



## Policy costing request—during the caretaker period for a general election

<b>Name of policy:</b>	Marine reserves: protecting our marine ecosystems
Person requesting costing:	Senator Richard Di Natale
Parliamentary party:	Australian Greens
Date of request to cost the policy:	24 June 2016
<i>Note: This policy costing request and the response to this request will be made publicly available.</i>	
Has a costing of this policy been requested under Section 29 of the Charter of Budget Honesty (ie from the Treasury or the Department of Finance)?	No
Details of the public release of this policy (Date, by whom and a reference to that release):	Released 8 June 2016 by Australian Greens; <a href="http://greens.org.au/marine">http://greens.org.au/marine</a> ; <a href="http://rachel-siewert.greensmps.org.au/content/media-releases/reinstating-marine-parks-and-investing-shark-research-cornerstone-marine-pack">http://rachel-siewert.greensmps.org.au/content/media-releases/reinstating-marine-parks-and-investing-shark-research-cornerstone-marine-pack</a> .

Description of policy	
<p>Summary of policy (as applicable, please attach copies of relevant policy documents):</p>	<p>The policy would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reinstates the marine park management plans that were scheduled to come into effect in July 2014 for the South-west, North-west, North and Temperate East reserve networks, and the Coral Sea Commonwealth Marine Reserve.</li> <li>• Reinstates the Fisheries Adjustment Assistance Package associated with the introduction of marine park management plans as intended prior to the 2013 election, including the following components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Transitional Business Assistance (up front payments) to support changes to fishing operations displaced by reserves.</li> <li>○ A total of up to \$20m for ‘Sectoral measures’, to be awarded to projects to improve the long term sustainability of fisheries displaced by marine reserves.</li> <li>○ Removal of Commercial Fishing Effort - purchase of individual fishing entitlements, Business Advice Assistance and Re-employment assistance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide the following capped amounts (excluding any departmental costs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ \$8m in capped additional funding (\$2m annually, including administration costs, over the forward estimates) for coral bleaching research to the CSIRO</li> <li>○ \$6m for shark research (grants funding of \$2m per year, including administration costs), over the period 2017-18 to 2019-20.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Funding from 1 July 2017 to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Work through COAG to achieve consistent laws requiring that all sharks caught in Australia must be landed with their fins still attached to their bodies</li> <li>○ Create a central data source that records Australian sharks caught, species, and full details of shark fin imports and exports</li> <li>○ Create a working group of scientific and public policy experts (five SES Band 2, five scientific experts) that would meet over two years (2017-18 and 2018-19) to determine the best way to ban the possession, sale, and / or trade of imported shark fins in Australia, and consider options such as a moratorium on shark fishing in Commonwealth waters, or an import / export ban.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>What is the purpose or intention of the policy?</p>	<p>Improve protection for marine ecosystems, provide additional funding for key areas, and provide greater protection for sharks.</p>

<b>What are the key assumptions that have been made in the policy, including:</b>	
Is the policy part of a package? If yes, list the components and interactions with proposed or existing policies.	-
Where relevant, is funding for the policy to be demand driven or a capped amount? If a capped amount, are the costs of administering the policy to be included within the capped amount or additional to the capped amount?	-
Will third parties (for instance the States/Territories) have a role in funding or delivering the policy? If yes, is the Australian Government contribution capped, with additional costs to be met by third parties, or is another funding formula envisaged?	State and Territory governments play a role in administering marine park management plans.
Are there associated savings, offsets or expenses? If yes, please provide details.	-
Does the policy relate to a previous budget measure? If yes, which measure?	-
If the proposal would change an existing measure, are savings expected from the departmental costs of implementing the program?	-
Will the funding/program cost require indexation? If yes, list factors to be used.	-

<b>Expected impacts of the proposal</b>				
If applicable, what are the estimated costs each year? If available, please provide details in the table below. Are these provided on an underlying cash balance or fiscal balance basis?				
<b>Estimated financial implications (outturn prices)<sup>(a)</sup></b>				
	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20
Underlying cash balance (\$m)	-39.9	-50.4	-39.6	-21.8
Fiscal balance (\$m)	-39.9	-50.4	-39.6	-21.8
(a) A positive number for the fiscal balance indicates an increase in revenue or a decrease in expenses or net capital investment in accrual terms. A positive number in the underlying cash balance indicates an increase in revenue or a decrease in expenses or net capital investment in cash terms.				
What assumptions have been made in deriving the expected financial impact in the party costing (please provide information on the data sources used to develop the policy)?	-			
Has the policy been costed by a third party? If yes, can you provide a copy of this costing and its assumptions?	-			
What is the expected community impact of the policy? How many people will be affected by the policy? What is the likely take up? What is the basis for these impact assessments/assumptions?	ABARES previously completed estimates of the social and economic impacts - <a href="http://www.environment.gov.au/topics/marine/marine-reserves/overview/background">http://www.environment.gov.au/topics/marine/marine-reserves/overview/background</a>			
<b>Administration of policy:</b>				
Who will administer the policy (for example, Australian Government entity, the States, non-government organisation, etc)?	Australian Government in conjunction with state and territory governments.			
Please specify whether any special administrative arrangements are proposed for the policy and whether these are expected to involve additional transactions/processing (by service delivery agencies).	Eligibility assessments to be determined in detail – policy intent is to match the approach in place prior to the 2013 election.			
Intended date of implementation:	1 September 2016			
Intended duration of policy:	Assistance payments are one-off; management plans to be ongoing.			
Are there transitional arrangements associated with policy implementation?	-			

PBO Policy costing request—during the caretaker period for a general election

List major data sources utilised to develop policy (for example, ABS catalogue number 3201.0).	-
Are there any other assumptions that need to be considered?	-
<b>NOTE:</b> <i>Please note that: The costing will be on the basis of information provided in this costing request. The PBO is not bound to accept the assumptions provided by the requestor. If there is a material difference in the assumptions used by the PBO, the PBO will consult with the requestor in advance of the costing being completed.</i>	