REVIEW REPORTS

CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

PART V: OTHER TAXA

INTRODUCTION

The present Rapid Review of Concerted Action Species was conducted by UNEP-WCMC and follows on from the exercise presented to the consideration of the CMS Scientific Council at its 12th Meeting. This version of the review sheets takes on board some of the feedback received at that meeting, and in particular it has reduced its reliance on information from the grey literature in favour more exclusively of peer-reviewed content. Similarly, following the advice received from the Council, the review sheets have been complemented with summary sheets, which indicate the overall perceived trend of the species in each country. A synopsis of the status and level of action for each species is also provided in each section.

As explained at the 12th meeting of the Council, there are a number of characteristics and methodological considerations that need to be kept in mind in order to understand the nature and purpose of the review sheets. In particular, it should be noted that these reviews are not intended as comprehensive compilations of the existing information on the species reviewed, nor are the analyses of trends and conservation status provided intended to supersede the global assessments produced by IUCN (which are included in each sheet for information). Instead, these reviews are produced with three goals in mind:

1. to examine **at the country level** the status and the known level of action for the species protected by the CMS (at this stage, the Species in Appendix I subject of Concerted Actions – Resolution 7.1)
2. to compile in a single document a **summary of the main sources of information accessible to the CMS** via the CMS Information Management System (CMS IMS) in general (including the expert information systems to which it is interconnected) and at UNEP-WCMC;
3. to provide a draft of the possible primary format and content of the **CMS Rolling Papers**, which once in electronic format on the internet (if they are indeed developed as such) could be used by Councillors and other appointed authorities to share and manage knowledge on the status and conservation actions concerning the species protected by the Convention.

The summary of actions reported for each species and contained in each review refers to the information provided in the National Reports to the CMS submitted by the Parties to the Convention in 2002 (COP7), as at the moment of producing these Reviews, the 2005 Reports had not been produced yet. In addition to the information on actions available through the CMS Reports, the Reviews also make reference to any other recent action reported by other actors identified during the review of literature. Importantly, it should also be noted that these Reviews do not include yet the action reported by Agreements and MoUs of the CMS which, needless to say, represent a fundamental component of the conservation effort orchestrated by totality of the CMS family.

These Reviews are thus only produced as working documents, for discussion at CMS meetings only, and should not be circulated elsewhere without prior permission.

Anyone wishing to use this information elsewhere should contact the Species Programme at UNEP-WCMC for advice on appropriate use of the information and on citation.

Members and observers of the Scientific Council are invited to:

a) contribute any relevant information they may with to share which may improve the content of these Reviews;
b) advise on the usefulness of the exercise in general, and on the convenience of extending the model to other species protected by the CMS;
c) advise on the convenience of making this information and format available online, within the CMS environment, as a tool for CMS users to share and manage knowledge on the status of ,and conservation actions for CMS species.

Key to general synopsis

IUCN Status:

As reported from the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (www.redlist.org).

IUCN Trend:

The population is either increasing (↑), stable (➔) or decreasing (🡻). When no information about population trend is provided, there is a blank space in that column.

CMS Listed Range States:

The list of States in the distribution range of the taxon, according to the CMS Range List (2003). All range States were reviewed, including those marked as (Ex), (Ex?) and (?). When the European Union (EU) is listed as a range state by CMS, this is not included in the count but all the individual EU countries that are listed in brackets are counted.

All Range States:

The number of range states including range states reported in the literature reviewed, such as the Species Data Base (UNEP-WCMC), BirdLife International, IUCN/SSC publications, and other reliable publications. If a range state is included, which CMS does not currently list, a reference is provided.

CMS Parties Reporting Action:

This number represents the proportion of CMS Parties in the range that report conservation actions being undertaken for the taxon. This includes any actions reported in National Reports to CMS in 2002.

Range States Reporting Action:

This number represents the fraction of all range States (including those range States not included in the CMS range list but reported in the literature) in which conservation action was identified to be taking place.

