

24/7/2018

RE: DISCUSSION PAPER. TOWARDS A RISK-BASED APPROACH TO WILDLIFE LICENSING.

The Canary and Cage Bird Federation of Australia (CCBFA) represents many hundreds of clubs nationally including approximately 100 clubs throughout New South Wales. We support the protection and conservation of wild populations of avian species through a range of activities and projects. In terms of wildlife licensing we support a risk-based approach where our clubs work cooperatively with government to achieve the best outcomes for the native birds in our care and in the wild. CCBFA operates across all jurisdictions and have represented aviculturists on a variety of government committees at both state and national level. Aviculture has a proud self-regulatory history in Australia largely via the clubs and their various governing and representative bodies.

Given the complexity and large number of CCBFA affiliate clubs represented for this review, CCBFA appointed an expert bird group to manage and make recommendations on behalf of the tens of thousands of NSW bird keepers represented. We invited representatives from OEH and DPI to assist this group, unfortunately all invitations to date have been declined. We thank all expert bird group members for their input and work to date.

FRAMING OUR SUBMISSION

CCBFA first engaged in the review of wildlife licensing soon after the release of “*A review of biodiversity legislation in NSW, Final Report*” (18/12/14). Government agreed to implement all recommendations – of particular relevance is Section 6 titled *Managing wildlife interactions* which includes recommendations 27 and 28 as follows.

Recommendation 27 – Adopt a tiered and risk-based approach to the regulation of wildlife management in NSW to credibly regulate high-risk activities and reduce red tape for low-risk activities. The four tiers would be: exempt activities, code-based complying activities, assessable/licensed activities, and prohibited activities.

Recommendation 28 – Improve the public’s knowledge and understanding of wildlife conservation and management through community-oriented education programs about native plants and animals, the impacts of human-wildlife interactions, and the welfare needs of animals in captivity.

The following quote from Dr Hugh Possingham, review panel member, Chief Scientist of The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and Australian Research Council Laureate Fellow, The University of Queensland, aptly summarises the intent of the above recommendations.

Notably, a strong sentiment of the review panel was that regulations, should be looser (in general) because:

- 1. we want people to interact with wildlife (common species)*
- 2. breeders can make a big contribution to conservation, and*
- 3. the cost of the licensing process is large relative to its benefits.*

We are supportive of Section 6 and the above recommendations and have been making representation to OEH to assist implementation since our first meeting and submission with OEH policy staff on 5/8/2015.

Based on what is now years of ongoing discussion we are confident the following are agreed facts and should remain central when assessing new proposals to implement *Recommendation 27* and *Recommendation 28* above.

- **Fact 1.** - Managing the risk of native animals being taken from the wild (or returned to the wild) is critical to any new scheme ultimately receiving support from Government.
- **Fact 2.** - The current licensing system is overly prescriptive and difficult to enforce. The result is ongoing poor compliance together with inadequate risk management.
- **Fact 3.** - The Department of Primary Industries (DPI) is the lead animal welfare regulator via the *Protection of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979* (POCTA).

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION COMMENTS

- GC1. There is no doubt the major focus and effort on the part of OEH has been on implementing the risk-based approach to wildlife regulation required by *Recommendation 27*. In general, CCBFA is supportive of these efforts and this should be kept in mind as we identify and explain issues with proposals from within the discussion paper which is the subject of this submission.
- GC2. Unfortunately, no discernible effort has been directed towards implementation of *Recommendation 28*. This is the cause of much frustration on our part as our continued proposals and recommendations for a range of community-based engagement programs have been completely ignored. The success of the risk-based regulation regime into the future rests on a foundation of education, engagement and community partnerships. Formation of an ongoing consultative group is critical in this regard.
- GC3. A cultural change within OEH licensing branch is needed as they move from the current highly regulated system to the new risk-based system. Currently there is much frustration amongst bird keepers due to inefficiencies and unreasonable or trivial compliance operations. This needs to change so that native animal keepers are encouraged by staff in a working relationship. CCBFA and our affiliate clubs have much to offer in this regard.
- GC4. Throughout this review there has been significant input from a range of animal welfare advocates and organisations. Animal welfare is the highest priority for CCBFA and all our affiliate clubs. Animal welfare is critical for all captive birds and all bird species - exotic species, all native species including exempt, code-based, licensed, etc. We are in consultation with DPI now to review our *NSW Animal Welfare Code of Practice No 4 - Keeping and Trading of Birds*. This code is planned to cover animal welfare of all captive birds in all circumstances. OEH has been invited to join this process on multiple occasions and has declined. OEH proposals to implement piecemeal animal welfare regulation for birds is counterproductive.
- GC5. Role of proposed consultative committee.
- To act as a conduit between OEH and native animal keepers, aiming to improve community engagement and education programs.
 - Maintenance and review of OEH codes of practice for keeping native animals.
 - Maintenance and review of OEH private and dealer licence conditions.
 - Maintenance and review of OEH exempt, code-based and licensed species lists.
 - Appeal and review of applications to add species using the risk assessment tool (RAT) system.
 - Review of systems for rehoming escaped and abandoned native animal pets.
 - Review of the outcomes of the risk-based system and its implementation.
 - Appeal and review of licence proposals for *Managed citizen science project requiring collection of fauna from the wild in NSW*.
 - Assessing progress of *Managed citizen science project requiring collection of fauna from the wild in NSW* projects.

DISCUSSION PAPER COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following comments and recommendations reference and therefore should be read alongside the discussion paper.

1.3.1 Legal Framework (p3)

The purpose of the BC Act s.1.3 also includes:

(n) to support public consultation and participation in biodiversity conservation and decision-making about biodiversity conservation, and

(o) to make expert advice and knowledge available to assist the Minister in the administration of this Act.

It is these aspects of the BC Act that have been ignored within the discussion paper and during the entire review process thus leading to GC2 above.

We support the low risk exempt, code-based moderate and licensed high risk categories outlined at the top of page 4. We note that the welfare of all birds, including all exempt species are regulated under POCTA.

1.3.2 Objectives and benefits of a risk-based approach (p4)

This section completely neglects to address the significant benefits of and need for community engagement as a central requirement to a successful risk-based approach. We continue to recommend formation of a consultative committee as a necessary first step to engaging with community-based stakeholders so as to ensure the risk-based approach continues to be supported by the native animal keeping community. There is much we have to offer in terms of promoting the risk-based system, and in terms of discouraging non-compliance. We predict the lack of a consultation process moving forward will likely result in less community support and lower levels of compliance.

We support development of a new licensing management system. However we note that many bird keepers are not IT literate so paper-based alternatives are required.

1.3.4 The use of codes of practice (p5)

We agree in principle with the use of codes of practice. CCBFA formed an expert bird group which has considered codes of practice. To date OEH has failed to engage with this group, including in regard to codes of practice as outlined in GC4 above. The proposed unsatisfactory code of practice accompanying the discussion paper was developed without consulting CCBFA.

3.1.1 Commercial Kangaroo Harvest Management Plan (p9)

We note at the top of p10 that OEH convenes the Kangaroo Management Advisory Panel comprised of a range of key stakeholders. Table 3 indicates 3,646 licensees under this program. Currently there are well in excess of 30,000 licensed native animal keepers and an order of magnitude higher of unlicensed and keepers of exempt native bird species. We again strongly recommend a consultative committee to represent the interests of these hundreds of thousands of native animal keepers.

5.1 Animal Keeper Licences (p23)

As a member of the Native Animal Keepers Consultative Committee (NAKCC) we note recognition in para 6 of the NAKCC convened by OEH prior to the development of the BC Act. We are dismayed and surprised there is no proposal to continue the NAKCC or its equivalent. A consultative group is central to the ongoing success of this risk-based approach to managing wildlife interactions, including the fulfilment of many of the discussion paper proposals. The continuation of NAKCC or its equivalent has been a central recommendation of bird groups and reptile groups. Who has opposed

this recommendation? And why has the continuation of NAKCC (or similar) not been proposed in the discussion paper?

Further we note a commitment from the Manager, Wildlife Biodiversity Reforms to convene a meeting of the NAKCC to discuss submissions to this process once digested by the reforms team. A further meeting will be required to work through the proposed species list changes.

5.1.1 Current licensing framework (p23)

Currently there is acknowledged and enormous non-compliance with licensing as emphasised by **Fact 2**. OEH has done little to promote or enforce the current system, presumably due to an acknowledgement that the system is outdated and fails to meet its objectives.

Current licence conditions, including those outlined on p25,26 require work. We made editing recommendations in our previous submission. Given there is no revised version we reserve an opportunity to review the licence conditions prior to implementation.

5.1.2 Proposed risk-based approach to licensing (p26)

We support the proposed risk-based approach to licensing.

