

Teck Frontier Oil Sands Mine Project Joint Review Panel

Final Submissions of the Government of Canada

INTRODUCTION

On behalf of the Government of Canada I acknowledge that we are on the traditional territories of the First Nations people of Treaty 7, including the Blackfoot Confederacy, the Tsuut'ina, and the Stoney Nakoda as well as the Métis Nation of Alberta, Region 3.

1. The Attorney General of Canada appears on behalf of a number of Federal departments and agencies that are Federal Authorities for the purpose of this proceeding pursuant to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*.¹ These include Transport Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Environment and Climate Change Canada, Health Canada, and the Parks Canada Agency. These Federal Authorities have presented scientific or expert information or knowledge, in relation to their respective department's mandates and their roles within those mandates that may assist the Panel in rendering their assessment of the Frontier Project for the purpose of *CEAA, 2012*.
2. In addition to this information or knowledge, presented in their written and oral submissions and in answers to cross-examination questions or undertakings, the Federal Authorities have also participated in the hearing process leading to the appointment of this panel and the scheduling of this hearing. They further participated the supplemental information request process by providing comments regarding the sufficiency of the information provided by the proponent based on the scientific or expert knowledge they possessed.

¹ SC 2012 c 19

3. The Attorney General also represents the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency which attended on behalf of the whole of the federal government. It appeared in a non-expert capacity to speak to a rights impact assessment methodology, developed jointly with the Mikisew Cree First Nation, as well as its preliminary assessment on potential impacts on rights and recommendations for mitigation measures arising from the application of that methodology. Agency officials also attended to provide the panel with an explanation of the proposed mitigation measures currently being contemplated by the Government of Canada and the Mikisew Cree First Nation.
4. I repeat that the Agency officials who appeared as witnesses before the Panel do not have any role in assisting the Panel with its assessment of the project pursuant to *CEAA, 2012* and are specifically restricted from interacting with panel staff in respect of this assessment.
5. I will speak briefly about Canada's role in these proceedings to contextualize the evidence provided and will then highlight certain evidence provided by the Federal Authorities.

CANADA'S ROLE IN THESE PROCEEDINGS

6. Canada's role in these proceedings arises from and is defined by section 20(d) of *CEAA, 2012*. That section, as it applies in this process, requires that

Every federal authority that is in possession of specialist or expert information or knowledge with respect to a designated project that is subject to an environmental assessment must, on request, make that information or knowledge available, within the specified period, to... the review panel.
7. Federal Authorities are not here to advocate for or against the Project. They have appeared as impartial experts to provide information or knowledge in response to the Panel's request. The provision of this information is a necessary and important part of this process; by virtue of their mandates and resources, these authorities have certain information or knowledge that will assist the Panel in conducting its environmental

assessment. That they are here to assist in the conduct of an assessment under *CEAA, 2012* is key to understanding their role.

8. These are complex processes involving the application of scientific principles and knowledge, a great deal of research and information gathering, and the application of a myriad of rules, regulations, and policies. As was evident from both their written materials and the evidence provided at the hearing, the Federal Authorities sought to provide the Panel with the best available information and evidence to assist it in conducting the environmental assessment, and to enable it to provide its rationale, conclusions and recommendations in respect of this project.
9. It is important to stress that scientific information and scientific opinion may differ and even be in conflict. Teck has made a number of comments regarding the evidence of Canada's witnesses. Those witnesses attended at the hearing to provide knowledge or information. Canada will not comment at length on Teck's statements as there is no need. It is sufficient to note that experts will sometimes disagree. Parties should exercise caution in characterizing normal disagreements as misleading or as containing an animus or malicious intention not supported by the evidence. Further, minor mistakes, if any are made, should not be inflated beyond defensible proportions. The evidence of Canada's panel speaks for itself and should be evaluated on its merits.

EXPERT KNOWLEDGE OR INFORMATION

10. With regard to the evidence provided, we will highlight some specific points already raised by four federal authorities and the Agency. This should be brief; however, the brevity of this highlighting should not be taken to be a minimization or rejection of any of the other evidence put forth by those authorities in either their written submissions or at the hearing. The government of Canada continues to rely on that evidence and asks the Panel to consider the evidence as a whole.

