

**ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS TO THE ROWLEY  
SHOALS MARINE PARK DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN AND  
INDICATIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR EXTENSIONS TO  
THE EXISTING MARINE PARK**



Prepared by the  
**Department of Environment and Conservation**  
*for the*  
**Marine Parks and Reserves Authority**

2007



Department of  
**Environment and Conservation**





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>34</b>

\* \* \*

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE 1: NUMBER AND ORIGIN OF SUBMISSIONS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>TABLE 2: ANALYSIS TABLE FOR PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>

\* \* \*



## INTRODUCTION

Prior to the gazettal of a marine conservation reserve or the adoption of a management plan for an existing reserve, the *Conservation and Land Management Act 1984* requires that the Minister for the Environment release a draft or indicative management plan to provide an opportunity for the community to comment on the management proposals. On 5 January 2004 the *Rowley Shoals Marine Park Draft Management Plan and Indicative Management Plan for Extensions to the Existing Marine Park* (hereafter referred to as the 'draft plan') was released for public comment.

At this time, a Notice of Intent was placed in the *Government Gazette* and advertisements were placed in two editions of *The Western Australian* and *The Broome Advertiser* to advise that the draft plan was available for comment. The draft plan was distributed to state and local government departments, tertiary institutions, libraries, stakeholder groups and numerous individuals who expressed interest during the planning process. Copies of the draft plan were available for perusal at Departmental and Local Government offices and copies were also available for purchase from DEC's State Operations Headquarters and Departmental offices at Broome and Fremantle. To facilitate public input, a postage paid 'Have Your Say' brochure was produced, that provided interested parties with a form to indicate their views on key aspects of the draft plan. An electronic copy of the draft plan was also available on the Department of Environment and Conservation's (DEC)<sup>1</sup> NatureBase website and submissions could be lodged electronically.

The statutory three-month public submission period closed on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2004, although late submissions were accepted. A total of 30 public submissions (25 letters, three online forms and two emails) on the draft plan were received. All submissions were summarised and the issues raised were considered by DEC, the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority and Government. Comments made in submissions were assessed on the cogency of points raised.

The public submissions to the plan were reviewed according to the process outlined below.

- All submissions were recorded in a spreadsheet as they were received and responses summarised and collated according to the section of the draft plan they addressed.
- A summary of the key issues arising from the submissions was provided to the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority (MPRA) and all submissions were made available to the Authority.
- The MPRA considered the issues raised in the public submissions and then provided advice to the Minister for the Environment.
- The Government then considered this advice and the issues raised during the public submissions period. On 10 December 2004 the Government gazetted amendments to the boundary of the Rowley Shoals Marine Park. The Government also announced the final decisions in respect to the management zoning to be implemented for the Park.
- DEC prepared a final management plan to give intent to the Government's decisions and address finer scale issues raised during the public submission period.
- The management plan for the extended Rowley Shoals Marine Park was approved by the Minister for the Environment on XXXX.
- The analysis of public submissions was finalised to summarise the key issues that were raised and how those issues have been addressed.

This document outlines how the submissions were summarised and provides an analysis of the public submissions. For the issues raised, it also indicates if the plan was amended and, a brief rationale for this decision to amend or not amend the plan. It should be noted that several

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) was formed on 1 July 2006 through the amalgamation of the Department of Conservation and Land Management and the Department of Environment. Reference to DEC prior to this date is to be interpreted to mean the former Department of Conservation and Land Management.

submissions raised the same or related issues, and these have been amalgamated where appropriate, for simplicity.

## ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

A total of 30 public submissions on the draft plan for the Rowley Shoals Marine Park were received. The majority of submissions received were letters (25 submissions), as well as three online forms and two emails. No submissions were received via the 'Have Your Say' brochure and no proforma submissions or petitions were received. The number and origin of submissions are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1: Number and origin of submissions**

Submitters	Number of submissions	Percentage (%)
Individuals	6	20
Non Government organisation	14	47
Government (State)	6	20
Government (Commonwealth)	4	13
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

A list of the submitters to the draft plan is given in Appendix 1.

The analysis of public submissions to the *Rowley Shoals Marine Park Draft Management Plan and Indicative Management Plan for Extensions to the Existing Marine Park* is presented in Table 2. The analysis contains:

- a summary of each major issue or point raised and the number of submissions that raised the issue (in parentheses)
- an indication of whether or not the comment resulted in an amendment to the final management plan and the criteria by which each comment was assessed. Minor editorial changes referred too in the submissions have also been made; and,
- a brief statement responding to the comment and, if appropriate, indicating what action was taken to amend the final management plan.

The criteria referred to in Table 2 are detailed below.

1. The draft plan **was amended** if a submission:
  - a) provided additional resource information of direct relevance to management;
  - b) provided additional information on affected user groups of direct relevance to management;
  - c) indicated a change in (or clarified) government legislation, management commitment or management policy;
  - d) proposed strategies that would better achieve management objectives and aims; or
  - e) indicated omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity.
2. The draft plan **was not amended** if the submission:
  - a) clearly supported the draft proposals;
  - b) offered a neutral statement or no change was sought;
  - c) addressed issues beyond the scope of draft plan;
  - d) made points that were already in draft plan or were considered during its preparation;
  - e) was one amongst several widely divergent viewpoints received on the topic and the strategy of draft plan was still considered the best option; or
  - f) contributed options which are not possible (generally due to some aspect of existing legislation or Government policy).

