1-1-2013

Changes to land tenure and pastoral lease ownership in Western Australia's central rangelands: Implications for co-operative, landscape-scale management

Eddie J. Van Etten
Edith Cowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworks2013>

Part of the [Natural Resources and Conservation Commons](#)

[10.1071/RJ11088](https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworks2013/806)

This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of: Van Etten, E. J. (2013). Changes to land tenure and pastoral lease ownership in Western Australia's central rangelands: Implications for co-operative, landscape-scale management. *The Rangeland Journal*, 35(1), 37-46. Available [here](#)

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.

<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworks2013/806>

1 **Changes to land tenure and pastoral lease ownership in Western**
2 **Australia's central rangelands: implications for co-operative,**
3 **landscape-scale management**

4
5 *Eddie J. B. van Etten*

6 Centre for Ecosystem Management, School of Natural Sciences, Edith Cowan
7 University, Joondalup 6027, Perth, Australia.

8 Email: e.van_etten@ecu.edu.au
9

10 **Abstract.** The majority of arid and semi-arid land in the Western Australian pastoral
11 zone has a long history of livestock grazing within an extensive network of
12 predominantly family-held pastoral leases. A variety of different groups have
13 purchased pastoral leases in the last five decades and, for many, making a profit from
14 pastoralism is no longer a priority. For the central rangelands of Western Australia,
15 these groups have included: government agencies, who have purchased some 9 % of
16 pastoral leases by area; private conservation organisations (<1 % purchased);
17 aboriginal communities and groups (c. 7 %); and mining companies (c. 13 %). The
18 purchases of pastoral leases by government agencies was designed to improve the
19 conservation status of arid-zone ecosystems, and is the first step in a process of
20 changing land tenure to a conservation reserve. This paper summarises the extent and
21 other characteristics of these changes in land tenure and ownership of pastoral leases,
22 and explores the implications for land management and conservation, stemming from
23 these changes. It demonstrates that large areas of contiguous land with no or reduced
24 domestic stocking can now be found in many parts of these rangelands, particularly in
25 the Coolgardie, Yalgoo and Pilbara bio-regions, with some leaseholders actively

managing land for the conservation of biodiversity and restoring sites degraded through past over-grazing. In some bio-regions, such land covers considerable proportions of sub-catchments, suggesting that broad-scale conservation management and restoration objectives may be realised. It is argued that to fully realise these objectives requires effective communication and co-ordination between land managers, including sharing of ideas, view-points and resources. In particular, mining companies, now major holders of pastoral leases in Western Australia, can play an important role in contributing to and even facilitating such objectives.

Additional keywords: land-use change, mining, pastoralism, grazing management, property rights, multi-functional transition, landscape ecology, ecosystem management, catchment management

Introduction

The various types of land tenure, and their spatial extent and configuration, can have a profound effect on rangeland condition. This is because land tenure legally mandates the permissible uses of land, constraints to such uses and specific property rights, as well as influencing the objectives of rangeland management (Holmes 1997, 2006; Homewood and Thompson 2010). Differences in rangeland condition have been regularly noted across types of land tenure (Homewood *et al.* 2001; Vetter *et al.* 2006; Williams *et al.* 2009) and, indeed change of tenure, such as from a pastoral lease to a conservation lease, has resulted in improvements in rangeland condition (Cheal 2009). Quantification of changes in land tenure over time is, therefore, likely to be of interest to managers of rangelands and policy-makers more generally. Common types of rangeland tenure are lease systems (the long-term rental of government or Crown land by third parties for grazing and/or other activities), freehold and various types of traditional land tenure, such as through long-term association with land by indigenous people.

The characteristics of the landholder can have an equally persuasive effect on rangeland condition through their influence on such things as overall land management ethos, management priorities and economic imperatives (Huntsinger *et al.* 2010). Type of landholder can cut across types of land tenure; for instance, in Australia, indigenous people may hold rangelands through freehold title (mostly non-transferable), common-law native title or ownership of a pastoral lease (Holmes 2010). Quantification of spatial changes in land, based on landholder type, is also likely to be of interest to those responsible for rangeland policy and management.

There has been a long history of pastoralism in the arid and semi-arid lands of Western Australia. European settlers first began grazing domestic livestock in the

southern Murchison region in the 1860s and, by 1910, most of the land suitable for grazing along the Murchison and Gascoyne Rivers, and their major tributaries, had been allocated to pastoralists (Burnside 1979; Curry *et al.* 1994). Initially, pastoralists in these areas made use of existing surface waters and shallow wells nearby, thereby concentrating impacts on river frontages and around wells. Generally, higher and more persistent stocking rates of livestock were achieved from the 1920s onwards as technology became available for constructing deeper earthen dams and bores (Pearson and Lennon 2010). The establishment of these permanent or otherwise long-term watering points facilitated the spread of leases away from major river systems. By the 1930s almost all of the semi-arid and arid woodland and shrublands in the western half of Western Australia and south of the Tropic of Capricorn were under pastoral lease and subject to grazing by livestock, mainly sheep and cattle (Curry *et al.* 1994). By 1955, close to 90 % of the Murchison, Gascoyne and Carnarvon bio-regions were covered in more-or-less spatially continuous pastoral leases. Most of these leases have been held and run as small family operations, many of whom lived permanently on the stations, a tradition which is now less common. For most of the period from 1910 to 1990, with the notable exceptions of prolonged drought periods, such as 1935-1941 and the late 1970s, the pastoral industry in these regions has been financially profitable (Brandis 2008).

The impacts of widespread and sustained grazing pressure, not only from domestic livestock but also kangaroos and feral animals, such as goats, have been substantial in these rangelands and include loss of vegetation and microbial crusts with subsequent soil erosion, as well as changes in the composition of plant species towards less preferred plant species, particularly around water-points (Wilcox and McKinnon 1972; Curry *et al.* 1994; Landsberg *et al.* 1997; Ludwig *et al.* 1997).

89 Regional rangeland surveys have indicated that 25 % of the rangelands of Western
90 Australia are in poor condition, with the Murchison bio-region having the highest
91 proportion of land in poor range condition (42 %) and the Pilbara bio-region the
92 lowest (12 %; EPA, 2004), although there is evidence of improving range condition
93 away from major drainage systems (Watson *et al.* 2007). Much of the impact of
94 pastoralism in these regions can be attributed to the persistence of very high stocking
95 rates, built up through runs of wet years, into a succeeding period of severe drought
96 (Stafford Smith *et al.* 2007). Pastoralism is also implicated in the loss of biodiversity;
97 for instance, it is often cited as one of the primary reasons for the loss of small- to
98 medium-sized mammals throughout arid and semi-arid Australia (Letnic 2007).

