Government of Western Australia
Department of Mines and Petroleum

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 4964/1
Permit type: Purpose Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Shark Bay Resources Pty Ltd**

1.3. Property details

Property: *Shark Bay Solar Salt Industry Agreement Act 1983*, Mining Lease 260SA, (AM 70/260) General Purpose Lease 09/2
Local Government Area: Shire of Shark Bay
Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
20		Mechanical Removal	Flume Replacement, Access Track Upgrade and Associated Activities

1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Grant
Decision Date: 28 June 2012

2. Site Information

2.1. Existing environment and information

2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

Vegetation Description	Clearing Description	Vegetation Condition	Comment
Beard vegetation associations have been mapped for the whole of Western Australia and are useful to look at vegetation in a regional context. Two Beard vegetation associations have been mapped within the application area (GIS Database): 112: Hummock grasslands, shrub steppe; *Acacia ligulata* over *Triodia plurinervata*; and 1423: Shrublands; scrub-heath in Shark Bay area, mainly *Acacia* spp. The vegetation within Mining Lease 260SA was mapped at a scale of 1:25 000 by Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (Mattiske) in 1996. A flora and vegetation survey of proposed development areas was also conducted at this time and included a proposed borrow pit, additional crystallisers and pond systems. The entire application area is not covered by this survey. According to Shark Bay Resources Pty Ltd (Shark Bay Resources) (2012) the vegetation not mapped by the survey is likely to be the same as the vegetation associations already mapped within the application area. Based on vegetation mapping and vegetation associations identified within the Mattiske (1996) survey, the following vegetation associations are likely to occur within the application area: **Association 5:** Closed to Low Shrubland of *Melaleuca huegelii* subsp. *pristicensis* thickets fringing inlets and birridas; **Association 7:** Closed to Open Low Shrubland of *Thryptomene baeckeacea*, *Salsola kali*, *Rhagodia preissii* subsp. *obovata*,	Shark Bay Resources has applied to clear 20 hectares within an application area of approximately 77.2 hectares for the purpose of flume replacement, upgrading access tracks and associated activities (GIS Database). The application area is located on Useless Inlet, approximately 5 kilometres south west of Useless Loop. The proposed clearing is required to facilitate the replacement of a flume which was built in the 1960s from asbestos which has since deteriorated (Shark Bay Resources, 2012). The application also includes the upgrading of access tracks and the reinstating of a fauna proof fence along the flume.	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery, 1994); to Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery, 1994).	The vegetation condition has been inferred from orthophotos and historical land uses classified using the Keighery (1994) scale.

Atriplex bunburyana and *Acacia tetragonophylla* with occasional emergent *Acacia ligulata*, *Acacia rostellifera* and / or *Acacia sclerosperma* on mid to upper slopes of sand dunes of Useless Inlet; and

Association 9: Low closed to open shrubland with occasional emergent *Acacia ligulata* over *Triodia plurinervata* and/or *Triodia bromoides* on red sand dunes, occasionally with limestone pebbles larger than 20 centimetres, on the lower to upper slopes above birridas.

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

The application area is located in the Shark Bay region which is an area of high biological diversity and has been listed on the World Heritage list. Mining Lease 260SA was excised from this area and, therefore, the application area is not within the Shark Bay World Heritage site. The Shark Bay region represents a meeting point of three major climatic regions and forms a transition zone between two major botanical provinces, the South West and Eremaean provinces (DSEWPC, 2012). The region has notable plant and animal species diversity with many species found only in the interzone area or at the limits of their range (DSEWPC, 2012).

Mattiske (1996) conducted vegetation mapping and a flora and vegetation survey within Mining Lease 260SA in 1996. Vegetation within the lease was mapped at a scale of 1:25 000. Fieldwork was undertaken from 29 July to 2 August 1996. In 2010 Mattiske updated the survey report in relation to changes in taxonomic nomenclature and conservation status of flora and plant communities.

Mattiske (1996) identified 17 vegetation associations within the lease area. Whilst the majority of the application area on General Purpose Lease 09/2 was not mapped, based on the mapping conducted it is likely that the unmapped areas are consistent with those already mapped within the application area (Shark Bay Resources, 2012). There has been three vegetation associations mapped within the application area (Mattiske, 1996). These vegetation associations appear to mostly be in degraded condition (GIS Database).

According to available databases, no Threatened Ecological Communities have been located within the application area (GIS Database). The application area is located within the boundary of the Priority Ecological Community (PEC) Hypersaline Community Number 2 Stromatolites of Hamelin Pool (GIS Database). Hamelin Pool is located approximately 60 kilometres east of the application area (GIS Database). Given that stromatalites are not found within the application area and the distance to Hamelin Pool, it is not expected that this PEC will be impacted by the proposed clearing.

