

**DEPARTMENT
OF
AGRICULTURE**

DRAFT

**MANAGING THE RANGELANDS
OF
WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

A FRAMEWORK FOR THE FUTURE

2001

MANAGING THE RANGELANDS OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA – A FRAMEWORK FOR THE FUTURE.

Table of contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND AND DRIVERS OF CHANGE

CURRENT ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT FOR RANGELANDS

Current Issues Associated with Administration/Management

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS TO ADDRESS ISSUES

- 1. An approach that meets the emerging scenario.**
- 2. Building onto the “Managing the Rangeland” agreed position.**
- 3. Influencing structural change and investment.**
- 4. A management framework that implements activity and monitors progress.**
- 5. A regional delivery system.**
- 6. New processes, administrative requirements, land management functions/activity**
- 7. Statutory and non-statutory approaches to underpin land management.**
- 8. Consultation and implementation.**
- 9. Resourcing the approach.**

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSION

APPENDIX 1 - Trends for the region SOUTHERN RANGELANDS _____

APPENDIX 2 – Rangeland Council Paper _____

APPENDIX 3 – QMF _____

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - Managing the Rangelands.

This paper presents a discussion and suggests a process for reviewing and recommending changes to the institutional management arrangements for the rangeland that will position Western Australians to meet the future. This paper:

- Reviews the forces/trends that are impacting on the rangeland context
- Acknowledges current policy statements, treaties, conventions and agreements
- Recognises and suggest that the community needs to set landuse objectives and key management issues
- Considers contemporary management and partnership approaches/frameworks for resource use industries that meet accountability requirements
- Recommends a delivery structure at State, Regional and District levels to manage the framework
- Identifies and modifies administration and resource management approach to meet community expectations and/or legislative requirements
- Outlines the statutory basis to underpin the approaches

as well as to

- Suggest a process to involve the stakeholders to be a part of the change process

It also acknowledges that there will need to be both a short and long-term strategy to effect long-term change.

- 1) In the short-term there will need to be a two-pronged approach:
 - a) an interim approach (eg, where should the Pastoral Lands Board sit now) to continue to fulfil current obligations,
 - b) a process that reviews all land management statutory and administrative arrangements and align these with the new departmental roles and responsibilities as determined by the Machinery of Government Task Force Report.

In setting the short-term approach we must position the interim arrangements so that they can easily “morph” into the outcomes of the longer-term consultative development process.

- 2) The longer-term development approach designs and looks at implementation approaches that institutionalises an on-going management framework and partnerships.

The paper then makes recommendations to implement the preferred approach.

BACKGROUND AND DRIVERS OF CHANGE

The forces and trends that will impact on the rangeland.

To recommend a new approach to manage the rangeland for the future we must first analyse the things that are likely to impact on us. These influences/trends are (can be) international, national, statewide and/or local. Over the last 2 years the department has been reviewing these and setting policy direction to meet these influences. These include (an Executive Summary of these trends and influences is attached) emerging issues:

- in rural community development
- for rural business management
- in natural resource management

Of the issues identified in the above the following were seen as particularly important :

- Environmental management systems at property and regional scale will become more important as consumers, their suppliers and their home countries all demand evidence of sustainable practice. The latter will be using the sustainability requirement as a way to reduce access to markets in which they are competing. Suppliers will use sustainability to gain a market advantage with consumers.
- Adequate conservation of flora and fauna is already a requirement of international treaties to which Australia has signed. The conditions and their implementation will become tougher.
- Tradeable credits for carbon sequestration will make conservation of rangeland attractive. Just how this plays itself out is unknown, but there will be a market in carbon credits, and the rangeland does lock up carbon.
- A Tenure system that allows multiple use is now more clearly essential. We need to allow for simultaneous use of the landscape by pastoralists, Aboriginal people, conservation, tourism, mining and intensive agriculture.

In essence the analysis indicates that we must design an approach that meets the emerging scenario - the requirements of the future, rather than administrate for the way of the past.

