

# **Coast to Coast 2008**

**DARWIN, NT**

## **Workshop Notes**

**3rd National Coastal, Estuarine &  
Marine  
Natural Resource Management  
Workshop**

***'Maintaining Momentum'***

**Monday 18 August 2008  
Darwin Convention Centre**



## Table of Contents

○ National Role of Marine Protected Areas .....	1
○ Indicators, monitoring and reporting – learning from the National Land & Water Resources Audit .....	2
○ Continuity of Information .....	3
○ Recovering Coastcare .....	4
○ Crossover between NRM and Marine Science .....	6
○ Coastal Catchments Initiative (CCI) – Past, Present and Future directions for water quality .....	7
○ Landscape Scale Approaches to Marine Values Protection esp. for MPAs .....	9
○ Capacity building for C&M workers .....	10
○ Engaging the private sector in NRM .....	11
○ Future Coasts – Climate Change .....	12
○ Building Momentum Merchants to Improve Marine Biodiversity Outside MPA's .....	14
○ What do community groups (caring for natural areas/coast) need to keep going? .....	16
○ Treasury – the issue of \$ and the real world disconnect .....	18
○ What is the best way to support community groups in the new NRM .....	19
○ Web Delivery Needs: National .....	21
○ Declare National Crisis – River Murray Lakes and Coorong .....	22
○ Strengthening the bio-competitiveness of CEM strategies and outcomes .....	23
○ Fighting Inertia – How do we introduce new ideas and approaches for improving NRM decision making. ....	24
○ Marine Pests – resolving funding and priorities at State level .....	25
○ Coastal Setbacks / Coastal Protection – Lessons learned, problems & solutions .....	26
○ Roles and responsibilities in marine management and conservation! Who does what, and why? – Expectations – Do they do their job? .....	27
○ Algal Blooms – marine/estuarine/fresh .....	28
○ Desalination Plants .....	29
○ The integrated marine observing system 2 years on. ....	31
○ National Coastal Policy – how might this support NRM priorities. ....	32
○ Social and Economic – why aren't we engaged and effective? .....	33



TOPIC

## **National Role of Marine Protected Areas**

SESSION INITIATOR

Joe Mumford

PARTICIPANTS

Sarah Bignell, Bev Clarke, Chris Ball, Mary Beckett

KEY LEARNINGS

- Difficult process in all state
- National Representative System – up to states to implement – only Vic and SA reps in discussions
- Legislation needed to create - can be very political process
- This session took a different tack to what was planned

## TOPIC

# Indicators, monitoring and reporting – learning from the National Land & Water Resources Audit

## SESSION INITIATOR

Richard Mount

## PARTICIPANTS

Ben Hyde, Chris Deer, Joe Klemke, Patricia Van Baumgarten, Emma Murray, Peter Bayliss, Nicole Middleton, B Higgins, Jenny Liell-Cock, Tim Pritchard, Gavin Bird.

## KEY LEARNINGS

- The NLWRA is closing – probably in late October
- The ECM work plan 2006-08 produced a large number of outputs, most of which are available on the Audit website
- One final report will carry the Audit learnings through the the Aust Govt
- Richard Mount presented briefly on the learnings generated by the Audit's ECM work plan
- He noted some of the key areas he considered needed to have their momentum maintained including:
  - The Environmental Condition Assessment Framework (ECAF)
  - The ECAF Report Card Manual
  - OzCoasts
  - More collection of functional information such as DEMs, hydrodynamics
- The other participants contributed to the following:
  - The ECAF provides stricture and context where currently there is little
  - While there are problems with the focus on resource condition indicators, they still serve a useful purpose in the right circumstances
  - There has been a lot of investment in resource condition monitoring; however, the ECAF approach would underpin investment in data that support modelling and predictive approaches
- Who will champion this work now?
- Comments included:
  - Richard Mount said that he would be seeking to ensure the team writing the MERI framework strategy during the next six months would be aware of the close fit between the ECAF and MERI
  - As there is no obvious 'owner' of the ECAF, others commented that we would have to insert the concept into the forums and mechanisms we have access to such as ICAG and the MACC
  - Richard noted that the ECAF NRM report card manual concept had been put up for a CFOC open grant of \$400k but there was no certainty of receiving that grant. The grant team consisted of key people around Australia

TOPIC

## Continuity of Information

SESSION INITIATOR

Derek Shields

PARTICIPANTS

Alex Grant, Adrienne Frears, Elizabeth Williams, Rhys Collins, Garry Reynolds, Teresa Gurney.

KEY LEARNINGS

- Using search engines to find public documents: huge array of information but hard to find particular documents, especially within NRM
- Knowledge exchange often by chance meetings of key staff members
- Data audit needed by NRM; several different databases exist – need central “depository” for data and reports
- Knowing where threatened species are will help community groups target projects, better chance of getting funding, better outcomes.
- Dollars needed for positions to maintain data collection
- How far back do you go for including data? Good quality data could be included even if it was collected 20 years ago
- SE NRM Board – “NRM space?” – GIS-based web with public access. Example of good storage system and access
- National method of storing data? Corangamite CMA – spatial/data system for estuaries which cost \$50k to set up
- Updating databases – needs review/budget
- Should be able to do a search/portal on Govt funded projects for estuarine and marine as this is public data
- Dangers of outside interpretation (vested interests) of raw data?
- SA Conservation Council - Reefwatch – some dollars to interpret data
- Interagency communication issues in Vic – need to know who is doing what?
- Estuary entrance management – no data to back up closing/opening. Someone has developed a framework/matrix for opening with respect to this issue. Cross links with monitoring database
- States need to ideas of other states and incorporate into new databases i.e. not reinventing the wheel
- Use of PDAs for data entry in the field e.g cybertracker. Backing up datasheets
- Making data known, perhaps not accessible to everyone
- Staff turnover equals many projects are forgotten after a few years
- Each state needs a “stats nerd” to collate and document projects

## TOPIC

# Recovering Coastcare

## SESSION INITIATOR

Tony Flaherty

## PARTICIPANTS

Jeremy Neilson, John Davis, Dylan Gleure??, Rhys Collins, John Amor, Debora De Fizeitas, Bev Clarke, Mark Rodrigue?, Andrienne Frears, Kate Spurore, Nick Harvey, Kerry McEwan, Norm Farmer, Chris Lukes, Anna Wind, Chiara Danese.

