



## FNQROC Animal Management and Wildlife Stewardship Policy

### Workshop 1, 25 July 2017

**Participating councils:** CSC, DSC, CRC, CCRC, HSC

**Scope of policy:** clear definitions are required for legislative and non-legislative approaches for internal and external dealings with wildlife matters. They will set the scope for the regional policy content and local government dealings with wildlife matters.

#### **Wildlife and animal related definitions –**

**Wildlife** – native fauna which is ‘wild by nature’ as per the Queensland Nature Conservation Act 2002. Although not exclusive a range of key species for a considered response were identified in workshop one, primarily these include key iconic wildlife species of the region.

**Domestic animals** – non-native animals including stock animals owned, kept, fed or otherwise sustained by people.

**Pest animals** – non-native animals living in a wild state (non-domestic).

**Issues** - the wildlife issues the policy needs to address fall into two streams which we have phrased as **management** and **stewardship** (in a nutshell what wildlife do to us; and what we do to/or on behalf of wildlife). By simple definition these can be described as;

**Wildlife management** – responding to complaints from; or threats to; community in response to wildlife matters.

**Wildlife stewardship** – ensuring local governments and the communities they represent act in a way which ensures that the wildlife of our region is sustained into the future.

**Policy context** – in workshop one we asked the question “*is there consistency between LG’s legislative obligation versus community expectations?*”; the short answer is no. Community expectation is greater than the roles and responsibilities delegated to LG in legislation (biosecurity, local laws and planning) or the Local Government Act. Council’s role as prescribed by legislation (particularly where legislation outlines responsibilities to LG) is less than the role community expect LG’s are required to play; or less than the role LG’s expect themselves to play.

We acknowledge local government has limited prescribed (legislative) responsibility for wildlife but community will often come to council as a first port of call, or when frustrated with dealing with other jurisdictions. Some of the reasons collated in workshop one are;

- Council provides an opportunity for face to face communication.
- Community expect LG to advocate on their behalf when there is inaction or lack of feedback from other jurisdictions.
- LG customer request systems (usually) ensure a timely response or feedback is provided.
- Council technical and customer service staff usually want to assist (not good at saying no).
- Councils are the end of the line for devolution in government, if they don't respond then no-one else will.
- Councils have a relatively good handle on local context, case/situation history and often have personal rapport with individual landholders.

**Delivery context-** workshop one identified councils have two distinct roles in the responding to wildlife management, a compliance role; and an educative role. Further defining these through the policy will assist to demarcate the boundaries of what we attend to and what we devolve and what processes and procedures are used.

Workshop one also captured an outline of the internal delivery and communication structures within councils who typically respond to wildlife matters. One key theme which arose in workshop one was that open spaces more than often translate to open ended. Consequently a clear definition of boundaries of what councils do and don't respond to and a more defined process of self-help in our customer service responses would reduce the number of wildlife matter queries entering CR systems

## Workshop 2, 24 August 2017

Workshop one identified a series of first courses of action. There are already a range of initiatives and processes in place or development within individual councils which could be shared across the region. These will be workshopped with external agencies and partners in workshop two.

**Opportunities for regional collaboration –** workshop one identified a range of regional opportunities for collaboration and resource sharing, these included;

- CR setup, knowledge bases and sharing of information, workflows and categories.
- Compliance approaches and tools.
- Procurement of animals traps, monitoring cameras etc.
- Development and delivery of communication tools.
- Local laws alignments, development and delivery.
- Sharing of operational policies and workflows.
- Shared advertising programs (development and delivery).
- Co-investment in 'fast tracking' good ideas which are already underway or which are identified by policy.

**Opportunities and requirements for working with other jurisdictions and external partners-** workshop one identified a range of key points for clarification and opportunities for collaboration with other jurisdictions and external partners. These included;

- Clear demarcation of state government versus LG responsibility.
- Investigating the establishment of an MOU between state and local jurisdictions to define roles and responsibilities.
- Identifying clear definitions of wildlife, domestic and pest animals and ensuring they are consistent with the legislative intent and operations of state departments or local laws.
- Establish clear work flows (for internal and external) to guide council response to wildlife matters.
- Defining suitable enclosures requirements across multiple legislations (e.g. deer, dogs, cats).