

Submission  
No 399

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

**Name:** Name suppressed

**Date Received:** 21 July 2026

---

Partially  
Confidential

## Inquiry into dingoes in national parks in New South Wales

Livestock producer East Monaro Wild dog working Group

July 2026

To whom it may concern

The debate over management of Wild dogs/Dingoes have been an ongoing issue for our collective landscape since European settlement, the importance of these animals in the natural ecosystem and the connection with the traditional owners is not questioned by livestock producers but the management (or lack thereof) or clear conservation outcomes on public lands repeatedly sees significant repeated impact on domestic livestock, livestock producers, rural communities and the agricultural industry. There has been a repeated cycle of impact, agitation, action, and complacency over multiple generations with no long-term combined strategy that has collective objectives for both conservation and impact mitigation.

The establishment of Wild Dog Management Plans in the early 2000's in parts of NSW was a positive step towards collective management and acknowledgment of often conflicting objectives. Through the introduction of Schedule 2 dingo conservation areas within New South Wales National Parks, and associated funding for population control outside of these areas to mitigate impact on livestock, a balance was achieved. Through these plans working groups were established and management strategies were discussed collectively at the same table and invited all stakeholders to contribute, and issues were resolved through conversation/negotiation of the stakeholders.

Unfortunately, over time success of this model bred complacency and review or updating management strategies was not undertaken, legislation changed funding/resourcing was reduced and relationships and trust have been eroded.

As we live in a modified environment that includes boundaries (imposed by humans) and the landscape is now a mosaic of land tenures and uses, the dingo is no longer free to roam (without impact) across the landscape. Agriculture, conservation and urban areas have defined areas with activities that dingo's impact or are impacted by. Dingoes are now constrained by boundaries relating to tenure and populations must be maintained to ensure that they are managed within the areas of conservation without impacting neighbouring land. Given these constraints, conservation of dingoes cannot be purely ideological, it must be defined by science, facts and evidence. Questions need to be asked and answered to ensure that the conservation objectives can be

understood and accounted for when seeking balance between conservation and impact mitigation.

Evidence tells us that dingoes impact livestock. Evidence tells us that this impact results in unacceptable animal welfare outcomes, emotional distress on livestock producers, economic impact on rural economies and can create divides within the community.

Ideological conservation does not provide answers to (or evidence proving) sustainable dingo populations or impact on or benefit to other native species within defined conservation areas, it often relies on assumptions arrived at through philosophical and emotional beliefs of individuals without a wholistic perspective of the landscape outside of theoretical conservation.

New South Wales National Parks (NPWS) does not currently have a clearly documented dingo conservation strategy that defines how conservation of dingoes is achieved. The current conservation (and control) of dingoes varies depending on the individual perspective of area managers or political pressures of the time. Population management is often reactive based on livestock impacts and subsequent complaints from the rural sector and resulting in political pressure. Funding is not consistent and management is in some cases contracted out to Local Lands Services which removes NPWS from connection to direct responsibility.

Regardless of the future status of dingoes as a pest or a native species, the impact on livestock, producers, community and the agricultural industry remains the same. Changes in legislation or protection status require impact mitigation strategies to be considered, maintained and or modified. Jurisdictions that have modified or altered the status of dingoes and have not taken this into account have seen increased impact on livestock and consequential impact on livestock producers and rural communities.

Under the NSW Biosecurity Act all land managers have a general biosecurity duty, this duty does not appear to be applicable to NPWS in relation dingoes (or other pest animals). Local Land Service (LLS) who has the regulatory responsibility under the NSW Biosecurity Act have what could be seen as a conflict of interest by holding contracts with NPWS for dingo control and as the regulatory authority under the Biosecurity Act. There is a question over the ability for LLS to have a non-biased view given these contractual arrangements with NPWS and how compliance with the provisions under Biosecurity Act are assessed or implemented.

Current NPWS boundary fencing policy is not consistent with progressions in management options and its intention is dated. It has been written to solely protect the conservation estate from incursions from domestic livestock and not considering impacts of pest (or native) animals residing on public land that impact neighbours. With exclusion fencing seen as a viable addition to assist in reducing the impact of predation

on livestock by dingoes and impacts of other pest animals, the benefits are promoted and supported across the landscape of many jurisdictions, the current NPWS policy does not support equal responsibility with neighbouring landholders, and considerations to include this for the broader benefit to the community are not supported. (Attachment A) Dingo conservation advocates often promote non-lethal management methods to be introduced but the current policy and position of NPWS clearly do not support mutual erection or maintenance of exclusion fencing (where feasible) as part of the broader management strategy. Modernising this policy to align with improvements in/benefits of exclusion fencing should be considered essential as part of the future balance between dingo conservation and impact mitigation.

How do we break the cycle? One of the most challenging aspects of conservation vs impact mitigation is removing emotion, reframing the arguments into conservations, respecting differing objectives and accepting balance as a solution. Too often there a separate conversation form different perspectives on this topic, the conversations need to be in the same room with strategies aimed at long term solutions favouring the community as a whole not one individual stakeholder, adhoc management or funding reliant on political cycles does not provide long term success.

NPWS is a manager of a significant portion of NSW that abuts agricultural land and are often seen as an 'absentee landholder' as they do not have a local connection with or investment in the local communities in which their reserves are located. If dingo conservation is to continue to part of the NPWS doctrine, they need to become more proactive and prominent in leading landscape management and develop, employ and promote adequate strategies that identify long term objectives which are supported with adequate funding and resources into perpetuity so this does not continue to be a generational problem for all sides of the debate.

Thankyou for the opportunity to provide input

If there are any questions or clarification is required regarding this submission, please feel free to contact me.

Regards