

Referral form

Refer proposed action or strategic proposal under the *Environment Protection Act 2019*

Before you fill in the form

Guiding notes

- This form must be read in conjunction with environmental impact assessment guidance for proponents on the [NT EPA website](#) including Referring a proposal to the Northern Territory Environment Protection Authority (NT EPA).
- This form contains five (5) parts:
 - Part A – Proponent details
 - Part B – Proposal details
 - Part C – Referral details
 - Part D – Referrer declaration
 - Part E – Nominated contact.
- This form contains two checklists:
 - Cross reference of matters addressed in the referral report
 - Proponent’s general duty.
- This form will be published.
- Further guidance or example responses are provided below in light grey text.

These guiding notes may be deleted before submitting the referral form and report.

PART A – Proponent details	
Name of the proponent (<i>legal entity</i>)	Groote Holdings Aboriginal Corporation (GHAC)
Proponent details	<i>Name:</i> Mark Hewitt <i>Position/responsibility:</i> Chief Executive Officer <i>Physical address:</i> Level 15, Charles Darwin Centre, 19 Smith Street Darwin NT 0800 <i>Postal address:</i> As above. <i>Phone:</i> (08) 8942 9444 <i>Email:</i> mhewitt@ghac.com.au
Proponent Trading Name if relevant	Groote Holdings Aboriginal Corporation
Australian Business Number/s Australian Company Number/s	ABN – 68 766 239 594

Provide a description of the organisational structure with respect to responsibility of the proposed action, environmental approvals and implementation.	GHAC is an Aboriginal Corporation established to facilitate the Economic Development Local Decision Making Agreement (LDMA) between the NT Government and the Anindilyakwa Land Council. GHAC is a registered charity and not-for-profit. The Chief Executive Officer holds responsibility for environmental approvals and implementation.
Joint-venture partners (if applicable)	<i>Name:</i> <i>Physical address:</i> <i>Postal address:</i> <i>Phone:</i> <i>Email:</i>
PART B – Outline of the proposal and location	
Outline of the proposed action or strategic proposal (proposal)	
Name of proposal	Little Paradise Development
Provide a brief summary (one or two paragraphs) of the proposal including the activity type/ industry/ duration.	<p>GHAC is proposing to develop a marine industry focused development designed to support the long-term economic and social future of all Anindilyakwa clans of the Groote Archipelago. The Project includes a marina facility, associated biosecurity compounds, logistics camp and aquaculture facility.</p> <p>The Project comprises the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marina Harbour Facilities – Including ferry, barge and recreational boat harbourage facilities; • Biosecurity Zones 01 & 02 – Construction and operation marina support and laydown area providing for biosecurity and functions to support marine operations; • Logistics and Base Camp (Lease 1) – Base camp for the development and maintenance of the Little Paradise precinct including initial residential and office accommodation, storage and other necessary infrastructure; • Aquaculture Facility (Lease 2) – Aquaculture facility involving breeding areas, hatchery, cold storage, workers accommodation and other necessary infrastructure.
Location	
Provide location details as: a) street address, suburb	N/A

b) tenement, lot/section numbers, town/hundred, NT Portion or pastoral lease numbers, as applicable	NT Portion 1632
c) the nearest town, recognisable feature, and distance and direction from that town/feature to the site of the proposed action. If the proposal includes several locations, provide location details for each location. For example, a mine at location 1 and a processing site at location 2.	3.8 km north-east of Alyangula
Name of the Local Government Area/s in which the proposal is located.	East Arnhem Local Government
What is the land tenure type, and proposed land tenure type ?	NT freehold
Does the proponent have the legal (land) access required for the implementation of all aspects of the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/> No If no, provide details of legal access authorisations /agreements / tenure is required and from whom. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, provide an indication of legal access authorisations / agreement / tenure. Agreements with local TOs and the board of the ALC. Land and intertidal (to mean low water mark) based components of the Project fall within the Anindilyakwa Land Trust area. The Anindilyakwa Land Trust holds unalienable freehold title of Aboriginal land which is administered by the Anindilyakwa Land Council pursuant to the <i>Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976</i> . Proposed developments on Aboriginal land are regulated by lease agreements allowed for section 19 (S19) of the Land Rights Act. Two separate S19 lease areas have been authorised by the ALC (in consultation with the Traditional Owners) within Leases 1 and 2. The wharf will require a crown lease.
Is the land zoned under the NT Planning Scheme ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, what is/are the zoning/s?

