

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 122

**Topic:** Little Mulgrave National Park –  
funding for eradication of Yellow  
Crazy Ants

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

In answer to questions regarding Yellow Crazy Ant infestation in Little Mulgrave National Park the department has identified that this is a state responsibility. Prior to the recent Queensland election, however, the Commonwealth provided \$5.4 million in funding towards this problem.

1. Has the full \$5.4 million been allocated to the Crazy Ant problem?
2. What additional funding is the Commonwealth planning to provide to combat Yellow Crazy Ant infestations?

**Answer:**

1. As noted in Senate Estimates in May 2012, the management of tramp ants, including yellow crazy ants, is primarily the responsibility of individual states and territories.

However, the Australian Government has allocated over \$5.4 million to the Northern Territory and Christmas Island to combat this issue.

2. In 2012/13, \$268,000 (GST exclusive) was allocated under Caring for our Country to the Wet Tropics Management Authority to support activities to manage yellow crazy ants in the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area, including the Little Mulgrave National Park. The ants have been spreading through parts of the World Heritage listed rainforest around Cairns in Far North Queensland.

The Commonwealth Government provided this funding for a surveillance program on the basis that the Queensland Government would fund an eradication scheme.

Recently, Biosecurity Queensland has downgraded its action to eradicate yellow crazy ants, saying it has reprioritised its resources.

The Commonwealth Government is yet to finalise the next phase of the Caring for our Country Program, however control of invasive pests will be a high priority for funding in the 2013/2018 Program. Including funding from the current program, over \$95 million will have been allocated to fund nationally cost-shared eradication programs for significant pests and diseases to 2016/17.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 123

**Topic:** Indigenous Heritage Program

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Scullion asked:**

Please indicate whether the programs and measures listed below are still operating in 2012-13. If they are still operating, please provide by program/ measure the current allocation and expenditure year to date (please indicate in respect of any of these programs/measures if information has already been provided):

a. Indigenous Heritage Program.

**Answer:**

The Indigenous Heritage Program continues to operate in 2012-13. The current allocation for the Program is \$3.645M. Expenditure year to date is \$38,800.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 124

**Topic:** Australian Heritage Council's report -  
Dampier Archipelago

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Ludlam asked:**

1. On what date was the Australian Heritage Council's report on the World Heritage values of the rock art of the Dampier Archipelago handed down to your department.
2. Will the Minister be making a formal response to Australian Heritage Council's (AHC) emergency assessment of the outstanding universal values of the Dampier Archipelago (including the Burrup Peninsula).
3. The Report found there is adequate existing research and data to justify that the heritage of the Dampier Archipelago meets the threshold of Outstanding Universal Value against World Heritage Criterion i - The Dampier Archipelago represents a masterpiece of human creative genius. What is the Ministers response to this?
4. The Report also found the Dampier Archipelago may also meet Criterion iii - The Dampier Archipelago bears a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilisation which is living, but that further work is required with Ngarda-Ngarli people to document the relationship between their beliefs and practices, and the images on the Dampier Archipelago. How will the Minister facilitate this work?

The report listed four categories of potential threats to the heritage values of the Dampier Archipelago site exist, these being:

- a. Industrial development;
  - b. Knowledge, management and engagement of the Ngarda-Ngarli people.
  - c. Secondary impacts from industrial development; and
  - d. Recreation, tourism and vandalism.
5. Of these four categories the first two present the highest risk threat to the heritage values. How is the Minister actively working to reduce those threats?
  6. Please outline the nature and details of engagement with the WA government on the issue of World Heritage Listing of the Dampier Archipelago including the Burrup Peninsula, to date.
  7. Please provide an update on any progress on a management plan between the WA Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) and the Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation (MAC).

**Answer:**

1. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) received the report on 5 April 2012.
2. The Minister is currently considering the Australian Heritage Council's report on the potential outstanding universal value of the Dampier Archipelago (including Burrup Peninsula).
3. Refer to the answer to question 2.
4. Refer to the answer to question 2.
5. The Dampier Archipelago (including Burrup Peninsula) was protected in 2007 by including the place in the National Heritage List under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. The department is working with the Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation and industry under two conservation agreements relating to the Dampier Archipelago (including Burrup Peninsula) to address the threats described in the Australian Heritage Council's report. Projects include the establishment of a pilot Aboriginal Land and Sea ranger unit administered by the Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation and heritage celebration and communication initiatives that also support the local Aboriginal community.
6. The Western Australian Government is best placed to advise on its engagement on the issue of world heritage listing of the Dampier Archipelago including the Burrup Peninsula. SEWPaC officials have regular discussions with the Western Australian Department of Environment and Conservation on the management of the Dampier Archipelago (including Burrup Peninsula) National Heritage Listed place, and in the last 12 months this has included discussions on the Australian Heritage Council's report on potential world heritage values.
7. The Western Australian Department of Environment and Conservation advise that a draft management plan is currently under development in conjunction with Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation. The management plan will be signed off after the formalisation of the joint management agreement for the proposed Murujuga National Park.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 125

**Topic:** Consideration of heritage projects for 2013

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Ludlam asked:**

1. Is the Minister currently considering which world heritage projects he should undertake next year?

**Answer:**

1. The Minister is currently considering a process for a world heritage nomination for Cape York Peninsula whereby only areas which have Traditional Owner consent will be included in the nomination.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD

**Question No:** 126

**Topic:** Heritage and Wildlife Division – budget

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Ludlam asked:**

1. How has the department been affected by the efficiency dividend.
2. In particular, please outline the number of staff, programs or line items that have been cut?
3. Please provide a history of funding to Heritage since 2000 to date, including FTEs, changes to the operating budget, and grants.

**Answer:**

1. The impact of the efficiency dividend on the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) is \$17,141 million in 2012/13.
2. The department budgets on the basis of its total resources. As the total resources available is impacted by a number of factors including Australian Government policy and priorities and general cost increases, it is not possible to identify the number of staff and programs that have been cut as a direct result of the application of the efficiency dividend.
3. The table below outlines the history of funding from the year 2000. The 2012/13 budget and staff numbers includes the total for the Heritage and Wildlife Division as a whole.

Financial Year	Departmental Appropriation	Administered Appropriation	Total Appropriation	Staffing ASL
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	
2012/13	16,308	12,992	29,300	147
2011/12	13,280	12,997	26,277	83
2010/11	19,051	14,233	33,284	107
2009/10	14,774	59,282	74,056	115
2008/09	19,234	20,045	39,279	117
2007/08	21,009	9,508	30,517	100
2006/07	22,778	13,924	36,702	102
2005/06	22,210	20,754	42,964	105
2004/05	22,385	5,235	27,620	108
2003/04	9,204	1,739	10,943	72
2002/03	11,404	10,554	21,958	63
2001/02	10,968	16,102	27,070	74
2000/01	7,010	5,230	12,240	71

The figures have been extracted from the department's Portfolio Budget Statement (PBS) and therefore reflect initial budget allocations for each year. For comparative purposes, the departmental appropriation excludes revenues from independent sources, given the variable and unpredictable nature of these funding sources.

An allocation for the Kokoda Initiative of \$4.5 million has been provided by AusAid, which is not reflected in the PBS figures.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question 127**  
**No:**

**Topic:** Kangaroos – removal of data from department website

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Rhiannon asked:**

The Department of Environment website previously had publically available kangaroo survey data, and quota and take data across Australia from various dates ranging from 1975 to the present, however earlier this year the historical datasets from 1975 to 1998 were removed from the website.

1. Whose decision was it to remove the data, and was the data removed at the request, concern or recommendation of any kangaroo industry affiliated individuals, researchers, or government agencies? And if so, whom and what are the details?
2. On what date was the data removed from public access, and when was that data originally made available on the website?
3. The Acting Director of Wildlife Trade Assessments in DSEWPaC advised a researcher who accesses and refers other investigators to the now removed data, that “earlier statistics were omitted because adding them would unnecessarily complicate the spreadsheet and web usage statistics showed that there were very few people accessing these older pages”.
  - a. By what process was it determined that researchers and the public found the data tables removed too complicated?
  - b. Given the complicated nature of, for example, ABS datacubes and spreadsheets, why are kangaroo researchers and interested investigators deemed as not capable of understanding the removed data which were presented in very clear and simple tables?
4. Has the data been removed because the industry and government does not wish to make public that the government’s own data shows severe historic decline in kangaroo populations and the actual numbers of species shot over the years?
5. In the interests of transparency and the importance of public knowledge and access to data, what is the process that would enable the removed data to be reinstalled on the website as excel spreadsheets – given the ease of converting tables into such databases and the little webspace a number of such clearly labelled spreadsheets would take up?
6. May I have a copy of the web usage statistics from 2002 until the time the data was removed from the website, regarding access to the national and state based “historical tables” (data) that have been removed.