## KEY LEARNINGS:

Resource Assessment Inquiry in 1993 recommended 'Coastcare'.  
New Coastcare program needs to iron out problems with indigenous and remote communities.  
Election promise to continue Coastcare.  
Coastcare is easily understood and adopted by community.  
Separate paragraph in bilateral agreements.  
Coast Action in Vic. and Coast West in WA groups but community prefers Coastcare.  
Under Coastcare – National Forums were powerful events and AG Facilitators attended for information exchange and training.  
Provide opportunities for coastal and marine facilitators to get together for state and national forums and formalise.  
Forums for community groups to network, training, interaction.  
New arrangements don't have a formal linkage to NRM plans and investment in coastal and marine – is a weakness.

Communicate these issues to Commonwealth Inquiry (House of Reps Standing Ctee on Climate Change, Envir. & the Arts).  
Maintain coastal and marine facilitators in NRM regions and need for long term AG support.  
New Coastcare facilitators need to fit in with Coast Action/Coast West and NRM Regions.  
Develop MoU between regions and state – will improve situation.  
In Vic, 5 fully funded C&M facilitators by state. 2 facils by AG.  
20,000 volunteers in Coastcare in Vic.  
Some strengths in Coastcare facils in State Agencies.  
Coastcare should include marine.  
Coastal and marine needs to be high priority in CFOC.  
Ensure Coastcare facilitator support for Coastcare groups in NRM regions.  
Agreements depend on circumstance (area) of coast.  
State ownership Integration and ownership (eg Vic) important.  
Mobilise people that live on the coast to look after the coast.  
Recognise social component of Coastcare not just bio-physical.  
CFOC (community Coastcare) funding not linking to community groups.  
Support for NRM regions to deliver coastal and marine movement.  
National objectives don't fit C&M priorities (NRM plans and CM plans).

## State and Regional C&M Plan.

Add coast and marine to national priorities for ICZM.  
'Hotspots' would take more than \$250K funding – would take a lot more funds.  
Funds directed towards eco-system based management, not 'hotspots'.  
Principles of coastal management not being applied.  
Lack of communication from AG re: Coastcare from LAL initiatives and and campaigns to NRM regions and C&M facilitators.  
LAL needs to be directed to work with NRM regions re: Coastcare.  
Develop strategic national framework for Coastcare – IT WORKED!!

## KEY KEY KEY LEARNINGS!

- Ensure Coastcare Facilitator support for Coastcare groups in NRM regions.
- Recognise social component of Coastcare (not just bio-physical).

- CFOC (Community Coastcare) funding not linking to community groups - needs to be for community.
- Support for NRM regions to deliver coastal and marine management.
- National objectives don't fit C&M plans.
- Add Coast and Marine to national priorities for ICZM.
- Funds directed towards eco-system based management, not 'hotspots'.
- Lack of communication of AG to Coastcare re: LAL initiatives and campaigns to NRM regions and C&M facilitators.
- LAL needs to be directed to work with NRM regions re: Coastcare.
- Develop Strategic National Framework for Coastcare (IT WORKED!!!)

TOPIC

## **Crossover between NRM and Marine Science**

SESSION INITIATOR: Alex Grant

PARTICIPANTS: Sue Mudford, Emma Williams, Sophie Keen, David Harper, Hanna Fletcher, Sheryn Prior, Julie Hansen, Sarah Bignell, Russell Willing

### KEY LEARNINGS:

Young scientists unaware of marine management perspective.

Projects put forward from NRM bodies to students in line with regional priorities.

Targeted research for management.

Liaise with others doing similar work. On-ground works groups informing science, or involved with it.

Two-way relationship - researchers talking to managers.

'Service' to access and interpret most significant points from research; takes time; needs dedicated resources 'Knowledge brokers'.

NRM negotiate to get University library access?

Difficult to get \$ for research.

Cross-state cooperation could be improved – NRM/science agencies.

Work/outcomes – are they being hidden from Aust. Govt.?

Partnerships! Collaboration! Opportunities!

Upskill NRM Board memngbers.

Do 'we' need to start a new relationship/partnership with marine science agencies? Do they need upskilling in NRM processes? Do they know they can access \$ for research via NRM?

How can they communicate back to 'us' the key points for management?

Focused research happening in western Vic. Issues with transparency and intellectual property.

Intellectual property issues with contractors inparticular.

Identifying marine research priorities with research agencies.

Networks.

## TOPIC

# Coastal Catchments Initiative (CCI) – Past, Present and Future directions for water quality

## SESSION INITIATOR

Mark Rodrigue

Participants: Peter Pfenning, Jo Klemke, Libby Mears, Kerryn McEwan, Alain Purnell, Jocelyn Dela-Cruz, Beth Beveridge, Jeremy Neilson, Dave Patmore, Nicole Middleton, Dylan Gleave, Jamie Corfield, Peter Bayliss, Randall Lee, Andrew Harford, Julie Hansen

## KEY LEARNINGS:

### Background:

- CCI projects are an initiative funded through NHT2 to provide for the development of Water Quality Improvement Plans (WQIP) in identified coastal hotspots.
- CCI projects exist in all states and NT and include:
  - SA – Port Waterways – Plan published and being implemented (doing well)  
- Adelaide Coasts – Plan out for review
  - NSW – Great Lakes – Plan developed – being implemented, doing well  
- Botany Bay – Plan developed
  - QLD – Healthy Waterways – Moreton Bay – good progress with strong support  
- Port Curtis – dealing with heavy metals  
- Reef WQIPs – 3 – 4 separate plans
  - Tasmania – Derwent Estuary
  - WA – Peel-Harvey Estuary
  - NT – Darwin Estuary
  - Vic  
– Better Bays and Waterways (Port Phillip and Western Port) – Plan in final draft  
- Gippsland Lakes and Corner Inlet – final CCI funded program – No WQIP

### Current Challenges

- Limited or no coordination across CCI projects leading to duplication of efforts
- Some tensions and political processes that have, and are, compromising opportunities for CCI adoption and implementation
- The science that informs CCI plan development is not in itself sufficient to engage investors, governments and industry groups
- There has been some resistance to adopting strategies within CCI WQIPs as they are perceived as Commonwealth business – the reality is they are everyone's business
- Within some CCI projects there are areas that have such strong history of changed landscapes that makes opportunities for improvements very limited leading to perceptions of lack of progress (SE QLD)
- Some state / regional agencies / local government feel outside the WQIP process and do not understand how they relate to WQIPs – there is a clear need to “line up the ducks”

### What has contributed to successful CCI projects?

- long timeframe for development allowing for building of real and strong relationships for plan implementation
- well coordinated and strong steering committees that include key decision makers from major stakeholders
- \* a genuine shared vision that is meaningful to all that need to contribute to its implementation, including state/local governments, NRM/CMA boards, industry, community is CRITICAL

