Government of Western Australia
Department of Mines and Petroleum

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 7425/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Western Mining Pty Ltd**

1.3. Property details

Property: Mining Leases 20/519, 20/520, 20/522, 20/523, 20/524, 20/525
Local Government Area: Shire of Cue
Colloquial name: Cue Victor Project

1.4. Application

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

1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Granted
Decision Date: 25 May 2017

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 for the whole of Western Australia. T Beard vegetation associations have been mapped within the application area (GIS Database).

18: Low woodland; mulga (Acacia aneura);
313: Succulent steppe with open scrub; scattered Acacia sclerosperma and Acacia victoriae over bluebush.

A flora and vegetation survey of the application area was undertaken by Paul Armstrong and Associates (2017) between 5 to 11 September 2016. The following six vegetation associations were identified within the application area:

Shrublands
Mulga: Scrub dominated by *Acacia aneura* growing 3 to 5 metres tall; over Open Low Scrub to Low Scrub to Heath dominated by *Eremophila georgei* or *Senna artemisioides* subsp. *filifolia*; over Open Dwarf Scrub to Dwarf Scrub dominated by *Ptilotus obovatus*.

Open Mulga: Open Scrub dominated by *Acacia aneura* growing 2 to 5 metres tall; over Open Low Scrub to Low Scrub dominated by *Eremophila georgei*; over Open Dwarf Scrub to Dwarf Scrub dominated by *Ptilotus obovatus* or *Ptilotus polakii* subsp. *polakii*.

Drainage Line: Scrub to Thicket dominated by *Acacia aneura* growing 2 to 8 metres tall; over Open Low Scrub with no species dominating; over Open Dwarf Scrub dominated by *Maireana georgei* and *Ptilotus obovatus*; over Very Open Herb, if present, dominated by *Cephalipterum drummondii*.

Quartz Scree: Open Scrub dominated by *Acacia aneura* growing 2 to 5 metres tall; over Open Low Scrub to Low Scrub dominated by *Eremophila georgei*; over Open Dwarf Scrub to Dwarf Scrub dominated by *Ptilotus obovatus* or *Ptilotus polakii* subsp. *polakii*.

Greenstone Outcrop: Open Scrub dominated by *Acacia aneura* growing 2 to 6 metres tall; over Open Dwarf Scrub dominated by *Ptilotus obovatus*; over Very Open Herb, frequently dominated by *Cephalipterum drummondii*.

Disturbed Areas
Recovering Mulga: Areas that have been previously cleared including for mines, scraping for dry-blowing, roads and tracks.

Clearing Description

Cue Victor Project
Western Mining Pty Ltd proposes to clear up to 53.43 hectares of native vegetation within a total boundary of approximately 53.43 hectares for the purposes of mineral production. The project is within and adjacent to Cue in the Shire of Cue (GIS Database).

Vegetation Condition

Completely Degraded: No longer intact; completely/almost completely without native species (Keighery, 1994);

To

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

Comment The vegetation condition was assessed by botanists from Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016).

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 may be at variance to this Principle

The proposed clearing is located within the Murchison Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA) bioregion, and the Eastern Murchison IBRA subregion (GIS Database).

The flora and vegetation survey undertaken by Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016) identified six vegetation associations within the application area. There are significant parts of the application area that have been disturbed by past mining and pastoral activities (Paul Armstrong and Associates, 2016). None of the vegetation associations within the application area were identified as being a Threatened or Priority Ecological Community (Paul Armstrong and Associates, 2016).

The Level 1 flora survey of the greater Cue Victor Project recorded a total of 157 flora species from 38 families (Paul Armstrong and Associates, 2016). During the survey, one species of Threatened flora was indentified, as well as three species of Priority flora, and one collection that is possibly a new taxon that could not be adequately identified in the field (Paul Armstrong and Associates, 2016). Potential impacts to these flora species may be minimised by the implementation of a flora management condition.