11. As we will not be addressing all of the recommendations or evidence set out by the Federal Authorities, we would like to thank the Panel and its staff for their consideration of the same.

Health Canada

12. With respect to monitoring, Health Canada's evidence at the hearing was that, due to the inherent uncertainties of the human health risk assessment, it is not possible to determine whether the Proponent's risk estimates are actual overestimates or whether additional mitigation may be required.² As modelled data cannot be confirmed unless actual data is obtained to validate the exposure predictions, Health Canada gave evidence and its opinion in support of its recommendation that methylmercury concentrations in fish be monitored in any waterbody that could be potentially impacted by the project and from which people are or could be harvesting and consuming fish.³

13. This monitoring, in Health Canada's view, would help ensure that predictions are accurate and that consumption advisories remain protective of human health.⁴ Further, Health Canada recommended that Teck commit to a precautionary approach and monitor changes in lead concentrations in environmental media.⁵

14. Health Canada could not comment on whether these monitoring recommendations will be incorporated into existing regional monitoring initiatives, but is of the view that it is important that monitoring be completed in a consistent manner for the duration of the project.⁶

² Document 489, pdf page 334, 339-340

³ Document 489, pdf page 339-340. Document 655, pdf page 188, line 1-25, pdf page 189, line 1-11.

⁴ Document 489, pdf page 339-340. Document 655, pdf page 188, line 1-25, pdf page 189, line 1-11.

⁵ Document 489, pdf page 341. Document 655, pdf page 16 line 5-18, pdf page 28, line 16-24

⁶ Document 655, pdf page 93, line 7-21.

15. Transport Canada's evidence was that it has the ability, within its regulatory processes, to include terms and conditions within project approvals to address impacts and cumulative impacts to navigation.⁷ As was heard throughout these proceedings, the Athabasca River and surrounding watersheds are complex and changes in water flow and water level may have the potential for broader ecological impacts.⁸ Transport Canada's evidence was that its jurisdiction is limited to addressing impacts to navigation. Any mitigation measures chosen to protect navigation must be designed to avoid inadvertent and undesirable impacts to other aspects of the ecosystem such as fish and fish habitat or the sensitive ecosystem of the Peace-Athabasca Delta.

16. Transport Canada confirmed that it continues to support a regional approach to water management, which can more effectively consider all of the cumulative impacts of water withdrawal for oil sands operations.⁹ To support this regional approach, and to further its own understanding of the impacts of water withdrawal on navigation, Transport Canada advised that it is working to complete a Navigation Study in spring 2019.¹⁰ Transport Canada also confirmed that it is committed to working with the Province of Alberta.¹¹ It committed to sharing the results of the study not only with Alberta, but also with other partners including Indigenous groups, Parks Canada, and Environment and Climate Change Canada.¹²

⁷ Document 489 pdf page 370, Section 5.0

⁸ Document 489 pdf page 366, Section 4.2.3

⁹ Transcript page 3184 lines 24-25 and page 3135 lines 1-2

¹⁰ Document 489, pdf page 368-369, Section 4.3.3 and transcript page 3134 lines 24-25 and page 3135 lines 1-2

¹¹ Transcript page 3135 lines 12-17 and Document 489, pdf page 369

¹² Transcript page 3135 lines 12-17

Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)

17. ECCC's recommendations included monitoring, baseline data collection, and follow up programs.¹³ It requests that the Panel recommend that such monitoring data be made publically available.
18. With regard to mercury and methyl-mercury, ECCC's evidence was that removal of the organic layer from pond/reservoir infrastructure will likely reduce mercury methylation in the new reservoir but will not remove mercury-methylation entirely.¹⁴ As described in ECCC's submission to the JRP,¹⁵ there are additional factors to be considered when assessing the contribution of methyl mercury production in the new reservoirs that Teck has not considered.¹⁶ ECCC would therefore highlight the recommendations and methods put forward in its submission requesting that additional monitoring and modelling using site specific parameters, for mercury and mercury methylation, be completed prior to construction of the Project's pond/reservoir infrastructure (FHCL, OSSP) if the Project is approved.¹⁷
19. With regard to acid deposition, ECCC presented information to the panel which showed that, based on 2013 emission levels for sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides, regional aquatic critical load exceedances have been reached over a sizeable area of Northern Alberta and Saskatchewan.¹⁸ ECCC provided data to the panel demonstrating that there are an increasing number of regional lakes with acidification trends, and increasing levels of significance associated with these trends.¹⁹ Additionally, ECCC's evidence demonstrated SO₂ concentrations continued to increase between 2013 and

