

Fiordland Wapiti Herd of Special Interest Draft Herd Management Plan

Submission Attachments - submitter last name Wa - Wr

Table of Contents

Walker, Michael (328)	1
Walker, Jeffrey (320)	4
Warren, Tom (324)	8
White, Nicole (239) - Environment Southland	11
Whitehead, Keith (224)	16
Wilson, Greg (225)	18
Windust, Brad (350)	20
Wright, Dean (341)	24

Michael Walker

Submission Details

Eirwen Harris Mitchell

From: Michael Walker s9(2)(a)
Sent: Friday, 5 December 2025 10:46 am
To: wapitiHOSIHMP
Subject: Submission on Wapiti HOSI Management Plan

Categories: Green category

You don't often get email from s9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

My submission below.

My name is Michael Walker and I **support** the Herd Management Plan in principle but believe amendments are needed for it to work well for the Fiordland Wapiti herd.

Background and what it means to me and my family

The Fiordland Wapiti Herd is truly special to New Zealand. I am s9(2)(a) years old and have been annually entering the National Park in Fiordland since I was 18 years old, predominately with my father and brother but also with friends to hunt and fish. In a modern fast paced world with a lot of distractions, experiences in Fiordland are treasured and words seem completely inadequate to explain them to those who haven't had the experience themselves. The physical and mental challenges involved in recreating in this part of Aotearoa are intense, and to be able to test oneself and those who brave to enter this environment is one of life's true treasures in my eyes. The weather can be brutal, the country is extreme and the allure it has to many like me is almost spiritual. The birdlife is second to none.

I have been lucky enough to have accessed many of the famous valleys, tops and parts of the Wapiti area including the Glaisnock, Nitz, Worsley, Wapiti River, Wild Natives, Dark River, Charles and other blocks. These places have formed a unique chapter in New Zealand history, largely built around the Wapiti herd which has been managed outstandingly by the Fiordland Wapiti Foundation. Take for example the extremely high standards the FWF set in terms of the way they have successfully encouraged and educated those that hunt Wapiti through clever modern tools like the app they have developed to encourage recordings of native bird sighting, encourage rubbish removal and ensure the right deer and taken by hunters. They are environmental ambassadors for how people ought to treat this World Heritage area and fill an enormous hole that DOC simply cannot afford to undertake. Culling, trapping and back country hut maintenance are the obvious examples, which have involved thousands of volunteer hours and millions of dollars over time. Given the difficulties in accessing this part of the country and the resources required, the National Park is probably in some of the best condition it has been in the past 100 years. This is not by accident, the FWF have worked consistently and tirelessly to achieve this outcome and stewardship of the legacy. One in which I want to be able to share with my children when they are old enough and have the skills to experience one of the world's true treasures.

Specific comments on the Plan requiring amendment

1. The Herd Management plan should support hunter and community-led management and positive social and economic outcomes.
2. All funds for the Herd of Special Interest (Wapiti) must be sent directly from the funding source to the implementing end user or group. In this case the Wapiti Foundation.
3. It should not be routed through DOC or GAC or any government body for discretionary redistribution.

4. The operational plan should serve as a flexible management tool that inspires innovation, and this HOSI presents an opportunity not only to manage wapiti but also to advance deer control techniques in New Zealand.
5. This plan must remain separate from the Herd management plan. This document needs to be an adapted management plan that is developed by the implementer of the Herd of Special Interest, in this case the Fiordland Wapiti Foundation.
6. Monitoring enables adaptive management and demonstrates whether the management of Fiordland Wapiti Foundation is achieving the objectives and strategies of this Plan.
 - Management including monitoring should relate back to these objectives and be efficient and effective i.e. they should not be costly and provide little value. They should inform management responses aligned with an adaptive management framework. Overdue bureaucracy and draconian approaches should be avoided as they are not efficient and do not result in tangible outcomes, as evidenced by the nibble and versatile approach of the FWF over the past two decades in particular.
 - Monitoring should only reflect the impact deer have on the environment. Faecal pellet counts should not be included. They are subjective and do not truly reflect deer impacts.
7. Delegations should be assigned to groups with the right skills.
8. The Fiordland Wapiti Foundation possesses the expertise required to implement and manage the HOSI and operational plan, having demonstrated consistent success in this area over the past two decades.
9. Clear guidance is needed on whether HOSI falls under DOC or GAC legislation.
10. A Wapiti HOSI is not about “Control” of Wapiti; it is about “Active Management.”
11. I would like to see all reference to the term ‘control’ removed from the HMP in preference for the term ‘management,’ to reflect the reality of what a Wapiti HOSI HMP is trying to achieve.
12. The ‘control’ narrative and that style of language reflects previous failed approaches to managing deer in New Zealand

