

**INQUIRY INTO DINGOES IN NATIONAL PARKS IN NEW
SOUTH WALES**

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 5 June 2026

Partially
Confidential

I am writing to express concern that the management of dingoes and wild dogs in NSW national parks must remain practical, evidence-based and grounded in the real-world impacts on adjoining landholders.

While cultural consultation has a place in government decision-making, it should not outweigh the direct experience of farmers and land managers who deal with the daily consequences of wild dog and dingo activity. Over many years, consultation processes have often produced broad statements about cultural or ecological value, but they have not provided practical solutions for the people losing livestock, income, time and sleep due to predation.

The people most affected are not generally those living in the city or commenting from a distance. They are the farmers, graziers and rural landholders who manage stock, maintain fences, check paddocks, recover mauled animals and bear the financial and emotional cost when wild dogs or dingoes move out of national parks and onto private land.

Any inquiry into dingo management must give serious weight to those who live beside these parks and manage the land every day. Their knowledge is not theoretical. It comes from direct observation, lived experience and responsibility for livestock welfare. These people understand the difference between an idealistic conservation argument and the reality of a calf, lamb or foal being attacked.

National parks do not exist in isolation. When predator numbers increase or control programs are reduced, the impacts often spill directly onto neighbouring properties. It is unreasonable for policies to be shaped mainly by people who do not carry the consequences of those decisions.

This submission does not argue for unnecessary or careless destruction of dingoes. However, it strongly supports the continued use of practical control measures where dingoes or wild dogs threaten livestock, working animals, native wildlife or neighbouring properties. Management must remain flexible, localised and responsive to actual impacts.

The NSW Government should ensure that farmers and adjoining landholders have a central role in any management framework. Their evidence should be treated as essential, not secondary. Consultation with other groups may be appropriate, but it must not become a substitute for listening to the people who are directly affected and who understand the land through daily responsibility.

In simple terms: dingo and wild dog management should be led by evidence, livestock impact, local knowledge and practical land management – not by distant opinions or feel-good policy positions.