

There is no Dingo dilemma: legislation facilitates culling, containment and conservation of Dingoes in New South Wales

Peter J. S. Fleming^{1,2,3}, Guy Ballard^{2,4} and Nathan Cutter⁵

¹ Vertebrate Pest Research Unit, NSW Department of Primary Industries, Orange, New South Wales 2800, Australia. E-mail: peter.fleming@dpi.nsw.gov.au

² Ecosystem Management, School of Environmental and Rural Science, University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales 2351, Australia

³ Institute for Agriculture and the Environment, Centre for Sustainable Agricultural Systems, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Queensland 4350, Australia

⁴ Vertebrate Pest Research Unit, NSW Department of Primary Industries, Armidale, New South Wales 2800, Australia

⁵ Regions, Industry, Agriculture & Resources, NSW Department of Primary Industries, Orange New South Wales 2800, Australia

ABSTRACT

The perceived dilemma about Dingoes overly simplifies a complex “wicked problem”. Similarly, it is simplistic to suggest that to “cull, contain or conserve” Dingoes are mutually exclusive options or are the only options for managing Dingoes at a state-wide level. The legal instruments enacted and implemented in New South Wales (NSW) attempt to accommodate conflicting values, impacts and drivers. Since the first Dingo symposium in 1999, there has been a series of legislative changes pertaining to Dingo management. That legislation, and associated regulation and policy, addresses the management of Dingoes and other free-roaming dogs such that the dilemma is perceived rather than actual. The main new legal operand in New South Wales is the *Biosecurity Act* 2015, but other States have similar legislation. Here we outline the application of this Act and others to the management of Dingoes in NSW and conclude that they can be variously culled, contained and conserved, within and across large landscapes, depending on context and managers’ objectives.

Key words: Act, damage mitigation, enclosure, exclosure, policy, regulation, wild dog

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7882/AZ.2020.035>

Introduction

There are usually more than two diametrically opposing positions in human/wildlife conflicts. Dingoes (*Canis familiaris*, Linnæus 1758)¹, as an exemplar of such a perceived dilemma, have many different potential values and impacts depending on the situation (Corbett 2001; Fleming *et al.* 2001; Smith 2015a). Dingoes are iconic, totemic, culturally important, beneficial and detrimental, and are variously admired, ignored, feared, revered, loved, accepted, hated, despised or valued by those who are aware of them (e.g. Newsome *et al.* 2015; Payne *et al.* 1930; Rolls 1969; Smith 2015b; van Eeden *et al.* 2018; Walters 1995; Wardell-Johnson *et al.* 2018). They are neither “good” nor “bad” and their management for conservation, iconic or cultural status, human welfare or agricultural protection is neither simply a good thing nor a bad thing: context is everything.

Although dilemmas are situations where difficult choices are required between two or more alternatives (e.g. to cull, contain or conserve Dingoes), the etymology of dilemma implies a dichotomy of choices in “The Dingo Dilemma”. We choose to avoid perceived and false dichotomies such as good vs bad (Rosling *et al.* 2018) and kill vs conserve (Dickman and Lunney 2001). A false dichotomy evokes the impression that there are only two sides to an issue and tends to polarise debate and entrench opinions (Rosling *et al.* 2018). It amplifies confirmation biases where evidence is interpreted in alignment with existing beliefs, expectations, or particular hypotheses (Nickerson 1998). False dichotomies are rarely helpful in providing solutions to complex or “wicked problems” (term coined by H. Rittel: Churchman 1967). A wicked problem is a practical, social or cultural issue that is difficult or impossible to resolve to an agreed endpoint because there are many differing opinions about the issue and its solutions (Rittel and Webber 1973): Dingo management is an archetypal wicked problem. This creates a conundrum as to how we can, could and should manage the Dingo.

¹ The current correct taxonomy and nomenclature of Dingoes is *Canis familiaris* (Alvares *et al.* 2019; Jackson *et al.* 2019; this volume). Contrary to recommendations of Smith *et al.* (2019) and Cairns *et al.* (this volume), we will use this taxonomy unless, or until, otherwise resolved by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The management of the Dingo is often conflicted because of multifarious perspectives and values placed on it. Perspectives vary depending on time frames and definition. Are they “native”, i.e. present in Australia before 1400 (a date legacy of the Australian Government’s *Endangered Species Protection Act 1992* that was carried forward into the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*)? Are they introduced or alien? Introduction was before about 3,500-4,600 years before present when they first occurred in the archaeological record (Corbett 2001; Smith and Savolainen 2015; Jackson *et al.* this volume), but may have been earlier, i.e. ~5,000-10,000 years before present (Cairns *et al.* 2019; Savolainen *et al.* 2004). Introduction estimates that precede South Asian dog domestication dates and separation of Kangaroo Island and Tasmania from mainland Australia at the melting of the last Ice Age are logically impossible. Are they “invasive” animals? We intend no negative value judgement in this descriptive adjective, rather that “invasive” simply describes their propensity to enter new environments, establish and multiply, and alter ecologies (despite contrary discourse by some, e.g. Hillier 2017; Larson 2005). Cultural perspectives are inconsistent within communities and vary across ethnicities, language groups and country (e.g. Indigenous introduction to this forum; Smith 2015b; Walters 1995).