**Table 2: Analysis table for public submissions**

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
<b>General Comments</b>			
1	The Park should be a conservation zone that prohibits the taking of sea life. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No 2d</i>	Marine parks are multiple use areas that aim to reduce user conflict and impacts and so maintain the ecological integrity of an area. Marine parks include sanctuary zones, that are 'look but don't take' zones. A balance between conservation and sustainable use has been determined.
2	DEC and the Department of Fisheries (DoF) should give further consideration to the proposal that was drafted by all Kimberley charter operators. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	<i>No 2d</i>	The proposal was considered during the planning process with a number of the components included in the draft plan prior to release for public comment.
3	Fisheries management needs to be a component in the planning and management process. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No 2d</i>	The Department of Fisheries were involved in the planning process and have an ongoing role in the management of the fisheries in the area, as well as in assisting with implementation of the management plan. This is clearly acknowledged in the plan.
4	Suggest the establishment of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between DEC and DoF on marine parks. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>Yes 1e</i>	DEC and DoF work collaboratively to implement the whole-of-Government objective of establishing a network of marine conservation reserves in WA. A MOU for the Rowley Shoals Marine Park is in place. A MOU between the Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Fisheries was agreed in 2005 to formalize cooperation and integration between the Departments in the management of the State's marine protected areas. There is now specific reference to this MOU in the plan.
5	Suggest the Management Plan make reference to the MOU between the Commonwealth and WA Rowley Shoals Management Liaison Committee. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No 2d</i>	A number of references are made in the plan to the MOU between the Commonwealth and the State Government with respect to the collaborative management of the area.
6	The Rowley Shoals Marine Park should be managed by DoF as 99% is a marine environment. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No 2f</i>	DEC has legislative responsibility under the <i>Conservation and Land Management Act 1984</i> for marine park management.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
7	Support for the need for a marine park in the Rowley Shoals reef system. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the Plan.
8	There should be provisions to protect the northern reef systems (i.e. Scott Reef, Seringapatam Reef and Ashmore Reef) that are intimately related to the Rowley Shoals. (3 submissions)	No 2c	The Scott and Seringapatam Reefs are indicated in the Marine Parks and Reserves Selection Working Group Report (1994) as being worthy of consideration as marine reserves and as such may be reserved in the future. Ashmore Reef is already a Commonwealth marine national nature reserve, managed by the Commonwealth Government.
9	Suggest stakeholders should be provided a table outlining datasets available for the purpose of habitat mapping in the area and information of species' characteristics, special features, fish populations, spawning sites etc also be provided. (2 submissions)	No 2d	The key information datasets are summarised in the background sections for each ecological value and in the figures in the plan.
10	Suggest that there should be easily accessible data (tables and maps) showing proportional representativeness of each habitat type in both the proposed marine park and the Interim Marine and Coastal Regionalisation for Australia (IMCRA) region. (2 submissions)	No 2f	The available information on habitat mapping is already included in the management plan. There is insufficient data on habitat distribution throughout the entire bioregion to allow for such proportions to be calculated with a reasonable degree of accuracy.
11	There should be consideration to include relevant indigenous and cultural heritage issues, for example, the National Estate listing for the Rowley Shoals notes that it is possible that Indigenous cultural values of National Estate significance may exist throughout these islands. (1 submission)	No 2d	No evidence was provided during the planning process to suggest historical or traditional indigenous use of this area. If this information is forthcoming, the management of the area will take this into account.
12	Concerns over the resourcing of the draft plan due to the remote location of the Rowley Shoals. (3 submissions)	No 2d	Government has committed new funds for implementation of the Plan and ongoing management of the Park. In addition to this, collaborative arrangements have been developed between DEC and DoF to maximize Government efficiency and effectiveness in implementing the management plan.
13	There should be considerations for including reference to relevant illegal foreign fishers and associated issues. (1 submission)	No 2d	Reference to illegal foreign fishing as a pressure on specific ecological values is made in these sections as well as in the general compliance section.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
14	Concerns over the lack of acknowledgement of the DoF's role as the lead agency in the management of fish resources within WA, or its role in the delivery of maritime compliance in the draft plan. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2d	The role of DoF is clearly identified in Table 1 and in the context of all fishing related strategies.
15	The Fisheries Notice No. 238 and 239 under <i>Fish Resources Management Act 1994</i> should not be cited as a legitimate reason for protection of protected species within sanctuary zones. The validity of the argument presented to extend the sanctuary zones is therefore questioned and not supported. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2c	The Plan does not cite notices under the <i>Fish Resources Management Act 1994</i> as a reason for establishment of sanctuary zones. Sanctuary zones are established for biodiversity conservation.
16	A closed season for access to the marine park should be established between January and June each year. This should be done in consultation with stakeholders and be reviewed yearly <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2e	Given the level of visitation to the Rowley Shoals, a closed season is not thought to be necessary.
<b>Executive Summary</b>			
17	The statement on page v '...localised impacts on some targeted fish species...' is not backed up by scientific evidence. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	This statement about localized impacts on some targeted fish species is based on anecdotal evidence from a range of sources. Research and monitoring programs will aim to quantify the level of these impacts.
18	Concerns over the exclusion of recreational fishing interests in the consultative process. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No 2d	Input was requested and received from the recreational fishing sector during the planning process and preparation of the Plan and this was a key consideration in the design of the zoning scheme.
19	Concerns that there has been no wide community involvement in the preparation of the draft plan. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2d	There were opportunities for community involvement through consultation with key stakeholders and through the release of the draft and indicative plans for public comment.
<b>Introduction</b>			

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
20	Mermaid Reef Management Plan lists strategies where consultation should occur with DEC. Suggest that there be reference to consultation and co-operation with DEH over relevant strategic management issues of the Rowley Shoals outlined in the draft Plan such as compliance, research and monitoring. (1 submission)	<i>Yes</i> <i>1e</i>	Plan amended to expand on interagency co-operation in section 8.3. Plan makes reference in several instances to the MOU between the State and Commonwealth in regard to management of the Rowley Shoals.
<b>Definition of the area and reserve tenure</b>			
21	Support for extending the Park to the limit of WA coastal waters as current boundaries are inadequate/ it will enhance DEC's ability to protect the environment and will significantly improve the management of fishing. (9 submissions)	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
22	Do not accept the statement '...it is clear that the current boundaries are inappropriate in relation to protection of the values of the Park and the management of human usage of the area.' (Page v). If an activity represents a demonstrable threat, then a management response should be developed however threats from human activity have not been demonstrated at Rowley Shoals due to the lack of clear demonstrational ongoing research. (1 submission)	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	The boundaries and the need for the extensions were carefully considered. The proposed boundaries reflect a desire to better address the CAR principles (comprehensive, adequate and representative protection of habitats and species) and facilitate an integrated approach to the management of the major activities in the area. A precautionary approach is applied to management in the face of threatening processes. The plan includes a significant emphasis on research and monitoring strategies which will assist in assessing threats to, and impacts on the Park's values.
23	Agree the proposed boundaries should be amended to include subtidal coral reef communities and deepwater habitats as the current boundaries are inadequate. (2 submissions)	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
24	Concerns over the proposed extensions as it would significantly impede development of petroleum resources in the area. (1 submission)	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	The <i>CALM Act</i> states that petroleum activities can occur in areas <i>other than</i> sanctuary and recreation zones and special purpose zones where the activities are incompatible with the primary purpose of the zone. The plan allows for these activities in the general use zone subject to EPA approval.
<b>Vision and Strategic Objectives</b>			

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
25	Agree with the vision statement. There is a need for protection / the area is currently in a pristine state and needs to be maintained. (4 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the Plan.
26	The vision statement fails to recognise the non-anthropogenic events such as tropical cyclones and water temperature has on the Reef. (2 submissions)	No 2d	The vision statement does not specifically list pressures, rather is an overarching statement of community aspirations for the area. The plan makes reference to non-anthropogenic effects on the Shoals.
27	Suggest that the reference 'ecologically sustainable recreation' be removed from the vision statement as the area has relatively low use. (1 submission)	No 2e	The vision statement reflects the multiple use nature of the Park. Moreover, it is a vision for 20 years during which time visitation to the area is likely to increase. The vision statement in the management plan is considered to be appropriate.
28	As the vision statement is a long-term goal, suggest that consideration could also be given to identifying goals for the short and medium term, e.g. further contribution toward the National Representative System of Marine Protected Areas (NRSMPA). (1 submission)	No 2d	The contribution of this reserve to the NRSMPA is highlighted in the section on strategic objectives (Section 3.). Short and long term targets for the ecological and some social values are indicated in the plan.
<b>Strategic Objectives</b>			
29	Disagree with the environmental objectives for the Park and the proposed extensions. (1 submission)	No 2e	These strategic objectives represent the broad goals of marine conservation reserves under the <i>Conservation and Land Management Act 1984</i> and reflect Government policy. The strategy of the Plan is therefore still considered the best option. Support for the Plan.
30	Agree with the environmental objectives for the Park and the proposed extensions. (3 submissions)	No 2a	
31	Agree with the social objectives of the Park and the proposed extensions. (2 submissions 6)	No 2a	
32	Support for the strategic objectives. (1 submission)	No 2a	
33	Human activities will increase in the future and so the area must be managed to ensure the marine environment is not detrimentally affected. (1 submission)	No 2a	

