On behalf of
**Environment Advisory Unit**
**Department for Communication, Climate Action and Environment**

Date
**April 2019**

Project Number
**1700003678**

# STATUATORY ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT SCREENING DETERMINATION REPORT FOR IOLAR APPLICATION (WELL 52/01-A)

RAMBØLL

# STATUATORY ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT SCREENING DETERMINATION REPORT FOR IOLAR APPLICATION (WELL 52/01-A)

| | |
|---|---|
| Project No. | **1700003678** |
| Issue No. | **05** |
| Date | **11/04/2019** |
| Made by | **Kim Moore / MarineSpace** |
| Checked by | **Kim Moore** |
| Approved by | **Peter Bruce** |



**Version Control Log**

| Revision | Date | Made by | Checked by | Approved by | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 12/04/2019 | KM/MS | KM | PB | EIA Screening Opinion Report |

Ramboll
5th Floor
7 Castle Street
Edinburgh
EH2 3AH
United Kingdom
T +44 131 297 2650
www.ramboll.co.uk

# CONTENTS

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Ramboll UK Limited (herein referred to as Ramboll) has been commissioned by the Department for Communications, Climate Action and Environment (herein referred to as DCCAE) to provide assistance with regards to the statutory assessment of applications for consent submitted in respect of offshore geophysical and seismic survey acquisition applications and exploratory drilling.

CNOOC Petroleum Europe Ltd (formally known as Nexen Petroleum UK Ltd) (referred to herein as the applicant) has submitted an application for consent pursuant to the provision of Section 5(2) of the Continental Shelf Act 1968 to carry out proposed exploration drilling on well 52/01-A (Iolar) under Frontier Exploration Licence (FEL) 3/18. This will entail placing a temporary wellhead and associated infrastructure on the seabed. The competent authority (DCCAE) is required to give consideration to the potential for likely significant effects of such activities, with respect to the European Union (Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)) (Petroleum Exploration) Regulations 2013 and the EU Directive (2014/52/EU), as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU (herein referred to as "The EIA Directive". This report provides an assessment of the applicant's request for screening determination (supported by an EIA Screening Report). Public consultation on the information provided by the applicant has been undertaken by the DCCAE. The consultation responses received by the DCCAE have been taken into consideration in the preparation of this report.

The report provides a conclusion that can be used by the DCCAE to issue a screening determination.

Table ES.1 summarises the overall screening determination.

**Table ES.1: Summary of screening assessment for projects listed on Annex II of the EIA Regulations**

| Outcome of Screening Report Assessment | Overall Screening Opinion / EIA Required? |
|---|---|
| ~~Likely Significant Effects on the Environment~~ | ~~**EIA required**~~ |
| ~~More information is required to inform decision~~ | ~~**Unknown if EIA is required – Request further information from the applicant**~~ |
| No Likely Significant Effects on the Environment | **EIA not required** |

.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

Ramboll UK Limited (herein referred to as Ramboll) has been commissioned by the Department for Communications, Climate Action and Environment (herein referred to as DCCAE) to provide assistance with regards to the statutory assessment of a request by CNOOC Petroleum Europe Limited (formerly known as Nexen Petroleum U.K. Limited) for an Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Determination, submitted in respect of drilling of a single exploratory well in the Iolar prospect under Frontier Exploration Licence (FEL) 3/18 in the Porcupine Basin offshore of the west of Ireland.

## 1.1 Project Background

FEL 3/18 (previously Licence Option 16/7) was acquired by Nexen as part of the 2015 bid round. The Iolar well will be the first drilled by Nexen in Ireland and is a large Jurassic structural closure on the western side of the Porcupine Basin adjacent to the Porcupine High. The purpose of this exploratory well is to gather data on the reservoir characteristics, hydrocarbon presence, pressures and temperatures. Once the exploration drilling operations are complete, the well will be abandoned, whether or not commercially viable quantities of hydrocarbons are found.

The European Union (Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)) (Petroleum Exploration) Regulations 2013 require that all Exploration Licences granted under the Petroleum and Other Minerals Development Act 1960 be assessed to establish if they would be likely to have significant effect on the environment. This requires that all applications to carry out exploration activities must be subject to at EIA Screening in the first instance to determine if an EIA is required.

This report has been prepared as a statutory assessment of a request for an Environmental Impact Assessment screening determination.

## 1.2 Documents Reviewed

The following documents have been reviewed to inform this report:

- Iolar Exploration Well – Environmental Risk Assessment (EIA Screening) Report. Document No. IE-EXP-52/04-IOLAR-HS-00010-RP-01 Rev U2. Dated 04/10/18. Prepared by Xodus Group on behalf of Nexen.
- Iolar Exploraton Well – Underwater Archaeological Assessment. Document No. IE-EXP-52/04-IOLAR-HS-00022-RP-01. Rev U1. Dated 05/11/18. Prepared by Xodus Group on behalf of Nexen.
- Response letters received from An Taisce to DCCAE dated 13 December 2018 and 21 January, 2019 in response to public consultation.
- Response letter from Friends of the Irish Environment to DCCAE (21 January ) in response to public consultation.
- Response email from Gluaiseacht to DCCAE dated 21 January 2019 in response to public consultation.
- CNOOC Petroleum Europe Limited (formerly known as Nexen Petroleum U.K. Limited) response to DCCAE email dated 12th February requesting further information, dated 21st February 2019;
- Response letter received from An Taisce to DCCAE dated 7th March 2019 in response to public consultation on further information submitted by CNOOC Petroleum Europe Limited, 21st February 2019.

# 2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

## 2.1 Legislative context

This review of the CNOOC Petroleum Europe Limited request for EIA screening opinion has been prepared having regard to relevant European and Irish legislation and jurisprudence, including:

- EU Directive on assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (Environmental Impact Assessment) Directive (2011/92/EU) and as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU;
- European Union (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Petroleum Exploration) Regulations 2013 (S.I. No 134/2013);
- European Union (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Petroleum Exploration) (Amendment) Regulations 2019 (S.I. No 124 of 2019).

