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Background

Section D3.3 (page 64) of the Tasmanian Forest Practices Code (2000) requires that threatened species listed in both the Tasmanian, Threatened Species Protection Act 1995 and the Commonwealth, Environment Protection and Biodiversity Act 1999 be taken into account in the preparation of forest practices plans (FPPs), both on Crown land and on private land.

Section 51 of the Tasmanian Threatened Species Protection Act 1995 provides a link to the Tasmanian forest practices system, through permit conditions:

51. Offences relating to listed taxa
   (3) A person acting in accordance with a certified forest practices plan or a public authority management agreement may take, without a permit, a specimen of a listed taxon of flora or fauna, unless the Secretary, by notice in writing, requires the person to obtain a permit.

Clause 51 is not an exemption from the requirements of the TSPA – it simply recognises the adequacy of the planning systems that deliver certified forest practices plans to appropriately manage threatened species.

Division 4 of the Commonwealth, Environment Protection and Biodiversity Act 1999 states that in regions covered by regional forest agreements:

(1) Part 3 does not apply to an RFA forestry operation that is undertaken in accordance with an RFA.
(2) In this Division:
   RFA or regional forest agreement has the same meaning as in the Regional Forest Agreements Act 2002.
   RFA forestry operation has the same meaning as in the Regional Forest Agreements Act 2002.

Note: This section does not apply to some RFA forestry operations. See section 42.
42 This Division does not apply to some forestry operations
Subdivisions A and B of this Division, and subsection 6(4) of the Regional Forest Agreements Act 2002, do not apply to RFA forestry operations, or to forestry operations, that are:
(a) in a property included in the World Heritage List; or
(b) in a wetland included in the List of Wetlands of International Importance kept under the Ramsar Convention; or
(c) incidental to another action whose primary purpose does not relate to forestry.

Hence forestry activities are essentially ‘exempt’ from the referral process under this Act because of the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement but there are exceptions to these exemptions (dependent on the definitions of ‘forestry operations’ and legal interpretation).

Dot point two of Section D3.3 (page 64) of the Tasmanian Forest Practices Code (2000) provides the key statement relating to the planning system recognised by the Tasmanian Threatened Species Protection Act 1995 and the Regional Forest Agreement. This dot point states that:

‘Threatened species will be managed in wood production areas in accordance with procedures agreed between the Forest Practices Board and DPIWE. The Agreed procedures will include the development of endorsed management prescriptions through consultation among landowners, Forest Practices Officers and specialists within the Board and DPIWE.’

The Agreed procedures are an important mechanism for the management of threatened species under the forest practices system ensuring that the requirements of the Threatened Species Protection Act 1995 and the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Act 1999 are met in areas covered by the Tasmanian forest practices system. They were introduced in 2000 and incorporated into the Forest Practices Code (2000). The FPA and DPIPWE revised the procedures in 2010 to reflect current thinking in terms of the roles and responsibilities of the FPA and DPIPWE.
In this document we report on implementation of the Agreed procedures during the 2011–12 reporting period. This report meets the requirements of clause 9 of the Agreed procedures and contributes to meeting recommendation 16 of the second five-yearly review of progress with implementation of the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement (Ramsey, 2008)

Report on implementation

(A) Roles and responsibilities

• Joint roles and responsibilities of the FPA and the DPIPWE

a. The Forest Practices Authority (FPA) and the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment (DPIPWE) will cooperate on the development of procedures, tools, objectives, endorsed management prescriptions and training for the management of threatened species within forests and/or threatened non-forest vegetation types at both the strategic (landscape) level and at the operational (forest practices plan) level.

- FPA Biodiversity program staff and staff from the Threatened Species Section of DPIPWE collaborated on the review of the Threatened Fauna Adviser in 2011–12. Two members of each organisation were on the project steering committee for this project. The consultant to the project has completed the review and the revised web-based tool had been developed. The review covered procedures, objectives and endorsed management prescriptions.