CCBFA supports the Risk Assessment Tool (RAT) to facilitate changes and additions to the species lists. However, based on major issues revising species lists in the past we require a process including review or appeal mechanism moving forward.

We recommend a time limit of 60 days for each RAT to be assessed followed by a formal evidence-based reply. If the RAT is unsuccessful then the proponent is entitled to appeal to the consultative committee (NAKCC or equivalent) who has powers to reassess the matter in consultation with OEH.

Concerns about the risk-based approach (p27)

Opposition to the risk-based approach from wildlife rehabilitation and “animal welfare groups” shows a lack of understanding of the realities of wildlife licensing non-compliance in **Fact 2**.

There is no causal evidence presented as to how a risk-based licensing system leads to abandonment of animals. Most birds currently kept are not licensed, yet we are unable to identify any significant abandonment or deliberate release to the wild cases whatsoever.

Concerns about exempt species welfare expressed in the discussion paper are unfounded and show a lack of understanding of current animal welfare regulation by DPI, who are the primary regulator in this area - refer GC4 and **Fact 3**.

Management of abandoned, escaped and seized native animal pets (p27)

CCBFA and its affiliates ARE animal welfare groups, indeed we are the experts on animal welfare for birds. Groups such as RSPCA, Animal Welfare League, the Humane Society International and others promote bird welfare, however they do not possess or even claim to possess expertise with regards to bird welfare. We imagine the same applies to reptiles. The term “animal welfare groups” is a misnomer in the discussion paper.

CCBFA has been unable to locate any data on any POCTA compliance operations involving birds whatsoever. We have requested from RSPCA, on numerous occasions, details of all compliance operations involving birds - calls, investigations, prosecutions, etc. anything over the last 5, 10, 15, 20 years. We have not received a response. This is a concern as we have no doubt that animal welfare breaches involving birds would be occurring. We can only conclude that those tasked with POCTA compliance are ineffective in this area.

Consultation on the matter of abandoned, escaped and seized native animal pets is ongoing with further stakeholder meetings, including CCBFA planned by OEH. CCBFA and its affiliates already rehome an unknown significant number of birds nationally through the bird club network. The

number of birds rehomed by our member clubs far exceeds those retrieved by “animal welfare” and rehabilitation groups.

CCBFA does NOT agree that BC regulations for managing wild animals unable to fend for themselves should be applied to escaped or abandoned native animal pets.

Our current recommendation within our 2/3/18 response to this matter is as follows.

We recommend birds, once determined to be pets, are transferred as soon as possible to a local bird group. CCBFA is able to provide suitable contacts in most areas throughout NSW, and indeed Australia wide. Individual wildlife carers are not specialists in the large range of avian species in captivity – our membership includes specialists for most species and is well equipped to care for such animals.

We are at a loss as to why the above recommendation has not been proposed for implementation.

Proposed codes of practice (p28)

CCBFA agreed and recommended that the current DPI NSW *Animal Welfare Code of Practice No 4 - Keeping and Trading of Birds* should be THE code of practice. As described in GC4 this code is under review.

The OEH *Draft Code of Practice for Keeping Native Birds* accompanying the discussion paper goes well beyond the agreed DPI code as we detail under **Draft codes of practice** later in this submission.

Record keeping and annual returns (p28)

We support the simpler one line per species return.

The current licence conditions, including signed and dated receipts, require revision as recommended previously in this and other CCBFA submissions.

Changes to the NSW Native Animal Keepers' Species List (p28)

We welcome the opportunity to submit further proposals using the risk assessment tool (RAT).

CCBFA note a commitment from the Wildlife Biodiversity Reforms team to convene a meeting with relevant OEH staff to resolve any disagreement prior to implementation.

We again recommend removing all hybrid species from the species lists. The propagation of hybrids is discouraged by aviculturists. If hybrids are included there are potentially thousands of possibilities. If the current proposed species lists, combined with our further edits and additions below are implemented then there will be few if any hybrids that are not combinations of code-based species, which avoids difficulties classifying any existing individual hybrid birds.

Appendix A includes RATs for the following 16 species we recommend moving from licensed (B2) to the code-based species list. Care and knowledge of market forces is required during RAT assessment as licensing has the potential to skew the market, usually to the detriment of the species the system aims to protect.

Alisterus scapularis Australian king-parrot

Aprosmictus erythropterus Red-winged parrot

Aythya australis Hardhead

Cacatua leadbeateri Major Mitchell's cockatoo

Calyptorhynchus banksia Red-tailed black-cockatoo

Cyclopsitta diophthalma Fig-parrot

Epthianura tricolor Crimson chat

Lathamus discolor Swift parrot
Malurus cyaneus Superb fairy-wren
Neochmia phaeton evangelinae Crimson finch (white bellied)
Northiella haematogaster narethae Naretha blue bonnet
Poephila cincta cincta Black-throated finch (southern subspecies)
Polytelis anthopeplus monarchoides Regent parrot (eastern subspecies)
Ptilinopus regina Rose-crowned fruit-dove
Ptilinopus superbus Superb fruit-dove
Zosterops lateralis Silvereye

A key thing to mention regarding the addition of new species is that there are MANY husbandry guidelines published and available BUT a lot more needed and its where aviculture can provide something very worthwhile (for example, Striated Pardalote as an analogue for the endangered Forty-spotted Pardalote, Red-kneed Dotterel as analogue for Hooded Dotterel) BUT the point is you have to keep them in captivity in the first place if you want to record details of their captive management.

Appendix B includes RATs for the following 20 species recommended for inclusion on the licensed (B2) species list.

Acanthorhynchus superciliosus Western spinebill
Artamus leucorhynchus White-breasted woodswallow
Artamus minor Little woodswallow
Artamus personatus Masked woodswallow
Biziura lobate Musk duck
Caligavis chrysops Yellow-faced honeyeater
Certhionys pectoralis Banded honeyeater
Dicrurus bracteatus Spangled drongo
Egretta garzetta Little egret
Erythrogonys cinctus Red-kneed dotterel
Falcunculus frontatus frontatus Eastern shrike-tit
Lichenostomus unicolor White gaped honeyeater
Melithreptus gularis White-chined honeyeater
Melithreptus lunatus White-naped honeyeater
Pachycephala rufiventris Rufous whistler
Pardalotus striatus Striated pardalote
Phylidonyris pyrrhoptera Crescent honeyeater
Plectorhyncha lanceolata Striped honeyeater
Ramsayornis fasciatus Bar breasted honeyeater
Todiramphus macleayii Forest kingfisher

Keeping native mammals as pets (p29)

CCBFA continues to support the addition of further mammal species to the species list. We strongly refute the current uninformed OEH policy statement on mammals which is universally debunked by all scientific and keeper literature. OEH must encourage native mammal keeping – it is central to the recommendations of the Independent Biodiversity Legislation Review Panel and must be re-examined.

5.1.3 Proposals for comment

Staged approach to implementing risk-based regulation (p29)

The intention initially for a limited number of birds (and other species) to move to the code-based system as a pilot is **STRONGLY** opposed for the following reasons.

1. The proposed code-based bird list includes species kept by most aviculturists. If just one of the species kept by an aviculturist remains on licence during the pilot implementation, then the aviculturist must retain their licence with no advantage in terms of reduced effort or cost.
2. Whether a licensee keeps one or many licensed species is irrelevant in terms of the OEH administrative effort and costs.
3. A half-half risk-based system will only serve to confuse most licensees unnecessarily.
4. The risk-based system has been recommended and accepted by government and is legislated within the BC Act. There is no legislative reason to delay full implementation for three years.
5. There was an expectation that the new system would be in place at the beginning of 2018. To now extend full implementation another three years into the future will cause further confusion and further non-compliance.
6. The concerns of rehabilitation and “animal welfare groups” are largely in relation to animal welfare. Animal welfare, although important, has little to do with wildlife licensing of native birds – it is a DPI matter as described in GC4.

CCBFA can accept that no new species will be added to the exempt list for the first three years of the risk-based system.

We **STRONGLY** oppose the proposal that the existing 41 exempt species will be required to comply with the current OEH *Draft Code of Practice for Keeping Native Birds*.

Proposing to include exempt species as code-based species is unexpected – some initial issues as a consequence of this proposal are as follows:

1. It opens up a whole raft of issues that have clearly not been considered by OEH and are well outside the scope of the BC Act. Concern for animal welfare is misguided as described in GC4.
2. This is a potentially significant issue for all exempt species but particularly problematic for thoroughly domesticated species such as Budgerigars, Zebra finches, Cockatiels and the like.
3. Inclusion of exempt species means hundreds of thousands of unlicensed native animal keepers are now included in the system, yet they have not been consulted.