## 2.2 Relevant guidance

This report has been prepared having regard to guidance on EIA screening for planning authorities, published by the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government (DHPLG) in 2018[1]. In addition, the structure and content of this report is based upon the methodology published by the European Communities in 2001[2].

## 2.3 Public consultation

The application by the applicant was advertised by DCCAE on their website following reciept of the application on 21 December 2018. Submissions were advertised by DCCAE to be received by close of business on 21 January 2019 to ensure consideration by the Minister.

Three responses were received prior to the deadline and the points raised by these have been considered and responded to as provided in the following sections:

- Response letters received from An Taisce to DCCAE dated 13 December 2018 and 21 January 2019.
- Response letter from Friends of the Irish Environment to DCCAE (undated).
- Response email from Gluaiseacht to DCCAE dated 21 January 2019.

Following the provision of additional information on the 21 February 2019, a further letter was received from An Taisce to DCCAE dated 7 March 2019.

**Consultation Responses**

The following general responses have been received.

- **Regulatory process**: Concerns raised in regard to the lack of regulatory process for assessing exploration and development applications. The involvement of Department officials in the commercial and licensing aspects as well as environmental provides a percieved lack of objectivity and bias in the decision-making process.
- **Regulatory process:** Concerned that the public consultation has not engaged directly with bodies specified under SI No 134/2013 – European Union (EIA) (Petroleum Exploration) Regulations 2013.
- **Regulatory process:** All future applications need to determine how Ireland will meet its commitment under the Paris Agreement and provisions of Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act 2015 are to be met.

[1] https://www.housing.gov.ie/sites/default/files/publications/files/guidelines_for_planning_authorities_and_an_bord_pleanala_on_carrying_out_eia_-_august_2018.pdf
[2] http://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/eia/eia-guidelines/g-screening-full-text.pdf

- **Regulatory process:** The status of the consultation with regard to the Environmental Impact Assessment and Habitats Directive is unclear, including the process for notification of decisions by the Department to parties making submissions, and procedures for Judicial Review of any decision by the Department.
- **Public consultation process**: The public notification is not widely publicised on other media, such as newspapers or social media platforms and the current process of publicising public consultation is currently not transparent.

These general responses are in regard to the current regulatory process that exists within Ireland and since they are not project specific are not responded to by this report.

2.3.1 Project Specific Objections

The following specific responses have been received:

| Consultee | Project specific comment | Response |
|---|---|---|
| An Taisce | It is clear from information in the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report that a Natura Impact Statement and Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is required. The Appropriate Assessment screening, Natura Impact Statement and Appropriate Assessment should meet in full the requirements of Irish law, CJEU judgments and Advocate General opinions in relation to the Habitats Directive. The current report and recommendations therein does not meet Irish and European law requirements and protections. | The adequacy of the AA Screening Report will be reviewed and a reported separately to this report. |
| | The Archaeological Assessment Summary Report is inadequate for the purposes of an EIA screening. It is not acceptable that the results of the ROV survey will not be available for assessment at EIA screening stage. | Adequate consideration is given to the potential for effects on archaeological receptors. |
| | An Environmental Impact Assessment Report should be prepared for this development and an Environmental Impact Assessment conducted in accordance with all relevant European directives. The current EIA screening report fails to meet the requirements of several European laws including inter alia Council Directive 2011/92/EU amended by 2014/52/EU, Council Directive 92/43/EEC, Council Directive 2008/56/EC and Commission Decision 2017/848 | This report confirms whether the application meets the requirements of the environment (Environmental Impact Assessment) Directive (2011/92/EU) and as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU. |
| | The international significance of the fishing resource in the area of drilling is clear from the report, as is the fact that the migratory path of tuna, which follow the Gulf Stream, could possibly be active in the area and that there is a likelihood of interaction between the drilling and tuna fishing operations. An Taisce submits that there is insufficient information on the presence of tuna and other fish species in the zone of drilling | The applicant's report notes the presence of the Albacore tuna fishery potentially in and around the drilling operation. This fishery is noted by the applicant to commence in July and typically finish in September. Whilst VMS data, presented by the applicant, for the past three years shows that the tuna shoals have not entered the area since 2014. The applicant notes that "Albacore tuna is a free swimming pelagic species |

| Consultee | Project specific comment | Response |
|---|---|---|
| | and that any consideration of the impact on fish is premature and should at least await the outcome of fisheries surveys by the Marine Institute programmed for later this year. The pre-drilling fisheries study is lacking in any assessment of risk to fish from a blowout, or other form of leak of petroleum during the drilling operation. | and can turn up anywhere and it would take a lot of research to predict the seasonal variations in the tuna fisheries". Consideration of the effects on marine biota in the event of discharges to sea and accidental releases have been assessed by the applicant, and considered in this report. |
| | There has been no proper assessment of cumulative impacts and effects on habitats, species and the environment of other offshore exploration and drilling, either the cumulative impacts of previous exploration within this NEXEN site or the cumulative impacts of this site with other off shore exploration sites. | Further details on the cumulative assessment were requested from the applicant. This report confirms that the consideration of both in-combination and additional cumulative effects with the proposed project is appropriate. |
| | There has been no proper assessment of climate change impacts and effects. | The assessment of climate change in regard to the application for drilling is considered adequate. The applicant has confirmed that any future phases of exploration or production would be subject to further EIA and consents. This report considers these additional stages of EIA and consenting sufficient to control/avoid any likely significant climate change effects associated with the Iolar drilling application. |
| Friends of the Irish Environment | It is submitted that this application requires a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment Report as the screening reports are inadequate. | This report confirms whether the information provided meets the requirements to allow a decision to be made on whether an EIA is required.<br>The adequacy of the AA Screening Report will be reviewed and a reported separately to this report. |
| | The seabed area of the Porcupine Basin includes cold water coral reefs which are a priority habitat under the Habitats Directive. The current level of marine protection designation in Porcupine Basin area is inadequate to reflect the importance of sea bed habitat. The impact of the activity proposed on marine mammals and on a range a range of fish species including tuna migration paths requires assessment. | The potential effects on the ecology of the baseline environment are considered to be adequately assessed in the information provided by the applicant. No additional information is required to support the assessment. |
| Gluaiseacht | Increasing effects of climate change for the benefits of the few. | The assessment of climate change in regard to the application for drilling is considered adequate. The applicant has confirmed that any future phases of exploration or production would be subject to further EIA and consents. This report considers these additional stages of EIA and consenting sufficient to control/avoid any likely significant climate change effects associated with the Iolar drilling application. |

| Consultee | Project specific comment | Response |
|---|---|---|
| | The Porcupine Seabight is a very important ecological area and we are just finding out how important the area is for blue and fin whales. We shouldn't be threatening these habitats by oil and gas drilling and seismic surveys. | The potential effects on the ecology of the basline environment are considered to be adequately assessed in the information provided by the applicant. No additional information is required to support the assessment. |

