

From: environment policy
Sent: Wednesday, 24 May 2017 2:59 PM
To: environment policy
Subject: Environmental Regulatory Reform

Please provide any comments you may have on the NT EPA's Roadmap. `

What other initiatives could be introduced to improve the quality of information available in the assessment and approval process?

What mechanisms could be introduced to better access and use Indigenous traditional knowledge in the system?

directly fund representative participation on a per-project basis.

Should draft Environmental Assessment Reports be made available for review? Either to proponents or publicly? What value is there for either proponents or the public by making the draft reports available for review?

Should upfront engagement with the community be legislated so that all referral documents are required to contain a consultation report as well as an ongoing stakeholder engagement plan?

How can meaningful community engagement be achieved in the EIA process while keeping timeframes manageable?

set target for engagement, not consultation. A high level of proponent effort in consultation is meaningless if it does not directly translate to engagement. rather than ticking off boxes for consultation actions, proponents should be required to meet basic measurements of engagements before progressing each step (eg number of formal responses, attendance at public meetings, number of targeted stakeholder meetings)

Should draft EIS documents that are provided to the NT EPA before publication (for adequacy review) include a consultation report (outlining the outcomes of engagement through the EIA process and how this has informed the draft EIS) as well as a proposed stakeholder engagement plan to illustrate how the public is to be engaged through the exhibition period? Should an EIS document fail its adequacy review if it does not provide evidence of ongoing engagement and community input into the project?

Do you support any of the options outlined? Please provide information to explain why an option is supported.

If you do not support third-party referrals, please provide information to support this position. Are there other mechanisms to address the issue of regulating consistently and fairly across the whole of the Territory?

Should the legislation include provisions that allow for third-party injunctions and if so, how broadly should these be applied (that is, to the public or to defined groups?). Please outline the concerns you have if you do not support third-party injunctions.

How can this proposal be improved to strike the appropriate balance between providing business certainty and ensuring accountability in decision making? What groups or entities should be included or not included? Please provide information to explain your position.

Do you have any suggestions for how we can ensure frivolous and vexatious applications are minimised or avoided?

Which decisions made in the assessment, approval and monitoring system should be reviewable? Please provide information to explain your position.

Should a statement or recommendation made in an assessment report be subject to review?

Which option (1, 2, 3 or 4) is best for the Territory? Please provide information to explain your position.

What alternative option do you suggest we consider?

Might your position change depending on who is given responsibility for decisions in the assessment and approval processes? i.e. Might your position change if the NT EPA was not responsible for decisions in the assessment system?

What combination of responsibilities should the NT EPA be given? Please provide information to explain why an option is supported. What improvements to the environmental management system will be achieved as a result of the NT EPA having these responsibilities?

If you consider the NT EPA should not retain any of its existing responsibilities, who should be tasked with those responsibilities as the alternative? Please provide information to explain your position.

Any other comments?