- CCI projects are a good framework for development of coordinated funding bids through Caring for Our Country (CFOC)
- Some CCI projects have developed a well recognised “branding” that allows for broader engagement particularly with communities and partners, e.g. Healthy Waterways (SE QLD)

#### Looking Forward

- CCI projects were part of the previous governments NHT funding program
- CCI WQIPs are in various stages of completion/implementation
- Funding through Caring for Our Country does include opportunities for implementing actions identified in WQIPS
- There exists an imperative for state and local government to remain engaged in WQIP implementation as this is a shared responsibility
- While critical aquatic habitats have been identified in CFOC no clear water quality have been identified
- There exists a real challenge to maintain a focus on water quality as a threat to marine/coastal values
- A framework for change in managing coastal/ marine values is required
- There is a critical need for all CCI projects to communicate info/data/successes/concerns back to communities
- Maintaining a focus on the receiving waters and their values (e.g. such as seagrass, fishing opportunities, recreation, biodiversity)
- WQIP projects require realistic goals that are measurable and that can be reported

## TOPIC

# Landscape Scale Approaches to Marine Values Protection esp. for MPAs

## SESSION INITIATOR

Mark Rodrigue

## PARTICIPANTS

John Amor, Sue Mudford, Rachel Fagetter, Jo Klemke, Peter Bayliss, Steve Winderlich, Jeni Liell-Cook, Sophie Keen, Sarah Bignell

## KEY LEARNINGS

- Landscape scale approaches require consideration of whole ecosystems and the linkages between them, including the links between land and sea
- Examples of landscape scale initiatives include Habitat 141 (Western Victoria) Catchment to Coast programs (Parks Victoria), Port Philip Environmental Management Plan to reduce N loads to the bay from both point and diffuse Victoria
- Successful management of threats to marine values requires recognition of the linkages across the entire system
- Cultural landscapes and the relationship between people and their own landscape / seascape are critical components to be considered in effective NRM, especially for CEM
- Great opportunities exist to link traditional views of “Country” to landscape management ( NT/ Vic)
- The hEeeling Walk and Festival in Western Victoria uses the metaphor of the eel migration from inland to the sea to build understanding of the connections across whole landscapes
- Marine protected areas need to consider broader landscape areas in the development of management approaches, and require the building of partnerships with those responsible for Land/ water management including communities and industry
- The key challenge for improving marine management is the split b/w terrestrial and marine management in policy development and implementation
- Opportunities exist to:
  - Provide better access to whole of landscape information from community, NRM Boards, agencies, local govt using online information networks ( Including new software for spatial data such as Google Earth)
  - Utilise marine habitat mapping information to engage land managers of the marine assets at risk within their management areas
  - Asset / threat approaches for marine areas would provide managers / investors with clearer pictures of priorities for action in protecting marine values

### **Recommendation:**

That the new Caring for Our Country Business Plan recognises and adopts a landscape scale approach to NRM, that allows for the linkages across landscapes to the marine environment to be both recognised and supported through investment

TOPIC

## Capacity building for C&M workers

SESSION INITIATOR: Chris Ball

PARTICIPANTS: Nick Harvey, Sophie Keen, Bill de la More, Amy McDonald, Karman Lippitt, Ross Martin, Geoff Withycumbe, Emma Williams, Sheryn Prior, Nicole Middleton, Vanessa Walsh.

KEY LEARNINGS:

SA – research information from MCCN & AG facilitators

- Strategic \$ for capacity building project
- Information professional capacity – future needs?

NT – on ground officers essential

NSW – Now looking at formal arrangements tri-partie instead of just state. No cons council being approached by NRM bodies

TAS – 3 NRM regions partnerships LG – huge loss AG facilitator

WA – AG lost but added to others responsibility

- need consistency with contact at community level, share information, continuity important.

Continuity of program, not necessarily facilitators

Engaged in national program, facilitators regularly shared info – national facilitator network.

Coastal \$ now available, what's missing? On-ground works US employment - Is the Baloree right? What's best investment?

Need cumulative lecturing, where's the evaluation? Coordination.

How measure intangibles? Relationships, trust, develop nurture community groups, support newcomers, Mickey Mouse projects – maybe worthwhile on context

Now back to lottery, previously state assessment could include small stories.

What level of support required at each state?

Where's the science?

1. What do we need ? What appropriate level of facilitation required? Social science research. Effectiveness of facilitation?
2. How do we get it? Where next? Political influence needed, policy needs to reflect capacity building requirement.

TOPIC

## **Engaging the private sector in NRM.**

SESSION INITIATOR: Dan Messiter

PARTICIPANTS: Alex Gaut?, Geoff Withycentre?, Andrew Harford, Petra Ringeltaube, Libby Mears, Rhonda Williams, Julie Hame, Amy McDonald, Scott Schilg, Erin Nash, Derek Shields, Craig Moinsan?, Andrei Souto, Ross Martin, Garry Reynolds, Dave Patmore, Alain Purnell, Peter Pfenny?

### KEY LEARNINGS:

Public Private Partnerships – public land creating revenue to fund NRM

National Scheme for development contributions – connection between development and where funds are invested.

Industry to fund extension officers (to comply with legislation and regulators).

Tourism visiting public space – know how to make people pay.

### Federal Initiatives:

Tourism – people from overseas paying to do community based work.

Sustainable communities initiatives.

Lifesaving/Westpac > sustainability training and education for young members.

Invitation to present, attend.

Incentives for industry to get on NRM boards, community coastal groups, associations, Aust. Coastal Society etc. & vice versa!

Get them to contribute!

Next Coast to Coast – Have specific sessions for developers to present.

Tassie NRM initiative – whole farm process.

Corporate Social & Environmental responsibility – big companies, regulation, public reporting and accreditation, give them tools to do the ?, what's in it for them?, marketing opportunity.

Corporation like to support large integrated organisations.

Coastcare (Landcare Aust Ltd) can provide funding for local community projects – independent review process (don't take money (sponsorship) from anyone).

-should promote that companies who donate have passed this 'accreditation'.

Scott Gibson – contact for Coastcare projects. (LAL/Coastcare Business Partnerships Ph 02-94121040

### Taking an idea to private enterprise:

Compelling value proposition: Something exciting, out of the ordinary; tangible to the company; space for them to input.....Then you will get industry excited.

Legislation.

Untied funding from industry rather than project specific funding (remove cynicism – pay offs, constant revenue stream.

NGO – more reactive to.