# 3. PROJECT DETAILS

**Table 3.1: Project Details**

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Title: | Iolar Exploration Well |
| Applicant: | Nexen |
| Frontier Exploration Licence (FEL) Reference: | FEL 3/18 |
| Date EIA Screening Report Received: | 14th November 2018<br>Further information received 21st February 2019. |

Brief Project Description:

The proposed well is located in FEL 3/18, 232.4 km west of the Irish mainland in the Porcupine Basin in water depths of 2.162 km. A spud date of April 2019 has been assumed since this is the earliest window for drilling operations and is likely to be favourable in terms of weather. The total duration of drilling is expected to be between 100 and 150 days. The weather window for drilling activities is between 1 April and 30 September.

A safety exclusion zone of 500 m around the drill ship whilst on station is proposed. The proposed drill ship (IceMAX) will maintain its position over the drilling location for the duration of the drilling activities using a dynamic positioning system. Drilling equipment is installed on the deck of the vessel, with the derrick normally placed in the middle of the ship. The well will be drilled through a moon pool that extends to the water's surface below the derrick.

Helicopters will be used to transfer personnel to and from the drill ship for the duration of the drilling period. Helicopters may also be used to occasionally supply the drill ship with equipment required at short notice and would also be used in the event of an emergency situation. Otherwise all transport of drilling equipment, supplies, water, fuel and food will be undertaken by supply vessels, which will also return waste and surplus equipment to shore. These vessels will also perform safety standby operations.

A single deviated well is proposed although should the well be deemed a success then there is potential for a short side track for coring purposes. The Iolar well will be drilled to either 6.31 km total vertical depth subsea in the success case or 5.923 km in the dry hole case. The drilling will consist of a number of phases:

1. Spudding: drilling or jetting of a 36" hole through the surface of the seabed into which a 36" conductor pipe will be cemented (a Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) will be used to minimise the amount of cement discharged to the seabed and provide visual monitoring);
2. Drilling: well sections of decreasing diameter (from 26" to 8.5") are drilled and casings installed and cemented to provide stability. Drilling fluid will be used and will be circulated back to the drill ship. Both Water Based Muds (WBM) and Oil Based Muds (OBM) are anticipated to be used depending on the down hole conditions.

The first two sections of the well will be drilled before the installation of a marine riser and therefore drilling fluids, rock cuttings and residual cement returns will be discharged directly onto the seabed. The sections will be jetted/drilled using seawater and WBM. Thereafter OBM will be used which will be circulated back to the drill ship, where drill cuttings and residual OBM will be skipped and shipped to shore for management, recovery and/or disposal in accordance with relevant waste management legislation.

Vertical Seismic Profiling (VSP) may be required and is used to establish the geological structure of the formations through which the well passes. VSP uses a small air gun array with receivers positioned inside the well. Typical VSP operations can take 6 to 12 hours to complete. The VSP source is expected to generate a noise level around 220 dB re 1uPa @ 1 m, with the majority of noise concentrated at low (<100 Hz) frequencies. These operations will be undertaken from the drill ship.

Once all operations are complete, the well will be permanently plugged and abandoned. Mechanical and cement plugs will be placed along the well at points where hydrocarbons could enter the well, thus isolating them from the surface. The wellhead will be severed and pulled a minimum of 3 m below the seabed.

# 4. SCREENING CHECKLIST

## 4.1 Determining whether a Project should be subject to an EIA

Under Article 4(1) of the (Environmental Impact Assessment) Directive (2011/92/EU), as amended by Directive (2014/52/EU) (herein referred to as 'the EIA Directive), projects listed in Annex I of the Directive shall be made subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment, unless an exemption is granted by the Irish Government (as the member state), due to exceptional circumstances.

Under Article 4(2) of the EIA Directive, member states must determine whether projects listed in Annex II of the Directive shall be made subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment through either case-by-case examination and / or thresholds or criteria set by the member state.

In Ireland, for oil and gas exploration activities, the EIA Directive is implemented through the European Union (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Petroleum Exploration) Regulations 2013 (the 'EIA Regulations'). Article 6(1) of the EIA Regulations allow the Minister for Communications, Energy and Natural Resources to exempt an application for petroleum exploration activities from the requirement to submit an EIA, where they are satisfied that exceptional circumstances so warrant and after consultation with the Minister for the Environment and Local Government. Through this mechanism, an applicant may demonstrate such 'exceptional circumstances' apply if they are able to describe how there is no potential for significant adverse effects as a result of their proposed activities.

Table 4.1 is sets out the first step in determining whether a project requires an EIA under the EIA directive.

**Table 4.1 Checklist – EIA Screening for Seismic/ Geophysical Survey or Exploratory Drilling Project**

| | |
|---|---|
| Is the project listed on Annex I of the EIA Directive?<br><br>• If Yes EIA is required for the project.<br>• If No EIA may be required for the project - Proceed to Sections 4.2 and 4.3. | No |
| If No - Is the project listed on Annex II of the EIA Directive?<br><br>• If Yes, EIA may be required for the project - proceed to Sections 4.2 and 4.3.<br>• If No, EIA is not required for the project. | Yes, the project is considered under Annex II 2(d) Deep drillings. |

## 4.2 Information to be provided by the Developer on the projects listed in Annex IIA of the EIA Directive

Under Article 4(4) of the EIA Directive specified information is required to be provided by the Developer on the characteristics of the project and its likely significant effects on the environment.