Please refer to the section that follows under the heading **Draft Codes of Practice (p30)** for complete recommendations on edits to the code which will assist with minimising the impact of this issue.

CCBFA supports and looks forward to working with OEH on the development of community education programs to promote compliance with the risk-based approach. We recommend such programs be ongoing under the support of the consultative group recommended in GC2.

CCBFA and its affiliate clubs will continue to take responsibility for escaped birds, both native and exotic as described under the heading **Management of abandoned, escaped and seized native animal pets (p27)** above.

We support regular reviews of the outcomes of the risk-based system including review of the code-based species list. We recommend this as an ongoing process at least annually under the remit of the consultative committee described in GC2.

We do NOT support a review contemplating a return to the failed prescriptive licensing regime.

Species to be regulated by code of practice (p30)

We presume and recommend the *Revised NSW Native Animal Keepers' Species List*, together with our recommended edits and additions is implemented in full as part of the initial implementation of the new risk-based system.

Scientific and common names used by OEH's biodiversity data repository (BioNET) should be included on species lists, however the common names used in aviculture MUST also be included. Not including common names used in aviculture will definitely result in confusion and unintentional non-compliance.

Draft codes of practice (p30)

In the main we support the *Draft Code of Practice for Keeping Native Birds* but have some suggestions that will avoid concerns that have been raised by keepers of currently exempt species and those keepers who were expecting less onerous requirements for birds that are proposed to move to the code-based system.

Suggested areas for attention are:

- 3.1.5 If sites such as Gumtree and Petlink qualify then we can see no issues if not, there will be extensive non-compliance which we would like to avoid.
- 3.1.6 Exempt bird species are routinely traded by pet shops and do not require an OEHL licence. Note we also strongly recommend all code-based species to be freely traded by pet shops.
- 4.1.1 We believe keeping of records should be a Standard such as total numbers in and out annually with receipts for licenced birds i.e. B2. With maintaining records for code-based birds becoming a guideline, thus avoiding massive non-compliance and a backlash from current keepers of exempt species such as budgies, zebra finches, cockatiels, etc.
- 4.2.1 is best covered within the DPI code and does not cover the basics of disease diagnosis in any rigorous manner.
- 4.2.2 The use of leg rings is widespread in bird keeping and should be added to the guideline, with microchipping reserved for some particularly high value species.
- The Notes at the bottom of page 4, although well meaning, are best included in the DPI code.

The DPI *NSW Animal Welfare Code of Practice No 4 - Keeping and Trading of Birds* is planned to cover animal welfare of all captive birds in all circumstances. As described in GC4 this code is under review now, we again recommend OEHL engages with this process so that edits to the OEHL code of practice, OEHL licensing conditions and the DPI code work together logically.

Annual Records (p30)

CCBFA agree that annual returns should not be required for code-based species. We support the simplified one row per species annual returns for advanced bird licence holders.

We support abolishing the B1 class into a single class (currently B2) for all licensed bird species not regulated by code or exempt.

5.2 Dealer licences (p31)

CCBFA questions the current OEH policy titled *Commercial trade of protected native animals: Policy directive*. This policy requires review in light of the risk-based approach which is the subject of the discussion paper. It is a glaring anomaly that private individuals will be able to freely trade in all code-based species whilst a highly regulated pet shop is unable to do the same.

We feel that the growth of on-line trading has in part been encouraged by over regulating pet shops which have increasingly ceased trading in native birds thus leading to a place for on-line traders. Many bird keepers would prefer to deal with pet shops but have little choice as pet shop numbers selling birds dwindle.

We wish to encourage more pet shops to trade in birds and to trade in a wider variety of species. Pet shops are an introduction to aviculture for most hobbyists.

A “Dealer’s licence” should NOT be required to trade commercially in code-based species. If private persons can trade code-based species freely then the same must be true for Pet Shops who are thoroughly regulated via DPI. The current status quo proposal is discriminatory and unworkable.

CCBFA recommends a dealer licence is implemented to enable commercial trade in all B2 species available to advanced bird licence holders.

Licences for animal expos (p33)

Licences for animal expos are NOT supported and will be strongly opposed by the avicultural community. Such events are run and operated by not-for-profit community-based bird clubs for the benefit of their members.

Transactions at these events are between seller and buyer, the club simply provides the venue.

Bird sales and other club events are and have been successfully self-regulated forever without issue. We have a self-regulated code of practice for bird sales which focuses on the welfare of all birds at all such events, not just licensed natives.

5.2.2 Regulation of online dealing (p33)

We STRONGLY oppose the proposed “Commercial dealing in native animals, other than a pet shop” licence class for birds. Such a licence goes well beyond the object of the BC Act and is an ATO matter, or perhaps at best a DPI POCTA matter. The rationale applies to all animals, native or exotic, and to all businesses. The move to online trading is prevalent in most retail sectors and attempts to influence such trade has a history of unintended consequences.

We make the following points in response to concerns expressed in this section of the discussion paper.

1. All birds, both native and exotic deserve similar treatment in terms of welfare as described in GC4. Animal welfare is primarily a DPI matter.
2. Private aviculturists are the primary source of information regarding bird welfare. Purchasing direct from an aviculturist is the best way to obtain accurate and reliable husbandry and dietary advice.
3. We support specialist bird shops who employ or are aviculturists and respect their extensive and professional expertise. Unfortunately, such expertise is not always present in general pet shops employing a range of sales assistants. To universally claim superior bird welfare expertise is available via pet shops compared to via private aviculturists is clearly untrue.

5.2.3 Proposal for comment (p34)

In response to the first and second paragraph refer to above comments under heading **5.2 Dealer licences (p31)** and heading **Licences for animal expos (p33)**.

In relation to the proposed new licence class for “commercial dealing in native animals, other than a pet shop” we make the following comments.

1. The discussion surrounding this matter in NSW has not progressed. Nevertheless, CCBFA looks forward to our involvement in further consultation on this matter.
2. Attempts to distinguish trading native birds as a hobby from trading native birds as a business has been considered in all states. In most cases the simple rule that hobbyists cannot trade animals unless bred or held for six months, whilst commercial dealers can buy and sell immediately has proven to last the test of time. We recommend continuing this simple system.
3. CCBFA agrees that the Australian Tax Office (ATO) criteria to distinguish between hobby and business activity may be suitable if such a distinction is indeed required. However, the ATO and its ruling system should be an absolute defence to any ruling made based on OEH criteria.
4. For birds, there would currently be few, if any, commercial operations making a living out of trading native bird species. Commercial operations make a living trading exotic parrot species, accessories, feed, supplements or a combination of these items. Therefore, attempts by OEH to distinguish between dealing in native animals as part of a hobby and dealing in native animals undertaken as a business are a poor use of OEH resources.
5. Regulation of pet shops is a DPI matter. Consideration could be given to broadening the DPI definition of a pet shop to encompass online commercial dealing (not just in native species) as part of the current DPI POCTA review process.

5.3 Interstate import and export licences (p35)

CCBFA supports the proposal to NOT require import or export licences for all exempt and code-based species.

CCBFA supports discontinuation of import and export licences where DPI already requires reporting under the *Exhibited Animals Protection Act 1986*.

6 Scientific licences (p39)

In our previous submission dated 20/6/2017, CCBFA via the expert bird group recommended an additional licence class titled “*Managed citizen science project requiring collection of fauna from the wild in NSW*”. The rationale for this proposed licence class is as follows.

- Implementation of Recommendation 28 in *A review of biodiversity in NSW, Final Report* which is required by Government to be implemented.
- Promote the sharing of husbandry knowledge and expertise between all captive animal stakeholders nationally and internationally including OEH/NPWS, display establishments and DPI.
- Encourage the maintenance of sustainable captive populations via managed documented processes.
- Utilise the vast network of avicultural societies to assist with threatened species recovery and conservation efforts.
- Aviculture is involved in threatened species efforts for many species, both native and exotic, and our expertise is keenly sought nationally and internationally. We would be happy to present practical examples.

- Contribute the vast knowledge, expertise and resources of private aviculturists to threatened species conservation efforts.
- Reduce the incentive for illegal take-from-the-wild through the provision of a legal managed process.

The discussion paper makes no attempt to address or progress the above proposal.

CCBFA recommends a meeting with relevant OEH scientific licensing staff and members of the expert bird group to explore and progress this proposal.

7 Licence Fees

Assuming the proposed risk-based system, including no private or dealer licences required for code-based species is implemented then licences will only be required for advanced bird keepers and bird dealers for B2 species.

- We support similar fees as currently apply, that is approximately \$60 per year for advanced bird keepers and approximately \$600 per year for bird dealers.
- We support discounts for pensioners and discounts to encourage online lodgement.
- Available licence terms should be variable. We suggest options of 1, 2 and 5 years.
- OEH must begin sending out licence renewal notices in advance of licence expiry dates.

