



Rat eradication using aerial baiting Current agreed best practice used in New Zealand

Version 3.1

Authors: Keith Broome, Chris Golding, Kerry Brown, Peter Corson, Philip Bell,



Photo K. Broome, DOC

Version	Date	Comment
3.1	May 2017	Minor updates
3.0	July 2014	Revised Version for website publication
2.2	October 2011	IEAG Approved version
2.1	May - Sept 2011	Revised drafts circulated to IEAG
2.0	August 2010	Revised draft circulated to IEAG
1.1	October 2006	IEAG Approved version
1.0	August 2006	Draft version circulated to IEAG

This document can be cited in references as:

Broome, K.G.; Golding, C.; Brown, K.P.; Corson P.; Bell, P.; 2017: Rat eradication using aerial baiting: Current agreed best practice used in New Zealand (Version 3.1). New Zealand Department of Conservation internal document DOC-29396, Wellington, New Zealand.

New information and suggested improvements to this document can be made to Keith Broome kbroome@doc.govt.nz.

© Copyright 2017, New Zealand Department of Conservation

In the interest of forest conservation, we support paperless electronic publishing.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	4
INTRODUCTION	4
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION CURRENT AGREED BEST PRACTICE - AERIAL BAITING ...	8
FEASIBILITY STUDY	8
PROJECT DESIGN	9
PLANNING	10
IMPLEMENTATION	15
MONITORING AND EVALUATION	17
CONCLUSION.....	19
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	20
REFERENCES.....	20
Appendix 1 Rat eradication projects on NZ islands 1997-2017	24

SUMMARY

Eradication is not control 'intensified'. It must remove the last individual which means taking individual behaviour into account from the very beginning, and the level of resourcing is 'whatever it takes'. The New Zealand Department of Conservation Island Eradication Advisory Group advises wildlife managers planning to eradicate rats using the technique of aerial broadcast of rodenticide baits. This knowledge represents the current agreed best practice available at the time of publication and provides a benchmark of rat eradication practice for temperate island ecosystems. These best practice guidelines are valuable for eradications outside New Zealand but require adaptation to suit other legal, political, social, and environmental situations. The advice presented has been gleaned from some of the largest and most challenging projects worldwide and there is a good track record of success with this method. The continuous improvement of our best practice allows new information to be readily incorporated and promulgated. The flexibility to allow case by case modifications to be considered during project planning to meet emerging issues has been a particular strength of the system. Recent eradication failures within the tropical zone highlight the need for emerging best practice to be documented for tropical island projects.

INTRODUCTION

Eradication of invasive species populations differs greatly from control of those same species and requires a shift in thinking about the approach. Population control sustains a harvest of pests to reduce numbers and therefore impacts. The level of harvest balances acceptable impacts of remaining pests and efficiency in the costs of harvest. Eradication is not control 'intensified', It must remove the last individual which means taking individual behaviour into account from the very beginning, and the level of resourcing is 'whatever it takes'. Every step in the design and implementation of an eradication project must strive to minimise the risk of failure with robust and meticulous planning (Cromarty et al, 2002). To under-achieve eradication, even though this may still be a high level of control, means failure. The approach must be to over-achieve it.

The social context and engagement with relevant communities of interest is sometimes overlooked by biologists with a strong focus on biodiversity goals. Specialist skills and advice in this area can often make a big difference to the feasibility and sustainability of outcomes (Morrison et al 2011). Effective consultation and communication with stakeholders is often a critically important aspect of an eradication project, especially for aerial baiting which can be unfamiliar and disconcerting to some people (Fitzgerald et al 2000). The guidelines presented here do not comprehensively address community engagement processes but some advice is provided.

Aerial baiting is carried out on New Zealand (NZ) islands using helicopters fitted with navigational guidance systems which carry purpose built bait application buckets on their cargo hooks (figure 1). These buckets use a motor driven spinning disc to 'throw' bait in a wide circle below the helicopter. The forward motion of the helicopter along pre-determined parallel flight lines generated by the navigation computer produces an even spread of rodent baits up to 50m either side of each flight line.



Figure 1. A helicopter with baiting bucket applying rodenticide baits to Macquarie Island in 2011.

This paper collates advice provided by the NZ Department of Conservation (DOC) Island Eradication Advisory Group (IEAG) to support wildlife managers planning to eradicate rats using the technique of aerial broadcast of rodenticide baits. All three invasive rat species are targeted in New Zealand: Norway rat (*Rattus norvegicus*); ship rat (*R. rattus*) and kiore (*R. exulans*). Mice (*Mus musculus*) are also targeted with similar methods, but are outside the scope of this paper and are covered elsewhere (Broome et al 2017) due to some differences in technique.

The IEAG is a small group of DOC staff who represent the best island pest eradication experience available within DOC. Set up in 1997 to capture existing knowledge and expertise and provide technical advice to DOC projects, the role has diversified to include evaluation of best practice, island biosecurity guidance, building capability within DOC, advice on national priorities and international networking, including advice to projects outside NZ to maintain DOC's knowledge base (Broome et al 2011). The advice and practices described here are agreed by members of the IEAG as the most appropriate for rat eradications taking place on NZ islands. However many aspects have application elsewhere, especially in temperate climates with latitudes similar to NZ (29 to 52 degrees South).

We use the term 'current agreed best practice' because best practice is a fluid concept which needs frequent updating to remain 'current' with the latest available information. It is 'agreed' by a network group of expert practitioners, in this case the IEAG, because not every aspect of the advice given is proven as fact by robust science, rather it falls into the category of expert opinion. Agreement among experts in the absence of robust science is sometimes challenging but this interaction to forge agreement does fill

the gap in advising 'what to do' in situations where assumptions and judgement is called for (Martin et al 2012).

Following current agreed best practice does not guarantee success but it does help minimise the risk of failure. All pest eradication projects have unique ecological circumstances, political climates and abiotic constraints (e.g. terrain or weather) which necessitate some variations to the advice stated. In these circumstances, we urge project managers to seek further expert advice on the best way forward for their particular circumstances. We do not intend DOC's current agreed best practice to be used as a 'code of practice' available to regulatory agencies to enforce compliance. However, deviations from best practice should state their rationale in operational plans and fully consider any consequent risks to the project.

Within DOC, we regard current agreed best practice documents as 'live' and open to constant updating and improvement as new technologies, understanding or issues arise in this field. The IEAG discuss suggestions for change and produce a new version of the agreed best practice. We produced version one as an internal document in 2006 and heavily revised it in 2010. This is version 3.1, available on the Department's website. The IEAG maintain other eradication best practice documents for rat eradication using other techniques (e.g., ground based broadcast and bait station delivery of rodenticide) and for other pest species (e.g., rabbits) as internal documents. A best practice document closely following this version but with important differences in eradication design to target mice is also available (Broome et al 2017).