- The FPA Biodiversity program and Threatened Species Section of DPIPWE collaborated in the running of two (north and south), two day courses for forest planners and others involved in natural resource management such as local government, NRM and environmental consultants. This course (Fauna course II) covered the ecology and management of threatened fauna species and is a pre-requisite for forest planners wishing to upgrade from FPO inspecting to FPO planning certification.

- The FPA Biodiversity program and Threatened Species Section of DPIPWE collaborated on the RFA priority species project funded through the Commonwealth, Caring for Our Country program.

b. The FPA and the DPIPWE will liaise on any cases that may lead to applications under Part 5 (Conservation Covenants) of the Nature Conservation Act 2002 relating to the refusal or amendment of applications for forest practices plans for the purpose of protecting a threatened species. Where such cases proceed to a tribunal, the FPA and the DPIPWE will cooperate in providing evidence to the tribunal.

- There were no cases in 2011–12.

• Primary roles and responsibilities of the DPIPWE

a. Developing strategic plans and other strategic instruments for the management of threatened species as prescribed in legislation, plans and policies for which the department is responsible.

- Threatened Species Section, DPIPWE with assistance from FPA prepared a draft species strategic plan for the swift parrot in 2011–12 which is intended to provide strategic guidance for the conservation management of Swift Parrot breeding habitat across all spatial scales and land tenures, and land use planning and approval processes in Tasmania.

- TSS has finalised a recovery plan for threatened stag beetles that covers five species (including Simsons stag beetle, Bornemisszas stag beetle, Vanderschoors stage beetle, broad-toothed stag beetle and Mt Mangana stag beetle) that will be advertised for public comment in 2012–13. A revised recovery plan for the swift parrot and threatened Tasmanian forest epacrids (11 RFA priority species), Eucalyptus ovata – Callitris oblonga forest community (covering North East pine Callitris oblonga) and new recovery plans for King Island
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threatened species (covering RFA priority species species: King Island scrubtit, King Island brown thornbill, King Island green rosetta, southern hairy red snail, matted waterstarwort Callitriche sonderi, Australian mulberry Hedycarya augustifolia and boottace Bush Pimelia axiflora subsp. axiflora), native wintercress Barbarea australis, Davies waxflower Phebalium daviesii, creeping dusty miller Spiryridium obcordatum, threatened Tasmanian ferns (10 RFA priority species), and threatened Tasmanian lowland euphrasia species (five RFA priority species) were adopted by the Commonwealth Government in 2011–12. A final draft revised recovery plan for Tasmanian threatened orchids (38 RFA priority species) and a new final draft of the blind velvet worm were provided to the Commonwealth Government for compliance testing under EPBC Act in 2011–12.

- TSS further developed the website and content for the Threatened Species Link in 2011–12 including descriptions of flowering times and identification times, and habitat preferences for approximately 250 RFA priority flora species and species management profiles for 30 species primarily RFA priority fauna species. The Threatened Species link will be launched in late 2012. The Threatened Species Link is a web based information and planning tool providing current and easily accessible advice on the conservation and management of threatened species.

- TSS prepared listing statements for 13 RFA priority fauna species during 2012 including: giant freshwater lobster, golden galaxias, Great Lake paragalaxias, shannon paragalaxias, authors paragalaxias, clarence galaxias, pedder galaxias, saddles galaxias, swamp galaxias, western galaxias, grey goshawk, King Island scrubtit, King Island brown thornbill and spotted tailed quoll.

b. Co-ordinating and participating in research and monitoring of the impacts of land use activities and other factors on the maintenance of habitat and populations of threatened species.

- Threatened Species Section and broader DPIPWE undertook habitat and/or population monitoring for the following RFA priority species: New Holland mouse, Tasmanian devil, swift parrot, punarra brown butterfly, chaostola skipper, forty-spotted pardalote, King Island scrubtit and a large number of threatened flora species (to varying degrees) in 2011–12.

Primary roles and responsibilities of the FPA

a. Organising and coordinating training in threatened species and the use of the planning tools for Forest Practices Officers and others involved in the forest practices plan (FPP) planning process.

