

# Analysis of public submissions

to the

## **Ningaloo Marine Park Draft Management Plan and Indicative Management Plans for the Extension to the Existing Park and the Muiron Islands Marine Management Area**

Prepared by the Department of Conservation and Land Management  
for the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority

**January 2005**



---

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>135</b>
APPENDIX I: SUBMITTERS TO THE INDICATIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN (NB DOES NOT INCLUDE EMAILED SUBMISSIONS USING THE ‘SAVE NINGALOO’ PROFORMA SUBMISSION FORM) .....	135

\* \* \*

---

## **LIST OF TABLES**

---

TABLE 1: FORMAT OF THE SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED .....	3
TABLE 2: ORIGIN OF NON-PROFORMA SUBMISSIONS BY ORGANISATION TYPE.....	3
TABLE 3: ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS .....	5

\* \* \*

---

## 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 26 July 2004, the *Ningaloo Marine Park Draft Management Plan and Indicative Management Plans for the Extension to the Existing Park and the Muiron Islands Marine Management Area* was released for public comment.

At this time, a notice was published in the *Government Gazette*, advertisements were placed in two editions of *The West Australian* and *Northern Guardian* to advise that the indicative/draft management plan was available for public comment. The plan was distributed to State and local Government departments, tertiary institutions, libraries, peak bodies, stakeholder groups and numerous individuals who expressed interest during the planning process. A 'Have Your Say' product was produced comprising an information booklet, map and submission form (proforma) and distributed to assist the community in preparing a submission. The plan was available for inspection at the offices and libraries in the Shire of Exmouth and the Shire of Roebourne. Copies of the plan were available at the CALM offices in Kensington, Fremantle, Exmouth, Carnarvon and Karratha. An electronic copy of the plan and submission form were also made available on the Department of Conservation and Land Management's (CALM) *NatureBase* web site to allow people to lodge a submission electronically.

The public submission period closed on 29 October 2004 with a total of five thousand seven hundred and eighteen submissions received by this date. Submissions that were received after the closing date are not included in this summary. Submissions were assessed on the cogency of points raised. No subjective weighting was given to any submission for reasons of its origin or any other factor, which would give cause to elevate the importance of any submission above another.

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 comments were summarised and collated according to the section of the indicative management 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 available to the Authority.
- The Marine Parks and Reserves Authority (MPRA) considered the major issues that were raised in the public submissions and then provided advice to the Minister for the Environment.
- The Government then considered this advice and the major issues raised during the submission period. On the 30 November 2004, the Government gazetted amendments to the Ningaloo Marine Park boundary and created the Muiron Islands Marine Management Area. The Government also announced the final decisions in respect to the zoning for the reserves.
- CALM prepared a final management plan to give intent to the Government decisions and address finer scale issues raised during the public submission period.
- The management plan for the extended Ningaloo Marine Park and the Muiron Islands Marine Management Area was approved by the Minister for the Environment on 7 January 2005.
- The analysis of public submissions was then finalised to outline whether the draft/indicative management plan was amended in relation to the issues raised in the submissions.

This document outlines how the submissions were summarised and provides an analysis of the public submissions. It also indicates if the plan was amended, and the reasons why or why not the plan was amended as a result of the public submissions. It should be noted that numerous submissions raised the same or related issues, and these have been amalgamated where appropriate.

## ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

A total of five thousand seven hundred and eighteen submissions were received by the close of the submission period. The format of the submissions received is detailed in Table 1. The majority of submissions were made via a proforma letter on the 'Save Ningaloo' website ([www.save-ningaloo.org](http://www.save-ningaloo.org)) with a total of 5148 submissions made in this way. Some of these 'Save Ningaloo' proforma letters included additional individual comments. Submissions were received from individuals, community groups/representative bodies, Local, State and Commonwealth Government, commercial groups and tertiary institutions and other non-government research organisations. The majority of the written (i.e. non-proforma) submissions received were from individuals (Table 2).

The 5148 'Save Ningaloo' submissions mostly raised several generic issues (e.g. the need to have 30-50% of the reserves designated as sanctuary zones), while, in contrast, many of the 462 non-proforma submissions provided comment on numerous specific issues (e.g. individual sanctuary zones). The statistical summaries presented (e.g. agree/disagree) in this report for individual zones are drawn largely from the 462 non-proforma submissions and do not include the 5148 'Save Ningaloo' submissions.

**Table 1: Format of the submissions received**

Submission Format	Number
CALM 'Have Your Say' submission form	189
CALM online 'Have Your Say' submission form	48
E-mail submission	35
Letter submission	68
Lighthouse Bay proforma letter <sup>1</sup>	25
Western Angler submission form <sup>2</sup>	77
Wilderness Society proforma letter <sup>3</sup>	31
Wilderness Society letter <sup>4</sup>	97
'Save Ningaloo' proforma <sup>5</sup>	5148
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5718</b>

<sup>1</sup> Proforma letter, which referred specifically to usage of the Lighthouse Bay area

<sup>2</sup> An alternative submission form posted on the Western Angler website ([www.westernangler.com.au](http://www.westernangler.com.au))

<sup>3</sup> Proforma letter posted on the Wilderness Society website ([www.wilderness.org.au](http://www.wilderness.org.au))

<sup>4</sup> Individual letters from community members gathered by the Wilderness Society

<sup>5</sup> Proforma letter posted on the 'Save Ningaloo' website ([www.save-ningaloo.org](http://www.save-ningaloo.org))

**Table 2: Origin of non-proforma submissions by organisation type**

Sector	Number
Individuals	385
Community groups/representative bodies	39
Local Government	2
State Government	6
Commonwealth Government	4
Commercial groups	21
Tertiary institutions and other non-government research organisations	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>462</b>

The analysis of public submissions to the *Ningaloo Marine Park Draft Management Plan and Indicative Management Plans for the Extension to the Existing Park and the Muiron Islands Marine Management Area* is presented in Table 3.

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; 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 3 are detailed below:

1. The 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 plan was not amended if a submission:
  - a) clearly supported the draft proposals;
  - b) offered a neutral statement or no change was sought;
  - c) addressed issues beyond the scope of the plan;
  - d) made points that were already in the plan or were considered during its preparation;
  - e) was one amongst several widely divergent viewpoints received on the topic and the strategy of the plan was still considered the best option; or
  - f) contributed options that are not possible (generally due to some aspect of existing legislation, or Government policy).

**Table 3: Analysis of public submissions**

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
<b>General Comments</b>			
1.	Ningaloo is unique and/or irreplaceable and/or should be protected/for future generations and/or should be kept in a natural state. <b>(99 submissions plus 1108 specific additional comments added to the ‘Save Ningaloo’ proforma)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
2.	Current management is adequate. <b>(18 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Due to anticipated increases in visitor numbers, global threats such as climate change and results of research and monitoring, it is not believed that current management will be adequate in the future.
3.	Human and government intervention should be kept to a minimum. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
4.	The area or marine life of the area has improved. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
5.	There have been negative changes to the environment and/or the coast, such as decreases in fish stocks due to human activity, commercial operations. <b>(13 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
6.	Careful/comprehensive management is needed to preserve the area from any commercial developments/human impacts/positive management measures need to be taken. <b>(21 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
7.	The proposed regulation and changes to usage of the park will have future conservation benefits. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
8.	Management needs to balance conservation and sustainable use. <b>(14 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
9.	Fauna/flora protection should be the priority. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
10.	Applying broad blanket principles limits the capacity to address specific local problems in an effort to maintain public access/activities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The plan is outcome-based and covers the entire Ningaloo region. Specific site planning can and will address localised issues as they arise.
11.	Necessity to have an ongoing review of the management plan to address any deficiencies or oversights. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	The plan includes mechanisms for ongoing review (annual, by CALM and triennial, by the MPRA) of management which, if found to be inadequate, can be addressed through an adaptive management approach.
12.	Impressed by the draft plan. In favour of programs which protect our environment in a sustainable manner while allowing responsible people access to protect well managed areas/plan well constructed and comprehensive. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
13.	Further protection should extend approximately 10-15 km inland to also protect wildlife access to the marine park. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The lands referred to are not included in this plan as they are outside the boundaries of the park. Other mechanisms such as Ningaloo World Heritage listing and inclusion of the coastal strip into the reserve system would facilitate improved integration of terrestrial and marine management.
14.	It is not only Ningaloo Reef that needs protection but the land area in the close proximity to the reef. Kalbarri, Coral Bay and Exmouth need strong urban development plans for the future, if not the growth of these areas will affect reef areas adjacent to them. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The lands referred to are not included in this plan as they are outside the boundaries of the park. Other mechanisms such as Ningaloo World Heritage listing and inclusion of the coastal strip into the conservation reserve system would facilitate improved integration of terrestrial and marine ecosystem management.
15.	There is inadequate scientific data to support the proposed management regime. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Adequate scientific biophysical and social information and data was used to develop the draft plan and proposed zoning.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
16.	Confident that the MPRA has sufficiently considered the environmental and social impacts that the management plan and extension would have in order to justify the proposed changes. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
17.	When integrated with coastal management, meaningful community involvement and independent monitoring, this plan will deliver long-term benefits for the sustainable management of all our marine ecosystems, habitats and fisheries. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
18.	Supportive of emphasis on research, monitoring, education and public involvement as key strategies for the effective management and conservation of the Ningaloo Marine Park. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
19.	Would like to see some of the existing land areas south of the national park, maintained as at present i.e. free from park constraints. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The plan does not address management of adjacent terrestrial areas in the south of the park.
20.	This management plan is the best tool we have for directly protecting the reef. <b>(7 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
21.	The issue of duty of care is a major oversight of the plan, especially with regard to the growing number of marine related deaths and incidents in the region. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1c)	Additional strategies have been added to ensure visitor risk issues are properly considered. The Department of Planning and Infrastructure has a primary role in respect to marine safety issues.



SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
22.	The simplest, most cost effective and best way to achieve management plan aims (protection/restoration) is through application of the precautionary principle. Precautionary principle is mentioned only once in the plan (p81). Given that the principle is a commonly accepted and used principle of environmental policy it is a matter which is relevant for the MPRA to consider throughout the entirety of the plan otherwise the plan will be liable to judicial review. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Plan makes adequate reference to the precautionary principle. The precautionary principle is implicit in many of the zoning, research and monitoring, education, direct intervention, etc. strategies that are outlined in the plan
23.	Commends CALM's efforts in development of the new zoning and management arrangements. Believe the plan has the potential to be equal to any similar efforts world wide, including the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
24.	The plan is heavily biased towards conservation (no loss, no degradation, no disturbance). <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	The primary statutory purpose of a CALM Act marine park plan is conservation of the marine environment.
25.	Confusion about terminology between reserves, sanctuaries, parks, conservation areas in the plan. Often unclear as to what the text refers. Need more specific terminology, to improve text in this regard. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	A glossary of terms has been included in the plan.
<b>Introduction</b>			
26.	On page 2, paragraph 4 needs to have reference added to the precautionary principle applying to development proposals. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	This overarching principal is referred to in the plan.
27.	In Section 2.3, paragraph 3 requires amendment to mention the importance of integrated management of land and waters. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Reference is made to integrated management of the marine and terrestrial environments.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
<b>Management Context</b>			
28.	The plan should apply for longer than ten years. (1 submission)	No (2f)	The CALM Act sets management plans for a term of ten years.
29.	The draft plan needs to update its references to the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> . (1 submission)	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to reflect the correct name and finalisation of this regional strategy.
30.	Ensure the management plan acknowledges the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> and encourages cross agency cooperation and coordination in the implementation of both plans. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Reference to cross-agency cooperation and coordination is adequately covered in the plan.
31.	The plan should endeavour, where possible, to reiterate the <i>Statement of Planning Policy No. 9.3 Ningaloo Coast (SPP6.3)</i> and <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> . (1 submission)	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to make reference to the <i>Statement of Planning Policy No. 9.3 Ningaloo Coast</i> .
<b>Management Framework</b>			
32.	Ningaloo Marine Park and/or marine parks in general should be managed by the Department of Fisheries under the <i>Fish Resources Management Act 1994</i> . (26 submissions)	No (2f)	Marine reserves are established under the CALM Act primarily to conserve the marine flora and fauna of the State and to manage human use of these areas, and are not for the purposes of managing fishing. The reserves are vested with the MPRA and managed by CALM. The <i>Fish Resources Management Act 1994</i> is primarily for the sustainable management of exploited fish stocks and for the protection of the habitats of fish. This Act is administered by the Department of Fisheries, which manages exploited fish stocks throughout the State, including in marine conservation reserves, in collaboration with CALM and MPRA.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
33.	Management of the coastal strip should be done by or in partnership with pastoralists. <b>(14 submissions)</b>	No (2f)	Marine parks are established under the CALM Act primarily to conserve the marine flora and fauna of the State and to manage human use of these areas. The parks are vested with the MPRA and managed by CALM in conjunction with other stakeholders as appropriate as outlined in the plan.
34.	Fishing in the marine park should be controlled by the Department of Fisheries (monitoring fish stocks, applying bag limits etc). <b>(6 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. Fishing in marine conservation reserves is managed by the Department of Fisheries in collaboration with CALM and the MPRA.
35.	Current management is adequate. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The current management regime was established over ten years ago, and is now considered to be inadequate for managing Ningaloo Reef over the next decade.
36.	The park should be managed with more emphasis on a variety of fishery management methods and more emphasis on involving and developing user cooperation. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan outlines a range of strategies relating to integration with fisheries management and public involvement in management. The Department of Fisheries can implement a variety of strategies if these are considered necessary for fisheries management.
37.	Management of the marine park needs to be improved. <b>(19 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	The aim of reviewing the management plan is to update and improve management of the reserves.
38.	Management requires adequate resourcing. The marine park is currently under resourced. <b>(20 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. The Government has allocated additional funds for the implementation of the plan.
39.	Requires an independent management board <b>(18 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	The reserves are vested (legally entrusted) to the MPRA, an independent, community-based, statutory committee appointed by the Minister for the Environment. The MPRA audits the implementation of the reserves and advises the Minister.
40.	CALM and the Department of Fisheries should work in cooperation. There is need for a MOU between CALM and the Department of Fisheries regarding marine parks in general, and Ningaloo Marine Park in particular. <b>(25 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	The plan supports an improved level of integration and cooperation between CALM and the Department of Fisheries.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
41.	The CALM planning process continues to ignore fisheries management reforms and the changes in community attitudes towards recreational fishing. Fisheries management needs to be involved as a component in the planning and management process. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Marine reserves are managed by CALM in conjunction with the Department of Fisheries, and fisheries managers participate in all stages of the planning process, including attendance by the Department of Fisheries Executive Director or a delegate to all MPRA meetings. Fisheries management regimes continue to apply in marine reserves.
42.	Marine conservation should be determined by consensus of community representatives properly informed with valid scientific information. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The planning process involved community representatives, and was based on the best available scientific information.
43.	Better management will be of greater benefit to the community than closing sections of the reef to recreational fishers. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	The park will be managed more effectively following allocation of increased funding.
44.	The claim that the document has been prepared in consultation with government agencies (Section 8.1.1 pg 84) while technically correct, is not transparent from this documentation <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to provide more detail of the consultation with other government agencies.
45.	The Department of Industry and Resources (DoIR) has previously requested that the section describing management targets explain that, in the absence of quantitative data or information on the values of the marine conservation reserve, qualitative targets should be utilised. DoIR understands that this is a decision of the MPRA and would appreciate the plan (Management Targets, pg 7) being amended to reflect this decision. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan makes reference to development of quantitative targets early in the life of the plan, where these are not currently stated. Where quantitative targets are not possible, qualitative targets will be developed.
46.	Where a strategy generally identifies a relevant agency (in brackets) to implement the strategy, the Ningaloo Sustainable Development Office (NSDO) should be included on matters of planning and land use. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to include reference to Ningaloo Sustainable Development Office as an implementing agency where appropriate.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
47.	CALM should concentrate their efforts in the protection of habitat and leave the protection and management of marine fauna to the Department of Fisheries. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2f)	CALM has a statutory responsibility to manage marine fauna under the CALM Act (in marine conservation reserves) and <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> for off-reserve areas of State waters.
48.	North West Cape, the Ningaloo Marine Park and/or the proposed marine management area should not be managed by CALM. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2f)	CALM has a statutory responsibility to manage marine conservation reserves under the CALM Act.
49.	Concerns raised regarding terminology under the CALM Act for marine conservation areas as compared with Commonwealth legislation and IUCN categories. Leads to community confusion over the level of protection provided and needs to be revisited to bring terminology in line with national and international usage. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	This would require changes to legislation, which are outside the scope of the management plan.
<b>Regional Perspective</b>			
50.	The Muiron/Sunday islands should be a priority in management. Publish more about their ecological values in the final plan. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to include greater reference to the ecological values of the Muiron and Sunday islands.
<b>Definition of Area and Reserve Tenure</b>			
51.	The information provided on the tenure map (Fig. 2) could be updated to reflect the regional land use plan (Fig. 4 of the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> ) to provide detail of the proposed future terrestrial development and land use of the Ningaloo coast to assist in the marine planning of the park. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Proposed future terrestrial development and land use as described in the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> will be considered during the preparation of a recreation master plan for the area

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
52.	The two port areas of Point Cloates and Point Maud within the marine park are also vested with the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure under the <i>Marine and Harbours Act 1981</i> . Given that an inter-departmental dialogue to resolve all the issues related to dual vesting of ports and marine parks has already commenced, an appropriate text note should be inserted in the new management plan, similar to what has been agreed for the 'Capes' marine park dual vesting issue. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to note presence of Ports and process is underway to review the need for the dual vesting of port areas.
53.	Where the Department of Defence (DoD) property boundary extends down to low water mark, this will have been established to enable DoD to secure a sensitive facility. I can see the merit from CALM's perspective of having State jurisdiction to high water mark - thereby being able to manage public access to the beach adjacent to the marine park. Whether DoD can accommodate the State will depend on whether or not the security issues remain paramount <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Plan recommends that the State Government liaise with the Commonwealth in regard to amendment of boundaries of Ministry of Defence lands, where appropriate.
54.	On page 13, paragraph 2. This should include the coast area to the foothills of the range. This could be covered with an MOU that passed over control to the Department of Defence during defence events. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	This is not considered necessary to manage activities in the park.
Vision and Strategic Objectives			
55.	Agree with vision statement. <b>(252 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
56.	Disagree with vision statement. <b>(66 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The vision statement in the plan is considered to be the best option.
57.	Vision should include education, conservation, maintenance of species, and protection of the area from human impacts. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
58.	Reducing bag limits will achieve the vision. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The primary purpose of the reserves is to protect marine biodiversity, not only to protect fish stocks. A reduction in bag limits will not ensure the protection of all ecological and social values.
59.	Vision does not allow for development in Exmouth. <b>(2 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The vision statement seeks to ensure that protection of the ecological and social values of the reserves will benefit the local and broader communities.
60.	Permitted activities should be defined. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Activities that are permitted in the reserves are detailed in Tables 5 and 7.
61.	People should be able to access the park with minimal environmental impact. Balance conservation and use. <b>(8 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
62.	Vision needs to first reflect state, federal and indigenous laws and statutory requirements. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. The vision is based on legislation as outlined in Section 2 of the plan.
63.	Vision can only be achieved if fishing and camping is restricted and/or people are excluded and/or shipping is excluded. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The vision provides for a variety of sustainable uses.
64.	This isn't about a vision, it's about fishing. Unfairly targets recreational fishers/ no further restrictions on fishing. <b>(16 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	The vision provides for a variety of sustainable uses, including fishing.
65.	Vision needs to be defined (i) better condition, (ii) heritage values, (iii) adverse human impacts and (iv) it is unclear what is meant by the term 'fully protected'. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Values, acceptable impact on values and levels of protection are defined in the management plan. 'Fully protected' means 'no disturbance by human activities.'
66.	Will ensure protection against population growth and growth in popularity/insurance policy so that future generations may enjoy the area. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
67.	I don't believe that everyone will share the same values of the reef and therefore will not go to the trouble to do anything to save it from destruction. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	The plan contains a range of educational strategies designed to raise awareness of the values of the reserves.
68.	This vision does not go far enough. The whole of the reef should be protected by marine park and national park, i.e. Cape Range National Park needs extending at least to Coral Bay. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2c)	The management plan proposes protection of the entire reef through a range of strategies that include representative fully protected sanctuary zones. The Cape Range National Park is subject to a separate planning process.
69.	The vision statement can't be measured and is unachievable. The scope is too wide and there is no justification to bring it into existence. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes performance measures for each value, which in combination assess the adequacy of management and the achievement of the vision statement.
70.	Agree in principle, but disagree with the belief that creation of sanctuary zones is the best way to achieve these objectives. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are one of a number of management tools that are employed in marine reserve management.
71.	We encourage reference to the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> in the strategic objectives or supporting text to reiterate the tools and guiding principles that have been put in place on the coastal and terrestrial environment to assist in protecting the environmental values of the marine park. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan makes reference to other statutory and non-statutory management measures within and external to the reserves.
72.	The vision statement seems very idealistic considering that we don't have enough baseline data to establish the true condition of all the stated habitats, to effectively measure changes over the coming decade. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes research and monitoring strategies to increase environmental knowledge of the reserves over the life of the management plan.
73.	Agree with the vision statement, but implies that impacts can be accurately measured and predicted for all systems. Does not fully incorporate potential for precautionary management; implies if there is no measurable impact, then no action is required. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	In the absence of quantitative assessments of impact, a risk assessment is undertaken to assess the degree of concern and the possible need for management action.



SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
74.	Vision is supported if the Muiron Islands are included in the Ningaloo Marine Park. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The planning process identified that a marine management area was the most appropriate marine conservation reserve type for waters surrounding the Muiron Islands.
75.	Vision statement that natural attributes should be in the same or better condition as 2004 is a great sentiment that we endorse as a statement of overall trends. An alternative vision or operational goal that sits beneath the existing vision could be 'positive trends in maintenance or improvement of water quality, reef habitats and populations, averaged over years to decades, recognizing that transient reversals over significant areas can and may happen.' <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The vision statement is considered to be appropriate for the reserves, given current knowledge of the area.
76.	Not realistic/cannot manage natural events, e.g. cyclones, global warming. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	While natural and global events of this magnitude cannot be actively managed, the plan includes strategies to increase knowledge of the impacts of such events on the reserves.
77.	The use of the words 'fully protected' may be difficult to implement at an operational level. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	'Fully protected' relates primarily to preventing removal of fauna and flora, but may also include restricting activities where these are impacting on the ecosystem.
78.	Need a key strategic goal of management to determine what is natural/baseline and what targets would protect natural structure and function. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. This issue is addressed in management strategies for ecological values.
<b>Environmental objectives (general)</b>			
79.	All objectives are essential to maintaining the integrity of the reef ecosystem and/or are within generally accepted standards of environmental protection. <b>(11 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
80.	The numbers of turtles, dugongs, manta rays and whales are increasing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change is sought.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
81.	Disagree that some species are not to be harvested. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	There are some species that should be protected given their specific ecological and social values and/or because they possess biological characteristics that make them particularly vulnerable to over-exploitation.
82.	All of the environmental objectives have to be met to ensure adequate environmental protection. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
83.	Cultural needs should be taken into account with regard to species that are not to be harvested. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Indigenous take is addressed in the plan in Section 7.2.1.
84.	Although management plan objectives are sound, we must expect some impact on abundance. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Loss of abundance of target species is addressed in the plan.
85.	There should be no disturbance to any important animal that demands protection (e.g. turtles). <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
86.	Do not agree that non-harvested species abundance should increase above current levels. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended so that the target for non-harvested species is that abundance of these species is maintained at natural levels.
87.	Should be greater reference to threats posed by introduced marine species. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to include threats posed by introduced marine species.
88.	For effective conservation, restrict high impact activities (e.g. commercial fishing, mining exploration), and allow for low impact activities (e.g. recreational fishing and spear-fishing). <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Marine conservation reserves in WA are managed on a multiple-use basis, which provides for a range of sustainable activities.
89.	Objectives are unrealistic as attracting more people in the area will cause more environmental damage. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Objectives are not necessarily unrealistic. The plan includes a range of management strategies to ensure that increased visitation does not result in increased environmental damage.
90.	It is unfair to attain objectives by excluding the public. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The public is not excluded from any part of the reserves, however particular activities are restricted in certain areas.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
91.	When integrated with coastal management, meaningful community involvement and independent monitoring, this will deliver long-term benefits for the sustainability of marine ecosystems, habitats and fisheries. Scientists suggest that special areas like Ningaloo, which has the second highest number of endemic species of any marine area in the world, needs up to 100% protection. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
92.	The management of ecological values is generally supported. The coastal tourism framework detailed in the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> requires consideration of declared rare or priority flora and fauna species in the master planning and site development plan process which precedes sustainable tourism approval. Important populations and breeding or feeding areas should be identified, featured and protected from disturbance. This will ensure that coastal development has minimal impact upon the ecological values detailed in Section 7.1. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies for identification of important wildlife areas.
93.	Better integration with the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> is encouraged. The reference to the strategy should be updated to advise that the Government is committed to the Ningaloo coast being managed as public lands for conservation and recreation purposes and that vesting of the coastal pastoral lease exclusion areas on the Ningaloo coast adjacent to the marine park is intended to be generally in the Conservation Commission of WA. Further assessment is required as part of the implementation of both the regional strategy and management plan to achieve the management objectives of this ecological value. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to reflect the correct name and finalisation of this regional strategy.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED		AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
94.	Baseline data is not present for many of the ecological values so evaluating an improvement in these will be difficult. The natural state must be quantified. (1 submission)	No (2d)	The plan addresses the need for establishing baseline information on ecological values early in the life of the management plan.
95.	Impacts on environmental objectives appear to be localised. (1 submission)	No (2b)	No change sought.
96.	The plan repeatedly states ‘development proposals which may impact on (environmental value) are subject to environmental impact assessment by the DoE/EPA.’ This statement is not true and in the context of the NMP, is misleading. The EPA only conducts environmental impact assessments on proposals which are referred to it and which it considers to be likely to have a significant impact on the environment. The EPA assesses on average, about 50 proposals throughout the State each year. There is no way that any person can state that particular proposals will be assessed – the EPA has discretion whether to assess in each case. The DoE does not have any statutory role in environmental impact assessment, other than when it is issuing works approvals for prescribed (usually industrial) premises. Therefore it is also misleading to say that the DoE will conduct assessment. (3 submissions)	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to more accurately reflect the intent of the submission.
97.	The plan states ‘any development proposals need to be consistent with the management targets for (environmental value) and other ecological values’. This statement is misleading to say that future proposals will be consistent with management targets. (3 submissions)	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to more accurately reflect the role of targets in assessing development proposals.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
<b>Geomorphology</b>			
98.	Agree with objective. <b>(274 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
99.	Disagree with objective. <b>(35 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
100.	Management objectives should not be attained by excluding activities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	Marine reserves are managed on a multiple-use basis, which seeks to accommodate a range of activities. It is necessary that some activities be excluded from particular zones to achieve conservation objectives.
101.	Human activity has already or will result in significant impacts and/or modifications to geomorphology in the reserves. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	The plan includes strategies to minimise impacts on geomorphology.
102.	The word 'significantly' is fairly ambiguous in the objective, and requires clarification. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Targets in Section 7.1.1 indicate the level of acceptable change.
103.	Geomorphology of the reserves should not be significantly altered. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
104.	The objective should read 'to ensure the variety of plants and animals (biodiversity), their abundance and their habitats are maintained or enhanced'. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The objective in the plan is still considered to be the best option.
105.	The objectives and strategies appear very sound. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
106.	Undertake research to map the seabed and identify sediment and substrate types and their patterns of distribution across the continental shelf adjacent to the park. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	New research strategies have been added.
107.	Undertake research to improve understanding of the degree of interaction between the coastal zone and the groundwater estuary. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
108.	Undertake research to investigate the morphology and evolutionary history of the Ningaloo Reef system and identify reef growth characteristics and their relevance for maintenance of reef biodiversity. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
109.	Undertake research to map the seabed of the shallow shelf to seaward of the Ningaloo Reef crest and investigate whether seabed morphology can be used as a surrogate for benthic habitats and community assemblages. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	New research strategies have been added.
110.	Undertake research to improve knowledge of the groundwater system and the relationship between the shallow coastal plain aquifers to the reef system. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
<b>Sediment Quality</b>			
111.	Agree with objective. <b>(289 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
112.	Disagree with objective. <b>(17 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
113.	Human health standards are too subjective. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Human health standards for sediment quality are outlined in <i>Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality</i> (ANZECC and ARMCANZ 2000).
114.	Inappropriate coastal developments, particularly at Coral Bay, threaten sediment quality. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to ensure that coastal developments consider and where possible comply with management targets.
115.	Management will have limited capacity to maintain sediment quality. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Most pressures on sediment quality will originate from within or adjacent to the reserves and can be managed. Unpredictable events such as oil spills are addressed at a state-wide level, and are addressed in the plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
116.	The plan lacks strategies to mitigate impacts caused by anti-fouling compounds and fuel spills from small boats. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Reference is made to these issues in the plan.
117.	Undertake research to better understand the influence of circulation patterns and human use on sediment quality. (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	New research strategies have been added.
<b>Water Quality</b>			
118.	Agree with objective. (289 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
119.	Disagree with objective. (16 submissions)	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
120.	High water quality is maintained by circulation patterns. (1 submission)	No (2b)	No change sought.
121.	Human health standards are too subjective. (1 submission)	No (2d)	National human health standards for water quality are outlined in <i>Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality</i> (ANZECC and ARMCANZ 2000).
122.	Maintaining environment health should be the prime management objective. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
123.	Inappropriate coastal developments, particularly at Coral Bay, threaten water quality. (2 submissions)	No (2d)	Most pressures on water quality will originate from within or adjacent to the reserves and can be managed. Unpredictable events such as oil spills are addressed at a state-wide level, and are addressed in the plan.
124.	Terrestrial runoff from structures, roads, car parks etc should be trapped and cleansed of contaminants before release into the ocean. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Contamination from such sources is not currently considered to represent a significant pressure on water quality. However, this suggestion may be considered if monitoring suggests a significant input of pollutants from these sources.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
125.	Management will have limited or no capacity to maintain water quality. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Most pressures on water quality will originate from within or adjacent to the reserves and can be managed. Unpredictable events such as oil spills are addressed at a state-wide level, and are addressed in the plan.
126.	Suggest research into the internationally significant marine component of the extensive ground water estuary (anchialine system) extending into the coastal karst of the Cape Range. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to include a strategy to undertake further research into these systems.
127.	Research on circulation and hydrodynamics in and around Ningaloo should be a high priority, given potential risks from, for example, terrestrial runoff, oil exploration and production. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to develop an understanding of circulation and hydrodynamics in the reserves.
128.	As an additional strategy, there may be a case for reviewing the risk posed by allowing sewage discharge from boats into general use zones. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Sewage discharge from boats into general use zones is currently considered to represent a minor environmental risk.
129.	'Fuel and Oils' are identified as risk factors, but not included as performance measures. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Such compounds are included as 'toxicants' in the performance measures.
130.	Performance measure 1 'Nutrients: Chlorophyll a and inorganic nutrient (N) concentration in seawater' needs to recognise the episodically high values of these parameters that may arise naturally as a result of upwelling events along the Ningaloo Reef front. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Water quality monitoring over time will identify natural patterns of variation in water quality to provide a baseline for comparison.
131.	Designation of sewage discharge areas for the southern and northern extensions and the existing park should be consistent. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The proposed sewage discharge zones for the southern and northern extensions follow the same conventions as for the existing park.
132.	Education should aim to promote best practise at all times to minimise pollution from boating. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. Strategies in the plan address these issues.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
133.	Undertake research into the physical and biological oceanography of the Ningaloo reef system and investigate how seasonal and inter-annual variability of nutrient supply contributes to/limits productivity to Ningaloo. (2 submissions)	Yes (1d)	A relevant research strategy has been amended.
134.	Undertake a program of instrument deployment and analysis in order to develop, validate and calibrate ocean colour satellite data products as well as biogeochemical and ecological models. (1 submission)	No (2d)	This is addressed as part of the broader research strategy identified above. Strategies emphasise management's information requirements rather than details of methodology.
135.	Conduct a thorough review of current knowledge on currents and climate variability impacts influencing the Ningaloo Region. (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
136.	Develop finescale 3D nested hydrodynamic model(s) to be nested within the existing scaleable models developed by SRFME and the Wealth from Oceans Flagship for WA. (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	This strategy is encompassed within a new research strategy.
137.	Recommends the strategy 'Establish baseline water quality monitoring programs for areas within the reserves that have been or are exposed to contaminant inputs' be upgraded from (M) ranking to (H). (1 submission)	No (2d)	A medium ranking is appropriate for this strategy in view of the risks posed by contaminants.
138.	Improve understanding of the benthic-pelagic coupling within the reef system and the role of the biological oceanography in contributing to/limiting productivity. (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
139.	Undertake research on the productivity of Ningaloo, with an emphasis on primary productivity, to provide a better understanding of the potential impacts of human activities and natural disasters. (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added, while baseline monitoring will also contribute to addressing this issue.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
<b>Coral Reef Communities</b>			
140.	Agree with objective. <b>(280 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
141.	Disagree with objective. <b>(28 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
142.	Restriction of motorboats from shallow reef would prevent coral damage from outboard motors. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan makes reference to damage to shallow reefs from motorboats, and education programs will address this issue. In some cases there may be a need to control boating activities in areas where significant damage is occurring.
143.	Big boats are causing reef damage, not dinghies. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
144.	This easily accessible reef needs careful management and protection from human impacts to protect habitats and/or maintain biodiversity. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
145.	Has already been coral damage in some areas. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
146.	The reef is not dying, new coral growth occurs after disturbances (e.g. after cyclones). <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
147.	An objective of no loss is unrealistic in the presence of human activity. 'Minimal loss' should be used in preference to 'no loss' or 'no significant loss'. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The meaning of 'no loss' management targets is qualified in footnotes in the plan. In a management context, 'no loss' typically excludes losses of a minor, transient or accidental nature.
148.	The management proposal discriminates against recreational fishers, who cause little damage to coral. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Extraction of fish can potentially cause ecological changes that are detrimental to coral reef ecosystems.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
149.	Shell collecting should be banned. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Recreational and commercial shell collecting is currently prohibited in the majority of the reserves. While commercial collecting is permitted in some parts of the general use zone, the fishery is required to demonstrate that it is ecologically sustainable within three years.
150.	Concern about widespread damage caused to coral by anchoring. Support installation of moorings and/or banning anchoring, especially in popular areas. <b>(44 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
151.	Coral communities at Ningaloo are generally in good condition, with areas of localised impacts. Commend strategies that support research on coral communities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
152.	There should be long term monitoring of coral reef communities, particularly in areas of high usage. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. The plan includes strategies to monitor coral reefs most at risk of degradation.
153.	Indicator species would provide a performance measure for biodiversity assessment and changes in biodiversity. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1a)	Strategies to develop monitoring programs for coral reefs have been added to the plan.
154.	Agree that deep-water communities are poorly understood and require research. The opportunity also exists to examine processes of natural coral reef recovery and methods of enhancing the recovery. Support for research on coral community metabolism and circulation as a high priority. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to add research strategies relating to deep-water communities and the recovery of coral communities. Coral community metabolism has been extensively studied on reefs worldwide and, as such, is not currently considered to be a research priority for the Ningaloo reserves.
155.	Existing pressures should be: dilute petroleum releases/oil spills, nutrient enrichment in areas of low flushing, sediment loads from development, indirect impacts of fishing on reef communities. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The risk analysis does not support these factors being an increasing risk during the life of the plan. However, the risk assessment will be regularly updated.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
156.	Policing and prosecution of discharge needs consideration. (1 submission)	No (2d)	This will be considered in the implementation of the plan.
157.	The plan needs to acknowledge that historical and current recreational and commercial fishing pressure on Ningaloo is likely to have caused substantial impacts on the whole ecosystem including coral reef communities. (3 submissions)	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to refer to possible historical ecosystem effects caused by recreational and commercial fishing.
158.	Include rubbish, plastics, fishing gear, fishing line and elevated water temperatures as existing and potential uses/pressures. (1 submission)	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to include litter as an existing or potential pressure.
159.	There is no mention of a monitoring program at Ningaloo, that monitors both areas of reef at risk and those not at risk (eg. control sites). It is vital to have a monitoring program that extends the length of Ningaloo. (1 submission)	No (2d)	An extensive monitoring program is outlined in the plan. Monitoring effort will be concentrated on those areas perceived to be most at risk. Other monitoring will include an assessment of the recovery of coral at Bill's Bay, the ecosystem effects of fishing on the reef and the distribution and abundance of <i>Drupella</i> on the reef.
160.	Support for Strategies 4 and 7. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
161.	Insert a new strategy as follows 'Understanding the connectivity of coral reef populations, both, within Ningaloo Marine Park and with reefs to the north and south'. (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to include strategies to address research on biological connectivity.
162.	Undertake research to develop a monitoring protocol to estimate annual coral recruitment within the park and to better understand the connectivity of coral reef populations both within NMP and within reefs to the north and south. (2 submissions)	Yes (1d)	A research strategy has been amended to: 'Undertake research for the development of cost-effective monitoring protocols to estimate coral recruitment within the reserves and investigate the implications for coral reef resilience and connectivity (CALM).'

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
163.	Initiate a program of monitoring and ecological study of coral communities, including studies on demography, to better understand causes and drivers of change in coral communities. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	A research strategy has been amended to: ‘Undertake research for the development of cost-effective monitoring protocols to estimate coral recruitment within the reserves and investigate the implications for coral reef resilience and connectivity (CALM).
164.	Assess the impact of climate change on coral reefs and coral growth in particular, in order to understand localised impacts at Ningaloo. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
165.	Undertake research to identify biodiversity surrogates to monitor coral reef health. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
166.	Undertake research to better understand processes of natural recovery and to develop methods of enhancing recovery of coral reef communities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
<b>Filter feeding communities (other than coral reefs)</b>			
167.	Agree with objective. <b>(269 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
168.	Disagree with objective. <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
169.	Endorse Strategy 2, as it addresses a basic information need. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
170.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
171.	Do not support ‘none’ for major pressures as prawn trawling of these communities may impact larval supply from these communities to Ningaloo Reef. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Extensive filter feeding communities occur in deep waters seaward of the Ningaloo Reef and to a lesser extent in Exmouth Gulf. Current data suggests that trawling does not substantially overlap with these filter-feeding communities.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
172.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The use of 'positive' as a desired trend for the abundance and/or diversity of particular ecological values only refers to instances where existing abundances and/or diversity are likely to be below the desired 'natural' level.
173.	Will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Plan outlines research requirements, which are linked to performance measures.
174.	Zoning does not adequately protect these communities in the northeast of the Ningaloo Marine Park. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Zoning in the north east of the park provides some protection to these communities. Further research is required to establish the adequacy of the existing zoning scheme.
175.	Trawling is recognised as the greatest threat, but the proposed mapping of these communities in areas where trawling occurs will not tell us about the potential direct (e.g. trawl gear) and indirect (e.g. increased turbidity) impacts of trawling. As there is no background data to show what these areas were like before trawling, the long-term target of 'no loss' of filter feeding community diversity is ill founded and warrants refinement. Data on the undisturbed benthic community composition and characteristics should be the basis for developing appropriate management targets. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The 'no loss' benchmark for this value is determined from when the reserves are gazetted, as historical losses of species diversity and/or abundance are unlikely to be recoverable.
176.	Support research to increase knowledge of filter feeding communities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to include research strategies to characterise the distribution and abundance of filter feeding communities.
<b>Shoreline intertidal reef communities</b>			
177.	Agree with objective. <b>(269 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
178.	Disagree with objective. <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
179.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
180.	Strategies for the management of this habitat appear to be sound. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
181.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The use of 'positive' as a desired trend for the abundance and/or diversity of particular ecological values only refers to instances where existing abundances and/or diversity are likely to be below the desired 'natural' level.
182.	Will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan outlines research requirements, which are linked to performance measures.
183.	More shoreline intertidal reef communities should be in sanctuary zones. <b>(2 submissions)</b> .	No (2d)	The current zoning scheme represents a balance between conservation and use. Many shoreline intertidal reef areas are relatively inaccessible, which provides a level of 'informal' protection. Monitoring will however assess the level of impacts in these systems given current use.
184.	Include measures that provide protect shoreline intertidal reef communities from unsustainable collecting (e.g. a blanket ban on collecting invertebrates and molluscs). <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes a strategy to assess the nature, level and impacts of human activities on shoreline intertidal reef communities. The collection of most molluscs is already prohibited throughout the reserves.
185.	The short-term target 'not applicable' is erroneous, as the long-term target cannot be met without information on diversity. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1a)	Short-term targets will be developed when data is available.
<b>Soft sediment communities</b>			
186.	Agree with objective. <b>(269 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
187.	Disagree with objective. <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
188.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
189.	Strategies for the management of this habitat appear to be sound. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
190.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The use of 'positive' as a desired trend for the abundance and/or diversity of particular ecological values only refers to instances where existing abundances and/or diversity are likely to be below the desired 'natural' level.
191.	Will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan outlines research requirements, which are linked to performance measures.
192.	Concerns about the adequacy of protection of soft sediment communities in the reserves, especially given the past and present impact of trawling on these habitats. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	In the absence of historical knowledge of these communities, the baseline condition for this value is considered as being that at the time of reserve gazettal.
<b>Macroalgal and seagrass communities</b>			
193.	Agree with objective. <b>(269 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
194.	Disagree with objective. <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
195.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
196.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, 'desired trend/s' in the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	Yes (1e)	The use of 'positive' as a desired trend for the abundance and/or diversity of particular ecological values refers to instances where existing abundances and/or diversity are likely to be below the desired 'natural' level. The 'desired trend/s' for this value have been amended to 'constant'.



