



QUEENSLAND
FARMERS'
FEDERATION



Draft Queensland Feral Pig Management Action Plan 2026-2031 March 2026

Prepared by
Jo Sheppard, CEO, QFF
E: qfarmers@qff.org.au

Prepared for:
Invasive Plants and Animals, Biosecurity Queensland,
Department of Primary Industries (DPI)

Contents page

| | |
|--|----|
| About the Queensland Farmers' Federation | 2 |
| Introduction | 2 |
| Summary of key recommendations | 3 |
| Industry evidence of impacts | 4 |
| Cross-sector observations | 4 |
| Horticulture..... | 4 |
| Cotton | 6 |
| Cane..... | 6 |
| Submission | 7 |
| Agricultural industry group's role | 7 |
| NRM organisations | 7 |
| Governance relationships between bodies | 8 |
| How will regional action plans actually be delivered?..... | 8 |
| Establishing a baseline for measuring progress | 9 |
| Education, Extension, and Integrated Pest Management | 10 |
| Conclusion | 13 |

This submission is provided to:

Invasive Plants and Animals, Biosecurity Queensland,
Department of Primary Industries (DPI)

Submitted via email: stewardship@detsi.qld.gov.au

Our members

- Queensland Fruit & Vegetable Growers
- Cotton Australia
- CANEGROWERS
- Greenlife Industry QLD
- eastAUSmilk
- Queensland United Egg Producers
- Turf Queensland
- Pork Queensland
- Australian Chicken Meat Federation
- Bundaberg Regional Irrigators Group
- Burdekin River Irrigation Area
- Central Downs Irrigators Ltd
- Fairburn Irrigation Network
- Mallowa Irrigation
- Pioneer Valley Water Co-operative Ltd
- Theodore Water Pty Ltd
- Eton Irrigation
- Lockyer Valley Water Users

About the Queensland Farmers' Federation

The Queensland Farmers' Federation (QFF) is the united voice of agriculture in Queensland.

Our members are agricultural peak bodies who collectively represent more than 13,000 farmers who produce food, fibre and foliage across the state.

QFF's peak body members come together to develop policy and lead projects on the key issues that are important to their farmer members and the Queensland agriculture sector.

Together, we form a strong, unified voice leveraging our effectiveness by working together to drive policy and initiatives that support a strong future for Queensland agriculture.

Introduction

The Queensland Farmers' Federation (QFF) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the Draft Queensland Feral Pig Management Action Plan 2026-2031.

Feral pigs remain one of the most significant biosecurity threats to Queensland's primary industries. The Plan estimates losses of approximately \$95 million in 2023, yet this figure almost certainly understates actual impacts given the absence of systematic data collection across most agricultural sectors. This illustrates the scale and urgency of the problem with production losses, infrastructure damage, compromised market access, disease risks, and rising on-farm control costs all eroding farm viability and regional resilience.

Feral pigs cannot be managed through isolated or short-term actions. An effective response requires a long-term, well-resourced, landscape-scale program led by government and delivered in genuine partnership with industry, regional bodies, and landholders across all tenures. No single agency or land tenure can achieve the sustained population reductions the sector needs.

QFF supports the Plan's focus on stronger state leadership and cross-tenure coordination. However, incremental or underfunded measures will be insufficient to prevent reinfestation or achieve meaningful outcomes. The Plan must be operationally strong, consistently funded, and integrated with existing regional and on-farm programs, ensuring that actions are practical for producers, equitable for smaller operations, and capable of delivering results at scale.

A critical issue the Plan must address is how regional action plans will actually be delivered. A strategic document, however well-crafted, achieves nothing without a clear mechanism for translating its priorities into coordinated, on-ground activity. The Plan should clearly identify and resource a delivery model responsible for translating regional plans into coordinated action across properties and tenures. This model must have established regional relationships, the capacity to engage producers across sectors, and the ability to monitor and report on activity in real time so that adaptive management can occur throughout the life of the Plan.

