

Draft Discussion Paper 2015/01
As at Tuesday, 11 August 2015

Proposal for the Creation of an Oceans Institute

Invitation to comment on this paper

Closes Friday, 9 October 2015

Please send feedback to Wendy McGuinness at wmcg@mcguinnessinstitute.org in an email or attached as a PDF or Word document.

This discussion paper is work in progress. It is now open for consultation and wider discussion. Following receipt of feedback, this paper will undergo further review before final copies are sent to a wide range of interested parties such as politicians, iwi and philanthropists and leaders in the public service, industry and NGOs.

About the McGuinness Institute

The McGuinness Institute is a non-partisan think tank working towards a sustainable future, contributing strategic foresight through evidence-based research and policy analysis. *Project 2058* is the Institute's flagship project and includes a research programme that aims to explore New Zealand's long-term future. *Project One Ocean* sits within *Project 2058* – see the Institute's website for more information.

About the authors

Wendy McGuinness is Chief Executive of the McGuinness Institute.

Guy Chisholm holds a BA (Hons) in English from University of Canterbury and a diploma in publishing from Whitireia Polytechnic.

Contact details:

Wendy McGuinness
McGuinness Institute
Level 2, 5 Cable Street
PO Box 24-222, Wellington 6142
Phone: +64 4 499 8888
Email: wmcg@mcguinnessinstitute.org
www.mcguinnessinstitute.org

Background

This paper forms part of the McGuinness Institute's *Project One Ocean*, which explores how New Zealand might best manage its oceans. The Institute has been working on this project since 2012.

In March 2015 the McGuinness Institute released *Report 10: One Ocean: Principles for the stewardship of a healthy and productive ocean*. This report explores the seascape of New Zealand – the past, present and future. It identifies the need for change in the way New Zealand governs its ocean space and the upcoming opportunities and challenges involved.

More specifically, *Report 10* demonstrates why sound public policy for ocean management is difficult to develop at present; the current framework lacks the vision, the principles and the place for experts, citizens and commercial interests to come together. Instead, trade-offs occur around the Cabinet table, leaving busy people to grapple with difficult and complex issues urgently and often without considered guidance. We believe future New Zealanders (and their Pacific neighbours) deserve a more considered, creative and durable approach to ocean management.

A proposed oceans institute

The national oceans policy, the development of which was initiated in July 2000, never eventuated. Other options for governance would be the creation of a 'Ministry for Oceans', a 'minister for oceans' or a 'parliamentary commissioner for oceans'; however, if none of these comes to fruition, we must find ways to progress the management of this public asset for the good of current and future New Zealanders.

The creation of an oceans institute would be a practical way to bring people together to work towards the management of oceans for the good of all New Zealanders. This option is explored in this discussion paper.

On Tuesday, 16 June 2015 the McGuinness Institute hosted a round-table discussion regarding the creation of such an institute. This event saw the meeting of many experts with different experiences and concerns but with a shared interest in the effective management of our oceans space. Notes from this event and subsequent correspondence are documented in the appendices. The people involved in this initiative are listed on the following page.

It should be noted that the McGuinness Institute has reached out to all iwi, providing a copy of *Report 10* and informing them of the proposed oceans institute's development, as it sees the involvement of iwi in improving oceans governance as essential. Responses thus far indicate that this is an initiative that some iwi are interested in pursuing.

Based primarily on the ideas generated during the 16 June 2015 round-table discussion, this discussion paper will address the key points of the proposal as well as making recommendations as to the next steps.

1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this discussion paper is to explore the idea of creating a place and space for a broader policy discussion on oceans governance, namely the creation of an oceans institute. In particular this paper summarises and build upon the key points raised at the round-table discussion, which was hosted by the McGuinness Institute on 16 June 2015. This paper will outline all of the salient points that have been discussed to date, identify a number of discussion points for further consideration and suggest some next steps for moving the dialogue forward.

2.0 Contributors towards the discussion

Listed below are some of the people (along with their organisation/affiliation) who attended the round-table discussion to explore a proposal for an oceans institute or have shown interest in the project. Please note that the opinions documented in this paper are not necessarily endorsed by every person or organisation listed below; rather this paper aims to summarise the diverse range of views and ideas gathered to date and to identify some issues for further discussion.

The points raised during the round table are recorded in the appendices: Appendix 1 is the document *Initial Notes From the One Ocean Round Table: Proposal for a Pacific and Southern Oceans Institute*; Appendix 2 builds on this document – it incorporates feedback we have received since the round table and includes minor edits, and the points have been categorised further to make them clearer.

