

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	6
METHODOLOGY.....	7
THE DEPARTMENT AND ITS ENVIRONMENT.....	9
The Role, Functions and Structure of the Department	9
The State Sector Reforms	11
The Environment in which the Department Operates	11
THE DEPARTMENT'S SYSTEMS AND PERFORMANCE	13
Allocation and Management of Resources.....	13
Planning and Risk Management.....	13
Reporting	14
Human Resources.....	15
Internal Audit.....	16
The Performance of the Department and its Chief Executive	18
THE DEPARTMENT'S 1995 REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES IN THE WEST COAST CONSERVANCY	21
THE RELEVANCE AND EFFECT OF MATTERS IDENTIFIED BY THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE COLLAPSE OF A VIEWING PLATFORM AT CAVE CREEK	23
The Issues Identified by the Commission of Inquiry as Affecting the Department's Performance	23
The Recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry with respect to the Building Act; the Health & Safety in Employment Act; and other Legislation.....	24

FINDINGS 26

RECOMMENDATIONS..... 27

CONCLUSIONS..... 28

APPENDICES

1 Terms of Reference
2 Sites Visited, Interviews Conducted and Unsolicited Submissions Received
3 Legislation under which the Department has Responsibilities
4 The Department's Outputs for 1995/96
5 The Department's Structure
6 Maps of the Department's Lands and Offices

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1 The Department of Conservation was established in 1987 following a review of environmental administration. It brought together the majority of Government's conservation functions from six other government agencies, enabling an integrated approach to be taken to managing the conservation estate.
- 2 The Department is a large organisation with a daunting task to accomplish. It has wide ranging and complex functions under the Conservation Act 1987, relating to the management of the conservation estate and protection of New Zealand's natural and historic resources. It also has responsibilities under a range of other legislation, including significant functional and advocacy responsibilities under the Resource Management Act 1991.
- 3 There is a high level of interest and emotion generated by many of the issues the Department deals with. There are often conflicting pressures on the Department, notably reflecting the tension between conservation, use, development, Iwi and tourism perspectives. This exposes the Department to considerable external scrutiny, and some litigation, and creates a requirement for the Department to be highly consultative in the development of its policies and operations.
- 4 Because of its geographic spread, a decentralised organisation is required to manage the conservation estate. The Department was originally established with a highly devolved management system. The Chief Executive, since his appointment in 1990, has introduced more national standards and systems so as to overcome some inconsistency in service delivery nationally and to provide greater assurance of acceptable performance to the Chief Executive. New systems and improvements to existing systems are underway which, when implemented, will provide further assurance to the Chief Executive.
- 5 The Department has a robust business planning system and a financial management system which is appropriate to its needs. The business planning system has been incrementally modified over recent years and is now well established. It has been generally successful in integrating consideration of national and local priorities. The financial management system has played a major role in the significant improvement in the Department's financial performance over recent years. The system is generally operating effectively throughout the organisation.
- 6 Risk analysis is undertaken in various ways throughout the Department (and has included national standards for huts and bridges) and reporting against identified risks is generally adequate. However, there has been no systematic framework in place to ensure that a consistent approach to risk analysis is taken across the Department or that all potential risks are considered in each Conservancy. This is being addressed through development of a comprehensive quality assurance system, entitled Quality Conservation Management.
- 7 The Department's system for planning and managing projects should have been adequate for the majority of small projects but a more adequate system is needed for planning and managing major or complex projects. In some functional areas, systems to deal with complex projects are provided at national

level and are operating well. In addition, the Department has made good progress in developing a new, comprehensive system of project planning and management.

- 8 While the reporting systems across the Department are generally of a good standard and appropriate to the business needs of the organisation, there is some variability in the quality of the information reported. The systems and controls in place vary markedly, with some Conservancies having good control systems in place to provide assurance as to the information which is being reported. Other Conservancies do not have such complete systems and therefore could not provide the same level of assurance.
- 9 There has been a significant improvement in the Department's approach to human resource management over the past two years as a result of the development of a People Plan by the Department. The Department needs to develop a strategy to ensure it will have the people it requires in the medium term, including an analysis of its recruitment and staff development needs. Until recent times, important aspects of staff training have not been a priority for the Department. There is a significant backlog of identified training requirements. The Review Team is concerned over the extent of training required in the Department, and in particular, the Department's ability to release staff from their output work to undertake training.
- 10 The Department's internal audit function has not provided the Chief Executive with the assurance he needs that the Department's systems are operating properly and that departmental policies and practices are being adhered to. The internal audit programme should be based on the systematic assessment of risk referred to above. There is a need for a specific contract with Audit New Zealand on the additional financial audit work they perform, so that there is a clear understanding of the respective scope and programme of work undertaken by the internal and external audits.
- 11 The Review Team noted a wide variation in the standard of management practices and performance at the Conservancies visited. Most were operating at an acceptable to very good standard, with a few being judged to be in need of improvement or poor in some aspects of their operation. This was evident in areas such as staff supervision, project management, self review, risk assessment, and implementation of statutory requirements.
- 12 Resourcing is a major issue for the Department. The Department needs to take a more strategic approach to consideration of its funding needs in relation to its ability to deliver its outputs and fulfill its statutory requirements. The Review Team was not required, nor was it able, to form a view on the adequacy of the Department's funding. The Department's core functions have never been costed on a zero base. The Department is therefore not well placed to put forward an objective case for additional funds where its obligations increase. The Review Team is of the view that the Treasury and the Department should, as a matter of priority, work together to establish a more robust basis on which to assess the level of funding required for the Department to meet its responsibilities and obligations.
- 13 For Public Service managers there is a tension between the implicit requirements of the State Sector Act 1988 and the Public Finance Act 1989. This tension is between the public service ethos, which has traditionally underpinned management in the Public Service, and is enshrined in the State Sector Act, and the purchasing approach to financial decision making which accompanies the Public Finance Act. The former leads Chief Executives to do as much as

they possibly can with available resources; the latter leads, in times of fiscal constraint, to prioritising and a reduction in outputs produced. Where there is a heavy load of non-discretionary functions this could lead to a reduction in standards and quality of service delivery. Accountabilities in this situation are not clear.

