



Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 6029/1
Permit type: Purpose Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Dragon Energy Limited

1.3. Property details

Property: Mining Lease 47/1471
Local Government Area: Shire of Ashburton
Colloquial name: Rocklea Iron Ore Project

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
153		Mechanical Removal	Mineral Production

1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Grant
Decision Date: 1 May 2014

2. Site Information

2.1. Existing environment and information

2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

Vegetation Description Beard vegetation associations have been mapped over the whole of Western Australia and are useful to look at vegetation in a regional context. Two Beard vegetation associations have been mapped over the application area (GIS Database):

162: Shrublands; snakewood scrub; and

567: Hummock grasslands, shrub steppe; mulga & kanji over soft spinifex & *Triodia basedowii*.

A level 2 flora and vegetation survey was undertaken by Dinglebird Environmental from 26 September to 5 October 2011. The following six vegetation units were identified within the application area (Dinglebird Environmental, 2012; Phoenix Environmental Sciences (Phoenix), 2014):

1. **Aa.Apr.Epo.Te:** *Acacia aptaneura* and *A. pruinocarpa* Open Low Woodland over *Acacia* spp. and *Eremophila phyllopoda* subsp. *obliqua* Shrubland to Open Shrubland over *Triodia epactia* Hummock Grassland;

2. **El.Aan.Te:** Scattered *Eucalyptus leucophloia* over *Acacia ancistrocarpa* Open Shrubland over *Triodia epactia* Hummock grassland on stony hilltops, and *Acacia aptaneura* and other *Acacia* spp. over *Triodia* spp. Hummock Grassland on slopes;

3. **El.Ap.Ta:** Scattered *Eucalyptus leucophloia* over patches of *Acacia pruinocarpa* over *Triodia angusta* greater than *T. wiseana* Closed Hummock Grassland;

4. **Aap.Ax.Epo.Sgch.Tb:** *Acacia aptaneura* Low Open Woodland on upper gentle stony slopes and *Acacia xiphophylla* on lower stony slopes over *Eremophila phyllopoda* subsp. *obliqua* and *Senna glutinosa* subsp. *chatelainiana* Low Open Shrubland over *Triodia brizoides* Hummock Grassland with patches of *Sporobolus australasicus* Tussock Grassland;

5. **Ch.Ta:** Scattered to Low Open Woodland of *Corymbia hamersleyana* over *Acacia* spp., *Eremophila* spp. and *Senna* spp. Open Shrubland over *Triodia angusta* Hummock Grassland; and

6. **Ax.Av.Aap.Tw.Ta:** *Acacia xiphophylla* and *A. victoria* Tall Shrubland to Tall Open Shrubland, with *A. aptaneura* in drainage lines, over *Eremophila* spp. and *Senna* spp. over mixed low shrubs over annual grasses and *Triodia wiseana* and/or *T. angusta* Hummock Grassland.

Clearing Description Rocklea Iron Ore Project.
Dragon Energy Limited proposes to clear up to 153 hectares of native vegetation within a boundary of approximately 153 hectares for the purpose of mineral production. The project is located approximately 32 kilometres south-west of Tom Price within the Shire of Ashburton.

Vegetation Condition Excellent: Vegetation structure intact; disturbance affecting individual species, weeds non-aggressive (Keighery, 1994);

to

Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery, 1994).

Comment

The vegetation condition was derived from a report prepared by Dinglebird Environmental (2012).

The project includes the construction of three pits, two waste dumps, a run of mine pad, a camp and access roads.

3. Assessment of application against clearing principles

(a) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises a high level of biological diversity.

Comments

Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

A flora and vegetation survey identified six different vegetation units within the application area (Phoenix, 2014). These vegetation units are well represented throughout the local area. The condition of the vegetation ranged from Excellent to Degraded, with the majority of the vegetation in Very Good to Excellent condition (Phoenix, 2014). None of the vegetation associations recorded were identified as a Threatened or Priority Ecological Community (Dinglebird Environmental, 2012).

The flora survey (which also covered areas outside the application area) recorded a total of 203 flora taxa from 101 genera and 41 families (Dinglebird Environmental, 2012). A population of 34 individuals of the Priority 4 flora species *Ptilotus trichocephalus* was recorded 50 metres outside the application area (Dinglebird, 2012). Whilst this species was not recorded within the application area, suitable habitat exists and other populations may be present. According to Florabase, there are 18 records of this species at the Western Australian Herbarium from locations across the Gascoyne and Pilbara bioregions (Western Australian Herbarium, 2014). There were nine species of weed recorded within the greater survey area (Dinglebird Environmental, 2012). Potential impacts to biodiversity as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a weed management condition.

