

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
<b>Legal</b>	<b>Overview</b>	Submissions made commented on the law and binding policies that pertain to the decision.			
	<b>General:</b>	Tahr are an historic and recreational resource that should be recognised and protected on public conservation land.	Not relevant - a decision for Parliament.	No change.	Not to be covered.
		That the legislation, and therefore operational management, is misguided in its focus on indigenous biota and should be reviewed.	Not relevant - a decision for Parliament.	No change.	Not to be covered.
		Co-governance with Ngāi Tahu is not clearly required by the law or binding policy.	Not agree.	Consider a wording change if necessary.	Needs to be explained.
	<b>Objectives of control</b>	Equal recognition of commercial and recreational opportunities with environmental protection.	Relevant binding provisions place environmental protection ahead of either recreation or commerce.	No change	Not to be covered.
		Operative sections of general policy and park management plans say that tahr should be exterminated in national parks and carefully controlled elsewhere.	Agreed.	Already covered.	Guiding principles from law and policy need to be spelled out.
		Primacy of protecting indigenous biodiversity and upholding the law as it is written.	Agreed.	Already covered.	Guiding principles from law and policy need to be spelled out.
	<b>Moving tahr:</b>	One submission argued that it was within the legal mandate of DOC to transport bull tahr out of national parks rather than shoot them there.	Capture/convey/keep in activity would require permit under legislation. Is it economically sensible?	No change.	Option of live capture of bulls for safari parks?
	<b>Responsibility:</b>	One submission asserted that it is solely the responsibility of DOC to manage tahr, not hunters.	Legal responsibility is DOC's. There is a clear role for recreational and commercial hunting in control activity.	No change.	Clarify roles.
	<b>Policies and Plan:</b>	One submission provided a comprehensive list of the binding policies and plans that should be considered.	Agreed.	Perhaps add.	Use in drafting.
<b>Tahr numbers</b>	<b>Overview:</b>	Numbers were certain to still be too high and the proposed control was necessary.	Agreed.	Provide for learning as we go about further control priorities based on this year's control results. What we do with the other 125 hours. Check for cost effectiveness. Discuss with GAC within timeframe specified by DOC. Urgent to allow for control re weather. DOC decides and implements.	Not to be covered.
		Others feared that the level of control proposed could result in very low numbers of tahr.	Not agreed. GAC acknowledges still too high in every MU except 7. Proposed level of control is based on suite of observations in addition to population modelling.	Provide for working with GAC on operational priorities.	Consider targets for units as well intervention densities to make things clearer?

			<b>Decision</b>	<b>Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan</b>	<b>Longer term plan</b>
		<b>Noted land tenure changes from pastoral lease to DOC (83K). What does this need for total numbers of tahr that can be sustained?</b>	Added areas for hunters. Noted. Not relevant. Intervention densities apply to the whole MU.	No change.	Design of research and monitoring need to provide information required for any review of the control plan.
	<b>At which intervention is required:</b>	<b>One submission drew an analogy of farming practice to draw attention to the value of a healthy landscape to maintaining a healthy tahr herd.</b>	Not agreed. Farming and nature conservation requirements are not analogous. Might have more application on pastoral leases.	No change.	Not to be covered.
	<b>Population data:</b>	<b>Two submissions particularly focused the lack of accurate data on the tahr populations and how their numbers and demographics might be responding to hunting, control, and environmental factors.</b>	Relevant. Population data was robust as at autumn 2019 within defined confidence limits. Agreed absolute populations not known across the management units. Limited knowledge of demographics acknowledged. Decision needs to take into account uncertainty.	Take into account learning as we go after 125 hours and commitment to research and monitoring.	Include based on results of research and monitoring plan process.
		<b>One gave detailed prescriptions for the sort of data that should be gathered.</b>	Relevant to the extent the ops plan includes prescription for the research and monitoring plan.	Amend if being more prescriptive or descriptive for the research and monitoring plan.	Include based on results of research and monitoring plan process.
