

S00040 – Matt Joiner

I don't believe OEH should be involved in deciding who mitigates native damage on a landholder's property, beyond granting the landholder permission to have said damage mitigated. There are already structures and policies in place to license and control means such as firearms, and violations in using those means are not of concern to OEH. Putting excessive burden on landholders and shooters to provide irrelevant information to OEH will only risk decreased visibility due to non-reporting etc.

There is some talk in rural communities about it being easier to obtain damage mitigation permits. I see nothing to such effect in the summaries. In particular it needs to be possible to obtain permits easily, and without tags. Tags aren't really enforceable anyway, are time-consuming, and wasteful to print. Farmers should be able to apply for a permit to mitigate natives for a period, without restrictions on who does the shooting per above, and be able to report numbers online.

Kangaroo harvesting is very highly regulated. While regarding all harvested meat as intended for human consumption until it arrives at the abattoir sounds convenient, it actually results in a lot of waste of kangaroo meat due to people preferring to leave the carcasses rather than harvest due to all the red-tape that's involved, even when most of the meat goes to pet-food and other products anyway. Allowing a lower-standard pet-food/animal products channel will increase legitimate harvesting activity and decrease waste, and allow specializing the human consumption channel to lift margins there. Due to these low margins and high requirements, game harvester numbers are undesirably at an all-time low.