From:	Jan Davis
To:	Tasmanian Salmon Study Secretariat
Subject:	Stakeholder Engagement Plan - Independent Study of the Tasmanian Salmon Industry
Date:	Monday, 22 June 2026 10:23:42 AM
Attachments:	Submission on the Independent Study of the Tasmanian Salmon Industry Stakeholder Engagement Plan JDavis 260622.pdf

---

Good morning

Please find attached my submission on the Stakeholder Engagement Plan for the Independent Study of the Tasmanian Salmon Industry.

My comments are directed to the proposed engagement process, rather than the substantive merits of salmon farming or individual operators. In particular, I recommend that the plan include a distinct stakeholder category for individual Tasmanians and public-interest contributors, together with a clear pathway for people who do not fit within the current institutional, sectoral, geographic or organisational categories to participate in the study.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Regards

Jan Davis

m. [redacted]

Please note: I choose to work flexibly, at times that fit in with my commitments. If you receive an email from me when you are not working, please do not rush to respond. I look forward to hearing from you at a time that suits your own work-life balance.

AGRIBUSINESS TASMANIA

Via email: salmonstudy@tas.gov.au

Stakeholder Engagement Plan - Independent Study of the Tasmanian Salmon Industry

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Stakeholder Engagement Plan for the Independent Study of the Tasmanian Salmon Industry.

I make this submission as an individual Tasmanian with a long-standing interest in agriculture, animal welfare, regulation, governance and public policy. My comments are directed to the proposed stakeholder engagement process, rather than to the substantive merits of salmon farming or individual operators.

Having said that, I do not oppose salmon farming as a matter of principle. Like any other form of farming or food production, it should be able to operate where it meets contemporary standards for animal welfare, environmental protection, biosecurity, transparency, and community accountability.

At the same time, I recognise that salmon farming in Tasmania has become a highly polarised issue. Much of the public debate is now conducted through fixed pro-industry or anti-industry positions, which can make it difficult for more nuanced, independent, or public-interest perspectives to be heard.

For that reason, I welcome the stated commitment in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan to independence, transparency, evidence-based engagement, inclusivity, and safety. These principles are essential if the study is to build public trust and provide a credible basis for future decision-making.

However, I am concerned that the current stakeholder register does not clearly identify a pathway for individual Tasmanians, or people with relevant professional or public-interest experience, who are not speaking on behalf of an organisation, campaign group, industry body, regulator, affected locality, or political constituency.

The stakeholder groups currently identified include regional and coastal communities, Tasmanian Aboriginal groups, the salmon industry, industry workforce, other industries, the scientific and research community, environmental and conservation organisations, government agencies and regulators, Members of Parliament, and international peers.

These are all important groups and should clearly be included. However, they do not adequately capture individual community members who may have informed and relevant perspectives but do not fit neatly within any of those categories.

This is a significant gap.

The Tasmanian salmon industry is not only a matter for directly affected coastal communities, industry participants, environmental organisations, regulators, or elected representatives. It is also a statewide public policy issue.

Tasmanians may have legitimate interests as consumers, taxpayers, recreational users of public waters, people with professional experience in animal welfare or environmental regulation, people with agricultural or food production experience, or simply as members of the broader community concerned about the integrity of decision-making.

In my own case, I would not comfortably fit within the listed stakeholder categories. I am not a salmon industry participant, a member of an environmental campaign organisation, a representative of a coastal community directly affected by salmon farming, a regulator, a researcher, or an elected representative.

However, I do have relevant experience and perspectives that may assist the study, particularly in relation to animal welfare standards, agricultural regulation, public trust and social licence.

This is unlikely to be unique.

There will be other Tasmanians with relevant experience, knowledge, or perspectives who similarly fall outside the current stakeholder register.

I therefore recommend that the Stakeholder Engagement Plan be amended to include an additional stakeholder group, namely *Individual Tasmanians and public-interest contributors*.

A suggested rationale for engagement could look something like this:

To capture informed perspectives from individual Tasmanians who are not speaking on behalf of an organisation, industry body, campaign group, affected locality, or political constituency, but who may bring relevant professional, governance, regulatory, animal welfare, agricultural, consumer, recreational, community or public policy experience to the study.

This category would not replace the existing stakeholder groups. Rather, it would strengthen the engagement framework by ensuring that the process is genuinely inclusive and not limited to organised, institutional or directly affected interests.

I also recommend that the final Stakeholder Engagement Plan clearly explain how individual contributors can participate in the study. This could include:

- a clear public submissions process;
- public webinars or information sessions;
- the ability for individuals to identify relevant experience or expertise when making a submission;
- targeted follow-up interviews where an individual submission raises matters of particular relevance;
- publication of de-identified themes arising from individual submissions; and
- clear communication about how individual public-interest contributions have been considered in the study.

It will also be important to distinguish between individual submissions that are simply expressions of opinion and those that provide relevant evidence, practical experience or informed analysis. That distinction is consistent with the plan's evidence-based approach.

However, it should not mean that individual contributors are treated as peripheral to the process.

A credible engagement process should allow for people who sit outside the usual stakeholder blocs to be heard. Indeed, these perspectives may be especially valuable in a debate that has become so polarised.

In summary, I support the broad intent and principles of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, but recommend that it be amended to expressly include individual Tasmanians and public-interest contributors as a stakeholder group, with a clear explanation of how their input will be invited, considered and reflected in the study.

This would improve the inclusiveness, credibility and transparency of the engagement process, and help ensure the study is informed by a broader range of Tasmanian perspectives than those represented through formal stakeholder organisations or directly affected interests.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Yours sincerely



Jan Davis

22 June 2026