7. Would the Minister agree the removal of the historical data now available misrepresents historical fact?
8. With the previous question in mind, the now available datasets on the website list a total of 803 whiptail wallabies being shot in Queensland from 2001 to 2003. However the removed data lists another 451,508 whiptail wallabies shot from 1975 to 1999.
  - a. Please provide the population data for all macropods subject to shooting across Australia, for all years where data exists.
  - b. Has the correlation between the numbers of whiptail wallabies shot in Queensland historically and the trendlines in population estimates over time been analysed?
    - i. If not, why not given the potential seriousness of any declines, and the ease of calculating such basic scientific data?
9. In the pdf version of the datasets currently available on the department's website, now without its historical pre 2001 data, it is stated that "prior to 2008, a small number of whiptail wallabies were commercially harvested in Queensland but are not included in this table" (p13): please explain how the historical total of 451,508 shot from 1975 to 2001 represents a "small" number of animals shot?
  - a. Would the Minister or department describe the 54,000 whiptail wallabies shot in 1979 alone as "small" compared to the data which remains on the website indicating 803 shot between 2001 to 2003?
  - b. What was the process, and on whose advice was this strongly deceptive language used?

**Answer:**

1. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) made the decision to remove the statistics. The department did not receive any requests to remove the data.
2. The data was put on the web in 2000 or earlier and removed from the website on 5 July 2012.
- 3a. The earlier statistics were replaced by a simpler spreadsheet to make the data from 2002-2011 more accessible to members of the public and be easier for the department to maintain and update.
- 3b. Refer to 3a.
4. No.
5. A request can be made to the department.

6. The department is unable to provide web usage statistics back to 2002. The statistics for the last three years are included in the following table.

**Web Usage Statistics for Historical Tables**

Time Period	Number of Unique Page Views						
	National	NSW	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA
17 Aug 2009-17 Aug 2010	161	55	76	31	39	72	48
18 Aug 2010-18 Aug 2011	196	26	45	20	33	50	32
19 Aug 2011-20 Aug 2012	124	48	38	48	20	27	41

7. No.
- 8a. Population estimates for red kangaroos, eastern and western grey kangaroos and wallaroo/euros are available. The population estimates are included in Tables 1-4 and cover only the areas where commercial harvesting occurs. Only one survey was undertaken for whiptail wallabies. The survey was undertaken in the harvest region (south-eastern Queensland) in 1987-88 and resulted in a population estimate of 695,800.
- 8b-8b(i). No. It is not possible to determine whether the numbers harvested correlate with population trends. Whiptail wallaby populations were only surveyed once.
9. The text in the table that states that a small number of whiptail wallabies were harvested prior to 2008 only refers to the wallabies harvested during the years covered by that table. The table covers the period 2000-2012.
- a. Refer to the answer to question 9.
- b. Refer to the answer to question 9.

**Table 1: Red Kangaroo (*Macropus rufus*)**

Note: Population estimates are based on aerial and ground surveys and are for the areas within Australia where commercial harvesting occurs. The actual national populations would be significantly higher as these figures do not include estimates for areas not surveyed.

<b>Year</b>	<b>New South Wales</b>	<b>Queensland</b>	<b>South Australia</b>	<b>Western Australia</b>
1981	4,626,000	1,960,850	2,175,200	889,600
1982	5,700,000	1,927,670	1,363,600	1,151,867
1983	3,400,000	1,894,490	813,200	1,414,133
1984	2,557,500	1,861,310	747,600	1,676,400
1985	3,662,650	2,527,678	1,139,900	1,894,567
1986	3,989,700	2,283,769	1,129,900	2,112,733
1987	4,304,350	2,448,371	963,300	2,330,900
1988	5,332,000	2,901,848	1,475,000	2,349,967
1989	6,356,550	2,404,494	1,428,500	2,369,033
1990	6,973,450	2,767,678	1,951,100	2,388,100
1991	7,370,250	3,390,000	1,669,100	2,083,667
1992	5,190,795	3,109,131	1,647,400	1,779,233
1993	4,395,426	2,899,694	1,491,600	1,474,800
1994	3,960,106	3,224,606	1,343,600	1,257,333
1995	4,185,494	2,792,457	2,060,500	1,039,867
1996	3,787,113	4,390,000	2,048,000	822,400
1997	5,285,995	3,050,000	1,487,000	878,200
1998	5,809,757	4,870,000	2,007,000	1,934,300
1999	4,705,664	5,440,000	1,708,000	2,330,000
2000	4,391,385	8,940,000	1,833,000	2,742,100
2001	5,121,413	8,851,000	1,775,000	1,687,100
2002	4,798,558	5,539,158	1,546,000	1,750,100
2003	2,235,114	3,752,242	994,000	1,746,500
2004	2,508,236	2,673,569	1,188,000	1,617,445
2005	2,241,497	3,296,450	1,052,000	1,163,300
2006	2,182,788	3,717,086	1,149,000	843,900
2007	2,524,448	3,435,635	962,000	723,880
2008	2,869,709	4,551,999	1,116,000	755,196
2009	2,456,795	5,004,684	1,031,000	904,506
2010	3,013,908	3,603,509	1,074,000	850,731
2011	3,972,522	5,745,591	1,158,000	638,185

**Table 2: Eastern Grey Kangaroo (*M. giganteus*)**

Note: Population estimates are based on aerial and ground surveys and are for the areas within Australia where commercial harvesting occurs. The actual national populations would be significantly higher as these figures do not include estimates for areas not surveyed.

<b>Year</b>	<b>New South Wales</b>	<b>Queensland</b>
1981	6,098,400	8,297,261
1982	9,324,000	7,882,864
1983	5,292,000	7,468,467
1984	2,741,760	7,054,071
1985	4,515,840	10,649,981
1986	5,262,012	11,877,301
1987	4,920,210	10,716,209
1988	3,849,930	10,552,709
1989	5,994,500	8,968,071
1990	8,037,960	7,810,339
1991	8,614,710	10,850,000
1992	7,874,100	8,482,582
1993	7,738,749	7,179,782
1994	5,426,382	6,293,133
1995	5,384,828	5,483,288
1996	4,427,575	6,170,000
1997	4,947,349	6,470,000
1998	5,754,812	9,440,000
1999	5,426,433	11,100,000
2000	5,755,494	17,400,000
2001	6,829,471	22,891,800
2002	8,293,707	15,089,542
2003	4,627,831	9,247,997
2004	3,328,133	7,783,707
2005	2,670,822	8,205,676
2006	2,936,255	7,488,671
2007	3,036,020	7,307,595
2008	4,104,232	7,327,249
2009	3,909,270	7,714,654
2010	4,756,792	6,652,443
2011	5,258,104	10,799,679

**Table 3: Western Grey Kangaroo (*M. fuliginosus*)**

Note: Population estimates are based on aerial and ground surveys and are for the areas within Australia where commercial harvesting occurs. The actual national populations would be significantly higher as these figures do not include estimates for areas not surveyed.