The checklist provided in this section (Table 4.2) confirmsn whether the screening report submitted for a project listed on Annex II of the EIA Directive provides the required information.

The developer is required by Article 4(4) to consider (where relevant) the available results of other relevant assessments on the effects of the environment carried out pursuant to other Union legislation other than the EIA Directive.

**Table 4.2: 'Information to be provided' criteria, as set out in Annex IIA of the EIA Regulations**

| **Does the request for screening determination provide sufficient information, with particular regard to:** | **Yes / No / Unsure?** | **Briefly summarise whether the applicant meets the requirements:** |
|---|---|---|
| a) A description of the project including in particular:<br>(a) A description of the physical characteristics of the whole project and, where relevant, the demolition works.<br>(b) A description of the location of the project, with particular regard to the environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected. | Yes | An adequate description is provided on the physical characteristics of the whole project, and its location with particular regard to the environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected. |
| b) A description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the project. | Yes | An adequate description is given to the aspects of the environment that is likely to be affected by the project. |
| c) A description of any likely significant effects, to the extent of the information available on such effects, of the project on the environment resulting from:<br>(a) The expected residues and emissions and the production of waste, where relevant;<br>(b) The use of natural resources, in particular soil, land, water and biodiversity. | Yes | An adequate description and consideration is given of the likely effects on the environment. |
| d) The criteria of Annex III shall be taken into account, where relevant, when compling the information in accordance with points 1 to 3. | N/A | The criteria in Annex III were taken into account where relevant when compiling the information referred to above. See Section 4.3 below for further details |

## 4.3 Criteria to determine whether a project listed on Annex II of the EIA Directive is likely to have a Significant Effect on the Environment

Under Article 4(3) of the EIA Directive, when determining whether a project listed on Annex II requires EIA, the Irish government (as the member state) must take into account the relevant selection criteria set out in Annex III of the Directive.

Annex III criteria area grouped into three main categories; 'characteristics of the projects', 'location of the projects' and 'type and characteristics of the potential impact' of the projects as set out in Table 4.3 – 4.5.

### 4.3.1 Characteristics of Project

Table 4.3 summarises the consideration given by the applicant to the 'Characteristics of the Projects' in the screening report.

**Table 4.3: 'Characteristics of the Project' criteria, as set out in Annex III of the EIA Regulations**

| **Does the request for screening determination provide sufficient information on the characteristics of projects, with particular regard to:** | **Yes / No / Unsure?** | **Briefly summarise whether the applicant meets the requirements for a screening opinion:** |
|---|---|---|
| a) The size and design of the whole project; | Yes | Detailed information is presented regarding the size, location, nature, duration, design and operational methodology for the activity being assessed. |
| b) Cumulation with other existing and/or approved projects; | Yes | Consideration is given by the applicant to the cumulation with other existing and/or approved projects. The applicant has confirmed that they acknowledge the possibility for other exploration activity during 2019 but no information on any specific planned activities was available or reasonably foreseeable at the time of writing.<br>The applicant states that a review of current submissions indicates that there are no oil and gas activities planned that are likely to have a cumulative impact with the proposed Iolar exploration well. Based on currently available information, the following other oil and gas activities or developments have been identified:<br>1. The Iolar well is located approximately 414 km South of the subsea Corrib gas field which is located in the Slyne/Erris Basin.<br>2. The Iolar well is approximately 383 km South West of the Kinsale gas field and platform which is in the Celtic Sea Basin. PSE Kinsale Energy Limited has lodged an application to decommission the Kinsale Area gas fields and facilities. |
| c) The use of natural resources, in particular land, soil, water and biodiversity; | Yes | The information provided by the applicant describes the use of natural resources. |
| d) The production of waste; | Yes | The information provided by the applicant describes the production of waste. |
| e) Pollution and nuisances; | Yes | The information provided by the applicant describes pollution and nuisances. |
| f) The risk of major accidents and/or disasters, which are relevant to the project concerned, including those caused by climate change, | Yes | The information provided by the applicant describes the risk of major accidents and/or disasters.<br>Extensive effort has been applied to predicting the potential effects of major accidents and/or disasters associated with the project and the likelihood of |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| in accordance with scientific knowledge; | | such events occurring. The applicant describes the management and mitigation measures that will be implemented to reduce the risk of such events to As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP). |
| g) Risks to human health (e.g. due to water contamination or air pollution). | Yes | The information provided by the applicant describes the risks to human health.<br>The potential risks to human health of the project have been assessed competently. |

### 4.3.2 Location of Project

The 'Location of Projects' Criteria, as set out in Annex III of the EIA Regulations, considers the environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by projects with particular regard to specified criteria.

Table 4.4 provides a template to determine whether a Screening Report submitted by an applicant for a project listed on Annex II of the EIA Regulations, meets the requirements for the 'Location of the Projects' Annex III criteria, required for the assessor to determine a Screening Opinion.

**Table 4.4: 'Location of the Projects' Criteria, as set out in Annex III of the EIA Directive, meet the requirements to determine a Screening Opinion.**

| **The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the project are considered in the Screening Report, with particular regard to:** | **Yes / No / Unsure?** | **Briefly summarise whether the applicant meets the requirements for a screening opinion:** |
|---|---|---|
| a) The existing and approved land use; | Yes | The existing seabed and its features were adequately described, including the baseline environment. The seabed is licensed under FEL 3/18 to the applicant and therefore deemed suitable for the proposed project. Furthermore, the area of the project is within an area designated for offshore exploration and has been assessed by the Irish Offshore Strategic Environmental Assessment 5. |
| b) The relative abundance, availability, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources (including soil, land, water and biodiversity) in the area and its underground; | Yes | The relative abundance, availability, quality and regenerative capacity were adequately described where applicable in the baseline and assessment of environmental risks. |
| c) The absorption capacity of wetlands, riparian areas and river mouths; | N/A | The project location means that this 'Location of Projects' criteria is not applicable. |
| d) The absorption capacity of coastal zones and the marine environment; | Yes | The absorption capacity of the marine environment (and coastal zones where applicable) were adequately described. |
| e) The adsorption capacity of mountain and forest areas; | N/A | Given the offshore location of this projects, this criterion is not applicable. |
| f) The absorption capacity of nature reserves and parks; | N/A | The project location means that this 'Absorption capacity of nature reserves and parks' criteria is |