QFF looks forward to working closely with DPI and Biosecurity Queensland to implement the Plan and strengthen cross-sector collaboration.

Summary of key recommendations

1. Publish a comprehensive, auditable baseline and require climate-adjusted reporting. Develop and publish a detailed baseline of feral pig populations, geographic distribution, and agricultural and environmental impacts concurrently with Plan implementation rather than delaying on-ground action and require progress comparisons to account for seasonal and climatic variability to accurately measure management outcomes.
2. Embed industry engagement and establish a clear delivery mechanism for regional action plans. Strengthen the role of agricultural stakeholders in feral pig management, and identify and commit to a specific, resourced delivery vehicle capable of translating regional action plans into coordinated on-ground activity across all sectors and tenures. The Plan must answer the question of how regional action plans will actually be delivered, for example, who will be responsible, what authority they will have, and how they will reach landholders at the property level.
3. Make monitoring mandatory, standardised and nationally aligned. Replace “investigate” with “develop and implement” for all monitoring actions, establish standardised protocols within 12 months, operationalise integration with national data systems (e.g., FeralScan, ABARES), and explicitly align reporting frameworks with the National Feral Pig Action Plan to ensure compatible indicators, datasets, and reporting cycles, including cross-border population dynamics.
4. Resource a genuine nil-tenure model with financial assistance and extension. Provide financial assistance, extension services, and clear operational guidance to enable all landholders, particularly smaller or resource-limited operations, to participate in coordinated control efforts. Include government-managed lands to prevent reinfestation and implement bulk-procurement and subsidised access to high-cost methods (e.g., aerial shooting and traps).
5. Strengthen governance, provide operational authority, and publish a statewide operational plan. Empower the Plan’s oversight group with defined data access, reporting, and operational authority; clarify governance structures, decision-making pathways, and escalation mechanisms; and ensure regional priorities, standards, and reporting are aligned through an intermediate statewide operational plan that sets minimum standards, priority zones, and state-level aggregation of regional data.
6. Define and fund pest coordinators and contractor management. Clearly define the responsibilities, geographic scope, and reporting requirements of pest coordinators, secure sustainable ongoing funding, and maintain a public register of licensed feral pig contractors to support consistent, humane, and effective control. Coordinators must also deliver education and extension on IPM and cultural measures and connect directly with the Plan’s delivery mechanism to ensure on-ground outcomes.
7. Support the development and deployment of innovative feral pig control approaches. Proactively support the research, approval, and practical implementation of emerging control methods that could expand the available management toolkit and improve long-

term population suppression. This includes enabling new policy and market mechanisms, such as the *Reducing Emissions through the Management of Introduced Hooved Animals* carbon methodology, to be explored and leveraged where they can deliver both biosecurity and environmental outcomes.

Industry evidence of impacts

Cross-sector observations

- Government-managed lands, particularly national parks and state forests, represent the most significant structural gap in any landscape-scale program. Without coordinated management on these tenures, reinfestation of controlled private land is inevitable.
- Carcass disposal is a practical barrier: effective trapping requires access to earthmoving equipment for carcass burial; smaller and peri-urban operations commonly lack this capacity, reducing the appeal and uptake of trapping as a control method.
- Inconsistent local government response fragments coordination: evidence across multiple LGAs shows wide variation in council support, with some deploying specialists proactively and others redirecting responsibility to landholders. This inconsistency directly undermines the landscape-scale approach the Plan seeks to achieve.
- Exclusion fencing delivers clear productivity benefits but is cost-prohibitive and vulnerable to hazard damage: example data show substantial yield increases after fencing, but flood and cyclone damage (and lack of rebuild funding) make fencing a high-risk investment for many growers.
- Population recovery undermines isolated effort: Field reports indicate typical mob sizes of 17-30 animals and that coordinated removal of approximately 70% of a local population is usually required before numbers meaningfully decline.

