

Commonwealth Environment Program

Result

Commonwealth marine area

Relevant requirements not met

RoN Decision Submission 1

RoN

Daniel Thompson

Decision

Opportunity to modify and resubmit

Reason for decision:

Based on the available information and my review of the findings of the assessment team and their recommendations above, I am not reasonably satisfied that the environment plan meets the criteria set out in regulation 34.







Based on the available information, I am not reasonably satisfied that the titleholder complies with financial assurance requirements of the Act (subsection 571(2)) in relation to the petroleum activity. Further, I am not reasonably satisfied that the compliance is in a form that is acceptable to NOPSEMA.

Team conclusions Submission 2



Acceptance Criteria

Environment Plan is appropriate for nature and scale of activity

Do not Recommen

| Commonwealth Environment Program | Result |
|---|---|
| World Heritage properties | Relevant requirements met  |
| National Heritage places | Relevant requirements met  |
| Ramsar wetlands | Relevant requirements not met  |
| Listed threatened species and communities | Relevant requirements not met  |
| Listed migratory species | Relevant requirements not met  |
| Commonwealth marine area | Relevant requirements not met  |


RoN Decision Submission 2


| | |
|--|---|
| RoN <input data-bbox="98 979 1048 1037" type="text" value="Daniel Thompson"/>  | Decision <input data-bbox="1137 979 2087 1037" type="text" value="Opportunity to modify and resubmit"/>  |
| Reason for decision: <div data-bbox="98 1114 2139 1410" style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 10px;"> <p>Based on the available information and my review of the findings of the assessment team and their recommendations above, I am not reasonably satisfied that the environment plan meets the criteria set out in regulation 34.</p> <p>Based on the available information, I am not reasonably satisfied that the titleholder complies with financial assurance requirements of the Act (subsection 571(2)) in relation to the petroleum activity. Further, I am not reasonably satisfied that the compliance is in a form that is acceptable to NOPSEMA.</p> </div> | |

Team conclusions Submission 3


Acceptance Criteria


Environment Plan is appropriate for nature and scale of activity

Recommend 

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="text"/> |  | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Highlight Issue |
| <p>The assessment team recommends that the decision maker can be reasonably satisfied that the EP is appropriate for the nature and scale of the activity. Please refer to Assessment Report A1096104 for detailed findings.</p> | | | | | |


Environment Plan demonstrates that the impacts and risks will be reduced to ALARP


Recommend 

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="text"/> |  | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Highlight Issue |
| <p>The assessment team recommend that the decision maker can be reasonably satisfied that the EP demonstrates that impacts and risks will be reduced to ALARP. Please refer to Assessment Report A1096104 for detailed findings.</p> | | | | | |


Acceptance Criteria


Environment Plan demonstrates that impacts and risks will be of an acceptable level

Do not Recommen 

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="text"/> |  | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Highlight Issue |
| <p>The assessment team recommend that the decision maker cannot be reasonably satisfied that the EP demonstrates that impacts and risks will be of an acceptable level. Please refer to Assessment Report A1096104 for detailed findings.</p> | | | | | |


Environment Plan provides for appropriate performance outcomes, standards and measurement criteria


Do not Recommen 

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="text"/> |  | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Highlight Issue |
| <p>The assessment team recommend that the decision maker cannot be reasonably satisfied that the EP provides for appropriate performance outcomes, standards and measurement criteria. Please refer to Assessment Report A1096104 for detailed findings.</p> | | | | | |


Acceptance Criteria


Environment Plan includes appropriate implementation strategy and monitoring, recording and reporting arrangements

Do not Recommen 

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="text"/> |  | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Highlight Issue |
| <p>The assessment team recommend that the decision maker cannot be reasonably satisfied that the EP includes appropriate implementation strategy and monitoring, recording and reporting arrangements. Please refer to Assessment Report A1096104 for detailed findings.</p> | | | | | |


Environment Plan demonstrates appropriate level of consultation


Do not Recommen 

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="text"/> |  | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Highlight Issue |
| <p>The assessment team recommend that the decision maker cannot be reasonably satisfied that the EP demonstrates an appropriate level of consultation. Please refer to Assessment Report A1096104 for detailed findings.</p> | | | | | |

Acceptance Criteria


Environment Plan complies with the Act and regulations

Do not Recommen 







| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="text"/> |  | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Highlight Issue |
| <p>The assessment team recommend that the decision maker cannot be reasonably satisfied that the EP complies with the Act and regulations because. Please refer to Assessment Report A1096104 for detailed findings.</p> | | | | | |