- 14 There is a large range of management issues to be addressed in the West Coast Conservancy. The Department's internal review concluded that the state of organisational health in this Conservancy was low. The Review Team endorses this finding. However, the unique features of the Conservancy such as the size, geographical spread, and range of activities, including mining and other use issues, need to be kept in mind in order to appreciate the pressures and difficulties under which the Conservancy operates. These are compounded by the difficulties of working in an often hostile environment. In spite of this, the dedication and commitment of staff to conservation values is strong.
- 15 Head Office made Regional Conservators responsible for implementation of the Building Act 1991 and the Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992, but was not sufficiently timely or proactive in ensuring consistent implementation. There was a degree of variation among Conservancies in the extent to which the requirements of these Acts were implemented.
- 16 When the Director-General was appointed, early in 1990, he took charge of an organisation that was still in the early stage of its development. The Treasury, the Audit Office and State Services Commission had serious concerns over the state of its financial systems. Accordingly, financial management, business planning and resource prioritisation were given greater attention. As noted in this report, these areas are now operating well.
- 17 In addition to the achievements outlined in paragraph 16 above, and the introduction of other major initiatives and conservation strategies, the Director-General has been systematically introducing new and improved systems, although as noted, this process is not complete. The Cave Creek disaster has undoubtedly given impetus to speeding it up. In our opinion the Director-General has performed well in a complex and demanding role and we endorse the State Services Commissioner's assessments that he has either exceeded or met the expectations of an able and competent Public Service Chief Executive.
- 18 It is quite clear that the cause of the collapse of the platform at Cave Creek was not a lack of funding of the project. There can never be a one hundred percent guarantee that there will not be human error or failure, no matter how strong an organisation's systems and procedures. Having undertaken this review we believe that the systems currently within the Department of Conservation, together with new and improved systems in progress, make the possibility of a failure such as occurred at Cave Creek extremely unlikely.

INTRODUCTION

- 19 On 28 April 1995, a Department of Conservation viewing platform at Cave Creek on the West Coast of the South Island collapsed, with the loss of 14 lives. A Commission of Inquiry was appointed to inquire into the tragedy. The Commissioner, Judge G S Noble, reported to the Governor General on 10 November 1995.
- 20 In his report, the Commission of Inquiry raised issues relating to the management and resourcing of the Department of Conservation. In light of the Commissioner's findings, the State Services Commissioner has carried out a review of the performance of the Department and its Chief Executive under section 6(b) of the State Sector Act in respect of the matters arising from the report of the Cave Creek Commission of Inquiry.
- 21 The State Services Commissioner appointed: Mr Michael Morris, a senior partner in KPMG Peat Marwick and Chairman of the Land Transport Safety Authority (Convenor); Mr Michael Collins, a consultant and former Director-General of the DSIR; Ms Joan Fleming, a consultant and former Deputy General Manager of the Iwi Transition Agency; to undertake the review. In addition, Dame Miriam Dell, who has been active in conservation matters for many years, was appointed as an Advisor and participated fully in the review. The State Services Commission provided staff and support facilities to assist in carrying out the review and field work.
- 22 The Terms of Reference for the review are attached at Appendix 1.
- 23 In terms of the Public Service employment framework, the State Services Commissioner reviews the performance of the Chief Executive and the Chief Executive is responsible for reviewing the performance of the Department's employees. The Review Team was therefore not required to consider the performance of individuals other than the Chief Executive.

METHODOLOGY

- 24 The Review Team was set up by the State Services Commissioner at short notice. It commenced its substantive work on Friday 1 December 1995 and completed its field work on Thursday 14 December 1995. In working to such a tight timeframe, the Review Team had to structure its inquiries in a manner which would enable it to address adequately the matters raised in its Terms of Reference. While there were matters that the Review Team would have wished to investigate in greater depth had time been available, these matters are not considered material to the Terms of Reference. The Review Team was careful to ensure that conclusions have been soundly based on the information obtained.
- 25 The review required an analysis of how the Department of Conservation identifies and manages the key issues and risks associated with its functions and operations, and how it allocates and manages resources. The review has also focused on whether the 'systemic failure' referred to in the report of the Commission of Inquiry into Cave Creek was indicative of a general failure of systems throughout the Department.
- 26 To undertake this analysis, the Review Team found it necessary to collect data from which it could assess the effectiveness of the management and systems and procedures across the Department. In order to collect the required data, the Review Team:
- a obtained documentary information from the Department regarding Departmental systems and procedures;
 - b undertook a series of site visits to six Conservancies and six Field Centres and conducted interviews with Regional Conservators and members of their management team, Field Centre Managers and other staff;
 - c conducted a range of interviews with senior staff in the Department's Head Office, other Departmental staff, and external parties considered necessary by the Review Team;
 - d undertook an analysis of the Department's performance reporting;
 - e received and considered performance reports undertaken by central agencies: the Audit Office; the Treasury; and State Services Commission; and
 - f evaluated the Department's key management control systems and procedures in terms of their adequacy for the purpose for which they were established.
- 27 Because of the timeframe for the review, the Review Team did not formally seek submissions from other interested parties. However, where interested parties contacted the Review Team they were encouraged to provide a submission. All submissions received were considered in the Review Team's analysis of the issues in the Terms of Reference.
- 28 A list of the sites visited, the interviews conducted and submissions received is contained in Appendix 2.
- 29 The Review Team sought corroboration of information provided before drawing conclusions. Feedback was given to the Regional Conservators following site visits, and to the Director-General prior to finalising findings.

- 30 The Review Team wishes to acknowledge the high level of cooperation it received from the management and staff of the Department. Information requested by the Review Team was provided in a comprehensive and timely manner. In addition, departmental staff facilitated the Review Team's visits to Regional Conservancies and Field Centres.

THE DEPARTMENT AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

The Role, Functions and Structure of the Department

- 31 The Department was established in 1987 following a review of environmental administration. It brought together almost all of the major conservation functions of Government, which had been previously located in the New Zealand Forest Service, the Department of Lands and Survey, the Wildlife Service and Historic Places Trust in the Department of Internal Affairs, the Commission for the Environment, and the Ministries of Transport and Agriculture and Fisheries.
- 32 The Review Team has been impressed by the scale and diversity of the Department's functions and tasks. The Department is a large organisation with wide ranging and complex functions relating to management of the conservation estate and protection of New Zealand's natural and historic resources. The Conservation Act (s6) records the Department's functions as:
- '...to administer this Act and the enactments specified in the First Schedule to this Act, and, subject to this Act and those enactments and to the directions (if any) of the Minister,-
- (a) To manage for conservation purposes, all land, and all other natural and historic resources, for the time being held under this Act, and all other land and natural and historic resources whose owner agrees with the Minister that they should be managed by the Department:
 - (b) To advocate the conservation of natural and historic resources generally:
 - (c) To promote the benefits to present and future generations of-
 - (i) The conservation of natural and historic resources generally and the natural and historic resources of New Zealand in particular;
 - (ii) The conservation of the natural and historic resources of New Zealand's sub-antarctic islands and, consistently with all relevant international agreements, of the Ross Dependency and Antarctica generally; and
 - (iii) International co-operation on matters relating to conservation:
 - (d) To prepare, provide, disseminate, promote, and publicise educational and promotional material relating to conservation:
 - (e) To the extent that the use of any natural or historic resource for recreation or tourism is not inconsistent with its conservation, to foster the use of natural and historic resources for recreation, and to allow their use for tourism:
 - (f) To advise the Minister on matters relating to any of those functions or to conservation generally:
 - (g) Every other function conferred on it by any other enactment.'
- 33 In addition to the Conservation Act, the Department has responsibilities under a wide range of other legislation including significant functional and advocacy responsibilities under the Resource Management Act. A list of the legislation under which the Department has responsibilities is contained in Appendix 3.
- 34 The Department's functions are reflected in the range of outputs purchased from the Department by the Minister of Conservation. The outputs purchased in the current financial year are listed in Appendix 4.

