

Introduction

Name:

Privacy of natural persons

Email:

Privacy of natural persons

Business name or organisation (if applicable):

Position title (if applicable):

Is this an individual submission or on behalf of a group or organisation?

Privacy of natural persons

Please indicate which group you most identify with or are involved in?

Privacy of natural persons

Please specify the group that you most identify with

Please indicate which type of group your submission represents

Please specify the group or organisation that your submission is on behalf of.

Vision

Do you agree or disagree with the overall vision for the minerals and petroleum sector in New Zealand?

Strongly disagree

Why?

1. I believe that greenwash is being used to disguise a business-as-usual approach. The climate crisis that we are facing is receiving less attention than the habit of digging up and consuming resources. There is no distinction made between fossil fuels, which must go to zero as fast as possible because they are driving climate change, and other minerals which should be assessed on their environmental impact. There is no distinction made between aggregates, rock used for roading and concrete which are abundant and can be mined with very low impact, and minerals like gold which cause major environmental disruption. Metals essential for the transition to a zero carbon economy (eg lithium, cobalt) should be given priority over those which are merely "nice to have" (eg gold – there is enough gold already above ground for essential industrial uses.)

What is your vision for the minerals and petroleum sector in New Zealand?

Stop demand. Truly a gargantuan goal, but being able to have products repaired rather than being told "You'll have to buy a new one." should be our goal. Limit demand and the need to mine more minerals and petroleum will be reduced as well. Limit the amount of minerals and petroleum being mined and demand will have to decrease as a consequence. Mineral and Petroleum exploration is driving and being driven by a consumer based economy. The only vision we all should be seeking is one of a stable future. The enormity of what we face if the climate collapses dwarfs the challenges of phasing out petroleum and minerals; and gas is not a transition fuel.

How can New Zealand sustainably derive value from its petroleum and minerals resources?

When an object or material is valued, it is not squandered or simply thrown away. Accepting that natural resources are finite in nature would shape our policies. Limited

resources require limiting how much we dig up, selecting carefully what we use the resources for and eliminating waste. If time, money, effort and other resources were used to extract minerals and petroleum and shape it into a consumable product, that product and its materials should not end up in a landfill. We act as though it is our right to dig up and use whatever we want, and we have squandered a great many resources--that's not sustainable. If we want to "sustainably derive value", we must first apply value and stop considering mineral and petroleum extraction as an industry right. The Minerals and Petroleum sector operate with a mindset that resources can always, must always, be mined because people need them. What people need is clean water, clean air and a stable environment.

Objectives for the minerals and petroleum sector

Objective for a sector that: “Responsibly delivers value for New Zealand (a) Supporting a productive, sustainable and inclusive economy (b) Supporting New Zealand's transition to a carbon neutral economy”.

Disagree

Why?

Again, language is camouflaging the fact that there is no identifiable change being initiated through this objective. Who defines value and 'responsibly'? I feel that it is irresponsible to continue promoting mineral and petroleum exploration to grow the economy. Allowing more fossil fuel extraction is irresponsible when there is overwhelming scientific evidence and global consensus that fossil fuels contribute to (cause) climate breakdown. As long as language such as this is being used, there will be no transition. We will look back on the foolishness of believing that in the current climate we can promote mineral and petroleum exploration SUSTAINABLY. This is absolutely obsolete in the current ecological emergency. “Value” from minerals is not value; it is a hefty tab to be picked up by our children. Every tonne of coal, oil or gas extracted in New Zealand will be burned and end up in the atmosphere, somewhere in the world. Whether it's counted as New Zealand's emissions or those of another country, it will contribute to climate change. We can get more value in other industries: Renewable energies provide more jobs; even in the United States more than twice as many people work in solar and wind as in extractive industries. Let's get real value, not sell Papatuanuku for short term profit. We must acknowledge the farce that is perpetual economic growth, and embrace an economy of well being- where 'value' from petroleum makes no sense. The incoming hydrogen plant in Taranaki is a concern, with the considered “blue hydrogen” option perpetuating a reliance on gas. The enormous investment should instead be going straight to 100% renewable energies, rather than this expensive and risky half-way solution. It will not restructure any of the current, damaging wealth and power structures, is based on unproven technology in CCS, and creates further problems for future generations to deal with in terms of buried carbon. We could instead use this review for an opportunity to design a more community generated energy system, a democratizing of energy monopolies, and a purposeful and ambitious transition away from the unarguably catastrophic current extractive system. In short, there is no sustainable way to continue to extract minerals and resources in Aotearoa.