- FPA staff, in collaboration with TSS, DPIPWE, organised and coordinated a three day course (Fauna course I and II) held in both the north of the state and the south of the state in 2011–12. The first part of the course (Fauna course I – 1 day) covered planning procedures and tools. This course is recognised as a pre-requisite for the FPO Training Course. The second part (Fauna course II – 2 day) focussed on species of high conservation significance (threatened species) and the rationale behind current Code provisions. This course also covered the use of the relevant planning tools (Biodiversity Values Database and threatened Fauna Adviser) and how to implement management recommendations. This course is recognised as an important requirement for upgrading from FPO Inspecting to Planning certification.

58 planners and seven natural resource managers from local councils or NRM organisations attended the courses.

b. Assessing notifications lodged as part of the FPP planning process as required to ensure that the planned operations are in accordance with the requirements of the Forest Practices Code and associated planning procedures.
FPA Biodiversity Program staff processed 137 notifications for advice on threatened flora and/or fauna issues as part of the FPP development process between 1/7/11 and 30/6/12. Of these, 99 were on State forest, with the remainder a mix of private operations (see Table 1.2 in the FPA Annual report). Field assessments were undertaken for about 17 per cent of notifications.

The FPA compliance program assessed 55 FPPs covering the full range of forest operations in 2011–12 as part of the annual compliance audit. The results of this audit are in Appendix 3 of the FPA annual report. A review of compliance questions relating to threatened species commenced in 2012.

c. Developing and providing site-specific management advice for forest practices plans where the planned operations are not covered by endorsed management prescriptions. This may involve consultation with relevant specialists within the DPIWPE and other organisations where specific expertise is required.

As indicated in 3(b) FPA Biodiversity Program staff processed 137 notifications for advice on threatened flora and/or fauna issues as part of the FPP development process between 1/7/11 and 30/6/12. Of these, 99 were on State forest, with the remainder a mix of private operations (see Table 1.2 in FPA Annual report). Field assessments were undertaken for about 17 per cent of notifications. DPIWPE specialists and specialists from the Inland Fisheries Service were consulted when specific expertise was required.

Tables 1 and 2 provide the number of requests for advice for threatened flora and fauna species, respectively. The majority of requests for advice were for threatened fauna species where there are no standard agreed management actions delivered through the Threatened Fauna Adviser (eg., Masked owl, Tasmanian devil and Spotted-tailed quoll) or where habitat identification or management issues are complex (eg., wedge-tailed eagle, Grey goshawk).

The majority of requests for advice were for native forest operations (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flora</th>
<th>Total Notifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acacia axillaris – midlands wattle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia pataczekii – wallys wattle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caladenia tonellii – robust fingers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colobanthus curtisiae – grassland cupflower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epacris virgata – pretty heath</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentachondra ericifolia – fine frillyheath</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimelea curviflora var. gracilis – slender curved riceflower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poa mollis – soft tussockgrass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranunculus acaulis – dune buttercup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodanthe anthemoides – chamomile sunray</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thismia rodwayi – fairy lanterns</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncinia elegans – handsome hookseed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola cunninghamii – alpine violet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westringia angustifolia – narrowleaf westringia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthorrhoea bracteata – shiny grasstree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fauna</th>
<th>Notifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Number of requests for advice for threatened flora species.

