

Name	Ashley Cox
Business (if applicable)	Airsight
Email address or preferred method of contact	[REDACTED]
Postcode	2304
Do you want your submission marked as confidential? *	No
Do you want to receive future notifications and updates on the PNF Review? *	Yes
Which of the following best describes you? *	Landholder
Which draft PNF Code are you providing a submission on? *	Northern NSW

My comments

Overall I think the changes are generally positive though suspect there is some devil in the detail. I would like to see increase onus on the contractors (If involved) to better manage species retention. Reducing the basal area retention rate may increase the selection on high value leaving more low value timebers. A better calculation would be to look at basal retention by species. i.e. Gray gum is of low value and tends to be left, I'd rather see a forest with a good mix of species and it is hard for land holders to get contractors to comply with this.

I think there is too much onus put on landowners and not enough on contractors to adequately complete roading, species selection, basal retention etc. I don't think a landholder should not be held accountable but at the same time I think more responsibility should be put on contractors including being involved in any post harvest burning. My experience in regards to rainforest is that it is incorrectly identified by the authorities, changing the code won't change this but it is unnecessarily difficult to prove that areas are not rainforest.

I'd like to see it made easier to turn PVP's off so that if a landholder wants to utilise land for conservation rather than harvesting they can easily make the change.