PROPERTY RIGHTS AUSTRALIA
STAND YOUR GROUND
Est. 2003

EMAIL: pra1@bigpond.net.au
PHONE: 0493 667 561
POSTAL ADDRESS: PO Box 2175, Wandal QLD 4700

17 July 2026

Property Rights Australia Submission to the NSW Legislative Council Animal Welfare Committee Inquiry into Dingoes in National Parks in New South Wales

Executive Summary

Property Rights Australia Inc. recognises the ecological and cultural significance of dingoes, however, recognition of that significance cannot become a license for government to increase, protect or inadequately manage predator populations on public land while transferring the resulting costs, risks and animal suffering to neighbouring landowners.

The central issue is not whether dingoes should exist in New South Wales. The issue is whether public land managers will remain legally and practically responsible for preventing unacceptable impacts beyond park boundaries.

The NSW Government's own policy acknowledges that wild dogs (a term which includes dingoes, feral dogs and their hybrids) can kill and harm livestock; that both public and private occupiers must take practical measures to minimise impacts on neighbouring land; and that effective management requires coordinated control across tenures.[2] Any weakening of that framework would not remove the impacts of wild dogs. It would merely shift more of those impacts from government land onto private land. That is not conservation. It is cost and burden shifting.

Wild dog attacks impose far more than the market value of dead livestock. They cause serious animal suffering, disrupt breeding programs, reduce productivity, force changes in enterprise, impose fencing and control costs, consume enormous amounts of unpaid labour and cause significant psychological distress to farmers and their families.

The Australian Government estimates that wild dogs cost the agricultural sector up to $302 million each year, with livestock losses identified as the primary impact.[6] That figure cannot capture the distress of finding livestock mauled, disembowelled or left alive with catastrophic injuries.

Property Rights Australia submits that:

1. targeted wild dog control must be retained;
2. the General Biosecurity Duty must continue to apply equally to public and private land managers;
3. National Parks must not become protected breeding reservoirs from which dingoes and wild dogs continually disperse;
4. effective control must be maintained across park boundaries and other high-risk areas;
5. any management change should include independent agricultural, biosecurity, animal-welfare, social and economic impact assessments;
6. landowners must not be required to absorb losses caused or materially increased by government policy; and
7. where government decisions increase those losses, government must fund prevention, control and compensation.

Further detail is provided in the 13 recommendations on pages 14 and 15. Conservation policy carries responsibilities. Government cannot claim the benefits while outsourcing the consequences.

1. About Property Rights Australia

Property Rights Australia is a national, non-partisan organisation advocating for the protection of private property rights, fair and accountable government decision-making, and the equitable treatment of landowners affected by legislation, regulation and public policy. Our members include farmers, graziers and rural landowners who manage land, livestock, biodiversity, weeds, pests, fire and biosecurity risks every day.

Property Rights Australia supports practical environmental conservation. However, conservation measures must be evidence-based, properly costed and implemented without imposing disproportionate or uncompensated burdens on individual landowners.

This submission primarily addresses paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (e), (f) and (g) of the Committee's terms of reference, including the legislative and policy framework, ecological role of dingoes, impacts of current government programs, future management and related matters.

2. The Inquiry Must Examine Consequences Beyond Park Boundaries

The terms of reference concentrate heavily on dingoes within National Parks. The consequences of management decisions, however, do not remain within National Parks. Dingoes and other wild dogs do not recognise cadastral boundaries, park plans, tenure classifications or policy distinctions.

A decision to reduce baiting, trapping or other control within a park may affect:

- adjoining grazing properties;
- landowners many kilometres from park boundaries;
- livestock welfare;
- threatened native species;
- neighbouring control programs;
- rural businesses and employment;
- the viability of sheep, goat and cattle enterprises;
- community safety and domestic animals.

The Committee must therefore assess not only the treatment of dingoes on public land, but the external impacts created by their management, or lack thereof. A policy cannot be judged solely by what happens inside the land on which it operates. It must be judged by its total consequences.