Objective for a sector that: “Is productive and innovative”.

Disagree

Why?

I strongly agree with the need to be both productive and innovative, but innovation in this sector is trying to fix the most serious problem facing humanity with clever technology that masks a business-as-usual approach. Carbon capture, robotic mining devices, remotely operated vehicles, innovative conveyance systems and new generation imaging tools are considered innovative, but these are just expensive toys that allow the mining industry to reach deeper and deeper into the earth and the oceans because our natural resources are becoming scarce. Innovation is recycling and up-cycling current products so that no mineral that has already been extracted from the earth goes to waste in a landfill. The market will continue to encourage rampant consumerism as long as the minerals and resources continue to be readily and easily available. It is neither productive nor innovative to keep digging up resources to build new stuff that will eventually be thrown away.

Objective for a sector that: “Is effectively regulated”.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

"Effective" by whose measure? The industry would say that the sector is too heavily regulated now, while conservationists and environmentalists and science itself indicates that the industry has been left to its own devices for too long. Loopholes have become entrenched in the system. The Strategy should set a timeframe for the phase out of fossil fuels, starting with no new coal mines or oil and gas wells, and protecting essential uses of these fuels (eg steel making) for as long as possible, while closing down uses for which there are good substitutes, like electricity generation, promptly.

Are there any other objectives for the minerals and petroleum sector that you would like us to consider in the strategy?

The Strategy proposes “balancing impacts across all 4 capitals”. This is insane short term thinking, similar to Walter White making a little meth to pay the bills--not sustainable and actually dangerous. Climate and environmental protection must take precedence over revenue to the Crown. Gas is NOT a sustainable bridge to a low carbon (let alone zero carbon) economy. It’s carbon dioxide emissions are more like 60% of coal rather than the 50% often quoted by industry, and we have to add to that significant methane releases from all parts of the production and use cycle. The industry is well aware of these facts. Gas should be phased out in the same way as coal and oil.

Guiding principles

Principle: The environment, ecosystems, and biodiversity are respected now and in the long term.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

Of course that sounds lovely, but there isn't any power in it. The environment, ecosystems and biodiversity must be PROTECTED. If we are that jolly innovative and determined to be sustainable, then all of our aspirations for comfort should fall second to protecting the very earth that keeps us alive. The UN report released 7 May 2019 set out the species extinctions we’re causing through climate change and

environmental pollution: "We are eroding the very foundations of economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide." The recent IPBES Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystems described the issue that we are currently in the biggest biodiversity crisis ever faced in human history. Within that context, New Zealand is at the extreme end- with the highest ratio of threatened species of any country in the world. Continuing petroleum and mineral exploration in full knowledge of this would be the very definition of stupidity.

Principle: Māori cultural interests are understood and respected.

Agree

Why?

Modern society can learn wisdom from the indigenous people who lived harmoniously with the earth for centuries.

Principle: Support the transition to a carbon neutral economy by 2050.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

Support is not strong enough. "Support" can be watered down to simply mean 'agree with'. Our governmental policies must shape and build a carbon neutral economy. Leading climate scientists say we have a good 12 years to keep warming at 1.5, but only 12 years.

