

# Consultation submission form

## A Draft Minerals Strategy for New Zealand to 2040

MAY 2024

### How to submit using this form

This form is used to provide feedback on the draft Minerals Strategy for New Zealand to 2040.

When completing this submission form, please provide comments and reasons explaining your choices. Your feedback provides valuable information and informs decisions about the design of the strategy.

You can submit this form by 5pm, Wednesday, 31 July 2024 by:

- Email to [resourcesfeedback@mbie.govt.nz](mailto:resourcesfeedback@mbie.govt.nz) with subject line '**Minerals Strategy Consultation 2024**' and BCC [climateclubnz@substack.com](mailto:climateclubnz@substack.com) OR

- Mailing to:

**Minerals Strategy Consultation 2024**

Resource Markets Policy

Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment

PO Box 1473

Wellington 6140

Your feedback will contribute to further development of a Minerals Strategy for New Zealand. It will also become official information, which means it may be requested under the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).

The OIA specifies that information is to be made available upon request unless there are sufficient grounds for withholding it. If we receive a request, we cannot guarantee that feedback you provide us will not be made public. Any decision to withhold information requested under the OIA is reviewable by the Ombudsman.

## Submitter information

The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) would appreciate if you would provide some information about yourself. If you choose to provide information in the “About you” section below it will be used to help MBIE understand the impact of our proposals on different occupational groups. Any information you provide will be stored securely.

### A. About you

Name:

Privacy of natural persons

Email  
address:

Privacy of natural persons

### B. Are you happy for MBIE to contact you if we have questions about your submission?

Yes

No

### C. Are you making this submission on behalf of a business or organisation?

Yes

No

If yes, please tell us the title of your company/organisation:

### D. The best way to describe your role is:

Academic/researcher

Independent expert (please specify below)

Consultant (please specify below)

Business owner (please specify below)

Tradesperson (please specify below)

Student (please specify below)

Industry group (please specify below)

Other (please specify below)

Industry participant (please specify below)

Prefer not to say

Please specify here:

**Librarian/researcher**

**E. Privacy information**

- The Privacy Act 2020 applies to submissions. Please check the box if you do not wish your name or other personal information to be included in any information about submissions that MBIE may publish.
- MBIE may upload submissions, or a summary of submissions, received to MBIE's website at [www.mbie.govt.nz](http://www.mbie.govt.nz). If you do not want your submission or a summary of your submission to be placed on our website, please check the box and type an explanation below:

*I do not want my submission placed on MBIE's website because... [insert reasoning here]*

**F. Confidential information**

- I would like my submission (or identifiable parts of my submission) to be kept confidential and have stated my reasons and ground under section 9 of the Official Information Act that I believe apply, for consideration by MBIE.

If you have checked this box, please tell us what parts of your submission are to be kept confidential.

## A Minerals Strategy for New Zealand to 2040

MBIE is developing a *Minerals Strategy for New Zealand to 2040* to enable us to take a long-term, strategic approach to how we develop our mineral resources. This does not include petroleum which already has an advanced regulatory regime.

Minerals play an essential role in New Zealand's economic growth through high-paying jobs, Crown royalties, direct positive impact in the regions where mining takes place, and through export revenues. Minerals are also critical inputs into products that are necessary for other sectors to thrive, including the use of aggregates in construction and infrastructure.

Minerals will continue to play a major role in New Zealand's export-led economic growth and contribute to our economic functions, but the minerals sector faces some risks and challenges. These include lack of complete understanding about our minerals ecosystem, supply risks, social license, and a regulatory system that needs to be improved to enable investments.

These challenges require a long-term strategic approach to ensure that resource development for our economic prosperity happens in a responsible manner. Developing a minerals strategy is a fundamental first step in ensuring that we have a strategic framework for resource production.

The Minerals Strategy Discussion Document seeks feedback on the context and design of the strategy. It discusses key strategic issues, challenges and opportunities facing the minerals sector in New Zealand, and how we could address them.

The strategy is built on three key pillars, **Enhancing prosperity for New Zealanders**, **Demonstrating the sector's value**, and **Delivering minerals for a clean energy transition**, and identifies specific actions the Government could take to position the minerals sector to deliver value in an environmentally responsible manner.

Please see the Minerals Strategy Discussion Document for more information.

### Questions for the consultation

1. Are the strategic pillars of the Draft Strategy (**Enhancing prosperity for New Zealanders, Demonstrating the sector's value, and Delivering minerals for a clean energy transition**) suitable or is there more we need to consider?

Yes, they are suitable                       No, they are not suitable                       Not sure/no preference

Is there anything you would like to tell us about the reason(s) for your choice? Or is there more we need to consider?

As someone who lives in a region (Taranaki) where I have seen the negative impacts of the greed of extractive industries such as mining, I must say this strategy looks like it was written by the mining industry for their financial benefit with a veneer of greenwashing for good measure.

It is premised on the assumption that kiwis want to transition to clean energy by increasing the exploitation of raw minerals (producing more greenhouse gases particularly through coal in the process), using traditional mining techniques and the unquestioned truth that economic growth is and should be the people's priority. I question your assumptions.

