



Final Report

**Jurisdiction Report -
Tasmania**

**National Framework
for the
Management and
Monitoring of
Australia's Native
Vegetation**

**Prepared for
Environment Australia
November 2000**

URS

in association with

Griffin NTFM ACN 008 471 121



URS Australia Pty Ltd

ACN 000-691-690

7 – 11 Barry Drive, TURNER ACT 2612, Australia

Tel: +61 (2) 6248 6936 • Fax: +61 (2) 6248 6999

© Commonwealth of Australia 2000

Published by the Department of Environment and Heritage

This work is copyright. Information presented in this document may be reproduced in whole or in part for study or training purposes, subject to the inclusion of acknowledgment of the source and provided no commercial usage or sale of the material occurs. Reproduction for purposes other than those given requires written permission from the Department of Environment and Heritage. Requests for permission should be addressed to Assistant Secretary, Corporate Relations and Information Branch, Environment Australia, GPO Box 787, Canberra, ACT, 2601.

The views expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the Commonwealth of Australia. The Commonwealth does not accept responsibility for any advice or information in relation to this material.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	2
1.1	What is the National Vegetation Framework?.....	1
1.2	Purpose of the Evaluation.....	2
2	Evaluation Approach & Methodology	4
2.1	Evaluation Approach.....	4
2.2	Evaluation Method.....	4
2.3	Tasmania Workshop.....	6
3	Tasmania Work Plan Output	8
3.1	Tasmania Work Plan – Setting the Scene.....	8
3.2	Linking the Work Plan with Key Challenges.....	8
3.3	Measuring Work Plan Success.....	11
3.4	Linking Work Plan Outputs with National Vegetation Framework Desired Outcomes.....	19
3.5	Best Management Practices – Biodiversity Assessment.....	21
3.6	Evaluating Against NVF Vision and Goals.....	23
4	Evaluation of Progress against Work Plan Commitments and the National Framework	27
4.1	Assessment of the Tasmania Work Plan and Implementation.....	27
4.2	Improvements to Tasmania Work Plan.....	27
4.3	Tasmanian Progress against the National Vegetation Framework.....	28
4.4	Ongoing Independent Evaluation Arrangements.....	29
5	Conclusions and Recommendations	30

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Actions Rated Against Key Challenges.....	9
Table 2	Summary of Progress Against Success Measures.....	12
Table 3	Assessing Work Plan Actions against NVF Desired Outcomes.....	19
Table 4	Progress Against Long-Term NVF Goals.....	24
Table 5	New and Revised Key Challenges.....	28

Glossary

Abbreviation/Acronym	Definition
ANZECC	Australia New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council
BD	Biodiversity
BMP	Best Management Practice
CALP	Catchment and Land Protection
CAR	Comprehensive, Adequate and Representative
CMA	Catchment Management Authorities
DPIWE	Department of Primary Industry, Wildlife and Environment
EA	Environment Australia
EPA	Environment Protection Authority
EVC	Ecological Vegetation Classes
FT	Forestry Tasmania
GIS	Geographic Information System
IBRA	Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia
ICM	Integrated Catchment Management
LFW	Land for Wildlife
LGA	Local Government Area
MMM	Management and Monitoring Mechanism
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NVF	National Vegetation Framework
NVI	National Vegetation Inventory
NVR	Native Vegetation Retention
R&D	Research and Development
RFA	Regional Forest Agreement
RMPS	Resource Management and Planning System
RPDC	Resource Planning and Development Commission
SCC	Standing Committee on Conservation
SOE	State of Environment
TOR	Terms of Reference
WP	Work Plan

1 Introduction

1.1 What is the National Vegetation Framework?

In June 1998, ANZECC agreed to the development and implementation of the National Framework for the Management and Monitoring of Australia's Native Vegetation (National Vegetation Framework). The intention of this policy initiative was to provide a unified, multilateral forum through which to pursue improvements to native vegetation management and monitoring.¹

In February 1999, ANZECC Standing Committee on Conservation (SCC) agreed that it would be appropriate to engage an independent consultant to conduct a preliminary assessment of the jurisdictions against the draft National Vegetation Framework. A report was subsequently produced - "Native Vegetation National Overview" – which documented the key challenges for vegetation management and monitoring within each jurisdiction.

For the purpose of the NVF, eight jurisdictions were identified in Australia comprising the 7 states and territories, and the Commonwealth. Following endorsement of the NVF and the jurisdiction interim Work Plans by ANZECC in December 1999, each jurisdiction continued preparation of an interim Work Plan that is considered to be the principal means of implementing the National Vegetation Framework. The Work Plans identified the vegetation management and monitoring activities, time frames for when each activity was to occur, responsibility for implementation of the activities and indicators for measurement of success.

The native vegetation outcomes being sought in the Framework are:²

- a reversal in the long-term decline in the extent and quality of Australia's native vegetation cover by:
 - conserving native vegetation, and substantially reducing land clearing;
 - conserving Australia's biodiversity; and
 - restoring, by means of substantially increased revegetation, the environmental values and productive capacity of Australia's degraded land and water;
- conservation and, where appropriate, restoration of native vegetation to maintain and enhance biodiversity, protect water quality and conserve soil resources, including on private managed land for agriculture, forestry and urban development;
- retention and enhancement of biodiversity and native vegetation at both regional and national levels; and
- an improvement in the condition of existing native vegetation.

¹ Environment Australia, n.d , *Consultancy Brief*, Canberra.

² ANZECC, 1999, National Framework for the Management and Monitoring of Australia's Native Vegetation, ACT.

The more specific vegetation outcomes being sought within the context of integrated natural resource management for the Tasmanian Work Plan are described in Section 3 below.

At the ANZECC July 2000 meeting it was agreed to publicly release the Work Plans. At the commencement of the evaluation in October 2000, the Commonwealth and ACT had publicly released their final version of the Work Plan, with interim work plans available from other jurisdictions.

1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

At the December 1999 meeting, the ANZEC SCC noted that an independent evaluation of progress against the National Vegetation Framework and the fulfilment of Work Plan Commitments should commence mid 2000, with the report presented to the Council at the December 2000 meeting.

ANZECC identified the purpose of the evaluation was 'to assess progress against the National Framework for the Monitoring of Australia's Native Vegetation and fulfilment of the Work Plan commitments' (that were developed by each jurisdiction). Incorporated into the evaluation process was the additional focus of evaluating the appropriateness and effectiveness of the Work Plans for achieving long term sustainable vegetation management. The Terms of Reference for the Evaluation are provided below.

Terms of Reference

A. Assessment of Effectiveness of Work Plans and their Implementation

1. Assess current vegetation management and monitoring practices in jurisdictions against those set out in the respective Work Plans and against best practice.
2. Assess anticipated long term vegetation management and monitoring outcomes against the Work Plans.
3. Assess progress by jurisdictions in meeting the Work Plan success measures within the identified timeframes.

B. Propose Improvements

4. Propose improvements to Work Plan management mechanisms that are feasible, practical and relevant to jurisdictions and take into account best practice. Proposed improvements should be within the context of National Framework objectives.
5. Suggest a process for jurisdictions to review and refine Work Plans on a continuing basis, to provide, amongst other things, for improvements in understanding of how best to achieve best practice native vegetation management.

