



12 December 2025

Referrals Gateway

Environment Assessment Branch Department of the Environment

GPO Box 787

Canberra ACT 2601

To Whom it may concern,

RE: Ichthys Carbon Capture and Storage Project, Ref: 2025/10366

1. The Environment Centre NT (ECNT) is the peak community sector environment organisation in the Northern Territory of Australia, raising awareness amongst community, government, business, and industry about environmental issues, assisting people to reduce their environmental impact, and supporting community members to participate in decision-making processes and action.
2. We refer to the Invitation for Public Comment published on 28 November 2025 with respect to the referral made by Inpex Operations Australia Pty Ltd (**Inpex**) for the “Ichthys Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) Project” (the **Proposed Action**) including:
 - a. A referral form;
 - b. The EPBC Referral supporting information document (**SID**);
 - c. The Project Proponent’s Health, Safety, Security, Environment and Quality Policy;
 - d. EPBC Act Protected Matters Report;
 - e. The Project Proponent’s Likelihood of Occurrence Assessment; and,
 - f. The Project Proponent’s Stakeholder Engagement Plan.
 - g. (together, **the Referral**).

Summary

3. In summary, ECNT submits that:
 - a. The Minister should exercise the power under s74B of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth) (EPBC Act) to decide that the Referral is clearly unacceptable on the basis of the information in the Referral, because it would have unacceptable impacts on matters of national environmental significance (**MNES**).
 - b. In the alternative, given the deficiencies in information provided in the Referral, then the Minister should request more information pursuant to section 76(1) of the EPBC Act.

- c. In the alternative, pursuant to s 75(1) of the EPBC Act, the Minister should decide that the Proposed Action is a controlled action with the following applicable controlling provisions as discussed in detailed below
 - a. Listed migratory species (s 20);
 - b. Listed threatened species and communities (ss 18 and 18A).

The proposed action

4. Inpex seeks to undertake the following activities:
 - The construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning of approximately 12 kilometres of interlinking 16-inch CO₂ pipelines and associated utilities infrastructures.
 - The hot commissioning, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of the Ichthys LNG facility AGRU and CCES components, including the cessation of operation of the currently operational acid gas incinerators.
5. The Project footprint comprises a total area of approximately 77 hectares. The Project footprint includes the following five defined areas:
 - a. the Ichthys CCS pipeline area
 - b. the Ichthys CCS pipeline tie-in station area
 - c. the Ichthys CCS (Darwin LNG link) pipeline area
 - d. the Darwin LNG pipeline tie-in station area
 - e. the supplementary power intake substation area.
6. The proponent states that the Proposed Action is not part of a staged development or related to other actions or proposals in the region, however we note that two related actions were recently referred under the EPBC Act: The Ichthys LNG Acid Gas Removal Unit (AGRU) Upgrade & Carbon Capture Storage (CCS) Preparedness Project (EPBC Number: 2025/10273), and the Bonaparte Carbon Capture and Storage Project, EPBC Number: 2025/10356).
7. As the proposed activities include alterations to the Inpex Ichthys LNG facility, including removal of the acid gas incinerator (AGI) units, we submit that this referral is also connected to the Ichthys Gas Field, Offshore and onshore processing facilities and subsea pipeline project (EPBC 2008/4208).
8. The Proponent proposes that up to 300Mt of carbon dioxide may be transported and injected as part of the Proposed Action, making the project significantly larger than any offshore carbon capture and storage project currently in operation globally and entailing significant risks and impacts that have not previously been the subject of a decision under the EPBC Act.

Controlled action decision: The law

9. Under s 75(1) of the EPBC Act, the Minister must decide whether the Proposed Action is a controlled action and, if so, which provisions of Part 3 of the Act are controlling provisions.
10. The mandatory considerations for that decision are set out in sub-s(1A) – (2B) of s 75 and include this submission.
11. An action is a controlled action if the taking of the action without an approval under Part 9 for the purposes of a provision of Part 3 would be (subject to presently irrelevant exceptions) prohibited by the provision. In this case, it is ECNT’s submission that the relevant provisions are:
 - Listed threatened species and communities (ss 18 and 18A);
 - Listed migratory species (s 20).
12. Under s76(1) of the EPBC Act, If the Minister believes on reasonable grounds that the referral of a proposal to take an action does not include enough information for the Minister to decide whether the action is a controlled action or which provisions of Part 3 (if any) are controlling provisions for the action, then the Minister may request the person proposing to take the action to provide specified information relevant to making the decision.

