



TEMPLATE FOR INPUT INTO THE AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE STRATEGY

Overview

This template should be used to provide comments on the content of the Australian Heritage Strategy.

Contact Details

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Name of Organisation: | Wetlands Research Association Inc (WRA) |
| Name of Author: | Dr V Semeniuk |
| Date: | 9 th June 2014 |

Questions

Please add your comments for some or all of the questions provided with the Strategy's three high level themes below. If you have other information you wish to provide, please add this in the "Other comments" field.

1. Improve National Leadership

What are the most important things the Australian Government should be doing to offer leadership in heritage?

This is a question that the Australian Government should be resolving after reading the information supplied in this submission.

How can the Australian Government provide guidance and support for our national heritage—while still empowering other government, industry and community members to take responsibility and get involved?

This is a question that the Australian Government should be resolving after reading the information supplied in this submission.

What priority areas are important to you, your organisation or group?

Geoheritage and wetlands

What practical actions would you suggest to improve national heritage leadership?

Suggestions on how to progress heritage matters, who to partner with, and information on the inadequacies of this current strategy are provided as an attachment from WRA in this submission. But if the question is strictly "what practical actions would you suggest to improve national heritage leadership", you are asking community groups and stakeholders to show how you can lead them. This is unacceptable from a Government Agency. The information from the submissions should be used to design a proper and robust strategy for heritage.



2. Pursue Innovative Partnerships

What partnerships are most needed within the heritage sector?

Biotic environment and Geoheritage

What heritage roles and responsibilities should be led by governments, peak heritage organisations or community groups in the 21st century?

For wetlands and geoheritage, allocation of funds to identify sites of National significance.

How should resources be shared through heritage partnerships to ensure the greatest return on agreed priorities?

This question can only be answered after all submissions have been forwarded and from there priorities have been determined.

Can you provide examples of successful innovative partnerships you or your organisation have established?

WRA has worked in a collaborative manner with community groups in the management of wetlands, for example,

1. Wetlands Conservation Society
2. Lake Meallup Preservation Society
3. Derby Residents Action Group
4. Friends of Yellagonga Regional Park
5. Corio Swamp Group
6. Walpole and Nornalup Inlet System Advisory Committee
7. Peel Preservation Group
8. Friends of Brixton St Wetlands
9. Friends of Koondoola Bushland
10. Bullsbrook Action Group
11. Quinns Rocks Environmental Group
12. Lark Hill LCDC
13. Port Kennedy LCDC
14. Conservation Council of WA
15. Friends of Moore River Estuary and Guilderton Community Association)
16. Leschenault Inlet Catchment Council
17. Denmark Conservation Society
18. FRAYGLE (the Yalgorup Lakes Conservation Group)
19. South Coast Environment Group
20. South Coast Wetland Group



3. Enable encourage communities to understand and care for their heritage

What should the Australian heritage sector be doing to help the Australian community better engage in heritage activities?

Promote community groups

How can a shared understanding of our national heritage be developed and best celebrated together?

Through publications, promotion of sites, web-links, documentaries, government-sponsored ecotourism and geotourism, and fund publications of specific documented areas by community groups

Do you have any examples of activities that have been successful in promoting local heritage to a broader audience?

Using scientific societies to organise tours, excursions, publications, and lectures

What is the role of technology and new media in providing greater community access to heritage?

Use of publications and websites

Other comments

This National Heritage Strategy document IS SERIOUSLY DEFECTIVE.

As a document to progress heritage matters, the National Heritage Strategy completely ignores geoheritage and does not recognise major stakeholders in the Earth Science such as the Geological Society of Australia who have worked over the decades to help identify sites within Australia of geoheritage significance. Some of the studies to help identify geoheritage sites were even funded by the Federal Government as part of the AHC process.

The Natural World is comprised of abiotic and biotic components, i.e., geology and biology, and in this National Heritage Strategy document the words 'geology' and 'geoheritage' are not even mentioned. While 'biodiversity' is mentioned only once in a context of funding that has been provided for determining biodiversity of World Heritage areas, the concept of expanding on understanding Australia's biodiversity is absent. Biology and taxonomy are not at all present as words in the document. This is unacceptable.



WRA has produced a more detailed but brief document to illustrate the deficiencies of the National Heritage Strategy. The attached document focused on Geoheritage, provides criticisms and information on the inadequacy of the current National Heritage Strategy document in terms of content, on what should be carried out to increase recognition of geoheritage issues, and who to be involved with in partnerships.

The criticisms and information on the inadequacy of the current National Heritage Strategy document are provided because I believe the current has to be redrafted to be more comprehensive and sent out in this more comprehensive form to invite commentary from stakeholders particularly in the natural sciences of ecology, environment, and geoheritage.