## TOPIC

# Future Coasts – Climate Change

SESSION INITIATOR - Annette Hatten

## PARTICIPANTS:

Annette Hatten, Mick Dortmans, Steve Winderlich, Russell Willry, Hannah Fletcher  
Elizabeth Williams, Kedong Yin, Chiara Danese, Andrea Critto, Teresa Gurney  
Jane Rowe, Chris Ball, Sophie Keen, Rachel Faggetter, Sheryn Prior  
Seb Drewer

## KEY LEARNING

- Planning scheme legislations for conditions on development – tools in planning scheme.
- VCAT can work for us – better costal planning ad recognition for climate change.
- Impacts on wetland.
- Various States undertaking coastal vulnerability projects – options climate change strategy.
- Corridors – better links protected areas.
- Potential impacts for Indigenous People.
- Overwhelmed with information – ‘riding the wave’
- Project repeat photography – document changes same place / time.
- Cost / benefit analysis to assess worthwhile expenditure
- Importance of buffer zone
- Community participation coastal planning
- Risk framework – specific case study
- Recycling of river water
- Key – community, planning, mechanisms / decision making, infrastructure
- Recommendations adapt to climate change
- Mitigation measures
- Fires, floods
- Sea change impact and climate change – planning issues appropriate tools – draw lines (land subject to climate change) or choose not to develop.
- Tough political decisions need to be made to address planning issues – land subject to climate change overlays – Insurance companies will help this happen
- Liability issues
- No chance for environmental processes to protect coast
- How to get information available to Local Government Authorities who make the decisions.
- More research temperate marine environments;
- Not just storm surge, higher temperature, impact on fisheries;
- How to get coastal vulnerability into state Government planning;
- Question: Evasive species movement as political threat?
- Question: How baseline data is defensible?
- Problem: current land ownerships;
- Proposals national benchmarks/nested approached Federal, State and Local Governments;
- Need detail assessments especially geo technological;
- Predictions 2030 and 2070;
- Need for better data as baseline/encourage Australia Government assistance;
- Case studies as examples – mangroves, wetlands, catchments;
- Water quality – receiving (?) environments;
- Other countries are looking at retreat where Km of land is being lost. Why invest protective structures that won’t work against the force of nature;
- Example of this are Europe, North USA engineering structures;
- Any building proposed on coastal land should show how it would deal with the impacts of climate change;
- We need to question health insurance issues such as “Ross river fever”;
- Need to engage the developers to learn about coastal vulnerability;
- Currently the financial sector is driving the climate change initiatives;

- Legislation is not able to deal with climate change challenges;
- Need for a step approach with the community and the political process (a slow approach);
- Apply precautionary principles;

### **Impacts from climate change**

- Sea level rise;
- Inundation;
- More storms with greater severity;
- Impact on biodiversity corridors;
- Wetlands;
- Fires, floods;
- Evasive species mitigations;
- Greater health problems;
- Water quality;
- Fisheries;

### **Responses-what we need to do**

- Vulnerability assessments;
- Development planning tools to place limits and conditions on development;
- A national climate change strategy

### **Where we are now**

- Overwhelmed with information “riding the wave”;
- “Doomsday” preachers – accusations;
- In need of tough political decisions;
- We have a problem – the forces of nature are powerful;

### **What we can do**

- We can inform coastal forums, land managers, etc;
- Bring the community along especially the developers;
- Government can acquire some coastal land;
- Develop national awareness and benchmarks;
- Document changes e.g. photographic records;
- A cost benefit analysis;
- Learn from the Northern hemisphere who are more advanced (Coastal engineering solutions are not seen to be the answer);
- Head for the hills – retreat sound the bugle?
- Change will be driven by the financial sector (\$).

## TOPIC

# Building Momentum Merchants to Improve Marine Biodiversity Outside MPA's

## SESSION INITIATOR

Jo Klemke –DSE Victoria

## PARTICIPANTS

Erin Nash (VCC-Vic), Andrew Harford (DEWHA), Matt Boland (VCC-Vic), Seb Drewer (Ayre Peninsular NRM Board), Olivier (Connell Wagner), Annette Hatten (CCB), Libby Mears (VCC), Jamie Corfield (Hydrobiology), Sue Botting (CCNen), Alex Grant (CCSA), Marilyn Ah Chee, Penny Gillespe (DSE-Vic) Joe Mumford

## KEY LEARNINGS:

- Can't look on state by state basis – needs national approach - what is sustainable at least on SE state basis.
- Terrestrial mechanisms – maintaining off-reserve protection is a priority there too. Although ecologically different, there may be some useful parallels at a principle level.
- SA project – cumulative impacts of the range of threats in the Gulf (SARDI)
- Adelaide coastal waters study (WQIP)
- Offsets, land tenure issue with applying but also commercial interests.

### Key Question:

What do we know and could contribute to improving these key marine systems.

➤ would provide basis for trading.

Tropical areas largely pristine – lack of info outside GBR esp an issue.

Key issue is to get info. – How do we find it?

Raise community understanding they don't know what's there.

Intrinsic connection and value – opportunity to capture this by communication.

Could do a thorough assessment of existing parks – many people opposed to extension of marine parks need basis for communicating issue with them.

Northern Australia – grow understanding through discharge licences site specific focus now but trying to develop protocols that can extend.

Can industry investment from discharge licence monitoring be better coordinated to address wider marine R&D priorities.

SA marine planning approach – coming from a usage rather than biodiversity values perspective.

NSW – SE corner of Tasman many predictions for climate change impacts. Need to understand c/c changes as this will clearly influence where to invest in future.

Qld – Formed a partnership among Univer's, agencies etc. > develop a water quality monitoring program across catchment –estuaries-sea. Monitoring 2X/yr> report card for each council. This info about condition then needs to be used to identify and address problems. There is a risk this focuses attention solely on water quality and monitoring at the expense of other issues and an action to address threats > great educational tool but not as effective with regard to outcomes.

Purpose of monitoring is a real issue. Need to inform some action rather than nec. continuing for the sake of it.

Info/education element is a priority > but needs to be in a framework about responding to risks (see above – Qld experience).

What are the drivers for investment:

consumers can be a big driver. Fish habitats issue – doesn't engage as much.  
other industry – mining.

Philanthropy – how to harness this in marine environment – demonstrate what you are buying –  
can we develop and market some good tools to stimulate interest.

Can fisheries investment better focus on cumulative fisheries impacts with EPFM approach.  
-opportunities to engage with rec. fishers (big part of community) and with family based  
commercial fishers (who have a long-term focus perhaps).

NSW swathe mapping program pass on areas of particular interest – broad scale > will then  
use to focus priorities for detailed mapping.

## TOPIC

### **What do community groups (caring for natural areas/coast) need to keep going?**

#### SESSION INITIATOR

John Davis

#### PARTICIPANTS

Mick Dortmans, Erin Nash, Jeni Liell-Cook?, Vicki Hodges, Joe Mumford, Rachel Allan, Bev Clarke, B Higgins, Chris Lukes, Rachel Faggelta?, Kate Sputore, Melissa Coaks, John Amor, Kristy Blackburn.