3. Reciprocal Responsibility: Government Must Meet the Standards It Imposes on Landowners

Private landowners are subject to extensive legal duties concerning biosecurity, native vegetation, threatened species, animal welfare, chemical use, fire, weeds, water and land management. Those obligations are routinely justified on the basis that activities on one property may affect other properties or the wider community. That principle must operate both ways.

If private landowners are expected to prevent weeds, pests, fire and other risks escaping from their properties, public land managers must be expected to prevent foreseeable and unacceptable predator impacts escaping from theirs.

The NSW Government's current wild dog policy expressly states that the General Biosecurity Duty applies to occupiers of both private and public land, requiring practical measures to minimise negative impacts on their own and neighbouring land.[2] That obligation must not be weakened, avoided or reinterpreted merely because the animals involved may have ecological or cultural significance. Significance does not extinguish responsibility.

The National Wild Dog Action Plan similarly recognises that NSW public and private land occupiers must take practical measures to minimise negative impacts from wild dogs on neighbouring lands. It also records that plans of management for reserves must consider pest threats and the social and economic context of reserves, including coordinated pest management across tenure boundaries.[5]

Property Rights Australia rejects any framework under which:

- government protects or increases predator populations;
- neighbouring landowners suffer the consequences;
- landowners must fund additional fencing and control as a result of Government decisions;
- landowners bear livestock losses and animal-welfare impacts;
- and government accepts no corresponding liability.

That arrangement privatises the costs of a public policy. It is fundamentally incompatible with equal treatment, natural justice and secure property rights.

4. The Existing NSW Framework Already Recognises Both Conservation and Control

The current NSW Wild Dog Management Strategy 2022–2027 does not require the eradication of dingoes. It seeks to balance control where wild dogs cause negative impacts with conservation in areas where those risks are low. The NSW Government states that conservation is to be achieved by focusing control in high-risk locations and refraining from control in lower-risk parts of the landscape.[2] [4] It allows dingoes to fulfil ecological and cultural roles in appropriate areas while preserving management capacity where livestock, threatened species or people are at risk.

The NSW Government also identifies wild dogs as priority pest animals under all 11 Regional Strategic Pest Animal Management Plans. Its published material states that wild dogs threaten livestock and some native fauna through predation, harassment and disease transmission.[3]

The inquiry should therefore be cautious about proposals built on the false premise that existing policy is simply a program of indiscriminate dingo eradication. The present framework already recognises conservation.

5. Population Monitoring, Genetics and the Evidence Base for Policy Reform

5.1 Effective Policy Requires a Complete Evidence Base

Wildlife management should be guided by the best available scientific evidence. Property Rights Australia strongly supports continued investment in research that improves understanding of Australia's wild canid populations. However, science should inform public policy - it should not be selectively relied upon to justify predetermined policy outcomes.

Good public policy requires more than genetic information alone. It requires a comprehensive understanding of population size, regional distribution, ecological function, management outcomes, agricultural impacts and long-term monitoring.

At present, there is no comprehensive, nationally accepted estimate of the total free-ranging wild canid population in either New South Wales or Australia. While local population studies have been undertaken in particular landscapes using methods such as camera trapping, occupancy modelling and aerial surveys, no comprehensive state-wide or national population estimate currently exists against which broader policy decisions can be assessed.[18]

Similarly, work undertaken through the National Wild Dog Action Plan identified significant shortcomings in Australia's ability to consistently monitor wild dog populations, impacts and management outcomes. The National Metrics Project concluded that Australia required a nationally consistent monitoring, evaluation and reporting framework because existing information was insufficient to adequately measure management effectiveness over time.[19]

This creates an important policy challenge. Without understanding the approximate size and distribution of the population being managed, it becomes difficult to determine how representative existing genetic studies are, how populations are changing over time, or whether proposed legislative reforms are likely to achieve their intended objectives.

Property Rights Australia is not suggesting that governments must know the exact number of wild canids before making management decisions. Such precision is neither practical nor necessary for a highly mobile species. However, where governments propose significant legislative or policy reform based substantially upon new scientific evidence, there should be sufficient baseline information to assess whether that evidence is representative of the populations affected and to objectively measure the consequences of policy changes after they are implemented.