	<b>Uncertainty in numbers:</b>	<b>Following from the lack of data on tahr populations these same two submissions went on to describe the role of population projections in making operational decisions and concerns about an approach that DOC appears to have taken, but has not explained.</b>	Relevant.	The ops plan should include the rationale for the quantum and distribution of effort for official control.	Include based on results of research and monitoring plan process.
	<b>Male/female ratios:</b>	<b>Three submissions provided detail about the importance of male female ratios in operational decisions on control. They felt that the bias produced by selectively controlling females had not been sufficiently taken into account in operational decisions.</b>	No evidence provided to support contentions. Not relevant to this operational plan.	No change.	Include based on results of research and monitoring plan process.
	<b>Population growth:</b>	<b>One submission argued that the decision on levels of control for the operational plan was based on unrealistically high population growth rates of tahr. They said that such rates could not be achieved by the male biased herds in less than ideal conditions.</b>	Not relevant. Refers to context provided around the modelling. Not how the decision was made or would be reconsidered.	No change.	Include based on results of research and monitoring plan process.
<b>Control effort</b>	<b>Overview:</b>	<b>One said they had been pressing for the level of effort shown in the 2020/2021 for many years and appended copies of letters to the Minister of Conservation to that effect.</b>	Relevant in that this is the NZCA and the Department and the Minister are required to consider its advice.	Suggests not significantly reducing the total quantum of effort to be prescribed.	Should be considered.
	<b>Needed to implement HTCP 1993:</b>	<b>One said that control in recent years will have reduced numbers to levels where further control is not required.</b>	Not agreed. No evidence to support this contention.	No change.	
		<b>Another suggested the approach should be to focus on areas of high density and areas of high natural value.</b>	Agreed.	Already covered.	Priority for research. To further understand high nature conservation value areas.

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
	How control should be achieved:				
		One said that there does not appear to be any environmental imperative to remove all tahr from the national parks immediately, even if the aim is eventual elimination. Because of: the demographic effects, the opportunity cost of culling bulls, the lack of an environmental imperative to immediately eliminate all tahr from the national parks, and the recreational and commercial benefits to the hunting community from them harvesting the remaining bulls.	Not agreed. Must follow National Parks Act and Policy.	No change.	
		About half of the proposed control hours in MU4 have been undertaken already. To allow hunters access to some tahr hunting in this MU, and for them to make a contribution to controlling bulls, the remainder of the control work in this unit should be postponed until June 2021.	Not agreed. Recommendation is to continue to control tahr to the intervention density in the control plan.	No change.	
		If bulls must be shot, and recreational hunters and guides are unable to do so in time, then it is most efficient to consider commercial uses of them, rather than shooting to waste.	Relevant but dependent on viability of any commercial activity.	No change.	
		Where it prevents shooting to waste, the Council recommends consideration of commercial live capture, cape harvest, WARO or other uses from aerial harvest.	Relevant but dependent on viability of any commercial activity.	No change.	
		Several submissions advocated focusing on nannies. One summed it up thus, Culling nannies not only reduces the herd size now (as does culling bulls), but it has two future effects that are different to bull culling: longer suppression of the population because nanny tahr live much longer (bulls not shot are more likely to die of natural causes than are nannies), a reduction in future recruitment (only nannies have kids and their productivity is essentially independent of bull numbers)	Relevant. The operational plan had this focus outside national parks. The operative decision would be whether to reinstate it for control inside the parks. Recommendation is to continue to control tahr to the intervention density in the control plan.	Already covered in the plan, no change.	
	WARO and AATH:	Put Tahr on normal WARO permit with conditions.	Relevant. Not achievable within the timeframe for this operational plan.	No change.	
		DOC culling to be done July AUG SEP, July away from where there will be hunters.	Relevant. Evidence suggests July to mid-November is appropriate.	Include indicative operational timing within the feral range in the plan. Needs flexibility if conditions prevent control in this period.	

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
		<b>3 No culling, WARO or AATH within 1 KM of Huts or Known Campsites</b>	Not agreed as a default rule. Operational matter.	Consider for operational procedures rather than plan. Best endeavours to provide real advice to hunters.	