99 Following decades of stability, noteworthy changes to land tenure and the type
100 of holder of pastoral leases have occurred in Western Australia's rangelands in recent
101 years. Some of these are reasonably well-documented, such as the holding of pastoral
102 leases by the Western Australian Department of Environment and Conservation
103 (WADEC) for the purposes of conservation (Brandis 2008). Under this process,
104 pastoral leases were systematically evaluated, based on specific selection criteria, and,
105 if suitable and available, purchased from the holder by the government and reverted to
106 Unallocated Crown Land as an interim measure before changing to a conservation
107 land tenure at a later date (Brandis 2008; Economics and Industry Standing
108 Committee 2010). Less well-publicised are the holding of pastoral leases by mining
109 companies, indigenous groups and various conservation and scientific organisations
110 for whom pastoralism is usually not the main priority or activity.

111 To date, no overview of these changes in land tenure and of the holders of
112 pastoral leases, in terms of spatial area and configuration, has been published, nor has
113 an exploration of the broader ecological and conservation implications of these

changes been undertaken. This paper seeks to quantify changes to Western Australian pastoral leases from the 1950s to recent times, chiefly in terms of amendments to land tenure and the types of lease holders, and evaluates the potential for such changes to realise outcomes for nature conservation and the restoration of degraded landscapes. It is particularly focussed on exploring the implications of land tenure and landholder changes on landscape- to regional-scale ecosystem patterns and processes. The study area is the main rangeland belt across central Western Australia, which are arid and semi-arid lands consisting predominantly of *Acacia* shrublands/woodlands, and is delineated by six bio-regions (Pilbara, Gascoyne, Carnarvon, Yalgoo, Murchison and Coolgardie), covering some 76 m ha in total (Fig. 1). It excludes the Nullarbor and the three Kimberley rangeland bio-regions as these are distinct in terms of pastoral lease ownership, vegetation and climate, as well as being spatially separate from the main rangeland belt of Western Australia. Bio-regions are broad-scale geographic classifications of land based on biophysical characteristics as determined by the interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (Thackway and Cresswell 1997) and are commonly used for conservation planning and assessment purposes.

Definitions, data and spatial analyses

Although pastoral lands and their resources are owned by the Crown in Western Australia, leases may be bought or sold on the open market and, hence, for the purposes of this paper, a person or organisation can be holder of a pastoral lease which gives them rights to graze that land and sell livestock from it. The holder of a pastoral lease is also referred to as the lessee or leaseholder. Three types of holders of pastoral leases are recognised in this paper: 1) individual, family or company, referred to as private leases in this paper, for whom pastoralism (grazing of livestock) is the

main objective and means of livelihood; 2) mining company, who may maintain some livestock but whose main objective is typically not pastoralism but rather mineral extraction, exploration and/or access; and 3) aboriginal group where pastoralism may be an objective, but not always the only one (e.g. traditional land uses may also be practised; Eringa and Wittber 2010) - these are referred to as indigenous pastoral leases in this paper. Two additional categories of ownership are recognised for pastoral leases acquired between 1998 and 2008 for the purpose of conservation: 1) 'WADEC' for those many pastoral leases purchased by WADEC in this period; and 2) 'non-government conservation' which represents pastoral lease purchases by private conservation organisations. The WADEC-held leases are planned to be converted to conservation reserves, the first step of which has involved relinquishment of the lease which results in automatic but interim reversion of land to the Unallocated Crown Land category. The proposed next step is formal change of tenure to conservation reserve which requires approval by the Western Australian State Parliament which has yet to occur. Most of the WADEC-held leases, therefore, are no longer pastoral leases in terms of land tenure but are maintained as a separate entity in this paper to highlight recent trends in conversions of leases and the fact that this transition in tenure to conservation reserve is likely to take some time and is not guaranteed.

Spatial and temporal data on land tenure and lease ownership within the study area was obtained from a number of sources (Table 1). Data on land tenure was obtained from the National Land and Water Resources Audit of Australian rangelands, which includes detailed land tenure maps for 1955, 1965, 1975, 1985, 1995 and 1999. This data was then updated using other government spatial databases (Table 1) and statistics (e.g. land tenure statistics of the WADEC and the

Collaborative Australian Protected Area Database to provide statistics on land tenure for 2008). Spatial data on the holders of pastoral leases was obtained from a GIS coverage of pastoral leases (with categories based on audit of lease holders conducted in late 2008) maintained by Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia (Table 1).

GIS coverages on land tenure and lease ownership were intersected with catchment and region coverages from the interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia database (Table 1) using the Spatial Analysis extension in ESRI ArcGIS v.9 (ESRI, Redlands, California, US) to generate statistics on the spatial extent of various types of land tenure and the holders of leases by region and major catchment. All coverages were rendered consistent in terms of map projection, datum (GDA94), UTM zone (50) and unit of measure before spatial analyses.

Changes in land tenure and the holders of pastoral leases in central Western Australian rangelands

Although the vast majority of land in the study area remains as pastoral lease tenure (~ 65 %; Table 2), the area and number of pastoral leases has declined since 1955, especially those held by families and/or companies (non-indigenous leases in Fig. 2). Between 1955 and 2008, the area of non-indigenous leases declined by 8.9 m ha, which represents about 12 % of the study area (Fig. 2). The bulk of this change has occurred since 1995 and is mostly attributable to pastoral leases being purchased by the WADEC and aboriginal organisations. Pastoral leases owned by aboriginal groups have increased gradually over the last few decades (Fig. 2) and now occupy almost 5 % of the study area (Table 2).