What is the current land use of the proposal site/s?	Aboriginal land, predominately undisturbed eucalyptus woodland with area of existing disturbance (e.g., roads and disused rock wharf).
What is the approximate distance (direct line) and direction to the closest human sensitive receptor? For example, residence, accommodation, hospital, school, homeland from the proposal.	Little Paradise Aboriginal satellite community - 120 m north of the Project area at the closest point.
What is the proposed end land use of the proposal site/s	Indefinite commercial operation. Rehabilitated to existing eucalyptus woodland habitat if uses cease.
Consultation	
Provide an overview of consultation undertaken specific to the proposal and potential environmental impacts.	Community members have been informed about the proposal through website updates, stakeholder discussions over several years and emails to key stakeholders. The ALC has undertaken extensive consultations with the traditional Aboriginal owners, Aboriginal people who live in the relevant areas of land and other Aboriginal communities or groups that may be affected by the proposed development. There have been at least 14 separate formal consultation sessions with Traditional Owners with their input shaping the proposal.
List the matters raised in consultation and identify how the proposal has been modified to respond to stakeholder feedback.	Matters raised and addressed in the project design include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of relevant key Indigenous persons for consultations and inclusion of those representatives in working sessions; • Identification and protection of cultural heritage sites; • Protection of sensitive environmental areas; • Economic ventures to be progressed as part of the project to best serve the community; • Prevention of impacts to neighbouring Aboriginal communities of Little Paradise and Bartalumba Bay – exclusion of project activities from these areas


	<p>and upgrading of the access road that will serve these communities and the Project.</p> <p>The project has been significantly refined based on both stakeholder input and on survey findings. Section 2.2 of the referral main report details the full list of refinements and alternatives considered.</p>
PART C – Referral type	
<p>What type of proposal is being referred?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> proposed action</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> strategic proposal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> proponent initiated EIS referral</p>
<p>Provide a brief justification including the reasons why you consider the action may have a significant impact on the environment and is referred to the NT EPA.</p> <p>Refer to section 11 of the EP Act and the NT EPA's environmental factors and objectives.</p>	<p>The project is being referred as Groote Eylandt and the broad archipelago have significant ecological value because the terrestrial fauna species present are relatively protected from key threatening processes that exist on the mainland. While the project is limited in spatial scale, it involves a marine component with direct and indirect disturbance, along with a proposed aquaculture facility discharge. However, substantial refinements to the Project have been made following ecological surveys to avoid significant impacts. Furthermore, studies indicate impacts will be limited and unlikely to constitute a significant impact. This considers the measures to avoid, manage and mitigate potential impacts presented in the Risk Register. The following is a summary of the NT EPA environmental factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landforms – One risk was identified as relevant to landforms. The residual risk was assessed as Low. While the project intersects the coastal landscape, the landform is widespread and the main development is setback, with the wharf being placed at the location of an existing degraded wharf structure. • Terrestrial Environmental Quality – A total of 17 risks were identified as relevant to TEQ. Of these, one had a residual rating of High, two as Moderate and 14 as Low. There will be no significant storage of chemicals and most excavation will be above 5m AHD with limited likelihood to intersect ASS. The disturbance area is spatially limited. • Terrestrial Ecosystem – A total of 18 risks were identified as relevant to TE. Of these, one had a residual rating of High, two as Moderate and 15 as Low. The project intersects habitat for several threatened species, but the extent is limited and

outside of mapped key areas (e.g., roosting/nesting areas). Management measures have been proposed to avoid potential impacts to shorebirds.

