



Consultation Document on Listing Eligibility and Conservation Actions

***Cophixalus hosmeri* (Rattling Nursery Frog)**

You are invited to provide your views and supporting reasons related to:

- 1) the eligibility of *Cophixalus hosmeri* (Rattling Nursery Frog) for inclusion on the EPBC Act threatened species list in the Critically Endangered category; and
- 2) the necessary conservation actions for the above species.

Evidence provided by experts, stakeholders and the general public are welcome. Responses can be provided by any interested person.

Anyone may nominate a native species, ecological community or threatening process for listing under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) or for a transfer of an item already on the list to a new listing category. The Threatened Species Scientific Committee (the Committee) undertakes the assessment of species to determine eligibility for inclusion in the list of threatened species and provides its recommendation to the Australian Government Minister for the Environment.

Responses are to be provided in writing either by email to:
species.consultation@environment.gov.au

or by mail to:

The Director
Marine and Freshwater Species Conservation Section
Wildlife, Heritage and Marine Division
Department of the Environment and Energy
PO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601

Responses are required to be submitted by 22 October 2018.

Contents of this information package	Page
General background information about listing threatened species	2
Information about this consultation process	2
Draft information about the subspecies and its eligibility for listing	4
Conservation actions for the subspecies	9
References cited	10
Consultation questions	12

General background information about listing threatened species

The Australian Government helps protect species at risk of extinction by listing them as threatened under Part 13 of the EPBC Act. Once listed under the EPBC Act, the species becomes a Matter of National Environmental Significance (MNES) and must be protected from significant impacts through the assessment and approval provisions of the EPBC Act. More information about threatened species is available on the department's website at: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/index.html>.

Public nominations to list threatened species under the EPBC Act are received annually by the department. In order to determine if a species is eligible for listing as threatened under the EPBC Act, the Threatened Species Scientific Committee (the Committee) undertakes a rigorous scientific assessment of its status to determine if the species is eligible for listing against a set of criteria. These criteria are available on the Department's website at: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/pubs/guidelines-species.pdf>.

As part of the assessment process, the Committee consults with the public and stakeholders to obtain specific details about the species, as well as advice on what conservation actions might be appropriate. Information provided through the consultation process is considered by the Committee in its assessment. The Committee provides its advice on the assessment (together with comments received) to the Minister regarding the eligibility of the species for listing under a particular category and what conservation actions might be appropriate. The Minister decides to add, or not to add, the species to the list of threatened species under the EPBC Act. More detailed information about the listing process is at: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/nominations.html>.

To promote the recovery of listed threatened species and ecological communities, conservation advices and where required, recovery plans are made or adopted in accordance with Part 13 of the EPBC Act. Conservation advices provide guidance at the time of listing on known threats and priority recovery actions that can be undertaken at a local and regional level. Recovery plans describe key threats and identify specific recovery actions that can be undertaken to enable recovery activities to occur within a planned and logical national framework. Information about recovery plans is available on the department's website at: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/recovery.html>.

Information about this consultation process

Responses to this consultation can be provided electronically or in hard copy to the contact addresses provided on Page 1. All responses received will be provided in full to the Committee and then to the Australian Government Minister for the Environment.

In providing comments, please provide references to published data where possible. Should the Committee use the information you provide in formulating its advice, the information will be attributed to you and referenced as a 'personal communication' unless you provide references or otherwise attribute this information (please specify if your organisation requires that this information is attributed to your organisation instead of yourself). The final advice by the Committee will be published on the department's website following the listing decision by the Minister.

Information provided through consultation may be subject to freedom of information legislation and court processes. It is also important to note that under the EPBC Act, the deliberations and recommendations of the Committee are confidential until the Minister has made a final decision on the nomination, unless otherwise determined by the Minister.

Privacy notice

The Department will collect, use, store and disclose the personal information you provide in a manner consistent with the Department's obligations under the Privacy Act 1988 (Cth) and the Department's Privacy Policy.

Any personal information that you provide within, or in addition to, your comments in the threatened species assessment process may be used by the Department for the purposes of its functions relating to threatened species assessments, including contacting you if we have any questions about your comments in the future.

