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| **Table 1: Approaches to identifying the targets of restoration, with associated strengths and weaknesses** |
| **Target of restoration** | **Restoration focus** | **Strengths and weaknesses** |
| Threatened species | Project focuses on providing requirements of species with a conservation rating. | Addresses the specific needs of priority species; can be particularly resource intensive if populations are in critical state so requires cost benefit analysis. |
| Focal species | A group of species that collectively are most at risk of threatening processes within a landscape – restoration efforts are focused on these species assuming that other less threatened species will also be conserved by the actions. | Sound approach if data are available to indicate which species are most at threat (often lacking). |
| Functional response group | A group of actively declining species that are associated with a particular habitat and are affected by the same threats or losses in habitat components. | Sound approach and may optimise use of resources to target more than one declining species at a time, but data are lackingto confidently identify species trends and functional response groups for many areas. |
| Keystone species | Project focuses on managing for species whose presence is considered crucial to maintaining the organisation and function of the ecosystem. | Data often lacking to identify keystone species; may or may not address needs of individual declining species. |
| Umbrella species | Project focuses on restoring for species that require large areas of habitat, providing the “umbrella” for other species. | Assumes that other species are threatened by the same processes as the umbrella species which may not be the case. |
| Flagship species | Project focuses on restoring habitat forwell-known and usually ‘likeable’ species to generate public interest and support. | May provide resources for a range of associated species but may or may not address the needs of species in decline. |
| Patch size and connectivity across landscape | Project does not necessarily have a species- specific goal; focuses on connectivity, size and arrangement of habitat patches with the general idea that ‘bigger and more connected’ patches are better for overall species diversity. | Often used, this approach may be hit and miss in whether it addresses the habitat needs of priority species currently in decline; may encourage dispersal of pest species if these threats are not addressed concurrently. |