

Response ID ANON-4EM2-EKY8-S

Submitted to **Native vegetation issues paper**

Submitted on **2020-01-30 11:07:49**

Your details

1 What is your name?

Name:

[REDACTED]

2 Can we publish your response?

Yes, you may publish my response anonymously

3 What is your email address? (optional)

Email:

[REDACTED]

4 What is your postcode? (optional)

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

5 Do your views officially represent those of an organisation?

No, these are my personal views

If yes, please specify the name of your organisation.:

6 Which of the following best describes the group or person you represent?

Private citizen

If other, please specify.:

7 Which of the following best describes the sector you represent?

Government

If other, please specify.:

8 Are there specific parts of your submission that you want to keep confidential?

If yes, please outline which specific parts of your submission must be kept confidential and explain why. :

A State native vegetation policy

9 Referring to the proposed policy objective statements below, how well do you support each one in guiding our development of a policy?

Objective 1 matrix - Objective 1:

Supported

Please explain in the text box below.:

I support the intent but believe the wording needs to be carefully considered. Management can't be transparent – the decision making of what management will be applied needs to be transparent. I suggest a reword. I would also be keen to see what your strategic direction is in the context of these objectives and have these clearly defined. You have kind of done this in each of the boxes but it hasn't actually been defined as the "strategic approach".

My suggestion:

"Decisions in relation to the management of native vegetation is consistent, transparent and strategic and strikes a balance between environmental, economic, social and cultural values of all Western Australians. "

Objective 2 matrix - Objective 2:

Supported

Please explain in the text box below.:

I support the intent but believe the wording needs to be carefully considered. Ecological function and biodiversity at a landscape scale? Who other than a biologist or environmental scientist really understands these terms? Try using more widely known language and/or the language you have defined within the document itself and keep any non-essential science speak out of it. My suggestion:

"Western Australia's native vegetation is strategically conserved to ensure it continues to provide appropriate values (Economic, Cultural, Environmental, Health, Educational and Aesthetic and Recreational) for all Western Australians"

Objective 3 matrix - Objective 3:

Supported

Please explain in the text box below.:

What about "at risk" fauna that relies on native vegetation?

This whole objective is on a different level to the previous two this is more 'what we aim to protect'

Suggestion (noted this is what you aim to protect not the overall approach): "Higher priority and strategic protection for unique and at risk native vegetation and areas that support at risk fauna, tailored to the bioregional setting"

10 What opportunities are presented by the development of a State Native Vegetation Policy focused on how government manages vegetation?

Please provide your answer in the text box below.:

Better information

11 How do you use native vegetation data within your sector? (Choose as many options as you require)

To plan for conservation, To plan for restoration, For baseline information for monitoring

If you have chosen 'other', please specify:

12 Which of the following elements of better information provision would be most relevant to your sector? (Choose as many options as you require)

Evidence-base for decisions

If you have chosen 'other', please specify:

13 What other opportunities are presented by improved information and improved access to information?

Please provide your answer in the text box below.:

Better regulation

14 Which of the following elements of better regulation would be most important to your sector? (Please rank your top three)

Rank better reg elements - Improved protection for native vegetation:

2

Rank better reg elements - Ensuring development is sustainable:

Rank better reg elements - Streamlined regulation for cost saving:

Rank better reg elements - Clearer requirements for business certainty:

Rank better reg elements - Improved assessment timeframes:

Rank better reg elements - Transparent, evidence-based decisions:

1

Rank better reg elements - Improved compliance and enforcement of unauthorised clearing:

Rank better reg elements - Equitable treatment of all proponents:

Rank better reg elements - Confidence in the regulatory system for all stakeholders:

Rank better reg elements - Other:

3

If you selected Other, please provide further information.:

hmm is your ranking 1= highest priority and 3 = lowest? This is not clear.

I have used 1 as the highest priority.

If done correctly improved protection for native fauna that need the vegetation

15 What other opportunities are presented by better regulation?

Please provide your answer in the text box below.:

A bioregional approach

16 Which of the following elements are the most important to you/your sector? (Please rank your top three)

Rank bioregional elements - 1. Transparent outcomes and objectives:

Rank bioregional elements - 2. Leveraging local knowledge:

Rank bioregional elements - 3. Strategic and innovative approach to conflicting interests:

3

Rank bioregional elements - 4. Clear targets and thresholds:

Rank bioregional elements - 5. Planned approach to dealing with cumulative impacts:

1

Rank bioregional elements - 6. Effective monitoring and evaluation framework:

Rank bioregional elements - 7. Supporting public-private partnerships for conservation:

2

Please explain in the text box below.:

17 What other opportunities are presented by a bioregional approach?

Please explain in the text box below.:

More effective management of threats applicable to a particular region.

18 What concerns are presented by a bioregional approach, for your sector?

Please explain in the text box below.:

Other initiatives

19 What initiatives do you think would work best to improve native vegetation outcomes in your region?

Pricing, incentives and markets (e.g. biodiversity banking, offsets, carbon farming etc), Nature-based or cultural tourism

Please explain in the text box below.:

20 What else could be done to improve the management of native vegetation to arrest the decline of native vegetation extent and condition?

Please provide your answer in the text box below.:

Increasing peoples awareness of the values we can attribute to native vegetation and the wildlife these areas support.