Apart from some minor areas of quartz outcrop and drainage lines, the fauna habitats within the application area are common and widespread within the Murchison bioregion (Outback Ecology, 2012). Given the habitats present and the previous disturbance, the application area is not expected to contain a high level of faunal diversity.

Ten introduced flora species were identified by Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016) within the application area. Weeds have the potential to significantly change the dynamics of a natural ecosystem and lower the biodiversity of an area. Potential impacts to the biodiversity as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a weed management condition.

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

Methodology

Outback Ecology (2012)
Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016)

GIS Database:
- IBRA Australia
- Pre European Vegetation
- Threatened and Priority Flora
- 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 may be at variance to this Principle

No targeted fauna survey information was provided for the application area, however during the flora suvrey undertaken by Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016) no Malleefowl nests were observed. The assessing officer reviewed aerial imagery of the area and survey reports from the region and identified four potential habitats as occurring within the application area:

- Acacia woodland over low heath
- Open stony plain (quartz)
- Drainage line
- Quartz outcrop

Based upon survey information and aerial imagery of the area, it appears that each these habitat types had varying levels of disturbance from past grazing, pastoral and mining activities (Outback Ecology, 2012; Paul Armstrong and Associates, 2016; GIS Database). Along with these habitats there was a significant portion of the application area mapped as disturbed areas which are likely to have little habitat value for local fauna species (Paul Armstrong and Associates, 2016). The quartz outcrop and drainage line habitats were identified as being significant fauna habitats (Outback Ecology, 2012). The quartz outcrop habitat was found in small isolated areas and represents variation in the often flat and open landscape (Outback Ecology, 2012; GIS Database). This habitat has the potential to provide refugia for small mammals and reptiles and also provide a

vantage point for birds of prey. The drainage line habitat supports denser vegetation that provides shade and shelter as well as an ephemeral water source during substantial rainfall events (Outback Ecology, 2012; GIS Database). The linear nature of drainage lines helps provide linkages and corridors between habitats in the local area (Outback Ecology, 2012). The majority of the drainage line habitat mapped by the fauna survey is outside of the application area (GIS Database).

There are a number of conservation significant fauna species that have the potential to occur within the application area, particularly avian species (DPaW, 2017; Outback Ecology, 2012). The application area is not expected to be significant habitat for these avian species given there is already large parts of the application area previously disturbed by mining and there are large areas of better quality habitat in the region. The threatened fauna species Malleefowl (*Leipoa ocellata*) and Western Spiny-tailed Skink (*Egernia stokesii badia*) are both possibly found within the application area. The Malleefowl may intermittently utilise the application area, however, it is not likely to remain in the area for prolonged periods of time as a history of mining and pastoralism has reduced the suitability of the habitat (Outback Ecology, 2012). The Western Spiny-tailed Skink has been recorded within 20 kilometres of the application area (DPaW, 2017). Isolated patches of Rocky outcrops and small stands of Acacia provide some marginal habitat within the application area (Outback Ecology, 2012). Potential impacts to the Western Spiny-tailed Skink may be minimised by the implementation of a fauna management condition.

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

Methodology

DPaW (2017)
Outback Ecology (2012)
Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016)

GIS Database:
- 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 at variance to this Principle

According to available databases, there are records of the Threatened Flora species *Eremophila rostrata* subsp. *rostrate* as occurring within and surrounding the application area (GIS Database).

A flora and vegetation survey of the application area was undertaken by Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016) between 5 to 11 September 2016. During this survey, several populations of *Eremophila rostrata* subsp. *rostrate* were identified within the application area, with further populations having been identified in previous surveys. Brown and Buirchell (2011) describes the plant as an erect shrub growing 1.2 to 3m tall with dark green leaves 20 to 40mm long and 0.7 to 1mm in diameter, with pink to carmine flowers 24 to 30mm long. It has a restricted distribution limited to near Cue (DPaW, 2017).