Current policy statements treaties, conventions and agreements

In designing any future approach we need to be cognisant of existing agreements and policy, particularly those which will pragmatically guide and assist a new approach. To this end the “Managing the Rangeland” policy statement is an agreed position of some 8 State departments and endorsed by the PGA and Conservation Council of WA. The policy statement also recognises and is consistent with other existing treaties, conventions, principles and agreements. The Managing the Rangeland statement provides

an overarching framework for sustainable habitation and recognises government activity needs to be actioned in the following key areas:

- Economic development and structural change
- Sustainable land use
- Business activity
- Support for the social fabric
- Environmental protection

It makes sense to build on to this agreed position and seek to modify to meet any new approach

Meeting community expectations

As well as meeting “trends and treaties” there are local (State, wider community and industry) expectations to meet. As technology increases and allows greater involvement and transparency in public policy and delivery, resource use industry need to meet these wider expectations and adopt contemporary management models expected of a resource use industry. To ensure the industry is using and meeting future needs it must embrace a leadership approach. Governments must also work within these models. To achieve involvement there will need to be a consultative framework of the appropriate stakeholders that set goals and objectives and agree to acceptable targets/benchmarks. There must also be ways to influence investment and institutional processes to ensure structural change is continuously being implemented.

An agreed consultative mechanism that can lead and influence structural change and investment is required.

Managing the delivery of activities to meet community objectives

If you set community based objectives there must be activities and a management process in place to ensure there is action to meet these expectations. There must also be ways to demonstrate that what’s being done is meeting the community objectives and there needs to be a process by which this monitoring informs any need for revision. To this end there must be a contemporary management system put in place that action the range of strategies needed to meet the expectations/objectives and monitors progress against objectives.

A management framework that implement activity and monitors progress is required.

Managing local variations

To implement a range of strategies/activity that will meet objectives and delivered through a recognised management system/approach will need local adaptation and delivery. Given the vastness of the Western Australian rangeland and the geographic

biophysical, social and enterprise diversity we will need a delivery model that reflects this. What is best practice in the Kimberly's may not be, or is irrelevant, on the Nullabor.

Any delivery system must have engagement at regionally appropriate scale.

New ways of managing and monitoring

The assumption here is that to meet changing community expectation there will be a need to change the way we currently do what we are doing. Thus the roll-out of any new way of doing business will require the adaptation, modification or development of new processes, administrative requirements along with a range of other activity. Land managers, scientists, regulators, administrators and the like will require changing the way they do things. This will mean a change process will need to be designed, initiated and managed. Institutional process may require statutory changes. New ways of managing and monitoring pastoral leases will need to be introduced.

What are the alternative and new processes, administrative requirements, land management functions/activity etc, needed to meet community expectations??

Market driven, legislatively enforced?

Any management system/approach will need to provide accountability. Currently we manage the rangeland by way of a number of statutory vehicles. Some of the above changes will and can be done under voluntary codes, other aspect under existing legislation. Other changes will require new approaches, for example, "duty of care" and "codes of practice" need definition and market driven approaches need to be underpinned by the notion of the environmental bottom line.

What mix of statutory and non-statutory approaches can we use and what administrative structures do we need to manage these approaches?

Ownership of Change

Putting in place any new or alternative way of managing the rangeland will require a change management approach. Changes will be required by a range of stakeholders therefore these stakeholders will have to have a collective ownership of the way forward. As well commitment needs to be given by the primary drivers and resources will be required. Going through the process will create expectations and the ability to ensure agreed action at the end of the process must be pre-arranged and agreed. On-going delivery frameworks must be institutionalised to ensure the plan has a chance to succeed and adapt. This will have to include capacity to influence changes at the highest level of government and industry through to changed management regimes in the paddock.

Clearly a consultative development approach is required to initiate short and long- term measures to manage the rangeland.

CURRENT ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Rod Williams to drop his section in here !!!!!!!!!!!!!