- 35 The Department's structure provides for both national and regional integration of functions. National integration is achieved through Head Office divisions, which are each headed by a director. Each division has national responsibility for a specific functional area (eg. Protected Species). Geographic integration is achieved through all of the Department's functions within a particular geographic area (Conservancy) being the responsibility of the Regional Conservator. The Executive Management Team (EMT), comprising the top management of the Department, provides strategic direction, makes major resource allocation decisions and oversees the work of the Conservancies and Head Office divisions. The Department's structure is set out in Appendix 5.
- 36 The Department is widely represented throughout the country. In addition to its Head Office, the Department has 14 Regional Conservancy offices, and 73 Field Centres, as well as a number of Visitor Centres and Field Bases. The geographic spread of the Department is illustrated in Appendix 6. The Department administers approximately 28% of the country's land area, with the largest conservancy encompassing an area equivalent to 20km either side of State Highway One from Wellington to Auckland. Conservancies differ markedly depending on the nature of the estate they are responsible for administering.
- 37 When established, the Department operated a highly decentralised management system. The structure was modified following a review by Coopers & Lybrand in 1989. A number of submissions received by the Review Team brought to our attention current proposals for the reorganisation of the Department. In general, the submissions received affirmed the importance of an integrated Department and, on these grounds, rejected the need for reorganisation. The Review Team does not believe that another reorganisation at this time would be in the best interests of the conservation estate in New Zealand, and the responsibilities attached to managing it.
- 38 Since the appointment of the current Chief Executive in 1990, the extent of devolved authority has been decreased with the introduction of national standards and national systems. This has been in response to some inconsistency in service delivery nationally, but more importantly, to provide greater assurance of acceptable performance to the Chief Executive.
- 39 Head Office is responsible for strategic direction, policy development and the development of standards in functional areas. Regional Conservators have responsibility for the Department's operations and key outputs in their region. They have considerable operational decision-making discretion, operating under devolved authority, both in relation to statutory functions, and with respect to the management of the Department in their region. Although national standards have been established in many areas, the Department still has some way to go to provide the necessary level of policy and operational guidance to Conservancies.
- 40 The Chief Executive is employed by the State Services Commissioner, their relationship being formalised in a contract of employment. In addition, there is an annual Performance Agreement between the Chief Executive and the Minister of Conservation which refers to a Purchase Agreement outlining the outputs the Minister and the Chief Executive agree the Department should produce for that year. The State Services Commissioner has the statutory role of reviewing the performance of the Chief Executive in relation to the above agreements.

The State Sector Reforms

- 41 As part of the wider macro- and micro-economic and public administration reforms of the 1980's, wide-ranging reform of the public sector management system was introduced by the State Sector Act 1988 and the Public Finance Act 1989. Underpinning these two Acts is a philosophy of enhancing public sector performance by establishing:
- a clear roles for, and relationships between, all involved; and
 - b accountability processes based around:
 - clear, prior specification of desired performance;
 - appropriate delegation of decision-making authority;
 - subsequent reporting and monitoring of actual achievement; and
 - careful application of incentives and sanctions.
- 42 The State Sector Act made departmental chief executives responsible to their Ministers for the performance of the Department. The Act also gave chief executives the full rights, duties and powers of an employer in respect of all departmental staff, tempered by the requirement to operate within government policy and a requirement to consult with the State Services Commissioner on collective interest issues (eg. industrial relations).
- 43 The Public Finance Act made the distinction between the goods and services produced by the Department (outputs) and the impacts on, or consequences for, the community of those outputs (outcomes). The Act made Chief Executives responsible for the production of agreed outputs, but not the achievement of outcomes. This was based on the premise that Chief Executives should not be held accountable for things they do not have the full ability to control.
- 44 The Public Finance Act also distinguished between Government's interests as owner of a Department and as principal purchaser of the outputs produced by the Department. Chief Executives are:
- a accountable to the purchase Minister(s) for the quantity, quality and cost of outputs produced by the Department; and
 - b separately accountable to the Responsible Minister for the financial management of the Crown's investment in the Department as a whole. This aspect extends to the maintenance of all aspects of departmental capability and integrity, including systems of planning, internal control, reporting and risk management.

The Environment in which the Department Operates

- 45 There is a high level of interest and emotion generated by many of the issues the Department deals with. Particular interest groups, local authorities, users of the conservation estate, Iwi Maori, and the general public all have a keen interest in various aspects of the Department's work as manager of the conservation estate and other aspects of New Zealand's natural heritage.
- 46 There are often conflicting pressures on the Department, notably reflecting the tension between conservation, use, and development perspectives, which are manifested in tensions between: wild animal control and recreational hunting; habitat protection and pressures from the public for access to wildlife

sanctuaries; the relative allocation of resources between the 'front-country' (ie. the more accessible facilities) and the back-country; tourism and conservation; and the accommodation of Maori conservation perspectives and customary use. The Department is the only government department which is required by legislation to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. This adds a further complexity to the Department's conservation responsibilities.

- 47 This environment exposes the Department to a high level of external scrutiny, and some litigation, and creates a requirement for the Department to be highly consultative in the development of its policies and operations. The New Zealand Conservation Authority and seventeen regional Conservation Boards have been established under the Conservation Act to provide formal mechanisms for community input into the Department's policies and operations.
- 48 The nature of the Department's work attracts staff who are highly motivated. It is generally acknowledged that many of the Department's staff are committed to the conservation cause. They are therefore often highly motivated to achieve conservation goals, which does not always sit easily with resourcing or other management constraints. This can lead them to try to do too much, which is a feature of the Department's culture the Chief Executive is endeavouring to overcome.
- 49 Since its establishment, the Department has been given responsibility for more "demand driven" activities associated with the Resource Management Act 1991 and Biosecurity Act 1993, and has had an increase in volume of work associated with Treaty issues. The Review Team has some concerns that the Department's delivery of its fundamental and statutory conservation activities may be constrained by the need to fund additional responsibilities, particularly given the level of fixed costs in its budget, such as its Field Centre infrastructure.
- 50 Since the establishment of the Department, the Public Service has experienced a period of considerable macro- and micro-economic and public administration reform. Tied to these reforms has been a period of fiscal restraint which has required Public Sector organisations to become more efficient. This included the requirement to increase outputs at the expense of overheads and departmental infrastructure. The Commission of Inquiry suggested that the Department is under resourced. This seems to be supported, for example, in the minutes of the Planning and Development Select Committee of August 1995 "... it is clear to the Committee that the Department is under resourced and the Committee therefore continues to express its serious concern over the level of funding for Vote Conservation".
- 51 If it is accepted that the Department was underfunded on establishment (the Review Team has not itself addressed this issue as it is beyond the scope of its Terms of Reference), the impact of these fiscal restraints is likely to have been greater on the Department of Conservation than on most other Public Service Departments.