Horticulture¹

- Underestimated financial burden: Individual horticulture operations report annual losses ranging from \$40,000 to over \$200,000 due to crop losses, infrastructure damage (irrigation, fencing, orchard trees) and control costs. However, because no systematic sector-wide data collection exists, current estimates almost certainly understate the true economic toll.
- Growers bear control costs with little coordination: Feral pig control is largely undertaken individually and at growers' expense, with no centralised advice, coordination support or mechanism to access professional hunters. At the same time, equipment costs have escalated sharply, with trap prices increasing by roughly 200% in

¹ Queensland Fruit and Vegetable Growers (QFVG) growers and stakeholder's feedback collected across Wet Tropics, Fitzroy Basin, Burnett, Western Downs and SEQ regions, 2025-2026.

recent years (with some units now marketed for up to \$10,000) placing effective control beyond the reach of many smaller operations.

- State lands act as a persistent reinfestation source: National parks and state forests are consistently identified by growers as the origin of pig incursions onto farmland, yet landholders and professional hunters currently have no practical access arrangements to manage populations on these lands.
- Industry-led innovation presents an opportunity: Many growers are already deploying remote cellular trap cameras, thermal imaging, drone-assisted hunting and GPS-coordinated hunting teams. With appropriate support, these tools could form part of a coordinated state monitoring and response framework.
- Biosecurity and food safety risks are significant: Feral pigs are known vectors of Panama TR4 (*Fusarium wilt*), *Phytophthora cinnamomi*, Q fever and Leptospirosis, and also spread invasive weeds such as cats claw creeper and nut grass. Additionally, Freshcare and HARPS food safety standards require any produce contacted or damaged by pigs to be excluded from sale, creating a hidden compliance and waste cost for growers.

Table 1 QFVG growers and stakeholder’s survey. Estimated annual financial impact of feral pigs per property, by region and commodity, 2025-26.

| Region | Crop/Farm type | Estimated annual cost / impact per property |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Burdekin | Pineapple | \$75,000-\$200,000 (production loss + replanting) |
| Fitzroy Basin | Macadamia | \$50,000 labour + \$200,000-\$300,000 infrastructure damage + \$7,500 aerial operations |
| Walkamin (Wet Tropics) | Banana, Sugarcane, Lemons, Lychees | \$40,000-\$50,000 p.a. (excluding biosecurity costs) |
| Mary Valley | Macadamia | ~\$100,000 historical; \$15,000 for pig-proof fencing (6 ha) |
| Western Downs | Melons | ~\$150,000 production loss + \$45,000 management (incl. \$7-8,000 pre-baiting grain) |
| Burnett / Fitzroy / Mary | Corporate horticulture | \$200,000+ per entity on exclusion fencing; further 102 km in progress |
| North Burnett | Mixed horticulture | ~170 pigs trapped annually; ongoing trap & camera maintenance costs |
| Fitzroy Region | Mixed horticulture | \$165 per pig via professional hunter; mob sizes of 16+ escalate costs rapidly |
| Burnett (Avocado) | Avocado | Up to \$150,000 for irrigation repair/labour alone, excluding productivity losses |

Cotton

- Quantification is the immediate priority: No reliable data currently exists on feral pig impacts across the cotton sector. Until this is addressed, it is not possible to build a credible, targeted management strategy.
- Landscape-scale coordination is essential: Isolated control efforts on private land will not succeed while feral pig populations persist on adjacent government-managed lands, particularly national parks. Any effective program must take a whole-of-landscape approach with no gaps in tenure.
- Education and cultural measures are underweighted: Many landholders lack a clear understanding of integrated pest management, particularly the role of cultural measures, such as water point management, habitat modification, and crop residue management, that support and extend the impact of shooting and baiting campaigns.
- Cross-border coordination is critical: Queensland shares feral pig populations with NSW and the Northern Territory across extensive border regions. The Plan must clearly articulate its alignment with the National Feral Pig Action Plan and establish cross-border coordination mechanisms, as the effectiveness of any Queensland strategy is partly contingent on that alignment.