Also highlight current issues associated with current approach

RECOMMENDED ACTION TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES

This section takes the key issues and/or questions highlighted above and presents recommendations and options. The key issues are:

- 1. Analysis indicates that we must design an approach that meets the emerging scenario. What are the emerging scenarios?**
- 2. It makes sense to build on to the “Managing the Rangeland” agreed policy position and seek to modify to meet any new approach.**
- 3. We need a leadership mechanism that can lead and influence structural change and investment and set community expectations.**
- 4. We need a management framework that implements activity and monitors progress to meet these community expectations.**
- 5. The delivery approach must engage at regionally appropriate scales. How do you do that and what does it look like?**
- 6. What are the alternative and new land management processes and functions/activity needed to meet community expectations?**
- 7. What mix of statutory and non-statutory approaches can we use?**
- 8. A consultative and implementation development approach to initiating the short and long- term measures to manage the rangeland.**
- 9. Resourcing the approach.**

Analysis indicates that we must design an approach that meets the emerging scenario. What are the emerging scenarios?

Based on the emerging attached (Appendix 1.) trends, how might the Rangelands look in twenty years? Looking at the possible futures, and creating distinctly different scenarios, raises the question of what is most likely, and of what future we want. Work already done in this area has identified four possible scenarios, each set twenty years from now.

Continuing Pastoralism Scenario

In this scenario, prices rise enough to make grazing profitable. The cost/price squeeze keeps demanding productivity improvements, but most in the industry achieve this. Pastoralists reduce activity in marginal country and improve their grazing management. Technological innovations also push productivity along. Regional targets for the sustainable use of natural resources are set and followed by all land users. Government maintains agricultural services to the pastoral industry, but other service providers move to the larger regional centres.

The Big Park Scenario

Twenty years on, most land has been retired from pastoralism. Wool prices have stayed low, and the industry is no longer profitable except in very limited locations. Large conservation areas are created, supported by the desire of urban-dwellers to protect the environment. Some former pastoralists have become Rangeland managers, using their experience to conserve and rehabilitate the country, or have moved into tourism ventures. The large areas of Rangelands leases previously bought up by mining companies revert to the Crown when mining finishes. Miners are required to lodge a bond for all pastoral leases, and this funds environmental management and rehabilitation. Aboriginal groups also acquire leases, but mostly don't use these for production. Tourism becomes a major industry, on the coast and inland in areas of high interest. All landholders, including the Crown, follow regional targets for environmental management.

Land Rights Scenario

The impact of the Mabo and Wik judgements is not changed by any further legislation. Uncertainty of tenure and protracted negotiation slow down investment and innovation in the Rangelands, and legal and settlement costs make pastoralists highly vulnerable to low commodity prices. Miners adjust quickly to the new legal circumstances, using their considerable financial capacity to reach agreements on access. Nonetheless, the growth of mining activity slows.

Many leases are acquired by Aboriginal communities but are mainly used as living places rather than as a basis for enterprise. Most groups do not continue pastoral production, although some do.

A Place for All of Us - The preferred scenario

Twenty years from now, human activity in the Rangelands has become richer and more diverse. There are many different kinds of businesses operating and they are all after robust sustainable prosperity.

In the pastoral industry, there is a much more flexible approach to grazing management, focused on the condition of the land and its vegetation, not just the condition of stock. A broader range of animals is grazed, with the mix of animals adjusted to fit market conditions and seasonal changes. Pastoralists have adopted new technology and management systems and many have diversified their enterprises. Government regulations and incentives have supported these changes, but the primary driver of change has been pastoralists' own business decisions.

Grazing often occurs in association with other ventures - horticulture, aquaculture, native foods, tourism, and rural retreats. These occupy niches in the landscape, with water, accessibility and the attractiveness of an area being key factors in determining where these new ventures take root. Habitats that only occur in areas attractive to human activity are carefully protected.

In the less fertile areas, rangelands managers are employed to control feral animals and fire and rehabilitate degraded areas. Sustainability is accepted as a fundamental goal and all landholders, including the Crown, follow regional indicators and targets for

environmental management. The network of parks and reserves expands, Aboriginal groups have title to some areas, and mining continues, but none of these totally dominate the landscape.