Lionel Carter*	Victoria University of Wellington
Malcolm Clark*	National Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research
Bronwen Golder*	Pew Charitable Trusts
Pat Helm*	Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
Sue Keith*	Environmental studies graduate/formerly Department of Conservation
Shonagh Kenderdine*	Former Environment Court judge
Ngahuia Leighton*	Antarctic Youth Council/New Zealand Treasury
Scott Macindoe	LegaSea
Ann McCrone	World Wildlife Fund New Zealand
Wendy McGuinness*	McGuinness Institute
Kura Moeahu	Kaiwhakarite for the Parliamentary Service
Tim Naish*	Victoria University of Wellington
Bernie Napp*	Straterra
James Palmer	Ministry for the Environment
Stuart Prior*	Prior Group and Honorary Consul for Belarus in New Zealand
Ray Wood*	Chatham Rock Phosphate Ltd
Karl Woodhead	Royal New Zealand Navy
Bob Zuur*	World Wide Fund New Zealand

*Attended the 16 June 2015 round table at the McGuinness Institute.

3.0 Defining the problem

New Zealand has one of the largest exclusive economic zones (EEZs) in the world, an asset which gives us great opportunity but also great responsibility. The proposed institute would exist to ensure that New Zealand manages this space optimally for the benefit of current and future New Zealanders.

The people who have been involved in the discussion to date have a diverse range of backgrounds and interests; the unifying feature of this group is the shared belief that New Zealand needs to manage its oceans effectively.

Oceans governance is a complex field, and while there are many issues that contribute to its complexity, the 16 June round-table discussion at the McGuinness Institute revealed some high-level points regarding the problems that the proposed institute may solve:

1. New Zealand does not have an overarching national oceans policy, and therefore decisions relating to oceans management are done in an ad hoc manner.
2. Effective leadership is lacking for the kaitiakitanga¹ of New Zealand's oceans. There is no ministry for oceans, minister for oceans or parliamentary commissioner for oceans, and none of these options appear forthcoming.
3. Policy-makers, commercial interests and oceans experts do not communicate effectively at present, creating a log-jam of policy issues on ocean governance.
4. New Zealand's oceans have gained a reputation as an undesirable space for international investment and research (as noted by an NGO and an industry representative).
5. Climate change affects the oceans – both environmentally and commercially – and these threats are not being properly managed.

The 'Why an oceans institute is necessary' section in Appendix 1 details many more issues that have prompted the development of the proposed institute.

4.0 The proposal

The proposal is to establish an independent policy institute for the Pacific and Southern oceans, possibly based in Wellington, New Zealand. The primary function of this institute would be advocacy, and it would focus on delivering evidence-based policy advice to government. Ultimately, the institute would exist for the public good, and as such must act for the benefit of all New Zealanders.

¹ Kaitiakitanga can be interpreted as trust, guardianship or stewardship.

Below is an outline of the proposed purpose of an oceans institute:

The oceans institute will develop slow, reflective, creative and relevant public policy on ocean governance for consideration by parliamentarians, policy analysts and the wider public. In doing so, it will adopt the concepts of:

Applying hindsight, insight and foresight:

- enabling durable public policy to develop that builds on the lessons, values and goals of past, particularly those of iwi;
- utilising existing and emerging instruments, institutions and information; and
- identifying emerging issues on the horizon so that slow, reflective and proactive policy develops before private parties invest significantly – ideally allowing policy to develop before or at least alongside economic demand and technological advancements.

Adopting inclusiveness and transparency:

- applying a principle-based approach for the guardianship of a healthy and productive ocean;
- engaging with all stakeholders, including iwi, academics, commercial interests, the New Zealand Navy, NGOs and other parties interested in using, researching and protecting the oceans so that all views are heard and considered;
- gathering, coordinating, assimilating and reporting on emerging academic data, information and scientific knowledge regarding the state of the oceans. It will do this by building relationships with academic national and international organisations;
- informing and engaging with the general public on the challenges and opportunities existing within the ocean environment; and
- strengthening international relationships, showcasing an open and inclusive approach to ocean governance.

Importantly, the oceans institute will not:

- undertake its own scientific research (it can only make suggestions on areas where research is lacking).
- accept any funds or services from groups, such as industry or NGOs that have strings attached (it must remain independent).
- operate as a decision-making body (a policy thinker – it can only make suggestions).

