



GISERA | Gas Industry Social and Environmental Research Alliance

Minutes of the Queensland Research Advisory Committee Meeting No. 13 held in Brisbane on Friday, 20 May 2022

OPENING

The meeting of the CSIRO GISERA Queensland Research Advisory Committee (RAC) was called to order at 10.05 am (AEST) on Friday, 20 May 2022.

PRESENT

Damian Barrett: GISERA Director (CSIRO)

Tom Measham: Research Director (CRC for Transformations in Mining Economies, UQ)

Andrew Drysdale: Managing Director (Alsajad Natural Research Management)

Sanjeev Pandey: Executive Director, Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment (QLD DNRM)

Fraser Power: Stakeholder & Advocacy Manager (Australia Pacific LNG) – for Robert Hirst

Other participants:

Cameron Huddlestone-Holmes: GISERA QLD State Leader (CSIRO)

Jizelle Khoury: GISERA Executive Officer (CSIRO)

Apologies:

Robert Hirst: HSE Manager (Australia Pacific LNG)

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The GISERA Director welcomed all members to the meeting and provided an overview of GISERA for the new members present. The agenda was unanimously approved as distributed. Apologies were received from Robert Hirst.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

2. PROJECT PROPOSAL

Methane contributions from holding ponds - a desktop study

The GISERA Director provided a summary of the project proposal.

Key points raised:

- There is an identified gap in the national greenhouse gas inventory around fugitive emissions associated with water holding ponds (produced water from production of natural gas). This project will collate current and emerging literature, existing company and publicly available data, and will look at what technologies exist to mitigate emissions in these ponds and bring all together as part of the analysis.
- Each operator manages water in a slightly different way (via different engineering operations). It will be important to understand the flow of water (and where gas might separate from water) and the propensity of ponds to generate additional methane through biological processes. It is complex and this is a starting point to understand the processes and how they vary.
- An output of the desktop study could include a process flow diagram.
- The inclusion of 'aquatic systems' in this project title and proposal requires further clarification.
- Careful consideration of tone required with the comparisons made to other contributors to methane emissions e.g., feedlots. It is fine to have reference points to other industries, but some points included may be perceived as bias. The proposal should focus on getting towards the Net Zero target. The final report can provide greater context and statistics.
- A representative from the Arrow, UQ's Centre for Natural Gas and OGIA to be invited to participate in the project's Technical Reference Group.

Outcome: The QLD RAC approved this project, subject to the actions below being addressed to the satisfaction of the GISERA Director.

Action: The research proponent to clarify what types of 'aquatic systems' will be considered and why in this desktop study.

Action: The research proponent to reframe proposal to emphasise Net Zero target and remove any comparisons that may appear bias and create tension between other industries.

Action: The research proponent to invite a representative from Arrow, UQ's Centre for Natural Gas and OGIA to participate in the project's Technical Reference Group.

3. PROJECT PROPOSAL

Cooper Creek flood modelling scenarios

The GISERA Director provided a summary of the project proposal.

Key points raised:

- A polarising issue in the community and will need to navigate through carefully.
- The way the proposal is currently framed, there is a risk that the intent of this work could be misinterpreted, and the results misused. The project outputs are not intended to be the decision-making process. The project will provide scientific advice into the decision-making process. It will use modelling as a guide towards decision making. The modelling helps understand the impact and processes to consider, when going through an informed development.
- An important part of the communications will be what modelling is and is not. The messaging needs to be clear when it goes to community.
- This project should start the conversation and could feed into the establishment of condition benchmarks for the Cooper Floodplain identifying indicators and reporting so that it can be tracked.
- In methodology section - task 4 – under the external contractor’s digital interactive product, the objectives should align more with overall project objectives as there may be perception issues that we are supporting industry. This is inconsistent with the messaging of the rest of the project.
- Consider merging the 3 points under task 4 to changing to ‘Risks to the environment and other infrastructure from floods amended by climate change and natural gas infrastructure interaction’. Otherwise, re-frame these points to avoid misinterpretation including:
 - Point 3 – clarify whether this project is only looking at benefits (and not the negatives). If looking at positives and negatives, then make that clearer and put higher up in the objectives of that task. If flood model is about providing benefits, could state ‘the output of the flood model would have benefits to people in region by understanding flood dynamics.’ Also, if not merging the 3 objectives, move this to first objective.
- The workshops with various stakeholders are an important part of this project. The research proponent should use this opportunity to listen and take on board local knowledge (both technical and social aspects). It would be worthwhile bringing in CSIRO’s GISERA Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Manager to assist with design and implementation of the stakeholder workshops.
- Sanjeev Pandey left the meeting at 12.10 pm.