| **The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the project are considered in the Screening Report, with particular regard to:** | **Yes / No / Unsure?** | **Briefly summarise whether the applicant meets the requirements for a screening opinion:** |
|---|---|---|
| | | not applicable. |
| g) The absorption capacity of areas classified under national legislation; Natura 2000 areas are designated by Member States pursuant to Directive 92/43/EEC abd Directive 2009/147/EC; | Yes | The abundance, availability, quality and regenerative capacity were adequately described where applicable in the baseline and assessment of environmental risks. |
| h) The absorption capacity of areas in which there has already been a failure to meet the environmental quality standards, laid down by Union legislation and relevant to the project or in which it is considered that there is such a failure; | N/A | The project location means that this 'Absorption capacity of areas in which there has been a failure in environmental quality standards' criteria is not applicable. |
| i) The absorption capacity of densely populated areas; | N/A | Given the offshore location of this projects, this criterion is not applicable. |
| j) The absorption capacity of landscapes and sites of historical, cultural or archaeological significance | Yes | The absorption capacity of landscapes and sites of historical, cultural or archaeological significance were adequately described where applicable in the baseline and assessment of environmental risks. |

### 4.3.3 Type and characteristics of the potential impact

The 'type and characteristics of the potential impact' criteria, as set out in Annex III of the EIA Directive, consider whether a project is likely to have a significant effect on the environment. Likely significant effects are considered in relation to the criteria set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3, with additional regard to the impact on the project factors specified in Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive: population and human health; biodiversity, with particular attention to species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC; Land, soil, water, air and climate; material assets and cultural heritage and the landscape, in addition to the interaction between these factors. Table 4.5 provides a checklist to determine whether a Screening Determination could be made in regard to the type and character of the potential impact of a project.

**Table 4.5: Template to Determine Screening Opinion for Type of the potential impact of a Project**

| **Factor (as specified in Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive)** | **Briefly summarise the environmental receptor / activity interactions considered:** | **Character of impact** | | **Does applicant concludea Significant Effect is likely? (Yes/No/ Unknown?)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Description of character of impact** | **Does the screening report provide information on character of impact?** | |
| Population and human health | **Other sea users – fishing vessels and shipping.**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant. Associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Possible impacts on other users resulting from the presence of the project are considered. Collision risk, exclusion, seabed hazards resulting from dropped objects and the effects of deviation from established navigation routes identified as potential risks are the likely risks to population and human health identified from the project. These arise from risks of accidents/disasters, collisions, etc.<br>**Atmospheric emissions – air quality.**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant. | The magnitude and spatial extent of the impact; | Yes | No. No significant effects are likely on other sea users.<br>No significant effects are likely as a result of emissions. Effects on this receptor is considered to be of minor consequence.<br>No significant effects are likely as a result of discharges to sea. Effects on this receptor are considered to be of either minor or negligible consequence,<br>No significant effects are likely on other sea users as a result of accidental releases. |
| | | The nature of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The transboundary nature of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The intensity and complexity of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The probability of the impact; | Yes | |

| Factor (as specified in Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive) | Briefly summarise the environmental receptor / activity interactions considered: | Character of impact | | Does applicant concludea Significant Effect is likely? (Yes/No/ Unknown?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Description of character of impact** | **Does the screening report provide information on character of impact?** | |
| | Associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Emission of a range of substances identified as potential risks. Environmental and health effects of emissions defined. | The expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact; | Yes | |
| | **Discharges to sea – water quality.** Key activities are clearly defined and relevant. Associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Release to the water column of a range of substances related to the planned activity identified as potential risks. Environmental and health effects of such releases defined. | The accumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing or approved developments; | Yes on the basis of the additional information provided by the applicant. | |
| | **Accidental releases – water quality, fishing industry, tourism.** Key activities are clearly defined and relevant. Associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Possible sources of accidental release of pollutants related to the planned activity identified as potential risks. Environmental and health effects of such releases defined. Dispersal of accidental releases investigated to determine scale and severity of likely effects. | The possibility of effectively reducing the impact. | Yes | |
| Biodiversity, **with particular attention** to species and | **Physical Presence - Benthic habitats and species** Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Effects of activity on benthic habitats considered along with assessment of | The magnitude and spatial extent of the impact; | Yes | No significant effects are likely on benthic habitats as a result of physical presence. Effect on this receptor is considered to be of minor consequence, with an expected frequency of occurrence of less than or equal to three months. The overall |
| | | The nature of the impact; | Yes | |

| Factor (as specified in Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive) | Briefly summarise the environmental receptor / activity interactions considered: | Character of impact | | Does applicant concludea Significant Effect is likely? (Yes/No/ Unknown?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Description of character of impact | Does the screening report provide information on character of impact? | |
| habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC; | severity and longevity of effects. Sensitivity of species likely to found in the vicinity of the project discussed and likely effects of the project properly considered.<br>**Underwater noise - Marine mammals**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Effects of noise associated with the activity on marine mammals considered along with assessment of severity and longevity of effects. Sensitivity of species likely to found in the vicinity of the project discussed and likely effects of the project properly considered.<br>**Discharges to sea - Benthic habitats and species, marine biota and water quality**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Effects of discharges to sea associated with the activity on both habitats and species considered along with assessment of severity and longevity of effects. Sensitivity of marine biota generally, protected sites, habitats and species likely to be found in the vicinity of the project discussed and likely effects of the project properly considered. Consideration also given to near field and far field effects of discharges thought consideration of dispersal of pollutants.<br>**Accidental releases - Marine biota, water quality,** | The transboundary nature of the impact; | Yes | environmental risk is therefore considered to be negligible.<br>No significant effects are likely on marine mammals as a result of underwater noise. Effect on this receptor is considered to be of minor consequence, with an intermittent expected frequency of occurrence of less than two hours per day or once per month for less than three days. The overall environmental risk is therefore considered to be minor.<br>No significant effects are likely on benthic habitats and species as a result of discharges to sea. Effect on this receptor is considered to be of minor consequence, with an expected frequency of occurrence less than 10 days. The overall environmental risk is therefore considered to be negligible.<br>No significant effects are likely as a result of accidental releases. Effect on this receptor is considered to be of severe consequence, with an expected frequency of occurrence to be remote. The overall environmental risk is therefore considered to be minor, which requires further assessment to determine whether there is potential for significant effects. This further assessment has been undertaken as part of the documentation submitted to determine the scale and severity of |
| | | The intensity and complexity of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The probability of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing or approved developments; | Yes on the basis of the additional information provided by the applicant. | |
| | | The possibility of effectively reducing the impact. | Yes | |

