

Extending the Tasmanian Regional Forestry Agreement questionnaire

Your details

First name

Amy

Last name

ROBERTSON

Organisation

personal (forester/environmental scientist).

Email address

Phone number

Please tick one of the following

- I confirm that my completed questionnaire does not contain sensitive information and can be published in full on the Department of State Growth website.
- My completed questionnaire should **NOT** be published on the Department of State Growth website.

Privacy Notice

You are providing personal information to the Tasmanian Department of State Growth (the Department), which will manage that information in accordance with the *Personal Information Protection Act 2004*. The personal information collected here will be used by the Department for the purpose of receiving and verifying contact details for stakeholders who have chosen to submit a completed questionnaire on the extension to the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement. Failure to provide this information may result in the non-acceptance of your questionnaire or records not being properly maintained. The Department may also use the information for related purposes, or disclose it to third parties, including the Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, in circumstances allowed for by law. You have the right to access your personal information by request to the Department and you may be charged a fee for this service.

Copyright in completed questionnaires resides with the author(s), not with the Department of State Growth.

In providing a completed questionnaire, you agree that:

- unless you indicate otherwise below (or as otherwise determined by the Department of State Growth), your questionnaire will be published on the Department's website and will remain on the Department's website indefinitely
- the Department can contact you about your questionnaire
- for published questionnaires from individuals, your name will be published with your questionnaire. All other contact details will be removed from your questionnaire
- for published questionnaires from organisations, your name and your organisation's details will be published with your questionnaire.

Please select your interest/s with extending the RFA

- Forest management system
- Resource certainty
- Research and development
- Threatened species
- Comprehensive Adequate and Representative reserve system
- Heritage values
- Socio-economic data
- Value of industry
- Employment figures

Other interests (please list)

Risk management (community resilience, bushfires)
Community engagement.
Effectiveness + efficiency

Your feedback

Please list any publicly available non-government documents, reports or data that the Australian and Tasmanian governments could consider in extending the Tasmanian RFA, and that have not already been provided to the governments through the third five-yearly RFA review, or by other means?

Where applicable, please list the publication title, date, author and url.

Bushfire inquiry reports: 2013 Tasmanian
Report of the inquiry into the 2002-03 Victorian bushfires.

What research and development priorities are important to Tasmanian forestry industry stakeholders?

Having a management and regulatory system that is genuinely adaptable, in order to be responsive to the research and developments that occur through time; This comes from a simple + outcome-focussed system.

No point in researching alternative silvicultural options if the fee/prescription/community engagement processes are too strict or unresponsive to consider them.

Little incentive to explore or introduce new processing or market ideas if the framework for royalties, product definitions (eg. 'sawlog') or sustainable yield is too rigid.

And a significant risk to cooperative threatened species/vulnerable land management when approval processes or prescriptive requirements become too complex and expensive. Eg. cheaper to build the dam then pay a fine if caught, than follow the planning process!

What socio-economic data and analysis is important to Tasmanian forest industry stakeholders?

I'm really concerned at the breakdown I see between community residents and the management of their broader land environment.

Partly caused by a mobile + aging population who have less familiarity with what's beyond their back fence, but also by cutting back and restructuring land management organisations.

Risks including vandalism, rubbish-dumping, ^{illegal firewood cutting,} lack of maintenance, weeds/pests, bushfires are all visibly increasing. Can we find some data to quantify this?

And can we then recognise the importance of managing and preventing ~~of~~ these issues in our forests?

How could the governments improve outcomes-focused monitoring and reporting on threatened species and biodiversity, as part of extending the Tasmanian RFA?

Tell a story, to allow community members to engage with and understand the process at a detail/on-ground level through to the strategic picture, and overtime.

Need to include + communicate relative risk and priorities to improve understanding + engagement.

What other improvements could be made to the RFA framework?

Rec 16 (simplification) goes towards addressing the problem of the complex, awful beast the RFA has evolved into. But this needs to go further: it's not just cutting the excess but renewing the core values that will reinvigorate the RFA.

The RFA was based on great stuff - if it wasn't, natural selection would have killed it instead of evolving it during its 20 year lifetime. But 'extending' ~~it~~ will fail to really deal with the cumbersome beast.

Strengths include the triple bottom line approach, CAR reserve concept, PNFE, sustainable yield, ^(resource security) and presenting the Agreement as a prioritisation and risk management agreement by leaders for us all. Transparency and reasoning are fundamental (and transparency of reasoning!).

The community engagement and uptake of the original RFA are still in people's memory, it's only more recent adjustments to the RFA that have diluted support for it, or the youngest generation who are unaware. ^(a bit like the AIDS campaign). A little 'renewal' of community engagement over a draft of the next RFA, ~~start~~ especially a clearer Agreement that is focussed on those successful core elements, could refocus and bring together our land managers.

System/process issues sitting under the RFA could be stimulated in more constructive directions by a clear, broadly effective document.

Few will take much notice if it's just a tweaked rollover, but if it moves forward then that encourages all us stakeholders to move with it - review the Code of Forest Practices, strategise industry development, step up threatened species decision-making, invigorate certification standards etc.