Many of the WADEC-held pastoral leases were acquired under the Gascoyne-Murchison Strategy between 1998 and 2004 with some 4 m ha across 37 pastoral leases (including 19 part leases) being purchased in this period (Brandis 2008; Hughes and Jones 2010). The Gascoyne-Murchison Strategy was implemented to improve ecological, social and economic sustainability across these regions. With inclusion of these and more recent conversions of pastoral leases, conservation reserves now occupy some 11.5 % of the study area (up from <1 % in 1955; Table 2 & Fig. 2). Although almost all of these WADEC-held pastoral leases are presently Unallocated Crown Land, this is a temporary measure as previously noted. During this transition period, they are managed for conservation by the WADEC under a Memorandum of Understanding between the WADEC and Department of Regional Lands and Development (Economics and Industry Standing Committee 2010).

The contribution of these pastoral leases held by the WADEC to improving the network of conservation reserves has been assessed in detail (Brandis 2008). Other changes in the holders of pastoral leases have also occurred, especially since the late 1990s. Non-government conservation organisations have recently purchased leases in and around the Yalgoo bio-region, namely Mt Gibson and Faure stations by the Australian Wildlife Conservancy, and White Wells and Eurardy stations by Bush Heritage Australia. Pastoral leases managed for conservation by Non-government conservation organisations now cover some 48 800 ha of the study area (Fig. 3), although the total area of these reserves is 231 000 ha. This is because these reserves straddle the study area boundary, i.e. they extend into the Avon and Geraldton Sandplain regions to the south. Another example of a new type of owner is the CSIRO who purchased the Boolardy lease (357 000 ha) in 2009, primarily to facilitate astronomical research including the proposed Square Kilometre Array. Aboriginal-

controlled pastoral leases have also increased, including land set aside as Indigenous Protected Areas such as a section of Ninghan station in the Yalgoo bio-region, to around 4.4 m ha. Lastly, as of 2008, 43 pastoral leases covering 8.4 m ha were controlled by mining companies or their subsidiary interests (Fig. 3). Typically mining companies have purchased pastoral leases where they have considerable mining leases and/or activity. Mining companies, for instance, hold some 24 % of pastoral leases in the Coolgardie bio-region and some 44 % of leases in the Fortescue River catchment in the Pilbara bio-region (Table 2). Although leases are regularly changing their holder, and are sometimes held indirectly by mining companies through their ownership of pastoral companies, the data demonstrates that mining companies now have at least as much current or former pastoral land under their management as conservation agencies and aboriginal groups combined (Fig. 3). Furthermore, the holding by mining companies of pastoral leases is likely to increase over coming years in line with major expansions in mining activity predicted throughout the study area. Pastoral leases are currently of up to 50 years duration in Western Australia and will next expire in 2015; 95 exclusions on 75 leases across the state are planned for 2015, mostly for areas deemed to be of conservation significance (some 1.4 m ha in total; Karel Enringa, pers. comm.).

The outcome of these recent purchases of pastoral leases is that some 71 % of leases, including the recent WADEC acquisitions, by both area and number, are privately held, mostly by families but also by some pastoral companies, whilst the other 29 % is being managed by groups for whom making a profit from pastoralism is not necessarily a priority (Fig. 3). This percentage of leases and ex-leases managed by non-private owners varies from region to region (e.g. high in Coolgardie, Pilbara and Yalgoo bio-regions and low for the Carnarvon bio-region; Table 2). For some owners

(WADEC, Bush Heritage Australia and Australian Wildlife Conservancy), these leases (or ex-leases) are managed solely for the purposes of nature conservation, with de-stocking and varying degrees of de-watering (i.e. closing artificial water-points) being practised, which has generated some controversy (Economics and Industry Standing Committee, 2010). Many mining companies have adopted more conservative stocking regimes on their pastoral leases, with some practicing, at least temporarily, de-stocking. Although some mining companies, especially in the Pilbara bio-region, have appointed station managers and continue to obtain profits from pastoralism, for most it is of secondary or minor importance as the main reasons for the holding of the lease are to allow unfettered access to mineral resources and reduce risks and liabilities such as those associated with straying stock.

Leaseholders need to demonstrate some pastoral practice on their lands and are not permitted to use land for non-pastoral purposes under the conditions of the *Land Administration Act 1997* (Western Australia) except where a diversification permit has been granted to enable an alternative use. Temporary de-stocking, or spelling, is allowed under this Act to facilitate recovery of severely degraded land. Section 108 of the *Land Administration Act 1997* states that “the lessee must use methods of best pastoral and environmental practice, appropriate to the area where the land is situated, for the management of stock and the management, conservation and regeneration of pasture for grazing”. There is, therefore, considerable scope to adjust stocking regimes in accordance with more long-term sustainability objectives. A pertinent example of how mining companies may strive to improve conservation values of their pastoral leases, whilst maintaining conservative pastoralism, is Mt Weld station which is working to a sustainability and biodiversity management plan (James *et al.* 2001).

In 2011, an amendment to the *Land Administration Act 1997* to allow for different types of pastoral lease, including a ‘rangeland lease’ which permits a greater diversity of uses, such as conservation, tourism and indigenous uses, was proposed as part of the Rangeland Reform Process in Western Australia (RDL 2011). Such an amendment, if passed, will allow Non-government conservation organisations, mining companies and other owners more scope to adjust stocking and generally manage land in line with their chosen objectives and ethos. In Western Australia, changing patterns of rangeland holders, in combination with changes in socio-economic conditions both locally and more broadly, are driving changes to land tenure arrangements and legislation, and can be seen as important steps in the shift from production-only livestock systems to that of multiple values and land uses (Hughes and Jones 2010). This multi-functional transition has been reported in rangelands elsewhere in Australia (Holmes 2002, 2010) and other affluent countries (Huntsinger *et al.* 2010).

Although the WADEC aimed in part to disperse their purchases of pastoral leases under the Gascoyne-Murchison Strategy to improve representation and coverage of poorly reserved ecosystem/vegetation types (Brandis 2008), the more random and opportunistic nature of the availability of pastoral leases for sale, as well as the concentration of pastoral leases held by mining companies in the main mining belts, means that large contiguous areas of these non-private pastoral leases now occur (DAWA 2002; Fig. 1). Nine such areas have been identified and many of these have adjoining or intervening formal conservation reserves further expanding the area of land no longer managed for traditional pastoralism (numbers cross-reference to Fig. 1): 1) Hamersley Ranges and Upper Fortescue Valley; 2) West Pilbara: Onslow - Pannawonica-Karratha; 3) Meekatharra – Kumarina; 4) Sandstone – Lake Mason; 5) Northern Goldfields: Leinster to Wiluna; 6) Northern Goldfields: Laverton to Lenora;

7) North of Perenjori to Koolyanobbing; 8) Northern Geraldton Sandplains to Shark Bay; and 9) Southern Goldfields - Kalgoorlie area.