A level 2 fauna survey that covered the application and surrounding areas recorded a total of 117 vertebrate fauna species comprising of 18 mammal, 68 bird and 31 reptile species (Phoenix, 2011). A short range endemic survey of the same area recorded 40 different taxa from 19 families and least 22 genera (Phoenix, 2012). The areas of the greatest diversity for fauna species were riparian habitats associated with the Hardey River (Phoenix, 2011; 2012). This habitat is outside of the application area. The habitats within the application are not likely to support a higher level of faunal diversity than surrounding areas.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology

Dinglebird Environmental (2012)
Phoenix (2011)
Phoenix (2012)
Phoenix (2014)
Western Australian Herbarium (2014)

(b) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the maintenance of, a significant habitat for fauna indigenous to Western Australia.

Comments

Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

A level 2 vertebrate fauna survey that included the application area was undertaken by Phoenix in September 2011. This survey identified the following four habitats within the application area (Phoenix, 2011):

- Grass plain;
- Non-riparian mulga woodland;
- Grassland on rocky slope; and
- Minor drainage line.

These habitats are all well represented in the local area (Phoenix, 2011). The minor drainage line habitat was observed to be impacted by cattle grazing (Phoenix, 2014). Due to the impacts on the understorey, this habitat recorded lower numbers of ground dwelling mammals and reptile species than the other habitats (Phoenix, 2011).

Several fauna species of conservation significance may be found within the application area. There were two inactive mounds of the Western Pebble-mound Mouse (*Pseudomys chapmani* – Priority 4) found within the non-riparian mulga woodland habitat (Phoenix, 2011). A number of other inactive mounds were recorded during the fauna survey outside the application area (Phoenix, 2011). Vegetation growth around the mounds suggests that they may be quite old. Areas of ranges to the west of the application area are more likely to support an active population of Western Pebble-mound Mice (Phoenix, 2011). The proposed clearing is not likely to have a significant impact on habitat for this species.

The Pilbara Olive Python (*Liasis olivaceus* subsp. *barroni* – Schedule 1; Vulnerable), Australian Bustard (*Ardeotis australis* – Priority 4) and the Rainbow Bee-eater (*Merops ornatus* – Migratory) were all recorded during the fauna survey outside the application area (Phoenix, 2014). All of these records were from within

riparian habitats associated with the Hardey River. Whilst these species are likely to utilise and pass through the application area, the application area is not likely to represent significant habitat for these species.

A short range endemic (SRE) invertebrate fauna survey was also conducted in September 2011 by Phoenix (2012). The survey recorded two taxa of confirmed SREs, three species that are likely SREs and three taxa of potential SREs (Phoenix, 2012). The majority of these were associated with the riparian habitat of the Hardey River which is outside of the application area (Phoenix, 2012). The species of snail *Rhagada 'small banded'* was recorded from three locations within the application area (Phoenix, 2014). This species was also recorded from eight other locations outside of the application area during the survey (Phoenix, 2012). This species has also been recorded from other areas in Tom Price and Brockman and the proposed clearing is not expected to impact on this species as a whole (Phoenix, 2012).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Phoenix (2011)
Phoenix (2012)
Phoenix (2014)

(c) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it includes, or is necessary for the continued existence of, rare flora.

Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

According to available databases, there are no records of any Threatened Flora species within 20 kilometres of the application area (DPaW, 2014, GIS Database). The flora survey of the application area did not record any Threatened Flora species (Dinglebird Environmental, 2012).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Dinglebird Environmental (2012)
DPaW (2014)
GIS Database:
- Threatened and Priority Flora

(d) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the maintenance of a threatened ecological community.

Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

According to available databases, there are no records of any Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) within the application area (GIS Database). The vegetation survey of the application area did not identify any communities listed as a TEC (Dinglebird Environmental, 2012).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Dinglebird Environmental (2012)
GIS Database:
- Threatened Ecological Sites Buffered

(e) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is significant as a remnant of native vegetation in an area that has been extensively cleared.

Comments Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

The application area falls within the Pilbara Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA) bioregion in which approximately 99.6% of the pre-European vegetation remains (see table) (GIS Database, Government of Western Australia, 2013).

The vegetation of the application area has been mapped as Beard vegetation associations 162 and 567 (GIS Database). These vegetation associations have not been extensively cleared as over 99% remains at both a State and bioregional level (see table) (Government of Western Australia, 2013). There has not been extensive clearing in the local region and the vegetation of the application area is not a remnant nor does it form part of any remnants within the local area (GIS Database).