¹³ Document 489, pdf page 10

¹⁴ Transcript, 3521, 3613 ; Document 489 pdf page 214

¹⁵ Document 489, pdf page 211 - 219

¹⁶ Document 489, pdf page 211 - 219

¹⁷ Document 489, pdf page 212 – 215; 218-219

¹⁸ Document 489, pdf page 173-179

¹⁹ Transcript 3550 line 21-25; Document 609, pdf page 2

2017.²⁰ ECCC's analysis indicates that cumulative acidifying emissions in the oil sands region needs to be reduced to prevent ecosystem damage, and that these emissions need to be verified using surface concentration and satellite measurements.²¹ Finally we would note that Dr. Makar's paper was peer reviewed and as such should not be lightly discounted.

20. With respect to Bison, ECCC's evidence was that the Project represents a high risk to the Ronald Lake wood bison herd, even with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures.²² The herd is highly sensitive to disturbance, and this sensitivity alone could trigger a range shift, regardless of forage limitations.²³ Given the close proximity of the Ronald Lake herd to diseased bison in Wood Buffalo National Park, even a small shift in range, caused by either forage limitation or sensory disturbance, could result in disease transmission to the Ronald Lake herd.²⁴ ECCC's evidence was that transfer of disease to Ronald Lake bison would likely permanently alter the conservation value of the herd and use of the herd by Indigenous people, and could impact attainment of the population and distribution objectives outlined in the final recovery strategy for wood bison in Canada.²⁵ The mitigation measures proposed by Teck to prevent movement or contact with the diseased bison in the Park are uncertain or are likely to be ineffective, and could also adversely affect other wildlife species such as boreal caribou.²⁶ In addition, while a biodiversity offset or compensation area could protect some bison habitat outside the Project disturbance area, it would not mitigate project effects on the herd, in particular the risk of disease transmission.²⁷

²⁰ Document 609, pdf pg 14

²¹ Document 489, pdf page 171-175

²² Document 489 pdf page 73-74, 79

²³ Document 489, pdf page 54-55, 70, 73-74

²⁴ Document 489, pdf page 68-74

²⁵ Document 489, pdf page 77-78

²⁶ Document 489, pdf page 75-78

²⁷ Document 489, pdf page 76-77

21. With regard to whooping cranes, ECCC's evidence was that the Project represents a high risk of mortality for whooping cranes.²⁸ Based on telemetry data, a relatively high number of whooping cranes have landed in close proximity to the proposed mine during migration.²⁹ Evidence from other oil sands mines indicates that whooping cranes can land on tailings ponds, despite the presence of best-available bird deterrent technology, and could be attracted to certain features on tailings ponds such as sandy beaches or shallow water.³⁰ Collectively, this evidence suggests there is a high risk that whooping cranes will land on Teck's tailings ponds, resulting in a high risk of bird mortality.³¹ Best-available bird deterrent technology, such as that proposed by Teck, is unlikely to mitigate this risk.³²

Parks Canada

22. Wood Buffalo National Park is a World Heritage Site. World Heritage Sites are designated to protect those parts of cultural and natural heritage that are of outstanding interest on a global scale and therefore need to be preserved as part of the world heritage of humanity as a whole. A world heritage site can be designated using one or more of four different criteria,³³ which do not necessarily relate to ecological integrity. For example, a national park could be designated a world heritage site if it contains:

- (vii) ...superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance; or
- (viii) ...outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;³⁴

neither of which directly concerns ecological matters.

