

**MINUTES OF THE 7<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE NSW KANGAROO  
MANAGEMENT ADVISORY PANEL**

**OEC CENTRE, DUBBO - 15<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2006**

**PRESENT:** Rosyln Muston – Chair (Evans & Peck), Joshua Gilroy (DEC), Nicole Payne (DEC), Sarah Carr (DEC), Tony English (AVA), Sandy Bright (PAWD), Marie Russell (RLPB), Mike Mulligan (AGMPA), Marsha Isbester (NSW Farmers Assoc. – alternate)

**APOLOGIES:** Geoff Woods (DPI), Steve Coleman (RSPCA), Rosemary Barnes (NSW Farmers Assoc.), Grant List (replacement for Mike Cavanagh KIAA)

**Arrangements for the Meeting**

DEC will explain how the summary of the submissions was made and the process that DEC followed. Each Panel member will be given a chance to give their view on the submissions but will be asked to be clear if they are personal views or the views of their organisations.

**1. Formalities**

**Ratification of Minutes #6**

- The minutes for Meeting #6 were formally adopted.

**Review of Actions from Meeting #6**

**Action 1:** When preparing the handbook for chiller operators, include consultation with AQIS (Canberra) – Steve Roberts 62716438 – industry first contact, as well as NSW Food Authority etc.

Noted for when chiller handbook is being prepared.

**Action 2:** Updated MOU to be provided to all members.

Sent with draft Minutes #6 on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2006

**Action 3:** Non-commercial statistics for the year to date to be supplied.

Attached as Appendix 1 to draft Minutes #6.

**Action 4:** Sandy to pass on to the RLPB that the trapper needs to contact DEC and discuss the issue further to determine if any changes can be made.

Sandy has passed the information on. DEC has not as yet heard from the trapper.

**Action 5:** KM staff will meet with the Commonwealth DEH to ensure all issues that have been raised to both the Commonwealth and DEC are considered before finalising the draft.

DEC met with DEH on 9<sup>th</sup> August.

**Action 6:** All submissions plus summary table to be collated and sent at least a week prior to the meeting.

Sent 26 July 2006, and late submissions and updated summary sent to Panel members on 1 August 2006. DEC is still waiting on a signed submission from DPI, but has received a draft from Geoff.

**2. Draft KMP 07-11**

**Submissions – general comments**

- DEC explained to the Panel how the summary of submissions was made and the process that will follow. Each submission was read and the issues raised in the submission identified in a spreadsheet under various headings. Where issues were considered to be very similar, they were then grouped into more general categories within these headings.

- Every issue raised will be addressed and all comments from organisations taken into consideration.
- One of the questions asked in analysing the submissions will be if the issue supports the plan or if changes to the plan are needed.
- The Panel was asked to make general comments on the submissions:

Mike Mulligan (AGMPA) - Mike's first comment was that he was disappointed with the attendance at the meeting and the lack of representation from other organisations. He found no surprises with the submissions and from an Industry point of view the plan had every support with no proposal for modification. Mike thought the "Joey Dispatch" issue was predictable and that the allocation of tags matter needed addressing.

Marsha Isbester (NSW Farmers Assoc) – Marsha found no surprises with the issues raised in the submissions but was surprised at the small number of submissions received. The question was asked if submissions that did not provide the name and address of the sender should be rated as less important than those that contained the sender's name.

Marie Russell (RLPB) – Marie stated that the number of submissions was a surprise and asked if we should disregard those submissions that did not contain name and address details. Marie was happy with the process that DEC had adopted to deal with the submissions, but did ask for a further discussion on the issue of skin only shooting.

Sandy Bright (PAWD) – Sandy was also happy with the summary process and found no surprises with the content of the submissions. PAWD has asked that Sandy still press for skin only shooting to be included in the plan as a management tool for certain circumstances, rather than as a blanket provision.

Joshua Gilroy (DEC) – Josh stated that the content of some of the submissions shows that stakeholders would like to see a plan that also covers operational issues, such as the allocation of tags and the number of shooters.

