



**Respondent No:** 568

**Login:** Anonymous

**Email:** n/a

**Responded At:** Jul 13, 2018 14:36:42 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 13, 2018 14:36:42 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

- |   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| Q1. <b>First name</b>   | ████                 |
| Q2. <b>Last name</b>  | ████                 |
| Q3. <b>Phone</b>  | not answered         |
| Q4. <b>Mobile</b>   | ████████             |
| Q5. <b>Email</b>  | ████████████████████ |
| Q6. <b>Postcode</b>   | ████                 |
| Q7. <b>Country</b>  | Australia            |
| Q8. <b>Stakeholder type</b>   | Individual           |
| Q9. <b>Stakeholder type - Other</b>   | not answered         |
| Q10. <b>Stakeholder type - Staff</b>  | not answered         |
| Q11. <b>Organisation name</b>   | not answered         |
| Q12. <b>What is your preferred method of contact?</b>   | Email                |
| Q13. <b>Would you like to receive further information and updates on IFOA and forestry matters?</b> | No                   |
| Q14. <b>Can the EPA make your submission public?</b>  | Yes, but anonymous   |
| Q15. <b>Have you previously engaged with the EPA on forestry issues?</b>                            | No                   |

**Q16. What parts of the draft Coastal IFOA are most important to you? Why?**

The compliance and monitoring aspect is all important. Previous logging laws have attempted to constrain the damage done to large diverse forests, but mysteriously failed, even with the EPA watching them. EPA seems to make negligible movements against FCNSW for overlogging, and backs off easily. Their prosecution database shows 4 minor convictions against "Forestry" since 2000. Actions against Forestry are always forced by local environmentalists. EPA ejects trouble-maker employees who care about forests. The very small and independent EDO attempts actions against the government, so it gets budget threats. By inference, if the EPA did its job and attacked Forestry, it would also get shut down. What I'm saying is, that even though EPA is supposed to be independent, and remaining staff are still moderately antagonistic to Forestry, they still somehow couldn't prosecute Forestry over the hundreds of important laws that Forestry routinely broke. I can see in Chapter 8, under "monitoring program", that the creation and the running of it will be left in charge of Forestry. WHAAAAAATTTTT ??? (With some small help from the DPI, the agency that just invited White Spot prawn disease into Australia) Monitoring and prosecution HAS TO BE independent, but this is all down to a mysterious Steering Committee (129.3) 129.3 FCNSW must provide a monitoring program endorsed by the monitoring steering committee to the Chief Environment Regulator of the EPA and the Deputy Director General (Strategy and Policy) of DPI for their approval within 12 months following the commencement of this approval. The draft itself needs to specify independence from government and Forestry, and guaranteed funding for prosecution, if not monitoring. The idea that FCNSW should provide it is hideous, and the steering committee will likely point this out, and somehow be ignored. They need to be helped by the wording in the IFOA. The paragraphs are moderately OK, except for the way they start: 129.3 FCNSW must provide 129.1 FCNSW must establish (b) FCNSW must implement I don't want to see FCNSW anywhere in those paragraphs. It's like you haven't learnt anything about government. ----- The rest of the questions in your submission can't be answered until an independent monitoring and prosecutions department is established. If it's not independent, then I answer all questions in the strong environmental negative.

---

**Q17. What parts of the draft Coastal IFOA do you think have a positive outcome on the management of environmental values or the production of sustainable timber? Why?**

not answered

---

**Q18. What parts of the draft Coastal IFOA do you think have a negative outcome on the management of environmental values or the production of sustainable timber? Why?**

not answered

---

**Q19. What are your views on the effectiveness of the combination of permanent environmental protections at the regional, landscape and operational scales (multi-scale protection)?**

not answered

---

**Q20. In your opinion, would the draft Coastal IFOA be effective in managing environmental values and a sustainable timber industry? Why?**

not answered

---

**Q21. General comments**

Native forestry yields need to be dropped, or laws protecting the environment can't work. Old growth forest should stay old growth. Monitoring is easy. You just walk into the forest, look at all the trashed trees, and then prosecute. You don't need techno mumbo jumbo to pretend you are monitoring.

---

**Q22. Attach your supporting documents (Document** not answered

1)

---

Q23. **Attach your supporting documents (Document 2)** not answered

---

Q24. **Attach your supporting documents (Document 3)** not answered

---