Outcome: The QLD RAC would like the research proponent to revise the proposal taking to account all the points raised and submit a revised proposal via email to the RAC for consideration.

Action: The research proponent to reframe proposal to ensure this work is seen as advice into a decision-making process, not the decision-making process itself.

Action: The research proponent to revisit and recraft the objectives listed in the methodology section – task 4.

Action: The research proponent to clearly articulate what the modelling will and will not do during the stakeholder workshops and include discussion of model limitations and sensitivity in final reporting and communications.

Action: The research proponent to discuss how the project results could inform condition benchmarks for future monitoring.

Action: The research proponent to include the GISERA's Communication and Engagement Manager in the design and implementation of the stakeholder workshops.

4. PROJECT PROPOSAL

CWB4: Trends in community wellbeing and attitudes to CSG development – Comparisons across industry phases from 2014 to 2024

The GISERA Director provided a summary of the project proposal.

Key points raised:

- The results are broken down by region. It would be useful if results could also identify themes as it could help plan and shape future community investment.
- At conclusion of this work, there is scope to look at cooperative outcomes.
- The Darling Downs Regional Drought Resilience Plan is currently being drafted. It would be useful to establish a link between both projects. It will be important to leverage the GISERA work and use any learnings. The research proponent should interact with the Director - Rural Economies Centre of Excellence, USQ to establish that link.
- Sanjeev Pandey's decision on the proposal will be sought out of session.

Outcome: The QLD RAC approved this project, subject to the following conditions:

1. Sanjeev Pandey's out-of-session approval
2. the actions below being addressed to the satisfaction of the GISERA Director.

Action: The GISERA Executive Officer to seek Sanjeev Pandey's comments/approval out-of-session.

5. EXISTING PROJECT

Update on outcomes of Health project

The GISERA Director provided an update on the current health project and pathway to delivery.

6. FUTURE RESEARCH

Discussion on future research ideas/priorities

Ideas for further research included:

- Subsidence - there is a view that there should be no CSG development on prime agricultural land – a communications project on issues arising following current project that looks at consequences.
- Fugitive emissions from abandoned coal exploration bores.
- Migration of fugitive gas during CSG development (look at on a regional scale). Look at how much and how it migrates through the system.
- Economic outcomes in the Surat 10 years after construction of the CSG industry.
 - What are the realised benefits and what were the opportunity costs?
 - Has CSG infrastructure facilitated other industries (renewables in particular).
 - Lessons for other regions with emerging gas developments (potential to be a national-scale project).
- Net Zero principles and how to achieve them, including the role of gas and its eventual endpoint.
- Legacy issues post closure.
- Appropriate conditions to monitor to evaluate impacts in the Galilee or Cooper basins.
- Land condition benchmarking based on the Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA) bioregions.

ITEMS FOR NOTING OR DISCUSSION BY EXCEPTION

7. OTHER BUSINESS

No matters raised.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the QLD Research Advisory Committee is yet to be scheduled. It is anticipated that a meeting will occur once further proposals are established.

MEETING CLOSE

The meeting closed at 2.00 pm (AEST).

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS FROM GISERA QLD RAC MEETING #13 – 20 MAY 2022

Agenda Item	Action
20-05-22 Item 2	The research proponent to clarify what types of ‘aquatic systems’ will be considered and why in this desktop study.
20-05-22 Item 2	The research proponent to reframe proposal to emphasise Net Zero target and remove any comparisons that may appear bias and create tension between other industries.
20-05-22 Item 2	The research proponent to invite a representative from Arrow, UQ’s Centre for Natural Gas and OGIA to participate in the project’s Technical Reference Group.
20-05-22 Item 3	The research proponent to reframe proposal to ensure this work is seen as advice into a decision-making process, not the decision-making process itself.
20-05-22 Item 3	The research proponent to revisit and recraft the objectives listed in the methodology section – task 4.
20-05-22 Item 3	The research proponent to clearly articulate what the modelling will and will not do during the stakeholder workshops and include discussion of model limitations and sensitivity in final reporting and communications.
20-05-22 Item 3	The research proponent to discuss how the project results could inform condition benchmarks for future monitoring.
20-05-22 Item 3	The research proponent to include the GISERA’s Communication and Engagement Manager in the design and implementation of the stakeholder workshops.
20-05-22 Item 4	The GISERA Executive Officer to seek Sanjeev Pandey’s comments/approval out-of-session.