		<b>4 Wilderness Blocks should be 1st weekend May to 2nd weekend of July</b>	Relevant.	Cannot commit for this plan. Needs further work before a decision could be made on this.	
		<b>The Department [should] explore potential employment opportunity through the Jobs for Nature initiative in order to utilise professional and commercial hunters who have been negatively affected by the Covid-19 pandemic, to achieve tahr population levels as specified in the HTCP.</b>	Relevant	Already in plan, no change.	
		<b>The Department must make it easier for WARO operators to be able to operate, adding tahr (excluding identifiable bulls) to the existing WARO permit with spatial and temporal provisions to prevent conflict in April, May, June, is the necessary first step.</b>	Relevant. Not achievable within the timeframe for this operational plan.	Decisions on this not able to be covered in the ops plan.	
	<b>Control of bull tahr:</b>	<b>The arguments for controlling the bulls in national parks were predominantly compliance with relevant law and policy. A secondary argument was that national parks have important indigenous biota vulnerable to tahr</b>	Agreed.	Already in plan, no change.	
		<b>The arguments against controlling bulls in national parks were:</b>			
		<b>Bull tahr are highly valued by hunters.</b>	Relevant, discretionary. Sufficient opportunity for hunting bull tahr outside national parks. Will control to intervention densities in national parks.	Already in plan, no change.	Consider in longer term planning.
		<b>Bull tahr are a drawcard for hunters leading them to control tahr and other exotic species.</b>	Relevant, but no evidence offered. There will still be tahr to hunt after planned control activity.	Already accommodated outside national parks, no change.	Consider in longer term planning.
		<b>Bull tahr are a draw card leading to additional support of the commercial hunting industry in that hunters will come to NZ (rather than other countries) to hunt red deer because of the concurrent opportunity to hunt tahr.</b>	Relevant, discretionary. Sufficient opportunity for hunting bull tahr outside of national parks. Will control to intervention densities in national parks.	Already in plan, no change.	Consider in longer term planning.
		<b>Controlling bulls is unnecessary in controlling overall populations as their numbers are irrelevant to recruitment.</b>	Will control to intervention densities in national parks. Relevant outside national parks.	Already accommodated outside national parks, no change.	Consider in longer term planning.
		<b>With enhanced access recreational and commercial hunting could achieve control without official culling.</b>	Relevant, but past evidence is otherwise. Ongoing consideration of improving access but controlled by national parks management plans and effects on other users.	Could include reference to working with stakeholder to enhance hunter access.	Consider in longer term planning.

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
		<b>There are no documented adverse effects on rare or threatened plants from tahr in the park.</b>	Relevant, but overridden by policy prescriptions.	No change.	Consider in longer term planning.
		<b>Bull tahr have high natural mortality.</b>	Not relevant.	No change.	Consider in longer term planning.
		<b>If nannies are removed bull tahr will leave of their own accord to seek mates.</b>	Not relevant, anecdotal.	Already accommodated outside national parks, no change.	Consider in longer term planning.
	<b>Priority areas:</b>	<b>One suggested a focus on national parks and getting numbers down as far as practicable and then focus on the two wilderness areas, the Hooker, Landsborough and the Adams</b>	Relevant. Would not meet requirements of the control plan. The operational plan did not have this level of detail on priority areas. In setting such detail, if it is done, regard should be had to comments in other sections on areas important for recreational hunters and commercial activity.	Consider hierarchy of priorities in the control plan and information on densities in areas.	
		<b>Another suggested as focus locations: True left of the Copland round to Misty Peak , true left bottom of Horace Walker, Douglas/Clue to Lame Duck Flat, True left of Callery, Waikukupa and Omoeroa faces, Cook River. In setting such detail, if it is done, regard should be had to comments in other sections on areas important for recreational hunters and WARO.</b>	Relevant. Would not meet requirements of the control plan if only focused here. The operational plan did not have this level of detail on priority areas. In setting such detail, if it is done, regard should be had to comments in other sections on areas important for recreational hunters and commercial activity.	Consider hierarchy of priorities in the control plan and information on densities in areas. Discuss with GAC after first 125 hours.	