²⁸ Document 489, pdf page 123-126

²⁹ Document 489, pdf page 116 - 124

³⁰ Document 489, pdf page 125-126

³¹ Document 489, pdf page 116-128

³² Document 489, pdf page 125, 128

³³ Document 384, pdf page 65

³⁴ Document 384, pdf page 65

23. In the case of Wood Buffalo National Park World Heritage Site, the designation criteria include:

Criterion (vii): *the great concentrations of migratory wildlife are of world importance and the rare and superlative natural phenomena include a large inland delta, salt plains and gypsum karst that are equally internationally significant.*

Criterion (ix): *Wood Buffalo National Park is the most ecologically complete and largest example of the entire Great Plains-Boreal grassland ecosystem of North America, the only place where the predator-prey relationship between wolves and wood bison has continued, unbroken, over time.*

Criterion (x): *Wood Buffalo National Park contains the only breeding habitat in the world for the Whooping Crane, an endangered species brought back from the brink of extinction through careful management of the small number of breeding pairs in the park. The park's size (4.5 million ha), complete ecosystems and protection are essential for in-situ conservation of the Whooping Crane.*³⁵

24. The designation describes ecosystem components and processes, is linked to ecological integrity, and specifically mentions species at risk. Because of the different reasons for designating a world heritage site, the only way to assess the management of a site or the effects of a project on it is by comparing potential impacts to the reasons for designation.

25. With respect to species at risk, Teck provided a number of SARA permits as aids to cross-examination and seemed to suggest they had some relevance to the proposed project.³⁶ They do not. While the methodology used by Parks Canada is consistent, the circumstances for each permit are very different.

26. Some permits relate to destruction of critical habitat or residences, which is not at issue with this project.³⁷ Assessing destruction to critical habitat requires additional assessment steps related to the description of critical habitat, the biophysical attributes, and activities likely related to destruction listed in recovery strategies and/or action plans. When examining the potential for jeopardizing the survival or recovery of a species,

³⁵ Document 489, pdf page 392

³⁶ Document 648 - 04

³⁷ Document 648 – 04 pdf page 10-11, 12-13, 14-15, 18-19, 23-24

changes to habitat would rarely have the same level of effect on a population as would killing individuals. As such, each has to be evaluated in its own context.

27. In only two permits provided to the Panel was there an identified possibility of mortality to individuals. In one case the risk was identified as temporary during construction.³⁸ In the other, the proposed mitigation measures were known to be effective; additionally the impacting activity was decreasing over time while the population of the species at risk was increasing. While the permit rationale did not characterize the risk of an individual being harmed from the activity, the information indicates it is very low.

Whooping Crane

28. The Panel might also benefit from further comments on Parks Canada's assessment of effects whooping crane. The assessment can be conducted using Teck's methodology or Parks Canada's methodology.

29. Parks Canada questions Teck's medium magnitude assessment for the population abundance and distribution. Teck assessed impacts to whooping crane stopover habitat as a high magnitude effect. It initially assessed the risk of mortality as low, later changing it to medium. In its methodology of combining individual assessments to form an overall assessment for the population abundance and distribution, Teck normally took the highest magnitude ranking of habitat, connectivity or mortality.³⁹ In the case of whooping crane, however, Teck used the lowest of the rankings to develop its overall assessment of medium – the sole exception to their methodology. Given ECCC's assessment of the high probability of whooping crane landing on Frontier mine tailings ponds⁴⁰ and the high mortality risk to birds which come into contact with tailings ponds,⁴¹ Parks Canada questions Teck's ranking of medium risk of mortality.

³⁸ Document 648 – 04 pdf page 12-13

³⁹ Document 163 : Project update, volume 3, section 11, page 11-311

⁴⁰ Transcript page 3178 lines 16-21

⁴¹ Transcript page 3178 lines 23-25

30. Using the methodology it applies when issuing species at risk permits, Parks Canada considered it essential to consider the risk of mortality against the population and distribution objectives. Given this is the only self-sustaining population of whooping crane on the planet, the recovery strategy indicates that the population goal for the population is 1000.⁴² The current population is in the 490s.⁴³ The population is well below the goal and, importantly, the growth rate of whooping cranes is low, only 4% annually.⁴⁴ ECCC demonstrated the high probability of whooping crane landing on the proposed Frontier mine tailings ponds⁴⁵ and the high mortality risk to birds which come into contact with tailings ponds.⁴⁶ This risk from interactions with tailings ponds is not a onetime risk; it will exist during the spring and fall migration periods for up to 41 years when the tailings ponds are present.⁴⁷ On this basis, Parks Canada is concerned project could slow the attainment of the recovery objectives.

