



Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 8316/1
Permit type: Purpose Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Norton Gold Fields Limited

1.3. Property details

Property: Mining Lease 24/564
Mining Lease 24/565
Mining Lease 24/616
Miscellaneous Licence 24/228
Miscellaneous Licence 24/229
Miscellaneous Licence 24/230

Local Government Area: City of Kalgoorlie-Boulder
Colloquial name: Golden Cities

1.4. Application

| Clearing Area (ha) | No. Trees | Method of Clearing | For the purpose of: |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|--|
| 300 | | Mechanical Removal | Mineral Production and associated activities |

1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Grant
Decision Date: 07 February 2019

2. Site Information

2.1. Existing environment and information

2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

- Vegetation Description** The vegetation of the application area is broadly mapped as the following Beard vegetation association/s:
10: Medium woodland: red mallee group; and
2903: Medium woodland; Salmon gum, goldfields blackbutt, gimlet and *Allocasuarina cristata* (GIS Database).
- The majority of the application area is mapped as Beard vegetation association 10. With the western end of the proposed haul road mapped as Beard vegetation association 2903.
- A flora and vegetation survey was conducted over the application area and the surrounding areas by Native Vegetation Solutions during October 2017. The following vegetation associations were recorded within the application area (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2018):
- Eucalyptus griffithsii* and *E. oleosa* over *Acacia acuminata* and *Acacia aneura* over *Triodia irritans*;
 - Low woodland of *Eucalyptus oleosa* and *Casuarina pauper* over scrub of *Acacia hemiteles* and *Eremophila dempsteri* over dwarf scrub of *Ptilous obovatus* and *Marieana triptera*;
 - Open mallee of *Eucalyptus* over scrub of *Acacia acuminata*/*Acacia ramulosa*/*Acacia effusifolia* over hummock grass of *Triodia irritans*;
 - Low woodland of *Eucalyptus clelandii* over low scrub of *Senna artemisoides* subsp. *filifolia* and *Acacia hemiteles*;
 - Eucalyptus oleosa* thicket;
 - Eucalyptus salmonophloia* and *Eucalyptus oleosa* over *Acacia acuminata* over mixed shrubs (creekline vegetation);
 - Mulga woodland;
 - Low woodland of *Casuarina pauper* over *Senna* shrubland;
 - Eucalyptus salmonophloia* over *Marieana sedifolia* and schelerophyll shrubland;
 - Open mallee of *Eucalyptus oleosa* and *Eucalyptus griffithsii* over low scrub of *Senna artemisoides* subsp. *filifolia* over hummock grass of *Triodia irritans*; and

k) Thicket of *Acacia effusifolia* and *Acacia acuminata* over hummock grass of *Triodia irritans*.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Clearing Description | Golden Cities. Norton Gold Fields Limited proposes to clear up to 300 hectares of native vegetation within a boundary of approximately 1,196 hectares, for the purpose of mineral production and associated activities. The project is located approximately 34 kilometres north of Kalgoorlie, within the City of Kalgoorlie-Boulder. |
| 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 (2018). The proposed clearing is for mining activities and mining related infrastructure including a haul road (Norton Gold Fields, 2018). The application area includes some areas historically cleared for mining activity (Norton Gold Fields, 2018). |

