

CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED DECISION CRITERIA

The Ministry of Fisheries (MFish) is going to use decision criteria to help us allocate MFish resources across our work. They will also help us decide which pieces of work to do. We are interested in your views on whether the proposed criteria are appropriate. **Submissions close on 28 May 2010;** contact information is at the bottom of this document.

PURPOSE

- 1 MFish is going to use decision criteria to help allocate MFish resources. We now seek your views on the adequacy of the proposed criteria.
- 2 Decision criteria will align decision making with the long term strategic direction set out in the Fisheries 2030 document. They do this by ensuring proposed activities contribute to, or match, Fisheries 2030 strategic goals. Those goals are reflected in each element of the criteria.
- 3 Criteria will be used to assist MFish to prioritise the allocation of resources (for instance in deciding which pieces of work to do). However, criteria do not replace MFish policy analysis. Instead the proposed criteria will inform analysis.
- 4 Decision criteria will provide consistency and transparency. They do this by providing a standardised process for decision making. Consistent application of decision criteria is important to ensure credibility in MFish processes. Decision criteria also ensure that decision makers receive all the information necessary to make an informed decision.

PROPOSED DECISION CRITERIA

- 5 The proposed criteria are broken into three parts:
 - Part One establishes the **strategic context** of the activity being proposed and seeks information on why MFish should resource the activity. This requires outlining what impact the activity will have on MFish objectives. Impacts include both the contribution to and repercussion of undertaking the activity. Ensuring all relevant impacts on MFish strategic direction are identified ensures that the net value proposition of criteria two and three can properly be explored.
 - Part Two explores the **value** of the activity. Information is sought as to how the activity will either contribute or detract from MFish objectives. These criteria are closely aligned to the use and environment outcomes contained in Fisheries 2030.
 - Part Three ensures appropriate **governance conditions** contained in Fisheries 2030 have been taken into account.

I. The strategic context of the activity in relation to other MFish outcomes

A: Gives effect to MFish outcomes

- 6 This criterion requires an explicit assessment of how the proposed activity will affect MFish outcomes, including:
- Priorities – Ministerial priorities, strategic fit, etc: how the activity contributes or negatively affects Ministerial priorities or wider MFish strategic goals.
 - Fisheries 2030 – Outcomes, Objectives and Actions: how the activity fits with MFish’s long term strategic plan.
 - MFish legislative obligations, policies and standards: how the activity meets legal requirements and complies with policies and Ministry standards.
- 7 Consideration is given to whether the activity is compatible with government goals and priorities. These include:
- Economic growth and reform of national resource management.
 - Cross government strategies and initiatives including the international strategy, (Natural Resource Sector network, shared services and so forth).
- 8 An activity will either contribute towards meeting an MFish objective, or not, but in either case may have wider repercussions. For instance, ensuring sustainability of fish stocks may promote ensuring fisheries management systems integrity, but reduce the possibility of utilisation for certain stocks. These tensions should be made explicit in any analysis.

II. Value of the activity and environment

- 9 There are two parts to this assessment. The first part identifies how the activity will affect the use of fisheries in regard to the Fisheries 2030 outcome: “Fisheries resources are used in a manner that provides greatest overall economic, social, and cultural benefit”. This requires an assessment of how the proposed activity will either contribute or detract from this goal. How the activity impacts stakeholders should be addressed. The second part assesses whether the proposed activity meets the Fisheries 2030 outcome: “The capacity and integrity of the aquatic environment, habitats, and species are sustained at levels that provide for current and future use”.

B: Provides for the use of fisheries

- 10 Criterion B requires an assessment of the net value and benefit the activity would provide from the use of the fisheries resource and how the activity will contribute to (or detract, from) the use-based objectives (economic, social, and cultural) of the activity. Information on how an activity may negatively impact on the use outcome and objectives outlined in Fisheries 2030 should be provided. In addition, how the activity impacts stakeholders should be addressed. This will include any compliance costs for stakeholders.

C: Manages environmental sustainability within environmental limits

- 11 Criterion C requires an assessment of the net value and benefit of how the activity will affect environmental sustainability. For example, the development of environmental standards

around seabird management may lead to a reduction of environmental impacts of a fishery. Again, this criterion does not include assessing the MFish costs of undertaking the activity.

III. Governance conditions, including value for money of the activity, obligations to Maori and stakeholders

D: Obligations to Maori

- 12 This criterion evaluates the net value and benefit the activity would provide relating to the delivery of obligations to Maori. The criterion ensures the activity is consistent with MFish obligations to Maori under the Deed of Settlement. Consideration should also be given to whether the proposed activity assists in the integration of customary and commercial interests.

E: Provides for value for money within fiscal constraints:

- 13 This criterion requires an assessment of the governments resources required to undertake the activity, both to implement the activity and to manage it in the future. Analysts proposing the allocation of resources should provide information on capital and operating costs, as well as staff time that may be needed to implement changes. Equally, information detailing whether MFish has the current capability or capacity to complete the activity is required. This includes forecasting out-years, including monitoring the activity. Cost recovery should be addressed here, as should any efficiencies to be gained from undertaking the activity.

F: Considers stakeholder interests:

- 14 This criterion requires an assessment of possible stakeholder interests, conflicts, and potential reactions, and how MFish might respond to those.

G: Any other relevant consideration:

- 15 This last criterion is a 'catch all' to provide for any other relevant considerations. This criterion requires an assessment of factors external to MFish and agencies outside the control of MFish and the risks that this activity addresses and what risks may become evident in undertaking this activity.

SUBMISSIONS

- 16 Please provide any submissions by 28 May 2010. Written submissions should be emailed to matt.burt@fish.govt.nz or posted to Matthew Burt, Ministry of Fisheries, PO Box 1020, Wellington.
- 17 If you require any further information on this proposal please contact Matthew Burt on the email address above or by phone on 04 819 4600.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John Beaglehole".

John Beaglehole
Manager, Office of the Chief Executive