#### WHY ARE COMMUNITY GROUPS IMPORTANT?

Eyes and ears of enforcement.

Have deep knowledge – historical, technical.

Committed.

Attract investment – corporate, philanthropic, govt.

Can be contracted to do specific jobs.

Do work others don't see as priority

Care in areas which Local Govt. can't.

Do physical work.

Value of contribution is large.

Form of social indicator.

Build social capital.

Bring pressure on key organisations etc.

Can apply their knowledge to public process.

Give community ownership of NRM issues.

Contribute to capacity of wider community.

Contribute to diversity of ideas and thinking of Govt.

Cross political boundaries.

#### KEY LEARNINGS:

Coastal strategy must articulate the needs and role of community groups.

Community groups in Victoria have been involved in developing the State Coastal Strategy.

Groups need support through NRM regions.

Need to be valued (Regional Networks) – who are traditional owners,

- who are admin support helpers,

- who are corporate partners who might be available.

Groups want -someone to recognise achievements

- Someone to validate design factors

- Continuity of support in writing grants

- Opportunity to share successes and struggles

Coastcare local hero awards were widely appreciated in the community.

Caring for our country needs to continue to provide for sharing of ideas.

Group need a voice in NRM bodies and council.

Group usually become vocal at the time of development conflicts or environmental disaster.

Applications are used to express group priorities. There must be a way to get the messages from the groups heard.

Facilitators are very important to work between funding guidelines and the group and the priorities.

Emotional aspect of failed applications needs to be addressed.

Community groups are very diverse. So directed support is required that takes account of the needs and capacity of the groups.

Projects need to overlap with land manager resources and priorities.

The total request in the Coastcare grants for groups should be made public as an expression of what the community believes to be the needs in the area of coastal and marine 'care'. ie. \$200m requested for a \$60m pool offered.

Community groups need to build partnerships with NRM, research, govt. agencies etc.

Some groups have only small capacity to do small projects but still need to be encouraged.

Facilitator support! Why are the 4 evaluations findings not leading to ongoing support?

Facilitators are the link between the higher levels of strategic planning and helping partnership – they need to be involved.

Facilitators have a role to help community group and local government talk together and then work together.

CCGps could have an MOU with local Govt Council to clarify roles and enable communication.

Council's turnover at staff level and elected council level. NRM worker on council staff is a helpful position.

Vic Conservation management networks stand outside of Govt and are able to help community group address some of their needs for more 'political' steps with local.

#### WHAT TO DO: (ACTIONS):

Complaint and appeal process for unsuccessful applications for funding.

C&M Facilitators are essential for coastal program to work as endorsed by the 4 reviews.

Community group need to engage with political process for their issues.

Group need to see themselves as a foundation block within our democracy.

## TOPIC

### **Treasury – the issue of \$ and the real world disconnect.**

#### SESSION INITIATOR

Kim McClymont NSW Parks & Wildlife Group DECC

#### PARTICIPANTS

Lynda Radke, Xiaojing Li, Jane Rowe (East Gippsland Shire Council, Vic), Vicki Hodges (Dept. Env., Water, Heritage & the Arts), Sue Mudford (Western Coastal Board, Vic.), Craig Momsa (SCCE), Simon Cloverdale (GHD), Steve Blackley, (Western Coastal Board, Vic.).

#### KEY LEARNINGS:

1. Influencing key decision makers via invitation to visit and see the issues. Then to gain influence and support from them.
2. New Zealand model – potential to use this model where enviro-economic data is available within an integrated multi-department model.
3. Recognising the benefit of providing resources to maintain and support infrastructure cf. complete upgrade and higher costs in future (talking to economists in their terms).
4. Accountability. Environmental accountability vs financial accountability. ie: difficult to achieve/show long term environmental changes and outcomes within timeframe (1 year). Potential to expand to 3-5 year program. Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting, very important.
5. Sometimes programs restrict project achievement because of the criteria – eg; funds for on-ground works but no staff.
6. Need political 'savvy' to understand grant system and treasury. Need 'political' as well as 'social, economic, cultural and environmental'. Treasury/economists – ie; very clearly defined systems and outcomes.
7. Limited capacity by potential proponents to develop applications. Therefore, could use simple EOI proforma process and integrate with other potential applications > invest in good staff.

## TOPIC

# What is the best way to support community groups in the new NRM

## SESSION INITIATOR

Kristy Blackburn

## PARTICIPANTS

Melissa Coates, Jeni Liell-Cock, Terea Gurney, Jeremy Neilson, Rhonda Williams, Alain Purnell, Christopher Lukes, Andrei Souto, Roger Fenwick, Anna Wind, Adrienne Frears, Peter Pfennig, Kerryn McEwan, Kate Sputore, Garry Reynolds, Rachel Allan, Bev Clarke, Tony Flaherty, Dave Patmore, John Amor, Rachel Faggetter,

## KEY LEARNINGS:

- Difficulties: unstable NRM roles.
- Coastcare facilitators exist in Vic.
- Big staff turnover to support Coastcare groups.
- Staff left and weren't replaced and no funds to support groups.
- NRM region in Sthern tas doesn't support community groups so southern Coastcare Assoc'n of tas was established.
- Challenges under CFOC -national objectives and coastcare groups
- Pre-election promise for Coastcare with no facilitation support.
- Hard for groups to fill out community Coastcare grants.
- Supported Coastcare Groups – Eyre Peninsular NRM board.
- Important to get funding for groups.
- NRM funding uncertain to regions greater than 40% down.
- Hard to maintain project officers.
- Facilitators informed not to support community group with applications.
- Coastcare groups don't want to write applications, just plant trees.
- Write CVA into applications to assist with training.
- Role of facilitator to progress groups and learn from each other.
- CVA not consistent and not well trained.
- Partnerships - important to define roles.
- Recognise achievement of groups – individuals.
- Scientific/botanical expertise in community plus hire experts.
- Weed training/bird spotting
- Group capacity low – only 4 people in some Coastcare Groups.
- Not consistent approach to bird monitoring – trying to get consistent state approach.
- Support networks broken down in 2002 again now.
- Vic. has sustained coordinated approach to groups plus consistency.
- Used to be invigorated groups in Tas, now less so.
- WA Govt. funded community grants program minus facilitator network.
- New CFOC and priority area Coastcare and Govt. commitments plus reduced funding, therefore positions have finished.
- Need coordinators to make things happen and seek private investment.
- Identify icon areas for regions (bio),
- 2000 CFOC and open grants in this round.
- Coordinators roles have changed to office based and don't assist on-ground works.
- Groups want and need support in writing grants and are getting burnt out.
- Paying volunteers (15-20% project officer position). Pay for petrol and office supplies.
- Coastcare Association (eg SCAT) pay members to write applications and run projects.
- Many applications are not Coastcare groups but surf clubs, local govt. etc.
- Facilitator's regions can be huge – eg WA. \$50K is not much to spend on coasts.
- Schools and groups are getting frustrated because facilitators can't support them – lack of continuity.
- Need established long term positions.
- Uncertainty in NRM – lack of information coming to regions.
- NRM contracts uncertain.
- Vic still going strong because of Coastcare facilitators supporting groups.
- 1996 clear messages to AGovt. that we need CC facilitators.