C. Propose suitable ongoing independent evaluation arrangements

Propose a mechanism and time frame for independent evaluation of Work Plans on an ongoing basis, noting that vegetation management and monitoring activities are to be evaluated against agreed native vegetation outcomes and identified best practice.

D. Assess progress against the National Framework for the Management and Monitoring of Australia's Native Vegetation

Evaluate how far actions in Work Plans enable each jurisdiction to achieve the vision and principles underpinning the National Framework especially the national goal to reverse the long-term decline of native vegetation in Australia.

The evaluation examined the performance of the jurisdiction Work Plans, from the release of NVF by ANZECC in December 1999, until September 2000. Our work examined the vegetation management and monitoring activities undertaken by the lead agencies in each jurisdiction that contribute to the progress of the Work Plan.

The review was implemented within a tight time frame to meet the reporting requirements of ANZECC. State agencies were the primary contributor to the Jurisdiction Work Plan evaluation. Other non-government stakeholders' views were also sought to contribute to the evaluation, but the timetable contributed to a reduced level of interaction by some stakeholders.

2 Evaluation Approach & Methodology

2.1 Evaluation Approach

A central component of the evaluation was to devise an effective method that would allow evaluation of the eight jurisdictions Work Plans in a restricted time frame, while still allowing for jurisdiction input and discussion. The following provides a description of the approach employed for the evaluation, and method used to evaluate the jurisdiction Work Plans. The approach to the evaluation consisted of the following :

- **Team meeting to confirm evaluation approach** – all members of the team that were leading the evaluation in the various jurisdictions met over a two day period, shortly after signing of the contract. The purpose of this meeting was to ensure an evaluation approach was devised that addressed the Terms of Reference and ensure that all members of the team had an opportunity to input and understand the agreed approach to ensure consistency in data-gathering and familiarity with process.
- **Contact with Jurisdictions** – managers of each Jurisdiction evaluation directly contacted agency stakeholders to inform them of the NVF evaluation process and invite participation. A time for a stakeholder meeting to be undertaken to discuss the Work Plan was confirmed.
- **Pre-meeting Preparation** – Due to time limitations, a preliminary desk-top analysis was undertaken by the consultant team, reviewing the Tasmanian Work Plan against a number of criteria. This information was circulated to all participants prior to the Work Plan evaluation meeting to allow for stakeholder review.
- **Jurisdiction Meeting** – a jurisdiction meeting was conducted to discuss progress of Work Plan and identify opportunities for improvement. The process used during the meeting is described in Section 2.2.
- **Draft Jurisdiction Report** - the manager for each jurisdiction evaluation prepared a draft report that documented the outcomes from the jurisdiction meeting and included points made during consultation with other stakeholders such as non-Government agencies and select interest groups external to the formal jurisdiction evaluation meeting.
- **Jurisdiction Review** –the draft jurisdiction report was then sent to all participants in the Tasmanian Jurisdiction Work Plan evaluation meeting for comment.
- **Jurisdiction Final Report** Comments were then incorporated into the Tasmanian jurisdiction report and presented to Environment Australia as the Final Jurisdiction Report.

2.2 Evaluation Method

A consistent approach was employed in each jurisdiction meeting to address the Terms of Reference. Each section is briefly described below.

Session A Review Work Plan against Key Challenges

Key Challenges were identified for each jurisdiction in the Dore Report. As these were developed prior to the Work Plans, they were presumed to be drivers for the Work Plan Actions. Therefore, to determine the effectiveness of the Work Plans, the Actions were reviewed to determine how well they address the challenges. A matrix was prepared that compared Tasmanian key challenges with Work Plan actions and level of influence. For each Management and Monitoring Mechanism (MMM), a rating was given for the level of influence each action could have in addressing the Key Challenge for that mechanism.

Following discussions with the primary Tasmanian Work Plan contact, the draft matrix was presented at the Jurisdiction meeting and revised for its validity and for the individual and collective impact of the action(s) in addressing all the key challenges listed for the Jurisdiction. Modifications to the list of Actions was made to increase the beneficial impact on the Key Challenges and applicability of the Key Challenges for their current relevance to the achievement of the outcomes listed in the NVF. Where Key Challenges have become less relevant – i.e. they have been addressed or the program has moved in a different direction; the need for contributing actions was reviewed. Where new challenges were identified these were incorporated into the Work Plan.

Session B. Assessment of Work Plan Success Measures

In order to evaluate Work Plan progress, quantification of achievements was provided against the Success Measures (or Performance Indicators) for each Work Plan activity. For each listed Success Measure, quantified information on the achievement to date was provided by the jurisdiction and further discussed during the evaluation meeting. If no progress was made, this was also noted and discussed during the meeting (what was the reason for lack of progress, what needed to change etc.) Where performance indicators were deemed inappropriate, these were reviewed and amended during the evaluation meeting.

Session C Appropriateness of Work Plan Activities against the NVF Management and Monitoring Outcomes

Our initial reading of the NVF, the Dore report and the individual Work Plans suggested that the relationship between the management mechanisms in the Work Plans and the Key Challenges is generally straightforward. However the relationship with the Desired Outcomes in the NVF was less so. Our approach to assessing this relationship was to test how well the individual actions in the Work Plans contributed to the Desired Outcomes using another matrix.

Each action for each Management and Monitoring Mechanism (listed across the X-axis) was assessed in regards to contribution to the NVF Desired Outcome, listed on the Y-axis. The rating criteria used in Section A (High/Medium/Low Influence) was applied in Section C.

Recognising that a desk-top assessment was undertaken subjectively, and relying on limited information, the jurisdiction evaluation meeting was used to review the matrix for its validity and the implications for achievement of the NVF outcomes. The jurisdiction

meeting was then used to modify the list of Actions to improve contribution to the achievement of the NVF Desired Outcomes where necessary.

Session D Best Management Practices

A key criteria of the Terms of Reference was to determine if and how Best Management Practices (BMP) are being applied when undertaking vegetation Management and Monitoring Mechanisms and Activities in each jurisdiction.

The National Vegetation Framework identifies a range of BMPs against the seven Management and Monitoring Mechanisms. Due to the time limitations associated with the evaluation, the URS/Griffin nrm team nominated one Management and Monitoring Mechanism per jurisdiction that will be investigated in depth from a Best Management Practice perspective during the jurisdiction meeting, rather than the entire set of MMM's. This process will, across the jurisdictions, address the range of BMP's identified in the ANZECC framework for the nominated mechanism, and be reported as a Case Study in the relevant jurisdiction report.

For Tasmania, the BMP of Biodiversity Assessment (as part of Planning and Assessment) was used as the Case Study example. The ANZECC framework BMP's were used as the main guide to discuss Assessment during the Tasmanian evaluation meeting. This information was then compiled into a 'snap shot' of BMP for inclusion into the Jurisdiction report.