	Pre-European area (ha)*	Current extent (ha)*	Remaining %*	Conservation Status**	Pre-European % in DEC Managed Land
IBRA Bioregion – Pilbara	17,808,657	17,733,583	~99.6	Least Concern	8.37
Beard veg assoc. – State					
162	547,312	545,772	~99.7	Least Concern	26.07
567	777,506	774,895	~99.7	Least Concern	22.49
Beard veg assoc. – Bioregion					
162	20,009	19,739	~98.6	Least Concern	0
567	776,823	774,213	~99.7	Least Concern	22.51

* Government of Western Australia (2013)

** Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002)

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002)
Government of Western Australia (2013)
GIS Database:
- IBRA WA (Regions - Sub Regions)
- Pre-European Vegetation
- Rocklea 50cm Orthomosaic

(f) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is growing in, or in association with, an environment associated with a watercourse or wetland.

Comments Proposal is at variance to this Principle

There are several ephemeral watercourses within the application area (GIS Database). Some of the vegetation unit Ax.Av.Aap.Tw.Ta was identified as being associated with drainage lines in the area (Dinglebird Environmental, 2012). The fauna survey also identified several areas of 'minor drainage line' habitat within the application area (Phoenix, 2011). The fauna survey noted that the understorey of creekline habitats was typically heavily degraded by cattle. These areas recorded higher numbers of bird species and lower numbers of ground dwelling mammal and reptile species (Phoenix, 2011). The application area is immediately adjacent to vegetation associated with the Hardey River. Care should be taken to ensure that the proposed clearing does not increase the spread of weed species into the Hardey River. Potential impacts from weeds may be managed by the implementation of a weed management condition.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Dinglebird Environmental (2012)
Phoenix (2011)
GIS Database:
- Hydrography, linear

(g) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation.

Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

The application area has been mapped as occurring on the Boolgeeda, Paraburdoo, River, Robe and Rocklea land systems (GIS Database). The River land system is highly susceptible to erosion if vegetative cover is removed (Van Vreeswyk et al., 2004). There was only approximately 0.6 hectares of this land system mapped within the application area (approximately 153 hectares) (GIS Database). The other land systems are all not generally prone to erosion (Van Vreeswyk et al., 2004). Potential impacts from erosion may be minimised by the implementation of a staged clearing condition.

The application area is relatively flat so the proposed clearing is not expected to cause an increase in the amount of water erosion in the area (GIS Database). The proposed clearing of 153 hectares is not likely to cause groundwater levels to rise leading to an increase in soil salinity.

Based on the above the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology Van Vreeswyk et al. (2004)
GIS Database:
- Rangeland Land System Mapping

(h) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to have an impact on the environmental values of any adjacent or nearby conservation area.

Comments **Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**
The application area does not lie within any conservation areas or Department of Parks and Wildlife managed lands (GIS Database). The nearest conservation area is Karijini National Park which is located approximately 41 kilometres east of the application area (GIS Database). At this distance the proposed clearing will not impact on the environmental values of the National Park.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS Database:
- DEC Tenure

(i) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause deterioration in the quality of surface or underground water.

Comments **Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**
There are no permanent watercourses within the application area (GIS Database). There are several perennial drainage lines which are only likely to flow following heavy rains (GIS Database). The proposed clearing is not likely to impact the quality of surface water in the local area.

The application is not located within Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA) (GIS Database). The groundwater within the application area is between 500 – 1,000 milligrams per litre of Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) (GIS Database). This is considered to be potable water. It would not be expected that the proposed clearing would cause salinity levels within the application or surrounding area to alter.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS Database:
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide
- Hydrography, linear
- Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSAs)

(j) Native vegetation should not be cleared if clearing the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the incidence or intensity of flooding.

Comments **Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**
With an average annual rainfall of 400 millimetres and an average annual evaporation rate of 3,400 millimetres there is likely to be little surface flow during normal seasonal rains (GIS Database). Whilst large rainfall events may result in the flooding of the area, the proposed clearing is not likely to lead to an increase in incidence or intensity of flooding.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

Methodology GIS Database:
- Evaporation Isopleths
- Mean Average Rainfall

Planning instrument, Native Title, Previous EPA decision or other matter.

Comments
There is one native title claim (WC2010/016) over the application area (GIS Database). This claim has been registered with the National Native Title Tribunal on behalf of the claimant groups (GIS Database). However, the tenure has been granted in accordance with the future act regime of the *Native Title Act 1993* and the nature of the Act (i.e. the proposed clearing activity) has been provided for in that process, therefore, the granting of a clearing permit is not a future act under the *Native Title Act 1993*.