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
<b>Values of the Area</b>			
34	Agree with the social values. (1 submission)	<i>No</i>	Support for the Plan.
35	There should be direct liaison with the WA Fishing Industry Council regarding the number of commercial line fishing operators in the area of the Park. (1 submission)	<i>2a</i> <i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	Advice from DoF in the planning process was that there was no commercial fishing occurring in the Shoals or in the surrounding waters.
<b>Management Frameworks</b>			
36	Agree with the management frameworks. (1 submission)	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the Plan.
<b>International and National Context</b>			
37	No comments on this section		
<b>State Policy Context</b>			
38	No comments on this section		
<b>Legislative Framework</b>			
39	No comments on this section		
<b>Responsibilities of Authorities and Government Agencies</b>			
40	The Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) should be listed as an agency in this area as it has responsibility for the management of the Imperieuse Reef light and radio beacon situated on Cunningham Island. (1 submission)	<i>Yes</i> <i>1e</i>	Plan amended to include AMSA in the list of management agencies with responsibilities in the area.
<b>Description of Management Issues</b>			
41	Agree with the management issues. (1 submission)	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the Plan.
<b>Management of Ecological and Social Values</b>			
42	Support for the values, objectives and targets in this section. (1 submission)	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the Plan.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
43	Suggest that management objectives should be clearly linked to the identification and management of specific key threats. The development of subsequent monitoring programs should then focus on how these threats will be evaluated or monitored and reported on. It is critical that a baseline be established against which specific monitoring and data collection can take place. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	Where clear threats have been identified, management objectives are clearly linked to these and monitoring needs identified will clearly relate to the threats. Monitoring and research are key components of the plan and the MPRA will conduct and audit of the management of the Park.
44	Concerns that the management objectives do not take into account the difficulty in establishing causal links between human activity and variations in the abundance in fish populations, e.g. no baseline data is cited. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	Management of the marine park includes (1) monitoring the values of the Park and the pressures on these values and (2) conducting research to evaluate the causal links between human activities and impacts on the values. Both monitoring and research strategies form a key component of the overall suite of management strategies found in the management plan. The specific targets (for which baseline data will be collected) are phrased in terms of trends as few data are currently available. However, one of the benefits of implementing the plan is that it will result in the collection of this data.
<b>Ecological Values</b>			
45	Support the management strategies for the ecological values as outlined in the tables in Section 7.1 of the draft plan/management strategies are researched well. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the Plan.
46	It is hoped that adequate resources have been allocated to implement the management strategies <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	Government has committed new funds for implementation of the Plan and ongoing management of the Park.
<b>Geology and Geomorphology</b>			
47	Agree that geological features such as seabed, reefs and beaches should not be significantly altered as a result of human activity. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the Plan.
<b>Water quality</b>			

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
48	Agree that the quality of seawater should meet human health standards at all times for swimming and other water sports. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
49	Agree that the quality of seawater and sediments should be maintained at all times to ensure seafood meets human health standards. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
50	Support for the preservation of the water quality/that waste cannot be discharged less than 1nm from the reef perimeter. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
51	The Rowley Shoals should be nominated to the Australian Maritime Safety Authority as an area of 'extreme sensitivity' as the draft plan omits to provide any defence against the grounding of significant tonnage vessels. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2c</i>	The process of defining sensitive sea areas is a national issue and relies on establishing that an area has a high risk of vessel grounding. On a statewide basis, there is a very low level of commercial shipping in this area and the Rowley Shoals would not be ranked as a high risk nationally.
<b>Intertidal coral reef communities</b>			
52	Agree there should be no permanent loss, as a result of human activity, in the diversity and abundance of intertidal coral reef communities in the Park and proposed extensions. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
53	Sanctuary zones will not necessarily stop or minimise non-fishing activities and pressures (e.g. anchor damage) <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	The pressures identified for intertidal coral reef communities will be managed by a range of strategies including the establishment of sanctuary zones. Specifically, the establishment of sanctuary zones will address the issues of specimen collecting and will leverage additional resources to combat illegal fishing in general. Other pressures, e.g. reef walking, will be addressed through, for instance, education programs. Strategies in the plan to minimise anchor damage include education of Park users and installation of moorings.
54	In relation to strategy 5, AMSA would like its current environmental guidelines to form the basis of any agreement that is to be entered into between AMSA and DEC for access to the island infrastructure. <b>(1</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2c</i>	Comment noted, however the specific nature of the agreement will be negotiated between the two agencies and will not form part of the management plan.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
	submission)		
<b>Subtidal coral reef communities</b>			
55	Agree there should be no permanent loss, as a result of human activity, in the diversity and abundance of subtidal coral reef communities in the Park and proposed extensions. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
56	Support for strategies 1, 2, 4 to 8/ strategies to reduce coral damage from anchoring and mooring. (3 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
57	Recent monitoring by AIMS indicates anchor damage to corals at Mermaid Reef. As Mermaid Reef is less frequently visited than Clerke or Imperieuse, there is concern that anchor damage could be significant. (1 submission)	No 2d	A mooring plan will be implemented including a designated mooring and anchoring area at Clerke Reef. Ongoing monitoring as indicated in the management plan will assess the level of anchor damage in the Park and where this is found to be occurring, measures can be taken to alleviate such damage.
58	Support for the restriction of anchoring in sensitive areas and agree with the installation of public moorings. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
59	Disagree with the proposed sanctuary zone boundaries to include subtidal coral reef communities and deepwater habitats, as the area does not need protection. (1 submission)	No 2d	Sanctuary zones aim to provide adequate protection to representative areas of all habitats/communities. The inclusion of subtidal coral reef communities and deep water habitats contributes to fulfilling this aim.
<b>Invertebrate communities (excluding corals)</b>			
60	Agree there should be no loss, as a result of human activity, in the diversity of invertebrate species in the Park and proposed extensions. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
61	Agree there should be no loss, as a result of human activity, in the abundance of non-targeted invertebrate species in the Park and proposed extensions. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
62	Agree the abundance of targeted invertebrate species is to be maintained at sustainable levels in areas open to fishing. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
63	This section should also include the giant clam species <i>T. crocea</i> and <i>T. maxima</i> which are equally if not more abundant there. It is also the most southern record of the giant clam <i>T. gigas</i> . (1 submission)	Yes 1a	Plan amended to include reference to these species.
64	Rowley Shoals may have a unique mollusc fauna, with species found there not being found at other sampling locations of similar latitude (1 submission)	Yes 1a	Plan amended to include these comments.
65	The populations of trochus and bêche-de-mer have been depleted in reefs north of the Rowley Shoals and therefore require a higher degree of protection due to their importance in a regional context. (1 submission)	Yes 1a	Plan amended to include these comments.
66	A clear definition of what a 'specimen' is should be included in the Plan. (3 submissions)	No 2d	"Specimen" shell collecting has the same meaning as that under the <i>Fish Resources Management Act 1994</i>
67	Support for the strategies proposed to control recreational invertebrate collection, in particular strategy 2, provided relevant user groups are consulted prior to legislation being passed. (3 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
<b>Finfish</b>			
68	Agree there should be no loss, as a result of human activity, in the diversity of finfish species in the Park and proposed extensions. (3 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
69	Agree there should be no loss, as a result of human activity, in the abundance of non-targeted (i.e. non-fished) finfish in the Park and proposed extension. There are long term deleterious effects on pelagic fish stocks caused by fishing (3 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
70	Agree the abundance of targeted (i.e. fished) finfish species is to be maintained at sustainable levels in areas open to fishing. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
71	The Polka dot Cod ( <i>Plectropomus areolatus</i> ) is abundant in the lagoon and should therefore not be included in the proposal to extend the protection of all coral trout species. (1 submission)	No 2e	Polka dot cods, as members of the serranid family, typically show very low resilience to fishing. They are aggregate spawners which also contributes to their low resilience. The proposal to extend protection to this species is supported by the Department of Fisheries.
72	Agree with 2 to 6. (1 submission)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
73	Disagree with strategy 1. (1 submission)	No 2e	The strategy of the plan is still considered the best option.
74	Agree that species of fish currently protected should continue to be protected. (1 submission)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
75	Propose that all species of billfish caught within the Park be released. (1 submission)	No 2d	The strategies for finfish include liaison with DoF to ensure that all fishing is sustainable. The specific nature of these management arrangements will be developed on an ongoing basis by DoF.
76	Support for strategies 2 to 6 as positive application of resources to develop an understanding of the finfish diversity and abundance in the Park. (3 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
77	Concerns about the benefits of strategy 1 to finfish populations as many finfish species are already protected under Fishing Notice 238, through bag limits, there is limited seasonal access to the lagoons, the fish in the lagoons are targeted mainly for sport and released. Limiting recreational fishing to a small area in Clerke Reef will concentrate impacts of recreational fishing. (3 submissions)	No 2e	Sanctuary zones are established primarily for the conservation of biodiversity rather than the maintenance of sustainable fishing. While fisheries management and marine parks are complementary, they have different objectives. The zoning should not be seen as primarily a mechanism to manage fish stocks. The strategy of the management plan is still considered

