



Press release

Amsterdam, 1 August 2024

Greenpeace not allowed by court to obstruct installation of production platform N05-A with demonstration

The Amsterdam District Court banned Greenpeace from stopping within a 500-metre radius of the convoy of ONE-Dyas' N05-A production platform transport and installation site in the North Sea. The court made this ruling this afternoon following the summary proceedings filed by ONE-Dyas against Greenpeace and served this morning. This work was due to start this week, but was hindered by Greenpeace boats anchoring at the site. ONE-Dyas and its contractors are pleased that installation work can now resume as soon as possible. This means that natural gas with the lowest carbon footprint will be available by the end of 2024, reducing the Netherlands' and Germany's dependence on imported natural gas.

The Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate has given permission for this gas extraction project after a thorough licensing procedure. The environmental impact report for N05-A is the most comprehensive study for a gas development in the North Sea to date. Independent advisory bodies such as the EIA Commission and TNO endorse that the project meets the strict environmental criteria in force. As long as there is still demand for natural gas, locally extracted natural gas is the best option for achieving the Netherlands' climate goals. In the North Sea Agreement, it has been agreed that production will stop as soon as there is no more domestic demand.

Chris de Ruyter van Steveninck, CEO ONE-Dyas: "The transition to 100 per cent renewable energy takes time. As long as there is still demand for natural gas, we, together with the Dutch government, are taking responsibility for our own production. By doing so, we are less dependent on countries outside the EU, keep the ecological footprint a lot lower and contribute to a resilient economy. Saying no to our own production and then importing is not the solution for a better environment. Earlier, opponents tried to stop the project through the courts. In these court cases, Greenpeace, among others, explicitly put forward climate impacts as grounds for appeal. These were considered in detail by the Administrative Law Judge, who ruled that the project could proceed. That Greenpeace, despite being ruled against by the court, tried to stop the project in this way disappoints us. We respect the right to demonstrate, but Greenpeace is deliberately doing so in a location to frustrate timely installation and commissioning of the



production platform. We are pleased that the judge rightly pointed this out to Greenpeace and ruled that Greenpeace should not obstruct the implementation of the project."