According to available databases, there are no registered Aboriginal sites of significance within the application area (GIS Database). It is the proponent's responsibility to comply with the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* and ensure that no Aboriginal sites of significance are damaged through the clearing process.

The project was referred to Environmental Protection Authority (EPA). The determination of the EPA was 'Not Assessed - Managed under Part V Division 2 of the EP Act'.

It is the proponent's responsibility to liaise with the Department of Environment Regulation, Department of Parks and Wildlife and the Department of Water to determine whether a Works Approval, Water Licence, Bed and Banks Permit, or any other licences or approvals are required for the proposed works.

The clearing permit application was advertised on 24 March 2014 by the Department of Mines and Petroleum

inviting submissions from the public. No submissions were received.

Methodology GIS Database:
- Aboriginal Sites of Significance
- Native Title Claims – Registered with the NNTT

4. References

- Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002) Biodiversity Action Planning. Action planning for native biodiversity at multiple scales; catchment bioregional, landscape, local. Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Victoria.
- Dinglebird Environmental (2012) Level 2 Flora and Vegetation Survey Rocklea Project Area. Unpublished report for Dragon Energy Ltd, dated April 2012
- DPaW (2014) NatureMap: Mapping Western Australia's Biodiversity - Department of Parks and Wildlife. <http://naturemap.dec.wa.gov.au/default.aspx> (Accessed 24 April 2014).
- Government of Western Australia (2013) 2012 Statewide Vegetation Statistics incorporating the CAR Reserve Analysis (Full Report). Current as of October 2012. WA Department of Environment and Conservation, Perth.
- Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
- Phoenix (2011) Vertebrate Fauna Survey of the Rocklea Iron Ore Project. Unpublished report for Dragon Energy Ltd, dated December 2011.
- Phoenix (2012) Short-range Endemic Invertebrate Fauna Survey for the Rocklea Iron Ore Project. Unpublished report for Dragon Energy Ltd, dated March 2012.
- Phoenix (2014) Dragon Energy Limited Early Tonnes Iron Ore Project M 47/1471. Supporting information for a clearing permit application, dated 28 February 2014.
- Van Vreeswyk, A.M.E., Payne, A.L., Leighton, K.A. and Hennig, P. (2004) Technical Bulletin - An Inventory and Condition Survey of the Pilbara Region, Western Australia, No. 92. Department of Agriculture, Government of Western Australia, Perth, Western Australia.
- Western Australian Herbarium (2014). FloraBase - The Western Australian Flora. Department of Parks and Wildlife. <http://florabase.dpaw.wa.gov.au/> Accessed 24 April 2014.

5. Glossary

Acronyms:

BoM	Bureau of Meteorology, Australian Government
CALM	Department of Conservation and Land Management (now DEC), Western Australia
DAFWA	Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia
DEC	Department of Environment and Conservation, Western Australia
DEH	Department of Environment and Heritage (federal based in Canberra) previously Environment Australia
DEP	Department of Environment Protection (now DEC), Western Australia
DIA	Department of Indigenous Affairs
DLI	Department of Land Information, Western Australia
DMP	Department of Mines and Petroleum, Western Australia
DoE	Department of Environment (now DEC), Western Australia
DoIR	Department of Industry and Resources (now DMP), Western Australia
DOLA	Department of Land Administration, Western Australia
DoW	Department of Water
EP Act	Environmental Protection Act 1986, Western Australia
EPBC Act	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Federal Act)
GIS	Geographical Information System
ha	Hectare (10,000 square metres)
IBRA	Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources – commonly known as the World Conservation Union
RIWI Act	Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914, Western Australia
s.17	Section 17 of the Environment Protection Act 1986, Western Australia
TEC	Threatened Ecological Community

Definitions:

{Atkins, K (2005). *Declared rare and priority flora list for Western Australia, 22 February 2005*. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Como, Western Australia} :-

- P1** **Priority One - Poorly Known taxa:** taxa which are known from one or a few (generally <5) populations which are under threat, either due to small population size, or being on lands under immediate threat, e.g. road verges, urban areas, farmland, active mineral leases, etc., or the plants are under threat, e.g. from disease, grazing by feral animals, etc. May include taxa with threatened populations on protected lands. Such taxa are under consideration for declaration as 'rare flora', but are in urgent need of further survey.