Session E Visioning - evaluation of overall progress and likely long term impact of the National Vegetation Framework

This session in the Jurisdiction evaluation meeting looked collectively at the Visions in the Work Plans to assess how effectively the mechanisms being implemented now, will achieve those Visions in future. Plausible process methods were used for this assessment. In using plausible process, you work back from a major goal or vision to identify what would be needed now to achieve the goal or vision within anticipated timeframes.

For instance, if an overall goal is to better integrate management of native vegetation management, you might expect the work plans to include management and monitoring measures which will effectively support integrated management. If an overall goal is to attain a net gain in extent and quality of native vegetation, then the work plans ought to include measures which are likely to have the effect of controlling clearing and/or compensating with equivalent plantings within the anticipated timeframe of the Framework. From this type of assessment, number of key indicators of overall progress were identified and analysed to evaluate the likely long-term impact of the National Vegetation Framework.

2.3 Tasmania Workshop

The review team met with vegetation managers from the key Tasmanian agencies for a one day workshop on 10 October 2000. A preliminary assessment of Work Plan outcomes

against key challenges and success measures was undertaken with the review team and Stephen Harris prior to the workshop. These along with an assessment of progress against NVF outcomes and a case study of biodiversity assessment were the core agenda items of the workshop. The workshop was attended by:

- Stephen Harris, Senior Botanist DPIWE.
- Mick Brown, Assistant Chief (Projects) FT DPIWE.
- Peter Bosworth, Mgr Reserve Development Unit DPIWE.
- Ian Marmion, Bushcare Coordinator.
- Evan Boardman, Local Government Association.
- Naomi Lawrence, Threatened Species Botanist DPIWE.
- Bruce Howard and Jason Alexandra from the review team.

A revision of the key challenges, activities and the structure of the Tasmanian Work Plan became a major focus of the workshop. The participants agreed that such a revision would provide a useful outcome of this review.

3 Tasmania Work Plan Output

3.1 Tasmania Work Plan – Setting the Scene

Tasmania has a large proportion of its native vegetation intact but remaining vegetation communities are still threatened by harvesting/conversions in forested areas, agriculture and urban development. A greater proportion of Tasmania than any other State has been incorporated into conservation reserves with 21% of land area in formal State Reserves (National Parks, Nature Reserves, State Reserves, Aboriginal Sites and Historic Sites), about 40% of forested lands are reserved from logging. However, there remain a significant number of ecological communities that require protection on private lands to ensure an adequate level of protection. Non-forest vegetation is not well represented.

Tasmania's Resource Management and Planning System (RMPS) involves legislation, State policies, regional planning, Local government strategic plans and Local government statutory planning schemes. It does not contain specific controls on native vegetation. National Parks, State Forest, other lands used for forestry purposes, mining, marine farms and the operations and lands associated with hydroelectricity generation are exempted categories and subject to different planning systems, processes, regulations etc. A Biodiversity Strategy is being developed, and is intended to address the major issues associated with the conservation of native vegetation.

3.2 Linking the Work Plan with Key Challenges

The objective of this component of the review was to assess the alignment of Management and Monitoring Mechanism activities against the key challenges defined in the Dore Report. Table 1 presents Tasmania's revised Key Challenges, and shows the result of the review according to the revised Work Plan structure as developed in the workshop. The numbering of activities is based on the Work Plan and is presented in Section 3.3. The criteria for the influence rating score are:

- **High** influence – The Action has direct relationship to the Key Challenge and when implemented will have a high impact in addressing the Challenge;
- **Medium** influence – the Action has a moderate to high relationship to the Key Challenge and when implemented will have a moderate impact in addressing the Challenge; or only some relationship but with a high impact;
- **Low** influence – the Action has some relationship to the Key Challenge but when implemented will have only a low impact in addressing the Challenge; and
- **No** influence – the Action may have some relationship to the Key Challenge but when implemented it will have no effective impact in addressing the Challenge.

Note: Some of the gaps in alignment of actions to key challenges arise because of the inclusion of suggested new challenges. Seven new challenges are presented, twelve were revised and several of those from the Dore report were removed.

Note: The Tasmanian Workshop recognised that Activities align against Key Challenges across Management and Monitoring Mechanisms. The results show this cross referencing. It was suggested that this should occur where Activities are components of integrated programs.

Of the 21 challenges, revised or as stated in the Dore Report only three did not score a rating of medium or higher. This indicates that the listed activities align well and have a direct relationship to the key challenges and will generally have a medium or high impact in addressing that Key Challenge. New or existing Key Challenges that are not well addressed by current activities are:

- Remove disincentives and contradictory policy for the conservation of native vegetation (New);
- Apply effective statutory planning instruments at regional levels (Revised);
- Address the neglect of R&D into non-vascular flora (Revised);
- Develop and implement a R&D strategy to support vegetation management (New); and
- Clarify incentive/compensation issues for private land conservation of native vegetation (Revised).

Table 1 : Actions Rated Against Key Challenges

	Management and Monitoring Mechanism Alignment Rating		
	High	Medium	Low
4.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Governments and Community			
Remove disincentives and contradictory policy for the conservation of native vegetation (New)			

	Management and Monitoring Mechanism Alignment Rating		
	High	Medium	Low
4.2 Planning and Assessment			
Filling the remaining gaps in the vegetation inventory particularly on reserved lands, and by completing the baseline 1:25,000 vegetation mapping in the State	4.2.1.2, 4.2.1.3		4.2.2.1, 4.2.2.2, 4.2.2.3, 4.2.3.1- 4.2.3.6
Consistently implement an integrated approach to NRM at local and regional scales and incorporating vegetation management in this approach	4.2.3.1, 4.2.3.2, 4.2.3.3, 4.6.3.4		4.2.2.1
Developing 'whole-of-catchment' plans informed by initiatives such as TasVeg2000, bioregional classifications (IBRA) and the RFA processes	4.2.3.2, 4.2.3.3		4.2.2.1, 4.2.3.1
Apply effective statutory planning instruments at regional			

levels (Revised)			
Use existing planning and inventory information effectively for state and regional strategies and local plans (Revised)	4.2.3.1, 4.2.3.2, 4.2.3.3	4.2.2.1, 4.6.3.4	

	Management and Monitoring Mechanism Alignment Rating		
4.3 Formal Reserve System	High	Medium	Low
Provide resources to strengthen protective mechanisms to improve flora conservation (Revised)		4.2.1.3, 4.2.3.4	
Develop and apply cost-effective effective mechanisms to achieve reserves on private land (Revised)		4.2.1.3, 4.2.3.4	
Improve reservation status of under-represented ecosystems to meet CAR targets (New)	4.3.1.1, 4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.3		

	Management and Monitoring Mechanism Alignment Rating		
4.4 Communication & Capacity Building	High	Medium	Low
Achieving greater coordination amongst the native vegetation/NRM players.	4.2.3.1, 4.2.3.2, 4.2.3.3, 4.6.3.4	4.2.2.1, 4.4.1.1, 4.4.1.2	
Changing attitudes to the role of native vegetation on farms and along rivers and streams – introducing the concept of ‘duty of care’	4.2.3.1, 4.4.1.1	4.5.3.1, 4.5.4.1, 4.6.2.1, 4.6.3.1	
Improve conservation R&D processes to underpin improved adaptive management regimes (Revised)		4.2.1.1 – 4.2.1.4, 4.2.3.1 – 4.2.3.3	
Addressing the neglect of R&D into non-vascular flora			
Deliver a comprehensive community education and capacity building strategy (New)	4.4.1.1	4.2.3.1, 4.4.1.2, 4.4.2.1, 4.4.2.2	
Develop and implement a R&D strategy to support vegetation management (New)			