At this stage it is unknown what structure the institute would take and who would be involved, but it is proposed that the institute involve an array of stakeholders and promote a multidisciplinary approach. Unlike the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, who looks at environmental issues,² the

² 'The functions of the PCE are drawn from the [Environment Act 1986](#) (S.16), and the Commissioner has wide discretion to exercise them. They include

- Review the system of agencies and processes set up by the Government to manage the country's resources, and report to the House of Representatives
- Investigate the effectiveness of environmental planning and management by public authorities, and advise them on remedial action
- Investigate any matter where the environment may be or has been adversely affected, advise on preventative measures or remedial action, and report to the House
- Report, on a request from the House or any select committee, on any petition, Bill, or any other matter which may have a significant effect on the environment
- Inquire, on the direction of the House, into any matter that has had or may have a substantial and damaging effect on the environment
- Undertake and encourage the collection and dissemination of information about the environment
Encourage preventive measures and remedial actions to protect the environment.

See <http://www.pce.parliament.nz/about-us/functions-and-powers/#Powers>

oceans institute would look at all issues relating to the whole domain: commercial, environmental and social. That will be its major strength – creating a place and space for a discussion about one of New Zealand’s major public assets.

The suggested institute names of ‘Kupe Pacific and Southern Oceans Institute’ or ‘Kupe Oceans Institute’ have been met with wide approval thus far, as Kupe is a strong symbol with regard to New Zealand’s oceans. Kupe is also widely considered a tapu historical figure, so this name could not be used without the permission of relevant iwi.

5.0 Specific objectives of an oceans institute

It is important that the proposed institute acts with ‘one voice’ and shows consistency in its approach, although it is currently in the nascent stages of development and its scope is yet to be refined. Based on the ideas that saw some consensus from those involved in this initiative, the McGuinness Institute considers the following to be the key objectives of an oceans institute. For further details, please see the appendices, which contain the notes from the 16 June 2015 round table and provides a broader context for the points below.

The six objectives identified to date are listed as follows and discussed in more detail below:

1. Inform and advocate on behalf of the public.
2. Become a credible and reliable source of information for oceans policy and decisions – creating a bridge between oceans experts (including scientists, academics and those in industry) and public servants.
3. Collaborate with a diverse range of national stakeholders, including industry, government, CRIs, NGOs, universities, iwi and the public, and also international stakeholders, particularly industry and NGOs.
4. Encourage activity from international investors and researchers.
5. Challenge the perceived dichotomy of environment vs economy and promote sustainable commercial activity.
6. Maintain independence and be non-partisan and apolitical.

Objective 1: Inform and advocate on behalf of the public.

To be successful, an oceans institute would:

- a) engage in two-way communication and ensure political engagement with oceans management happens at every level by providing sound, clear and easily-accessible information regarding oceans (for example, success in the future might be for all political parties to develop a comprehensive oceans policy prior to the 2017 elections).
- b) speak in plain language and be a transparent organisation;
- c) create some mechanism or mechanisms that inform New Zealanders and increase public interest in our oceans; and
- d) find innovative or entertaining ways of bringing the oceans to the public; e.g. collaborating with organisations such as Weta Workshop and using virtual tools.

Objective 2: Become a credible and reliable source of information for oceans policy and decisions – creating a bridge between oceans experts (including scientists, academics and those in industry) and public servants.

To be successful, an oceans institute would:

- a) establish a strong reputation locally, nationally and globally; encourage wide-ranging views;
- b) deliver quality and relevant work early on, as the credibility of an institute will be judged by its initial achievements;
- c) look at how things are being done internationally but also be innovative and become an example worldwide for effective oceans management;
- d) provide officials and ministers with high-quality information and opinions to help shape policy; and
- e) establish more effective channels for communication and stronger relationships between public servants and oceans experts.

Objective 3: Collaborate with a diverse range of national stakeholders, including industry, government, CRIs, NGOs, universities, iwi and the public, and also international stakeholders, particularly industry and NGOs.

To be successful, an oceans institute would:

- a) take a multidisciplinary approach, accessing expertise and knowledge from a range of fields;
- b) promote a cross-sector approach towards oceans management within government;
- c) encourage a more holistic view of our marine environment; and
- d) engage meaningfully with Māori and Pasifika.

Objective 4: Encourage activity from international investors and researchers.

To be successful, an oceans institute would:

- a) promote New Zealand as a fair, consistent (minimising uncertainty) and prosperous place to do business;
- b) promote innovation in oceans management and give New Zealand the chance to receive attention on the global stage;
- c) acknowledge and promote that New Zealand universities and CRIs are already contributing world-class research in various areas of oceans studies; and
- d) build the mana of New Zealand and alter our restrictive international reputation (as noted by industry and NGOs alike).

Objective 5: Challenge the perceived dichotomy of environment vs economy and promote sustainable commercial activity.