Figure 2. Pacific Invasives Initiative eradication resource kit project process diagram. This diagram is borrowed with permission from the Pacific Invasives Initiative (PII) <http://www.pacificinvasivesinitiative.org/> It shows the typical stages in the life cycle of an eradication project and how stakeholder engagement, monitoring and evaluation, and biosecurity are ongoing activities relevant to every stage. A wealth of useful guidance, document templates and examples are available in this resource kit.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION CURRENT AGREED BEST PRACTICE – AERIAL BAITING

Where possible the current agreed best practice is stated for each subject and followed in *italics* with further explanation. We use **Bolding** to allow the reader to readily find topics of interest and numbering to facilitate discussion on particular points.

FEASIBILITY STUDY

1. Complete a peer reviewed **feasibility study** before finally committing to an eradication project¹. This study should fully evaluate the social and biological context, and identify all issues to overcome to deliver and sustain the stated goals and predicted outcomes with the maximum chances of success (Broome et al 2005). *A good feasibility study will clearly articulate the goals of the project and the rationale behind them. It will provide a sound basis for investors to evaluate the costs, risks, benefits and scope of a project. This information is directly relevant to the project design phase.*
2. Identify all possible **stakeholders** during the feasibility study and determine the level of interest, support, opposition and social issues to resolve during consultation (Ogden and Gilbert 2011). Consultation with key stakeholders during the feasibility study stage, before any decision to take the project forward has clear advantages (Griffiths et al 2012).
3. **Reassess feasibility** if at any time critical factors change or new issues emerge before project implementation. *For example, a change in stakeholder support may render the project untenable or the necessary ongoing biosecurity unsustainable* (Wilkinson and Priddel 2011, Oppel et al 2010).
4. Identify all **biosecurity** risks for the project at the feasibility study stage. This includes the risks of quarantine failure, sabotage and target animals reinvading through swimming to the island. The distance rats can swim to reinvade islands may vary from site to site and is largely unknown in any more than a general sense (Russell 2007). We only know the current recorded longest swim for each species, which has proven an unreliable predictor of future swimming abilities. Multiple factors may influence the probability of rats successfully swimming to an island (e.g. water temperature, current, coastal cliffs, predators in water and on land, prevalence of floating debris) (Russell 2007; Russell et al 2008a). For NZ conditions we propose below a ballpark indicator of risk:
 - *R. norvegicus* can swim better than *R. rattus* which can swim better than *R. exulans*.
 - At 50 meters all rats can easily invade by swimming, they will do so frequently.
 - At 500 meters *R. rattus* will invade but the frequency of incursions may be low. *R. norvegicus* could, in many circumstances, reach the island every year.
 - If the distance is near the currently known record for the species they can be expected to invade but may not.
 - If the distance is twice the currently known record, reinvasion by swimming may not occur, but we do not consider it impossible.
 - Only for islands several kilometres off-shore can we categorically say rats will not be capable of swimming there but the risk of quarantine failure is ever present no matter how far.

¹ For unpublished examples of eradication project documents see PII Resource kit for eradication of rats and cats <http://rce.pacificinvasivesinitiative.org/> or contact the authors.

5. Take representative **DNA samples** from each population of target species on the island and from likely/possible source locations on the mainland or neighbouring islands. (Russell et al 2010; Russell et al 2009, Fewster et al 2011). *Results can estimate gene flow to the island which will support a decision on whether an eradication is the best course of action or if other options should be investigated (e.g. sustained control). While the cost of DNA analyses can sometimes be significant, it is far lower than the financial and social costs (e.g. loss of public support) of having rats quickly reinvade an island. DNA comparisons can determine if rodents collected on the island after the eradication reinvaded or were part of the original gene pool, i.e. the eradication failed. DNA can also confirm the species present. We have some cases of misidentification of rodent species in NZ eradication projects which we discovered during DNA analyses (Griffiths et al 2013).*
6. Identify all necessary **trials and research** required to eliminate knowledge gaps in the biological and logistical aspects of the project. Some of these information needs may be driven by what stakeholders want to know. *Knowing about these requirements during the feasibility stage allows time and money to be built into the project design and informs the decision to invest further in the project.*
7. Where natural **alternative food** is abundantly available to rodents all year round, even if only at specific sites on the island, undertake bait acceptance trials during the feasibility study to determine whether all rats will eat the bait. These trials need to, as much as possible, replicate the conditions encountered during the implementation phase and be of sufficient scale to minimise edge effects (e.g. unmarked rats which have moved into the trial area).

PROJECT DESIGN

8. A **project plan** will greatly enhance the transparent management of an eradication project. This document will take account of the issues and complexities raised in the feasibility study and clearly outline the roles, actions and timeline to achieve project goals². Unambiguous project governance, clarity in decision making and opportunities for technical input are all indicators of a good project plan. *Eradication failures can be technical, logistical or a result of poor project management. A good project plan helps to manage the project well. Project success requires more than just good biological and logistical planning (Morrison et al 2011).*
9. When **costing** projects take care to cost all aspects adequately and allow for contingencies. *Money shortages affect morale and lead to cutting corners which raise operational risks. If this leads to failure, it will be more expensive in the long term.*
10. The **choice of technique** will depend on local circumstances and should be investigated through a feasibility study prior to operational planning. The most common method in New Zealand to eradicate rodents has been the aerial application of rodent baits containing the second generation anticoagulant toxin brodifacoum, the focus of this best practice. If aerial application is not feasible then investigate hand broadcasting brodifacoum baits. If this is not feasible then consider applying brodifacoum baits in bait stations. If brodifacoum cannot be used, consider cereal baits containing the first generation anticoagulant diphacinone as a higher risk alternative. Bait containing diphacinone is restricted to use in bait stations in New Zealand. *A hand broadcasting operation usually requires more people involved and takes longer to implement, thereby increasing the chances of mistakes. It may require track cutting with the associated cost and environmental damage. Applying bait in stations increases the length of the project implementation phase and introduces another variable, the bait station. The latter is particularly relevant when targeting more than one rodent species because inter-*

² For further information on project planning see http://rce.pacificinvasivesinitiative.org/project/3_Project_Design.html

and intra-specific competition may result in some animals avoiding the stations. With first generation anticoagulants rats may need to feed for several days on the bait to consume a lethal dose.

11. Consider **non-target species** present on the island that may consume or spoil bait (e.g. ungulates, rabbits). Options to manage this include controlling them prior to rodenticide application or applying extra bait to compensate. *The presence of other mammals increase the risk of operational failure because they can sometimes eat large quantities of bait leaving the potential for some rats to remain unexposed to a lethal dose of the toxin.*
12. Give thorough consideration to the potential for **non-target effects on native species present**. Undertake a peer reviewed Assessment of Environmental Effects and build any necessary mitigation measures into project planning from the outset³. Unintended outcomes or 'surprise effects' can result from removing invasive rodents from the island ecosystem (Courchamp et al 2011). A well-considered Assessment of Environmental Effects must identify all potential environmental costs and benefits and allow the project management team to make transparent decisions on what mitigation is appropriate. *An eradication project must have benefits which outweigh the costs and risks that remain after mitigation. Perceptions of non-target impacts can be an important reason for stakeholder opposition to a project.*
13. Clearly define the **area to be treated**. The treatment area must include all dry land accessible to the target species including neighbouring islands, islets and rocks, as well as those in inland water (e.g. lakes) etc. *Baiting all potential rat habitat is critical.* Treat rock stacks above high water around an island even if rat presence seems unlikely. Use the known or suspected swimming ranges for the target species of rat very conservatively when deciding which rock stacks do not need treatment. Treat islands on inland water (lakes) in the same way. *This will eliminate the possibility of rats surviving nearby to reinvade the island.* Minimise the number and size of exclusion zones for aerial coverage of bait. *Alternative baiting techniques to cover these areas usually carry a higher risk of failure than aerial. Exclusion zones add complexity to the aerial application and increase the risk of bait gaps between techniques.* Ensure island size is correct, if any doubt exists either physically measure the island size early in the planning phase or use the largest known figure as a worst case scenario. *Past projects have found discrepancies which could lead to a shortage of bait available to complete a larger than expected island (Pierce et al 2010, Torr and Brown 2012).*
14. In **summary**, the fundamental requirement is to ensure sufficient bait is distributed to every rat territory on the island to provide a lethal dose of high quality toxic bait to every individual rat. This requires good management of bait quality, good timing, and comprehensive coverage of the island with adequate quantities of bait which will remain available to rats for several days.