Cane

- Access to effective control tools has become more difficult: Growers report increasing barriers to accessing 1080 bait since licensing responsibility shifted from DPI to Queensland Health. In some LGAs, council distribution policies limit supply (e.g. one bait per pig photo), while direct licensing approvals have taken over a year, delaying effective control.
- Production losses are substantial but once again poorly quantified: Feral pigs cause significant damage to sugarcane through rooting, trampling and feeding on cane stools. Estimates from the Herbert region suggest losses of around \$1 million per year, though the absence of consistent statewide monitoring means the total industry impact is likely higher.
- As an example, historic records from the Herbert region (2009-2019) show tens of thousands of tonnes of cane lost annually in some years. A 2022 survey of 20 growers in the Innisfail district identified 1,182 hectares affected, equating to 21,548 tonnes of lost cane, while pigs destroyed around 16,500 tonnes in the Mackay region in 2014, worth roughly \$1 million.²

Table 2 Estimates of crop losses and pigs removed 2009-19 (Historic data from Hinchinbrook Shire Council and HCPSL)

² Hinchinbrook Shire Council and Herbert Cane Productivity Services Ltd (HCPSL). (2009-2019). Estimates of crop losses and feral pigs removed.

| Year | Pigs controlled | Cane lost |
|------|-----------------|----------------------|
| 2009 | 807 | 28,725t |
| 2010 | 948 | 15,992t |
| 2011 | 795 | No data ³ |
| 2012 | 929 | 33,324t |
| 2013 | 652 | 12,599t |
| 2014 | 1018 | 6,044t |
| 2015 | 796 | 5,540t |
| 2016 | 550 | 6,373t |
| 2017 | 662 | 12,977t |
| 2018 | 550 | 10,837t |
| 2019 | 163 | 15,299t |

Submission

Agricultural industry group's role

As currently drafted, the responsibility allocated to agricultural industry groups is a single dot point: "Promote collaborative feral pig management." This is an inadequate description of the role that industry bodies like QFF and other peak bodies can and should play. QFF recommends the agricultural industry role be expanded to include:

- Active participation in the development and review of regional feral pig action plans
- Representation on local and regional coordinating committees
- Communication and extension to industry members on biosecurity obligations and best practice management methods.

NRM organisations

While NRM organisations are listed with more comprehensive responsibilities than agricultural industry groups, the Plan does not clearly articulate how NRM bodies connect with the DPI-led oversight group, regional action plan committees, local government biosecurity planning, and pest coordinator networks. In practice, NRM organisations often play a de facto coordinator role, with activities that overlap significantly with pest coordinators and local government biosecurity officers.

QFF recommends the Plan include a schematic or narrative description of how these bodies interact operationally, to avoid duplication and ensure efficient use of limited resources.

³ No data on crop losses collected due to crop damage by Cyclone Yasi.

Governance relationships between bodies

The stakeholder section does not clearly describe how the multiple governance bodies interact in a coherent system. Key questions that remain unanswered include:

- How does the Queensland Invasive Plants and Animals Committee (QIPAC) interact with the Plan's oversight group?
- How do the Queensland Government's existing feral pest initiatives (including funded programs through DPI) align with and feed into the Plan's regional action planning structure?
- What is the escalation pathway when a regional body identifies a problem that requires state-level intervention or additional resources?
- How are recreational shooters and commercial operators, listed as "all other stakeholders", integrated into coordinated campaigns without undermining best practice management?
- What are the access arrangements for managing feral pigs on state-controlled lands—including national parks, state forests, and land-locked properties involved in carbon projects, given that growers consistently identify these as primary sources of reinfestation?
- How does this Plan align with and contribute to the National Feral Pig Action Plan, and what cross-border coordination mechanisms are in place with NSW and the Northern Territory?

