

**From:** [Daniel Idczak](#)  
**To:** [epc\\_council](#)  
**Cc:** [ecosystems](#); [Dale Tonkinson](#); [Michael Sherwen](#); [Alen Slijepcevic](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Inquiry into ecosystem decline in Victoria - Transcript - 11 March 2021  
**Date:** Sunday, 11 April 2021 3:09 04 PM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[Transcript comments - DI 20210409.pdf](#)

---

Hi there,

Please find attached pages from the transcript where I have marked some changes, pages 14 and 18.

Also please find below responses to you questions on notice. If there is anything else please let me know and we will follow-up.

**The following questions were taken on notice:**

1. Specifics around the types of programs that could be implemented in the resource management space that the State Government could be doing differently, as noted on pages 15-16 of the transcript

-  
**Response:**

Not having mentioned "resource management" in our presentation, it is assumed this question relates to resourcing of programs as referred to in Item 3 of the *Terms of Reference* for this Inquiry, as agreed by Dr Bach when he first put the question during the final minutes of the hearing we attended (see Transcript: top of p. 16).

In summary, it is widely recognised that for many decades inadequate resources have been applied to encourage compliance with legislation in this area, viz. Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act, Planning and Environment Act, Catchment and Land Protection Act. It is notable that the very significant penalties applicable under the Environmental Protection Act seem to have been applied more frequently.

With respect to adequacy of funding for programs addressing aspects of ecosystem health and repair, we have pointed to the problems associated with short-term programs and the need to evaluate success over timeframes appropriate to the objectives of the program not a timeframe dictated by election, appointment or budget cycles. Programs need to offer longer-term resourcing (funding, advice, interactive monitoring and evaluation) subject to appropriate performance and governance criteria, and need to include flexible delivery models that can accommodate the many sources of variation in appropriate timing and expected results that are inevitable due to the inherent variability in complex natural systems.

**Additional questions on notice from Committee Members**

The following additional questions were provided by Committee Members following the hearing:

1. Previous submitters have commented and made statements that the logging of native forests is a key contributor to bushfires. What is the CFS's view on the veracity of this statement?

-  
**Response:**

As the CFA does not have responsibility for fire suppression or prevention over the extensive public land estate where most native forest logging is undertaken, we do not have any data and have not carried out any research with which to have evidence for a sufficiently informed view. The question would need to clarify what is meant by 'a contributor to bushfires'. This could mean a contributor to ignition sources, or changes in severity and fire behaviour, or ease of response. Logging may influence these factors in different ways both positively and negatively, and vary over time with changes in regulations (such as restrictions on operating on high fire danger days). It is worth noting that logging machinery and workers play an important role in bushfire suppression.

Regards,  
Daniel Idczak



**Daniel Idczak** Vegetation Management Team Leader  
CFA Headquarters – Bushfire Management 8 Lakeside Drive Burwood East 3151

Protecting lives and property



[cfa.vic.gov.au](http://cfa.vic.gov.au)

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]