- P2** **Priority Two - Poorly Known taxa:** taxa which are known from one or a few (generally <5) populations, at least some of which are not believed to be under immediate threat (i.e. not currently endangered). Such taxa are under consideration for declaration as 'rare flora', but are in urgent need of further survey.
- P3** **Priority Three - Poorly Known taxa:** taxa which are known from several populations, at least some of which are not believed to be under immediate threat (i.e. not currently endangered). Such taxa are under consideration for declaration as 'rare flora', but are in need of further survey.
- P4** **Priority Four – Rare taxa:** taxa which are considered to have been adequately surveyed and which, whilst being rare (in Australia), are not currently threatened by any identifiable factors. These taxa require monitoring every 5–10 years.
- R** **Declared Rare Flora – Extant taxa (= Threatened Flora = Endangered + Vulnerable):** taxa which have been adequately searched for, and are deemed to be in the wild either rare, in danger of extinction, or otherwise in need of special protection, and have been gazetted as such, following approval by the Minister for the Environment, after recommendation by the State's Endangered Flora Consultative Committee.
- X** **Declared Rare Flora - Presumed Extinct taxa:** taxa which have not been collected, or otherwise verified, over the past 50 years despite thorough searching, or of which all known wild populations have been destroyed more recently, and have been gazetted as such, following approval by the Minister for the Environment, after recommendation by the State's Endangered Flora Consultative Committee.

{Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice 2005} [Wildlife Conservation Act 1950] :-

- Schedule 1** **Schedule 1 – Fauna that is rare or likely to become extinct:** being fauna that is rare or likely to become extinct, are declared to be fauna that is need of special protection.
- Schedule 2** **Schedule 2 – Fauna that is presumed to be extinct:** being fauna that is presumed to be extinct, are declared to be fauna that is need of special protection.
- Schedule 3** **Schedule 3 – Birds protected under an international agreement:** being birds that are subject to an agreement between the governments of Australia and Japan relating to the protection of migratory birds and birds in danger of extinction, are declared to be fauna that is need of special protection.
- Schedule 4** **Schedule 4 – Other specially protected fauna:** being fauna that is declared to be fauna that is in need of special protection, otherwise than for the reasons mentioned in Schedules 1, 2 or 3.

{CALM (2005). Priority Codes for Fauna. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Como, Western Australia} :-

- P1** **Priority One: Taxa with few, poorly known populations on threatened lands:** Taxa which are known from few specimens or sight records from one or a few localities on lands not managed for conservation, e.g. agricultural or pastoral lands, urban areas, active mineral leases. The taxon needs urgent survey and evaluation of conservation status before consideration can be given to declaration as threatened fauna.
- P2** **Priority Two: Taxa with few, poorly known populations on conservation lands:** Taxa which are known from few specimens or sight records from one or a few localities on lands not under immediate threat of habitat destruction or degradation, e.g. national parks, conservation parks, nature reserves, State forest, vacant Crown land, water reserves, etc. The taxon needs urgent survey and evaluation of conservation status before consideration can be given to declaration as threatened fauna.
- P3** **Priority Three: Taxa with several, poorly known populations, some on conservation lands:** Taxa which are known from few specimens or sight records from several localities, some of which are on lands not under immediate threat of habitat destruction or degradation. The taxon needs urgent survey and evaluation of conservation status before consideration can be given to declaration as threatened fauna.
- P4** **Priority Four: Taxa in need of monitoring:** Taxa which are considered to have been adequately surveyed, or for which sufficient knowledge is available, and which are considered not currently threatened or in need of special protection, but could be if present circumstances change. These taxa are usually represented on conservation lands.
- P5** **Priority Five: Taxa in need of monitoring:** Taxa which are not considered threatened but are subject to a specific conservation program, the cessation of which would result in the species becoming threatened within five years.

Categories of threatened species (Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999)

- EX** **Extinct:** A native species for which there is no reasonable doubt that the last member of the species has died.
- EX(W)** **Extinct in the wild:** A native species which:
 (a) is known only to survive in cultivation, in captivity or as a naturalised population well outside its past range; or
 (b) has not been recorded in its known and/or expected habitat, at appropriate seasons, anywhere in its past range, despite exhaustive surveys over a time frame appropriate to its life cycle and form.
- CR** **Critically Endangered:** A native species which is facing an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild in the immediate future, as determined in accordance with the prescribed criteria.
- EN** **Endangered:** A native species which:
 (a) is not critically endangered; and
 (b) is facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild in the near future, as determined in accordance with the prescribed criteria.

VU

Vulnerable: A native species which:

- (a) is not critically endangered or endangered; and
- (b) is facing a high risk of extinction in the wild in the medium-term future, as determined in accordance with the prescribed criteria.

CD

Conservation Dependent: A native species which is the focus of a specific conservation program, the cessation of which would result in the species becoming vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered within a period of 5 years.