Range States in Which Species Occurs in Protected Areas:

The fraction of all range states in which the species occurs in a protected area (P. A.). If a species has been reintroduced to a protected area, then this is still counted.

Key to specific synopses

The species summary sheets provide a concise overview of the information included in the more detailed Reviews. For each species, the summary sheet contains information on status, trends and conservation actions at the national level in each range state. These summary sheets do not intend to provide a comprehensive account of each taxon in question, but instead they are designed to produce a concise overview of the information on population status, trends and on conservation actions, that are readily available through the CMS IMS and in the literature.

Information contained in the summary sheets:

Range States
The range state list included range states registered in the CMS Range List as well as additional range States for which there are reliable references (e.g. BirdLife International, IUCN/SSC publications, etc.). CMS Parties are identified by use of upper-case font.

Status
The status at the national level is not represented using threat categories such as the IUCN Red List classification, since these categories are not standardised across different countries. A species is registered under a generic category of threat in a particular range state if it is included in a National Red List (or equivalent publication). Absence of information, however, should not be interpreted as an indicator that the species is not threatened in that country. Range states in which the species is registered as nationally threatened have a dot (●) in the 'Status' column, and range states for which the species is reported as extinct have an "**ex**" in the status column (or "**ex?**" if it is supposed to be extinct but information is lacking).

Trend
The apparent population trend in that range state is included, based on the information reviewed. The population is either increasing in that range state (↑), stable (➔) or decreasing (🡻). Intermediate trends stages are recorded using the symbols (🡽) for stable to increasing, and (🡾) for stable to decreasing. Range states for which no information on status was available or where the status is uncertain, are represented by an ? in the 'Trends' column.

CMS Actions
If conservation action(s) in a CMS Party range state were reported to CMS through National Reports in 2002 (note that at the time of producing this reports, 2005 National Reports had not been submitted), this is represented by a ✓ in the 'CMS Actions' column. If no action is reported this is represented with a ✗. Range states that are not CMS Parties, have a blank space in that column section.

Other Actions
If recent conservation actions other than those reported to CMS were reported in the literature for a range State, whether this be a Party or not to CMS, a ✓ is used. If no other conservation action is reported, then the range state has a blank space in this column.

General Synopsis

Name	IUCN Redlist	IUCN Trend	Countries in CMS Range List	All Range States reported in literature	CMS Parties reporting action	Range States reporting action	Range States in which species occur in P.A.
Lontra provocax	EN	?	2	2	1/2	2/2	2/2

Status by countries in range

Country	Reported as nationally threatened	Apparent trend	CMS actions reported (in 2002 National Reports)	Other recent actions reported in the literature
Argentina	●	?	×	✓
Chile	●	↓	✓	

REVIEW OF CONCERTED ACTION SPECIES

MAMMALIA: MUSTELIDAE

SPECIES: *Lontra provocax* (Thomas, 1908)

SYNONYMS: *Lutra provocax*

COMMON NAME: Huillin; Southern River Otter (English); Huillin; Loutre du Chili (*French*); Huillín; Lobito patagonico; Nutria chilena; Nutria de Chile (Spanish)

RANGE STATES: ARGENTINA; CHILE

RED LIST RATING: EN A3c (Vogel, 2004)

CONSERVATION STATUS AND ACTIONS:

The southern river otter is a freshwater species. Rest and den sites are found in areas with dense vegetation and abundance of above-ground roots, small rocks or broken stones, which provide suitable crevices from which the animal can view the adjacent water without being exposed (Vogel, 2004). Studies confirm the association of Southern river otter with high densities of riparian vegetation, shallow river and stream channels with floodplains, and aquatic environments with above-ground roots, woody debris and abundant small to medium stones or gravel (Earthwatch Institute, 2004).

This freshwater species was widely distributed in Chile and Argentina a century ago, from the Cauquenes and Cachapoal Rivers to the Magellan region in Chile but is now restricted to a few isolated areas from Cautín to Futaleufú (Vogel, 2004; Earthwatch Institute, 2004).