The unevenness in the spatial distribution of pastoral lease holders is evident when comparing bio-region to catchment statistics: e.g. some 72 % of the Murchison River and Gascoyne River catchments are covered in private pastoral leases, whereas the broader Murchison and Gascoyne IBRA regions have 60 – 63 % of the land surface covered in such leases (Table 2; Fig. 1). Such discrepancies reflect the large number of pastoral leases held by mining companies in areas of active mining to the east of these catchments where drainage occurs to the inland of the continent, but also may reflect greater profitability of pastoralism towards the west, which translates into fewer properties being available for purchase, especially along the floodplains of the major river systems. There are relatively few areas set aside for conservation or not under pastoral management along the major river floodplains, such as the Murchison and Gascoyne Rivers, where degradation is widespread and often severe (Wilcox and McKinnon 1974; Curry *et al.* 1994; Pringle *et al.* 2006). This has important implications for broad-scale land management and restoration, which are explored below.

Management of rangelands at landscape to regional scales

Through the relatively new disciplines of landscape ecology and ecosystem management, there is now a greater appreciation of ecological processes and other ecological phenomena operating over broad spatial scales (Christensen *et al.* 1996; Lindenmeyer *et al.* 2008; Stafford Smith and McAllister 2008). Some examples of such processes relevant to rangelands of the study area are summarised in Table 3. Although individual pastoral leases in Western Australia typically cover >100 000 ha,

the subdued topography, ancient and well-sorted soils and landforms, and the sparse nature of the vegetation, mean many of these processes need to be managed over a number of contiguous leases.

A prime example of a broad-scale process operating in arid rangelands is surface water flow and subsequent redistribution of alluvial soil and other resources (Pringle and Tinley, 2003). Typically this process has been monitored and managed at within-landscape scales through the quantification and, where necessary, restoration of vegetation patch to inter-patch soil fluxes (Tongway and Ludwig 2010). However, much remedial action directed locally is likely to be of short-term benefit if base levels downslope have been incised and thereby lowered due to erosion within watercourses which may follow overgrazing, for instance. Incision causes faster, more confined flows which results in further gullying and lateral erosion, and increased sedimentation downstream, as well as increasing and expanding desiccation upstream (Pringle and Tinley, 2003; Pringle *et al.* 2006). Thus a sequential process of land degradation can be set in place, gradually moving to upper parts of the catchment (Pringle and Tinley 2003). In other words, dysfunction at the catchment scale may take precedence over that at local and landscape scales and, furthermore, management actions may have impacts considerable distance away, both upstream and downstream. This suggests that leaseholders must co-operate at the broad scales of catchments or sub-catchments to be effective in restoration.

Another key process operating at broader spatial scales is the movement of fauna, particularly emus and kangaroos. Many of these are nomadic or semi-nomadic and may move over large distances as they seek food resources generally available following large episodic rain events (Davies 1984); some fences, e.g. barrier fences, and other structures can impede such movements resulting in increased grazing and

trampling impacts where animals accumulate. Such vertebrates are also dispersers of seed over long distances thus facilitating regional gene flow (Calvino-Cancela *et al.* 2006, 2007). Similarly, control of exotic vertebrates, such as foxes, wild dogs and goats, is likely to be more effective when practiced at a regional scale compared to lease or paddock scale.

Fire is another key ecological factor operating at broader spatial scales (Table 3). Most rangelands within the study area can potentially experience fire although mostly only following abundant rain and/or sustained low grazing pressures (Nano *et al.* 2012). Vegetation types, dominating around the margins of the study area, e.g. shrublands on sandplains and hummock grasslands, however, tend to experience widespread wildfires which may burn unchecked for days or even weeks, often crossing lease and land tenure boundaries. Such wildfires homogenise landscapes in terms of fuel age and habitat characteristics (Burrows *et al.* 2006). Management strategies to deal with such large fires include improving suppression capabilities and/or introducing a patch burning scheme to lower fuel levels and create landscape-scale mosaics of different burn ages; both approaches require co-operation across properties/leases given the expanses of land involved (Legge *et al.* 2011).

The establishment of conservation reserves on pastoral leases as part of the Gascoyne-Murchison Strategy increased the proportion of vegetation associations represented in reserves from ~ 29 % to ~ 58 %, and the proportion well represented in reserves (those with > 10 % of their spatial extent in reserves) from ~ 7 % to about a third (Brandis 2008). Therefore despite the planned nature of lease acquisitions under the Gascoyne-Murchison Strategy, many vegetation associations are not represented in reserves, which is not unexpected given that many have restricted distributions (<50 000 ha). Nor could they be expected to protect the majority of species given high

spatial turnover of species within some ecosystems (Gove *et al.* 2008; Gibson *et al.* 2011). The responsibility for stewardship for many of these unreserved and poorly-reserved vegetation types and species, therefore, falls to leaseholders and emphasises the need for off-reserve conservation strategies.

Co-operative rangeland management across pastoral leases

It has been argued that co-ordination and co-operation across adjoining pastoral leases is required to effectively manage certain ecological and threatening/degradation processes. Impairment of certain processes is resulting in catchment-scale dysfunction and requires a joint approach over whole catchments or sub-catchments as appropriate (Pringle and Tinley 2003). Although the need to manage such processes across broad spatial scales is not new, this need is not always recognised by agencies with responsibilities for rangeland management. The shift towards multiple ownership types and land use in the study area presents both additional challenges and opportunities to fulfil such management objectives (Hughes and Jones 2010). Achieving integrated, community-driven catchment management can be difficult in any region but there is now a huge amount of experience gained from broad-acre agricultural regions (Curtis and Lockwood 2000). Additional obstacles which need to be overcome to achieve effective co-operation in rangeland areas include financial constraints faced by many leaseholders, as well as the large distances between pastoral stations and their remoteness from relevant management and administrative agencies; having a greater range of organisations with direct responsibility or interest in rangeland management may actually hinder such co-operation through increased bureaucracy and discouragement of local initiatives (Hughes and Jones 2010). In terms of opportunities, having a greater range of values and management objectives,

including conservation, may foster and promote greater focus and acceptance on broad-scale restoration and land stewardship objectives more broadly (Kreuter *et al.* 2006). Furthermore, the rise in new, non-private leaseholders and land managers, such as mining companies and conservation organisations, may help initiate and facilitate cross-lease co-operation, and help fund management actions as required. This is already happening locally in some rangeland areas where neighbours are building on existing working relationships to improve communication and better manage threatening processes such as fire and feral animals. A good example is from the southern Yalgoo area where managers of contiguous leases/land (Bush Heritage Australia, Australian Wildlife Conservancy, WADEC, Ninghan Indigenous Protected Area, pastoralists and mining companies) are working towards forming an association with some initial funding coming from the mining sector. The message emerging here is that it may be more productive to let such collectives evolve through local contacts rather than forcing co-operation via remote government bureaucracies.