PLANNING

15. Well prior to the eradication operation, establish island **biosecurity** procedures to prevent the reinvasion of the target species or invasion of other pest species, particularly those which would have a higher chance of successful establishment in the absence of the target species (Russell et al 2014). Allow enough time to implement and test any required improvements before the eradication begins. *The risk of future invasions of introduced species needs management from the outset to protect the investment made in carrying out the eradication operation. The eradication itself represents a potential biosecurity risk when landing significant amounts of cargo.*

³ For unpublished examples of eradication project documents see PII Resource kit for eradication of rats and cats <http://rce.pacificinvasivesinitiative.org/> or contact the authors.

16. Where an **external permission** is required, apply for a period of several years. *This allows flexibility to undertake the operation in subsequent years, if other factors cause project delays.* Establish a good working relationship with the permitting authority early in the process to facilitate the transfer of information and avoid misunderstandings. Permission applications should attempt to keep conditions as general as possible to allow flexibility in how they are complied with as planning progresses. For example, stipulate an overall average bait sowing rate which is the total amount of bait transported to the island (including contingency bait) divided by the total area of the island. If the detail of the bait spreading pattern and calculations have not been finalised before the permission application is made then choose a worst-case scenario for the application. *This will allow re-baiting of parts of the island (e.g. to fill gaps) without risk of breaching conditions on rate of application.* Once the permission has been received, go through the conditions in detail to check they can be complied with. Seek amendments where necessary. Cross-check planning documents to ensure the conditions are covered by delegated tasks where necessary. *We suggest annotating a copy of the permission indicating where each condition is covered. This information will be used in the readiness check (see point 31).*
17. Winter to early spring is the **preferred season** in NZ to apply the bait. *We base this timing on past successes and it tends to coincide with times of natural food scarcity, lower numbers of rats and low breeding. It can also coincide with times of low non-target activity.* Actual target dates for application will involve a trade-off between these and other factors relating to the island's environmental, social and logistical constraints. However biological constraints associated with the target species should take precedence over project management or financial difficulties. If necessary be prepared to postpone the project into the following year rather than increase the risk of not completing the implementation during the optimal time (Springer 2014).
18. Where practical, eliminate or reduce as many other **potential sources of rat food** as possible before baiting (e.g. store all food scraps from the field teams inside sealed rodent proof containers, seal all emptied food containers and tins inside sealed rodent proof containers, etc). Where possible, bury or dispose at sea any wildlife found dead. *This will minimize the risk of rodents utilizing alternative foods in preference to the toxic baits.*
19. For all **toxic baits**, evaluate carefully the available evidence supporting:
 - The 100% acceptance to target species
 - Knowledge of the risks to non-target species
 - Other environmental effects
 - Storage and handling properties
 - Performance when used in mechanical bait spreading buckets

In New Zealand, the most-widely used bait for rat eradication projects which meets the above criteria is Pestoff Rodent Bait 20R™ (Animal Control Products www.pestoff.co.nz) containing 20ppm brodifacoum. Ten millimetre diameter (2gm) baits are currently most often used, but 12mm and 16mm baits have been used with success (Broome 2009).

20. Check the **legal conditions** of registration of the bait product. The intended use must be in compliance with label instructions available on the product label. If the bait is Pestoff Rodent Bait 20R™ comply with the 'Limitations on Use' requirements on the product label. For DOC projects where the eradication:
 - Covers land on NZ islands where stock return to graze in future or

- On the NZ mainland behind a pest proof fence.
 - The project must comply with the approved code of practice (Animal Control Products 2006).
21. Aim to apply bait in **two separate applications** about 10 days⁴ apart. *This may counter an unforeseen deluge washing out the first drop and may allow young rats in the nest at the time of the first drop exposure to fresh bait in the second drop if breeding is underway.* Once again the final interval between applications will become a trade off between weather and logistical constraints which require expert judgement by members of the project team with current situational awareness. **Apply 8 kg/ha for the first application, and 4.5 kg/ha for the second** application. Use higher sowing rates when other species are present which will take bait (*see point 11 above*). *These sowing rates have worked many times previously on single species rat eradications in New Zealand. Lower rates may be possible but remain untested and the IEAG consider lower flow rates, through bait sowing buckets of current design, at risk of causing temporary stoppages in bait flow potentially leading to gaps in coverage which will not show in GPS data.*
22. Apply the **first application of bait** in parallel **flight lines** guided by GPS and spaced to 50% of the effective swath width produced by the sowing bucket. When setting up the GPS flight lines the sowing bucket swath width should be conservatively set to a distance where bait has shown (in calibration trials) to be consistently sown. *This is often less than the maximum distance the bucket can throw baits, and will reduce the risk of leaving insufficient bait or gaps in coverage.* Set the bucket bait flow rate for the first bait application at half the required rate (e.g. at 4kg/ha with swath overlaps by 50% resulting in a total application rate of 8kg/ha on the ground).
23. In the **first and second applications** apply additional **bait around** the island's **coastline** (to the water's edge) in addition to the parallel flight lines. The distance coastal sowing should be extended inland will depend on the terrain, 70m is usually sufficient. *Coastal baiting further reduces the risk of gaps in bait coverage caused by one or more of several problems during bait application along parallel flight lines:*
- *delays in bait flow through the sowing bucket starting a line*
 - *shutting off bait flow too early at the end of a line;*
 - *bucket swinging as a result of helicopter turning causing the bait trajectory to change.*
- Coastal baiting also provides extra bait in littoral zones which are often favoured feeding grounds for rats. Very steep areas (i.e. slopes exceeding 50 degrees) should receive an additional application of bait in each drop. On many islands, steep slopes are only found on the coastline where additional coastal swathes will suffice but where steep slopes are found inland they must be mapped and extra bait applied. This will ensure adequate bait is applied to steep terrain which has a larger actual area than the 2D plan area calculated from maps and to counter uneven bait distribution from bait falling down-slope.*
24. In the **first and second applications** ensure **other 'special' areas** are **treated**, by specifically targeted actions. Bait should be applied in, around and where practical under all buildings (all portions, including cellars, attics, etc), in large caves, on offshore rock stacks that are still exposed at high tides, on islets within inland lakes, steep cliffs etc. Create a comprehensive list of every site requiring special treatment beforehand, and 'tick them off' when baiting of each has occurred. Baiting in

⁴ A review of timing between applications for 27 past eradication projects reveals an average of 21 days with a range of between 1 and 62 days. This mostly reflects the difficulty of finding settled weather in NZ winters.

buildings should be done by placing a known number of baits in a shallow dish (e.g. paper plate) which will allow regular checks to be carried out and any missing or damaged bait to be replaced. It is prudent to continue building baiting long after the aerial application of bait elsewhere. Islands with permanent human habitation should continue for six months or longer. Bait application around buildings is best done by aerial application. *This keeps the operation less complex by avoiding exclusions zones around buildings* However other constraints may require hand broadcasting or bait stations (Wilkinson and Priddel 2011).