Nicole Payne (DEC) – Nicole was also surprised that relatively few submissions were received, but noted that these did cover the full spectrum of opinion. Those received without name and address could not be acknowledged, but will be considered. All submissions were acknowledged as being received by DEC, where possible.

Geoff Wood (DPI) – Geoff's comments regarding the submissions were received by email and were read to the Panel members.

- The "stand out" issues recognised as being most relevant to the Panel from these general comments were:
  1. Dispatch of young at foot
  2. Sustainable Use concepts
  3. Skin-only Shooting
  4. Lack of representation at the meeting
  5. Tag Allocations
  6. That all issues needed to be addressed
  7. Socio-economic objectives
  8. The requirements of the EPBC Act
  9. The Animal Welfare aim
  10. The sex ratio of the harvest.
  11. Survey methodology for Euros.

#### **Submissions received by the Commonwealth DEH.**

- Only 2 submissions were received by DEH. Issues involved were:
  1. The FATE Project – DEH received an identical submission to that sent to DEC
  2. RSPCA – Humane treatment and confusion over the Code of Practice.

## **DEH Comments on the draft plan**

- Thirty seven issues were raised with DEC by DEH over the draft plan. They included:
  1. Points of clarification around licensing.
  2. Biology, Ecology and Conservational issues. Would like to see additional information included in this section including a summary of the relevant information.
  3. Should include a separate aim on animal welfare and Code of Practice issues.
  4. Some Performance Indicators need to be clarified.
  5. Additional reporting to DEH. DEC and DEH are negotiating what will be in the reports.
  6. Maps to be included showing distribution of species.
  7. A provision in the plan for minor changes to happen without going through the approval process.
  8. A list of the organisations represented on the KMAP.
- Joshua commented that we (DEC/DEH) would be creating too many weaknesses in the plan if too much information was included.

*Action 1: The draft document from DEH was supplied to all members at the meeting and will be sent to those not in attendance.*

### **Analysis of relevant issues.**

#### **1. Dispatch of Joeys at foot.**

- Tony English (AVA) acknowledged that there were difficulties with compliance, but also thought that most people had major problems with this particular issue.
- Sandy Bright (PAWD) commented that in nature young at foot were not sought out and disposed of when predators killed their mothers and should we, because in this case man is the predator, differentiate between nature and the harvest.
- Nicole Payne (DEC) who is a member of the working group for the Code of Practice review explained that the group had looked at different options to deal with the issue. For example – avoiding harvesting females, and methods of dealing with joeys that can be caught when the female has been culled.
- Tony asked if the Code of Practice was enforceable.
- DEC advised the group that the compliance with the code is enforceable and that shooters can be prosecuted. DEC can and does investigate and take action over breaches of licence conditions.
- The chair raised the concern that this was a major issue, but was it sufficiently major to abandon the plan?
- The group acknowledged that the lack of progress from the working group with the Code of Practice was of major concern and that the Commonwealth needed to speed up the progress.

*Action 2: The Group asked that Joshua write to the Commonwealth with a letter of concern as to the lack of progress with the Code of Practice review.*

#### **2. Skin Only Shooting.**

- Sandy Bright (PAWD) has asked again that a tool be put in place in the plan to revisit skin only shooting should the need arise.
- Mike Mulligan (AGMPA) made reference to the review done by DEC early in 2006 to the pros and cons of skin only shooting. The project had been done and accepted by the majority.
- DEC explained that the issue can and will be re-addressed at the end of this five year plan.
- Members agreed to stay with the decision not to include skin only shooting in the 07-11 plan, but also agreed that the issue could be raised again at a later date.

#### **3. Sex Ratio of Harvest.**

- Joshua explained that when there is a drop in populations, as there is currently, more females are targeted by the shooters. When populations are high the shooters can be more selective.
- Nicole suggested that the data collected by DEC was probably not 100% correct, but is sufficiently accurate to confirm that it is still a strongly male biased harvest.

- Mike Mulligan agreed with DEC saying that the average weights of carcasses appearing in chillers indicated a male biased harvest.

