



Native vegetation issues paper consultation - summary of workshop feedback

Overview

This document contains summaries of all the feedback collected at the Perth and regional workshops. It represents a subset of the full feedback collected from workshops and used to inform development of the draft policy.

During workshops, full feedback was gathered through the GroupMap platform. Individual participants entered their groups' feedback directly into GroupMap using a laptop. Participants received a copy of the full feedback by email, after each workshop.

Index

Albany.....	2
Broome	2
Bruce Rock	2
Bunbury	3
Esperance	3
Geraldton.....	3
Kalgoorlie.....	4
Karratha.....	4
Katanning	4
Northam.....	5
Perth	5
Port Hedland.....	7



	Summary
Albany <i>23 Jan 20</i>	<p>Participants generally supported the initiatives, including the state policy but expressed concern over the lack of detail. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ‘Striking a balance’ is not appropriate and the policy should be about protecting the environment. Consider Environmental Protection Policy model.• Farmers and other land managers need to have financial incentives to revegetate or protect native vegetation.• Support for strategic landscape scale management of vegetation• Information systems and data across agencies needs to be better but questioned whether anything could be meaningfully done due to high costs.• Resourcing for government management of native vegetation in general.
Broome <i>5 Dec 19</i>	<p>Participants supported opportunities to leverage local knowledge and approaches that take into account diverse values of native vegetation in the Kimberley Bioregion. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The policy should be about protecting native vegetation.• Compliance and enforcement needs to be robust.• Capturing the status of native vegetation through improving mapping and transparency is important.• Provide better clarity on requirements for land clearing and certainty of timeframes for business.• Allow for Aboriginal and community knowledge in planning for bioregional approaches and in native vegetation information.• Support bush products industries.
Bruce Rock <i>21 Jan 20</i>	<p>At the Bruce Rock workshop, there was strong local government representation with participants’ key concern being roadside clearing. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of mention of the Aboriginal Heritage Act (WA) and Native Title Act (Cth) and of Aboriginal perspectives in the issues paper.• Concern about lack of consideration of constraints (e.g. funding timeframe constraints, scheduling of council meetings) in timeframes for clearing applications – major challenge for road upgrade projects.• Protection of existing native vegetation in the wheatbelt is not enough, given the historic extent of clearing – need significant revegetation at a larger scale.• Need mechanisms for farmers to be able to generate an income stream for revegetation and protection, taking advantage of carbon farming and offsets.



	Summary
Bunbury <i>2 Dec 19</i>	<p>Participants supported partnership opportunities, the concept of a bioregional approach and a single policy to provide improved clarity and consistency. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recognised inadequacies in data collection, mapping, and associated funding, including inadequate baseline data and a lack of appropriate, standardised data which is contemporary, accessible and shared.• Need for increased transparency, tighter exemptions, more refusals and increased enforcement of clearing permits, and to incentivise conservation and disincentivise clearing.• Offsets process is unclear and may not offer a net improvement; offsets to be appropriate (right values), published.• Need an improved focus on provision of public information and education, including in relation to invasive weeds and fauna management.• Policy needs to address threats like pests (e.g. weeds including arum lilies and introduced wattles; rabbits; kangaroos; inappropriate fire regimes)
Esperance <i>31 Jan 20</i>	<p>Participants broadly supported the concept of a policy and a bioregional approach. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regulation is unclear and inconsistent (over time and between officers/agencies) with turnover of staff contributing to the problem• Need locally tailored rules for clearing• Concerns the policy will become invalid with change of govt and/or increase complexity• Need resourcing for more on ground surveys – Esperance flora poorly known• Lack of enforcement of unlawful roadside clearing
Geraldton <i>17 Jan 20</i>	<p>Participants supported a bioregional approach and opportunity to apply local knowledge to help inform decisions. Key points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A need for improved follow-up, enforcement and feedback on illegal clearing and associated decision making.• Native vegetation protection should drive decision making to enhance extent and condition but should also take account of social, economic and cultural values.• Accessing ongoing funding and resourcing.• Need to support stakeholder communications and connectivity, including between regions and across borders.• Fragmented, inadequate and unreliable data, and a lack of data sharing.



