

Recovery Team meeting MINUTES

South-eastern Glossy Black-Cockatoo



Date: Wednesday 19 February, 2025

Time: 9.00am - 11.30am (QLD time)

Members in attendance

Firstname	Surname	Organisation	Attendance?
Daniella	Teixeira	Glossy Black Conservancy + Queensland University of Technology	Y
Samantha	Morris	Glossy Black Conservancy	Y
Lauren	Hook	NSW Dept of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water	Y
Guy	Castley	Griffith University	Y
Trish	Mooney	Chair, SA Glossy Black-Cockatoo Recovery Team	Y
Karleah	Berris	SA Glossies	Y
Gabriel	Crowley	Adelaide University	Y
Gabriel	Conroy	University Sunshine Coast	Y
Mike	Barth	Glossy Black Conservancy	Y
Hunter	McCall	QLD Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation	Y
Belinda	Rossack	VIC Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action	Y
Matt	Cameron	NSW Dept of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water	Y

Invited observers in attendance

Elli	Webb	Glossy Black Conservancy	Y
Tim	McGrath	AG Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment & Water	Y
Adrian	Caneris	Glossy Black Conservancy	apology
Eloise	Dowd	AG Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment & Water	apology

Meeting minutes for Wednesday 19 February 2025

1. Acknowledgement of Country	
2. Welcome and Introductions	
3. Review Draft Terms of Reference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There were no objections to the draft TOR and they were formally adopted by the committee. 	
4. Chair and Deputy Chair roles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ratifying Chair - Dr Daniella Teixeira was nominated as Chair by the Glossy Black Conservancy. There were no other nominations and Dani was ratified as Chair of the Recovery Team. b. Electing Deputy Chair - Guy Castley nominated Lauren Hook for the role of Deputy Chair. There was no opposition. Lauren accepted the nomination and was elected Deputy Chair unanimously. 	
5. Timeline for development of Recovery Plan <p>The Australian Government advised two potential options for timeline around Recovery Plan development and approval - one with a draft ready by 10 May and one with a draft ready by 30 July.</p> <p>Gay asked if we do a substantial rewrite of the plan, will it need to go back to state agencies for comment - which might push timelines out.</p> <p>Tim: provided clarity around statutory public comment period includes targeting of states and territories. Minister then writes to states and territories to jointly endorse the plan.</p> <p>The committee agreed that they would work towards a July timeline for writing a thorough draft Recovery Plan for presentation to the TSSC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Draft ready by 30 July for inclusion in TSSC September meeting papers. 3 month consultation period. Sent for final endorsement at early 2026 TSSC meeting and Ministerial approval in first half of 2026. 	
6. Review Australian Government guidance document - discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee discussed the need for a species profile to exist - even if as a separate document. • Trish - very important to think about the audience for this plan - consider the groups using this for guidance. • Must be easily readable - very important. • Mike - plan should be very defined and direct - with very specific actions and 	ACTION: Karleah to send KI strategic plan document to Recovery Team members

targets

- Karleah offered to send the SA document around
- Dani - still so many unknowns with this species - need to be clear around the uncertainty and actions to address those.
- Tim - important to keep in mind - this document, at the end of the day, it is a TSSC document - an independent committee that recommends this plan to the Minister that she makes under the EPBC Act. It may change, because it has to meet the Minister's expectations. It is a statutory document that sits static in place and does not 'sunset'. It could be a document that sits there for 10 years. Important to write this document in a way that does not change.
- Need a plan that flows well, has a good story and does not repeat info in other documents such as conservation advices, etc.
- Gabe asked Tim to share a few Recovery Plans considered 'good' by the department - but Tim said there is no 'one-plan-fits-all'. Recovery Team should do situation analysis to inform planning process. Be clear on problem, audience, barriers - run an exercise where we ID sensitive points of species' life history on which to build actions. Build template from there. Important to tell a fit-for-purpose story.

9:40am Matt Cameron joined the meeting.

- Dani asked Tim a question around uncertainty and how to manage new knowledge as it becomes available. For example, new mapping for SEQ - what happens if we need to incorporate that new information that's different to what we're considering as we are writing the plan?
- Tim - two choices under EPBC Act - Conservation Advices more adaptable documents which can be updated. A decision to have a Recovery Plan = administrative vortex, stuck in time, hard to vary that information. Ideally we need to get the plan done after we get habitat mapping done and have clear habitat map on foraging resources that can be in the plan. We only finalise it when we know we have a good static doc to drive into the future.
- Tim - suggests getting habitat mapping right before we finalise a plan.
- Tim says Recovery Team have other alternatives, eg. could release habitat mapping and it could be placed on SPRAT website. Annual reporting from Recovery Team will be accessible to the public. Could release report on new habitat mapping accessible on AG website.
- Mike - KI strategic plan sat separate to Recovery Plan - implementable action plan. Difficult to work on something that is set in stone. Needs to be adaptable to dynamic situations.
- Tim - that's exactly what this plan needs to say. Complex species / system with lots of uncertainty. What are the areas of uncertainty? Telling that story - along with need for adaptability and need for new information.
- Dani - lots of those specific actions will come down to key organisations like the Conservancy, regional NRM organisations, who can plan actions for their own