A major focus of co-operation between neighbouring lessees and managers revolves around managing boundary issues, especially where land managed for conservation abuts that managed principally for livestock production (Brandis 2006, 2008). Boundary issues include movement of unwanted animals (livestock straying into conservation areas and kangaroos moving into pastoral leases), maintaining fences, weed invasion, fire movement, gate closure and access controls. The WADEC has a “Good Neighbour Policy” which establishes responsibilities in such circumstances (WADEC, 2007). Dramatic shifts in land ownership in rural areas often leads to problems particularly where management objectives and ethos of new owners differ from the status quo, and especially where such changes are perceived to be imposed by government (Holmes 2006). There appears to be growing concern

412 amongst private pastoral leaseholders within parts of the study area over the lack of
413 committed resources and on-ground managers on newly acquired leases, as well as
414 increasing conflict between neighbouring lease-holders over different and sometimes
415 opposing land management practices (Hughes and Jones 2010; Economics and
416 Industry Standing Committee 2010). This has developed despite considerable public
417 consultation during the lease purchase phase by the WADEC (Brandis 2008) and
418 suggests that achieving effective working relationships between landowners and
419 general acceptance of land use/tenure changes amongst local communities is not
420 straight-forward and requires a sustained effort in terms of resources and time.
421 Additionally it suggests that top-down approaches are less likely to be successful over
422 the longer term than bottom-up, community-driven change (Hughes and Jones 2010).
423 Despite these difficulties, it is expected that government agencies will still have an
424 important role in initiating and facilitating co-operative approaches over broad spatial
425 scales involving many leases. A prime example of where this has worked in the study
426 area is the Ecosystem Management Understanding Project, initially an element of the
427 Gascoyne-Murchison Strategy and largely funded by the National Heritage Trust and
428 co-ordinated by WADEC and Department of Agriculture for Western Australia. This
429 programme involved the employment of landscape ecologists with local rangeland
430 knowledge as facilitators to help landholders prepare Environmental Management
431 Systems for their leases, as well as fostering an ecological sustainable land
432 management ethos in which catchment-level processes and management were
433 considered integral to achieving sustainable production outcomes. Lessees from some
434 77 properties within the study area (including 10 WADEC-acquired leases) took part
435 in the Ecosystem Management Understanding Project between 2000 and 2004
436 (Pringle *et al.* 2003). The project was popular with pastoralists and was highly

successful, especially in terms of establishing working relationships between pastoralists, industry, indigenous groups and the ecologists involved. It has since been run in similar form in other parts of Australia (Walton and Pringle 2010).

Conclusions

New landholders, particularly mining companies, but also conservation agencies and aboriginal groups, are now, either directly or indirectly, managers of large expanses of current or former pastoral leases across the rangelands of arid and semi-arid Western Australia. The combined area of their leases, some 8.6 m ha, is some 20 % of the total area of the central rangelands of Western Australia, and in some regions they are the majority landholder with contiguous expanses of non-private leases linking with formal conservation reserves. As mining companies and conservation agencies, both private and government, are not dependent on earning a living from their leases, they may be in a better position to not only deploy ecologically sustainable pastoral practices and restoration on their own leases but also facilitate, fund and contribute to broader-scale management and nature conservation initiatives which cross lease and other land tenure boundaries.

Acknowledgements

Tony Brandis, David Goodall and Hugh Pringle are thanked for comments on earlier versions of this paper and general advice. DAFWA and other agencies mentioned in Table 1 are thanked for supplying GIS data. Karel Eringa and two anonymous reviewers are thanked for providing constructive criticisms which greatly improved the paper.

References

- Bertuch, M., and van Etten, E. J. (2004). Mulga deaths adjacent to haul roads in the eastern Goldfields. *In*: 'Living in the Outback: conference papers of the Australian Rangeland Society Biennial Conference, Alice Springs, July 2004.' (Eds G. N. Bastin, D. Walsh and S. Nicolson.), pp. 245-251. (Australian Rangeland Society: Adelaide.)
- Brandis, T. (2006). Managing protected areas in the rangelands: new neighbours – new challenges. *Range Management Newsletter* **6**, 1-3.
- Brandis, A. J. (2008). 'Rescuing the rangelands: management strategies for restoration and conservation of the natural heritage of the Western Australian rangelands after 150 years of pastoralism.' (Western Australian Department of Environment and Conservation: Perth.)
- Burnside, D. G. (1979). The pastoral industry of the North-West, Kimberley and Goldfields. *In*: 'Agriculture in Western Australia. 150 years of Development and Achievement 1829-1979'. (Ed. G.H. Burvill), pp. 249-262. (University of Western Australia Press: Perth.)
- Burrows, N. D., Burbidge, A. A., Fuller, P. J., and Behn, G. (2006). Evidence of altered fire regimes in the Western Desert region of Australia. *Conservation Science Western Australia* **5**, 272–284.
- Calvino-Cancela, M., Dunn, R. R., van Etten, E. J .B., and Lamont, B. B. (2006). Emus as non-standard seed dispersers and their potential for long-distance dispersal. *Ecography* **19**, 1-9.
- Calvino-Cancela, M., He, T., and Lamont, B. B (2007). Distribution of myrmecochorous species over the landscape and their potential long-distance dispersal by emus and kangaroos. *Diversity and Distributions* **14**, 11-17.

488

489 Cheal, D. (2009). Twenty years of grazing reduction in semi-arid woodlands. *Pacific*
490 *Conservation Biology* **15**, 268–277.