	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
197.	Populations of benthic algae fluctuate naturally and a long-term target of ensuring 'no loss' of algae in the park needs to be carefully considered. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Management targets for this value in the plan refer no loss due to human activity as opposed to natural fluctuations.
198.	Will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan outlines research requirements, which are linked to performance measures.
199.	Education programs should highlight the differing structure and ecology of macro algae and sea grasses. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Education programs will focus on all major ecosystem components.
200.	Recommends the existing strategy 'Undertake research to better characterise the diversity, distribution and abundance of seagrass and macroalgal communities within the reserves' be upgraded from (H) ranking to (KMS). <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	A high priority ranking is considered appropriate for this strategy in view of the relative significance of this value and the current threats.
201.	Undertake research to investigate the role of macroalgal and seagrass communities to the reef ecology generally and improve understanding of the importance of this resource to marine fauna (e.g. dugongs, turtles and juvenile fish). <b>(3 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added. This value will also be considered as part of research on reef health indicators.
<b>Mangrove communities (including mudflats)</b>			
202.	Agree with objective. <b>(279 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan
203.	Disagree with objective. <b>(22 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
204.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
205.	Support for the management background and/or strategies for this value. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
206.	Human activities don't impact on mangroves. (2 submissions)	No (2b)	Physical disturbance, pollution events, mud crabbing and groundwater extraction have been identified as existing and potential pressures on mangroves in the reserves.
207.	Concerns regarding the potential damage or loss of mangroves in the reserves due to unmanaged access. (2 submissions)	No (2d)	Trampling has been identified as the current major pressure on mangrove communities in the reserves. Detailed site management would be implemented where impacts are recognised or are likely to occur.
208.	A small mangal in Yardie Creek is compromised by vehicles crossing the entrance when the sandbar is closed. (1 submission)	No (2c)	Yardie Creek is not part of the Ningaloo Marine Park. This issue will be considered in the review of the Cape Range National Park management plan.
209.	All mangal and mudflat areas should be included in sanctuary zones. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	The majority of mangrove and mudflat areas are included in sanctuary zones.
210.	Mudcrabbing should be restricted or prohibited in mangal/mudflat areas. (4 submissions)	Yes (1d)	The permitted activities table has been amended to clarify that recreational mudcrabbing is only permitted in general use and recreation zones of the marine park and unzoned areas of the marine management area.
211.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	The use of 'positive' as a desired trend for the abundance and/or diversity of particular ecological values only refers to instances where existing abundances and/or diversity are likely to be below the desired 'natural' level.
212.	The targets are vague – there is really no threat to biodiversity (Target 1). Target 2 may better be expressed as no loss of mangrove area than biomass. (1 submission)	Yes (1e)	The diversity target refers to the whole mangrove community. Mangrove area may be used as a surrogate for biomass, however biomass may be a better indicator for mangrove health.
213.	Short-term targets for this value need to be developed as a priority. (1 submission)	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to add a statement about development of quantitative targets early in the life of the plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
214.	Concern that the plan lacks specific strategies to protect mangroves from oil spill. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	The plan includes a strategy under Section 7.1.3 (Water Quality) to map the ecological and social values of the reserves that are highly sensitive to oil spills and make this information available to State Committee for Combating Marine Oil Pollution. Strategies outlined in the <i>National Marine Oil Spill Contingency Plan</i> , which would apply in the event of an oil spill, are not duplicated in the plan.
<b>Coastal Biological communities</b>			
215.	Agree with objective. (260 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
216.	Disagree with objective. (37 submissions)	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
217.	All species should be maintained at current or better levels. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
218.	Coastal communities are not degraded. (2 submissions)	No (2b)	Unmanaged tracks and camping have degraded coastal communities in the marine park.
219.	Vehicle access is already restricted. (1 submission)	No (2b)	No change sought.
220.	The management objective is unrealistic unless access is limited. (1 submission)	No (2e)	Restricting access to particular areas is one of various management strategies that could be used to manage coastal areas of the marine park.
221.	Degraded areas should be rehabilitated. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Section 8.7 of the plan includes strategies to rehabilitate degraded areas.
222.	Effective collaboration with relevant agencies and leaseholders will be important to manage coastal areas of the marine park. (4 submissions)	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to ensure collaborative management of the coastal strip.
223.	Public education is important with regard to managing coastal areas of the marine park. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Strategies for public education about the ecological values of the reserves are included in the plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
224.	Recommend that a strategy be considered to ‘input to planning and development processes, and conduct ‘before and after’ research and monitoring in areas where proposals are approved.’ (3 submissions)	No (2d)	This strategy is implicit in the environmental impact assessment process.
225.	Research on trophic links between coastal and marine food webs would enhance integrated management of these areas. (1 submission)	No (2b)	Research on this topic is not currently considered to be a priority in the reserves.
<b>Seabirds and migratory waders</b>			
226.	Agree with objective. (269 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
227.	Disagree with objective. (33 submissions)	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
228.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	The use of ‘positive’ as a desired trend for the abundance and/or diversity of particular ecological values only refers to instances where existing abundances and/or diversity are likely to be below the desired ‘natural’ level.
229.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. (4 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
230.	The management objectives, strategies and targets for this value appear to be sound. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
231.	There should be no disturbance to birds as a result of human activities. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Management targets for birds state that there will be no loss of abundance or diversity as a result of human activity in the reserves.
232.	Will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. (1 submission)	No (2d)	The plan outlines research requirements, which are linked to performance measures.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
233.	The plan may provide a false sense of security to suggest that there are no 'current major pressures' (p42) acting on seabirds and migratory waders. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	No additional information has been provided.
<b>Finfish</b>			
234.	Agree with objective (non-target species). <b>(269 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
235.	Disagree with objective (non-target species). <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
236.	Agree with objective (target species). <b>(265 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
237.	Disagree with objective (target species). <b>(38 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
238.	Disagree that targeted fish should be harvested at 'sustainable' levels. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2f)	Sustainable fishing is a permitted activity in appropriate areas of multiple use marine conservation reserves.
239.	The harvesting of target species needs to be closely managed. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. The Department of Fisheries manages fishing in all State waters, including marine conservation reserves.
240.	Support the management objectives and strategies for the management of finfish in the reserves. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
241.	Support for monitoring finfish assemblages, and particularly targeted, territorial and/or long-lived species. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
242.	Boat fishing and GPS technology are a major threat to fish stocks. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Boat fishing is listed as an existing and/or potential pressure on fishes. Technology-driven increases in fishing efficiency must be carefully considered.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
243.	Current fisheries management is adequate. (17 submissions)	No (2d)	The Department of Fisheries manages fishing in all State waters, including marine conservation reserves.
244.	There is no evidence that fish stocks are under threat. (2 submissions)	No (2b)	The Department of Fisheries manages fishing in all State waters, including marine conservation reserves.
245.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. (3 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan. Fishing is allowed in appropriate areas of marine conservation reserves under existing WA government policy.
246.	Concerns about possible ecosystem impacts caused by depletion of targeted fishes. (2 submissions)	No (2d)	This issue is raised in Section 7.2.8 (Recreational fishing) of the plan.
247.	The draft plan has ignored the recent changes to fishing regulations in the West Coast and Gascoyne regions, which have effectively halved the daily bag limits for many targeted species. (1 submission)	No (2d)	These issues have been considered in the plan
248.	A separate marine park fisheries management group should be created to examine and assess fishery management issues for the reserves. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Such a group is not considered to be necessary at this time.
249.	Many fishes range widely outside the reserve boundaries and can only be managed by measures that extend far beyond the limits of the reserves. (1 submission)	No (2d)	The Department of Fisheries manages fishing in all State waters, including marine conservation reserves. Fisheries management outside the reserves is important in relation to managing fish stocks inside the reserves.
250.	The use of the phrase 'not unacceptably impacted' in the Management Objectives is qualitative and subjective: 'not detectably impacted' would be more appropriate. (1 submission)	No (2e)	While management objectives are qualitative, performance measures and targets generally provide quantitative direction for management.
251.	Objectives should say 'sustainability' and not 'no impact' and that sustainable practices may leave some observable changes, particularly in high use areas. (1 submission)	No (2d)	The Management Objective refers to 'no unacceptable impact'. Management targets clarify the acceptable levels of impact in different zones of the reserves.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
252.	Seek to increase populations of target species. (1 submission)	Yes (1e)	The plan stated that there should be no loss of protected finfish species abundance throughout the reserves, and that the abundance and size composition of finfish species in sanctuary zones and conservation areas. The management targets have been reworded to clarify that the abundance of fish species in no fishing areas should be at natural levels, which may mean that abundance needs to be increased to regain natural levels where abundance has been reduced through historical fishing activities. Areas subject to recreational fishing will be determined in collaboration with the Department of Fisheries.
253.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	The use of 'positive' as a desired trend for the abundance and/or diversity of particular ecological values only refers to instances where existing abundances and/or diversity are likely to be below the desired 'natural' level.
254.	If there is a need to protect species further (than current fisheries management regimes) then justification comprising scientific data and research should be provided to all user groups. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Scientific information is available. Notwithstanding this, the plan will direct management for the next ten years so needs to be precautionary given the likely increase in usage. The plan includes strategies to undertake research to characterise the diversity and abundance of finfish in the reserves, identify species needing further protection, identify spawning sites and quantify by-catch.
255.	Non-target species will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Plan outlines research and monitoring strategies linked to performance measures.
256.	One of the key results of the heavy fishing pressure observed in parts of the Ningaloo Marine Park is a reduction in the mean size of target species. The management strategies presented in the draft management plan are wholly inadequate, and fail to address the key aspects of finfish management for the area. Some hard decisions need to be made to sustainably manage finfish in the area, and a comprehensive education program must back this up. (1 submission)	No (2d)	The plan is not a detailed prescription for the management of exploited fish species. Rather, the management plan details strategies that relate more to the conservation implications of fishing. The Department of Fisheries is responsible for management of fish stocks in the park.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
257.	The target of 'no loss' of target species in sanctuary zones seems a little conservative. Suggest an additional long-term target of increased biomass, diversity and mean size of finfish within sanctuary zones compared to the present, and to comparable non-sanctuary zones. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to reflect this.
258.	Objectives, strategies and targets are inadequate if the plan wants to manage spatial extraction of fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan is not a fisheries management plan.
259.	Objectives - what is an acceptable impact? Evaluated across park or in sanctuary zones? Need a hierarchical set of objectives for within and outside sanctuary zones. Need research to evaluate such approaches. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Objective to be read in conjunction with targets to determine acceptable impact.
260.	Strategies cannot address the objectives unless there is a priority to address the different fish responses expected in different zones. Long-term targets need to be specified by zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Long-term management targets outline the responses expected in different management zones.
261.	Spatial comparisons of fish populations should be a KMS. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Research to characterise the diversity and abundance of fish in the reserves is a KMS.
262.	Bag limits must be policed. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The Department of Fisheries enforces fishing regulations in all State waters, including marine conservation reserves. The plan indicates that CALM rangers can also be cross-authorised for this purpose.
263.	Strong independent research is required to effectively determine sustainable harvest of target fish species. Need to know sustainable levels of take for each target fish species. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Plan includes a strategy to determine level of acceptable take of target species in collaboration with the Department of Fisheries.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
264.	It should be the absolute highest priority of this management plan to initiate research into the impacts (direct and indirect) of fishing pressure upon the Ningaloo Reef ecosystem. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to include a strategy in Section 7.1.4 to undertake research on the effects of fishing on the coral reef system.
265.	The strategy to manage recreational fishing should also include compliance and research on ecological effects as well as measures to ensure sustainable management. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies in regard to compliance, research in ecological effects of fishing and research and monitoring of fish abundances.
<b>Invertebrates</b>			
266.	Agree with objective. <b>(252 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
267.	Disagree with objective. <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
268.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
269.	Agree with the assessment that knowledge of invertebrates is poor. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
270.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The use of 'positive' as a desired trend for the abundance and/or diversity of particular ecological values only refers to instances where existing abundances and/or diversity are likely to be below the desired 'natural' level.
271.	Will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan outlines research requirements, which are linked to performance measures.
272.	Need to enhance fisheries management with regard to invertebrates in the reserves. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to determine management targets for targeted invertebrates and quantify and possibly reduce fisheries by-catch of invertebrates.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
273.	Invertebrate populations in the reserves should not be described as being in an 'undisturbed' condition due to fishing and collecting. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to include anecdotal evidence of decreases in shell and lobster populations.
274.	Trophic cascades in regard to invertebrates need to be investigated. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes a strategy to undertake research to characterise invertebrate diversity, distribution and abundance in the reserves.
275.	Strategies cannot address the objectives unless there is a priority to address the different invertebrate responses expected in different zones. Long-term targets need to be specified by zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Long-term management targets outline responses expected in different management zones.
276.	Spatial comparisons of invertebrate populations should be a KMS. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Research to characterise the diversity, distribution and abundance of invertebrates in the reserves is a KMS.
277.	Research on benthic invertebrate communities should be expanded to examine benthic-pelagic coupling with particular focus on finfish. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	This issue is addressed as part of a new research strategy:
<b>Sharks and rays</b>			
278.	Agree with objective. <b>(269 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
279.	Disagree with objective. <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
280.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
281.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The use of 'positive' as a desired trend for the abundance and/or diversity of particular ecological values only refers to instances where existing abundances and/or diversity are likely to be below the desired 'natural' level.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
282.	Will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan outlines research requirements, which are linked to performance measures.
283.	Strategies cannot address the objectives unless there is a priority to address the different shark and ray responses expected in different zones. Long-term targets need to be specified by zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Long-term management targets outline the required end points for the management zones.
284.	Spatial comparisons of shark and ray populations should be a KMS. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Research to characterise the diversity and abundance of sharks and rays in the reserves is a KMS.
285.	Support management strategies 1 and 5 (p 47). <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
286.	Support for the objectives, strategies and targets for this value. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
287.	Shark aggregations have been identified as potentially at risk from visitor interference. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Strategies in the plan will identify ecological values at risk from human activities. Detailed site management will be implemented, where appropriate, to mitigate these risks.
288.	Undertake research to improve understanding of shark and ray movement patterns (both spatial and temporal) in the park and determine the adequacy of sanctuary zones in providing protection across their range <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The comments are adequately addressed under two existing strategies.
<b>Whale sharks</b>			
289.	Agree with objective and targets. <b>(269 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
290.	Disagree with objective. <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
291.	There is no impact from human interaction with whale sharks. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	Boating activity and commercial interaction tours are listed as existing and potential impacts on whale sharks.
292.	Laws are already in place for interaction <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	The <i>Whale Shark Interaction Management Plan</i> details whale shark management in the reserves, and commercial interaction tours operate under a code of conduct.
293.	The whale shark interaction industry appears to be effectively managed. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
294.	Support for the objectives and strategies in the plan. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
295.	Observation can educate without causing harm. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
296.	Wildlife interaction needs to be closely monitored. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
297.	Concern that interaction activity will impact on whale sharks. <b>(8 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Boating activity and commercial interaction tours are listed as existing and potential pressures on whale sharks. The <i>Whale Shark Interaction Management Plan</i> details management of these species and commercial whale shark tours operate under a code of conduct.
298.	Short-term and long-term targets for whale sharks could be included. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes management targets for whale sharks.
299.	The long-term target only reflects population abundance and provides no measure of behavioural responses by whale sharks to interactive activities. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to include a strategy to continue to monitor whale shark reaction to nature-based tourism activities.
300.	An education program should be considered to target private boat owners. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	This will be considered as part of the overall education program.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
301.	Substantial non-interaction areas for whale sharks should be established, possibly in the vicinity of Point Cloates. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to include this as a possible future management option should the existing management approach not be effective.
302.	The incidence of non-commercial interactions and boat strikes should be investigated. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Non-commercial interactions are currently considered to be a relatively minor management issue.
303.	Studies of wildlife interaction tourism impacts should be independent of CALM, as CALM benefits from licensing operators. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Research on wildlife interaction tourism impacts will be carried out by a variety of groups, including CALM staff and tertiary institutions.
304.	The management objective can only be attained if people are banned from area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The plan aims to sustainably manage boating and interactive activities in proximity to whale sharks in the reserves.
305.	Undertake research on the migratory patterns of whale sharks and improve knowledge of whale shark behaviour and physiology determining their movement patterns through the water column. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
306.	Undertake biological oceanographic research to establish the relationship of spatial and temporal patterns in biophysical variables (e.g. temperature, nutrients, phytoplankton, zooplankton) to whale shark aggregation and migration. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
307.	Undertake research to determine the behavioural response of whale sharks to tourism activities over time. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
<b>Manta rays</b>			
308.	Agree with objective. <b>(270 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
309.	Disagree with objective. (33 submissions)	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
310.	There is no impact from human interaction with manta rays. (3 submissions)	No (2b)	Boating activity and commercial and recreational activities are listed as existing and potential pressures on manta rays. The actual impact, if any, has yet to be clearly determined.
311.	Interaction will always result in some disturbance. (4 submissions)	No (2d)	The plan refers to potential impacts caused by interaction activity. Commercial operators apply a voluntary code of conduct to manta ray interaction tours.
312.	Laws are already in place for interaction (2 submissions)	No (2b)	Manta rays are protected from fishing under the <i>Fish Resource Management Act</i> , however the legislation is not sufficient to manage interaction operations.
313.	Observation can educate without causing harm. (1 submission)	No (2b)	No change sought.
314.	The assessments and management objectives, strategies and targets appear sound. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
315.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
316.	CALM should have an interaction policy for manta rays, and all fauna subject to tourism interaction. (1 submission)	No (2d)	The plan includes a strategy to develop a code of conduct for manta ray interaction.
317.	The management objective can only be attained if people are banned from area. (1 submission)	No (2e)	The plan aims to sustainably manage boating and interactive activities in proximity to manta rays in the reserves.
318.	The strategy 'Undertake community education programs, compliance monitoring and liaison with commercial operators...' has the lowest priority. This should be remedied in the final draft. (3 submissions)	Yes (1d)	The priority for this strategy has been changed to a 'medium' priority.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
319.	Support research into the ecology of manta rays, with a particular focus on feeding ecology, distribution and aggregations. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	An existing management strategy proposes studies on the ecology of manta rays.
320.	Undertake research into the genetic diversity of manta rays. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	This issue is not currently considered to be a management priority.
<b>Whales and dolphins</b>			
321.	Agree with objective. <b>(269 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
322.	Disagree with objective. <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
323.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
324.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The use of 'positive' as a desired trend for the abundance of cetaceans refers to the fact that many populations are still recovering after having been massively depleted by whaling.
325.	Will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan outlines research requirements, which are linked to performance measures.
326.	Power vessels follow and harass whales. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	This issue is addressed through notices under the Wildlife Conservation Act.
327.	The assessments and management objectives, strategies and targets for this value appear sound. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
328.	Undertake research to improve understanding of the importance of the region to whale population demographics and ecology. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
329.	Undertake research to investigate the behavioural response of whales to nature-based activities such as whale watching and determine the adequacy of management activities in minimising disturbance from human activities. (2 submissions)	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
<b>Turtles</b>			
330.	Agree with objective. (269 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
331.	Disagree with objective. (33 submissions)	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
332.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. (4 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
333.	The assessments and management objectives, strategies and targets for this value appear sound. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
334.	Nesting turtles and hatchlings are vulnerable and should be given high conservation priority. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	Various education, monitoring and research and coastal management strategies in the plan will protect nesting turtles and hatchlings, and contribute to turtle conservation in general.
335.	While aiming to manage impacts caused by human activity, the plan should not aim to increase natural populations. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	The use of 'positive' as a desired trend for the number of nesting turtles refers to the fact that populations have been depleted by feral animals and/or hunting.
336.	The number of nesting turtles as a performance indicator is more appropriate as a long-term target whereas nest disturbance is more realistic for achieving short-term targets. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Nest disturbance is a performance measure for turtles.
337.	High numbers of turtles makes fishing at Mildura Wreck Reef difficult. (1 submission)	No (2b)	No change sought.



	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
338.	The peak nesting period for marine turtles is between December and March (see page 56, paragraph 2). <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended to reflect the comment.
339.	Will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan outlines research requirements, which are linked to performance measures.
340.	Significant disturbance of turtle nests could be stopped by banning vehicles from nesting beaches. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes a strategy to identify environmentally sensitive coastal areas of the reserves and prohibit vehicle access where necessary in Section 7.2.7 (Coastal use).
341.	Concern that the proposed increase in sanctuary zones is insufficient to protect critical turtle habitat. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are not the only method employed to protect turtles and important turtle habitat. Various education, monitoring and research and coastal management strategies in the plan will also contribute to turtle conservation.
342.	Request that ‘current pressure from indigenous hunting in the region is believed to be minimal’ be amended to ‘current pressure from indigenous hunting in the region is minimal’. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended accordingly.
343.	Suggest a strategy that addresses litter-related mortality of marine animals. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Litter is not currently considered to represent a significant pressure on marine animals in the reserves.
<b>Dugong</b>			
344.	Agree with objective. <b>(269 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
345.	Disagree with objective. <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
346.	The abundance and distribution of all species should be protected. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
347.	The proposal is the minimum required to protect dugongs. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
348.	Will require comprehensive research linked to performance measures. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan outlines research requirements, which are linked to performance measures.
349.	The assessments and management objectives, strategies and targets for this value appear sound. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
350.	Support research on the movement of dugongs through the reserves and their habitat requirements in this area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes a strategy to undertake research to better understand dugong population, distribution and habitat requirements in the reserves.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
<b>Social Objectives (general)</b>			
351.	Social objectives should be secondary to environmental protection, allowing only those activities that do not impact on the environment <b>(32 submissions)</b>	No (2d/2f)	The plan provides for a range of activities and includes strategies to ensure they are sustainable and consistent with conservation objectives and the purpose of the reserves. Marine parks and marine management areas are multiple use areas.
352.	Social objectives can be achieved without placing blanket bans on activities in popular areas. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The plan does not institute 'blanket bans' on most access or activities. Certain activities are restricted in particular zones to achieve management objectives. Prohibiting all access or activities would not be consistent with the multiple-use policy of marine reserve management.
353.	Social objectives and the protection of the Ningaloo experience for future generations can be achieved with minimum restrictions. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan details management regimes that ensure the Ningaloo experience can still be enjoyed, while ensuring use of the area is environmentally sustainable.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
354.	Activities should be managed equitably, but the meaning of the word 'equitable' needs to be clear. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
355.	The plan must include management and organisational strategies, in particular with respect to education and enforcement and the resources to implement these. <b>(7 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan details a management framework, performance measures and targets, and education strategies to achieve objectives. The Marine Parks and Reserves Authority audits performance with respect to these goals.
356.	Access needs to be appropriately managed. <b>(7 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	The plan provides for ongoing sustainable and equitable use of the reserve.
357.	Public stewardship should be encouraged. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for plan. Section 8.6 details public participation to engender community ownership of the reserve.
358.	Commercial activities should not occur in the marine reserves, or if they do, should be low impact recreational activities. <b>(9 submissions)</b>	No (2f)	Government policy allows for sustainable multiple use in marine parks and marine management areas. This may include a range of commercial activities that are not considered to be 'low impact'.
359.	Increasing visitor numbers need to be managed. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
360.	Specific objectives are needed if the marine reserves are to be effectively managed. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. The plan details specific management objectives for maintenance of the reserves.
361.	Protection of Ningaloo as a marine reserve and the promotion of nature appreciation will deliver both conservation and economic benefits. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	Support for the plan.
362.	Support for the breadth of social values considered. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
<b>Indigenous heritage</b>			
363.	Ningaloo is of cultural and spiritual significance to	No (2a)	Support for the plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	indigenous people. <b>(2 submissions)</b>		
364.	It is important to preserve the cultural and indigenous heritage of this wilderness area because of its value to the community and/or because indigenous heritage is irreplaceable. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
365.	There has already been destruction of aboriginal cave art. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	These areas are outside the boundary of the marine reserves.
366.	Indigenous people and the Department of Indigenous Affairs should be involved in the interpretation of indigenous history in the area and in the development of education strategies relating to indigenous issues <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to involve local indigenous groups in educating reserve visitors about indigenous heritage.
367.	The area should be placed under aboriginal management. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2f)	Marine reserves are managed by CALM under the CALM Act, however the plan includes strategies for indigenous involvement in the management of the reserves.
368.	Coastal management strategies need to consider impacts on aboriginal heritage sites as protected under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> . <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to protect aboriginal heritage sites.
369.	The background section needs to be amended to more accurately reflect the marine reserves' indigenous values. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to reflect this change.
370.	Access for indigenous people needs to be maintained <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan supports ongoing access and maintenance of the area.
371.	There should be no camping on the Muiron Islands unless it is for traditional purposes. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	Outside the scope of the plan.
372.	There should be training for indigenous people to support	No (2d)	The plan supports ongoing management by and participation of Aboriginal people.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
	employment within the marine reserves. <b>(1 submission)</b>		
373.	Indigenous take of rare species, such as dugong and turtles, should not be allowed. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2f)	Existing legislation permits indigenous take of dugong and turtles. The number of these species taken by indigenous people in the reserves is currently small and the plan has strategies to ensure this activity is sustainable.
374.	Indigenous heritage is not an appropriate value as there should not be special consideration for any particular group. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Indigenous heritage is one of the social values of the reserves and, as such, is addressed in the plan. Involvement of indigenous groups is an important aspect of management and is consistent with Government policy.
<b>Maritime heritage</b>			
<b>Seascapes</b>			
375.	Agree with objective (preserve the wilderness and aesthetic values that are an integral part of the 'Ningaloo experience'). <b>(256 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
376.	Disagree with objective (preserve the wilderness and aesthetic values that are an integral part of the 'Ningaloo experience'). <b>(23 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
377.	The 'seascape' value should be maintained in its current condition. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Seascape targets in the plan aim to minimise degradation of the seascape and maintain the amenity value of selected seascapes in the reserve, recognising that the popularity of the area will lead to some changes.
378.	The Ningaloo Sustainable Development Office should be included along with LGA's as a responsible body. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to included NSDO as a responsible agency, where appropriate.
<b>Wilderness</b>			

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
379.	Agree with objective. (preserve the wilderness and aesthetic values that are an integral part of the 'Ningaloo experience'). <b>(256 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
380.	Disagree with objective (preserve the wilderness and aesthetic values that are an integral part of the 'Ningaloo experience'). <b>(23 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
381.	The 'wilderness' value should be maintained in its current condition. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Wilderness targets in the plan aim to designate wilderness areas and maintain the amenity value of these designated areas.
382.	Wilderness is the most important of the social values. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Wilderness has been identified as an important social value within the marine reserves.
383.	Wilderness <i>per se</i> is of little value if people are excluded or fishing is stopped. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	A wide range of uses is supported in the marine reserves and these are consistent with also maintaining wilderness values.
384.	Wilderness values have already been eroded, particularly along coastal areas through current and proposed infrastructure including car parks, toilet blocks and pine log barriers. <b>(7 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The multiple use nature of marine reserves in Western Australia means that, in addition to supporting wilderness values, there will be some areas that are dedicated to the infrastructure required to support reserve visitation.
385.	Human activity must be managed to ensure wilderness values are not destroyed. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The management strategies in the plan were developed to ensure sustainability.
386.	Further detail should be provided as to the short and long-term targets for access to the Ningaloo coast. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Levels of land-based access will be determined through a 'level of acceptable change' as per strategies associated with ecological values and 'wilderness' targets.
387.	An additional strategy ensuring regular consultation between the MPRA and the Ningaloo Sustainable Development Office in the future sustainable tourism development of the Ningaloo coast is recommended. It is recommended that the Ningaloo Sustainable Development	Yes (1c)	The plan has been amended to include NSDO as a responsible agency for each strategy. An additional strategy regarding consultation is not required as the need for collaborative management is emphasised throughout the plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	Office be included as a relevant agency in the three associated strategies. <b>(1 submission)</b>		
388.	The term 'remote' should be used rather than 'wilderness' to be consistent with the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> and given the majority of the land has been used for pastoral purposes and so is technically not a wilderness. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The term 'wilderness' is still considered the most appropriate term for the plan.
389.	The background section should include more detail on the coastal tourism framework as reflected in the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> , particularly the remote and semi-remote coastal sectors along the Ningaloo coast. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The background section has been amended accordingly.
390.	The <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> does not give due consideration to protection of wilderness values and the management plan must address the fact that the tourism development nodes along the coast will undermine this value. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan incorporates strategies, including liaison with appropriate stakeholders to ensure that tourism develops sustainably.
391.	Wilderness value needs to be preserved, but this cannot be achieved in popular locations. A wilderness area in the southern extension around Cape Farquahar would be appropriate and help encourage long-term shifts in community attitudes towards catching a feed only. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to identify key wilderness areas of the reserves.
<b>Water sports</b>			
392.	Agree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(195 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
393.	Disagree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(83</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	<b>submissions)</b>		
394.	Agree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(246 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
395.	Disagree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(31 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
396.	There needs to be additional management of activities such as snorkelling, diving and anchoring that damage reefs. <b>(7 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The management plan includes a range of education strategies to minimise environmental impacts from these sources. The plan also recommends ongoing site recreational planning to manage ongoing use. Restrictions on activities, boating etc may be implemented where necessary during the life of the plan.
397.	The plan should reflect the moratorium on boat launching facilities recommended in the <i>Ningaloo Coast Regional Strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> and the continued implementation of the Coral Bay Boating Strategy. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The plan includes strategies to determine the appropriate level of infrastructure in liaison with key stakeholders.
398.	The potential impacts of a wide range of activities, particularly those involving motorised water craft, needs to be considered with respect to the reserves as a whole, other users and sanctuary zones. <b>(17 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	A recreation master plan will be developed for the whole of the reserves, with particular attention given to possible user conflict in areas of high recreation use. This plan will consider a range of boating issues, such as anchoring and mooring.
399.	Red Bluff is an internationally significant surfing destination and its use for this activity should continue. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The marine reserves proposal allows for a range of sustainable uses of the reserves, including surfing.
400.	The potential negative impacts of surfing need to be managed. There is a need for appropriate infrastructure, such as sewage provision, track hardening, restricting vehicular access etc, to alleviate impacts from surfing. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	All coastal users, not only surfers, have the potential to impact on coastal communities. The plan includes strategies to minimise such damage.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
<b>Marine nature-based tourism</b>			
401.	Agree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(194 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
402.	Disagree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(83 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
403.	Agree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(252 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
404.	Disagree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(31 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
405.	The study on human use at Ningaloo referred to in the plan is incorrect: at least 90% of people who travel to Exmouth by road intend to fish as well as pursue other activities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Independent researchers at Ningaloo undertook the study referred to in the plan.
406.	Tourism (snorkelling and diving) can be a valuable economic activity and ecotourism is supported. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Environmentally sustainable use of the reserves is promoted throughout the plan.
407.	All boating should be stopped with the exception of some charter operations. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Restriction of boating in the reserves would only be undertaken where its level is found to be incompatible with other uses. In this instance, zoning and regulations would be used to separate incompatible activities.
408.	Management of tourism needs to become more stringent given numbers of tourists keep increasing. <b>(10 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan recognises that tourism to the area will increase. The plan details site planning and licensing that will facilitate sustainable tourism management.
409.	Exmouth relies heavily on tourism and the marine reserves will have a negative impact on the local economy. <b>(21 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Tourism relies on the maintenance of the reserves' values. There is likely to be significant economic benefits by protecting these values. Recreational fishing is