<p>regions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gay - because the species covers such a large area, regional recovery / action plans will need to be embedded in recovery process. Plan needs to be written in such a way that it gives those regional plans agency. • Guy - because species is widespread - some of the pressures facing species in other regions will need to be captured by agencies responsible for actions on the ground - what's relevant for NSW might not be relevant for other states, for example. • Tim - be clear on positives / benefits of us doing this - benefit we get is collaborative buy-in. At end of day, we hope that States agree to make it and implement it. Another positive is that the Minister in making any decision must not act inconsistently with a recovery plan. That needs to drive content of the plan - to help Minister make good decisions about habitat and habitat loss. If all states and territories buy into the plan - have to be clear about what they're buying into. Be very clear on research needs, to have adaptive management. • Trish - feeding habitat mapping can be based on she-oak species and other parameters. Concerns around nesting - recruitment key issue around recovery of species. Tricky to produce nesting habitat maps. Dani agrees, huge knowledge gap for this species. Gay - also sensitive. How detailed do we want nesting habitat mapped in a public sense. Ensure focus is on nesting as well as feeding habitat. 	
<p>7. Recovery Plan</p> <p>a. Taking stock after review of existing plan and comments - round room thoughts and feelings</p> <p>Gay - has done a revision of intro sections of the plan + we have comments that we'll look at. If we can get that tidied up, we can circulate and respond to new draft. Gay hasn't circulated revisions to the plan more widely yet. (Tidy up intro bits - biology / knowledge - and then rest of it we need to start from scratch - what do we think significant threats are / where they are / how do we address them. Not currently well-focussed.</p> <p>Dani - reinforced that the plan is being written by the whole Recovery Team not just one person managing tracked changes. Need a good strategy for how we do this strategically.</p> <p>Mike Barth left meeting at 10:00am</p> <p>Other high level thoughts on draft plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire. The way it's represented is often in a negative way. Most people acknowledge it's about inappropriate fire regimes for feed tree species and Glossies themselves. Something we need to get right. Many differences in feed tree response to fire - problematic to have that level of detail in recovery plan, so way we represent it - be careful and nuanced in how we approach so right messaging is out there. 	

- Objectives - how they're stated. Vague terminology around what needs to happen and how will be measured. Need to put some work into making sure objectives are SMART - overarching thing to consider. (Tim said this is a theme coming strongly from TSSC as well).
- Question around recommendations in the plan delivering outcomes for the species - eg. if there was a recommendation around no further clearing of habitat, does that have any teeth? Tim says committee may change that language depending on Minister's needs. Eg. in this instance, make sure we're clear that habitat loss is the primary driving threat - and therefore need to clearly define what is habitat. Be clear about what's causing habitat clearing, what the drivers are, be clear that this is part of this species recovery story. More about content, science, causal / flow-on effects.
- Plan alludes to knowledge gaps, eg. around nesting. But in table of threats says predation is low. Because we don't have that knowledge, recruitment may be decimating the population but we don't know it yet. Current mismatch between what's in the plan and what's in the table.
- Plan needs to be simplified overall - one table, thought-through process, so it can be used on ground - useful for someone wanting to create a glossy project for example.
- Most vulnerable species say - our objective is to get it off the list so we need to reverse decline. But need to be clear on key driving threats. That's why a situation analysis is useful. (eg if fire is key driving threats, look at refuges, fire management as strategies). Need to be clear on key threats and focus on those.
- Timing - while developing a plan quickly is ideal, it's also important to get it right. If we want to run workshops, go through a process, that's OK.
- We need to get that background, basic ecological knowledge sorted out and the move onto a completely new risk table and move on from there.

Elli Webb left the meeting at 10:20

b. Working draft ok or do we start from scratch?

Gay - need a process to ID what we do and when. Everybody seems to feel that the uncertainties and difficulty in bringing it all together is an impediment. We need to get to a point where we're happy with that and then go on to assessing real risks and where they are. Different in different places. Then another stage in process - do that assessment Tim's talked about - and then only after that can we go about doing strategies and actions.

