

Raw list of comments from participants

Ocean management structured discussion hosted by the McGuinness Institute, Tuesday 27 May 2014

Question 1b: What aspects of the current framework are working **ineffectively** towards this goal?
productive ocean.

Comment
Devolving/avoiding central government responsibilities e.g. to councils, and being unable to progress [on] tough issues.
Allowing the use of the ocean for economic gain by relatively few.
The model of "assets" omits the system linkages.
What about 'stability' instead of durability?
Unable to make strategic protection/use decisions across activities.
Lack of joined up framework - decisions on activity by activity basis. Lack of planning - decision by decision.
Uncertainty. Lack of information.
Adversarial ≠ collaboration.
Don't know the sum of individual decisions, may not lead to healthy and productive ocean.
How can we know how effective we are when the data is so fragmented and the agencies and industries cannot really share information? Ineffective: Lack of data; Lack of sharing data; Problems collecting data; Difficulty remembering what the marine env. was before - generational amnesia; Lack of community data.
Non-market values are barely recognised in the EEZ and CS Act. Intrinsic values not recognised. Not effective at giving recognition even to non-extractive values, let alone intrinsic values.
Lack of "public good" science.
No provision for marine spatial and ecosystem based management - vestigial in EEZ Act but no operational provision.
The over-arching public policy goal for economic growth omits both the concepts of limits and a full understanding of well-being both of the ecosystem and the human well-being.
EEZ and CSA is designed for policy instability.
Disjointed policy across Ministry and Departments.
Mapping the oceans and identifying sensitive environments and resources. i.e. informal policy, there is no commitment to spending money to find out more about the oceans.
There is no framework - many different Acts/legislation.

Adversarial process to get outcomes.
Public debates in media are generally sensationalised.
Different management regimes have different purpose and therefore goals. No common public goals - fishing quotas etc.
Public opinion is polarised to the point of prejudice regarding deep sea resource exploitation. The framework needs to bring the 'extreme' views together in public forum to dispel myths on deep sea exploitation and other issues.
There also needs to be better media engagement, in particular by scientists, to facilitate a balanced and informed discussion.
Lack of cohesion across too many different pieces of legislation.
QMS not efficient enough
Too much bottom-up process for conservation results in delays
Imbalance of say or clout of some industries against others or different sectors
No clear leadership from government
Insufficient funding for research
There is no integrated framework, i.e. multiple or non-connected pieces of legislation and policy, not all of which deal with all elements of use and protection.
All sectors of society (communities, Maori, industry etc) value the marine environment but not all sectors have a voice and not all are informed about the issues.
Different government/management agencies have very different goals and objectives.
There is a mismatch between bottom-up and top-down elements. They are on different pages as the processes are separate to a large extent.
Too many pieces of legislation that overlap (or not) and make it hard to achieve goals e.g. managing protected species falling under fishing act.
Disjointed marine reserves that do not form a coherent network that will effectively mitigate climate change or other perspectives.
Lack of a "centralised" surveillance programme that central and local govt own and that accurately informs us of our current and emerging issues.
Collaboration ≠ compromise
More funding for research
The EEZ is a missed opportunity.
Educative initiatives about ocean management.
Too much talking/ranting.
Emphasis on blue-sky research by funding agencies.
Speaking in an accessible language about these things.

Measurement and monitoring.
WHO is missing from this conversation? Framing as a management issue can alienate voices who are missing but have a stake e.g. young voices, who have this future the longest.
Ad hoc legislation without overarching goal over all pieces.
Information gathering: what resources are in the ocean; the environment in the ocean; measurement and monitoring. Inadequate info means lack of understanding, means inadequate decisions.
Government agencies have a narrow focus, none is willing to take leadership of ocean management, fragmented responsibility.
Everyone is aware of the impact of uncertainty on ocean management, but there is no recognition of the importance of reducing uncertainty.
Doing anything in the ocean is expensive, there is no commitment to investing in knowledge to improve management outcomes, need baseline data.
The framework is Byzantine in its complexity. Until it is better defined its effectiveness cannot be judged.
A lack of information and knowledge of the 'actual' issues versus perceived impacts on ecological/natural ecosystems.
Lack of collective working together in central and local government and lack of common understanding between management agencies.
Lack of baseline data on species diversity throughout NZ.
Lack of understanding of the importance and significance marine pests pose to the environment.
Need to strengthen relationship between sectors: science, NGOs, Govt; and create space for the forums to share information and get public opinion to inform policy.
Many policy shapers have a shocking dearth of actual evidence. Ministers have an alarming lack of info, or WILL r.e. environment and social issues.
Not enough consideration of human dimensions of management (e.g. consider fishers not just fish)
Having to assign value to natural resources - cannot recognise intrinsic value that does not and cannot have price.
Quota Management System
Lack of acknowledgement of the need to know the limits of natural resources when working to meet the human needs.
Disconnect between management/conservation of different parts of our ocean (i.e. fisheries protected areas not recognised in EEZ Act).
Lack of 'baseline information' collected independently and consistently.
Some ministerial decisions should be removed to reduce impact of 'political plans' from science based decisions.
Communication with public on ocean policy.
Not joined up.
No joined up thinking.
No durability.