- Same message needed now.
- Need active and vocal communities. Philanthropic funding and partnerships.
- Vic CMA's formed technical marine working groups.
- Tas NRM boards don't have coastal expertise.
- Wording in new CFOC dropped marine completely, now aquatic.
- Issue re: access for groups in WA to look after coast, low population, fragile coastline.
- Groups need incentive to look after schools.
- Local shires don't have funds to manage coast.
- Remote area working bees – create camp, need coordination.
- What govt. is doing on coast is good – five fold increase in funding for coasts.
- National business plan in Sept. after the auditors report with more specific targets.
- Bushcare groups not happy (disillusioned).
- Remote areas need protecting and need facilitators.
- State Coastcare facilitators lost.
- Hotspots hangover from catchment initiatives.

TOPIC

## **Web Delivery Needs: National**

SESSION INITIATOR

Lynda Radke

PARTICIPANTS

Rhonda Williams, Penny Gillespie, Sarah Bignell, Norm Farmer, Xiaojing Li, Kim McClymont, Vivienne Panizza, Amy McDonald, Peter Davies, Tereasa Gurney, Andrew Critto

KEY LEARNINGS:

Problems:

Poor updating of websites – maintenance problems

Level of information is useless/outdated

Web-search quality poor (internal websearches)

Poor data base design in some cases

Poor metadata

Expense in setting up and then on-going costs

State Governments do not see as high priority

Technology is great but not always on the mark

Interpretation versus data

Intellectual property and data security – 5% of research projects see the light of day

People are used to google-earth

NRM Reports disappear – are not made available

Needs:

Clear custodianship

Reference to metadata – clear and good quality

National portal with links to state portals. Network to maintain this NRM-States-National ie: a nested system/tiered/federated.

Recognition of importance – of the need to be resourced.

Build in 'sustainability of infrastructure'!

Logging of map sites, estuary/beach reports

Historical data – not on a department website

How many projects in an area under NHT, CFC funding – a 'blog' or 'twiki'

More fisheries data in more detail

Coast guard – boat crossings recreational pressure

Milestones with payments attached to ensure data delivery

TOPIC

## **Declare National Crisis – River Murray Lakes and Coorong.**

SESSION INITIATOR

Mary Beckett

PARTICIPANTS

Adrienne Friars? MDBC, Ben Hyde (SA), Matt Boland (Vic), Paul Robb (Vic), Seb Brewer, Liz Williams (SA), Bill Hutchinson (WA), Travis Ferrari (Vic), Vanessa Walsh (NT), Karman Lippit (NT).

KEY LEARNINGS:

National Security Issue now.

Poison – Acid Sulphate.

Food Basket of Australia – threat.

Over use over many, many years.

Needs independent, non-political authority to manage whole system.

Maybe to manage water nation wide.

Needs emergency power. Like 'Franklin River' in Bob Hawke times.

We all need to learn from this mis-management – not economics before environment.

## TOPIC

# Strengthening the bio-competitiveness of CEM strategies and outcomes

## SESSIONS INITIATOR

Sue Mudford

## PARTICIPANTS

- Sue Botting
- Christine Crawford
- Emma Williams
- Steve Blakeley
- Mary Beckett

## KEY LEARNINGS

1. Need to present biodiversity argument in appropriate terms. EG. No. of jobs preserved/created; value of dollars in ecosystem services provided.
2. Assess and complete the value of ecosystem services.
3. use existing projects, ie the value of water to all users, especially agriculture and aquaculture.
4. Compare value of ecosystem services with alternative structures by example.
5. Value does not mean to be only dollars: Triple Bottom Line. Can we be smarter using better assumptions.
6. Need safeguards in the assessment of the methodology used. Also, checks and balances for the assumptions.
7. Murray River – Need a national non-political approach away from commercial world of buying and selling. Must be an independent body.
8. Recognised property rights for water needed, eg. Environmental water reserve (as in VIC).
9. Proposed tax incentives planned in VIC for ‘water’ donations from land holders with water permits.
10. Lack of understanding and learning by state governments about eg Murray Darling Basin water and Western Australia salinity. Governments need to learn from each other.
11. Murray River Issue: Acid Sulfate Soils potentially being exposed could highlight as a national bio-security issue via poisoning.
12. Recognition of the community as part of the environmental system. Eg people ‘donate’ water to the environment. We are the environment.
13. Terminology – need to change to reflect the meaning and outcome.
14. Lack of understanding of ecosystems eg “Water is wasted and flows out to the sea”. Need to highlight the interconnectedness, benefit for fishing and fish breeding.
15. Aquifer systems. Lack of scientific data on existing capacity.
16. Skills shortage in new and emerging areas eg. Ecosystem services, ground water, estuaries.
17. Lack of on-going resourcing for staff, in funding – continuity of employment etc.
18. (Questionable) strategic approach – scarifying one wetland for another. Millions of dollars to protect rare species compare with funds directed to other projects with more gain.
19. Intergenerational equity eg. Eastern bristle bird in Qld. Too expensive to maintain breeding project so birds will euthanased.
20. Accountability and use of legal planning laws so that people are prosecuted for illegal clearing.
21. Increased nurturing role by ALL needed.
22. Form partnerships with indigenous people if possible and appropriate.
23. Look at potential partnerships with industry.