Michael Walker

Principal

P: [redacted] M: [redacted] 4

E: [redacted]

W: www.toddwalker.com

Todd Walker

You may notice we have a new name and look. Explore the new Todd Walker at toddwalker.com.

 **Our offices will be closed from 5pm on Tuesday 23rd of December 2025 and will reopen on Monday 19th of January 2026. If you require assistance over this time, please click [here](#) for more information about who can be contacted over the break.**

CONFIDENTIALITY: The contents of this email (including any attachment) may be legally privileged and confidential. Any unauthorised use of the contents is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please advise us immediately, and then delete this email together with all attachments.

Jeffrey Walker

Submission Details

Eirwen Harris Mitchell

From: s9(2)(a)
Sent: Friday, 5 December 2025 10:53 pm
To: wapitiHOSIHMP
Subject: Wapiti HOSI Management Plan Submission
Attachments: Wapiti Submission.docx

Categories: Green category

You don't often get email from s9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

I attach my submission.

Regards
Jeff Walker

My submission below.

My name is Jeffrey Walker and I **support** the Herd Management Plan in principle but believe amendments are needed for it to work well for the Fiordland Wapiti herd.

Background and what it means to me and my family

The Fiordland Wapiti Herd is truly special to New Zealand. I am 53 years old and have been annually entering the National Park in Fiordland since I was 19 years old. Over the 50 years I have been in all of the Fiords, diving , tramping , hunting and exploring. I have introduced my children to Fiordland and my two sons are regular visitors.

I have travelled extensively overseas and can say Fiordland is a very special place in the world.

The physical and mental challenges involved in recreating in this part of Aotearoa are intense, and to be able to test oneself and those who brave to enter this environment is one of life's true treasures . The weather can be brutal, the country is extreme and the allure it has to many like me is almost spiritual. In places the birdlife is special.

I have been lucky enough to have accessed many of the famous valleys, tops and parts of the Wapiti area including the Glaisnock, Nitz, Worsley, Large Burn, Mid Burn , Wild Natives, Dark River, Steiner Burn, Charles and other blocks. These places have formed a unique chapter in New Zealand history, largely built around the Wapiti herd which has, in recent years , been managed outstandingly by the Fiordland Wapiti Foundation. This wasn't always the case. My first impressions in the 1970s and 80s was of a declining herd . The Fiordland Wapiti foundation have arrested that decline by taking charge of the management of the herd. Take for example the extremely high standards the FWF set in terms of the way they have successfully encouraged and educated those that hunt Wapiti through clever modern tools like the app they have developed to encourage recordings of native bird sighting, encourage rubbish removal and ensure the right deer and taken by hunters. They are environmental ambassadors for how people ought to treat this World Heritage area and fill an enormous hole that DOC simply cannot afford to undertake. Culling, trapping and back country hut maintenance are the obvious examples, which have involved thousands of volunteer hours and millions of dollars over time. Given the difficulties in accessing this part of the country and the resources required, the National Park is probably in some of the best condition in my 53 years of visiting. This is not by accident, the FWF have worked consistently and tirelessly to achieve this outcome and stewardship of the legacy. One in which I want to be able to share with my grandchildren when they are old enough and have the skills to experience one of the world's true treasures.