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
78	Suggest that there be restrictions on future fishing operations but an increase in the dive sector instead of rezoning. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2e</i>	the best option.  The appropriate balance of activities throughout the Park will be determined according to the principles of sustainability over the life of the management plan.
<b>Turtles</b>			
79	Agree there should be no loss in the diversity and abundance of turtles in the Park and proposed extensions. <b>(3 submissions 6)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
80	Support for the management objectives and strategies outlined to preserve the ecological value of turtles at the Shoals although threat to turtles will not be addressed through sanctuary zone implementation. <b>(2 submissions )</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
<b>Seabirds</b>			
81	Agree there should be no loss in the diversity and abundance of seabirds in the Park and proposed extensions. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
82	Support for the management objectives and strategies outlined to preserve the ecological value of seabirds at the Shoals. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
<b>Cetaceans</b>			
83	Agree there should be no loss in the diversity and abundance of cetaceans in the Park and proposed extensions. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
84	Support for the management objectives and strategies as outlined to preserve the ecological value of cetaceans at the Shoals. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
<b>Social Values</b>			
85	Agree with the management strategies for the social values as outlined in the tables in Section 7.2 of the draft plan <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan
86	Agree with the management strategies for the social values in the draft plan	<i>No</i>	No change sought

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
	but they need to be put in place effectively. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>2b</i>	
87	Agree with the management strategies for the social values in the draft plan but support further restrictions/prohibitions of all fishing activities in the area to keep the area pristine. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	The recommended zoning and management strategies represent an appropriate balance of use and protection.
<b>Scientific research</b>			
88	Disagree with the need for the implementation of zoning strategies for scientific research. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	The Government considers zoning to be a key strategy for the management of the area and provision of unimpacted areas representative of the habitats of the Shoals is essential to facilitate monitoring and research programs in the Park.
89	Support for the management objectives for scientific research as the more knowledge that is obtained, the better the area can be managed. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
<b>Water sports</b>			
90	Strategy 4 should be given a higher priority rating than low. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>Yes</i> <i>1d</i>	Plan amended to include this strategy as a medium level priority
91	Disagree with the proposal to prohibit shark feeding and propose a shark interaction special purpose zone/shark feeding zone should be established at the points from the western edge of Clerke Reef 17°16'S and 17°19'S, the north eastern corner of Imperieuse Reef from 118°58'E and 17°33'S, and the south eastern corner of Imperieuse Reef from 17°38'S and 118°56'E to restrict user conflicts. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2e</i>	Due to safety concerns, the strategy of the management plan is still considered the best option.
92	Support for the management objectives and strategies outlined to preserve the water sport values, providing consultation with user groups is entered	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	Restrictions based on zoning will come into effect following the gazettal of the extensions and management plan. The

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	into before any zoning restrictions are implemented and 'incompatible' activities are established. (3 submissions)		Department will undertake enforcement/education programs to advise users of new Park restrictions. If in the future changes to the zoning are required, this must be undertaken with consultation with the community as outlined in the CALM Act.
93	Support for the ban on unlicensed fish feeding but suggest that licensed feeding only be permitted if it can conclusively be established that the activity does not either affect natural behaviour of the species being fed or have any trophic impacts. (2 submissions)	No 2d	The conditions for fish feeding are provided in license conditions. There is likely to be some impact on fish behaviour and potential for impacts on fish densities and population structure. This will be monitored and where significant impacts are detected, this activity will be changed or discontinued.
94	Suggest that fish feeding needs specific objectives and targets. (1 submission)	No 2d	These are contained in the licensing conditions for this activity.
<b>Seascapes</b>			
95	Support for the management objectives and strategies as outlined to preserve the social value of seascapes at the Rowley Shoals. (2 submission )	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
<b>Nature-based tourism</b>			
96	Support of the management objectives and strategies outlined to preserve the social values of nature-based tourism. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
97	Floatplane access to the Park should only be permitted as a tender to an existing charter operation. (1 submission)	No 2d	Applications for licenses to operate a floatplane in the Park will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with the management plan and management of commercial operations at the Shoals.
98	In 10 years as the demand for tourism grows, there may be a need to review the conditions of existing licenses to ensure the ability of the tourism operators to meet the needs of their customers within a sustainable development context (1 submission)	No 2d	The plan indicates ongoing management of tourism activities, including licensing to ensure sustainability of this industry. Reviews as indicated are likely to occur when licenses expire.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
99	Suggest that the maximum number of passengers that may be carried during any charter should not exceed the carrying capacity of the principle licensed vessel. (1 submission)	No 2c	Addresses issues beyond the scope of the management plan. DPI is responsible for vessel safety.
100	There should be limitations set on the number of visitor allowed to the Park each year at a level which would maintain the values of the Park, which should be established in consultation with authorities and user groups. (3 submissions)	No 2d	The management plan targets set these limitations. Carrying capacity of the area can be considered in terms of the sustainability of the activity (e.g. total amount of fishing) or in terms of wilderness values (i.e. the provision of a remote experience). The former is determined based on evaluations of the impacts of the activities.
101	The short-term strategy of restricting visitation to no more than 120 people at any one point in time should be reconsidered through consultation with key stakeholders and be based not only on wilderness but the overall social and ecological values. (1 submission)	No 2e	This figure provides considerable room for growth and encourages operators to co-ordinate visits to avoid all visiting the same site at the same time. The short-term target provides guidance on the maximum level of activity at this time however wilderness value includes a strategy to liaise with relevant stakeholders to review the targets during the life of the plan.
102	Suggest that there is a seasonal closure to access to the Park between January and June each year that should be established in consultation with authorities and user groups. (2 submissions)	No 2e	The strategy of the management plan is still considered the best option. It is not considered necessary given that weather conditions restrict visitation.
103	There may be some short-term economic impacts to fishing charter operators as they will need to go further afield to fish due to sanctuary zones. However the long term aim of biodiversity conservation is supported as this will benefit the State via nature-based tourism. A two-year period of change over should be implemented to allow fishing charters to restructure their businesses and market their operations differently. (1 submission)	No 2d	The draft management plan was released in January 2004 following many years of consultation which highlighted the likelihood of a significant proportion of the Shoals being zoned as sanctuary zone. It is likely that the new rules and regulations for the Park will take some time to implement. This has provided two years notice of the changes and therefore a 'change over period' is not considered appropriate.
104	Continue working with tourism operators regarding visitor education,	Yes	Plan amended to make this requirement for ongoing

