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

Name

Kim Strong

Email address

████████████████

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?

No Answer

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 because this is continually over ridden and there are too many exemptions for development, farming and agriculture.

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?

a. No, there is not enough policing by National Park rangers. Our wildlife is already only left in remnant and fragmented habitats taking of species of wildlife and plants from these areas only places more pressure on each species. b. No, having a plan where recreational shooters are allowed in National Parks to shoot feral animals is unsafe for humans and animals. Hunters are known to seed the national parks with feral species as there have been arrests. Dogs are taken into the national parks and some are left behind adding to the problem. There is no behavioural science used behind the processes recreational hunters used so studies have shown that this makes the feral animal problem worst rather than better. Weeds are circulated by logging trucks and they only plant When logging takes place there is no regard for wildlife placing their welfare at risk. c. Yes I think that this has been effectively managed.

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, more protection is needed before licence to harm is given out. Wildlife culling and commercial other licences must not be exempt from POCTA laws. Licence to harm public consultation period and notices to welfare and conservation organisations should be mandatory. The Government should be the authority prosecuting acts of cruelty and not a not-for-profit charity. Convictions should have higher penalties.

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?

as above

Are the provisions for marine mammals effective?

No Answer

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?

Wildlife rehabilitation licence's should be regulated similar to the Victorian model which is a licence for each individual rehabilitator and a separate licence for wildlife organisation. In NSW the political interests of wildlife groups has a detrimental effect on the care of wildlife because it is those political concerns that are put ahead of the needs of the animals in care. This leaves the only option to leave the organisation and forfeit your licence to rehabilitate. It also gives a monopoly for wildlife rehabilitation in NSW. There have been many complaints about the governance of wildlife organisations to NPWS over many years. Hopefully reviewing this act can improve the situation for welfare of wildlife. Licence to cull 121 wildlife should be reviewed as neighbours can each apply for a licence for the same animals, hence culling double or more of the amount. These should also be placed for public consultation time before licence is granted partially for development applications where many animals are culled and or translocated. The current systems need more protection for wildlife not less.

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

No, numbers are animals (partially the Kangaroo industry) are not scientifically calculated and therefore we would never be able to calculate what is sustainable and what is not.

Theme 6: Information provisions

No Answer

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?

No Answer

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

No Answer

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

No Answer

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?

No Answer

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?

No Answer

Should private conservation data be collected and if so how?

No Answer

Other comments

No Answer