

Submission 4 - Anonymous

Anonymous User just submitted the survey 'Theme 1: Objects and principles for biodiversity conservation' with the responses below.

Should there be an aspirational goal for biodiversity conservation?

Conservation of biodiversity is critical knowing the huge loss of flora and fauna up till this time. No clearing of endangered species or endangered colonies should be allowed. It is a crime against humanity and the planet. The recent clearing of the endangered Duffys Forest Ecological Community in Frenchs Forest is an example of blatant ecocide for private gain when there were preferred 'brown' sites available at existing hospitals.

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?

This government does not understand the value of a healthy environment. When all the trees have been cleared and all the fish are gone they will understand we can't eat money

To what extent are the current objects being met?

Current objects are not met, and our natural wildlife is not valued

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

Only changes to our current laws which further protect, respect and value our unique environment for future generations are acceptable

Anonymous User just submitted the survey 'Theme 2: Conservation action' with the responses below.

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?

Landowners must be required to protect ecosystems, but with some form of reward system

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?

Land use must change for lasting food security to suit the changing environment and climate. Permaculture methods will prove successful, therefore education in a new way of thinking about the land is necessary.

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?

The Nature Conservation Trust has a good record. There must also be continuous scientific studies to improve conservation

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 further land clearing for farming, mining and coal seam gas. There is enough land for farming if used efficiently and there is urgent need to embrace renewable energy and introduce extended producer responsibility to avoid unnecessary mineral extraction all for short-term product manufacture.

How should any tradeoffs be assessed?

No tradeoffs where our environment is concerned. Humanity depends on biodiversity and a healthy environment. You can't eat money

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

Not enough vision towards future generations. Always ask: what will they think in 100 years?

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

Greed is the 'b' all and end all. There is little respect for nature and little understanding within the community of how important our environment is for the future

Anonymous User just submitted the survey 'Theme 3: Conservation in land use planning' with the responses below.

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

They are not effective as political donations are making sure that the big donors get what they want in favour of conservation of our environment and biodiversity

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

Stop all political donations in order to strengthen and enhance outcomes for biodiversity and ecosystem services.

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

There is nothing more important than the protection of water and biodiversity to the future health of our farmland and existence. No more land clearing can be easily monitored by satellite images.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey 'Theme 4: Conservation in development approval processes' with the responses below.

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?

Too much corruption exists, the communities are not consulted, but TOLD what they will get. Offset practices are RUBBISH. eg the endangered Duffys Forest Ecological Community [at the ridiculously placed and planned private Frenchs Forest hospital] cannot be offset as there is no such land available. It is a crime against nature and future generations.

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. All planning must consider the natural environment above all others and one methodology may not be possible as so many considerations must be taken into account.

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?

There is too much corruption and assessment is not done honestly eg. the EIS by SMEG has failed to include endangered flora and fauna on the F Forest hospital site. This amounts to deliberate ecocide.

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. It seems the company chosen for the EIS is told what to find. Too much corruption in our system. Refer to the continuing ICAC findings of both Liberal and Labour parties at the expense of future generations of humanity and biodiversity.

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

Get rid of all political donations

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

There has been no loss of development opportunities. On the contrary, there is only continuing loss of biodiversity

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?

Long term social and economic benefits will only exist the biodiversity is respected, valued and preserved

How can offsets be more strategically located?

No offsets suffice when they are out of area and different biodiversity types. No project should go ahead when the so-called offset is not beneficial to the preservation of the specific biodiversity

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

No. There is already too much loss of biodiversity and self regulation has NEVER worked and NEVER will

Anonymous User just submitted the survey 'Theme 5: Wildlife management' with the responses below.

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 because there is no wide education to inform all Australians how important the natural environment is to all humans

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?

The Government should not be allowed to trash environmental laws by creating so called state significant sites in order to help their buddies who have made generous corrupt political donations

Are the provisions for marine mammals effective?

No. The shark nets are still catching marine mammals and fishing is allowed to destroy the marine biodiversity

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?

No. Proper wider education about the value and need for wildlife, policing and fining is not sufficient

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

Over fishing is causing dead zones in our oceans. Only by increasing marine sanctuaries can we hope to save species breeding grounds.

Anonymous User just submitted the survey 'Theme 6: Information provisions' with the responses below.

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?

At this time our natural environment has no value, when the community sees its government clear endangered colonies secretly from the inside of the site to the outside

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

Urgent registration of what natural environments are left is necessary and local communities must be given a stronger voice than the political donors who have all the influence at present

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

Generally the information is credible but the laws to protect it are not there or are illegally bent to suit the developers' wants

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

Not effective because of political corruption. Why have we lost the Endangered Duffys Forest Colony and why are our iconic koala populations threatened for roadways?

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

Threatened species should be top priority so the utmost effort must be made to preserve them

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?

State and national lists must conform to the highest standard of protection of species

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?

Yes, but this government has no respect for critical habitat when political donations get in the way

Should private conservation data be collected and if so how?

Local communities must be consulted together with the scientific community