| Factor (as specified in Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive) | Briefly summarise the environmental receptor / activity interactions considered: | Character of impact | | Does applicant concludea Significant Effect is likely? (Yes/No/ Unknown?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Description of character of impact | Does the screening report provide information on character of impact? | |
| | **protected sites**<br>Key activities are clearly defined, and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. As with discharges to sea, effects of accidental releases to sea associated with the activity on both habitats and species considered along with assessment of severity and longevity of effects. Proper consideration also given to potential effects on water quality. Sensitivity of marine biota generally, protected sites, habitats and species likely to be found in the vicinity of the project discussed and likely effects of the project properly considered. Consideration also given to near field and far field effects of discharges thought consideration of dispersal of pollutants. | | | the effect. |
| Land, soil, water, air and climate; | **Physical Presence - Benthic habitats and species**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Effects of activity on the structure and character of the seabed considered along with assessment of severity and longevity of effects. Sensitivity of the seabed in the vicinity of the project discussed and likely effects of the project properly considered.<br>**Atmospheric Emissions - Air quality**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and | The magnitude and spatial extent of the impact;<br>The nature of the impact;<br>The transboundary nature of the impact;<br>The intensity and complexity of the impact; | Yes<br>Yes<br>Yes<br>Yes | No significant effects are likely on benthic habitats and species. Effect on this receptor is considered to be of minor consequence, with an expected frequency of occurrence of less than or equal to three months. The overall environmental risk is therefore considered to be negligible.<br>No significant effects are likely on atmospheric emissions. Effect on this receptor is considered to be of minor consequence, with an expected frequency of occurrence of less than or equal to three months. The overall environmental risk is |

| Factor (as specified in Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive) | Briefly summarise the environmental receptor / activity interactions considered: | Character of impact | | Does applicant concludea Significant Effect is likely? (Yes/No/ Unknown?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Description of character of impact | Does the screening report provide information on character of impact? | |
| | associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Effects of activity on the air quality considered along with assessment of severity and longevity of effects. Potential effects on climate also investigated through specific consideration of emission of greenhouse gases and use of hydrocarbon resources.<br>**Discharges to sea - Water quality**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Effects of discharges to sea associated with the activity on water quality considered along with assessment of severity and longevity of effects. Consideration also given to near field and far field effects of discharges thought consideration of dispersal of pollutants.<br>**Accidental releases – Water quality.**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Effects of accidental releases associated with the activity on water quality are considered along with assessment of severity and longevity of effects. Consideration is also given to near field and far field effects of discharges through consideration of dispersal of pollutants. | The probability of the impact; | Yes | therefore considered to be negligible.<br>DCCAE requested further information to ensure that the screening determination adequately addresses the potential for secondary or cumulative climate change effects that could be associated with future phases of development. The Applicant has responded to confirm that the project is an exploration project only. Any potential indirect, secondary or cumulative climate change effects that may be associated with any future phases of development, i.e., further exploration or appraisal phase / oil or gas production, are therefore not reasonably foreseeable at this stage. In any case, the key control (mitigation) that would prevent likely significant effects at this stage is the requirement for further EIA and consents to be issued prior to any future phases of development. Climate change effects would need to be considered again at that stage.<br>No significant effects are likely on water quality as a result of discharges to sea. Effect on this receptor is considered to be of minor consequence, with an expected frequency of occurrence of less than or equal to three months. The overall environmental risk is therefore considered to be negligible.<br>No significant effects are likely on water quality as a result of accidental releases. Effect on this receptor is considered to be of severe consequence, |
| | | The expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing or approved developments; | Yes on the basis of the additional information provided by the applicant. | |
| | | The possibility of effectively reducing the impact. | Yes | |

| Factor (as specified in Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive) | Briefly summarise the environmental receptor / activity interactions considered: | Character of impact | | Does applicant concludea Significant Effect is likely? (Yes/No/ Unknown?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Description of character of impact | Does the screening report provide information on character of impact? | |
| | | | | with an expected frequency of occurrence to be remote. The overall environmental risk is therefore considered to be minor, which requires further assessment to determine whether there is potential for significant effects. This further assessment has been undertaken as part of the documentation submitted to determine the scale and severity of the effect. |
| Material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape | **Physical Presence - Benthic habitats and species**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Potential effects on the condition and morphology of the seabed discussed and scale and severity of effects considered.<br>**Physical Presence - Seascape**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Potential effects on seascape discussed and scale and severity of effects considered.<br>**Physical Presence - Other sea users including fishing vessels and shipping**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Collision risk, | The magnitude and spatial extent of the impact; | Yes | No significant effects are likely on benthic habitats and species and seascape as a result of physical presence. Effects on this receptor are considered to be of minor consequence.<br>No significant effects are likely on other sea users.<br>No significant effects are likely on water quality as a result of discharges to sea.<br>No significant effects are likely on other sea users as a result of accidental releases. |
| | | The nature of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The transboundary nature of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The intensity and complexity of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The probability of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact; | Yes | |