Specific comments on the Plan requiring amendment

1. The Herd Management plan should support hunter and community-led management and positive social and economic outcomes.
2. All funds for the Herd of Special Interest (Wapiti) must be sent directly from the funding source to the implementing end user or group. In this case the Wapiti Foundation.

3. It should not be routed through DOC or GAC or any government body for discretionary redistribution.
4. The operational plan should serve as a flexible management tool that inspires innovation, and this HOSI presents an opportunity not only to manage wapiti but also to advance deer control techniques in New Zealand.
5. This plan must remain separate from the Herd management plan. This document needs to be an adapted management plan that is developed by the implementer of the Herd of Special Interest, in this case the Fiordland Wapiti Foundation.
6. Monitoring enables adaptive management and demonstrates whether the management of Fiordland Wapiti Foundation is achieving the objectives and strategies of this Plan.
 - Management including monitoring should relate back to these objectives and be efficient and effective i.e. they should not be costly and provide little value. They should inform management responses aligned with an adaptive management framework. Bureaucracy and draconian approaches should be avoided as they are not efficient and do not result in tangible outcomes, as evidenced by the nibble and versatile approach of the FWF over the past two decades in particular.
 - Monitoring should only reflect the impact deer have on the environment. Faecal pellet counts should not be included. They are subjective and do not truly reflect deer impacts.
7. Delegations should be assigned to groups with the right skills.
8. The Fiordland Wapiti Foundation possesses the expertise required to implement and manage the HOSI and operational plan, having demonstrated consistent success in this area over the past two decades.
9. Clear guidance is needed on whether HOSI falls under DOC or GAC legislation.
10. A Wapiti HOSI is not about “Control” of Wapiti; it is about “Active Management.”
11. I would like to see all reference to the term ‘control’ removed from the HMP in preference for the term ‘management,’ to reflect the reality of what a Wapiti HOSI HMP is trying to achieve.
12. The ‘control’ narrative and that style of language reflects previous failed approaches to managing deer in New Zealand

Jeffrey Walker

Tom Warren

Submission Details

Eirwen Harris Mitchell

From: Tom Warren [s9(2)(a)]
Sent: Friday, 5 December 2025 9:23 am
To: wapitiHOSIHMP
Subject: Submission re Wapiti Consultation

Categories: Green category

You don't often get email from [s9(2)(a)] [Learn why this is important](#)

To Whom this may concern

I support the Herd Management Plan in principle but believe amendments are needed for it to work well for the Fiordland Wapiti herd.

I have been actively hunting the Fiordland area for 15 years, and watched the Wapiti foundation move to control and organise the ballot system, the herd, and make it an internationally recognised phenomenon. It has also helped keep Te Anau alive. The herd is the draw card for hundreds of hunters, associated businesses and conservationists every year.

The herd management Plan under HOSI needs to reflect the values of the Fiordland Wapiti herd keeping the herd pure in bloodline, not allowing over breeding, and allowing the interaction between conservation of fauna, and the herd dynamics.

The Wapiti herd has heritage, brings income to the associated areas, is unique, and connected to nature. The hunting, and tramping to view the herd brings Health and wellbeing to individuals/ and to families that partake in the spectacles generated by the herd .

I believe that the Herd Management plan should support hunter and community-led management and positive social and economic outcomes.

All funds for the Herd of Special Interest (Wapiti) must be sent directly from the funding source to the implementing end user or group. In this case the Wapiti Foundation.

It should not be routed through DOC or GAC or any government body for discretionary redistribution.

And the financial reporting should not be a requirement within the Herd Management Plan.

The operational plan should serve as a flexible management tool that inspires innovation, and this HOSI presents an opportunity not only to manage wapiti but also to advance deer control techniques in New Zealand.

This plan must remain separate from the Herd management plan. This document needs to be an adapted management plan that is developed by the implementer of the Herd of Special Interest, in this case the Fiordland Wapiti Foundation.