491

492 Christensen, N. L., Bartuska, A. M., Brown, J. H., Carpenter, S., D'Antonio, C., Francis, R.,
493 Franklin, J. F., MacMahon, J. A., Noss, R. F., Parsons, D. J., Peterson, C. H., Turner, M. G.,
494 and Woodmansee, R. G. (1996). The report of the Ecological Society of America Committee
495 on the scientific basis for ecosystem management. *Ecological Applications* **6**, 665–691.

496

497 Curry, P. J., Payne, A. L., Leighton, K. A., Hennig, P., and Blood, D. A. (1994). 'An
498 inventory and condition survey of the Murchison River catchment and surrounds, Western
499 Australia.' Technical Bulletin No. 84. (Department of Agriculture, Western Australia: South
500 Perth.)

501

502 Curtis, A., and Lockwood, M. (2000). Landcare and catchment management in Australia:
503 lessons for state-sponsored community participation. *Society and Natural Resources* **13**, 61–
504 73.

505

506 Davies, S. J. J. F. (1984). Nomadism in response to desert conditions in Australia. *Journal of*
507 *Arid Environments* **7**, 183–193.

508

509 DAWA (2002). 'Rangeways: community-based planning for ecologically sustainable land use
510 in the Western Australian Goldfields.' Miscellaneous Publication 9/2002. (Department of
511 Agriculture, Western Australia: South Perth.)

512

513 Economics and Industry Standing Committee (2010). 'The Department of Environment and
514 Conservation's management of former pastoral leases'. Economics and Industry Standing
515 Committee Report No. 4. (Legislative Assembly, Parliament of Western Australia: Perth.)

516

517 EPA (2004). 'Environmental protection and ecological sustainability of the rangelands in
518 Western Australia.' Position Statement No. 5. (Environmental Protection Authority, Western
519 Australia: Perth.)

520

521 Eringa, K. P. and Wittber, N. C. (2010). Beyond Black Stumps: fostering improved ecological
522 and economic outcomes on Aboriginal held pastoral stations. In: 'Proceedings of the 16th
523 Biennial Conference of the Australian Rangeland Society, Bourke'. (Eds D.J. Eldridge and C.
524 Waters) (Australian Rangeland Society: Perth).

525

526 Gibson, N., Meissner, R., Markey, A. S., and Thompson, W. A. (2011). Patterns of plant
527 diversity in ironstone ranges in arid south-western Australia. *Journal of Arid Environments*
528 **77**, 25-31.

529

530 Gove, A. D., Dunn, R. R., and Majer, J. D. (2008). The importance of species range attributes
531 and reserve configuration for the conservation of angiosperm diversity in Western Australia.
532 *Biodiversity and Conservation* **17**, 817-831.

533

534 Grice, A. C. (2006). The impacts of invasive plant species on the biodiversity of Australian
535 rangelands. *The Rangeland Journal* **28**, 27-35.

536

537 Holmes, J. (1997). Diversity and change in Australian rangeland regions: translating resource
538 values into regional benefits. *The Rangeland Journal* **19**, 3-25.

539

540 Holmes, J. (2002). Diversity and change in Australia's rangelands: a post-productivist
541 transition with a difference? *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* **27**, 362-384.

542

- Holmes, J. (2006). Impulses towards a multi-functional transition in rural Australia: gaps in the research agenda. *Journal of Rural Studies* **22**, 142–160.
- Holmes, J. (2010). The multifunctional transition in Australia's tropical savannas: the emergence of consumption, protection and indigenous values. *Geographical Research* **48**, 265–280.
- Homewood, K., and Thompson, D. M. (2010) Social and economic challenges for conservation in East African rangelands: land use, livelihoods and wildlife change in Maasailand. In: 'Wild rangelands: conserving wildlife while maintaining livestock in semi-arid ecosystems.' (Eds J. T. du Toit, R. Kock and J. C. Deutsch.), pp. 340-366. (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd: Chichester, UK.)
- Homewood, K., Lambin, E. F., Coast, E., Kariuki, A., Kikula, I., Kivelia, J., Said, M., Serneels, S., and Thompson, M. (2001). Long-term changes in Serengeti-Mara wildebeest and land cover: pastoralism, population, or policies? *PNAS* **98**, 12544-12549
- Hughes, M. and Jones, R. (2010). From productivism to multi-functionality in the Gascoyne–Murchison rangelands of Western Australia. *The Rangeland Journal* **32**, 175–185.
- Huntsinger, L., Johnson, M., Stafford, M., and Fried, J. (2010). Hardwood rangeland landowners in California from 1985 to 2004: production, ecosystem services, and permanence. *Rangeland Ecology and Management* **63**, 324-334.
- James, C. D., True, D., Lamont, R., and Longworth, J. (2001). 'A biodiversity conservation plan for Mt Weld station'. (Placer Granny Smith: Perth.)

571 Kennedy, M., Phillips, B. L., Legge, S., Murphy, S. A., and Faulkner, R. A. (2012). Do
 572 dingoes suppress the activity of feral cats in northern Australia? *Austral Ecology* **37**, 134–139.
 573
 574 Kreuter, U. P., Nair, M. V., Jackson-Smith, D., Conner, J. R., and Johnston, J. E. (2006).
 575 Property rights orientations and rangeland management objectives: Texas, Utah, and
 576 Colorado. *Rangeland Ecology & Management* **59**, 632-639.
 577
 578 Landsberg, J., James, C. D., Morton, S. R., Hobbs, T. J., Stol, J., Drew, A., and Tongway, D.
 579 J. (1997). ‘The effects of artificial sources of water on rangeland biodiversity’. (Environment
 580 Australia and CSIRO: Canberra.)
 581
 582 Letnic, M. (2007). The impacts of pastoralism on the fauna of arid Australia. *In*: ‘Animals of
 583 arid Australia: out on their own?’ (Eds C. Dickman, D. Lunney and S. Burgin), pp. 65-75.
 584 (Royal Zoological Society of New South Wales: Mosman, New South Wales)
 585
 586 Legge, S., Murphy, S., Kingswood, R., Maher, B., and Swan, D. (2011). EcoFire: restoring
 587 the biodiversity values of the Kimberley region by managing fire. *Ecological Management
 588 and Restoration* **12**, 84–92.
 589
 590 Lindenmayer, D., Hobbs, R.J., Montague-Drake, R., Alexandra, J., Bennett, A., Burgman, M.,
 591 Cale, P., Calhoun, A., Cramer, V., Cullen, P., Driscoll, D., Fahrig, L., Fischer, J., Franklin, J.,
 592 Haila, Y., Hunter, M., Gibbons, P., Lake, S., Luck, G., MacGregor, C., McIntyre, S., Mac
 593 Nally, R. , Manning, A., Miller, J., Mooney, H., Noss, R., Possingham, H., Saunders, D.,
 594 Schmiegelow, F., Scott, M., Simberloff, D., Sisk, T., Tabor, G., Walker, B., Wiens, J.,
 595 Woinarski, J., and Zavaleta, E. (2008). A checklist for ecological management of landscapes
 596 for conservation. *Ecology Letters* **11**, 78-91.
 597