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	<b>submissions)</b>		still permitted in most of the reserves (70%), so it is unlikely that visitation will fall as a result of the new management scheme.
410.	Tour operators need to be monitored. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	All commercial operators on CALM managed lands and waters require a licence to operate, the conditions of which include reporting requirements.
411.	Coral viewing boats have little or no impact on marine values. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	This activity, like other ecotourism activities, will be managed to ensure sustainability.
412.	The draft management plan carefully considers the management requirements given the projected increase in visitor numbers to the reserves over the next 10 years. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
413.	Tourism WA has identified Ningaloo Reef as the most important iconic experience in WA as part of their Destination Development Strategy. The value of directly related tourism activities in the area equated to ~\$127m into WA's economy. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
414.	Tourism WA research suggests that divers accept the management plan and support sanctuary zones and that charter fishing operators generally believed the changes would cause minimal disruption to existing operations and little or no increase in costs. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
415.	The plan is consistent with Tourism WA's focus on developing sustainable nature-based eco tourism activities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
416.	The management plan has been based on very little research and the Woods and Dowling study (2002) is flawed. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The Woods and Dowling report was only one of several information sources considered during the planning process.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
417.	Commercial tours etc should be restricted to existing levels so as not to adversely effect the environment. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes a number of strategies to ensure sustainability of commercial tourism activities, including an evaluation of the scale of the activity.
418.	The plan should identify the need for the preparation of a recreation and tourism strategy/master plan that acknowledges the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> , with a particular focus on the management and tenure of coastal camping (including beach camping). <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to make reference to recreation and tourism site planning.
419.	There is a need for codes of conduct to be established for industries interacting with iconic megafauna to ensure those industries remain sustainable. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	A number of codes of conduct currently exist for interaction with megafauna. The plan includes strategies to develop additional codes of conduct where necessary.
420.	Commercial operators should not gain sole access to areas at the expense of independent users. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan clearly indicates that access to the reserves is to be equitable.
421.	More infrastructure will be needed to accommodate increasing numbers of visitors. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	This issue is beyond the scope of the plan.
422.	No more commercial/residential development on the west coast of North West Cape. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	This issue is beyond the scope of the plan.
423.	Strict regulations on boating are necessary to ensure there is no damage to the coral reefs through fuel discharges or by dropping anchors. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to ensure that boating activities do not damage the marine environment.
<b>Coastal use</b>			
424.	Agree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(194 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
425.	Disagree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(83 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
426.	Agree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(245 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
427.	Disagree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(31 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
428.	CALM needs to look at the Carnarvon-Ningaloo Coast Strategy and work closely with DPI to ensure that visitor numbers and impacts are ecologically sustainable. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan provides for collaborative management with other relevant agencies.
429.	Access for camping and the unique nature of camping at Ningaloo need to be maintained. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Coastal camping is planned and/or managed by various groups, including CALM, local governments, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and pastoralists. The <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> provides an overall framework for coastal use and development. This framework provides for a range of camping opportunities along the coast.
430.	Camping should be reduced and/or only day use be allowed. <b>(19 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Coastal camping is planned and/or managed by various groups, including CALM, local governments, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and pastoralists. The <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> provides an overall framework for coastal use and development. This framework provides for a range of camping opportunities along the coast.
431.	Camping facilities need to be increased. <b>(13 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Coastal camping is planned and/or managed by various groups, including CALM, local governments, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and pastoralists. The <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> provides an overall framework for coastal use and development. This framework provides for a range of camping opportunities along the coast.
432.	Camping outside of the Cape Range should be managed by	No (2d)	Coastal camping is planned and/or managed by various groups, including CALM,

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	station owners. <b>(1 submission)</b>		local governments, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and pastoralists. The <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> provides an overall framework for coastal use and development. This framework provides for a range of camping opportunities along the coast.
433.	The use of all terrain vehicles should cease in terrestrial environments adjacent to sanctuary zones because of the impacts on fauna and flora. Commercial vehicle tours should not be permitted in these areas. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to limit access to sensitive areas of the reserves and to prohibit vehicular access to sensitive coastal areas where appropriate.
434.	CALM needs to look at the Carnarvon-Ningaloo Coast Strategy and work closely with the Department for Planning and Infrastructure to ensure that visitor numbers and impacts are ecologically sustainable. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan provides for collaborative management with other relevant agencies.
435.	Particular attention needs to be paid to coastal dune erosion, particularly in high use areas such as Turquoise Bay. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to deal with coastal erosion and to identify key sites requiring remediation.
436.	Proper management will ensure long term access for coastal activities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	Support for the plan.
437.	The coastal camping node of Shack Beach has been renamed Horse Paddock. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to reflect the name change.
438.	Consultation and cooperation between the NMP and the NSDO is encouraged to further address beach, dispersed and coastal camping assessment as part of the implementation of both the management plan and <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> . <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to include NSDO as a responsible agency for implementation of strategies.
439.	Existing, environmentally sustainable campsites within the 40m zone from high water mark could be compromised by	No (2d)	Legal and sustainable camping is permitted within the 40m coastal strip.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	the proposals within the plan. <b>(1 submission)</b>		
440.	Coastal use activities such as shoreline fishing and reef walking need to be managed to ensure they do not cause damage. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to monitor impacts of human activities and indicates that detailed site planning may be appropriate in some sensitive areas of high use.
441.	Current overnight accommodation in the Cape Range National Park is heavily biased to motor homes/caravans with little provision for light-weight/low impact camping (tent, swag). <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	This issue is outside the scope of the plan. The Cape Range National Park Management Plan addresses management regimes for camping in the National Park.
442.	Firewood collection should be prohibited. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The management of firewood collecting is addressed through management of recreational nodes in the coastal strip.
443.	Access for 4WD vehicles requires attention further detail including reference to the coastal access network detailed in the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> . <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	This issue is outside the scope of the plan.
<b>Recreational fishing</b>			
444.	Agree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(194 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
445.	Disagree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(83 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
446.	Agree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(246 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
447.	Disagree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(31 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
448.	Recreational fishing should not be permitted or should be significantly restricted in the reserves. <b>(17 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones will provide areas free of all extractive activity.
449.	Recreational (beach) fishing should be allowed to continue in the reserves. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Under this proposal the majority of the reserves' beaches remain open for recreational shore-based fishing.
450.	Recreational fishing is sustainable and there is no evidence of overfishing by recreational fishers. <b>(47 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan is one of a suite of tools that will help ensure that recreational fishing remains sustainable.
451.	Recreational fishing has an environmental impact and overfishing is a concern. <b>(14 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	The plan includes a number of strategies to ensure that recreational fishing is and remains sustainable.
452.	Existing bag and possession limits are sufficient and/or would be sufficient if they were enforced. <b>(14 submissions)</b>	No (2f)	Bag and possession limits are determined by the Department of Fisheries.
453.	Bag limits should be reduced or need to be reconsidered, particularly for boat-based fishing. <b>(20 submissions)</b>	No (2f)	Bag and possession limits are determined by the Department of Fisheries.
454.	Netting should be restricted or prohibited. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2f)	Restrictions on netting are controlled by the Department of Fisheries. Netting is currently restricted to specific sites in the marine park.
455.	The area needs to be protected from anchor damage. <b>(7 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to educate people with respect to appropriate anchoring in order to avoid damage. However, if ongoing significant damage to coral occurs, the plan allows for designation of specific no anchoring areas and, where appropriate, moorings.
456.	Spearfishing is a very selective form of fishing and bag limits may need to be revised; it may be appropriate to ban spearfishing. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The Department of Fisheries manages bag and possession limits for all recreational fishing activities to ensure sustainability. Under separate regulations, there are currently restrictions on spearfishing in the reserves.
457.	Spearfishing on air should be banned rather than all spearfishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	No distinction is made between these forms of spearfishing for management purposes.
458.	Spearfishers should not be singled out from other	No (2d)	The existing restricted area for spearfishing (i.e. between Tantabiddi Creek and

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	recreational fishers with respect to additional restrictions. <b>(11 submissions)</b>		Winderabandi Point) remains in place. The only additional restriction relates to the special purpose (shore-based activities) zones, where all fishing except for shore-based line fishing is prohibited.
459.	Total recreational fish catch should be reduced by reducing the long term stay to a maximum of 14 days. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Outside the scope of the plan.
460.	There should not be fishing competitions and/or promotion of reserves as a fishing paradise. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Marine reserves support multiple use activities and this includes sustainable recreational fishing when sustainable.
461.	Maintaining fish stocks will maintain tourist numbers. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes a number of strategies to ensure conservation of fish populations.
462.	Recreational fishers should be encouraged to only catch what they need, and barbless hooks should be used at all times. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The Department of Fisheries is responsible for regulating fishing activity, including setting bag limits and restrictions on the use of particular fishing gear.
463.	Fishing brings significant economic returns to Exmouth. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Recreational fishing is acknowledged as an important social value in the marine reserves.
464.	The inclusion of managed recreation zones within the reserves is supported. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Recreation zones are proposed in the park.
465.	Alternatives to sanctuary zones have not been considered with respect to managing recreational fishing. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2c)	The primary purpose of sanctuary zones is the conservation of marine biodiversity rather than fisheries management. The Department of Fisheries uses a range of strategies to manage recreational fishing.
466.	Access for elderly beach fishers needs to be improved. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes a number of strategies to ensure equitable access to the reserves.
467.	There is a large catch and release component in recreational fishing and the plan should reflect the significant change in attitudes by many recreational anglers, where the fishing experience is much more important than the retained catch.	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to note an increase in catch and release fishing.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	<b>(1 submission)</b>		
468.	In order to maintain catch history data, it is important that tagging programs for game fish are continued in traditional fishing areas. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Game fishing continues in the majority of the waters of the reserves. Northern sanctuary zones in particular do not extend seaward in order to allow game fishing to continue.
469.	Recreational anglers are the largest group of visitors to the area and are an essential and integral part of the area's economy. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Recreational fishing is identified as a key social value of the reserves.
470.	Seaward extensions to existing sanctuary zones should be amended to allow pelagic fishing while prohibiting demersal fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to include a special purpose (benthic protection) zone adjacent to Mandu sanctuary zone, in which trolling by recreational fishers is permitted.
471.	There is no evidence that recreational fishing is inconsistent with the document's vision statement. Recreational fishing is effectively managed under fisheries management, does not affect biodiversity, and is ecologically sustainable. <b>(16 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Recreational fishing is supported in the majority of the reserves area. It is worth noting that recent research indicates possible ecosystem changes caused by removal of emperors by recreational fishing outside sanctuary zones.
472.	Recreational catch and effort should be monitored. Bag and size limits are useful to preserve certain aspects of fish populations, such as minimum or maximum sizes. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. The Department of Fisheries is responsible for regulating size and bag limits in the reserves.
473.	The management plan needs to address damage caused by private boating and recreational fishing as opposed to focusing on tour operators that are already governed by licences <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies for educating users about damage to the marine environment, monitoring of impacts of usage, and where appropriate, detailed site planning to minimise user conflict and environmental damage.
474.	Shore based recreational fishing zones should be created in at least a 200 m strip from the shoreline. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Special purpose (shore-based activities) zones allow recreational fishing for a distance of 100m seaward of the shore.
475.	Support for stock enhancement using cultured fishes. <b>(1</b>	No (2e)	Fisheries management is carried out by the Department of Fisheries. There is

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	<b>submission)</b>		currently no justification for stock enhancement of fishes in the reserves.
476.	Should be able to spearfish reef fish in the southern extension areas using existing bag limits. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. Spearfishing is permitted in the southern extension of the park, except in sanctuary zones.
477.	Research should be undertaken to investigate the effects of recreational aquarium collecting on the reef ecology. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Recreational collecting is not permitted in the Ningaloo Marine Park.
478.	Research should be undertaken to: 'Model the impacts of recreational fishing, assuming a range of future management trajectories' and 'Understand trophic cascades and the ecosystem effects of fishing under different protection strategies (i.e. zoning)'. <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2d)	Such studies will be considered under the broader research strategy.
<b>Scientific research</b>			
479.	Agree with objective (promote education, public participation and scientific research). <b>(265 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
480.	Disagree with objective (promote education, public participation and scientific research). <b>(19 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
481.	A detailed assessment is needed with respect to the value of the current sanctuary zones in meeting the objectives of the Ningaloo marine reserves. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Government has committed five million dollars (2005-2009) to research in the Ningaloo Marine reserves, which will include research into the effectiveness of sanctuary zones. The plan details research strategies throughout.
482.	Research initiatives should be linked to the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> . <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
483.	A comprehensive database of research being undertaken within the reserves needs to be established. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	The plan includes a strategy in Section 8.4 to maintain a database of current and historical research in the reserves.
484.	Research proposals need to be evaluated to ensure the	No (2d)	Permits from CALM are required to conduct research in marine conservation

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
485.	research does not cause damage <b>(1 submission)</b>  Review of the text in the plan to clarify: (a) what the plan means in regard to research as opposed to scientific research; (b) when references to research are made, whether the plan is referring to research needed for management or as a legitimate purpose of the reserves. Planning instruments concern the scientific community in two principal ways (a) as contributors to the planning and management process and (b) as legitimate users. Research includes but is not synonymous with scientific research. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	reserves.  The plan has been amended to change objectives.
<b>Education</b>			
486.	Agree with objective (promote education, public participation and scientific research). <b>(264 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
487.	Disagree with objective (promote education, public participation and scientific research). <b>(19 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
488.	Use outcomes from research to inform and enhance education programs and to increase awareness. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes a strategy in Section 8.4 to maintain a database of current and historical research in the reserves.
<b>Commercial fishing</b>			
489.	Agree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(193 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
490.	Disagree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(83 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
491.	Agree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(246 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
492.	Disagree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(31 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
493.	Commercial fishing in Exmouth Gulf should be banned, as it is an important nursery area. Aquaculture should be promoted. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The Department of Fisheries is responsible for ensuring the sustainability of commercial fishing and promotion of aquaculture.
494.	Commercial fishing should be limited or not permitted in the reserves <b>(42 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Marine reserves are multiple use areas and sustainable commercial fishing is supported.
495.	Commercial fishing depletes stocks of both target and nontarget species. <b>(10 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The Department of Fisheries manages commercial fishing, and this activity is restricted in the reserves. Commercial fishing is only permitted in some areas of general use zones. The plan includes specific strategies to ensure the sustainability of commercial fishing.
496.	CALM should focus on banning commercial trawling to protect the sponges and soft corals that are being damaged in Exmouth Gulf. <b>(16 submissions)</b>	No (2f)	The Department of Fisheries manages commercial fishing, and this activity is restricted in the reserves. Commercial fishing is only permitted in some areas of general use zones.
497.	There are currently no limits on commercial fishers. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	The Department of Fisheries manages commercial fishing, and this activity is restricted in the reserves. Commercial fishing is only permitted in some areas of general use zones.
498.	Aquarium collecting of coral, shells, rock or sand should not be permitted in the marine reserves. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Aquarium and specimen shell collecting will only be permitted in the reserves in some areas of general use zone, where the activity can be demonstrated to be ecologically sustainable within three years of reserve gazettal. Collection of coral, 'live' rock and 'live' sand will not be permitted in the reserves.
499.	Some elements (bag and boat limits) of the 'charter vessel fishing' industry operating in the Ningaloo Marine reserves are unsustainable, and this use should be urgently reviewed	No (2d)	Charter boat fishing is managed by the Department of Fisheries. The plan includes strategies for assessing sustainability of all fishing activities.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	for its sustainability. (2 submissions)		
500.	The collection of live rock and coral is sustainable (2 submissions)	No (2d)	MPRA have considered this issue and do not support the removal of live rock and coral that constitute 'habitat' from these reserves.
501.	Licensed aquarium collectors should be compensated given the additional restrictions on their collecting areas. (1 submission)	No (2d)	The <i>Fishing and Related Industries Compensation (Marine Reserve) Act 1997</i> provides the mechanism by which the holder of a Department of Fisheries authorisation for commercial fishing, aquaculture, pearling or fish processing operations may seek compensation if the commercial value of the authorisation is shown to be diminished by the establishment of a marine nature reserve, or exclusion zone in a marine reserves or marine management area.
502.	Commercial marine aquarium and specimen shell collecting should be treated in the same way as other commercial fisheries. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Commercial aquarium and specimen shell collecting, like other forms of commercial fishing, will only be permitted in general use zones of the reserves subject to this activity being demonstrated to be ecologically sustainable within three years of gazettal.
503.	Commercial fishing in the reserves should be monitored and the ecosystem impacts of extraction assessed. (1 submission)	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to conduct such research and monitoring.
504.	Ecologically sustainable fishing attained through integrated fishery management will do more to improve fish stocks than sanctuary zones. (1 submission)	No (2c)	The primary purpose of sanctuary zones is conservation of marine biodiversity rather than fisheries management. Whilst sanctuary zones will assist in stock management, primary strategies for the management of commercial fisheries are implemented by the Department of Fisheries.
505.	Commercial marine aquarium and specimen shell collecting can not be justified on the basis that other types of commercial fishing can occur in general use zones. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Commercial aquarium and specimen shell collecting will only be permitted in general use zones of the reserves subject to this activity being demonstrated to be ecologically sustainable within three years of gazettal.
506.	Aquaculture, and its introduction to Ningaloo Reef, is not mentioned in this section. This is a serious oversight. (3 submissions)	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to make reference to the <i>Gascoyne Aquaculture Development Plan</i> .

