



Australian Government

Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts



Dr Ian Holland
Committee Secretary
Senate Standing Committee on Environment,
Communication and the Arts
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Dear Dr Holland

On 4 December 2008 my Division responded to a question that was placed on notice at the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communication and the Arts for the Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing in October 2008. Senator Colbeck asked "how many nominations were received as part of this culling process and how many were not taken forward (in 2008)". This question appears on ECA 136 of the transcript.

I wish to advise that this response was incorrect and I have included a revised response with this letter. There is both a track changes version of the original response and clean version of the revised response enclosed.

It would be appreciated if you could please inform all committee members of this correction.

I apologise for any inconvenience this may cause.

Yours sincerely

Peter Burnett
First Assistant Secretary
Approvals and Wildlife Division

2 April 2009

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts Committee

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	43
Output:	1.5		
Division/Agency:	Approvals and Wildlife Division		
Topic:	FPAL Nominations for the 2008 Assessment Period		
Hansard Page ECITA:	136		

Senator Colbeck asked:

How many (nominations) were received as part of this culling process and how many were not taken forward (in 2008)?

Answer/s:

The call for nominations was open from 3 November 2007 to 31 March 2008. The number of nominations that were eligible for consideration for inclusion in the 2008 Finalised Priority Assessment List (FPAL) was 59. Of these, ~~23~~ 24 were new public nominations and 35 were nominations eligible for reconsideration. A total of 29 items were included on the 2008 FPAL, being 20 species, 7 ecological communities and 2 key threatening processes. 30 items were not included on the FPAL, being 3 species, 22 ecological communities and 5 key threatening processes. 9 of the nominations that were not included on the 2008 FPAL are eligible for reconsideration for inclusion in the 2009 FPAL. These include 1 species, 5 ecological communities and 3 key threatening processes. 21 nominations are not eligible for reconsideration in 2009, being 2 species, 17 ecological communities and 2 key threatening processes. These 21 nominations have been considered twice by the Threatened Species Scientific Committee and not recommended for assessment on both occasions.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts Committee

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	43
Output:	1.5		
Division/Agency:	Approvals and Wildlife Division		
Topic:	FPAL Nominations for the 2008 Assessment Period		
Hansard Page ECITA:	136		

Senator Colbeck asked:

How many (nominations) were received as part of this culling process and how many were not taken forward (in 2008)?

Answer/s:

The call for nominations was open from 3 November 2007 to 31 March 2008. The number of nominations that were eligible for consideration for inclusion in the 2008 Finalised Priority Assessment List (FPAL) was 59. Of these, 24 were new nominations and 35 were nominations eligible for reconsideration. A total of 29 items were included on the 2008 FPAL, being 20 species, 7 ecological communities and 2 key threatening processes. 30 items were not included on the FPAL, being 3 species, 22 ecological communities and 5 key threatening processes. 9 of the nominations that were not included on the 2008 FPAL are eligible for reconsideration for inclusion in the 2009 FPAL. These include 1 species, 5 ecological communities and 3 key threatening processes. 21 nominations are not eligible for reconsideration in 2009, being 2 species, 17 ecological communities and 2 key threatening processes. These 21 nominations have been considered twice by the Threatened Species Scientific Committee and not recommended for assessment on both occasions.