RECOMMENDATION: A planning mechanism is required to guide action by Western Australians to meet the challenges of the future.

It makes sense to build on to the “Managing the Rangeland” agreed policy position and seek to modify to meet any new approach.

If the above-preferred scenario is a broad consensus on what the future should look like, what mechanism is needed to steer and manage us to this preferred position? These mechanism should be embodied in policy at the highest level. As mentioned earlier the “Managing the Rangeland” policy statement needs to be continually reviewed in light of more contemporary analysis and community development work. As well, governments change and policy needs to reflect current agenda’s and responsibility of agencies need to align with core technical skills and mandates.

The Department of Agriculture has had and still needs to take a lead role in driving rangeland policy and institutional development and as such we should initiate through Cabinet the institutional arrangements needed to drive change and meet the challenges of meeting the preferred future. This leadership role needs to embrace the stakeholders and engender a mechanism that creates the broadest level of ownership of the way forward.

A range of Government processes are available to ensure that action is endorsed at the highest level.

RECOMMENDATION: That Minister Chance takes a lead role in driving rangeland policy through the Regional Development Cabinet Sub-committee to Cabinet. Other options include the Environmental Cabinet Sub-committee or the emerging NRM Commission for land and Water however Minister Chance is unlikely to be as involved in these forums as he would be with regional development, given his dual portfolio responsibility.

That the “Managing the Rangeland” statement be used as a basis for providing a renewed “Vision” for the State and a platform for an approved, resourced Action Plan.

We need an agreed leadership mechanism that can lead and influence structural change and investment.

As acknowledged above our leadership role needs to embrace the stakeholders and engender a mechanism that creates the broadest level of ownership of the way forward. The notion of a “Rangeland Council/Commission” or “Sustainable Rural Development Board” (established under the Ag. Mgmt. Bill) or a Rangeland Working Group or Sub-committee of the NRM Commission for Land and Water reporting through the Regional Development or Environment Cabinet Sub-committee is proposed.

Minister Chance has endorsed the recommendation (from the GMS’ Mid-Term Review) to develop Terms of Reference for a “Rangeland Working Group” that pursues and recommends the States future policy platform for the rangelands including:

- A new approach to multiple use tenure
- Implementation of an environmental quality assurance system
- Developing commercial opportunities through a sustainable development framework
- An ongoing regionally based mechanism that allows local decision making and contribution to Government policy and management of the rangelands.

RECOMMENDATION: That a Rangeland Working Group be established and given TOR to put in place the wider agenda being explored in this paper. Attached (appendix 2) is a paper that explores the potential role and functions of such a “Council”. One of the functions of this peak body would be to consult, express and set the higher-level community objectives for managing the rangeland.

A management framework that implements activity and monitors progress.

Governments cannot manage the rangelands *per se*, but they can set the institutional framework and contribute to building the capacity of those that make day to day decisions affecting resource management, financial well being for a viable rural community.

The role of government is seen as one of setting the framework that allows sustainable habitation of the rangelands. This should be based on ESD principles. A more specific role of Department of Agriculture is to also develop research and develop gaps in our knowledge for enterprises principally under pastoral tenure used for agricultural (i.e. livestock and other) production. These activities must also support the statutory and strategic requirements of the Agency and authorities like the Pastoral Lands Board and Agriculture Protection Board particularly resource (economic, social, animal, plant and land) monitoring.

However, sustainable habitation of the rangelands needs to be actioned at the range of scales, ie paddock through regional to a rangeland-wide scale; across land tenures, uses and owners. It is also imperative that Department of Agriculture’s agenda is constructed

to be compatible with those agendas developed by other government agencies and funding bodies.