Further, the Commonwealth, State and Territory governments have agreed to share threatened species assessment documentation (including comments) to ensure that all States and Territories have access to the same documentation when making a decision on the status of a potentially threatened species. This is also known as the '[common assessment method](#)'. As a result, any personal information that you have provided in connection with your comments may be shared between Commonwealth, State or Territory government entities to assist with their assessment processes.

The Department's Privacy Policy contains details about how respondents may access and make corrections to personal information that the Department holds about the respondent, how respondents may make a complaint about a breach of an Australian Privacy Principle, and how the Department will deal with that complaint. A copy of the Department's Privacy Policy is available at: <http://environment.gov.au/privacy-policy>

Cophixalus hosmeri

(Rattling Nursery Frog)

Taxonomy

Conventionally accepted as *Cophixalus hosmeri* (Zweifel, 1985).

Species Information

Description

The Rattling Nursery Frog is a small species of frog (snout-to-vent length of males to 14 mm, females to 17 mm), belonging to the family Microhylidae. It is the lightest of Australian *Cophixalus* with mean adult mass of 0.27 g (Williams 2007). The most consistent morphological character for distinguishing it from other *Cophixalus* species of similar size is its relatively short hind legs (Zweifel 1985). The Rattling Nursery Frog is grey-brown above with obscure darker flecks and blotches, the most consistent being a chevron-shaped mark between the shoulders and a streak behind the eye. The throat, chest and sometimes abdomen are dark grey with paler stippling or the abdomen and thighs are sometimes yellowish. The skin is smooth to slightly granular above and smooth below (Cogger 2014). The male call is a rapidly pulsed tap with some variation occurring between individuals within sites but all of the various calls are of considerably higher frequency than other Australian *Cophixalus* species (Hoskin 2004).

The eggs are relatively large and are laid in very moist soil or more recently have been found in the axils of palms (Anstis 2017). The tadpole develops inside the egg and when it has completed metamorphosis it hatches from the egg as a fully formed froglet (Zweifel 1985).

Distribution

The Rattling Nursery Frog is restricted to the Carbine Tableland in the Wet Tropics of northern Queensland, and is found only at altitudes greater than 800 m above sea level on Mt. Lewis and Mt. Spurgeon (Zweifel 1985; Shoo & Williams 2004). Peak abundance occurs between 1000 to 1200 m (Williams 2007) and the core distribution within the Wet Tropics is in “rainforest refugia” which are thought to be the most stable rainforest areas over geological time (Williams 2007).

Relevant Biology/Ecology

The Rattling Nursery Frog occurs in simple microphyll vine-fern forest in areas of continuous rainforest habitat. Breeding males form small, discrete calling aggregations (Williams 2007).

The microhylids of the Australian Wet Tropics differ from most other frog species in that they are terrestrial breeders and do not need surface water to breed. They require high levels of soil and litter moisture to prevent dessication of the eggs during development (Williams 2007). One parent (usually the male) will generally attend to the eggs until hatching occurs (Felton et al. 2006; Hoskin 2004; Williams 2007). The embryo develops directly in the egg and then hatches out as a tiny froglet. The eggs are large relative to other frog species (3 mm) and clutch sizes average 6 (4-7) with eggs linked in a “rosary chain” by a thin, gelatinous cord (Anstis 2017). The nests of the Rattling Nursery Frog have been found under logs and rocks or in cricket holes (Williams 2007) or in the axils of palms up to 60 cm above the ground (Anstis 2017).

The generation length of the Rattling Nursery Frog is unknown. Male microhylids (*C. ornatus*) have been found aged between 4 and 14 years (average age of males was 5.5) (Williams 2007).

Threats

Threats to the Rattling Nursery Frog include climate change, habitat degradation and introduced species. The table below lists the threats impacting the species in approximate order of severity of risk, based on available evidence.