THE DEPARTMENT'S SYSTEMS AND PERFORMANCE

Allocation and Management of Resources

- 52 The Department was established in 1987 with a small Head Office, which had a policy focus, and with operational responsibilities decentralised to the regions. The Department became operational without adequate management control systems in place. Furthermore, a major restructuring took place in 1989 which further reduced the size of Head Office. Since 1990, when the current Chief Executive was appointed, good progress has been made with the development of management systems.
- 53 The Department has a financial management system (DoCFIN) which is appropriate to its needs. It was put in place in 1989/90 and has been progressively developed as the needs of the organisation have evolved. It has played a major role in the significant improvement in the Department's financial performance over recent years.
- 54 The financial management system is generally operating effectively throughout the organisation. The improvements in the financial systems and performance have been reflected in favourable reports on the Department by the Audit Office and the Treasury. This is a significant achievement by the Chief Executive. However, there are some areas where further improvement is necessary. DoCFIN is not at present on-line to all Field Centres, due in some cases to factors outside of the Department's control, and some transactions are still recorded manually. In addition, as not all Field Centres record commitments, there is a gap in the Department's financial information.
- 55 Management of resources at the Head Office level could be more strategic. The Department's core business (ie. that which it has to undertake) has not been costed on a zero base, including at the time of its establishment. A number of non-discretionary tasks have been allocated to or accepted by the Department since then, without, the Department believes, adequate recognition of the impact of the new work on its ability to fund and carry out existing work programmes.
- 56 The Department's information system is extensive but not yet complete. A national computer network is being implemented but is not yet fully in place. As a consequence of this, there are still some local information systems operating. Accordingly, the Review Team found some variability between Conservancies in the level of access to information systems. This may, in part, be due to the gap that followed the departure of the Information Services Manager in July 1993. The Information Services have since been reviewed and a Computer Services Manager has recently been appointed. There was also some variability in the ability of Conservancies to track key information. Some Conservancies were not able to locate easily key instructions from Head Office.

Planning and Risk Management

- 57 The Department has put in place a number of regular procedures to identify organisational risk but has not undertaken a systematic risk evaluation across-the-board, although this is intended as an early priority for the Internal Audit Unit. While risk analysis is undertaken in various ways throughout the Department, and has included standards for huts and bridges, there is no

systematic framework in place to ensure that a consistent approach is taken across the Department or that all potential risks are considered in each Conservancy. Those not covered by national standards remain the responsibility of the Regional Conservator. We would comment, however, that there are many other organisations in New Zealand that have not implemented a comprehensive risk assessment process.

- 58 The Department has a robust business planning system. It has been incrementally modified over recent years and is now well established. The system has been generally successful in integrating consideration of national and local priorities, but appears to lack the flexibility to facilitate easily the transfer of resources between Conservancies.
- 59 As at March 1995, the Department's system for planning and managing projects was adequate for planning and managing the majority of small projects. There were national functional projects which were controlled well but more adequate systems were needed for complex projects carried out in Conservancies. While the Department had developed a project planning form, its primary focus was on financial management and it provided inadequate guidance or detail on other aspects of project planning. However, some Conservancies had developed and implemented more sophisticated project planning and management systems which appeared to be working well.
- 60 Since March 1995 the Department has made good progress in establishing a new, comprehensive system for project planning and management. While this has focused initially on quality assurance for visitor facilities, the quality assurance framework which has been developed is being adapted across all of the work of the Department under the banner of 'Quality Conservation Management', and will encompass self review and audit.

Reporting

- 61 Reporting systems across the Department are generally of a good standard and appropriate to the business needs of the organisation. Business plan and financial reporting from regions occurs on a four-monthly cycle timed to reflect the business cycle of the organisation. Financial reporting to top management is by way of a monthly variance report highlighting exceptions, and four-monthly physical performance reports. All Conservancies prepare weekly status reports which are amalgamated at Head Office for the Chief Executive and for discussion with the Minister. In addition, the Chief Executive meets with the Department's Public Awareness Manager daily to consider public issues.
- 62 There is significant interaction, both regionally and nationally, between the Department's managers. The EMT, the Department's top management group, meets on a weekly basis to consider policy issues and issues of departmental performance. In addition, a Corporate Management Team (CMT), comprising top management, Head Office Directors and Regional Conservators, meets twice a year to discuss issues of national priorities and strategic overview. At a regional level, there are regular meetings of the senior management teams within each Conservancy.
- 63 The frequency and extent of interactions between regional managers and Field Centre staff varies across the Department. Functional managers in Conservancies maintain links with Field Centre staff to advise on project specification and report on project performance in their functional areas. The position of Operations Manager generally carries responsibility for overall

monitoring of the work of Field Centres, including the identification and correction of weaknesses. In some cases, however, it was evident that the Operations Manager did not have sufficient information about what was happening in the field to be able to fulfill adequately this aspect of the role.

- 64 Whilst reporting systems are good, there is some variability in the quality of the information reported. The Review Team found that the systems and controls in place varied markedly between Conservancies. Some Conservancies have good control systems in place to provide assurance as to the information which is being reported. Others do not have such complete systems and therefore could not provide the same level of assurance. In addition, while there are examples where excellent information is available (eg. possum control), the project information reported in some Conservancies provides good quantitative reporting but little or no qualitative reporting. Audit New Zealand has confirmed that qualitative reporting still presents practical difficulties for a number of government agencies.

Human Resources

- 65 A significant improvement in the Department's approach to human resource management over the past two years is evident. A comprehensive People Plan was developed in 1993 and 1994. Prior to that, it appears that the Department performed well in industrial relations, which was at that time a priority requirement for human resources. It did not develop a comprehensive approach to human resource management such as the People Plan now addresses because the Chief Executive's priorities were directed towards improving the business and financial systems. The People Plan provides detailed objectives for developing the Department's relationship with its people, developing its personnel systems and procedures and linking individual performance with business planning. This is a significant development which deserves recognition.
- 66 The Department needs to develop a strategy to ensure that it has the people it will need in the medium term. Currently the Department's workforce planning consists only of a staff ceiling system for each Conservancy and directorate and collating anecdotal information on staff capability. However, the department plans to establish systems at Conservancy, division and national levels to monitor trends in recruitment and retention of staff, and to assess short, medium and long term skill requirements. These systems are still to be put in place. Concern was also expressed, both within the Department and externally, about the salary differentials in some areas between the Department and other employers.
- 67 Implementation of the Department's Planning and Performance Review system (PPR), designed as a tool for managing individual performance within the Department, appears to provide a good platform for initiatives in other aspects of human resource management. The PPR system was successfully implemented for the 1995/96 performance year and has had a high level of acceptance throughout the Department, filling what appears to have been an area of considerable variability in the Department's previous management practice. In particular, there appears to have been little consistency in the manner in which staff, including Regional Conservators and Field Centre Managers, have been held accountable for their work performance. There is evidence that the use of PPR is facilitating improvements in other areas of personnel practice in the regions, such as job specifications. It is also providing

information which will facilitate the identification of national training priorities by Head Office.

