

zerowaste 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?

Yes. Australia cannot afford to lose any biodiversity for the sake of big business gains

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?

The legislation is not worth the paper it is printed on if it can be overturned by turning a site into a state significant site

To what extent are the current objects being met?

It is a very risky time for biodiversity survival as the state government can do what it likes in spite of any listings as state significant.

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

Get rid of government ability to make any land 'state significant' if it means a site can be then cleared without community consent.

zerowaste 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?

All landowners must be educated to become environmental stewards who protect ecosystems and need to be rewarded for their efforts and cost to do so

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 owners need the knowledge of using natural systems such as permaculture to gain the best production on their land whilst maintaining a healthy ecosystem. The two can go hand in hand.

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?

Organisations proven to have good results in maintaining ecosystems on private land should be given public/private funding to carry on their work

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?

Community groups which are known to be advocates for preserving biodiversity must be given government aid and legal aid to protect our failing ecosystems.

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

Local communities are generally well placed to monitor and evaluate conservation. Satellite tracing over time is a good indicator.

How should any tradeoffs be assessed?

No endangered species or ecological communities can be ethically traded off. There are enough 'brown' sites available to prevent loss of habitat.

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

This must be the most short sighted system when a site such as the only wildlife corridor and Endangered Duffys Forest Ecological Community with its huge old trees and endangered flora and fauna can be trashed from within to build a private hospital away from the centre of the population it is supposed to serve and the endangered iconic koala colony can be risked for a super highway being constructed through the middle of the bushland when there are clear alternative routes which do not endanger the wildlife.

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

Current practice is all about deals for the boys who give the political donations as is seen right now in the ICAC headlines.

zerowaste 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 a joke. The Endangered Duffys Forest Colony EIS has not been done professionally as species which were clearly on the site and proven by photographs have not been listed. It can only be improved if political donations are banned and there are true studies and consultation with the local communities.

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

Depressingly hopeless. Even before plans are finalised ecosystems are trashed and the authorities pass the buck from one department to another. No reasonable plans are even made to catch, save species. Their deaths are not even noted. It seems this is done to shut the community up because there is nothing left to save.

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

The community and scientific knowledge and advice must be acted on when it comes saving ecosystems. For too long our political leaders put no value on biodiversity and ecosystems believing humans can conquer nature. Strategic planning is non-existent when each department does not know what the other departments are doing on the same project.

zerowaste 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?

No political donations and proper community consultation before decisions are finalised will harmonise the process

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?

It is not possible for a single approach as each site is different. But scientific and local knowledge must be taken seriously for any type of development always with decisions being based on the best way to work WITH nature.

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?

It is failing miserably when an EIS is done to deliberately not list all endangered and other species on a site. The developer must never be allowed to carry out their own EIS.

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's a joke. And now the EDO funding has been further cut there is no way to protect threatened species, populations and ecological communities. Get rid of political donations and corrupt government practices.

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

NO political donations, NO corruption.

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

Lost development opportunities are generally in the areas of environmentally sustainable industries. The focus is on making the same mistaken practices over and over.

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?

The loss of endangered species cannot be offset. As if setting aside a piece of land in the western suburbs of Sydney can ever replace the loss of the Endangered Duffys Forest Ecological Community?

There are always better alternatives for developments on 'brown' sites than trashing biodiversity further.

How can offsets be more strategically located?

Offsets do not work. The only reason these are 'offered' is to bluff the community that the government cares about biodiversity.

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

Self regulation does not work anywhere on this planet. Businesses must have laws which restrict their naturally greedy tendency to get rich quick at any cost. Future generations are not part of the consideration when it comes to profit. Economy means 'get rich quick at any cost' - not its original meaning of using the most conservative way.

zerowaste 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?

More funding and employment in the field of ecology and biodiversity would be effective in the long term

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?

Shooters must not have the right to enter National Parks. It does not protect native animals. Only trained rangers can do this. Employ a larger team and the government will find there are more dollars from tourism.

Are the provisions for marine mammals effective?

Shark nets still catch marine mammals but are not effective at deterring sharks. The Government must curb the building and extending of ports for coal and coal seam gas export as these pose too much of a threat to the marine environments and marine mammals

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?

There must be employment of marine rangers in the area where they are needed eg Cabbage Tree Bay continues to suffer loss as the officers are sited up on the N coast. No-one has been fined for breaking the law.

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

Not sure

zerowaste 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?

Biodiversity and natural assets once lost cannot be retrieved. Making money for the short term gains must be stopped immediately. We cannot eat money.

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

Local communities and scientists must be the ones to collect biodiversity data and be responsible for this until political donations [and the ensuing corruption] are banned.

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

Much knowledge is already within local communities but scientists need to be well funded to gather more data.

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

The listing is often there but worthless when governments can trash its value by calling a site 'state significant' to satisfy their huge political donors.

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

No. But at this time threatened species listings have no weight as long as political donations are not banned

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?

The Federal Government must not leave all decision making to the state. The Franklin River would not have been saved if not for Federal intervention

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?

The identification of critical habitat is an effective tool for biodiversity conservation and we should list critical habitat for more species where relevant and useful, but until political donations are banned we will continue to see these habitats trashed and corrupt practices continuing.

Should private conservation data be collected and if so how?

Yes. Many trials have been advertised over the radio with very good results. Many in our communities see the conservation of biodiversity as being highly significant in the protection of our environment for maintaining water and food security and preventing pollution and speeding climate chaos

zerowaste just submitted the survey 'Other comments' with the responses below.

Other comments

Never at any time has the danger to survival of humankind been so high. Humans depend on a healthy environment, protecting and maintaining the surviving species from the onslaught of modern destructive lifestyles. This can only be done when true community consultations and advice is taken seriously, particularly in and around densely populated cities where sustainable practices to protect the natural ecology and farmlands are even more vital. BAN POLITICAL DONATIONS to avoid corruption from government representatives and big business. The health of our planet depends on conservation and zero waste.