

Project Order

Proforma 2014

1. Short Project Title (less than 15 words)

Ensuring biodiversity offset success: the right kind of seed for a rare daisy (*Rutidosia lanata*)

Long Project Title

Ensuring biodiversity offset success: Chromosomal and breeding system analysis of *Rutidosia lanata* to determine optimal seed sourcing strategies for reproductive success and ecological viability of translocated populations.

GISERA Project Number

B4

Proposed Start Date

1 August 2014

Proposed End Date

30 June 2015

Project Leader

Prof. Andrew Young, CSIRO

2. GISERA Research Program

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity Research | <input type="checkbox"/> Marine Research | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water Research | <input type="checkbox"/> Social & Economic Research | <input type="checkbox"/> GHG Research |

3. Research Leader, Title and Organisation

Prof. Andrew Young
Director, Centre for Australian National Biodiversity Research
Research Director, National Research Collectors
CSIRO
Time commitment: 7%

4. Summary (less than 300 words)

The perennial herb *Rutidosia lanata* is currently the subject of a large-scale translocation operation by Origin Energy as part of its biodiversity offsets program. Relocation of in excess of 100,000 plants may be necessary in order to offset impacts from construction of the Australia Pacific LNG project. Successful establishment of a self-sustaining (demographically viable) population relies on knowledge of basic reproductive ecology and genetic diversity (chromosomal variation) for the species. This project will provide data on these issues and use this information to generate seed sourcing and deployment strategies that will maximise the viability of translocated *R. lanata* populations. This information will form the basis for development of a biologically based translocation plan. Lessons from this research will be communicated to partners through a workshop that will outline both the results obtained for this species and also provide general information regarding genetic and reproductive considerations that are relevant to plant translocations aimed at providing successful biological offsets.

5. Budget Summary (From Excel Budget Pack worksheet “Project Plan Summary”)

| Expenditure | 2011/12 Year 1 | 2012/13 Year 2 | 2013/14 Year 3 | 2014/15 Year 4 | 2015/16 Year 5 | Total |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Labour | | | | 173,055 | | 173,055 |
| Operating | | | | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Total Costs | | | | 198,055 | | 198,055 |
| CSIRO | | | | 198,055 | | 198,055 |
| Total Expenditure | | | | 198,055 | | 198,055 |

| Expenditure per Task | 2011/12 Year 1 | 2012/13 Year 2 | 2013/14 Year 3 | 2014/15 Year 4 | 2015/16 Year 5 | Total |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Task 1 | | | | 19,805 | | 19,805 |
| Task 2 | | | | 19,805 | | 19,805 |
| Task 3 | | | | 59,419 | | 59,419 |
| Task 4 | | | | 59,416 | | 59,416 |
| Task 5 | | | | 19,805 | | 19,805 |
| Task 6 | | | | 19,805 | | 19,805 |
| Total Expenditure | | | | 198,055 | | 198,055 |

| Cash Funds to Project | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | Total |
|-------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|---------|----------------|
| Partners | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | |
| CSIRO | | | | 118,833 | | 118,833 |
| Sub Total | | | | 118,833 | | 118,833 |
| Total Cash to Partners | | | | 118,833 | | 118,833 |

| Source of Cash Contributions | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | Total |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|---------|----------------|
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | |
| GISERA | | | | 118,833 | | 118,833 |
| Total Cash Contributions | | | | 118,833 | | 118,833 |

| In-Kind Contribution from Partners | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | Total |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | |
| CSIRO | | | | 79,222 | | 79,222 |
| Total In-Kind Contribution from Partners | | | | 79,222 | | 79,222 |

| | Total funding over all years | Percentage of Total Budget |
|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| GISERA Investment | 118,833 | 60% |
| CSIRO Investment | 79,222 | 40% |
| Total Other Investment | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 198,055 | |