Matters of National Environmental Significance

13. Inpex has identified 17 threatened avifauna species, 3 threatened terrestrial mammal species, 3 threatened marine mammal species, 1 threatened terrestrial reptile species, 2 threatened marine reptile species, and 45 threatened migratory species that are likely to, or may, occur in the project area.
14. The project proponent does not identify any critical habitat for avifauna in the Referral, however the pipeline will transect saltpans that meet the definition of a nationally important habitat for the critically endangered Far Eastern Curlew, with records at the site meeting the threshold for this definition.¹ A second site of national significance for the species is found at East Arm Wharf, around 4km from the Inpex Ichthys LNG plants and the site of some of the planned venting as part of this Proposed Activity.
15. Inpex states that “Given the identified threatened shorebird species and the little tern are highly mobile in nature and suitable habitat is present throughout the wider Darwin and northern Australian region, it is considered unlikely that the Project activities would result in a long-term decrease in the size of a population of threatened avifauna.”²

¹ Lilleyman, A. et al (2017) Distribution and abundance of migratory shorebirds in Darwin Harbour, Northern Territory, Australia, Northern Territory Naturalist 28. Accessed via <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/92c4/c8b02698d7749c31831b0afada1da61817ef.pdf>, p37

² SID, p214

16. ECNT submits that Inpex has mischaracterised the importance of habitat for migratory shorebird species. Inpex has disregarded the factors that contribute to habitat suitability for shorebirds, including availability of areas at high tide such as the saltpans intersected by the proposed project area and tendency among shorebird species towards high levels of site fidelity. Inpex has not explained the risks and likelihood of significant impacts in the context of relevant monitoring studies that demonstrate the unique significance of the habitat to be impacted by this project, nor has Inpex provided adequate information about the nature and extent of impacts on habitat.
17. As a result, the Referral is inconsistent with the Industry guidelines for avoiding, assessing and mitigating impacts on EPBC Act listed migratory shorebird species (**Migratory Shorebird Guidelines**), which require projects to consider whether an action is proposed in an area that contains important habitat for one or more migratory shorebird species; the direct and indirect impacts that could result from the action; and measures that could be taken to reduce the level of impact, such as timing the impact to coincide with periods when few birds are present.³
18. ECNT observes that several of Inpex’s key conclusions about the likelihood of significant impacts are based on incomplete information about the nature and extent of risks and impacts as a results of the Proposed Activity. For example, Inpex concludes that “there is no credible pathway that could result in disruption of the breeding cycle of a population of threatened marine reptile species. Project disturbance activities would occur largely occur within terrestrial areas of Middle Arm.”⁴ Similarly, Inpex concludes that “no trees, recorded within the Project area, meet the threshold for potential hollow-bearing trees that could support breeding and roosting threatened mammals” such as the bare-rumped sheath-tailed bat, the northern brushtail possum, and black-footed tree-rat.
19. Inpex has failed to adequately consider how impacts of atmospheric emissions will impact MNES outside of the activity footprint area, despite an established evidence base about the significant impacts of such emissions (discussed below). Inpex has not presented modelling about the composition, direction, and concentration of CO₂ plumes from planned or unplanned atmospheric discharge events. It is erroneous to conclude there is ‘no credible pathway’ for significant impacts when the location and nature of those impacts it not understood.
20. As is discussed below, the Proposed Activities involve three decades of large volumes of planned and unplanned toxic atmospheric emissions which pose a threat of direct

³ Australian Government, Department of the Environment and Energy (2017) EPBC Act Policy Statement 3.21: Industry guidelines for avoiding, assessing and mitigating impacts on EPBC Act listed migratory shorebird species. Accessed via <https://www.dcceew.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/bio4190517-shorebirds-guidelines.pdf> (Migratory Shorebird Guidelines), p16

⁴ Inpex, Supplementary Information Document (**SID**) p237

mortality, injury, disturbance, and habitat degradation for MNES at the Middle Arm Peninsula.

21. Inpex should demonstrate how the proposed activities align with the Migratory Shorebird Guidelines⁵, Conservation Advice for the Far Eastern Curlew, and the National Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles.