	<b>Timing of control</b>	<b>The Operational Plan was silent on when operations would take place. Late winter/spring are the times when there is least disruption to the hunting sector, and other backcountry users. Snow conditions at these times facilitate culling. Animal welfare considerations mean there should not be any control work from mid-November until the end of February. Delaying remaining control work in MU4 to June 2021 is desirable. Significant reductions in tahr numbers in MU4, particularly of males, will mean there is little incentive for hunters to be there at that time, mitigating the adverse effects anticipated if control work were undertaken at that time in other MUs. It would also provide the opportunity for hunting in the interim</b>	Relevant. Note that the operational plan 2019/2020 specified official control would take place in July to November but this was not stated in 2020/2021	Include operational timing in the plan	Include operational timing in the plan
		<b>Another submission elaborated: DOC culling should be done in July AUG Sep when most hunters have finished and before nannies have kids, do the culling in July away from where hunters will be, Wilderness Tahr Blocks should start first weekend of May and finish 2nd weekend of July,7.</b>	Relevant. Evidence suggests July to mid-November is appropriate.	Include indicative operational timing within the feral range in the plan. Needs flexibility if conditions prevent control in this period. Note timing of ballots as covered above.	

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
	Effort and setting targets:	Some submissions wanted targets in the operational plan set in terms of numbers of tahr to be controlled, or the number of tahr that should remain after control. These also wanted more specification at the management unit level. The arguments for these additions were that:	Relevant, arguments against this approach in affidavits.	Consider for plan putting in based on last year what range of numbers of tahr that might be shot this year.	Consider for longer term plan.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The control plan refers to tahr numbers and so should the operational plan.</li> </ul>	Not agreed. The control plan refers to numbers in the management units not the numbers to be removed. There is no necessary corollary.	No change.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would assist hunters know what was being sought in each place.</li> </ul>	Relevant. Goes to the efficacy of recreational hunting in achieving control objectives. Requires detailed work that cannot be completed for this ops plan.	No change.	Consider for longer term plan.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasons could be given for the targets adopted increasing understanding.</li> </ul>	Relevant if targets are adopted, may refer to hours of aerial control.	Consider for plan.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stopping points for control could be identified in each place.</li> </ul>	Relevant to the extent the stopping point relates to efficiency and effectiveness rather than leaving enough for hunters.	Provide for learning as we go about further control priorities based on this year's control results. What we do with the other 125 hours. Check for cost effectiveness. Discuss with GAC within timeframe specified by DOC. Urgent to allow for control re weather. DOC decides and implements.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intervention densities should be the stopping point for control.</li> </ul>	Not agreed.	Intervention densities are a maximum population not a minimum population. Provide for learning as we go about further control priorities based on this year's control results. What we do with the other 125 hours. Check for cost effectiveness. Discuss with GAC within timeframe specified by DOC. Urgent to allow for control re weather. DOC decides and implements.	

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
<b>Control in national parks</b>	<b>Overview:</b>	Submitters were divided whether it was desirable to pursue control of tahr to zero density in national parks.	Relevant.	No change.	
		<b>Arguments for doing so were:</b>			
		· National parks provide a safe haven for New Zealand's native species.	Agreed.	Consider for plan.	
		· It is required by the National Parks Act, policy, and management plans.	Agreed.	Consider for plan.	
		· Tahr numbers are in excess of the targets set in the Himalayan Thar Control Plan.	Agreed.	Consider for plan.	
		· It will provide opportunity for Aotearoa's biodiversity to thrive, ensuring the enjoyment of the National Parks, and the Southern Alps for generations to come.	Agreed. Necessary but insufficient by itself.	Consider for plan.	
		<b>Arguments against were:</b>			
		· It creates unnecessarily different approaches for different classes of PCL.	Not agreed. PCL must be managed according to binding law and policy which distinguishes	No change.	