CCBFA looks forward to further consultation with OEH regarding licence fees.



Community-based animal groups ARE the animal welfare experts.

The real animal welfare experts are the hundreds of community-based animal groups, along with the veterinary profession and of course farmers. All these groups have been animal welfare educators and advocates for hundreds of years. Animal welfare is central to our day-to-day existence, it is what we do, and our expertise is specialised and professional.

APPENDIX A

RATs for the following 16 species we recommend moving from licensed (B2) to the code-based species list.

Alisterus scapularis Australian king-parrot

Aprosmictus erythropterus Red-winged parrot

Aythya australis Hardhead

Cacatua leadbeateri Major Mitchell's cockatoo

Calyptorhynchus banksia Red-tailed black-cockatoo

Cyclopsitta diophthalma Fig-parrot

Epthianura tricolor Crimson chat

Lathamus discolor Swift parrot

Malurus cyaneus Superb fairy-wren

Neochmia phaeton evangelinae Crimson finch (white bellied)

Northiella haematogaster narethae Naretha blue bonnet

Poephila cincta cincta Black-throated finch (southern subspecies)

Polytelis anthopeplus monarchoides Regent parrot (eastern subspecies)

Ptilinopus regina Rose-crowned fruit-dove

Ptilinopus superbus Superb fruit-dove

Zosterops lateralis Silvereye

SPECIES

Common Name	King Parrot		
Scientific Name	Alisterus scapularis		
Current Species List Class	B1, companion	Proposed Class	CODE

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of New South Wales, CCBFA.		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	None recorded.		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from the species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	(Hard release) Aviary bred escapees would stand little chance of surviving.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Many hundreds in private aviculture. Some 70 in zoos and wildlife parks (ASMP). Secure captive population including colour mutations	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate.</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Breeders, although increasingly colour mutations are being bred of this popular parrot.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Standard parrot diet.	
Housing requirements	Reasonably large aviaries for flight, although suspended cages are also a reality for this species.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed.	
Other issues	Easy to sex so no problems with selecting pairs and setting up appropriate nesting arrangements.	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Aviculture of this species well known, and a LOT of literature available. Husbandry Manual has been published (see ASZK Registry of Husbandry Manuals)	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

The substantial captive population of this species, and the fact that it is not threatened in the wild point towards OEH taking a sensible risk management view. Given that the species is no more difficult to breed and manage than a rosella – and there is no demand for any wild originating rosellas- and that there is an increasing focus on the breeding of colour mutations there is little risk for king parrots.

SPECIES

Common Name	Red-winged Parrot (Crimson-winged Parrot)		
Scientific Name	Aprosmictus erythropterus		
Current Species List Class	B1, Companion	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	None		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Aviary escapees would represent no risk to environment. Would be unlikely to survive a hard release/ escape.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Hundreds. Some 20 in Australian zoos and wildlife parks. Lower numbers than King Parrots because can be aggressive thus not so easy in a mixed exhibit.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least Concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Breeders produce enough for market demand, and there is no threat of poaching. Given that the species is known for its aggression there will never be significant demand for wild birds.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Easy parrot to maintain.	
Housing requirements	Large aviaries or suspended cages. Tends to be kept in pairs rather than in mixed species arrangements.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed. No more difficult than any rosella species.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Analogue information via King Parrot Husbandry Manual is available via ASZK Registry. Substantial avicultural literature on captive management exists.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

The captive population is limited to those who like to display and breed this beautiful species; however it tends to be aggressive – which is an aspect to be managed. There is little perceived threat to the wild population from poaching.

SPECIES

Common Name	Hardhead		
Scientific Name	Aythya australis		
Current Species List Class	B2	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW/ CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	None recorded		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries recorded for this species.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	Medium	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Rescue and release of casualty waterbirds tends to have a higher success rate than most normal, thus it is plausible that escaped Hardheads might survive and reproduce in the wild. If pinioned, then impossible to survive in the wild.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Some 90 specimens in Zoos (who have no further capacity)(ASMP). Approximately similar numbers Pheasant and Waterfowl Society of Australia.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least Concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Waterfowl breeders, zoos, wildlife parks.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Straightforward waterfowl diet.	
Housing requirements	Nylon mesh covered pond is preferred to open ponds which require pinioning, which is less practised these days.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency		<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Literature, especially from the PWSA is available; plus a substantial waterfowl captive management literature. Several Husbandry Manuals are published on waterfowl – Cape Barren Goose, Mandarin Duck to name a few.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

In the spirit of trying to make the Biodiversity review best work for all, it is recommended to have some species as portals to draw potential waterfowl keepers though, which being CODE require no licensing. If people do ok with Hardheads (and possibly Wood Duck would be another appropriate candidate) then they could look to keep other species – which may require licensing. Industry participants have suggested this species.

SPECIES

Common Name	Major Mitchell's Cockatoo		
Scientific Name	Cacatua leadbeateri		
Current Species List Class	B1, Companion	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	None		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Escaped cockatoos would need to join a wild flock in order to thrive post release. Individual birds could join the flocks of other white cockatoos and might survive, but they wouldn't reproduce in the wild.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Many hundreds in private aviculture; approximately 50 in zoos and wildlife parks (ASMP data)...but popular pet and likely underestimate of total population in captivity.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least Concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Well established captive population. So there is no need to draw on any wild population, and bird keepers are not a market for any poached birds.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Standard white cockatoo diet.	
Housing requirements	Suitably sized aviaries.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed. Easy to sex.	
Other issues	Cockatoos are inappropriate cage pets requiring a substantial amount of behavioural enrichment	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Husbandry Manual available (see ASZK Registry). A LOT of literature for this beautiful species abounds. Books on cockatoo management, magazine articles...	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Our community really represents little to no risk of poaching, although it is conceded that there may be some poaching in the regions for local pets as one does see Majors in cockatoo cages in country towns (but almost never in the cities). Looks like an education program would be the way to go recommending the keeping of colour mutations of Cockatiels over inappropriate keeping of these large and intelligent parrots.

SPECIES

Common Name	Red-tailed Black-cockatoo		
Scientific Name	Calyptorhynchus banksii		
Current Species List Class	B1, Companion	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW, CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	None		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species reported.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Escaped captive bred black cockatoos would have zero possibility of surviving in the wild; certainly not establishing breeding populations.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Several hundreds in private aviculture. Commonest Black cockatoo kept. Likewise in Zoos and Wildlife parks.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern, but threatened for graptogyne subspecies. Poaching is not a serious threatening process for this population.	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Abundant in that anyone wanting to acquire Red-tailed Black cockatoos have no trouble acquiring them.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Less demanding than other Black cockatoos. However fairly simple.	
Housing requirements	Large aviaries. Not a good cage bird at all. Very demanding as a pet.	
Ease of breeding	Easiest of the Black cockatoo species .	
Other issues	Easy to sex. However high demand re behavioural enrichment and management otherwise prone to stereotypies if kept as singletons.	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Husbandry Manual published (ASZK Registry). Substantial literature available.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

At species level, the RTBC represents an intergrade population between several subspecies; although there are some breeders who maintain pure subspecies populations, studbooks, etc. Some time ago the NT government allowed legal take of subspecies there. RTBCs are well established in captivity. Long lived and reliable breeders. Limited number of people wanting them.

The thinking is that people interested in Black cockatoos should be funnelled towards keeping this one- which is easiest plus has substantial captive population via CODE. The other species could remain B2 (although since WA government has hammered poaching via DNA with result that there is now no poaching at all). Perhaps a WA DNA approach to YTBC, Glossies would be useful and to also to anyone who thinks they are holding graptogyne subspecies of *C.banksii* instead of a licensing approach.

Note that zoos now depend on the avicultural populations for any Black cockatoos so are not a source.

SPECIES

Common Name	Fig Parrot		
Scientific Name	Cyclopsitta diophthalma		
Current Species List Class	B2	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW/ CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	None recorded.		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries listed against this species.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low to zero. Since we are considering NSW and given that very few breeders of fig parrots would live near suitable habitat for the species.		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	A viable escapee population is highly unlikely to survive in the wild		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Hundred to two hundred, mainly in private avicultural sector, however some in Zoos and wildlife parks (ZAA)	
Conservation status in the wild	Least Concern – except for coxeni (E) ...but see below.	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Breeders of the species. Zoo surplus is also a probability. No real problem in obtaining stock.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Figs, seeds. Aviculture well known.	
Housing requirements	Standard aviaries, may also be kept in planted aviaries however need to be kept under wire as good chewers.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	A Fig Parrot Husbandry Manual was developed by Currumbin Sanctuary, thus would be available via ASZK Registry. Literature on fig parrots is fairly extensive.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

The two subspecies kept are C.d. marshalli (Marshalls Fig Parrot of Cape York) and the more numerous is Macleays Fig Parrot C.d. macleayii. Macleays is Cairns area.