To be successful, an oceans institute would:

- a) promote sustainable economic activity – advocate for exploitative endeavours that can be maintained in the long term;
- b) provide rigorous evidence-based policy advice in order to carry out the previous point; and
- c) avoid being viewed as an environmental lobby group.

Objective 6: Maintain independence and be non-partisan and apolitical.

To be successful, an oceans institute would:

- a) be independently funded. Prevent the institute's direction being dictated by financial sources.
- b) ensure a code of ethics is introduced as part of the institute's establishment;
- c) plan to a realistic budget (as the institute is not conducting scientific research, there is no need for a significant investment); and
- d) be open-minded and inclusive.

6.0 Next steps

The McGuinness Institute will be sending this draft out to a range of potential parties to stress test assumptions, to gauge the level of support, and if this proposal does have value, to identify ideas on how an oceans institute might best come to fruition. We also plan to meet with a range of parties to explore this idea, or other ideas, around ocean governance later this year.

The successful establishment of an oceans institute will hinge on engagement with a wide range of people. This paper invites comments on all the following but is not limited to these questions:

1. Is it true that there is currently no place for a multidisciplinary cross-sectorial discussion on ocean governance (Section 3 above)? Does a policy gap exist? If yes, would an ocean institute fill this gap?
2. Is the purpose statement (described in the blue box in Section 4 above) concise, complete and useful? If no, how could it be improved?
3. Are the six objectives set out in Section 5 above useful? How could these be improved?
4. Who would lead the institute? How could such leadership incorporate all of the objectives set out in Section 5?
5. Who would fund the institute? How would the institute maintain non-partisanship and independence once funded?
6. How would CRIs and universities engage/support/complement such an oceans institute? How can the institute best utilise/support their knowledge and expertise?
7. Would the recreational fishing industry be happy to engage/support the establishment of an oceans institute?
8. Would the commercial fishing industry and exploitative industries engage/support the establishment of an oceans institute?
9. How best could an oceans institute meaningfully engage with Māori and Pasifika?
10. How best could an oceans institute meaningfully engage with international parties?

In 2016, we would like to set up a small establishment group to take the initiative forward and address the potential structure, membership, funding and operating policies for the proposed ocean institute. In addition to the list in Section 2, we would like to talk with a number of other parties such as the Ministry of Transport and Maritime New Zealand. If you are aware of other stakeholders we should be talking with, please contact us. Please note feedback closes Friday, 9 October 2015.

Appendix 1: Initial Notes From the One Ocean Round Table: Proposal for a Pacific and Southern Oceans Institute

See this document attached as the following page.

DRAFT

Why

a Pacific & Southern Oceans Institute is necessary

1. We do not have the necessary structures in place to manage the range of complex issues we have to face.
2. We do not have the broad-ranging spectrum of skills, knowledge or legislation – there is no durable platform for guardianship of this resource.
3. There is an opportunity for NZ to do something on the global stage, with scale and creativity.
4. Develop principles and guidelines to help decision-makers – future ocean watch.
5. Focus on strategy in policy development – connecting policy and good practice. Evidence-based policy is key (eg Sustainable Seas), but it should not all be about scientific research.
6. Speak up for research. NZ's ocean space is large, but the number of people who manage the oceans is small. We don't know much about it, and we don't know how it will change. Climate warming is ocean warming.
7. Independent role is a political imperative: transparency, accountability and responsibility. Independent funding is also vital, but current system of funding creates competition between players, possibly not delivering best outcomes for oceans governance.
8. Huge gap in political leadership – difficult to gain consensus over time (eg fresh water over the last 10 years) – does there need to be a pressure group? Land and Water Forum aimed to develop interface between science and policy, but could this work over oceans where boundaries, responsibilities and accountabilities are even less clear?
9. Integration – lacking one ocean concept – yes there is some 'bottom-up' traction, but there has been a consistent lack of top-down leadership – not top-down/different perspectives – need consistent voice.
10. Conveying power – need institution for public good – active constituency. Communications usually promote self-interest – need info that is purely for public good. Need an institution with little or no self-interest – non-partisan.
11. 'Never going to be easier than now.' Issues are becoming

How

to bring an institute into being
(Note: Requires further discussion)

1. Not costly and not too grand – cost-effective. Ideally exist within the normal government framework. For example, establishing a Parliamentary Commissioner for Oceans.
2. You would need legislation to bring about a Parliamentary Commissioner for Oceans, and presumably you would want it to be a govt bill.
3. Have a mandate, terms of reference, relevance, goals, funding mechanisms, etc.
4. Be apolitical.
5. Dual approach – has cross-sectoral/industry support but also needs public support too.
6. Must have tight time frame (deliverable outputs).
7. Long-term funding provided – but many options – including
8. (i) Parliamentary Commissioner for Oceans, (ii) dividing/regrouping e.g. small portion from NIWA and other relevant CRIs, (iii) working with other major countries investing in oceans – USA, Russia, Germany, China, etc; (iv) working with philanthropists.
8. Must have autonomy.
9. Must be open to engage with all political parties.
10. Cross-sectoral approach.
11. Develop a name and purpose for the Institute in Māori that resonates with our history and our future (such as Kūpe Pacific and Southern Oceans Institute).
12. Facilitate dialogue – not about the science. Dialogue is less expensive than research.
13. Look at how things are being done internationally.