598 Ludwig, J.A., Tongway, D.A., Freudenberger, D.O., Noble, J.C., and Hodgkinson, K.C.
 599 (Eds.) (1997). 'Landscape ecology, function and management: principles from Australia's
 600 rangelands.' (CSIRO: Melbourne.)
 601
 602 Nano, C. E. M., Clarke, P. J., and Pavey, C. R. (2012). Fire regimes in arid hummock
 603 grasslands and *Acacia* shrublands. *In*: 'Flammable Australia: fire regimes, biodiversity and
 604 ecosystems in a changing world'. (Eds R. A. Bradstock, A. M. Gill and R. J. Williams),
 605 pp.195-214. (CSIRO Publishing: Melbourne.)
 606
 607 Parsons, B. C., and Gosper, C. R. (2011). Contemporary fire regimes in a fragmented and an
 608 unfragmented landscape: implications for vegetation structure and persistence of the fire-
 609 sensitive mallee fowl. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* **20**, 184–194.
 610
 611 Pearson, M., and Lennon, J. (2010). 'Pastoral Australia: fortunes, failure and hard yakka: a
 612 historical overview 1788-1967'. (CSIRO: Melbourne).
 613
 614 Pringle, H. J. R., and Tinley, K. L. (2003). Are we overlooking critical geomorphic
 615 determinants of landscape change in Australian rangelands? *Ecological Management and*
 616 *Restoration* **4**, 180-186.
 617
 618 Pringle, H. J. R., Watson, I. W., and Tinley, K. L. (2006). Landscape improvement, or
 619 ongoing degradation – reconciling apparent contradictions from the arid rangelands of
 620 Western Australia. *Landscape Ecology* **21**, 1267-1279.
 621
 622 Pringle, H. J. R., Tinley K. L., Brandis T., Hopkins A. J. M., Lewis M., and Taylor L. (2003).
 623 The Gascoyne-Murchison strategy: a people-centred approach to conservation in arid
 624 Australia. *In*: 'Rangelands in the new millennium: Proceedings of the Seventh International
 625 Rangelands Congress.' (Eds N. Allsop, A. R. Palmer, S. J. Milton, K. P. Kirkman, G. I. H.

626 Kerley, C. R. Hurt and C. J. Brown.), pp. 213–223. (Document Transformation Technologies:
627 Durban, South Africa.)
628
629 RDL (2011). ‘Rangeland tenure option discussion paper, April 2011’. (Department of
630 Regional Lands and Development, Government of Western Australia: Perth.)
631
632 Stafford Smith, M., and McAllister, R. R. J. (2008). Managing arid zone natural resources in
633 Australia for spatial and temporal variability – an approach from first principles. *The*
634 *Rangeland Journal* **30**, 15–27.
635
636 Stafford Smith, D. M., McKeon, G. M., Watson, I. W., Henry, B. K., Stone, G. S., Hall, W.
637 B., and Howden, S. M. (2007). Learning from episodes of degradation and recovery in
638 variable Australian rangelands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **104**, 20690
639 - 20695.
640
641 Thackway R., and Cresswell I. D. (1997). A bio-regional framework for planning the national
642 system of protected areas in Australia. *Natural Areas Journal* **17**, 241-247.
643
644 Tongway, D. J., and Ludwig, J. A. (2010). ‘Restoring disturbed landscapes: putting principles
645 intoPractice’. (Island Press: Washington DC.)
646
647 Vetter, S., Goqwana, W. M., Bond, W. J. , and Trollope, W. W. (2006). Effects of land
648 tenure, geology and topography on vegetation and soils of two grassland types in South
649 Africa. *African Journal of Range and Forage Science* **23**, 13-27.
650
651 WADEC (2007). ‘Good Neighbour Policy.’ (Western Australian Department of Environment
652 and Conservation: Perth).
653

654 Walton, J., and Pringle, H. J. R. (2010). The Ecosystem Management Understanding (EMU)
 655 pilot project - building landscape literacy using local knowledge to improve rangeland health
 656 in the Neales River Catchment of South Australia. In: 'Proceedings of the 16th Biennial
 657 Conference of the Australian Rangeland Society, Bourke' (Eds D.J. Eldridge and C. Waters).
 658 (Australian Rangeland Society: Perth).
 659
 660 Watson, I. W., Thomas, P. W. E., and Fletcher, W. J. (2007). The first assessment, using a
 661 rangeland monitoring system, of change in shrub and tree populations across the arid
 662 shrublands of Western Australia. *The Rangeland Journal* **29**, 25–37.
 663
 664 Wilcox, D. G. and McKinnon, E. A. (1972). 'A Report on the Condition of the Gascoyne
 665 Catchment.' (Department of Lands and Surveys: Perth, Western Australia.)
 666
 667 Williams, A., Wang, M., and Zhang, M.A. (2009). Land tenure arrangements, property rights
 668 and institutional arrangements in the cycle of rangeland degradation and recovery. *In*:
 669 Rangeland degradation and recovery in China's pastoral lands (Eds V.R. Squires, L. Xinshi
 670 and L. Qu), pp. 219-234. (CABI: Wallingford UK).
 671

672

673 **Table 1. Geographic Information System (GIS) coverages used in this study,**
 674 **together with source of information and date of last update.**

675

GIS Coverage	Custodian	Last Revised
National Land and Water Resources Audit of Australian rangelands (1955 to 2000)	Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics	28-9-2005
Pastoral lease boundaries for Western Australia with ownership categories	Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia	30-11-2008
Interim biogeographic regionalisation for Australia, Version 6.1	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities	20-12-2004
Nested catchments data for the Australian continent - minimum area threshold 500 km ²	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities	10-1-2004

676

677

678 **Table 2. Percentage of total land area for different types of land tenure and pastoral lease holders in the central rangelands of Western Australia as of 2008.** % of
679 total current and former pastoral lease area are in parentheses. Catchment and interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) regions are defined and spatially
680 delineated as per Table 1.