<b>Year</b>	<b>New South Wales</b>	<b>South Australia</b>	<b>Western Australia</b>
1981		656,395	673,300
1982		620,840	711,833
1983		362,074	750,367
1984		224,790	788,900
1985		379,654	864,333
1986		399,012	939,767
1987	1,693,650	409,877	1,015,200
1988	1,315,650	442,074	1,090,633
1989	2,010,750	447,605	1,166,067
1990	2,722,440	383,012	1,231,200
1991	2,922,570	369,185	1,125,167
1992	2,772,000	495,605	1,008,833
1993	2,484,496	515,951	892,500
1994	2,090,463	762,469	764,567
1995	2,552,778	1,214,381	636,633
1996	1,727,832	1,026,000	508,700
1997	2,107,718	952,000	664,700
1998	1,878,601	963,000	664,700
1999	2,088,768	969,000	688,300
2000	1,792,228	853,000	748,145
2001	2,031,612	751,000	642,380
2002	2,387,589	810,000	566,700
2003	1,265,031	679,000	666,900
2004	896,420	689,000	1,433,900
2005	602,208	550,000	1,473,500
2006	653,524	576,000	1,412,700
2007	726,363	535,000	1,893,295
2008	989,559	625,000	1,264,929
2009	722,255	658,000	1,653,464
2010	662,982	720,000	1,407,376
2011	496,059	674,800	1,177,534

**Table 4: Euro/Wallaroo (*M. robustus*)**

Note: Population estimates are based on aerial and ground surveys and are for the areas within Australia where commercial harvesting occurs. The actual national populations would be significantly higher as these figures do not include estimates for areas not surveyed. *M. robustus* was also harvested in Western Australia until 2002 and from 2007-2009.

<b>Year</b>	<b>New South Wales</b>	<b>Queensland</b>	<b>South Australia</b>
1989	300,000		
1990	413,700		
1991	434,000	1,250,000	
1992	456,000	1,256,737	
1993	456,000	1,163,615	
1994	433,200	1,123,752	
1995	450,528	1,205,434	
1996	351,414	1,274,815	
1997	397,096	1,800,000	412,000
1998	431,879	2,660,000	412,000
1999	427,559	5,250,000	412,000
2000	448,750	5,810,000	412,000
2001	448,750	5,831,500	401,000
2002	448,750	2,227,428	388,000
2003	220,738	2,389,168	390,000
2004	208,104	2,468,407	520,000
2005	208,104	2,705,734	467,000
2006	208,104	1,950,901	488,000
2007	114,966	2,343,408	406,000
2008	114,966	2,740,994	505,000
2009	114,966	2,405,729	465,000
2010	88,430	1,916,855	411,000
2011	88,430	3,799,973	494,800

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 128

**Topic:** Leadbeater's Possum recovery plan  
– public consultation and review

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Di Natale asked:**

The Department's answer to this question also claimed that the Recovery Plan has completed a period of public consultation and has been reviewed by the Threatened Species Scientific Committee.

1. Please provide details of when, where and with whom public consultations occurred in this context, including who was consulted and over what period of time.
2. What date was the Plan shown to the Commonwealth Threatened Species Scientific Committee?

**Answer:**

1. The draft recovery plan was made available for public comment from 4 March to 3 May 2011. Advertisements inviting comments from members of the public were placed in *The Australian* newspaper on 4 March 2011 and the *Commonwealth Gazette* on 9 March 2011.
2. The draft recovery plan was provided to a Threatened Species Scientific Committee (TSSC) working group in mid-November 2011, for review ahead of the full TSSC meeting in March 2012. At the same time, the draft recovery plan was made available to all TSSC members to view and provide comments to the working group.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 129

**Topic:** Leadbeater's Possum recovery plan  
– response to Budget Estimates  
question on notice 120

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Di Natale asked:**

2012 Budget Estimates Question 120 to the Department asked what action was being undertaken in relation to the Commonwealth's Leadbeater's Possum recovery plan. The Department advised that The Commonwealth recovery plan for Leadbeater's possum is being revised.

This answer appears to conflate the Victorian Action Statement under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act with the federal Recovery Plan under the EPBC Act.

The Victorian Action Statement has been under revision for 3 years, since August 2009 but a revised version has not yet been completed or approved. It appears that the Commonwealth recovery plan is not in fact being revised independently of the Action Statement.

1. Did the Department's previous answer conflate the Victorian Action Statement under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act with the federal Recovery Plan under the EPBC Act?
2. Is the Department aware of whether the Commonwealth recovery plan is being revised independently of the Victorian Action Statement? If so, please provide details of this process, including particularly timelines, parties involved and details of any public consultations which have occurred or are planned.
3. Is there any difference between the proposed Victorian Action Statement under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act and the federal Recovery Plan as currently proposed? If yes what are these differences?

**Answer:**

1. No. There was no mention of the Victorian Action Statement in the response to the May 2012 Budget Estimates Question 120.
2. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) understands that the Victorian Department of Sustainability and Environment (DSE) is revising the Victorian Action Statement in parallel with the recovery plan, but the Commonwealth Government is not directly involved with the Victorian Action Statement, which is solely a Victorian Government matter.



The current Leadbeater's Possum recovery plan is being revised by the Victorian DSE in consultation with the department. Once the plan has been finalised it will be considered for adoption as a national recovery plan under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (the EPBC Act).

3. The department has had no direct involvement with the Victorian Action Statement, which is solely a Victorian Government document.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 130

**Topic:** National Heritage Strategy

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Ludlam asked:**

1. Further to 95 submissions being received by 15 June 2012, please outline the expected timeline from here and when it is expected that the Strategy will be released.
2. What will a National Heritage Strategy mean in concrete terms for Australian heritage.
3. How will the successive cuts to the Heritage department impact on the ability for national oversight of any strategy.

**Answer:**

1. The timing of release of the final strategy has not yet been determined.
2. The contents of the strategy are still being developed.
3. See response to question 2.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD

**Question No:** 131

**Topic:** Obligate Seeding Proteaceae

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Siewert asked:**

What is the status of the assessment of the Obligate Seeding Proteaceae as a threatened ecological community & what are the plans for funding and resourcing the protection of this Threatened Ecological Community?

**Answer:**

The Threatened Species Scientific Committee has commenced its assessment of *Obligate Seedling Proteaceae and Kwongan of the Esperance Sandplains* for potential listing as a threatened ecological community under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 132

**Topic:** Predator control in the Central Highlands

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Di Natale asked:**

In 2012 Budget Estimates Question 120 to the Department, the Department advised that Recovery Actions under the current plan that are being implemented by the Victorian Department of Sustainability and Environment include \$1 million invested over four years for predator control in the central highlands. Please provide details of this program, specifically:

1. Can the Department provide any final, progress or interim reports, or any other documentation of this kind relating to this program? Are any such documents publicly available?
2. What predators were/are targeted by this program? In what geographic areas?
3. Was this program supported by any research into predation of Leadbeaters Possum specifically? What were the intended Outcomes of this Program? Was it designed specifically and solely to protect the Leadbeater's Possum? If the program was not specifically or solely targeted at protecting the Leadbeater's Possum, how many other species were intended to be protected by the program?
4. How was the program implemented? Which agency or agencies implemented it?
5. Please provide a breakdown as to how this \$1 million was spent. How much was spent on staffing?
6. Is this funding now exhausted? If so when did funding conclude and have any other predation control programs taken its place?

**Answer:**

The program that has been referred to is a predator control project managed by the Victorian Government. Queries should be referred to the Victorian Government.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question 133**  
**No:**

**Topic:** Sustainability of kangaroo -  
harvesting

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Rhiannon asked:**

The federal government requires kangaroo management plans be developed before kangaroo products may be commercially exported and which must demonstrate the harvest of kangaroos is ecologically sustainable and does not have a detrimental impact either on the harvested species or their ecosystems. The government also states that the biology, population sizes and trends of the species are “carefully examined”:

1. Is the Minister aware that NSW survey data shows unrelenting downward trendlines for all species of large kangaroos from 1975 to current?
2. Is the Minister aware that the four large macropods have been nominated to the NSW Scientific Committee, based on these trends and a review of the population ecology and biology of these species? If not, why not given the commitment to “careful examination” of trends and biology of species?
  - a. Will the Minister requesting review of those findings and the concerns expressed in that paper, given the issuing of export licenses is dependent on “careful examination” of trends and sustainability?
  - b. Will the Minister ensure any such review is independent and not carried out by researchers who have been or are funded by the RIRDC or the KIAA, which have explicitly stated bias towards supplying research that only supports the commercial shooting of kangaroos?
  - c. Will or has the Minister applied the precautionary principle in granting export licences for all macropods given the concerns in that nomination are relevant to all population estimates of kangaroos across Australia?