1. An informed society that understand the challenges and opportunities facing our ocean. New Zealanders valuing oceans – currently it doesn't mean much to us – like Antarctica. Need an effective interface.
2. A small and dynamic group of experts that understand the challenges and opportunities facing our ocean. They also have skills in communicating complex scientific analysis.
3. The proposed institute promotes the use of plain language. If talking to interest groups – they should focus on the people who really matter.
4. Diverse stakeholders, such as iwi, industry and NGOs, want to work together in an integrated manner and then communicate to all. It should advocate for slow, proactive, evidence-based, considered public policy rather than creating fast, reactive policy tools.
5. A small, tight, focused, reliable, secure institution exists. It should not over promise, particularly in its early days. It should have independent funding and political sponsorship (i.e. not left to flounder along).
6. International parties want to work here! Fund here! What's interesting to other countries? Authenticity, credibility – doing interesting things – showcasing how to integrate nation states

12. Education around oceans governance – we need an informed ocean constituency that can communicate options and consequences of actions (or no actions). Provide clarity over the choices we as a society face.
13. A public good organisation will reduce the burden/load on NGOs – we don't have to dilute agencies' roles and responsibilities. Bring together an existing fragmented process; develop targets that can lead to real results – working independently or together towards common goals.
14. Currently no vehicle exists in society to help engage/inform/make a decision 'by society'. There is no mechanism to bring about a range of different options for consideration. For example, we have so many mechanisms in regard to land but very few public mechanisms with ocean governance. On land, anyone can join in with councils – no equivalent for oceans.
15. Connecting transport, defence, fisheries and minerals in ocean governance (connecting the dots).
16. Navigation of our seas is a significant part of our history (eg Kūpe, Cook).

Risks

acting as obstacles to its establishment

1. Keep scope small and tight, tightly focused.
2. Must have in place a public engagement process.
3. Everything is in the public domain – open data.
4. Set out context and assumptions clearly.
5. Tackle false dichotomy of environment vs economy – and find common goals.
6. Not aiming to come up with an overall solution but putting in place a process that
6. Inability to guess what stakeholders want.
7. Getting big too quickly – risk being swamped.
8. Funding disappearing.
9. Overpromising and under delivering Culture/different environment.
10. How do we get people excited about the oceans?
11. Easily ignored by government (or could become a political football).

15. During the 2017 elections – every political party produces a fully formed oceans policy that responds to values of NZers.
16. Responds quickly and sharply to emerging global opportunities and risks.
17. Explain why NZ is or is not acting. Frame discussions – are we using the best?
18. Not act or be seen as an environmental lobby group but an advocate for good ocean governance. Avoid 'green' image.
19. It acts with one voice (not competing interests).
20. Know to use quality evidence-based info (why NZ has good reputation). Seen as serious enough, has mana locally, nationally and globally.
21. Clear communication – has a mandate, credibility, relevance, vision, measurable goals, feedback loops, terms of reference, funding, etc.
22. Political engagement exists at all levels – MPs understand the

What

success would look like

17. Our responsibilities under the Antarctic Treaty System.
18. The Pacific and Southern oceans are very interrelated – you cannot draw lines in the ocean.
19. Experts are unsure what bureaucrats are doing.
20. Decreasing interest in New Zealand from both international NGOs (funding) and overseas commercial interests (investment) as nothing much happening. There has been a noticeable decrease in recent years.
21. Government won't care until it is an issue that will get them voted out.
22. This institute could fill a political void.
23. Speed up the policy process; it is not always a win/lose situation – solutions are not necessary expensive – conflict does not always exist.
24. We are reasonably good at coastline but not deep sea ocean research and management.
25. New Zealanders are using the oceans more and more.

How

such an institute would operate in practice
(Note: Requires further discussion)

1. Keep scope small and tight, tightly focused.
2. Must have in place a public engagement process.
3. Everything is in the public domain – open data.
4. Set out context and assumptions clearly.
5. Tackle false dichotomy of environment vs economy – and find common goals.
6. Not aiming to come up with an overall solution but putting in place a process that
7. Working with the scale – few people/big ocean (put a few people into battle).
8. Not a decision-maker but advocate informed choices/options.
9. Multidisciplinary approach is good: legal, science, policy, advocacy, academic, environmental protection, economic development, cultural interests and global connections.