Potential risks and impacts on Matters of National Environmental Significance

Atmospheric Emissions

22. The Proposed Activity has the potential to significantly impact listed and migratory species and their habitats through planned and unplanned atmospheric emissions of CO₂ and air toxics.
23. If a leak or loss of containment occurs along the 12 km CO₂ export pipeline or at one of two proposed tie-in stations proposed as part of the Proposed Activity, the impacts on MNES could be fatal. High concentrations of CO₂ are hazardous because CO₂ is colourless and odourless. Its high density compared to oxygen means that it can remain low to the ground and create risks of asphyxiation.⁶ A 2020 CO₂ pipeline rupture in Mississippi, USA resulted in at least 45 people nearby being admitted to hospital.⁷
24. Beyond the risks and impacts of CO₂ emissions, the Proposed Activities will also result in the planned or unplanned release of a range of air toxins, including benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene (**BTEX compounds**) as well as hydrogen sulphide (**H₂S**).
25. Inpex confirms that incineration of BTEX chemicals at the Ichthys LNG facility will cease, because the “CO₂ stream (including all contaminants) would be diverted to the CCES and transported via pipeline to an offshore storage site for sequestration.”⁸ On this basis, “the acid gas incinerators would be removed from operational service once the CCS system is performing as planned.”⁹ The purpose of the acid gas incinerators is to

⁵ Australian Government, Department of the Environment and Energy (2017) EPBC Act Policy Statement 3.21: Industry guidelines for avoiding, assessing and mitigating impacts on EPBC Act listed migratory shorebird species. Accessed via <https://www.dcceew.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/bio4190517-shorebirds-guidelines.pdf> (**Migratory Shorebird Guidelines**)

⁶ Parliament of Australia, House of Representatives Committees (n.d.) Chapter 5: The environmental benefits and risks of CCS and public perception, p. 55–68. Accessed via https://www.aph.gov.au/parliamentary_business/committees/house_of_representatives_committees?url=scin/geoseq_uestation/chapter5.htm; CIEL (2024) Deep Trouble – The Risks of Offshore Carbon Capture and Storage. Centre for International Environmental Law. Deep-Trouble-The-Risks-of-Offshore Carbon-Capture-and-Storage.pdf

⁷ Simon, J. (2023) The U.S. Is Expanding CO₂ Pipelines. One Poisoned Town Wants You to Know Its Story. National Public Radio (NPR), 21 May 2023. Accessed via https://www.npr.org/2023/05/21/1172679786/carbon_capture-carbon-dioxide-pipeline

⁸ SID, p56

⁹ SID, p71. NB: It is unclear what performance indicators would need to be met for Inpex to consider the system to be performing as planned.

“oxidise trace amounts of benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene (BTEX) and H₂S contained in the CO₂ stream received from the AGRU’s.”¹⁰ Inpex’s license for the Ichthys LNG facility stipulates that the venting of AGRU acid off gas will be infrequent and only when the incinerator is shut down for maintenance.¹¹

26. Although Inpex has failed to describe the anticipated volume of BTEX and H₂S in both planned and unplanned emissions scenarios and the potential risks and significant impacts, we know from other sources that the BTEX and H₂S component of the CO₂ source gas is likely to be significant. In its 2024-5 Environmental Monitoring report, Inpex reported benzene levels in feed gas to the AGRU Hot Vent up to 380ppmv, toluene at up to 300ppmv, and H₂S at up to 150ppmv.¹²
27. Inpex has not demonstrated if or how it will align with the Interim National Action List¹³ for offshore carbon sequestration, which sets out maximum values for impurities.
28. ECNT is deeply concerned about the lack of information provided by Inpex about the composition of the feed CO₂ gas and the risks and impacts associated with its planned and unplanned release, particularly give plans to take acid gas incinerators (**AGIs**) offline and therefore eliminate alternative options for removal of air toxics.
29. In humans, exposure to airborne BTEX is linked to a range of negative health outcomes, including as “hemato-toxicity for benzene, hematological effects and chromosomal aberrations for ethylbenzene, renal toxicity for toluene, and respiratory symptoms for xylene exposure.”¹⁴ BTEX compounds are both volatile and mobile, spreading over wide areas. Bird species are more likely to be impacted by reactive gases and aerosols than mammalian species because of the structure of their respiratory system.¹⁵ Potential risks and impacts of chronic or acute exposure for bird species is poorly understood, but may include increased risk of respiratory infection, immunosuppression, and impacts on endocrine systems and reproduction.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ NTEPA (2022) Environmental Protection Licence for EPL 22805, accessed via https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/_media/waste-and-pollution/register/epl/gas/ichthys-lng/epl228-05-environment-protection-licence-ichthys.pdf

¹² Inpex (2025), EPL228 Annual Environmental Monitoring Report 2024-2025, accessed via https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/1567278/epl228-annual-environmental-monitoring-report-2024-25.PDF

