

SUBMISSION – Sally Edwards, [REDACTED] NSW [REDACTED] (Farmer, Volunteer, Rural Community Capacity Builder)

- **CONSULTATION TARGET?**

In seeking public feedback, what is the target or international benchmark set for this review? Does that target demonstrate that an adequate level of consultation has been completed? In a quick, informal survey of farming friends online, majority of my farming colleagues did not know about this paper being on public exhibition? I question both the accessibility of this review and the promotion. For a national review in Agriculture and Land Use – the significance of this paper is high and I would expect that consultation levels would need to be high to match its level of importance. I would like to review feedback on this target and the associated achieved consultation levels.

- **EFFECTIVE PROMOTION**

Utilising existing networks and agricultural media effectively is important for reviews like this to be transparently accessible by the whole industry. Eg. The Land newspaper (NSW) – story and advertisements, notices through rural LGAs, advertising through farming networks and organisations across the nation.

- **TIMING OF EXHIBITION**

Exhibiting such an important paper over the Christmas period, is not good practice. It would appear the intention was to reduce participation. This is both unfair and inequitable.

- **CLIMATE CHANGE SCRUTINY**

I don't recall Australians being invited to participate or provide feedback on our Australian Government's decision to accept only the Climate Change research and data from the IPCC and the United Nations (UN) Climate Action. Australia needs to broaden its Climate Change research sources and start scrutinising renowned global independent research. IPCC scientists all "sing from the same hymn sheet" and Australia surely has more strength and integrity than just continually taking this for granted? Wouldn't it be in our best interests to scrutinise the research that evidences contradictory data and weigh it up in a balance and considered way? In my time here on planet earth, I have spent all my life living in rural areas and majority on farmland in close contact with nature and the climate. While I have observed many different changes and cycles of nature and weather, I have also observed many many improvements in the way we treat the earth and its many ecosystems. I know with utmost certainty that if I need clean air or water to depend on that I can and will find that in rural and

agricultural areas over and above a city area. Water does not originate from a tap or from a bottle. Food does not originate from a supermarket.

To be led to believe that animals (nature) cause more detriment to our climate, than say, development of cities and suburbs, over consumption of electricity (climate controlled Air Conditioning 24/7) or from highly built up areas, & highly populated areas utilising vehicles is ludicrous.

“Biogenetic methane from grazing animals is a natural process, the CH₄ is broken down naturally in the atmosphere returning to carbon dioxide and water. Cows can't add to the environment, they can only cycle atmospheric gasses, the grass is made up of natural gases, even if the cows were not present the grasslands would release methane from the decaying process.” - There are a diverse range of scientific opinions and theories, such as this, that all need considering and scrutinising to reevaluate and weigh up the costs to not just Agriculture, but also the environment, presented by the proposed actions of Net Zero policy.

- My belief is that I can't contribute anything of value to opportunities or developing emissions pathways etc, not until the very basis of this requirement is scrutinised more transparently and in a considered and balanced way.
- I support review into the over consumption and overuse of electricity, energy and water, transport and industrialised practices.
- I support URGENT review into the rapid transition to renewables at the cost of Agriculture and rural and regional areas, the environment and the people.
- I support review into the basis of the Net Zero Target, the Climate Change science and opposing papers, questions, data and research. There is an equilibrium somewhere in the middle, called the truth, at either ends of the climate change spectrum lie financially compromised and self-interested research and data. Australia needs to use common-sense and independently review this and find this place of truth and equilibrium.
- I support national educational efforts to reduce energy usage and consumption, to shorten food-miles, to localise economies and services. The industrialisation and globalisation of food production, manufacturing and services all contribute to an increase in both environmental and climate damage, in my opinion.
- I support a review into our existing biodiversity offset system.
- I support rigorous and robust discussions, both nationally and industry-led on emissions, emission identifying, assessing and reporting and on the carbon cycle. There is certainly not one clear and transparent and measurable conclusion to emissions where Agriculture is concerned. How can we look at

sustainable land management if this basis for the need is not widely debated and accepted?

- In my personal opinion and experience, Climate Change has not contributed to a slowed growth in Agricultural productivity, there are many things that I can say have, but Climate Change is not one of them. Agriculture has experienced “character assassination” towards many of the ag industries and producers, this has contributed to a slowed growth, availability of workforce is a contributor (due to competition with other sectors – mining and renewables), centralisation of banking and lending services has been a major contributor also.
- I fundamentally disagree with the “future physical climate risk” as caused by Climate Change, so cannot agree with any of the proposed mitigation measures. It’s like building a bridge over the wrong river, and those profiting from the build of the bridge evidencing the need for the build in the first place. In the end, the bridge won’t make a difference, because the wrong river was crossed. The other river, which actually needed crossing will still be there... I believe we’ve got the wrong river in regards to Climate Change...
-