



Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 6820/1
Permit type: Purpose Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Gascoyne Resources (WA) Pty Ltd**

1.3. Property details

Property: Mining Lease 09/148
Miscellaneous Licence 09/62
Local Government Area: Shire of Upper Gascoyne
Colloquial name: Glenburgh Gold Project

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
369		Mechanical Removal	Mineral Production and associated activities

1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Grant
Decision Date: 30 December 2015

2. Site Information

2.1. Existing environment and information

2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

Vegetation Description The clearing permit application area has been broadly mapped as the following Beard vegetation associations: 165: Low woodland; mulga and snakewood (*Acacia eremaea*); and 166: Low woodland; mulga and *Acacia victoriae* (GIS Database).

A flora and vegetation survey was conducted by Native Vegetation Solutions during May and October 2012 over an area of approximately 301 hectares, which includes the current clearing permit application area (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013).

The following five vegetation communities were recorded within the survey area (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013):

Open shrubland: Open shrubland with *Acacia cuspidifolia* over mixed shrubs (*Eremophila*, *Senna*) and herbs on flat plains;

Creekline Vegetation: Mulga shrubland over mixed shrubs and herbs, along creek line;

Laterite - Ironstone Ridge Shrubland: *Acacia cuthbertsonii* and *Acacia victoriae* over *Maireana georgei* and *Aristida contorta* shrubland across ridges;

Laterite Undulating Hills Shrubland: *Acacia aneura* var. *aneura* shrubland over mixed shrubs and herbs on undulating hills; and

Quartz Outcrop Shrubland: *Acacia aneura* var. *aneura* shrubland over mixed shrubs and herbs on hill crest.

Clearing Description Glenburgh Gold Project. Gascoyne Resources (WA) Pty Ltd (Gascoyne Resources) proposes to clear up to 369 hectares of native vegetation within a boundary of approximately 1,420 hectares, for the purposes of mineral production and associated infrastructure. The project is located approximately 280 kilometres east/southeast of Carnarvon, within the Shire of Upper Gascoyne.

Vegetation Condition Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery, 1994);
to
Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery, 1994).

Comment The vegetation condition was derived from a vegetation survey conducted by Native Vegetation Solutions (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013).

The proposed clearing is for the development of a new gold mine. Mining related infrastructure will include 10

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 within the Augustus subregion of the Gascoyne Bioregion of the Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) (GIS Database). The Augustus subregion is characterised by rugged low sedimentary and granite ranges divided by broad flat valleys (CALM, 2002). Mulga woodland over *Triodia* species occurs on shallow stony loams on rises, while the shallow earthy loams over hardpan on the plains support open Mulga woodland. The dominant land-use of the subregion is grazing (CALM, 2002).

A Level 2 flora and vegetation survey was conducted by Native Vegetation Solutions over the application area and surrounding areas during May and October 2012 (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013). A total of 97 flora species, from 21 families and 45 genera were recorded within the survey area (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013).

No Threatened Flora have been recorded within or in close proximity to the application area, and none were found during the survey (GIS Database; Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013). Database searches revealed ten species of Priority flora with the potential to occur within the application area, based on known distributions, however, none were recorded during the flora survey (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013).

No Threatened or Priority Ecological Communities have been recorded within or in close proximity to the application area, and none were found during the survey (GIS Database; Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013).

The vegetation condition within the survey area was described as Good to Very Good on the Keighery scale, with parts of the application area previously disturbed by vehicle tracks and mineral exploration activities (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013).

The application area falls within the Glenburgh pastoral lease (GIS Database), and previous vegetation disturbance has occurred from pastoral activities, including weed invasion in some areas (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013). Two weed species, *Cenchrus ciliaris* (Buffel Grass) and *Portulaca oleracea* (Purslane) were recorded during the survey (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013). Weeds have the potential to out-compete native flora and reduce the biodiversity of an area. Potential impacts to biodiversity as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a weed management condition.

Level 2 fauna surveys were conducted over the application area during May 2011 and May and October 2012 (Clark Lindbeck, 2015). The fauna surveys recorded a total of 111 fauna species, including 31 reptiles, six native mammals, four introduced mammals, six bats and 64 bird species (Clark Lindbeck, 2015). The survey results were considered representative of the expected fauna assemblage for the region (Clark Lindbeck, 2015).

