

submitted the survey 'Questionnaire' with the responses below.

### **What works well in the proposed policy for managing flying-foxes?**

I do not agree that the policy shift needs to be away from the bats. They were here first. People moved into their homes first. Nature is hard enough on them without humans getting into the mix. Please reconsider

### **What could be improved?**

The policy needs to focus on saving the bats and improving habitats. Netting that does not injury the bats needs to be the only kind approved. Approved/licensed sanctuaries should be allowed to keep any injured bat that is not able to fend for it self/ not be releasable. These bats would be great education tools. Humans have reduced the natural habitat of the bats in such a way as to put themselves in the path of the bats. The bats need to not be punished for the mistake man has made.

### **From your experience are there other things that could be included?**

More education of the farmers, fruit growers and citizens is important. Humans have already pushed the planet to the brink. Bats are enormously important in sustaining crops, eating insects, pollinating, seed dispersal and medical knowledge. Do your part to save them please.

### **Any other comments?**

Flying-fox Camp Management Policy Please read below my comments in regard to the proposed Flying-fox Camp Management Policy. I have focused on sections that don't meet the aim of managing flying foxes sustainably or humanely. • Routine Camp Management Actions (Level 1 Actions) Level 1 actions could be misused (intentionally or otherwise) to disperse a bat colony or to kill or harm to animals in the colony. The wording of the policy needs to make it clear that "routine camp management actions" don't have the effect of disturbing, distressing or harming flying-foxes. It should be clear that penalties that apply under the existing law will prevail if unauthorized actions are taken. • Creation of Buffers (Level 2 Actions) Effectively the same issue applies to this section, where these actions could be misused to disperse, kill or harm bats. For that reason, I believe that the same constraints and warnings should apply to actions taken under this section as suggested above for level 1 actions. • Camp disturbance or dispersal (Level 3 Actions) The draft policy "recommends" using a coordinator. A "recommendation" won't be sufficient to satisfy the requirements of this policy (i.e. that the flying-foxes are managed sustainably). Rather, appointment of an experienced Coordinator should be mandatory. • Camp disturbance or dispersal (Level 3 Actions) Similarly the draft policy lists conditions where dispersals are "not recommended". To ensure that there is no doubt that dispersals are not conducted under inherently inhumane conditions it is important that dispersals may not be conducted under those four conditions. I feel very strongly it is essential for actions endorsed by government agencies to be sustainable and ethical. • Is shooting of flying-foxes allowed? I share the view expressed by many others that the shooting of flying foxes is inherently inhumane, and it should be ended as soon as possible. It is indiscriminate, and at the time of year that many crops are 'at risk', flying foxes may have dependent young that will die a slow death from starvation when their mothers are killed. In closing, I want to say that it is my strong opinion that it legally and ethically incumbent upon the NSW Government to provide protection for its wildlife, and to

have in place policies that prevent animal cruelty and unsustainable behavior, so I urge you to strengthen the welfare and sustainability issues of the policy as per my suggestions. There is world wide concern regarding the policies in Australia about the flying fox population. Please know your actions are being watched by all bats lovers worldwide. Sincerely, Dianne

**About you**

Optional

**Name**

Dianne Gargaro