Monitoring of vegetation enables adaptive management and demonstrates whether the management of Fiordland wapiti is achieving the objectives and strategies of this Plan.

Management including monitoring should relate back to these objectives and be efficient and effective i.e. they should not be costly and provide little value. They should inform management responses aligned with an adaptive management framework. Overdue bureaucracy and draconian approaches should be avoided as they are not efficient and do not result in tangible outcomes.

Monitoring should only reflect the impact deer have on the environment. Faecal pellet counts should not be included. They are subjective and do not truly reflect deer impacts.

The Fiordland Wapiti Foundation possesses the expertise required to implement and manage the HOSI and operational plan, having demonstrated consistent success in this area over the past two decades.

Clear guidance is needed on whether HOSI falls under DOC or GAC legislation.

A Wapiti HOSI is not about "Control" of Wapiti; it is about "Active Management."

I would like to see all reference to the term 'control' removed from the HMP in preference for the term 'management,' to reflect the reality of what a Wapiti HOSI HMP is trying to achieve.

The 'control' narrative and that style of language reflects previous failed approaches to managing deer in New Zealand

Tom Warren

Mobile: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

Nicole White - Environment Southland

Submission Details

Our reference: A1372074

8 December 2025

The Conservator
Department of Conservation
Christchurch
Via Email to: wapitihosihmp@doc.govt.nz



Attention: Wapiti HOSI draft HMP Submissions

Environment Southland's Submission on Fiordland Wapiti Herd of Special Interest Draft Herd Management Plan

The Southland Regional Council, trading as Environment Southland (Environment Southland), welcomes the opportunity to participate in the consultation on the Fiordland Wapiti Herd of Special Interest Draft Herd Management Plan.

While this submission has been reviewed and approved by the Council, it is yet to receive formal endorsement, which will be sought at the next available Council meeting. As such, this submission is provided on a without prejudice basis.

Please contact Marcus Roy, Government and Policy Manager s9(2)(a) if you have any queries regarding this submission.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J A McPhail".

J A McPhail
Chair

Encl

Environment Southland's Submission on Fiordland Wapiti Herd of Special Interest Draft Herd Management Plan

Introduction

1. Environment Southland (the Council) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the Fiordland Wapiti Herd of Special Interest (HOSI) Draft Herd Management Plan (the Plan) released by the Department of Conservation (DOC). The Council deeply appreciates its partnership with DOC, which has been invaluable in achieving positive outcomes for Southland. As the regional authority with responsibilities for biodiversity, biosecurity and broader environmental management across Southland, the Council has a strong interest in ensuring that introduced species within the region are managed in a way that protects ecological health and reflects local values.
2. The Council acknowledges the longstanding involvement of the Fiordland Wapiti Foundation (FWF) in deer control and related conservation activities. The Plan seeks to formalise these existing arrangements under a statutory framework, providing clearer guidance and continuity for management of the established wapiti herd within the Fiordland National Park.
3. While the Council recognises the practical need for an enduring management framework, several aspects of the Plan require refinement to ensure effective biodiversity outcomes, strong Treaty partnership, clear accountability and consistent deer management both within and beyond the designated Wapiti Area.
4. In summary, Environment Southland:
 - Supports the Plan in principle as a realistic and pragmatic approach for an established herd.
 - Identifies several areas requiring clarification, particularly regarding funding, monitoring and implementation responsibilities.
 - Recommends stronger engagement with Te Ao Mārama Inc (TAMI) and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu to meet Treaty partnership expectations.
 - Emphasise that support for this Plan does not imply support for HOSI designation elsewhere in the National Park system.