A total of 182 vascular plant species from 123 genera and 51 families were recorded within the larger survey area (Mattiske, 2010). Several introduced species were recorded during the survey with Mattiske's 2010 update stating that no species are declared under the *Agriculture and Related Resources Protection Act 1976*. Potential impacts from weeds as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a weed management condition.

According to Mattiske (2010), six priority flora species were recorded during the vegetation survey. Only the species *Triodia bromoides* (Priority 4) occurs within the vegetation associations present in the application area (Mattiske, 2010). This species is known from 37 records, the majority of which are from the Shark Bay region (Western Australian Herbarium, 2012). Given the large amount of disturbance within the application area and large areas of undisturbed habitat outside the application area, the vegetation present is not likely to be significant habitat for this species.

The application area has an existing flume and access roads present and the large majority of the area has been previously cleared. Given, the level of existing disturbance, it is not likely that the application area supports a high level of faunal diversity.

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

Methodology

DSEWPC (2012)
Mattiske (1996)
Mattiske (2010)
Shark Bay Resources (2012)
Western Australian Herbarium (2012)
GIS Database:
- Shark Bay 1.4m Orthomosaic
- Threatened Ecological Sites Buffered

(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

No targeted fauna surveys were undertaken within the application area and the fauna habitats present within the application area have not been recorded. The vegetation within the application area is considered to be largely in degraded condition, based on aerial imagery (GIS Database).

Mattiske (1996) stated that the vegetation associations of the application area were common in the local area. As the vegetation and landforms within the application area are common throughout the local region, it would be considered likely that most fauna would be able to relocate into adjacent suitable habitat if present within the application area upon the commencement of clearing.

A search of DEC's NatureMap database revealed records of eleven conservation significant fauna species within a 20 kilometre radius of the application area (DEC, 2012). According to available databases, there are no records of conservation significant fauna occurring within the application area (GIS Database). The clearing of 20 hectares of native vegetation is not likely to significantly impact these species due to the relatively high degree of disturbance that has impacted on the habitat value of the application area.

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

Methodology

DEC (2012)
Mattiske (1996)
GIS Database:
- Shark Bay 1.4m Orthomosaic
- Threatened Fauna

(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 Threatened Flora within the application area (GIS Database). A search of the DEC's NatureMap database identified no Threatened Flora species as occurring within a 20 kilometre radius of the application area (DEC, 2012).

No Threatened Flora was recorded during the vegetation survey undertaken in 1996 (Mattiske, 2010).

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

Methodology

DEC (2012)
Mattiske (2010)
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 known Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) within the application area (GIS Database). The buffer of the nearest recorded TEC is located approximately 400 kilometres south east of the application area (GIS Database).

According to Mattiske (2010), there are no TECs listed for Useless Loop.

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

Methodology

Mattiske (2010)
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 Yalgoo Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA) bioregion in which over 98% of the pre-European vegetation remains (see table) (GIS Database, Government of Western Australia, 2011).

The vegetation of the application area has been mapped as Beard vegetation associations 112 and 1423 (GIS Database).

Over 80% of these Beard vegetation associations remains at both a state and bioregional level (Government of

Western Australia, 2011). The vegetation within the application area itself it not a remnant or does not form part of any remnants within the local area (GIS Database).

	Pre-European area (ha)*	Current extent (ha)*	Remaining %*	Conservation Status**	Pre-European % in IUCN Class I-IV Reserves* (and post clearing %)
IBRA Bioregion – Yalgoo	5,057,314	4,987,193	~98.68	Least Concern	10.75 (10.9)
Beard veg assoc. – State					
112	26,454	25,150	~95.07	Least Concern	0.52 (0.52)
1423	28,412	28,362	~99.82	Least Concern	-
Beard veg assoc. – Bioregion					
112	5,049	4,193	~83.04	Least Concern	-
1423	27,778	27,747	~99.89	Least Concern	-
Beard veg assoc. – Subregion					
112	5,049	4,193	~83.04	Least Concern	-
1423	27,778	27,747	~99.89	Least Concern	-

* Government of Western Australia (2011)
** 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 (2011)
GIS Database:
- IBRA WA (Regions - Sub Regions)
- Shark Bay 1.4m 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 not at variance to this Principle**
There are no natural watercourses or wetlands within the application area (GIS Database). The application area does contain the flume which is an artificial water source. The vegetation within the application area is not considered to be growing in association with any watercourse or wetland.

