



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

Name of policy:	Protecting Our Precious Places
Person requesting costing:	Sen Di Natale
Parliamentary party:	Australian Greens
Date of request to cost the policy:	30 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):	5 June 2016 http://greens.org.au/wildlife 7 June 2016 http://greens.org.au/wildlife Senator Waters 23 June 2016 http://greens.org.au/news/qld/greens-commit-full-funding-eradicate-yellow-crazy-ants-while-other-parties-make-half

Description of policy	
<p>Summary of policy (as applicable, please attach copies of relevant policy documents):</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish an Expert Taskforce with \$2 million in funding which will design a new <i>Environment Act</i>: • To create a new independent <i>National Environment Protection Authority (NEPA)</i> with \$130 million per year of funding. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All funds from Dept of Env't program 1.5 will be transferred to the new EPA (2016-17 PBS here http://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/resources/cf243495-d7df-4dc8-84fd-4411be7f4df7/files/environment-pbs-2016-17.pdf page 35) - approx \$55m per year – see cost table below. ○ Shortfall between 130m pa and existing funding for prog 1.5 will be covered by new funding • Provide funding to reform the Federal Court system to allow better access to justice - \$2m over 4 years • Restore the Biodiversity Fund axed under the Coalition, with \$2 billion in funding over 6 years, with \$1 billion to be injected immediately. To be administered by the Department of Environment. The next \$1 billion will be invested in the first year beyond the forward estimates. • Provide \$30 million per annum for 3 years for comprehensive studies to identify and map important habitat, bioregional planning, and other matters • Provide \$10 million per annum to support the rapid listing of all species and ecological communities which belong on the threatened list; Develop and resource the implementation of recovery plans and threat abatement plans for listed species and ecological communities; and fund additional research • Provide the new EPA with the following additional funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ \$3 million for a review of World Heritage Areas ○ \$20 million per year for three years to implement the results of the review to improve protection of heritage values. • Funding for the Wet Tropics Management Authority to deliver Yellow Crazy Ant eradication programs over 10 years. Provide additional Federal funding of \$17.5 million over 4 years comprised of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$5 million per year for 3 years 16/17 – 18/19 • \$2.5 million per year for 7 years, to be matched by the Queensland State government.
<p>What is the purpose or intention of the policy?</p>	<p>Improve environmental protection in Australia</p>

What are the key assumptions that have been made in the policy, including:	
Is the policy part of a package? If yes, list the components and interactions with proposed or existing policies.	No
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?	Capped
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?	New Agency, the NEPA Fed contribution is capped
Are there associated savings, offsets or expenses? If yes, please provide details.	Yes, savings by moving funding from Dept of Env't Program 1.5 into the new EPA
Does the policy relate to a previous budget measure? If yes, which measure?	No
If the proposal would change an existing measure, are savings expected from the departmental costs of implementing the program?	No
Will the funding/program cost require indexation? If yes, list factors to be used.	Ongoing funding to the EPA will require CPI indexation

Expected impacts of the proposal				
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?				
Estimated financial implications (outturn prices)^(a)				
	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20
Underlying cash balance (\$m)				
Fiscal balance (\$m)	-1116.5	-134.5	-135.5	-102.5
(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)?	Nil			
Has the policy been costed by a third party? If yes, can you provide a copy of this costing and its assumptions?	No			
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?	Better protection of environment and access to justice			

Administration of policy:	
Who will administer the policy (for example, Australian Government entity, the States, non-government organisation, etc)?	Department of Environment and the new National Environment Protection Agency
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).	No
Intended date of implementation:	1 September 2016
Intended duration of policy:	Ongoing
Are there transitional arrangements associated with policy implementation?	No
List major data sources utilised to develop policy (for example, ABS catalogue number 3201.0).	N/A
Are there any other assumptions that need to be considered?	No
<p>NOTE:</p> <p><i>Please note that:</i></p> <p><i>The costing will be on the basis of information provided in this costing request.</i></p> <p><i>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></p>	

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

PROTECTING PRECIOUS PLACES

Measure (\$m)	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	MEASURE TOTAL
Taskforce to create a new Environment Act	2	0	0	0	2
Establish new independent EPA (additional new funding)	71	74	75	72	292
Biodiversity Fund - establishment (\$2 billion over 6 years)	1000	0	0	0	1000
Threatened species - habitat mapping	30	30	30	0	90
Threatened species - listing, recovery plans and research	10	10	10	10	40
Costs changes in court	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	2
WHA and RAMSAR review and mgmt improvements	3	20	20	20	63
TOTAL new spending (w/ yearly totals)	1116.5	134.5	135.5	102.5	1489
Reduced funding to DoE program 1.5	-59	-56	-55	-58	-228
Extra funds to EPA from DoE prog 1.5	59	56	55	58	228
Total spending on independent EPA	130	130	130	130	520
TOTAL spending on policy package including existing spend on DoE prog 1.5 (w/ yearly totals)	1175.5	190.5	190.5	160.5	1717