As of the latest suvery in the area, 330 *Eremophila rostrata* subsp. r*ostrate* have been identified within the survey area, with 30 of these being within 50 metres of proposed disturbances (Paul Armstrong and Associates, 2016). This would be considered by the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 as “taking” (disturbing) these 30 plants, which represents 9.1% of the population. It has been proposed by Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016) to realign potential disturbances to greater than 50 metres away, otherwise a flora licence from the Department of Parks and Wildlife will be required.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is at variance to this Principle. It is recommended a flora management condition be implemented to minimise potential impacts to Threatened flora.

Methodology

DPaW (2017)
Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016)

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). There were no vegetation communities recorded during the vegetation survey that were analogous with any TECs (Paul Armstrong and Associates, 2016).

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

Methodology Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016)

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 Murchison IBRA bioregion (GIS Database). The vegetation within the application area is broadly mapped as the following Beard vegetation associations:

18: Low woodland; mulga (Acacia aneura);
313: Succulent steppe with open scrub; scattered Acacia sclerosperma and Acacia victoriae over bluebush.

These vegetation associations (18 and 233136) have not been extensively cleared as over 90% remains at both a state and bioregional level (see table) (Government of Western Australia, 2015).

The vegetation within the application area is not a remnant of native vegetation within an area that has been extensively cleared.

	Pre-European area (ha)*	Current extent (ha)*	Remaining %*	Conservation Status**	Pre-European % in DPaW Managed Land
IBRA Bioregion - Murchison	28,120,587	28,044,823	~99.73	Least Concern	7.78
Beard vegetation associations - State					
18	19,892,305	19,843,727	~99.76	Least Concern	6.62
313	68,844	65,261	~94.8	Least Concern	0.00
Beard vegetation associations - Bioregion					
18	12,403,172	12,363,252	~99.68	Least Concern	4.96
313	68,844	65,261	~94.8	Least Concern	0.00

* Government of Western Australia (2015)
** 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 (2015)

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 not likely to be at variance to this Principle

According to available databases, there are no permanent watercourses or waterbodies within the application area (GIS Database).

There are several watercourses around the proposed clearing areas, however none of them head towards the proposed working areas. Most are small surface creeks and contain water for 24-48 hours after a large rainfall event, with the water rapidly absorbed by the granites. It is not uncommon for the creeks to be dry 24 hours after a half inch rainfall event.

The Cue water reserve is approximately 3km North of the project, and captures drainage from the two creeks

to the right of the highway. This reserve will not be affected by the project as there are low ridges to the North and East of the project which prevent flow to the reserve from the mine area.

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

Methodology GIS Database:
- Geodata, 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 areas are mapped as occurring on the Austin, Sherwood and Wiluna land systems (GIS Database).

The Austin land system is generally not susceptible to erosion, however, the removal of vegetation on drainage tracts can lead to increased erosion (Curry et al., 1994).

The Sherwood land system is characterised by widespread stony granite plains with laterite breakaways (Mabbutt et al., 1963). The alluvial fan unit of the Sherwood land system is prone to shallow gullying, and the drainage tracts have fragile soils which are highly susceptible to water erosion (Mabbutt et al., 1963).

The Wiluna Land System is characterised by low greenstone hills with occasional lateritic breakaways and broad stony slopes, lower saline stony plains and broad drainage tracts (Curry et al., 1994). It supports sparse mulga shrublands with patches of halophytic shrubs (Curry et al., 1994). The drainage tracts vegetation unit present within this landsystem is mildly to moderately susceptible to accelerated erosion when degraded (Curry et al., 1994). This land system shows some localised erosion as a result of mining activities (Curry et al., 1994).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing may be at variance to this Principle. Potential impacts from land degradation as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a staged clearing condition.