		· There does not appear to be any environmental imperative to remove all tahr from the national parks immediately because of:			
		o Demographic effects.	Not agreed. Will control to intervention densities in national parks.	No change.	
		o The opportunity cost of culling bulls.	Not agreed. Overridden by policy. Will control to intervention densities in national parks.	No change.	
		o The recreational and commercial benefits to the hunting community from them harvesting the remaining bulls.	Not agreed. Will control to intervention densities in national parks. Does not override environmental imperatives in National Parks Act.	No change.	
		o The loss of benefits of free control from recreational hunters who will no longer hunt in national parks where they have little/no chance of successful trophy hunt.	Noted. Questionable. Will control to intervention densities in national parks. Does not override environmental imperatives in National Parks Act.	No change.	Hunter behaviour in research programme.
		o Reducing opportunities for recreational hunters in the national parks would increase recreational hunting pressure in other MUs and lead to resurgence in conflict between the recreational and commercial hunting sectors.	Noted. Questionable. Will control to intervention densities in national parks. Does not override environmental imperatives in National Parks Act.	No change.	Hunter behaviour in research programme.
		One submission said that control in national parks should exclude hunter landing site areas and around all huts and tracks (3km buffer).	Not agreed. Will control to intervention densities in national parks.	No change.	

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
<b><u>Control outside national parks</u></b>	<b>Overview:</b>	<b>Submissions were united on the priority of preventing range expansion.</b>	Relevant. Covered in ops plan.	No change.	
	<b>Outside the feral range and in exclusion zones:</b>	<b>One submission said that there is priority to target and eradicate tahr on pastoral leases outside the feral range, in accordance with the 1993 plan.</b>	Relevant. In ops plan.	Extend to pastoral leases outside the feral range after consultation with LINZ.	Central concern.
		<b>All submissions that commented agreed that preventing range expansion was the highest priority for the control of tahr. Some submissions said that all further effort in the 2020/2021 period should be focused in these areas.</b>	Agreed outside feral range is a high priority. Not agreed that all further effort should only focus outside the feral range.	No change.	Central concern.
	<b>In other Management Units:</b>	<b>Within Management Units outside the national parks hunters generally advocated decreasing the amount of official control from that set out in the 2020/2021 operational plan. The reason provided were:</b>	Not agreed in terms of total quantum of effort given estimated population size.	No change.	
		<b>• No species are confirmed to be threatened or at risk of extinction from the current densities of tahr.</b>	Not relevant. Extinction is too high a threshold.	No change.	Priority for research. To further understand high nature conservation value areas.
		<b>• There are no updated scientific measurements to indicate densities exceed thresholds.</b>	Agree there is no populations estimated from surveys in autumn 2020. Populations are extrapolated from autumn 2019 context and subsequent knowledge. Estimated population on PCL only.	No change.	Central concern
		<b>• The large number of tahr removed over the past two years has resulted in a considerable population reduction.</b>	Not clear that this is true. Replacement could be too high.	No change.	
		<b>• Official control may not be required for the HTCP targets to be realised through time due to ongoing reductions following female biased harvest that has yet to be realised.</b>	Not agreed. No evidence provided.	No change.	
		<b>Two submissions provided detailed recommendations at the Management Unit level. In summary they said:</b>			
		<b>• MU1 Reduce hours of control in MU1 pending monitoring of post-cull tahr density. Areas that are readily accessible to recreational hunters should not receive DOC control. Priority locations for official control are difficult to access areas where recreational hunting has least effect.</b>	Relevant. Agree with priority approach. Not agree with reducing groups to 10 in isolation from considering localised density. Apply rest of intended 25 hours after reviewing control in 2020.	Discuss with GAC after reviewing control to date. Focus on efficiency and effectiveness and reducing impact on hunting where consistent.	Ensure research and monitoring programme supports future management actions.



