

Appendix **Eight**



**Southern
Prospects**
2004 - 2009

*The South Coast Regional
Strategy For Natural
Resource Management*

**SIF PRINCIPLES AND
PRIORITY-SETTING MATRIX**

Appendix 8 Guiding Principles for the Salinity Investment Framework

1. *The top priority public investments are those which generate the greatest public benefits per dollar of public investment.* Whether protection of a particular asset falls into this "top priority" category depends on the costs of preventative treatments, the effectiveness of the treatments and the values of the assets. "Values" include social and environmental values, as well as economic values.
2. *Direct financial assistance to landholders to undertake salinity action should be strategic and should not exceed the public benefits that result.* It should be focused on priority areas with high value and high probability of success.
3. Where the priority is high and net public benefits are sufficient, Government should be prepared to take strong action to ensure protection of the asset. This might also include compensation or structural adjustment, regulation, monitoring to ensure achievement.
4. Where the public priority is low but there are extensive private assets at risk, public investment should be aimed at industry development. Appropriate industry development is activity that seeks to develop profitable systems to prevent or contain salinity or to adapt to saline land and water.
5. Inevitably, a targeted investment strategy in salinity management will result in an unequal distribution of investment across the State. Government must accept, and the community appreciate, that the limited funds available for public investment in salinity can only target assets where there is the highest public benefit.
6. Government must fulfil its statutory obligations for land, natural resources and functions (such as research) when it sets its priorities for investment in salinity action. These obligations are required by law and should be taken into account early in the planning process. This emphasises the need for people to better understand socio-political processes at all levels.
7. *The processes required for priority-setting will involve ongoing learning and need constant feedback.* Over time, funding priorities will change as new information becomes available and programs adapt, goals are met and new challenges arise. Feedback will be assisted by making assumptions explicit at all stages, and especially so when assessing and re-assessing feasibility of options.
8. *Setting priorities must proceed even when there is only limited or imperfect information on prevailing environmental, social and economic circumstances.* Doing nothing because not everything is known is generally not a good response. The impact of and lessons learnt from early actions should be used to improve understanding of catchment processes.

Priority Setting Matrix for Management Actions

1. Does the management action protect or restore a priority (high value) asset or underpin its protection or restoration?	<i>score only one column to the right</i>	protects more than one high priority asset =4	protects a high priority asset=3	protects one or more medium assets=2	protects one or more low value assets=1	no assets protected/ unknown=0
2. Does the management action reduce or remove a high threat or is it essential to underpin threat abatement?	<i>score only one column to the right</i>	addresses more than one high threat =4	addresses a high risk/ management action located in high risk area=3	medium risk/medium risk area=2	low risk/ low risk area=1	does not address threats / unknown =0
3. Is the management action technically feasible? ie Is there strong evidence/experience to support this action contributing to an improvement in resource condition as measured by regional RC indicators?	<i>score only one column to the right</i>	action will effect significant improvements in more than one of the resource condition targets =4	action will effect significant improvements in one of the resource condition targets =3	action will effect moderate improvements in one or more resource condition targets = 2	action likely to effect minimal improvement on resource condition targets =1	nil demonstrated OR unknown =0
4. Is there a risk that the management action may have detrimental impacts (direct or indirect) on any other resource condition targets?	<i>score only one column to the right NB If more than minimal detrimental impacts are likely, the management action should not be considered further unless compensatory actions are also included</i>	no detrimental impacts =4			minimal on one other =1	minimal impacts on more than one =0
5. Is the management action supported by the community?	score only one column to the right	strong support demonstrated through community consultation and/or previous community participation in the action =4	strong support likely =3	moderate support =2	community support limited =1	no community support =0

6. Will the management action address the causes rather than the symptoms of threats to resource conditions?	score only one column to the right	action addresses causes of threats to resources =4		action is primarily to restore condition of resources =2		addresses symptoms only =0
max score = 24						
High = 24-22: Medium = 21-19: Low = 18-0						
Is the management action required as a first step in a program OR is the management action required to prevent serious degradation of a high value asset in the immediate future?	score only one column to the right		A= essential first step OR needs to be implemented quickly to prevent further deterioration in resource condition; A = score of 4 in 1&2	B= Important component of a program, can be undertaken immediately but not as time-critical as A; B = Score of 4 in either 1 or 2	C= requires A or B to occur first	