## TOPIC

# **Fighting Inertia – How do we introduce new ideas and approaches for improving NRM decision making.**

## SESSION INITIATOR

Jamie Corfield

## PARTICIPANTS

Peter Pfenning, Scott Schlig, Penny Gillespie, Garry Reynolds, Dave Patmore, Simon Coverdale, Julie Hansen

## KEY LEARNING

- New ideas generated all the time. Can be too dismissive of existing ideas or level of innovation in Australia;
- Lots of great ideas being generated but younger players / scientists (in particular) don't always know how to get those ideas recognized or taken up;
- Lots of experienced people in government agencies with knowledge of how the bureaucratic process works. But this knowledge isn't disseminated. Too younger players – enough. Element of protectiveness here.
- Traps for young players include:
  1. Identifying a champion within the agency
  2. Don't try to convince agencies or clients that their approach is a panacea (cure all approach).
  3. Don't try to push methods that totally usurp (replace) existing methods.
  4. Need to bring ideas to the table that fulfill a social plus business context that represents value for money.
  5. Don't approach top people first.
  6. There could be much more done by facilitating knowledge transfer between players – ideas included 'Quick Quotes' that are currently available from Garry Reynolds and Internal Wikipedia type system to connect ideas with people and vice versa.
- Need for better system for identifying appropriate networks such as Caring for our Country Networks and Coastal and Marine Facilitators. Again, better use of technology could help direct players to their appropriate networks.
- Perhaps, a need to have regular workshops with Industries on how to engage Government agencies. It has happened in Victoria for a while but no longer.
- A related topic is how can government agencies best obtain new ideas.
- Sometimes agencies have trouble framing the NRM issue / questions. This could benefit from the input of fresh ideas to assist with framing those questions.
- Senior policy makers often rely on word of mouth from their facilitators to determine what ideas are out there.
- Therefore, players need to be able to identify and contact the facilitators to present new ideas.

TOPIC

## **Marine Pests – resolving funding and priorities at State level**

SESSION INITIATOR

Penny Gillespie

PARTICIPANTS

Steve Leske, Jo Klemke, Tony Flaherty, Melissa Coates, Petra Ring...  
Seb Drewer, John Amor, Sue Mudford

KEY LEARNINGS

- Need to be able to manage around severe infestations –acknowledge they are there but can't do much at the moment
- What are the implications of not managing pests on asset values?
- Need consistency and updating what the high risk pests are
- Turn a pest into a commercial resource (eg fish food)
- Marine pest management investment is nowhere near the level spent on rabbits
- Need to do research on impact of managing marine pests: eg. NPSS in Port Phillip Bay – Constant collection may cause site damage
- Research on impact of clearing an area- need an evidence-based approach.

Funding- Can fisheries and other industries contribute to the cost of prevention and monitoring of spread?

- Is money available for R&D? eg FRDC
- R&E should also go beyond priority species, eg species profiling
- It appears that the Australian Government's previous Marine Pest Program has lost its strategic edge (lost strategic mechanisms), for example Ocean Rescue 2000, R&D investment in control technologies for emerging pests
- Needs to be a national approach
  - Have lost CRIMPE
- Need Federal investment in community monitoring programs 'Eyes in the Water'

TOPIC:

## **Coastal Setbacks / Coastal Protection – Lessons learned, problems & solutions**

SESSION INITIATOR

Hannah Fletcher

PARTICIPANTS

Annette H, Paul Robb, Jane Rowe, Dan Messiter

KEY LEARNINGS

- Coastal setbacks: people want it to be quantified, but as soon as a figure is chosen (eg. 100m setback) it becomes the 'rule' when it was only intended as a guide (like other planning legislation)
  - Setbacks initiated in the 80's, but still no clear process for how they can be applied effectively
  - Regulators (eg. State government) not transparent
  - Setbacks need to be determined by topography
  - Hazard Definition:
    - Brunn Rule is not an appropriate modelling method
- WA- A 3cm increase in MSL =38m setback. This completely ignored site specific factors.
- Define a range of SLR that is site specific- a reference point
  - Still debatable what change in storm surge will be with SLR
  - Adaptable solutions: Keep monitoring as science improves and re-evaluate the setback
  - WA needs legislation for setbacks to become binding, as currently only policy
  - Why should governments be liable for people building in erosion / inundation prone areas?
  - Different states very different arrangements eg. NSW local governments determine setbacks. LGA study of hazards on beach by beach basis.
  - A generic setback can be completely insufficient in some areas, yet the same setback excessive in other situations.

SUMMARY

- Site specific setbacks Australia- wide and within individual States and Territories
- Coastal engineering / hazard report
- Climate Change adaptation plan
- Needs to be a national approach with policy written into legislation

TOPIC

**Roles and responsibilities in marine management and conservation!  
Who does what, and why? – Expectations – Do they do their job?**

SESSION INITIATOR

Patricia Van Baumgarten

PARTICIPANTS

Sheryn Prior, Matthew Boland, Adrienne Frears, John Davis, Travis Ferrari, Vicki Hodges, Vanessa Walsh, Alex Gaut, Chris Ball, Annette Hatten, Mary Backett.

KEY LEARNINGS:

1. FACT.
  - No Leadership
  - No cross communication (various bodies)
  - Big Knowledge gaps > how to deal with them?
  - New Government – rebadged.
  
2. SOLUTION
  - Overarching strategy
  - Business plan
  - Conservation Council SA Discussion paper.
  
3. Others:
  - What is Natural Resource Management? Which resources? CAP section.

TOPIC

## **Algal Blooms – marine/estuarine/fresh**

SESSION INITIATOR:

Petra Ringeltaube

PARTICIPANTS

Simon Coverdale GHD, Rhys Collins, Jane Rowe

KEY LEARNINGS:

Chlorophyll a

Explanations of algal blooms

Examples of algal blooms were given by participants

Problems are everywhere but nothing has been solved

Problem solving depends on local area and/or species which is blooming

Solve the problem at the source

Familiarity with algal bloom not high

TOPIC

## **Desalination Plants**

SESSION INITIATOR

Petra Ringeltaube

PARTICIPANTS

Hannah Fletcher, Dan Messiter, Rhys Collins, Julie Hanse

KEY LEARNINGS

Victoria: No law and regulation

The bigger the better

Need for water > desalination plant build nonetheless

Sydney: Desalination plants are a waste of energy – recycling is a much better option.

Public perception with recycling drinking water is not good.

Melbourne drinking water comes from Thomson's dam (30% capacity at the moment) moving drinking water through 'holding dams'.

Good idea if it is the last option, in Australia we should have enough other options available.

Localised solutions, eg; smaller plants, designed for local needs.

Drinking 'recycled' water is 'political dynamite', politicians rather like to put infrastructures into place.

Water tanks are 'trendy' – not used for drinking in Victoria

- only at places outside water services.

Rain water to use for drinking purposes – storage problem!

Major problem is the 'high energy' use.

Politics and common sense are not a married couple – takes courage.

Geelong and Sydney in crisis water.

Dams are built to get below 30%.

Complete lack of communication to the wider public.

Things need to be meaningful.

2 very good marketing strategies > good campaign > good messages.

Usually information on desal plants is kept 'in house'.

Environmental damage not assessed enough?