Perceptions of the value of the Dingo in Australian ecosystems also vary, as do their roles. The flyer for this symposium outlined some of those values and roles: “... options include culling this carnivore, especially where it preys on stock, or containing dingoes with fences, or at the other end of the spectrum, conserving the dingo because of its role as an apex predator that has recognisable benefits for managing ecosystems, including suppressing the invasive alien carnivores – the cat and the fox.” However, the first and last statements are contested. For example: compare Allen and Fleming (2004) and Fleming and Korn (1989) with Allen (2016), Allen (2015) and Campbell *et al.* (2019) about dingoes and livestock losses; compare Fancourt *et al.* (2019) and Allen *et al.* (2014) with Newsome *et al.* (2017) and Letnic *et al.* (2012), among others, about dingo suppressive effects on mesopredators; and consider Laurie Corbett’s statement at the 1999 RZS Dingo symposium that, “Dingoes are common and everywhere and no native species or ecosystems are dependent on them” (from Corbett’s unpublished Powerpoint presentation). Canid roles vary (Fleming *et al.* 2017b), and so management actions can/should/must be flexible when needs change.

Regardless of perceptions and perspectives about values and roles, the key to managing a wicked problem such as the Dingo is to concentrate on their impacts upon various human and environmental values (Hone 1994, 2007; Olsen 1998). That is, concentrate on benefits and costs of Dingoes and manage them accordingly: where they do good, promote them; where they do harm, reduce that harm; where people want to keep them, let them; and where

their impact is neutral, retain the status quo. Although sometimes poorly understood, legislation, regulations and associated policy in New South Wales (NSW) can and do facilitate this pragmatic approach to the wicked problem.

Here we revisit the purpose of the 1999 RZS Dingo symposium papers of Davis (2001), Davis and Leys (2001) and Fleming (2001), track the legislative journey to the current day and provide concluding remarks to assist with Dingo management. Of note is that only one of the NSW legal instruments taxonomically defines a Dingo or other free-roaming dog. In a carry-over of Schedule 3 of the repealed *Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995* into Schedule 4 of the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2015* (see below for details), the Key Threatening Process, “Predation and Hybridisation by Feral Dogs, ‘*Canis lupus familiaris*’” ascribes that commonly-used (Kreplins *et al.* 2019) but incorrect trinomen (see Jackson *et al.* 2017) to feral dogs.

NSW legislative position in 1999

In the 1999 RZS Dingo symposium, policy solutions were outlined to address changes in NSW legislation pertaining to the management of Dingoes under the then-current NSW legislation (Davis 2001; Davis and Leys 2001; Fleming 2001). Prior to 1998, Dingoes, “native dogs” and wild-living dogs of whatever breed, were all declared noxious animals (*Pastures Protection Act 1934*: Fig. 1) and private landholders were obliged to “continuously suppress and destroy” all of them on land they owned or occupied. On National Park estate, Schedule 11 of the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974* considered Dingoes as native and offered them protection on those lands by default. Modern domestic dogs were, and still are, specifically prohibited from such lands. Until 1998, the Crown (and hence managers of public lands) was not bound by the *Pastures Protection Act 1934* and its successors. These factors, despite the *Pastures Protection Act 1934* holding primacy over the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*, provided potential conflict between Acts (Davis 2001; Davis and Leys 2001). This led to a real problem of definition for managers of public lands because hybridisation among dogs was already recorded (e.g. Corbett 2001; Jones 1990; Newsome and Corbett 1982), there was a contradiction between Dingoes being considered a wild dog subject to control under the *Pastures Protection Act 1934* but native and protected under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*, and the latter failed to account for the common dispersion of free-roaming dogs of whatever genetics across land tenure boundaries (e.g. Robley *et al.* 2010).

Davis (2001) reported on two new pieces of legislation; the *Companion Animals Act 1998*, which allowed the keeping of Dingoes as pets or working dogs whereas previously they could only be so kept under licence, and the *Rural Lands Protection Amendment Act 1998* (RLP Act). Under the RLP Act, all declared animals required “Eradication” (which term was defined as “continuous suppression and

| Act | Year | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------|--|------|--|--|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 1921 | | 1934 | | | | 1974 | | 1986 | | 1991 | | 1998 | 1999 | 2002 | | 2013 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2019 | |
| Pertaining to killing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pastures Protection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rural Lands Protection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local Land Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biosecurity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Game and Feral Animal Control | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wild Dog Destruction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Border Fence Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pesticides | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pertaining to containing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wild Dog Destruction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Border Fence Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Exhibited Animals Protection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dividing Fences | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Companion Animals | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pertaining to conserving | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| National Parks and Wildlife | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biodiversity Conservation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 1. A timeline of New South Wales legislation pertaining to the management of Dingoes (years 1934 to 1974 are not to scale). Extant legislation in black.

destruction”) on all lands, including those owned by the Crown, and Dingoes and other wild dogs were declared pests under a Pest Control Order. Extant legislation (i.e. the *Wild Dog Destruction Act 1921*) continued to prevent the keeping of dingoes in the Western Division of NSW (i.e. “Clause 26 *Possession of dingo: Any person who, without the written authority of the board, has in the person’s possession any dingo or half-bred dingo is guilty of an offence*”).