It is noted that Cyclopsitta diophthalma coxeni is threatened. It is unknown in captivity, and if populations were found and a captive population was considered desirable – then that would be a matter for a recovery team. It is implausible that this large and well marked subspecies would be poached from the wild.

SPECIES

Common Name	Crimson Chat		
Scientific Name	Ephthianura tricolor		
Current Species List Class	B2	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW/ CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	None recorded		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases wrt this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Very low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Escapees would almost certainly not survive in the wild.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	One to two hundred in private aviculture; tens in Zoo collections (ZAA records)	
Conservation status in the wild	Least Concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Breeders, especially those who keep smaller softbilled birds.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Chats are related to Honeyeaters, and have a fairly broad dietary range – but reasonably simple- seeds, insectivorous softbill food, nectar etc however live food required for rearing young.	
Housing requirements	Planted aviaries with low shrubs.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed if live food is supplied for the raising of young.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	A husbandry manual on the species is available (ASZK) – Crimson Chat by Luke Pirotta. Avicultural literature on the genus eg Rosemary Hutton's book; Society and conference presentations; magazine articles and aviary visits.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

The three species of Ephthianura are all kept in private aviculture (Orange Chat and White- fronted chats) however Crimson Chats are best established. Clearly there are challenges with the other two species and it should be noted that albifrons is threatened.

In the spirit of the Biodiversity review, it is proposed that if a species that DOES well is made easy by being in CODE, then that will direct breeders towards that species – sort of as a portal. Then once they have gained experience they might like to try for the related ones, or just keep with the CODE recommended one.

SPECIES

Common Name	Swift Parrot		
Scientific Name	Lathamus discolor		
Current Species List Class	B1, Companion	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of New South Wales; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic disease or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Aviary bred birds as escapees would be unlikely to survive hard release. Soft release and acclimatisation – behavioural, dietary and other aspects of fitness would need to be addressed ahead of release.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Hundreds, mainly in the private sector. Few in zos, which is surprising for such a threatened species. There are over 10,000 in European aviaries.	
Conservation status in the wild	Critically Endangered	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Adequate captive population. No incentive to poach, and with this species being on the ropes anyone doing such a thing would be viewed by the community as completely inappropriate.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Simple.	
Housing requirements	Standard aviaries. Also suspended aviaries.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed .	
Other issues		
Keeper competency		<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	A Husbandry Manual is currently being written for this species as a prelude to a CMP – captive Management Plan and studbook by the private community.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

This is a critically endangered species with a substantial captive population in which the zoo population is tiny compared to those held in private hands. By being pro-active and managing the captive population well with studbook and Captive Management Plan the avicultural community aims to be able to provide support to any recovery plan. We certainly do not want to see a re-run of the Orange-bellied Parrot debacle.

The recommendation is for the species to go to CODE to facilitate maximum involvement by the avicultural community.

SPECIES

Common Name	Superb Fairy-wren		
Scientific Name	Malurus cyaneus		
Current Species List Class	B2	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW/ CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Aviary bred Blue Wrens, as with all aviary bred birds would need time to adjust to wild conditions – and that is not usually accorded to them by more predatory species eg currawongs. Unlikely to survive without soft release.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Probably 50 or more in private aviculture. Zoos and Wildlife parks tend to keep other species of this genus rather than the common cyaneus (depending on their location).	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern.	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Breeders of Maluridae.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Simple. Fairy-wrens are surprisingly robust species.	
Housing requirements	Planted aviaries.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed.	
Other issues	Keep generally as pairs or small groups.	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Analogue guidelines at Genus level exist. Husbandry Manual for Splendid Fairy-wren published. See ASZK Registry. Substantial literature on smaller softbills such as Blue Wrens available. (Rosemary Hutton's book included).	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

This common species represents no threat of poaching. The Superb Fairy-wren is an IDEAL species to encourage seed eating finch breeders to transition to softbilled birds. It is slightly more demanding than finches...but not very much so. It could be argued that it is no more difficult than foreign finches which require livefood.

The thinking is that we should provide portals through which to encourage people who want to keep softbills by making the licensing requirements as simple as possible, thus CODE for this species.

SPECIES

Common Name	Crimson Finch (white-bellied) AKA (White-bellied Blood Finch)		
Scientific Name	Neochmia phaeton evangelinae		
Current Species List Class	B1, Companion	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; Finch Society of Australia; CCBFA.		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	None		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries recorded for this species.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low to zero		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Escaped birds would almost certainly not survive. Most areas where the species is kept are far removed from their Cape York habitat.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	One to two hundred. All in private aviculture. No records for current numbers in Zoos (ZAA)	
Conservation status in the wild	Least Concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Breeders.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Seed eating grassfinch. Simple diet.	
Housing requirements	Standard planted aviaries.	
Ease of breeding	Easy, if correctly housed and managed. The aviculture of Crimson Finches is understood, hence good populations of both nominate (black bellied) and white bellied subspecies.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Avicultural literature, aviary visits to those expert in management of <i>Neochmia phaeton</i> . Magazine articles and presentations at avicultural societies.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

The nominate form Black-bellied Crimson Finch (AKA Blood finch rather than Crimson finch) is well established and its captive management is well understood. The white-bellied subspecies is not threatened and there is no demand for any poached birds given the sustainable captive population. There is no cogent reason to have the subspecies in B2, and so it is recommended to move to CODE in line with the other forms. Having additional paperwork (B2) could be a disincentive to some to keep and breed the form.

SPECIES

Common Name	Naretha Blue Bonnet		
Scientific Name	Northiella haematogaster narethae		
Current Species List Class	B1, Companion	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW, CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	None		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	People keeping this species are usually far removed from the western Australian desert areas that are its habitat. Unlikely that escapees would survive, and if they did they would almost certainly not breed.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	One to two hundred in private sector. None in zoos or wildlife parks (because they tend to be too aggressive for mixed exhibits...hence of little interest for zoos).	
Conservation status in the wild	Least Concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Breeders of Naretha bluebonnets. There is no poaching problem with this species.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Standard parrot food for this inland species.	
Housing requirements	Standard aviaries, however normally need to be housed in individual pairs as notably aggressive.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed.	
Other issues	Their aggression limits their numbers as many people won't keep them. Potential keepers need to know what they are getting themselves into. However a very beautiful species.	
Keeper competency	BASIC.	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Substantial literature.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Some decades ago the Western Australian government allowed a legal take of Narethas to see if in setting up a captive population would stop poaching. It did, The number of people who wanted Narethas were able to obtain them fairly easily. The trouble is with the bird itself as Blue Bonnets would have to be among the most aggressive of parrots. So both the number of people wanting to hold them and the population of the birds is limited, and likely fluctuates around a mean of fairly low hundreds in captivity. There is no poaching pressure on them whatsoever, hence the category for this Western Blue Bonnet should be the same as for the Eastern Blue Bonnet *Northiella haematogaster*.

BTW I think that latest taxonomy would have this as a full species *Northiella narethae*.

SPECIES

Common Name	Black-throated Finch (southern subsp) AKA Parson Finch		
Scientific Name	Poephila cincta cincta		
Current Species List Class	B1, Companion	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of New South Wales/ Finch Society of Australia/ CCBFA.		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	None		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No injuries or zoonotic diseases recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low to zero from aviary bred stock. .		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Any individual or small number escapees would almost certainly not survive. Any recovery program would require planned approach in which the fitness of captive bred stock to survive would be addressed.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Many hundreds.	
Conservation status in the wild	Threatened	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Bird breeders.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Seed eating finch with simple diet.	
Housing requirements	Standard planted aviaries suitable. The secure captive population is testament to ease of housing and management.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	NONE to BASIC.	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Extensive husbandry material available in avicultural literature, including books on Australian Finches and their management, Society publications, industry publications and lectures and presentations at Society and Conference meetings.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

The species Black-throated Finch *Poephila cincta* is listed as B1, Companion with recommendation to move to Code. As is *Poephila cincta atropygialis* (the black rumped Diggles Finch). The nominate southern subspecies *P.c.cincta* is well marked (white rumped) and has a substantial captive population. It will assist the management of this precious population if it is as easy to keep as the black rumped form (code – thus not requiring extensive paperwork. Finch breeders (Finch Society of Australia) maintain very good records of this notable population; there is no evidence of any poaching from the wild and aviculturists would take a very dim view of any such activity. Development in the area of its range remains a major threat to its survival.