	Management and Monitoring Mechanism Alignment Rating		
4.5 Incentives	High	Medium	Low
Apply an effective mix of incentives, duty of care and regulatory approaches (Revised)		4.5.3.1, 4.5.4.1	
Finalise the development of the strategic approach to the PLRP and other incentive schemes	4.5.3.1, 4.5.4.1	4.3.1.2, 4.3.1.3	
Clarify incentive/compensation issues for private land conservation of native vegetation (Revised)			

	Management and Monitoring Mechanism Alignment Rating		
4.6 Regulatory Mechanisms	High	Medium	Low
Controlling exploitative wild harvesting of plants (Revised)	4.6.3.2, 4.6.3.3		
Ensure retention of native vegetation on private land (New)	4.6.2.1		
Minimising conversion of native vegetation into plantations (Revised)	4.6.2.1, 4.6.3.1		
That plantation establishment guidelines ensure that all native forest is assessed and subject to control processes before it is cleared (Revised)	4.6.3.1		
Ensure consistent application across all tenures of vegetation retention legislation (Revised)	4.6.2.1		
Incorporate native vegetation management into statutory Local government planning (Revised)	4.2.3.2, 4.6.2.1		

	Management and Monitoring Mechanism Alignment Rating		
4.7 Monitoring & Evaluation	High	Medium	Low
Develop a process to prioritise, coordinate and fund monitoring efforts (Revised)	4.7.1.1	4.7.1.2 – 4.7.1.7	
Ensure that monitoring data can be fed back into management	4.7.1.1	4.7.1.2 – 4.7.1.7	
Ensure compliance with the negotiated covenants and management agreements (New)	4.7.1.1	4.7.1.2 – 4.7.1.7	
Develop a consistent monitoring framework for Tasmania (New)	4.7.1.1	4.7.1.2 – 4.7.1.7	

3.3 Measuring Work Plan Success

At the workshop the agency vegetation managers were requested to evaluate the level of achievement of Actions against the Success Measures. The results of this are reported in this section. The workshop also provided an opportunity to update and revise the Success Measures – in some cases they were revised. A summary of achievement assessments is provided in Table 2. Note that this table also presents Tasmania’s revised Work Plan as per the revisions arising from the workshop.

Table 2 : Tasmania Work Plan & Summary of Progress Against Success Measures

Management Mechanisms	Action	Responsibility	Timeframe	Success Measure	Level of Achievement
4.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Government					
<i>4.1.3 State Government Role</i>	4.1.3.1 Encourage a complementary approach to vegetation management and protection across government.	DPIWE/ other agencies and Local Government	June. 2001	Adoption of complementary approach.	State biodiversity strategy - March 2001 release Draft for public consultation out now
4.2 Planning and Assessment					
<i>4.2.1 Vegetation Inventory, Data Collection and Mapping</i>	4.2.1.1 Assessment of conservation and reservation status of species	DPIWE/FT/ FPB/ Tasmanian Herbarium	Ongoing	Improved reservation and conservation status as described in State of the Environment, State of the Forests, and DPIWE publications	State of the forest planned for 2002 to fit RFA schedule. SOE also fits RFA and SoF schedule. SOE report every five years - ongoing
	4.2.1.2 Carry out flora surveys of reserves and publish report and maps *	DPIWE/ FT/ FPB/ Tasmanian Herbarium	June. 2002	Completed inventories of reserved species	Reports, maps and species lists completed for 70% of reserves but at different levels of detail
	4.2.1.3 Complete 1:25,000 vegetation mapping of the State	DPIWE	June. 2001	Maps available	On target
	4.2.1.4 Continue studies on taxonomy & distribution of flora (*) with special focus on the lesser known categories of flora	Tasmanian Herbarium	Ongoing	Atlases and information sufficient to assess conservation and reservation status	On target
<i>4.2.2 Biodiversity Status Assessment</i>	4.2.2.1 Continue to improve live databases of plant species and communities locations	DPIWE/ Tasmanian Herbarium	1. updated db for rare and threatened flora in place by December.	Accessibility of information 1. continuous updating of census on Website 2. periodic printing of	significant progress (estimate of 50% completed) framework developed

Management Mechanisms	Action	Responsibility	Timeframe	Success Measure	Level of Achievement
			2000, 2. db framework for remaining flora in place and being populated by June 2001	Census updates	
	4.2.2.2 Continue to review taxonomy of State's flora	Tasmanian Herbarium	Ongoing	Census updates	completed
	4.2.2.3 Continue to build voucher collections for the State's flora. Participate in HISCOM which is committed to ready exchange of electronic data and the "Virtual Australian Herbarium"	Tasmanian herbarium	ongoing	An increasing proportion of db site records underpinned by voucher collections	Db record verified, Aprox. 60%70% of threatened flora completed
<i>4.2.3 Regional Vegetation Management Planning</i>	4.2.3.1 Prepare a State Nature Conservation Strategy	DPIWE	March. 2001	Achievement of milestones in the Strategy	State biodiversity strategy
	4.2.3.2 Prepare vegetation plans for catchments and/or LGAs for priority areas (*) A number of catchment management plans are being prepared and these will incorporate vegetation priorities	DPIWE/ Local Government	Staged completion	Coverage by vegetation plans of the rural and settled districts	Vegetation plans done Half LGA demonstrating progress or completed Catchment plans done for Meander, Tamar and Midlands
	4.2.3.3 Complete the partnership agreements with Local Government dealing with NRM issues	DPIWE	Ongoing	Partnership agreements between state and local Government	??
	4.2.3.4 Review the conservation status and management options for specialised habitats: Lowland heathlands Montane and high altitude grasslands Sphagnum bogs	Uni of Tas/DPIWE DPIWE DPIWE	Sept. 1999 June. 2000	Status report Status report	Completed or under way