- **Hydrological Processes** – A total of 8 risks were identified as relevant to HP. Of these, all were assessed to have a residual risk of Low. The Project does not intersect defined watercourses and will not be abstracting groundwater at the location for use. There is very limited interaction to features of HP.
- **Inland Water Environmental Quality** – A total of 11 risks were identified as relevant to IWEQ. Of these, all were assessed to have a residual risk of Low. There will be no significant storage of chemicals, the Project does not intersect defined watercourses and is at the base of a small catchment with very limited interaction to features of IWEQ.
- **Aquatic Ecosystems** – A total of 12 risks were identified as relevant to AE. All were assessed to have a residual risk of Low. There will be no significant storage of chemicals, the Project does not intersect defined watercourses and is at the base of a small catchment with very limited interaction to features of AE.
- **Coastal Processes** – One risk was identified as relevant to CP. With the single risk having a residual risk rating of High. Coastal process changes are modelled to occur from the wharf but are not predicted to be significant. Minor accretion and wave sheltering is predicted to promote mangrove expansion to the south of the wharf with minor direct impact to benthic communities.
- **Marine Environmental Quality** – A total of 7 risks were identified as relevant to MEQ. Of these, all were assessed to have a residual risk of Low or Moderate. There will be minor direct impact to benthic communities, low risk of pollution due to no large storage of chemicals and no proposed dredging.
- **Marine Ecosystems** – A total of 10 risks were identified as relevant to ME. Of these, one had a residual rating of High, three as Moderate and six as Low. A limited area of marine habitat for benthic and marine flora and fauna will be lost. There is low risk of pollution due to no large storage of chemicals and no proposed dredging.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality – A total of 3 risks were identified as relevant to AQ. All were assessed to have a residual risk of Low. The Project presents a temporary and localised risk to air quality from dust and particulate matter during construction, with no significant point source operational emissions. • Atmospheric Processes – A total of 3 risks were identified as relevant to AP. All were assessed to have a residual risk of Moderate or Low. Although the clearing and construction would contribute to minor emissions, there will be no major single source of GHG emissions in the operational component. The proponent is targeting carbon neutrality through various actions. • Community and Economy – A total of 13 risks were identified as relevant to CE. All were assessed to have a residual risk of Moderate or Low. The project presents an opportunity to develop long-term sustainable economic development project for residents of the Grootte Archipelago with significant benefits. • Culture and Heritage – A total of 3 risks were identified as relevant to CH. All were assessed to have a residual risk of Moderate or Low. Cultural heritage surveys, anthropology studies and AAPA investigations have been completed and inform the project layout and activities. • Human Health – A total of 10 risks were identified as relevant to HH. Of these, one had a residual rating of High, two as Moderate and seven as Low. Measures to protect the health of workers and island residents have been informed by a survey and reporting from NT Health.
Does the proposal involve an action that may be or is a controlled action under the Commonwealth <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (EPBC Act)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has the proposed action been referred?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, provide the date referred and reference number (EPBC number)? Date: EPBC number:

<p>If referred, has a decision been made on whether the proposed action is a controlled action?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, check the appropriate decision outcome and provide the decision in an attachment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Decision – controlled action <input type="checkbox"/> Decision – not a controlled action</p>
<p>PART D – Proponent referrer details and declaration</p> <p>*The referral form must include the declaration signed by the proponent, or where the proponent is an organisation or business, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or duly authorised delegate within the proponent company.</p>	
<p>Who is referring this proposal?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proponent <input type="checkbox"/> Authorised representative within proponent entity</p>
<p>Does the proponent request that the NT EPA treat any part of the information in the referral as confidential under section 281(2) of the EP Act?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>If yes, provide an application in accordance with regulation 271 of the Environment Protection Regulations 2020 and submit the confidential information as a separate attachment</p>
<p>Referral declaration <u>by proponent</u>:</p> <p>I, Mark Stephen Hewitt., declare that I am authorised to refer this proposed action/strategic proposal on behalf of Groote Holdings Aboriginal Corporation, and further declare that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the attached environmental impact assessment documents have been prepared in accordance with the EP Act and EP Regulations; and • the attached environmental impact assessment documents (including attachments) are true; and • the attached environmental impact assessment documents do not provide false or misleading information and I know it is an offence to provide false and misleading information, noting the penalties under section 260 of the EP Act, and section 119 of the <i>Criminal Code Act 1983</i>; and • the proponent fully understands that referral under the EP Act does not limit, in any way, the requirements of the proponent to ensure approvals under any other regulatory regime are applied for, and adhered to; and • the proponent has fulfilled its general duty in accordance with section 43 of the EP Act. <p><i>Note: if the NT EPA determine that an environmental approval is required, the proponent will be requested to provide supporting documents during the assessment process such as details to support that the person is a fit and proper person to hold an environmental approval in accordance with section 62 of the EP Act</i></p>	
<p>Name: Mark Hewitt</p>	

