



Murray River System: Regional Knowledge Exchange Mulwala Services Club 3 April 2007

Notes from Presentations:

Incentive Delivery

- **Murray CMA** (Alex Knight)
 - 38 veg units
 - wildlife “losers” and “winners”
 - existing programs (landholder incentives), threatened species grants, local government/public lands incentive
 - initiatives (community wildlife survey, “Summit to Slopes Biolink”, Market Based Instruments)
- **North East CMA** (Jeff Taylor)
 - program structured around key assets (land, water, biodiversity)
 - site of delivery mechanisms (direct works, landholder partnerships, grants, MBI/River Tender in Ovens catchment, education, Landcare support)
 - implementation strength is in:
 - the variety of mechanisms;
 - standard of works;
 - capacity bldg (eg Landcare);
 - technical capacity
 - all Landcare groups get base funding to achieve NRM outcomes with 5.2EFT Landcare coordinators who do not manage CMA projects only capacity building
 - weaknesses – not enough public money to ‘fix’; just touches the surface of capacity building; disincentive for achieving multiple outcomes
 - money from gov’t come in “silos” therefore difficult
- **Murrumbidgee CMA** (John Francis)
 - 25 subcatchments of which 12 are of priority
 - design delivery in partnership with Landcare network
 - bulk buying of materials
 - catchment prioritisation done by Rapid Stream Assessment; modelling predicted outcomes based on ecosystem outcome
 - incentive PVP delivery:
 - strengths = on Land Title
 - weaknesses = clunky computer system; requires timely follow up; requires balance between PVP delivery and support
- **North Central CMA** (Aaron Gay)
 - Partnerships, Action, Community, Effectiveness (PACE)
 - past works where done in conjunction with DPI which led to management confusion
 - DPI now is a contractor to CMA (MOU)
 - PACE is trying to remove ‘silos’
 - prior to PACE model, the CMA was struggling to meet Regional Catchment Strategy targets
 - asset based not threat based prioritisation

- **Lower Murray-Darling CMA** (Lesley Palmer)
 - bulk of works are outsourced to external contractors
 - incentive PVPs require a high level of support for landholders to meet the milestone; as such, previous “low” priority projects were brought forward to be able to keep up the momentum and spending on NRM
 - quadruple bottom line (social, eco, environmental, cultural)
 - Ballarat Uni owns Nanya Station (30,000ha) and do all the M&E on the NRM activities
 - partnerships with local government eg Broken Hill storm water works
 - landholder training linked with all people doing works under perpetuity agreements

- **Goulburn Broken CMA** (Wayne Tennant, Tim Barlow, Bec Luckie)
 - CMAs (Vic) have legislative strength eg Catchment & Land Protection Act 1994, Water Act 1989 (to control illegal works and to initiate works instream)
 - MBIs (Greengraze/Bush returns)
 - GB has 3 Implementation Committees- each of which have separate regional NRM plans
 - the greater the landholder contribution, the higher their project priority becomes
 - scientists and landholders are agreeing on what the catchment priorities are
 - property plans for works (GIS based)
 - Local Area Plans (LAP) – bottom up approach; developed over 2yrs with CMA staff; now implementing LAPs after community have prioritised activities

- **South Australia Murray-Darling Basin NRM Region** (Amy Goodman)
 - 2004 NRM Act started
 - traditional incentives (facilitated by local action groups) and auction/tender based incentives
 - 11 local action groups across catchment
 - strong community ownership of incentives program
 - big weakness
 - no on-going contractual management to manage funded site
 - compromise between consistent incentives
 - “Bush Bids” tender program (Aust Govt biodiversity funding) where tenderer enters into 10yr agreement

- **Discussion**
 - recognition of history that each CMA has and that of staff history
 - variation in legislative responsibility
 - community are tired of being involved in planning but at the same time don't feel engaged in development
 - securing agreements on Land Title (VIC question)
 - “social capital” can be what secures long term NRM management ie a visit by CMA staff once a year (or every 5 yrs)
 - traditional site/assets recognised as an equal value in stewardship payments
 - MBI trial in VIC (Coragamite CMA)