3. Assessment of application against Clearing Principles

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

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Comments | <p>Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle</p> <p>The clearing permit application area is located within the Eastern Murchison subregion of the Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) Murchison Bioregion (GIS Database). The subregion is characterised by its internal drainage and extensive areas of red sandplains, supporting Mulga woodlands, hummock grasslands, saltbush shrublands and Halosarcia shrublands (CALM, 2002).</p> <p>A flora and vegetation survey of the application area and surrounding areas was conducted in October 2017 by Native Vegetation Solutions. The survey recorded a total of 152 flora species, from 70 genera and 29 families. Eleven vegetation associations, were recorded within the survey area. The vegetation condition overall was considered to be "Good" to "Very Good" on the Keighery scale (Keighery, 1994; Native Vegetation Solutions, 2018).</p> <p>No Threatened or Priority Flora are known to occur within the survey area and none were recorded during the flora survey (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2018; GIS Database).</p> <p>No Threatened or Priority Ecological Communities, have been recorded within the survey area (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2018; GIS Database).</p> <p>The following weed species were recorded in the survey area: <i>Centaurea melitensis</i> (Maltese Cockspur), <i>Dittrichia graveolens</i> (Stinkwort) and <i>Salvia verbenaca</i> (Wild Sage) (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2018). None of these species are listed as declared plants under the <i>Biosecurity and Agriculture Management Act 2007</i> (DPIRD, 2018).</p> <p>A fauna habitat and Malleefowl (<i>Leipoa ocellata</i>) survey of the application area and surrounding area was conducted in November 2017 (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018a). The survey found four broad fauna habitats and two active Malleefowl mounds in the area.</p> <p>The annual Malleefowl monitoring conducted in December 2018 found no active mounds within the application area (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018b). However, two active mounds were found within approximately 100 metres of the boundary of the application area (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018b).</p> <p>The vegetation associations, fauna habitats and landform types present within the application area, are well represented in surrounding areas (Norton Gold Fields, 2018; GIS Database). The application area is unlikely to represent an area of higher biodiversity than surrounding areas, in either a local or regional context.</p> <p>Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.</p> |
| Methodology | <p>CALM (2002) DPIRD (2018) Keighery (1994) Native Vegetation Solutions (2018) Norton Gold Fields (2018) Terrestrial Ecosystems (2018a). Terrestrial Ecosystems (2018b)</p> <p>GIS Database: - IBRA Australia - Pre-European Vegetation</p> |

- Threatened and Priority Flora
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities Boundaries
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities Buffers
- Threatened Fauna

(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

A fauna desktop assessment noted that five species of threatened fauna and five migratory species of birds had potential to occur in the application area (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018a). A likelihood of occurrence and impact assessment found the Malleefowl (*Leipoa ocellata*) (listed as Vulnerable under both State and Federal legislation) would be likely to occur in the proposed project area and be impacted by the clearing (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018a).

A fauna survey of the application and surrounding area was conducted in November 2017 by Terrestrial Ecosystems. The survey broadly identified habitat type and searched for Malleefowl and their mounds. The survey recorded four fauna habitats (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018a):

1. Open shrubland with understorey of spinifex or tussock grasses;
2. Open eucalypt woodland over shrubs and chenopods of varying densities;
3. Dense shrubland; and
4. Mallee and shrubs of varying density.

The targeted Malleefowl search, recorded one Malleefowl and six mounds within the survey area; consisting of four inactive mounds and two active mounds. A further active mound was recorded just south of the survey area (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018a).

The annual Malleefowl monitoring survey conducted in December 2018 by Terrestrial Ecosystems recorded 22 mounds within a broader survey area. Two active mounds and three recently active mounds were recorded (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018b). All active and recently active mounds have been excluded from the application area (Norton Gold Fields, 2018). Two inactive mounds were recorded in the application area; and two active mounds were found within 100 meters of the application area (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018b).

The clearing impacts on vertebrate fauna were generally considered to be low given the large areas of similar habitat in adjacent areas (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018a). However, the proposed clearing could potentially significantly impact Malleefowl. The 2018 Malleefowl monitoring results indicate that Malleefowl are still present and breeding in the area (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2018b). Therefore, the proposed clearing of native vegetation may result in the loss of significant habitat for indigenous fauna.

Potential impacts to fauna habitat may be minimised by the implementation of a Malleefowl management condition.

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

Methodology

Norton Gold Fields (2018).
Terrestrial Ecosystems (2018a)
Terrestrial Ecosystems (2018b)

GIS Database:

- Imagery
- Pre-European Vegetation
- 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

There are no known records of Threatened flora within the application area (GIS Database). Flora surveys of the application area did not record any species of Threatened flora (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2018).

The vegetation associations within the application area are common and widespread within the region (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2018; GIS Database), 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 (2018)

GIS Database:

- Pre-European Vegetation
- Threatened and Priority

(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 or in close proximity to the application area (GIS Database).

A flora and vegetation survey of the application area did not identify any TECs (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2018).