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
507.	The boundaries of the marine reserves should be adjusted to coincide with the boundary of the Exmouth Gulf Prawn Managed Fishery (i.e. Point Murat to South Muiron Islands). The current inshore sanctuaries would be retained in this proposal and further areas of interest that fall within the fishery could be renegotiated with the MPRA for possible inclusion in the marine reserves. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current boundaries are considered to be the best option.
508.	Strategies to manage commercial fishing should include compliance and research on ecological effects as well as measures to ensure sustainable management, such as monitoring fish abundance. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes such strategies to conduct research on ecological effects.
509.	The scale of collection for aquarium species needs to be monitored. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to monitor commercial catch in the reserves.
510.	The current scale of use for aquarium collecting in the reserves is not indicated. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan indicates that historically there has been no commercial aquarium and specimen shell collecting in the Ningaloo Marine Park.
511.	Commercial fishing should not be allowed in general use zones. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The plan provides for a wide range of sustainable activities in the reserves, including commercial fishing in general use zones north of Tantabiddi and south of Point Maud.
512.	Commercial rock lobster fishing should not be permitted in any area of the Ningaloo Marine Park. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Commercial rock lobster fishing is not permitted in any area of Ningaloo Marine Park.
513.	Commercial wet lining should not be permitted in any area of the Ningaloo Marine Park. Commercial wet lining compounds existing recreational fishing pressures and should be removed from the equation. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
514.	Commercial trawling should not be permitted in the general use zone east of North West Cape to afford protection for filter feeding and soft sediment benthic communities. <b>(2</b>	No (2d)	Current data suggests that trawling does not overlap with filter feeding communities. Sanctuary zones in Exmouth Gulf have been increased to better represent soft-sediment communities.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	<b>submissions)</b>		
515.	Fishing quotas need to be reduced. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The Department of Fisheries determines fishing quotas to ensure that commercial and recreational fishing is sustainable.
516.	Independent research is required to effectively determine sustainable harvest of target fish species. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to include a strategy to determine levels and effects of commercial fishing.
<b>Petroleum development</b>			
517.	Agree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(194 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
518.	Disagree with objective (allow for and manage a wide range of recreational and commercial activities). <b>(83 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
519.	Agree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(246 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
520.	Disagree with objective (manage human activities in a sustainable and equitable way). <b>(31 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Management objectives are consistent with the purpose of the reserves.
521.	Petroleum exploration should not be permitted, as the pressure to drill if reserves are found will be too great. / The area needs to be protected from mining. / Ban petroleum exploration and mining. <b>(7 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	While petroleum exploration is permitted in the park subject to the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> , petroleum drilling and mineral development is not. If viable reserves are discovered within the park, directional drilling from outside the reserves may be viable.
522.	Petroleum or mineral exploration, drilling or development and dredging or dredge spoil dumping should not be permitted in the marine management area. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The area is highly prospective for hydrocarbons. Marine management areas allow for petroleum exploration and production.
523.	Seismic testing and exploration impacts wildlife and should not be permitted. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2f)	Government policy permits seismic testing in marine reserves.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
524.	Developments with the potential to impact on Exmouth Gulf and its associated mangroves and island reserves must be subject to strict and prohibitive (infrastructure, volumes stored etc) conditions. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c, 2d)	The majority of Exmouth Gulf and associated mangroves lie outside the reserves. Development proposals in the marine management area will be subject to the relevant government approvals.
525.	Hydrocarbon exploration should be allowed in the southern extension. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan allows seismic exploration (subject to environmental assessment), but does not allow any drilling operations.
526.	There is a discrepancy in the plan: page ix indicates that petroleum exploration and production would be permissible in general use areas but the zoning map appears to indicate that such activity would not be permitted in general use zones. The zoning should reflect the intent of the New Horizons Policy, which states that petroleum activities are permitted in parts of general use and special purpose zones of marine reserves subject to assessment. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Petroleum exploration and production are, in general, permissible in general use zones of marine reserves. However, State Government policy in regard to the Ningaloo Marine Park states that, while seismic exploration may be permitted, drilling is not permitted in the Ningaloo Marine Park.
527.	The plan's requirement that petroleum activities and pipelines would be subject to assessment by relevant agencies can be met through existing requirements under the EP Act consistent with <i>New Horizons</i> . <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan indicates that the standard approvals process for petroleum exploration and development would continue to apply in the marine reserves.
528.	The plan may need to accommodate emergency and pollution response requirements, e.g. access and use of beaches, shorelines, and other areas in the reserves and surrounds for transport, storage, set down areas, equipment and material stockpiles, waste handling etc. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan addresses this requirement, however this would be done under the umbrella of the Statewide oil spill response arrangements.
529.	The intent to include petroleum related activities, subject to approval in zones proposed for the marine management area, is appreciated. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
530.	Oil rigs or ships carrying oil in proximity to the reef should be banned as a major oil spill would have catastrophic	No (2d)	A State working group is examining the risks from shipping to Ningaloo and will recommend appropriate mechanisms to manage this risk.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
531.	effects on the whole reef. <b>(1 submission)</b>  Section 7.2.12 Petroleum Development, paragraph 3 refers to the legislative framework by which the DoIR manages petroleum proposals. As well as the Acts mentioned, the <i>Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act 1967</i> and the <i>Petroleum Act 1967</i> should be added. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to make reference to these Acts.
532.	The Cabinet decision of 1994 that banned petroleum activity in the Ningaloo Marine Park related to the existing marine park and should not automatically extend to the southern extension. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	State Government Policy in regard to petroleum development in the existing Ningaloo Marine Park will apply in the southern extension.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
<b>Extension to the Marine Park and establishment of Muiron Islands Marine Management Area</b>			
533.	Support the proposal to extend the Ningaloo Marine Park south to Red Bluff. <b>(261 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
534.	Do not support the proposal to extend the Ningaloo Marine Park south to Red Bluff. <b>(116 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The extension of the park is an appropriate strategy to protect and manage the Ningaloo Reef ecosystem in its entirety. In addition, the southern section of the reef will come under significantly increased pressure in the future.
535.	Support the establishment of the Muiron Islands Marine Management Area. <b>(147 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
536.	Do not support the establishment of the Muiron Islands Marine Management Area. <b>(57 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The establishment of the marine management area was considered an appropriate action to protect the high ecological values and manage use of this area.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
537.	Extensions should be larger and encompass greater areas than recommended (e.g. Exmouth Gulf). <b>(40 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Additional areas were not considered appropriate for vesting at this point in time.
538.	There is no scientific justification for the extensions. <b>(29 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The proposal to reserve the additional waters is based on scientific knowledge of the ecological values and in consideration of the existing and future uses of the area that require management.
539.	The areas are inaccessible and/or low use, so there is no need for extensions. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	There is extensive use of the Muiron Islands and parts of the southern extension, and there is significant potential for increased visitation within the life of this plan.
540.	Extensions should provide for conservation and sustainable multiple use. <b>(9 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Management of extensions provides for conservation outcomes and sustainable multiple use.
541.	Extension requires adequate planning and management to ensure conservation. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Plan details management framework to ensure conservation outcomes.
542.	Extensions should become sanctuary zones in total. / Sanctuary zones should be larger. / There should be more sanctuary zones. / Sanctuary zones should be continuous rather than patchy. <b>(8 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The proportion of the reserves classified as sanctuary zones is considered to be an appropriate balance to meet conservation and resource use requirements.
543.	Concerns about the extent of multiple-use, in particular the priority given to commercial and recreational fishing. There should be no extractive activities. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	The management plan provides a balance between protection and use of the marine environment.
544.	The Muiron Islands Marine Management Area should be vested as a marine park. <b>(11 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The Muiron Islands Marine Management Area category was considered to be the most appropriate reserve category.
545.	Support for increased marine protected areas as long as they are sensible increases and areas are closed off to everyone and not just one user group. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The sanctuary zones in the park allow access, but all extractive activities are prohibited.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
546.	The marine management area discriminates against recreational fishers whilst still allowing other extractive activities including mineral and petroleum exploration. To protect this valuable area it should be included in the park and all mining and exploration should be excluded. (4 submissions)	No (2e)	‘Assess’ will not necessarily mean approval to operate. However, it should be noted that all drilling for petroleum is prohibited in the Ningaloo Marine Park, whilst recreational fishing is permitted in most of the park. Ninety-three per cent of the marine management area remains open for recreational fishing.
547.	Sanctuary zones have been placed to protect dive sites and reduce other uses (2 submissions)	No (2e)	Sanctuary zones have been placed primarily for biodiversity protection and conservation, but in some cases sanctuary zones have been configured to overlap with existing dive sites.
548.	The plan discriminates against recreational activities. (15 submissions)	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones were placed to maximise biodiversity conservation outcomes while minimising the impact on current use. For example, shore based activities zones have been placed adjacent to sanctuary zones to permit beach fishing in these areas. While the plan provides for a wide range of sustainable recreational activities throughout the reserves, both recreational and commercial extractive activities are prohibited in sanctuary zones.
549.	Protecting the habitat should not empower the Government to exclude the public. We must have all conservation areas open for our enjoyment. (1 submission)	No (2e)	Sanctuary zones are accessible to the community for a range of ‘passive’ activities.
550.	Sanctuary zones will adversely affect recreational fishing. (3 submissions)	No (2e)	The majority of the park’s waters and coastline remain open for recreational fishing. Sanctuary zones are likely to help maintain fishing over the long-term.
551.	Concerns that sanctuary zones will be further extended in the future to exclude recreational fishers. (8 submissions)	No (2d)	The management plan will be reviewed after ten years with full public consultation. If further sanctuary zone extensions were proposed, the public must be consulted through a statutory public consultation process.
552.	Disagree with blanket closures of sections of the coast rather than addressing specific problems in specific areas. (1 submission)	No (2e)	Specific issues will be dealt with through other management strategies. Sanctuary zones are an important tool for marine biodiversity conservation.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
553.	Believe that the southern extensions to Ningaloo Marine Park could be managed as a coastal wilderness area with very limited vehicle access and fishing from shore for immediate consumption and/or catch and release-as an alternative to sanctuary zones. <b>(13 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are established for biodiversity conservation, not for fisheries management. Catch and release fishing was not supported as an alternative to sanctuary zones but this does not preclude the Department of Fisheries implementing these restrictions as part of recreational fisheries management.
554.	Do not support extending the park south to Red Bluff, as it is a different marine environment than further north however a case could be mounted to extend the park south to Three Mile Camp and Gnarraloo Bay, as this area is really the start of the Ningaloo reef proper. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Extending the park to Red Bluff protects the Ningaloo Reef in its entirety as it shifts from fringing barrier reef to true fringing reef. It also ensures that the areas of the reef that are more typical of a temperate system, and the tropical/temperate transition along the reef from south to north is protected.
555.	The southern extension should have no sanctuary zones and/or unless they allow angling to be managed rather than excluded. <b>(24 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Sanctuary zones have been created in the southern extension for biodiversity conservation not fisheries management.
556.	The Department of Fisheries should manage the marine management area as the predominant activity is fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	Marine reserves are managed by CALM under the CALM Act for conservation purposes. The Department of Fisheries continues to manage fishing activities in marine reserves.
<b>Zones in the Ningaloo Marine Park, extension and proposed marine management area</b>			
557.	Agree to the use of sanctuary zones to protect the values of Ningaloo. <b>(210 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
558.	Disagree to the use of sanctuary zones to protect the values of Ningaloo. <b>(106 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The implementation of sanctuary zones is an important management strategy to ensure the conservation of the reserves' marine biodiversity. A zoning scheme is one of a suite of complementary management tools that will be used to achieve the objectives of the plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
559.	Agree that an almost complete reliance on sanctuary zones is the best way to manage marine flora and fauna within marine parks ( <i>Western Angler</i> proforma only). (2 submissions)	No (2e)	The plan includes a suite of management tools, in addition to sanctuary zones, that will be used to manage the marine reserves.
560.	Disagree that an almost complete reliance on sanctuary zones is the best way to manage marine flora and fauna within marine parks ( <i>Western Angler</i> proforma only). (67 submissions)	No (2a)	The plan includes a suite of management tools, in addition to sanctuary zones, that will be used to conserve marine biodiversity and manage human use.
561.	Agree to proposed extensions to the existing sanctuary zones. (168 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
562.	Disagree to proposed extensions to existing sanctuary zones. (112 submissions)	No (2e)	The extension of the sanctuary zone will address ecological deficiencies in the zoning scheme – specifically by providing protection for marine communities that were not previously protected from extractive activities.
563.	Agree to the new sanctuary zones in the marine park and extensions. (157 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
564.	Disagree to the new sanctuary zones in the marine park and extensions. (70 submissions)	No (2e)	The extension of the sanctuary zone will address ecological deficiencies in the zoning scheme – specifically providing protection for marine communities that were not previously protected from extractive activities.
565.	Support some sanctuary zone extensions, but not as many as are proposed. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	The extension of the sanctuary zone will address ecological deficiencies in the zoning scheme – specifically providing protection for marine communities that were not previously protected from extractive activities.
566.	The area of sanctuary zones should be increased and/or be 30% of each marine habitat protected or at least 50% of Ningaloo Marine Park or reef. (84 + 5148 proforma submissions)	Yes (1d)	Sanctuary zones in the marine park have been increased to approximately 34% of the total area of the park and provide representation of the major marine habitats in the park.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
567.	Support working towards a consistent and coherent zoning of the contiguous State and Commonwealth waters. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
568.	Sanctuary zones should not extend seaward in all cases as small boats need to fish inside the reef. <b>(12 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones have not been extended seaward in all cases. Sanctuary zones in lagoon areas (i.e. inside the reef) have been placed, where possible, away from the major boat access points.
569.	All sanctuary zones boundaries should extend to the outer limit of State waters to protect deeper water habitats and soft sediment communities, and ensuring that these communities are given adequate and replicated protection latitudinally within the marine park. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Several large sanctuary zones have been extended to the seaward boundary of the park. The expansion of all sanctuary zones to the seaward boundary was not considered to be necessary. In the northern part of the marine park the sanctuary zones were not extended to the seaward boundary of the park in response to concerns expressed by local recreational fishing interests.
570.	The sanctuary zones outside the reef are less likely to be useful but it is not unreasonable to establish 1 or 2 to enable research in this area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	The park varies significantly in structure and marine communities from north to south. The seaward extensions have been placed to provide representation of these communities.
571.	Seaward extensions will not protect most finfish, as the majority of species caught in this area are pelagic. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Seaward extensions to sanctuary zones are established for biodiversity conservation, not for fisheries management. Demersal species (e.g. red emperor) are also targeted in deeper water.
572.	Recommend consideration of special purpose trolling in seaward sections of sanctuary zones, as the seaward extensions will do nothing to protect most finfish, as the majority of species caught in these areas are pelagic. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to change the seaward extension of Mandu sanctuary zone to a special purpose (benthic protection) zone that permits recreational trolling.
573.	More education is required with regard to the benefits of sanctuary zones. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
574.	Areas most at risk and/or special or unique places should be a priority for protection in sanctuary zones. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	While this factor is taken into account in the placement of sanctuary zones, a range of other ecological and social factors must be considered as well.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
575.	Where sanctuary zones are adjacent to existing or proposed sustainable tourism nodes identified in the Coastal tourism framework, ongoing consultation and coordination within the NSDO is recommended. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
576.	Object to the designation of the landward boundaries as 100 m from the high water mark as defined in the legend on the map, because that will mean that no fishing will be possible in some shallow areas at low to mid tides. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Fishing from the shore is permitted in recreation zones. It is also permitted in special purpose (shore-based activities) zones located adjacent to many sanctuary zones. Line fishing from the shore is permitted along 70% of the coastline of the marine park.
577.	Zone boundaries will be difficult to locate and/or should be marked with buoys and/or should be aligned with identifiable reef features or north-south and east-west. <b>(6 submissions)</b> .	No (2d)	Where possible the zone boundaries have been aligned with easily identifiable features and in a north-south and east-west alignment. The plan indicates that sanctuary zones will be marked so that zone boundaries are evident to visitors.
578.	Move sanctuary zone boundaries to 100 m offshore of reef edge rather than to state limit. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The extension of the sanctuary zone will address ecological deficiencies in the zoning scheme – specifically provide protection for marine communities that were not previously protected from extractive activities.
579.	Managing sanctuary zones is impracticable. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are implemented using a variety of strategies, including signage, education, surveillance and enforcement.
580.	No sanctuary zones should be permitted within 3-5 km of boat ramps. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Every effort was made to locate sanctuary zones away from areas of high recreational boating use. Where sanctuary zones were placed in proximity to boat ramps to achieve conservation objectives, the sanctuary zones were reduced in size to minimise impacts.
581.	Any sanctuary zones should be accompanied by either/or both (a) a sunset clause defining a time limit (b) regular monitoring to gauge effectiveness. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan details monitoring, which would be undertaken in the park. The plan is reviewed every ten years and the MPRA audits implementation of the management plan every three years.
582.	Sanctuary zones could be reduced in the future once the reef has recovered or new areas alternated on a rotation basis. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The management plan, including the configuration of zoning, is reviewed every ten years. The value of these areas for conservation and for research and monitoring purposes would be diminished if a ‘rotation’ policy was adopted.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
583.	Sanctuary zones should extend to and include the shoreline. No shore-based line fishing should be permitted. (3 submissions)	No (2a)	Shore-based line fishing is not permitted in sanctuary zones. Where shore-based activities zones are indicated adjacent to sanctuary zones, the sanctuary zone boundary is located 100m offshore.
584.	Support further restriction of shore fishing, particularly near Coral Bay and Yardie Creek. (1 submission)	No (2e)	Coral Bay and Yardie Creek are popular areas for line fishing from the shore. While some restrictions on shore fishing are indicated for these areas, further restrictions would have had a major impact on shore based fishing.
585.	Exclude shore-based fishing from sanctuary zones and include 'shore fishing only' areas within some of the recreation zones. (1 submission)	No (2d)	All fishing is not permitted in sanctuary zones. In some instances, sanctuary zone boundaries have been placed 100m offshore to facilitate shore-based angling.
586.	There should be mandatory 100 m (seaward) fishing zones along the shoreline of sanctuary zones. / Beach fishing has no impact on fish stocks. (2 submissions)	No (2d)	Special purpose (shore-based activities) zones have been established adjacent to many of the sanctuary zones. They have not been applied in all cases, as representative areas of intertidal habitat should also be included in the representative system of sanctuary zones.
587.	Recreational fishing should not be permitted adjacent to any sanctuary zones. (2 submissions)	No (2d)	The issue of 'edge-effects' will be examined as part of the research plan to assess the effectiveness of the sanctuary zones.
588.	The integrity and preservation of the unique ecosystem of the Ningaloo Reef can only be ensured if sanctuary zones are both adequate and representative and as such the increase from 10% to 28% of the total areas of State waters is supported. (5 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
589.	Adequate representation of habitats in no-take areas is need for scientific reference areas. (2 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
590.	Do not believe sanctuary zones are the best way to protect the marine environment and/or manage human activity. Sanctuary zones are not required. (8 submissions)	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are only one tool in a complementary suite of management strategies that will be implemented.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
591.	Sanctuary zones are required, but in combination with other management alternatives. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Other management alternatives have been outlined in the plan such as education, research and monitoring, enforcement, etc.
592.	Rather than sanctuary zones, need to consider other management options, such as areas for trolling, single hooks or barbless hooks only, no anchoring zones, catch and release zones etc. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	Sanctuary zones are primarily created for biodiversity conservation, not fisheries management. The plan was, however, amended to include a special purpose (benthic protection) zone, in which trolling is permitted. Proposals for catch and release, barbless hooks, etc. can still be implemented by the Department of Fisheries, if these are considered to be an appropriate strategy for fisheries management.
593.	Sanctuary zones should be amended to allow fishing and have as a 'no take away' areas. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones provide areas free of extractive activities to provide a high level of protection and provide areas where research can be undertaken to compare these to areas subject to human activity.
594.	Bag limits for fishing are important but can only ever do so much. Sanctuary zones are needed so that natural systems can be restored. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. Sanctuary zones are established for biodiversity conservation, and are not for the purpose of fisheries management.
595.	Creating more exclusion zones is not management. The area should allow development that enhances rather than restricts the experience that allows tourism to flourish without restrictions. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan allows for sustainable development of the area while managing human impacts.
596.	Sanctuary zones are not required as this is a fisheries management issue. <b>(9 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are established primarily for biodiversity conservation and not for fisheries management. They are one of a suite of complementary management strategies, which also include education, public participation, surveillance and enforcement, research and monitoring. Fisheries management in marine conservation reserves is carried out by the Department of Fisheries.
597.	Agree with the need for sanctuary zones to protect habitat and vulnerable stocks, but would like the consideration of other management tools and Department of Fisheries regulations. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are one of a suite of complementary management strategies, which also include education, public participation, surveillance and enforcement, research and monitoring. Fisheries management in marine conservation reserves is carried out by the Department of Fisheries.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
598.	Support the 'layering' of zone protection, i.e. establishing 'no-go' zones at the heart of sanctuary zones. The sanctuary zones themselves (in some instances) might then have 'catch and release only' zones on their boundaries, between them and recreational fishing zones. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The majority of sanctuary zones are sufficiently large that edge effects will most likely be minimal, reducing the need for buffering of these zones. Research programs will consider the need for buffering and the 'edge effect'.
599.	Because fisheries are not overexploited in the area, there is not the need for such a large proportion of the park to be sanctuary zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are established primarily for biodiversity conservation and not for fisheries management. They are one of a suite of complementary management strategies, which also include education, public participation, surveillance and enforcement, research and monitoring. Fisheries management in marine conservation reserves is carried out by the Department of Fisheries.
600.	Concerns that the extensions are justified solely on Westera and Hyndes (2001), and non-WA based research. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	The requirement for sanctuary zone extensions has been based on a range of scientific research and data.
601.	Some sanctuary zones are necessary to assess the impacts of uses, such as fishing, on the resident targeted fish in the park and look for secondary effects on other species, like sea urchins etc. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
602.	The only research done on finfish (Westera and Hyndes) did nothing to prove that sanctuary zones can help the overall protection of fish stocks in the park. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are for overall biodiversity conservation, not specifically for the protection of fish stocks.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
603.	Sanctuary zones are simple, inexpensive and highly effective management tools. It is a matter of common sense that we should maintain undisturbed marine habitats. Sanctuary zones are both an insurance policy and also scientific reference yardsticks. Sanctuary zones appeal to tourists who want to experience natural marine places. They are increasingly important to the economic dynamic of regions like Ningaloo, as they bring critical ecological benefits. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
604.	Sanctuary zones should be total exclusion areas. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Marine parks are managed as multiple-use areas. Sanctuary zones allow for passive, non-extractive activities.
605.	Sanctuary zones are important for biodiversity conservation. <b>(9 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
606.	There should be an adequate buffer between land activities and the marine environment incorporating whole biotic assemblages and interacting landscapes. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The terrestrial and marine environments will be managed in an integrated and sympathetic manner.
607.	Both sanctuary and recreation zones are critical to ensure the sustainability of the Ningaloo Reef and its longevity as a tourism drawcard for WA. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
608.	Scientists suggest that special areas like Ningaloo, which has the second highest number of endemic species of any marine area in the world, containing 500 species of fish, 200 species of coral and 600 species of molluscs, needs up to 100% protection. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The area of sanctuary zones has been increased to approximately 34% and other areas will allow sustainable use to ensure conservation outcomes.
609.	Need to apply the precautionary principle to management (focusing on substantial sanctuary zones) to improve ecosystem health and provide resilience <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. The precautionary principle was applied in development of the zoning scheme.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
610.	Only 28% of the marine park has been designated as sanctuary zones. The GBRMPA has 33% and the Townsville Declaration on Coral Reef Research and Management (JCU 2002) recommends 30-50%. The majority of the sanctuary zones fail to meet one of the key criteria of the RAP process, Representative Areas Program for the GBR World Heritage Area, namely that 'where possible no take areas should have a minimum of 10km (for coastal bioregions) along their smallest dimension.' (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to increase the area of sanctuary zones in the park to 34%. Zone dimensions have been increased and habitat representation is greater.
611.	Sanctuary zones allow for breeding areas to maintain some fish abundance, and prevent overfishing and possible extinction of some species. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
612.	Sanctuary zones are the most important strategy to prevent further declines in fish stocks. Sanctuary zones should be increased to 50%, and be advertised as fish reproductive zones. (1[374])	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to include approximately 34% of the area of the park in sanctuary zones. Sanctuary zones are established for biodiversity conservation not fisheries management.
613.	The whole marine park should be a sanctuary zone (no-take area). (16 submissions)	No (2e)	Making the entire marine park a sanctuary zone would not represent a balanced outcome, and was not considered necessary to protect the ecological values.
614.	All new proposed sanctuary zones are small in comparison to the existing zones with extensions and are too small according to minimum no take area of 10km along their smallest dimension. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Some sanctuary zones have boundaries smaller than 10 km. The size of these zones reflects consideration of recreational users of the area.
615.	Require an area that has had very little if any human use to date and close it as a research zone, not allowing any recreational entry, boats snorkelling etc. This would keep an area completely free of human use of limited research purposes to stand as a baseline for monitoring and performance of sanctuary zones. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are open for non-extractive activities and many of these have very low use therefore providing excellent opportunities for research and monitoring.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
616.	Consideration needs to be made of the reserve design to ensure that replicate sanctuary zones incorporate sufficiently large areas of all marine habitats to meet goals of conserving finfish diversity. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to include approximately 34% of the area of the park in sanctuary zones with zones of an appropriate size.
617.	Conditional support for sanctuary zones, depending on whether they are exclusion or allow limited activities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Sanctuary zones permit passive uses, however extractive activities are not permitted.
618.	Support sanctuary zones in the southern extension for research as area is remote. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
619.	The restriction of recreational fishing in this area by implementing sanctuary zones is not going to ensure these objectives are met. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	A network of sanctuary zones is a key strategy to ensure the conservation of marine biodiversity in the marine park.
620.	There is insufficient justification for the implementation of sanctuary zones. <b>(16 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Review of the management plan noted that the existing zoning scheme was not sufficiently adequate or representative in relation to currently accepted scientific criteria for representation and adequacy.
621.	There is a misconception that has yet to be proven regarding sanctuary zones protecting trophic cascades. All sanctuary zones do is prohibit the community from fishing. There is a place for sanctuary zones to protect habitat and vulnerable stocks but in general fish are better protected under current fisheries regulations and move constantly along the Ningaloo coast. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are created primarily for biodiversity conservation. The management of targeted fish stocks is achieved through fisheries regulations. The Department of Fisheries manages fishing in all State waters, including in marine conservation reserves.
622.	The extensions to sanctuary zones should be halved and reviewed again in the future. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	This approach would reduce representation and adequacy of the sanctuary zones and was not considered appropriate.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
623.	Sanctuary zones will increase fishing pressure on areas still available for fishing ( <b>23 submissions</b> )	No (2d)	Some displaced fishing effort is likely to occur. The plan requires the Department of Fisheries to set appropriate abundance targets for recreation and general use areas, and fish stocks will be managed to meet these targets. There may also be spillover and enhanced recruitment of fish from sanctuary zones. Monitoring will be undertaken to establish the effectiveness of sanctuary zones and to assess fishing effort and the abundance of target fish. This information will be used in future reviews of park management.
624.	Sanctuary zones preserve fish stocks for no-one. ( <b>1 submission</b> )	No (2b)	The sanctuary zones provide high protection areas for biodiversity conservation, and help maintain a healthy ecosystem, which is needed to maintain fish stocks.
625.	Sanctuary zones impact on the Ningaloo experience by restricting and/or banning activities and may be detrimental to sustainable development, business investment and/or tourism. ( <b>19 submissions</b> )	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones, in which extractive activities are not permitted, will cover approximately 34% of the total area of the marine park leaving the majority of the park available for fishing. The plan includes strategies to permit sustainable development, and protect the values on which tourism relies. These strategies should assist in maintaining a sustainable local tourism industry.
626.	There has been insufficient research to determine if the current sanctuary zones are enough or too much and there is no baseline information and/or evidence that reefs are in decline. ( <b>5 submissions</b> )	No (2d)	There has been research in Ningaloo and in similar coral reef ecosystems in Australia and around the world that support the establishment of sanctuary zones for biodiversity conservation. The optimum size and distribution of these zones will be the subject of ongoing research programs in the park to assist in future reviews of the zoning scheme.
627.	Disagree with the belief that the creation of sanctuary zones is the best way to achieve management plan outcomes. There is no evidence to support this. ( <b>4 submissions</b> )	No (2d)	Zoning is an important management strategy. It is one of a suite of complementary management tools that will be used to achieve the objectives of the plan.
628.	Allow free passage through sanctuary zones. ( <b>2 submissions</b> )	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones do not preclude the passage of vessels.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
629.	Positioning of sanctuary zones in the southern extension closes the last shallow protected waters accessible from the mainland to aquarium collectors. Granting access to the general use zone of the existing marine park does not compensate for losses in the extensions as this area is of little commercial use to the fishery. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The zones have been chosen on the basis of the distribution of marine habitats and existing uses. Commercial aquarium fishery concerns have been considered, but could not be accommodated without impacting on the overall objectives for the zoning scheme of the plan.
630.	All sanctuary zones should be no-anchoring areas, and moorings should be installed. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to undertake detailed site planning in areas of high use, including, if necessary restricting anchoring and/or installing moorings.
631.	Zoning proposed for the southern extension will not allow future consideration of petroleum pipelines. It would be preferred that the zoning scheme for that section of coast permitted shore access for future offshore petroleum discoveries. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	There are sanctuary and general use zones in the southern extension to the park. The general use zones do not preclude the future potential installation of pipelines.
632.	All sanctuary zones should be increased to include contiguous shoreline intertidal reef and soft sediment communities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	Sanctuary zones have been increased to approximately 34% of the park. Soft sediment and shoreline intertidal reef habitats are represented in sanctuary zones.
633.	Humpback whale sanctuary classification would be appropriate. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	There is only a small overlap of the reserves with the area in which humpback whales rest during seasonal annual migrations. The plan includes a strategy to educate visitors about whale interactions in the reserves.
634.	The habitats off North West Cape are poorly represented in the proposed sanctuary zoning, especially the highly diverse filter feeding communities that double as nursery areas. Some of the limestone reefs and specifically the area to the west, known as Helby Bank, should be incorporated into a sanctuary zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones in the northern area of the park are generally small and do not extend seawards as making large sanctuary zones would have major impacts on recreational fishers.
635.	Support for more extensions to sanctuary zones to protect turtle and dugong habitat between Bruboodjoo and Winderabandi Points. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan was amended to join the Cloates and Dugong sanctuary zones and increase the size of the Winderabandi sanctuary zone.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
636.	Zoning does not protect filter feeding communities in outer Exmouth Gulf to the north east of the marine park. Need a sanctuary zone to help understand levels of trawling threat and modification of habitat due to it. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Filter feeding communities are provided some protection in sanctuary zones. A greater area of sanctuary zone was not proposed in this area, as it is an area of high use for recreational fishing.
637.	The conservation areas within the marine management area are inconsistent with the <i>New Horizons</i> policy as they prohibit fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2f)	The CALM Act provides for management zoning of marine management areas and zoning of marine management areas is consistent with Government policy.
638.	Southern extension should be a special purpose zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The strategy in the plan is still considered to be the best option.
639.	Paragraph 3, p 81, should be deleted from the plan. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	This paragraph details how the sanctuary zone scheme has met the key principles for zone design and the process by which zoning was developed.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
<b>Individual sanctuary zones NB Read in conjunction with broad comments of support/opposition to sanctuary zones</b>			
	<b>Bundegi - specific comments on this zone</b>		
640.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>56 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>25 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
641.	Should extend sanctuary zone to the eastern edge of the recreation zone to protect sponge habitat. <b>(1 submission).</b>	No (2d)	Further extension of this zone was not considered appropriate given the high use recreational fishing activity in the area.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
642.	Support this extension. It does encompass a good representative section of the unique second reef line, while still leaving a similar area open to fishing <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
643.	There is no evidence that recreational fishing has had a detrimental effect to the area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
644.	To further protect this sanctuary zone, no anchoring should be enforced and an adequate mooring system should be installed for commercial operators and recreational boaters to minimise impact to reef system. <b>(23 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
645.	Extra boundary post should be erected at both ends to facilitate finding ones position when wading out at low tide. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to clearly mark the sanctuary zones.
646.	The shore area of rocks at the northern end of the existing sanctuary zone should be re-opened as this was an important angling spot before it was closed. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The zoning scheme in the plan is still considered to be the best option.
647.	This sanctuary zone should be extended further to include the deeper water habitats and soft sediment communities of Exmouth Gulf, a large embayment area not represented on the seaward Ningaloo coast of the Cape Range Peninsula. The zone should be bigger to meet the principles of the GBRMPA Representative Areas Program. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Further extension of this zone was not considered appropriate given the high use recreational fishing activity in the area.
648.	Extension does not interfere with recreational fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
	<b>Murat - specific comments on this zone</b>		