SPECIES

Common Name	Regent Parrot (eastern subspecies)		
Scientific Name	Polytelis anthopeplus monarchoides		
Current Species List Class	B1, Companion	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of New South Wales; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred escapees unlikely to survive, and certainly wouldn't establish feral breeding population.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Hundreds. Some 50 in Zoos and wildlife parks, however they are managed at species level, not subspecies.	
Conservation status in the wild	Eastern population threatened.	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Breeders of Regent Parrots. A reasonable captive population exists.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Simple parrot diet for largely seed eating species.	
Housing requirements	Aviaries or large suspended cages.	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed.	
Other issues	Mixes reasonably well with other species.	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Analogue information available at genus level as there are published Husbandry Guidelines for Superb Parrot and Princess Parrot (ASZK Registry). Substantial avicultural literature exists.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

The population is mainly *anthopeplus* nominate or intergrade at the moment. The eastern and western subspecies are different – the one yellowish and the other greenish. However, the captive population would likely be an intergrade one, mainly comprised of western genes.

SPECIES

Common Name	Rose-crowned Fruit Dove		
Scientific Name	Ptilinopus regina		
Current Species List Class	B1, Companion	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The avicultural Society of New South Wales; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Aviary bred individuals stand low chance of surviving in the wild. Where breeders live tends to be far removed from the habitat of this species.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Hundreds in captivity. In excess of 70 in zoos and Wildlife Parks (ASMP data). ASMP maintains a studbook and it is a Managed Population	
Conservation status in the wild	Vulnerable.	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Softbill and native pigeon breeders. Also zoos, however anyone obtaining from zoos will be required to join the program and breed and manage according to captive management plan.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Well understood and available. Pellets, fruits, berries.	
Housing requirements	Planted aviaries.	
Ease of breeding	Fairly easy to breed.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Analogue information at genus level with Husbandry Manual for Magnificent Fruit Dove published (ASZK Registry). Smaller Ptilinopus species more commonly kept. Substantial avicultural literature exists.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Commonly kept by softbill and native pigeon fanciers.

SPECIES

Common Name	Superb Fruit Dove		
Scientific Name	Ptilinopus superbus		
Current Species List Class	B2	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW/ CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic disease or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Aviary bred individuals stand low chance of surviving in the wild. Where breeders live tends to be far removed from the habitat of this species.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	50 or so in private aviaries. 50 -60 in zoos and wildlife parks (ASMP data)	
Conservation status in the wild	Vulnerable	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Numbers for this sexually dimorphic species are lower than for the rose-crowned (P. regina) because there is no CMP –captive management plan and studbook for this species.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Simple. Pellets, fruits berries.	
Housing requirements	Planted aviaries	
Ease of breeding	Fairly easy to breed.	
Other issues	Sexually dimorphic, which makes breeding easier.	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Analogue information at genus level with Husbandry Manual for Magnificent Fruit Dove published (ASZK Registry). Smaller Ptilinopus species more commonly kept. Substantial avicultural literature exists.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Commonly kept by softbill and native pigeon fanciers.

SPECIES

Common Name	Silvereye		
Scientific Name	Zosterops lateralis		
Current Species List Class	B2	Proposed Class	Code

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW/ CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Aviary bred Silvereyes, as with all aviary bred birds would need time to adjust to wild conditions – and that is not usually accorded to them by more predatory species eg currawongs. Unlikely to survive without soft release.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Perhaps 50 in private aviculture. Some 60 in Zoos and wildlife parks (ASMP data) but note that Z&WPs plan to hold nearly 200.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern. The threat status might relate to the Norkolk Island bird- doubtfully a subspecies of lateralis, but in any case ZERO threat from poaching.	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Reasonable captive population.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Simple. Insectivore mix with small fruits and berries,	
Housing requirements	Planted aviaries	
Ease of breeding	Easy to breed	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Avicultural information – softbilled bird books, magazines, Society presentations all point to this generalist as a worthwhile avicultural subject.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

The Silvereeye is an IDEAL species to encourage seed eating finch breeders to transition to softbilled birds. It is slightly more demanding than finches...but not very much so. It could be argued that it is no more difficult than foreign finches which require livefood.

The thinking is that we should provide portals through which to encourage people who want to keep softbills by making the licensing requirements as simple as possible, thus CODE.

APPENDIX B

RATs for the following 20 species recommended for inclusion on the licensed (B2) species list.

Acanthorhynchus superciliosus Western spinebill

Artamus leucorhynchus White-breasted woodswallow

Artamus minor Little woodswallow

Artamus personatus Masked woodswallow

Biziura lobate Musk duck

Caligavis chrysops Yellow-faced honeyeater

Certhionys pectoralis Banded honeyeater

Dicrurus bracteatus Spangled drongo

Egretta garzetta Little egret

Erythrogonys cinctus Red-kneed dotterel

Falcunculus frontatus frontatus Eastern shrike-tit

Lichenostomus unicolor White gaped honeyeater

Melithreptus gularis White-chined honeyeater

Melithreptus lunatus White-naped honeyeater

Pachycephala rufiventris Rufous whistler

Pardalotus striatus Striated pardalote

Phylidonyris pyrrhoptera Crescent honeyeater

Plectorhyncha lanceolata Striped honeyeater

Ramsayornis fasciatus Bar breasted honeyeater

Todiramphus macleayi Forest kingfisher

SPECIES

Common Name	Western Spinebill		
Scientific Name	Acanthorhynchus superciliosus		
Current Species List Class	N/A	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW and CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Michael Mitchell	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	NIL		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Extremely Limited		
Likelihood	MEDIUM	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Being kept in low numbers it would be extremely unlikely for pair/s to firstly escape and remain together and survive to breed.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Established but not in large numbers	
Conservation status in the wild	Least Concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	The species is lawfully kept in both South Australia and Western Australia	

Welfare and Husbandry

Dietary requirements	Same as other Honeyeater species	
Housing requirements	Same as above. No special requirements	
Ease of breeding	Medium	
Other issues	None known	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Liaison with other experienced aviculturists. Husbandry Guidelines for honeyeater species have been published (ASZK Registry)	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

These birds can be lawfully obtained, are established in captivity in other states and husbandry methods are the same as other Honeyeaters currently kept in NSW.

SPECIES

Common Name	White-breasted woodswallow		
Scientific Name	Artamus leucorhynchus		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of New South Wales; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme.phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Nil		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	medium	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low as they are native to NSW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred individuals escaping would not survive.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Low numbers in zoos and wildlife parks, but are exhibited and do well in captivity.	
Conservation status in the wild	Of least concern	
Impact on wild populations	Low	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Zoos and wildlife parks.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Basic softbill insectivore requirements. Same as for other species of Woodswallows .	
Housing requirements	Planted softbill aviary.	
Ease of breeding	Some softbill experience needed. Fairly easy.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	Basic	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	A husbandry manual for White-browed Woodswallow has been published (ASZK Registry) .	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Species flagged in Appendix 2.

SPECIES

Common Name	Little Woodswallow		
Scientific Name	Artamus minor		
Current Species List Class	N/A	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	John Kearney	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	NIL		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	LOW This species is endemic NSW		
Likelihood	MEDIUM	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	This species is found virtually Australia wide. Escaped birds would have no impact on the wild populations.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Low. Is held legally in captivity in at least one other state. Woodswallows are exhibited in Zoos and wildlife parks (ASMP data)	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Currently held, or permission to take from the wild from aviculturist Gregory Mayo Northern Territory.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	As per other woodswallows already held in captivity. White browed, White breasted and Dusky Woodswallows.	
Housing requirements	As per other woodswallows kept in captivity.	
Ease of breeding	MEDIUM	
Other issues	NIL	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Husbandry Manual on White-browed woodswallow published (ASZK Registry)	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Close relatives, the White-browed , White breasted and Dusky woodswallows, are successfully being kept and bred in captivity .All requirements and husbandry would be the same..

SPECIES

Common Name	Masked Woodswallow		
Scientific Name	Artamus personatus		
Current Species List Class	N/A	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	John Kearney	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	NIL		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	LOW This species is widespread throughout Australia.		
Likelihood	MEDIUM	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred individuals escaping would have little chance of survival. This species is found virtually Australia wide. Escaped birds would have no impact on the wild populations.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Is held legally in captivity and in the Zoo system (ASMP data)	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Currently held in three states, SA NT and NSW zoo system.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	As per other woodswallows already held in captivity. White browed, White breasted and Dusky Woodswallows.	
Housing requirements	As per other woodswallows kept in captivity.	
Ease of breeding	MEDIUM	
Other issues	NIL	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Husbandry Manual for White-browed Woodswallow published (ASZK Registry of Husbandry Guidelines)	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Close relatives, the White-browed, White breasted and Dusky woodswallows, are successfully being kept and bred in captivity .All requirements and husbandry would be the same..