Management Mechanisms	Action	Responsibility	Timeframe	Success Measure	Level of Achievement
	Offshore islands (*)	DPIWE	Dec. 2000 June. 2000	Status report Status report	
	4.2.3.5 Identify and manage particular areas for management of Phytophthora-susceptible communities.	DPIWE/ FT	June. 2001	A system of areas established for protection of susceptible communities.	On target
	4.2.3.6 Implementation of State Weedplan (*) including development of: Weed Alert Network database of weed distribution weed risk assessment for State priorities and implementing new weed management legislation.	Ongoing Milestone: complete by October 1999 Milestone: establish weed db by June 2001	Ongoing Milestone: complete by October. 1999 Milestone: establish weed db by June. 2001	Actions implemented. Recommendations considered & implemented	Significant progress - Weed act Officers appointed DB established Weed risk assessments under way Regional weed plans
4.3 Formal Reserve System					
<i>4.3.1 Formal Reserve System</i>	4.3.1.1 Complete gazettal of new formal CAR reserves for forests (#)	DPIWE/FT	December. 1999	A CAR reserve system for forests on public land	Under way
	4.3.1.2 Set targets for a CAR reserve system for non-forest and do gap analysis (*)	DPIWE	June. 2001	Specific targets for a CAR reserve system for non-forest	On target dependent on TasVeg 2000
	4.3.1.3 Implement a CAR reserve system for non-forest *	DPIWE	Not set	CAR reserve system	dependent on TasVeg but covenanting program contributing
4.4 Communication & Capacity Building					
<i>4.4.1 Community Education</i>	4.4.1.1 Implement a technical extension program to assist on-ground vegetation management by landholders	DPIWE	Ongoing	Accessibility to advice by all clients	In place - dependent on Bushcare NHT funds to continue
	4.4.1.2 Construct and update a website with vegetation mapping/species locations linked to management	DPIWE	Website construction: Sept. 99;	Accessibility to advice by all clients	Bushcare website in place Parks and wildlife website up GIS data available via websites

Management Mechanisms	Action	Responsibility	Timeframe	Success Measure	Level of Achievement
	guidelines		update: ongoing		
<i>4.4.2 R&D and Extension</i>	4.4.2.1 Complete regional vegetation management manuals (*) The forest botany manuals will continue to be distributed amongst the network of Forest Practices Officers and other relevant officers.	DPIWE	June. 2002	Completion of forest botany manual series	Forest manuals exist but revision underway
	4.4.2.2 Manuals for priority areas will be distributed to relevant sectors in government	FPB	June. 2000	Complete manuals for priority areas	Veg manuals for NE and midlands completed, Threatened flora manual by 2000
4.5 Incentives					
<i>4.5.2 Property Right and Market-based Measures</i>	4.5.2.1 Sixty three onion growers have passed the provisional audit standards of the Responsible Agriculture Program (which has sustainability and nature conservation criteria) by Jan. 2000 and many are expected to undergo a verification audit	DPIWE	November. 2000	Environmental accreditation for growers linked to better management of bush on participating farms	Completed and being used as an example of EMS in agriculture, Feeding into Tas ag code of practice
<i>4.5.3 Revolving Funds</i>	4.5.3.1 Purchase, covenant and resell suitable properties with nature conservation values	NGO's/ DPIWE through RFA implementation group.	ongoing	Increase in the land area subject to covenants.	Not yet in place but preparations being made
<i>4.5.4 Differential Rating & Taxation Measures</i>	4.5.4.1 Promote the adoption through local government of incentive measures such as rate relief, that reduce the cost to landholders of owning and managing large areas of bushland	Local Government Association/ DPIWE/EA	Ongoing	Measures implemented	I LGA committed - Northern Midlands ## Investigating elsewhere
	4.5.4.2 Organise a conference to look at incentive measures: "Beyond Roads, Rates and Rubbish"	LGAT/ DPIWE/EA	August. 2000	Recommendations for further action	Done
4.6 Regulatory Mechanisms					

Management Mechanisms	Action	Responsibility	Timeframe	Success Measure	Level of Achievement
<i>4.6.1 Threatened Species/Ecological Communities Protection</i>	4.6.1.1 Review status of threatened species based on improving nature of ecological/distributional data	DPIWE	ongoing	Continuing refinement of threatened species schedules	On track
<i>4.6.2 Land Clearing Regulation (Vegetation Cover Retention)</i>	4.6.2.1 Implement mechanisms to encourage native vegetation retention and management including the protection of riparian vegetation consistent with the agreed outcomes of the National Vegetation Initiative as set out in the Tasmanian partnership Agreement.	DPIWE/FPB/ FT	December. 2000	Implementation of appropriate measures improving vegetation	Under development And policy consideration
<i>4.6.3 Industry/Land Use Codes of Practice (Guidelines for plantation establishment)</i>	4.6.3.1 Check that existing plantation establishment guidelines are being met in relation to regional conservation values.	FT/FPB		Guidelines met	Forest practices board M&E and audit programs developed
	4.6.3.2 Implement relevant actions in the RFA eg regulatory controls and management system for treefern harvesting (#)	DPIWE/ FT/FPB	Sept. 1999	An operating management system for sustainable harvest of treeferns.	Advanced stage of development
	4.6.3.3 Review controls and regulations required for wild flora harvesting, access to genetic resources.	DPIWE	December. 2000	Adequate regulatory framework for dealing with this issue	Threatened species not progressed only threatened flora
	4.6.3.4 Continue to review and improve regulatory instruments for protection and management of vegetation.	All relevant agencies	Ongoing	Continuing review and improvement	Legislative review under way on all legislation that relates to biodiversity All nature con legislation reviewed

4.7 Monitoring & Evaluation					
<i>4.7.1 Cover & Condition Monitoring</i>	4.7.1.1 Work towards the integration of State of the Environment reporting, State of the Forests Reporting and reporting against RFA.	All agencies but in particular: RPDC/DPIWE/FT/FPB	2002	Number of actions implemented from the SoE recommendations report	Integration of monitoring programs is in place
	4.7.1.2 Continue to monitor the maintainence of the permanent forest estate	FPB/DPIWE	continuous		Under way
	4.7.1.3 Continue long term monitoring of disease and fire regime effects on vegetation cover, condition and composition.	DPIWE/FT/Other	ongoing	Maintain a permanent forest estate	Monitoring and fire mapping in place
	4.7.1.4 Complete base map for vegetation condition (*)	DPIWE	March. 2001	Uptake of information in vegetation planning	Under way and on target
	4.7.1.5 Undertake 5 yearly monitoring of vegetation change *	Uni of Tas/DPIWE/FPB	Ongoing/periodic	5-yearly land clearance figures	Happening as part of Tas SoE
	4.7.1.6 Develop a DPIWE policy on monitoring vegetation change and impacts on vegetation for conservation planning	DPIWE	June. 2001	More efficient effort in monitoring and better adaptive management	Yes - draft completed
	4.7.1.7 Monitor areas set aside for threatened species protection from Phytophthora *	DPIWE/ FT/ FPB/ RPDC	June. 2000	Length of time that the areas remain Phytophthora-free	Monitoring program continues
	Collect data to support appropriate ANZECC Core Environmental Indicators for Biodiversity and provide to State of the Environment program for regular reporting*	DPIWE/FT	Ongoing	Data collected.	Biodiversity SoE committee and Forest monitoring in operation
	Develop an ecological management system for reserves and a Reserve management Code of Practice	DPIWE/ FT/DPAC/ DIER	March. 2001	Improved adaptive management of vegetation & other values in reserves	Under way in code

3.4 Linking Work Plan Outputs with National Vegetation Framework Desired Outcomes

The Tasmanian Work-Plan Actions were rated against the NVF desired outcomes according to how direct the relationship is likely to be, and the likely level of impact (the same criteria were used as for the assessment the relationship between Actions and Key Challenges). Initial ratings by the review team were discussed during the workshop. The ratings agreed from the workshop are provided in Table 3.