	Summary
Kalgoorlie <i>29 Nov 19</i>	<p>Participants supported the proposal of a longer-term policy to support planning and improve consistency, and to improve data systems. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bioregional approach generally supported as a way for departments to provide consistent advice and to take into account specific threats and values.• Need to increase transparency and consistency of clearing enforcement and outcomes• Better information is required, including ground truthing and data access but requires funding and reliable baseline data• Need to manage across agencies and jurisdictional boundaries and to improve consistency.• Need to recognise localised impacts and regional (vs state) risks
Karratha <i>18 Dec 19</i>	<p>Participants supported the broad objectives and opportunities to better manage biodiversity through improved information and data linkages across agencies. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enhancing access, understanding and interpretation of good, reliable information is essential.• Pilbara sub-regions and associated threats are complex, need more knowledge, including local knowledge.• Policy needs to articulate environmental threats effectively within framework of the region's economic, mining and rail developments.• Climate change, weed management, over-grazing and fire control impacts need to be better addressed.• Offsets are not protecting or improving native vegetation in the Pilbara.• View that regulations are not equitably applied to economic stakeholders and that uncleared land needs to be better regulated.
Katanning <i>22 Jan 20</i>	<p>Participants supported a balanced approach to the policy and regulation of native vegetation. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accessible and usable data, and a single source of information.• Provide clarity for stakeholders around permitted clearing and exemptions.• Lack of clarity in roadside clearing permits and approvals timeframes not aligned with time constraints of funding. Appeals process can impact applications.• Given the extensive clearing, the wheatbelt needs revegetation and farmers need funding (for example through carbon farming).• Amount approved for clearing is not equitable between coastal and inland shires, with Wheatbelt shires less able to afford consultants for vegetation surveys or offsets.



	Summary
Northam <i>3 Dec 19</i>	<p>Participants supported the concept of a State policy to bring legislation, information and agencies together for more consistency. Should be evidence-based and informed by stakeholders. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concerns that regulatory controls (such as exemptions) are inadequate and inconsistently applied; inadequate enforcement.• Need to capture value of the environment to Aboriginal communities.• Offsets are inconsistent and are being exploited; need increased resourcing and transparency.• Need improved data, data sharing and access, including to reduce access times, confidentiality issues and costs.• Need to include local knowledge and to balance economics with environment and public safety.• Support for bioregional approach, enabling use of local knowledge and taking account of diversity.
Perth <i>28 Nov 19</i>	<p>Participants supported the stated outcomes and benefits and the opportunities presented through a state policy, to develop bioregional approaches with shared access to a single data system. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Preference for policy to be embedded in legislation and resourced, to support common aims across government. Protection should be primary driver in decision making, to achieve net benefit• Need to enhance information and data systems and associated funding, increase accuracy and ground truthing• Enforcement should be better funded, applied more consistently, be more transparent and be more targeted to high risk areas. Consider fines.• Regional decision making in socio-economic context is required, applying local knowledge.• Need to understand priorities, targets and environmental outcomes. Need improved recognition of cumulative impacts• Recognise relevance of Bushforever Policy.



	Summary
Perth <i>9 Dec 19</i>	<p>Participants supported contemporary, integrated policy option with bioregional planning approach to enhance stakeholder consultation and access to data and information. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policy resourcing, coordination with other agencies and how to measure effectiveness• Concerns regarding data confidence, lack of sharing, incomplete mapping and need for assessments to be consultative.• Clearing under exemptions needs to be recorded.• Local and state regulation responsibilities need to be clarified with better communication to enhance consistency.• Overarching document should link to all Acts and policies (including review of CwltH NV objectives).• Need to define benefits and how targets will be tailored to bioregions
Perth <i>20 Jan 20</i>	<p>Participants supported more opportunities for stakeholder input and understanding, enhance data collection and accessibility and to prioritise and manage initiatives and investments more strategically. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Need to integrate and link the policy with existing State agency policies, and to build on the work of other States and the Commonwealth.• Offsets policies need to be strengthened and better understood, to help ensure a net benefit.• Enhance the quality of data, including through using agreed data sets, ground truthing and through providing funding and training to increase the reliability of data collection and interpretation.• Clearing approaches need to be better integrated, and resourcing is needed to better monitor compliance.• The policy should inform and empower landowners to better manage and protect native vegetation, including through incentives.



	Summary
Perth <i>4 Feb 20</i>	<p>Participants supported reform for government alignment, a strategic regional approach, enhanced consistency, and access to shared data. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Long term social, economic and environmental effects need to be examined including in context of heritage, recognition of historical losses and cumulative impacts. Environmental protection should be given more weight.• Need for updated, standardised, verified, shared, clear and accessible data and information• Bioregional approach could generate opportunities for Aboriginal land and sea managers, compliance with Aboriginal heritage and native title legislation, identifying and considering Aboriginal values in regulation.• Need consistent, transparent policies and improved legislation, supporting protection of ecosystems, not just native vegetation• Increase focus on native vegetation protection, not on offsets; also on restoration incentives to achieve net benefit; link conservation to job creation (e.g. rangers).
Port Hedland <i>10 Dec 19</i>	<p>Participants broadly supported the four initiatives set out in the issues paper. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The policy should integrate all sectors and bring them together but needs to have longevity across government cycles• Information and systems require regular updating and review. Government needs to promote information that is available to the public and opportunities for contribution (citizen science)• Better regulation would result in greater consistency but it would be difficult to standardise across the State• Bioregional approach is vital due to vegetation differences across the State, but need to be sure it is at an appropriate scale