25. Overlap swathes for the **second application** 25%. Set the bait spreading bucket flow rate at 3 kg/ha resulting in a total application rate of 4.5 kg/ha on the ground. Flight lines for the second application should not be identical to those used for the first. A change in the heading (bearing) of parallel flight lines, a change in the initial starting point for bait laying, and/or a change in blocks assigned to each pilot (where multiple helicopters are used) are all ways to reduce the risk of gaps in bait coverage (*which are not apparent in GPS data*) from the second application replicating gaps produced in the first application; and *further reducing the risk of gaps in bait coverage overall*.
26. When ordering **bait**, allow at least 10% **contingency** for unforeseen events (e.g. spillage, loss of some bait, larger treatment area than expected, additional treatment of areas i.e. coastline). If the island size is not definitively established, or it is less than 50ha, or has a complex shape, then allow a greater contingency. *Island size is sometimes reported incorrectly. Small islands or those with complex coastlines will likely need more bait to fix mistakes than the 10% calculation allows for.* Build in allowances for places where extra bait may be required. Get bait quantity calculations peer reviewed. *Running out of bait before the entire island is covered will result in failure.* Consider the disposal of excess bait during planning (i.e. unused contingency bait). Where possible plan to use it on the island to enhance areas of highest risk.
27. **Install and test equipment** for all navigational guidance before the operation to ensure they function and integrate correctly when using multiple aircraft. This should include the ability to download and upload flight lines between a computer and the helicopter GPS unit whenever required in the field. *Minor issues of electronic compatibility can, at best cost valuable time during implementation and, at worst lead to errors in recording coverage or prevent flight lines being inspected for complete coverage. The lead pilot must not only bait the island comprehensively, s/he must have the evidence to prove it* (See also point 29 below).
28. Log **island boundaries** (coastline) into the GPS before sowing begins with the project manager in the helicopter directing the pilot. *This will ensure the boundary is logged exactly where the project manager wants it and give a check on the total island area at the outset of the sowing.* Do this well ahead of time and combine it with testing GPS and radio signal coverage, and finalising loading site requirements. *The accuracy required when logging boundaries cannot be achieved while sowing bait.*
29. Have **back-up equipment** including aircraft, loading, sowing and GPS on site or available at short notice. *Having alternatives for all critical machinery will reduce the risk of breakdowns preventing the operation being completed in the chosen weather window. Breakdowns take valuable daylight time to fix compared with swapping to back up equipment on site and ready to go.* Ensure computer equipment, including back-up equipment, for viewing/printing GPS flight data is available on site and compatible with the aerial contractor's equipment. *It is important to carefully view flight line data at a scale suitable to identify possible gaps in coverage and fill these gaps on the same day of each application. The LCD screen available to the pilot on some GPS systems is not adequate for this task.*
30. **Plan for extra capacity** to complete the bait sowing in as short a time as possible. This will allow a contingency of 'spare time' to fix any problems arising. *Even small problems can use up valuable*

daylight hours during an operation. Wherever possible, aim to cover the entire island in a single day. Completing bait coverage in a single day poses least risk of failure due to rodents moving from un-baited areas into areas where bait has degraded or disappeared. It also reduces the risk of weather changing to affect the last bait to be applied. For very large islands which cannot be treated in a single day the risk of rodent movement between treated/untreated areas needs to be addressed in the planning and decisions taken on a case by case basis during operations.

31. Have operational **planning peer reviewed** throughout development, *to ensure the eradication design matches the terrain and ecology of the island and you have thought the details of the logistics through completely.* Involving peer reviewers early in the process allows better exchange of information, better final plans and better buy in by all involved in the planning. Giving peer reviewers an opportunity to familiarise themselves with the island through a field visit and background information will help them to identify pertinent comments. Invite peer reviewers or other experts to check the state of readiness for the project team to proceed to implementation. Do this in time to allow any changes or improvements identified to be implemented. *This gives an independent audit of the state of planning, training and logistical organisation of the project to ensure you can deliver on the implementation as it is described in the (peer reviewed and subsequently revised) operational plan.*
32. Choice of **aircraft** will depend on:
 - Availability and pilot familiarity - *the primary concern is to select the best pilots with the best equipment.*
 - Loading options - *very large capacity buckets require a mechanical loading system, whereas smaller buckets can also be loaded by hand*
 - Haul distance from the loading site to the treatment area - *long hauls are more cost effective with bigger loads and fewer trips; aircraft size makes little difference when actually sowing bait*
 - Landing options - *larger aircraft need larger sites and more fuel*
33. Choice of **pilot(s)** is crucial to the success of the operation and there is no substitute for experience. Consider:
 - Experience with aerial baiting and eradication projects in particular
 - Experience with the selected aircraft
 - Experience with the selected navigational guidance system
 - Experience with other aspects of the project requiring specialist flying skills (e.g., operating off ships, marine rescue.
 - Personality - willingness to take direction but give considered feedback and ability to work as part of a team
 - Availability at short notice throughout the entire operational period to undertake the project.

Confirm the lead pilot early in the planning so s/he can contribute to the project planning as part of the project team. Consider opportunities to involve and up skill other pilots. *The skill required to apply bait to the required standard for eradication projects using this equipment comes only with the experience of many hours using the equipment in the air. The skill should be viewed as highly specialised and additional to the (already demanding) skill of flying a helicopter.*