Table 2. Number of requests for advice for threatened fauna species.
Accipiter novaehollandiae – grey goshawk 10
Alcedo azurea diemenensis – azure kingfisher 1
Aquila audax fleayi – wedge-tailed eagle 45
Astacopsis gouldi – giant freshwater crayfish 11
Charopidae Skemps – Skemps snail 1
Chrysolarentia decisaria – Tunbridge looper moth 1
Dasyurus viverrinus – eastern quoll 8
Engaeus granulatus – central north burrowing crayfish 1
Engaeus spinicaudatus – Scottsdale burrowing crayfish 1
Engaeus orramakunna – Burnie burrowing crayfish 1
Galaxias fontanus – swan galaxias 4
Galaxiella pusilla – dwarf galaxias 1
Goedetrechus mendumae – cave beetle (Ida Bay) 1
Haliaeetus leucogaster – white-bellied sea eagle 6
Helicarion rubicundus – burgundy snail 2
Hickmanoxyomma cavaticum – cave harvestman 1
Hoplogonus simsoni – Simsons stag beetle 1
Hoplogonus vanderschoori – Vanderschoors stag beetle 3
Idacarabus cordicollis – cave beetle (Hastings Cave) 1
Lathamus discolor – swift parrot 11
Limnodynastes peroni – striped marsh frog 1
Lissotes latidens – broad-toothed stag beetle 1
Lissotes menalcas – Mt. Mangana stag beetle 7
Litoria raniformis – green and gold frog 2
Oreixenica ptunarra – ptunarra brown butterfly 3
Oxyethira mienica – caddis fly (Ouse River) 1
Perameles gunnii gunnii – eastern-barred bandicoot 13
Prototroctes maraena – Australian grayling 2
Pseudemoia pagenstecheri – tussock skink 3
Sarcophilus harrisii – Tasmanian devil 30
Tasmanipatus anophthalmus – blind velvet worm 1
Tasmanipatus barretti – giant velvet worm 3
Tasmaphena lamproides – keeled Snail 1
Tyto novaehollandiae castanops – masked owl 21

Table 3. Number of requests for advice by operation type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation Type (simple)</th>
<th>Notifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partial harvest</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearfell native regeneration</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Monitoring and reporting on the standard of compliance with, and the effectiveness of, the endorsed or site-specific management prescriptions contained within forest practices plans.

- The FPA compliance program assessed 55 FPPs covering the full range of forest operations in 2011–12 as part of the annual compliance audit. The results of this audit are in Appendix 3 of the FPA annual report.
A total of 92 compliance investigations were completed in the financial year, of which there were 60 investigations which found a breach. Of the 92 that were completed there were five investigations relating to threatened species. Three of the five related to swift parrot, and in all of these it was determined that there was no breach. The two other investigations regarding threatened species, was the harvesting of a wildlife habitat clump containing a known grey goshawk nest and FPO planning standards in relation to management prescriptions for a known wedge-tailed eagle nest. In the case of the grey goshawk the contractor was fined $6000 and the FPO received a formal warning and directed by the Board of the FPA to attend the FPA/DPIPWE threatened fauna course (Fauna course II). The other investigation regarding the wedge-tailed eagle nest resulted in the FPO receiving a formal warning and a variation was written to the FPP to include management prescriptions for the wedge-tailed eagle.

In addition to the annual compliance audit a special project was also initiated in 2011–12 to assess the implementation of swift parrot management advice between the January 2009 and February 2011 period (Schofield, 2011). A sample of 35 certified forest practice plans (FPPs) were randomly selected from a total of 138 biodiversity evaluations, received by the FPA in the study period, that were prepared by forest practices officers (FPOs) as part of developing a FPP within the known eastern breeding range of the swift parrot. The sample included FPPs for clearfell harvest, partial harvest systems and land clearing on public and private land tenure. FPO’s use of planning tools, assessment of habitat, both nesting and foraging, and the implementation of management prescriptions in the field were evaluated. An additional 10 plans (Sample 2), nine on private property, which had previously been assessed in a study completed by FPA and TSS in 2004 were also evaluated (Munks et al. 2004). The use of these FPPs enabled a comparison with a benchmark and provided an opportunity to evaluate reforestation and the longevity of Forest Practices Code management prescriptions.

The results of this ‘thematic’ study to date (31 have been assessed as of 30 June 2011 and included in this report) indicates a high level of competency by FPOs in the use of the standardized planning tools to prepare and certify FPPs. These results reflect well on FPO training, provided by the FPA and TSS and FPO skill level in using the planning tools and interpretation of the information. However the results indicate that there is still room for improvement in the planning process. The key area warranting improvement is the need for FPOs to verify at the time of certification that there has been no change in information, for example known nests sites within the FPP area. Secondly it is important that the databases, administered by the FPA and TSS, containing information on known nest sites must be updated in a timely fashion. Further, given the complexity of planning for swift parrot and the significant changes in breeding range boundaries and the guidelines issued to FPOs it is important that the FPA ensure that FPOs training is maintained.

e. **Undertaking investigations and taking any enforcement action that is necessary to achieve compliance with the prescriptions contained within forest practices plans, in conjunction with the DPIPWE where relevant.**

- The Section Head, Threatened Species, DPIPWE was notified of any threatened species related compliance investigations throughout the 2011–12.