However, there were practical problems with the RLP Act. Firstly, real eradication is impossible in most circumstances (see Bomford and O’Brien 1995) and eradication (as defined under the Act) of Dingoes was both never attempted and undesirable on some lands. Secondly, and notwithstanding the biological and behavioural characteristics that predispose certain species to invasiveness (Olsen 1998; Pimentel et al. 2000; Salo et al. 2007), in most cases of human-invasive animal conflict, it is the situation in which they and people occur rather than the species itself that is problematic (Fleming et al. 2017a; Jarman 1990). Contrary to this, the Pest Control Order for wild dogs targeted the species rather than the situation and Dingoes, being included as wild dogs by definition within the Regulations associated with the RLP Act, were caught up in the Pest Control Order. Thirdly, the new Act also had potential internal conflict with the *National Parks & Wildlife Act 1974*, under which Dingoes were unprotected, but conserved on much of the National Parks and Wildlife Service estate as native animals present prior to 1788. Fourthly, the Crown was bound by the new legislation, and this meant that land managers of public land were legally obliged to conduct control where none had previously been undertaken or where Dingo conservation was an objective.

Andrew Leys (NSW NPWS) and Eric Davis (NSW Agriculture) used a regulatory instrument to resolve

these difficulties by scheduling land and instituting planning requirements (Davis and Leys 2001). Under the Regulations of the RLP Act, all of NSW was included in Schedule 1, where the “eradication” requirements stood, excepting lands specifically identified in Schedule 2. On those lands (mostly national parks, nature reserves and State Forest lands), Dingo and other wild dog conservation was allowed in the context of a strategic management plan for neighbour protection and that plan had to be agreed to by direct neighbours or the local Rural Lands Protection Board as their representative (Davis 2001). The scheduling provided a logical solution, but was variously misinterpreted: some public land managers thought that there could be no wild dog control on Schedule 2 lands, some private land managers thought similarly and some people thought that all National Parks were Schedule 2 lands and that Dingoes were protected in all NPWS estate. Such confusion persisted even until the legislation changed 18 years later. Although planning processes became more prevalent (e.g. Baker et al. 2002), few, if any, wild dog management plans were specifically written for Schedule 2 lands.

Current legislation pertaining to Dingo management

Acts for culling and killing Dingoes

Culling, although widely used in invasion biology (e.g. Caughley 1980; Fryxell et al. 2014; Jenkins et al. 2010), is a problematic term. Livestock producers and breeders, and animal geneticists, constrain the meaning to selective removals of animals to eliminate disease (e.g. neosporosis, Hall et al. 2005) or improve the genetic merit and performance of a population (e.g. Brown 1967; Hatcher et al. 2018). In contrast, invasive animal managers use the term more generally and with euphemistic overtones

to mean the lethal removal of animals. “Killing” is a more honest, but more confronting, description of what is done and we will use it here: killing animals is sometimes essential to achieve management objectives (Ballard and Fleming 2016; Fleming and Ballard 2019).

The *Local Land Services Act 2013* superseded the RLP Act to accommodate the formation of 11 Local Land Services regions, but encapsulated all the pest animal components of the RLP Act without changes. However, the current Act, the *Biosecurity Act 2015*, is additional to the *Local Land Services Act 2013* and was instituted to provide uniformity of approach to all biosecurity issues in NSW, i.e. endemic and exotic animal and plant pathogens, and invasive species— i.e. pest animals and plants. The major change to invasive species management under the *Biosecurity Act 2015* was to concentrate on the impacts and potential impacts of extant species like the wild dog rather than declaring them “noxious” and requiring their “eradication”. Consequently, the declaration of wild dogs, including Dingoes, in the Wild Dog Pest Control Order was repealed along with the pest management functions of the *Local Land Services Act 2013*. The objective of the new *Biosecurity Act 2015* is to prevent negative impacts and biosecurity risks to agricultural, environmental and community values by priority pest animals and other biosecurity matters. Pest animals are defined in Section 15 (1) and (2) according to one or more of nine adverse effects they potentially have on those values. The objective is to stop priority pest animals and biosecurity matter moving from one piece of land to another, similar in principle to management of animal and plant pathogens. The Crown is bound, as in the predecessor *Rural Lands Protection Act 1998*. In the current *Local Land Services Act 2013*, the act of invasive animal management is defined as “to prevent, eliminate, minimise or manage the biosecurity risk posed by, or the biosecurity impact of, a pest, within the meaning of the *Biosecurity Act 2015*”. This meaning persists and encapsulates landowners and occupiers’ obligations under the *Biosecurity Act*.

To fulfil requirements of the *Biosecurity Act 2015*, eleven Local Land Services Regional Pest Advisory Committees (RPACs) comprising representatives from major land users in each region and relevant environment and industry representatives were formed. RPACs determine priority pest animals for their district and list them with control and mitigation actions in Regional Strategic Pest Animal Management Plans (RSPAMPs). The intent of the RSPAMPs is to involve all key stakeholders across all land tenures for a more effective and inclusive approach to managing priority pest animals specific to each region.