Region	Pastoral Lease			Ex-Pastoral Lease	Other Tenure		
	Private	Mining	Aboriginal	WADEC *	Conservation Reserve [@]	UCL	Freehold & Other [#]
Catchment							
Murchison	71.6 (81.2)	4.2 (4.8)	8.8 (10.0)	3.5 (4.0)	2.7	3.5	5.7
Fortescue	31.4 (51.0)	27.2 (44.1)	3.0 (4.9)	0	6.2	21.8	10.3
Ashburton	52.1 (80.2)	8.1 (12.4)	4.2 (6.4)	0.6 (1.0)	8.5	24.5	1.8
Gascoyne	71.3 (77.3)	6.7 (7.3)	4.5 (4.9)	9.7 (10.6)	1.8	2.1	3.7
IBRA Region							
Carnarvon	76.7 (86.6)	0.3 (0.3)	5.0 (5.7)	6.6 (7.4)	3.9	6.3	0.9
Coolgardie	14.9 (61.8)	5.9 (24.4)	0	3.4 (13.8)	26.5	46.0	3.4
Gascoyne	61.2 (77.5)	4.2 (5.3)	5.6 (7.1)	8.0 (10.1)	2.5	16.8	1.5
Murchison	60.0 (69.1)	15.3 (17.6)	4.9 (5.6)	6.7 (7.8)	1.7	10.4	0.8
Pilbara	40.7 (63.3)	12.6 (19.7)	7.8 (12.1)	3.2 (4.9)	6.1	23.8	5.9
Yalgoo	48.2 (63.4)	5.3 (6.9)	3.9 (5.1)	18.7 (24.6)	8.3	11.9	3.6
Total Central W.A. Rangelands	51.2 (71.7)	9.2 (12.9)	4.9 (6.8)	6.2 (8.6)	5.3	20.4	2.9

681 [@]Conservation Reserve here refers only to formal or gazetted reserves. [#]Other land tenure include water reserves, road reserves, indigenous tenure (not including pastoral
682 leases) and reserves for special purposes. *This category refers to recently purchased pastoral leases by the WADEC for conservation which are in process of being converted
683 to formal conservation reserves via temporary reversion to Unallocated Crown Land.
684
685

Table 3. Examples of ecological processes and phenomena operating at landscape to regional spatial scales which may require co-operation amongst neighbouring pastoral leaseholders and other land managers to effectively manage, together with examples of management issues and relevant case studies from the Western Australian rangelands.

Ecosystem Process	Western Australian rangelands examples	Case study reference(s)
<u>Energy and Material Flows</u>		
Erosion-deposition patterns and processes	Incisions causing lowering of base levels and upstream desiccation and erosion	Pringle and Tinley (2003); Pringle <i>et al.</i> (2006)
Water and nutrient flows	Disruption of sheet (surface) flow by roads and railways	Bertuch and van Etten (2004)
<u>Biotic movement and gene flow</u>		
Seed and pollen dispersal	a) Long distance seed dispersal by emus and other fauna b) Weed colonisation	Calvino-Cancela <i>et al.</i> (2006, 2007) Grice (2006)
Movement of larger vertebrates	a) Barriers to seasonal migration of macropods and emus; b) Effective feral animal control, e.g. goats, wild dogs; c) Distribution of watering points	Davies (1984) Letnic (2007) Kennedy <i>et al.</i> (2012)
<u>Landscape heterogeneity and connectivity</u>		
Home range area	Adequate habitat for conservation of top order predators, such as birds of prey and (perhaps) dingo	Letnic (2007) Kennedy <i>et al.</i> (2012)
Patch mosaics of preferred habitats, including refuge areas	a) Fire management to create replicated post-fire seral stages; b) Species which may require long unburnt patches (e.g. mallee fowl) c) Maintenance of refuge areas for species to survive extremes (e.g. drought)	Burrows <i>et al.</i> (2006); Parsons and Gosper (2011)
Corridors to facilitate movement between habitat patches	Healthy, well-vegetated riparian and floodplain zones	Stafford Smith and McAllister (2008)
Species turnover (between and within communities)	Reservation and off-reserve strategies to protect biodiversity and communities	Brandis (2008); Gibson <i>et al.</i> (2011)
<u>Fire regimes</u>		
Wildfire spread and behaviour	a) Wildfires burning across properties due to lack of resources to control wildfires b) Prescribed fire to control fuel build up over whole landscapes	Burrows <i>et al.</i> (2006) Nano <i>et al.</i> (2012)

Fig. 1. Map showing ownership type of current and recently relinquished pastoral leases in central Western Australian rangelands (study area comprising 6 interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) regions and major catchment boundaries are indicated). Leases shown here are active pastoral leases as of 2008 as well as recently relinquished leases purchased by government for conservation between 1998 and 2008 (shown as WADEC). Numbers 1 to 9 cross-reference to text.

Fig. 2. Temporal trends in area of major land tenure types of central W.A. rangelands (6 interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia regions: Pilbara, Gascoyne, Murchison, Carnavon, Coolgardie & Yalgoo) from 1955 to 2008. (*Indigenous pastoral lease and non-indigenous pastoral lease are the same tenure but have been sub-divided to show the proportion of leases that come under indigenous administration. Indigenous pastoral leases do not include aboriginal land administered or owned by Aboriginal land trusts, land councils or Aboriginal local governments.) Unallocated Crown Land (UCL) here does not include temporary reversions of WADEC-purchased pastoral leases.

714
715

a)

716
717
718

b)

719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729

Fig. 3. Types of holders of pastoral leases within study area as of 2008 by: a) area in km²; and b) number of leases (including part leases). Note: WADEC are pastoral leases recently purchased by the Western Australian Dept of Environment and Conservation and have been reverted to Unallocated Crown Land as an interim measure before conversion to conservation tenure at a later date.