Number	Threat factor	Threat status	Evidence base
1.0	Climate change		
1.1	Temperature increase, extreme weather events e.g. cyclones, droughts	Known potential	<p>The Rattling Nursery Frog is found only at high altitude on two mountains in the wet tropics of northern Queensland. Distribution modelling for this species suggests a population reduction of greater than 40% if temperatures increase by 1°C (Shoo 2005).</p> <p>Climate change modelling carried out by Williams and Hilbert (2006) suggests that five <i>Cophixalus</i> species (including <i>C. hosmeri</i>) would lose more than 50 percent of their core habitat with a 1 °C increase in temperature. However an increase by 3 - 5 °C is predicted to be more likely in the next 50 years. All species are restricted to mountain tops and are already at the limits of their potential elevational ranges. Therefore the impacts of climate change are thought to be the greatest threat to the survival of these microhylid frogs (Williams 2007). The Rattling Nursery Frog was ranked second on the list of the 20 most vulnerable vertebrate species to climate change in the Wet tropics (Williams & Hilbert 2006).</p> <p>Changes in hydrology and other effects of climate change (e.g. reduction in food supply) may also alter the susceptibility of frogs to disease, but these impacts are likely to be variable among species and sites (DoEE 2016).</p>
2.0	Habitat loss and degradation		
2.1	Clearing, trampling, fragmentation, altered hydrology	Known potential	Feral pigs are responsible for habitat damage and potentially cause adult frog mortality (Richards et al. 1993).
3.0	Invasive species		
3.1	Yellow Crazy Ants (<i>Anoplolepis gracilipes</i>)	Known potential	Yellow crazy ants spray formic acid to subdue prey, which causes burns and irritates the skin and eyes of animals. They can have severe impacts on a range of ecological processes and lead to significant loss of biodiversity. Yellow crazy ants were detected within the World Heritage Area and Little Mulgrave National Park in 2012 and now cover up to 61 ha (WTMA 2016) within

			these protected areas. In December 2013 yellow crazy ants were also detected in the Kuranda area (WTMA 2016).
4.0	Disease		
4.1	Amphibian chytrid fungus	Known current	Chytridiomycosis is an infectious disease caused by the amphibian chytrid fungus (<i>Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis</i>) that affects amphibians worldwide, causing mass die-offs and some species extinctions (DoEE 2016). However, the prevalence of chytrid is extremely low in Australian microhylids (Hauselberger & Alford 2012).

Assessment of available information in relation to the EPBC Act Criteria and Regulations

Criterion 1. Population size reduction (reduction in total numbers)			
Population reduction (measured over the longer of 10 years or 3 generations) based on any of A1 to A4			
	Critically Endangered Very severe reduction	Endangered Severe reduction	Vulnerable Substantial reduction
A1	≥ 90%	≥ 70%	≥ 50%
A2, A3, A4	≥ 80%	≥ 50%	≥ 30%
A1	<p>Population reduction observed, estimated, inferred or suspected in the past and the causes of the reduction are clearly reversible AND understood AND ceased.</p> <p>(a) direct observation [except A3]</p>		
A2			
A3			
A4			

Evidence:

The generation length has not been determined for any species of Australian microhylids (Williams 2007). There are no data available to evaluate the population trend over any three generation period.

The data presented above appear to be insufficient to demonstrate if the species is eligible for listing under this criterion. However, the purpose of this consultation document is to elicit additional information to better understand the species' status. This conclusion should therefore be considered to be tentative at this stage, as it may be changed as a result of responses to this consultation process.

Criterion 2. Geographic distribution as indicators for either extent of occurrence AND/OR area of occupancy			
	Critically Endangered	Endangered Restricted	Vulnerable Limited

	Very restricted		
B1. Extent of occurrence (EOO)	< 100 km ²	< 5,000 km ²	< 20,000 km ²
B2. Area of occupancy (AOO)	< 10 km ²	< 500 km ²	< 2,000 km ²
AND at least 2 of the following 3 conditions indicating distribution is precarious for survival:			
(a) Severely fragmented OR Number of locations	= 1	≤ 5	≤ 10
(b) Continuing decline observed, estimated, inferred or projected in any of: (i) extent of occurrence; (ii) area of occupancy; (iii) area, extent and/or quality of habitat; (iv) number of locations or subpopulations; (v) number of mature individuals			
(c) Extreme fluctuations in any of: (i) extent of occurrence; (ii) area of occupancy; (iii) number of locations or subpopulations; (iv) number of mature individuals			

Evidence:

The calculated extent of occurrence (EOO) is 44 km², and the area of occupancy (AOO) is 28 km² (unpublished data DoEE 2017). These figures are based on the mapping of point records from post-1997 (20 year timeframe), compiled from state and Commonwealth agencies along with museums, research institutions and non-government organisations. The EOO was calculated using a minimum convex hull, and the AOO calculated using a 2x2 km grid cell method, based on the IUCN Red List Guidelines 2014.