**Answer:**

1. New South Wales survey data shows that macropod populations have fluctuated in size. Since 2007, there have been increases in red kangaroo and eastern grey kangaroo populations.
2. No.
  - a. No.
  - b. Refer to 2a.
  - c. Yes.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 134

**Topic:** Sustainability of kangaroo - quotas

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Rhiannon asked:**

With reference to the government's "careful examination" of the sustainability of commercial kangaroo shooting:

1. How is a 15 – 20% quota justified as sustainable when the population growth rate of kangaroos is biologically only 3 - 8%, and that in good seasons only?
2. How is the shooting of kangaroos during drought justified as sustainable when you have up to 25% adult mortality per annum and no juvenile recruitment leading up to a 35% population reduction pa?
3. With reference to the department's website claim that since 2001 the percentage of the quota "used" has been averaging less than 65%, how does this correlate with actual counts of populations within each kangaroo management zone since 1975 or the earliest datasets for population estimates, quotas and takes (kangaroos actually shot).
4. In early 2012 the labelling of the quota data on the Dept Environment website was changed to "sustainable quota". On what and whose advice was this label changed to include the word 'sustainable', and was this part of a marketing exercise given the government's commitment to building overseas markets for kangaroo products?

**Answer:**

1. A 15 – 20 per cent quota is justified as sustainable according to published scientific literature (Caughley, 1987; Hacker et al. 2003, 2004) and has been demonstrated via the monitoring of harvested kangaroo populations.
2. Quotas are based on population estimates from regular surveys. During drought harvesting may be discontinued in some areas.
3. The percentage of quota that has been used does not correlate with actual counts of populations. The percentage of quota used is driven by market demand.
4. The department added the word 'sustainable' in 2012 to reflect that a quota is set at or below a sustainable rate. This wording change was not part of a marketing exercise. The department is not involved in building overseas markets or any marketing of kangaroo products.

## ***References***

Caughley G (1987a) 'Ecological relationships', in G Caughley, N Shepherd & J Short (eds), Kangaroos: their ecology and management in the sheep rangelands of Australia, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 159-187

Hacker R, McLeod S, Druhan J, Tenhumberg B & Pradhan U (2004) Kangaroo management options in the Murray-Darling Basin, report to Murray-Darling Basin Commission, Canberra.

Hacker RB, McLeod SR & Druhan J (2003) Evaluating alternative management strategies for kangaroos in the Murray-Darling Basin, final report to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, Canberra.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 135

**Topic:** Threatened species – threat abatement plan development

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Waters asked:**

1. For how many listed threatened species and ecological communities has a threat abatement plan been developed?
2. What has been the average time between listing of a threatened species or ecological community and the development of a recovery plan?
3. How are recovery plans actually implemented? Who is obliged to comply with them, who funds their implementation, what change have they affected for the predicament of the subject species or ecological community?
4. How often are recovery plans updated to take account of the best available science?

**Answer:**

1. There are 13 approved threat abatement plans. There are also 473 recovery plans in place covering 754 threatened species and 23 ecological communities. In addition, there are another 109 plans currently in preparation covering 172 threatened species and 23 ecological communities.
2. As there are 754 threatened species and 23 ecological communities covered by recovery plans, it is not possible to generate this information without substantial diversion of resources.
3. The implementation of recovery actions is generally the result of collaborative investment in and participation by all levels of Government, non-government organisations, research organisations and community groups. As the majority of recovery plans under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (the EPBC Act) are adopted State and Territory recovery plans, their implementation is largely facilitated by the relevant jurisdiction. Implementation for many recovery plans is overseen by a recovery team comprising representative stakeholders.



Recovery plans are binding on the Australian Government and the government is responsible for implementation in Commonwealth areas. Under section 268 of the EPBC Act a Commonwealth agency must not take any action that contravenes a recovery plan. Approvals under section 18 of the EPBC Act for actions that may have a significant impact on listed threatened species or ecological communities in states or territories must not be inconsistent with a recovery plan (or threat abatement plan).

The funding of conservation measures consistent with identified recovery plan actions comes from a range of Commonwealth Government programs including Caring for our Country and the Biodiversity Fund. These programs are further complemented by State and Territory Government funding programs.

For many species and ecological communities it may take some time before significant and long-lasting improvements in condition are observed following conservation intervention. Examples where recovery program investment and implementation is leading to improvement in the conservation of the species include the Northern Hairy Nosed Wombat, Western Swamp Tortoise and threatened plants on Kangaroo Island.

4. Under section 279 of the EPBC Act, the Minister may, at any time, review a recovery plan or threat abatement plan that has been made or adopted and consider whether a variation of it is necessary. Each plan must be reviewed by the Minister at intervals of not longer than 5 years. Reviewing and revising plans including updating with new information is part of the adaptive management approach to recovery planning.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD

**Question No:** 136

**Topic:** Threatened species – Key  
Threatening Process nominations

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Waters asked:**

1. How many nominations for KTPs have been submitted to the Department since 2007? For each please detail:
  - a. When was the nomination received?
  - b. Was it listed? If so, when?
  - c. If not, on what grounds was the nomination not supported?
  - d. If not listed due to lack of adequate information, what steps has the Department taken to get adequate information to allow assessment in future?

**Answer:**

1. Since 2007, the department has received 14 nominations to list KTPs under the EPBC Act.
  - a-c. Responses to questions a-c are provided in the following table.

Note: In addition to the nominations outlined below, a nomination to list 'Novel biota and its impact on biodiversity' is also currently under assessment. This nomination was put forward by the Threatened Species Scientific Committee (TSSC) (it is not a public nomination).

<b>KTP Nomination</b>	<b>Date nominated</b>	<b>Is it listed? If so, when?</b>	<b>Why nomination not supported</b>
Biodiversity decline and habitat degradation in the Australian rangelands due to the proliferation, placement and management of artificial watering points	4/01/2007	No	Currently under assessment
Fire regimes that cause biodiversity decline	16/02/2007	No	Currently under assessment

KTP Nomination	Date nominated	Is it listed? If so, when?	Why nomination not supported
The loss and degradation of native plant and animal habitats by invasion of escaped garden plants	9/05/2007	Yes - 8/01/2010	Not applicable
Resuspension of Polluted Marine Sediments into the Parent Water Body as a Result of Development or Dredging	9/05/2007	No	Not eligible for consideration under EPBC Act as the nomination did not meet requirements specified by the EPBC regulations.
The invasion, establishment and spread of <i>Lantana camara</i> impacts negatively on native biodiversity including many EPBC listed species and communities	10/05/2007	No	This nomination was not prioritised for assessment as it falls fully within the scope of a broader KTP under assessment.
Ecosystem degradation, habitat loss and species decline due to urban, semi-urban, industrial & other similar development (e.g. infrastructure development) and subsequent human occupation affecting nationally critically endangered, endangered or vulnerable species or ecological communities or those likely to become so.	26/03/2009	No	This nomination was not prioritised for assessment as it encompasses the effects of a number of other KTPs, assessment would duplicate work already completed or underway, and the proposed KTP was insufficiently defined, extending across multiple ecosystems and multiple sub-threats.
Human population growth in Australia	22/03/2010	No	This nomination was not prioritised for assessment as this process is influenced by a broad range of economic and social drivers, only some of which are under governmental control. It would also overlap with existing KTPs.
Ecosystem degradation, habitat loss and species decline due to invasion in southern Australia by introduced Tall Wheat Grass ( <i>Lophopyrum ponticum</i> )	26/03/2010	No	This nomination was not prioritised for assessment as it falls fully within the scope of a broader KTP under assessment.

KTP Nomination	Date nominated	Is it listed? If so, when?	Why nomination not supported
Degradation of listed species and communities by urban, semi-urban and other development	24/03/2011	No	This nomination was not prioritised for assessment as it encompasses the effects of a number of other KTPs, and assessment would duplicate work already completed or underway.
Herbivory and Habitat destruction by Feral Deer	30/03/2011	No	This nomination was not prioritised for assessment as it falls fully within the scope of a broader KTP under assessment.
Aggressive exclusion of birds from potential woodland and forest habitat by overabundant noisy miners <i>Manorina melanocephala</i>	8/4/2011	No	Currently under assessment.
Recreational game fishing – competition game fishing especially for sharks, tuna and marlins	20/03/2012	No	To be considered in 2013.
Fatal injury to marine mammals, reptiles, and other large marine species through boat strike on the Australian coast	22/03/2012	No	To be considered in 2013.
Ecosystem degradation, habitat loss and species decline in arid and semi-arid Australia due to the invasion of buffel grass ( <i>Cenchrus ciliaris</i> and <i>C. pennisetiformis</i> )	22/03/2012	No	To be considered in 2013.