| Task | Milest one Number | Milest one Description | Funded by | Participant Recipient | Start Date (mm-yy) | Delivery Date (mm-yy) | Fiscal Year | Fiscal Quarter | Payment \$ |
|--------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|
| Task 1 | 1.1 | On signing of contract | GISERA | CSIRO | Aug 14 | Aug 14 | 14-15 | 1 | 11,883 |
| Task 2 | 2.1 | Specimen delivery | APLNG | CSIRO | Sept 14 | Oct 14 | 14-15 | 2 | 11,883 |
| Task 3 | 3.1 | Completion of flow cytometry | GISERA | CSIRO | Oct 14 | Apr 15 | 14-15 | 2 | 35,651 |
| Task 4 | 4.1 | Completion of Pollination experiment | GISERA | CSIRO | Oct 14 | Apr 15 | 14-15 | 2 | 35,650 |
| Task 5 | 5.1 | Client Workshop | GISERA | CSIRO | Apr 15 | May 15 | 14-15 | 4 | 11,883 |
| Task 6 | 6.1 | Delivery of report | GISERA | CSIRO | May 15 | Jun 15 | 14-15 | 4 | 11,883 |

6. Other Researchers (include organisations)

(State time commitment to project by each Researcher listed)

| Researcher | Time Commitment (project as a whole) | Principle area of expertise | Years of experience | Organisation |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------------|
| Andrew Young | 0.07 | Experimental design, crossing studies and data analysis | 25 plant reproductive ecology and genetics | CSIRO |
| David Marshall | 0.95 | Flow cytometry | 25 ecology, 1 in flow cytometry | CSIRO |

7. GISERA Objectives Addressed

Carrying out of research and improving and extending knowledge of social and environmental impacts and opportunities of CSG-LNG projects for the benefit of the CSG-LNG industry, the relevant community and the broader public.

8. Program Outcomes Achieved

Details are provided in *Section 13. Project Objectives and Outputs*.

9. Program Outputs Achieved

Details are provided in *Section 13. Project Objectives and Outputs*.

10. What is the knowledge gap that these research outputs will address?

Two key knowledge gaps will be addressed by this project. The first will be the identification of any chromosome races that exist within *R. lanata* to advise sourcing and deployment of plants for translocation. Unintentional mixing of plants with different chromosome numbers will severely compromise restoration success through generation of sterile plants. Second, current observations of seed set in *R. lanata* indicate reproductive failure (very low seed set) in nursery populations. This may well be because populations have low numbers of genetic mating types (S-alleles). Controlled pollination experiments aim to confirm the species' self-incompatibility system and identify how mixing populations can increase reproductive success by combining genotypes with different mating types.

11. How will these Research outputs and outcomes be used in State Government and other water managers to achieve Adaptive Management of Water Resources?

NA

12. Project Development (1 page max.)

The project was developed through consultation between Origin Energy and the CSIRO Biodiversity Portfolio (Young) regarding genetic and ecological factors that were likely to limit the long-term success (viability) of restoration plantings.

The value of the project is in its application of scientific data about genetic structure and breeding systems gathered from focused experiments and observations to directly improving the efficiency and effectiveness of replanting that are required under Australia Pacific LNG's various environmental approvals.

As per the Coordinator-General's report on the EIS, Australia Pacific LNG may only clear plants protected under the NC Act in accordance with a clearing permit (or exemption) and must provide offsets for the permanent loss of EVNT plants (Appendix 1, Part 1, Condition 7(a)[i&ii]). The condition stipulates that offsets must be provided in accordance with the "Queensland Government Environmental Offsets Policy 2008" (QGEOP) and generally in accordance with the "Queensland Government Policy for Biodiversity Offsets (Consultation Draft)". This policy was finalised in October 2011.

Australia Pacific LNG has obtained multiple permits for the clearing of *R. lanata* which typically require "an offset to be provided in accordance with the 'Australia Pacific LNG Environmental Offset Strategy' and generally in accordance with the Queensland Biodiversity Offset Policy 2011". Under this policy, offsets for Endangered plants must be provided at a ratio of 1:5. These permits also require contribution to the enhancement of knowledge of the species.

This work builds on a growing body of outcome-focused restoration science that integrates genetic and ecological analyses to understand and overcome limits to plant population viability. Similar work has been conducted successfully by this CSIRO research team on restoration of several other grassland species in particular the daisy *Rutidosia leptorrhynchoides* and the pea *Swainsona recta*.

