

## SECTION 1

**Do you consider the main biodiversity threats identified in the Consultation Draft (see below) to be the most important in reversing the decline in Australia's biodiversity?**

**Climate change:**

Strongly Agree

**Invasive species:**

Strongly Agree

**Loss and fragmentation of habitats:**

Strongly Agree

**Degradation of habitats:**

Strongly Agree

**Unstable use of natural resources:**

Strongly Agree

**Changes to the aquatic environment and water flows:**

Strongly Agree

**Inappropriate fire regimes:**

Strongly Agree

**Are there any other threats you think should be addressed?**

Institutional Arrangements, Bilaterals, Legislation at 4 levels of Govt do not follow the Strategy or the Precautionary Principle. Institutional Arrangements, Urban Planning and Coastal Management legislation Regional Planning and Mining Legislation are all Threatening Processes with statistically lamentable chance of recourse. The Lack of Specific Biodiversity Protection Legislation at all levels of Government continues to escalate local and regional extinctions.

## SECTION 2

**Do you agree or disagree that the proposed 'priorities for change' (outline in the 'Making Enduring Changes' section) will be effective at delivering the Strategy's vision to ensure Australia's biodiversity 'is healthy, resilient to climate change and valued for its essential contribution to our existence'?**

The reports have not been tabled on Resilience , Refugia, Coastal and Continental Climate Change Corridors. Contact Emeritus Professor Ray Specht on Resilience components. The generalised wording and without specific examples does not put weight on bilaterals or strengthen Bilaterals or EPBC Act or direct Caring for Country .

**Do you think the 'six priorities for change' identified are the most important ones? If not what others would you suggest?**

Legislative Changes Recovery The lack of Baseline assessments, lack of on going monitoring and lack of requirements of State of Environment Reporting at 3 other levels of Government has contributed to the escalations of extinctions. Positive Overhaul of World Heritage Act, GBRMPA and EPBC Act needed for Protection of Continental Coastal Zone Plans and funded Programs

**Do you have any comments on the vision?:**

The vision is clouded with Funding cuts to NRM Bodies escape clauses in Bilaterals and recent demise of the Land and Water Division and scientists like Rick Price.

## SECTION 3

**Do you believe the Consultation Draft:**

**promotes a good balance between conservation on private and public lands?**

Strongly Disagree

**will facilitate a good mix of regulation and incentives?**

Strongly Disagree

**provides a good balance between marine and terrestrial issues?**

Somewhat Agree

**provides the necessary national framework to produce innovative conservation action?**

NULL

**has a sufficient focus on institutional arrangements and change?**

Somewhat Disagree

**provides sufficient emphasis on improving community awareness of biodiversity?**

Strongly Disagree

**addresses the need to implement conservation action at the appropriate scale(s)?**

Strongly Disagree

**is applicable to urban and rural environments?**

Strongly Agree

**provides a clear framework for balancing conservation, social and economic issues?**

Strongly Disagree

**adequately deals with the issue of climate change?**

Strongly Disagree

**Do you have any other comments on these issues?**

Legislative powers are not included in the the Strategy , however that really means the Committee should be making strong recommendations for review and resourcing in a separate report to Government

#### **SECTION 4**

**Do you think the Consultation Draft adequately covers the roles of Indigenous peoples in biodiversity management?**

Many Clans have missed the funding in making their claims south of Townsville to NSW Border . Without that support, the Language , oral Knowledge and inter generational connections and sites are being lost. Federal and State Native Title needs revision. Without those conflicts being resolved the critical indigenous contribution to biodiversity and land use will remain hidden and much lost.

#### **SECTION 5**

**Do you agree or disagree that the proposed arrangements for reporting on implementation will be effective in the monitoring and evaluation of the expected outcomes (results) of the Consultation Draft?**

Somewhat Disagree

**Do you have any suggestions for alternative reporting arrangements?**

Some Agreement to deal with Local Authorities as has been done with the Council of Mayors in Southern Qld for NRS. SOEs are needed

#### **SECTION 6**

**To what extent is the Consultation Draft an appropriate national framework to achieve biodiversity conservation benefits, considering the different responsibilities, legislation and funding arrangements between governments?**

The 2011 SOE should be brought forward to inform the Strategy as Local Extinctions are predicated for Quoll and Koalas ( EPA 2008) (Carrick 2009)and perhaps some Gliders is SEQld . No work has been undertaken on Coastal Rainforesat pigeons since CHROME F.

#### **SECTION 7**

**Is the Consultation Draft likely to encourage a good mix of public and private investment in biodiversity conservation?**

Strongly Disagree

**If not, how can the Consultation Draft improve in this area?**

#### **SECTION 8**

**Is the Consultation Draft sufficiently clear about its role and how it will be implemented?**

Funding , implementation and Monitoring are vague.

#### **SECTION 9**

**Does the Consultation Draft reflect the best practice on biodiversity conservation?**

In \_Part NO Needs a separate volume on best Practice

## **SECTION 10**

### **Will the Consultation Draft effectively engage private sector interests in long-term biodiversity conservation?**

No it needs peak organisations ACF TWS WWF plus Poola Foundation Pew Foundation Etc and the bevy of Land Trusts BHF and AWC to set proposed legislation to set up equivalent Trusts to USA for Private Investment