Dredging.

UP FRONT. WAY FORWARD.

Social. Economical. Ecological.

SEE APPROACH

1. Aspects to be evaluated.

2. Identify exactly the needs.

3. Identify exactly alternatives.

4. Communicate – effectively to the wide public.

Climate change.

People in government and private sectors.

Young people nowadays demand conditions at their workplace.

Personal experience is important.

CAMPAIGN THAT HELPS PEOPLE TO CONNECT TO UNDERSTAND WHERE THE WATER IS COMING FROM.

People need to be more responsible.

What else to do?

Charge more \$ for water.

Because, \$\$ communicate the best.

Planning scheme lags for conditions on development – tools in planning scheme.

VCAT can work for us – better coastal planning and recognition for climate change.

Impacts on wetland

Various States undertaking coastal vulnerability projects – options climate change strategy.

Corridors – better links protected areas.

Potential impacts for Indigenous People

Overwhelmed with information – ‘riding the wave’

Project repeat photography – document changes same place / time.

Cost / benefit analysis to assess worthwhile expenditure

Importance of buffer zone

Community participation coastal planning

Risk framework – specific case study

Recycling of river water

Key – community, planning, mechanisms / decision making, infrastructure

Recommendations adapt to climate change

Mitigation measures

Fires, floods

Seachange impact and climate change – planning issues appropriate tools – draw lines (land subject to ?) or choose not to develop.

Tough political decisions need to be made to address planning issues – land subject to climate change overlays – Insurance companies will help this happen

Liability issues

No chance for environmental processes to protect coast

How to get information available to Local Government Authorities who make the decisions.

TOPIC

## **The integrated marine observing system 2 years on.**

SESSION INITIATOR

Randall Lee

PARTICIPANTS: Norm Farmer, Sarah Bignell (SA DEH), Mary Beckett (SA), Travis Ferrari (Vic, GHD), Mark Rodrigue, Liz Williams, Derek Shields, Richard Mount, Kedong Yin, Beth Beveridge, Peter Bayliss, Anotrea Grilto, Ben Hyde, Russ Willing, B Higgins.

KEY LEARNINGS

40% aware of IMOS.

Interface between marine and coastal networks often tenuous – is IMOS doing the same?

Impact from coastal activities – how can IMOS show this?

Need to ?? smaller scale boundaries for marine (from current? IMCRA) to better characterise regions – not necessarily as borders but as dynamics.

Relevance to NRM regions – to 3NM – on interface between coastal catchments and marine 'coastal boundary layer'.

Ocean colour in-situ array to 'calibrate' satellite imagery > for 2009 review.

Disconnect between science and 'grass roots' work > can IMOS emii address this key gap.

Coastal erosion (weekly rates) as a product .... eg from NSW ?? buoy network??

Productivity maps.

Changes ... is the network set-up to resolve this?

Project .....proposals – can they fit into existing network structure?

new facilities

access to user group.

## TOPIC

### **National Coastal Policy – how might this support NRM priorities.**

#### SESSIONS INITIATOR

Chris Rees

#### PARTICIPANTS

Rhonda Williams  
Matt Bound  
Nick Harvey  
Libby Mears  
Emma Murray  
Julie Hansen  
Erin Nash  
Nicole Middleton

Melissa Coates  
Vivienne Panizza  
Linda Radke  
Chiara Danese  
Debona De Freitas  
Sue Botting  
Emily Hughes Dit Cils

Hannah Fletcher  
Kim McCay  
John Davis  
Chris Lukes  
Scott Schilg  
Alain Purnell  
Dave Patmore

#### KEY LEARNINGS

##### Expectations:

- Minimum setbacks, eg 100m minimum, rezoning and reservation of further areas.
- Possibly nationally consistent planning principles
- Australian Government could play a coordinating role in funding research programs and access to information. Better partnerships.

##### Constraints:

- Each state has its own definition of the coastal zone and coastal policy.

##### Policy Development/Scope

- Provide a framework for funding NRM engagement
- Local Government would implement policy better under a national approach (compare with National Water Commission).
- It should be a triple bottom line sustainable development policy
- Need to differentiate between development control and broader strategic planning and national priorities – avoid Australian Government influence on development control.
- We need a policy statement that's not time-bound.
- The value of a implementation package is noted. Danger in tying policy to an implementation package.
- Legislation may be a better approach and less likely to be changed. Eg USA model.
- Possibility of sitting under existing legislation should be explored eg. EPBC Act.
- The NRM framework needs to work with coastal policy frameworks – onground coastal issues are not always well served. National Coastal Policy should establish formal linkages with NRM.
- Policies often don't deal with cumulative impacts (in EU strategic environmental assessments are required).
- Policy needs to involve three tiers of Government/trilateral agreements and engagement with NRM regions.
- Possibly resource NRM bodies to participate in development assessments.
- Use best practice planning principles – look at those from RAC inquiry, Planning Institute of Australia and seachange taskforce.
- Coastal Spaces (Vic) provides a growth blueprint that may have national value in achieving consistency. It controls rezoning processes. It doesn't address the carrying capacity.
- NSW Comprehensive Coastal Assessment took a triple bottom line approach.
- Incentives?
- National coastal policy should include state waters (3nm limit).
- Should address national issues and international obligations.
- Integrate with national oceans policy.

## TOPIC

## **Social and Economic – why aren't we engaged and effective?**

### SESSION INITIATOR

Steve Blackley, Western Coastal Board, Victoria

### PARTICIPANTS

Liz Williams, Scott Schlig, Kezong Yin, Kerryn McEwan, Mick Antmans, Kim Mccymont, Kate Sputore, Ian Purnell, Christine Crawford, Andrew Harford, Beth Beverledge, Sue Behing, Rhonda Williams, Roger Ferrich, Teresa Gurney, Joe Mumford, B Higgins, Karman Lippitt, Russell Wilg

### KEY LEARNING

- The challenge of putting value on social and environmental values. 'What currency' should be used – skills and capacity required and availability of information.
- Value system requires influencing – e.g. While culture doesn't value environment like Aboriginal culture did.
- Social and economic are often perceived as being in conflict with environmental values. Leads to trade offs.
- Social, economic and environment are all inter-related: Needs to be explicit.
- Social and economic values of cities are often disconnected from the actual CEM assets / threats.
- Need to promote and celebrate social and economic ideas and projects. In particular, do positive things.
- 'NRMers' and sea change issues need to build better bridges with financial and business interests and issues.
- Left field opportunities – environment as a security issue / international investment with ethical focus
- Clarity required for benefits and funding programs and demonstration of return on investment.
- Ecosystem service opportunities for economic development and sustaining remote communities.