The ratings were developed to indicate strengths and any gaps in the way the Draft Work Plan addresses the desired suite of outcomes. Attendants at the workshop stressed that the Work-Plan was primarily developed to address biodiversity issues. If Actions provide other outcomes then they should be considered as secondary effects, the primary outcome of Work Plan activities was seen as biodiversity conservation.

Table 3 : Assessing Work Plan Actions against NVF Desired Outcomes

4.2 Planning and Assessment	4.2.1 Vegetation Inventory, Data Collection and Mapping	4.2.2 Biodiversity Status Assessment	4.2.3 Regional Vegetation Management Planning
<i>Biodiversity</i>	4.2.1.1 H 4.2.1.2 H 4.2.1.3 H 4.2.1.4 H	4.2.2.1 H 4.2.2.2 M 4.2.2.3 L	4.2.3.1 H 4.2.3.2 H 4.2.3.3 M 4.2.3.4 H 4.2.3.5 M 4.2.3.6 H
<i>Soil and water resources</i>	4.2.1.3 M		4.2.3.1M 4.2.3.2 M 4.2.3.3 M
<i>Hydrology</i>			4.2.3.2 M 4.2.3.3 M
<i>Land productivity</i>	4.2.1.3 H		4.2.3.2 M 4.2.3.3 M 4.2.3.6 H
<i>Sustainable land use</i>	4.2.1.3 H		4.2.3.1 L 4.2.3.2 M 4.2.3.3 M 4.2.3.6 H
<i>Natural & cultural heritage</i>			4.2.3.2 M 4.2.3.3 M
<i>Indigenous peoples</i>			4.2.3.2 M 4.2.3.3 M
<i>Climate change</i>	4.2.1.3 L		4.2.3.2 M 4.2.3.3 M

4.3 Formal Reserve System	4.3.1 Formal Reserve System		
<i>Biodiversity</i>	4.3.1.1 H 4.3.1.2 M 4.3.1.3 H		
<i>Soil and water resources</i>	4.3.1.1 M 4.3.1.2 M 4.3.1.3 M		
<i>Hydrology</i>			
<i>Land productivity</i>			
<i>Sustainable land use</i>			
<i>Natural & cultural heritage</i>	4.3.1.1 H 4.3.1.2 H 4.3.1.3 H		
<i>Indigenous peoples</i>			
<i>Climate change</i>	4.3.1.1 L 4.3.1.2 L 4.3.1.3 L		

4.4 Communication & Capacity Building	4.4.1 Community Education	4.4.2 R&D and Extension	
<i>Biodiversity</i>	4.4.1.1 M 4.4.1.2 M	4.4.2.1 H 4.4.2.2 H	
<i>Soil and water resources</i>	4.4.1.1 M		
<i>Hydrology</i>	4.4.1.1 M		
<i>Land productivity</i>			
<i>Sustainable land use</i>	4.4.1.1 M 4.4.1.2 M		
<i>Natural & cultural heritage</i>	4.4.1.1 M 4.4.1.2 M		
<i>Indigenous peoples</i>			
<i>Climate change</i>			

4.5 Incentives	4.5.2 Property Right and Market-based Measures	4.5.3 Revolving Funds	4.5.4 Differential Rating & Taxation Measures
<i>Biodiversity</i>	4.5.2.1 M	4.5.3.1 H	4.5.4.1 M 4.5.4.2 M
<i>Soil and water resources</i>		4.5.3.1 L	4.5.4.1 M
<i>Hydrology</i>			
<i>Land productivity</i>	4.5.2.1 M		4.5.4.2 M
<i>Sustainable land use</i>	4.5.2.1 M	4.5.3.1 M	4.5.4.1 M 4.5.4.2 M
<i>Natural & cultural heritage</i>		4.5.3.1 H	4.5.4.1 M
<i>Indigenous peoples</i>			
<i>Climate change</i>		4.5.3.1 L	4.5.4.1 L

4.6 Regulatory Mechanisms	4.6.1 Threatened Species/Ecological Communities Protection	4.6.2 Land Clearing Regulation (Vegetation Cover Retention)	4.6.3 Industry/Land Use Codes of Practice (Guidelines for plantation establishment)
<i>Biodiversity</i>	4.6.1.1 M	4.6.2.1 H	4.6.3.1 H 4.6.3.2 L 4.6.3.3 M 4.6.3.4 H
<i>Soil and water resources</i>		4.6.2.1 H	4.6.3.1 M
<i>Hydrology</i>			4.6.3.1 M
<i>Land productivity</i>			4.6.3.1 H
<i>Sustainable land use</i>		4.6.2.1 H	4.6.3.1 M 4.6.3.3 L 4.6.3.4 M
<i>Natural & cultural heritage</i>		4.6.2.1 H	4.6.3.1 M
<i>Indigenous peoples</i>			4.6.3.1 M
<i>Climate change</i>		4.6.2.1 H	4.6.3.1 M

4.7 Monitoring & Evaluation	4.7.1 Cover & Condition Monitoring		
<i>Biodiversity</i>	4.7.1.1-7 All M		
<i>Soil and water resources</i>	4.7.1.1-7 All M		
<i>Hydrology</i>	4.7.1.1-7 All M		
<i>Land productivity</i>	4.7.1.1-7 All M		
<i>Sustainable land use</i>	4.7.1.1-7 All M		
<i>Natural & cultural heritage</i>	4.7.1.1-7 All M		
<i>Indigenous peoples</i>			
<i>Climate change</i>	4.7.1.1-7 All M		

3.5 Best Management Practices – Biodiversity Assessment

The Tasmanian vegetation managers at the workshop selected Biodiversity Assessment (a sub-section of Planning and Assessment) for the case study, based on a comparative strength and recent development in best management practice in that area. The case study was developed during the workshop, the outcomes are summarised below.

Tasmania has recognised that vegetation mapping is fundamental to a range of important processes including:

- Reserve system design and reserve selection;
- Identifying important habitat and communities;
- Assessing the conservation status of species and communities;
- Supporting the development of effective regulatory and incentive regimes/programs; and

- Providing spatial information for monitoring programs at appropriate scales, eg SOE reporting.

The current mapping program in Tasmania aims to complete an initial coverage of the state using 140 vegetation types at 1/25000.

A small team of staff has a huge degree of technical skill and efficiency but has a problem with "skills leakage" due to problems of short-term contracts etc. Managers are trying to plan for and address the disruption due to the conclusion of the NHT programs and the loss of dollars to support the continuing work programs. The potential loss of expertise is a serious risk. Maintenance of both technical capacity and corporate knowledge is needed to complete the program.

The mapping programs are recognised as critically important to Tasmania's biodiversity conservation and management capacity. A tight timeframe for the work has encouraged some technical innovation:

- Overlays of GIS layers (geology, topography, climate etc) are used to support extrapolation of vegetation types based on expert judgements. These judgements are then verified by periodic ground truthing;
- Modelling has been used to work out likely patterns of Pre-European vegetation for the National Vegetation Information System; and
- Automation of some of the mapping processes – transfer of line-work from period photos to the map base.