General comments

5. The Council acknowledges that the Plan offers a coordinated mechanism to continue deer control, monitoring and associated conservation work within the Wapiti Area. The structured monitoring programme and annual reporting requirement have potential to support adaptive management and improve transparency over outcomes.
6. However, the Plan is written at a high level and lacks specificity in several critical areas, including monitoring methods, responsibilities for implementation and performance measures. Without clearer accountability and detail about who delivers what, how often and to what standard, the Council is concerned that biodiversity outcomes may not be achieved, and enforcement may fall short.
7. The Council is also concerned that DOC is expected to cover expanded ecological monitoring from existing local budgets. These budgets support a broad range of conservation activities across Southland. Without additional support or contingency

mechanisms, expanded monitoring requirement could inadvertently divert resources from other priority biodiversity or pest management work in the region.

8. Engagement with iwi requires strengthening. While the Plan refers to Papatipu Rūnanga participation, it does not demonstrate direct consultation with TAMI or reflect how iwi perspectives have shaped the proposed approach. The Council encourages DOC to develop a more explicit Treaty partnership framework to support appropriate iwi involvement in decision-making, monitoring and the assessment of impacts on taonga species.
9. The Council also notes that the Plan references genetic monitoring but lacks clarity on its purpose and methodology. Given the extensive hybridisation of wapiti and red deer, genetic monitoring risks being misleading if its purpose and limitations are not clearly defined. Results could be misinterpreted as indicating clear distinctions that does not exist biologically, potentially suggesting to decision-makers, stakeholders and the public that management can or should prioritise specific genetic traits. Without clear objectives, methodology and interpretation guidance, genetic monitoring risks being misunderstood as a conservation tool when it may instead reflect hunting-related preferences rather than biodiversity outcomes.
10. Finally, the Council emphasises that management within the Wapiti Area cannot occur in isolation. DOC must continue actively managing deer outside the designated HOSI boundary to avoid creating areas of unmanaged browsing pressure and perceptions of selective enforcement.

Recommendations

Environment Southland recommends that DOC:

- a. Clarify responsibilities, timeframes and measurable performance indicators across monitoring, population control, reporting and operational delivery.
- b. Strengthen engagement with TAMI and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, ensuring the Plan reflects Treaty partnership expectations and provides for meaningful iwi involvement.
- c. Define funding responsibilities and establish a contingency plan to ensure management continues if hunting or sponsorship revenue declines.
- d. Clarify the purpose and methodology of genetic monitoring or remove it if it cannot be implemented in a meaningful and scientifically robust way.
- e. Confirm DOC's ongoing responsibilities for deer management outside the HOSI boundary, including monitoring and control expectations in surrounding areas.
- f. Revise the Plan to provide clearer accountability and implementation detail, improving transparency and supporting evaluation over the five-year period.
- g. Include a statement recognising that HOSI designation is not intended as a precedent for other National Parks, unless comparable ecological and management circumstances exist.

Conclusion

11. Environment Southland supports the intent of the Draft Fiordland Wapiti Herd of Special Interest Management Plan and acknowledges the need for an enduring management framework for the established wapiti herd. However, refinements are needed to ensure

biodiversity protection, durability of delivery, clear accountability, and strong Treaty partnership.

12. The Council welcomes ongoing engagement with DOC as the Plan is refined and would be pleased to provide further technical input on monitoring, biodiversity considerations and regional implications.

Keith Whitehead

Submission Details

Eirwen Harris Mitchell

From: Keith Whitehead s9(2)(a)
Sent: Thursday, 4 December 2025 8:55 pm
To: wapitiHOSIHMP
Subject: Wapiti Management Plan

Categories: Green category

You don't often get email from s9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

The Wapiti Heard should remain in the control of the Wapiti Foundation in consultation with DOC. All funding for the management of the herd of special interest is to be managed by the foundation once again in consultation only with DOC.

Wapiti are a special breed, Fiordland is a special place, being able to hunt Wapiti is both a national and international experience available within New Zealand only.

The complete to date system has been managed up until now and will be into the future very successfully by the Wapiti Foundation with no immediate need to change this system.

Don't change something that is not broken.