The IUCN defines the term ‘location’ as “a geographically or ecologically distinct area in which a single threatening event can rapidly affect all individuals of the taxon present. The size of the location depends on the area covered by the threatening event and may include a part of one or many subpopulations. Where a taxon is affected by more than one threatening event, location should be defined by considering the most serious plausible threat” (IUCN 2001; 2012).

There are two major subpopulations of the Rattling Nursery Frog located approximately 12 km apart on Mt. Lewis and Mt. Spurgeon within the Carbine Tablelands (Zweifel 1985; Hoskin 2004; Shoo & Williams 2004). The IUCN Guidelines (2017) indicate that subpopulations such as these, located at the same altitudes in identical habitat on geographically similar mountains should be interpreted as a single location for the species because they may be affected by the same “most serious plausible threat” – in this case climate change. Therefore, despite their geographic separation these two subpopulations are considered to be a single location for the purposes of this assessment.

A continuing decline in area of occupancy and area, extent and/or quality of habitat may be inferred based on climate change (Shoo 2005).

The data presented above appear to demonstrate that the species is **eligible for listing as Critically Endangered** under this criterion. However, the purpose of this consultation document is to elicit additional information to better understand the species’ status. This conclusion should therefore be considered to be tentative at this stage, as it may be changed as a result of responses to this consultation process.

Criterion 3. Population size and decline			
	Critically Endangered Very low	Endangered Low	Vulnerable Limited
Estimated number of mature individuals	< 250	< 2,500	< 10,000
AND either (C1) or (C2) is true			
C1 An observed, estimated or projected continuing decline of at least (up to a max. of 100 years in future)	Very high rate 25% in 3 years or 1 generation (whichever is longer)	High rate 20% in 5 years or 2 generation	Substantial rate 10% in 10 years or 3 generations

C2	An observed, estimated, projected or inferred continuing decline AND its geographic distribution is precarious for its survival based on at least 1 of the following 3 conditions:		(whichever is longer)	(whichever is longer)
(a)	(i) Number of mature individuals in each subpopulation	≤ 50	≤ 250	≤ 1,000
	(ii) % of mature individuals in one subpopulation =	90 – 100%	95 – 100%	100%
(b)	Extreme fluctuations in the number of mature individuals			

Evidence:

Surveys of calling males estimated density of the Rattling Nursery Frog at approximately 42 per hectare (Shoo & Williams 2004; Williams 2007). Over an AOO of 28 km² this equates to over 100 000 male frogs in the population.

Even without taking females into account this is well in excess of the threshold of 10 000 individuals to be eligible under this criterion.

The data presented above appear to demonstrate that the species is **ineligible for listing** under this criterion. However, the purpose of this consultation document is to elicit additional information to better understand the species’ status. This conclusion should therefore be considered to be tentative at this stage, as it may be changed as a result of responses to this consultation process.

Criterion 4. Number of mature individuals			
	Critically Endangered Extremely low	Endangered Very Low	Vulnerable Low (Medium-term future) ¹
Number of mature individuals	< 50	< 250	< 1,000
D2 ¹ Only applies to the Vulnerable category Restricted area of occupancy or number of locations with a plausible future threat that could drive the species to critically endangered or Extinct in a very short time	-	-	D2. Typically: area of occupancy < 20 km ² or number of locations ≤ 5

¹ The IUCN Red List Criterion D allows for species to be listed as Vulnerable under Criterion D2. The corresponding Criterion 4 in the EPBC Regulations does not currently include the provision for listing a species under D2. As such, a species cannot currently be listed under the EPBC Act under Criterion D2 only. However, assessments that demonstrate eligibility for listing under other criteria may include information relevant to D2. This information will not be considered by the Committee in making its assessment of the species’ eligibility for listing under the EPBC Act, but may assist other jurisdictions to adopt the assessment outcome under the [common assessment method](#).

Evidence:

As outlined under Criterion 3 the population of this species is well in excess of 1 000 individuals. The data presented above appear to demonstrate that the species is **ineligible for listing** under this criterion. However, the purpose of this consultation document is to elicit additional information to better understand the species’ status. This conclusion should therefore be considered to be tentative at this stage, as it may be changed as a result of responses to this consultation process.