Tasmania plans to underpin the mapping generated information with detailed plot assessment. The intensively sampled plots will yield information on:

- Ecological processes;
- Species composition and change over time; and
- Responses to episodic events such as fire.

The plot sampling will be used to establish the quality of the vegetation. A manual is planned which specifies the minimum standards for plot survey and sampling so as to ensure that plots are sampled using a comparable set of standards.

The information generated by the mapping and modelling is made available via the web. It is being used or will be used for a range of different purposes at a range of different scales, such as:

- At the state-wide scale it will be used to assist in the CAR assessments and further reserve planning;
- At the regional scale it is being used to support the development of regional NRM plans and ICM plans; and
- At the property scale it is being used to identify areas of conservation significance and to support improved management.

The information is available on the web where species overlays are linked to management advice for different species and communities. Access privileges to threatened species locations vary.

The vegetation mapping has supplied valuable information for a range of uses. It has proven valuable for:

- Design and targeting of incentive programs, such as helping to allocate the incentives to meet targets eg via targeting the covenanting program;
- To support the work of vegetation (and revegetation practitioners) who can access and use the vegetation data; and
- Assisting the RFA process by helping to support the setting of conservation targets.

In conclusion, mapping and inventory should be seen as an important foundation investment which supports improved planning and management in a wide range of ways at a range of scales.

3.6 Evaluating Against NVF Vision and Goals

The overall long-term impact of the Tasmanian Draft Work Plan was assessed against the long-term goals of the NVF using several process indicators. Progress against these indicators was discussed and recorded during the workshop. The outcomes against these indicators are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4 : Progress Against Long-Term NVF Goals

Outcome	Plausible process indicators	Comments on Progress
1. A reversal in the long term decline in the extent and quality of native vegetation (by June 2001)	Planning undertaken.	The current mapping program addresses native vegetation condition. Tasmania is beginning to get baseline data to describe quality as well as extent. Just developing the baseline tools and skills to monitor and respond to land management issues such as the side effects of the RFA process # is this RFA side effects like more logging of private forests or do we mean the impact of plantation developments.
	Plans resourced and being implemented	Outcomes will be dependant on continuing funding beyond NHT. Work in urban areas may continue without NHT funding but work in rural areas is at risk
	People with knowledge and skills required	This capacity is in part reliant on NHT funding. Will/are suffering from skills leakage from these projects because of the short term nature of grant funded projects. Because there is a low base level of skills this work is vulnerable to these losses.
	Monitoring and evaluation of all aspects leading to revision of plans	Don't have a coherent monitoring and evaluation framework but are working towards achieving the base data for targeted monitoring Have the processes for setting conservation targets and priorities

Outcome	Plausible process indicators	Comments on Progress
2. 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	Reasons for clearance of native vegetation has changed post the RFA process. One of the unintended consequences is the increase in plantations in native forests. Native vegetation is being cleared for plantation forests. The rate of clearing for agriculture is now relatively low. The aim was for plantations to go on low quality farm land but they are being established on areas with native vegetation.
	Programs in place to restore, where appropriate, native vegetation to maintain/enhance biodiversity and protect land and water resources on private all land	Need to resolve conflicting policy that exists within the Department and between government agencies. This issue has come into focus with the integration of Agriculture. The RFA process should have been aligned with requirements of other land management policy and processes.
	Programs and measures in place to encourage development and adoption of best management practices for native vegetation management in agricultural, forest and urban enterprises	
	Appropriate monitoring and assessment programs are in place to detect change in native vegetation quantity and geographic extent	

Outcome	Plausible process indicators	Comments on Progress
3. 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	Acts as per listing in Dore Report
	Biodiversity and native vegetation targets are set and measures are in place to achieve those targets at both regional and national levels	Have a process for setting targets, and recovery plans for threatened species.
	Appropriate monitoring and assessment programs are in place to detect change in native vegetation biodiversity	

Outcome	Plausible process indicators	Comments on Progress
4. 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	Developing prescriptions for management of vegetation types Covenanted lands have management plans
	Policies and programs are in place to restore native vegetation quality where appropriate	Very little native vegetation restoration undertaken. First step is fencing and natural recruitment
	Appropriate monitoring and assessment programs are in place to detect change in native vegetation quality	Fencing Incentive Scheme areas – encourage photos of plots. Aim to monitor the ecological processes not just the fence.

4 Evaluation of Progress against Work Plan Commitments and the National Framework

4.1 Assessment of the Tasmania Work Plan and Implementation

Of 21 Key Challenges (either as revised or stated in the Dore Report) only three did not score a rating of medium or higher. This indicates that the listed activities align well and have a direct relationship to the key challenges and will generally have a medium or high impact in addressing that Key Challenge. The Key Challenges that are identified as not being well addressed by current activities are:

- Apply effective statutory planning instruments at regional levels (Revised);
- Addressing the neglect of R&D into non-vascular flora; and
- Clarify incentive/compensation issues for private land conservation of native vegetation (Revised).

Of the seven new Key Challenges developed two did not align with current activities, they are:

- Remove disincentives and contradictory policy for the conservation of native vegetation (New); and
- Develop and implement a R&D strategy to support vegetation management (New).

Major achievements include the Tasmanian Biodiversity Strategy which is currently in draft form and being presented for public comment. It is ahead of target and set for release in March 2001. Complete vegetation mapping of the State at 1:25,000 scale is on target for completion by June 2001. Catchment vegetation plans have been completed for Meander, Tamar and Midlands regions and half of LGAs have plans under development. A legislative review is under way on all legislation that relates to biodiversity conservation.

Most activities were recorded as being on-target, completed or ongoing as per plan. Biodiversity assessment activities are well advanced. The current mapping program addresses native vegetation condition, Tasmania is beginning to get baseline data to describe quality as well as extent. This is a vital requirement for monitoring the reversal of the decline in the extent and quality of native vegetation. Tasmania is just developing the baseline tools and skills to monitor and respond to land management issues such as the side effects of the RFA process.

4.2 Improvements to Tasmania Work Plan

As a result of the workshop substantial revisions were made to the Draft Tasmanian Work-Plan. The structure of the revision process provided a useful basis to progress the structure and content of the work-plan – these revisions are presented as Table 2. The review process highlighted some imprecise definitions of actions and success measures. The review also provided recommendations for changes to the Management and Monitoring Mechanism structure indicated by the National Framework. It was suggested that:

- “Research and Development and Extension” should be split into discrete sections; and
- there is a requirement for an “Implementation” mechanism.

The revised work plan has been re-ordered and numbered with headings according to the National Framework headings. Some definitions have been tightened to better reflect actual activities and success measures. Seven new Key Challenges were developed, twelve were revised and several were removed. The overall content of the Actions was maintained.