- Dani - basically means we're starting from scratch. Understanding that things will change quite a lot.
- Get background info right. Get clear on aspects of species ecology that matter to recovery planning
- Then strategic workshop(s) - would be ideal to get together face-to-face (situation analysis)
- Then move into clear threats, strategies, actions - these will be informed by state of current knowledge.
- Tim said may be able to support with funding for resourcing / workshop

Belinda - if we have very strong actions in the plan - how does the state use those plans to find exemptions? Do they have to go back to Feds around using recovery plan actions / asking to be exempt from those actions.

Tim - comes down to content from plan and how it's written and could impact whether States decide to make the plan jointly. There is a difference between a 'do not' clear and a 'do' protect - for example.

An action is something you do, not something you do not do.

States may say that those actions don't agree with them and therefore don't jointly make the plan - so might only get one state join up.

Tim - but we want to write the plan so that we do get buy-in.

Lauren - Building off the points that Tim raised - We need to think about what can support a Minister's decision rather than box them in (plus NSW is committed to offsets so we want an approval blanket no to development). This then could divide the plan into two (theoretical) parts (1) info and evidence to support minister, and (2) practical actions we can undertake to improve conservation of species

c. Review comments on AG 2022 draft Recovery Plan

Dani asked the committee whether they wanted to proceed with a review of these comments or move onto action planning for moving forward? It was agreed that we would proceed with a 1-2 sentence update on each of the responses and any intel that could help shape new draft of plan.

Glossy Black Conservancy (Guy Castley + Gabriel Conroy)

- Fire
- Objectives quite vague - they need to be measurable and we need metrics we can use to make decisions
- Refer to estimates of population size (for example) that don't exist and even to do so would be challenging.
- Widespread nature of species means requirements vary from one region to the next - need to capture - also how habitats respond to some of those threats.

Central West LLS (Guy Castley + Gabriel Conroy)

- Importance of inland populations - important to consider given large scale impacts like fire.
- A lot of synergy in comments raised by Conservancy. Much crossover - esp around background info.
- Key feature - also IDed there is a local strategic plan. (As a Recovery Team, we need to know which plans exist - KI / this one / GBC Conservation Guidelines)
- Need to acknowledge community groups working on-the-ground and ensure they have agency. Be good to get a handle on exactly what work is happening on the ground.

Riverina LLS (Matt Cameron + Lauren Hook)

- Short para detailing habitat in their area and some of the projects happening in that area

Birdlife Australia (Matt Cameron + Lauren Hook)

- Lauren has table that can be shared.
- Main oversight - Birdlife specified they'd like to be part of a Recovery Team. (Dani confirmed that this happened and they can't commit)
- Population trends - clarification around surveys used / numbers. If using diff survey methods are they comparable.
- Structural - threats / actions in different tables that don't say the same thing.
- Critical habitat - worth chatting more about. No reference to clustered nesting habitat in the doc and would be good to include. And recommending we include indicators to match strategy (Eg. Eastern Bristlebird RP has good indicators to aid in recovery).
- Another point for addition is that there are nestbox projects that are currently underway in NSW and QLD. This info was missing.

Parks Vic (Belinda Rossack + Gay Crowley)

- Added some DEECA comments along the way
- Mostly had faith science was well-covered and didn't go into analysis on that. Focus on process, related to strategies, actions, performance criteria and how to make them SMART. If revising plan, some comments less relevant (eg. do we think deer are a nation-wide issue, if so, which species)
- Vic listing no longer critically endangered, now vulnerable - nothing to do with reduction in threats to species. Bi-product of bilateral agreements. Vic populations clearly in trouble.
- Improvements to evidence base and management effectiveness - be clear on how we evaluate outcomes.
- Habitat mapping - something we all agree needs more discussion / detail. Whether consistent approach or not? Need conversation on that. One action is assessing health of habitat - but need clarity around what we mean by health for she-oak habitat.
- Some gaps - genetic loss, artificial nest hollows and effectiveness, management strategies to protect against things like planned burning.
- Fire - add new criteria around assessing fire severity.

Matt: We can spend too much time focusing on range wide monitoring and chasing metrics (reporting) to demonstrate some improvement in overall status. This will be very difficult to achieve. Its better to focus on local populations and deliver actions for these and report on progress made securing them. The RP metric then becomes number of local populations secured. - for further discussion.