¹³ DCCEEW (2024) Interim National Action List for offshore carbon dioxide sequestration, accessed via <https://www.dcceew.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/interim-national-action-list-for-offshore-carbon-dioxide-sequestration.pdf> (**National Action List**)

¹⁴ Saeedi, M et al (2024) Interaction of benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene with human’s body: Insights into characteristics, sources and health risks *Journal of Hazardous Materials Advances*, Vol 16

¹⁵ Sanderfoot, Olivia V. and Holloway, Tracey (2017) Air pollution impacts on avian species via inhalation exposure and associated outcomes *Environ. Res. Lett.* **12**

30. In humans, H₂S can lead to collapse, coma and death from respiratory failure within a few seconds after one or two inspirations, at high levels.¹⁶ It can cause high acute toxicity to aquatic life, birds, and animals.¹⁷

Anticipated emissions

31. Inpex acknowledges that venting of the CO₂ stream would be required at various stages of the proposed activity and estimates total anticipated emissions from several scenarios. Based on information provided in the Referral, vented emissions may be as high as 3Mtpa.¹⁸
32. A major failing in the information provided in the Referral is that key details about the nature of venting events are missing, including but not limited to the composition of the CO₂, the timing of venting events and the volume of vented emissions at each event, and the anticipated movement of the vented CO₂ plume.
33. Further, ECNT submits that Inpex has not substantiated the accuracy of anticipated emissions estimates, nor disclosed the assumptions behind them or identified all possible reasons for venting. Inpex should account for the following potential situations in developing an estimate of anticipated emissions:
- a. **Technical problems with transport or injection.** Inpex has estimated venting of 150,000 Tpa due to “occasions where the CCES cannot export, which includes issues with the availability of the third-party CO₂ injection system.”¹⁹ Inpex has not provided a basis for this estimate, which is of concern because of a history of CCS technical failures globally. Chevron’s Gorgon CCS project in Western Australia has reported declining sequestration success rates since commencing operations; in FY 2024-25 the project successfully stored only 25% of the CO₂ removed from the Gorgon and associated gas fields.²⁰ Globally, the maximum capture rate of existing projects is around 83%²¹.
 - b. **Failure to comply with standards for CO₂ feed gas composition as set out in the National Action List (NAL).** As discussed above in, Inpex reported benzene levels in feed gas to the AGRU Hot Vent up to 380ppmv, and toluene at up to 300ppmv. Inpex has not demonstrated if or how it will align the National Action List for offshore carbon sequestration. Further, Inpex has not estimated likely venting volumes that will be required if and when the project is unable to demonstrate compliance with the NAL.

¹⁶ DCCEW (n.d.) Hydrogen sulfide *Substance Fact Sheets*. Accessed via <https://www.dcceew.gov.au/environment/protection/npi/substances/fact-sheets/hydrogen-sulfide>

¹⁷ Ibid

¹⁸ SID, p78

¹⁹ SID, p79

²⁰ Morrison, Kevin (2025) World’s Largest CCS project hot new low on amount of carbon captured and stored. *Renew Economy*. Accessed via <https://reneweconomy.com.au/worlds-largest-ccs-project-hits-new-low-on-amount-of-carbon-captured-and-stored/>

²¹ IEEFA (n.d.) Fact Sheet: Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) has a poor track record. Accessed via <https://ieefa.org/sites/default/files/2024-02/fact-sheet-CCS-ADR.pdf>

- c. **Unexpected subsurface storage behaviours that could lead to CO₂ leakage and subsurface geological failure.**²² Globally, even projects that have successfully met sequestration targets – like Norway’s Sleipner and Snøhvit projects (which together sequester around 1.7 to 1.8Mtpa of CO₂, a much smaller volume than Inpex’s anticipated target of 10Mtpa) – have encountered unanticipated issues with subsea storage. The Institute for Energy Economic and Financial Analysis concluded that, based on the case of the Snøhvit projects “even after steadfast study and monitoring using top-level technology and engineers, actual behavior of what has been studied can turn out to be substantially different and replacement plans may need to be implemented with speed in order to avoid catastrophe.”²³
- d. **Life extension of the Ichthys LNG plant beyond the life of the Bonaparte CCS project.** The current estimated lifespan of the Ichthys LNG facility is to 2058. Inpex aims to both secure backfill gas for the existing infrastructure after the Ichthys field is exhausted, and pursue expansion of existing facilities.²⁴ This could significantly prolong the operational life of the Ichthys LNG facility beyond the anticipated duration of the Bonaparte CCS project. The removal of the AGIs as part of the proposed activities in this referral would mean that any extension of the Ichthys facility would need to account for management of air emissions without AGI facilities.

