

POLICY COSTING REQUEST – DURING THE CARETAKER PERIOD FOR A GENERAL ELECTION

Name of policy:	Protecting Threatened Species			
Person requesting costing:	Senator Milne			
Date of request to cost the policy:	14 August 2013			
<i>Note:</i> This policy costing request and the response to this request will be made publicly available.				
Has a costing of this policy been requested under Section 29 of the Charter of Budget Honesty (i.e. from the Treasury or the Department of Finance and Deregulation)?	No			
Details of the public release of this policy (Date, by whom and a reference to that release)	24 July 2013, Senator Milne/ Senator Waters http://greensmps.org.au/content/media-releases/greens- announce-plan-prevent-extinction-crisis			
Description of policy:				
Summary of policy (as applicable, please attach copies of relevant policy documents):	Provide \$30 million per annum to: o Fund comprehensive studies to identify and map important habitat nationally (including protected ecological communities, areas of critical habitat for threatened species and important wildlife corridors); o Protect that habitat through bioregional plans that guide development and establish clear no-go zones for different activities within each region across Australia. Provide \$10 million per annum to: o Support the rapid listing of all species and ecological communities which belong on the threatened list; o Develop and resource the implementation of recovery plans and threat abatement plans for listed species and ecological communities; o Fund additional research required to help turn around Australia's biodiversity decline. Restore the Government's \$470 million cuts to the Biodiversity Fund.			
What is the purpose or intention of the policy?	To deliver genuine protection for our nationally threatened species and precious wild spaces, far better environmental information for the community and greater certainty for industry			

What are the key assumptions that have been made in the policy, including:

PBO POLICY COSTING REQUEST – DURING THE CARETAKER PERIOD FOR A GENERAL ELECTION

Is the policy part of a package?	No
If yes, list and outline components and interactions with proposed or existing policies.	
Where relevant, is funding for the policy to be demand driven or a capped amount?	Capped amount. \$30 million per year is allocated for departmental and administered funds for bioregional planning. \$10 million per year will be allocated to support the rapid listing of all threatened species and ecological communities, the development of recovery plans and threat abatement plans for listed species and ecological communities, and additional research required to help turn around Australia's biodiversity decline. \$470 million to reverse budget cuts to the Biodiversity Fund.
Will third parties (for instance the States/Territories) have a role in funding or delivering the policy?	Bioregional planning assessments will be undertaken in partnership with states governments.
If yes, is the Australian Government contribution capped, with additional costs to be met by third parties, or is another funding formula envisaged?	
Are there associated savings, offsets or expenses? If yes, please provide details.	In regions where bioregional assessments / planning has been completed, there may be associated savings for the Department, as it will have a reduced project by project environmental assessment burden (as fewer projects will require Commonwealth assessment as long as they are rolled out in accordance with the requirements set out under the bioregional plan, subject to appropriate community consultation on setting the requirements so there is no overall reduction in community participation rights).
Does the policy relate to a previous budget measure? If yes, which measure?	No
If the proposal would change an existing measure, are savings expected from the departmental costs of implementing the program?	No change.
Will the funding/program cost require indexation? If yes, list factors to be used.	No.

PBO POLICY COSTING REQUEST – DURING THE CARETAKER PERIOD FOR A GENERAL ELECTION

Expected impacts of the proposal

If applicable, what are the estimated costs each year? If available, please provide details in the table below. Are these provided on an underlying cash balance or fiscal balance basis?

Estimated financial implications (outturn prices) ^(a)

Protecting threatened species	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Underlying cash balance (\$m)	0	-40	-40	-40
Fiscal balance (\$m)	0	-40	-40	-40

(a) A positive number for the fiscal balance indicates an increase in revenue or a decrease in expenses or net capital investment in accrual terms. A positive number in the underlying cash balance indicates an increase in revenue or a decrease in expenses or net capital investment in cash terms.

Reversing cuts to biodiversity fund	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Underlying cash balance (\$m)	-51	-71	-54	-50
Fiscal balance (\$m)	-51	-71	-54	-50
What assumptions have been made in deriving the expected financial impact in the party costing (please provide information on the data sources used to develop the policy)?	The above figures for restoring funding to the Biodiversity Fund relate to the cuts from the 2013 Budget and do not take into account the additional cuts made by the Government as outlined in its Economic Statement.			
Has the policy been costed by a third party? If yes, can you provide a copy of this costing and its assumptions?	Yes, by the PBO, 24 June 2013 and 25 July 2013.			
What is the expected community impact of the policy? How many people will be affected by the policy? What is the likely take up? What is the basis for these impact assessments/assumptions?	Far more clarity and certainty about the protections in pla nationally important species and wild places across Austr resulting in more effective and more strategic environr protection, as well as increased certainty and re regulatory burden on development.		oss Australia – environmental	

PBO POLICY COSTING REQUEST – DURING THE CARETAKER PERIOD FOR A GENERAL ELECTION

Administration of policy:			
Who will administer the policy (for example, Australian Government entity, the States, non-government organisation, etc.)?	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Populati and Communities		
Should departmental expenses associated with this policy be included in this costing?	Departmental expenses should be included within the capped amount.		
If no, will the Department be expected to absorb expenses associated with this policy?			
If yes, please specify the key assumptions, including whether departmental costs are expected with respect to program management (by policy agencies) and additional transactions/processing (by service delivery agencies).			
Intended date of implementation.	1 July 2014 for the additional funding for threatened specific protections From 2013/14 financial year for restoring funding to the Biodiversity Fund.		
Intended duration of policy.	Across forward estimates		
Are there transitional arrangements associated with policy implementation?	No, as it is an extension of current departmental activity.		
List major data sources utilised to develop policy (for example, ABS cat. no. 3201.0).			
Are there any other assumptions that need to be considered?	No		

NOTE:

Please note that:

- The costing will be on the basis of information provided in this costing request.
- The PBO is not bound to accept the assumptions provided by the requestor. If there is a material difference in the assumptions used by the PBO, the PBO will consult with the requestor in advance of the costing being completed.