13. Project Objectives and Outputs

The objective of this project is to provide guidelines as to how best to undertake *R. lanata* translocations to minimise biological limits to reproductive success and maximise population viability. The outputs may also inform requirements for future *R. lanata* offset requirements. Benefits of the project will include; 1) Development of clear guidelines for *R. lanata* offset plantings with regard to seed sourcing and deployment; 2) improved likelihood of success of *R. lanata* translocations through establishment of genetically and reproductively viable populations; 3) Communication of general information regarding the genetic and reproductive constraints to be considered when undertaking plant translocations for biodiversity offset purposes – these will be outlined in the partners workshop.

This project will examine two specific biological issues that may limit the success of the proposed translocations of *Rutidosia lanata* and provide data-based translocation guidelines to minimize their effects on reproductive performance and population viability. Specifically these are:

1. **Chromosome number and inter-population cytogenetic structure.** Assessment of variation in chromosome number among *R. lanata* populations. Cytogenetic races have been identified in the con-generic species *Rutidosia leptorrhynchoidea* which has diploid ($2n=2x=22$), tetraploid ($2n=4x=44$) and hexaploid ($2n=6x=66$) plants. Mixing of individuals with different base chromosome numbers is likely to result in the generation of dysgenic progeny (seed) with uneven chromosome numbers that will be infertile. Such chromosome mixing events cannot be reversed and are likely to represent a long-term threat to the viability of any re-established population. Therefore identification of any chromosome races that exist within *R. lanata* is very important in terms of sourcing and deployment of plants for translocation. **Research:** Screen 10-15 populations for differences in genome size using flow cytometry (5-10 individuals per population) and confirm chromosome numbers of each ploidy group using chromosome counts from root squashes of representative individuals (if available).

2. **Reproductive constraints due to low numbers of genetic mating types.** Current observations of seed set in *R. lanata* indicate reproductive failure (very low seed set) in nursery populations. Two other species in the genus *Rutidosia* (*R. leptorrhynchoidea* and *R. leiolepis*) are both known to have genetic self-incompatibility systems. These systems prevent selfing and mating between relatives and in populations that have low genetic variation at the self-incompatibility locus (S-locus) this will severely constrain seed set. Current observations of low seed set in *Rutidosia lanata* may well be because populations have low numbers of genetic mate types (S-alleles). If this is the case translocation planning should aim to maximize genetic diversity at the self-incompatibility locus by mixing genotypes from different populations to restore mate availability and seed set. This has proved a successful strategy for *R. leptorrhynchoidea*. **Research:** Conduct controlled-pollination experiments to: a) demonstrate whether *R. lanata* has a genetic self-incompatibility system; b) Measure genetic variation at the incompatibility locus in five populations to determine if low seed set is due to low numbers of genetically compatible mates; c) Conduct inter-population crosses to determine whether mixing plants from different populations can restore S-locus genetic diversity, mate availability and significantly increase seed set.

14. Project Plan

All experimental design, cytogenetic analysis and crossing studies as well as data analysis and interpretation and writing of the final report will be undertaken by CSIRO staff. Origin Energy will be responsible for sourcing and transporting live plants to CSIRO Plant Industry in Canberra to be used for both cytogenetic (10-15 populations of 5-10 plants each) and experimental crossing work (5 populations of 10-15 plants each, can be five of the same populations as use for cytogenetic work). This includes obtaining all required permits and permissions.

14.1 Project Schedule

| ID | Task Title | Task Leader | Scheduled Start | Scheduled Finish | Predecessor |
|----|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------|
| 1 | On signing of contract | Andrew Young | Aug 14 | Aug 14 | |
| 2 | Specimen delivery | Andrew Young | Sept 14 | Oct 14 | |
| 3 | Completion of flow cytometry | Andrew Young | Oct 14 | Apr 15 | |
| 4 | Completion of Pollination experiment | Andrew Young | Oct 14 | Apr 15 | |
| 5 | Client Workshop | Andrew Young | Apr 15 | May 15 | |
| 6 | Delivery of report | Andrew Young | May 15 | Jun 15 | |

Task 1.

