



In this submission, CANA is focussing mainly on fossil fuels. We do, however, also acknowledge and endorse the submissions from other, minerals-focussed groups such as Kiwis Against Seabed Mining and Coromandel Watchdog, both of whom are focussing on ironsands and other seabed mining, and the mining for gold and other minerals in the Coromandel.

1. Your thoughts on what you would like to see in a petroleum and minerals resource strategy

The first overarching priority is that we must acknowledge the climate and ecological emergency we face. No self-respecting government can, in the current socially or scientifically acceptable climate, talk about petroleum strategies in any way other than how to phase them out.

Yes, we need a just transition, but the far more pressing issue is that **all of us** will be affected by internal / external migration, world crop failures, extreme weather events, and rising sea levels (with associated loss of homes and infrastructure).

The MAIN focus of a petroleum and minerals resource strategy for Aotearoa needs to be on an exit strategy.

The Economic Climate Emergency

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.

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.*

Species extinction and biodiversity

We are now also aware of the critical state of species extinction:

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."

New Zealand is not immune to this. Our NZ state of the environment report 2019 says we're already suffering the impact of climate change.

*Given all of this, what we need to see from a Petroleum and Minerals Strategy is an exit strategy. There is no place for fossil fuels in New Zealand's future - we must move swiftly to a low-carbon economy. This must be the **main purpose** of a review of this strategy.*

2. Your perspectives on the future of petroleum and minerals in New Zealand

Future – imperative to phase out, quickly.

The [IPCC 1.5 report](#) tells us that in 12 years' time we have to have decarbonised our energy and electricity systems - or at least be well on the way to that - in order to keep global warming to 1.5°C. The IPCC also told us that there is a huge difference in impacts between 1.5°C and 2°C of warming. The costs to New Zealand at 1°C of warming have already been huge; and the cost of our high per capita emissions will be far greater to our Pacific neighbours.

"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."

The enormity of what we face dwarfs the challenges of phasing out petroleum and minerals. Gas is not a transition fuel- it is a delay tactic and a waste of time and energy when we can

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.

3. Your perspective on the current regulatory regime for petroleum and minerals in New Zealand

The current regulatory regime is obviously insufficient. OMV invading the South Basin and Taranaki opened to exploration on iwi land are current examples of legal ecocide. We should certainly not allow any mining on conservation land. We know better now, we know what the effects will be, and the law must be updated accordingly.

A consistently recurring concern that of job loss. This can be negated with all the considerable work going into the Just Transition movement, both in Aotearoa and globally. As seen in overseas examples such as [Germany](#) and [Denmark](#), the way forward is in retraining, upskilling and transitioning workers in extractive industries into healthier, restorative industries- which will be not only superior ecologically but safer working environments as well.

With the tide of public opinion moving swiftly against extractive industries which are causing climate breakdown, there is no reason to not offer much more satisfying work opportunities than those dwindling on from the fossil fuel industries. The Tapuae Roa Strategy, for a Just Transition in Taranaki released in 2017 proves that the extractive industry acknowledged it is coming to an end even before the end of the offshore block offers.

4. Your thoughts on any issues you have with the CMA that you would like to be explored as part of the CMA review

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.

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 foolhardy indeed.

5. Your thoughts on how New Zealand can sustainably derive value from its petroleum and mineral resources.

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.