

Why

a Pacific & Southern Oceans Institute is necessary

- 1. We do not have the necessary structures in place to manage the range of complex issues we have to face.
- 2. We do not have the broad-ranging spectrum of skills, knowledge or legislation – there is no durable platform for guardianship of this resource.
- 3. There is an opportunity for NZ to do something on the global stage, with scale and creativity.
- 4. Develop principles and guidelines to help decision-makers – future ocean watch.
- 5. Focus on strategy in policy development – connecting policy and good practice. Evidence-based policy is key (e.g. Sustainable Seas), but it should not all be about scientific research
- 6. Speak up for research. NZ's ocean space is large, but the number of people who manage the oceans is small. We don't know much about it, and we don't know how it will change. Climate warming is ocean warming.
- 7. Independent role is a political imperative: transparency, accountability and responsibility. Independent funding is also vital, but current system of funding creates competition between players, possibly not delivering best outcomes for oceans governance.
- 8. Huge gap in political leadership – difficult to gain consensus over time (e.g. fresh water over the last 10 years) – 'does there need to be a pressure group?' Land and Water Forum aimed to develop interface between science and policy, but could this work over oceans where boundaries, responsibilities and accountabilities are even less clear?
- 9. Integration – lacking one ocean concept – yes there is some 'bottom-up' traction, but there has been a consistent lack of top-down leadership – not top-down/different perspectives – need consistent voice.
- 10. Conveying power – need institution for public good – active constituency. Communications usually promote self-interest – need info that is purely for public good. Need an institution with little or no self-interest – non-partisan.
- 11. 'Never going to be easier than now.' Issues are becoming so much more complex and interrelated – 95% of NZ underwater.
- 12. Education around oceans governance – we need an informed ocean constituency that can communicate options and consequences of actions (or no actions). Provide clarity over the choices we as a society face.
- 13. A public good organisation will reduce the burden/load on NGOs – we don't have to dilute agencies' roles and responsibilities. Bring together an existing fragmented process; develop targets that can lead to real results – working independently or together towards common goals.
- 14. Currently no vehicle exists in society to help engage/inform/ make a decision 'by society'. There is no mechanism to bring about a range of different options for consideration. For example, we have so many mechanisms in regard to land but very few public mechanisms with ocean governance. On land, anyone can join in with councils – no equivalent for oceans.
- 15. Connecting transport, defence, fisheries and minerals in ocean governance (connecting the dots).
- 16. Navigation of our seas is a significant part of our history (e.g. Kupe, Cook).
- 17. Our responsibilities under the Antarctic Treaty System.
- 18. The Pacific and Southern oceans are very interrelated – you cannot draw lines in the ocean.
- 19. Experts are unsure what bureaucrats are doing.
- 20. Decreasing interest in New Zealand from both international NGOs (funding) and overseas commercial interests (investment) as nothing much happening. There has been a noticeable decrease in recent years.
- 21. Government won't care until it is an issue that will get them voted out.
- 22. This institute could fill a political void.
- 23. Speed up the policy process; it is not always a win/lose situation – solutions are not necessary expensive – conflict does not always exist.
- 24. We are reasonably good at coastline but not deep sea ocean research and management.
- 25. New Zealanders are using the oceans more and more.

How

to bring an institute into being
(Note: Requires further discussion)

- 1. Not costly and not too grand – cost-effective. Ideally exist within the normal government framework. For example, establishing a Parliamentary Commissioner for Oceans.
- 2. You would need legislation to bring about a Parliamentary Commissioner for Oceans, and presumably you would want it to be a govt bill.
- 3. Have a mandate, terms of reference, relevance, goals, funding mechanisms, etc.
- 4. Be apolitical.
- 5. Dual approach – has cross-sectoral/industry support but also needs public support too.
- 6. Must have tight time frame (deliverable outputs).
- 7. Long-term funding provided – but many options – including
 - (i) Parliamentary Commissioner for Oceans,
 - (ii) dividing/regrouping e.g. small portion from NIWA and other relevant CRIs, (iii) working with other major countries investing in oceans – USA, Russia, Germany, China, etc; (iv) working with philanthropists.
- 8. Must have autonomy.
- 9. Must be open to engage with all political parties.
- 10. Cross-sectoral approach.
- 11. Develop a name and purpose for the Institute in Māori that resonates with our history and our future (such as Kupe Pacific and Southern Oceans Institute).
- 12. Facilitate dialogue – not about the science. Dialogue is less expensive than research.
- 13. Look at how things are being done internationally.

