



Name: Maritime Union of Australia

Submission date: 11/06/2025

1. Reduce the cost of meeting carbon targets

1. What could be done to improve the cost-effectiveness and alignment of policies to reduce emissions across the industrial, electricity and transport sectors?

More could be done to ensure alignment of maritime/offshore and net zero policies. To date, the potential for offshore wind is not being properly included in net zero funding and policies for electricity, for example the Capacity Investment Scheme and AEMO's Integrated System Plan. There is no evidence to date that this will improve with the outcome of the NEM Review.

This is a problem because offshore wind offers very significant generation capacity, near industrial and population load centres, with high capacity factors of 40-50%. Offshore wind generation is complementary to other forms of renewable energy, with higher output during summer peaks, evening peaks, winter peaks, and other periods of slow onshore winds. This means that it can reduce the need for load-shedding at industrial facilities, reduce the need for high-cost gas peaking generation (and other expensive storage), reduce the need for transmission build-out and the number of impacted landowners, and reduce the overall system emissions. See CEC and Deloitte, Winds of Opportunity: Powering Australia's clean energy future, June 2024 and Briggs, C., M. Hemer, P. Howard, R. Langdon, P. Marsh, S. Teske and D. Carrascosa, 2021. Offshore Wind Energy in Australia, P3.20.007 – Final Project Report. Hobart, TAS: Blue Economy Cooperative Research Centre.

In transport, the potential for mode shift to maritime has not so far been included in the net zero transport sector plan. This is despite evidence that mode shifts from road transport to container ships would reduce emissions by around 60%. For more details see Robin Smit and Paul Graeme Boulter, Impacts of mode shift on well-to-wheel emissions from inter-capital transport in Australia – Part II: Sea and air transport, Explora: Environment and Resource, 2024: 1(1):3471, p.17.

2. Are there gaps in the emissions-reduction policies in the industrial, electricity and transport sectors which should be addressed?

The participant did not respond to this question.

3. Are there any duplicative emissions-reduction policies in the industrial, electricity and transport sectors which could be streamlined?

Yes, as outlined above, planning for offshore wind needs to be better included in the planning for the future electricity system, given its potential, as well as the significant number of licences and areas that have been declared.

In transport, as outlined above, the potential emissions reduction from mode shift to maritime should be fully evaluated.

2. Speed up approvals for new energy infrastructure

1. Are planning and approvals processes for large energy infrastructure taking too long? If so, what causes the most delay?

Yes. In particular, the planning and approvals process for offshore wind is much longer, more complex, and subject to greater restrictions for work taking place on the same vessels in the same areas for the offshore oil and gas industry.

While both industries are subject to the EPBC Act and state requirements, offshore oil and gas projects have access to a single streamlined process delivered through NOPSEMA. However, EPBC approvals for offshore renewable energy do not go through NOPSEMA, but through a different process recently established in the Department of Environment. Offshore wind projects must also separately apply to state planning authorities, and comply with safety and environmental requirements through the Offshore Infrastructure Regulator (OIR, a part of NOPSEMA).

We understand that the result has been longer approval times, significant duplication of effort, and different requirements applied to the same or similar activities – with more restrictions placed on offshore wind feasibility and developments than offshore oil and gas. The situation is perverse, and is holding back important scale and capacity in the energy transition. Offshore wind offers very significant generation capacity, near industrial and population load centres, with high capacity factors of 40-50%. Offshore wind generation is complementary to other forms of renewable energy, with higher output during summer peaks, evening peaks, winter peaks, and other periods of slow onshore winds. This means that it can reduce the need for load-shedding at industrial facilities, reduce the need for high-cost gas peaking generation (and other expensive storage), reduce the need for transmission build-out and the number of impacted landowners, and reduce the overall system emissions. See CEC and Deloitte, *Winds of Opportunity: Powering Australia's clean energy future*, June 2024 and Briggs, C., M. Hemer, P. Howard, R. Langdon, P. Marsh, S. Teske and D. Carrascosa, 2021. *Offshore Wind Energy in Australia*, P3.20.007 – Final Project Report. Hobart, TAS: Blue Economy Cooperative Research Centre

2. How can planning and approvals processes be sped up without unduly compromising regulatory standards?

The government should accredit the Offshore Infrastructure Regulator to undertake the EPBC review and approval process for offshore wind projects, consistent with the role it performs for offshore oil and gas (as NOPSEMA). This will help to reduce the number of regulators, minimise avoidable duplication of processes, leverage existing skill sets and understanding of the offshore construction industry within the OIR, and ensure consistent application of expectations between regulators and offshore industries. Agreement should also be sought with state government to be included in this streamlined process.

3. Should clean energy projects be treated differently to other projects for the purpose of environmental and other approvals? If so, how?

Yes, projects that deliver emissions reduction at scale must be prioritised. However, currently the opposite is taking place.

4. What can be done to build local community support for new energy infrastructure projects?

Training and quality employment is critical to building community support for new energy infrastructure.

Our union represents 13,000 ordinary Australians working in the maritime industry. We support the construction of new energy infrastructure to achieve emissions reductions, but this must also deliver quality employment – or, as a democratic organisation, we will lose the support of members and our ability to advocate for projects that deliver action on climate change.

5. Please outline any evidence showing the productivity benefits of faster approvals for energy projects.

The participant did not respond to this question.

3. Encourage adaptation by addressing barriers to private investment

1. What are the barriers and enablers impacting decisions by owner-occupiers, landlords and developers about how housing is built and updated over time so that it is resilient to the effects of climate change?

The participant did not respond to this question.

2. What information do people need to make decisions about where to live, how to build and how to upgrade their homes to appropriately factor in climate change?

The participant did not respond to this question.

3. What are the most cost-effective retrofitting options for improving the resilience of Australia's existing housing stock? What are their costs and benefits?

The participant did not respond to this question.

4. What role might minimum standards play in ensuring the resilience of Australia's housing stock?

The participant did not respond to this question.

5. The impacts of climate change are being factored into the regulation of where and how houses are built in different ways around Australia. What does leading practice look like? Where is there room for improvement? Are there lessons we can learn from other countries?

The participant did not respond to this question.