SPECIES

Common Name	Musk duck		
Scientific Name	Biziura lobata		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW, CCBFA and the Pheasant and Waterfowl Society of Australia.		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Nil		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low as they are native to NSW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred escapees usually do not recruit well to the wild, however waterfowl tend to be more successful. Still would be low risk.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Few in zoos and wildlife parks. Unknown numbers in private aviculture.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Limited sources. Would likely require application to wildlife authorities in some jurisdiction for limited capture.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Basic waterfowl diet	
Housing requirements	Basic largish planted waterfowl aviary.	
Ease of breeding	Not known	
Other issues	This is an aggressive species in captivity and tends to be shunned.	
Keeper competency	Basic	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Other aviculturists, zoos and online groups and forums. It is desirable that Husbandry Guidelines be written detailing captive management experiences, as this is an unusual species of diving duck.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Flagged as an Appendix 2 species. Older literature available (such as Frith: Waterfowl in Australia)...but it would be important to keep this species and record details and publish them.

SPECIES

Common Name	Yellow-faced honeyeater		
Scientific Name	Caligavis chrysops		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Nil		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	medium	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low as they are native to NSW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred individuals escaping would be unlikely to survive.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Low numbers kept in zoos and wildlife parks and private collections	
Conservation status in the wild	Of least concern	
Impact on wild populations	Low	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Limited. Application for wild collection from a jurisdiction that allows such may be necessary	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Basic softbill insectivore/ nectarivore requirements. Same as for other species of honeyeaters.	
Housing requirements	Basic largish planted softbill aviary.	
Ease of breeding	Some softbill experience needed. Fairly easy.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	Basic	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Other aviculturists, zoos and online groups and forums. Honeyeater Husbandry Guidelines for Helmeted Honeyeaters and Blue-faced Honeyeater published. ASZK Registry.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Flagged in Appendix 2. Development of Husbandry Guidelines and publication of same desirable.

SPECIES

Common Name	Banded Honeyeater		
Scientific Name	Certhionys pectoralis		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW and CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	John Kearney	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	NIL		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	LOW This species would not survive if it escaped.		
Likelihood	MEDIUM	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	This species would not survive if it escaped. If this species did escape it would have no impact on wild populations.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Is held legally in captivity in at least one other state. Permission to take from the wild.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Currently held , permission to take from the wild in Northern Territory by aviculturist Gregory Mayo	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	As per other small nectarivores already held in captivity.	
Housing requirements	Well planted aviary with flowering trees and shrubs. As per other small Softbills kept in captivity.	
Ease of breeding	Medium	
Other issues	NIL	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Liaison with other experienced aviculturists.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Similar species such as the white naped honeyeater and White chinned honeyeater are successfully being kept and bred in captivity, all requirements and husbandry would be the same.

SPECIES

Common Name	Spangled Drongo		
Scientific Name	Dicrurus bracteatus		
Current Species List Class	N/A	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	John Kearney	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	NIL		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	LOW. This species is found in NSW so if this species escaped there would be no impact on the wild population or other species.		
Likelihood	MEDIUM	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred individuals escaping would have low chance of survival. If this species escaped from captivity there would be no impact on the wild population.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Is held legally in captivity in at least one other state. Permission to take from the wild.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Northern Territory, aviculturist Gregory Mayo, permission to take from the wild.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	As per similar species the Satin and Regent bowerbird, Orioles and Catbirds already held in captivity.	
Housing requirements	As per other bowerbirds, orioles, figbirds and catbirds kept in captivity.	
Ease of breeding	Medium	
Other issues	NIL	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Liaison with other experienced aviculturists. Analogue Husbandry Manuals are published – Satin Bowerbird and Regent Bowerbird (ASZK Registry)	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Similar species such as Bowerbirds, Orioles, Figbirds and Catbirds are successfully being kept and bred in captivity. All requirements and husbandry would be the same as these species. Desirable to develop and publish Husbandry Guidelines for this species.

SPECIES

Common Name	Little Egret		
Scientific Name	Egretta garzetta		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA.		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Jeff Bray	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Nil		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries recorded for this species.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	medium	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low as they are native to NSW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred individuals escaping have little chance of surviving in the wild, however waterbirds tend to do better than most.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Low numbers in zoos and wildlife parks and private collections.	
Conservation status in the wild	Of least concern	
Impact on wild populations	Low	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Limited. Application for wild collection from a jurisdiction that allows such may be necessary	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Basic softbill insectivore requirements. Same as for other species of waterfowl/waders	
Housing requirements	Basic largish planted waterfowl aviary.	
Ease of breeding	Some softbill experience needed. Fairly easy.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	Basic	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Other aviculturists, zoos and online groups and forums. Husbandry Guidelines for Pied Heron published (ASZK Registry)	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Analogue information is available (Pied Heron) to support keeping of this species.

SPECIES

Common Name	Red-kneed dotterel		
Scientific Name	Erythrogonys cinctus		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Low		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	Medium	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low as they are native to NSW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred escapees usually do not survive. Soft release is required for success.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Low numbers maintained in collections such as Featherdale Wildlife Park	
Conservation status in the wild	Of least concern	
Impact on wild populations	Low	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Limited. Application for wild collection from a jurisdiction that allows such may be necessary	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Basic softbill insectivore requirements.	
Housing requirements	Basic largish softbill habitat aviary with water features.	
Ease of breeding	Some softbill experience needed.	
Other issues	Important as analogue for similar but threatened Charadriiformes.	
Keeper competency	Basic	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Avicultural literature including works such as Rosemary Hutton's book. Very desirable to develop a Husbandry Guideline for this species and publish same.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Flagged in Appendix 2. Desirable to develop guidelines for the management of this species, as would be useful for analogues that are threatened.

SPECIES

Common Name	Eastern shrike-tit		
Scientific Name	Falcunculus frontatus frontatus		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW & CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Nil		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low. Featherdale Wildlife Park.		
Likelihood	Medium	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low as they are native to NSW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred escapees stand little chance of survival on hard release.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Low.	
Conservation status in the wild	Of least concern	
Impact on wild populations	Low	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Likely application to wildlife authorities in a jurisdiction that will allow capture.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Basic softbill insectivore requirements. Same as for other species of softbills.	
Housing requirements	Basic largish planted softbill aviary.	
Ease of breeding	Some softbill experience needed.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	Basic	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Other aviculturists, zoos and online groups and forums. It would be desirable for holders of this species to write a Husbandry Manual as there is nothing out there for this family.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Creating a Husbandry Manual detailing the management experiences for this species would be of value. Appendix 2.

SPECIES

Common Name	White-gaped Honeyeater		
Scientific Name	Lichenostomus unicolor		
Current Species List Class	N/A	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of New South Wales; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	John Kearney	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	NIL		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia)	<i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia)
		<i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal.	<i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment.
		<i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	LOW This species would not survive if it escaped.		
Likelihood	MEDIUM	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild.	<i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild
		<i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread.	<i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled.
		<i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred individuals escaping would stand little chance of survival. This species would not survive if it escaped. If this species did escape it would have no impact on wild populations.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Is held legally in captivity in at least one other state. Permission to take from the wild.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Currently held , permission to take from the wild in Northern Territory by aviculturist Gregory Mayo	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	As per other small nectarivores already held in captivity.	
Housing requirements	Well planted aviary with flowering trees and shrubs. As per other small Softbills kept in captivity.	
Ease of breeding	Medium	
Other issues	NIL	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Liaison with other experienced aviculturists. Husbandry Manuals for Honeyeaters published (ASZK Registry) Blue-face Honeyeater and Helmeted Honeyeater.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Similar species such as the Yellow tufted and White plumed honeyeater are being successfully kept and bred in captivity, all requirements and husbandry would be the same.

SPECIES

Common Name	White-chinned Honeyeater		
Scientific Name	Melithreptus gularis		
Current Species List Class	N/A	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	John Kearney	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	NIL		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	LOW This species would not survive if it escaped.		
Likelihood	MEDIUM	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred individuals escaping would stand little chance of survival. This species would not survive if it escaped. If this species did escape it would have no impact on wild populations.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Is held legally in captivity in at least one other state. Permission to take from the wild.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Currently held , permission to take from the wild in Northern Territory by aviculturist Gregory Mayo	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	As per other small nectarivores already held in captivity.	
Housing requirements	Well planted aviary with flowering trees and shrubs. As per other small Softbills kept in captivity.	
Ease of breeding	Medium	
Other issues	NIL	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Liaison with other experienced aviculturists. Husbandry Manuals on Honeyeaters have been published (ASZK Registry) – Helmeted Honeyeater and Blue-face Honeyeater.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Similar species such as the white naped honeyeater are being successfully kept and bred in captivity, all requirements and husbandry would be the same.