The flora and fauna species, vegetation communities and fauna habitats found within the application area are well represented within the region, and the application area is unlikely to represent an area of higher biodiversity than surrounding areas, in either a local or regional context.

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

Methodology

CALM (2002)
Clark Lindbeck (2015)
Native Vegetation Solutions (2013)
GIS Database:
- IBRA Australia
- Pre-European Vegetation
- Threatened and Priority Flora
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities (TECPEC) - boundaries

(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

Level 2 fauna surveys were conducted over the application area and surrounding areas during 2011 and 2012, with the most recent survey conducted by Umwelt Australia Pty Ltd (Umwelt) in October 2012 (Clark Lindbeck, 2015).

The following five broad habitat types were identified within the application area (Umwelt, 2013):
Open shrubland;
Creekline vegetation;
Laterite – Ironstone ridge shrubland;

Laterite undulating hills shrubland; and
Quartz outcrop shrubland.

Umwelt (2013) concluded that the fauna and fauna habitats occurring within the application area are typical of the region, and are well represented in surrounding areas.

Desktop surveys of available databases recorded sixteen fauna species of conservation significance with the potential to occur within the application area, based on known distributions (Clark Lindbeck, 2015; Umwelt, 2013). The majority of these species are birds, which tend to be wide ranging and are unlikely to be dependent on the vegetation and habitats proposed to be cleared (Umwelt, 2013). Other species, such as the Greater Bilby (Vulnerable) are only known from historic records and are considered to no longer occur in the area (Umwelt, 2013).

Two fauna species of conservation significance were recorded during the fauna surveys:

Merops ornatus (Rainbow Bee-eater) (Migratory); and
Sminthopsis longicaudata (Long-tailed Dunnart) (Priority 4).

The Rainbow Bee-Eater is a migratory species which ranges over most of mainland Australia. The Rainbow Bee-eater occurs mainly in open forests and woodlands, shrublands, and in a variety of cleared to semi-cleared habitats, often occurring in close proximity to water (DotE, 2015). This species was opportunistically observed during one survey of the application area (Clark Lindbeck, 2015). While the vegetation within the application may not be the preferred habitat for this species, the soft loamy soils near creek lines may provide suitable breeding areas. However, no evidence of nesting has been recorded within the application area, and it is considered most likely that the Rainbow Bee-Eater is a transitory visitor to the area during normal migratory patterns, and is not dependant on the application area for either foraging or breeding habitat (Umwelt, 2013).

The Long-tailed Dunnart prefers rocky habitats that support low open woodlands or Acacia shrublands with an understorey of spinifex (Umwelt, 2013). One individual was captured during the Autumn 2012 survey, however no other evidence of its presence was recorded during any of the fauna surveys. Umwelt (2013) report that while rocky landscapes may be its preferred habitat, this species has been recorded from several other habitat types and is thought to be very wide ranging in low numbers throughout a variety of habitat types. Given the extent of suitable habitat outside of the application area Umwelt (2013) conclude that the proposed clearing is unlikely to have any significant impact on this species.

The landforms, vegetation associations and fauna habitat types found within the application area are well represented within the region (Clark Lindbeck, 2015; Umwelt, 2013; GIS Database), and the vegetation proposed to be cleared is unlikely to represent significant habitat for fauna in a regional context.

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

Methodology Clark Lindbeck (2015)
DotE (2015)
Umwelt (2013)
GIS Database:
- Aerial imagery
- Pre-European Vegetation

(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

There are no records of Threatened flora within or in close proximity to the application area (GIS Database), and a flora survey of the application area did not record any species of Threatened flora (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013).

The vegetation associations recorded within the application areas are well represented in surrounding areas (GIS Database; Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013), and the vegetation proposed to be cleared is unlikely to be necessary for the continued existence of any species of Threatened (rare) flora.

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

Methodology Native Vegetation Solutions (2013)
GIS Database:
- Threatened and Priority Flora
- Pre-European Vegetation

(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

There are no known Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) located within a 50 kilometre radius of the application area (GIS Database).

Surveys of the application area did not identify any TECs (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2013).

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

Methodology Native Vegetation Solutions (2013)

GIS Database:

- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities (TECPEC) - boundaries

(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 area applied to be cleared is located within the Gascoyne IBRA Bioregion (GIS Database). There is approximately 99% of pre-European vegetation remaining within the bioregion (Government of Western Australia, 2014).