Without a robust baseline, future governments will have no objective means of determining whether changes to dingo management have improved biodiversity, reduced livestock losses, altered predator populations or achieved the conservation outcomes they were intended to deliver.

In other words, effective policy requires not only good science, but also the ability to measure whether that science translates into better on-ground outcomes.

5.2 Recent Genomic Research Represents an Important Scientific Advance

Property Rights Australia acknowledges the significance of the genomic research undertaken by Cairns *et al.* (2023), which used genome-wide single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) analysis to investigate the ancestry and population structure of Australia's wild canids.[1]

The study concluded that previous microsatellite testing likely underestimated dingo ancestry in many wild populations and identified at least five genetically distinct dingo populations across Australia. The research represents an important scientific advance and significantly improves understanding of Australia's wild canid genetics.[1] [17]

Improved scientific understanding should continue to inform wildlife conservation and management across Australia. However, improved scientific understanding does not automatically justify changes to operational management or legislation.

Genetic composition is only one factor that governments must consider when developing public policy.

Agricultural impacts, animal welfare, biodiversity outcomes, public safety, biosecurity obligations, regional economies and the practical operation of existing management programs are equally important considerations. Accordingly, genetic research should inform policy - not determine it in isolation.

5.3 Important Questions Remain About Regional Representation

The Cairns *et al.* study analysed tissue, blood or buccal samples collected from 307 free-ranging wild canids and 84 captive dingoes from locations across Australia.[1] This represents one of the largest genomic datasets assembled to date.

Nevertheless, the published sampling map demonstrates that sampling density varied considerably across the continent. Many samples originated from eastern coastal Australia, Queensland, Victoria, South Australia and parts of Western Australia. By comparison, comparatively few samples were collected from inland New South Wales, with particularly limited representation from central and far western New South Wales.[1]

Consideration must be given to whether the available sampling provides sufficient regional representation to support legislative reform affecting every part of Australia. This is a standard scientific consideration regarding the representativeness of any sample population. The researchers themselves acknowledge substantial regional population structure, identifying at least five genetically distinct dingo populations while recognising that additional regional variation is likely to exist.[1]

The study also notes that many of the free-ranging samples were obtained through existing wild dog control programs, supplemented by samples provided by government agencies, private landholders and other sources.[1]

This raises another legitimate scientific question. If many sampled animals originated from existing wild dog control programs, do those animals accurately represent the broader free-ranging wild canid population, or do they primarily represent the subset of animals most likely to come into conflict with livestock producers and public land managers? This distinction is important because animals repeatedly involved in livestock predation may not necessarily reflect the broader population in terms of behaviour, movement or genetic composition.

Additional sampling from under-represented regions would improve confidence that future legislative and policy decisions are based upon a population that is geographically representative of Australia's diverse wild canid populations.

5.4 Local Evidence Demonstrates Regional Variation

The importance of regional variation is illustrated by observations from Central West New South Wales. Property Rights Australia has been advised by Central West Local Land Services that, over the past five years, 31 wild canids known to have been trapped or shot within their operational area have subsequently undergone genetic testing.[20]

According to advice provided by Central West Local Land Services:

- only two animals contained greater than 95 per cent dingo ancestry;
- most animals contained approximately 75 per cent dingo ancestry; and
- the lowest recorded animal contained approximately 25 per cent dingo ancestry.[20]

These observations have not been published in peer-reviewed scientific literature and should therefore be interpreted accordingly.

Nevertheless, they reinforce an important point. Regional variation appears to exist within New South Wales. If local observations differ from broader national trends, further investigation should occur before those broader trends become the basis for state-wide legislative reform.

Scientific understanding is strengthened by continued testing, refinement and additional evidence.

This highlights the importance of ongoing regional sampling and population monitoring before governments implement significant legislative changes affecting wild canid management across the State.