QFF recommends that the Plan include a clear governance diagram or narrative outlining the relationships between all bodies, including decision-making authority and escalation pathways.

A useful reference is the National Fire Ant Eradication Program, which establishes a defined governance structure with a National Management Group for strategic decisions, supported by technical and assurance committees and a program board that includes government and industry representation.

How will regional action plans actually be delivered?

Regional action plans are never self-executing. They require people, systems, relationships, and resources to translate written priorities into coordinated activity across potentially thousands of properties spanning multiple tenures. Without a clearly identified and adequately resourced delivery mechanism, regional action plans risk becoming aspirational documents that sit largely unimplemented, particularly in more remote areas and for smaller landholders who lack the capacity to navigate complex program structures independently.

This absence of a clear delivery mechanism is a structural risk that will certainly undermine this Plan. QFF strongly recommends that DPI resolve this question as a matter of priority, in genuine consultation with industry bodies and regional stakeholders, before the Plan is finalised.

QFF strongly recommends the commitment to the following:

- a clearly defined and resourced delivery model responsible for coordinating on-ground action at property and landscape scales
- demonstrated reach into the agricultural community, including established relationships with producers across sectors and the capacity to engage landholders who may not otherwise interact with government programs
- integration with monitoring and reporting systems so that on-ground data informs the Plan's adaptive management framework
- support for smaller and resource-limited landholders whose participation is critical to the nil-tenure approach
- alignment with existing funding frameworks to maximise efficiency and avoid duplicating regional coordination structures.

Establishing a baseline for measuring progress

Sections 1-4 of the Plan provide solid foundation, outlining feral pig distribution, behaviour, and current management approaches. Mapping and data tools, including the National Feral Pig Current Distribution Map, Queensland Feral Pig Distribution Map, FeralScan, and Queensland Pest Distribution Maps, are valuable resources for landholders and coordinators.

However, the draft Plan lacks a clearly established baseline against which its effectiveness can be measured over the five-year term. While the Plan acknowledges seasonal fluctuations in feral pig populations, it does not provide a current state benchmark that captures, at minimum:

- estimated current feral pig population numbers by region or bioregion
- geographic distribution and density estimates at a comparable resolution
- current costs of agricultural damage by sector and by region
- key environmental impact indicators, such as extent of wetland and threatened species habitat affected.

QFF recommends DPI, in conjunction with the proposed Plan oversight group:

- develop a baseline concurrently with Plan implementation rather than delaying on-ground action
- establish consistent monitoring and reporting frameworks across the five-year term while progressively building the baseline dataset
- track population and impact trends over time, allowing seasonal variability to be averaged out rather than relying on comparisons between “equivalent seasons”
- focus reporting on outcomes (population reduction and impact mitigation) rather than just outputs, to maintain stakeholder confidence and support future funding.

Nil-tenure approach (Goal 1, Objective 1)

The Plan's commitment to a coordinated, cross-tenure approach is strongly supported by QFF. Objective 1 under Goal 1 rightly identifies the nil-tenure model (coordinated control activities undertaken across adjoining properties regardless of land ownership) as a cornerstone of effective feral pig management. The Plan is correct in its assertion that without landscape-scale coordination, pig populations on untreated areas will rapidly reinfest controlled areas.

However, the Plan does not adequately address accountability or resourcing for the nil-tenure approach. Participation is currently voluntary, with no mechanisms to manage non-participating landholders, including government entities (i.e., the Australian Army, state forests, etc). Without accountability mechanisms, gaps on non-participating properties threaten the effectiveness of coordinated control.

Many recommended control methods, particularly aerial shooting, are expensive. While aerial operations are highly effective (averaging 79% population reduction according to the Plan), they place a substantial financial burden on individual landholders. In practice, this will result in uneven adoption across the State, with well-resourced producers undertaking control while neighbouring properties, potentially through no fault of their own, cannot afford to participate.