- 68 Important aspects of staff training policy and direction have not been a priority for the Department until recent times. While some functional areas have been well addressed, there is still a significant backlog of identified training requirements in the regions. This has not been able to be met because of the level of funding available to regions for training and the priority given by Head Office to training needs. There is some inconsistency in training budgets between regions and some variability in the backlog of training needs across regions.
- 69 The People Plan has given greater Head Office direction to staff training policy than was the case previously. The Department has employed a human resources development manager whose responsibilities include the development of an effective staff training and development capability in the Department. However, the Review Team has concerns over the extent of the training required within the Department, and in particular, the Department's ability to release staff from their output work to undertake training.

Internal Audit

- 70 The Review Team considers that the Department's internal audit function has not provided the Chief Executive with the assurance he needs that the Department's systems are operating properly and that departmental policies and practices are being adhered to. Annual work programmes are prepared for both internal and external audit, but the work programmes in respect of internal audit for this financial year have not been implemented due to work on the Cave Creek Inquiry. A programme based on a systematic assessment of risk should be developed as a matter of management priority.
- 71 In September 1994, the Department restructured its Internal Audit Unit following a review of that function in mid 1993. That review resulted in a new direction for the Unit, primarily based around the role of providing an independent check on the wide range of self review systems operating in the Department. Although new internal audit staff were appointed, the development of a comprehensive self audit system, and some other implementation work, have been delayed, due to the need to provide support to the Inquiry into the Cave Creek incident. There is an urgent need for the resumption of the training of internal audit staff and the introduction of self audit. Notwithstanding the Department's initiatives in this area, in the absence of a systematic assessment of risk, it is of concern to the Review Team that no internal financial audits have been undertaken in Conservancies for two and a half years, and few in Head Office in the same period.
- 72 The Department relies on Audit New Zealand to carry out financial audits at Head Office and Conservancy levels, and has the Audit New Zealand Audit Director on its Audit Committee. As agreed with the Department, Audit New Zealand adjust their programme to provide greater coverage than would be the case purely to meet external audit standards, in order to provide the Chief Executive with greater assurance of financial systems. The Review Team considers that there is a need for a specific contract with Audit New Zealand on the additional financial audit work they perform, so that there is clear understanding of the respective scope, programme, materiality, and reporting of work by the internal and external audits.

- 73 At a regional level there is variability in audit practice, uneven implementation of internal controls and self audit, and different understandings of the concept of self audit. The review of the Internal Audit Unit identified the development of a formal self audit system as a major priority for the Unit. The Chief Executive has acknowledged the need for priority action in this area, along with improvements in quality assurance processes and project management.

The Performance of the Department and its Chief Executive

- 74 The performance of departmental Chief Executives is reviewed annually by the State Services Commissioner. In undertaking his review, the Commissioner seeks input from the Minister, the Chief Executive, nominated referees and the Treasury.
- 75 Over the last five years as Director General, Mr Mansfield has been assessed by the Commissioner as having either exceeded or met the expectations of an able and competent Public Service Chief Executive. This assessment has taken into account the significant improvements to the Department's management systems which have taken place in an environment of continuous change. It has also reflected the strong leadership provided by the Chief Executive, in developing an emphasis on professionalism in the delivery of outputs and implementing the objectives of the Government, and in fostering ownership of a vision for the organisation through the Atawhai Ruamano (Conservation 2000) process.
- 76 The approach taken by the Director-General in developing the management systems of the Department is consistent with what would be expected of a Chief Executive of any large organisation. The time that it takes to bring about the overall changes in the management systems of an organisation will be dependent upon the availability of resources and the environment in which the Chief Executive has to work. The Review Team is satisfied with the progress made by the Director-General in bringing about the necessary changes.
- 77 While submissions received by the Review Team from a few ex-staff members and consultants to the Department were critical of the Chief Executive's performance, other submissions received showed overwhelming support for his handling of the Department. The Deputy Director-General has assured the State Services Commissioner that the Director-General has the full support of the Corporate Management Team.
- 78 While the developments noted in paragraph 75 have resulted in a significant improvement in the Department's performance, and its resource management generally, there remain significant gaps in Head Office guidance to Conservancies. Of the six Conservancies visited, the Review Team found a wide variation of practice. Most were operating at an acceptable to very good standard, with a few being judged to be in need of improvement or poor in some aspects of their operation.
- 79 The Chief Executive has focused on ensuring Head Office identify key priorities for the Department and on guiding Conservancies in their implementation. This has meant that less effort has gone into guidance on operational matters in some areas. This is evident in areas such as staff management, project management, self audit, risk assessment, and implementation and monitoring of some important statutory requirements. These are handled very well in some Conservancies and not well in others. There is a need for Head Office to do more to share examples of good practices evident in some Conservancies.
- 80 There is a climate within the Department reflecting a pervading belief that the Department is underfunded. However, it cannot be said that the failure of the platform at Cave Creek was the result of underfunding for the project, or that funding constraints prevented proper procedures being followed. However, the Chief Executive believes that he has been operating in a situation where the

Department has not been properly funded and this needs to be taken into account in assessing his performance.

81 The Department has advised the Review Team as follows:

"The Chief Executive has developed clear conservation priorities through the Conservation 2000 strategic intent exercise and the multi-year plan - prepared in consultation with the Treasury, and these priorities have been incorporated in the Government's strategic result areas in its Path to 2010 documents and in Environment 2010, the Government's strategy on the environment. More detailed funding cases have been prepared for the implementation of the Visitor Strategy, to stem the decline in threatened species and advance animal pest control. The Chief Executive has informed the Government of the stresses on the Department's infrastructure. However what should be recognised is that the tight fiscal criteria issued by the Cabinet have excluded the Department from putting up comprehensive funding cases for consideration. In addition, with the emphasis on Department's achieving price controls and making "savings" to achieve budget reductions, there has been pressure to make infrastructure reductions. Therefore the Chief Executive has had limited success in achieving funding, particularly for infrastructural requirements or new obligations. This situation has been recognised and reported on by the Planning and Development Select Committee of Parliament." (see paragraph 50).

82 The Department and the Treasury need to work together to establish a basis for reassessing the Department's funding requirements. In the past, a good relationship has existed between the Department and the Treasury officials responsible for analysing the Department's vote. However, this relationship now appears to be at a low ebb. The Department and the Treasury jointly need to take a more strategic view of the Department's funding requirements. In addition, the Chief Executive needs to be more directly involved in the Department's relationship with the Treasury in order that the funding requirements of the Department's business may be better understood.