Criterion 5. Quantitative Analysis			
	Critically Endangered Immediate future	Endangered Near future	Vulnerable Medium-term future
Indicating the probability of extinction in the wild to be:	≥ 50% in 10 years or 3 generations, whichever is longer (100 years max.)	≥ 20% in 20 years or 5 generations, whichever is longer (100 years max.)	≥ 10% in 100 years

Evidence:

Population viability analysis appears not to have been undertaken. Therefore, there are insufficient data to demonstrate if the species is eligible for listing under this criterion. However, the purpose of this consultation document is to elicit additional information to better understand the species' status. This conclusion should therefore be considered to be tentative at this stage, as it may be changed as a result of responses to this consultation process.

Conservation Actions

Recovery Plan

A decision about whether there should be a recovery plan for this species has not yet been determined. The purpose of this consultation document is to elicit additional information to help inform this decision.

Primary Conservation Actions

- The primary conservation action for the Rattling Nursery Frog is to manage known threats to the species, resolve knowledge gaps relating to potential threats to the species and prioritise conservation actions to address them.

Conservation and Management Priorities

Habitat loss and disturbance

- Implement a program ensuring suitable habitat is maintained in areas currently supporting populations of the Rattling Nursery Frog and investigate options for enhancing the resilience of the species' current habitat to climate change.
- Investigate the development of a assisted colonisation (translocation) strategy in response to the threat of climate change. The strategy should include consideration of the benefits and risks of undertaking a coordinated series of translocations of *Cophixalus* species to mountain tops further south as increased temperatures impact on their survival and reproductive success.

Invasive species (including threats from grazing, trampling, predation)

- Reduce the impacts of habitat destruction by feral pigs on existing populations by using fencing (where feasible) and reducing pig numbers.
- Control yellow crazy ants by baiting at critical stages of the ants' life cycle.

Disease

- Minimise the spread of the amphibian chytrid fungus by implementing suitable hygiene protocols (Murray 2011) to protect priority populations as described in the *Threat*

abatement plan for infection of amphibians with chytrid fungus resulting in chytridiomycosis (Department of the Environment and Energy 2016).

- Provide disease identification and prevention protocols (methods of handling, diagnostic keys, etc.) to researchers and land managers for use in the field.

Stakeholder Engagement

- Interested nature conservation, land management and land holder groups could be engaged in conservation management activities, such as survey and monitoring, but should be made aware of the need to follow correct field practices and hygiene protocols to mitigate the risks of trampling and disease transmission. If necessary, use workshops to aid stakeholders in developing the skills and knowledge required to manage threats to this species while undertaking these activities.
- Inform the public about the status and recovery efforts for the species, e.g. by providing information to visitors to the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area and publicising the species through the media.

Survey and Monitoring priorities

- More precisely assess the population size, distribution and ecological requirements of the Rattling Nursery Frog.
- Design and implement a monitoring program for the Rattling Nursery Frog.

Information and Research priorities

- Improve knowledge of the reproductive biology, age structure and growth rates of the Rattling Nursery Frog.
- Improve knowledge of the thermal tolerance limits of the Rattling Nursery Frog and assess its possible response to future climate scenarios.
- Improve understanding of how climate change will likely impact on the Rattling Nursery Frog due to altered temperatures, rainfall, environmental stressors and disease virulence.
- Improve understanding of husbandry methods for the species.
- Improve understanding of the impacts of feral pigs and yellow crazy ants on the Rattling Nursery Frog.

References cited in the advice

- Anstis M. (2017). *Tadpoles and Frogs of Australia* 2nd Edition. New Holland Publishers Pty Ltd, Australia.
- Cogger H G (2014). *Reptiles and Amphibians of Australia*. 7th edn. CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, Victoria.
- Felton A R, Alford R A & Schwarzkopf L (2006). Multiple mate choice criteria and the importance of age for male mating success in the microhylid frog, *Cophixalus ornatus*. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology* 59:786-795.
- Hauselberger K F & Alford R A (2012). Prevalence of *Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis* infection is extremely low in direct-developing Australian microhylids. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms* 100,191-200.
- Hoskin C J (2004). Australian microhylid frogs (*Cophixalus* and *Austrochaperina*): phylogeny, taxonomy, calls, distributions and breeding biology. *Australian Journal of Zoology* 52,237-269.