23. Obtains support/buy-in from senior officials, universities + CRIs.
24. Develops links with modern tools; for example, creating virtual access – Weta/James Cameron.
25. Has a role of exploring the future – like the 'Centre for Advanced Engineering' in Chel.
26. Durable over the long term. No borders over long time frame – has to live beyond political timelines and geographical boundaries.
27. Has gained public support and engagement. Has developed a way of working – a clever process – that is transparent, logical and is trusted.
28. Commercial sectors noticing impact on shellfish, salmon farming and fishing changing (possibly due to change in currents and warming of sea). Commercial sectors need something to happen.
29. The proposed governance body creating an innovative structure that fills the gaps of historic approaches.
30. Learning from a thorough analysis of the Land and Water Forum process.
31. Having a code of ethics.

Appendix 2: Notes from the 16 June oceans round table

Below are the key points put forward at the round-table discussion (as documented in *Initial Notes From the One Ocean Round Table: Proposal for a Pacific and Southern Oceans Institute* [Appendix 1]) and from subsequent correspondence.

Please note that these points represent a range of opinions and as such do not provide, nor are they intended to provide, a unified approach to improving oceans management. These ideas are shared with the intention of invoking discussion that will further the process of establishing a Pacific and Southern oceans institute.

Why an oceans institute is necessary

During the round table and subsequent correspondence the following points were identified to illustrate why a Pacific and Southern oceans institute is necessary:

1. General issues:
 - a) There is a need for an independent institute to provide evidence-based policy for the betterment of conservation and use of New Zealand's marine environment.
 - b) Ninety-five per cent of New Zealand is underwater. New Zealand is fortunate in having sovereign rights and responsibilities over one of the largest ocean areas in the world, and so its national culture and prosperity will inevitably have an increasing marine orientation.
 - c) Independent funding is vital, but the current system of funding for oceans research and governance creates competition between players, possibly not delivering the best outcomes for oceans governance.
2. Governance and political issues:
 - a) Making changes to the way New Zealand governs its oceans is never going to be easier than now, as issues are becoming more complex and interrelated and New Zealanders are using the oceans more and more.
 - b) New Zealand does not have the necessary structures in place to manage the range of complex issues it has to face.
 - c) New Zealand does not have the broad-ranging spectrum of skills, knowledge or legislation – there is no durable platform for guardianship of this research.
 - d) New Zealand needs to develop principles and guidelines to help decision-makers.
 - e) New Zealand's ocean space is large, but the number of people managing the oceans is small.
 - f) There is a huge gap in political leadership – making it difficult to gain consensus over time. This has been evident through issues surrounding fresh water over the last 10 years, where the Land and Water Forum aimed to develop an interface between science and policy. Questions arise over whether this framework could be applied to oceans, where boundaries, responsibilities and accountabilities are even less clear.
 - g) Things are not integrated; the 'one ocean' concept is lacking. There may have been some 'bottom-up' traction, but there has been a consistent lack of top-down leadership. Cross-sectoral collaboration is vital to connect the way we manage transport, defence, fisheries, minerals and all other oceans activities and concerns.
 - h) The Pacific and Southern oceans are very interrelated – you cannot draw lines in the ocean. Therefore, a more holistic approach is necessary.
 - i) New Zealand is reasonably good at coastline ocean management but not deep sea ocean management.