Signature:		
		
Date: 16/07/2024		
Position: Chief Executive Officer		
Organisation (if a business or organisation): Groote Holdings Aboriginal Corporation		
Email: mhewitt@ghac.com.au		
Address: Level 15, Charles Darwin Centre, 19 Smith Street, Darwin NT 0801		
PART E – Nominated contact		
Contact details for proponent contact (provide the details for the person who will be corresponding with the NT EPA on the proposal)	<i>Business name:</i> Groote Holdings Aboriginal Corporation <i>Name of primary contact:</i> Mark Hewitt <i>Physical address:</i> Level 15 Charles Darwin Centre, 19 Smith Street Darwin NT 0801 <i>Postal address:</i> As above. <i>Phone:</i> (08) 8942 9444 <i>Email:</i> mhewitt@ghac.com	
Contact details of consultant (if relevant, provide the details for the person who will be corresponding with the NT EPA on the proposal on behalf of the proponent)	<i>Business name:</i> CDM Smith Australia <i>Name of primary contact:</i> Paul Davey <i>Physical address:</i> Level 1, 48-50 Smith Street Darwin NT 0801 <i>Postal address:</i> As above. <i>Phone:</i> 0429 925 538 <i>Email:</i> daveyp@cdmsmith.com	
CHECKLIST 1 - Cross reference of matters addressed in the referral report (for more detail refer to the Referring a proposal to the NT EPA guidance)		
Item	See Referral guidance for further detail on information requirements	Report section / page
<i>Publication statement</i>	Provide name and qualifications of relevant contributors to the referral.	Section 1.3 - Environmental Consultant Details
<i>Executive summary</i>	Overview of the proposal, its potential for significant impact and key conclusions.	Executive Summary