The application area is broadly mapped as Beard vegetation associations 165: Low woodland; mulga and snakewood (*Acacia eremaea*); and 166: Low woodland; mulga and *Acacia victoriae* (GIS Database). Approximately 100% of the pre-European extent of these vegetation associations remains uncleared at both the state and bioregional level (Government of Western Australia, 2014). Hence, the vegetation proposed to be cleared does not represent a significant remnant of vegetation in an area that has been extensively cleared.

	Pre-European area (ha)*	Current extent (ha)*	Remaining %*	Conservation Status**	Pre-European % in DPaW managed lands
IBRA Bioregion - Gascoyne	18,075,219	18,067,441	~ 99	Least Concern	10.3
Beard vegetation association - State					
165	732,343	732,341	~ 100	Least Concern	1.95
166	387,530	387,511	~ 100	Least Concern	1.03
Beard vegetation association - Bioregion					
165	697,447	697,445	~ 100	Least Concern	2.05
166	309,650	309,645	~ 100	Least Concern	1.26

* Government of Western Australia (2014)

** 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 (2014)

GIS Database:

- IBRA Australia

- Pre-European Vegetation

(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 no permanent watercourses or wetlands within or in close proximity to the application area (GIS Database).

There are several seasonal watercourses passing through the application area, the most substantial of which is the Geeranoo Creek (GIS Database). Seasonal watercourses in the region are dry for most of the year, only flowing briefly following significant rainfall events (Clark Lindbeck, 2015). A flora and vegetation survey over the application area identified one of the vegetation associations as "Creekline Vegetation", however this vegetation association did not include riparian species (Clark Lindbeck, 2015).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is at variance to this Principle. However, management practices will be implemented to minimise the potential impacts to the Geeranoo Creek, other watercourses, and downstream vegetation (Clark Lindbeck, 2015). Potential impacts as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a watercourse management condition.

Methodology Clark Lindbeck (2015)
GIS Database:
- Hydrography, Lakes
- Hydrography, linear

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

Comments Proposal may be at variance to this Principle

The application area is broadly mapped as the Jimba, Pells, Durlacher, Phillips, and Agamemnon land systems (GIS Database). These land systems have been mapped and described in technical bulletins produced by the former Department of Agriculture (now the Department of Agriculture and Food).

The Agememnon land system is described as rugged hills and ridges of schist, gneiss, granite and quartz above extensive stony slopes, supporting scattered tall shrublands of Acacia and Eremophila (Waddell et al., 2012).

The Durlacher land system is described as stony plains, lower tributary drainage plains and low stony rises, supporting scattered tall shrublands of mulga, other Acacias and chenopod low shrubs (Waddell et al., 2012).

The Jimba land system is described as gently sloping alluvial plains, mostly devoid of surface mantling, with disorganised and complex drainage features below minor ridges and pebbly plains, supporting scattered tall and low Acacia shrublands with some chenopods (Waddell et al., 2012).

The Pells land system is described as low hills, mesas and ridges of sedimentary rocks, supporting tall shrublands of mulga and other Acacias (Waddell et al., 2012).

The Phillips land system is described as low hills and undulating uplands of crystalline rocks, supporting mulga and other Acacia-dominated tall shrublands (Waddell et al., 2012).

The majority of the above-mentioned land systems are protected by stony mantles, however they may be susceptible to erosion if the surface is disturbed. Due to the lack of stony surface mantles, the Jimba land system can be particularly susceptible to erosion if disturbed (Payne et al., 1987). The Jimba Land System occurs only over the northern end of the proposed haulroad (Clark Lindbeck, 2015).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing may be at variance to this Principle. Management practices will be implemented to minimise the risk of erosion and potential land degradation (Clark Lindbeck, 2015). Potential land degradation as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a staged clearing condition.

Methodology Clark Lindbeck (2015)
Payne et al. (1987)
Waddell et al. (2012)
GIS Database:
- Land Systems

(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 nearest conservation area is the former Dalgety Downs pastoral lease, which is located approximately 53 kilometres northeast of the application area, at its nearest point, and is managed by the Department of Parks and Wildlife (GIS Database). The proposed clearing is unlikely to have any impacts on the environmental values of this or any other conservation area.