The approach needs to identify the things we need to do to meet the Department's responsibilities (aspects), articulates best practices (targets) identifies the hazards and critical control points that will provide the best "bang for buck" activity (investment decision) stipulates the benchmarks for best practice (monitoring points) and determines and identifies gaps and deficiencies (R&D requirements) to achieve sustainable habitation. This is required to be achieved hierarchically at the range of scales from land management type, paddock, property/enterprise, district, region through to rangelands-wide aspects. For example information required for monitoring at the paddock scale (ie setting stocking rates) must (where possible) aggregate up to meet rangeland-wide monitoring requirements (ie SoE reporting).

A look at management frameworks in other resource use industry shows a number of models being used, however essentially the contemporary ones are all based on risk management/QA/EMS type approaches. Some of the more advanced approaches don't only define the risks (and opportunities) they have a logical framework to implement and **manage** the strategies and the range of activities needed to achieve objectives. These objectives are usually market or community based.

The attached (see appendix 3) approach has been developed for our context and has drawn on:

- Quality Management Framework (QMF) principles as defined by the Quality Management Council of Australia
- Quality Assurance Systems eg ISO 14000 and SQF
- Environmental Management Systems and Stewardship approaches
- Risk Assessment techniques
- Pressure/State /Response model
- Evaluation Methodology
- Benefit Cost Analysis

A QMF approach provides rigour, a consistent approach over time and repeatability and is based on six themes, which taken together, represent the components of sustainable habitation based on ESD principles, irrespective of the agency or organisation concerned. The themes are; financial, social, environmental, industry, trade and legislative. These six themes are a "first cut" and will need to be refined overtime through continuous improvement.

For each theme, multiple scales are possible. These need to be identified early and explicitly to avoid confusion during discussion. For each theme (by each scale) an overall goal or objective needs to be identified. Once this is done, those activities that we, or our clients affect, need to be identified as well as indicators that reflect these effects. These indicators can be regarded within a Pressure State Response framework. For each indicator, using a monitoring or assessment process, the current best management practice needs to be identified and the current industry standard determined. Where there

is a large gap between the two, the best strategic and tactical approach to raising the standard needs to be identified and in some cases, developed.

RECOMMENDATION: That a Quality Management Framework be adopted, refined and “bedded in” as a management approach and implementation tool.

A delivery system that engages at regionally appropriate scale. How do you do that and what does it look like?

There are two major vegetative systems in the Western Australia rangeland – grasslands and shrublands. Within each there are well-defined socio-geographic and landscape systems. In socio-geographic terms, Western Australians identify with:

- The east and west Kimberley
- Pilbara
- Gascoyne and Murchison
- and North-East Goldfields and Nullabor

These also mirror land system to some extent. Industry and some institutional structures already base themselves around these. For example the LCDC’s, RAC’s, PGA and NHT RAP’s, PLB representation are linked to these socio-geographic areas. There needs to be one regional representational body that carries out a number of regional functions. Existing forums need to be conjoined and given common terms of reference which is underpinned in statutory provisions. The terms of reference should include:

- manage the regional requirements of the rangeland council/commission and maintenance and delivery of the QMF system.
- define local best practice and acceptable benchmarks
- advice on strategies to meet these benchmarks and monitor regional scale land management performance against these benchmarks
- advise departments on audit exceptions and whether individual cases meet best practice standards

To achieve this will require agreement with stakeholders and in our view can be initiated under the Agricultural Management Bill.

RECOMMENDATION: Establish stakeholder involvement in the development of 4-5 regional NRM groups that take a holistic and accountable approach to “Managing the Rangelands”.

RECOMMENDATION: That the administrative management of pastoral leases be on the basis of a QA approach based on inter lease comparison with an environmental bottom-line.

What mix of statutory and non-statutory approaches can we use and what administrative structures do we need to manage these approaches?

Luke etc

A consultative and implementation development approach to initiating the short and long- term measures to manage the rangeland.

Short term

A Cabinet Submission is being developed based on the Ministers instructions to place the PLB within the Agriculture portfolio.

The Minister has also requested the GMS to pursue “bankable tenure” for enterprises wishing to diversify and to pilot a number of cases to demonstrate and to define the process so that other enterprises can readily follow this approach. Initial industry consultation and agreement has been negotiated with a number of enterprises to pursue this process on a pilot basis.