Regards
Keith Whitehead

Greg Wilson

Submission Details

Eirwen Harris Mitchell

From: Greg Wilson s9(2)(a)
Sent: Friday, 5 December 2025 7:22 am
To: wapitiHOSIHMP
Subject: fiordland hosi

Categories: Green category

You don't often get email from s9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern

I wish to submit on the plan for Wapiti to be a herd of special interest in the Fiordland national Park. I support efforts to bring this into being as there is a body of evidence over the last 25 yrs that the approach of Hunter led herd management and conservation actually works. In light of this I respectfully ask that any management plan be based on science, fact and measurable outcomes. Please ensure that vegetation, ecosystems and the beauty, serenity and wildness of FNP remain as undisturbed as possible. The presence of Wapiti needs to be managed so that the hunting of a fine healthy herd continues to contribute to a healthy environment. We have to admit that only with the income derived from the trophy hunting experience offered by this unique herd in this unique environment is the level of animal control needed even possible. Management plans need to reflect this. I personally have spent 13 yrs as one of the trappers who check and maintain the trap lines run by the fwf and can attest to the conservation outcomes provided by this work, all paid for by hunters. Please don't mess with a system that works, support it with wise long-term robust, outcome focussed planning. Thankyou
Greg Wilson.

Brad Windust

Submission Details

Eirwen Harris Mitchell

From: Brad Windust s9(2)(a) >
Sent: Saturday, 6 December 2025 8:59 pm
To: wapitiHOSIHMP
Subject: Submission on the Draft Wapoti Herd of Special Interest (HOSI) Management Plan
Categories: Green category

You don't often get email from s9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

Brad Windust

s9(2)(a)

s9(2)(a)

Ph s9(2)(a)

Submission on the Draft Wapoti Herd of Special Interest (HOSI) Management Plan

Kia ora,

Thank you for allowing me to have my say on this matter.

I oppose the proposal to establish a Wapoti Herd of Special Interest (HOSI) in Fiordland. Deer are an introduced browsing pest whose impacts on native forests, shrublands, and biodiversity are extremely well-documented. Elevating deer to a protected or semi-protected status within conservation land directly contradicts the purpose of these areas and undermines Aotearoa's ecological recovery efforts.

I cannot believe we are at the point of granting a protected status to a destructive, invasive herbivore in National Parks. This decision will go down in history in the same way the Government's introduction of stoats and possums is remembered. You will never be forgotten, but not in a good way.

It is embarrassing when we consider our forefathers, who saw firsthand the ecological devastation deer caused in Fiordland and worked tirelessly to eradicate them. They understood what was at stake and risked their lives removing tens of thousands by helicopter in the 1960s. They weren't doing it for fun, they were doing it because the forests were collapsing.

If anyone doubts the impact of deer, send them to Chalky Island. There you will see exactly what a Fiordland forest looks like when deer have never been present: abundant, layered, diverse, and full of native plants that are now almost absent in mainland Fiordland. Compare that to what you see today, deer (essentially big goats) have eaten out the understory, leaving forests open, dry, and fragile.

Large areas of Fiordland are already in a state of ecological collapse. The grey patches many people think are natural variation are dead canopy trees. Once the understory is stripped, wind and drying increase dramatically. Large trees become stressed from drought, windthrow, and exposed roots. They die. Gaps form. Then the canopy die-off accelerates. This is exactly what will happen elsewhere if deer are given new legal protection.

There will always be deer to hunt in Aotearoa. They are exploding in number in many regions simply because hunters tend to target stags. There is absolutely no need to protect them on conservation land. Doing so will only accelerate their population growth, block urgently needed population-control culls in the future, and set a dangerous precedent.

If the objective is to support hunting, then do it properly: pay hunters to remove deer, including hinds; build huts to improve access; and give hunters the resources they need. But do not protect a browsing pest at the cost of the forests and biodiversity Te Tiriti requires the Crown to safeguard.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi Obligations

This proposal conflicts with Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The Crown has a duty of active protection over taonga, which includes indigenous species, ecosystems, and the mauri of the whenua. Giving a destructive, invasive species elevated legal status within conservation areas weakens the Crown's ability to protect these taonga, and strengthens the interests of commercial hunting at the expense of ecosystem health. Te Tiriti requires the Crown to prioritise the wellbeing of the natural environment, not undermine it by protecting species that actively deplete native habitats and biodiversity.