SPECIES

Common Name	White-naped honeyeater		
Scientific Name	Melithreptus lunatus		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Nil		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	Medium	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low as they are native to NSW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred individuals escaping pose no risk as very low probability of surviving in the wild. Soft release of such birds would be necessary.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Low numbers in zoos and wildlife parks. Low numbers in private aviculture	
Conservation status in the wild	Of least concern	
Impact on wild populations	Low	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Limited. Application for wild collection from a jurisdiction that allows such may be necessary	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Basic softbill insectivore/nectarivore requirements. Same as for other species of honeyeaters	
Housing requirements	Basic largish planted softbill aviary.	
Ease of breeding	Some softbill experience needed. Fairly easy.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	Basic	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Other aviculturists, zoos and online groups and forums. Husbandry Guidelines for honeyeaters have been published – Helmeted Honeyeater and Blue-faced Honeyeater. (ASZK International Registry of Husbandry Manuals)	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Flagged in Appendix 2. Desirable to develop Husbandry Guidelines and publish same.

SPECIES

Common Name	Rufous Whistler		
Scientific Name	Pachycephala rufiventris		
Current Species List Class	N/A	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Michael Mitchell	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	NIL		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Extremely Limited		
Likelihood	MEDIUM	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	This species is found virtually Australia wide. So any extremely limited risk of escape would have no impact on the wild populations. Captive bred individuals escaping would be unlikely to survive.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Is held legally in captivity in at least one other state. Some 30 in zoos and wildlife parks	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Currently held in South Australia. Zoos and wildlife parks another source.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	As per other small insectivores already held in captivity.	
Housing requirements	As per other small Softbills kept in captivity.	
Ease of breeding	Medium	
Other issues	NIL	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Liaison with other experienced aviculturists	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

The close relative, Golden Whistler, is successfully being kept in captivity and all requirements and husbandry would be the same as for those.

SPECIES

Common Name	Striated Pardalote		
Scientific Name	Pardalotus striatus		
Current Species List Class	N/A	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Michael Mitchell	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	NIL		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic disease or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Extremely Limited		
Likelihood	MEDIUM	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred individuals escaping would be unlikely to survive.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Kept legally in South Australia; low numbers in Zoos and wildlife parks (ASMP data)	
Conservation status in the wild	Least Concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Currently kept in aviaries in South Australia	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Same as other small Softbills currently held.	
Housing requirements	Same as other small Softbills currently held.	
Ease of breeding	Medium/Difficult	
Other issues	NIL	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Liaison with other experienced aviculturists.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Dietary, housing, management is all the same as other Softbills currently held. It is highly desirable that experiences with pardalotes in captive management be recorded and presented as published Husbandry Manual to aid in the options that might be attempted for threatened analogues such as Forty-spotted Pardalote.

SPECIES

Common Name	Crescent honeyeater		
Scientific Name	Phylidonyris pyrrhoptera		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW plus CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme.Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Low		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded.		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	Medium	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low as they are native to NSW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred escapees would not be expected to thrive on hard release.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Low numbers in zoos and wildlife parks. Unknown numbers in private aviculture	
Conservation status in the wild	Of least concern	
Impact on wild populations	Low	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	None identified. Lawful capture from a jurisdiction that allows this is an option .	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Basic softbill insectivore/ nectarivore requirements. Same as for other species of honeyeaters	
Housing requirements	Basic largish planted softbill aviary.	
Ease of breeding	Some softbill experience needed. Fairly easy.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	Basic	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Husbandry Manuals are published on a range of Honeyeaters – Helmeted Honeyeater; Blue-faced Honeyeater – see ASZK Registry.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Honeyeaters while straightforward tend to be aggressive (like most nectarivores). Creation of a Husbandry Manual for the Genus would be desirable- but of course you have to start somewhere and KEEP an animal in captivity before you can write a husbandry manual about experiences.

SPECIES

Common Name	Striped honeyeater		
Scientific Name	Plectorhyncha lanceolata		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW; CBBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Graeme Phipps	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Nil		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	medium	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low, as they are native to NSW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred escapees unlikely to survive. Soft release would be a minimum requirement for successful recruitment to the wild.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Low numbers in specialist collections such as Featherdale Wildlife Park.	
Conservation status in the wild	Of least concern	
Impact on wild populations	Low	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Limited. Application for wild collection from a jurisdiction that allows such may be necessary	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Basic softbill insectivore/ nectarivore requirements. Same as for other species of honeyeaters	
Housing requirements	Basic largish planted softbill aviary.	
Ease of breeding	Some softbill experience needed. Fairly easy.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	Basic	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Other aviculturists, zoos and online groups and forums.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Species flagged in Appendix 2. Development of Husbandry Manual desirable.

SPECIES

Common Name	Bar breasted Honeyeater		
Scientific Name	Ramsayornis fasciatus		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	The Avicultural Society of NSW and CCBFA		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	John Kearney	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	NIL		
Likelihood	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries recorded for this species		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	LOW This species would not survive if it escaped.		
Likelihood	MEDIUM	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	LOW	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	This species would not survive if it escaped. If this species did escape it would have no impact on wild populations.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Is held legally in captivity in at least one other state. Permission to take from the wild.	
Conservation status in the wild	Least concern	
Impact on wild populations	LOW	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Currently held , permission to take from the wild in Northern Territory by aviculturist Gregory Mayo	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	As per other small nectarivores already held in captivity.	
Housing requirements	Well planted aviary with flowering trees and shrubs. As per other small Softbills kept in captivity.	
Ease of breeding	Medium	
Other issues	NIL	
Keeper competency	BASIC	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Liaison with other experienced aviculturists	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

Similar species such as the white naped honeyeater and White chinned honeyeater are successfully being kept and bred in captivity, all requirements and husbandry would be the same.

SPECIES

Common Name	Forest kingfisher		
Scientific Name	Todiramphus macleayii		
Current Species List Class	New	Proposed Class	B2

PROPOSED BY

Organisation	CCBFA via the Expert Bird Group		
Email	[REDACTED]		
Contact Person	Jeff Bray	Telephone	[REDACTED]

HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY RISKS

Potential injuries and/or diseases	Nil		
Likelihood	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Frequent (more than 10 events p.a. in Australia) <i>MEDIUM</i> Occasional (1-10 events in Australia) <i>LOW</i> Not known to harm human safety and safety	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Life threatening or fatal. <i>MEDIUM</i> Requires medical treatment. <i>LOW</i> No treatment or minor first aid only.	
Details & References	No zoonotic diseases or injuries from this species recorded		

RISK OF ESCAPED ANIMALS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Potential impact of escaped animals	Low		
Likelihood	Medium, but wouldn't matter as they are native to NSW	<i>HIGH</i> Readily survive and reproduce in the wild. <i>MEDIUM</i> Might survive and reproduce in the wild <i>LOW</i> Would not survive and reproduce in the wild	
Consequence	Low	<i>HIGH</i> Impacts may be significant and widespread. <i>MEDIUM</i> Impacts may be limited or controlled. <i>LOW</i> Little or no impact.	
Details & References	Captive bred escapees are unlikely to survive in the wild.		

RISK OF TAKE FROM THE WILD

Estimated captive population in Australia	Zoo and wildlife Parks numbers are low – approximately 20 (ASMP data). Similar numbers in private aviculture.	
Conservation status in the wild	Of least concern	
Impact on wild populations	Low	<i>HIGH Adequate supply is not available from lawful sources interstate.</i> <i>LOW Adequate supply is available from lawful sources interstate</i>
Sources of lawful supply	Other breeders, zoo and wildlife park surplus.	

WELFARE & HUSBANDRY

Dietary requirements	Basic softbill insectivore requirements. Same as for other species of kingfishers which are kept and bred in NSW	
Housing requirements	Basic largish planted softbill aviary.	
Ease of breeding	Some softbill experience needed. Fairly easy.	
Other issues		
Keeper competency	Basic	<i>NONE Easy to keep and handle, no specific expertise required</i> <i>BASIC Safe to keep and handle, if guidance material available</i> <i>EXPERT Complex to keep and handle, high safety risks, training and/or experience required</i>
Sources of guidance material and training	Other aviculturists, zoos and online groups and forums. Husbandry Manuals for both Forest Kingfisher and closely related Sacred Kingfisher are published. (See ASZK Registry). ASMP/ZAA seeking Species Coordinator for zoo population.	

OTHER COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED CHANGE

The species should be added to schedule as it is kept in captivity and has published Husbandry information available.