5.5 Genetics Should Inform Conservation, Not Dictate Operational Management

Regardless of genetic ancestry, the practical realities confronting landholders remain unchanged. A wild canid that repeatedly attacks livestock causes the same economic loss, animal suffering and psychological trauma whether subsequent laboratory testing identifies it as containing 25 per cent, 75 per cent or 99 per cent dingo ancestry.

Similarly, a wild canid preying upon threatened native fauna does not become less harmful because of its genetic composition.

Operational management must therefore remain focused upon:

- demonstrated behaviour;
- actual impacts;
- livestock welfare;
- biodiversity outcomes;
- public safety; and
- biosecurity risk.

Genetic research has an important role in identifying populations that warrant long-term conservation.

However, it should not become a practical barrier preventing timely management of animals causing unacceptable impacts to livestock, biodiversity or neighbouring communities.

Management decisions should continue to be based primarily on impact rather than ancestry.

5.6 Property Rights Australia's Position

Property Rights Australia supports continued investment in genetic research and recognises the valuable contribution it makes towards understanding Australia's wild canid populations. However, the organisation submits that governments should exercise considerable caution before relying upon genetic research alone as the basis for major legislative or policy reform.

At present:

- there is no comprehensive, nationally accepted estimate of Australia's free-ranging wild canid population;[18] [19]
- regional genetic variation appears significant;[1]
- some regions remain comparatively under-represented in published genomic research;[1]
- local operational evidence suggests differing genetic compositions between regions;[20] and
- genetics alone cannot determine whether individual animals pose unacceptable risks to livestock, biodiversity or neighbouring communities.

Accordingly, Property Rights Australia submits that any future changes to dingo management should be based upon multiple lines of evidence, including:

- population monitoring;
- regional genetic research;
- ecological outcomes;
- livestock impacts;
- biodiversity responses;
- animal welfare considerations;
- biosecurity obligations; and
- the practical experience of landowners and land managers who live and work alongside wild canids every day.

Only through a comprehensive evidence base can governments develop management policies that are scientifically credible, operationally practical, socially responsible and capable of delivering measurable conservation outcomes.

6. Ecological Claims Must Be Tested, Not Assumed

Property Rights Australia accepts that dingoes may perform important ecological functions in some landscapes. However, the ecological effects of dingoes are not uniform across every ecosystem, season, prey base or land use.

The NSW Government states that wild dogs may have positive and negative environmental impacts. It notes that they may regulate some herbivores, but may also prey on threatened species, including koalas and beach-nesting birds, and that population-level impacts on some native species remain unclear.[3]

The NSW Scientific Committee's assessment of predation and hybridisation by feral dogs also records mixed research findings concerning whether dingoes suppress foxes and cats, including studies finding no evidence of suppression at relevant scales.[8]

The Committee should reject simplistic propositions that:

- more dingoes automatically produce better biodiversity outcomes;
- reducing control will necessarily suppress foxes and cats;
- dingo presence benefits every threatened species;
- ecological benefits inside a park outweigh all impacts outside it;
- one management model can apply across NSW.

These are scientific questions requiring location-specific evidence.

Policy should be based on measurable ecological outcomes, including monitoring of:

- dingo and wild dog abundance;
- fox and feral cat activity;
- threatened-species populations;
- prey availability;
- livestock attacks;
- hybridisation;
- movement across tenure boundaries;
- the effects of control and non-control areas.

Where ecological claims are relied upon to justify a policy change, the burden should rest on government to demonstrate those claimed benefits and disclose the associated costs and risks. Landowners should not be used as unwilling participants in an uncontrolled ecological experiment.

7. The Animal-Welfare Debate Cannot Ignore Livestock

An inquiry conducted by the Animal Welfare Committee must consider the welfare of all animals affected by policy - not only the welfare of predators.

Wild dog attacks are frequently violent and prolonged. The NSW code of practice acknowledges that wild dogs may maim livestock without killing them and may kill sheep while leaving carcasses uneaten. It also recognises that predation can threaten the economic viability of livestock enterprises.[7]

Attacked livestock may suffer:

- torn flesh and muscle;
- bites to the throat, hindquarters and abdomen;
- severed tendons;
- disembowelment;
- shock and blood loss;
- miscarriage;
- infection;
- extended suffering before discovery;
- euthanasia because injuries cannot be treated.