<i>Introduction</i>	Include a brief introduction to the proposal and the proponent (noting proponent details are also to be included in the referral form / environmental approval application form).	Section 1 Introduction
<i>Proposal description - Key components</i>	Provide a clear and detailed description of the proposal, referencing maps and spatial information. Provide a key components summary table. Identify uncertainty / likely changes if particular elements of a proposal require further design at the time of referral. Provide an account of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, operations, or industries that are related the current proposal.	Section 2 Project Description
<i>Proposal description - Location and regional context</i>	Location and regional context.	Section 3 Location and Regional Context
<i>Proposal description - Alternatives (options)</i>	Describe any alternatives (location, timeframes, activities) considered or are under consideration in scoping and developing the proposal. Describe how the analysis of alternatives accounted for the <i>principles of environment protection and management</i> (Part 2 of the EP Act). Justification for the preferred/selected option. Describe any assumptions critical to your assessment.	Section 2.2 Project Refinement and Alternatives
<i>Proposal description - Application of the:</i> – <i>Principles of environment protection and management</i> (Part 2) – <i>General duty of proponents</i> (s43)	Discuss how the proposal accounts for the <i>principles of environment protection and management</i> (Part 2 of the EP Act) and the general duty of proponents provided for under section 43 of the EP Act: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Principles of ecologically sustainable development• Environmental decision-making hierarchy• Waste management hierarchy.	Section 4 Environmental Approvals Process and Relevant Legislation
<i>Consultation</i> Refer to NT EPA Stakeholder Engagement guidance 2020	The EP Act (section 3 and section 43) puts an obligation on the proponent to consult with stakeholders and the community in the development of the proposal. As an example, the referral should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a description of stakeholder engagement and community consultation undertaken• an outline of the method and process of consultation with stakeholders• a summary of the key matters raised during consultation	Section 5 Consultation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> any changes made as a result of consultation the ongoing consultation, and options for feedback whether the consultation has or has not been undertaken in accordance with NT EPA guidance on Stakeholder Engagement whether the consultation has or hasn't been undertaken in accordance with the section 43 (EP Act) general duty of proponents (see Checklist 2). 	
<i>Strategic and statutory context</i>	Table discussing proposal specific legislation, policies, and guidelines that are and may be applicable to the proposal and the sequencing and status of those, is provided.	Section 4 Environmental Approvals Process and Relevant Legislation
<i>Environmental Factors</i>	<p>The sections below relate to information that describes the potential impacts of the proposal on the NT EPA's Environmental factors.</p> <p>Information requirements for each environmental factor identified by the pre-referral screening tool are provided (any technical studies and surveys included).</p>	Section 8.1 Relevant Environmental Factors
<i>Environmental Factors and objectives</i> Presence/absence of environmental values	<p><i>Repeat for each NT EPA Factor being considered for your proposal/referral</i></p> <p>The presence or absence of relevant environmental values and sensitivities are verified.</p> <p>Specify the source and currency of information (e.g. desktop assessments, and/or field surveys, the methods used, dates, sources, and whether the approach is conducted in accordance with relevant regulatory and industry guideline.</p>	Section 8 Environmental Impact Assessment
<i>Environmental Factors and objectives</i> Potential impacts and consistency with relevant policy/guidance	<p><i>Repeat for each NT EPA Factor being considered for your proposal/referral</i></p> <p>Assessment of potential impacts (negative, direct, indirect, cumulative, short and long-term) of the proposal.</p> <p>Relevant policy and guidance described.</p> <p>Residual / remaining impact to the environmental factor described.</p>	Section 8 Environmental Impact Assessment
<i>Environmental Factors and objectives</i> Environment protection and management	<p><i>Repeat for each NT EPA Factor being considered for your proposal/referral</i></p> <p>Describe in terms of management hierarchies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> measures proposed to avoid, mitigate or offset (if appropriate) 	Section 8 Environmental Impact Assessment AND Appendix C Risk

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> effectiveness of proposed measures and the level of confidence of implementation whether the NT EPA's objective for the environmental factor is likely to be met. 	Register
<i>Environmental Factors and objectives</i> Cumulative impacts	<p><i>Repeat for each NT EPA Factor being considered for your proposal/referral</i></p> Describe potential cumulative impacts.	Section 8.2.5 Indirect and Cumulative Impact

CHECKLIST 2 - Consideration of the Proponent's general duty (in accordance with section 43 of the EP Act)

Section 43 General duty of proponents	Done	Comment
The following principles of ecologically sustainable development must be taken into consideration in the design of the proposed action.		Provide comment here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision-making principle 	✓	As part of the planning and design GHAC has considered short-term and long-term economic, environmental, social and equitable issues and have included the community in the decision-making processes. Notably, the Anindilyakwa Traditional Owners have provided the guiding direction to the Project inclusions. The Project inclusions and layout have been driven by environmental surveys and findings, with the aim of avoiding sensitive environmental and cultural heritage sites, and accounting for long-term environmental and equitable considerations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principle of proportionality 	✓	A range of management and mitigation measures have been proposed to prevent or limit potential environmental impacts from the project (refer to the attached Risk Register). These have been considered and proposed accounting for (proportionally) the risk of harm or impact that is addressed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precautionary principle 	✓	A risk assessment has been developed for the Project which carefully identifies and evaluates associated environmental risks (refer to Section 8 – Risk Assessment of Environmental Factors in the main referral report). Notably, risks vary across the Project stages. For example, the risk of impacts from vegetation clearing are highest during the construction stage. The risk assessment process has considered the

