

Annex 5

Plausible indicators for the NVF Vision

Annex 5 : Plausible indicators for the NVF Vision

| NVF Vision | Plausible process indicators | Comments on Progress |
|---|---|---|
| A reversal in the long term decline in the extent and quality of native vegetation | Planning undertaken. | There is no total overview linking various components under a cohesive and co-ordinated planning approach, although nearing that ideal in some areas. There are 3 Ministers under the NHT secretariat. Have regional plans that go to the level of identifying projects of maximum benefit in the region and are integrated into regional planning frameworks. There are many initiatives and the Native Vegetation Scheme is the closest to meeting the needs of the NVF vision in the state. |
| | Plans resourced and being implemented | Funding is opportunity driven as evidenced by the Interim Natural Resource Management legislation (not at implementation stage). Catchment Board plans are resourced and implemented. Biodiversity has always been the poor cousin of NLP, therefore in the past they have not had the basic information layer as the basis for good planning and decision-making. To put things on an even keel, need 4X as much funding for Bushcare as NLP. Now is the right time to integrate plans of different departments and divisions, as there is a good basic information layer in place on biodiversity. Funding is dependent on NHT for many initiatives other than standard legislative background planning. Applications require references to links with other regional biodiversity plans. The devolved grants process is well developed in SA and at the stage to determine if cost-sharing is right. |
| | People with knowledge and skills required | State is getting a clearer vision of what it is trying to achieve. Staff are well trained and experienced but there are limitations imposed by funding. |
| | Monitoring and evaluation of all aspects leading to revision of plans | Regional biodiversity plans are supposed not to be static documents, with success evaluated over 5 year timeframe in terms of implementation. Statistics are collected in a number of areas but not adequately evaluated and not linked with performance indicators, targets or benchmarking in a direct manner. |
| Goals | | |
| Conservation and where appropriate, restoration of native vegetation to maintain and enhance biodiversity, protect water quality and conserve soil resources, including on private land managed for agriculture, forestry and urban development | Native vegetation is protected by effective clearing controls on all land | This is the case statewide. Recently controls on certain classes of urban trees have been implemented. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Programs in place to restore, where appropriate, native vegetation to maintain/enhance biodiversity and protect land and water resources on private/ all land | Yes, but the state does not have low entry level programs for private conservation (eg Land for Wildlife). There is a need for multiple levels for people to enter at the level they feel comfortable (Land for Wildlife, Sanctuary, Heritage Agreement), and a package of programs with environmental outcomes that people can be directed to. |
| | Programs and measures in place to encourage development and adoption of best management practices for native vegetation management in agricultural, forest and urban enterprises | Yes: Bush Management Advisors, threatened species habitat recovery, mid North Grasslands Working Group, Operation Bounceback, Heritage Agreement management program, development of weed risk assessment procedures, PMP for peri-urban land owners. There are gaps (eg no protection for dead habitat trees – need to develop educational programs). ForestrySA did not have input to the Work Plan. |
| | Appropriate monitoring and assessment programs are in place to detect change in native vegetation quantity and geographic extent | The Native Vegetation Act requires accountability and reporting on what has been approved, but there is no evaluation. There is a will to monitoring & evaluation of Heritage Agreements. M & E is built in to look at outputs not outcomes regionally. Threatened species have good measuring sticks on a national basis. Superficial satellite based National audit in 90-95 showed no major change in SA, but there was no real integration of habitat quality into that. NLWRA is trying to come up with best practice quality assessment. Monitoring programs in place but do not look at change. Important part of monitoring is looking at trend data, but linkages to management plans are not being made although the National Parks Consultative Committee now wants to review all research to summarise outcomes and provide direction linked with plans. Better links between research and direction are needed. |
| Retention and enhancement of biodiversity and native vegetation at both regional and national levels | Appropriate environment protection policies and measures are in place to protect biodiversity at regional and national levels | Yes: Native Vegetation clearance controls, threatened species recovery programs, implementation of Pastoral Land Management Act and other state Acts. |
| | Biodiversity and native vegetation targets are set and measures are in place to achieve those targets at both regional and national levels | Set at the gross level under CARRS (strategic purchase), target areas for Heritage Agreements (where CARRS not covered). High biological value ranking system is used to determine priorities. |
| | Appropriate monitoring and assessment programs are in place to detect change in native vegetation biodiversity | Quality is not generally assessed except in the case of new areas from now on. There is some Heritage Agreement land monitoring. Any new areas purchased have a monitoring program planned from the start. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| An improvement in the condition of existing native vegetation | Policies and programs are in place to manage native vegetation to conserve condition as well as cover- through duty of care; native vegetation covenants, partnerships etc | Yes – Heritage Agreements. Not all run by government (eg Coorong Local Action Planning Group, Bush for Life sites, landcare groups) |
| | Policies and programs are in place to restore native vegetation quality where appropriate | Regional Biodiversity Plans set the framework. A program for pre-European vegetation mapping is in place as basis. Other programs: remnant-linking corridors, grazing removal from HA, some on-park programs, Rangelands. Devolved process community programs. |
| | Appropriate monitoring and assessment programs are in place to detect change in native vegetation quality | Some in monitoring sites and reference areas in Rangelands, but generally, no overall monitoring program in place. |