Longer Term

To roll-out the thrust of this paper will need a planned approach based on agreement.

The Minister has given the clear mandate through the approval of the GMS Mid-term Review to set up a Rangeland Working Group (or in his terms a Rangeland “Commission”) to pursue the development of a new approach to “Managing the Rangelands” with a specific request to develop a broader based multiple land use tenure.

The thrust of this paper has also been discussed to varying degrees with and by a range of players including:

- Bernard Bowen of the EPA
- Paul Vogel of the new environmental policy unit
- Rachael Siewert of the WA-CCA
- Denise True of the WWF for Nature
- Charlie Nicholson and Peter Curry from DEP
- Angus Hopkins, Kelly Gillen and Ian Keally from CALM.
- Quintin Harrington, Commerce and Trade
- PGA Pastoral Committee (cautious agreement on thrust)
- PLB (who probably didn’t agree or didn’t understand)
- SLCC (who have been leading the thrust)
- Regional Chairs Group
- NHT RAP

- Kerryl Enwright of the APB
- Tom Day, Ex Chair of the NPNCA now Deputy Chair of the Conservation Commission

It would be fair to say that there is general agreement with the thrust presented in this paper and almost unanimous agreement that a more solid rangeland management framework needs to be developed. To this end we do not believe that a proposal along the line of this paper would meet strong initial resistance. Notwithstanding this, the process will still need to be progressed carefully and greater grass roots involvement/consultation will need to be well managed.

In reality we are moving the agency's technical capacity and processes towards being able to administratively manage in the above way. Through the GMS the elements of this administrative management framework is being pursued through:

Design and Consultation

- Industry Self-Management project – developed to create institutional change by adopting an industry self-management approach to NRM. This project currently funds salary and operating of Mark Lewis (100days/yr), Rod Williams (20days/yr) and Ian Watson (20days/yr) for change management/community engagement.

Management

- The Regional Environmental Management Program Sub-committee (Chaired by Tom Morrissey) has been working across government and stakeholder groups to create a general understanding of the need for a more integrated approach to managing the rangelands. REMP has acknowledged SLCC's role in commencing debate on a more integrated rangeland institutional management framework and development of some form of peak management approach.

REMP (and the former SRPG) has also supported SLCC in seeking stakeholder involvement in the development of regional NRM groups that take a holistic approach to NRM. To this end, SLCC has sponsored the development of creating 4 – 5 regional NRM groups based on the Kimberley, Pilbara, Gascoyne Murchison and N-E Goldfields/Nullabor. These groups are seen as critical in bringing together the range of existing and overlapping roles of RAC's and LCDC etc. They will be important also for ratifying regional and local BPM's that form the standard for QA and statutory requirements.

- REMP staff also developed the Quality Management Framework approach (appendix 3) and have discussed the concept with a range of stakeholders with the view to seeking agreement on the approach being used more universally. A discussion with Paul Vogel indicates that this approach will be consistent with the requirement of the ESD Unit and some form of universal managing/reporting framework will be useful.

Discussion with Greg Pickles also indicates the risk management approach used by APP can easily be adopted within the framework. We will continue to refine this as information/data comes available through this process and the Eco-Accreditation and other (see below) benchmarking and monitoring projects.