Animals that survive may suffer stress, reduced condition, disrupted maternal behaviour and reduced production.

It would be ethically inconsistent for the Committee to scrutinise every control method applied to dingoes while treating the suffering of attacked sheep, cattle, goats, alpacas, working dogs and domestic pets as a secondary consideration.

Humane control is important. So is preventing the need for animals to endure predation.

8. The Human Cost of Wild Dog Attacks

Wild dog attacks are not ordinary production losses. They involve farmers repeatedly finding animals they have bred, raised and cared for dead or catastrophically injured. Producers may patrol at night, check vulnerable livestock continually, lose sleep, abandon paddocks and live with the knowledge that further attacks can occur at any time.

The NSW Wild Dog Management Strategy recognises that attacks on livestock can have major financial impacts, affect land-use and enterprise decisions and cause severe emotional impacts when animals, including pets, are attacked.[4] Meat & Livestock Australia has also reported the significant psychological trauma experienced by producers dealing with continuing wild dog attacks.[9]

These impacts include:

- anger, distress and helplessness;
- sleep deprivation;
- increased family stress;
- loss of confidence in government agencies;
- reduced willingness to invest;
- fear during lambing and calving;
- withdrawal from sheep or goat production;
- feelings of isolation where complaints are minimised or dismissed.

The language of “coexistence” can sound reasonable from an office or an urban policy forum. It has a very different meaning to a farmer collecting mauled livestock at first light. Government must not romanticise a policy whose brutality is experienced principally by animals and people outside the land on which that policy is imposed.

9. The Financial Cost Is Substantial and Under-recorded

The Australian Government states that wild dogs cost the agricultural sector up to $302 million annually, principally through stock losses.[6] Direct livestock deaths are only one component of the loss. Other costs include:

- missing animals never recovered;
- injured livestock;
- veterinary treatment and euthanasia;
- reduced lambing and marking percentages;
- abortions and calf losses;
- reduced weight gain;
- premature sale of livestock;
- changes from small-stock to less suitable enterprises;
- fencing, baiting and trapping;

- surveillance equipment;
- time spent checking livestock and responding to attacks;
- lost genetic investment;
- reduced land value or productive potential.

Historic NSW material has indicated that livestock injuries and losses may be substantially under-reported.[12] There are obvious reasons for this. Farmers may not find every carcass, may be unable to prove cause of death, may not know where to report an attack or may see no value in reporting when no effective response follows. The absence of a report is not evidence of the absence of damage.

9.1 Producer case study: sixty scanned-in-lamb ewes

Meat & Livestock Australia documented the experience of a producer who lost 60 scanned-in-lamb ewes over six weeks. The immediate estimated financial loss was $15,000, in addition to the emotional toll.[10]

That figure does not fully account for the unborn lambs, genetic value, replacement costs, lost future production, time spent monitoring the flock or the distress of repeatedly finding attacked animals.

This is why losses cannot be reduced to the saleyard value of a carcass.

9.2 Enterprise change is itself a loss

Wild dog pressure can influence whether landowners continue running sheep and goats. The ABARES literature review found that the presence and impacts of wild dogs can be a major factor in whether landholders choose to stock sheep.[11]

When predator pressure forces a farmer out of the enterprise best suited to the property, the loss extends beyond individual animals. It affects:

- farm profitability;
- employment;
- contractors;
- local saleyards and processors;
- regional agricultural diversity;
- food and fibre production;
- the long-term use and value of the land.
-

Government policy must not make productive agricultural land progressively unusable for small livestock and then dismiss the result as a private business decision.