			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One submitter said for MU2 limited control as population is now low. Other submission said planned control would not reduce population to HTCP intervention density. Cull certain areas after further liaison. Target females, juveniles and non-identifiable males. Reduce female-kid groups to 10. DOC aerial control priority locations: Aciphylla Creek faces, true left of Lambert Creek, Willberg Range around Avalon Peak, Adams Range northern faces, Bettison Faces, true left of the Perth below the Scone.</li> </ul>	<p>Relevant. Agree with priority approach. Not agree with reducing groups to 10 in isolation from considering localised density. Apply rest of planned 25 hours after reviewing control in 2020.</p>	<p>Discuss with GAC after reviewing control to date. Focus on efficiency and effectiveness and reducing impact on hunting where consistent.</p>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MU3 One submission said the proposed control is unlikely to reduce populations to HCTP intervention density. Another said some official control is needed in inaccessible areas to recreational hunters. Target females, juveniles and non-identifiable males. Reduce female-kid groups to 10. Areas that are readily accessible to recreational hunters should not receive DOC control. Priority locations for official control are difficult to access areas where recreational hunting has least effect.</li> </ul>	<p>Relevant. Agree with priority locations. Not agree with reducing groups to 10 in isolation from considering localised density. Consider increasing above the planned 20 hours after reviewing control in 2020.</p>	<p>Discuss with GAC after reviewing control to date. Focus on efficiency and effectiveness and reducing impact on hunting where consistent.</p>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MU5 Some official control is needed. Target females, juveniles and non-identifiable males. Reduce female-kid groups to 10. DOC aerial control priority locations: Ben Ohau Range, Neumann Range.</li> </ul>	<p>Relevant. Agree with priority approach. Not agree with reducing groups to 10 in isolation from considering localised density. Consider increasing above the planned 10 hours after reviewing control in 2020.</p>	<p>Discuss with GAC after reviewing control to date. Focus on efficiency and effectiveness and reducing impact on hunting where consistent.</p>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MU6 Some official control is needed in the inaccessible areas to recreational hunters. However, substantially reduce the planned control because the current proposal will reduce the tahr population well below the HTCP-specified target. DOC aerial control priority locations: true left of Jacobs, parts of the Landsborough (e.g. Zora).</li> </ul>	<p>Relevant. Agree with priority approach. Not agree with reducing groups to 10 in isolation from considering localised density. Apply rest of 40 planned hours after reviewing control in 2020.</p>	<p>Consult with GAC after reviewing control to date. Focus on efficiency and effectiveness and reducing impact on hunting where consistent.</p>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MU7 Cancel the planned control.</li> </ul>	<p>Relevant. Agree to consider.</p>	<p>Change plan to say likely no further control in MU7. Discuss with GAC after reviewing control to date.</p>	

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
<b><u>Social and economic</u></b>	Overview:	Submissions from hunters focused on the value of tahr as a trophy big game animal. It was said that tahr are now the most important big game trophy in New Zealand to recreational hunters. Tahr were also cited as a food source. Some argued that hunting is a legitimate recreational and commercial activity. They said that shooting bulls now has adverse effects for commercial and recreational hunters.	Noted. Discretionary.	Note areas available for hunting and areas where control will happen and what will be avoided and the areas of pastoral lease etc.	
	COVID-19	A key part of the context for the decision noted in submissions was the COVID-19 pandemic and its effects on tourism including guided hunting. They suggest that international hunter bookings will carry forward (rather than being cancelled) and therefore many more tahr will be hunted at once when the borders reopen. One submission discusses a potential for Jobs for Nature employment for hunters. They also note that there will be no international hunting control this year with the implication that official control is therefore more important this year.	Noted.	No change.	
	Relationship with the hunting sector:	Multiple submissions discuss loss of trust with DOC and/or a worsened relationship between DOC and the hunting sector. They say that hunters have a unique stakeholder relationship in that they are part of implementation of the plan. This includes perception that DOC has “fostered the establishment of businesses around the tahr resource and has profited from concession fees & AATH offsets”. They cite connections between hunter trust and willingness to provide data, including through the App.	Noted.	Better articulate the learning approach and rationale for planned management.	
