

Author name: R. Treweeke

Date of submission: Tuesday, 2 July 2013

**Submission:**

Risk creators e.g., those who allow pests to remain on their property: in some locations landholders because of geography have landscapes that are natural habitat for pests such as feral pigs i.e. wetlands. In some circumstances it would not be equitable to expect individuals to bear the total cost of control. There is a 'common' good achieved by assisting the landholders' in such a situation to stop the spread. This is where cross subsidisation may be considered.

Box 5.4 Native vegetation: it would seem that the assumption underlying a landholder being a risk creator is that they 'clear' land of native vegetation. When a landholder is dealing with the issue of an 'invasive native shrub' the act of clearing is actually 'improving' the landscape within the definition in the Native Vegetation Act, so not all clearing is a risk. It may lead to greater diversity of plant species, as well as animals and birds, reduce erosion and salinization and improve the soil water holding capacity. An example where a general rule does not apply.

Is it the case that with regard to biosecurity that clear identification can be made of 'risk-bearing' and 'risk-creating' stakeholders? Given the ability of some bio-security threats to move through processes beyond the control of landholders i.e. Hendra virus and fruit bats, how is that responsibility to be apportioned?

Some 'services' may not be demanded, either by the 'community' or by landholders, but are recognised by government as being necessary, or not, as the case may be. Ovine Johnnes disease is one such where there is no unity within the sheep industry, the veterinary profession or differing State jurisdictions.

The most difficult issue is to include the urban/peri-urban communities in the paying for biosecurity services because they may well be 'risk' creators as well as beneficiaries of clean food and fibre and properly functioning landscapes.

There is a case for the urban communities to pay a share and assist those areas where the rate base is thin, in the same way local government is assisted by way of grants from the Commonwealth government to assist with covering expenses far beyond the local communities' ability to fund.