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	mooring arrangements, visitor management, and maintaining the values of the Park. (1 submission)	<i>1e</i>	collaboration more explicit. Continued collaboration with stakeholders is a key strategy expressed throughout the plan.
105	The DoF role in the management of charter vessels operating within the area should be mentioned in the management plan. (1 submission)	<i>No 2d</i>	The draft plan contains information regarding the DoF role in recreational fishing management, including charter fishing.
<b>Recreational fishing</b>			
106	Support for the management objectives in relation to the social values of recreational fishing. (4 submissions)	<i>No 2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
107	More research is needed on how charter operators operate before they are adversely affected by closures. (1 submission)	<i>No 2d</i>	The views of chart fishing operators were considered in the planning process.
108	Concerns about the effects that restrictions on fishing will have on the recreational fishing community and charter operators. Suggest the zoning strategies are reviewed. (3 submissions)	<i>Yes 1b</i>	Potential impacts on the recreational fishing community and charter fishing operators were considered during the planning process. Most charter and recreational fishing targets areas outside the areas to be established as sanctuary zones and targets highly mobile species that will move in and out of the sanctuary zones. Fishing regulations also currently prohibit the catch of many sedentary species which occur in shallow areas. It is expected that, whilst the new zones will affect some activities, overall impact on the major charter-based fishing activities will not be significant. The strategy also reflects the precautionary principle. To provide greater opportunities for recreational fishing inside the lagoon, the recreation zone in Clerke Reef lagoon was extended.
109	Acceptance of strategies 3 to 7 as they will ensure fishing in the Park remains at an ecologically and socially sustainable level. (4 submissions)	<i>No 2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
110	Disagree with strategy 1, but agree with strategies 2 to 7. (1 submission)	<i>No 2a, 2e</i>	Support for the management plan for strategies 2 to 7 and the strategy of the management plan is still considered the best

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
111	Support the recommendation that the Rowley Shoals become a 'no take away' area i.e. catch and release or catch for immediate consumption only. (6 submissions)	No 2a	option for strategy 1 as zoning is a key strategy in the management of the Park.  Support for the management plan.
112	Sanctuary zones should allow access to recreational fishers under the basis of no retention of fish under a special set of rules developed by the DoF in consultation with the recreational fishing sector. (1 submission)	No 2f	Extractive activities are not permitted in sanctuary zones under the <i>Conservation and Land Management Act 1984</i> and nor would this approach be appropriate for the protection of biodiversity.
113	The proposed zoning structure does not meet the requirement (point three page 38) of recreational fishing. (5 submissions)	Yes 1b	The proposed zoning has been amended to increase the area available for fishing in the Clerke Lagoon. As most fishing occurs outside the areas to be established as sanctuary zones and targets highly mobile species that will move in and out of the sanctuary zones. A significant area is provided in the Clerke lagoon. Therefore there will be opportunities for fishing both outside and within the lagoon.
114	Propose all shark species be protected similarly to the Maori wrasse, coral trout and cod, as shark abundance on reefs further north are relatively low in comparison to the Rowley Shoals and are therefore important in a bio-regional context. (1 submission)	No 2c	The plan includes a strategy to review sustainability and protect fish species as considered necessary for fishing
115	Concerns over the statement 'There is a need to review the merit of allowing catch and release fishing...' as the draft plan fails to recognise the merits of catch and release practices. (5 submissions)	No (2d)	Discussions on a range of potential fishing types such as catch and release occurred during the planning process. There is currently little data on the effects of catch and release fishing for most species and as such the plan indicates that there is a need to review impacts of catch and release fishing, with a particular focus on determining post-release survival where currently unknown.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
116	Agree that catch and release practices referred to on page 38, require a review and in lieu of the necessary research, the precautionary principle would suggest that fishing on the outer reef slopes and in the lagoons be banned. (1 submission)	No 2a	Support for the management plan in relation to catch and release practices. Representative areas of 'outer reef slope' are zoned as sanctuaries which will not allow fishing.
117	Catch and release anglers should not be excluded from sanctuary zones. (3 submissions)	No 2f	Sanctuary zones, under the <i>Conservation and Land Management Act 1984</i> , do not allow for any "take", which includes catch and release fishing.
118	There should be an operator's Code of Practice to endorse 'catch and release' fishing and ensure fishing activities are subject to experienced supervision. (1 submission)	No 2d	The development of Codes of Practice is a key strategy in the plan and the plan also promotes efforts to minimise the impacts of user activities.
119	Recommend that fishing be allowed for consumption only. (2 submissions)	No 2e	Discussions on a range of potential fishing types such as catch and release and for consumption only occurred during the planning process, however the strategy of the management plan is still considered to be the best option.
120	Plan does not address other options available for Rowley Shoals such as specific size or bag limits, or encouraging the use of fish release friendly gear. Plan does also not acknowledge recreational fisher driven management reforms. (1 submission)	No 2c	Sanctuary zones are being established primarily for biodiversity protection and conservation. Fisheries management controls such as the setting of bag and size limits etc are the responsibility of DoF and relate to fish sustainability.
121	Rather than a ban on taking coral trout of the genus <i>Plectropomus</i> , extractive fishing within the Park should be subject to boat limits, for example not more than six demersal and six pelagic species. This is because <i>Plectropomus</i> is the genus targeted for on-site consumption (2 submissions)	No 2c	DoF have responsibility for setting boat and bag limits in State Waters and they believe that protection of this genus is an appropriate strategy to protect this species.
122	Extension of sanctuary zones to include greater areas of the outer reef at Clerke and Imperieuse to prevent conflict between recreational diving and	No 2d	The zoning scheme outlined in the management plan provides for biodiversity protection and ongoing sustainable recreational