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
649.	<p><i>Western Angler</i> proforma</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>12 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>68 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
650.	Do not support zone because of use for recreational fishing-very popular with small boat operators and close to Bundegi ramp. <b>(11 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Proximity to the boat ramp was taken into account in consideration of this zone. The zone is small acknowledging the popularity of the area for recreational fishing.
651.	No scientific justification for this zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan provides scientific justification for sanctuary zones in the marine park. There was also specific habitat mapping undertaken which identified significant filter feeding communities during the planning process.
652.	Recommend a trolling only zone instead of a sanctuary zone to preserve filter feeding communities, and address impacts on these communities through anchoring controls and moorings. <b>(16 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
653.	Very little fishing occurs in the Murat sanctuary zone area. This area is also covered by the restricted waters associated with the pier. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The sanctuary zone lies outside the Department of Defence restricted waters.
654.	This is a daily travel route for many large craft, which are more likely to cause distress to the filter feeders than fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
655.	Not supportive of the existing protected waters around the naval pier. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	This closed area is managed by the Department of Defence and is outside the scope of this plan.
656.	Agree with the extension to the sanctuary zone as part of a network of protected habitat and to protect communities that are vulnerable to dive and fishing related pressures. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
657.	This area could be catch and release. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
658.	Anchoring controls required and/or moorings should be installed. <b>(16 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
659.	Murat sanctuary zone is of inadequate size to protect the filter feeding and soft sediment communities in this area. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	This sanctuary zone provides protection to filter feeding and soft sediment communities. Enlarging this zone would unacceptably impact on recreational fishing.
660.	Do not support shore fishing adjacent to the sanctuary zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Shore fishing is not permitted in the sanctuary zone. A special purpose (shore-based activities) zone has been established adjacent to the Department of Defence restricted area.
	<b>Lighthouse - specific comments on this zone</b>		
661.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>7 responses.</b></li> <li>Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>109 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
662.	Shore based fishing should be permitted adjacent to this zone as it is heavily used and is very important to recreational fishers. <b>(56 submissions)</b>	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to include a special purpose (shore-based activities) zone adjacent to the sanctuary zone, which permits beach fishing from the shore.
663.	Support the offshore waters being sanctuary zone. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
664.	Beach fishing should be prohibited as rocks cause gear loss. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	This is a particularly popular beach fishing area.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
665.	The sanctuary zone is of concern, and needs to be shifted away from caravan park. <b>(12 submissions)</b>	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to include a special purpose (shore-based activities) zone adjacent to the sanctuary zone, which permits beach fishing from the shore. The sanctuary zone was moved to the east away from the caravan park.
666.	Do not support this sanctuary zone because it is important for recreational fishers and is the only place to fish during a southerly wind. <b>(48 submissions)</b>	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to include a special purpose (shore-based activities) zone adjacent to the sanctuary zone, which permits beach fishing from the shore. Also the seaward extension was reduced, partly to cater for this concern.
667.	Support for an extension to one of the proposed new sanctuary zones in the north (e.g. Lighthouse Bay) to represent deep water habitat in the north of the park and provide additional protection to habitat adjacent to potential trawl grounds. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	Extension of the Lighthouse Bay sanctuary zone would unacceptably impact on recreational fishing.
668.	Would support a smaller zone with the western boundary moved to the east, so that the zone boundaries were the same distance each side of North West Cape. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to include a special purpose (shore-based activities) zone adjacent to the sanctuary zone, which permits beach fishing from the shore. Also, the whole zone was shifted to the east.
669.	A no anchoring policy would benefit this area and must include moorings put in place to protect fragile corals in this area. <b>(27 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
670.	Walking on the reefs at Lighthouse Bay at low tide 3-4 days a month does not damage reefs. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
671.	This sanctuary zone will have a high social cost and/or will have a negative impact on the Exmouth economy. <b>(7 submissions)</b>	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to include a special purpose (shore-based activities) zone adjacent to the sanctuary zone, which permits beach fishing from the shore. Major changes have been made to this zone in response to these specific concerns.
672.	Spearfishing should be permitted in this area. <b>(2 submissions).</b>	No (2b)	Shore-based line fishing is the only activity permitted. This is to protect the values and also to facilitate compliance.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
673.	Would support a much smaller sanctuary zone that includes the sites used by commercial dive charters (e.g. Blizzard Ridge, Labyrinth, Gulliver's and Hundreds and Thousands). <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	A much smaller zone would not provide significant protection for representative habitats in this area. The current zone includes popular Lighthouse Bay dive sites.
674.	It is popular for shore-based fishing due to its close proximity to lighthouse Caravan Park. It also provides a safe fishing area for small boats during the frequent periods of strong southerly winds. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to include a special purpose (shore-based activities) zone adjacent to the sanctuary zone, which permits beach fishing from the shore. The seaward extension was also reduced to address this concern.
675.	This sanctuary zone should be extended to the park boundary to protect deeper water habitats and soft sediment communities, and ensure adequate and replicated protection, particularly as no other sanctuary zone extends to the State waters boundary in this northern region. Blizzards ridge dive site should be included <b>(8 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Extending this sanctuary zone to the limit of State waters was not done in deference to local recreational fishing concerns.
676.	Fishing and diving can co-exist in this area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
677.	The proposed zone should be reviewed in light of current Department of Defence (DoD) restrictions, current facilities and access points and turtle nesting areas, and manage cooperatively with DoD. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to include a special purpose (shore-based activities) zone adjacent to the sanctuary zone, which permits beach fishing from the shore.
678.	Do not allow shore fishing adjacent to the sanctuary zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan has been amended to include a special purpose (shore-based activities) zone adjacent to the sanctuary zone, which permits beach fishing from the shore.
	<b>Jurabi - specific comments on this zone</b>		

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
679.	<p><i>Western Angler</i> proforma</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>12 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>76 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
680.	The habitat in question is already adequately represented in the Ningaloo Marine Park and overlaps traditional fishing grounds. At the very least the northern boundary should be moved 1.4 km south to avoid areas of major importance to local crayfish divers. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
681.	Ban reef walking to collect shells and octopus. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The taking of octopus will not be permitted in the special purpose (shore-based) activities zone. Shells cannot be collected in the whole marine park under existing legislation.
682.	Should be a no-anchoring area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
683.	Do not support sanctuary zone as it is used by recreational fishers and divers. It is close to tourist accommodation, boat ramp facilities and amenities at Tantabiddi. There is also a lack of factual scientific data and research to justify this proposal. <b>(33 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints. There is strong scientific justification for the zone.
684.	Should be renamed Turtle sanctuary zone due to large aggregations of turtles found there. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	There is already a ‘Turtles’ sanctuary zone in the marine park.
685.	Shore fishing should be permitted. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Supports the plan.
686.	Do not allow shore fishing adjacent to the sanctuary zone. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Shore fishing is permitted in the special purpose (shore-based) activities zone, which is adjacent to the sanctuary zone.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
687.	Should not extend out into the general use zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1b)	Sanctuary zones boundary amended to angle the seaward boundary so as not to extend into the general use zone.
688.	Extension of this sanctuary zone out to the boundary of state waters would be an invaluable precautionary addition with little impact on fishing access, and major potential benefits for conservation and fulfill one of the RAP key principles for sanctuary zones. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Extending this sanctuary zone to the limit of State waters was not done as a concession to local fishing interests.
689.	Do not support sanctuary zone as it is one of the small areas of useful shallow water for aquarium collectors in the general use zone. The original zone proposed in the December 2003 'first draft' had an angled seaward boundary, which followed the edge of the recreation zone. A reversion back to this original boundary is required to allow access to some waters of a depth that is economically viable to the commercial aquarium fishery. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1b)	Sanctuary zones boundary amended to angle the seaward boundary so as not to extend into the general use zone.
690.	Strongly against this sanctuary zone due to concern that it will eventually become a no-anchoring zones and preclude access for surfing offshore, or force people to paddle from shore which is dangerous. The southern boundary should be moved north to clear our surf spot. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Anchoring is permitted in the sanctuary zone.
	<b>Tantabiddi - specific comments on this zone</b>		
691.	<p><i>Western Angler</i> proforma</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>10 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>73 responses.</b></li> </ul>		

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
692.	The zone appears to have been proposed as a sanctuary zone due to commercial glass-bottom/charter boat operators. This is inequitable and is not supported. (5 submissions)	No (2d)	Part of the rationale for the zone was to provide small areas free of extractive activity for viewing by visitors in this area.
693.	Another sanctuary zone is required here extending north and south 1 km and out to 100 m. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Expansion of this zone would have a major impact on recreational fishing given the proximity to the boat ramp.
694.	Would support a smaller sanctuary area than what is proposed (e.g. 1 km by 500 m) to accommodate the glass bottom boat tour that operates from Tantabiddi, and also to provide a snorkelling area in close proximity to the boat ramp. (1 submission)	No (2d)	This zone has already been reduced by approximately 60% to take into consideration recreational fishing in the area and the proximity to the boat ramp.
695.	This sanctuary zone is too close to a major boat ramp as small boats launch and fish in this area. (26 submissions)	No (2d)	This zone is small taking into consideration the recreational fishing in the area and the proximity to the boat ramp.
696.	This zone should be a no-anchoring area to protect the reef. (30 submissions)	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
697.	There is insufficient scientific justification for this zone. (22 submissions)	No (2d)	There is ecological and social justification for this zone based habitat mapping and on the use of this area.
698.	The sanctuary zone should be extended to encompass the lagoon areas from south of the Tantabiddi boat ramp, to the proposed southern boundary of the Mangrove sanctuary zone. (2 submissions)	No (2d)	Expansion of this zone would have a major impact on recreational fishing given the proximity to the boat ramp.
699.	This sanctuary zone is too small to be effective and should be bigger to buffer from activities permitted in the surrounding general use area and meet RAP principles. (2 submissions)	No (2d)	Expansion of this zone would have a major impact on recreational fishing given the proximity to the boat ramp.
700.	Requires sanctuary zone markers. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Sanctuary markers will be installed for this zone.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	<b>Mangrove Bay - specific comments on this zone</b>		
701.	<p><i>Western Angler</i> proforma</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>15 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>65 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
702.	The area is adequately protected. If the sanctuary zone goes ahead it would focus too much fishing pressure on the areas between Tantabiddi boat ramp and Mangrove Bay. (2 submissions)	No (2d)	The expanded zone will provide better protection for lagoon and back-reef communities.
703.	This area is rarely visited by recreational fishers. Most are fly fisherman who practice catch and release. (1 submission)	No (2e)	No change sought.
704.	Against extending the sanctuary zone out over the reef as a lot of recreational fishing is done outside the reef. (21 submissions)	No (2d)	The boundary of the sanctuary zone approximates the reef edge, and was moved in response to this specific concern.
705.	This sanctuary zone should be extended further seaward to include the outer reef ecosystem, which also needs to be protected/or out to State limits. (4 submissions)	No (2d)	Further extension of this zone was not considered appropriate given the high use recreational fishing activity in the area.
706.	This proposed extension may be supported with the condition that the boundary of the extension is only to the eastern edge of the reef platform and not into deeper water. The westward side of the Ningaloo reef in this area is a highly prized recreational fishing ground for boats, which do not anchor but approach the reef and fish the reef edge. (25 submissions)	No (2d)	The boundary of the sanctuary zone approximates the reef edge, and was moved in response to this specific concern.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
707.	A no anchoring policy may benefit this area. (26 submissions)	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
708.	Realignment of the boundaries significantly reduce the shore fishing area, which includes a fair bit of favourite area for catch and release. Suggest re-opening of the flats at low point to shore angling, so that the rare opportunity to sight cast for bonefish can be explored. (1 submission)	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
709.	If the sanctuary zone is not to extend beyond the reef then moorings (50, 75 or 100 m radius in which no anchoring and no fishing would occur) would prove highly valuable to this highly used zone. For instance, the dive sight Nick's Lumps (adjacent to the Mangroves, on the back of the reef). (1 submission)	No (2d)	The plan has strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
710.	Recommend an extension to at least approximately 21° 55.300 S. This would also the include a set of bommies used virtually every day of the whale shark season, known as Ranger bommies or Taminas Reef. (1 submission)	No (2e)	Further extension of this zone was not considered appropriate given the high use recreational fishing activity in the area.
	<b>Lakeside - specific comments on this zone</b>		
711.	<p><i>Western Angler</i> proforma</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>71 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>24 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
712.	Allow seasonal camping. (1 submission)	No (2c)	Outside the scope of this plan as camping is within the Cape Range National Park
713.	The areas is a highly used camping ground and will only result in antagonising visitors that have camped there in the past. (2 submissions)	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
714.	There is no scientific value in such a small sanctuary zone. <b>(8 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
715.	This sanctuary zone is too small to be effective in protecting inshore lagoonal coral bommies and their associated biota that it is supposed to from activities permitted in the surrounding general use zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Further extension of this zone was not considered appropriate given the high use recreational fishing activity in the area.
716.	This area is rarely visited by recreational fishers. Most are fly fisherman who practice catch and release. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
717.	Support the sanctuary zone at Lakeside. It is used by local high school and other interest groups for educational purposes and represents exceptional snorkelling. <b>(20 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
718.	Allow recreational fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	Under the CALM Act fishing is not permitted in sanctuary zones.
719.	Should be a no-anchoring area. <b>(8 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
720.	Should be parallel to the coastline. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	A north to south line has been chosen to simplify compliance.
	<b>Mandu - specific comments on this zone</b>		
721.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>9 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>78 responses.</b></li> </ul>		

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
722.	Restricts game fishing. / Pelagic fishing and trolling should be permitted in the extension to this zone. / Many pelagic species are targeted on a catch and release basis. (28 submissions)	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to change the proposed seaward extension of Mandu sanctuary zone to a special purpose (benthic protection) zone that allows recreational trolling.
723.	There is no justification for excluding anglers from the western side of the reef. (38 submissions)	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to change the proposed seaward extension of Mandu sanctuary zone to a special purpose (benthic protection) zone that allows recreational trolling.
724.	Do not support zone. If there was evidence of overfishing, then a case could be made for seasonal closures during spawning times or other additional management strategies if there is found to be a need for them. (16 submissions)	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to change the proposed seaward extension of Mandu sanctuary zone to a special purpose (benthic protection) zone that allows recreational trolling.
725.	This area is rarely visited by recreational fishers. Most are fly fisherman who practice catch and release. (1 submission)	No (2b)	No change sought.
726.	With boundary marking in deeper water impossible, enforcement of this type of extension will be difficult. (13 submissions)	No (2d)	Marking of the zones will be addressed in the implementation the plan.
727.	The existing sanctuary zone is not clearly marked at present. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	Marking of the zones will be addressed in the implementation the plan.
728.	The zone should be extended south to meet Osprey sanctuary zone. (1 submission)	No (2e)	Further extension of this zone was not considered appropriate given the high use recreational fishing activity in the area.
729.	Ban anchoring. (2 submissions)	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
730.	Realignment of the boundaries removes south Tulki Bay and northern most beach at Bloodwood Creek from the shore area. Support the shore area being left as it is now at very least. These two spots are very important to many catch and release anglers. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
731.	Should extend zone to the outer limit of State waters to provide some protection to all habitats and communities from the shore. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The plan has been amended to change the proposed seaward extension of Mandu sanctuary zone to a special purpose (benthic protection) zone that allows recreational trolling
732.	Allow shoreline recreational fishing in existing the sanctuary zone. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
	<b>Osprey - specific comments on this zone</b>		
733.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>12 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>72 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
734.	Yardie creek should be a sanctuary zone on both banks to preserve this unique area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	Yardie Creek is not part of the marine park, it is in the Cape Range National Park.
735.	Restricts game fishing. Pelagic fishing should be permitted in the extension to this zone. <b>(23 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	A major inadequacy of the previous zoning scheme was the lack of deeper water habitats in sanctuary zones. This zone extension has addressed this inadequacy.
736.	Do not support this extension as recreational fishers at Yardie Creek fish in the sheltered lagoon. If they have to go south of the creek then they either have to fish in the boat passage or traverse through it to the next lagoon. This will cause safety issues. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
737.	Do not support zone. If there was evidence of overfishing, then a case could be made for seasonal closures during spawning times or other additional management strategies if there is found to be a need for them. <b>(7 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	A major inadequacy of the previous zoning scheme was the lack of deeper water habitats in sanctuary zones. This zone extension has addressed this inadequacy.
738.	There is no evidence presented to suggest that such an extension seaward is required. <b>(36 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	A major inadequacy of the previous zoning scheme was the lack of deeper water habitats in sanctuary zones. This zone extension has addressed this inadequacy.
739.	Allow shoreline recreational fishing. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Shore fishing is permitted adjacent to the extensions to this zone.
740.	Could be extended to cater for outer reef observations. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
741.	Should be a no fly zone to prevent wildlife disturbance. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	This is not currently to be considered a significant threat to the marine wildlife.
742.	This area is rarely visited by recreational fishers. Most are fly fisherman who practice catch and release. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
743.	Would support no-anchoring in this zone. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
744.	A 'no take away' from this area could be introduced instead of extending the sanctuary zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
745.	Shore fishing should not be permitted in this sanctuary zone. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	There is a balance in this area: some shoreline is open to shore-based fishing and in some areas the sanctuary zone extends to the shoreline.
746.	Do not support southern extension of this zone. If this is going to be closed off no anchor zones will stop access for surfing. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Anchoring is permitted in the sanctuary zone. However, anchors should be set in sand areas to avoid damaging the reef. Public moorings may be installed for use by surfers if necessary.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	<b>Winderabandi - specific comments on this zone</b>		
747.	Western Angler proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>53 responses.</b></li> <li>Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>36 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
748.	Don't change existing boundaries. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The boundaries of this zone were amended to increase the area of lagoon under protection.
749.	Allow beach fishing to continue. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for plan. The plan allows for continued shore based fishing.
750.	No justification for a sanctuary zone as fish numbers are not depleted. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are primarily for biodiversity conservation and are not implemented for fisheries management.
751.	To give adequate protection to such a feature it would be necessary to prohibit anchoring. <b>(22 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
752.	This area would need to be clearly marked. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Marking of the zones will be addressed in the implementation the plan.
753.	An alternative shape to the sanctuary zone would be more practical and acceptable. New boundaries must be justified further and be clearly marked. <b>(20 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Marking of the zones will be addressed in the implementation the plan.
754.	Support the concept of protecting the unusual double reef feature by closing the area between the reefs to fishing. / It is heavily used by tourists <b>(21 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for plan.
755.	This area is rarely visited by recreational fishers. Most are fly fisherman who practice catch and release. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
756.	Recommend extension to follow the outer reef line. (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to increase the size of Winderabandi sanctuary zone.
757.	Prohibit all netting from this sanctuary zone. (1 submission)	No (2e)	Netting is not allowed in the sanctuary zone, but is allowed in the special purpose (shore-based activities) zone at Winderabandi Point.
758.	Exclude shore fishing adjacent to this sanctuary zone. (2 submissions)	No (2e)	Shore fishing is an important activity in this area.
759.	Should be parallel to the habitats, i.e. rotate the rectangle. (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to increase the size of Winderabandi sanctuary zone.
760.	This is a popular camping spot and this zone will affect Ningaloo Station. (1 submission)	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
761.	Zone is too small and should be increased to a size adequate to provide such protection. (2 submissions)	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to increase the size of Winderabandi sanctuary zone.
762.	More research is required. (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	Higher priority on research strategies in plan.
763.	Recommend increasing the sanctuary zone north to include the Bundera Coastal Protection area as described in the Ningaloo Coast Regional Strategy (p38). It would have the added benefits of: a) bringing a new area of the lagoon under total protection, and b) creating larger, simpler sanctuary zones. (3 submissions)	Yes (1a)	The zone has been expanded to include this area.
	<b>Cloates - specific comments on this zone</b>		
764.	<p><i>Western Angler</i> proforma</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>10 responses.</b></li> <li>Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>72 responses.</b></li> </ul>		