34. Considering the above factors, ECNT submits that Inpex should, at minimum, provide as part of this referral the following information to better inform an understanding of the risks and impacts of anticipated emissions:

- a. Rationale for the vented emissions estimates presented in the Referral.
- b. Detail of the composition of vented emissions, including impurities.
- c. Detail of the estimated volume of emissions at each anticipated venting event.
- d. A substantiated description of the assumed success rate for CO₂ capture, transport, and storage.
- e. Atmospheric emissions estimates and plume modelling for a range of sequestration success scenarios.
- f. An analysis, based on reported volumes of impurities in the AGRU feed gas at the Ichthys LNG facility, of the likely composition of the CO₂ stream in comparison to maximum values set out in the NAL.
- g. Analysis of the risks and impacts associated with venting that may be required as a result of non-compliance with the NAL.

²² IEEFA (2023) Norway’s Sleipner and Snøhvit CCS: Industry models or cautionary tales? Accessed via <https://ieefa.org/sites/default/files/2023-06/Norway%E2%80%99s%20Sleipner%20and%20Sn%C3%B8hvit%20CCS-%20Industry%20models%20or%20cautionary%20tales.pdf>

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Hokawa, Itoshi (n.d) Expansion Strategy of the LNG Business – Ichthys LNG. Accessed via <https://www.inpex.com/english/ir/library/pdf/presentation/e-Presentation20240909-b.pdf>

h. A description of mitigation measures adequate to prevent significant impacts to MNES as a result of venting.

35. Notwithstanding concerns around the completeness and accuracy of emissions estimates discussed above, ECNT is deeply concerned about the significant impacts of the anticipated air emissions as described in the Referral.
36. ECNT submits that venting of the CO₂ stream – even at volumes anticipated by Inpex in the Referral - with no measures in place to remove air toxics represents a significant and unacceptable impact. Venting of the CO₂ could result acute and chronic health impacts on MNES including migratory shorebirds, marine reptiles, and terrestrial mammals.
37. Inpex acknowledges that routine and non-routine atmospheric emissions are one factor that may may modify, destroy, remove, isolate or decrease the availability or quality of habitat for EPBC Act-listed avifauna. Inpex also acknowledges atmospheric emissions may impact listed avifauna, but concludes that “the nature of these impacts is considered to be localised and/or temporary in nature and are expected to cause negligible behavioural impacts to threatened avifauna.”²⁵
38. ECNT submits that the temporary or localised impact of atmospheric emissions does not diminish the significance of these impacts. ‘Temporary’ or short-term venting, where it occurs at high volume, could result in direct mortality, and where impacts are ‘localised’ they may be localised to areas of significant ecological value, including nationally significant habitat for the Far Eastern Curlew.
39. Conservation Advice for the Far Eastern Curlew establishes as a conservation and management priority that “future development projects avoid any activities that disproportionately affect the upper tidal flats and/or areas providing major foraging opportunities as identified by species experts, local studies, and site managers.”²⁶ Inpex has not demonstrated that vented emissions will not disproportionately impact this important habitat.
40. ECNT submits that the planned venting activities as described in the Referral are not consistent with the Migratory Shorebird Guidelines.²⁷ Ongoing venting of CO₂ and toxic pollutants in areas of high ecological value for migratory shorebirds could result in direct mortality, disturbance, habitat loss, and degradation of habitat, if movement of the vented plumes make existing habitat unsuitable for use by migratory shorebird species.

²⁵ SID, 213

²⁶ Far Eastern Curlew Guidelines, p19

²⁷ Australian Government, Department of the Environment and Energy (2017) EPBC Act Policy Statement 3.21: Industry guidelines for avoiding, assessing and mitigating impacts on EPBC Act listed migratory shorebird species. Accessed via <https://www.dcceew.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/bio4190517-shorebirds-guidelines.pdf> (**Migratory Shorebird Guidelines**)