34. **Bait spreading buckets** should produce a consistent swath pattern and constant rate of spread whether full or near empty. Check this by calibrating the bucket prior to the operation. Calibrate all bait buckets, including spares and any deflector modifications prior to the operation. Use a bait bucket specifically designed for distributing cereal pellets *to minimise bait breakage during sowing. A spinner designed for spreading fertiliser may increase the number of broken baits. All buckets, even those of identical design and manufacture, behave differently and need to be checked.* Sowing buckets should have a proven reliable system for pilot to start and stop bait sowing (e.g. bucket on/off switch is interfaced with the GPS system). *This will minimise the risk of bait gaps undetectable in the GPS printout and risk of sowing bait outside the treatment area.*
35. Use **GPS navigational guidance** to ensure uniform, total coverage of the area. When using multiple aircraft ensure compatibility of guidance systems to allow integration of flight line data. Produce bait coverage maps on the day of the operation in time to identify and fill gaps. GPS navigational guidance systems can be differentially corrected (DGPS) or not (GPS). DGPS receives another radio signal giving corrections to the aircraft position indicated by the GPS satellites. This can increase accuracy of the position to less than 1 metre. GPS positions without differential correction are subject to a number of signal errors which, in a worst-case scenario (i.e. where every error is at theoretical maximum and in the same direction) can reach about 15 metres. In practice this rarely happens and may only be momentary during a flight line unless there is a malfunction. IEAG consider DGPS desirable but not strictly necessary for rodent eradication operations using best practice design elements identified here (i.e. proven pilot and equipment with wide swath sowing buckets; 50% overlap in flight lines and more than a single application) which compensate for anomalies in bait coverage caused by GPS error. Make the final decision following discussions between the lead pilot and the project manager.
36. **Use freshly manufactured bait** where possible. Do not store for longer than recommended by the manufacturer (12 months for Pestoff Rodent Bait 20R). *This ensures high bait palatability, which has a direct influence on success. Old baits have been used successfully, but may be less palatable than natural food available to the target species at the time of application.*

IMPLEMENTATION

37. Check the condition of bait (e.g. hardness, intactness, moisture) by opening some of the bags of bait (before accepting delivery). Take quality control **bait samples** at the factory and during the operation. Store samples for later testing if required or immediately if there is any doubt. *This may allow bait quality and toxin loading issues to be discounted if the operation is later found to have failed.*
38. **Handle bait with care** to avoid crushing or contamination. Where bait is packaged in paper-walled sacks, avoid or minimize repeated handling of individual bags during transportation where possible. Never throw bags of bait. Do not stack more than 8 bags high. Avoid stacking pallets of bait on top of others to save space. Separate bait from fuel or other chemicals during shipping and storage to avoid contamination from spills or fumes. Do not use contaminated bait. *Presenting bait to all rodents in the best condition possible will maximise palatability and avoid problems with sowing equipment*
39. Undertake regular inspection of **bait** when in **storage** and take measures to minimise damage, especially from water leaks, condensation or attack by rodents or insects i.e. by placing traps around bait and spraying the storage area with pyrethrum sprays. Bait storage on the island would ideally use an existing building, however tents, plywood/plastic/ waxed cardboard boxes, or steel shipping containers have all been used successfully. *Bait must be kept dry and free from contamination or damage whilst in storage to ensure good condition and high palatability when applied.*

40. A weather forecast of at least 72 hours (3 nights) without significant rain (ie more than 10mm) is best for bait application. *This should give all rats time to encounter and eat a lethal dose of bait.* A **decision to go ahead with the baiting** involves trade-offs which require expert input at the time. Use an experienced professional weather forecaster to provide a forecast specifically for the treatment area. The project manager must make the final decision to go ahead after considering the weather forecast information and the views of the lead pilot and other members of the project team. Flying operations needs all the key people to agree it's safe to begin, but any one person in the team can stop the project if they consider it unsafe to continue. The pilot always retains the authority to stop operations if s/he considers flying conditions to be unsafe. *If the weather is too windy when applying bait, the risk of gaps in coverage increases due to bait drifting downwind and/or aircraft being pushed off course. Gusty wind is least desirable as its influence on bait and aircraft is variable and unpredictable. If the weather is too wet after bait application, the target animals may not eat the bait before it is destroyed. If the bait becomes wet before it is applied it can cause problems with the sowing bucket.*
41. Put in place a '**decision support team**' whose role is to provide advice and support to the project manager on the day of the application (i.e. help identify issues, provide advice and act as a sounding board for project manager), when s/he is making decisions. Membership is confined to those present on the day of the application because they will understand the local situation. Members may include lead pilot, deputy project manager and eradication advisor.
42. When the bait **bucket empties during sowing** there is potential for gaps if the refilled bucket does not resume sowing in the right place. Instruct pilots to be conservative in overlapping the resumption of a bait application flight line with the point where sowing had previously stopped.. *This avoids a gap in bait coverage which could not be detected in GPS printouts.*
43. Monitor bait usage throughout the bait application. *Sowing rates can vary due to flying conditions or mechanical problems with the bucket.* A careful **check of bait sowing rates** can be maintained with most GPS systems in 2 ways:
- by having the pilot radio in the number of hectares shown on screen as completed with each bucket load. The target number of hectares will be the size of the load multiplied by the sowing rate.
 - A spreadsheet can maintain a running total for each aircraft, of the amount of bait loaded into the bucket and the area covered within the treatment boundary by that quantity of bait as it comes to hand from downloaded data.
- The smaller the island the closer the rate needs to be monitored as there is less opportunity to make changes. *Finishing the bait before the island is covered will lead to failure.*
44. View **flight line data** early to establish everything is set up and working. Schedule subsequent downloads at each refuelling to identify and fill gaps in coverage before the end of the day. *Completing bait coverage in a single day poses least risk of failure due to rats moving from un-baited areas into areas where bait has degraded or disappeared.* Download and review data carefully near the beginning of the operation. Things to check:
- the equipment works and the data can be viewed as expected;
 - the application rate is as expected;

- the average work rate (productivity) of the helicopters is in line with predictions and if not the actual rate is extrapolated out to recalculate the total flying time (and fuel) required to finish the job;

Flight line data will need ongoing scrutiny to identify potential gaps in coverage for later re-sowing. Filling gaps in bait coverage is important but should be at the end of each day and not take precedence over completion of the block. Keep a level of contingency bait in reserve for the final loads and to give all the flight line data thorough scrutiny before distributing the last of the bait. View flight line data at a realistic scale to identify gaps easily. Use a laptop with mapping software. *Printouts of small scale or viewing GPS screens in the aircraft are inadequate to eliminate the possibility of gaps being overlooked.*

45. Re-sow all but the smallest **gap in bait coverage** indicated in the navigational guidance data even if it appears to be covered by the 50% overlap. The size of the gap tolerable is related to the anticipated movement of the target species over the period bait is likely to be available. Gaps larger than 15m are usually filled by extra applications when targeting ship rats. *The GPS printout will show where the helicopter went but not necessarily where the bait landed on the ground, so gap filling needs to be conservative.*
46. Complete **the first application** over the entire island at the prescribed **rate** or higher, even if this means using some bait originally planned for the second application. If required, make adjustments to the rate for the second application. *The first application is important to get right because weather or other circumstances may prevent a second application.*
47. The project manager should decide what **rock stacks** above mean high water require bait application when flying the boundaries with the pilot, if s/he has not already decided this. The project manager can also decide whether an observer with aerial eradication experience is required to fly with the pilot during bait application on rock stacks. *Where to lay the bait is the project manager's decision, not the pilot's.* Map or list all relevant rock stacks and cross them off as they are baited for each application. *Some islands can be challenging to differentiate between rocks as part of the coastline and those to treat separately.*
48. On **large islands** with several days operation interspersed by weather delays the project manager and decision support team should consider the need to reapply bait over a previous work to counter potential rat movement. Some of the factors to consider when making this decision:
 - length of delay
 - shape of the baited and unbaited areas
 - proximity to natural barriers
 - condition of bait already laid
 - overall progress and time constraints on the project
 - any bait supply constraints
 - weather forecast
 - species present