	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
765.	Against the seaward addition as this is not justified and/or recreational fishing should be able to continue. Any proposed sanctuary zone should be limited to the reef edge or allow for trolling. <b>(51 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	This zone has been extended to provide better overall protection of the park, and better representation of habitats in sanctuary zones.
766.	Do not support the extension of the sanctuary zone south to Point Cloates. <b>(11 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
767.	If you were to extend this sanctuary zone then it would be fair to leave Winderabandi proposed zone off the agenda. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
768.	Should be extended south to meet Dugong Zone <b>(1 submission)</b> .	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to join the Cloates and Dugong sanctuary zones.
769.	This area is rarely visited by recreational fishers. Most are fly fisherman who practice catch and release. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
770.	Should be a no-anchoring area. <b>(9 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
771.	Allow angling from the shore. <b>(14 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	There are areas where fishing from shore is permitted adjacent to this zone.
772.	The proposal will restrict fishing to either the dangerous 'Black Rock passage' or force small boaters owners to go outside State waters which is unsafe for small boats. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
773.	This sanctuary zone provides some protection to coastal and offshore habitats. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for plan.
774.	Fishing from the shore should not be permitted. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Shore fishing is an important activity in this area.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
775.	More research is required. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	Increased research will be undertaken in the park.
776.	This would be a good location to examine the impact of no-take management outside the reef. An outside the reef sanctuary could extend from the whaling passage into Norwegian Bay to the Black Rock passage and cause only minimal inconvenience. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to join the Cloates and Dugong sanctuary zones.
777.	A sanctuary zone in this situation, remote from commercial and most recreational fishing would facilitate research on the benefits of the seaward extensions. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for plan.
	<b>Dugong - specific comments on this zone</b>		
778.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>42 responses.</b></li> <li>Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>39 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
779.	The sanctuary zone next to Ningaloo Station is too large and should be halved. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
780.	Zone supported as it provides protection to all habitats and communities from the shore to the outer limit of State waters. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for plan.
781.	Disagree with the seaward extension of this sanctuary zone. No justification for this extension and/or no reason to restrict fishing for pelagic species. <b>(16 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	A major inadequacy of the previous zoning scheme was the lack of deeper water habitats in sanctuary zones. This zone extension has addressed this inadequacy.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
782.	Concerns over justifying the extension solely on Westera and Hyndes (2001) to protect a single genus of demersal fish. If there was evidence of overfishing of lethrinids and there was a need to protect spawning areas then seasonal spawning closures should be used. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The zone extensions are based on a number of criteria relating to biodiversity conservation, and are not being implemented to protect particular fishes.
783.	Do not support the Dugong sanctuary zone as it excludes recreational rock lobster fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
784.	Beach fishing should be allowed in the existing sanctuary zone. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2f)	Under the CALM Act fishing is not permitted in sanctuary zones.
785.	The existing sanctuary zone is not properly marked on shore and is not marked at all at sea <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	This is an operational matter that will be addressed as appropriate in the implementation of the management plan.
786.	Recreational fishers rarely visit this area, and most are fly fisherman who practice catch and release. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
787.	The proposal will restrict fishing to either the dangerous 'black rock passage' or force small boaters owners to go outside State waters which is unsafe for small boats. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
788.	There should be no anchoring and moorings should be installed. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
789.	Not convinced the value of extending the sanctuary zone seaward, but agree that information on this topic is required. This sanctuary zone would facilitate research on this matter. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	Yes (1e)	A comprehensive research plan has been included in the plan to address this information need.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	<b>Bateman - specific comments on this zone</b>		
790.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>14 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>66 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
791.	Do not believe that recreational fishing is detrimental to biodiversity in this area and so do not support this zone. <b>(22 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
792.	The Batemans Bay sanctuary zone needs to be extended further north to contain the whole <i>Porites</i> system. The most important area has been excluded from the sanctuary zone. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
793.	This sanctuary zone should be extended to the outer limit of State waters thereby protecting deeper water habitats and soft sediment communities and ensuring that these assemblages are given adequate and replicated protection. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
794.	Anchoring should be banned within the zone to protect the coral <b>(18 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
795.	Shore fishing should be permitted. <b>(9 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
796.	Recreational fishers rarely visit this area, and most are fly fisherman who practice catch and release. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
797.	Diving should be banned. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
798.	Allow recreational fishing on the outer reef. (5 submissions)	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
	<b>Maud - specific comments on this zone</b>		
799.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>58 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>16 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
800.	Extend Maud sanctuary zone south to include Lottie's Lagoon, more coral and/or deep water habitat. (5 submissions)	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to extend Maud sanctuary zone south to include Lottie's Lagoon
801.	The area north of the Maud sanctuary zone needs to be included in the zone to provide a reprieve from fishing pressure as it is small area where at least five potato cod reside and breed. (1 submission)	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
802.	This sanctuary zone should be extended to the limit of State waters thereby protecting deeper water habitats and soft sediment communities and ensuring that these assemblages are given adequate and replicated protection. (6 submissions)	No (2d)	This zone was not extended to the limit of State waters because of the seaward extension of sanctuary zones to the north and south and because of the high use of the area by recreational fishers.
803.	Bill's Bay is degraded or damaged by overuse and/or natural processes. (17 submissions)	No (2b)	No change sought.
804.	This sanctuary zone is too large and should be halved in size. (1 submission)	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
805.	This sanctuary zone is working well. Leave as is. (2 submissions)	No (2a)	The zone has one minor amendment to the southern boundary.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
806.	Concern that zoning is being changed to allow a facility to be constructed south of Coral Bay at Moncks Head. This location is not the best place to construct such facility if the environment is to be protected. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Maud sanctuary zone boundary has been amended slightly so the proposed Moncks Head boating facility is not in the sanctuary zone. This minor amendment excised approximately 2ha of mostly sand habitat from the sanctuary zone, and did not involve the excision of reef areas. Overall, Maud sanctuary zone has been increased to include reef areas to the south.
807.	Recreational fishers rarely visit this area, and most are fly fisherman who practice catch and release. <b>(1 submission)</b> .	No (2b)	Fishing is not permitted in the sanctuary zone. Any fishing activity that currently occurs in the zone is illegal.
808.	The proposed Moncks Head boat launching facility will contribute to continuing degradation and encourage inexperienced boaters to use the dangerous south passage. <b>(15 submissions)</b>	No (2c)	Beyond the scope of the plan. The positioning of the boating facility is a matter that is being addressed through a separate Government process.
809.	The beach fishing zoning as suggested is supported <b>(14 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for plan.
810.	Shore fishing should not be permitted adjacent to this sanctuary zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Shore fishing is permitted in some areas adjacent to the sanctuary zone. This is to provide opportunity for visitors to Coral Bay to undertake this activity.
811.	The boundary should be a straight line from the point to the outer corner to correct a previous deficiency. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
812.	The Maud sanctuary zone has actually decreased in area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2 (b)	While there was a minor proposed excision of 2ha of mostly sand habitat from the Maud sanctuary zone to allow construction of the proposed Moncks Head boating facility, a larger area has been added to this zone.
	<b>Pelican - specific comments on this zone</b>		

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
813.	<p><i>Western Angler</i> proforma</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>17 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>64 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
814.	There is no justification to support the westward extension of this sanctuary zone. ( <b>30 submissions</b> )	No (2d)	A major inadequacy of the previous zoning scheme was the lack of deeper water habitats in sanctuary zones. This zone extension has addressed this inadequacy.
815.	Should allow fishing for pelagic species, but not bottom species and/or the creation of a 'no take away' from this area could also be introduced, instead of extending the sanctuary zone. ( <b>3 submissions</b> )	No (2d)	A major inadequacy of the previous zoning scheme was the lack of deeper water habitats in sanctuary zones. This zone extension has addressed this inadequacy.
816.	Given limited land access there is no benefit having a sanctuary zone in the area. ( <b>6 submissions</b> )	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
817.	Ban anchoring in this sanctuary zone. ( <b>19 submissions</b> )	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
818.	This area is heavily used by recreational fishers. ( <b>1 submission</b> )	No (2b)	No change sought.
819.	Recreational fishers rarely visit this area, and most are fly fisherman who practice catch and release. ( <b>1 submission</b> ).	No (2b)	No change sought.
820.	Support as this provides some protection to all habitats and communities from the shore to the outer limit of State waters. ( <b>1 submission</b> )	No (2a)	Support for plan.
821.	Prohibiting people from the area is not the right approach. ( <b>1 submission</b> )	No (2b)	Access to the sanctuary zone is not prohibited.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
822.	This sanctuary zone should be expanded further to incorporate at least the 50 m depth, as this area is important. The sanctuary zone should also be expanded for a distance of 10km along the coast. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1a)	The plan has been amended to extend Pelican sanctuary zone to the north and south.
823.	The proposed sanctuary zone should be extended along the shoreline to combine the proposed Pelican Point and Cape Farquhar sanctuary zones to compliment the adjoining as described in the <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> 'area of environmental management priority'. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	This zone has been extended.
824.	Allow recreational shore fishing in this sanctuary zone. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	Recreational shore fishing is permitted in the special purpose (shore-based activities) zones adjacent to the north and south extensions to this sanctuary zone. Fishing is not permitted in the sanctuary zone.
825.	Reduce bag limits in this area to four fish per day area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The Department of Fisheries manages fishing in all State waters, including in marine conservation reserves.
	<b>Cape Farquhar - specific comments on this zone</b>		
826.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>13 responses.</b></li> <li>Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>68 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
827.	Recommend extending zone south. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	This would have an unacceptable impact on recreational and commercial fishing.
828.	This sanctuary zone should be extended to the outer limit of State waters to protect deeper water habitats, soft sediment communities and/or ensure that these assemblages are given adequate and replicated protection. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	This would have an unacceptable impact on recreational and commercial fishing.



	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
829.	This sanctuary zone is too big. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
830.	Do not support this zone, as the lagoon (Coral Garden) is vital for aquarium collectors. We require access to all the lagoon waters from 23° 37.700' S to 23° 36.500' S. Would support a smaller sanctuary zone (e.g. 2 km wide) to the north or south of this area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
831.	This is unacceptable because it excludes recreational anglers. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
832.	The location of this sanctuary zone discriminates against shore based spear fishing. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
833.	Allow recreational fishing along the shoreline and outer reef. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
834.	The entire area should be managed holistically, instead of scattered sanctuary zones. <b>(17 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The reserves will be managed holistically with sanctuary zones as a key component of management.
835.	This area should be a wilderness fishing area that allows catch and release and/or catch-for-a-feed only. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Sanctuary zones are implemented for biodiversity conservation, and are not a fisheries management strategy.
836.	Reduce bag limits in this area to four fish per day area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The Department of Fisheries manages fishing in all State waters, including in marine conservation reserves.
837.	This sanctuary zone should continue out to Commonwealth waters and to a depth of at least 50m. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	This was considered, but would have had an unacceptable impact on recreational and commercial fishing.
838.	Prohibiting people from the area is not the right approach. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Access to the sanctuary zone is not prohibited.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
839.	A sanctuary zone is not needed in this lower use area, as there is no scientific basis to justify using resources establishing and policing such a zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
840.	Conditional support for this sanctuary zone if returned to the original configuration that was proposed. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
	<b>Gnarraloo - specific comments on this zone</b>		
841.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>14 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>64 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
842.	This sanctuary zone should be changed to a recreation zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
843.	The public should have continued access. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	Access to the sanctuary zone is not prohibited.
844.	This sanctuary zone should be removed, as there is little coral cover. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	Sanctuary zones are implemented for the conservation of all marine biodiversity, not just corals.
845.	Spear fishing should be permitted in Gnarraloo Bay. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
846.	This sanctuary zone discriminates against recreational fishers. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	All extractive activities are prohibited in sanctuary zones.
847.	Whilst there is strong support for this sanctuary zone due to the good coral in the area, it is recommended that the existing boat ramp remain outside the zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
848.	Agree with this sanctuary zone, but suggest that shore fishing be allowed left of the boat ramp. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
849.	Allow recreational fishing along the shoreline. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
850.	Allow recreational fishing along outer reef. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
851.	This sanctuary zone should be relocated and split into two zones to allow our aquarium collector licensees to continue work in sheltered water inside the bay. The first very small zone (approx 200 m diameter) to protect the very shallow coral garden on the corner of the sandy point with its centre approx 23° 45.800' S and 113° 32.45' E. The large block of Gnaraloo sanctuary zone needs to be relocated to the south (1.5 nautical miles) to allow access to inside and outside lagoon (northern boundary located at 23° 44.400' S). <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
852.	This sanctuary zone should be extended to the outer limit of state waters to protect deeper water habitats and soft sediment communities and ensure that these assemblages are given adequate and replicated protection. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
853.	A sanctuary zone in this low use area cannot be justified. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
854.	Instead of a sanctuary zone, it would be better to make the area a no anchor zone and/or restrict the amount of fish that can be taken away. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
855.	A wilderness fishing area that allows catch and release and catch-for-a-feed only is more appropriate than a sanctuary zone. <b>(5 submissions)</b>  <b>Three Mile - specific comments on this zone</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
856.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>15 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>62 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
857.	This sanctuary zone should be extended to the outer limit of State waters thereby protecting deeper water habitats and soft sediment communities and ensuring that these assemblages are given adequate and replicated protection. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Sanctuary zones to the north and south extend into deep waters and provide protection for deeper water habitats. Furthermore, the Three Mile camping area is a major tourism node, where fishing is a popular activity.
858.	This sanctuary zone discriminates against recreational fishers. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	All extractive activities are prohibited in sanctuary zones.
859.	Prohibiting people from the area is not the right approach. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	Access to the sanctuary zone is not prohibited.
860.	Disagree with this sanctuary zone. Suggest a small sanctuary zone in the lagoon in front of Three Mile Camp. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
861.	This sanctuary zone is supported. The area immediately in front of the Three Mile Camp is not appropriate for collection activities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for plan.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
862.	The sanctuary zone would be supported if the zone was reduced in area so that the boundary is to the outer end of the reef only, with the northern boundary only 1km above the southern boundary. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
863.	There is no scientific justification for creating and enforcing a sanctuary zone in this low-use area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The justification for this zone is outlined in the plan.
864.	Make the area a no anchor zone. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
865.	The area should be a wilderness fishing area that allows catch and release and catch-for-a-feed only. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
866.	Should allow recreational fishing along the shoreline and the outer reef. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
867.	The entire area should be managed holistically, instead of scattered sanctuary zones. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The reserves will be managed holistically with sanctuary zones as a key component of management.
868.	This sanctuary zone should be inshore and parallel to the coast. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
	<b>Turtles - specific comments on this zone</b>		
869.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with this sanctuary zone: <b>17 responses.</b></li> <li>Disagree with this sanctuary zone: <b>62 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
870.	The public should have continued access. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	Access to the sanctuary zone is not prohibited.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
871.	Turtles sanctuary zone is too large and impacts on commercial aquarium collectors. Recommend southern boundary moved north to 23° 57.025' to allow continued access to this area. The northern boundary is appropriate as proposed. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The zones have been chosen on the basis of the distribution of marine habitats and existing uses. Commercial aquarium fishery concerns have been considered, but could not be accommodated without impacting on the overall objectives for the zoning scheme of the plan.
872.	There is no justification for this sanctuary zone in a popular fishing area. <b>(7 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
873.	This is unacceptable because it may exclude surfing in the future, if this activity was determined to be inconsistent with conservation objectives. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The management plan does not restrict surfing activities.
874.	This sanctuary zone will encourage snorkelling in an area that is dangerous for swimmers at times of intertidal change. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
875.	This sanctuary zone should not extend out to the limit of State waters. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The zone extends to the limit of State waters to provide representation of deeper water habitats.
876.	This sanctuary zone should be extended slightly to the limit of State waters. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	A north and south orientated boundary for this zone line is more practical for compliance.
877.	Instead of a sanctuary zone, it would be better to make the area a no anchor zone and/or restrict the amount of fish that can be taken away. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
878.	A wilderness fishing area that allows catch and release and catch-for-a-feed only is more appropriate than a sanctuary zone. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
879.	The entire area should be managed holistically, instead of scattered sanctuary zones. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The reserves will be managed holistically with sanctuary zones as a key component of management.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
<b>Zoning of the Marine Management Area</b>			
880.	Agree with the proposed conservation areas in the marine management area. <b>(155 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
881.	Disagree with the proposed conservation areas in the marine management area. <b>(56 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Zoning is an important management strategy. It is one of a suite of complementary management tools that will be used to achieve the objectives of the plan.
882.	Conservation areas are not big enough and should be made larger to protect the conservation values. <b>(12 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Enlarging these areas would have an unacceptable impact on recreation fishing.
883.	Conservation zones should be all the way to the shore and not allow line fishing from shore. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No 2 (d)	The conservation areas do extend to the shoreline.
884.	Muiron Islands are inaccessible so there is no need for conservation areas. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The Muiron Islands area is highly accessible and is under increasing pressure from a range of human uses.
885.	Adequate protection would be provided by fisheries regulations. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	Conservation areas are created for biodiversity conservation, not as a fisheries management measure. Fisheries management in the marine conservation reserves is carried out by the Department of Fisheries.
886.	A periodic ban on fishing at the islands will deter people from going to the islands. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
887.	Suggest shore based fishing be left open and fishing for pelagics in all three areas be allowed, even if only catch and release. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Adequate areas exist in the marine management area for these activities.
888.	Conservation areas will impact on the experience of visiting the Muiron Islands. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan will ensure conservation outcomes while maintaining a range of activities.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
889.	Conservation of these areas will benefit future generations. Excellent initiative to protect the high biodiversity around the Muiron Islands. The <i>Ningaloo coast regional strategy Carnarvon to Exmouth</i> highlights the Muiron Islands as areas of environmental significance. (4 submissions)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
890.	Proposal discriminates against recreational fishers while allowing mineral and petroleum exploration. Exploration and mining should be excluded from this area. (8 submissions)	No (2e)	Conservation areas are established for biodiversity conservation, not to exclude or penalise particular users. 'Assess' does not necessarily mean development proposals will be approved.
891.	Make one of the islands a 3 km conservation area and/or a reserve in part only. / Leave the Muiron Islands area as is. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
892.	Both Muiron islands should be protected under restrictions. There are significant nesting rookeries for turtles on the north east side of the south island. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Conservation areas are proposed for all three islands in the marine management area, while turtles are also protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act.
893.	The proposal is unfair to commercial aquarium fishers. (1 submission)	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
894.	There is no scientific justification for the conservation areas. (1 submission)	No (2d)	The conservation areas provide protection for representative marine communities in this reserve. Planning for the areas has been based on adequate scientific information.
895.	Seek assurance that once defined, no further restrictions will be added or implied. (1 submission)	No (2b)	Management plan can only be amended following a statutory public comment process.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	<b>Sunday Island - specific comments on this zone</b>		
896.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this conservation zone: <b>6 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this conservation zone. <b>55 responses</b></li> </ul>		
897.	Disagree with conservation areas. ( <b>3 submissions</b> )	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
898.	There is no evidence or indication that fish stocks in the area have suffered or are under threat due to recreational fishing. ( <b>22 submissions</b> )	No (2c)	Sanctuary zones are implemented for biodiversity conservation, and are not a fisheries management strategy. Fisheries management in marine conservation reserves is carried out by the Department of Fisheries.
899.	This conservation area is important for the aquarium fishery. ( <b>1 submission</b> )	No (2d)	Adequate areas remain for access by the aquarium fishery.
900.	This area is protected by its isolation. ( <b>1 submission</b> )	No (2e)	The Muiron Islands area is highly accessible and is under increasing pressure from a range of human uses.
901.	It is noted that petroleum activities are permitted but that recreational fishing is not. ( <b>13 submissions</b> )	No (2b)	Conservation areas are established for biodiversity conservation, not to exclude or penalise particular users. 'Assess' does not necessarily mean development proposals will be approved.
902.	The Sunday Island conservation area should be removed completely. ( <b>16 submissions</b> )	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
903.	Management of this area would be very expensive. ( <b>2 submissions</b> )	No (2b)	No change sought. Funds have been allocated for management of the area.
904.	Should allow shoreline and outer reef recreational fishing in this area. ( <b>2 submissions</b> )	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
905.	Support a ban on anchoring and the installation of moorings. <b>(2 submissions)</b>  <b>North Muiron - specific comments on this zone</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
906.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this conservation area: <b>9 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this conservation area: <b>66 responses.</b></li> </ul>		
907.	There should not be a conservation area here as it covers a large section of sheltered waters that has a diverse range of habitat and depth. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
908.	There is no evidence or indication that fish stocks in the area have suffered or are under threat due to recreational fishing <b>(19 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	Sanctuary zones are implemented for biodiversity conservation, and are not a fisheries management strategy. Fisheries management in marine conservation reserves is carried out by the Department of Fisheries.
909.	This conservation area cannot be justified. <b>(23 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
910.	There should be no anchoring and moorings should be installed. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
911.	Both islands should be protected under restrictions. There are significant nesting rookeries for turtles on the north east side of the south island. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Conservation areas are proposed for all three islands in the marine management area, while turtles are also protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act.
912.	The north Muiron conservation area needs to be expanded about 100 m west of the proposed boundary to include some of the best coral reef in this location. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
913.	It is noted that petroleum activities are permitted but that recreational fishing is not. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	Conservation areas are established for biodiversity conservation, not to exclude or penalise particular users. 'Assess' does not necessarily mean development proposals will be approved.
914.	Recommend changes to this zone to encompass areas identified by the WA Museum as having the highest diversity of fishes and molluscs and the most diverse marine topography of the waters surrounding the Muiron Islands. The channel between the two islands is highly diverse and should be included in the conservation area. The area of the Muiron Islands includes habitats not found at either the Montebello Islands or Ningaloo Reef and, as a consequence, has a higher biodiversity of fishes than any other mainland reef area in WA. This area may act as a stepping-stone for marine biota between the Montebello Islands and Ningaloo Reef. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current management arrangements represent an equitable balance at this point. Further research will determine if these arrangements are adequate.
915.	Should allow shoreline and outer reef recreational fishing in this area. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
916.	As the Muiron Islands are A class terrestrial reserves, the conservation areas should completely surround the islands. Contiguous terrestrial/marine conservation reserves are shown to have great conservation benefit and can be argued to have economic merit in 'high protection wilderness areas' that allow for human visitation. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints. This area is very important for recreational fishing.
	<b>South Muiron - specific comments on this zone</b>		
917.	<i>Western Angler</i> proforma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this conservation area: <b>4 responses.</b></li> <li>• Disagree with this conservation area: <b>72 responses.</b></li> </ul>		

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
918.	There is no scientific justification for this conservation area. <b>(8 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The conservation area is required to provide representation of habitats on the western side of the islands that are very different to the western side.
919.	There is no evidence or indication that fish stocks in the area have suffered or are under threat due to recreational fishing. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2c)	Conservation zones are implemented for biodiversity conservation, and are not a fisheries management strategy. Fisheries management in marine conservation reserves is carried out by the Department of Fisheries.
920.	The existing no fishing area on the north western shore of South Muiron Island is adequate. <b>(40 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The existing restricted fishing area does not encompass the range of habitats found in the reserve.
921.	The South Muiron conservation area should be extended to the northeast corner of the island to include significant rookeries for threatened marine turtle species. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints. This area is very important for recreational fishing.
922.	A no anchoring policy must be included in this area and moorings put in place to protect fragile corals. <b>(9 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	The plan has been amended to highlight strategies for detailed site planning, including provision for moorings and no-anchoring areas where appropriate.
923.	The South Muiron conservation zone is too large and excludes aquarium collectors from too much area. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Adequate areas remain for access by the aquarium fishery.
924.	The South Muiron conservation zone cuts off access to better fish on or around this island. Would prefer a boundary at the 20 m contour. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
925.	Management of this area would be very expensive. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No 2 (b)	No change sought. Funds have been allocated for management of the area.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
926.	The area of the Muiron Islands includes habitats not found at either the Montebello Islands or Ningaloo Reef and, as a consequence, has a higher biodiversity of fishes than any other mainland reef area in WA. This area may act as a stepping-stone for marine biota between the Montebello Islands and Ningaloo Reef. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
927.	Should allow shoreline and outer reef recreational fishing in this area. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The current arrangement is considered to be the most appropriate management option and the most equitable outcome after consideration of all viewpoints.
928.	The conservation areas should completely surround the islands to have contiguous terrestrial/marine conservation reserves. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The marine management area surrounds the islands but the conservation areas do not because the area is important for recreational fishing.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
<b>Permitted activities table</b>			
929.	The permitted activity tables in the management plan should be re-written as 'Marine Aquarium Specimen Collection' with footnotes to the effect that the Department of Fisheries management of the fishery precludes take of coral and live rock from Bundegi to Amhurst Point. This specimen collection must be a permitted activity in the general use zones of the reserves, which is closely managed by the Department of Fisheries and meets Environment Australia's sustainability guidelines. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Collection of coral live rock and sand will not be permitted. However fish and shell collecting may be permitted in parts of the general use zone and marine management area subject to this activity being shown to being ecologically sustainable within three years of gazettal of the plan.
930.	Expand the list of permitted activities in reserves as long as they are sustainable activities. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The list of activities in the permitted activities table is comprehensive and covers all activities that occur in the reserves.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
931.	Concerns over permitting seismic activity and oil exploration and/or petroleum activities and/or dredging and dredge spoil dumping. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	Muiron Islands are an area of high prospectivity for the petroleum industry. Petroleum activities in this area are subject to environmental assessments by the Environmental Protection Authority.
932.	Concerns over the inequity in relation to recreational fishing not being permitted in conservation areas when oil exploration, drilling and pipelines are 'assess'. (2 submissions)	No (2d)	Muiron Islands are an area of high prospectivity for the petroleum industry. Petroleum activities in this area are subject to environmental assessments by the Environmental Protection Authority.
933.	Table 7 states 'Assess - Activity will be permitted if assessed to be sustainable by relevant agencies'. These decisions should be made through further public consultation. (1 submission)	No (2d)	Activities, which are listed as 'assess' in the permitted activities table, will be subject to statutory environmental assessment processes.
934.	Concerns regarding the inconsistency between the Ningaloo Marine Park plan and the Montebellos indicative management plan. The definition of 'assess' and the difference between the long-term targets of 7.1.1 and 7.1.2. Suggest amending to be consistent with the Montebello's indicative management plan. (1 submission)	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to update long term targets for geomorphology and sediment quality to reflect those in the Montebello/Barrow Islands Indicative Management Plan.
935.	Concerns over the contradiction between long-term targets for 7.1.1 and 7.1.2 and Table 7. (1 submission)	Yes (1b)	The plan has been amended to update long term targets for geomorphology and sediment quality to reflect those in the Montebello Islands management plan.
936.	No aquaculture should be permitted in the marine park or marine management area. (3 submissions)	No (2d)	Aquaculture will only be permitted in general use zones if assessed to be sustainable by relevant agencies.
937.	Trolling for pelagic species should be permitted in sanctuary zones. (1 submission)	No (2f)	Extractive activities, including trolling, are not permitted in sanctuary zones under the CALM Act.
938.	All activities should be allowed in all zones unless those activities are proven to be incompatible with the declared purpose for the existence of the zone. (1 submission)	No (2f)	The CALM Act details the activities, which may or may not be permitted in (sanctuary and recreation) zones. The zones and activities permitted within them were extensively discussed during the planning process and the strategy outlined in the plan is considered the best option.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
<b>Education and Interpretation</b>			
939.	A marine biology learning centre should be established at Exmouth. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	While this issue is beyond the scope of this plan, a research centre is being established at Exmouth.
940.	Education is the key to all users gaining a better understanding of our environmental and how we impact upon it. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
941.	The education program to ensure users are aware of zoning restrictions and regulations that apply to their activities within the reserves will be key to successful implementation of the zoning scheme. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
942.	The libraries (text, audio-visual, photo), herbarium and specimen library initiated at the Milyering Visitor Centre are successful education tools for both the general public and professional visitors. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
943.	More resources required for appropriate education programs. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The education and interpretation strategy (Section 8.2) is a key element of the management plan. The Government has allocated significant additional resources for the management of the reserves. Public education will continue to be an important strategy for the management of the area.
944.	Education will be of greater benefit to the community than closing sections of the reef to recreational fishers. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2e)	The education and interpretation strategy (Section 8.2) is a key element of the management plan. However, zoning is also integral to the protection of Ningaloo Reef.
945.	Education contributes to sustainability. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
946.	Education is needed for boat anchoring, size and bag limits. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	The education and interpretation strategy (Section 8.2) is a key element of the plan and will include these issues.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
947.	Education is critical. / More education is required. <b>(30 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	The education and interpretation strategy (Section 8.2) is a key element of the plan. The Government has allocated significant additional resources for the management of the reserves. Public education will continue to be an important strategy for the management of the area.
948.	Undertake an independent survey of West Australian attitudes to marine conservation. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
<b>Surveillance and Enforcement</b>			
949.	Require more or adequate policing, more CALM staff, more Department of Fisheries staff, and more funding. <b>(60 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Surveillance and enforcement strategies (Section 8.3) in the plan discuss staffing and policing. Government has approved significant additional resources for management, including funds for enforcement to CALM and the Department of Fisheries.
950.	Require better signage. / Maintain zone markers. / Ensure sanctuary zone boundaries are clearly marked. <b>(10 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The plan indicates that signage and markers will be used to identify zone boundaries. Funds have been approved for this.
951.	It is difficult to make people comply with regulations. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	No change sought.
952.	Have enforceable penalties for prohibited activities. <b>(10 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Prohibited activities and appropriate penalties exist under CALM and Department of Fisheries regulations.
953.	Concerns that CALM officers are not able to fine people / enforce no take zones under the CALM Act. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	Cross authorisation of CALM officers to enforce fisheries regulations is planned to be implemented.