- d. Since 2007, no KTP nominations have not been listed, or not included on the Finalised Priority Assessment List, due solely to a lack of adequate information.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 137

**Topic:** Threatened species – nominations

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Waters asked:**

1. How many nominations for threatened species and ecological communities have been submitted to the Department since 2007? For each please detail:
  - a. When was the nomination received?
  - b. How far did the nomination progress? (PPAL/ FPAL)
  - c. Was it listed? If so, when?
  - d. If not, on what grounds was the nomination not supported/ not proceed for full assessment?
  - e. If not listed due to lack of adequate information, what steps has the Department taken to get adequate information to allow assessment in future?

**Answer:**

1. Since 2007, the department has received 122 nominations to list threatened species under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (the EPBC Act). In the same period the department has received 46 nominations for threatened ecological communities.
  - a-d. Responses to questions a-d are in **Attachment A** for threatened species and **Attachment B** for threatened ecological communities.
  - e. If a lack of information was the reason for a decision not to include a species or ecological community on a list the nominator was typically advised of that fact and it was noted that a new nomination may be submitted if new data becomes available. This applied both to decisions not to include the entity on the Finalised Priority Assessment List and, for those species that proceeded to full assessment, to not include them on the threatened species list under the EPBC Act. An exception to this is for the nomination of the snubfin dolphin. The department is currently undertaking a process to identify research that could enable the status of the snubfin dolphin to be assessed.

**ATTACHMENT A**

<b>Note:</b> Species are listed in alphabetical order within year of receipt, however if nominations are received after the call for nominations period (usually end of March), in any one year, they are considered for the PPAL/FPAL in the following year.							
<b>Species Nominated</b> <b>Scientific name</b>	<b>Common name</b>	<b>a. Date received</b>	<b>b. On PPAL?</b>	<b>On FPAL?</b>	<b>c. EPBC Listed?</b>	<b>Date listed</b>	<b>d. Reason for no assessment</b>
<i>Caladenia intuta</i>	ghost spider-orchid	10/05/2007	✓	2007	Include	08/01/2009	–
<i>Callocephalon fimbriatum</i>	gang-gang cockatoo	10/05/2007	✗	–	–	–	Ineligible: Failed regulations
<i>Conilurus penicillatus</i>	brush-tailed rabbit-rat	08/05/2007	✓	2007	Include	06/12/2008	–
<i>Cyclodomorphus praealtus</i>	alpine she-oak skink	07/06/2007	✓	2008	Include	24/12/2009	–
<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	leatherback turtle	09/05/2007	✓	2007	Uplist	08/01/2009	–
<i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i>	Patagonian toothfish	09/05/2007	✓	2008	No change	–	–
<i>Diuris flavescens</i>	Wingham doubletail	15/08/2007	✗	–	–	–	Ineligible: Failed regulations. Nomination re-submitted in 2009 - see entry below
<i>Elseya irwini</i>	Irwin's turtle	09/05/2007	✓	2007	No change	–	–
<i>Endiandra virens</i>	white apple	26/04/2007	✗	–	–	–	Ineligible: Failed regulations
<i>Hibbertia</i> sp. Bankstown (R.T.Miller & C.P.Gibson s.n. 18/10/06)	a shrub	12/02/2007	✓	2007	Include	16/01/2009	–
<i>Lasiopetalum</i> sp. Proston (J.A.Baker 17)	Proston lasiopetalum	10/05/2007	✓	2008	Include	12/02/2010	–
<i>Liopholis guthega</i>	Guthega skink	14/08/2007	✓	2009	Include	23/02/2011	–
<i>Litoria myola</i>	Kuranda tree frog	12/04/2007	✓	2008	Include	28/01/2010	–
<i>Melanotaenia utcheensis</i>	Utchee Creek rainbowfish	09/05/2007	✗	–	–	–	Ineligible: Failed regulations
<i>Nematoceras dienemum</i>	windswept helmet-orchid	10/05/2007	✓	2008	Include	12/02/2010	–
<i>Notelaea ipsviciensis</i>	Cooneana olive	02/04/2007	✓	2007	Include	22/01/2009	–
<i>Phebalium distans</i>	Mt Berryman phebalium	10/05/2007	✓	2007	Include	22/01/2009	–
<i>Reedia spathacea</i>	reedia	10/05/2007	✓	2007	Include	22/01/2009	–

<i>Thalassarche chrysostoma</i>	grey-headed albatross	07/05/2007	✓	2008	Uplist	24/12/2009	–
<i>Thelymitra cyanapicata</i>	blue top sun-orchid	10/05/2007	✓	2007	Include	08/01/2009	–
<i>Thelymitra sp. Kangaloon (D.L.Jones 18108)</i>	Kangaloon sun-orchid	10/05/2007	✓	2007	Include	08/01/2009	–
<i>Thunnus maccoyii</i>	southern bluefin tuna	02/01/2007	✓	2007	Include	15/12/2010	–
<i>Urolophus orarius</i>	coastal stingaree	09/05/2007	✓	2008	Not listed	–	–
<i>Centrophorus harrissoni</i>	Harrisson's dogfish	TSSC nomination	✓	2008	Currently under assessment	–	–
<i>Centrophorus moluccensis</i>	Endeavour dogfish	TSSC nomination	✓	2008	Not listed	–	–
<i>Centrophorus zeehaani</i>	southern dogfish	TSSC nomination	✓	2008	Currently under assessment	–	–
<i>Engaewa pseudoreducta</i>	Margaret River burrowing crayfish	28/02/2008	✓	2008	Include	24/04/2009	–
<i>Engaewa reducta</i>	Dunsborough burrowing crayfish	28/02/2008	✓	2008	Include	24/04/2009	–
<i>Engaewa walpolea</i>	Walpole burrowing crayfish	28/02/2008	✓	2008	Include	24/04/2009	–
<i>Phascolarctos cinereus</i>	koala	TSSC nomination	✓	2008	Include	02/05/2012	(Public nomination received in 2009 - superseded by TSSC nomination - see entry below)
<i>Prasophyllum atratum</i>	Three Hummock leek-orchid	28/03/2008	✓	2008	Include	13/11/2009	–
<i>Prasophyllum limnetes</i>	marsh leek-orchid	25/03/2008	✓	2008	Include	13/11/2009	–
<i>Pseudomys novaehollandiae</i>	New Holland mouse	24/08/2008	✓	2009	Include	11/08/2010	–
<i>Sarcophilus harrisi</i>	Tasmanian devil	26/09/2008	✓	2008	Uplist	29/05/2009	–
<i>Acanthophis hawkei</i>	plains death adder	25/11/2009	✓	2010	Include	11/05/2012	–
<i>Aipysurus apraefrontalis</i>	short-nosed seasnake	26/03/2009	✓	2009	Include	15/02/2011	–
<i>Aipysurus foliosquama</i>	leaf-scaled seasnake	26/03/2009	✓	2009	Include	15/02/2011	–
<i>Azorella macquariensis</i>	Macquarie azorella	26/03/2009	✗	–	Include	19/08/2010	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process