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	recreation fishing (2 submissions)		uses.
123	Propose that no fishing should be permitted inside Imperieuse Reef east of 118°57'E and that the rest should permit non-extractive fishing. (2 submissions)	No 2e	The zoning scheme outlined in the management plan provides for biodiversity protection and ongoing sustainable recreational uses.
124	Consideration should be given to including a limited recreational zone close to the outer boundary of the Park extensions in deepwater away from the reef slopes to allow only fishing for pelagic species, if the 'lee effect' is not present. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Deeper waters of the Park are primarily used for fishing for pelagic species. These deeper water areas are in general use zones which allow for this activity.
125	Consider amending the recommendations regarding recreational fishing by limiting target species, methods and by-catch as per 'Conservation Overview and Action Plan for Australian Threatened and Potentially Threatened Marine and Estuarine Fishes' by DEH. (1 submission)	No 2d	This is incorporated in the existing strategy, as a range of key documents would be consulted in formulating performance measures and targets for finfish. DoF has the responsibility for fisheries management in State Waters.
126	The lagoonal area set aside for recreational fishing will lead to an unsustainable localised fishing impact. (6 submissions)	Yes 1a	The recreation zone in Clerke Reef has been increased in size to provide an increased area available for recreational fishing. It is not expected that there will be an unsustainable concentration of fishing effort in the recreation zone within Clerke Reef given that most fishing in the Rowley Shoals is for highly mobile pelagic species, plus many of the lagoon species cannot legally be taken under the FRM notice and hence impacts should be low. Notwithstanding this, impacts will be monitored over the life of the plan and the plan reviewed if necessary.
127	Long term observations have shown a deleterious effect on pelagic fish stocks and so would like to see a cessation of all fishing in the Park. (1 submission)	No 2e	Marine parks in Western Australia are multiple use areas aimed at maintaining the ecological integrity of an area while allowing a variety of sustainable uses. Proposed zoning can effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area while permitting ongoing sustainable multiple use.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
128	Propose that recreational fishing continue in all but one third of the lagoons of Clerke and Imperieuse and that ongoing research be undertaken to establish if there is or is not impacts caused by recreational fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>Yes</i> <i>1a</i>	The recreation zone in Clerke Reef has been increased in size. Ongoing monitoring of impacts of human activity on the Park's values is addressed in the management plan.
129	Boat limits should not be accumulative and the removal of fish products from the Park should be prohibited. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	Specific recommendations to ensure the sustainability of fishing within the park will be considered by the Department of Fisheries.
<b>Petroleum exploration and production</b>			
130	Petroleum drilling should not occur anywhere in the Park as it would significantly affect the overall values of the Park. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	The CALM Act states that petroleum activities can occur in areas other than sanctuary and recreation zones and special purpose zones where the activities are incompatible with the primary purpose the zone. The plan allows for these activities in the general use zone subject to EPA approval.
<b>Wilderness</b>			
131	Human-made structures should also be kept to a minimum as to not impact on wilderness values with the exception of portable barbecues. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan which states that human made structures should be kept to a minimum. This does not apply to portable structures which are used temporarily and then removed from the Park
132	Agree with the wilderness value. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
133	Support for the requirements, management objectives and strategies proposed to maintain the social values of the wilderness experience. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
<b>Generic management strategies</b>			
134	Agree with the generic research, monitoring, surveillance and enforcement, education and interpretation, public participation, and direct management	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
	intervention strategies as outlined on pages 49-53 of the draft plan/generic strategies vital to success of the Park. <b>(3 submissions)</b>		
<b>Development of an Administrative Framework</b>			
135	No comments on this section		
<b>Development of a Zoning Scheme</b>			
136	Agree that the establishment of sanctuary zones will contribute to the protection of the values of the Rowley Shoals as peoples rights will be protected this way and it will enable the ecosystem to function in an area that is not directly affected by pressures from extractive activities, e.g. fishing. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	<i>No 2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
137	The Park can be better managed to suit all stakeholders without resorting to 'management by exclusion' as there are few visitors to the area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No 1e</i>	The use of sanctuary zones in some areas of the Park are considered an appropriate management strategy in order to protect biodiversity and conserve the area. The number of visitors does not detract from this objective. Whilst there may be relatively few visitors to the area currently, pressure will undoubtedly increase and there is also little information available as to the resilience of these systems to exploitation and therefore the precautionary principle is applied.
138	Sanctuary zones should restrict anchoring and mooring practices. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	<i>No 2d</i>	The Mooring Policy (Policy Statement No. 59) will provide a framework for moorings and anchoring within marine reserves.
139	Concerns about the justification of no-take areas as they need to be based on a known threat level based under the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council (ANZECC) process or (IMCRA). <b>(4 submissions)</b>	<i>No 2d</i>	Sanctuary zones are a proactive strategy to protect biodiversity. The plan indicates ongoing research and monitoring which will assist in assessing levels of threat to the values of the Park and the actual impacts of these activities. Without representative sanctuary zones, it would not be possible to assess these impacts.
140	There should be a complete ban on fishing in the area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No 2d</i>	Marine parks in Western Australia are multiple use areas aimed at maintaining the ecological integrity of an area while allowing a variety of sustainable uses. Proposed zoning can

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
141	The introduction of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) closures to recreational fishing was never discussed in the planning workshops or been published by the State Government. (1 submission)	No 2c	effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area while permitting ongoing sustainable multiple use. The GBRMPA closures were implemented after local planning workshops but the scientific principles developed were included later in the planning process.
142	Concerns over the appropriateness of using the GBRMPA representative areas program due to the unique nature and low human usage of the Rowley Shoals in comparison to the Great Barrier Reef. (3 submissions)	No 2e	The GBRMPA RAP guidelines are based on the ecology of tropical coral reef systems and can be applied to other similar environments irrespective of use.
143	Do not agree that sport diving and spear fishing are mutually exclusive, more specifically it is strongly suggested that proper zoning could provide an international model for co-existence within the marine reserve. (1 submission)	No 2e	Marine parks in Western Australia are multiple use areas aimed at maintaining the ecological integrity of an area while allowing a variety of sustainable uses. Proposed zoning can effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area while permitting ongoing sustainable multiple use.
144	The activities permitted/prohibited within each zone (Table 2) is supported, in particular the prohibition of spearfishing on compressed air within the recreational zones as the lagoon waters are important to protect and support for a total ban of spearfishing. (1 submission)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
145	Disagree with allowing spearfishing on the outside of the reef as this is where the mature breeding stock resides. (1 submission)	No 2e	Spearfishing will be permitted in some areas outside the reef while other areas of the reef slope are protected in sanctuary zones. It should be noted that most demersal species will be fully protected, hence spearfishing will focus primarily on pelagic species.
<b>Zoning</b>			
146	Disagree with the proposed arrangement of zones within the Rowley Shoals Marine Park and proposed extensions as it is fine the way it is. (5 submissions)	No 2e	Marine parks in Western Australia are multiple use areas aimed at maintaining the ecological integrity of an area while allowing a variety of sustainable uses. Proposed zoning can effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area while permitting ongoing