	Hunters as conservationists:	Multiple submissions discuss the contribution of the hunting sector to conservation initiatives. Some submissions frame this in terms of a value exchange model, noting that as the relationship with DOC worsens, hunters will contribute less to conservation and, conversely, that working with hunters as a conservation resource will enable realisation of aspects of tahr control and research have not been realised to date.	Noted.	No change.	As we develop the research and monitoring framework will be working with the hunting sector.

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
	Effects on recreational hunting:	One submission said that a failure to implement the Plan has resulted in an increase in availability of tahr for commercial and recreational use with consequent legitimate expectations of continuing access. It was said that livelihoods and a way of life were under threat. Recreational hunters said that the majority of their tahr hunts are conducted on public conservation land. Some commented on the direct effects of control on hunters. They said that the level of control proposed has the potential to damage DOC's relationship with landowners and hunters.	Relevant to the rate at which ops plans seek to achieve control plan objectives	Consider for plan as we look at the remaining hours.	As we develop the research and monitoring framework will be working with the hunting sector.
	Effects on commercial operations:	Tahr were said to be a draw card that benefits other parts of commercial hunting industry as well (e.g. red deer trophy hunting). Commercial operators said that the vast majority of 2020 booked hunters have deferred or rescheduled their hunts until after the border opens. Bulls are of high commercial value, which will be important for COVID recovery. They said that the total value of each mature bull tahr represents \$14,000 to the commercial hunting industry. This is the sum of the trophy fee, guiding fees, lodging, taxidermy and trophy export. They argued that the industry needs to be able to adjust to any changes to the tahr herd dynamic incrementally. Conversely, one submission said that many tahr would be left for hunters after control operations.	Noted.	Consider for plan as we look at the remaining hours.	
	Disturbance:	Some submissions said that recently DOC contractors have shot tahr in the immediate vicinity of hunters. They say that there is also potential for disruption of other PCL users from control operations. They note that one of the casualties may be recreational hunters' willingness to use the tahr kill reporting app.	Noted.	No change.	Look at ways that communication on planned control activities can be provided.
<u>Long term plan</u>	Overview:	One submission said that a long term plan that sets out how the control parameters will be met needs to be completed as a matter of priority.	Agreed.	No change.	
<u>Review of 1993 Plan</u>	Overview:	Two submissions (and one other organisation in support) argued that the Himalayan Thar Control Plan 1993 is outdated and needs to be reviewed. The arguments were:	Outside scope for the ops plan. Ministerial discretion.	No change.	

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To reflect modern expectations and provide consistency across the statutory and policy framework (to remove the requirement for zero density in national parks).</li> </ul>	Outside scope for the ops plan. Ministerial discretion. Also decision for Parliament	No change.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To enable all user groups and stakeholders to reengage in constructive consultation to find solutions to ensure that tahr are effectively managed and conservation values upheld.</li> </ul>	Outside scope for the ops plan. Ministerial discretion.	No change.	Function of a long term plan.
<b>Process</b>	Overview:	Submissions commented on the process involved in forming the operational plan for 2020/2021 and also on processes more generally involved in the management of tahr.	Relevant but covered by the High Court's decision	No change.	
	TCOP 2020/21 process:	Several submissions said that any comment they made before being informed of the quantum of control being proposed by the department should be set aside.	Agreed, done for those that requested it.	No change.	
		Hunter submissions said that the process for 2020/2021 had led to a loss of trust in the department.	Noted.	No change.	
		Some said that the department should have provided more information and clearer explanations of its proposals.	Noted.	Further context to be provided in new plan.	
		Several had concerns that they could not properly submit without knowing about the control operations completed after 1 July 2020.	Not agreed. Verified information was not available.	Commitment to a learning approach.	
	Tahr management processes:	One submission affirmed principles set out by the department in the 2018 operational plan.	Noted.	No change.	Consider principles in context of a reset for TPILG.
		Others referred to the inter-relationship of tahr control and the value of hunter goodwill in wider conservation activity including maintaining huts and dealing with pests.	Noted.	Note areas available for hunting and areas where control will happen and what will be avoided.	