Principle: The impact on people, communities and regions are managed in a just and inclusive way.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

The impact of climate change or the impact of transitioning to a carbon neutral economy? If we don't control our emissions, we will have no way to control climate breakdown. Watch a video of a collapsing ice shelf in Antarctica--once it starts, there is no way to stop it. The impact of full blown climate breakdown will have a devastating impact on people, communities, and regions. The impact of transitioning away from our reliance on fossil fuels is simply an inconvenience.

Principle: Support a circular economy by meeting resource needs through resource efficiency, recycling and reuse.

Agree

Why?

This is a noble ideal, but it is not what's driving this resource strategy document. This document has fresh, green-sounding language, but I don't get much of a sense of reduction. The underlying intention is obviously continued exploration, development and use. Why else compare the amount of money earned by people employed in the minerals and petroleum sector to the average wage and delineate the value of the resources in strictly monetary terms at the beginning of the document? Megan Woods' opening statement is, " Aotearoa New Zealand's future prosperity depends on a minerals and petroleum sector that can responsibly deliver the resources we need." This is not the language of change or innovation nor does it reflect the understanding

that future prosperity will be impossible if the earth's climatic structure falters completely and our natural weather and seasonal systems are lost completely.

Principle: Actions taken within the mineral and petroleum sector should align with the strategic direction of other related sectors and Government strategies.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

Yes, assuming that other related sectors and Governmental strategies prioritise a secure climate and future stability rather than growth.

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following principles for the Crown?

Principle: The Crown honours its duty towards Māori as a Treaty partner, adheres to the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and its duty to meet settlement commitments.

Agree

Why?

Principle: The Crown receives a fair financial return for its minerals and petroleum.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

This seems like such an obvious yes, but again, "fair" based on whose assessment of fair? Currently the taxpayer is subsidising the minerals and petroleum industry by providing tax-payer funded geological research and supporting their conferences which signal that they have access to extract our resources.

Principle: The Crown regulates in a way that is fair, transparent, reasonable and proportionate.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

This ridiculous on-line format is irritating, but the onslaught of inane questions and double speak is eroding my respect for this process. Of course The Crown should regulate in a way that is fair, transparent, reasonable and proportionate, but who defines what is fair, transparent, reasonable and proportionate? The Minerals and Petroleum industry has a LOT more money than the environmental, social and conservation groups who find some mining practices dangerous, polluting and irresponsible. Money buys a place at the table of power, which is hardly new. It's just that the feudal system has shifted from castles and "court" to golf courses and the courtroom. It may be reasonable for the Minister of Energy and Resources to speaking at the Petroleum Conference, but is it fair that the exclusive nature of the event denies ordinary citizens entry? Are the conversations that Ms Woods has with industry officials at the conference going to be transparent and available for all to discern? Are ministerial attendance at corporate events proportionally balanced against attendance at grassroot events where a non-industry point of view is being expressed?

Principle: The Crown honours the rights of current permit holders to continue production or exploration activities under existing permits.

Strongly disagree

Why?

I understand the need to play nice, and this approach has some merit, but it does not take into play the conditions under which the permits were obtained--was that process fair, transparent, reasonable and proportionate? Nor does it take into the account the climate crisis that is staring us in the face. The overwhelming need to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions demands a type of triage be applied. New exploration on existing permits, issued years ago, can not be justified in light of the climate science available today. The government's underlying obligation is to ensure the safety of its citizens, not the mining industry. Allowing the extraction of any material which will increase greenhouse gas emissions is morally wrong.

Principle: The Crown makes policy decisions based on the best evidence, and accounting for the foreseeable need for minerals and petroleum, both now and for future generations.

Agree

Why?

The best evidence today might influence permits that were granted in a previous time. The SPECIAL REPORT Global Warming of 1.5 °C offers unflinching evidence that we must go searching for more fossil fuels.

Principle: The Crown proactively engages and consults with relevant stakeholders and decisions are communicated in a clear and transparent way.

Agree

Why?