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

49. **Monitor** for the presence of **rats** after an eradication as part of normal biosecurity surveillance. However extra effort can be deployed to decrease the uncertainty around rodent survival if necessary. As a rule of thumb island managers in New Zealand normally wait at least two rodent breeding seasons before undertaking extra monitoring effort. *This gives time for any remaining rats to breed up to a level where they are likely to be detected.*

50. The variables to be considered when **declaring an eradication successful**:

- how long with no detections? *Longer timeframes in theory allow surviving pests to build up to detectable numbers so the productivity and timing of pest breeding has to be considered.*
- how hard have you looked? *This should incorporate a judgement on the quality of detection effort as well as the quantity (Russell et al 2008b; Samaniego-Herrera et al 2013).*
- the species involved- both target and non-target. Includes vulnerable species present in low numbers or previously present that may self-introduce if eradication is successful; species proposed to be translocated; and the species supposed to be eradicated (some are easier to detect than others). *Highly vulnerable native species might actually be good detection devices, e.g. the natural return of vulnerable seabirds on some islands with no sign of predation can be a good indication that the predators have gone.*
- the effectiveness of biosecurity *If this is not up to standard then the successful eradication might only be temporary anyway.*
- the urgency for confirmation i.e. what management action requires this information and how urgent is it? *If you have a critical species that needs urgent reintroduction to the island or if confirmation allows you to wind down or defer some other project, then confirmation is more urgent. If it's just to know the eradication was successful with no urgent management action (recognising that for eradication planning elsewhere the confidence of transferring lessons from a confirmed eradication is preferable) what's the rush?*
- the consequences of wrongly declaring success. *If the translocation proposal is to release a relatively robust or common species, then the consequences of being wrong about the eradication outcome are not that serious and perhaps you could afford to take a greater risk.*
- the cost. *Extremely remote islands can be very costly to visit so monitoring visits may be more cost effective if combined with other reasons for making the journey.*

To get the same confidence level that nil sign is confirmation of eradication do more effort early, less effort later. Too early and huge effort will still give little confidence, very late and minimal effort will give good confidence provided eradication failure can be distinguished from biosecurity failure through DNA samples (*See point 5 above*). Make these judgements on the facts available at the time (i.e. what has actually been done/ is the situation) rather than planned work.

51. Use a **range of indicators** to detect the presence of rats following eradication.

- Deploy a range of detection devices in the most likely places, it doesn't have to be a transect or grid, just try to sample different habitats and choose places most likely to have the target species.
- Look for rat sign wherever you go but especially around burrowing seabirds, sandy beaches or soft mud. Beware of sign that pre-dates the eradication which may be still present. *Faeces can often last for years in sheltered sites.*
- Consider some night searches if you have a likely area to look safely.
- A trained rodent detection dog is a useful and relatively sensitive tool (Gsell et al. 2010).
- If using kill traps result in captures of non-target species, leave the carcass secured in the trap for a few days to see if it gets scavenged by a rat.

All work should be recorded on GPS and mapped to show the amount of island coverage achieved. Any tangible sign or indication of rat presence should be photographed and if possible retrieved as a labelled sample for expert opinions on identification and DNA analysis.

52. **Detection devices** include snap traps, live capture traps, wax tags, chew cards, inked footprint tracking tunnels, dressed timber stakes soaked in peanut oil, candles, lard, chocolate, wax block rodenticide baits secured in bait stations, wooden boxes providing shelter and wood shavings as nesting material (rodent motels), trail cameras.

CONCLUSION

The global eradication database has records for 241 rat eradications in NZ since 1960 (some of these are simultaneous eradications of different rat species on the same island) (Island Conservation 2012). Of these 107 used aerial baiting with brodifacoum and with the exception of a possible failure to eradicate *R. exulans* from Kaikoura Island, all were successful, (although some have been reinvaded since by rats presumably swimming to the island). From 1985 to 1996 rat eradications using this method were undertaken on 23 islands covering a total of 3,781 ha. Most were single rat species projects. Since its inception in 1987, DOC has always had some form of technical advisory body to advise on island eradication projects (e.g. Island Peer Review Group, and currently IEAG) and hence the majority of projects within NZ have always had access to the current agreed best practice of the time. From 1997 (when IEAG came into existence) to 2017, 49 islands were treated using this method covering nearly 32,000 ha (Appendix 1).

Of the 49 island eradication projects 1997-2017, we can identify 41 which involved IEAG and followed best practice advice available at the time. The continued development of best practice for rodent eradications and its oversight by the IEAG gave both managers and funders the confidence to take on and succeed with increasingly larger and more complex projects. Many targeted more than one species of rat and some made 'world first' attempts at challenges such as multiple pest species (e.g. Rangitoto/ Motutapu Islands), large size (e.g. Campbell Island) or biosecurity (e.g. Project Island Song) (Griffiths et al 2013; McClelland 2011; Broome, 2009; <http://www.doc.govt.nz/conservation/restoration-projects/project-island-song>).

There is therefore a good track record for this method in NZ. Of course projects can be successful without the benefit of best practice (Appendix 1). However, the advice presented in this paper has been gleaned from some of the largest and most challenging projects worldwide (Howald et al 2007; Simberloff et al 2014; Towns and Broome 2003). In addition to NZ projects, IEAG has contributed to three large, remote and successful projects in temperate latitudes totalling a further 27,000ha. These are Macquarie Island (12800ha) (Springer 2014); Rat Island (2780ha) http://www.fws.gov/refuge/alaska_maritime/what_we_do/partnership/rat_island.html ; and phase 1 of South Georgia (15218ha) (South Georgia Heritage Trust 2010).

The continuous improvement of our best practice allows new information to be readily incorporated and promulgated. The flexibility to allow case by case modifications to be considered during project planning to meet emerging issues has been a particular strength of the system. We encourage project managers to follow best practice as closely as possible but to openly discuss with technical experts, any aspect which does not fit their circumstances, and to document their rationale for any deviations.

This paper has focussed on technical and project management advice for rat eradication projects in temperate conditions. Continuity of lessons and knowledge between projects in NZ has been largely

maintained over the last 30 years through a mixture of professional relationships, reporting and reviewing of projects and coordination through the Department of Conservation (Veitch and Bell 1990; Thomas and Taylor 2002; Cromarty et al 2002; Towns and Broome 2003; Clout and Russell 2006; Broome 2009; Broome et al 2011). Eradicating rats from tropical islands appears more challenging with a lower success rate thus far (Holmes et al 2015). However a workshop of eradication and tropical rodent ecology experts convened in 2013 has provided further advice to support eradication projects in these habitats (Keitt et al 2015).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to IEAG members past (Ian McFadden, Raewyn Empson, Derek Brown, Richard Griffiths, Andy Cox, Pam Cromarty and Peter McClelland) and present (authors of this paper) who have all contributed to the development of this advice. In particular Derek Brown who collated IEAG advice on individual projects into the first draft of the 2010 revision. Thanks also to Souad Boudjelas for allowing us to use the PII process diagram.