	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
954.	Better management of non-sanctuary zone areas is also becoming critical. Bag limits for Ningaloo Reef should be reviewed, and a strategy to control boat numbers established. There are poor levels of monitoring of human activity, compliance and education measures currently afforded the Ningaloo Reef. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Bag limits for the Gascoyne area (including Ningaloo Marine Park) have recently been revised (2003). However, the Ningaloo Research Fund will be used to investigate the adequacy of existing fisheries arrangements in the reserves and changes will be considered in appropriate.
955.	Enforce littering laws. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Litter is addressed in the plan.
<b>Research</b>			
956.	More research is required and/or a research plan should be developed. <b>(19 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan. The plan outlines a strategy to develop a coordinated and prioritised research plan (Section 8.4). The State Government has recently committed \$5,000,000 for research in the reserves and this funding will address the priorities identified in the research plan.
957.	Concerns regarding the lack of research conducted by CALM to date. <b>(5 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	There has been significant research undertaken in the Ningaloo Marine Park since it was established almost 15 years ago. CALM has initiated much of this research. The Ningaloo Research Fund will fund an enhanced program of research in the reserves.
958.	Research should be conducted by independent scientific organizations. / Decisions involving the future of the marine park should be based on unbiased scientific studies. <b>(8 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	Research at Ningaloo Marine Park is carried out by research institutions, such as universities, CSIRO and the Australian Institute of Marine Science, in collaboration with CALM.
959.	Need statistics to compare commercial to recreational fishing, as people believe commercial fishing causes greater environmental impacts. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Strategies in the plan address this issue.
960.	Concerns about where and/or how ongoing funding will be provided. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	As well as the Ningaloo Research Fund, the Government has allocated significant on-going funding for research and monitoring.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
961.	Ongoing research will be of greater benefit to the community than closing sections of the reef to recreational fishers. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Research and appropriate sanctuary zones are both vital to the conservation of Ningaloo Reef.
962.	Support for research in one or more of these areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• biodiversity inventories, assessment and protection,</li> <li>• sanctuary zone monitoring,</li> <li>• museum historical data,</li> <li>• informing the public,</li> <li>• seabed mapping to identify substrates and sediments on the continental shelf,</li> <li>• seabed mapping of the shallow shelf to seaward of Ningaloo Reef,</li> <li>• morphology and growth history of the reef system,</li> <li>• characterisation of lagoon sediments,</li> <li>• assessment of reef communities,</li> <li>• Ningaloo coastal management project which is a coastal management GIS,</li> <li>• coastal groundwater systems.</li> <li>• habitat and biodiversity surveys of Muiron Islands area,</li> <li>• baseline environmental and ecological data,</li> <li>• sanctuary zones,</li> <li>• tourist/wildlife interactions,</li> <li>• the impacts of diving and snorkelling, and</li> <li>• breeding and nursery grounds for fish. <b>(11 submissions)</b></li> </ul>	Yes (1d)	The research strategies in the plan were reviewed and amended as a result of public submissions. The plan also outlines a strategy to develop a coordinated and prioritised research plan (Section 8.4). The State Government has recently committed \$5,000,000 for research in the marine park and this funding addresses the priorities identified in the research plan.
963.	Concern as to whether the research strategies on the plan will be achieved in the life of this plan. <b>(3 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	The significant increase in research funds for Ningaloo Reef will greatly enhance the research effort.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
964.	Strongly support the priority establishment of a research and monitoring program to assess the impacts of existing sanctuary zones in all marine parks. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
965.	Undertake research to establish baseline standing stock/numbers and information on reproductive cycles and processes of exploited species. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	A number of new and/or existing strategies address this issue.
<b>Monitoring</b>			
966.	A comprehensive monitoring program needs to be established that will reliably provide baseline and replicated data in areas within proposed sanctuary zones and areas outside them / to assess the effects on sanctuary zones and make the audit public. <b>(6 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Monitoring is identified as a critical strategy in the plan and an audit of the management plan by the MPRA will occur every three years.
967.	The reserves should be monitored every three years. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	Monitoring is identified as a critical strategy in the plan. Additional funds have been provided by the Government to significantly increase the monitoring of the reserves.
968.	Support for higher investment in monitoring of the health of the Ningaloo Reef system. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2a)	Monitoring is identified as a critical strategy in the plan. Additional funds have been provided by the Government to significantly increase the monitoring of the reserves.
969.	A comprehensive monitoring program on all aspects of the plan needs to accompany the final plan to ensure the performance indicators stated in the vision can be adequately measured and reported upon / important to monitor and manage the marine life. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2b)	Monitoring is identified as a critical strategy in the plan.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
970.	Undertake research to establish protocols and standards for mapping and data collection of ecological and social values (e.g. resolution, spatial references, sampling design) to support assessment within a hierarchical approach. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1d)	A number of new strategies have been included to undertake research into the development of cost effective monitoring protocols of social and ecological values. In some cases it is implicit that such work is required to achieve the strategy.
971.	As a priority undertake research to establish park-wide baseline data for future monitoring and research. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Park-wide baseline data will be collected as part of monitoring and research.
972.	Undertake research to document Ningaloo’s cultural and natural heritage to provide context for assessment of current condition and status of the park values (both social and ecological). <b>(2 submissions)</b>	Yes (1d)	New strategies proposed for wilderness values, maritime heritage values and indigenous heritage values, in addition to many new strategies proposed for the various ecological values, represent a significant contribution towards achieving a better understanding of Ningaloo’s natural and cultural heritage.
973.	A general recommendation to upgrade to H-KMS for the mapping of ecological and social values identified in Section seven. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The need for mapping is assessed with consideration for current knowledge of a value, its relative significance and its vulnerability to threatening processes. These assessments are performed for each value and will vary accordingly.
974.	Undertake research to improve understanding of the effects of natural events on the ecology of Ningaloo. <b>(2 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Existing strategies that propose baseline monitoring will improve understanding of natural temporal and spatial variability. Natural events that pose a particular threat, such as climate change and predation by <i>Drupella</i> are addressed in specific strategies.
975.	Investigate the feasibility of broad-scale remote sensing technologies such as hyperspectral imagery for habitat mapping and mapping of biodiversity. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The suitability of these types of methods will be considered as part of the development of cost-effective monitoring protocols for the different ecological values.
<b>Public Participation – No comments on this section</b>			

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
<b>Direct Management Intervention</b>			
976.	Pristine areas should be maintained, while degraded areas should be improved. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
<b>Development proposals within the proposed reserves</b>			
977.	Coral Bay must be adequately seweraged, and no sewage outfall or septic overflow should be allowed to leach into the bay. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	Sewage treatment for Coral Bay is currently being upgraded.
978.	Require an all weather boat ramp at Bundegi. / Build more boat ramps and/or jetties. <b>(4 submissions)</b>	No (2c)	The Department for Planning and Infrastructure is responsible for development of launching facilities and is currently liaising with CALM in regard to development of a boating facility at Coral Bay.
979.	The use of moorings would be highly valuable at the Muiron Islands, especially at the regularly used dive sites. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2d)	The plan includes strategies to undertake detailed site planning, including mooring and boating controls.
980.	Moorings required in all sanctuary zones. / A mooring plan is required. <b>(8 submissions)</b>	No (2d)	Implementation of moorings where appropriate is detailed in the plan.
981.	Marker buoys required in South Passage to help those that do not know where to go. This in itself would help the reef system. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2c)	The Department for Planning and Infrastructure is responsible for the installation and maintenance of navigation markers.
982.	All future development must be subject to the highest and strictest environmental protection conditions and standards. <b>(1 submission)</b>	No (2a)	The plan indicates that all developments within the reserves are subject to planning and environmental approvals. The management targets will provide specific guidance in relation to the assessment of coastal developments.

	<b>SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED</b>	<b>AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/ACTION</b>
983.	Pleased to see that the demand for boat moorings has been considered in the plan. The mooring site plans need to be developed and implemented in the near future as a matter of priority, particularly at popular dive and snorkel sites and to cater for existing commercial tourism operators. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Support for the plan.
<b>Performance Assessment</b>			
984.	Use the Management Strategy Evaluation and Multiple Use Management products developed as part of the NWSJEMS project to enable an evaluation of the management strategies in the current Ningaloo Management Plan and predictive scenario assessment for a number of multiple use trajectories to inform future planning. (1 submission)	Yes (1d)	A new research strategy has been added.
<b>Audit by CALM – No comments on this section</b>			
<b>Audit by MPRA – No comments on this section</b>			
<b>Review of Management Plan</b>			
985.	Support the management measures undergoing regular and timely review and evaluation. Concerned with the intention to have the new plan in place for at least ten years. (1 submission)	No (2a)	Support for the plan. The CALM Act requires management plans to be ten-year plans.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUES/MAJOR POINTS RAISED	AMENDMENT (CRITERIA)	DISCUSSION/ACTION
	<b>Links with State Environment Reporting – No comments on this section</b>		
	<b>Links with National Environment Reporting – No comments on this section</b>		
	<b>References</b>		
986.	Citing is incorrect for the reference ‘May <i>et al.</i> 1983’: the words ‘National Parks Report 1 Perth WA’ is not correct as CALM was not established. <b>(1 submission)</b>	Yes (1e)	The plan has been amended.
	<b>Information Sources – No comments on this section</b>		

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX I: SUBMITTERS TO THE INDICATIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN (NB DOES NOT INCLUDE EMAILED SUBMISSIONS USING THE 'SAVE NINGALOO' PROFORMA SUBMISSION FORM)

#### Individuals

Harry Abrahams	Michael P. Candy	Ian Ernst
Penny Adam	Joan Carlin	Brett Evans
David Allen	Wendy Carlin	Leigh Ewbank
Julia Allen	Emma Carmody	Ric Fallu
Lindsay Alsop	Besim Ceric	Barry and Val Farquhar
Sandy Alsop	Caine Chappell	Ian Farrant
J. Altes	Heather Charlton	Rick Fenny
Naomi Altman	Simon Cheng	Steve Fewtrell
John Anderson	Eve Cliffin	J. A. Fitzsimons
Peter Anderton	Lisa Clune	G. D. Fogarty
Don Andrews	N. W. Cole	Dave Fornworth
Colin Asplin	Kylie Cook	Andrea Foster
Martin Auldist	Chris Cooke	Stephen Foster
P. Baddeley	Susan Cooper	Julian Fox
M. J. Bain	Terry Coote	Paul Freedman
Peter Baker	Cordelia	Kevin Gace
M. G. Barbard	Bob Cornell	Jillian Gamble
John Barrymore	Con Costa	Vicky Gandhi
Jean and Norm Beauchamp	Kevin A. Cotterell	Georgina Garbellini
Jim Beaudoin	Terry Cowley	Elizabeth Gardner
David Beeck	G. S. Cox	Frank Gaschk
R. and E. Beewham	Dorothy Crock	Matt Gates
Chris Bell	Peter Crock	Trevor Gerrick
J.W. Bell	Gabrielle Crocker	David Giltrap
Michelle and Rod Bell	Greg Crocker	Bob Ginivan
J. Belle	Kimberley Crofts	Rob Goldspring
Roland Bennett	Derek and Stella Cumberworth	Rowley Goonan
Fred Beringer	R. Davey	Sarah Gosney
Monica Biardo	Mark Davis	Bridget Gough
Craig Bibra	Tom Davis	Wal Grahame
Tony Black	Albert Dawson	Rob Grant
Shane Blackham	Mike De La Mare	Michael Grasso
Sam Blaxland	Brian Deering	Molly Greaves
Robert and Beth Boase	M. De-Iudicibus	Kim Greene
James Bonzas	Thelma De-Iudicibus	Margot and Paul Gregg
A. M. Botting	Gavin Dennison	Mark Grey
J. M. Botting	A. Dickinson	S. R. Grossmith
E. Bradley	Kiera Dingle	Mary Gudgeow
David Brash	Paul and Kristine Dixey	Kris Hall
Barbara Brown	Ray and Coral Dixey	Norman Halse
Suzie Brown	Christine Donovan	Igmar Hans
Eugene Browne	Jemma Doolan	Geoffrey Hanson
Jill Browne	Lee Dorman	Sue Harrington
R. Buchanan	W. Dorman	Peter and Nikki Harvey
Kim and Gina Burton	Noel and Joan Dubois	Robert Harvey
Pauline Burton	Ronnie and Kathrine Duncan	Susan Hayes
Scoltes Cabji	Warren Eather	Wolvetang Heijjer
Allison Campbell	Des Edwards	M. Heller
Linda Campbell	Ivan Edwards	Trevor Wayne Hendon
Ron Campbell	Peter Edwards	M. C. Hennessey
J. and F. Campion	Trevor Epding	Susan Hey



Raymond Hill	Frank Lindsey III	Brian Paskins
Ross Hill	Amanda Lloyd	Axel and Eske Passeck
Andrew Hilliar	Jenny Locke	Foley Patricia
Jacqueline Hine	L. J. Longbottom	Robert and Edith Peel
Alex Hodges	Eric Loughton	W. J. Perkins
P. A. Hodgson	Sandra Lymbery	A. J. Pitts
Leonie Horak	E. W. Lyttleton	Fred and Rita Platcher
Michelle Howard	Gerrard Macdonald	Sean Plozza
Tony Howard	Kate Macgregor	J. Poater
Tony Howard	Robert Madaffari	E. M. E. Poskitt
Rhea Howe	Paul Mahoney	Johan Potgieter
John Hoye	Kevin Male	Sarah Power
Victor Hundmarsh	Eric Maley	Basil Joseph Powley
Bruce Hunt	Fiona Maley	R. B. and J. J. Primrose
David Hunt	S. M. Maley	Naomi Prisgrove
Jim Hunter	Marco Manfredi	Alison Pynner
Mary and George Innes	Steve Marwick	Tim Quick
David F James	Roland Mau	Graeme Quin
Edna James	David and Rose Mavor	Craig Radford
Max and Sara Jamieson	Richard May	Malanie Rae
Pip and Bob Jarvis	Maya	Bryant Raymond
V. E. Jenkin	Colin and Mary Mayfield	Michael Reade
Helga Jennings	R. and S. McCamish	Peter Reeves
Mr and Mrs Johnson	Peter McCarthy	Jerome Rezel
S. and R. Johnston	Joanna McCluskey	Allison Richards
Alan Jones	John McGann	Kelly Ritchie
B. and J. E. Jones	Sam McGuinness	Ian Robertson
Anthony Jucha	Charles McInnes	Stan Rodwell
Caroyl Jupp	Tania McIntosh	Helen Ross
Victor Kane	Mick McIntyre	Ian Rotheram
Ric Karniewicz	David McKinney	Andrew Rowland
Nathan Kaye	Carolyn McMillan	Kylie Roy
David Keegan	P. S. McNamara	D. Ruby
M. and P. Kendrick	Rob Merrey	K. and D. Rundall
Wayne Kennedy	Shane Milligan	Gary Ryan
Samantha Kent	S. Miranda	Peter Ryan
Jo Kewallski	Chris Morgon	Ben Rykers
Mr King	I. Morley	Tracy Ryman
Andrew Kingham	Belinda Morrisey	Gris Sanders
David Kitson	Madison Mueller	Stan Schymanski
Walter Knoerreck	Barbara Muhling	C. L. Searle
Dorothy Kostera	Anthony Muiron	Jenny Sexton
J. A. Kostera	Miyuki Nagafuji	Aaron Seymour
Rena Koufakis	Jon Nevill	Ian Shackles
Alisha Kristensen	Brad Norman	Daniel Sharp
Katja Krummenacher	Peter and Brenda O'Boyle	Trevor Sharp
Raviraj Kumar	Rory O'Carroll	Lyn Sharpe
D. and I. Kurschat	Chris O'Dowd	Vivienne and Bill Shepherdson
Jeremy Lavender	John Oliver	L. A. and H. D. Silverthorne
Lisa Le Faucheur	A. Olivieri	P. J. Slater
Joan Le Poisevin	Suzanne O'Neil	Rohan Smith
Graham Leembruggen	Stephen and Diane	Brian Snyman
Sylvia Lerch	O'Shannessy	Lembit Soots
Elizabeth Lescheid	Annie Otness	Tomas Spanovskis
Murray Lewin	Peter and Joan Ovens	Stephanie Squires
Stephen Lightfoot	Michael Owens	Barry and Carol Stalker
Brett Linden	Lily Pantelic	Bob Stanley
Barbara W Lindsey	L. and M. Papini	V. Stenhouse
Bernie Lindsey	J. Pascal	Simon Stevens
Frank Lindsey II	Dick Pasfield	A. Stewart

Ian Stewart  
Christopher Still  
Dominic Stone  
Michael Stone  
Mike Stone  
Chris Strong  
Alan Owen Suchling  
E. A. Suhajea  
DianeI Sun  
Jenny Sutton  
Leon Syred  
A. Taylor  
Jocelyn A Taylor  
Diane Telford  
N. J. Thomas  
Jamie and Frank Trumpio  
Robert Turbett  
Neville John Turner  
R. D. Turner

Kate Umbers  
Chris Van Schill  
Peter Vukomanovic  
David Waayers  
Paul Wags  
Richard Wain  
John Wainscoat  
Gavin Walker  
Sharon Lee Walker  
Troy Walsh  
Robyn Waltho  
Andrew Wangridge  
Ron and Coral Watson  
Peter Watt  
John Webb  
John and Angela Webb  
Mark Westera  
Heath Westaway  
Warren Westaway

Craig and Nicole White  
R. R. and W. J. Winfield  
Natasha Wolff  
Liz Wood  
Andy Woodford  
Audrey Wright  
Brayden Wright  
Carla Wright  
D. Wright  
D. Wright  
Michael Wright  
Peter Wright  
Troy Wright  
Vicki Wundersitz  
Gloria Lyon-Roberts and Alex  
Liu

### **Local Government**

Carnarvon Shire Council  
Shire of Exmouth

### **State Government**

Department for Planning and Infrastructure  
Department of Fisheries  
Department of Indigenous Affairs

Department of Industry and Resources  
Tourism Western Australia  
Western Australian Museum

### **Commonwealth Government**

Australian Institute of Marine Science  
CSIRO  
Department of Defence

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

### **Tertiary Institutions and Non-Government Research Organisations**

Centre for Whale Research (W.A.) Inc.  
CRC Reef Research Centre  
Curtin University - Department of Applied Geology  
Murdoch University-Marine and Freshwater  
Research Laboratory

University of Western Australia - Faculty of  
Natural and Agricultural Sciences

### **Commercial**

Aquarium Specimen Collectors Association of WA  
Inc.  
Anglers Paradise, Fleets for Tackle  
Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration  
Association  
Barlo Firearms Tackleworld and Camping  
Bluewater Tackle  
Bluewater Tackle-Surf-Dive-Marine  
Dunsborough Charters  
Elefant Traks Pty. Ltd.  
Exmouth Chamber of Commerce and Industry  
Exmouth Supermarket  
Fineline Charters

Hakko Sunbay Pty. Ltd  
MG Kailis Group  
Ningaloo Deep Pty Ltd  
Ningaloo Ecology Cruises  
Paspaley Pearls  
Reel Girls Pty. Ltd.  
Strike Oil Ltd.  
Western Australian Fishing Industry Council Inc.  
Western Australian Professional Shell Fishermen's  
Association Inc.  
Woodside Energy Ltd

### **Community Groups/Representative Bodies**

Australian Anglers Association (WA Division) Inc.  
Australian Campers Alliance Inc.  
Australian Coral Reef Society Inc.

Amateur Fishing Group  
Australian Marine Conservation Society

Australian Marine Sciences Association (W.A.)  
Australian Marine Sciences Association (National)  
Australian Underwater Federation (WA)  
Australian Underwater Federation (National)  
Australian Underwater Federation (QLD)  
Bluewater Freedivers of WA  
C.A.R.E Inc.  
Cape Boardriders  
Cape Conservation Group  
Carnarvon Regional Recreational Fishing Advisory  
Committee  
Conservation Council of W.A.  
Coral Coast Parks Advisory Committee  
Coral Coast Park Council  
Dunsborough Angling and Aquatic Club  
Exmouth Game Fishing Club  
Exmouth Regional Recreational Fishing Advisory  
Committee  
Fowl Hook Fly Fishing Club (WA branch)  
Friends of Johnson Circle

Living Water Dive Club  
Nature Conservation Council of NSW  
Recfishwest  
Recreational Fishing Advisory Committee  
Reef Ball Foundation Inc.  
Saltwater Angling Club  
Spearfishing Commission Aust.  
Underwater Federation of WA  
State of Play  
Surf Rider Foundation  
Austalian Fishing Tackle Association Inc.  
Game Fishing Association of Australia Inc.  
Western Australian Game Fishing Association Inc.  
Wilderness Society W.A. Inc.  
World Wildlife Fund (Australia)  
Yamatji Land and Sea Council - Gnulli Native Title  
Holders Working Group