A total of 92 compliance investigations were completed in the financial year, of which there were 60 investigations which found a breach. Of the 92 that were completed there were five investigations relating to threatened species. Three of the five related to swift parrot, and in all of these it was determined that there was no breach. The two other investigations regarding threatened species, was the harvesting of a wildlife habitat clump containing a known grey goshawk nest and FPO planning standards in relation to management prescriptions for a known wedge-tailed eagle nest. In the case of the grey goshawk the contractor was fined $6000 and the FPO received a formal warning and directed by the Board to attend the FPA/DPIPWE threatened fauna course (Fauna course II). The other investigation regarding the wedge-tailed eagle nest resulted in the FPO receiving a formal warning.
and a variation was written to the FPP to include management prescriptions for the wedge-tailed eagle.

f. Collaborating with DPIPWE on, and participating in, research and monitoring priorities relating to threatened species management under the forest practices system.

- The Biodiversity Program’s staff contributed to 18 research and monitoring projects in 2011–12: eight were related to threatened species management issues. Four of these projects involve collaboration with Threatened Species Section, DPIPWE. These research projects are summarised in Table 1. The Research Biologist coordinated research and monitoring activities.

- There was considerable collaboration with external researchers, students and institutions. Most projects contributed to the CRC for Forestry–Biodiversity Programs and several projects were externally funded.

- An FPA student research grant was awarded to Dejan Stojanovic in 2012 for his research on swift parrot ecology. Considerable DPIPWE support was also provided for this project.

- The FPA Biodiversity Manager and Research Biologist and DPIPWE, Threatened Species Section Manager and Senior Zoologist continued to provide supervisory support to a number of DPIPWE/FPA/CRC supported Utas student projects with application to the management of forest associated threatened species including: Michael Todd (masked owls, PhD), Shannon Troy (spotted tailed quolls, PhD) and Jillian Smith (Tasmanian devil, Honours), Jo Potter (ptunarra brown butterfly, PhD), Nick Beeton (Tasmanian devil) and Matt Webb (swift parrot). Meetings have been conducted with several potential new students for 2012–13. The FPA also hosted a volunteer who explored GIS tools to establish a line-of-sight model for eagle nests.

- One of the milestones of the FPA and DPIPWE project, (Swift parrot and RFA Priority Species Project) funded by the Australian and Tasmanian governments in February 2010 (see 1.5, RFA priority species project in the FPA annual report), is to establish a program to monitor the effectiveness of management actions for RFA priority species (i.e. threatened species that are vulnerable to forestry activities). FPA Biodiversity Program staff compiled a number of reports (see the publications list) as part of this project, including a review of the implementation and effectiveness of management actions implemented for threatened species via the forest practices system. A process has been undertaken to determine the priorities for effectiveness monitoring and DPIPWE feedback will be sought in 2012–13.

- FPA provided technical support for the swift parrot annual monitoring program conducted by Threatened Species Section in 2011–12.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Activities during period 1/5/11 and 30/6/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of threatened species provisions of Tasmania's Forest Practices Code</td>
<td>A project monitoring the implementation of swift parrot management prescriptions in the 2009–11 period is ongoing, with data collection and analysis continuing. A project monitoring the implementation of threatened eagle nest management prescriptions is in the design stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective are current management actions in protecting wedge-tailed eagle nest sites in production forests?</td>
<td>Surveys for 2011–12 were completed. There were delays to data analysis in 2011–12 due to data issues but these have been rectified. A map predicting the areas in which eagle nests are most likely to be found has been produced and is under review. The 2007–2011 eagle report is in the draft stage. Paper published on the value of indirect signs in assessing nesting success (see publication list).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A volunteer intern worked to develop a standardised line-of-sight model for wedge-tailed eagle nest management.

