

Australian Marine Parks Management Planning Comments

I wish to comment on the Marine Parks network management plans, notably to but I want to briefly register my objection to reduced protections. Australia's marine park network was superb, but now is being undercut.

I expect that the conclusion is foregone because there was no need for a new review at all (the stated reason that there wasn't enough consultation is rubbish), and given that previous submissions where the community wants greater protection have been ignored.

I have a PhD in coastal science. **I strongly object to the fact that a claim is being made that the new zonings are based on 'science'**, when they are contradicted by even the independent review panel, and current understanding on the role of sanctuary zones. That the marine science community is so strongly opposed is indicative of how rorted 'science' is here.

Recent publication of the impact on turtles, cetaceans and seabirds by commercial fishing interests off eastern Australia show the impact and the need for sanctuary zones, self-evidently. **Having commercial fishing interests as a starting point, and protection is what is left over is unacceptable. Habitat protection zones are not substitutes for sanctuary zones.**

I object to the wholesale reduction of sanctuary zones in all parks (National Park zone) as a rule. There can be no justification for 50+% reductions. This is clearly unjustified, especially in 'jewel in the crown' reserves as in the Coral Sea. It is clearly being railroaded by vested interests. There was a process to determine the current zoning involving the vested interests, and they are being given a second go here.

I note that there are new National Park zones, but they should stand alone, not be a sop for reductions elsewhere. I have extensive field experience in the NSW Solitary Islands Marine Park and it was clear during the zoning years ago that the 'wrong' areas of estuaries were being selected for higher protection because the 'right' areas were popular with fishing. This isn't 'balance' at all, and makes a mockery of the sanctuary function for biodiversity including commercial species in key areas. **Having some marine parks without any sanctuary zones is a mockery, as is deliberately ignoring the independent review recommendations on needed zones.**

I note that oil and gas is still possible within the marine parks. **This is unacceptable for the potential for accidents, including by shipping a la the GBRMP.** This shouldn't have to be said, but maybe the agenda is to weaken protection, but pretending that the marine park system is still valued, and oil and gas are designated beneficiaries, along with commercial and recreational fishers. missions equally.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Nick Wilson
50A Sunrise Rd
Palm Beach 2108