83 Similarly, as with other agencies, the Chief Executive and the Department need to balance what appear to be tensions between the requirements of the Public Finance Act and the State Sector Act. When faced with Cabinet directives imposing tight constraints on budget proposals, the Chief Executive has consistently raised with his Minister the impact of such constraints on the Department and the desirability of greater funding. Ultimately however, the Chief Executive has recognised the limited availability of funds and, consistent with the general spirit of service expected under the State Sector Act, has sought to manage the Department within the available funding without significant changes to the quantity of the outputs in the Purchase Agreement with the Minister.

84 This type of response reflects the culture (both for Ministers and Chief Executives) which has traditionally underpinned such considerations in the senior Public Service, and is consistent with the need for the Chief Executive to maintain a long term relationship with the Minister. In the end, however, it may leave the Chief Executive in the position of having entered into, or being required to enter into, a Purchase Agreement that cannot be fulfilled to the required standards within the available funding. In this situation, it is not clear in the Public Service where the accountability would lie. As a consequence, there is some doubt as to the proper constitutional position if a Chief Executive is unable to meet the expected standards of performance due to funding constraints.

- 85 In the private sector the issue is likely to be much clearer. A Chief Executive would have a more direct opportunity to advise the Board regarding any particular proposal and of the consequences for the organisation and for the management responsibilities of the Chief Executive. Accountability would flow from this more direct relationship. The Public Finance Act is sometimes interpreted as achieving comparable relationships for the Public Service. It is our view that it is unlikely that the private sector model could ever apply in the same manner in the Public Service where the funding decisions and the management arrangements are more complex and where the requirements of public administration place different demands on the Chief Executive.
- 86 The Review Team has not found it necessary, nor within its Terms of Reference, to attempt to arrive at a conclusion on this very broad issue of accountability within the State Sector. It recommends, however, that the State Services Commissioner should research this aspect of public administration to clarify where the accountabilities should lie.
- 87 There are clearly differences of perception between the Government and the Department about the appropriate level of funding for the Department of Conservation. The framework for reaching a resolution of these differences is constrained by various requirements relating to the allocation of any additional funding in the budget round. The Review Team considers that a more strategic approach should be adopted between the Chief Executive and the Treasury to establish a robust zero-based business case covering all of the Department's responsibilities and obligations. This case would provide a basis for strategic decisions on additional funding for conservation, or decisions by the Government to maintain present funding but reduce lesser-priority conservation efforts. It should be recognised, however, that this would be a major undertaking for the Department, which would not be well placed to undertake such an exercise with its present staff and resources.

THE DEPARTMENT'S 1995 REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES IN THE WEST COAST CONSERVANCY

- 88 In September 1995 the Director-General set up a team to review the West Coast Conservancy with Terms of Reference focusing on internal operations and procedures within the Conservancy up to and following the time of the Cave Creek platform collapse (April 1995). The team was to make recommendations to address the efficiency and effectiveness of the Conservancy.
- 89 The internal review considered the West Coast Conservancy contributed well to conservation management in New Zealand, and suggested that, arguably, because of the nature of the Conservancy, it has a more difficult job than some other Conservancies.
- 90 The internal review found the Conservancy has an established process for the preparation and planning of the business plan but insufficient opportunity for negotiation between Field Centres and Conservancy specialists on priorities and project details. There was seen to be a need for more emphasis on coordinating priority setting, project planning and preparation, communication, and 'owning' and adjusting the business plan as priorities change. Recent financial reporting had been satisfactory.
- 91 Project management in the Conservancy was found to be inconsistently applied, and many staff who manage projects were unsure of their responsibilities. Training and guidance in these responsibilities was seen as a matter of urgency. Insufficient priority was found to be given to people management, to personnel matters and to internal communication. Shortcomings in the areas of management direction, approved strategies, supervision of outputs and day to day priority setting were found. At the time of the internal review, the Regional Conservator saw the need for a higher level licensing manager as a matter of priority, as in his view, this aspect of work places most pressure on the Conservancy.
- 92 The internal review found three (and possibly more) Field Centres to be staffed below the level of an adequate critical mass and saw the need for the Conservancy to critically review its operation to work out how best to deliver outputs and strengthen the role of Field Centres. Limited resources was considered by the internal review to be an issue but not the sole reason for the staffing or the performance issues. The Regional Conservator, on the other hand, considers the level of resourcing to be the Conservancy's core problem.
- 93 The internal review concluded that while no single element could be considered critical to the performance of the Conservancy, the elements reported, in combination, resulted in poor organisational health which the West Coast Review Team considered the most serious management issue facing the Conservancy.
- 94 Inclusion of the West Coast Conservancy in the Conservancies visited for this State Services Commission review enabled the Review Team to consider the West Coast alongside other Conservancies visited. This led the Review Team to endorse the finding of the Department's internal review that the state of organisational health in this Conservancy was low.

- 95 The West Coast internal review does not reflect so much on the performance of the Department and its Chief Executive as on the state of the Department in that Conservancy.

THE RELEVANCE AND EFFECT OF MATTERS IDENTIFIED BY THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE COLLAPSE OF A VIEWING PLATFORM AT CAVE CREEK

The Issues Identified by the Commission of Inquiry as Affecting the Department's Performance

- 96 It is important to note that the Review Team had a different focus to that which had earlier been given to the Commission of Inquiry. The Commissioner, Judge G S Noble, was constrained by his terms of reference to concentrate on matters relating directly or indirectly to the collapse of the viewing platform at Cave Creek. His Terms of Reference did not extend to a review of the performance of the Department as a whole. The Review Team has been given the specific task of conducting such a broader review of the performance of the Department. In particular, the Review Team has had to consider the management systems and management of resources by the Department. The Review Team has thoroughly examined the comments and recommendations made by Judge Noble in Part one of his Report.
- 97 In his Report, Judge Noble contended that when the Department was formed the necessary management systems were not provided. The need to plan for the introduction of management systems was brought to the attention of the Department's Establishment Unit by the Environmental Administration Review Secretariat, the organisation overseeing the 1987 environmental restructuring. A memorandum of guidance listing a checklist of possible systems developments for consideration was provided to the Establishment Unit for development and implementation. While the need for proper systems was clearly recognised by the then Director-General designate of Conservation, the decisions taken on staffing and resourcing late in 1986 led him to advise his Minister that some of the departmental functions would be deficient in a number of respects, and provision of minimal corporate servicing would result from decisions not to provide the Department with the resources it was seeking.
- 98 Whether as a consequence of resource constraints or otherwise, it seems that all the necessary management systems were not in place at the time the Department was established. The lack of progress in developing these systems in the early years of the Department's existence can, in part, be explained by the fact that the Department had three Chief Executives and three Ministers in its first three years, and underwent a major restructuring within the same period.
- 99 The adequacy or otherwise of funding is a matter of considerable importance in reviewing the management of the Department. The Treasury has suggested that the problem, from a management perspective, is one of priority setting rather than a lack of resources. The Review Team considers this to be a simplistic view. The Department's statutory responsibilities require it to exercise certain functions regardless of the level of funding. The Department is required to expend money and resources on functions which do not have a direct or high priority conservation benefit. These include carrying out control of agricultural weeds to comply with the Biosecurity Act (and previous legislation); carrying out fencing to meet the requirements of fencing notices issued under the Fencing Act 1978; processing applications for consents (tourism concessions, grazing licences, mining licences and access arrangements); and carrying out certain land administration functions. While the better managed Conservancies have addressed the funding problem at the local level by confining their work programmes to what they can achieve within their allocation, there is a need for

the Department as a whole to take a more strategic approach to its funding and priority setting.