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

Methodology Native Vegetation Solutions (2018)

GIS Database:

- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities Boundaries
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities Buffers

(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 Bioregion of the Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) (GIS Database). Approximately 99% of the pre-European vegetation still exists in the IBRA Murchison Bioregion (Government of Western Australia, 2018). The application area is broadly mapped as Beard vegetation associations 10: Medium woodland; red mallee group; and 2903: Medium woodland; Salmon gum, goldfield blackbutt, gimlet and *Allocasuarina cristata* (GIS Database). Over 96% of the pre-European extent of each of these vegetation associations remains uncleared at both the state and bioregional level (Government of Western Australia, 2018).

Therefore, the application area does not represent a significant remnant of native vegetation in an area that has been extensively cleared.

| | Pre-European area (ha)* | Current extent (ha)* | Remaining %* | Conservation Status** | Pre-European % in DBCA managed lands |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| IBRA Bioregion – Murchison | 28,120,587 | 28,044,823 | 99 | Least Concern | 7.7 |
| Beard vegetation associations – WA | | | | | |
| 10 | 145,676 | 144,163 | 98 | Least Concern | 3 |
| 2903 | 28,308 | 27,330 | 96 | Least Concern | 0 |
| Beard vegetation associations –Murchison Bioregion | | | | | |
| 10 | 65,387 | 64,757 | 99 | Least Concern | 4 |
| 2903 | 28,295 | 27,317 | 96 | Least Concern | 0 |

* Government of Western Australia (2018)

** 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 (2018)

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 the application area (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2018; GIS Database). Several minor seasonal creek lines pass through the application area (GIS Database).

There is creekline vegetation, *Eucalyptus salmonophloia* and *Eucalyptus oleosa* over *Acacia acuminata* over mixed shrubs, recorded in the survey area which, is growing in association with a minor seasonal creekline (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2017; GIS Database). However, the species composition does not significantly differ from the surrounding vegetation (Norton Gold Fields, 2018). Therefore, the impacts to the native vegetation associated with the watercourse are not considered to be significant.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is at variance to this Principle. Potential impacts to creekline vegetation may be minimised by the implementation of a watercourse management condition.

Methodology Native Vegetation Solutions (2017)
Norton Gold Fields (2018)

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 lies within the Doney, Gundockerta, Helag and Moriarty 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 Primary Industries and Regional Development).

The Gundockerta land system is the most extensive system within the application area, and consists of extensive gently undulating, calcareous, stony plains supporting bluebush shrublands. This land system may be susceptible to erosion if vegetation cover is removed (Pringle et al, 1994).

The Helag land system consists of hardpan plains supporting mulga and minor chenopod shrublands. This land system may be susceptible to erosion if vegetation cover is removed (Pringle et al, 1994).

The Moriarty land system consists of low greenstone and stony plains supporting chenopod shrublands with patchy eucalyptus overstoreys. This land system may be moderately susceptible to erosion if vegetation cover is removed (Pringle et al, 1994).

The Doney land system is described as calcareous plains supporting eucalypt woodlands, adjacent to salt lake systems. This land system is not generally susceptible to erosion (Pringle et al, 1994).

The proposed clearing of up to 300 hectares of native vegetation within a boundary of approximately 1,196 hectares, for the purpose of mineral production activities is unlikely to cause appreciable land degradation. Potential erosion may be minimised by the implementation of a staged clearing condition.

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

Methodology Pringle et al. (1994)

GIS Database:
- Landsystem Rangelands
- Soils, 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

There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of the application area. The nearest DBCA (formerly DPaW) managed land is the Bullock Holes Timber Reserve which is located approximately 26 kilometres south east of the application area at its nearest point (GIS Database). The proposed clearing is unlikely to impact on the environmental values of any conservation area.

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

Methodology GIS Database:

(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 the application area (GIS Database). The Broad Arrow Dam Catchment Area, Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA), is located approximately one kilometre from the western end of the proposed haul road. The proposed clearing is unlikely to impact the PDWSA. There are no permanent watercourses or wetlands within the area proposed to clear (GIS Database). Creek lines in the region are dry for most of the year, only flowing briefly immediately following significant rainfall (Norton Gold Fields, 2018). The proposed clearing is unlikely to result in significant changes to surface water flows.