- 1. An informed society that understand the challenges and opportunities facing our ocean. New Zealanders valuing oceans – currently it doesn't mean much to us – like Antarctica. Need an effective interface.
- 2. A small and dynamic group of experts that understand the challenges and opportunities facing our ocean. They also have skills in communicating complex scientific analysis.
- 3. The proposed institute promotes the use of plain language. If talking to interest groups – they should focus on the people who really matter.
- 4. Diverse stakeholders, such as iwi, industry and NGOs, want to work together in an integrated manner and then communicate to all. It should advocate for slow, proactive, evidence-based, considered public policy rather than creating fast, reactive policy tools.
- 5. A small, tight, focused, reliable, secure institution exists. It should not over promise, particularly in its early days. It should have independent funding and political sponsorship (i.e. not left to flounder along).
- 6. International parties want to work here! Fund here! What's interesting to other countries? Authenticity, credibility – doing interesting things – showcasing how to integrate nation states

Risks

acting as obstacles to its establishment

- 1. Conflicting interests stagnating progress.
- 2. Sole focus on research focus (e.g. NIWA does this).
- 3. Funding – how to create independent funding?
- 4. Mandate often linked to funding – e.g. if philanthropists fund it, will they be in charge?
- 5. Need officials (departments) to support (not just dependent on the will of govt but all of government). Not just govt support but support action.
- 6. Inability to guess what stakeholders want.
- 7. Getting big too quickly – risk being swamped.
- 8. Funding disappearing.
- 9. Overpromising and under delivering Culture/different environment.
- 10. How do we get people excited about the oceans?
- 11. Easily ignored by government (or could become a political football).

What

success would look like

- around the world. Help NZ mana – take away from partisan NZ. We need people to put money on the table and let NZ do something big. New Zealand's space programme is an oceans programme. Be an example of how to bring nations together to work on shared, complex problems.
- 7. Illustrates/register of public assets/commodities/resources in the ocean domain
- 8. Showcases iwi/Crown collaboration
- 9. Showcases public/private collaboration
- 10. Showcases local, national and international collaboration
- 11. Showcases a non-partisan approach to ocean governance
- 12. Wellington-based (reasons for politicians to come to Wellington) – 'attracts political leverage to Wellington (national weight + leverage globally). Sits well beside creative industries (Weta, etc).
- 13. Produces world-class research – a gold standard.
- 14. Engages with the Pacific island states, their issues, challenges and opportunities.

How

such an institute would operate in practice
(Note: Requires further discussion)

- 1. Keep scope small and tight, tightly focused.
- 2. Must have in place a public engagement process.
- 3. Everything is in the public domain – open data.
- 4. Set out context and assumptions clearly.
- 5. Tackle false dichotomy of environment vs economy – and find common goals.
- 6. Not aiming to come up with an overall solution but putting in place a process that works – 'keep dynamic process going'.
- 7. Working with the scale – few people/big ocean (put a few people into battle).
- 8. Not a decision-maker but advocate informed choices/options.
- 9. Multidisciplinary approach is good: legal, science, policy, advocacy, academic, environmental protection, economic development, cultural interests and global connections.
- conflicts and commonalities that exist before policy documents are placed before Cabinet – independent and credible.
- 23. Obtains support/buy-in from senior officials, universities + CRIs.
- 24. Develops links with modern tools; for example, creating virtual access – Weta/James Cameron.
- 25. Has a role of exploring the future – like the 'Centre for Advanced Engineering' in Chch.
- 26. Durable over the long term. No borders over long time frame – has to live beyond political timelines and geographical boundaries.
- 27. Has gained public support and engagement. Has developed a way of working – a clever process – that is transparent, logical and is trusted.
- 28. Commercial sectors noticing impact on shellfish, salmon farming and fishing changing (possibly due to change in currents and warming of sea). Commercial sectors need something to happen.
- 29. The proposed governance body creating an innovative structure that fills the gaps of historic approaches.
- 30. Learning from a thorough analysis of the Land and Water Forum process.
- 31. Having a code of ethics.