If the HOSI proceeds (which it should not), strict ecological conditions must apply

If, despite strong ecological evidence, this proposal is forced through, then the following minimum requirements must be included:

- Independent ecological monitoring

Monitoring must be carried out by ecologists who are independent from hunting groups, GAC, and DHA operational teams. This should include:

- Deer density monitoring
- Vegetation plots focusing on understory, seedlings, palatable species, and canopy health
- Monitoring of other pest species and interactions (e.g., stoats cats possums and rats).
- Clear time-bound performance measures

A fixed review cycle must be mandated — every five years — assessing:

- Whether deer numbers are increasing
- Whether vegetation health and biodiversity indicators are declining
- Whether canopy dieback or forest openness is increasing
- Whether taonga species (plants and birds) show negative trends

If any of these decline over the review period, the HOSI must be removed.

- Annual operational reporting

Even within the 5-year review cycle, annual public reporting should be required to track trends and ensure transparency.

- 1080 and other pest-control operations must not be restricted

A HOSI designation must not interfere with landscape-scale possum, stoat, ferret, rat, or wasp control. Deer cannot be allowed to block 1080 or ground-based pest control.

- Mandatory large-scale deer culls when thresholds are exceeded

If monitoring shows increasing deer density or declining ecosystem health, targeted culls must be triggered automatically.

These triggers need to be defined clearly in the final plan.

- The HOSI designation must not override conservation legislation

The purpose of conservation land is to protect biodiversity. A hunting-driven overlay cannot be allowed to compromise ecological values or DOC's statutory responsibilities.

Conclusion

Deer and pigs are already out of control across much of Aotearoa. Creating protected deer-hunting blocks in Fiordland, or anywhere else on conservation land, is not ecological management, it is political appeasement that will leave a lasting scar on our forests.

Conservationists warned the Government not to introduce stoats. The warning was ignored and the consequences have been catastrophic. We are warning you again: do not repeat the mistakes of the past.

Do not give deer legal protection on conservation land. And if you insist on proceeding, then safeguard biodiversity with strict, independent ecological oversight, mandatory culls, non-negotiable pest-control operations, and 5-yearly reviews that allow the entire HOSI designation to be scrapped if ecological health declines.

Please uphold Te Tiriti. Please uphold the purpose of conservation land. And please uphold the responsibility we all share to protect the forests and species that make Aotearoa unique.

Ngā mihi,

Brad Windust

s9(2)(a)

s9(2)(a)

Ph s9(2)(a)

Dean Wright

Submission Details

Eirwen Harris Mitchell

From: Dean Wright s9(2)(a)
Sent: Sunday, 7 December 2025 7:42 pm
To: wapitiHOSIHMP; sikaherdofspecialinterest@doc.govt.nz
Subject: Submission

Categories: Green category

You don't often get email from s9(2)(a) [Learn why this is important](#)

Tēnā koe,

Dean Wright

s9(2)(a)

Submission on the Draft Wapoti Herd of Special Interest (HOSI) Management Plan
And my Submission on the Draft Sika Herd of Special Interest (HOSI) Management Plan.

I do not agree with giving deer any type of legal protection on our conservation land. Absolute madness.

However, sadly it looks like this decision is already going ahead, so these are the non-negotiable conditions that must be met:

- Independent ecological monitoring by neutral ecologists.
- Strict 5-year review cycles to reassess deer numbers and ecosystem health.
- Annual public reporting on ecosystem impacts.
- No restrictions on pest-control operations.
- Mandatory large-scale deer culls if ecological health declines.
- Scrap the whole HOSI when it doesn't meet these targets in 5 years.

Ngā mihi

Dean

Dean Wright Photography

s9(2)(a)

s9(2)(a)

<https://deanwright.co.nz>