Technical and Administrative Requirements

- Pastoral Lease Inspection (PLI) project has designed a two-phase approach to developing a rigorous process that can be implemented so that it meets statutory and the QA approach based on the 1-5 star model.
- Ecology Management Unit (EMU) project is developing an on property process for “mapping” base resource capability and information that allows management decision to be made on stock management and infrastructure designs
- Eco-Accreditation project is developing best management practices (based on resource capability) for setting BMP’s at local and property scale. These BPM’s are critically linked to the QA and audit process and will form the basis of an accreditation framework that meets:
 - market requirements
 - on property management requirements
 - drives and demonstrates capital value and incentives based on condition, and
 - guides regulatory management intervention and environmental bottom line statutory responses
- Range Resource Inventory Survey project needs to provide input across PLI/EMU/Eco-Accred and eventually continue to roll-out EMU/Best practice across the rangeland starting with the older survey areas ie Gascoyne.
- WARMS project – is gearing up to modify to an audit approach and inclusion of biodiversity. A PhD student is being sort to undertake to do this work
- GMS/RCS Benchmarking project will develop a framework for the establishment of financial and production benchmarks and create the content through a business planning review process over the next two years. This model is designed to broaden the statistical base and take over from the MAFIA project. Social benchmarks will be incorporated from a number of existing processes (NL&WA, and a Commerce and Trade study being let at the moment).
- The establishment of a reserve system for the protection of biodiversity is being established so that we can, at State, regional and property scale, meet international QA/EMS/Stewardship requirements as well as meet treaties and conventions.

Legal Requirements

Add Luke stuff around here – it appears that initial implementation can be done under the Agriculture Management Bill (AMB), however what final statutory or non-statutory

requirements will need to be developed as the framework is agreed to by the range of stakeholders (ie the Rangeland Working Group) is yet to be determined. It is also unfortunate the AMB process did not embrace requests to including enabling functions for setting up accreditation mechanisms that formalised (codified?) the management of natural resources, however going through this process will present a case study approach in designing amendments so that this function can be enabled under the present Bill/Act.

??

??

Implementation Process

In terms of the actual consultation, the key approach suggested is;

- Concept development (Evolving)
- Discussion with stakeholders (See above list)
- Design model/s (green paper – based on this draft paper)
- Discussion with stakeholders and modification
- Formal and informal stakeholder input and agreement on model
- Action Plan based on preferred model
- Agreement on Action Plan and Resourcing
- Formal ratification by key stakeholders
- Implementation
- Institutionalise

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt the above consultation and implementation process and continue to integrate current activities to achieve the objectives

Resourcing the approach.

The establishment of the thrust of this paper will take a number of years. Obviously GMS is committing significant resources to this already. As highlighted earlier the Minister has already approved the recommendations of the GMS review which in a defacto-sense endorses the thrust proposed. To this end the GMS has costed and is currently seeking Federal agreement to reallocate funding within GMS to the approved measures. GMS has recommended it re-allocated \$300,000, over two years, to pursue the need for a more integrated rangeland institutional management framework and development of some form of peak management approach to

- Develop a new approach to multiple use tenure
- Implementation of an environmental quality assurance system
- Developing commercial opportunities through a sustainable development framework
- An ongoing regionally based mechanism that allows local decision making and contribution to Government policy and management of the rangelands.

It is envisaged this funding will be needed to undertake the consultation process and development/bringing together the regional NRM groups and development of the BPM's.

While GMS can be a major contributor other agency programs will need to commit to the thrust of this paper and contribute to the implementation project. It is envisaged the project team would be predominately SRD and APP driven with co-opting rights as required. To this end staff cost and operating cost are required from both these programs.

As well as project management other cost will eventuate to bed in the process over time. Gaps in information, R&D requirements are already known and these will be required to be addressed by the appropriate programs. The development of the new approach will need to be undertaken in parallel to the current administration requirements means that the two processes will have to be funded at the same time. This will mean temporary re-allocation of additional resources will be required. A dedicated project leader will be required to lead, integrate and action the plan.

It is envisaged that the on-going maintenance cost of the management framework and technical processes (PLI and APP Inspections) will be significantly reduced as the QA approach becomes industry funded. Industry will support these costs as the link between, the QA/1 – 5 star approach and the capital value of the lease and the reduced overhead costs as incentive-based reductions, become more explicit.

The table below highlights the existing funding from GMS committed over the next two years.