QLD Government (Daniella Teixeira + Hunter McCall)

- Population baseline - overall message is that we don't know what an appropriate baseline is - at which point in time are we measuring against (pre-bushfire, for example, but population declining before that) - what is the baseline and what metric of population should we be using.
- Critical habitat - if we go back to document of guidance from AG - difference between critical habitat and habitat critical for survival. Need to be explicit around how we define habitat critical for survival. How do we consider potential feeding and breeding habitat, and potentially if we get habitat modelling underway this

<p>knowledge gap will be addressed. Definitions important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land clearing policy - development of any land clearing policy AT ALL would not be consistent with goal of this strategy. Relates to discussion around offsets. <p><i>ACT Government (Daniella Teixeira + Hunter McCall)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Records of species in ACT few and far between - Main comment around considering impacts of climate change - pointed to some existing modelling of climate refugia - might be useful for us. Potentially using this approach we might be able to name areas that will be important under different climate scenarios. - Heat stress - dehydration / hyperthermia as potential impacts. <p>Gay - Hard to distinguish - at least for feeding habitat, what is critical and what is ancillary. These nuances to definition are problematic.</p> <p>Tim - important to consider attributes (eg hollow-bearing trees, water, etc.) and to include what we know. Only have to define habitat critical if needed - not a statutory requirement. Might define other areas (eg. areas essential for recovery - Tim shared an example from earless dragon). Can create another term that doesn't deal with records or what we know.</p> <p><i>North Coast LLS - (Karleah Berris + Trish Mooney)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Terminology and acronyms - Trish will send comments to Dani and Sam. <p><i>Canberra Ornithologists Group (Karleah Berris + Trish Mooney)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - When defining habitat restoration would be good to include promote natural regen of habitat, replanting new habitat - Concerned about lack of reference to conservation actions currently underway - felt this lack of recognition would disenfranchise community groups. 	
<p>8. Timelines and next steps</p> <p>a. What's the plan going to look like - structure? The Recovery Team brainstormed broad sections required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SECTION 1: Background info is important to get right - ecology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community engagement right up front, including Cultural importance ○ Executive overview of things that could support Minister and other large organisation to adapt policies - so that it's the first thing that they read. ○ Table that outlines key parts of the plan, potentially with live links ○ Visual elements - mapping product is critical - shows range of species, sightings clusters, where action is taking place, possibly habitat mapping as well. Possible to see at a glance, where species is, where significant info is and where action is taking place. (Could essentially map stakeholders) ○ Directory to statewide data sets and where everyone is storing this info. (If static document, then a place where people can reference conservation advice or details that might change) • SECTION 2 : Threats 	<p>Action: Tim to send Recovery Team members examples of schematic diagrams discussed</p> <p>Action: Sam will create 3 working documents (one for each section currently</p>

- Doesn't need major re-organisation. Just needs tidying up and putting some new things in. Don't want to start too much from scratch because real work is working out recovery actions - if we can circulate and do by email to get what people think is ok for sections 1 and 2 (and 3: populations under particular pressure). Process for getting that right. Can do that via email. Then have workshop session around prioritisation / strategies / actions.

It was agreed that the committee would work offline and via email on sections 1, 2 and 3 prior to defining objectives, actions, strategies.

- Risk matrix? Useful? Need to be precautionary around how we classify risks. Not sure in its current state that it's useful.
- We do need a risk matrix but need to discuss how we define things - especially those we don't know about.
- Those risk matrix and tables are often in conservation advices - Recovery Plans are more in-depth planning and thinking over time. So recommendation from Tim - in that threat section, rather than a table, have a schematic diagram - life history traits, threats, barriers to mitigating threats - framework for thinking about strategies and actions. Tim will send examples from recent plans.
- Indicative costs - will change dramatically over time. If this is a static document, how do we manage? Tim says recently they've been scrapped - only include if practical to do so. (Would just need to include statement around why actions have not been costed).

The Recovery Team agreed to work collaboratively via shared document - googledocs with a one-page filing system.

- Sam will create working document with first 3 sections based on Gay's edits to existing draft.
- Need a process with firm deadline for input into document and making changes so that at some point those 3 sections are in final draft form.
- Those people who reviewed existing comments, to incorporate those elements into new draft.
- When we get to threats and strategies - we workshop and start from scratch.

b. Review timelines discussed earlier -

The committee agreed to work towards the July deadline previously agreed to. If required, we can review timelines again as necessary.

c. Meeting dates between now and end June

The committee agreed to meet fortnightly for an hour, on the understanding that not all members will be able to attend all meetings.

Sam to send Doodle poll straight away with responses due by Friday COB.

d. Register as a Recovery Team

This item was not discussed, but the Conservancy will take the necessary action, with AG support, to have the Recovery Team formally registered by the Department.

Dr Teixeira closed the meeting at 11.38am

being drafted and edited) and a master document that contains live links to each of the sections.

Action: Sam to send Doodle Poll to capture best day / time for fortnightly meetings with responses due by COB Friday.

--	--