities within the operational area."

EOG replied on 19 July 2023, providing Tuna Australia with a Beehive Project Fact Sheet July 2023 – Tuna Australia. The fact sheet provided detailed information about the location of tuna fisheries in relation to the project area and potential risk, as well as demonstrating that the EP has control measures in place to reduce these risks to ALARP.

In regard to Tuna Australia's Service Agreement, mandating an hourly fee be paid with a minimum hour commitment, EOG's response referred to NOPSEMA's brochure, GL2086 *Consultation in the course of preparing an environment plan* (12 May 2023), which indicates that there is no requirement in law for titleholders to pay relevant persons' costs associated with consultation.

Moreover, EOG consulted with the individual Southern Bluefin Tuna and Western Tuna and Billfish fishery license holders and peak representative bodies in that the fishing zones for those specific fisheries overlap the geotechnical and drilling EMBAs. Further, EOG noted, based on ABARES data (see Section 11.6.1 of Appendix 11) that no recent fishing effort has occurred near the project area for any of the tuna fisheries.

EOG does not believe there is merit in entering into a Service Agreement with Tuna Australia for the following reasons:

- Guidance provided by NOPSEMA's guideline 2086;
- The lack of fishing in the area for the last three years;
- The fact that EOG is consulting directly with the fisheries that overlap the EMBA; and
- The limited scope of the activity being proposed.

Tuna Australia emailed EOG on 10 August 2023 stating that they "… have been forwarded an email from one of our members directing EOG Australia to speak to Tuna Australia about your Beehive project in the Boneparte Basin." Tuna Australia advised that AFMA has expressed concerns to NOPSEMA about titleholders directly consulting with statutory fishing rights (SFR) holders. Tuna Australia stated that "AFMA encourages energy companies to engage directly with industry associations to ensure targeted consultation." Tuna Australia re-issued their position statement and services agreement.

EOG replied on 25 August 2023 stating that they had reviewed the information provided on AFMA's position on engagement with SFR holders, and reiterated its position as detailed in EOG's email dated 19 July 2023.

Tuna Australia replied on 25 August 2023 claiming that consultation with tuna fishers should only occur through Tuna Australia. EOG responded on 13 September confirming its views as set out in its email dated 25 August 2023.

Tuna Australia emailed EOG on 25 October 2023 reiterating a number of previous claims and several new claims related to EOG's consultation. An assessment of merit was undertaken (**Appendix 7**). EOG replied on 27 November 2023 thanking Tuna Australia for their response and stating that Tuna Australia's comments are being taken into account. EOG advised that the EPs will be submitted as early as 11 December 2023 and invited further comment.

At the time of this EP submission, EOG has not received a response from Tuna Australia.

Bardi and Jawi Niimidiman Aboriginal Corporation

EOG organised an in-person meeting in Broome for 1 March 2023. None of the invited persons attended.

BJNAC emailed EOG on 14 April 2023 advising that the PBC will be meeting on 19-20 April 2023 to discuss the Beehive project. They stated that they need time to consider the Tipakalippa decision, EOG's compliance with the OPGGS(E) regulations, and risks and impacts to sea country. They advised that "… the PBC is currently unable to engage with you on a goodwill basis via attending and coordinating meetings, or with general correspondence." They advised that the PBC is preparing a resourcing protocol for EOG's execution to allow for the PBC to "… provide the assistance required to you."

On 5 June 2023, the BJNAC emailed EOG their draft Resourcing Protocol Agreement seeking to enter into an executed agreement with EOG prior to fully engaging with EOG. The BJNAC stated that the draft Resourcing Protocol Agreement proffered had been prepared to "align with the findings in the Court in the *Santos* decision around the requirements for consultation." However, the draft agreement seeks an explicit consent right for the BJNAC in respect of EOG's activity. This consent requirement included in the draft Resourcing Protocol Agreement does not align with legislative requirements or NOPSEMA's published guidance.

On 19 June 2023, the BJNAC emailed NOPSEMA raising several consultation concerns related to free, prior and informed consent. They asked for feedback and requested support to undertake culturally appropriate consultation. On 19 July 2023, EOG responded to this email thanking them for providing the draft Resourcing Protocol. EOG noted that titleholders are not required to gain consent and suggested a meeting should be held to discuss the draft Resourcing Protocol.

On 25 August 2023, EOG emailed BJNAC advising that it had been provided with a copy of the BJNAC email to NOPSEMA. EOG advised that the EPs would be submitted to NOPSEMA "as soon as the end of August 2023". EOG again suggested a meeting should be held to discuss the draft Resourcing Protocol.

On 26 October 2023, EOG emailed BJNAC advising that they have re-submitted both the Beehive Geotechnical and Exploration Drilling EPs to NOPSEMA for assessment. EOG again suggested a meeting should be held to discuss the draft Resourcing Protocol.

At the time of this EP submission, EOG has not received a response from BJNAC.

4.3. Public Exhibition of the EP

In accordance with OPGGS(E) Regulations 28(1) and 30, NOPSEMA published this EP (Revision 0) on the NOPSEMA website, so that members of the general public could view and comment on the contents of this EP. Once published, the EP was available for a period of 30 days between 9 May and 8 June 2022. Table 4.3 lists the print media in which EOG placed advertisements so as to promote the availability of the EP in order to seek public comment.

Subsequent to a change in project timing that resulted from delays brought about by the Tipakalippa decision (see Section 4.1), this EP was revised to take into account the new activity window and re-submitted to NOPSEMA and re-published on the NOPSEMA website. Once published, the EP was available for a period of 30 days between 12 October and 11 November 2023. Table 4.3 lists the print media in which EOG placed advertisements so as to promote the availability of the EP in order to seek public comment.

The public exhibition process is another avenue in which to identify relevant persons. In the case of this Beehive-1 drilling EP:

- Revision 0 EP exhibition (9 May to 8 June 2022) - only one commenter responded (CCWA) and raised several matters. These were addressed by EOG in the 'Titleholder Report', which is available on the NOPSEMA website (https://info.nopsema.gov.au/environment_plans/587/show_public).
- Revision 4 EP exhibition (12 October to 11 November 2023) – only one commenter responded (CCWA) and repeated matters they previously raised during the first public exhibition and included one new claim (see Table). These were addressed by EOG in the 'Titleholder Report', which is available with this EP on the NOPSEMA website.