

## Wildlife Act Review

To the reviewer,

Below are my submissions as a response to some of the questions raised in the Issue Paper.

1.5.3. Should 'game' animals be defined as wildlife in the Act or defined some other way or excluded from the Act entirely?

**Game animals such as deer, duck, quail, should continue to be defined as wildlife. However, an appropriate sub-category should also be present for game animals to allow for their continued management of their hunting. The Department of Environment, Land, Water, and Planning (DELWP) and the Game Management Authority (GMA) should be given a greater role in managing this category.**

3.2.1. Should the Act include provisions for consultation with the community on certain issues? What issues should undergo community consultation?

**The Act should consider and consult local stakeholders on issues such as development, zoning, introducing/repealing regulations, management of wildlife on public land, and others.**

3.5.2 Is full cost recovery appropriate, or should fees for some licences and activities be subsidised? What role is there for user pays or beneficiary pays principles? What, if any changes, should be made and why?

**Full cost recovery is not appropriate, as it may likely result in increased fees for hikers, campers, and other users. Keeping fees affordable for the general public to access activities, also has the intangible benefit/positive externalities of raising awareness on issues such as habitat conservation, land use, and others.**

5.8.1. Should the Act provide for third-party civil enforcement under the Act? How might this make a difference in achieving the intended outcomes of the Act?

**No. Laws should be enforced by personnel working for the State, not deputised third parties which may be partial to their own interests.**