- j) New Zealand needs to fulfil its responsibilities under the Antarctic Treaty System.
 - k) The institute could fill the political void that currently exists around oceans management.
 - l) The institute could bring together an existing fragmented process. We need to develop targets that can lead to real results – working independently or together towards common goals.
 - m) An independent role is a political imperative, providing transparency, accountability and responsibility.
3. Policy:
- a) New Zealand needs to focus on strategy in policy development – connecting policy and good practice. Evidence-based policy is key (e.g. Sustainable Seas), but it should not all be about scientific research.
 - b) New Zealand needs to speed up the policy process; it is not always a win/lose situation. Solutions are not necessarily expensive, and conflict does not always exist.
 - c) New Zealand needs more transparency in the public service and communication with oceans experts – both science and industry. Experts are unsure what bureaucrats are doing, and bureaucrats have little access to experts.
 - d) The institute could provide officials and ministers with a single reliable source of information and opinion to help shape policy.
4. Science and research:
- a) New Zealand needs to speak up for research. Not much is known about its oceans space, and it is not known how it will change. Climate change includes the warming of the oceans.
 - b) Policy that is grounded in good research is key.
 - c) New Zealand is reasonably good at coastline ocean research but not deep sea ocean research.
5. Society:
- a) Government won't care until it is an issue that will get them voted out. Therefore, the lack of public interest in oceans management is a key issue.
 - b) New Zealand needs an institution that is non-partisan and acts with little or no self-interest. Communications usually promote self-interest; New Zealanders need information purely for the public good.
 - c) Currently no vehicle exists to help engage and inform society and to make a decision 'by society'. For example, New Zealand has so many mechanisms with regard to land but very few public mechanisms with ocean governance. For land, anyone can join in with councils; however, there is no equivalent for oceans.
 - d) Education around oceans governance needs to be improved. New Zealand needs an informed ocean constituency that can communicate options and consequences of actions (or no actions). Leaders need to provide clarity over the choices New Zealand as a society faces.
 - e) Navigation of the seas is a significant part of our history (e.g. Kupe and Cook).
 - f) A public good organisation will reduce the burden/load on NGOs – the institute doesn't have to dilute agencies' roles and responsibilities.
6. International relations and opportunities:
- a) There has been decreasing interest in New Zealand from both international NGOs (funding) and overseas commercial interests (investment), as nothing much happening. There has been a noticeable decrease of interest in recent years. Increasing international interest is a key issue.
 - b) There is an opportunity for New Zealand to do something on the global stage, with scale and creativity.

What success would look like

During the round table and subsequent correspondence the following points were identified to indicate what success would look like for a Pacific and Southern oceans institute:

7. General issues:

- a) The institute obtains support/buy-ins from senior officials, universities and Crown research institutes.
- b) Action is taken regarding the commercial sectors, as they are noticing impacts on shellfish, salmon farming and fishing (possibly due to change in currents and warming of sea).
- c) The institute learns from a thorough analysis of the Land and Water Forum process.
- d) The institute looks at why previous formulations of New Zealand oceans policy have failed. Answering this question will help to define the basic requirements for a new policy institute.

8. The institute's image and position:

- a) The institute is not seen as an environmental lobby group but as an advocate for good oceans governance. It avoids the 'green' image.
- b) The institute is independent and credible. It is seen as serious enough and has mana locally, nationally and globally.
- c) The institute acts with one voice (not competing interests).
- d) The institute creates an innovative structure that fills the gaps of historic approaches.
- e) The institute employs a small and dynamic group of experts that understand the challenges and opportunities facing our ocean. They also have skills in communicating complex scientific analysis. It has the ability to bring in experts from various fields as necessary.
- f) The institute advocates for proactive, evidence-based, considered public policy rather than creating fast, reactive operational policy tools.
- g) The institute is a small, tight, focused, reliable, secure institution. It will not overpromise, particularly in its early days.
- h) The institute has independent funding and political sponsorship (i.e. not left to flounder along).
- i) The institute has a code of ethics.
- j) The institute is Wellington-based and thus attracts politicians and political leverage to Wellington (national weight and leverage globally).
- k) The institute sits well beside creative industries and develops links with modern tools; for example, creating virtual access to the oceans through Weta Workshop or James Cameron. This idea has not yet been discussed with either of these two entities.
- l) The institute has a role of exploring the future – like the Centre for Advanced Engineering in Christchurch.
- m) The institute is durable over the long term and is not encumbered by political timeframes or geographical boundaries.

9. Communication:

- a) Diverse stakeholders, such as iwi, industry and NGOs, want to work together in an integrated manner and then communicate to all.
- b) The institute promotes the use of plain language and thus communicates clearly. It has a mandate, credibility, relevance, vision, measurable goals, feedback loops, terms of reference, funding, etc.
- c) If talking to interest groups, the institute focuses on the people who have real power or influence.

10. The institute involves:
 - a) Iwi/Crown collaboration;
 - b) Public/private collaboration;
 - c) Local, national and international collaboration; and
 - d) A non-partisan approach to oceans governance.

11. Governance and political issues:
 - a) The institute allows for political engagement at all levels.
 - b) The institute ensures that MPs understand the conflicts and commonalities that exist before policy documents are placed before Cabinet.
 - c) The institute assists every political party in producing a fully formed oceans policy that responds to the values of New Zealanders during the 2017 elections.

12. Science and research:
 - a) The institute produces world-class research.
 - b) The institute registers public assets/commodities/resources in the ocean domain.
 - c) The institute is known for using quality evidence-based information. This in turn protects New Zealand's reputation in this field.