		applicable stages and based the assessment of residual risk on the stage for which the greatest risk is expected (i.e., consideration of a worst-case precautionary approach). Furthermore, the Project layout has been driven by survey findings using the precautionary principle to avoid areas of potential significance.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principle of evidence-based decision-making 	✓	Decisions during the planning and assessment of the Project have been made with the consideration of relevant information obtained from a variety of sources and professionals in appropriate fields. In all cases where a known source of direct field verified data is available, this has been used in preference of desktop data. Detailed ecological and anthropological field surveys were undertaken over several years for the Project planning. These actions gathered baseline data and identified potential occurrences and habitat for threatened species and areas of cultural heritage significance.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principle of intergenerational and intergenerational equity 	✓	GHAC is committed to ensuring the Project will not adversely impact on future generations and instead maintain a productive environment and provide opportunities for future Anindilyakwa Traditional Owners. While the Project seeks to provide equitable service provision to the Groote Eylandt residents it also provides a unique opportunity for direct training/upskilling of local Aboriginal residents and provision of intergenerational economic stability through direct employment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principle of sustainable use 	✓	A potential masterplan for the Project was first developed in 2019. The masterplan has been progressively refined to account for engineering and feasibility analysis, identification of the cultural and ecological constraints, and to deliver infrastructure that best fits the needs of Groote Archipelago residents. During the Project design process, a number of scenarios were considered and screened to evaluate the relative social, economic and environmental advantages and disadvantages of different Project alternatives. Project actions which possess the potential to generate environmental risks have been considered against the relevant principles of ESD. Decisions have been made on consideration of multiple options, based on relevant and scientific information and with the consultation of relevant personnel. GHAC is committed to maintaining environmental integrity and ensuring development is

		<p>sustainable and with mitigated impact on ecological health and diversity.</p> <p>GHAC is determined to ensure that the Project will deliver a net benefit to the environment and social values. The company is focused on ensuring that the avoidance hierarchy is adopted and that wherever possible impacts are proactively avoided through design, minimised through innovative construction and operation methods and mitigated through informed and ongoing adaptive management.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principle of conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity 	✓	<p>The Project has been designed with consideration and commitment to ensuring the protection and conservation of biological diversity and integrity. GHAC is committed to avoid the disturbance of threatened flora species where possible. Targeted surveys have been completed within the Project area and no threatened flora species have been identified.</p> <p>Areas of important ecosystems and threatened species habitat have been avoided to the greatest extent possible.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principle of improved valuation, pricing and incentive mechanisms 	☐	N/A
The following management hierarchies must be taken into consideration in the design of the proposed action.		Provide comment here
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental decision-making hierarchy 	✓	<p>A potential masterplan for the Project was first developed in 2019. The masterplan has been progressively refined to account for engineering and feasibility analysis, identification of the cultural and ecological constraint.</p> <p>The assessment has sought to achieve residual risks that are as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP) through application of the environmental decision-making hierarchy (to avoid or mitigate potentially significant environmental impacts) and implementation of an adaptive management approach in accordance with current NT EPA guidelines and industry standards.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste management hierarchy 	✓	<p>In the drafting of the Project waste management approach GHAC has considered the waste management hierarchy and implemented appropriate minimising, reusing, recycling and treatment techniques.</p>
Other section 43 considerations		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have communities that may be affected by the proposed action been 	✓	<p>Traditional Owner project consultations were undertaken on 14 occasions between 12 February 2021 and 10 March 2022.</p>

