

Site Readiness Review – to be completed by Save the Kiwi

Site/ Assessment details (Meta data)	
Site name:	
Site Ref/s:	
GPS (X/Y):	
Landowner name:	
Land Tenure: e.g., mix private and public land	
Date assessment:	
Assessor name:	

Land use (with pest control)		
Total area of project (ha):		
Type	Common Name	Number of ha
Native	e.g., coastal forest	
Exotic	e.g., <i>Pinus radiata</i>	
Farmland	e.g., sheep/ cattle	
Riparian/ wetland (5m or more)		
Other	e.g., vegetated gully, scattered scrub/ manuka	
Site diagram/ aerial photos showing tracks and waypoints of traps		

Site Assessment Scoring

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
Habitat description	Size (consider shape)	2) < 500ha 4) 500 – 1,500ha 6) 1,500 – 3,000ha 8) > 3,000ha		
	Nearby suitable kiwi habitat (> 10ha)	1) No suitable habitat within 10km 2) Closest suitable habitat > 10km away 3) Suitable habitat >5km away 4) Suitable habitat >1km away		
	Corridors	1) Isolated from other suitable vegetation for > 1km 2) Vegetation corridors are present within 500m – 1km 3) Vegetation corridors are present within 500m 4) Extensive vegetation corridors incl. exotic forest & vegetated waterways extending from boundary to native forest >10ha		
	Adjacent land use	1) Mostly urban/residential 2) Mostly agriculture 3) Mostly exotic forest 4) Mostly native forest		
Subtotal Intact Managed Kiwi Habitat (between 5 and 20) <i>Note: if the site does not meet the minimum requirements for kiwi, the assessment can be finalised here.</i>				Transfer total to scoring summary

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
Predator Control	Aerial 1080 use (note size of operation in ha under comments)	0) No aerial 1080 applications 2) Last aerial 1080 application more than 3 years ago (e.g. one-off) 4) Aerial 1080 application planned less frequently than 3 yearly (e.g. 5 – 7yrs for possum control) 8) Aerial 1080 application every 3 years		
	Other toxin use (e.g. ground bait stations, PAPP, Diphacinone) (note size of operation in ha under comments)	0) No applications 1) Last application more than 3 years ago 2) Applications in the last 3 years 4) Application currently active		
	Stoat control (trapping or ground-based poisoning)	0) No control 2) Limited control (not to Best Practice standards) 4) Meets Best Practice, but requires a management plan and regular auditing 6) Control network maintained to Best Practice and audited regularly; adaptive approach linked to monitoring		
	Ferret control (trapping or ground-based poisoning) Note: management needs to be on stand-by if	0) No control 2) Limited control (e.g. ad hoc trapping or poisoning), no Predator Control Plan 4) Control around the perimeter and along		

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
	ferrets detected within a 20km radius	main ridges – to minimum best practice 6) Control meets minimum best practice (comprehensive predator control plan in place and active) 8) Control network maintained to best practice and audited; adaptive approach linked to monitoring		
	Duration of the mustelid control programme	0) Not yet started 1) < 1 year 2) 1 – 3 years 3) 3 – 5 years 4) > 5 years		
	Dog control (where a known or suspected threat to the proposed population)	0) No control or management plan 2) Dog restriction signs at perimeter and at main access sites 4) Management plan in place, however not always adhered to by local community and/ or hunters and not enforced 6) Management plan in place and supported by most of the local community and/ or hunters (signage in place to stipulate dog restriction requirements) - plan enforced 8) Management plan in place and fully supported by hunters and community (signage in place to stipulate dog		