Methodology Curry et al. (1994)
Mabbutt et al. (1963)

GIS Database:
- Imagery
- Rangeland Land System Mapping
- Topographic Contours, Statewide

(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 is not located within a conservation reserve or DPaW managed land (GIS Database). The nearest conservation area is the ex Lakeside Pastoral Lease which is situated approximately 12 kilometres south-west of the application area (GIS Database). Given the distance separating the ex Lakeside Pastoral Lease and the application area, the proposed clearing is not likely to impact the environmental values of the conservation area.

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

Methodology GIS Database:
- DPaW Tenure
- Register of National Estate (Status)

(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 within a Public Drinking Water Source Area (GIS Database).

The groundwater in the local area has been recorded between 3,000 and 20,000 milligrams per litre of total

dissolved solids (GIS Database). The proposed clearing is not likely to cause salinity levels within the application or surrounding areas to alter.

The proposed clearing area is relatively flat, and is not associated with any permanent watercourses or waterbodies (GIS Database). The proposed clearing of approximately 53.43 hectares of native vegtation is unlikely to cause any deterioration in surface water quality.

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)
- Topographic Contours, Statewide

(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 232.9 millimetres and an average annual evaporation rate of 3,400 millimetres there is likely to be little surface flow during normal seasonal rains (BoM, 2017; 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 BoM (2017)

GIS Database:
- Hydrographic Catchments – Catchments

Planning instrument, Native Title, RIWI Act Licence, EP Act Licence, Works Approval, Previous EPA decision or other matter.

Comments There are two Native Title claims over the areas under application (WC2004/010; WC1999/046) (DAA, 2017). 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 (DAA, 2017). 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, 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 13 March 2017 by the Department of Mines and Petroleum inviting submissions from the public. No submissions were received.

Methodology DAA (2017)

4. References

BoM (2017) Climate statistics for Australian locations, Cue. Bureau of Meteorology. http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/averages/tables/cw_007017.shtml (Accessed 22 May 2017).

Curry, P.J., Payne, A.L., Leighton, K.A., Hennig, P. and Blood, D.A. (1994) An Inventory and Condition Survey of the Murchison River Catchment and Surrounds, Western Australia. Technical Bulletin No. 84. Department of Agriculture, Western Australia.

DAA (2017) Aboriginal Heritage Enquiry System. Department of Aboriginal Affairs. http://maps.dia.wa.gov.au/AHIS2/ (Accessed 22 May 2017).

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.

DPaW (2017) NatureMap. Department of Parks and Wildlife. http://naturemap.dec.wa.gov.au (Accessed 22 May 2017).
Florabase (2017) *Eremophila rostrata* Chinnock subsp. *rostrata* - Descriptions by the Western Australian Herbarium, Department of Parks and Wildlife. Text used with permission. https://florabase.dpaw.wa.gov.au/help/copyright - (Accessed 22 May 2017)
Government of Western Australia (2015) 2015 Statewide Vegetation Statistics Incorporating the CAR reserve analysis (Full Report). Department of Environment and Conservation, Western Australia, June 2015.
Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
Mabbutt JA, Litchfield WH, Speck NH, Sofoulis J, Wilcox DG, Arnold JA, Brookfield M and Wright RL(1963) General report on the lands of the Wiluna-Meekatharra area, Western Australia, 1958.CSIRO Land Research Series No. 7.
Paul Armstrong and Associates (2016) Vegetation Survey and Rare Flora Search of the Cue Victory Project, Conducted September 2016. Unpublished report dated October 2016.
Outback Ecology (2012) Level 1 Vegetation, Flora and Fauna Assessment. Unpublished report dated July 2012.

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)
DEE	Department of the Environment and Energy, Australian Government
DER	Department of Environment Regulation, Western Australia
DMP	Department of Mines and Petroleum, Western Australia
DRF	Declared Rare Flora
DoE	Department of the Environment, Australian Government (now DEE)
DoW	Department of Water, Western Australia
DPaW	Department of Parks and Wildlife, Western Australia
DSEWPaC	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (now DEE)
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority, Western Australia
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
PEC	Priority Ecological Community, Western Australia
RIWI Act	*Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914*, 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.