This research project is looking at the relationship between forestry activities and changes in stream flow, with the aim to develop a catchment management strategy for areas containing threatened galaxiids. The data has been obtained to calibrate the WAFL tool for the Swan-Apsley catchment, but modelling has yet to commence. Alternative approaches to examining the impact of harvesting on steamflow are also being explored with FT and DPIPWE.

A study has been initiated that is re-examining sites previously surveyed for the burgundy snail. The design has been finalised and sampling has commenced.

The Biodiversity Program’s Technical Officer assisted with the DPIPWE monitoring program.

Monitoring includes sites on Bruny Island and Maria Island being conducted by the TSS.

Shannon Troy is in doing data analysis and writing up her study examining the habitat preferences and den requirements of female Spotted-tailed quolls. Shannon’s results have contributed to the revision of the Biodiversity Values Database and the Threatened Fauna Adviser.

Mick Todd submitted his PhD thesis. Mick’s results have contributed to the revision of the Biodiversity Values Database and the Threatened Fauna Adviser.

Honours student Jillian Smith looked at the location of dens in the wild and in a free-range enclosure.

Dejan Stojanovic, ANU, has been undertaking a PhD on the breeding ecology of swift parrots, and has been testing the FPA Mature Habitat Availability Map.

Matt Webb (TSS) (enrolled at ANU) is undertaking a PhD study on the ecology of the swift parrot including population trends and habitat use.

Nick Beeton has completed a PhD study on devil habitat, population and disease modelling.

Jo Potter (Utas) has been undertaking a PhD on population trends and threats to ptunarra brown butterfly. This project is also supported by Gunns Limited, Surrey Hills.

### STUDENT PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY FPA and DPIPWE
**These projects are co-supervised or supported in other ways by FPA/DPIPWE staff.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape ecology of the Spotted tailed quoll</td>
<td>Shannon Troy is in doing data analysis and writing up her study examining the habitat preferences and den requirements of female Spotted-tailed quolls. Shannon’s results have contributed to the revision of the Biodiversity Values Database and the Threatened Fauna Adviser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat use, breeding and feeding ecology of the Tasmanian masked owl</td>
<td>Mick Todd submitted his PhD thesis. Mick’s results have contributed to the revision of the Biodiversity Values Database and the Threatened Fauna Adviser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den use by Tasmanian devils in the wild and in a free-range enclosure</td>
<td>Honours student Jillian Smith looked at the location of dens in the wild and in a free-range enclosure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift parrots ecology</td>
<td>Dejan Stojanovic, ANU, has been undertaking a PhD on the breeding ecology of swift parrots, and has been testing the FPA Mature Habitat Availability Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift Parrot ecology</td>
<td>Matt Webb (TSS) (enrolled at ANU) is undertaking a PhD study on the ecology of the swift parrot including population trends and habitat use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmanian devil habitat, population and disease modelling</td>
<td>Nick Beeton has completed a PhD study on devil habitat, population and disease modelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population trends and threats to ptunarra brown butterfly</td>
<td>Jo Potter (Utas) has been undertaking a PhD on population trends and threats to ptunarra brown butterfly. This project is also supported by Gunns Limited, Surrey Hills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publications from research and monitoring**

*Papers*

Webb, M H, Holdsworth, MC & Webb, J 2012, Nesting requirements of the endangered swift parrot (*Lathamus discolor*), *Emu* (on-line)

Wiersma, J & Koch, AJ 2012, Using surveys of nest characteristics to assess the breeding activity of the Tasmanian wedge-tailed eagle, *Corella* 36, 38–44.

Wiersma, J & Hull, C 2011, Do you have an eagle’s nest on your land?, *Tasmania 40°South*, September 2011, 61–62.

**Reports**


**Conference presentations, abstracts and posters**


**Theses submitted for projects supported or co-supervised by the FPA and DPIPWE**


Todd M 2012, Ecology and habitat use of a threatened nocturnal bird, the Tasmanian masked owl, PhD thesis, School of Zoology, University of Tasmania.
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