REFERENCES

Animal Control Products 2006. Aerial and hand broadcast application of Pestoff Rodent Bait 20R™ for the intended eradication of rodents from specified areas of New Zealand. Code of Practice prepared for NZ Food Safety Authority Wellington. <http://www.pestoff.co.nz/pdf/Code%20of%20Practice%2020R.pdf> (Accessed March 2014).

Broome, K.G.; Golding, C.; Brown, K.P.; Horn, S.; Corson P.; Bell, P.; 2017: Mouse eradication using aerial baiting: Current agreed best practice used in New Zealand (Version 1.0). New Zealand Department of Conservation internal document DOC-3034281, Wellington, New Zealand

Broome, K., Cromarty, P., Cox, A., Griffiths, R., McClelland, P., Golding, C. 2011. The Island Eradication Advisory Group (IEAG) – a model of effective technical support for eradication project planning and management. Poster abstract in Veitch, C.R., Clout, M.N., and Towns, D.R. (eds). Island invasives: eradication and management. Proceedings of the international conference on island invasives. Gland Switzerland: IUCN and Auckland, New Zealand: p 524.

Broome, K. 2009: Beyond Kapiti- A decade of invasive rodent eradications from New Zealand islands. *Biodiversity* Vol 10 No. 2 & 3 14-24. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14888386.2009.9712840>

Broome, K.G., Cromarty, P., Cox, A. 2005. Rat eradications – how to get it right without a recipe. Proceedings of the 13th Australasian Vertebrate Pest Conference, Te Papa Wellington, New Zealand, 2-6 May 2005: 152 – 157. <http://www.feral.org.au/rat-eradications-how-to-get-it-right-without-a-recipe/>

Clout, M. N.; Russell, J. C. (2006) The eradication of mammals from New Zealand islands. In: Koike, F.; Clout, M. N.; Kawamichi, M.; De Poorter, M.; Iwatsuki, K. (eds) Assessment and Control of Biological Invasion Risks. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, U.K., and Shoukadoh Book Sellers, Kyoto, Japan, pp. 127-141

Courchamp, F., Caut, S., Bonnaud, E., Bourgeois, K., Angulo, E., Watari, Y. 2011. Eradication of alien invasive species: surprise effects and conservation successes. In Veitch, C.R., Clout, M.N., and Towns, D.R. (eds). Island invasives: eradication and management. Proceedings of the international conference on island invasives. Gland Switzerland: IUCN and Auckland, New Zealand: Pp 285-289.

Cromarty, P.L., Broome, K.G., Cox, A., Empson, R.A., Hutchinson, W.M., & McFadden, I. 2002; Eradication planning for invasive alien animal species on islands – the approach developed by the NZ Department of Conservation. In Veitch & Clout, Turning the Tide: the eradication of invasive species. IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group. Pages 85-91.

http://www.issg.org/database/species/reference_files/TURTID/Cromarty.pdf

Fewster, R.M., Miller, S.D., Ritchie, J. 2011. DNA profiling- a management tool for rat eradication. In Veitch, C.R., Clout, M.N., and Towns, D.R. (eds). Island invasives: eradication and management. Proceedings of the international conference on island invasives. Gland Switzerland: IUCN and Auckland, New Zealand: 426-431.

Fitzgerald, G., Wilkinson, R., Saunders, L., 2000. Public perceptions and issues in possum control. In Montague, T.L. (ed). The brushtail possum. Biology, impact and management of an introduced marsupial. Manaaki Whenua Press, Lincoln NZ:187-197.

Griffiths, R., Buchanan, F., Broome, K.G., Butland, B., 2012. Rangitoto and Motutapu- a starting point for future vertebrate pest eradications on inhabited islands. Proceedings of the 25th Vertebrate Pest Conference, Monterey, California.

Griffiths, R., Broome, K., Brown, P., Buchanan, F. 2013. Multispecies invasive mammal eradication on Rangitoto and Motutapu Islands, Hauraki Gulf New Zealand. Department of Conservation internal report DOCDM-898404.

Gsell, A., Innes, J. G.; de Monchy, P.; Brunton, D. 2010: The success of using trained dogs to locate sparse rodents in pest-free sanctuaries. *Wildlife Research* 37 (1): 39-46.

<http://www.publish.csiro.au/paper/WR09117.htm> (Accessed March 2014).

Holmes, N.D., Griffiths, R., Pott, M., Alifano, A., Will, D., Wegmann A.S., Russell, J.C. 2015. Factors associated with rodent eradication failure. Biological Conservation special issue. Tropical island conservation: rat eradication for species recovery. Vol 185 8 – 16.

Howald, G.C., J. Donlan, J.P. Galvan, J.C. Russell, J. Parkes, A. Samaniego, Y. Wang, C.R. Veitch, P. Genovesi, M. Pascal, A. Saunders, and B. Tershey. 2007. Invasive rodent eradication on islands. *Conservation Biology*, Vol. 21 (5): 1258 – 1268.

Island Conservation, 2012. Database of Island Invasive Species Eradications. Hosted by the IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group <http://eradicationsdb.fos.auckland.ac.nz/> (Accessed March 2014).

Keitt, B., Griffiths, R., Boudjelas, S., Broome, K., Cranwell, S., Millet, J., Pitt, W., Samaniego-Herrera, A., 2015. Best practice guidelines for rat eradications on tropical islands. Biological Conservation special issue. Tropical island conservation: rat eradication for species recovery. Vol 185 17-26.

McClelland, P.J., 2011. Campbell Island – pushing the boundaries of rat eradications. In Veitch, C.R., Clout, M.N., and Towns, D.R. (eds). Island invasives: eradication and management. Proceedings of the international conference on island invasives. Gland Switzerland: IUCN and Auckland, New Zealand: 204-207.

Martin, T.G., Burgman, M.A., Fidler, F., Kuhnert, P.M., Low-Choy, S., McBride, M., Mengersen, K. 2012. Eliciting expert knowledge in conservation science. *Conservation Biology* 26 (1) 29-38. DOI: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2011.01806.x

Morrison, S.A., Faulkner, K.R., Vermeer, L.A., Lozier, L., Shaw, M.R. 2011. The essential non-science of eradication programmes: creating conditions for success. In Veitch, C.R., Clout, M.N., and Towns, D.R.