2. Are the key actions the right ones to deliver on our strategic pillars, and are they ambitious enough?

- Yes, the actions are the right ones and are ambitious enough  
 No, the actions are not the right ones ~~and not ambitious enough~~  
 Not sure/no preference

If **No**, what else might we need to consider?

Talk about giving us leading questions! This is insulting.

I do not think the draft strategy will genuinely increase the long term prosperity of most New Zealanders, and it definitely won't support an effective clean energy transition.

I do think it will increase the amount of long term toxic waste, with a negative impact the health of New Zealanders and the unique lifeforms we have the privilege of sharing this place with, for the financial benefit of large overseas corporations.

I am in no-way persuaded that this is justified by the pittance in royalties that the companies pay (with various tax breaks and special deals such as lower electricity prices), with fewer and fewer short-term high paid jobs. The mining industry is reducing human jobs and increasing the use of robots – hardly a win for New Zealanders.

As for trust, check out the mining industry track records: the tiny Tui mine clean-up alone cost New Zealand taxpayers \$22.5 million to clean up. The few remaining rare native snails from the Deniston plateau are still sitting in icecream containers in a shipping container, not out participating in an ecosystem they evolved to be a part of, as per the agreement with the mining company. The so-called 'land farms' in Taranaki which are basically toxic dumps, the toxic waste in southland from the aluminium smelter. Meanwhile, a storm like Cyclone Gabriel – known to be made more extreme as a result of the greenhouse gases we continue to contribute to – has cost us \$22.5 million and a number of human lives. Many in the affected areas are still trying to get back on their feet.

There are very good reasons why the mining companies lack a social mandate for their activities. They put profit before the planet and people, with no genuine concern for cleaning up after themselves and ensuring a long term thriving future.

I do support the idea of developing a circular economy. One that sees "urban mining" – ie mining our existing e-waste and landfill waste - and support for projects such as the GNS suggestion that we use the lithium produced as a by-product of our geothermal energy, as opposed to ripping open the earth and disrupting existing ecosystems that are already under stress as a result of human activity. We are dependent on these ecosystems and the beautiful, diverse and abundant creatures that we can learn so much from are dependent on us to clean up our act. It is a reciprocal deal, not some self-absorbed fantasy of everlasting extraction and so called 'wealth'.

We are continuing to find new species unique to this place – three more species of weta this week! I have been amazed by the life that we have started to find out about off the Taranaki coast: I definitely do not support seabed mining. We are already seeing some of our iconic marine species like penguins and seals washing up dead from starvation, pollution and overfishing.

What good are rare minerals if the population of oxygen producing krill at the bottom of the marine food chain declines to a point that we struggle to breathe or obtain healthy food to feed ourselves?

There is no economic growth on a dead planet. Wake up!

Our ocean life and our native old growth forests and wetlands are the most efficient carbon sinks that we have. There is no way we should be further imperilling these in pursuit of what purports to be a move to a clean energy future but which seems predominantly focused on short term, off shore gains concentrated in the hands of a few while pushing our planet towards more pollution, more death.

**3. Are there opportunities for our minerals sector we haven't considered?**

Yes, there are       No, there are none       Not sure/no preference

If **Yes**, what are the opportunities for our minerals sectors we should consider?

Yes, urban mining and recycling existing waste streams as described above. This includes recycling building waste rather than mining fresh aggregates.

**4. Are there challenges for our minerals sector we haven't considered?**

Yes, there are other challenges not considered  
 No, all challenges have been considered  
 Not sure/no preference

Is there anything you would like to tell us about the reason(s) for your choice?

Yes, aside from what is mentioned above, there is the potential for legal challenges, including from those representing future generations, and our responsibilities under international treaties around the rights of our indigenous people, cutting our emissions, etc etc. I will not be giving money to your political campaigns, I will be giving money to organisations which are prepared to legally challenge your unconscionable prioritising of short term profits over the long term health of the planet.

**5. Are there any other things we have missed that we should include, or things we should not include?**

# Thank you

Thanks for your feedback, we really appreciate your insight. It helps us establish a long-term strategic approach to ensure that resource development for our economic prosperity happens in a responsible manner.

To help us continue to develop a Minerals Strategy for New Zealand to 2040, we would appreciate any additional suggestions or comments you may have.

Please leave your feedback here:

Drop the Fast-track Approvals Bill. It concentrates decision making power in the hands of just three to four people whose views and values do not represent those of a significant chunk of the community. It is written in a way that is biased towards large corporations that focus on extracting maximum short term financial gains, with no genuine attempt to listen to feedback from the effect communities. In particular, the environmental, social, and public health impacts of some of the proposed projects are not required to be seriously considered. Our species is a part of and utterly dependent on nature's ecosystems which are already staggering under the assault of our societies' greed. An effective, long-lasting, sustainable and robust mineral strategy should not rely on such a bill nor encourage economic growth at the expense of our life support system.