| Factor (as specified in Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive) | Briefly summarise the environmental receptor / activity interactions considered: | Character of impact | | Does applicant concludea Significant Effect is likely? (Yes/No/ Unknown?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Description of character of impact | Does the screening report provide information on character of impact? | |
| | exclusion and seabed hazards resulting from dropped objects identified as potential risks. Potential effects on ability of other users to undertake activities and possible impacts on success of such activities also considered.<br>**Physical Presence - archaeological / heritage assets**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Risk of impacts to wreck sites and archaeological and heritage assets considered. Potential effects on ability of other users to undertake activities and possible impacts on success of such activities also considered.<br>**Discharges to sea - Benthic habitats and species, marine biota and water quality**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Effects of discharges to sea associated with the activity on resources that support productive, financial and recreational activity considered along with assessment of severity and longevity of effects. Consideration also given to near field and far field effects of discharges thought consideration of dispersal of pollutants.<br>**Accidental releases - Marine biota, water quality, protected sites, fishing industry, tourism**<br>Key activities are clearly defined and relevant and | The cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing or approved developments;<br>The possibility of effectively reducing the impact. | Yes on the basis of additional information provided by the applicant.<br>Yes | |

| Factor (as specified in Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive) | Briefly summarise the environmental receptor / activity interactions considered: | Character of impact | | Does applicant concludea Significant Effect is likely? (Yes/No/ Unknown?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Description of character of impact** | **Does the screening report provide information on character of impact?** | |
| | associated impacts are identified. Potential interaction with relevant receptors considered. Effects of accidental releases associated with the activity on material assets supporting productive, financial and recreational activity considered along with assessment of severity and longevity of effects. Consideration also given to near field and far field effects of discharges thought consideration of dispersal of pollutants. | | | |
| The interaction between the factors | The report provides an adequate consideration of the interaction between factors. The potential effects on natural resources and natural capital is described, and linkages between these natural resources and the activities they support is acknowledged.<br>Consideration of habitats and the biological communities supported by the habitats appears to be adequate to inform the consideration of impact risk completed in the report. Both the fundamental, direct effects of the proposed project, and the attendant effects on activities relying on the natural resources that might be impacted, are considered. | The magnitude and spatial extent of the impact; | Yes | No significant effects are anticipated. |
| | | The nature of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The transboundary nature of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The intensity and complexity of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The probability of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact; | Yes | |
| | | The cumulation of the | Yes on the basis of | |

| **Factor (as specified in Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive)** | **Briefly summarise the environmental receptor / activity interactions considered:** | **Character of impact** | | **Does applicant concludea Significant Effect is likely?**<br>**(Yes/No/ Unknown?)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Description of character of impact** | **Does the screening report provide information on character of impact?** | |
| | | impact with the impact of other existing or approved developments; | the additional information provided by the applicant. | |
| | | The possibility of effectively reducing the impact. | Yes | |

# 5. MITIGATION AND MANAGEMENT COMMITMENTS

The following mitigation and management commitments have been made by the applicant in the documentation reviewed. Table 5.1 documents the commitments made and whether these would be considered industry best practice or whether a condition is recommended to be included should a licence be issued.

**Table 5.1: Mitigation measures committed to by the applicant.**

| Discipline | Mitigation Measure Proposed | Industry Standard | Project Specific |
|---|---|---|---|
| Physical Prescence | A pre-spud ROV survey of the well site will be undertaken to increase the likelihood that areas of high sensitivity species and habitats will be avoided at the well site. | | ✓ |
| Interactions with Other Sea Users | Nexen will consult with relevant authorities and organisations as defined in the Rules and Procedures Manual, particularly the Sea Fisheries Protection Authority and the Sea Fisheries Policy Division, Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine to minimise interference impacts resulting from the project. | ✓ | |
| | A Notice to Mariners will be distributed by the Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport and a version of this will be run in selected local marine related publications. | ✓ | |
| | A vessel will operate on site for the duration of the project | ✓ | |
| | The drill ship and supply vessel will display SOLAS compliant lights and shapes and noise signals to alert other seafarers in the area | ✓ | |
| | A 500 m safety zone will be maintained around the drill ship whilst on location | | ✓ |
| | Nexen will consider the use of a Fishing Liaison Officer (FLO) on board the standby guard vessel which will operate on site for the duration of the project. | | ✓ |
| | The drill ship will have Safe Work Procedures to prevent dropped objects which will include (but not limited to):<br>• Good housekeeping practices with all wastes correctly stored;<br>• Storage of hazardous chemicals as per material safety data sheet (MSDS);<br>• Lift planning for over-the-side lifting (including appropriate crane rigging and load ratings, crane operator and rigger training and competency requirements) all lifting equipment will be tested and certified;<br>• A ship to ship transfer permit will be in place;<br>• All deck items will be securely stowed;<br>• Transfter of objects will use specialist equipment and consider environmental conditions;<br>• Ongoing personnel awareness and training and dropped object prevention programs (e.g. lanyards on hardhats, hand tools);<br>• Safe working procedures to prevent dropped objects; | ✓ | |

| Discipline | Mitigation Measure Proposed | Industry Standard | Project Specific |
|---|---|---|---|
| | • Procedures will be in place to ensure that the location of any lost material is recorded and that significant objects are recovered – including ROV and boat recovery where practicable;<br>• Waste Management Plan. | | |
| | The following planned communications with operational fisheries will be undertaken:<br>• Notification of the drilling activity to be given in detail in a "marine notice" which will be published on the Irish Department of Transport website. This marine notice is also sent to Irish Harbour authorities;<br>• A Radio Navigation Warning to be aranged by the Operator, and this will be broadcast numerous times daily by the Irish Coastguard for the duration of the drilling activities;<br>• Notification of the drilling activities to be given in detail in a Notice to Fishermen which will be published by way of advertisments to be placed in Kingfisher Fortnightly Bulletin an online publication for fishermen and the oil and gas industry. Advertisments also to be included in the montly editions of well known Irish fishing journals The Marine Times and The Irish Skipper. These publications have a wide UK, Scottish and Irish fishing industry audience and readership;<br>• In the case of other EU nationalities, a multi-lingual notification campaign comprising a translated factsheet to be distributed to a comprehensive list of fishing organisations and vessel owners in Spain and France, outlining details of the planned drilling operation. This notice to be distributed to these organisations in sufficient time and in advance of the planned operations. Notices to include a known point of contact ashore;<br>• Regular Securitae messages to be broadcast over VHF radio on agreed working channel;<br>• A Spanish and French speaking person ashore with working knowledge of both the fishing industry and drilling operations should be available in the event that liaison with foreign vessel owners is required;<br>• To avoid potential confusion, coordinates to be shared with the fishing industry are shown in WGS84 lat/long format. | | ✓ |
| Underwater Noise | A qualified and experienced marine mammal observer (MMO) shall be appointed to monitor for marine mammals and log all relevant events using standardised data forms. | | ✓ |
| | Sound-producing activities shall only commence in daylight hours where effective visual monitoring, as performed and determined by the MMO, has been achieved. Where effective visual monitoring, as determined by the MMO, is not possible, the sound-producing activities shall be postponed until effective visual monitoring is possible. | | ✓ |
| | As the water depth is >200 m pre-start-up monitoring shall be conducted at least 60 minutes before the activity is due to commence. Sound-producing activity shall not commence until | | ✓ |