TASK NAME: Sign contract.

TASK LEADER: Andrew Young

OVERALL TIMEFRAME: August 2014

BACKGROUND: Contract needs to be signed to allow project to proceed.

TASK OBJECTIVE: To sign the contract.

TASK OUTPUTS & SPECIFIC DELIVERABLES: Signed contract.

Task 2.

TASK NAME: Specimen Delivery.

TASK LEADER: Andrew Young

OVERALL TIMEFRAME: Sept 2014 - Oct 2014

BACKGROUND: Plants must be transferred from the nursery in Brisbane to CSIRO Canberra where they can be grown. Department of Environment and Heritage Protection Guidelines must be followed to undertake this process.

TASK OBJECTIVE: Live plants to be transferred from the nursery in Brisbane to CSIRO Canberra.

TASK OUTPUTS & SPECIFIC DELIVERABLES: Delivery of live plants to CSIRO Canberra.

Task 3.

TASK NAME: Completion of flow cytometry

TASK LEADER: Andrew Young

OVERALL TIMEFRAME: Oct 2014 to Apr 2015

BACKGROUND: Cytogenetic races have been identified in the con-generic species *Rutidosia leptorrhynchoides* which has diploid ($2n=2x=22$), tetraploid ($2n=4x=44$) and hexaploid ($2n=6x=66$) plants. Mixing of individuals with different base chromosome numbers is likely to result in the generation of dysgenic progeny (seed) with uneven chromosome numbers that will be infertile. Such chromosome mixing events cannot be reversed and are likely to represent a long-term threat to the viability any re-established population. Therefore identification of any chromosome races that exist within *R. lanata* is very important in terms of sourcing and deployment of plants for translocation.

TASK OBJECTIVE: Screen 10-15 populations for differences in genome size using flow cytometry (5-10 individuals per population) and confirm chromosome numbers of each ploidy group using chromosome counts from root squashes of representative individuals (if available).

TASK OUTPUT: Geographical mapping of cytogenetic variation in *Rutidosia lanata* and guidelines identifying common cytogenetic population groups that can be mixed and those that can't due to the likelihood of generating dysgenic plants.

SPECIFIC DELIVERABLE: Guidelines for translocation and population mixing that explicitly take cytogenetic variation into account.

Task 4.

TASK NAME: Completion of Pollination experiment

TASK LEADER: Andrew Young

OVERALL TIMEFRAME: Oct 2014 to Apr 2015

BACKGROUND: Current observations of seed set in *R. lanata* indicate reproductive failure (very low seed set) in nursery populations. Two other species in the genus *Rutidosia* (*R. leptorrhynchoides* and *R. leiolepis*) are both known to have genetic self-incompatibility systems. These systems prevent selfing and mating between relatives and in populations that have low genetic variation at the self-incompatibility locus (S-locus) this will severely constrain seed set. This suggests that low seed set in *Rutidosia lanata* may well be because populations have low numbers of genetic mate types (S-alleles). If this is the case translocation planning should aim to maximize genetic diversity at the self-incompatibility locus by mixing genotypes from different populations to restore mate availability and seed set. This has proved a successful strategy for *R. leptorrhynchoides*.

TASK OBJECTIVE: Conduct controlled-pollination experiments to: a) demonstrate whether *R. lanata* has a genetic self-incompatibility system; b) Measure genetic variation at the incompatibility locus in five populations and determine if low seed set is due to low numbers of genetically compatible mates; c) Conduct inter-population crosses to determine whether mixing plants from different populations (but of the same cytogenetic race) can restore S-locus genetic diversity, mate availability and significantly increase seed set.

TASK OUTPUT: Definitive information about the breeding system of *Rutidosia lanata* and whether or not it is self-incompatible. Determination of whether a low S-allele number is likely to be responsible for observed reproductive failure and if so whether inter-population transfer of plants can increase genetic mate availability and restore seed set.

SPECIFIC DELIVERABLE: Guidelines regarding how moving plants among populations can be used to increase local genetic variation and restore mate availability and reproductive success (seed set).