*Action 3: DEC will examine the data and look at trends over the years*

*Action 4: DEC will encourage field officers to check the numbers of female/male in chillers.*

#### **4. The Animal Welfare Aim.**

- This is a prominent issue, which DEC takes seriously.
- Page 15 of the plan should include a separate aim that explicitly deals with animal welfare. The aim will explain how DEC deals with breaches of the Code of Practice, and will have actions and performance indicators associated with it.

#### **5. Lack of Representation at the meeting.**

- Concerns have been raised with the lack of interests represented by the Panel. The Panel would welcome interest from other groups *eg.* conservational and aboriginal groups.
- DEC have made many attempts to have these groups involved.
- A gap at the table does not mean that these groups' issues are not addressed. This is continually being met by public submission, web page *etc.*
- The groups not represented on today's Panel were mainly due to unforeseeable circumstances.

*Action 5: DEC should attempt to have a one on one meeting with those representatives that could not be available for today's meeting.*

#### **6. Socio/Economic Objectives.**

- Do we need to add these to the plan?
- Tony English suggested that commercial harvesting at the moment does not provide any benefits to the landholder. He feels the FATE proposal does this and its merits should be tested and evaluated.
- DEC advised that the plan in its current state is not a barrier to the proposal.
- Sandy asked if the Fauna Dealer policy of eleven only would be a problem for the FATE proposal. As the plan does not specify a maximum number of Fauna Dealer licences, and this is a policy matter, it would not preclude some options likely under the FATE proposal.
- DEC are still in discussions with FATE and have advised them that they will need to lodge an Adaptive Management Experiment proposal to DEC which will be assessed in accordance with the plan. Aim 4, page 15 of the plan provides guidelines for how the proposal will be assessed.
- The plan as it stands has a good balance. It protects the species and does not limit social and economic objectives.

*Action 6: DEC will ask FATE to make a presentation to the Panel at the October meeting.*

#### **7. The EPBC Act**

- Submissions received varied as to whether the plan complies with the EPBC Act or not.
- DEH have asked for additional information to be included in the Plan.
- The Panel asked if the submissions picked up on any issue that DEH may have overlooked.
- Do any changes need to be made to the plan because of the issues raised in the submissions?
- The conclusion of the discussion was that DEH were covering the responsibility to meet EPBC Act requirements.

#### **8. Tag Allocation**

- Joshua raised the question with the Panel – should the allocation of tags be included in the Plan, as a lot of key stakeholders believed it should be?
- Marsha Isbester asked if shooters were utilising tags taken and what reporting was in place to cover this. The question of refunds and credits given on unused tags was also raised.

- Nicole explained the licensing, returns and tag re-allocation methods currently in place. She also explained “exceptional circumstances” referred to when considering extensions and in some cases refunds.
- The group decided that as circumstances with population numbers, trapper numbers *etc* changed yearly, prescribing these in the plan would allow less flexibility and therefore it was not an issue for the plan.

*Action 7: Each group will make submissions to DEC before meeting #8 (October 17<sup>th</sup>) on how they believe tags should be allocated in next years issue. These will be circulated to the group and a discussion will be held at the October meeting.*

## **9. Survey Methodology of Euros**

- The point was made that how this will be done has not been made clear in the plan.
- DEC explained that the plan only provides the opportunity for a Euro quota and this does not mean that there will be a quota set in any particular year. Because kangaroo numbers are still low as a result of the drought, it is unlikely that there are sufficient Euro populations to warrant the setting of a quota at this stage, however this may change during the life of this plan.

## **10. Other issues raised by submissions**

- Compliance especially in relation to the Code of Practice
- Too many Trappers

### **Compliance**

- Even though DEC do not monitor at the point of kill, there are several checks in place to ensure Trappers comply with the Code of Practice:
  1. Zero tolerance by DEC in acceptance of body-shot carcasses. There is a significant dollar incentive to the Trapper to shoot in accordance with the Code, as at a minimum, a \$300 fine applies for breach of this licence condition as well as the time and dollar costs to the trapper of shooting a kangaroo that cannot be sold.
  2. Industry do not accept body-shot carcasses
  3. Every carcass processed for human consumption is inspected before processing, and the trapper responsible can be identified from the tag number.
- Josh asked if the Panel agreed if zero tolerance was the correct approach or if we should give the trappers a chance to recoup their costs, as was the case in other states.  
There was no response from the Panel.