31. Whether using Teck's assessment methodology or Parks Canada's approach, it is necessary to consider additionally that whooping crane breed in Wood Buffalo National Park and that their presence was specifically mentioned for designating the Park as a world heritage site.⁴⁸

Bison Disease

32. Teck presented evidence that the risk of disease transmission to the Ronald Lake Bison herd from the Delta herd in Wood Buffalo National Park is high, but it would not increase as a result of the project. ECCC provided evidence illustrating that this is not the case and risk of disease transmission would indeed increase should the project be approved.⁴⁹ Teck also submitted that there are multiple mitigation options to reduce this risk and that

⁴² Document 489 pdf page 107

⁴³ Transcript page 3442 lines 12-13

⁴⁴ Document 489 pdf page 108

⁴⁵ Transcript page 3178 lines 16-21

⁴⁶ Transcript page 3178 lines 23-25

⁴⁷ Document 163 : Project Update Volume 1 and 3

⁴⁸ Document 489, pdf page 392

⁴⁹ Transcript page 3143-3155

the responsibility to implement these mitigations sits wholly with Parks Canada.⁵⁰ While there are mitigation options, ranging from fences, control zones, vaccination programs and fires, all of these mitigations have implementation challenges, unproven effectiveness, and serious ecological integrity implications.⁵¹ While Parks Canada has initiatives to mitigate disease transmission for the park as a whole, both Parks Canada and ECCC reiterated that additional studies of the Ronald Lake Bison herd and the receiving environment, including the Delta herd, are essential in order to better understand the ecology of both herds and identify which mitigation strategy would have the fewest negative ecological consequences and highest probability of success, if any. This additional work would not be required if the project did not proceed. It is therefore appropriate for Teck to fund this study as indicated in recommendation 5.1-1.⁵²

Peace-Athabasca Delta

33. Water quantity and quality in the Peace-Athabasca Delta are critical to the health of the ecosystems, the OUV of Wood Buffalo National Park and the traditional use of Indigenous people of the Peace Athabasca Delta. This project will increase the risks to water quality and Parks Canada has highlighted the need to apply the precautionary approach in identifying mitigation measures⁵³. With respect to water quantity, the cumulative effects on water bodies receiving water from both the Athabasca River and the Peace River have already been recognized as significant; this project will add to the problem.⁵⁴ In that context, strong measures of protection are necessary and Parks Canada made its recommendations to identify measures important for the protection of the OUV.

Assessing significance

34. Parks Canada's OUV submissions relate to the potential effects of the project on the environment as defined by section 5 of *CEAA, 2012*. The panel is not required to

⁵⁰ Transcript page 61

⁵¹ Transcript page 3157-3163

⁵² Transcript page 3163-3164

⁵³ Document 489 – pdf page 448

⁵⁴ Transcript page 3180 -3189

evaluate the significance of the project on the whole park; as a result, Parks Canada did not present evidence related to the overall condition of the Park or the significance of the project effects with respect to the whole park.⁵⁵ However, in following the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's *Operational Policy Statement Determining Whether a Designated Project is Likely to Cause Significant Adverse Environmental Effects under the CEAA, 2012*,⁵⁶ the effects on the OUV and Wood Buffalo National Park, on federal land, which include whooping crane, migratory birds, bison, and the Peace-Athabasca Delta, are part of the context in evaluating the significance of Section 5 environmental effects.

Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency

35. CEAA officials were available at the hearing to speak to the methodology that was co-developed with the Mikisew Cree First Nation to assess potential effects of the project the exercise of Aboriginal or treaty rights; to clarify, however, the methodology and preliminary assessment were provided on behalf of the Government of Canada. They were not provided as expert information or knowledge but as information for the Panel to consider as potentially useful in its own assessment of the project's impacts on the exercise of these rights.

36. The co-development of the methodology and its application as documented in the Government of Canada submission⁵⁷ provides for a preliminary assessment of potential impacts of the project on the exercise of Aboriginal or Treaty rights in a manner consistent with Canada's approach to reconciliation with Indigenous peoples and the recognition of Indigenous rights.

37. The Government of Canada has presented these preliminary results to demonstrate the application of the methodology, and potential mitigation and accommodation measures that were contemplated at the time it was completed; however, the assessment is still a work in progress. Any analysis conducted by the Panel – whether through this

⁵⁵ Transcript page 3414 lines 23-25

⁵⁶ Document 489 – PCA page 398

⁵⁷ Document 489 pdf page 580

methodology or otherwise – and any resulting mitigation it recommends which may serve as accommodation measures, will further inform the Government of Canada’s ongoing consultation activities with Indigenous groups.