Environment Plan does not involve the activity or part of the activity being undertaken in any part of a declared World Heritage property



Recommend 

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="text"/> |  | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | Highlight Issue |
| <p>The assessment team recommend that the decision maker can be reasonably satisfied that the EP does not involve the activity or part of the activity being undertaken in any part of a declared World Heritage property. Please refer to Assessment Report A1096104 for detailed findings.</p> | | | | | |

Other Considerations Submission 3

| Commonwealth Environment Program | Result |
|---|---|
| World Heritage properties | Relevant requirements met  |
| National Heritage places | Relevant requirements met  |
| Ramsar wetlands | Relevant requirements met  |
| Listed threatened species and communities | Relevant requirements not met  |
| Listed migratory species | Relevant requirements not met  |
| Commonwealth marine area | Relevant requirements not met  |

RoN Decision Submission 3

| | |
|--|---|
| RoN | Decision |
| Daniel Thompson  | Refused to accept  |
| Reason for decision: | |
| <p>Based on the available information and my review of the findings of the assessment team and their recommendations above, I am not reasonably satisfied that the environment plan meets the criteria set out in regulation 34.</p> <p>Based on the available information, I am not reasonably satisfied that the titleholder complies with financial assurance requirements of the Act (subsection 571(2)) in relation to the petroleum activity. Further, I am not reasonably satisfied that the compliance is in a form that is acceptable to NOPSEMA.</p> | |

Information for the Public Website. Please note: Location Map and Environment Plan are required for RoN approval!

Location Map

Submission - AS #2 - Map - Regia MSS ▼

A1149398

Environment Plan

Submission - AS #4 - EP - Regia MSS - Revision 5 - 2025-12-09 ▼

A1291727

OPEP (if applicable)

▼

OSMP (if applicable)

▼

Appendices

Submission - AS #4 - EP Appendices - Regia MSS - Revision 5 - 2025- ▼

A1291721

Nopsema Report

▼

Statement of reasons

Report - Published - Statement of Reasons - Regia MSS (A1322656)_F ▼

A1323035

Additional document (if applicable)

Submission - AS #4 - Public Report on Consultations - Regia MSS - EP ▼

A1291717

Activity Description to be Published

CGG Services Australia (CGG) is proposing to undertake the Regia three-dimensional (3D) marine seismic survey (MSS) in Commonwealth waters of the Otway Basin. The purpose of the Regia 3D MSS is to collect high-quality geophysical data about rock formations and structures beneath the seabed and assess potential for new oil and gas discoveries.

The Regia 3D MSS is a typical 3D survey using methods and procedures like others conducted in Australian waters. No unique or unusual equipment or operations are proposed. The active source area comprises the area within which 3D seismic acquisition will be undertaken and has a maximum acquisition area of 2750 km². The active source area is surrounded by a larger operational area (approximately 4,000 km²), for the purpose of line turns, run-ins, run-outs, seismic testing, and support activities. The operational area at its closest is approximately 12 km south of Port Fairy. Seismic acquisition will be undertaken in water depths no shallower than 50 m, and no deeper than 200 m.

The survey will involve a single seismic survey vessel towing a seismic source array with a total volume of 2,630 cubic inches (in³), at a water depth of between 5 - 10 m. The seismic source will use compressed air to emit regular pulses of sound that reflect off the seabed and underlying rock formations. The reflected sound wave will be received by up to 16 hydrophone streamers. Each streamer will be up to 8,100 m in length, spaced approximately 100 m apart and towed at a depth of approximately 25 m. During the survey, the seismic survey vessel will travel at a speed between 4-6 knots, discharging the seismic source approximately every 12.5 m. The survey vessel will typically acquire seismic data along a series of adjacent and parallel lines in a "racetrack" pattern. When the vessel completes the line, it will turn again to follow another line offset approximately 500 m from the first. This pattern is repeated until the required coverage is completed.

Relevant title(s) / Application Number

66VF7V

<https://public.neats.nopta.gov.au/Opggs/ApplicationTracking/c8acbf09-d54b-4b70-be34-aad4866c>

Check URL

Nominated Liaison Contact of Activity

Mr Paul Rheinberg
Business Development Manager
Level 2, 1060 Hay Street
West Perth, 6005, WA
08 9214 6200
contact@regiamss.com.au

Edit

Region(s)

Otway

Commonwealth waters adjacent to

Victoria

Sensitive Information (Not Published)

Sensitive Information

Submission - AS #4 - Report - Sensitive Information - Regia MSS - EP / 

Result



A1291723