*Action 8: Standing agenda Item. DEC will report to the Panel at every meeting on compliance matters and the MoU between DEC and NSW Food Authority.*

Sarah then gave the Panel a presentation and the chance to comment on all submission issues identified on the Summary of Submissions document, and their relevance to the Plan.

*Action 9: Analysis of Issues Document draft to be supplied to all KMAP members on completion by DEC*

### **Amendments to the draft plan?**

- The inclusion of the aim about animal Welfare.
- Changes requested by DEH
- Changing name of the Plan to make it clear that it only refers to commercial harvesting. *Eg* NSW Commercial Kangaroo Harvest Plan. There were no objections to this by any of the Panel members.

### **3. Other Business**

#### **Tag allocation update.**

- DEC expects that all zones will be either fully allocated or close to it by the end of the year.
- Several zones are already fully allocated, either for all species or for the dominant species in that zone.

*Action 10: Send current tag allocation to all KMAP members ASAP.*

#### **Non-commercial cull update.**

- Up to date non-commercial cull figures were supplied to the Panel members.
- The important facts which were pointed out on this document were:
  1. The non-commercial cull was only 2.24% of the commercial quota, despite some zones being fully allocated.
  2. The SE NSW zone data that shows non-commercial culling equivalent to 29.75% of the commercial quota actually covers a much larger area than that covered by the commercial zone. It was also pointed out that this was a new area, which had not fully accepted commercial shooting yet.
- AVA asked the question –“ if non-commercial shooters should be allowed to “chest-shoot” the kangaroos?” The chest being a much bigger target for those unprofessional shooters.
- Josh stated that he would like to see a separate Code of Practice designed for non-commercial shooters. As this had not happened, they were still required to shoot within the current Code that requires a brain shot.

#### **Compliance Update.**

- A large number of fines have been issued for breach of licence conditions.
- DEC have one court case current at the moment. This should be finalised on the 17<sup>th</sup> August 2006. The trapper involved has entered a guilty plea to 3 of the 4 offences.
- There is one other matter current. This is one of illegal shooting in the local area. DEC is intending to prosecute the alleged offender.

#### **FATE Project**

- The members have asked for a presentation by the FATE organisation at the next meeting.

#### **Next Meeting**

- The date of the 17<sup>th</sup> October 2006 has been identified for the next meeting. Members have asked to discuss:
  1. The sex ratio data
  2. The FATE project
  3. Non-commercial shooting (no guidance for non-commercial shooting)
  4. The idea of a presentation by Ron Hacker (DPI)
  5. Logistics on compliance and MoU between DEC and NSW NSW Food Authority.

#### **List of Actions:**

*Action 1: The draft document from DEH was supplied to all members at the meeting and will be sent to those not in attendance.*

*Sent with covering letter and draft minutes on 23 August 2006*

*Action 2: The Group asked that Joshua write to the Commonwealth with a letter of concern as to the lack of progress with the Code of Practice review.*

***Letter sent 23 August 2006***

*Action 3: DEC will examine the data and look at trends over the years*

*Action 4: DEC will encourage field officers to check the numbers of female/male in chillers.*

***To be distributed/discussed at Meeting #8***

*Action 5: DEC should attempt to have a one on one meeting with those representatives that could not be available for today's meeting.*

***RSPCA declined offer and confirmed continued support***

*Action 6: DEC will ask FATE to make a presentation to the Panel at the October meeting.*

***Item on Agenda #8***

*Action 7: Each group will make submissions to DEC before meeting #8 (October 17<sup>th</sup>) on how they believe tags should be allocated in next years issue. These will be circulated to the group and a discussion will be held at the October meeting.*

***Submissions distributed as received***

*Action 8: Standing agenda Item. DEC will report to the Panel at every meeting on compliance matters and the MoU between DEC and NSW Food Authority.*

***Item on Agenda #8***

*Action 9: Analysis of Issues Document draft to be supplied to all KMAP members on completion by DEC.*

***Document not provided***

*Action 10: Send current tag allocation to all KMAP members ASAP.*

***Sent with covering letter and draft minutes on 23August***