38. This Panel may choose to apply this methodology to its assessment of the potential impacts of this project on Mikisew Cree First Nation’s Aboriginal and Treaty rights and may choose to consider the proposed accommodation measures in the development of any of its recommendations.

39. It is our understanding that the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation has agreed to the application of this methodology to the assessment of the effects of the project on their members’ Aboriginal and Treaty rights.⁵⁸ If other Indigenous Groups request it, Canada also supports using this or a similar methodology to assess the potential impacts arising from this project on their Aboriginal and Treaty rights.

40. Nonetheless, we must reiterate that consultation in the context of environmental assessment, and an environmental assessment process itself, are not rights determining processes. As such, the Whole of Government preliminary assessment of potential impacts on the exercise of Aboriginal or Treaty rights does not contain, and is not intended to be used for, a determination of rights for any of the identified Indigenous groups or peoples. Instead, Canada has based this preliminary assessment on the impacts to rights as those rights have been presented to it.

41. In its August 31, 2018 submission to the Panel,⁵⁹ the Government of Canada indicated its intention to submit a document containing the general requirements and principles for a Project-specific monitoring committee prior to the close of the panel record. The submission indicated that should the proposed Project proceed, the Government of Canada is of the view that a Project specific monitoring committee including the federal and provincial governments, the Mikisew Cree First Nation, and potentially other Indigenous groups, would be appropriate to achieve Indigenous involvement on

⁵⁸ Document 489 pdf page 589

⁵⁹ Document 489 pdf page 624

monitoring related to the Project, advice on adaptive management, and input into regional based monitoring through the existing Oil Sands Monitoring (OSM) initiative.

42. It is our understanding that the Mikisew Cree First Nation agrees with the Government of Canada that, should the project proceed, there is a sound rationale for the establishment of the Committee. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, on behalf of the Government of Canada, continues to work together with the Mikisew Cree First Nation to discuss the potential scope, mandate, composition, responsibilities and resourcing for the Committee. Further discussion with other parties, including federal authorities within the Government of Canada, the Government of Alberta, and other Indigenous groups, is also required. The Government of Alberta has participated in initial and preliminary discussions with the Mikisew Cree First Nation and the Agency regarding the creation of a Committee. It is the Agency's understanding that Alberta supports, in principle, a Committee comprised of representatives from governments, Indigenous communities and industry to advise on environmental monitoring and management, should the project proceed.
43. The composition of the Committee, including purpose and governance structure, will be determined with further discussions with the relevant parties, and reflected in the eventual development of a Terms of Reference. Resources to support the Committee, as well as linkages with existing monitoring activities, such as the Oil Sands Monitoring Program, remains under discussion
44. We confirm that the Government of Canada continues to consult with Treaty 8 First Nations, Métis, and Non-Status Indigenous groups potentially affected by federal Crown activity in respect of this project. This Panel's processes will form an important part of Canada's consultation activities in respect of federal Crown conduct relating to this project to the extent possible. Nonetheless, Canada's consultation activities will continue after the Panel issues its report, and will be informed by the results of that report.

CONCLUSION

45. As noted earlier, we do not wish to suggest that what has been said today comprises the entirety of the Government of Canada's submissions in respect of this project. The federal departments and agencies reiterate and rely on their written submissions and oral evidence subject only to the corrections made on the record.
46. Our involvement in these proceedings was to assist the Panel in its environmental assessment of the proposed project pursuant to the provisions of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. We hope we have done so.
47. We would like to thank the Panel and its staff for their consideration of the evidence and recommendations put forward by the Federal Authorities in the written submissions and at the hearing. Indeed, we thank the Panel and its staff for their significant efforts over an extended period for the process as a whole. We look forward to receiving and reviewing the Panel's report which will inform the federal Government's decision making processes and activities in respect of this project moving forward.
48. We would also like to thank the proponent and all of the other participants in this process for their time and efforts in this matter.
49. On behalf of the entire federal government team for this project, we wish everyone the very best for the season and for 2019.