"Consultation" is yet another good idea that has been sullied through mis-use. Too often consultation has come to mean that a governing agency decides to do something that the general population probably won't like, so they hold a meeting "to consult with the public" and then they do as they please without listening to the views of the public. "Consult" needs to be something like "Gives attention to and noticeably responds to..."

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following principles for Industry?

Principle: Pursue continuous improvements in health and safety.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

But it needs to add: which include the health and safety impacts of the resource/material being extracted and the effect its end use will have on the general population"

Principle: Strive to implement industry best practice in operations.

Strongly disagree

Why?

I have a scathing disrespect for industry definition of best practice. The industry is highly motivated by profit, they consistently do whatever they can to keep profits high and costs low. Earning money for investors is what the industry strives to do. "Best practice in operations" is a sloppy attempt to disguise the basic function of economic

activity. It's cowardly trying to dress up a business's primary purpose as something else.

Principle: Seek innovative ways to improve the resource efficiency of extraction operations; and minimise the negative impacts of these operations.

Strongly disagree

Why?

In other words, keep doing what we've always done, but try to be a bit more environmentally aware. How about: Recognise that at times extracting the resource causes more harm than the resource's actual value.

Principle: Engage with stakeholders and implement management systems to understand and manage impacts, and realise opportunities for redress where needed.

Strongly disagree

Why?

Engage with stakeholders and those in opposition to navigate the way forward. Recognise and accept that no management system will address the negative social and environmental impacts of certain proposals. Realise these are opportunities to scale back and will aid in the transition to becoming carbon neutral. The Reserve bank stated that: "It is essential that all sectors of the economy work within a coherent national strategy on climate change. Decisions about future investment and development should factor in long-term climate risks." The local government association reports that \$14 billion of council infrastructure alone is at risk from sea level rise.

Are there any other principles you would like us to consider in the strategy?

Continued growth is not sustainable. There is no distinction made between fossil fuels, which must go to zero as fast as possible because they are driving climate change, and other minerals which should be assessed on their environmental impact. There is no distinction made between aggregates, rock used for roading and concrete which are abundant and can be mined with very low impact, and minerals like gold which cause major environmental disruption. Metals essential for the transition to a zero carbon economy (eg lithium, cobalt) should be given priority over those which are merely "nice to have" (eg gold – there is enough gold already above ground for essential industrial uses.)

Action areas intro

Action Area: Modernising the Crown Minerals Act

Strongly agree

Why?

The stated purpose of the Crown Minerals Act, from 1991, is "to promote prospecting for, exploration for, and mining of Crown owned minerals for the benefit of New Zealand." Clearly, this is out of date. If you look at the overall "benefits" for New Zealand, the most benefit can be derived from leaving the fossil fuels in the ground. Plan a Just Transition for those workers, of course. But the Crown Minerals Act is obsolete in the face of the climate and ecological emergencies facing both the planet and New Zealand in particular. And it's stated purpose needs to acknowledge this. For

oil and gas, this is a climate change issue, although the exploration for gas on land in Taranaki is also an environmental issue, with risks of polluting waterways even further. For coal, it's both an issue of climate change when it's burned, but also a health issue; especially in Southland and other provinces where industrial coal fired boilers and burners in schools and hospitals are a direct threat to the health of our children. Further, coal mining, especially on the West Coast, is a threat to our already threatened biodiversity.

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Go straight to renewables. Initial energy savings can come from using less- rather than digging up more, we can minimise our demand through initiatives such as steel recycling, subsidizing wood chip boilers to replace coal, insulated homes, and energy efficient appliances. Then; all efforts need to go into building infrastructure based in renewables. Any new infrastructure based in fossil fuels should not be allowed resource consent. Further, it should be clear that this includes private property. "Staying within the Paris Agreement 1.5°C temperature limit requires rapid, large-scale systemic transformations to fully decarbonise the global energy system by 2050."

Action Area: Securing affordable resources to meet our minerals and energy needs

Disagree

Why?