In NSW, Dingoes and other wild dogs are priority pest animals within all 11 Local Land Service RSPAMPs (Table 1). Under the *Biosecurity Act 2015*, all landowners and occupiers have a General Biosecurity Duty to manage the biosecurity risks posed by priority pest animals on their land and the biosecurity risks to other land managers likely to be posed by priority pest animals on their land (i.e. neighbour protection).

Under RSPAMPs, killing of Dingoes and other free-roaming dogs is facilitated to relieve biosecurity impacts and risks. If, because of the situation it is decided that killing Dingoes is essential to achieve value protection or diminish impacts, that does not mean the groups directing that work are psychopathological, indiscriminate and/or uncaring (see Marks 2013). Standard Operating Procedures (for best practice), Codes of Practice (agreed conduct dealing with welfare aspects of control) and Pesticide Control Orders (authorised application of toxins under the *Pesticides Act 1999*) govern any management responses. In effect, these constrain what can occur in time and space.

Part 2, Schedule 3 of the *Game and Feral Animal Control Act 2002*, indicates that a licence is required to hunt dogs (other than Dingoes) on public land, but is not required for hunting them on private land. This is confusing from

Table 1. Priority pest animals for the 11 Local Land Services Regional Strategic Pest Animal Management Plans (only those animals common to all 11 RSPAMPs are listed. Source <https://www.lls.nsw.gov.au/biosecurity/pestplan>, accessed 06/12/2019). Dingoes are included under “wild dogs”.

| Local Land Services region | Priority ranking | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| | Wild Dogs | Red Foxes | Feral Cats | Feral Deer | Feral Pigs | Feral Goats |
| Central Tablelands | 1 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| Central West | 1 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| Greater Sydney | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Hunter | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 6 |
| North West | 1 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 5 |
| Northern Tablelands | 3 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| South East | 4 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Murray | 6 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| Riverina | 7 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Western | 9 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 7 |
| North Coast | 12 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 7 |

a taxonomic viewpoint and the phrasing implies that a licence is required to hunt Dingoes on private land, which is incorrect under the requirements of the *Biosecurity Act*. It is also impractical because it is impossible for a hunter to distinguish a Dingo from a Dingo-like hybrid dog in the field (Elledge *et al.* 2008), “down the barrel of a gun” (Quanta *et al.* 1986).

In the Western Division of NSW, the *Border Fence Maintenance Act 1921* (formerly the *Wild Dog Destruction Act 1921*) allows the collection of funds from rated land managers and consolidated revenue, which can be used to kill Dingoes and other free-roaming dogs (also, see below).

Acts for containing Dingoes

In NSW, legislation and regulation allows for the containment of Dingoes. There are four aspects of Dingo containment: enclosure and enclosure, keeping them as companion animals, and keeping them for display and education.

Enclosure and enclosure are two sides of the same coin: both involve dog- or predator-proof fencing to either contain or exclude Dingoes. Enclosure to exclude Dingoes is important for livestock damage mitigation. For broadscale enclosure, the *Border Fence Maintenance Act 1921* applies to the dog-proof fence that separates the Dingoes in South Australia and Queensland from the north-west corner of the Western Division of NSW (McKnight 1969; Newsome *et al.* 2015). We note that predator-proof fencing is not without potential costs because other wildlife can become entrapped in the netting and wires (e.g. reptiles, Ferronato *et al.* 2014), desirable animal movements and gene flow can be restricted. Notwithstanding, enclosure of Dingoes in sufficient containment area has potential for their conservation management (e.g. Moseby *et al.* 2012; Newsome *et al.* 2015).

A small number of predator enclosures have been constructed in New South Wales in response to ongoing predation problems and a rise in popularity of cluster fencing (where several holdings band together to erect a dog-proof fence) in Queensland (Cockfield *et al.* 2018). These enclosures have been for fauna conservation (e.g. Australian Wildlife Conservancy’s Scotia Sanctuary, Hayward *et al.* 2012) and for livestock production (e.g. Wongwibinda Wild Dog Control Association, Northern Tablelands Local Land Services). There are also linear fences on the eastern Northern Tablelands and east of Kybean in the southern ranges for excluding free-roaming dogs from livestock production areas (McKnight 1969; Study Group of the New England Regional Development Association Undated, c. 1963). Because these fences usually separate two or more holdings, they are subject to provisions of the *Dividing Fences Act 1991*. That Act makes no reference to Dingoes specifically or to livestock damage mitigation purposes. Rather, a person can potentially execute their General Biosecurity Duty under the *Biosecurity Act* if

their fencing is of a standard that excludes, or contains, free-roaming dogs including Dingoes.

As noted by Davis (2001), people are allowed to keep Dingoes under the constraints and provisions of the *Companion Animals Act 1998*. Although Dingo keeping was still prohibited in the Western Division in 1999 when Davis presented, the subsequent repeal of the *Wild Dog Destruction Act 1921* has ensured consistency across the State. Now, owners do not need a permit to own and keep Dingoes. Responsible dog ownership includes that pet and working Dingoes be microchipped and registered like other dogs.