- (eds). Island invasives: eradication and management. Proceedings of the international conference on island invasives. Gland Switzerland: IUCN and Auckland, New Zealand: 461-466.
- Ogden, J., and Gilbert J., 2011. Running the gauntlet: advocating rat and feral cat eradication on an inhabited island – Great Barrier Island, New Zealand. In Veitch, C.R., Clout, M.N., and Towns, D.R. (eds). Island invasives: eradication and management. Proceedings of the international conference on island invasives. Gland Switzerland: IUCN and Auckland, New Zealand: 467-471.
- Oppel, S., Beavan, B.M., Bolton, M., Vickery, J., Bodey, T.W. 2010. Eradication of invasive mammals on islands inhabited by humans and domestic animals. *Conservation Biology* 25 (2) 232-240. DOI: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01601.x
- Pierce, R., Anterea, N., Coulston, G., Gardiner, C., Shilton, L., Taabu, K., Wragg, G. 2010. Atoll restoration in the Phoenix islands Kiribati: Survey results in November December 2009. EcoOceania Pty Ltd and Pacific Expeditions Ltd report for Government of Kiribati, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, NZ Department of Conservation, NZAID and Pacific Invasives Initiative.
<http://phoenixislands.org/pdf/pipa2009final1pdf.pdf> (accessed March 2014).
- Russell, J. C. 2007. Invasion ecology and genetics of Norway rats on New Zealand islands. PhD thesis. University of Auckland School of Biological Sciences. Section 6.2.4 pp140-145.
- Russell, J. C.; Towns, D.R. and Clout, M. N. 2008a. Review of rat invasion biology. Implications for island biosecurity. *Science for Conservation* 286. Department of Conservation, Wellington New Zealand.
<http://www.doc.govt.nz/upload/documents/science-and-technical/sfc286entire.pdf>
- Russell, J.C., Beavan, B.M., MacKay, J.W.B., Towns, D.R., Clout, M.N. 2008b. Testing island biosecurity systems for invasive rats. *Wildlife Research* 35. 215-221.
- Russell, J.C., Mackay, J.W.B., Abdelkrim, J. 2009. Insular pest control within a metapopulation context. *Biological Conservation* 142: 1404-1410. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2009.01.032
- Russell, J.C., Miller, S.D., Harper, G.A., MacInnes, H.E., Wylie, M.J., Fewster, R.M. 2010. Survivors or reinvaders? Using genetic assignment to identify invasive pests following eradication. *Biological Invasions* 12 1747-1757. DOI 10.1007/s10530-009-9586-1
- Russell, J.C., Sataruddin, N. S.; Heard, A. D. (2014) Over-invasion by functionally equivalent invasive species. *Ecology*. Vol 95 (8) 2268 – 2276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/13-1672.1>
- Samaniego-Herrera, A., Anderson, D.P., Parkes, J.P., Aguirre-Munoz, A. 2013. Rapid assessment of rat eradication after aerial baiting. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50 (6). 1415-1421. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2664.12147.
- South Georgia Heritage Trust 2010. Operational Plan for the eradication of rodents from South Georgia: Phase 1. Version 4. <http://www.sgisland.gs/download/SGHT/Operational%20Plan.pdf> (Accessed March 2014)
- Springer, K. 2014. Island Arks state of the islands report case study. Pest eradication on Macquarie Island. <http://islandarks.com.au/state-of-the-islands-report-case-study-pest-eradication-on-macquarie-island>
- Thomas, B.W. and Taylor, R.H. 2002. A history of ground –based rodent eradication techniques developed in New Zealand, 1959-1993. In Veitch & Clout , *Turning the Tide: the eradication of invasive species*. IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group: 301-310.

Torr, N. and Brown D. Henderson Island restoration project post operational report. Unpublished report for the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds UK.

Towns, D.R. and K.G. Broome. 2003. From small Maria to massive Campbell: forty years of rat eradications from New Zealand islands. *NZ Journal of Zoology* Vol. 30: 377-398.

<http://www.royalsociety.org.nz/Site/publish/Journals/nzjz/2003/031.aspx>

Veitch, C.R. and Bell, B.D. 1990. Eradication of introduced animals from the islands of New Zealand. In Towns, D.R., Daugherty, C.H., Atkinson, I.A.E., (eds). Ecological restoration of New Zealand islands. Department of Conservation Wellington.

Wilkinson, I.S., and Priddel, D., 2011. Rodent eradication on Lord Howe Island: challenges posed by people, livestock, and threatened endemics. In Veitch, C.R., Clout, M.N., and Towns, D.R. (eds). Island invasives: eradication and management. Proceedings of the international conference on island invasives. Gland Switzerland: IUCN and Auckland, New Zealand: 508-514.

Appendix 1 Rat eradication projects on NZ islands 1997-2017

Year	Island	Target <i>Rattus</i> Species	Area	Result	IEAG supported
1997	Centre (Rarotoka)	<i>exulans</i>	88	Successful	Yes
1997	Putauhinu	<i>exulans</i>	144	Successful	Yes
1997	East (Whangaokeno)	<i>exulans</i>	23	Successful	No
1998	Codfish (Whenua Hou)	<i>exulans</i>	1396	Successful	Yes
1999	Tinui	<i>norvegicus</i> <i>exulans</i>	141	Successful	No
1999	Whakaterepapanui	<i>norvegicus</i> <i>exulans</i>	103	Successful	No
2000	Mayor (Tuhua)	<i>norvegicus</i> <i>exulans</i>	1283	Successful	Yes
2001	Campbell	<i>norvegicus</i>	11300	Successful	Yes
2002	Raoul	<i>norvegicus</i> <i>exulans</i>	2941	Successful	Yes
2004	Little Barrier (Hauturu)	<i>exulans</i>	3083	Successful	Yes
2004	Owen (Horomaemae)	<i>rattus</i>	52	Successful	No
2005	Pearl	<i>norvegicus</i> <i>rattus</i> <i>exulans</i>	518	Successful (reinvaded)	Yes
2005	Bench	<i>exulans</i>	174	Successful	Yes
2005	Blumine (Pig)	<i>rattus</i>	484	Successful	No
2006	Big South Cape (Taukihepa)	<i>rattus</i>	939	Successful	Yes
2006	Big Moggy (Mokonui)	<i>rattus</i> <i>exulans</i>	86	Successful	Yes
2006	Solomon (Rerewhakaupoko)	<i>rattus</i>	25	Successful	Yes
2006	Pukeweka	<i>rattus</i>	3	Successful	Yes
2006	Macauley	<i>exulans</i>	278	Successful	Yes
2007	Pomona	<i>rattus</i>	262	Successful	Yes
2008	Kaikoura	<i>rattus</i> <i>exulans</i>	564	Reinvaded (May have failed for <i>exulans</i>)	Yes
2009	Rangitoto	<i>rattus</i> <i>exulans</i> <i>norvegicus</i>	2311	Successful	Yes
2009	Motutapu	<i>rattus</i> <i>exulans</i> <i>norvegicus</i>	1509	Successful	Yes
2009	Urupukapuka	<i>norvegicus</i> <i>rattus</i>	229	Successful	Yes
2009	Waewaetorea	<i>norvegicus</i>	55	Successful	Yes
2009	Motuarohia	<i>norvegicus</i>	63	Successful	Yes
2009	Moturua	<i>norvegicus</i> <i>rattus</i> <i>exulans</i>	166	Successful	Yes
2009	Motukiekie	<i>norvegicus</i>	34	Successful	Yes
2009	Poroporo	<i>norvegicus</i>	8	Successful	Yes
2009	Okahu	<i>norvegicus</i> <i>rattus</i>	27	Successful	Yes
2009	Rangiatea	<i>norvegicus</i>	2	Successful	Yes

2009	Motungarara	<i>norvegicus</i>	1	Successful	Yes
2009	Te Ao	<i>rattus</i>	12	Successful	Yes
2010	Indian	<i>rattus</i>	168	Successful	Yes
2011	Hen (Taranga)	<i>exulans</i>	509	Successful	Yes
2011	Ulva	<i>norvegicus</i>	305	Successful	Yes