		One submission proposed that DOC introduces a dedicated tahr liaison staff member, based in an office near the tahr herd, who is mandated to carry out effective recreational hunter and hunter organisation liaison, as contemplated by the Plan.	Operational matters outside the ops plan.	No change.	Could be considered.
		This submitter also requested that DOC comply with the reporting prescription set out in Appendix 8 of the Himalayan Control Plan.	Agreed.	No change.	
		Mention was made of potential contracting control by hunters provided for in the Plan.	It's provided for in the control plan.	No change.	Could be considered.
		One said that all official control should be by heli-operators, no ground hunters. Extending the tahr ballot period was also proposed.	Noted. Not agreed as a principle. Ballots could be considered see above.	No change.	

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
<b>Biodiversity</b>	Overview:	All submissions that commented affirmed the value of indigenous biodiversity but differed on whether it was being affected by tahr.	Agreed on value.	No change.	Nature conservation research, see above.
		One argued for tahr to be recognised as a valued part of biodiversity in New Zealand.	Not relevant - a decision for Parliament.	No change.	
	Indigenous biodiversity:	Some said that there was no certain information on the density of tahr that would cause adverse effects on native vegetation.	Noted. We are bound by the 1993 Plan until research and monitoring shows otherwise.	No change.	Nature conservation research, see above.
		They said there is no imminent threat, either to the environment or of a significant population increase, that would support the need for urgent action.	Not agreed. Committed to achieving HTCP.	No change.	
		Conversely another said native flora are ill equipped to defend against these grazing mammals. The grazing behaviour of tahr, they said, damages endemic flora, such as tall tussock, Mount Cook buttercup, NZ veronica, and Godley's buttercup, which is classed by the NZ Plant Conservation Network as threatened and nationally endangered. They said this damage has lasting implications for a variety of fauna including insects, moths, birds, and alpine lizards.	Noted.	No change	Nature conservation research, see above.
	Tahr:	One submission argued that tahr are listed as a near threatened species on the IUCN Red list and that New Zealand is the last stronghold of tahr. Another said that the failure of other countries to conserve tahr should not lead to allowing them to adversely affect native biota here. They did comment that tahr farming in New Zealand might help with conservation of tahr in the Himalaya.	Outside the scope of the ops plan.	No change	
<b>Research and monitoring</b>	Overview:	All submitters that commented agreed that an integrated research and monitoring programme for tahr was essential.	Agreed.	Will have a research and monitoring framework and will commence a research and monitoring programme in this period. Will include as a minimum population monitoring and impacts that tahr are having.	
		Some argued that the most immediate need was for accurate information on tahr populations including tahr densities and population, including age and sex data, in management units #1, #2, #3, #5 and #6.	Agreed the need for population monitoring.	Will have a research and monitoring framework and will commence a research and monitoring programme in this period. Will include as a minimum population monitoring and impacts that tahr are having.	

			Decision	Proposed Outcome for Ops Plan	Longer term plan
		Vegetation condition monitoring was affirmed as a priority, but submitters accepted that this would take some years to show significant trends.	Agreed.	Will have a research and monitoring framework and will commence a research and monitoring programme in this period. Will include as a minimum population monitoring and impacts that tahr are having.	
		One said that it was important to gather accurate information on the control exercised by recreational hunters.	Agreed that there is a need to improve our understanding on this matter.	No significant change. Consider adding link to tahr app with some description. Product developed by 4 agencies etc.	Consider as part of research and monitoring framework.
<b>LINZ land</b>	<b>Overview:</b>	Submitters that commented said that accurate information on tahr populations on land managed by LINZ was essential.	Agreed.	Covered in plan.	
		Professional guides noted though that control operations on these lands could compound effects of reductions in tahr populations on PCL.	Noted, not relevant as plan does not cover control on pastoral lease land.	No change.	
		One submitter indicated that the possibility that current work could lead to control on these lands was affecting the level of concern about control on PCL.	Noted.	No change.	