However, when kept for display, education or breeding for display, Dingoes are treated like other exhibited animals under the *Exhibited Animals Protection Act 1986*. Unlike owners of pet and working Dingoes, owners of exhibited Dingoes require a permit to exhibit, which is administered by the NSW Department of Primary Industries.

Acts for conserving Dingoes

People might want to conserve Dingoes for genetic, intrinsic, faunal, ecological, cultural and iconic values. The *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* facilitates the conservation of fauna (and flora) in New South Wales. Schedule 5 of the Act identifies Protected animals, which include any fauna that is native to Australia or that periodically or occasionally migrates to Australia. Dingoes are explicitly excluded from the list of Protected mammals, the definition of which states, “mammals—mammals of any species (including aquatic or amphibious mammals but not including dingoes)”. However, Dingo conservation occurs by default in much of the State where they are not considered a biosecurity or biodiversity threat, including areas of National Park and forested estate. In effect, management of Dingoes in all of NSW is now equivalent to that previously encompassed by Schedule 2 lands, as described in Davis (2001). For example, at the time of the 2019 RZS symposium, the majority of forested areas in north eastern NSW were not exposed to aerial baiting, although the largest wild dog control program in the State occurs there (see Fig. 1 in Ballard *et al.* 2020).

There is potential for confusion about the conservation status of Dingoes in National Parks estate because all NSW fauna is protected under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*. However, Dingoes and other fauna can be harmed “subject to provisions of another Act”, in this case the *Biosecurity Act 2015*. Under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*, it is also an offence to take any dog into all types of reserve and free-roaming, owned dogs are subject to impoundment under the *Companion Animals Act 1998*. This is to prevent disturbance and predation of extant wildlife on reserves, and as a conservation action to inhibit further hybridisation with Dingoes under Schedule 4 of the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* (see above).

There is, however, nothing in NSW legislation to prevent Dingo conservation, provided land owners and occupiers can demonstrate their General Biosecurity Duty is discharged. A General Biosecurity Duty is not compromised where there is no biosecurity risk of Dingoes on the land and they present no biosecurity risks to other lands. There are examples of such Dingo conservation possibilities (e.g. National Parks and Wildlife Service Wild Dog Program <https://www.nationalparks.nsw.gov.au/conservation-programs/wild-dog-control-program>, accessed 14/07/2020). Conservation-minded people can also achieve this by enclosure (e.g. Bargo Dingo Sanctuary, <https://dingosanctuarybargo.com.au/>, accessed 14/07/2020), and through associated wild dog management plans that are agreed among stakeholders at the Local Land Service level.

Concluding remarks

Legislatively, there is no “kill-or-serve” dilemma (Dickman and Lunney 2001) about Dingoes in NSW because there is no simple dichotomy of values or actions. Instead, various pieces of legislation, and associated regulation and policy instruments, allow the keeping, killing, exclusion, enclosure and conservation of Dingoes. As in most human: wildlife/ invasive animal conflicts, the predicament is produced by the multitude of benefits and costs of Dingoes and of associated values, thoughts,

beliefs and views among people. The legislation enables and encourages an adaptive management approach concentrating on the impacts of Dingoes and the different values they manifest for different stakeholders (Braysher 2017; Fleming 2001; Fleming *et al.* 2017a). It is possible to simultaneously “cull, contain and conserve” Dingoes at different places in the NSW landscape by following this approach and the roadmap of Allen *et al.* (2017). The roadmap concludes that Dingo conservation is “warranted, possible and conceptually quick and easy to implement” under existing Australian legislation and guidelines. However, we do caution that the existence of such legislative, regulatory and policy frameworks does not necessarily translate into consensus among conflicted people. Nonetheless, the end result, at a very large scale, is a landscape in NSW that still contains Dingoes (Cairns *et al.* 2019) and will continue to do so.

Acknowledgements

Discussions with Ben Russell, Bronwyn Fancourt, Andrew Claridge, Greg Mifsud, William Chang, Matthew Crane, Quentin Hart and Stephen Jackson ensured better understanding of legislation and its application in different situations. We thank the organisers of the RZS Dingo Dilemma Forum for the invitation to present 20 years on and acknowledge the improving comments of two anonymous reviewers.