- IUCN (2001). IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 3.1. IUCN Species Survival Commission. IUCN, Gland Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- IUCN (2012). IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 3.1. Second edition. Gland Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- IUCN (2017). IUCN Standards and Petitions Subcommittee 2017. Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 13.
- Richards SJ, McDonald KR & Alford RA (1993). Declines in populations of Australia's endemic tropical rainforest frogs. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 1,66-77.
- Shoo L (2005). Predicting and detecting the impacts of climate change on montaine fauna in Australian tropical rainforests. Thesis. Griffith University.
- Shoo L, Storlie C, Williams Y M & Williams S E (2010). Potential for mountaintop boulder fields to buffer species against extreme heat stress under climate change. *International Journal of Biometeorology* 54,475-478.
- Shoo L & Williams Y (2004). Altitudinal distribution and abundance of microhylid frogs (*Cophixalus* and *Austrochaperina*) of north-eastern Australia: baseline data for detecting biological responses to future climate change. *Australian Journal of Zoology* 52,667-676.
- Williams S E & Hilbert D W (2006). Climate change as a threat to the biodiversity of tropical rainforest in Australia. In: Laurance WF, CA Peres (eds) *Emerging Threats to Tropical Forests*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago. pp 33-53.
- Williams Y (2007). Ecological differences between rare and common species of microhylid frogs of the Wet tropics biogeographic region. Thesis. James Cook University.
- Zweifel R G (1985). Australian frogs of the family Microhylidae. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* 182,265-388.

Other sources cited in the advice

- Atlas of Living Australia (2016)
<http://spatial.ala.org.au/?q=lsid%3Aurn%3Aisid%3Abiodiversity.org.au%3Aafd.taxon%3A0dae967f-74bd-40f3-8946-84e61b2b0562#>
- Department of the Environment and Energy (2016). Threat abatement plan for infection of amphibians with chytrid fungus resulting in chytridiomycosis, Commonwealth of Australia 2016. Available from:
<http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/tap/infection-amphibians-chytrid-fungus-resulting-chytridiomycosis-2016>
- Department of the Environment and Energy (2017). Area of Occupancy and Extent of Occurrence for *Cophixalus hosmeri*. Unpublished report, Australian Government Department of the Environment, Canberra.
- Wet Tropics Management Authority (WTMA) (2016). Stamp Out Yellow Crazy Ants. Viewed 2 December 2016. Available on the internet at: <http://www.wettropics.gov.au/stamp-out-yellow-crazy-ants.html>.

Consultation questions

1. Do you agree with the current taxonomic position of the Australian Faunal Directory for this taxon (as identified in the draft conservation advice)?
2. Can you provide any additional references, information or estimates on longevity, age of maturity, average life span and generation length?
3. Has the survey effort for this taxon been adequate to determine its national distribution and adult population size?
4. Do you accept the estimate provided in the nomination for the current population size of the taxon?
5. For any population with which you are familiar, do you agree with the population estimate provided? If not, are you able to provide a plausible estimate based on your own knowledge? If so, please provide in the form:
 - Lower bound (estimated minimum):
 - Upper bound (estimated maximum):
 - Best Estimate:
 - Estimated level of Confidence: %
6. Can you provide any additional data, not contained in the current nomination, on declines in population numbers over the past or next 10 years or 3 generations, whichever is the longer?
7. Is the distribution as described in the nomination valid? Can you provide an estimate of the current geographic distribution (extent of occurrence or area of occupancy in km²) of this taxon?
8. Has this geographic distribution declined and if so by how much and over what period of time?
9. Do you agree that the taxon is eligible for inclusion on the threatened species list, in the category listed in the nomination?
10. Do you agree that the threats listed are correct and that their effects on the taxon are significant?
11. To what degree are the identified threats likely to impact on the taxon in the future?
12. Can you provide additional or alternative information on threats, past, current or potential that may adversely affect this taxon at any stage of its life cycle?
13. In seeking to facilitate the recovery of this taxon, can you provide management advice for the following:
 - What individuals or organisations are currently, or need to be, involved in planning to abate threats and any other relevant planning issues?
 - What threats are impacting on different populations, how variable are the threats and what is the relative importance of the different populations?
 - What recovery actions are currently in place, and can you suggest other actions that would help recover the taxon? Please provide evidence and background information.
14. Can you provide additional data or information relevant to this assessment?
15. Can you advise as to whether this species is of cultural significance to Indigenous Australians?