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

Methodology GIS Database:
- DPaW 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 Public Drinking Water Source Areas within or in close proximity to the clearing permit application area (GIS Database). There are no permanent watercourses or wetlands within the application area (GIS

Database). Several minor seasonal watercourses pass through the application area (GIS Database). Drainage lines in the region are dry for most of the year, only flowing briefly immediately following significant rainfall (Clark Lindbeck, 2015). Management practices will be implemented to minimise the risk of erosion and potential impacts to surface water quality (Clark Lindbeck, 2015).

The proposed clearing is unlikely to result in increased sedimentation of any watercourse, or cause deterioration in the quality of surface or underground water.

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

Methodology Clark Lindbeck (2015)
GIS Database:
- 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

The climate of the Augustus subregion is arid, with a highly variable summer and winter rainfall (CALM, 2002). Records from the nearest weather station to the application area (Dalgety Downs, approximately 18 kilometres to the northeast), indicate a mean annual rainfall of approximately 212 millimetres (BoM, 2015). Drainage lines in the area are dry for most of the year, only flowing briefly immediately following significant rainfall (Clark Lindbeck, 2015).

There are no permanent watercourses or waterbodies within the application area (GIS Database). Several minor seasonal watercourses pass through the application area (GIS Database). Temporary localised flooding may occur during heavy rainfall events. However, the proposed clearing is unlikely to increase the incidence or intensity of natural flooding events.

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

Methodology BoM (2015)
CALM (2002)
Clark Lindbeck (2015)
GIS Database:
- Hydrography, linear

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

Comments

The clearing permit application was advertised on 9 November 2015 by the Department of Mines and Petroleum inviting submissions from the public. No submissions were received in relation to this application.

There is one registered native title claim (WC2004/010) over the area under application (DAA, 2015). However, the mining tenement 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*.

There are no registered Aboriginal Sites of Significance located 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 Regulation, the Department of Water, and the Department of Parks and Wildlife, to determine whether a Works Approval, Water Licence, Bed and Banks Permit, or any other licences or approvals are required for the proposed works.

Methodology DAA (2015)
GIS Database:
- Aboriginal Sites of Significance

4. References

- BoM (2015) Bureau of Meteorology website - Climate Data Online. Australian Government, Bureau of Meteorology <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/data>
- CALM (2002) A Biodiversity Audit of Western Australia's 53 Biogeographic Subregions in 2002. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Western Australia.
- Clark Lindbeck (2015) Glenburgh Gold Project Supporting Document for Clearing Permit Application. Report prepared for Gascoyne Resources Pty Ltd, by Clark Lindbeck and Associates Pty Ltd, October 2015.
- DAA (2015) Aboriginal Heritage Enquiry System. Department of Aboriginal Affairs. <http://maps.dia.wa.gov.au/AHIS2/>
- 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.
- DotE (2015) Department of the Environment website. Species Profile - *Merops ornatus* – Rainbow Bee-eater. Australian Government, Department of the Environment <https://www.environment.gov.au/>
- Government of Western Australia (2014) 2014 Statewide Vegetation Statistics incorporating the CAR Reserve Analysis (Full Report). Current as of June 2014. WA Department of Parks and Wildlife, 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.
- Native Vegetation Solutions (2013) Glenburgh Gold Project Level 2 Flora and Vegetation Survey. Report prepared for Gascoyne Resources Pty Ltd, by Native Vegetation Solutions, February 2013.
- Payne, A L, Spencer, G F, and Curry, P J (1987) An inventory and condition survey of rangelands in the Carnarvon Basin, Western Australia. Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia. Technical Bulletin 73.
- Umwelt (2013) Glenburgh Gold Project Level 2 Fauna Assessment. Report prepared for Gascoyne Resources Pty Ltd, by Umwelt (Australia) Pty Ltd, February 2013.
- Waddell, P A, Thomas, P W E, and Findlater, P A (2012) A report on the Gascoyne River catchment following the 2010/11 flood events, Western Australia. Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia. Resource Management Technical Bulletin 382.

