

Anonymous User just submitted the survey 'Biodiversity Legislation Review Questionnaire' with the responses below.

Name

Jenny Packwood

Email address

[REDACTED]

Theme 1: Objects and principles for biodiversity conservation

No Answer

Should there be an aspirational goal for biodiversity conservation?

No Answer

Given available evidence about the value and state of the environment, are the existing legislative objects still valid? Do the current objects align with international and national frameworks, agreements, laws, obligations? If not, what objects are required?

No Answer

To what extent are the current objects being met?

No Answer

Could the objects of the current laws be simplified and integrated? If so, how?

No Answer

Theme 2: Conservation action

No Answer

Is the current system effective in encouraging landowners to generate public benefits from their land and rewarding them as environmental stewards? Or are current mechanisms too focused on requiring private landowners to protect ecosystem services and biodiversity at their own cost?

No Answer

Are there elements of the current system for private land conservation that raise impediments (for example, binding nature of agreements and potential loss of production) for individuals who want to manage their land for conservation? If so what are they? What incentives might be effective, efficient and equitable in promoting biodiversity conservation on private land?

No Answer

What should be the role of organisations and bodies, such as the Nature Conservation Trust, in facilitating and managing private land conservation through mechanisms such as conservation and biobanking agreements?

No Answer

How should the government determine priorities for its investment in biodiversity conservation while enabling and encouraging others (e.g. community groups) to contribute to their own biodiversity conservation priorities?

No Answer

How can the effectiveness of conservation programs be monitored and evaluated?

No Answer

How should any tradeoffs be assessed?

No Answer

To what extent is the system forward looking or dealing with legacy impacts?

No Answer

To what extent does current practice (rather than the legislation) determine outcomes?

No Answer

Theme 3: Conservation in land use planning

No Answer

How effective are current arrangements at ensuring biodiversity values are identified early and properly considered in strategic planning systems? How can they be improved?

No Answer

How effective are current arrangements for delivering strategic outcomes for biodiversity and enhancing ecosystem services? How can they be improved?

No Answer

How should the effectiveness of strategic planning approaches be monitored and evaluated?

No Answer

Theme 4: Conservation in development approval processes

Check box to view and respond to questions

To what extent has the current framework created inconsistent assessment processes, environmental standards, offset practices and duplicative rules? What can be done to harmonise processes?

Give all councils the same set of rules to follow when approving DAs and ensure that the applicant follows the rules. Having attended many tree felling events to rescue injured wildlife, it is horrendous for the animals. Most times to save money the developers hire land clearers who just want to get the job done as quickly as possible to make their money and get out. They just push the habitat trees over with huge machines making it difficult for us to access the branches. The animals are either injured or killed. All habitat trees should be checked for wildlife and if found, the tree should only be felled by a trained tree lopper using a cherry picker/climbing and lowering the branches slowly to the ground to allow for rescue by NPWS licensed wildlife carers.

Can we have a single, integrated approach to the approval of all forms of development, including agricultural development, that is proportionate to the risks involved? If yes, should one methodology (or a harmonised methodology) be used to assess all impacts? Does a need remain for some differences in assessment approaches?

No Answer

What are the advantages and disadvantages of the different biodiversity assessment methodologies? Are the rules transparent and consistent? Is the way data is used to underpin decisions transparent? Do the assessment methodologies appropriately accommodate social and economic values?

No Answer

Does the regulatory system adequately protect listed threatened species, populations and ecological communities? Is there utility in specifically protecting these entities through the regulatory system?

No they are not adequately protected. It is a costly process for the landowner.

Are there other models (international or Australian) that regulate activities impacting on biodiversity that may be relevant to NSW?

No Answer

Are there other models (international or Australian) that regulate activities impacting on biodiversity that may be relevant to NSW?

No Answer

To what extent has the current regulatory system resulted in lost development opportunities and/or prevented innovative land management practices?

No Answer

Some impacts cannot be offset. What are they? Are these appropriately addressed in approval systems? What is the relevance of social and economic benefits of projects in considering these impacts?

No Answer

How can offsets be more strategically located?

No Answer

Are there areas currently regulated that would be better left to self-regulatory codes of practice or accreditation schemes?

No Answer

Theme 5: Wildlife management

Check box to view and respond to questions

Have the threats to biodiversity posed by: (a) people taking animals and plants from the wild, (b) feral animals and weeds, and (c) illegally imported species, been effectively managed?

No most definitely not. Members of public are rescuing wildlife and retaining for their own use, or to try and raise them and then when they are suffering from various incorrect foods and procedures, they bring them to a wildlife group who then have to bear all vet and other costs and time to bring them back to good health for eventual release back to the wild.