- 100 We have found that the Department could have been more proactive and strategic in developing and monitoring management systems, but this fact did not relieve the Regional Conservators of their delegated and statutory responsibilities. The information the Review Team has gathered during the visits to six Conservancies has confirmed that an incident such as the tragedy that occurred at Cave Creek would not be repeated as a result of a general weakness in systems throughout the Department. If not for a tragic combination of circumstances, misunderstandings, and breakdowns in procedures and communications, such events, in our view, would have been unlikely to occur, in the West Coast Conservancy or elsewhere, had the then available systems and departmental procedures been used as intended.

The Recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry with respect to the Building Act; the Health & Safety in Employment Act; and other Legislation

- 101 Some submissions highlighted the Department's response to the Health and Safety in Employment Act. The Review Team has noted that the Department has now appointed a Health and Safety Manager.

- 102 The Commission of Inquiry's recommendation that the Crown's exemption from prosecution under the Building Act and the Health and Safety in Employment Act should be removed is beyond the scope of the Terms of Reference for this review. However, Judge Noble's recommendation (recommendation 1, page 93) that:

'The Department, with priority, completes and implements the project management system referred to, incorporating all necessary steps from initial conception of a project to post-completion inspection and checking; and adequately trains and continuously supports staff in its ongoing application, ensuring at all times that staff are appropriately qualified for appointed tasks'

is a matter for this review.

- 103 As noted in the Commission of Inquiry's report, the Department is developing an integrated framework for quality management. This includes engineering and design standards and detailed guidance on project management. The department advises that training design will be completed shortly, with full training expected to commence in February. An audit of the integrated framework is to be completed in early January 1996. In addition, a staff booklet is being prepared. Implementation of the framework has commenced on the West Coast and any new work is undertaken according to the new standards.

- 104 The Commission of Inquiry also raised the resourcing of the Department as an issue (recommendation 2, pg 92), in the context of ensuring adequate and properly qualified staff to ensure the correct implementation of the project management system. The Review Team has made general comments with respect to the Department's resourcing in paragraphs 12, 80-87, and 99.

- 105 The Commission of Inquiry recommended (page 91) that the Department promulgate the Health and Safety in Employment Act culture within the West Coast Conservancy and ensure its implementation and application by proper training and monitoring. The Review Team assessed the Department's systems

for implementing the Health and Safety in Employment Act. Key Conservancy managers have been trained in the requirements of the Health and Safety in Employment Act but the degree of implementation has varied between Conservancies. It is noted that other departmental procedures and position competencies cover safety aspects and that the new quality management system (including an integrated framework for visitor and safety management) systematically addresses legislative safety requirements.

FINDINGS

- 106 The Review Team found that the Department has a very demanding and complex role. The geographic spread of the conservation estate requires a decentralised organisation to manage it. The Department has to fulfill a wide range of roles in doing so and also has to manage conflicts between conservation, use, development, Iwi, and tourism perspectives in the development of its policies and operations.
- 107 Such an organisation needs robust national standards, and systems to monitor their use across all areas, to provide assurance to its Chief Executive that its resources are being correctly applied to departmental priorities and that consistent standards of performance are being achieved. The Department has made considerable progress over the last five years in improving its management systems.
- 108 However, there is still some way to go before those systems can be considered to be adequate to meet all the needs of the Department. In particular, the Department needs to be more proactive in implementing and using management controls to provide assurance to senior management that statutory obligations and performance requirements are being met. It also needs to take a more strategic approach to resource prioritisation and allocation.
- 109 A number of systems need to be implemented as a matter of priority. This includes a comprehensive risk assessment process and completion of the project management, self audit and review, visitor and staff safety, and training initiatives, all of which are already underway. There also needs to be more consistent and tighter accountability of Regional Conservators, Field Centre Managers and other staff than has been evident in the past. This should be achieved through the intended operation of the PPR system.
- 110 From our review, and as will be noted from the content of this report, it is clear that the failure which occurred in relation to the Cave Creek platform did not reflect a general weakness in systems throughout the Department, nor was it caused by a lack of funding for that project. Indeed, but for the tragic combination of factors surrounding the Cave Creek disaster, such events would, in our view, have been unlikely to occur, in the West Coast Conservancy or elsewhere in the Department, using the then available systems and Departmental procedures.
- 111 In the State Service Commissioner's assessment, Mr Mansfield, as Director-General, has either exceeded or met the performance required of an able and competent Public Service Chief Executive. During his time there have been significant achievements. We believe he has performed well and endorse the State Services Commissioner's assessment. Nevertheless, as noted in this report, there are some areas where a more proactive or strategic approach could have been more effective, but this does not detract from our assessment of his overall performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

112 On the basis of our findings, the Review Team:

a) Notes that:

- i the Department of Conservation is a large, distributed organisation with wide ranging and complex functions, tasks and statutory responsibilities relating to the management of the conservation estate and protection of New Zealand's natural and historic resources;
- ii the Review Team considers that the Department of Conservation's management systems are generally operating satisfactorily, but as would be the case with many other organisations, there are areas for improvement;
- iii the Review Team considered the operations of the West Coast Conservancy alongside other Conservancies visited and endorsed the findings of the Department's internal review, that the state of the organisational health of the West Coast Conservancy was low;
- iv the Review Team endorses the assessments of the State Services Commissioner that the Director-General has exceeded or met the expectations of an able and competent Public Service Chief Executive;

and b) Recommends that:

- i the Director-General of the Department of Conservation gives priority to:
 - developing a systematic organisational risk assessment process and its implementation;
 - developing a strategy to ensure the department will have the people it requires in the medium term, including an analysis of its recruitment and staff development needs;
 - implementing a comprehensive national staff training programme;
 - increasing the expertise of the Head Office Internal Audit function, implementing self audit activities across the organisation and agreeing the scope and coverage of internal and external audit;
 - reviewing Head Office policy for communicating directions on operations and sharing good practice across the organisation.
- ii the Treasury and the Department of Conservation co-operate to develop a zero-based costing model to report on the current cost structures of the Department's outputs;
- iii you clarify Public Service accountabilities in relation to the requirements of the State Sector Act and the Public Finance Act.