10. WildDogScan: Valuable Evidence, but Not a Substitute for Government Monitoring

WildDogScan allows landowners and communities to record wild dog sightings, damage, impacts and control activity. The data can assist coordinated on-ground control and provide a picture of activity across regions.[13, 14]

Property Rights Australia supports its use. However, data derived from voluntary reporting should be treated as a minimum indication, not a complete record of wild dog activity or livestock losses. Not every landowner:

- knows about the platform;
- has adequate internet or mobile coverage;
- records every incident;
- finds every carcass;
- can identify the cause of missing livestock;
- has time to enter reports;
- believes reporting will lead to action.

The Government should not use incomplete reporting to minimise the scale of the problem.

NPWS, Local Land Services and other agencies should integrate WildDogScan with properly resourced monitoring, verified attack reports, camera data, trapping records, baiting records and landowner observations.

Data collected from landowners must also lead to a response. Rural people should not be treated merely as unpaid data collectors for agencies unwilling to act on the evidence supplied.

11. Cross-Tenure Control Is Essential

Wild dog control is most effective when land managers work together across the landscape and use a combination of methods. This is expressly recognised by the NSW Government.[3, 4]

A single landowner cannot achieve sustained control where adjoining public land continually provides refuge or reinvasion.

Effective management may require:

- strategic aerial baiting;
- ground baiting;
- trapping;
- shooting by appropriately authorised persons;
- exclusion fencing;
- livestock guardian animals;
- surveillance and camera monitoring;
- rapid-response arrangements;
- coordinated timing across properties.

No one method will be appropriate in every location. For that reason, government should not remove effective tools before demonstrating that an equally effective, affordable and practical alternative is available.

Calls for landowners to rely principally on fencing or guardian animals ignore scale, terrain, cost, maintenance, flooding, native-animal movement and the operational realities of Australian grazing properties.

Non-lethal measures can assist some enterprises. They cannot substitute for coordinated population and impact management across every landscape.

12. Lessons from Western Australia: Do Not Legislate First and Resolve Consequences Later

The recent Western Australian debate concerning increased dingo protection demonstrates the uncertainty created when conservation proposals are advanced without clear guarantees for livestock producers and existing wild dog programs.

In June 2026, questions in the Western Australian Parliament concerned the future Wild Dog Action Plan and continued support for control.[15] Producer representatives have also sought assurances that the State's practical wild dog management framework will not be weakened.[16]

The lesson for New South Wales is not that Western Australia has already produced definitive long-term results. It is that major policy change should not proceed while its practical consequences for livestock producers, public land managers and regional communities remain unresolved.

Before any NSW change is considered, government must clearly determine:

- whether dingo status will restrict existing control;
- whether control can continue on public land;
- whether buffer areas will be maintained;
- whether landholders can respond to immediate threats;
- who will pay for additional prevention;
- who will compensate verified losses;
- how public land managers will be held accountable;
- what occurs where genetic status cannot be established;
- how policy will affect coordinated baiting programs.

New South Wales should not make sweeping legal changes and leave producers to discover the practical consequences after implementation. The evidence, impact assessment, funding and accountability framework must come first, and landowners must be part of the conversation throughout the whole process.

13. Indigenous Australians Knowledge and Cultural Significance

Property Rights Australia acknowledges that dingoes hold deep cultural significance for many Indigenous Australians.

Indigenous knowledge may make a substantial contribution to understanding dingo behaviour, landscape relationships and culturally appropriate conservation. However, Indigenous leadership and agricultural knowledge must not be presented as competing sources of legitimacy. Both deserve respect.

Indigenous Australians involvement should be incorporated into a broader framework that also includes:

- neighbouring landowners;
- livestock producers;
- Local Land Services;
- professional pest controllers;
- veterinarians;
- ecologists and biologists;
- animal-welfare specialists;
- regional communities.

The strongest framework will recognise cultural responsibility alongside responsibility for livestock welfare, neighbouring land, threatened species, rural livelihoods and food and fibre production.

14. Local Knowledge Must Be Given Evidentiary Weight

Farmers and graziers often hold decades - or generations - of direct knowledge about:

- wild dog movement corridors;
- breeding cycles;
- seasonal changes;
- livestock attack patterns;
- den locations;
- water availability;
- terrain;
- failures and successes of past control programs.