Groundwater in the application area is hypersaline (Norton Gold Fields, 2018). The proposed clearing is unlikely to cause deterioration in the quality of underground water.

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

Methodology Norton Gold Fields (2018)

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 region is semi-arid, with a low average rainfall of approximately 267.8 millimetres per year (BoM, 2019).

There are no permanent water courses or waterbodies within the application area (GIS Database). Seasonal drainage lines are common in the region and temporary localised flooding may occur briefly following 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 (2019)

GIS Database:

- Hydrography, linear

Planning Instrument, Native Title, previous EPA decision or other matter.

Comments

The clearing permit application was advertised on 14 January 2019 by the Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DMIRS), inviting submissions from the public. No submissions were received in relation to this application.

There is one native title claim (WC2017/001) over the area under application (DPLH, 2019). 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*.

There are no registered Aboriginal Sites of Significance within the application area (DPLH, 2019). 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 Water and Environmental Regulation and the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions, 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 DPLH (2019)

4. References

- BoM (2019) Bureau of Meteorology Website – Climate Data Online, Kalgoorlie-Boulder. Bureau of Meteorology. <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/> (Accessed 18 January 2019).
- CALM (2002) A Biodiversity Audit of Western Australia's 53 Biogeographic Subregions in 2002. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Western Australia.
- 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.
- DPLH (2019) Aboriginal Heritage Enquiry System. Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage. <http://maps.daa.wa.gov.au/AHIS/> (Accessed 22 January 2019).
- Government of Western Australia (2018) 2017 Statewide Vegetation Statistics incorporating the CAR Reserve Analysis (Full Report). Current as of December 2017. WA Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions. <https://catalogue.data.wa.gov.au/dataset/dbca-statewide-vegetation-statistics>
- 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 (2018) Level 1 Flora and Vegetation Survey of the Golden Cities Project Area, Broad Arrow. Report prepared for Norton Gold Fields Limited, by Native Vegetation Solutions, January 2018.
- Norton Gold Fields (2018) Purpose Permit Application, Golden Cities. Norton Gold Fields Ltd, December 2018.
- Pringle H.J.R., Van Vreeswyk, A.M.E., and Gilligan S.A. (1994) An Inventory and Condition Survey of rangelands in the north-eastern Goldfields, Western Australia, Department of Agriculture, Western Australia.
- Terrestrial Ecosystems (2018a) Level 1 Fauna Risk Assessment and the results of a Malleefowl for the Golden Cities project area. Report prepared for Norton Gold Fields Limited, by Terrestrial Ecosystems, January 2018.
- Terrestrial Ecosystems (2018b) 2018 Annual Malleefowl Monitoring – Enterprise, Carbine and Golden Cities. Report prepared for Norton Goldfields Limited, by Terrestrial Ecosystems, December 2018.

5. Glossary

Acronyms:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| BoM | Bureau of Meteorology, Australian Government |
| DAA | Department of Aboriginal Affairs, Western Australia (now DPLH) |
| DAFWA | Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia (now DPIRD) |
| DBCA | Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions, Western Australia |
| DEC | Department of Environment and Conservation, Western Australia (now DBCA and DWER) |
| DEE | Department of the Environment and Energy, Australian Government |
| DER | Department of Environment Regulation, Western Australia (now DWER) |
| DMIRS | Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety, Western Australia |
| DMP | Department of Mines and Petroleum, Western Australia (now DMIRS) |
| DPIRD | Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development, Western Australia |
| DPLH | Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage, Western Australia |
| DRF | Declared Rare Flora |
| DoE | Department of the Environment, Australian Government (now DEE) |
| DoW | Department of Water, Western Australia (now DWER) |
| DPaW | Department of Parks and Wildlife, Western Australia (now DBCA) |
| DSEWPaC | Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (now DEE) |
| DWER | Department of Water and Environmental Regulation, Western Australia |
| 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 (2017) Conservation Codes for Western Australian Flora and Fauna. Department of Parks and Wildlife, Western Australia}:-

| | |
|----------|--|
| T | Threatened species: Published as Specially Protected under the <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> , 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 1950*.

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 1950*.

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.