<i>Blechnum geniculatum</i>	a fern	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Botaurus poiciloptilus</i>	Australasian bittern	26/03/2009	✓	2009	Include	03/03/2011	–
<i>Callistemon wimmerensis</i>	Wimmera bottlebrush	25/03/2009	✓	2009	Include	31/03/2011	–
<i>Canis lupus dingo</i>	dingo	06/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Data deficient. Re-nominated in 2010 - see entry below
<i>Carcharhinus obscurus</i>	dusky whaler	26/03/2009	✓	2009	Currently under assessment	–	Yes: Minister requested further advice from TSSC on what would be required to address data deficiency and required timeline
<i>Cardamine gunnii</i>	common bittercress	24/03/2009	✓	2009	Not listed	–	–
<i>Carmichaelia exsul</i>	a shrub	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Coprosma inopinata</i>	a shrub	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Coprosma sp. nov.</i>	a shrub	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Corunastylis littoralis</i>	Tuncurry midge orchid	11/02/2009	✓	2009	Include	22/02/2011	–
<i>Craterocephalus fluviatilis</i>	Murray hardyhead	24/03/2009	✓	2010	Uplist	16/03/2012	–
<i>Diuris flavescens</i>	Wingham doubletail	11/02/2009	×	–	Currently under assessment	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Euastacus bispinosus</i>	Glenelg spiny freshwater crayfish	25/03/2009	✓	2009	Include	15/02/2011	–
<i>Eucalyptus yarraensis</i>	Yarra gum	26/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Ineligible: Failed regulations
<i>Geniostoma huttonii</i>	a shrub	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Hyridella glenelgensis</i>	Glenelg freshwater mussel	25/03/2009	✓	2009	Include	16/02/2011	–



<i>Idiosoma nigrum</i>	shield-backed trapdoor spider	25/03/2009	×	–	Currently under assessment	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>	shortfin mako	26/03/2009	✓	2009	Currently under assessment	–	Yes: Minister requested further advice from TSSC on what would be required to address data deficiency and required timeline
<i>Isurus paucus</i>	longfin mako	26/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Considered data deficient
<i>Lathamus discolor</i>	swift parrot	26/03/2009	✓	2009	No change	–	–
<i>Lepidorrhachis mooreana</i>	Little Mountain palm	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Passiflora herbertiana</i> <i>subsp. insulae-howeii</i>	a vine	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Pelargonium sp. Striatellum</i> (G.W.Carr 10345)	a shrub	26/03/2009	✓	2010	Include	21/12/2011	–
<i>Phascogale pirata</i>	northern brush-tailed phascogale	26/03/2009	×	–	Include	19/08/2010	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Phascolarctos cinereus</i>	koala	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Superseded by TSSC nomination; see entry above.
<i>Polystichum moorei</i>	rock shield fern	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Pomaderris vacciniifolia</i>	round-leaf pomaderris	27/05/2009	×	–	Currently under assessment	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Prasophyllum bagoense</i>	Bago leek-orchid	09/08/2009	✓	2010	Include	03/05/2012	–
<i>Prasophyllum innubum</i>	Brandy Marys leek-orchid	09/08/2009	×	–	Currently under assessment	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Prasophyllum keltonii</i>	Keltons leek-orchid	09/08/2009	×	–	Currently under assessment	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process

<i>Prasophyllum pruinosum</i>	plum leek-orchid	27/03/2009	×	–	Include	19/08/2010	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Senecio longicollaris</i>	a daisy	26/03/2009	✓	2010	No change	–	–
<i>Sepia apama</i>	Australian cuttlefish	26/03/2009	✓	2009	Not listed	–	–
<i>Solanum bauerianum</i>	bridal flower (Lord Howe Is.)	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Sphyrna mokarran</i>	great hammerhead	26/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Data deficient. Re-nominated in 2011 - on 2012/2013 FPAL - see entry below
<i>Sternula nereis nereis</i>	fairy tern (Australian)	26/03/2009	✓	2009	Include	03/03/2011	–
<i>Stiphodon allen</i>	Allen's cling goby	23/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Withdrawn - assessed under the synonym <i>Stiphodon semoni</i>
<i>Stiphodon semoni</i>	opal cling goby	23/03/2009	✓	2009	Include	16/02/2011	–
<i>Stiphodon sp. 1</i>	Daintree cling goby	26/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Taudactylus pleione</i>	Kroombit tinker frog	26/03/2009	✓	2010	Uplist	18/01/2012	–
<i>Thaumatoperla alpina</i>	alpine stonefly	26/03/2009	✓	2009	Include	31/03/2011	–
<i>Trisyntopa scatophaga</i>	a concealer moth	10/10/2009	×	–	Currently under assessment	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Xylosma parvifolium</i>	a shrub	24/03/2009	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Acizzia keithi</i>	Keith's plant-louse	29/01/2010	×	–	–	–	Minister accepted TSSC advice not to prioritise nomination for assessment
<i>Acizzia veski</i>	Vesk's plant-louse	29/01/2010	×	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Canis lupus dingo</i>	dingo	09/03/2010	×	–	–	–	Data deficient
<i>Carcharhinus leucas</i>	bull shark	09/03/2010	×	–	–	–	Data deficient
<i>Carcharhinus plumbeus</i>	sandbar shark	09/03/2010	×	–	–	–	Data deficient

<i>Cheilinus undulatus</i>	humphead Maori wrasse	TSSC nomination	✓	2010	Currently under assessment	–	Yes: Minister has requested further advice from TSSC
<i>Epinephelus daemeli</i>	black cod	TSSC nomination	✓	2010	Include	4/04/2012	–
<i>Falco subniger</i>	black falcon	18/01/2010	✗	–	–	–	Ineligible
<i>Genoplesium baueri</i>	yellow gnat-orchid	24/03/2010	✗	–	Currently under assessment	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Melaleuca megalongensis</i>	a shrub	16/02/2010	✗	–	–	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Pterostylis oreophila</i>	Kiandra greenhood	12/03/2010	✓	2010	Include	03/05/2012	–
<i>Sargassum amaliae</i>	a marine algae	24/03/2010	✗	–	Currently under assessment	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>	scalloped hammerhead shark	09/03/2010	✗	–	–	–	Considered data deficient. Re-nominated in 2012 - on 2012/2013 FPAL - see entry below.
The sawmillers, loggers and Red Gum communities of the Murray River		10/02/2010	✗	–	–	–	Ineligible: Failed regulations
<i>Adclarkia cameroni</i>	Brigalow woodland snail	22/09/2011	✗	–	Currently under assessment	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Adclarkia dulacca</i>	Dulacca woodland snail	22/09/2011	✗	–	Currently under assessment	–	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Alopias vulpinus</i>	thresher shark	24/03/2011	✗	–	–	–	Data deficient
<i>Brachychiton sp. Ormeau (L.H.Bird AQ435851)</i>	Ormeau bottle tree	24/02/2011	✓	2011	Currently under assessment	–	–
<i>Bidyanus bidyanus</i>	silver perch	TSSC nomination	✓	2011	Currently under assessment	–	–
<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	oceanic whitetip shark	24/03/2011	✗	–	–	–	Data deficient

<i>Eucalyptus aggregata</i>	black gum	25/10/2011	Eligible for reconsideration	-	-	-	To be considered for possible assessment in 2013
<i>Eucalyptus macarthurii</i>	Camden woollybutt	25/10/2011	×	-	Currently under assessment	-	Transferred to the Australian Government and State/Territory Partnership process
<i>Lamna nasus</i>	porbeagle	24/03/2011	Eligible for reconsideration	-	-	-	Data deficient
<i>Orectolobus maculatus</i>	spotted wobbegong	24/03/2011	✓	2011	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Pseudophryne corroboree</i>	southern corroboree frog	TSSC nomination	✓	2011	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Pseudophryne pengilleyi</i>	northern corroboree frog	TSSC nomination	✓	2011	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Rostratula australis</i>	Australian painted snipe	24/01/2011	✓	2011	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Selaginella andrewsii</i>	Tallebudgera spikemoss	24/02/2011	✓	2011	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Seriola brama</i>	blue warehou	TSSC nomination	✓	2011	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Sphyrna mokarran</i>	great hammerhead	18/03/2011	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Ardenna carneipes</i>	flesh-footed shearwater	05/03/2012	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Atalaya sp. Elizabeth River</i>	a shrub	21/03/2012	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Cryptoblepharus egeriae</i>	blue-tailed skink	22/03/2012	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-

<i>Cyrtodactylus sadleri</i>	Christmas Island giant gecko	22/03/2012	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Emoia atrocostata</i>	coastal skink	22/03/2012	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Emoia nativitatis</i>	Christmas Island forest skink	22/03/2012	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Lepidodactylus listeri</i>	Lister's gecko	22/03/2012	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Manta alfredi</i>	reef manta ray	23/03/2012	Eligible for reconsideration	-	-	-	To be considered for possible assessment in 2013
<i>Olax obcordata</i>	sweetheart leaves	22/03/2012	Eligible for reconsideration	-	-	-	To be considered for possible assessment in 2013
<i>Pommerhelix duralensis</i>	Dural land snail	22/03/2012	Eligible for reconsideration	-	-	-	To be considered for possible assessment in 2013
<i>Pteropus melanotus natalis</i>	Christmas Island flying-fox	21/03/2012	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>	scalloped hammerhead shark	13/03/2012	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-
<i>Sphyrna zygaena</i>	smooth hammerhead	TSSC nomination	✓	2012	Currently under assessment	-	-