The natural environment provides us with

1. Economic value (e.g. timber, fibre, food, employment, medicines, etc)
 2. Cultural value (e.g. sense of place, spiritual connection, etc)
 3. Aesthetic and Recreational values (e.g. a diversity of plants and animals provides visual stimulation and provides areas for outdoor recreational activity -walking, photography, bird watching, etc)
 4. Environmental value (e.g. erosion control, storing carbon, climate regulation, supports native fauna, soil building, etc)
 5. Health values (e.g. water filtration, pest regulation, air filtration,etc)
 6. Educational values (e.g. capacity to learn from our natural environment).
- If you get this right it is easier to 'sell' why it is important to maintain areas of native vegetation

Upload a document

21 If you would like to upload a document to support your submission, please upload it here.

Upload document 1 here.:

Issues paper Native veg comments.docx was uploaded

Please describe which question(s) document 1 relates to. :

Upload document 2 here.:

No file was uploaded

Please describe which question(s) document 2 relates to. :

BOX 1: Ecosystem services and costs incurred when they are lost

Ecosystem services are the benefits people derive from ecosystems (DEWHA 2010). They include:

- ▶ provisioning services including food, fibre and timber
- ▶ regulating services including erosion control, water filtration, climate regulation, pest regulation, pollination, seed dispersal and storing carbon
- ▶ supporting services including soil and biodiversity conservation and environmental water flows
- ▶ cultural services including supporting a sense of place for indigenous and non-indigenous people and nature-based or cultural tourism.

The natural environment provides us with

1. Economic value (e.g. timber fibre food employment medicines etc.)
2. Cultural value (e.g. sense of place, spiritual connection, etc.)
3. Aesthetic and Recreational values (e.g. a diversity of plants and animals provides visual stimulation and provides areas for outdoor recreational activity -walking, photography, bird watching, etc.)
4. Environmental value (e.g. erosion control, storing carbon, climate regulation, supports native fauna soil building etc)
5. Health values (e.g. water filtration pest regulation air filtration etc)
6. Educational values (e.g. capacity to learn from our natural environment).

If you get this right it is easier to 'sell' why it is important to maintain areas of native vegetation.

4. A state native vegetation policy.

Desired outcome: Set an enabling framework for consistent, transparent objectives for consideration of native vegetation across all government processes

Can I suggest this as your intent for your native vegetation policy instead of the above?

To set a clear, consistent and transparent framework that will enable strategic and effective decision making in relation to the management of native vegetation across all government sectors/decision making.

Possible approaches

Set the strategic direction for native vegetation management to clarify the Government's intentions and priorities to apply across the State.

▶ Promote a bioregional approach when setting objectives for native vegetation protection management—enabling consideration of region (bioregional (?)) specific processes (or threats) and values of areas with unique or at risk environmental values.

▶ Apply the same objectives consistently across all of the Government's decision-making that affects native vegetation.

Proposed policy objectives We are consulting on three proposed policy objectives. These objectives will not necessarily be in the policy, but your responses to them will help us to understand stakeholder perspectives across sectors as we draft the policy.

Commented [1]: This is semantics but I firmly believe in ensuring the audience understands what is written. So rather than use too much "environmental jargon" and alienating a large portion of the audience, how about calling this above list "Values"? Ecosystem services is not something the average Australian understands, but the word "value" is easier to understand and it allows you to fully encompass why it is important to conserve the native vegetation. The term values it is "bigger" than ecosystem services and also a much easier entity to measure. I would remove this whole statement

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63 cm

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.63 cm, No bullets or numbering

Commented [2]: This is really difficult to understand. I realise this is the intent of your native vegetation policy and may not be an actual statement in the policy but why not get it correct up front so everyone can understand what the intent of the policy is?
. See my suggestion in the text

Commented [3]: Are these possible approaches or are they actually what the policy intends to do? I think it what is what you intend to do and all three apply with some modifications.

1. You need a strategic approach
2. You need this approach to apply across all government agencies making decisions of native veg and fauna management
3. You require flexibility within the approach to ensure bioregional risks/threats and values are considered in decision making

Commented [4]: It wont just be about protection.

Commented [5]: This ensures cultural values and other values are captured in this approach

Commented [6]: Is that what you really intend? Or is it consideration of region specific threats? For example the reason a region might have a unique veg community is because too much clearing has happened. The process you wish to manage is clearing and applying a blanket rule of no more than say 5% of remaining vegetation across the state wont work in that bioregion if you wish to save that community. So you need to have and approach that is different in that bioregion. It might be for example no clearing. So you want an approach that is bioregion specific to manage threats specific to that region.

Commented [7]: Not sure you can do this if you also have a bioregional approach.

~~a. Western Australia's native vegetation is strategically conserved and restored strategically to ensure it continues to provide appropriate values (Economic Cultural Environmental Health Educational and Aesthetic and Recreational) for all Western Australians to maintain and improve ecological function and biodiversity at a landscape scale.~~

~~a. Decisions in relation to the~~ The management of native vegetation is consistent, transparent and strategic and strikes a balance between environmental, economic, social and cultural values outcomes ~~to of all~~ Western Australians.

~~b. Western Australia's native vegetation is strategically conserved and restored to maintain and improve ecological function and biodiversity at a landscape scale.~~

c. Higher priority and strategic protection for unique and at risk native vegetation and areas that support at risk fauna, tailored to the bio regional setting.

Commented [8]: Ecological function and biodiversity at a landscape scale? Who other than a biologist or environmental scientist really understands these terms? Try using more widely known language and/or the language you have defined within the document itself and keep any non-essential science speak out of it

Commented [9]: Management can't be transparent – the decision making of what management will be applied needs to be transparent. I suggest a reword. I would also be keen to see what your strategic direction is in the context of these objectives and have these clearly defined. You have kind of done this in each of the boxes but it hasn't actually been defined as the "strategic approach".

Commented [10]: These are in the incorrect order

Commented [11]: But didn't you define "bioregional" ?

Commented [12]: What about at risk fauna that relies on native vegetation?
This whole objective is on a different level to the previous two this is more 'what we aim to protect'