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
		restriction requirements) - or no plan required		
	Cat control	0) No control 1) Ad hoc control using opportunistic trapping or shooting 2) Control around the perimeter and along main ridges – to minimum best practice 3) Control meets minimum best practice (comprehensive cat control plan in place and active) 4) Control network meets best practice and audited, adaptive approach linked to monitoring		
	Possum and rat control (trapping or bait stations)	0) No control 1) Ad hoc control in place 2) Control around the perimeter and along main ridges – to minimum best practice 3) Control meets minimum best practice (comprehensive pest management plan in place) 4) Control network maintained and audited; adaptive approach linked to monitoring		
	Other species (e.g., deer, pigs, goats) shooting or trapping	0) No control 1) Ad hoc control in place (e.g. opportunistic shooting)		

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
		2) Control around the perimeter and along main ridges – to minimum best practice 3) Control meets minimum best practice (comprehensive control plan pest management plan in place and active) 4) Control network maintained and audited, adaptive approach linked to monitoring – or alternatively species not present		
Subtotal Predator Control (between 0 and 50)				Transfer total to scoring summary

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
Predator Monitoring (Result Monitoring)	Stoat monitoring outcomes	0) No monitoring 1) Trap catch data recorded (e.g., TrapNZ) 2) Monitoring completed to best practice (e.g., trap catch data recorded, tracking tunnels run to BP) 3) As per 2 above AND additional monitoring in place (e.g., trail cameras) 4) Monitoring linked and used for adaptive management to improve predator control		

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
	Ferret monitoring outcomes	0) No monitoring 1) Trap catch data recorded (e.g., TrapNZ) 2) Monitoring completed to best practice 3) As per 2 above AND additional monitoring in place (e.g., trail cameras) 4) Monitoring linked and used for adaptive management and used to improve predator control		
	Dog monitoring outcomes	0) No monitoring or documentation 1) Presence noted, but not acted on, no active Dog Control Plan in place 2) Presence noted and sightings responded to, Dog Control Plan in place and followed 3) No issues reported (e.g., full exclusion for dogs and strictly managed)		
Subtotal Predator Monitoring (between 0 and 11)				Transfer total to scoring summary

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
Native Species Monitoring (Outcome monitoring)	Kiwi presence	0) No known kiwi presence in < 50 years 1) Known presence in last 50 years 2) Anecdotal sign/ presence recorded (e.g. kiwi calls heard)		

		>20km away in last 10 years 3) Evidenced sighting recorded (e.g. kiwi probes, footprints, camera) in last 5 years 4) Current kiwi presence recorded via ARD/ call count/ surveys >20km away		
	Kiwi suitability for translocation <i>*Note - high abundance sites do not require further translocations. Recommendations around pair/ha varies per region</i>	0) Known kiwi presence at high abundance levels (e.g., more than 1 pair per 10ha) 1) Known kiwi presence at medium abundance (e.g., more than 1 pair per 20ha) 2) Known kiwi presence but sporadic or low abundance (e.g., less than 1 pair per 50ha) 3) Known kiwi presence >20km away		
	Other outcome monitoring (e.g., increasing whio numbers and kākā productivity)	0) No outcome monitoring 1) Anecdotal sighting recorded (e.g. kākā detection) 2) Monitoring done for small birds (e.g., 5-minute bird counts) 3) Monitoring done for indicator species (e.g. kākā, whio) 4) Monitoring programmes demonstrate effective control of mustelids and cats		
Subtotal Native Species Monitoring (between 0 and 11)				Transfer total to scoring summary

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
Project sustainability	Legal protection	0) No legal protection, no classified values 1) Classified values but not legally protected 2) Informal protection through community participation 3) High value site with legal protection -e.g., QEII		
	Financial sustainability of project (long-term security)	0) Uncertain - 1 year 1) 2 years 2) 3 years 3) 4 years or more		
	Landowner engagement – include neighbouring landowner support	0) None 2) Intermittent – e.g., access given to land and no further communications 4) Moderate – e.g., access given to land and landowner kept up to date on progress 8) High – e.g., landowner supportive and/or actively involved in mahi		
	Iwi commitment and involvement	0) None 2) Intermittent – e.g., occasional contact with spokesperson 4) Moderate – e.g., iwi/hapū kept up to date on progress/events 8) High – e.g., iwi/hapū actively support/involved with mahi and/ or through events (e.g. training wānanga/ workshops)		
	Community commitment and involvement	0) None		