<p>provided with information and opportunities for consultation?</p>		<p>The outcome of these consultations contributed to preparing a list of eight instructions to facilitate the identification of restricted areas within the Project study area. A Cultural Heritage Report has been developed for the Project and an authority certificate from the Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority has been issued.</p> <p>Beyond the Traditional Owners, consultation with various Government, community and industry stakeholders has been completed. GHAC commits to informing, consulting and involving the Groote Archipelago in relevant decisions and collaborating and empowering Traditional Owners and Aboriginal groups through advice seeking discussions and direct decision involvement.</p> <p>As part of the stakeholder engagement approach GHAC is committed to ongoing communication, one-on-one meetings and employment partnerships with Traditional Owners ensuring they are engaged in way where they respected, listened to and with recognition that they are an integral part of environmental decision-making processes for the Little Paradise development.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has consultation with affected communities, including Aboriginal communities' been undertaken in a culturally appropriate manner? 	<p>✓</p>	<p>Consultation has included standard modern approaches such as website updates and more direct forms including informal settings, such as field visits and helicopter surveys with Traditional Owners.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has community knowledge and understanding (including scientific and traditional knowledge and understanding) of the natural and cultural values of areas that may be impacted by the proposed action been sought and documented? 	<p>✓</p>	<p>Traditional Owner project consultations were undertaken on 14 occasions between 12 February 2021 and 10 March 2022. The outcome of these consultations contributed to preparing a list of eight instructions to facilitate the identification of restricted areas within the Project area.</p> <p>Furthermore, Traditional Owner input has shaped the layout and inclusions of the proposal.</p> <p>A Cultural Heritage Report has been developed for the Project and an authority certificate issued by the the Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority.</p> <p>GHAC has also consulted with the NTG Heritage Branch who have not raised concerns for potential heritage sites within the Project area.</p> <p>GHAC is committed to ongoing communication with the local community and providing avenues for input and feedback as well as seeking knowledge from Traditional Owners</p>

		and indigenous communities through the facilitation of relevant discussions.
Have Aboriginal values and the rights and interests of Aboriginal communities' been addressed in relation to areas that may be impacted by the proposed action?	✓	<p>Traditional Owner project consultations were undertaken on 14 occasions between 12 February 2021 and 10 March 2022. The outcome of these consultations contributed to preparing a list of eight instructions to facilitate the identification of restricted areas within the Project area.</p> <p>Furthermore, Traditional Owner input has shaped the layout and inclusions of the proposal. A Cultural Heritage Report has been developed for the Project and an authority certificate issued by the the Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority.</p> <p>The AAAC informed and sought feedback on the Project primarily through monthly meetings with the ALC 24-member Board. The Board, in turn, consults more broadly on important issues, like potential impacts on sacred sites and the environment, with a broader group of up to 240 Traditional Owners representing Anindilyakwa's two clan groups.</p> <p>Section 19 leases under the Land Rights Act of were authorised by the traditional Aboriginal owners in September 2021 to cater to the requirements of the project. The ALC has undertaken extensive consultations with the traditional Aboriginal owners, Aboriginal people who live in the relevant areas of land and other Aboriginal communities or groups that may be affected regarding the Section 19 leases and proposed development more broadly.</p>

How to submit

Email your completed form to Environmental Assessments, Department of Environment, Parks and Water Security at eia.ntepa@nt.gov.au

Further information

For further information, contact Environmental Assessments, Department of Environment, Parks and Water Security (DEPWS) at eia.ntepa@nt.gov.au or phone 08 8924 4218.

Collection notice

Purpose: The purpose for the collection of information using this form is to provide the NT EPA with the relevant information needed to administer the environmental impact assessment process under the *Environment Protection Act 2019*.

Failure to collect information: If the DEPWS does not collect this information, then correspondence will continue to be with the proponent last notified to the NT EPA/Minister and it may have implications in the Minister's consideration of a fit and proper person under s 62 of the Environment Protection Act and environmental approval holder entity/name.

Who is collecting the information: The information is collected by the DEPWS, who provide services to the NT EPA/Minister.

Who to contact for more information: The [DEPWS Privacy Policy](#) sets out how you can access and/or correct your personal information and how you can make a complaint if you feel we have not complied with the [Privacy Act 1988](#).

All enquiries about access, correction or to make a complaint should be directed to the Privacy Officer on (08) 8999 4410 business days, 8.00am - 4.21pm or write to PO Box 496, Palmerston, NT 0831 or email StrategicServices.DEPWS@nt.gov.au