13. Society:
 - a) The institute helps develop an informed society that understands the challenges and opportunities facing our ocean.
 - b) The institute creates an effective interface to develop an appreciation for oceans by all New Zealanders valuing oceans – currently oceans do not mean much to us – like Antarctica.
 - c) The institute engages with Pacific island states: their issues, challenges and opportunities.
 - d) The institute explains why New Zealand is or is not acting on specific issues. It frames discussions and asks: are we using the best?
 - e) The institute gains public support and engagement. It develops a way of working – a clever process – that is transparent, logical and trustworthy.

14. International relations and opportunities:
 - a) The institute attracts international parties who want to work and fund initiatives here. The institute interests other countries through authenticity, credibility, undertaking interesting projects and showcasing how to integrate nation states around the world.
 - b) The institute helps New Zealand's mana and take away from partisanship.
 - c) The institute allows people to put money on the table and let New Zealand do something big.
 - d) New Zealand's oceans programme is seen as the equivalent of a space programme.
 - e) The institute becomes an example of how to bring nations together to work on shared, complex problems.
 - f) The institute responds quickly and sharply to emerging global opportunities and risks.

How to bring such an institute into being

During the round table and subsequent correspondence the following points regarding how to bring a Pacific and Southern oceans institute into being were identified:

15. Ways to bring the institute into being:

- a) The institute must have long-term funding. There are many options for this, including (i) establishing a parliamentary commissioner for oceans, (ii) dividing/regrouping, e.g. a small portion from NIWA and other relevant CRIs, (iii) working with other major countries investing in oceans: USA, Russia, Germany, China, etc. and (iv) working with philanthropists.
- b) The institute must be cost-effective. It could exist within the normal government framework. Legislation would be required to bring about a parliamentary commissioner for oceans, and this would ideally be in the form of a government bill.
- c) The institute must have a mandate, terms of reference, relevance, goals, funding mechanisms, etc.
- d) The institute must be apolitical; it must be open to engage with all political parties. It must also encourage wide-ranging views.
- e) The institute must take a dual approach – it must have cross-sectoral/industry support, but it also needs public support.
- f) The institute must set tight time frames (i.e. deliverable outputs).
- g) The institute must act autonomously.
- h) The institute must take a cross-sectoral approach.
- i) The institute must develop a name and purpose in Māori that resonates with our history and our future (such as Kupe Pacific and Southern Oceans Institute).
- j) The institute must look at how things are being done internationally. (Once the institute is operational and begins innovating, it could become an example for the international community to look at to see how things are done.)

How such an institute would operate in practice

During the round table and subsequent correspondence the following points regarding how a Pacific and Southern oceans institute would operate in practice have been identified:

16. Ways that the institute would operate:

- a) The institute operates using the five 'I's: it is an Independent, Informed, Inclusive and Involved Institute.
- b) The institute's scope is kept small and tight – tightly focused.
- c) The institute's context and assumptions are set out clearly.
- d) The institute has in place a public engagement process.
- e) The institute adopts a policy where everything is in the public domain – open data.
- f) The institute tackles the false dichotomy of environment vs economy and finds common goals.
- g) The institute does not aim to come up with an overall solution but puts in place a dynamic process that works and can be maintained.
- h) The institute works with the scale. There are few people within the institute but the oceans are expansive, so the institute puts a few specialised people into battle.
- i) The institute is not a decision-maker but advocates informed choices and options.
- j) The institute takes a multidisciplinary approach: legal, science, policy, advocacy, academic, environmental protection, economic development, cultural interests and global connections.
- k) The institute facilitates dialogue and does not make it all about the science. Dialogue is less expensive than research.

Risks acting as obstacles to its establishment

During the round table and subsequent correspondence the following points were identified to indicate what risks may act as obstacles to the establishment of a Pacific and Southern oceans institute:

17. Risks:

- a) Sourcing independent funding and maintaining funding if received.
- b) Having a mandate that is linked to funding – e.g. if philanthropists fund it, will they be in charge?
- c) Conflicting interests stagnating progress.
- d) A sole focus on research (e.g. NIWA does this).
- e) Finding officials (departments) to support it and to support action.
- f) The inability to guess what stakeholders want.
- g) Getting big too quickly – the institute may risk being swamped.
- h) Overpromising and under-delivering.
- i) Difficulty getting people excited about the oceans.
- j) Being ignored by government (or becoming a political football).
- k) Being open to government influence (if the proposed institute were to take form through the establishment of a parliamentary commissioner for oceans, then this would be partially government funded and therefore open to government influence).
- l) Not learning from the past (previous formulations of New Zealand oceans policy have failed; without learning from the past, the institute may make similar mistakes).