References

- Allen, B.L. 2015. More buck for less bang: reconciling competing wildlife management interests in agricultural food webs. *Food Webs* 2; 1-9.
- Allen, B.L., Allen, L.R., Ballard, G., Jackson, S.M. and Fleming, P.J.S. 2017. A roadmap to meaningful dingo conservation. *Canid Biology and Conservation* 20; 45-56.
- Allen, B.L., Lundie-Jenkins, G., Burrows, N.D., Engeman, R.M., Fleming, P.J.S. and Leung, L.K.P. 2014. Does lethal control of top-predators release mesopredators? A re-evaluation of three Australian case studies. *Ecological Management & Restoration* 15; 191-195.
- Allen, L. 2017. Is landscape-scale wild dog control the best practice? *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management* 24; 5-15.
- Allen, L.R. and Fleming, P.J.S. 2004. Review of canid management in Australia for the protection of livestock and wildlife - potential application to coyote management. *Sheep and Goat Research Journal* 19; 97-104.
- Alvares, F., Bogdanowicz, W., Campbell, L.A.D., Godinho, R., Hatlauf, J., Jhala, Y.V., Kitchener, A., Koepfli, K., Krofel, M., Moehlman, P.D., Senn, H., Sillero-Zubiri, C., Viranta, S. and Werhahn, G. 2019. *Old World Canis spp. with taxonomic ambiguity: Workshop conclusions and recommendations, Vairão, Portugal, 28th - 30th May 2019*. CIBIO.
- Baker, K., Cathles, T., Corby, J., Franklin, N., Hunt, K.E., Jenkins, D.J., Morris, B., Southwell, P., Turner, K. and Vincent, J. 2002. *Brindabella & Wee Jasper Valleys Cooperative wild dog/ fox control plan, July 2002-June 2005*. (NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service: Queanbeyan).
- Ballard, G. and Fleming, P. 2016. Death by dingo: outsourcing pest control raises uncomfortable questions. In *The Conversation* 08/08/2016. <https://theconversation.com/death-by-dingo-outsourcing-pest-control-raises-uncomfortable-questions-63498>.
- Ballard, G., Fleming, P.J.S., Meek, P.D. and Doak, S. 2020. Aerial baiting and wild dog mortality in south-eastern Australia. *Wildlife Research* 47; 99-105.
- Bomford, M. and O'Brien, P. 1995. Eradication or control for vertebrate pests? *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 23; 249-249.

- Braysher, M.** 2017. *Managing Australia's pest animals: a guide to strategic planning and effective management*. (CSIRO Publishing: Clayton South).
- Brown, G.H.** 1967. The use of correlated variables for preliminary culling. *Biometrics* 23; 551-562.
- Cairns, K.M., Nesbitt, B.J., Laffan, S.W., Letnic, M. and Crowther, M.S.** 2019. Geographic hot spots of dingo genetic ancestry in southeastern Australia despite hybridisation with domestic dogs. *Conservation Genetics* 21; 77-90.
- Campbell, G., Coffey, A., Miller, H., Read, J.L., Brook, A., Fleming, P.J.S., Bird, P., Eldridge, S. and Allen, B.L.** 2019. Dingo baiting did not reduce fetal/calf loss in beef cattle in northern South Australia. *Animal Production Science* 59; 319-330.
- Caughley, G.** 1980. *Analysis of vertebrate populations. Reprinted with corrections*. (John Wiley and Sons: London).
- Churchman, C.W.** 1967. Guest editorial: Wicked problems. *Management Science* 14; B141-B142.
- Cockfield, G., Botterill, L.C. and Kelly, S.** 2018. A prospective evaluation of contingent loans as a means of financing wild dog exclusion fences. *The Rangeland Journal* 40; 591-601.
- Corbett, L.K.** 2001. *The Dingo in Australia and Asia. Second Edition*. (JB Books Australia: Marlestone).
- Davis, E.** 2001. Legislative issues relating to control of dingoes and other wild dogs in New South Wales. I Approaches to future management. In *A Symposium on the Dingo*. Sydney. (Eds C.R. Dickman and D. Lunney) pp. 39-41. (Royal Zoological Society of New South Wales: Mosman).
- Davis, E. O. and Leys, A. R.** 2001. Reconciling wild dog control and dingo conservation under New South Wales legislation. In *A Symposium on the Dingo*. Sydney. (Eds C.R. Dickman and D. Lunney) pp. 108-110. (Royal Zoological Society of New South Wales: Mosman).
- Dickman, C.R. and Lunney, D.** 2001. Last howl of the dingo: the legislative, ecological and practical issues arising from the kill-or-protect dilemma. In *A Symposium on the Dingo*. Sydney. (Eds C.R. Dickman and D. Lunney) pp. 95-107. (Royal Zoological Society of New South Wales: Mosman).
- Elledge, A.E., Allen, L.R., Carlsson, B., Wilton, A.N. and Leung, L.K.P.** 2008. An evaluation of genetic analyses, skull morphology and visual appearance for assessing dingo purity: implications for dingo conservation. *Wildlife Research* 35; 812-820.
- Fancourt, B.A., Cremasco, P., Wilson, C. and Gentle, M.N.** 2019. Do introduced apex predators suppress introduced mesopredators? A multiscale spatiotemporal study of dingoes and feral cats in Australia suggests not. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 56; 2584-2595.
- Ferronato, B.O., Roe, J.H. and Georges, A.** 2014. Reptile bycatch in a pest-exclusion fence established for wildlife reintroductions. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 22; 577-585.
- Fleming, P., Corbett, L., Harden, B. and Thomson, P.** 2001. *Managing the impacts of dingoes and other wild dogs*. (Bureau of Rural Sciences: Canberra).
- Fleming, P.J.S.** 2001. Legislative issues relating to control of dingoes and other wild dogs in New South Wales. II Historical and technical justification for current policy. In *A Symposium on the Dingo*. Sydney. (Eds C.R. Dickman and D. Lunney) pp. 42-48. (Royal Zoological Society of New South Wales: Mosman).
- Fleming, P.J.S. and Ballard, G.** 2019. Yes, killing is sometimes essential for conservation. *Australian Zoologist* 40; 41-48.
- Fleming, P.J.S., Ballard, G., Reid, N.C.H. and Tracey, J.P.** 2017a. Invasive species and their impacts on agri-ecosystems: issues and solutions for restoring ecosystem processes. *The Rangeland Journal* 39; 523-535.
- Fleming, P.J.S. and Korn, T.J.** 1989. Predation of livestock by wild dogs in eastern New South Wales. *Australian Rangeland Journal* 11; 61-66.
- Fleming, P.J.S., Nolan, H., Jackson, S.M., Ballard, G.-A., Bengsen, A., Brown, W.Y., Meek, P.D., Mifsud, G., Pal, S.K. and Sparkes, J.** 2017b. Roles for the Canidae in food webs reviewed: Where do they fit? *Food Webs* 12; 14-34.
- Fryxell, J.M., Sinclair, A.R.E. and Caughley, G.** 2014. *Wildlife ecology, conservation, and management*. (Wiley-Blackwell: Chichester).
- Hall, C.A., Reichel, M.P. and Ellis, J.T.** 2005. Neospora abortions in dairy cattle: diagnosis, mode of transmission and control. *Veterinary Parasitology* 128; 231-241.
- Hatcher, S., Dominik, S., Richards, J.S., Young, J., Smith, J., Tearle, R., Brien, F.D. and Hermann, N.** 2018. Ewe culling and retention strategies to increase reproductive rates in Merino sheep. *Animal Production Science* 58; 1545-1551.
- Hayward, M.W., L'Hotellier, E., O'Connor, T., Ward-Fear, G., Cathcart, J., Cathcart, T., Stephens, J., Stephens, J., Herman, K. and Legge, S.** 2012. Reintroduction of Bridled Nailtail Wallabies beyond fences at Scotia Sanctuary - Phase 1. *Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales* 134; A27-A37.
- Hillier, J.** 2017. No place to go? Management of non-human animal overflows in Australia. *European Management Journal* 35; 712-721.
- Hone, J.** 1994. *Analysis of vertebrate pest control*. (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge).
- Hone, J.** 2007. *Wildlife damage control*. (CSIRO Publishing: Collingwood, Victoria).