ATTACHMENT B

PPAL Year	Name of Nomination	Nomination Year (received)	PPAL	FPAL	Year listed on FPAL	EPBC Listed?	EPBC Listing Date	Reason for no assessment
2012	Banksia dominated woodlands of the Swan Coastal Plain bioregion	2012	✓	✓	2012	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2012	Cooks River and Castlereagh ironbark forest of the Sydney Basin bioregion	2012	✓	✓	2012	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2012	Hunter Valley remnant woodlands and open forests	2012	✓	✓	2012	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2012	Natural grasslands of the south Gippsland Plains	n/a	✓	✓	2012	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2012	The community of estuarine species dependent on salt-wedge estuaries of southern Australia	2012	✓	✓	2012	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2012	Aquatic ecological community in the catchment of the Snowy River	2012	✗	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Eligible for reconsideration in 2013.
2012	Groundwater dependent ecosystem of the Maules Creek Alluvial Aquifer	2011	✗	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The nomination was considered unlikely to meet listing criteria.

2012	Salt-wedge estuaries of southern Australia	2011	✓	✓	2012	under assessment (renominated as 'the community of estuarine species dependent on salt-wedge estuaries of southern Australia' which has been included on 2012 FPAL)	n/a	n/a
2011	Eucalypt Woodlands of the Western Australian Wheatbelt	2011	✓	✓	2011	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2011	Eyre Peninsula Blue Gum ( <i>Eucalyptus petiolaris</i> ) Grassy Woodland	2011	✓	✓	2011	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2011	Hinterland Sand Flats Forests and Woodlands of the Sydney Basin Bioregion	2010	✓	✓	2011	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2011	Obligate Seeding Proteaceae and Kwongan of the Esperance Sandplains	2011	✓	✓	2011	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2011	Plant Communities on Ferricrete in South-West Western Australia	n/a	✓	✓	2011	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2011	<i>Posidonia</i> Seagrass Meadows	2011	✓	✓	2011	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2011	Aquatic Root Mat Community 5 (Lake Cave) of the Leeuwin Naturaliste Ridge	2010	✗	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not considered a priority.

2011	Mallee Heath and Heathlands of the Esperance Sandplains	2010	✓	✓	2011	under assessment (renominated as 'Obligate Seeding Proteaceae and Kwongan of the Esperance Sandplains' which has been included on 2011 FPAL)	n/a	n/a
2011	Maroota Sands Swamp Forest	2010	✗	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Minister accepted TSSC advice not to prioritise nomination for assessment
2011	Sun Valley Cabbage Gum Forest	2010	✗	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Minister accepted TSSC advice not to prioritise nomination for assessment
2010	Claypans of the Swan Coastal Plain	n/a	✓	✓	2010	included	2012	n/a
2010	Kangaroo Island Narrow-leaved Mallee ( <i>Eucalyptus cneorifolia</i> ) Eastern Plains Complex	2009	✓	✓	2010	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2010	Lowland Grassy Woodland and Forest of the South East Corner Bioregion	2010	✓	✓	2010	under assessment		n/a
2010	Melaleuca Woodlands of Queensland Coastal Plains listed as Broadleaf Tea-tree ( <i>Melaleuca viridiflora</i> ) woodlands in high rainfall coastal Queensland]	n/a	✓	✓	2010	included	2012	n/a



2010	Monsoon Vine Thickets on the Coastal Sand Dunes of Dampier Peninsula (2010)	2010	✓	✓	2010	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2010	Murray Valley Natural Grasslands of the Southern Riverina Bioregion	2010	✓	✓	2010	included	2012	n/a
2010	Subtropical and Temperate Saltmarsh	2010	✓	✓	2010	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2010	Western Sydney Dry Rainforest in the Sydney Basin Bioregion	2009	✓	✓	2010	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2010	Gnarled Mossy Cloud Forest of Lord Howe Island	2009	✗	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Minister accepted TSSC advice not to prioritise nomination for assessment
2010	<i>Lagunaria Patersonia</i> Swamp Forest	2009	✗	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Minister accepted TSSC advice not to prioritise nomination for assessment
2010	Monsoon Vine Thickets of the Dampier Peninsula (2009)	2009	✓	✓	2010	under assessment (renominated in 2010)	n/a	n/a
2009	Giant Kelp Forests of the East and South Coasts of Tasmania	2009	✓	✓	2009	included	2012	n/a
2009	Lowland Subtropical Rainforest on Basalt Soils & Alluvium in North East New South Wales & South East Queensland	2009	✓	✓	2009	included	2011	n/a
2009	Macquarie Marshes	2008	✓	✓	2009	under assessment	n/a	n/a

2010	Peaty Swamp Forests of the Otway Ranges Victoria [Nominated as: Yeodine and Porcupine Creek Aquifer Intake Areas, Northern Otway Ranges (including five stream systems with extensive wetland, springs and native vegetation)].	2009	✘	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The nomination was considered unlikely to meet listing criteria.
2009	Riffle/Pool/Bar River Community of the South Eastern Queensland Bioregion (nominated as Riffle/Pool/Sandbank Community of the Mary River (Queensland) floodplain)	2008	✓	✓	2009	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2009	Southern Highlands Basalt Forests (nominated as Mt Gibraltar Forest / Robertson Basalt Tall-Open Forest / Southern Highlands Shale Woodland complex) [listed as Upland Basalt Eucalypt Forests of the Sydney Basin Bioregion]	2009	✓	✓	2009	included	2011	n/a
2010	Wetlands of the Swan Coastal Plain	2010	✘	n/a	n/a	ineligible- failed regs	n/a	n/a
2009	Camerons Cave Troglotic Community	2008	✘	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The nomination was considered unlikely to meet listing criteria.
2009	Cape Range Remipede Community	2008	✘	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The nomination was considered unlikely to meet listing criteria.

2009	Port Phillip Deep Canyon Marine Community	2008	✘	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The nomination was considered unlikely to meet listing criteria.
2008	Coolibah-Black Box Woodlands of the Darling Riverine Plains and the Queensland Brigalow Belt South Bioregions	2008	✓	✓	2008	included	2011	n/a
2008	Cumberland Plain Woodlands [listed as Cumberland Plain shale Woodlands and Shale-Gravel Transition Forest]	2007	✓	✓	2008	included	2009	n/a
2008	Lower Murray River and associated wetlands, floodplains and groundwater systems from the junction of the Darling River to the sea (nominated as Coorong and Lower Lakes (Lakes Alexandrina and Albert))	2008	✓	✓	2008	under assessment	n/a	n/a
2008	Thrombolite (Microbial) Community of Coastal Brackish Lakes (Lake Clifton)	2008	✓	✓	2008	included	2010	n/a
2008	Western Victorian Freshwater Swamps Community / Temperate Lowland Plains Grassy Wetland listed as Seasonal Herbaceous Wetlands (Freshwater) of the Temperate Lowland Plains	2008	✓	✓	2008	included	2012	n/a
2007	Inland Grey Box Woodlands [Listed as Grey Box (Eucalyptus microcarpa) Grassy woodlands and Derived Native Grasslands of South-eastern Australia]	2007	✓	✓	2007	included	2010	n/a
2007	Murray Mouth, Coorong North and South Lagoons	2007	✘	n/a	n/a	ineligible- failed regs	n/a	n/a

<b>NOTES:</b>	
	<p>1. There are a number of Ecological Communitites that were listed in the period 2007-2012 for which nominations were received prior to the 2007 Nomination Year.</p> <p>These were not included in this table.</p>

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 138

**Topic:** Threatened species – staffing and budget

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Waters asked:**

1. Provide the budget for and number of staff (equivalent) working on assessment of KTP nominations.
2. Provide the budget for and numbers of staff (equivalent) working on assessment of threatened species and ecological communities nominations.
3. Provide the budget for and number of staff (equivalent) working preparing or reviewing or revising recovery plans.
4. Provide the budget for and number of staff (equivalent) working preparing or reviewing or revising threat abatement plans.
5. Provide the budget for implementing recovery plans (or amount spent on recovery plans as part of caring for country funding).