Task 5.

TASK NAME: Client workshop

TASK LEADER: Andrew Young

OVERALL TIMEFRAME: Apr 2015 – May 2015

TASK DESCRIPTION: A workshop will be held with the client.

TASK OBJECTIVE: Review project results and implications for translocation as well as presenting generic information regarding biological factors affecting restoration targets and success.

TASK OUTPUTS & SPECIFIC DELIVERABLES: Client workshop explaining results and implications for translocation, as well as presenting generic information regarding biological factors affecting restoration targets and success.

Task 6.

TASK NAME: Delivery of Report

TASK LEADER: Andrew Young

OVERALL TIMEFRAME: May 2015 – June 2015

BACKGROUND: Project reporting is a key deliverable.

TASK OBJECTIVE: To produce a final report.

TASK OUTPUTS & SPECIFIC DELIVERABLES: Final report.

15. Budget Justification

The project leader Prof. Andrew Young (CSIRO) has 25 years of experience in plant conservation biology research specifically in the areas of genetic and ecological work that form the basis of this project. He has a strong international publication record and has been awarded an Australian Academy of Science medal for his work in plant conservation. He will take direct responsibility for completion of activities in Canberra.

Mr David Marshall is an experienced plant ecology technician who has recently undertaken training in plant cytogenetics.

The budget is primarily for the salaries of Young (5%) and Marshall (65%) who will undertake the bulk of the technical work associated with the project.

Additional budget items are for laboratory and glasshouse costs for the chromosome analysis and crossing studies.

16. Project Governance

Project reporting will be as per standard GISERA project reporting procedures. Interim reporting schedule will be:

| Task | Milestone description | Due date |
|------|----------------------------------|----------|
| 3 | Report on flow cytometry | Apr 15 |
| 4 | Report on pollination experiment | Apr 15 |
| 5 | Client workshop | May 15 |
| 6 | Final report | Jun 15 |

CSIRO will provide Graeme Bartrim and/or Laura Hahn with draft copies of scientific outputs/papers four weeks prior to submission for publication.

17. Communications Plan

Communications activities of this project will be undertaken in line with the GISERA Communications Plan.

18. Risks

The key project risk is the availability of sufficient flowering plants for the crossing studies and the ability to source fresh leaf material and roots tips for the chromosomal analyses. To minimise this risk live plants will be transferred from the nursery in Brisbane to the CSIRO Canberra where they can be grown. Department of Environment and Heritage Protection Guidelines must be followed to undertake this process. Note that CSIRO has suitable quarantine facilities but should it be necessary to use these rather than standard glasshouses additional costs are likely

Laboratory and glasshouse procedures in Canberra will all be compliant with CSIRO OHS regulations.

The project will not generate commercially valuable IP.

Capacity to deliver: The CSIRO science team is experienced in both chromosomal analysis and the crossing experiments involved in the plant breeding system work. If plants cannot be successfully transferred to Canberra then Origin Energy or Greening Australia staff will have to be trained to undertake crossing experiments and harvest roots tips and leaf samples from plants in Brisbane. This should be relatively straight forward to achieve.

Project Management: The project will be managed by Prof. Andrew Young (CSIRO) who has 25 years of experience in plant conservation biology research. He will take direct responsibility for completion of activities in Canberra and will work to assist with planning and training of staff to undertake activities that may be required in Brisbane should this be necessary.

19. Intellectual Property and Confidentiality

| Background IP (clause 10.1, 10.2) | Party | Description of Background IP | Restrictions on use (if any) | Value |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|-------|
| | CSIRO | None | | \$ |
| | | | | \$ |
| Ownership of Non-Derivative IP (clause 11.3) | NA | | | |
| Confidentiality of Project Results (clause 15.6) | Project results are not confidential. | | | |
| Additional Commercialisation requirements (clause 12.1) | NA | | | |
| Distribution of Commercialisation Income (clause 1.1) | NA | | | |
| Commercialisation Interest (clause 1.1) | Party | | Commercialisation Interest - N/A | |
| | APLNG | | | |
| | CSIRO | | | |
| | QGC | | | |