There is no framework. There is no oceans policy.
NZ polarised: no mechanism to find common ground. No collective discussion
No common good investment in knowledge needs.
Polarising legislation and regulation. Currently insufficient recognition of, or incentives for, collaboration or integration - including govt silos. Us vs them, use vs conservation, action vs precaution: until legislation removes these, we won't change.
We are somewhat working in the dark - in a knowledge vacuum. There is much we don't know about the physics and chemistry of the ocean - much less about biodiversity (especially in water column at depth) and even less about ecological interactions in relation to non-living processes. Hence we need more knowledge, knowledge, knowledge.
We have current insanity in legislation making it costly and difficult to collect marine life in EEZ and bring it ashore. This should NOT be regarded as importation!
There is no comprehensive framework for natural resources management (as it relates BOTH to use and conservation). The existing 'silos' are ineffective too - cumulative effects raised by James.
Lack of political leadership to encourage an integrated framework.
Not having a mechanism for collaborative approaches in the policy framework.
Fragmented legislative and agency response. They do it better overseas.
EEZ legislation not useful for strategic management of the oceans.
Adversarial approaches to oceans issues.
Disjointedness between scales of management and ecological processes.
Cross-sector conflicts.
Lack of collaboration between management agencies.
Lack of baseline info: habitat maps, stock-takes, species distributions/abundances.
So many Crown agencies administering so much different legislation = non-integrated.
Fragmentation of laws
Environmental education teaches fragments not the whole picture and interconnections and social as well as environmental and cultural implications.
Lack of integration between terrestrial framework decisions and implications for ocean.
Cumulative effects only when at point that breaks the camel's back - need precautionary approach.
Lack of monitoring.
Lack of public understanding.
Lack of agreed, prioritised and measured environmental baselines for marine/ocean environment.
Quota management system ineffective.

Need to integrate natural biodiversity use more effectively.
"Language" such as protection is limiting.
Preparing (and creating policy for) climate change / ocean acidification - is policy 'durable' in this context? Adaptive management.
Need monitoring and measurement (research investment) so that we can measure changes.
EEZ is missed opportunity.
Quota management, especially in regards to Ross Sea.
Land based water management and flow-on effects to marine environment.
Governments, and especially the current one, work to exclude voices of those who can rationally argue alternatives and other solutions. This government also discredits and denigrates international expertise and research that conflicts with their ideology.
Education and public sharing and discussion of knowledge to create a collaborative (and agreed = durable) robust framework for management as well as or including "hands-off" oceanic wilderness areas.
Oceans less visible than on-land conservation areas?
No "whole of govt" approach and no proactivity, only compliance. Current "framework" is siloed between govt agencies and policies so extraction and dredging (mining/drilling etc) not considered in healthy oceans policy.
Research is considered as largely finished - policy makers want models and solutions before system completely understood.
The current government's economic policy goals trumping environmental protection and climate change considerations, i.e. encouraging coal mining and oil drilling activities.
New Zealand govt inviting overseas companies to exploit our natural resources.
A compromise is needed but environmental groups and govt don't seem willing to compromise.
No overall objective for oceans and oceans management.
Lack of effective integration between many Acts and ongoing ring-fencing of fisheries (inside the Fisheries Act) whereas other acts often need to consent/concur etc with the Fisheries Act.
Burden on councils to make many high-calibre difficult decisions with inadequate resourcing/expertise and lack of clear national direction.
Competing objectives within acts and amongst/between acts.
Complete void re. effective communication and awareness within and between organisations and with the public.
Industry and partners are at the table (they see the value of the resource) but there is no driving force/mandate/collective will.
Lack of clarity on how the framework works and its content.
Politicised.
Lack of industry input into govt investment of levies.
Lack of precaution.
Lack of limits.

Lack of protection.
Lack of recognition of climate change and ocean acidification.
Lack of certainty for the environment.
Poor public participation and engagement of fisheries and EEZ legislation.
Failure of a poorly concerned EPA.
The BPAs were wrongly constructed, and should be abolished.
We need a marine protection Bill to complement the EEZ law.
The regimes should be horses for courses: matched to the nature, magnitude, spatial scale and duration of effects.
Zoning is for "thick" issues, where there are competing demands: e.g. fisheries. Case-by-case for "thin" issues: e.g. minerals, oil/gas
Better understanding and education needed.
Inadequate mechanisms for cumulative changes. Poor mechanisms for adaptation.
No guidance on allocation of share of externalities from decisions under different statutes.
Inadequate definition or acceptance of responsibility for performance.
Lack of value mapping, mapping ecosystem values, economic and social values. This hampers understanding and improving decisions for trade-offs.
Local depletion.
Too many statutes.
The conversation about a shared goal for our ocean space has not gained traction.
Understanding and recognising and measuring the value of the ocean for all.
Institutions: None at present really do a good job because they don't often think and act beyond concerns about their bottom line.
Challenge is information sharing and short term political carryon effecting long term decision making