Populations have been confirmed in only seven isolated areas all of which are threatened by a variety of factors including the removal of riverbank vegetation, dam construction, river and stream canalisation, and dredging, which has recently become one of the most serious threats to otter habitat. Furthermore, the large scale of forest destruction in southern Chile may be affecting several of the freshwater habitats through severe flooding and deposition of soil on the riverbeds. Accelerating habitat destruction and degradation throughout the southern river otter's range is the greatest threat to this species and is estimated to potentially lead to a future > 50% reduction in population size in those populations using rivers and lakes (freshwater habitats) (Vogel, 2004).

ARGENTINA:

Status: The Southern River Otter is very rare (IOSF, 2004). The only important and apparently self-sustaining population of Argentina lives in Nahuel Huapi sub-basin within the park. The greatest present threat is fragmentation and destruction of shoreline habitat in the portions privately owned, or not included in the Park. These comprise almost 20% of the shoreline length of Nahuel Huapi Lake (Chehebar, 2001). *Lontra provocax* is listed as `Endangered' in the Argentinean National Wildlife List (Vogel, 2004).

CMS actions: None reported.

Other actions: Monitoring of the Southern River Otter by IOSF in 2000 (IOSF, 2004).

CHILE:

Status: The huillin has disappeared from its northern range through hunting and loss of suitable habitat (Medina-Vogel *et al.,* 2003). The available information indicates that the species is present from Cautín (39º S.) to Magallanes (55º S.), inhabiting continental waters and coastal waters from Chiloé to Magallanes. Although data are lacking for part of its distribution, the population was estimated in 1983 to number 8,500 animals for the XII Region (Chile National report, 2002). Threats include poaching, freshwater pollution, deforestation, otters drowning in fishing nets and habitat destruction caused by draining of waterways (IOSF, 2004). An accelerated growth of fish farming could potentially lead to a future reduction around 50% of population size from those populations using the southern fjords and islands (marine habitats) of Chile over the next 10 years (Vogel, 2004). The decline of southern River Otter in Chile is now essentially dependent on the conservation of riparian vegetation, meandrous rivers, swamp forests and their relation to the surrounding human dwellings outside National Parks (Earthwatch Institute, 2004).

The Southern River Otter is listed in the Chilean Red Data Book of Vertebrates as

being in danger of extinction (Vogel, 2004).

CMS actions: Various ongoing projects in Regions IX and X and ecological studies of *Lutra*

provocax are planned in the south of Chile (Chile National Report, 2002).

Other actions: From 1998, research and activities about southern river otter ecology, spatial behavior and conservation have been carried out in Chile (Earthwatch Institute, 2004).

REFERENCES:

Chehebar, C. (2001) *The problematic coexistence of core areas, towns, tourism, rural settlements and ranches: the case of Nahuel Haipi and Linin National Parks, Argentina*. 2001 CERC Environmental Leaders Forum, Center for Research and Conservation. http://www.cerc.columbia.edu/training/pdf_files/chehebar_01.pdf Downloaded on 25/04/05.

Chile National Report (2002). National Report to CMS.

Earthwatch Institute (2004). Earthwatch Expedition - River Otters of Chile. http://www.earthwatch.org/expeditions/medinavogel.html#top Downloaded on 24/02/2004.

IOSF (International Otter Survival Fund) (2004). Otters of the World – South America http://www.otter.org/news/world3.html Downloaded on 23/02/2004.

Medina-Vogel, G, Kaufman, V. S, Monsalve, R and Gomez, V. (2003). The influence of riparian vegetation, woody debris, stream morphology and human activity on the use of rivers by Southern river otters *Lontra provocax* in Chile.

Vogel, G.M. (2004) *Lontra provocax*. In: IUCN (2004). 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org Downloaded on 22 April 2005.

* Range State not yet included in the CMS range list for this species.