CONCLUSIONS

- 113 The Commission of Inquiry into the Collapse of a Viewing Platform at Cave Creek identified a number of issues which were the catalyst for setting up this review. While there were weaknesses in the systems operating at the time of the tragedy, we believe that it was a combination of circumstances, misunderstandings, communication breakdowns and failure to follow procedures, but not a lack of funding, which resulted in conditions which made the disaster possible.
- 114 It is the opinion of the Review Team that the operation of existing systems and the new systems now in place, with further improvements identified or in process, provide a high level of assurance that such an unfortunate event is most unlikely to occur again.
- 115 In respect of the overall management systems and controls in the Department of Conservation, we believe that while improvements in systems and management practices are always possible, in the experience of the Review Team the Department does not compare unfavourably with other departments and organisations taking into account the environment in which it has and continues to operate.
- 116 In concluding this review, the Review Team has been impressed by the difficulty of the job the Department's staff has to do and notes that, in general, they do it well.

Michael Morris (Convenor)
Mike Collins
Joan Fleming
Miriam Dell (Advisor)

16 December 1995

APPENDICES

- 1 Terms of Reference
- 2 Sites Visited, Interviews Conducted and Unsolicited Submissions Received
- 3 Legislation under which the Department has Responsibilities
- 4 The Department's Outputs for 1995/96
- 5 The Department's Structure
- 6 Maps of the Department's Lands and Offices

TERMS OF REFERENCE

To carry out a review of the performance of the department and its Chief Executive under section 6(B) State Sector Act in respect of the matters arising from the report of the Cave Creek Commission of Inquiry and in particular to consider:

- 1 The planning, reporting, auditing systems (including information systems), and procedures adopted by the department to identify and manage the key issues and principal risks arising from carrying out the functions of the department.

Refer paragraphs: 5 ,6, 8, 10, 46, 58, 57-64, 70-73, 90
- 2 The department's systems for the allocation and management of resources; how it meets regulatory and reporting requirements.

Refer paragraphs: 2, 4, 12, 13, 16, 44,46, 48, 53, 55, 87, 99
- 3 The Human Resources policies and procedures adopted by the department to address workforce planning, job specification; and the selection, appointment and training of staff.

Refer paragraphs: 9, 48, 65-69, 78, 79, 91, 92, 97
- 4 The performance of the department and its Chief Executive in monitoring the management practices and procedures referred to in 1 to 3 above. This includes considering performance management systems at both organisational and individual levels and the mechanisms for reporting and assuring compliance.

Refer paragraphs: 4, 10, 11, 16, 23, 38-40, 70-73, 74-78, 79-81, 82-85, 86,87, 96-98,100.
- 5 The report of the department's 1995 Review of Management Systems and Procedures in the West Coast Conservancy.

Refer paragraphs: 88-95
- 6 The relevance and the effect of the matters identified by the Commission of Inquiry as affecting the performance of the department in relation to the Cave Creek project and other matters as require separate consideration and report.

Refer paragraphs: 13, 17,18, 96-100.
- 7 The recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry on procedures and systems for compliance with the Building Act; the Health and Safety in Employment Act; and other legislation.

Refer paragraphs: 2, 14, 15, 33, 40-44, 46,49, 101-105.

SITES VISITED, INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED AND SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

1. Site visits and interviews:
 - 1.1 Northland Conservancy, Whangarei
Regional Conservator
Operations Manager
Business/Finance Manager
Protection Manager

Keri Keri Field Centre
Field Centre Manager
 - 1.2 Bay of Plenty Conservancy
Regional Conservator
Operations Manager
Business/Finance Manager
Human Resources & Administration Manager
Two Senior Conservation Officers

Tauranga Field Centre:
Field Centre Manager
Two Senior Conservation Officers
 - 1.3 Tongariro/Taupo Conservancy
Regional Conservator
Operations Manager
Business/Finance Manager
Human Resources & Administration Manager
Conservation Officer

Taupo Field Centre
Acting Field Centre Manager
 - 1.4 Wellington Conservancy
Regional Conservator
 - 1.5 Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy
Regional Conservator
Two Operations Managers
Business/Finance Manager
Works Officer

St Anaud Field Centre
Field Centre Manager
Conservation Officer
 - 1.6 West Coast Conservancy
Meeting with Conservation Management Team (3 absentees)
Regional Conservator
Operations Manager, Southern
Business/Finance Manager

Human Resources & Administration Manager
Advocacy Manager

Arahura Field Centre
Field Centre Manager
Senior Conservation officer

- 1.7 Southland Conservancy
Regional Conservator (absent due to illness - not interviewed)
Operations Manager
Business/Finance Manager
Human Resources & Administration Manager
Three Senior Conservation Officers (one based in Te Anau Field Centre)
One Conservation Officer

Te Anau Field Centre
Field Centre Manager
Two Conservation Officers

2. Interviews with DOC Head Office personnel:
Director-General
Deputy Directors-General (2)
Assistant Director-General (Kaupapa Atawhai)
Executive Manager Strategic Development
Director Human Resources and Administration
Business Manager (Business Planning Systems)
Director Visitor Services
Manager Internal Audit
Financial Controller
Office Solicitor
Manager Computer Services

3. Other Government interviews:
Minister of Conservation
The Treasury
Audit New Zealand

4. Quasi Government agency interviews:
Chair, NZ Conservation Authority
Former Chair, NZ Conservation Authority

5. Other:
Mr H G Rennie QC, Counsel for the Department of Conservation,
Commission of Inquiry into the Collapse of a Viewing Platform
at Cave Creek
Hugh Barr and Owen Cox of Federated Mountain Clubs of
New Zealand
Kevin Smith and Barry Weeber of Royal Forest and Bird
Protection Society of New Zealand

6. Unsolicited submissions were received from:
Barbara Marshall - Federated Mountain Clubs of New
Zealand (Inc)
WC Clark - University of Canterbury
Margaret Mutu - Auckland University
Susan Forbes - Kotuku Consultancy
Tim Jackson - Waitangi National Trust
Hon Rob Storey - MP for Waikato
Joris de Bres - Public Awareness Manager for DoC
Lois Robertson - National Council of Women of New Zealand
JB Keith - on behalf of a group of farmers
Eugenie Sage - Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of
New Zealand (Inc)
LH Shand - Member of the public
Paul McGahan - former employee of DoC
Cath Wallace - Environment and Conservation Organisations of NZ Inc
A Wasmuth - Former Training Co-ordinator for DoC
OWG Lewis - NZ Native Forest Restoration Trust (Inc)
V Thomson - Algate Enterprises Ltd

APPENDICES 3-6 NOT ATTACHED