| Discipline | Mitigation Measure Proposed | Industry Standard | Project Specific |
|---|---|---|---|
| | at least 60 minutes have elapsed with no marine mammals detected within 1,000 m Monitored Zone by the MMO. | | |
| | Pre-start monitoring shall subsequently be following by a Ramp-up Procedure (where possible) which should include continued monitoring by the MMO. Airguns utilised in VSP generally fire for approximately two minutes then stop for 5-10 minutes before repeating the pattern. To ensure that marine mammals are given the opportunity to move away from the airguns as they commence firing, energy would be slowly increased to the maximum level over a period of 40 minutes, in a process called "soft-start". | | ✓ |
| | If there is a break in sound output for a period of 5-10 minutes (e.g. due to equipment failure, shut-down), MMO monitoring must be undertaken to check that no marine mammals are observed within the Monitored Zone prior to recommencement of the sound source at full power. | | ✓ |
| | If there is a break in sound output for greater than 10 minutes (e.g. due to equipment failure, shut-down or station change) then all Pre-start Monitoring and a subsequent Ramp-up Procedure (where appropriate following the Pre-start Monitoring) will be undertaken. | | ✓ |
| Atmospheric Emissions | Practical steps to limit the release of atmospheric emissions during the project will include advanced planning to enable efficient operations and fuel utilisation and well maintained and operated power generation equipment. | ✓ | |
| | The contractors will comply with the MARPOL Convention 73/78 Appendix VI on atmospheric emissions; no emissions of ozone depleting substances, content of sulphur in fuel oil will not exceed 35% m/m and no incineration of garbage containing more than traces of heavy metals. | ✓ | |
| | A vessels and the drill ship will comply with the Merchant Shipping (Prevention of Air Pollution from Ships) Regulations 2010-2017 | ✓ | |
| | Nexen will verify that drill ship contractor procedures align with the relevant Nexen Engineering requirements which cover all aspects of primary and secondary well control for floating drilling operations. | | ✓ |
| Discharges to the Sea | All Oil Based Muds will be skipped and shipped onshore for recovery and /or disposal in accordance with Waste Management legislation, and not discharged overboard. | | ✓ |
| | Cementing procedures will be in place to minimise the quantities of cement prepared and used, consistent with safe practices, and to minimise the amount of unused cement discharged. | | ✓ |
| | Chemicals will be selected in line with Nexen's chemical selection policy, reducing where possible the use of chemicals carrying substitution notifications and other product warnings. | | ✓ |
| | The management of drilling fluids, drill cuttings, cementing fluids and subsea control fluids will be consistent with all appropriate Nexen Engineering Standards, Operating Standards and Procedures. | | ✓ |

| Discipline | Mitigation Measure Proposed | Industry Standard | Project Specific |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Environmental risk assessment as part of PUDAC approval process, and identification of measures to reduce risk, will be carried out to obtain approval for chemical use prior to drilling operations commencing as per the PAD Rules and Procedures Manual. | ✓ | |
| Archaeology | A pre-spud ROV survey will be conducted at the well site to identify any marine artefacts that could potentially be disturbed, or any other obstructions. | | ✓ |
| | If potential marine artefacts are observed, a qualified marine archaeologist will be consulted prior to spud, and spudding will not commence until the marine archaeologist has confirmed that the spud location is free of marine artefacts. | | ✓ |
| | If any item of potential archaeological interest is identified, that item will be avoided and the well location be moved to an alternative location, which will also be subject to a pre-spud ROV survey and the same precautions identified above. A short report will be prepared by the marine archaeologist detailing the observations made and the actions taken. | | ✓ |
| | If a discovery of a ship wreck or object of historical interest is made during the above process, Nexen will immediately report the discovery and its location to the relevant Government Departments and Agencies identified by PAD (2014). | | ✓ |
| | Under these circumstances Nexen would also facilitate the statutory authorities in any investigations that they may need to carry out in accordance with the terms of the National Monuments Acts | | |
| General | All mitigation and management measures identified during the Environmental Risk Assessment Process will be incorporated into a commitments register. These commitments will be incorporated into the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the project. | | ✓ |

# 6. CONCLUSIONS

Table 6.1 provides a summary of the review of the applicant's screening assessment.

This report concludes that, on the basis that the mitigation measures proposed are secured by suitably worded conditions attached to the license, no likely significant effects on the environment will occur.

**Table 6.1: Conclusions of screening assessment, based on templates provided in Table 4.2-4.5, for projects listed on Annex II of the EIA Directive**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Summary of features of project and of its location indicating the need for EIA:**<br>None – the assessment supports the conclusion that an EIA is not required. | |
| **Do you agree with the applicant's screening assessment? If no, why?** | Yes |
| **Is the project likely to have significant effects on the environment?** | No |
| **Is an EIS required? (Yes / No / More Information Required?)** | No |
| **What further information is required to inform decision (if any)?** | None |

**Table 6.2: Summary of screening assessment for projects listed on Annex II of the EIA Directive**

| **Outcome of Screening Report Assessment** | **Overall Screening Opinion / EIA Required?** |
|---|---|
| ~~Likely Significant Effects on the Environment~~ | ~~**EIA required**~~ |
| ~~More information is required to inform decision~~ | ~~**Unknown is EIA is required - Further information required from the applicant**~~ |
| No Likely Significant Effects on the Environment | **EIA not required** |

.