Table 5 : New and Revised Key Challenges

4.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Governments and Community

Remove disincentives and contradictory policy for the conservation of native vegetation (New)

4.2 Planning and Assessment

Apply effective statutory planning instruments at regional levels (Revised)

Use existing planning and inventory information effectively for state and regional strategies and local plans (Revised)

4.3 Formal Reserve System

Provide resources to strengthen protective mechanisms to improve flora conservation (Revised)

Develop and apply cost-effective effective mechanisms to achieve reserves on private land (Revised)

Improve reservation status of under-represented ecosystems to meet CAR targets (New)

4.4 Communication & Capacity Building

Improve conservation R&D processes to underpin improved adaptive management regimes (Revised)

Deliver a comprehensive community education and capacity building strategy (New)

Develop and implement a R&D strategy to support vegetation management (New)

4.5 Incentives

Apply an effective mix of incentives, duty of care and regulatory approaches (Revised)

Clarify incentive/compensation issues for private land conservation of native vegetation (Revised)

4.6 Regulatory Mechanisms

Ensure retention of native vegetation on private land (New)

Minimising conversion of native vegetation into plantations (Revised)

That plantation establishment guidelines ensure that all native forest is assessed and subject to control processes before it is cleared (Revised)

Ensure consistent application across all tenures of vegetation retention legislation (Revised)

Incorporate native vegetation management into statutory Local government planning (Revised)

4.7 Monitoring & Evaluation

Develop a process to prioritise, coordinate and fund monitoring efforts (Revised)

Ensure compliance with the negotiated covenants and management agreements (New)

Develop a consistent monitoring framework for Tasmania (New)

4.3 Tasmanian Progress against the National Vegetation Framework

The major progress by Tasmania against the National Vegetation Framework is the current mapping program to describe native vegetation condition as well as extent. This is a vital requirement for monitoring the reversal of the decline in the extent and quality of native vegetation.

Strategic planning will benefit with the release of the Biodiversity Strategy and the completion of LGA vegetation plans. However it is still necessary to resolve conflicting policy that exists within DPIWE and between government agencies.

At this stage Tasmania doesn't have a coherent monitoring and evaluation framework to be applied for monitoring and evaluation of all aspects plan revisions, but are working towards achieving the base data for targeted monitoring of key areas and issues.

A major issue to be addressed is still clearance of native vegetation. The dominant driver for clearance of native vegetation has changed post the RFA process. Unfortunately indications are that one of the unintended consequences of the RFA process is the increase in plantations on what was native forest. Native vegetation is being cleared for plantation forests. The rate of clearing for agriculture is now relatively low. The aim was for plantations to go on low quality farm land but they are in fact being established on better quality native vegetation. The suggested reason is that RFA process was not aligned with the same requirements of other land management policy and processes.

4.4 Ongoing Independent Evaluation Arrangements

If regular independent evaluations are undertaken across all jurisdictions it provides a consistent approach however it is then unlikely to align with other monitoring cycles undertaken, for example SOE reporting. It is suggested that once it is agreed that a jurisdiction has satisfactorily aligned their Work Plan with the outcomes sought of the National Framework then it may be appropriate to undertake regular Work Plan evaluations on the same cycle as with other jurisdiction monitoring requirements.

As the review cycle matures it is essential that the focus shifts from an evaluation of process onto an evaluation of bio-physical outcomes. For that to happen it is therefore essential that each jurisdiction develops and applies the capability to assess both the extent and quality of their native vegetation. A degree of uniformity in methods and a timetable for achieving minimum national standards in vegetation assessment is needed.

Agreement on a defined time-table for reaching a range targets implied in the NVI will support future evaluations. An independent evaluation process would also benefit from having adequate lead times and resources. A process for sharing experience and knowledge across jurisdictions would support future evaluations and the achievement of the desired outcomes, such as adoption of BMP's.

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

The review process provided a useful opportunity for the workshop participants to revise the Tasmanian Work Plan. The Work Plan was restructured to better reflect the structure of the National Framework with some activities realigned to sit under more appropriate Management and Monitoring Mechanisms. The Key Challenges were reviewed with 12 revised, seven new added and several removed.

The review indicated that the listed activities generally align well and have a direct relationship to Key Challenges and will generally have a medium or high impact in addressing those Key Challenge. Key Challenges that were identified as not being well addressed by current activities are:

- Apply effective statutory planning instruments at regional levels (Revised);
- Addressing the neglect of R&D into non-vascular flora;
- Clarify incentive/compensation issues for private land conservation of native vegetation (Revised);
- Remove disincentives and contradictory policy for the conservation of native vegetation (New); and
- Develop and implement a R&D strategy to support vegetation management (New).

Most activities were recorded as being on-target, completed or ongoing as per plan. Biodiversity assessment activities are well advanced. The major progress by Tasmania against the National Vegetation Framework is the current mapping program to describe native vegetation condition as well as extent. This is a vital requirement for monitoring the reversal of the decline in the extent and quality of native vegetation.

At this stage Tasmania doesn't have a coherent monitoring and evaluation framework for monitoring and evaluation of all aspects for revision of plans but are working towards achieving the base data for targeted monitoring of key areas and issues. Tasmania is just developing the baseline tools and skills to monitor and respond to land management issues such as the side effects of the RFA process.

Clearance of native vegetation is still a major issue that needs to be addressed. The dominant driver for clearance of native vegetation has changed post the RFA process. Unfortunately indications are that one of the unintended consequences of the RFA process and the 2020 vision is the increase in plantations on what was native forest. Native vegetation is being cleared for plantation forests.

We were advised that the rate of clearing for agriculture is now relatively low compared to that being cleared for plantations. The aim was for plantations to go on low quality farm land but they are in fact being established on better quality native vegetation. The suggested reason is that market and taxation drivers favour plantation expansion and that the regulatory processes governing plantation development are not aligned with other land management policy and processes.

Recommendation 1 : That Tasmania develop and implement clearing control legislation.

Recommendation 2 : That an approval processes for clearing native vegetation for should be consistently applied regardless of the land use purpose - eg plantation forests or agriculture, mining, urbanisation.

With the amalgamation of state agencies in DPIWE inconsistencies in state and agency policy have been highlighted. Strategic planning will benefit with the release of the Biodiversity Strategy and the completion of LGA vegetation plans. However it is still necessary to resolve conflicting policy that exists within DPIWE and between government agencies.

Recommendation 3 : That Tasmania recognise the value of native vegetation to Tasmania and remove disincentives and contradictory policy for the conservation of native vegetation.

Tasmanian native vegetation protection and management programs have a high level of dependence on Commonwealth funding. This leaves programs and agency capacity vulnerable to short term cycles in funding availability.

Recommendation 4 : That the State Government fund critical areas of native vegetation management programs with support from the Commonwealth

The focus of the National Framework is on Planning, Assessment, R&D, and Monitoring and Evaluation. It was suggested that greater emphasis need to be placed on Implementation.

Recommendation 5 : That an Implementation Management and Monitoring Mechanism be added to the National Framework

Glossary

Abbreviation/Acronym	Definition
ANZECC	Australia New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council
BRS	Bureau of Resource Sciences
DPIWE	Department of Primary Industries, Water and the Environment
EA	Environment Australia
MMM	Management and Monitoring Mechanism
NCS	Nature Conservation Strategy
NVF	National Vegetation Framework
RFA	Regional Forest Agreement
SCC	Standing Committee on Conservation
TOR	Terms of Reference
WP	Work Plan