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
		2) Intermittent – e.g., occasional support from community 4) Moderate – e.g., community support from agencies involved in conservation 6) High – e.g., community actively involved through participation in project		
	Advocacy	0) None 2) Occasional opportunities (e.g., one-off visit to area by neighbours) 4) Moderate (e.g., support from agencies involved in conservation like Save the Kiwi, regular monthly social media posts) 6) High (e.g., high level of public awareness and support from agencies and the wider community such as weekly media posts, two or more newspaper articles or TV news events each year)		
Subtotal Sustainability of Project (between 0 and 34)				Transfer total to scoring summary

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
Other threats	Site Access	1) Hazardous terrain, difficult to access on foot 2) Medium terrain, access only on foot 3) Easily serviceable but requires quad bike 6) Easy access on foot or vehicle		

Theme	Indicator	Score and Description	Score	Score comment
	Risk of storm damage to trap network	0) Damage is very common, cover > 50% trap network inaccessible 1) Regular damage from storm events, common, 10-50% trap network inaccessible 4) Occasional storm event, up to 10% ground area flooded 6) No identifiable risk		
	Risk of droughts and other extreme climatic conditions	0) Droughts occur annually and require support for kiwi (e.g., supplementation water) 1) Regular drought events e.g., once every 2 – 5 yrs 4) Occasional drought event e.g., once every 5 – 10yrs 6) No identifiable risk		
	Risk of vehicle strike	0) High – e.g., close to suburban area 1) Medium – e.g., close to rural area 4) Minimal – e.g., few roads in area 6) No identifiable risk/ mitigation underway e.g., signage in place		
Subtotal Other Threats (between 1 and 24)				Transfer total to scoring summary

Site Assessment Scoring Summary

Addition all themes	Transfer score for each section above
Subtotal Intact Managed Kiwi Habitat (out of 20)	
Subtotal Predator Control (out of 50)	
Subtotal Predator Monitoring (out of 11)	
Subtotal Native Species Monitoring (out of 11)	
Subtotal Sustainability of Project (out of 34)	
Subtotal Other Threats (out of 24)	
TOTAL SCORE (out of 150)	

Assessment score (sum of scores for all Themes) scoring guide:

<80 = Poor, 80 - 99 = Fair, 100 - 119 = Good, 120 - 129 = Very good, 130 - 139 = Excellent, >140 = Outstanding

Red: Not ready

Orange: Needs work

Yellow: Needs minor work (e.g., complete dog plan; submit permit variation)

Green: Good to progress to permitting stage/ ready to receive kiwi

Pest control check-up – note recent species evidence

Species	Regional Pest Management Status	Seen/ heard/ signs?	Date of evidence	Abundance score*

* Abundance score: R= rare (sign or evidence encountered once or twice), O=occasional (2 -5 encounters), C= common >5 encounters), A=Abundant (everywhere)

Native species check-up – note recent species evidence

Species	NZTC category	Conservation Status	Seen/ heard/ signs?	Date of evidence	Abundance score*	Comments

* Abundance score: R= rare (sign or evidence encountered once or twice), O=occasional (2 -5 seen/heard), C= common >5 encounters), A=Abundant (everywhere)

Management recommendations for site

Action 1: Add topic here	Priority: High/ Medium/ Low	Comment:
Action 2: Add topic here	Priority: High/ Medium/ Low	Comment:
Action 3: Add topic here	Priority: High/ Medium/ Low	Comment:
Action 4: Add topic here	Priority: High/ Medium/ Low	Comment:
Action 5: Add topic here	Priority: High/ Medium/ Low	Comment:
Action 6: Add topic here	Priority: High/ Medium/ Low	Comment:

Once completed, forward to the project contact and discuss possible next steps.