- Jackson, S.M., Groves, C.P., Fleming, P.J.S., Aplin, K.P., Eldridge, M.D.B., Gonzalez, A. and Helgen, K.M. 2017. The Wayward Dog: Is the Australian native dog or Dingo a distinct species? *Zootaxa* 4317; 201-224.
- Jarman, P. 1990. Bird pest research: the gap between research and application. In *National bird pest workshop proceedings, University of New England, Armidale, 8-9 February 1990*. (Eds P. Fleming, I. Temby and J. Thompson) pp. 7-12. (NSW Agriculture & Fisheries: Glen Innes).
- Jenkins, H.E., Woodroffe, R. and Donnelly, C.A. 2010. The duration of the effects of repeated widespread badger culling on cattle tuberculosis following the cessation of culling. *PLOS ONE* 5; e9090.
- Jones, E. 1990. Physical characteristics and taxonomic status of wild canids, *Canis familiaris*, from the Eastern Highlands of Victoria. *Wildlife Research* 17; 69-81.
- Kreplins, T.L., Gaynor, A., Kennedy, M.S., Baudains, C.M., Adams, P., Bateman, P.W. and Fleming, P.A. 2019. What to call a dog? A review of the common names for Australian free-ranging dogs. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 25; 124-134.
- Larson, B.M. 2005. The war of the roses: demilitarizing invasion biology. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 3; 495-500.
- Letnic, M., Ritchie, E.G. and Dickman, C.R. 2012. Top predators as biodiversity regulators: the dingo *Canis lupus dingo* as a case study. *Biological Reviews* 87; 390-413.
- Linnæus, C. 1758. *Systema naturae per regna tria naturae, secundum classes, ordines, genera, species, cum characteribus, differentiis, synonymis, locis*. Tomus I, Editio decima, reformata Edition: i-ii, 1-824. pp. 38. (Laurentii Salvii: Holmiae [= Stockholm]). *The three kingdoms of nature systematically ordered according to classes, orders, genera, and species, with their characteristics, differences, synonyms and locations*. Volume 1, 10th revised edition.
- Linnell, J.D.C., Trouwborst, A., Boitani, L., Kaczensky, P., Huber, D., Reljic, S., Kusak, J., Majic, A., Skrbinek, T., Potocnik, H., Hayward, M.W., Milner-Gulland, E.J., Buuveibaatar, B., Olson, K.A., Badamjav, L., Bischof, R., Zuther, S. and Breitenmoser, U. 2016. Border security fencing and wildlife: The end of the transboundary paradigm in Eurasia? *PLOS Biology* 14; e1002483.
- McKnight, T.L. 1969. Barrier fencing for vermin control in Australia. *Geographical Review* 59; 330-347.
- Marks, C. 2013. Killing Schrödinger's feral cat. *Animal Studies Journal* 2; 51-66.
- Moseby, K.E., Neilly, H., Read, J.L. and Crisp, H.A. 2012. Interactions between a top order predator and exotic mesopredators in the Australian rangelands. *International Journal of Ecology* 2012; 1-15.
- Study Group of the New England Regional Development Association. Undated, c. 1963. *Dingoes in New England. Community Development Pamphlet No 7*. (University of New England: Armidale).
- Newsome, A.E. and Corbett, L. 1982. The identity of the Dingo. 2. Hybridization with domestic dogs in captivity and in the wild. *Australian Journal of Zoology* 30; 365-374.
- Newsome, T.M., Ballard, G.-A., Crowther, M.S., Dellinger, J.A., Fleming, P.J.S., Glen, A.S., Greenville, A.C., Johnson, C.N., Letnic, M., Moseby, K.E., Nimmo, D.G., Nelson, M.P., Read, J.L., Ripple, W.J., Ritchie, E.G., Shores, C.R., Wallach, A.D., Wirsing, A.J. and Dickman, C.R. 2015. Resolving the value of the dingo in ecological restoration. *Restoration Ecology* 23; 201-208.
- Newsome, T.M., Greenville, A.C., Letnic, M., Ritchie, E.G. and Dickman, C.R. 2017. The case for a dingo reintroduction in Australia remains strong: A reply to Morgan et al., 2016. *Food Webs* 10; 39-41.
- Nickerson, R.S. 1998. Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of General Psychology* 2; 175-220.
- Olsen, P. 1998. *Australia's pest animals: new solutions to old problems*. (Bureau of Resource Sciences and Kangaroo Press Pty Ltd, NSW: Canberra and Sydney).
- Payne, W.L.R., Fletcher, J.W. and Tomkins, B. 1930. *Report on the Royal Commission on rabbit, dingo, and stock route administration*. (Queensland Government: Queensland).
- Pimentel, D., Lach, L., Zuniga, R. and Morrison, D. 2000. Environmental and economic costs of nonindigenous species in the United States. *BioScience* 50; 53-65.
- Quanta, A.A., Reid, K., Ryder, M. and Thompson, C. 1986. You're the Voice. In 'Farnham, J., Whispering Jack'. (Ed. R. Fraser). (RCA Records: Australia).
- Robley, A., Gormley, A., Forsyth, D.M., Wilton, A.N. and Stephens, D. 2010. Movements and habitat selection by wild dogs in eastern Victoria. *Australian Mammalogy* 32; 23-32.
- Rittel, H.W.J. and Webber, M.M. 1973. Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences* 4; 155-169.
- Rolls, E.C. 1969. *They all ran wild*. (Angus and Robertson: Sydney).
- Rosling, H., Rosling, O. and Rosling Ronnlund, A. 2018. *Factfulness: Ten reasons we're wrong about the world - and why things are better than you think*. (Sceptre/ Hodder and Stoughton: London).