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
			sustainable multiple use.
147	Agree with the proposed arrangement of zones within the Rowley Shoals Marine Park and proposed extensions as it should be extended further. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
148	Concerns about the proposed zoning, as it does not allow for equitable use of the Park with different user groups. (4 submissions)	No 2e	Marine parks in Western Australia are multiple use areas aimed at maintaining the ecological integrity of an area while allowing a variety of sustainable uses. Proposed zoning can effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area while permitting ongoing sustainable multiple use.
149	Support for recreation and general use zones within the proposed boundaries. (1 submission)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
150	Concerns that the recreational fishing community will be adversely affected if the proposed zoning is accepted. (1 submission)	No 2d	A large percentage (approximately 74%) of the Park is still open to recreational fishing, as are adjacent waters.
151	Suggest that the proposed recreational zone be changed to a special purpose zone to allow petroleum drilling and development subject to assessment. (1 submission)	No 2d	A wide range of zoning strategies were considered during the planning process for this marine park. Proposed zoning can effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area while permitting ongoing sustainable multiple use.
152	Against the proposed changes to the zoning scheme as there is no scientific evidence for the need for closures to recreational fishing. (5 submissions)	No 2d	Sanctuary zones are established for biodiversity conservation, not for fisheries management.
153	The removal of access to the recreational fishing sector should follow the resource sharing protocol. (1 submission)	No 2c	Resource sharing is an allocation between commercial and recreational fishing sectors and the responsibility of the Department of Fisheries. It does not apply to the development of biodiversity conservation strategies.
154	Commercial fishing should not be permitted in the general use zone in the proposed extensions to the Park/excluded from all waters of the Park (2 submissions)	Yes 1d	Plan amended to prohibit all commercial fishing in the Park
155	Suggest an alternative to the proposed zoning by implementing the Kimberley Charter Boat Operator's Association (KCBOA) draft plan that	No 2e	A wide range of zoning strategies were considered during the planning process for this marine park. Proposed zoning can

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	Clerke and Imperieuse both be 50% no fishing and the rest catch and release, with take for consumption only on the outside of the reef. <b>(1 submission)</b>		effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area while permitting ongoing sustainable multiple use.
156	Propose that no fishing should be permitted inside Clerke Reef east of 119°22'E (including the mooring area) and that the rest should permit non-extractive fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2d	A wide range of zoning strategies were considered during the planning process for this marine park. Proposed zoning can effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area while permitting ongoing sustainable multiple use.
157	Propose that the designated mooring area at Clerke Reef be a special purpose zone for fish feeding as it promotes empathy for fish resources. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2e	A wide range of zoning strategies were considered during the planning process for this marine park. Proposed zoning can effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area while permitting ongoing sustainable multiple use. Fish feeding is managed through conditions on licenses.
158	Propose that reef walking be permitted in a nominated special purpose zone to be permitted under the direct supervision of charter vessel crew members as reef walking can create empathy for the marine environment. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2e	Reef walking is highly damaging and is not compatible with the protection of the ecological values of the Park. Empathy can be developed through other less destructive activities.
159	Suggest that due to the regional and international importance of the ecological values of the Rowley Shoals Marine Park, it should be zoned as a sanctuary in its entirety. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No 2f	Marine parks in Western Australia are multiple use areas aimed at maintaining the ecological integrity of an area, while allowing a variety of sustainable uses. Proposed zoning can effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area, while permitting ongoing sustainable multiple use.
160	Imperieuse Reef should be made into a sanctuary zone as it is a relatively low use, has high water quality and is a pristine area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2a	Support for the plan. All of the Imperieuse Reef lagoon is zoned as a sanctuary zone.
161	Suggest that all drop off zones at both Clerke and Imperieuse Reefs be protected by sanctuary zones. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2e	Marine parks in Western Australia are multiple use areas aimed at maintaining the ecological integrity of an area, while allowing a variety of sustainable uses. Proposed zoning can effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area, while permitting ongoing

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
162	Sanctuary zones located outside the lagoons on both reefs should be increased in size as they do not appear to include a continuum of habitat from deepwater to shallow reef tops and to prevent illegal poaching from lines that drift across from a boat located outside the sanctuary zone. (1 submission)	No 2e	sustainable multiple use.  Marine parks in Western Australia are multiple use areas aimed at maintaining the ecological integrity of an area, while allowing a variety of sustainable uses. Proposed zoning can effectively ensure the protection of this regionally and internationally significant area, while permitting ongoing sustainable multiple use.
163	Agree with the designated sanctuary zones in the Park on pages 45 and 46 as they will protect habitat unique to each Shoal system. (1 submission)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
164	Opposed to extensions of sanctuary zone on Clerke and Imperieuse Reefs, given the following rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As access to the Park is controlled by DEC licensed operators and can therefore restrict the number of recreational fishers visiting the area.</li> <li>• Propose that a combination of 'no-take' and 'no anchor' zones be used.</li> <li>• Anglers could be restricted to using barbless hooks.</li> <li>• As there is no crisis that requires management at this level. 3 submissions</li> </ul>	No 2e  2d  2d  2e	The strategy of the management plan is still considered a balanced outcome. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sanctuary zones have as a major objective the protection of representative habitats thus the issue is not the number of fishers but the presence/absence of extractive activities.</li> <li>• Anchoring/mooring will be managed across the whole Park, irrespective of zoning</li> <li>• Consideration of modifications to fishing gear such as the use of barbless hooks will be undertaken as limits on recreational fishing are considered by DoF.</li> <li>• Sanctuary zones are proactive tools to conserve biodiversity. Degrading and then having to rehabilitate is costly and an inappropriate approach. It is more desirable to be precautionary and be sure the area's values will be monitored. As such the precautionary principle is applied.</li> </ul>
165	Against the use of the precautionary principle as the area is in good condition and that current effort in the area is more than sustainable and as	No 2e	The Rowley Shoals Marine Park is one of a limited number of areas that have had minimal disturbance. The near natural and

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	Mermaid Reef already represents 33% of the Rowley Shoals. (1 submission)		remote wilderness character of the Shoals are values to be protected. In order to achieve this, the precautionary principle is an appropriate approach, particularly when there is limited information on the impacts of past and current activities. The strategy of the management plan is still considered to be a balanced outcome..
166	Mermaid, Clerke and Imperieuse Reefs need to be viewed as a single system. (6 submissions)	No 2d	The MOU between the State and Commonwealth provides the foundation for collaborative management of the Shoals. Collaborative arrangements provide a coordinated approach.
167	Mermaid Reef which is under Commonwealth jurisdiction effectively operates as a sanctuary zone by not permitting extractive activity, it covers 500km <sup>2</sup> . This represents 30% of the Rowley Shoal in total so what additional representation in sanctuary zones (at Clerke and Imperieuse) is required. (1 submission)	No (2c)	The Commonwealth Government is responsible for management of Mermaid Reef. The State Government is responsible for Management of Clerke and Imperieuse Reefs. Sanctuary zones have been recommended to ensure the values of Clerke and Imperieuse Reefs are maintained.
168	Concerns about the ability to identify the Clerke Reef proposed zoning as it is an obscure shape and will be difficult to identify on the ground or using a GPS/support for no recreation zone within Clerke Reef for compliance reasons. (5 submissions)	No 2d	Boundaries and compliance were carefully considered in developing the zoning recommendations.
169	Suggest that the sanctuary zone boundary go out to the proposed recreational zone boundary as to have a buffer around the sanctuary zone. There should then be a 100-200m between the sanctuary zone and general use zone. Submitter described suggested new boundaries (1 submission)	No 2e	The strategy of the management plan is still considered the best option. The requirements for simple boundaries are in some cases over-ruled by stakeholder aspirations (i.e. access to fishing areas).
170	The draft plan states 'The primary purpose of these [sanctuary] zones is to provide areas where natural processes can be studied...' (page 48) however, the existing sanctuary zones have not been studied to date, nor any data provided to justify the proposed extensions. (1 submission)	Yes 1e	Sanctuary zones have yet to be created in this Park (i.e. there are no existing sanctuary zones) and so there has not been the opportunity to undertake studies in unimpacted sites. When they are implemented, the plan recommends that research and monitoring be undertaken. However the plan has been amended to better clarify the purposes of sanctuary zones.