QFF therefore strongly recommends the Plan be amended to include:

- dedicated financial assistance to enable all landholders, particularly smaller or resource-limited operations, to participate in coordinated nil-tenure programs, especially for high-cost methods such as aerial shooting.
- advisory and extension support to help individual landholders plan and implement their role in regional control programs
- regional capacity assessments to identify landholders who may require financial or technical assistance to meet their general biosecurity obligations (GBO) within a coordinated campaign
- government-facilitated bulk procurement of commonly used control equipment, such as traps, to reduce cost barriers and ensure equitable participation
- explicit provisions for management on government-managed lands (national parks, state forests, and other public land), including access, authority, and resourcing arrangements.

Education, Extension, and Integrated Pest Management

The Plan does not currently give sufficient weight to landholder education as a core element of effective feral pig management. Grower feedback consistently indicates that many landholders do not have a strong understanding of integrated pest management (IPM) approaches, and in particular the role of 'cultural measures' (i.e., property-level practices such as crop residue management, water point management, and habitat modification) that can reduce feral pig attraction and complement active control campaigns.

QFF recommends the Plan include:

- A dedicated extension program covering IPM principles, cultural measures, and the integration of passive and active control techniques.
- Clear responsibility for extension delivery allocated to pest coordinators, agricultural industry bodies, and NRM organisations, with sufficient resourcing.
- Potential alignment of extension materials with the Plan's designated delivery mechanism and industry best management practice frameworks.

Monitoring and evaluation (Goal 1, Objective 4)

QFF has a material concern about the strength of the actions listed under Objective 4. As currently drafted, the key actions include “investigate appropriate monitoring information for landholders” and “investigate best methods to integrate Queensland data systems with national systems.” These are insufficiently ambitious for a five-year Plan, and risk monitoring remaining aspirational rather than operational throughout its life.

QFF recommends that the actions under Objective 4 be strengthened as follows:

- replace “investigate” with “develop and implement” for the core monitoring actions;
- establish mandatory, standardised data collection protocols, including camera monitoring, transect surveys, damage and impact assessments, and population density estimations, within the first 12 months of the Plan;
- ensure integration with national data systems (such as FeralScan and ABARES mapping) is operationalised, not merely investigated, within the Plan's first two years;
- explicitly align the Plan's monitoring and reporting framework with the National Feral Pig Action Plan, ensuring compatible indicators, datasets, and reporting cycles. Cross-border population dynamics with NSW and the Northern Territory should be captured within this aligned framework;
- link monitoring data outputs directly to the oversight group's reporting schedule, so that data informs adaptive management decisions in near-real time.

Plan Oversight Group (Goal 3, Objective 8)

QFF supports the establishment of a Plan oversight group as described under Objective 8, and welcomes the inclusion of agricultural industry representatives in this group's membership. A well-functioning oversight group is essential to ensuring that the Plan is more than a document, it must be a living framework that drives real change.

However, the Plan as drafted does not adequately define the powers and resources available to the oversight group. For the group to fulfil its coordination role meaningfully, it must have:

- timely access to DPI data, regional reporting, and monitoring outputs to make informed decisions about resource allocation and management adjustment
- the capacity to identify underperforming regions, analyse why, and recommend targeted resourcing or intervention

- structured, standardised progress reports from each regional plan area on a defined schedule, at minimum twice per year, containing outcome data not just activity data
- annual reports published and made publicly available to maintain transparency and stakeholder confidence.

QFF recommends that the Terms of Reference for the oversight group explicitly articulate these resource access rights and reporting expectations, and that this detail be incorporated into the Plan itself rather than left to a future governance instrument.