- Salo, P., Korpimäki, E., Banks, P.B., Nordström, M. and Dickman, C.R. 2007. Alien predators are more dangerous than native predators to prey populations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society Biological Sciences Series B* 274; 1237-1243.
- Savolainen, P., Leitner, T., Wilton, A.N., Matisoo-Smith, E. and Lundeberg, J. 2004. A detailed picture of the origin of the Australian dingo, obtained from the study of mitochondrial DNA. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 101; 12387-12390.
- Smith, B. 2015a. *The dingo debate: Origins, behaviour and conservation*. (CSIRO Publishing: Clayton South).
- Smith, B. 2015b. The role of dingoes in Indigenous Australian lifestyle, culture and spirituality. In *The dingo debate: Origins, behaviour and conservation*. (Ed. B. Smith) pp. 81-101. (CSIRO Publishing: Clayton South).
- Smith, B.P., Cairns, K.M., Adams, J.W., Newsome, T.M., Fillios, M., Déaux, E.C., Parr, W.C.H., Letnic, M., van Eeden, L.M., Appleby, R.G., Bradshaw, C.J.A., Savolainen, P., Ritchie, E.G., Nimmo, D.G., Archer-Lean, C., Greenville, A.C., Dickman, C.R., Watson, L., Moseby, K.E., Doherty, T.S., Wallach, A.D., Marrant, D.S. and Crowther, M.S. 2019. Taxonomic status of the Australian dingo: the case for *Canis dingo* Meyer, 1793. *Zootaxa* 4564; 173-197.
- Smith, B. and Savolainen, P. 2015. The origin and ancestry of the dingo. In *The dingo debate: Origins, behaviour and conservation*. (Ed. B. Smith) pp. 55-79. (CSIRO Publishing: Clayton South).
- van Eeden, L.M., Smith, B.P., Crowther, M.S., Dickman, C.R. and Newsome, T.M. 2018. 'The dingo menace': an historic survey on graziers' management of an Australian carnivore. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 25; 245-256.
- Walters, B.J. 1995. *The company of dingoes: Two decades with our native dog*. (Australian Native Dog Conservation Society Ltd: Bargo).
- Wardell-Johnson, A., Archer-Lean, C. and Carter, J. 2018. Dingo singing: the howl of the advocate. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 25; 37-49.