**Answer:**

1. KTP assessments: Budget \$97 332; Staff (full time equivalent) 1.0.
2. Threatened species assessments: Budget \$1 031 718; Staff (full time equivalent) 10.6.  
Threatened ecological community assessments: Budget \$988 929; Staff (full time equivalent) 9.0.
3. Budget \$1 596 111; Staff (full time equivalent) 10.55.
4. Budget \$1 708 504; Staff (full time equivalent) 9.23.
5. The funding of conservation measures consistent with identified recovery plan actions comes from a range of Australian Government programs including Caring for our Country and the Biodiversity Fund.

While these two major investment programs primarily support landscape level projects, these initiatives provide opportunities for funding of projects that may involve the implementation of recovery plan actions. To date approximately \$140 million of funded projects have contributed to the implementation of recovery plans.

These programs are further complemented by other Australian and state/territory governments funding programs which contribute to the conservation of threatened species and ecological communities.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 139

**Topic:** Threatened species recovery plans

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Waters asked:**

1. Please identify all threatened species or ecological communities listed under the EPBC Act that have been upgraded (ie to a lower protection level) or delisted due to the successful implementation of a recovery plan under the EPBC Act? [Note: this is not to include those changed due to better information about a species' status.]
2. How many key threatening processes now have a reduced impact on Australia's biodiversity due to successful implementation of a threat abatement plan under the EPBC Act? If any, which ones? Identify documents that evidence the reduced impact.
3. Have any audits of threat abatement plans been undertaken, what were their findings?

**Answer:**

1. Recovery is a long term objective. Examples to date where investment in and participation by government and the community in recovery programs is leading to improvement in the status of species, include species as diverse as the northern hairy nosed wombat, western swamp tortoise and threatened plants on Kangaroo Island.
2. Threat abatement plans identify the research, management, and other actions necessary to reduce the impact of a listed key threatening process on native species and ecological communities. Investment against actions has provided elements of threat abatement but overall the reduction in the impact on Australia's biodiversity is a long-term on-going process. Examples of specific actions include the development and testing of specific types of fences to exclude predators and herbivores (European red fox, feral cat, feral goat and rabbit) from sanctuaries, hygiene protocols for the handling of amphibians to prevent the spread of the pathogen chytridiomycosis, and the development of new toxins for feral pig control. Documents on these specific actions can be found at:  
<http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/invasive/projects/index.html>
3. Section 279(2) of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* requires each threat abatement plan to be reviewed by the Minister at intervals of not longer than five years. Reviews of many threat abatement plans can be found at:  
<http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/invasive/projects/index.html>

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 140

**Topic:** World Heritage listing - Dampier Archipelago/Burrup

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Ludlam asked:**

1. Is the Minister considering placing the Dampier Archipelago/Burrup Peninsula on the Tentative list? If not, why not.
2. Is the Minister aware that the Aboriginal custodians of the Burrup, represented by the Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation, voted unanimously for World Heritage listing earlier this year.

**Answer:**

1. The Minister is currently considering the Australian Heritage Council's report on the potential outstanding universal value of the Dampier Archipelago (including Burrup Peninsula). The council's report is available at:  
[www.environment.gov.au/heritage/ahc/national-assessments/dampier-archipelago/index.html](http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/ahc/national-assessments/dampier-archipelago/index.html)
2. The Minister understands that Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation has informed departmental officers that the corporation would be supportive of a world heritage assessment and nomination.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 141

**Topic:** World Monuments

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Ludlam asked:**

1. What's the Minister or Department's response to the fact that the Burrup has been included three times on the World Monuments Fund's list of 100 most Endangered Sites and has attracted much international anxiety over the years about its shocking neglect?
2. There are seven areas of land on the Burrup still zoned for potential industrial development.
3. What action is or will the Department undertake to make sure any further approvals are rigorously scrutinised to ensure that no further damage is done to rock art?
4. How can it be that industries which only last 20-25 years are allowed to do such irreparable harm to ancient, possibly as long as 30,000 year old record of human development, potentially the oldest on the planet?
5. Is the Minister aware that the WA government is currently considering the building of a sealed road up to the northern part of the Burrup, through National Heritage protected land rich in rock art?

**Answer:**

1. The Dampier Archipelago (including Burrup Peninsula) was protected in 2007 by the inclusion of the place in the National Heritage List under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (the EPBC Act).
2. Refer to the answer to question 1.
3. All referrals under the EPBC Act relating to any matter of national environmental significance, including national heritage values are subject to rigorous assessment.
4. Refer to the answers to questions 1 and 3.
5. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) has not received a referral for this project from the Western Australian Government. If the Western Australian Government proposes an action that has, will have, or is likely to have a significant impact on the National Heritage Values of the Dampier Archipelago (including Burrup Peninsula) the Western Australian Government, as the proponent, would be required to refer the project to the Minister under the EPBC Act for assessment and decision.



**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question 142**  
**No:**

**Topic:** Timelines for the completion of heritage assessments

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 7

**or Written Question:** (16/10/12)

**Senator Birmingham asked:**

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Are there timelines set against those priorities for the completion of assessments?

Ms Stone: When an assessment goes onto the finalised priority assessment list an initial timeframe for completion is set and we are able to extend that time line accordingly.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Perhaps you can give us on notice, as presumably it is an extract from the business plan, the list of priorities and the timelines that relate to them and any variations that have been made to those timelines.

Ms Stone: We can provide that.

**Answer:**

The below list shows for each of the assessment priorities from the 2012-13 Heritage and Wildlife Division Business Plan the following dates: the initial statutory timeframe as set on the Finalised Priority Assessment Lists for completion of the assessment, the current timeframe for completion of the assessment, and, where relevant, any intervening but superseded assessment completion dates:

**APPENDIX: NATIONAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENTS ON THE 2012-13 BUSINESS PLAN**

List	Place Name	FPAL	Original Assessment Deadline	Superseded extended completion dates	Current Assessment Deadline
NHL	Canberra - Central National Area and Inner Hills	09-10	30/06/2011	n/a	31/12/2012
NHL	Canberra and Surrounding Areas	09-10	30/06/2011	n/a	31/12/2012
NHL	Coral Sea	12-13	30/06/2014	n/a	30/06/2014
NHL	Moree Baths and Swimming Pool	09-10	30/06/2010	30/06/2011; 30/06/2012	30/06/2013
NHL	Murtoa No 1 Grain Store	10-11	30/06/2011	30/06/2012	30/06/2013
NHL	The Tarkine	11-12	30/12/2013	n/a	30/12/2013
NHL	Wurrwurrwuy	09-10	31/12/2010	30/06/2011; 30/06/2012	30/06/2013

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question No:** 143

**Topic:** Melbourne Royal Exhibition Building  
– funding agreement

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 8

**or Written Question:** (16/10/12)

**Senator Birmingham asked:**

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Does the museum have an obligation to report anything back to the department, or do you simply have a right to look at a monitoring program?

Ms Stone: I would need to take those exact details on notice.

**Answer:**

The funding for the protection and promotion of the Royal Exhibition Building is being managed in accordance with the Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations and the project agreement that was signed by the Commonwealth and Victorian governments in June 2012.

In accordance with the project agreement, the Victorian Government is responsible for providing annual progress reports on activities and a final project report to the Commonwealth Government within 90 days of completion of the project, which is currently scheduled for June 2016.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 5.1: HWD **Question 144**  
**No:**

**Topic:** UNESCO Monitoring Mission report

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 10

**or Written Question:** (16/10/12)

**Senator Waters asked:**

Senator WATERS: ...Perhaps you could take on notice the specific answer to that question of whether the government agrees with UNESCO that those particular areas north of Gladstone are existing major port areas or not. My interest is in establishing whether the government agrees with that assessment.

**Answer:**

The Australian Government will provide its response to the recommendation in the State Party Report on the State of Conservation of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area, which will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2013.