Absence of a statewide operational plan (Goal 3, Objective 9)

Objective 9 describes a planning hierarchy flowing from this state-level Plan through regional action plans to local government biosecurity plans and individual landholder activity. QFF supports this tiered approach in principle. However, there is a structural gap between this high-level Plan and the regional plans intended to operationalise it.

Without an intermediate layer, regional plans risk being inconsistent in quality, methodology, priorities, and reporting, even with template guidance from DPI. QFF recommends consideration be given to developing a Statewide Operational Plan that would:

- define the specific statewide priorities, themes and focus areas that all regional plans must address (e.g., biosecurity risk zones, threatened species habitat, priority agricultural areas);
- establish minimum standards for monitoring, reporting and compliance against which regional plans can be assessed;
- provide a mechanism for regional data to be aggregated and reported at a state level; and,
- enable the oversight group to assess and compare regional performance against consistent benchmarks.

Role of pest coordinators (Goal 3, Objective 10)

QFF strongly supports the pest coordinator function as a critical link between state and regional planning and on-ground action. Regional pest coordinators are arguably the most important operational element of any feral pig management system, the people who can translate policy into coordinated, landscape-scale activity.

However, in practice, the current system is ineffective. Coordinators are often given insufficient funding, excessively large geographic areas to cover, and high turnover means many roles remain vacant for months at a time. Canegrowers members and District

Managers frequently attempt to contact coordinators for support, only to be ignored for extended periods, highlighting a major operational gap.

The Plan provides insufficient clarity on the role, responsibilities, and authority of pest coordinators. The actions under Objective 10, “enhance established networks,” “support knowledge sharing,” and “investigate sustainable funding”, fall well short of defining what coordinators actually do in practice.

QFF recommends the Plan include a clear definition of the pest coordinator role covering at minimum:

- the geographic scope and coverage of each coordinator (e.g., local government area, bioregion, or NRM region);
- specific responsibilities in planning and executing coordinated control campaigns across tenures;
- reporting lines to the oversight group and regional action plan committees;
- role in monitoring and data collection at property and landscape scale; and
- function as a point of contact and extension provider for individual landholders, including delivery of IPM and cultural measure education to smaller operations.

QFF also recommends broader reforms to ensure coordinators are effective:

- a commitment to sustainable funding, rather than merely “investigating” options, to prevent positions being subject to short-term grant cycles that undermine continuity;
- clarification of how coordinators connect with and activate the Plan’s regional delivery mechanism, ensuring their activities translate into measurable, coordinated on-ground outcomes rather than operating in isolation; and,
- provision of necessary resourcing, support, and training, so coordinators can realistically perform their roles across their assigned regions.

Conclusion

The scale of feral pig impacts on Queensland agriculture is well-established, yet historically, the response has not matched the magnitude of the problem. A truly effective approach must be cross-sectoral, sustained, adequately resourced, and accountable through measurable outcomes.

While the Draft Plan establishes important policy frameworks and sets out regional priorities, its effectiveness will be fundamentally limited without a clearly defined and resourced delivery mechanism. Regional action plans cannot implement themselves; without an operational vehicle to coordinate on-ground activity, the Plan risks becoming aspirational rather than actionable. This structural gap threatens the Plan’s ability to achieve real population reductions, prevent reinfestation, and deliver equitable outcomes for all landholders.

QFF looks forward to working closely with DPI and Biosecurity Queensland to implement the Plan and is available to discuss any aspect of this submission at the earliest opportunity.

If you have any further questions, please contact Samuel Laffer at samuel@qff.org.au or Laurie Dowling at laurie@qff.org.au.

Yours sincerely

Jo Sheppard
Chief Executive Officer



This submission is provided by the Queensland Farmers' Federation

PO Box 12009 George Street, Brisbane Qld 4003
Level 8, 183 North Quay, Brisbane Qld 4000
ABN 44 055 764 488

Contact QFF

E: qfarmers@qff.org.au
P: 07 3837 4720
W: www.qff.org.au