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

Methodology 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 is mapped as occurring on the Edel land system (GIS Database). The Edel land system is described as undulating sandy plains with occasional dunes, limestone rises and saline flats; low *Acacia* shrublands with some saltbush and heath communities. The land has small areas of outcropping limestone and saline plains with shallow sandy soils and no drainage features. Some areas are susceptible to wind erosion when locally over-used (Payne et al., 1987). The clearing of 20 hectares of native vegetation for the purpose of replacing an existing flume and upgrading access tracks will not likely cause any appreciable land degradation within the application or surrounding areas.

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

Methodology Payne et al. (1987)
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 DEC managed lands (GIS Database). The nearest conservation area is the Shark Bay Marine Park, located approximately 2.5 kilometres west of the application area at its closest point (GIS Database). The proposed clearing will not have any significant impacts on the Shark Bay Marine Park. Carrarang Station, which is a DEC managed pastoral lease is located 3.3 kilometres west of the application area at its closest point (GIS Database). The area proposed for clearing does not provide an important ecological linkage or fauna movement corridor and is not likely to impact the environmental values of this conservation area (GIS Database).

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

Methodology

GIS Database:
- DEC Tenure
- Shark Bay 1.4m Orthomosaic

(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

The application area is not located within a Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA) (GIS Database). There are no permanent watercourses or water bodies within the application area (GIS Database). Any surface water within the application area is likely to only remain for short periods following significant rainfall events as the annual evaporation rate greatly exceeds rainfall (BoM, 2011; GIS Database). The proposed clearing is not likely to cause deterioration in the quality of any surface water within or outside of the application area.

At several points the application area runs adjacent to several salt evaporation ponds which are used by Shark Bay Resources for the production of salt. The quality of surface water within the salt evaporation ponds is likely to be considered hyper-saline. Groundwater salinities within the application area have been estimated in the range of 3,000-7,000 milligrams/Litre Total Dissolved Solids which is considered to be brackish to saline (GIS Database). The proposed clearing of 20 hectares for the replacement of an existing flume and upgrading access track is not likely to cause salinity levels in the local area to alter.

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

Methodology

BoM (2012)
GIS Database:
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide
- Hydrography, Linear
- Public Drinking Water Source Areas

(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 224.5 millimetres and an average evaporation rate of approximately 2,600 millimetres there is likely to be little surface flow during normal seasonal rains (BoM, 2012; GIS Database). Given the likelihood of little surface flow, the proposed clearing is not likely to cause or increase the incidence or intensity of flooding.

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

Methodology

BoM (2012)
GIS Database:
- Evaporation Isopleths

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

Comments

There is one native title claim over the area under application: WC98/17 (GIS Database). This claim has been registered with the National Native Title Tribunal on behalf of the claimant group. However, the mining 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.

It is the proponent's responsibility to liaise with the Department of Environment and Conservation 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 23 April 2012 by the Department of Mines and Petroleum inviting submissions from the public. There were no submissions received.

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

4. References

BoM (2012) Climate Statistics for Australian Locations. A Search for Climate Statistics for Denham, Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology, viewed 19 June 2012, <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/averages/tables/cw_006044.shtml>.

DEC (2012) NatureMap - Mapping Western Australia Biodiversity, Department of Environment and Conservation, viewed 19 June 2012, <http://naturemap.dec.wa.gov.au>.

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.

DSEWPC (2012) Australian Heritage Database, Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities. http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/ahdb/search.pl?mode=place_detail;search=place_name%3Dshark%2520bay%3Bkeyword_PD%3Don%3Bkeyword_SS%3Don%3Bkeyword_PH%3Don%3Blatitude_1dir%3DS%3Blongitude_1dir%3DE%3Blongitude_2dir%3DE%3Blatitude_2dir%3DS%3Bin_region%3Dpart;place_id=105020, viewed 11 June 2012.

Government of Western Australia (2011) Statewide Vegetation Statistics incorporating the CAR Reserve Analysis (Full Report). 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.

Mattiske (1996) Flora and Vegetation - Useless Loop Shark Bay. Unpublished report for John Consulting Services dated September 1996.

Mattiske (2010) Amendments of the Flora and Vegetation Survey of Useless Loop - Shark Bay. Unpublished report for Shark Bay Resources (Pty Ltd) dated August 2010.

Payne, A.L., Curry, P.J., & Spencer, G.F (1987) Technical Bulletin No. 73 An Inventory and condition survey of rangelands in the Carnarvon Basin, Western Australia. Department of Agriculture, Western Australia.

Shark Bay Resources (2012) Supporting document for a clearing permit application, dated 16 March 2012.

Western Australian Herbarium (2012) FloraBase - The Western Australian Flora. Department of Environment and Conservation. <http://florabase.dec.wa.gov.au/>

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.