Has the NPW Act and the supporting policy framework led to a positive change in the welfare of native animals (captive and free-living)? What role if any should the government have in ensuring the welfare of individual native animals – particularly where there are already stand-alone welfare laws such as the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979?

Yes the policies and procedures policies have been of great assistance to licensed wildlife carers however the issue is placed on groups themselves to chase up all members to enforce them. Assistance from NPWS staff in helping to enforce these policies would be of great benefit, it would provide backup for the individual groups when there is a problem with difficult carers who refuse to follow these guidelines and licence conditions, This is a major issue of conflict within a group, causing enormous amount of stress, paperwork and wasted time. I feel that the following documentation should be prepared and enforced where applicable by NPWS: 1. Policy and some set Procedures for care of specific animals (some have already been prepared). 2. Basic Education Manuals for specific animals with standard feeding and care limits. These should be used by all licensed groups with a little leeway for adding their group's requirements via procedures. 3. Conflict of Interest Management Policy for use of every group and if not resolved then assistance from NPWS to assist with a resolution. Most groups do not have any experienced members to undertake these issues and may only make the matters worse. At the moment if an issue is not resolved, then the only

option is to attend a Chamber Magistrate which they are reluctant to take this far. 4. Many more issues that govt staff could assist licensed groups with.

Has the NPW Act and the supporting policy framework led to a positive change in the welfare of native animals (captive and free-living)? What role if any should the government have in ensuring the welfare of individual native animals – particularly where there are already stand-alone welfare laws such as the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979?

No Answer

Are the provisions for marine mammals effective?

No knowledge

Is the current framework for wildlife licensing, offences and defences, including those applying to threatened species, easily understood? Is the current licensing system too complex? How can it be improved and simplified to focus on conservation outcomes?

Not as far as I can see. These issues require more assistance from NPWS to licensed wildlife groups to be able to issue with these offences by some members. 1. NPWS issues the rules and we are expected to enforce them. We are volunteers and do not have the time, money or experience to follow an issue through. 2. An NPWS ranger/manager should be able to attend their local group's monthly meetings to make themselves more accessible to committees and members to assist with problems and answer questions.

Is there currently appropriate regulation for the sustainable use and trade of wildlife?

No Answer

Theme 6: Information provisions

Check box to view and respond to questions

What information should be generated about the different kinds of value (for example, monetary and intrinsic value) of biodiversity and other natural assets in NSW?

No Answer

What type, quality and frequency of data should be collected about biodiversity? Who should be responsible for such a system?

Wildlife care groups already collect data on every animal that is rescued and these are forwarded to NPWS annually. This is done mainly by paperwork and is very cumbersome. A statewide simple database would be much easier, allowing every carer to input their stats immediately an animal comes into care. This would then save all groups/carers having to waste time in July/August each year chasing up data for the annual return. NPWS may then be able to follow up problems with diseases, health issues in areas, and oversee problems with specific carers.

Is current data about biodiversity highly credible and readily accessible? If not, how can quality and access be improved?

By NPWS having a state-wide database for every carer to record their rescued animals. See above. The data for each group would only be available to that group and be password protected.

How effective is the threatened species listing process (including the listing of key threatening processes) in guiding subsequent conservation action?

Very cumbersome, as I am never sure which dept requires the information. They are all too confusing and time consuming when we are time deficient when caring for injured wildlife.

Should threatened species listing decisions be decoupled from decisions on conservation actions (including recovery planning) and regulatory processes?

No Answer

To what extent, if any, does having national and state lists of threatened species cause confusion, regulatory burden or duplication of conservation effort? How could national and state lists be rationalised?

A database that could be accessed by all that we could simply type in the species name and the relevant information could pop up would simplify the problem. At the moment I have to print out a list on a regular basis to discuss with some carers who have no idea what animal/bird is on the threatened lists.

To what extent is the identification of critical habitat an effective tool for biodiversity conservation? Should we list critical habitat for more species where relevant and useful?

Most definitely, and ensure that it is protected forever with large enforced fines for those destroying it. This would also apply to councils approving highly inappropriate development applications.

Should private conservation data be collected and if so how?

NPWS should have a database for this information to be posted or a hard copy for those without computers, which we know there are still many.

Other comments

1. As wildlife carers are all volunteers, NPWS should provide each group with an annual donation based on the number and type of animals that come into their care. In country areas members do not have access to free and/or trained wildlife vets and often have to travel long distances to have their animals attended to by an experienced vet. Some vets are not prepared to waive the consult fees for wildlife and this and fuel costs and medications are a major cost problem for volunteers. Our money is raised by fundraising which also takes many hours for very little result. 2. Maybe NPWS could obtain common medications at a much cheaper rate to be offered to groups.