This knowledge is repeatedly gathered through observation and lived experience, not a short-term study.

Government models, genetic research and ecological theory can be valuable. They are not substitutes for local evidence.

Landowners must be involved before management plans are changed, not informed after the decision has effectively been made. Consultation must include:

- early release of proposed changes;
- access to the evidence relied upon;
- regional meetings in affected communities;
- adequate time for submissions;
- publication of impact assessments;
- written responses to practical concerns;
- ongoing landowner representation in management bodies.

Consultation is not genuine where the policy objective is predetermined and affected people are invited only to comment on its implementation.

15. Transparency and Independent Accountability

The existing NPWS policy provides for wild dog management plans in high-risk parks, collaboration with neighbours and data collection on control activity.[2] However, landowners cannot assess government performance if operational information is inaccessible, inconsistent or aggregated to the point of meaninglessness.

NPWS should publish annual, park-level information on:

- identified high-risk areas;
- current management plans;
- baiting, trapping and other control undertaken;
- expenditure;
- verified livestock attacks;
- reports received from neighbouring landowners;
- response times;
- repeat incidents;
- dingo and wild dog monitoring;
- ecological outcomes;
- compliance with management commitments.

Serious or repeated disputes should be reviewable by an independent body.

Government cannot be the land manager, policy-maker, data holder, compliance assessor and final judge of its own performance.

16. Recommendations

Property Rights Australia recommends that the Committee recommend to the NSW Government that it:

Recommendation 1 — Maintain balanced management
Affirm that the objective of NSW policy is responsible wild canid management - not eradication, but equally not unmanaged protection - recognising the ecological and cultural significance of dingoes while preventing unacceptable impacts on livestock, native fauna, neighbouring landowners and regional communities.

Recommendation 2 — Apply equal legal responsibilities
Confirm that the General Biosecurity Duty applies equally and enforceably to all public and private land managers, and require public authorities conserving dingoes to remain responsible for preventing and responding to unacceptable impacts beyond the land they manage.

Recommendation 3 — Retain impact-based management
Ensure operational management decisions continue to be based on demonstrated behaviour, location, risk and impact, rather than genetic ancestry alone, so that animals causing unacceptable impacts can be managed regardless of subsequent genetic classification.

Recommendation 4 — Retain effective management tools
Maintain access to all evidence-based control methods, including aerial baiting, ground baiting, trapping, authorised shooting, exclusion fencing and other appropriate measures, supported by coordinated cross-tenure management programs.

Recommendation 5 — Establish clear operational standards
Require public land managers to participate in coordinated regional management programs and introduce enforceable standards for responding to verified attacks, implementing agreed control programs and reporting management outcomes.

Recommendation 6 — Require a comprehensive evidence base before reform
Prohibit any material change to dingo protection or wild canid management legislation or policy until the Government demonstrates, through transparent and independently reviewed evidence, that the anticipated ecological benefits outweigh the agricultural, animal welfare, biosecurity, property rights, social and economic impacts.

Recommendation 7 — Establish a state-wide population and monitoring program
Develop a scientifically robust state-wide monitoring program to establish baseline estimates of the free-ranging wild canid population, monitor population trends, regional distribution, livestock attacks, biodiversity outcomes, predator interactions and cross-boundary movements before and after any policy changes.

Recommendation 8 — Strengthen the scientific evidence base
Support further independent genetic research in under-represented regions, including inland and central New South Wales, and require periodic independent review of the scientific evidence underpinning dingo management policy to ensure legislation reflects the best available knowledge.

Recommendation 9 — Improve transparency and accountability
Require annual public reporting on wild canid management, including population monitoring, genetic research, control activities, expenditure, livestock attack data, ecological outcomes and compliance with management plans, supported by an independent complaints and review mechanism for affected landowners.

Recommendation 10 — Establish a compensation framework
Develop a statutory compensation framework for verified livestock losses and reasonable additional management costs where government policy decisions or failures in public land management materially contribute to those losses.