	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
171	The proposal to make 95% of the existing Park and 3% of the proposed as a sanctuary zone will have significant implications on recreational fishing, e.g. the proposed zoning for Clerke Reef overlaps with the main area of recreational fishing interests. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	The overall area of sanctuary zone is approximately 24% of the Park. The majority of fishing at Rowley Shoals is for pelagic, highly mobile species. As such, there should be limited impacts on recreational fishing, a concern that was extensively considered in the development of the proposals.
<b>Education and Interpretation</b>			
172	Strongly support the initiative to educate users of the Park. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
173	Agree with this section. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
174	Suggest that the management plan includes educational strategies to ensure that persons visiting the Rowley Shoals are made aware of the different management requirements between the Commonwealth and State reserves as they have different IUCN categories. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	The educational strategies are summarised in section 8.2.
175	Education and awareness raising can assist in the management of a sensitive area and is especially important in this context with the isolated nature of the Rowley Shoals. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
<b>Surveillance and Enforcement</b>			
176	Agree with this section. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2a</i>	Support for the management plan.
177	Concerns over the lack of formal management of the Shoals while acknowledging restraints caused by remoteness. Need regular patrols by relevant agencies. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	Government has committed new funds for implementation of the Plan and ongoing management of the Park. Part of these funds will be directed to patrol and enforcement activities as indicated in the plan
178	Surveillance and enforcement is inadequate as it appears to rely on self-regulation and the activities of other Agencies. <b>(1 submission)</b>	<i>No</i> <i>2d</i>	Surveillance and enforcement is a shared responsibility between DEC and the DoF. These programs will be developed

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
			and implemented in a collaborative and integrated manner. The level of enforcement required will largely be a function of the success of education and awareness programs as community support leads to greater self compliance.
179	Support for the continuing cooperation between The Department of the Environment and Heritage (DEH) and DEC with respect to compliance and enforcement in reserves. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
180	DEH has identified the need for CoastWatch to have a high priority alert for illegal activities throughout northern Australia. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2b	Neutral statement, no change sought.
181	Proposed sanctuary zones should be larger easily-defined zones and use, where possible, straight lines and GPS co-ordinates. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2d	The size of the sanctuary zones represents a balance between covering complete ecosystems and supporting multiple use in other areas. The boundaries have been developed to facilitate ease of compliance wherever possible. In some cases less practical boundaries have had to be adopted to address compromises for extractive activities.
182	Concerns over the trend where Indonesian fishing vessels are using hand held GPS to locate the Rowley Shoals to illegally fish. Charter operators would provide a good surveillance opportunities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2d	The role of the general community, including tourism operators in management is stated in the Plan.
<b>Research</b>			
183	There is an urgent need for strategically planned ongoing scientific evaluation to become part of future Park management. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
184	Support of the management objectives as it is an important study site. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
185	Agree with this section. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
186	Suggest that DEC and DoF jointly manage the Research Program and have a combined database which will ensure there is no over collection of specimens. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2a	This joint role is indicated in strategy 1 of section 8.4

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
187	It is suggested that a policy of non destructive sampling be implemented in the sanctuary zones as there is no 'special purpose' zones established for scientific research purposes only. (1 submission)	No 2d	Research activities within sanctuary zones require a permit and the merits of destructive sampling are carefully considered in light of the benefits derived from the research and the need for such sampling.
<b>Monitoring</b>			
188	Propose the establishment of monitoring programs in conjunction with charter operators to increase knowledge of the Rowley Shoals ecology and user impacts/involvement of the community in monitoring. (4 submissions)	Yes 1e	Plan amended to include charter operators as partners in the monitoring strategies.
189	Agree with this section. (1 submission)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
190	Concerns over the expectation of additional ongoing monitoring that is proposed to be undertaken by the DoF, will require additional resources. (1 submission)	No 2d	The Government has committed funding to DoF for the implementation of the Plan and ongoing management of the Park. If deficiencies exist, additional resources can be sought.
<b>Public Participation</b>			
191	Support to establish a community based Marine Advisory Committee (MAC), provided that there is balanced representation. (1 submission)	No 2a	Support for the management plan
192	Agree with this section and suggest that a member of KCBOA be on the MAC. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan. Membership will be established in consultation with stakeholders.
<b>Direct Management Intervention</b>			
193	Agree with this section. (1 submission)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.
<b>Development Proposals within the park</b>			
194	Support for development of permanent moorings to protect corals. (6 submissions)	No 2a	Support for the management plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
195	All sanctuary zones should have designated moorings to assist commercial and recreational boaters to avoid anchor damage. (1 submission)	No 2d	The establishment, use and management of moorings will be guided by the Moorings Policy. It will not be practical to install moorings in all areas.
196	Suggest sand anchoring areas be identified in consultation with tourist operators to be used in the event that all moorings are occupied. (1 submission)	No 2a	Support for management plan
197	There should be designated anchor areas. (2 submissions)	No 2a	Support for management plan
198	The south eastern corner of the designated mooring area at Clerke Reef should be extended to include a point at 17°17.8'S and 119°22.8'E to include an additional two moorings. (1 submission)	No 2d	The establishment, use and management of moorings will be guided by the Moorings Policy.
199	There should be greater restrictions on anchoring to protect soft coral. (3 submissions)	No 2a	Support for management plan
200	Concerns over anchor damage and the associated management. (1 submission)	No 2d	The establishment, use and management of moorings will be guided by the Moorings Policy. Impacts of moorings will be monitored to ascertain and mitigate any unacceptable damage.
<b>Audit by DEC</b>			
201	No comments on this section		
<b>Audit by the MPRA</b>			
202	No comments on this section		
<b>Review of the Management Plan</b>			
203	No comments on this section		
<b>Links with State Environment reporting</b>			
204	No comments on this section		

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/ MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
<b>Links with National Environment Reporting</b>			
205	No comments on this section		
<b>References</b>			
206	No comments on this section		
<b>Information Sources</b>			
207	No comments on this section		

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1: SUBMITTERS TO THE INDICATIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

<b>Individuals</b>
Anonymous Michael Anderson Craig Carson Craig Gibson Troy Sinclair
<b>Commercial</b>
Broome Fishing & Dive Charters North Star Cruises Australia Reel Teaser Charters Scuba2
<b>Government</b>
Australia Maritime Safety Authority Australian Institute of Marine Science Department of Fisheries Department of Industry and Resources Department of the Environment and Heritage Environmental Protection Authority Western Australian Museum Western Australian Tourism Commission
<b>Community groups/representative bodies</b>
Aboriginal Legal Service of Western Australia, Inc Australian Marine Conservation Society (WA) Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association Broome Fishing Club Conservation Council of Western Australia Inc. Heritage Council of Western Australia National Native Title Tribunal Recfishwest Recreational Fishing Advisory Committee The Kimberley Charter Boat Operator's Association The Western Australian Game Fishing Association Inc. Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF)