5. Glossary

Acronyms:

BoM	Bureau of Meteorology, Australian Government
DAA	Department of Aboriginal Affairs, Western Australia
DAFWA	Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia
DEC	Department of Environment and Conservation, Western Australia (now DPaW and DER)
DER	Department of Environment Regulation, Western Australia
DMP	Department of Mines and Petroleum, Western Australia
DRF	Declared Rare Flora
DotE	Department of the Environment, Australian Government
DoW	Department of Water, Western Australia
DPaW	Department of Parks and Wildlife, Western Australia
DSEWPaC	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (now DotE)
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority, Western Australia
EP Act	<i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> , Western Australia
EPBC Act	<i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (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
PEC	Priority Ecological Community, Western Australia
RIWI Act	<i>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i> , Western Australia
TEC	Threatened Ecological Community

Definitions:

{DPaW (2015) Conservation Codes for Western Australian Flora and Fauna. Department of Parks and Wildlife, Western Australia):-

- T** **Threatened species:**
Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950*, listed under Schedules 1 to 4 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Threatened Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Threatened Flora (which may also be referred to as Declared Rare Flora).
Threatened fauna is that subset of 'Specially Protected Fauna' declared to be 'likely to become extinct' pursuant to section 14(4) of the Wildlife Conservation Act.
Threatened flora is flora that has been declared to be 'likely to become extinct or is rare, or otherwise in need of special protection', pursuant to section 23F(2) of the Wildlife Conservation Act.
The assessment of the conservation status of these species is based on their national extent and ranked according to their level of threat using IUCN Red List categories and criteria as detailed below.
- CR** **Critically endangered species**
Threatened species considered to be facing an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950*, in Schedule 1 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Threatened Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Threatened Flora.
- EN** **Endangered species**
Threatened species considered to be facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950*, in Schedule 2 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Threatened Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Threatened Flora.
- VU** **Vulnerable species**
Threatened species considered to be facing a high risk of extinction in the wild. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950*, in Schedule 3 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Threatened Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Threatened Flora.
- EX** **Presumed extinct species**
Species which have been adequately searched for and there is no reasonable doubt that the last individual has died. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950*, in Schedule 4 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Presumed Extinct Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Presumed Extinct Flora.
- IA** **Migratory birds protected under an international agreement**
Birds that are subject to an agreement between the government of Australia and the governments of Japan (JAMBA), China (CAMBA) and The Republic of Korea (ROKAMBA), and the Bonn Convention, relating to the protection of migratory birds. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950*, in Schedule 5 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice.
- CD** **Conservation dependent fauna**
Fauna of special conservation need being species dependent on ongoing conservation intervention to prevent it becoming eligible for listing as threatened. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950*, in Schedule 6 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice.
- OS** **Other specially protected fauna**
Fauna otherwise in need of special protection to ensure their conservation. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950*, in Schedule 7 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice.
- P** **Priority species**
Species which are poorly known; or
Species that are adequately known, are rare but not threatened, and require regular monitoring. Assessment of Priority codes is based on the Western Australian distribution of the species, unless the distribution in WA is part of a contiguous population extending into adjacent States, as defined by the known spread of locations.
- P1** **Priority One - Poorly-known species:**
Species that are known from one or a few locations (generally five or less) which are potentially at risk. All occurrences are either: very small; or on lands not managed for conservation, e.g. agricultural or pastoral lands, urban areas, road and rail reserves, gravel reserves and active mineral leases; or otherwise under threat of habitat destruction or degradation. Species may be included if they are comparatively well known from one or more locations but do not meet adequacy of survey

requirements and appear to be under immediate threat from known threatening processes. Such species are in urgent need of further survey.

P2 Priority Two - Poorly-known species:

Species that are known from one or a few locations (generally five or less), some of which are on lands managed primarily for nature conservation, e.g. national parks, conservation parks, nature reserves and other lands with secure tenure being managed for conservation. Species may be included if they are comparatively well known from one or more locations but do not meet adequacy of survey requirements and appear to be under threat from known threatening processes. Such species are in urgent need of further survey.

P3 Priority Three - Poorly-known species:

Species that are known from several locations, and the species does not appear to be under imminent threat, or from few but widespread locations with either large population size or significant remaining areas of apparently suitable habitat, much of it not under imminent threat. Species may be included if they are comparatively well known from several locations but do not meet adequacy of survey requirements and known threatening processes exist that could affect them. Such species are in need of further survey.

P4 Priority Four - Rare, Near Threatened and other species in need of monitoring:

(a) Rare. Species that are considered to have been adequately surveyed, or for which sufficient knowledge is available, and that are considered not currently threatened or in need of special protection, but could be if present circumstances change. These species are usually represented on conservation lands.

(b) Near Threatened. Species that are considered to have been adequately surveyed and that are close to qualifying for Vulnerable, but are not listed as Conservation Dependent.

(c) Species that have been removed from the list of threatened species during the past five years for reasons other than taxonomy.