Recommendation 11 — Ensure conservation does not transfer costs
Where government policy requires increased dingo conservation, provide ongoing funding for any additional prevention, monitoring or management measures required of neighbouring landowners, ensuring the costs of conservation are not transferred to private individuals.

Recommendation 12 — Strengthen community participation
Provide genuine and ongoing representation for livestock producers, neighbouring landowners, Indigenous Australians representatives, Local Land Services, veterinarians, ecologists and pest-management specialists in the development, implementation and review of wild canid management policy.

Recommendation 13 — Review policy outcomes
Undertake independent yearly reviews of any significant policy changes against predetermined ecological, agricultural, biosecurity, animal welfare and social performance indicators, with mechanisms for immediate intervention where unacceptable impacts are identified.

Conclusion

Dingoes have ecological and cultural significance. That fact does not answer the central public-policy question before this Committee: who bears responsibility when government conservation decisions cause harm beyond government land? The answer cannot continue to be the neighbouring farmer.

Private landowners are expected to control risks originating on their land. Government must be held to the same standard. It is neither fair nor sustainable to protect predators on public land while requiring neighbouring families to absorb the livestock deaths, animal suffering, lost production, sleepless nights, control costs and emotional trauma. Nor is it credible to describe such a system as “shared responsibility” where the benefits are claimed by government and advocates while the consequences are borne privately.

The present NSW framework already provides for both dingo conservation and targeted control. It should be strengthened through funding, transparency, measurable obligations and accountability - not dismantled on the basis of selective evidence or ideological pressure.

Conservation without responsibility is not conservation. It is the transfer of public policy costs onto private citizens who did not create the policy, did not consent to the risk and should not be forced to carry its consequences.

Further information

If you require further information or clarification on any points raised in the submission, please contact Emma Bowman (Vice-Chair and NSW Policy) at Property Rights Australia by email on pra1@bigpond.net.au or phone 0493 667 561.

References

[1] Cairns KM, et al. (2023). *Whole genome sequencing reveals the extent of dingo ancestry in Australian wild dogs*. *Molecular Ecology*, 32(20), 5420–5436.

[2] NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, *Wild Dog Policy*, updated 1 July 2024.

[3] NSW Environment and Heritage, *Wild Dogs—Pest Animals and Weeds*, updated 20 May 2025.

[4] NSW Department of Primary Industries, *NSW Wild Dog Management Strategy 2022–2027*.

[5] National Wild Dog Action Plan Steering Committee, *National Wild Dog Action Plan 2020–2030*.

[6] Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, *Priority Pest Animals*, updated 11 June 2026.

[7] NSW Department of Primary Industries, *Code of Practice and Standard Operating Procedures for the Effective and Humane Management of Wild Dogs*, 2022.

[8] NSW Scientific Committee, *Predation and Hybridisation by Feral Dogs—Final Determination*.

[9] Meat & Livestock Australia, *Working Together Key to Tackling Wild Dogs*, 10 January 2024.

[10] Meat & Livestock Australia, *Feedback*, Spring 2023, producer case study recording the loss of 60 scanned-in-lamb ewes.

[11] Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences, *Wild Dog Management in Australia—Social Impacts of Wild Dogs: A Review of the Literature*.

[12] NSW Department of Primary Industries, *Guard Animals for Livestock Protection*.

[13] Centre for Invasive Species Solutions, *WildDogScan*.

[14] PestSmart, *Monitor and Map with FeralScan*.

[15] Parliament of Western Australia, Legislative Council Hansard, 17 June 2026.

[16] Nationals WA, *Labor's Dingo Deal Is Creating Uncertainty for Livestock Producers*, 2026.

[17] University of Sydney – New DNA testing shatters wild dog myth

[18] ABARES – Wild Dog Management in Australia: Social Impacts of Wild Dogs – A Review of the Literature

[19] National Wild Dog Action Plan – National Metrics Project, Meat & Livestock Australia, 2016.

[20] Advice provided by Central West Local Land Services to Property Rights Australia Board Member, 2026.

[21] Stephens D, et al. *The Action Plan for Australian Dingoes.*