Project	01/02	02/03	Total
Industry Self-Management	151,000	151,000	302,000
Regional Enviro. Mgmt. Prog.	240,000	247,184	487,184
Quality Mgmt Framework	20,000	20,000	40,000
Pastoral Lease Inspection	20,000	20,000	40,00
Eco-Accreditation	246,228	224,272	470,500
Range Resource Inventory	15,000	15,000	30,000
Financial & Prod. Benchmarks	216,000	216,000	432,000
WARMS	15,000	15,000	30,000
National Reserve System	2,000,000	2,000,000	4,000,000
Total	3,063,228	2,768,456	5,831,684

The following table indicates the new funding required.

Project	Funder	01/02	02/03	Total
Project Mgmt	SRD/APP		75,000	75,000
Consultation and RWG	GMS	40,000	40,000	80,000
R&D (gaps & info)	SRD/APP		60,000	60,000
Develop BPM's	GMS	40,000	40,000	80,000
Regional NRM Grps	GMS	40,000	40,000	80,000
Modify PLI/APP Insp	SRD/APP		75,000	75,000
QA Manuals & Monitoring	GMS	30,000	30,000	60,000

Baselines				
Total		150,000	360,000	510,000*

* GMS \$300,000 to be reallocated in the new GMS State/Commonwealth Agreement.

RECOMMENDATION: Note and approve the funding arrangements

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION ONE: A planning mechanism for the rangelands is required to guide action by Western Australians to meet the challenges of the future.

RECOMMENDATION TWO: That Minister Chance takes a lead role in driving rangeland policy through the Regional Development Cabinet Sub-committee to Cabinet. Other options include the Environmental Cabinet Sub-committee or the emerging NRM Commission for Land and Water however Minister Chance is unlikely to be as involved in these forums as he would be with regional development, given his dual portfolio responsibility.

That the “Managing the Rangeland” statement be used as a basis for providing a renewed “Vision” for the State and a platform for an approved, resourced Action Plan.

RECOMMENDATION THREE: That a Rangeland Working Group be established and given TOR to put in place the wider agenda being explored in this paper. Attached (appendix 2) is a paper that explores the potential role and functions of such a “Council/Commission”. One of the functions of this peak body would be to consult, express and set the higher-level community objectives for managing the rangeland.

RECOMMENDATION FOUR: That a Quality Management Framework be adopted, refined and “bedded in” as a management approach and implementation tool.

RECOMMENDATION FIVE: Establish stakeholder involvement through the development of 4-5 regional NRM groups that take a holistic and accountable approach to “Managing the Rangelands” and implementing the regional management framework.

RECOMMENDATION SIX: That the administrative management of pastoral leases be to a recognised Quality Assurance standard with a regulatory imposed environmental bottom-line.

RECOMMENDATION SEVEN: Adopt a consultation and implementation process and continue to integrate current activities to achieve the objectives as highlighted.

RECOMMENDATION EIGHT: Note and approve the funding arrangements

CONCLUSION

Yadda Yadda Yadda

DUMP pile

QA and audit/ Duty of care notions as an option. Maintenance/use of existing legislative base or maybe the Ag Mgmt Bill. Which bits for Currently leases are valued on out of date carrying capacities and dollars per sheep area. Real estate agents use marginal advertising techniques to maintain inappropriate stocking rates to enhance lease values. This in turn creates

- *QA and commercial approaches to driving resource values ie one star – five star (attachment). Inspection, exf recommend for mWe therefore need to recognise this and build a delivery and management mechanism around this. In terms of what we are to deliver*

a and sRegional nrm bodies defining best practice that are codifiable and administered by departmental legislation. (Refer to Rods attached paper administration and monitoring processes needed to do this. what ID risk, options for managing risks. Underpin with QA framework for rigorous investment decision making, defines targets, identifies gaps and R&D rqmts, monitoring systems/need (Attachment of Rods (abridged/edited?) Paper? – probably needs structural flow chart)

Recommendation: Outline the range of changes to make the MTR contemporary (it was last modified in mid 1999) and outline the range of options to get this agreed to and what body should be responsible for it. It could be one of the relevant Cabinet sub-committees eg Regional Development or Environment ?. (Attachment of MTR action??) s etc. (Attach QMF??).

Appendix 1
Appendix 2
Appendix 3