

From: kachana **Sent:** Tuesday, 29 June 2021 **To:** Biosecurity Compliance Officer of DPIRD
Subject: G'day Paul

G'day Paul,

Trusting you are back in Perth and already missing the warm(?) Kimberley. (12 degrees here this morning 😊)

A brother-in-law asks:

- Is it the role of a public servant use regulations to keep people in check?
or
- Is there also a duty to assist members of the public (who try and do the right thing) to get on with the job within/despite the current framework?

As somebody who appreciates the opportunities that Australia presented to me some forty years ago, I continue to put trust in the latter.

In this vein I view your recent visit to Kachana, to be an opportunity to push the tabling of the real issues at stake here, higher up the bureaucratic chain of command.

I.e. Rather than a continued investment of taxpayer time and money on insignificant minor offences, should we not be embracing a context that has community relevance?

Hence:

- What are the purpose and intent of a Department that advertises:



- Would not 'improved ecological outcomes in remote rainfall-catchments' be covered by such intent?

- If current regulation makes for disincentives to protect and grow soil on watersheds and in rainfall-catchment areas, and in addition penalises related innovation, then should not such matters be addressed at strategic levels instead of at regulatory levels?

We remain aware that in our government bureaucracies we have selected for a culture where if somebody does something good, virtually nobody hears about it.

On the other hand, if somebody stuffs up, the whole world seems to hear about it.

Thus, A HUGE THANK YOU! to all those wonderful and practical individuals who for the sake of this potential opportunity have (over the years) risked bureaucratic wrath from above, whilst assisting us in the search for locally relevant solutions and options.

We have neither the scope nor the time to change legislation which appears to be based on faulty thinking/science and that provides us with unintended consequences.

Our only hope seems to be to continue to appeal to the integrity of individuals.

Further, I wish clarify some points raised during your questioning on 22.06.2021.

1. Kachana Pastoral Company PL (KPC) owns the pastoral lease to Kachana Station.
They do not own the land.
Associated with exercising any privileges permitted by the lease comes the responsibility of custodianship.
2. We explain what Kachana is all about in [a 3-minute video clip on this page](#).
3. In an 8-minute presentation [I bear testimony to what I have learnt during over 40 years in Australia](#).
4. [For a little more detail we have a 25-minute explanation](#).

5. [As early as 2002 we first began formally inviting collaboration with our departments.](#)
6. [May 2004 was the first time we officially approached the Department to initiate discussion about the opportunity we saw.](#)
7. 2004 to 2017 coordination and collaboration on the ground continued in the absence of any official departmental response from Perth.
8. Late 2017, the opportunity offered by KPC suddenly appeared to have become a “problem”.
9. The distinction we make between “feral” and “wild” (for the purpose of our position on the matter) is defined here: [Wild donkeys are not the same as feral donkeys](#)
10. With the facilitation of Professor Danielle Celermajer (Sydney Environment Institute, University of Sydney) a new way forward was explored. KPC bent over backwards to accommodate concerns about the containment of the donkey population in question.
11. Stipulations that followed were neither reasonable nor necessary. The nature of such unacceptable conditions demonstrated that there was no understanding of what was at stake here, nor of what it was that KPC was offering.
In consequence I called the whole donkey project off. (I had a lot of other things going on in my life at the time, so exact dates can best be gleaned from correspondence.)
12. The offer by KPC to host research and any new donkey-related projects still stands, but a new context will need to be defined.
13. My personal position on all of this is:
 - a. I continue to advise that **replacing herbivores with fire in our unmanaged rainfall-catchments is a very bad idea!**
 - b. I remind people of all walks of life that **"Ignorance of law excuses no one"** this tenet equally applies to the law(s) of nature.

To the point:

"3.5 It is conceivable that [directors who fail to consider "climate change risks" NOW could be found liable for breaching their duty of care and diligence in the future.](#)"

If corporate players risk the threat of litigation in regard to neglecting climate-related risk, it stands to reason that decision-makers and actors who impact trends in landscape function may too need to offer accountability.

- c. I have no intention to stand in the way of bullets.
However, I will do my utmost to hold accountable personally any decision-makers and people “simply following orders”, if they are involved in decisions and actions, that have demonstrable negative outcomes on the local ecology of the region.

Statements above are prompted by an ongoing wish to save a local population of wild donkeys for the purpose of developing and demonstrating the utility of a functional “landscape regeneration tool” in our seasonally dry tropics: <https://www.kachana-station.com/projects/studies-and-research/>

Paul, I would be very grateful if you could pass this on to those instructing you.

Wishing you a great day.

Regards,

Chris

PS

Please let me know if any of the links do not work for you.