41. With reference to EPBC Act-listed terrestrial mammals, Inpex acknowledges that atmospheric emissions may “lead to a reduction in ambient air quality and contribute to GHG emissions, which can have adverse effects on the natural environment and human health, as well as potential localised behavioural disturbances.”²⁸ However, Inpex dismisses the potential for significant impacts because of the temporary or localised nature the impacts. As discussed above with reference to avifauna, impacts that are temporary or localised may still be significant. Inpex has failed to model or consider the potential for atmospheric emissions to have a significant impact on terrestrial mammals.
42. Uncertainty about the movement and size of the vented CO₂ plume prevents us for understanding the likelihood of significant impacts on marine reptiles. Modelling on likely plume movement and concentration should be provided in the referral to inform an assessment of potential significant impacts on turtle species, in particular the Flatback Turtle for whom Darwin Harbour represents habitat critical for survival of the species.²⁹
43. While it constitutes a minor component of anticipated vented emissions, it is noteworthy that Inpex states that 3,000 tonnes of the CO₂ stream will be vented via cold vents per year.³⁰ Inpex does not describe the volume of likely emissions at any single anticipated cold vent release event, or consider the unique risks and impacts of releasing emissions via a cold vent. Cold venting of toxics can magnify their impact; ECNT notes that the Santos DLNG facility in Darwin Harbour *replaced* cold vent pipework with hot vent pipework to increase plume buoyance and mixing.³¹ In addition, it would appear that cold venting would take place from infrastructure close to ground level, further intensifying impacts for ground-dwelling species and potentially impacting adjacent nationally-significant habitat for the Far Eastern Curlew.

Unanticipated emissions

44. Inpex notes that “in an event of an emergency, venting of the pipelines may be required to affect a pipeline repair.”³² The estimated volume of CO₂ that could be vented in such a scenario is 890 m³ from the Ichthys CCS pipeline, and 360 m³ from the DLNG link pipeline.
45. In the absence of detail about how these numbers were calculated, we refer to the interim National Action List which establishes that in a “worst case of a catastrophic rupture to air however, the liquid CO₂ will immediately expand in air by an expansion ratio of 1:535 to gaseous CO₂. i.e., 1 L of liquid CO₂ will expand to 535 L of gaseous

²⁸ SID, p225

²⁹ DCCEEW (2017) Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia, accessed via <https://www.dcceew.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/recovery-plan-marine-turtles-2017.pdf>

³⁰ SID, p79

³¹ Santos (2024) Darwin LNG Annual Environmental Monitoring Report 2023, p72. Accessed via https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/_media/waste-and-pollution/register/epl/gas/conoco-phillips/epl217-03-santos-dlng-annual-environmental-monitoring-report-2023.pdf

³² SID, p79

CO₂.”³³ Applying this calculation to the anticipated release amount from the Ichthys CCS pipeline could be 476,150m³. Inpex has not accounted for the significant impacts of such an event, or appropriately identified MNES that may be significantly impacted.

46. In particular, ECNT notes the risk of unacceptable impacts on threatened and migratory shorebirds. As noted above, Inpex has erred in failing to discuss the impacts of the proposed activity in the context of Conservation Advice for the Far Eastern Curlew, Industry Guidelines for Migratory Shorebirds, and the National Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles.
47. A release of CO₂ and impurities such as BTEX chemicals and H₂S could be catastrophic for the Far Eastern Curlew, considering that the adjacent salt pan meets the threshold for a nationally significant habitat.
48. With reference to the Migratory Shorebird Guidelines, such an event also poses risk of direct mortality of birds leading to a substantial reduction in migratory shorebird numbers.³⁴
49. ECNT submits that Inpex has mischaracterised the likelihood of unanticipated emissions, by failing to substantiate its claim that such an incident would be “highly unlikely.” Inpex should describe the likelihood of rupture and other loss on containment events with reference to the following:
 - a. Historical data on pipeline leaks and ruptures.
 - b. Composition of the CO₂ stream and impact of impurities on pipeline integrity.
 - c. Impact of changing weather patterns over the lifetime of the Proposed Activities on pipeline integrity, including sea level rise and flood levels on the Middle Arm peninsula and increased intensity of cyclonic events.

Conclusion

50. In its Referral, Inpex has failed to demonstrate acceptability of the potential risks and impacts of the Proposed Action.
51. ECNT submits that even based on the incomplete information provided in the Referral, the project presents unacceptable impacts to MNES by leading to emissions of CO₂, BTEX compounds and H₂S close to sites of conservation significance.
52. We urge the Minister to exercise the power under s74B of the EPBC Act to decide that the Referral is clearly unacceptable on the basis of impacts on matters of national environmental significance.

³³ NAL, p10

³⁴ Migratory Shorebird Guidelines, p18

Thankyou for your consideration of this submission.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bree Ahrens', followed by a period.

Bree Ahrens
Senior Climate Campaigner
Environment Centre NT