Again, I believe the language of this statement is either misleading or deceitful. What does this mean? Shouldn't we already be securing affordable resources to meet our minerals and energy needs? Sound like an reason for promoting/allowing further exploration and extraction.

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

"Prioritise" mineral extraction and use to accomodate and promote a renewable energy system.

Action Area: Improving Treaty partnership

Agree

Why?

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Action Area: Improving stakeholder and community engagement

Agree

Why?

There is very little community engagement. Mineral and petroleum exploration and extraction is driven by the need to create a profit for shareholders and industry leaders. Shareholders and industry leaders are the stakeholders alongside the government who allows resource exploitation as long as they get a cut.

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Invite representatives from leading environmental and climate groups to sit on the board and share an equal voice in decision making.

Action Area: Improving industry compliance

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

Compliance to weak, ineffective regulations?? Why does it need to be improved?
What does that question say about the current state of affairs?

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Demand and expect industry compliance to environmental and social compliance

Action Area: Research and investment in better mining and resource use

Strongly disagree

Why?

We need to stop digging and start thinking. What really needs research is how to transition to an economy that is based on recycling, up-cycling and repair rather than the constant digging, demanding and expecting more.

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Research and investment into how to extract the valuable minerals from existing products that consumers have discarded because they have been provided with an upgraded version. The Reserve bank stated that: "It is essential that all sectors of the economy work within a coherent national strategy on climate change. Decisions about future investment and development should factor in long-term climate risks." The local government association reports that \$14 billion of council infrastructure alone is at risk from sea level rise. The law firm Bell Gully stated in their report: "The direction of travel is ultimately one-way: to a low-emissions economy." So, any income from mining especially for fossil fuels needs to be balanced against the kind of costs and risks that are set out above. The fact that "income" from mining is more accurately a debt borrowed from future generations can no longer be ignored. There are other climate costs, especially in the area of insurance, and then there are the health costs of burning coal, particularly in the South Island.

Are there any other action areas you would like us to consider as part of advancing this Strategy?

The Reserve bank stated that: "It is essential that all sectors of the economy work within a coherent national strategy on climate change. Decisions about future investment and development should factor in long-term climate risks." The local government association reports that \$14 billion of council infrastructure alone is at risk from sea level rise. The law firm Bell Gully stated in their report: "The direction of travel is ultimately one-way: to a low-emissions economy." So, any income from mining especially for fossil fuels needs to be balanced against the kind of costs and risks that are set out above. The fact that "income" from mining is more accurately a debt borrowed from future generations can no longer be ignored. There are other climate costs, especially in the area of insurance, and then there are the health costs of burning coal, particularly in the South Island.

Other

Are there any other comments you would like to make about the "Minerals and Petroleum Strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand: 2019-2029"?

In the past year, there have been numerous reports setting out the costs of the impacts of climate change - looking back at past climatic events, and also looking to the future.

A report to Treasury in 2018 estimated that “climate change attributable extreme rainfall-related floods have cost New Zealand around \$120M in climate change attributable privately insured damages over that ten year period.” And “climate change-attributable economic losses associated with droughts have cost New Zealand around \$720M over that ten year period.

However, this appears to be very conservative. A May 2017 Ministry for the Environment report estimated the economic cost of the 2012-13 drought alone to be \$1.5 billion. Also in 2018 Westpac advised that early action on climate change would save the country
 \$30 billion by 2050.

If you wish to, attach a document to this submission.

Use and release of information

We intend to upload submissions to our website at www.mbie.govt.nz. Can we include your submission on the website?

Yes

Can we include your name?

No

Can we include your email address?

No

Can we include your business name or organisation?

No

Can we include your position title?

No

Can we include the group you most identify with (if submitting as an individual)?

No

Can we include the group your submission represents (if submitting on behalf of a group or organisation)?

If there are any other parts to your submission that you do not want public on the website please note them below:

OIA publishing warning

If there is information in your submission that you wish to remain confidential, please note them below: