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## Executive Summary

## Introduction

A Conservation Assessment and Management Plan (C.A.M.P.) Workshop for South Asian Non-Human Primates was held from 5-9 March 2002 at the State Forest Service College (SFSC) in Coimbatore, India. More than 50 field biologists from all over South Asia participated along with four Indian zoo personnel. The IUCN SSC Primate Specialist Group was well-represented with members from South Asia, UK and USA, including the PSG Vice Chair for Asia. The workshop could take advantage of new information from the Indo-US Primate Project (MoEF/USFWS) in India, the University of Mysore Loris study in southern India and the Primate Biology Programme (Smithsonian Institution) in Sri Lanka and several other smaller projects.

The South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. was endorsed by the IUCN SSC Primate Specialist Group, the IUCN SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group, the IUCN Regional Biodiversity Programme (RBP), Asia and the Indo-US Primate Project. Conservation International, Primate Conservation, Inc., Chester Zoo, North Carolina Zoological Park, Lincoln Park Zoo, Oklahoma City Zoo, Toronto Zoo, the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria, and Appenheul Primate Park provided funds for the workshop.

## The C.A.M.P. Process

The C.A.M.P. Process was developed by the IUCN SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG). It includes assembling experts such as wildlife managers, SSC Specialist Group members, representatives of the academic community or private sector, researchers, captive managers and other stakeholders who provide the most current information in order to a) assign species and subspecies to IUCN Categories of Threat; b) formulate broad-based management recommendations, and c) develop more comprehensive management and recovery programs in situ and/or ex situ. Extensive review is carried out by participants who desire to do so before the final Report is compiled and finalised.

## The 2001 IUCN Red List Criteria (Version 3.1)

C.A.M.P. workshops use the most recent version of the IUCN Red List Criteria and Categories and, where appropriate, the IUCN SSC Guidelines for Application of IUCN Red List Criteria at Regional Levels, as tools in assessing the status of a group of taxa. In the last decade IUCN has improved the method of assessing taxa by incorporating numerical values attached to the different criteria for threat categories. The 2001 version of the Red List Criteria and Categories use a set of five criteria (population reduction; restricted distribution, continuing decline and fluctuation; restricted population and continuing decline; very small population; and probability of extinction) to determine the threatened categories, which are Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN) and Vulnerable (VU). Other categories are Extinct (EX), Extinct in the Wild (EW), Near Threatened (NT), Least Concern (LC), Data Deficient (DD) and Not Evaluated (NE).

## The Workshop

Six South Asian countries were represented at the workshop: India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh with participants present, and Bhutan and Pakistan via email throughout the exercise. C.A.M.P. workshops use working group sessions alternating with review in several plenary sessions. In this workshop the groups were organised by region into a Southern India Group, a North-East Alliance Group, a NorthCentral Group, and a Sri Lanka Group.

One of the important issues that had been addressed in the workshop concerned the revisions in primate taxonomy. Participants were given access to an unpublished manuscript authored by Brandon-Jones et al. that incorporated changes resulting from a Primate Specialist Group (PSG) workshop in 2000, to published revisions by Colin Groves (2001) and other refinements. Primates are relatively well-studied in some South Asian countries, so a separate spreadsheet for listing the extensive locality data was provided. This very detailed locality data, coordinated with maps, and the presence of an experienced taxonomist, made it possible for participants to correctly identify the subspecies surveyed and assess them.

With the added advantage of having many working field biologists from the range of these taxa, there were many more species and subspecies assigned to threatened categories than in the 2000 Red List of Threatened Animals, which used the revised PSG workshop taxonomy available then. In the C.A.M.P. workshop, 31 of the 43 primate taxa were categorized as threatened.

A Draft Report containing Taxon Data Sheets for all 43 taxa was given to participants at the end of the workshop thanks to the C.A.M.P. Data Entry Programme and hard work by recorders. This report reflects the corrections and comments that were returned on the draft Taxon Data Sheets. The output from the workshop has been submitted to the PSG Vice Chair for Asia for inclusion in 2003 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. This is an appropriate utilisation of information from local field biologists and primate students from South Asia, and a credit to their work.

There are at present 164 recognized zoos in India, which includes Large, Medium, Small and Mini Zoos / Deer Parks. As per current information (CZA, 2003) 52 of the Large, Medium and Small zoos in India, hold primates of various species. The status of some is uncertain because of recent taxonomic changes. The number in the 112 Mini-zoos and Deer Parks has not been updated by C.Z.A, but it is "considerable". In the remaining South Asian countries there are 14 major zoos, all of which hold from $1-9$ species of primates (Appendix 1). The C.A.M.P. workshop provided a forum and source of information for the Central Zoo Authority and the Indian zoo community to address ongoing revisions in primate taxonomy and nomenclature with reference to captive collections. The Conservation Breeding Working Group recommended that zoos with species and subspecies of uncertain taxonomies refrain from breeding them until they could be correctly identified to avoid unwanted propagation of hybrids.

## Recommendations

A series of recommendations for research and management of South Asian primates was derived from Taxon Data Sheets filled out by participants in the workshop. Key recommendations for research were taxonomic studies, surveys and life history studies; and for management included habitat management, public education and monitoring. Participants also drew up individual species action plans for nearly all taxa. Special issue working groups were formed on the following subjects: urban monkey problems; funding field studies; education and species conservation action, and conservation breeding.

## Table 1: Status of South Asian Primates

| Category | Endemics | Non-endemics | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critically Endangered (CR) | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |
| Endangered (EN) | 20 | 5 | 25 | $\square \frac{\mathrm{NT}}{14 \%}$ |
| Vulnerable (VU) | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |
| Near Threatened (NT) | 5 | 1 | 6 |  |
| Least Concern (LC) | 3 | 1 | 4 | - 9\% |
| Data Deficient (DD) | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| Not Evaluated (NE) | 3 | 0 10 | 0 43 | CR $5 \%$ $12 \%$ |

Table 2: Status of Endemic and Non-endemic taxa in detail

| Status | Endemics |  | Status | Non-endemics |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CR | 2 | 9\% 3\% 6\% | CR | 2 | DD |
| EN | 20 | NT | EN | 5 | ) |
| VU | 2 | \% | VU | 0 | LC |
| NT | 5 |  | NT | 1 | 10\% |
| LC | 3 | U | LC | 1 | EN |
| DD | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ | $6 \% \quad \begin{aligned} & \text { EN } \\ & 61 \%\end{aligned}$ | DD | 10 | NT $10 \%$ |



Figure 1: Endemic and Non-endemic primate taxa

## List of South Asian Primates, C.A.M.P., Coimbatore, India, March, 2002 Scientific Name, Commom Name and Status (R-Regional Assessment for South Asia*)

## Loridae

1. Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus
2. Loris lydekkerianus malabaricus
3. Loris tardigradus grandis
4. Loris tardigradus nordicus
5. Loris tardigradus nycticeboides
6. Loris tardigradus tardigradus
7. Nycticebus bengalensis

| Mysore Slender Loris | NT |
| :--- | :--- |
| Malabar Slender Loris | NT |
| Highland Slender Loris | EN |
| Dry Zone Slender Loris | EN |
| Highland Slender Loris | EN |
| Red Slender Loris | EN |
| Slow Loris | DD (R) |

## Cercopithecidae

| 8. Macaca arctoides | Stump-tailed Macaque | CR (R) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9. Macaca assamensis assamensis | Eastern Assamese Macaque | EN(R) |
| 10. Macaca assamensis, Nepal population | Assamese Macaque | EN |
| 11. Macaca assamensis pelops | Western Assamese Macaque | EN |
| 12. Macaca fascicularis aurea | Long-tailed Macaque | CR(R) |
| 13. Macaca fascicularis umbrosa | Nicobar Long-tailed Macaque | NT |
| 14. Macaca leonina | Northern Pig-tailed Macaque | EN(R) |
| 15. Macaca mulatta mulatta | Indian Rhesus Macaque | LC(R) |
| 16. Macaca radiata diluta | Pale-bellied Bonnet Macaque | LC |
| 17. Macaca radiata radiata | Dark-bellied Bonnet Macaque | LC |
| 18. Macaca silenus | Lion-tailed Macaque | EN |
| 19. Macaca sinica aurifrons | Wetzone Toque Macaque | EN |
| 20. Macaca sinica opisthomelas | Hill Zone Toque Macaque | EN |
| 21. Macaca sinica sinica | Dryzone Toque Macaque | EN |
| 22. Semnopithecus (Trachypithecus) johnii johnii | Nilgiri Langur | VU |
| 23. Semnopithecus entellus achates | Western Hanuman Langur | LC |
| 24. Semnopithecus entellus ajax | Himalayan Grey Langur | CR |
| 25. Semnopithecus entellus anchises | Deccan Hanuman Langur | NT |
| 26. Semnopithecus entellus entellus | Bengal Hanuman Langur | NT |
| 27. Semnopithecus entellus hector | Lesser Hill Langur | EN |
| 28. Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos | Dark-legged Malabar Langur | EN |
| 29. Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus | Central Himalayan Langur | NT (R) |
| 30. Semnopithecus priam priam | Coromandel Grey Langur | VU |
| 31. Semnopithecus priam thersites ${ }^{1}$ | Grey Langur | EN |
| 32. Semnopithecus priam thersites ${ }^{2}$ | Grey Langur | EN |
| 33. Trachypithecus geei | Golden Langur | EN |
| 34. Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei | Phayre's Langur | EN(R) |
| 35. Trachypithecus pileatus brahma | Buff-bellied Langur | DD |
| 36. Trachypithecus pileatus durga | Orange-bellied Capped Leaf Monkey | EN |
| 37. Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus | Blonde-bellied Capped Leaf Monkey | EN(R) |
| 38. Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus | Tenebrous Capped Leaf Monkey | CR |
| 39. Trachypithecus vetulus monticola | Montane Purple-faced Langur | EN |
| 40. Trachypithecus vetulus nestor | Western Purple-faced Langur | CR |
| 41. Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki | Dry Zone Purple-faced Langur | EN |
| 42. Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus | Southern Lowland Wetzone | EN |
|  | Purple-faced langur |  |

## Hylobatidae

43. Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock Hoolock Gibbon EN(R)
[^1]
## Status of South Asian Primates

2. Background Material

## The Conservation Assessment and Management Plan (C.A.M.P.) Process

The Conservation Assessment and Management Plan (C.A.M.P.) Workshop is a "process" which was designed and developed by the Late Dr. Ulysses S. Seal, then Chairman of the IUCN SSC
Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG) and Dr. Thomas J. Foose, initially to assist zoos to prioritise species for conservation breeding. Over the years, and as a result of the careful manner in which the workshops have been planned and conducted, C.A.M.P. workshops have evolved and many improvements from workshops conducted all over the world incorporated into the process. Now C.A.M.P.s are increasingly used as a means of assisting regional and national biodiversity planning and for contributing far greater numbers of species to the Red List of Threatened Species. During this time C.A.M.P.s have continued to evolve, encompassing more recent scientific methodologies related to the requirements of the Convention on Biodiversity. C.A.M.P. Workshop Reports make available the most current information from the most recent fieldwork, and thus provide crucial direction for strategic management of threatened taxa in larger taxonomic groups.

Because the output of C.A.M.P. workshops affects wildlife policy and management through the IUCN Red List and wildlife legislation which takes its cue from the Red List, the social and scientific principles and methods established by the Conservation Breeding Specialist Group, and which are in a continuous process of evolution and improvement, should be followed meticulously. C.A.M.P. workshops have been designed to collect the knowledge of many stakeholders and to reflect the result of their combined experience and opinion after discussion. The IUCN Red List Criteria developed by IUCN SSC is an elegant system for assessing species across taxonomic orders but it is only as good as the rigour and information used to apply the Criteria and thus derive a Category.

Thus, the Taxon Data Sheet, which organises and summarises information needed to derive a status, provides a logical framework for discussion, thus providing a uniform standard and maintaining scientific integrity.

A C.A.M.P. Workshop brings together a broad spectrum of experts and stakeholders consisting of wildlife managers, biologists, representatives of the academic community or private sector, researchers, government officials and captive managers to pull together all pertinent information necessary to:
a. evaluate the current status of populations and habitats in the wild and in captivity;
b. assess the degree of threat using IUCN Red List Criteria;
c. make recommendations for intensive management action; and
d. make recommendations for specific conservation-oriented research and education.

A C.A.M.P. Workshop is intensive and interactive which facilitates objective and systematic discussion of research and management actions needed for species conservation, both in situ and ex situ. Workshop participants assess the risks to the target group of taxa and formulate recommendations for action using a Taxon Data Sheet. The Taxon Data Sheet serves as a compendium of the data collected on the status of population and its habitat in the wild as well as recommendations for intensive conservation action. Taxon Data Sheets also provide documentation of the reasoning behind recommendations, of the criteria used for deriving a status, as well as details of other species-pertinent information.

Information gathering is focused on the most recent available data, estimates, informed guesses and identification of needed knowledge that allow:

1. assignment to IUCN categories of threat;
2. broad-based management recommendations;
3. specific conservation-oriented research recommendations useful to generate the knowledge needed to develop more comprehensive management and recovery programs in situ and/or ex situ.

On the last day of a C.A.M.P. workshop, participants form Special Issue Working Groups to discuss problems of conservation and management that emerged in the workshop, making recommendations for their solution using information and assessments generated in the C.A.M.P. If time permits there is also a session for personal commitments related to the recommendations.

The results of the initial C.A.M.P. workshops are reviewed by distribution to the following: 1. as a draft to workshop participants immediately following the workshop
2. as a draft after corrections to a few senior biologists who were participants in the workshop.
3. as a Report to experts and other users of the information in the greater conservation community

A C.A.M.P. workshop is defined as a "process" because it is a part of a continuing and evolving development of creating and improving conservation and recovery plans for the taxa involved. The C.A.M.P. review process facilitates dissemination of information from experts locally and internationally. The "process" presumes that conditions will change for the populations and habitat and a follow-up workshop will be required to reconsider issues in greater depth, or on a regional basis, or incorporate the inevitable changes. This "process" provides a system of monitoring of the population status over time as well as of the implementation and effectiveness of the earlier workshop recommendations.

The C.A.M.P. process is unique in its ability to prioritize intensive management action for species conservation in the wild and in captivity, if required. C.A.M.P. documents are used as guidelines by national and regional wildlife agencies, NGO's, and zoos as they develop their own action plans. C.A.M.P. reports, with their dependence on methodology that is participatory, objective and scientific have proved to be acceptable to states and nations as well as institutions for developing biodiversity strategies. C.A.M.P. workshops contribute to the wise worldwide use of limited resources for species conservation.

## The 2001 IUCN Red List Criteria (Version 3.1)

The C.A.M.P. workshop process employs the IUCN Red List Criteria as a tool in assessing species status in a group of taxa. The IUCN Red List Criteria were revised in 1994 and these objective criteria were revised again in 2000 and ratified by the IUCN for use in threat categorisation at the global level (IUCN, 2001). The structure of the categories includes extinct, threatened, non-threatened, data deficient and not evaluated divisions; the first three divisions are further split into subcategories (Figure 1). Since 1991, the old Red Data Book categories have undergone successive changes to accommodate general guidelines for across taxonomic groups. To make application of the Criteria more universal, numerical values were attached to the different criteria for threat categories. The 2001 version (version 3.1) also includes a purely quantitative criterion, which involves computation of the probability of extinction
 (such as in a population viability analysis) over a time frame for a taxon. The 2001 version of the Red List threatened categories are derived through a set of 5 criteria based on which the threatened category is assigned. The term "threatened" according to the 2001 IUCN categories means Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable. The 5 criteria for threat categories (IUCN, 2001) are:
(A) Population reduction
(B) Restricted distribution, continuing decline and fluctuation
(C) Restricted population and continuing decline
(D) Very small population
(E) Probability of extinction

For a taxon to be categorised as threatened, it needs to qualify for any one of the above 5 criteria only. Not qualifying for any of the above criteria could mean that a taxon is either not threatened or is data deficient.

With the popularisation of the 1994 IUCN Red List Criteria and its application around the world, various specialists and scientists of taxonomic groups suggested a more serious look at the criteria. The IUCN formed a Red List Review Committee in 1998 to suggest changes to the 1994 Criteria and after nearly 2 years of workshops and deliberations, the 2001 IUCN Red List Criteria were drafted and accepted in October 2000. All assessments from 2001 are based on the latest version (3.1) of the Red List Criteria, including the current Conservation Assessment and Management Plan (C.A.M.P.) Workshop for Primates of South Asia (2002). The changes in the Criteria can be referred in IUCN (2001) (Appendix I of this report) but the overall structure of the Categories is shown in figure 1. The changes in the structure of the categories from the 1994 iteration include the upgrading of Lower Risk near threatened and least concern to full categories Near Threatened and Least Concern. The subcategory of Lower Risk conservation dependant was removed completely from the new structure.


Figure 1: Structure of the 2001 IUCN Categories
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THE CATEGORIES A representation of the
relationships between the categories is shown in Figure 1 of the Report.

## EXTINCT(EX)

A taxon is Extinct when there is no reasonable doubt that the last individual has died. A taxon is presumed Extinct when exhaustive surveys in known and/or expected habitat, at appropriate times (diurnal, seasonal, annual), throughout its historic range have failed to record an individual. Surveys should be over a time frame appropriate to the taxon's life cycle and life form.

## EXTINCTINTHE WILD (EW)

A taxon is Extinct in the Wild when it is known only to survive in cultivation, in captivity or as a naturalized population (or populations) well outside the past range. A taxon is presumed Extinct in the Wild when exhaustive surveys in known and/or expected habitat, at appropriate times (diurnal, seasonal, annual), throughout its historic range have failed to record an individual. Surveys should be over a time frame appropriate to the taxon's life cycle and life form.

## CRITICALLY ENDANGERED (CR)

A taxon is Critically Endangered when the best available evidence indicates that it meets any of the criteria A to E for Critically Endangered (see Section V), and it is therefore considered to be facing an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild.

## ENDANGERED(EN)

A taxon is Endangered when the best available evidence indicates that it meets any of the criteria $A$ to $E$ for Endangered (see Section V), and it is therefore considered to be facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild.

## VULNERABLE(VU)

A taxon is Vulnerable when the best available evidence indicates that it meets any of the criteria A to E for Vulnerable (Sec. V), and it is therefore considered to be facing a high risk of extinction in the wild.

Note: As in previous IUCN categories, the abbreviation of each category (in parenthesis) follows the English denominations when translated into other languages (see Annex 2).

## NEARTHREATENED(NT)

A taxon is Near Threatened when it has been evaluated against the criteria but does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable now, but is close to qualifying for or is likely to qualify for a threatened category in the near future.

## LEAST CONCERN(LC)

A taxon is Least Concern when it has been evaluated against the criteria and does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable or Near Threatened. Widespread and abundant taxa are included in this category.

## DATADEFICIENT(DD)

A taxon is Data Deficient when there is inadequate information to make a direct, or indirect, assessment of its risk of extinction based on its distribution and/or population status. A taxon in this category may be well studied, and its biology well known, but appropriate data on abundance and/or distribution are lacking. Data Deficient is therefore not a category of threat. Listing of taxa in this category indicates that more information is required and acknowledges the possibility that future research will show that threatened classification is appropriate. It is important to make positive use of whatever data are available.

In many cases great care should be exercised in choosing between DD and a threatened status. If the range of a taxon is suspected to be relatively circumscribed, and a considerable period of time has elapsed since the last record of the taxon, threatened status may well be justified.

## NOTEVALUATED(NE)

A taxon is Not Evaluated when it is has not yet been evaluated against the criteria.

## THE IUCN RED LIST CRITERIA

## CRITICALLY ENDANGERED(CR)

A taxon is Critically Endangered when the best available evidence indicates that it meets any of the following criteria (A to E), and it is therefore considered to be facing an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild:
A. Reduction in population size based on any of the following: 1. An observed, estimated, inferred or suspected population size reduction of $>$ or $=90 \%$ over the last 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer, where the causes of the reduction are clearly reversible AND understood AND ceased, based on (and specifying) any of the following:
(a) direct observation
(b) an index of abundance appropriate to the taxon
(c) a decline in area of occupancy, extent of occurrence and/or quality of habitat
(d) actual or potential levels of exploitation
(e) the effects of introduced taxa, hybridization, pathogens, pollutants, competitors or parasites.
2. An observed, estimated, inferred or suspected population size reduction of $>$ or $=80 \%$ over the last 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer, where the reduction or its causes may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible, based on (and specifying) any of (a) to (e) under A1.
3. A population size reduction of $>$ or $=80 \%$, projected or suspected to be met within the next 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer (up to a maximum of 100 years), based on (and specifying) any of (b) to (e) under A1.
4. An observed, estimated, inferred, projected or suspected population size reduction of $>$ or $=80 \%$ over any 10 year or three generation period, whichever is longer (up to a maximum of 100 years in the future), where the time period must include both the past and the future, and where the reduction or its causes may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible, based on (and specifying) any of (a) to (e) under A1.
B. Geographic range in the form of either B1 (extent of occurrence) OR B2 (area of occupancy) OR both:

1. Extent of occurrence estimated to be less than 100 $\mathrm{km}^{2}$, and estimates indicating at least two of a-c:
a. Severely fragmented or known to exist at only a single location.
b. Continuing decline, observed, inferred or projected, in
any of the following:
(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 the following:
(i) extent of occurrence
(ii) area of occupancy
(iii) number of locations or subpopulations
(iv) number of mature individuals.
2. Area of occupancy estimated to be less than $10 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$, and estimates indicating at least two of a-c:
a. Severely fragmented or known to exist at only a single location.
b. Continuing decline, observed, inferred or projected, in any of the following:
(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 the following:
(i) extent of occurrence
(ii) area of occupancy
(iii) number of locations or subpopulations
(iv) number of mature individuals.
C. Population size estimated to number fewer than 250 mature individuals and either:
3. An estimated continuing decline of at least $25 \%$ within three years or one generation, whichever is longer, (up to a maximum of 100 years in the future) OR 2. A continuing decline, observed, projected, or inferred, in numbers of mature individuals AND at least one of the following $(\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b})$ :
a. Population structure in the form of one of the following: (i) no subpopulation estimated to contain more than 50 mature individuals, OR
(ii) at least $90 \%$ of mature individuals in one subpopulation.
b. Extreme fluctuations in number of mature individuals.
D. Population size estimated to number fewer than 50 mature individuals.
E. Quantitative analysis showing the probability of extinction in the wild is at least $50 \%$ within 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer (up to a maximum of 100 years).

## ENDANGERED(EN)

A taxon is Endangered when the best available evidence indicates that it meets any of the following criteria (A to E), and it is therefore considered to be facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild:
A. Reduction in population size based on any of the following:

1. An observed, estimated, inferred or suspected population size reduction of $>$ or $=70 \%$ over the last 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer, where the causes of the reduction are clearly reversible AND understood AND ceased, based on (and specifying) any of the following:
(a) direct observation
(b) an index of abundance appropriate to the taxon
(c) a decline in area of occupancy, extent of occurrence and/or quality of habitat
(d) actual or potential levels of exploitation
(e) the effects of introduced taxa, hybridization, pathogens, pollutants, competitors or parasites.
2. An observed, estimated, inferred or suspected population size reduction of $>$ or $=50 \%$ over the last 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer, where the reduction or its causes may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible, based on (and specifying) any of (a) to (e) under A1. 3. A population size reduction of $>$ or $=50 \%$, projected or suspected to be met within the next 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer (up to a maximum of 100 years), based on (and specifying) any of (b) to (e) under A1.
3. An observed, estimated, inferred, projected or suspected population size reduction of $>$ or $=50 \%$ over any 10 year or three generation period, whichever is longer (up to a maximum of 100 years in the future), where the time period must include both the past and the future, and where the reduction or its causes may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible, based on (and specifying) any of (a) to (e) under A1.
B. Geographic range in the form of either B1 (extent of occurrence) OR B2 (area of occupancy) OR both:
4. Extent of occurrence estimated to be less than 5000 $\mathrm{km}^{2}$, and estimates indicating at least two of a-c:
a. Severely fragmented or known to exist at no more than five locations.
b. Continuing decline, observed, inferred or projected, in any of the following:
(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 the following:
(i) extent of occurrence
(ii) area of occupancy
(iii) number of locations or subpopulations
(iv) number of mature individuals.
5. Area of occupancy estimated to be less than $500 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$, and estimates indicating at least two of a-c:
a. Severely fragmented or known to exist at no more than five locations.
b. Continuing decline, observed, inferred or projected, in any of the following:
(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 the following:
(i) extent of occurrence
(ii) area of occupancy
(iii) number of locations or subpopulations
(iv) number of mature individuals.
C. Population size estimated to number fewer than 2500 mature individuals and either:
6. An estimated continuing decline of at least $20 \%$ within five years or two generations, whichever is longer, (up to a maximum of 100 years in the future) OR 2. A continuing decline, observed, projected, or inferred, in numbers of mature individuals AND at least one of the following (a-b):
a. Population structure in the form of one of the following:
(i) no subpopulation estimated to contain more than 250 mature individuals, OR
(ii) at least $95 \%$ of mature individuals in one subpopulation.
b. Extreme fluctuations in number of mature individuals.
D. Population size estimated to number fewer than 250 mature individuals.
E. Quantitative analysis showing the probability of extinction in the wild is at least $20 \%$ within 20 years or five generations, whichever is the longer (up to a maximum of 100 years).

## VULNERABLE(VU)

A taxon is Vulnerable when the best available evidence indicates that it meets any of the following criteria (A to E ), and it is therefore considered to be facing a high risk of extinction in the wild:
A. Reduction in population size based on any of the following: 1. An observed, estimated, inferred or suspected population size reduction of $>$ or $=50 \%$ over the last 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer, where the causes of the reduction are: clearly reversible AND understood AND ceased, based on (and specifying) any of the following:
(a) direct observation
(b) an index of abundance appropriate to the taxon
(c) a decline in area of occupancy, extent of occurrence and/or quality of habitat
(d) actual or potential levels of exploitation
(e) the effects of introduced taxa, hybridization, pathogens, pollutants, competitors or parasites.
2. An observed, estimated, inferred or suspected population size reduction of $>$ or $=30 \%$ over the last 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer, where the reduction or its causes may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible, based on (and specifying) any of (a) to (e) under A1.
3. A population size reduction of $>$ or $=30 \%$, projected or suspected to be met within the next 10 years or three generations, whichever is the longer (up to a maximum of 100 years), based on (and specifying) any of (b) to (e) under A1.
4. An observed, estimated, inferred, projected or suspected population size reduction of $>$ or $=30 \%$ over any 10 year or three generation period, whichever is longer (up to a maximum of 100 years in the future), where the time period must include both the past and the future, and where the reduction or its causes may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible, based on (and specifying) any of (a) to (e) under A1.
B. Geographic range in the form of either B1 (extent of occurrence) OR B2 (area of occupancy) OR both:

1. Extent of occurrence estimated to be less than 20,000 $\mathrm{km}^{2}$, and estimates indicating at least two of a-c:
a. Severely fragmented or known to exist at no more than 10 locations. b. Continuing decline, observed, inferred or projected, in any of the following:
(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 the following:
(i) extent of occurrence
(ii) area of occupancy
(iii) number of locations or subpopulations
(iv) number of mature individuals.
2. Area of occupancy estimated to be less than $2000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$, and estimates indicating at least two of a-c:
a. Severely fragmented or known to exist at no more than 10 locations.
b. Continuing decline, observed, inferred or projected, in any of the following:
(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 the following:
(i) extent of occurrence
(ii) area of occupancy
(iii) number of locations or subpopulations
(iv) number of mature individuals.
C. Population size estimated to number fewer than 10,000 mature individuals and either:
3. An estimated continuing decline of at least $10 \%$ within 10 years or three generations, whichever is longer, (up to a maximum of 100 years in the future) OR 2. A continuing decline, observed, projected, or inferred, in numbers of mature individuals AND at least one of the following $(a-b)$ : $a$. Population structure in the form of one of the following:
(i) no subpopulation estimated to contain more than 1000 mature individuals, OR
(ii) all mature individuals are in one subpopulation.
b. Extreme fluctuations in number of mature individuals.
D. Population very small or restricted in the form of either of the following:
4. Population size estimated to number fewer than 1000 mature individuals.
5. Population with a very restricted area of occupancy (typically less than $20 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ) or number of locations (typically five or fewer) such that it is prone to the effects of human activities or stochastic events within a very short time period in an uncertain future, and is thus capable of becoming Critically Endangered or even Extinct in a very short time period.
E. Quantitative analysis showing the probability of extinction in the wild is at least $10 \%$ within 100 years.

Table 1: Status of South Asian primates with IUCN categories and criteria

| Scientific taxon name | Status, 2002 | Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loridae |  |  |
| 1. Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus | Near Threatened | - |
| 2. Loris lydekkerianus malabaricus | Near Threatened | - |
| 3. Loris tardigradus grandis | Endangered | A2cd+4cd; <br> B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 4. Loris tardigradus nordicus | Endangered | A2cd+4cd |
| 5. Loris tardigradus nycticeboides | Endangered | A2cd+4cd; B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 6. Loris tardigradus tardigradus | Endangered | A2cd+4cd |
| 7. Nycticebus bengalensis | Data Deficient in SA | - |
| Cercopithecidae |  |  |
| 8. Macaca arctoides | Critically Endangered in SA | C2a(i) |
| 9. Macaca assamensis assamensis | Endangered in SA | C2a(i) |
| 10. Macaca assamensis Nepal population | Endangered | B1a+b(i,ii,iii,v); C2a(i) |
| 11. Macaca assamensis pelops | Endangered | Blab(i,ii,iii)+2ab(i,ii,iii); C2a(i) |
| 12. Macaca fascicularis aurea | Critically Endangered in SA | A2c+3c+4c; B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v);D |
| 13. Macaca fascicularis umbrosa | Near Threatened | - |
| 14. Macaca leonina | Endangered in SA | B2ab(ii,iii,iv,v); C2a(i) |
| 15. Macaca mulatta mulatta | Least Concern in SA | - |
| 16. Macaca radiata diluta | Least Concern | - |
| 17. Macaca radiata radiata | Least Concern | - |
| 18. Macaca silenus | Endangered | C2a(i) |
| 19. Macaca sinica aurifrons | Endangered | A2cd +4 cd |
| 20. Macaca sinica opisthomelas | Endangered | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A2cd+4cd; B1ab(i,iii,iii,iv,v) } \\ & +2 \mathrm{ab}(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{ii}, \mathrm{iii}, \mathrm{iv}, \mathrm{v}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 21. Macaca sinica sinica | Endangered | A2cd+4cd |
| 22. Semnopithecus (T.) johnii johnii | Vulnerable | C2a(i) |
| 23. Semnopithecus entellus achates | Least Concern | - |
| 24. Semnopithecus entellus ajax | Critically Endangered | B1ab(iii,v)+2ab(iii,v) |
| 25. Semnopithecus entellus anchises | Near Threatened | - |
| 26. Semnopithecus entellus entellus | Near Threatened |  |
| 27. Semnopithecus entellus hector | Endangered | B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 28. Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos | Endangered | B2ab(ii,iii) |
| 29. Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus | Near Threatened in SA | - |
| 30. Semnopithecus priam priam | Vulnerable | B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 31. Semnopithecus priam thersites (India) | Endangered | B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 32. Semnopithecus priam thersites (Sri Lanka) | Endangered | A2cd+4cd |
| 33. Trachypithecus geei | Endangered | B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 34. Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei | Endangered in SA | C1+2a(i) |
| 35. Trachypithecus pileatus brahma | Data Deficient | - |
| 36. Trachypithecus pileatus durga | Endangered | C1+2a(i) |
| 37. Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus | Endangered in SA | C1+2a(i); D |
| 38. Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus | Critically Endangered | C2a(i) |
| 39. Trachypithecus vetulus monticola | Endangered | A2cd+4cd; B1ab(ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 40. Trachypithecus vetulus nestor | Critically Endangered | A2cd $+3 \mathrm{~cd}+4 \mathrm{~cd}$ |
| 41. Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki | Endangered | A2cd +4 cd |
| 42. Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus | Endangered | A2cd +4 cd |
| Hylobatidae |  |  |
| 43. Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock | Endangered in SA | A2abcd +3 bcd ; $\mathrm{C} 1+2 \mathrm{a}$ (i) |
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## Introduction

The South Asian region (once called the Indian subsontinent) consists of seven countries (Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka), which constitutes an area of very high biodiversity. This is attested by the fact that Mittermeier, et al. (1999) have identified two mainland "hotspots" within the region, e.g. Western Ghats and Eastern Himalaya. The region's biodiversity is threatened by developmental enthusiasm adopted by South Asian governments, and also by intermittent ethnic and political clashes. Primates, among other taxa, are facing varying degrees of extinction threats in the region. South Asia can claim 43 primate taxa, of which 2 are endemic species, 28 are endemic subspecies, 3 are endemic populations, 3 are non-endemic species and 7 are non-endemic subspecies.

In 1997, a C.A.M.P. Workshop for Indian Mammals, including 15 primate species which occur in India, was conducted as part of a larger project for India, the Biodiversity Conservation Prioritisation Project (BCPP). These assessments of endemic Indian primates were accepted by the IUCN SSC Primate Specialist Group (PSG) which sent it to IUCN SSC to be included in the 2000 IUCN Red List. The mammal workshop, of necessity, could include only a few primate specialists, as more than 400 mammals of India from all mammal groups had to be assessed. Therefore, five years later it was decided to conduct an entirely primate-focused C.A.M.P. Review of the 1997 assessments of Indian primates and a regional assessment of all primates of South Asia.

Primates form an integral part of biodiversity and a cognizable link between humans and nature. In South Asia several Hindu epics and plays of ancient times feature primates as integral to the philosophy of these works. This bond of kinship still exists between primates and humans in the region, which can be used to benefit biodiversity conservation by focusing on primates as flagship species. In addition, assessing the status of primates in this Workshop has not only provided conservation focus for this important taxonomic group regionally, but will also assist participating nations with a national assessment of primates for their country's biodiversity strategy.

Extensive efforts were made to contact all primate field biologists, and to collect information from other sources both published and unpublished. Primate field biologists from the range countries were prioritised for inclusion in the workshop. A complete list of participants and their affiliations appear at the beginning of the report.

## The Workshop

A Conservation Assessment and Management Plan Workshop for South Asian Non-human Primates was held during 5-9 March 2002 at the State Forest Service College (SFSC) in Coimbatore, India. About 50 participants including field biologists and taxonomists from all over South Asia participated along with four Indian zoo personnel and two members of the IUCN SSC Primate Specialist Group from USA and UK. The workshop could take advantage of new information from the Indo-US Primate Project in India (USFWS/MoEF), the Primate Biology Program (Smithsonian Institution) in Sri

Lanka and several other, smaller projects.
The South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. was endorsed by the IUCN SSC Primate Specialist Group, the IUCN SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group, the IUCN SSC Regional Biodiversity Programme (RBP), Asia and the Indo-US Primate Project. Sponsors of the workshop were Conservation International, Primate Conservation Inc., Chester Zoo, North Carolina Zoological Park, Lincoln Park Zoo, Oklahoma City Zoo, Toronto Zoo, the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria, and Appenheul Primate Park.

The primary focus of the workshop was endemic primate taxa of South Asia which number 33 in 2 Families, e.g. Cercopithecidae ( 25 taxa) and Loridae ( 7 taxa). These taxa were prioritised for first attention. Non-endemic primates were also covered, using the Regional Guidelines for Application of IUCN Red List Criteria at sub-global level. National assessments for species with distribution in more than one country were done.

The draft manuscript of the most recent taxonomic revisions by Brandon-Jones et al. as well as Colin Groves (2001) publication, stimulated intensive discussion at the workshop. The problem with both taxonomic systems was that some taxa, which had been considered as one species for some years and surveyed as such, had been split into several species (in the case of Groves) and subspecies (in the case of Brandon-Jones) and, on the other hand, some known subspecies had been ignored. It was decided to use the most recent draft of the Brandon-Jones et al. work with a few modifications as the workshop taxa list. Agreement on the final workshop species and subspecies list was the result of a consensus among taxonomists and a broad spectrum of field biologists that actually lived and worked in these species' ranges and were familiar, in many cases through close study, with the primates under consideration.

A selection of zoo directors were exposed to the revised taxonomy for the first time and deliberated on the effect of these revisions on their conservation strategy. The first steps toward a Primate Captive Action Plan for the whole of South Asia was initiated.

## Workshop objectives

The objectives of the workshop included:

- Networking of all South Asian primatologists - academics, government agencies, nongovernmental organizations and institutions, zoos, selected individuals and other stakeholders.
- Providing an opportunity for all stakeholders, particularly those native to South Asia, to actively participate in a process that results in the derivation of the conservation status of primate taxa of the region using the IUCN Red List Criteria and Categories.
- Deriving an accurate IUCN category for all South Asian primate taxa based on available information - published or unpublished - as a rapid assessment providing adequate documentation as required by the IUCN Red List protocol.
- Drafting specific taxon-based and habitat-based action plans for the protection of the primates and their habitat.
- Establishing research and management priorities for future action.
- Identifying immediate needs for practical conservation-oriented steps for follow-up.


## Workshop participants

The Workshop drew upon the collective expertise of local primate researchers gathered in a large group, perhaps the most representative ever for the South Asian Region. The primary objective of the workshop was to assess the conservation status of endemic and non-endemic primates of South Asia, giving priority to those thought to be under heavy threat. The "regional" focus, in which field biologists from at least four of the South Asian countries were brought together, had the real advantage of permitting discussion on trans-national issues of taxa ranging between countries. It created a bond between primatologists in the region who worked together very intensively for five days to produce a written product on the primates of their country and region that now can be used by policy makers, politicians, press and the public for conservation action.

## Output

Based on the data readily available in 2000, many primate taxa in the region (species and subspecies, endemic and non-endemic) already were identified as EN (19) and VU (11). The assessment in 2000 and in the earlier C.A.M.P. in 1997 did not, however, include much of the unpublished data that had been accumulated as the result of recent field studies, including those of doctoral candidates working under the auspices of the Indo-US Primate Project or the Smithsonian Primate Project. The output from the workshop was submitted to the PSG Vice Chair for Asia for submission to IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2003. This is a valuable practical application of data from local field biologists and primate students from South Asia and a credit to their work.

## Special issues

Participants also drew up individual Species Action Plans for nearly all species. "Special Issue" Working Groups were formed on the following subjects: Urban monkey problems; Funding Field Studies; Education and Species Conservation Action; and Conservation Breeding.

Special issues such as taxonomy were discussed along with basic information relevant to the conservation of each taxon (including population numbers, distribution, number of mature individuals, threats, trade, etc.) and ultimately an IUCN category was derived from the combined information from participants. Research and management recommendations were made on the basis of information collected on the status of the taxa. This Report and a summary of the Report will be widely circulated to workshop participants, wildlife agency personnel, conservation NGOs, policy makers, academic institutions and other individuals in order to aid primate conservation.

## Methods for assessment

Primates are relatively well-studied in some South Asian countries so an innovation in this C.A.M.P. was to provide a separate spread sheet for listing all known localities, instead of a few lines as normally is provided in the Taxon Data Sheets. For some species such as Hoolock Gibbon, Golden Langur, Rhesus and Bonnet Macaques, and all Sri Lankan primates, participants filled more than three long pages with locality data. This very detailed locality data, which was coordinated with maps, made it
possible for participants to correctly identify subspecies surveyed and assess them. Participants completed this demanding task before filling out their Taxon Data Sheets.

Data forms called "Biological Information Sheets" were distributed to all invitees and many who were not in a position to attend in person returned these forms with current information. Information from all sources was recorded in the C.A.M.P. Data Entry Programme for review by participants.

In a C.A.M.P., most of the work is done in working groups and reviewed in several plenary sessions. In this workshop the groups were organised by region with a South India Group, a North-East Alliance (including northeastern India, Nepal and Bangladesh), a North-Central Group (also included Nepal), and a Sri Lanka Group.

## Taxon Data Sheets and assessment logic

The Taxon Data Sheet used at the workshop was divided into various sections, viz.:

## 1. Part one

General information including taxonomy, habit, habitat, distribution, locality information, threats, populations, trade, field studies, data quality, qualifier and uncertainty.

## 2. Part two

Status assessment as per information provided in Part One based on the 2001 IUCN Red List Criteria, CITES listing, national wildlife laws, presence in protected areas and previous assessments.

## 3. Part three

Uncertainty issues related to data quality, qualifiers and group dynamics with respect to assessments.

## 4. Part four

Recommendations for research, monitoring, captive breeding, education, population and habitat viability assessment and comments on the species.

## 5. Part five

Information on migration between adjacent populations across international boundaries, threats, colonization effects, etc. to do with assessing species at the national level.

## 6. Partsix

Compilers of primary working group, reviewers of the data and sources referred to in deriving literature and other unpublished information.

Information was gathered in this 8-page Taxon Data Sheet and also electronically recorded in the C.A.M.P. Data Entry Programme developed by the Conservation Breeding Specialist Group. National assessment for primates within South Asia was attempted at the workshop after assessments of all endemic taxa were completed. For some taxa with problems, information on the overall distribution was gathered and an agreement made by participants that the status would be derived after the workshop after sorting out the taxonomy. All assessments were ratified by participants in plenary
sessions with much discussion, which ultimately led to consensus within the workshop.
The Taxon Data Sheets are included in a separate section of this report. A synopsis of information compiled for the species and data interpretation is given in the following pages for better understanding of the process and status assessments.

The information compiled using the Taxon Data Sheets was used in a logical deduction of the status first using the global IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria (2001) in the case of endemics. In the case of non-endemics, the taxon distribution within the region was assessed using the global criteria, followed by the regional guidelines. National assessments were carried out in a similar manner using the regional guidelines. The following flowcahrt interprets the use of information and the criteria in deriving the status.

Figure 2. Flowchart to explain the process of assessments for primates in South Asia*


## Interpretation and data source

The primate C.A.M.P. workshop was much enhanced by the presence of participants from the IndoUS Primate Project, a fact reflected in the amount of detailed distribution, population and status information on primates in different parts of the country. Primates are one of the better-studied mammal groups in the region, may be next only to large felids and pachyderms. The depth of study, however, follows a descending order of detail starting with macaques, langurs, gibbon and finally lorises. During the last 5 years the Indo-US Primate Project has helped with studies on the relatively neglected primate - gibbons in northeastern India; and University of Mysore has helped with the study on the Slender Lorises of southern India. The once rare Slender Loris has been found in many places in Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh and this report includes information from those studies. Although some studies on gibbons were done in the past, the northeastern team of the Indo-US project studied all the habitats in which gibbons are found and the results like-wise are incorporated in this report. The same depth of knowledge for gibbons in Bangladesh can be attributed to one group of primatologists from Dhaka and Jehangirnagar universities who have been studying them in different localities in the country. The degree of knowledge about primates is reflected in the details provided by the field biologists at the workshop. For the region, the most studies appear to have been conducted on Indian primates. To date, a few studies have been conducted in Bhutan; Tashi Wangchuk provided information and literature by email. Pakistan biologists were not present at the workshop, so the information for that country was obtained through the literature and by email with C. Shafique before and during the workshop proceedings.

## Distribution

Thanks to the extensive studies conducted by primatologists of the region, primate distribution was recorded by the participants at the workshop without much difficulty. For some better-studied taxa, distribution information was available to very minute details including the range or beat within a forested area. For the non-controversial taxa the distribution data fit into taxon data sheets easily as compared to the controversial taxa, viz., the Semnopithecus entellus group. The primatologists of the region were not very comfortable in distinguishing subspecies and therefore provided information for this group on the species level. They were able to separate the locality information according to Brandon-Jones' advice for subspecific distribution as per his study of museum specimens and their data. It was understood at the workshop that Brandon-Jones would work on the distribution further and reassign the ranges after a thorough study of museum specimens and their localities at the Bombay Natural History Society. The distribution ranges for the Semnopithecus entellus group presented in this report are based on the studies conducted after the workshop and with the agreement of all the workshop participants.

In the case of Sri Lankan primates, information on distribution of taxa is on a broader scale. The northern parts of Sri Lanka, subject to many years of war, had fewer up-to-date observations of primate distribution than parts of the island that had fewer travel restrictions. Where taxonomic difficulties arose (one subspecies of loris and one toque macaque) observations of geographic distribution relied on the nomenclature of earlier published works specific to Sri Lanka.

## Range, Area and population numbers

Since most taxa have very good information on the extent of occurrence and area of occupancy, more
accurate estimates were made at the workshop for primates on the mainland, thanks to the various focused primate studies. Unfortunately, for Sri Lanka this information was not available and only broad estimates were made for most taxa. There were no population estimates for lorises in South Asia.

## Data Quality

Much of the information provided was based on direct observations in recent field studies. Some comparative data from older studies was used to assess population and habitat declines. Indirect information from hunting of and trade in primates was used to derive threats and thereby status. As for taxonomy, it was decided to let taxonomists (mainly the PSG) sort out the information provided in the workshop. For all macaques, gibbon and langurs (except pileated langur in northeastern India), information on their distribution, threats and status was based on direct observation and some indirect evidence. For lorises in India and Sri Lanka, much of the distribution information was through direct observation but for other areas distribution was inferred from indirect sources and extrapolated from information from one or two locations.

## Uncertainty

Taxonomy produced the most uncertainty; participants were uncertain about the distribution of taxa, especially lorises and the Semnopithecus entellus group. However, this was sorted out with the experts providing information for the species and the taxonomists resolving the distribution of the subspecies.

## South Asian primate taxonomy

Contrary to popular belief, higher primate taxonomy remains unsettled and debatable and extensive basic taxonomic research is still required. In the Asian Colobinae, for example, the number of genera and their species composition are disputed. Dissent over generic status influences the output of a C.A.M.P. workshop only in deciding the generic nomenclature adopted. Dissonance at lower taxonomic levels directly dictates the number of populations assessed and their geographic distribution. The workshop was not convened to resolve these taxonomic issues, but many of the participants possessed information which could clarify some of the problems.

Brandon-Jones recommended selecting one available classification as the basis for the taxonomy followed by the workshop, so that the adopted generic arrangement is apparent, and assessed taxa can readily be identified without including in the report a precise definition of each taxon. Where the workshop felt obliged to digress in any respect from the selected classification, this is specified and explained later in the report.

The objective of the C.A.M.P. workshop was not merely to assess the conservation status of primate species, but also that of the smallest primate populations considered potentially recognizable as taxa. Such populations are usually termed subspecies, but where their status is more equivocal, the term "evolutionary significant unit" or "ESU' has been used. To facilitate this objective, it was appropriate to select a work which included an Asian primate subspecific classification. This unfortunately eliminated two major works: Corbet and Hill (1992) and Groves (1993), which otherwise would have suited as widely known, recently published, reasonably consensual classifications. Ellerman and Morrison-Scott (1966) does include a subspecific classification, but its generic, specific and subspecific arrangement has been largely superseded by more recent research and therefore to employ it would have involved a considerable amount of documented modification, effectively creating a new classification. The only remaining options seemed to be to follow Groves (2001) or the species and subspecies list adopted by the C.A.M.P. participants based on Brandon-Jones et al. draft and some older literature (like Hill, 1934).

Workshop participants decided to follow the work of Brandon-Jones et al. (2003; unpublished when the C.A.M.P. was conducted) because two of the authors involved in the compilation of that report ("Primate Taxonomy for the New Millennium", held at the Disney Institute, Orlando, Florida, USA, from 25-29 February 2000), Douglas Brandon-Jones and Ardith Eudey, were participants at the C.A.M.P. workshop and were able to respond to questions about this compilation. This classification had the added advantage of already having been adopted by the IUCN/SSC Primate Specialist Group as the basis for the 2001 Asian Primate Red List, and will be followed in the forthcoming primate taxonomy paper. Unlike Groves (2001), the Orlando workshop also made a concerted effort to identify all populations potentially recognizable as taxa, bringing it more in line with the objectives of the C.A.M.P. workshop.

Concern was expressed over the adoption of the generic name Semnopithecus for the Indian langurs. Some participants seemed to feel that, as there is still controversy over whether Trachypithecus is generically separable from Semnopithecus, the safer option would be to retain Presbytis, the generic name employed until recently. Brandon-Jones assured the workshop that, although a consensus might
eventually decide to retain Trachypithecus in Semnopithecus, there is no longer any likelihood that Semnopithecus will remain in Presbytis. Presbytis is now firmly established as the generic name denoting a distinct group of species, including Presbytis melalophos, restricted to the Malay Peninsula and archipelago.

The absence of taxonomic clarity related in particular to the Hanuman Langur, for example, apart from explaining the motivation behind the Orlando report, and providing general advice on Asian primate taxonomy, the chief task for Brandon-Jones was to overcome skepticism at the recognizability of Semnopithecus entellus subspecies. Most participants seemed unaware that the official tally, as sanctioned by Ellerman and Morrison-Scott (1966), is fifteen subspecies.

Some participants evidently doubted the existence of more than one subspecies, and were under the misapprehension that recognized subspecies are of recent inception. The reverse is actually the case and both Groves (2001) and the Orlando workshop have reduced the number of recognized Indian langur taxa. Groves (2001) recognized seven, the Orlando workshop recognized ten. No subspecies have been described since 1928 and at present there is no indication that any more remain to be described. Those that exist are distinct. Their recognition by Groves (2001) as seven species is not unreasonable. There is no question that the conservation status of each one should be separately assessed, and zoos should make efforts to avoid hybridizing them. Brandon-Jones had inadequate time to prepare a detailed report on Indian langur subspecies before the C.A.M.P. workshop, but discussion with participants, field observations and a stop-over at Mumbai, allowing an examination of the Bombay Natural History Society Asian colobine collection, enabled him to combine this with other information already in his possession and a literature survey to produce a review of the subspecies submitted for publication in Zoos' Print Journal. This will be the subspecific classification followed by both the Orlando and the C.A.M.P. report.

## Recent field studies

The report includes most of the recent field studies conducted on primate taxa in South Asia. This is available as part of the Taxon Data Sheet as also in the distribution tables.

## Results

From the previous figure of 15 taxa recognized in India (Molur et al., 1998), the current number of primate taxa stand at 43 . The 2002 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species lists almost the same number of taxa of primates as assessed in this workshop. However, the assessments differ due to better and more current information available at the CAMP. The overall status of primates as a group in South Asia is that 31 of the 43 taxa ( $72 \%$ ) are threatened! Two of the 12 non-threatened species lack any information for a meaningful status assessment and therefore are classified as Data Deficient. A summary of primate status in South Asia is provided in Table 1 along with the criteria for assessing the threatened taxa.

Thirty-three ( $77 \%$ ) of the 43 primates are endemic to South Asia. Their representation in different countries within the region is indicated in table 2. India tops the list with 13 endemic taxa followed by Sri Lanka with 12 endemic primate subspecies. Nepal has one endemic primate population, while 8 primate taxa are distributed in more than one country within South Asia. India and Sri Lanka have one
common subspecies of Semnopithecus priam thersites, but are assessed separately as 2 endemic populations. Comparing the status of endemics within India and Sri Lanka, all primates in Sri Lanka are threatened while $59 \%$ of the Indian primate taxa are threatened. In all 24 of the 33 endemic South Asian primates are threatened ( $73 \%$ ). Restricted distribution and rapid habitat degradation are the main reasons for threatened endemic primate taxa in Sri Lanka, while in other countries of South Asia, endemic primates are mainly threatened due to restricted distribution.

Non-endemic primates taxa (10) were assessed for only the South Asian region. Regional guidelines of the IUCN Red List Criteria were applied as per Gärdenfors, et al. (2001). Mainly distributed in the northeastern part of India and Bangladesh, these taxa have a range extending into southeastern Asia. Bunopithecus hoolock (previously called Hylobates hoolock) has a distribution extending beyond Myanmar into Thailand. The nominate subspecies found in South Asia (Bangladesh, Bhutan and India) also extends into Myanmar, but only up to the western banks of Chindwin River. Similarly, Nycticebus bengalensis, 5 Macaca taxa, 2 Trachypithecus subspecies and 1 Semnopithecus subspecies occur beyond South Asia. Since in most cases the distribution of the taxa is fragmented due to various reasons, the status in South Asia was derived using the regional guidelines, which either retained the global status for the taxa or increased the level of threat category in case of the South Asia population being a sink.

Table 1: Status of South Asian primates with IUCN categories and criteria.

| Scientific taxon name | Status, 2002 | Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loridae |  |  |
| 1. Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus | Near Threatened | - |
| 2. Loris lydekkerianus malabaricus | Near Threatened | - |
| 3. Loris tardigradus grandis | Endangered | A2cd+4cd; <br> B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 4. Loris tardigradus nordicus | Endangered | A2cd+4cd |
| 5. Loris tardigradus nycticeboides | Endangered | A2cd+4cd; B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 6. Loris tardigradus tardigradus | Endangered | A2cd +4 cd |
| 7. Nycticebus bengalensis | Data Deficient in SA | - |
| Cercopithecidae |  |  |
| 8. Macaca arctoides | Critically Endangered in SA | C2a(i) |
| 9. Macaca assamensis assamensis | Endangered in SA | C2a(i) |
| 10. Macaca assamensis Nepal population | Endangered | B1a+b(i,ii,iii,v); C2a(i) |
| 11. Macaca assamensis pelops | Endangered | B1ab(i,ii,iii)+2ab(i,ii,iii); C2a(i) |
| 12. Macaca fascicularis aurea | Critically Endangered in SA | A2c+3c+4c; B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v);D |
| 13. Macaca fascicularis umbrosa | Near Threatened | - |
| 14. Macaca leonina | Endangered in SA | C2a(i) |
| 15. Macaca mulatta mulatta | Least Concern in SA | - |
| 16. Macaca radiata diluta | Least Concern | - |
| 17. Macaca radiata radiata | Least Concern | - |
| 18. Macaca silenus | Endangered | C2a(i) |
| 19. Macaca sinica aurifrons | Endangered | A2cd+4cd |
| 20. Macaca sinica opisthomelas | Endangered | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A2cd+4cd; B1ab(i,iii,iii,iv,v) } \\ & +2 \mathrm{ab}(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{ii}, \mathrm{iii}, \mathrm{iv}, \mathrm{v}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 21. Macaca sinica sinica | Endangered | A2cd+4cd |
| 22. Semnopithecus (T.) johnii johnii | Vulnerable | C2a(i) |
| 23. Semnopithecus entellus achates | Least Concern | - |
| 24. Semnopithecus entellus ajax | Critically Endangered | B1ab(iii,v)+2ab(iii,v) |
| 25. Semnopithecus entellus anchises | Near Threatened | - |
| 26. Semnopithecus entellus entellus | Near Threatened |  |
| 27. Semnopithecus entellus hector | Endangered | B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 28. Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos | Endangered | B2ab(ii,iii) |
| 29. Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus | Near Threatened in SA | - |
| 30. Semnopithecus priam priam | Vulnerable | B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 31. Semnopithecus priam thersites (India) | Endangered | B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 32. Semnopithecus priam thersites (Sri Lanka) | Endangered | A2cd+4cd |
| 33. Trachypithecus geei | Endangered | B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v); C1+2a |
| 34. Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei | Endangered in SA | C1+2a(i) |
| 35. Trachypithecus pileatus brahma | Data Deficient | - |
| 36. Trachypithecus pileatus durga | Endangered | C1+2a(i) |
| 37. Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus | Endangered in SA | C1+2a(i); D |
| 38. Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus | Critically Endangered | C2a(i) |
| 39. Trachypithecus vetulus monticola | Endangered | A2cd+4cd; B1ab(ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 40. Trachypithecus vetulus nestor | Critically Endangered | A2cd $+3 \mathrm{~cd}+4 \mathrm{~cd}$ |
| 41. Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki | Endangered | A2cd +4 cd |
| 42. Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus | Endangered | A2cd +4 cd |
| Hylobatidae |  |  |
| 43. Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock | Endangered in SA | A2abcd +3 bcd ; $\mathrm{C} 1+2 \mathrm{a}$ (i) |

Table 2: Distribution of primates in South Asia indicating presence in countries within.

| Scientific name | SA | Ba | Bh | I | M | N | Pk | SL | E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loridae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus | NT |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 2. Loris lydekkerianus malabaricus | NT |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 3. Loris tardigradus grandis | EN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| 4. Loris tardigradus nordicus | EN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| 5. Loris tardigradus nycticeboides | EN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| 6. Loris tardigradus tardigradus | EN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| 7. Nycticebus bengalensis | DD | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | No |
| Cercopithecidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Macaca arctoides | CR | ? |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | No |
| 9. Macaca assamensis assamensis | EN | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | No |
| 10. Macaca assamensis ${ }^{1}$ | EN |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | E |
| 11. Macaca assamensis pelops | EN |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 12. Macaca fascicularis aurea | CR | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | No |
| 13. Macaca fascicularis umbrosa | NT |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 14. Macaca leonina | EN | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | No |
| 15. Macaca mulatta mulatta | LC | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | No |
| 16. Macaca radiata diluta | LC |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 17. Macaca radiata radiata | LC |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 18. Macaca silenus | EN |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 19. Macaca sinica aurifrons | EN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| 20. Macaca sinica opisthomelas | EN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| 21. Macaca sinica sinica | EN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| 22. Semnopithecus (Trachypithecus) johnii johnii | VU |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 23. Semnopithecus entellus achates | LC |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 24. Semnopithecus entellus ajax | CR |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | E |
| 25. Semnopithecus entellus anchises | NT |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 26. Semnopithecus entellus entellus | NT | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 27. Semnopithecus entellus hector | EN |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | E |
| 28. Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos | EN |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 29. Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus | NT |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | No |
| 30. Semnopithecus priam priam | VU |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 31. Semnopithecus priam thersites ${ }^{2}$ | EN |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | E |
| 32. Semnopithecus priam thersites ${ }^{3}$ | EN |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 33. Trachypithecus geei | EN |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 34. Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei | EN | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | No |
| 35. Trachypithecus pileatus brahma | DD |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 36. Trachypithecus pileatus durga | EN | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 37. Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus | EN |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | No |
| 38. Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus | CR |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | E |
| 39. Trachypithecus vetulus monticola | EN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| 40. Trachypithecus vetulus nestor | CR |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| 41. Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki | EN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| 42. Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus | EN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | E |
| Hylobatidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43. Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock | EN | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | No |
|  |  | 10 | 5 | 29 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 33 |

SA - South Asia; Ba - Bangladesh; Bh - Bhutan; I - India; M - Maldives; N - Nepal; Pk - Pakistan; SL - Sri Lanka; E - Endemic to South Asia, ${ }^{1}$ Nepal population, ${ }^{2}$ India population, ${ }^{3}$ Sri Lanka population

## Threats

No primate in South Asia is beyond threat. All the Critically Endangered, Endangered and Vulnerable taxa are under severe pressure due to different threats acting on them, while the non-threatened taxa still face threats of some kind. Table 3 lists all threats identified for the taxa at the workshop. The list for most taxa is similar with the exception of site-specific threats. Habitat loss is one major threats that affects primates throughout the region.

Habitat loss due to various reasons such as logging, agriculture, development, habitation, industry, commerce and fragmentation has resulted in many taxa being threatened beyond hope. Figure 3 summarises the threats for primates in South Asia. Seventy-six percent of the threats are habitat related and $24 \%$ are population related. Primates are under tremendous pressure because of continuing decline in habitat, which is more obvious in certain regions than others. Northeastern India and Bangladesh face a continuing crisis with loss of habitat for primates due to such factors as illegal encroachments, clearfelling for human settlements, logging for firewood and mining. This has resulted in many forested areas becoming fragmented, discontinuous and inhospitable for primate migration. In various cases, the degree of threat to the habitat is reflected in very small population counts in restricted areas of specialized primates such as Hoolock Gibbons. Primates inherently are shy and require a fair component of the habitat including canopy trees and food trees for maintaining a healthy group size and for dispersal. Lack of continuous forests as in the northeast has disturbed the population dynamics and is now a major threat.

Habitat loss in the past has resulted in reduced numbers of primates at present. Sri Lanka lost nearly half its forests in 40 years - forests that used to be home for primates. This amount of loss has been


Figure 3. Summary of threats for South Asian primates.
used as a basis to calculate population declines among primates there, which means that most of Sri Lankan primate taxa are threatened, usually Endangered.

Loss of habitat quality is another major threat identified for almost all primate taxa, although the effects of change in quality is not reflected in threat perception of a taxon. Man-made fires, minor forest produce collections, eco-tourism, human settlements in and around forest, among other activities, can cause changes to the quality of habitat, which in turn have a negative effect on many primate taxa.

Population declines were of concern with respect to all Sri Lankan primates and a number of mainland primates in South Asia. Due to loss of habitat over many years in the past, population trends were assessed based on correlations with habitat trends. Although no statistical interpretation was carried out to correlate the two, an understanding of the extent of habitat available in the past to that in the present gives an indication of the population trends.

Other threats to primates in the region are mainly from trade, accidental mortality, hunting/harvest. Primates are hunted for meat, medicine and in case of lorises particularly, as bad omen in different regions, a common significant threat to all primates. Reasons for hunting vary by region. Primates in the northeast are hunted mainly for food and for medicinal purposes, while in other regions they are hunted for reasons such as crop protection or as a taboo. Already impoverished populations of primates suffer from hunting, which could eventually lead to early local extinctions. Trade is an issue for only a few taxa, which may be taken for biomedical research or the pet trade. Table 4 summarises primates hunted and in trade.

Table 3: Threats affecting primates in South Asia.

| Taxon | Threats |
| :---: | :---: |
| Loridae <br> Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus | Hunting, traditional medicine, road kills, biomedical research, habitat loss and as bad omen. |
| Loris lydekkerianus malabaricus | Hunting for trade, as bad omen, biomedical and laboratory research, habitat loss |
| Loris tardigradus grandis | Clear-cutting, deliberate fires, trade, habitat loss by use of chemicals in agriculture. Koslanda, Thangamalai and Kotmale locations are heavily clearcut for timber and for other plantations. Increasing visitor pressure |
| Loris tardigradus nordicus | Hunting for folk medicine and habitat loss |
| Loris tardigradus nycticeboides | Land and water pollution, habitat loss due to agriculture, dairy husbandry, and vegetable cultivation |
| Loris tardigradus tardigradus | Deforestation due to urbanisation |
| Nycticebus bengalensis | Fisheries, habitat loss due to building roads, dams, power lines, fragmentation, soil loss/erosion, deliberate fires, hunting and trade for food, traditional medicine, and sport, accidental mortality, trapping, human interference, predators |
| Cercopithecidae <br> Macaca arctoides | Selective logging, timber and firewood collection for charcoal, fisheries, building roads, dams, power lines, deliberate fires, fragmentation, soil loss/erosion, hunting and trade for food, sport and traditional medicine, accidental mortality due to trapping. |
| Macaca assamensis assamensis | Selective logging, timber collection and firewood for charcoal production, fisheries, building roads, dams, power lines, deliberate fires, fragmentation, soil loss / erosion, hunting for sport, hunting and trade for food and traditional medicine, accidental mortality by trapping, alien invasive species, predators, hybridization. |
| Macaca assamensis Nepal population | Past threats: Grazing, shifting agriculture, firewood and charcoal production, selective logging, habitat loss, jhuming Present threats: Fodder collection, landslide |
| Macaca assamensis pelops | Past threats: Hunting, human settlement, habitat shrinkage, jhuming Present and future threats: Agriculture, firewood and charcoal production, selective logging, intentional poisoning (control), accidental mortality, road kills, trapping, landslide, changing human attitudes, man-animal conflict |
| Macaca fascicularis aurea | Aquaculture, agriculture, mangrove removal, human settlement, deforestation. Teknaf Peninsula population is completely decimated due to development activities (ship-building). |
| Macaca fascicularis umbrosa | Past threats: Human settlement, habitat loss <br> Present and future threats: Construction of roads on Katchal island and Great Nicobar island, hunting. |
| Macaca leonina | Selective logging, firewood and charcoal production, fisheries, timber extraction, building roads, dams, power lines, forest fragmentation, soil loss / erosion, deliberate fires, hunting and trade for sport, food and medicine cultural use, |


| Taxon | Threats |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | accidental mortality, deliberate fires, predators, habitat loss, jhuming, encroachment |
| Macaca mulatta mulatta | Past threats: Hunting, trade, accidental mortality, road kills, trapping, ecological imbalance (changes in native species dynamics), habitat loss, forest fire Present and future threats: Poisoning in Himachal Pradesh, human-animal conflict, wildfire, human settlement in Nepal terai |
| Macaca radiata diluta | Past threats: Hunting, trade, research, habitat loss <br> Present threats: Road kills <br> Future threats: Human interference |
| Macaca radiata radiata | Past threats: Agriculture, hunting, trade, road kills <br> Present and future threats: Infrastructure, road kills, research, pathogens / parasites, storms/flooding |
| Macaca silenus | Roads, dams, power lines, deforestation, fragmentation, crop plantations, agriculture, mining, hunting for food, trapping, habitat loss, changes in native species dynamics, pathogens/parasites, delayed sexual maturity and long interbirth interval, inbreeding. Landslide is a future threat. In private forests and plantations, change in land use is a problem for the species. |
| Macaca sinica aurifrons | Deforestation and habitat loss (large plantations and estates, that might have harboured some pocketed populations, are being reduced into smaller holdings unsuitable to support macaque groups or populations), shooting, snaring and poisoning as this animal is considered a pest. |
| Macaca sinica opisthomelas | Habitat loss due to agriculture (Coffee and tea plantation) in the past, fuel wood collection, vegetable plantations, encroachment, animal husbandry |
| Macaca sinica sinica | Mortality by poisoning and habitat loss. |
| Semnopithecus (Trachypithecus) johnii johnii | Past threats: Crop plantations, mining, dams, fragmentation, traditional medicine <br> Present and future threats: Human settlement, hunting, road kills, deliberate fires, habitat loss, storms/flooding, landslide |
| Semnopithecus entellus achates | Agriculture, habitat loss, man-animal conflict |
| Semnopithecus entellus ajax | Past threats: Overgrazing, building roads through forests, lopping, deforestation, agriculture, fire Present and future threats: Agriculture and development |
| Semnopithecus entellus anchises | Agriculture, habitat loss, man-animal conflict, wildfires |
| Semnopithecus entellus entellus | Agriculture, habitat loss, man-animal conflict in Bangladesh |
| Semnopithecus entellus hector | Mining, stone mining, firewood and charcoal collection production, timber collection, land distribution (resettlement) for landless people. |
| Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos | Past threat: Timber plantations <br> Present and future threats: Agriculture, human settlement, fragmentation, habitat loss, mining, deforestation, hunting, deliberate fires. |
| Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus | Timber, firewood and charcoal production, habitat loss |


| Taxon | Threats |
| :---: | :---: |
| Semnopithecus priam priam | Hunting, habitat loss |
| Semnopithecus priam thersites India population | Power lines, roads, human settlement, accidental mortality, habitat loss |
| Semnopithecus priam thersites <br> Sri Lanka population | Hunting for food, poisoning, trade, habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, loss of ecologically important species, increased human animal conflict. |
| Trachypithecus geei | Crop plantations, grazing, harvesting non-woody vegetation for firewood and charcoal production, selective logging, timber collection, human settlement, deforestation, fragmentation, trade, killed by domestic dogs, habitat loss, high juvenile mortality, inbreeding |
| Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei | Timber plantations, livestock ranching, shifting agriculture, firewood collection and charcoal production, infrastructure, human settlement, deforestation, fragmentation, collecting, illegal hunting for food, habitat loss, pesticides / chemical pollution, industrial pollution, inbreeding |
| Trachypithecus pileatus brahma | Not known |
| Trachypithecus pileatus durga | Crop plantations, timber, selective logging, firewood and charcoal production, human settlement, building roads, dams, power lines, deliberate fires, soil loss / erosion, fragmentation, hunting for sport, meat and traditional medicine, trapping, human interference, predators |
| Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus | Shifting agriculture, grazing, plantations, agriculture, timber, selective logging, firewood and charcoal production, human settlement, building roads, dams, power lines, deliberate fires, soil loss / erosion, forest fragmentation, hunting for sport, food and traditional medicine, accidental mortality, trapping, human interference, predators, habitat loss, poor reproduction |
| Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus | Crop plantations, grazing, shifting agriculture, timber, roads, soil loss / erosion, deforestation, hunting for traditional medicine and food, poisoning, hooking, human interference, habitat loss. |
| Trachypithecus vetulus monticola | Deforestation, fragmentation and habitat loss (crop plantation, development, human settlement) and hunting subsistence or small scale cash. |
| Trachypithecus vetulus nestor | Crop plantations, development (infrastructure, industry), human settlement, deforestation, fragmentation, illegal trade for food, pylon collision, habitat loss |
| Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki | Shifting agriculture, deforestation, human settlement, development, hunting for food, habitat loss, occasional cyclones in far northeastern areas of range. |
| Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus | Selective logging (wet zone forests in 1970s), human settlement, habitat loss (encroachment for agriculture/plantation/human habitation). Ill-conceived government organised translocation schemes of langur groups coming into conflict with man, pose a threat to taxon survival and overall biodiversity. |
| Hylobatidae <br> Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock | Selective logging, firewood and timber collection, charcoal production, human settlement, roads, dams, powerlines, fragmentation, soil loss / erosion, deliberate fires, cultural use, hunting for food, sport and traditional medicine, trapping (accidental mortality), unplanned tourism, predators (alien invasive species), habitat loss, poor reproduction. |

Table 4: Primates hunted and in trade in South Asia.
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Taxon } & \text { Hunting as a threat } & \text { Trade } \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Loridae } \\ \text { Loris lydekkerianus } \\ \text { lydekkerianus }\end{array} & \text { Hunting, traditional medicine } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Local and commercial trade for eyes and as live } \\ \text { animals for medicine, pet, zoos, road shows and } \\ \text { research. Trade for medicine is a major threat. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Loris lydekkerianus } \\ \text { malabaricus }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Hunting as a taboo, for trade, } \\ \text { biomedical and laboratory research }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Local, commercial and domestic trade for eyes, fur / } \\ \text { skin, for medicinal purposes and live animal trade as } \\ \text { pets, for zoos and for road shows }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Loris tardigradus grandis } & \text { Trade } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Local (commercial) trade for eyes for folk medicine } \\ \text { and meat for food. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Loris tardigradus } \\ \text { nordicus }\end{array} & \text { Hunting for folk medicine } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Local and commercial trade for eyes and meat for } \\ \text { food and as an aphrodisiac. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Loris tardigradus } \\ \text { nycticeboides }\end{array} & \text { Trade } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Local and commercial trade for eyes and meat by } \\ \text { tea plantation workers. Possible village level trade } \\ \text { for folk medicine. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Loris tardigradus } \\ \text { tardigradus }\end{array} & \text { Trade } & \text { Local, domestic, commercial trade for meat } \\ \hline \text { Nycticebus bengalensis } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Hunting and trade for food, } \\ \text { traditional medicine, and sport }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Local trade for meat, food and medicine and live } \\ \text { animal as pets. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Macaca radiata diluta }\end{array} & \text { Hunting } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Local trade for bones, meat for food and live animal }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Cercopithecidae } \\ \text { Macaca arctoides }\end{array} & \text { Hunting and trade for food } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Local trade in live animals for research and road } \\ \text { shows }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { pets and road shows. Hunted for sustenance }\end{array}\right\}$

| Taxon | Hunting as a threat | Trade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Macaca radiata radiata | Hunting, trade | Domestic and commercial trade for research and road shows |
| Macaca silenus | Hunting for food | Local trade for whole animal for pets. The taxon is hunted for sustenance for food near Amarambalam. There are reports of LTM used in medicine also. |
| Macaca sinica aurifrons | -- | Not in trade |
| Macaca sinica opisthomelas | -- | Probably not in trade for meat |
| Macaca sinica sinica | -- | Highly localised |
| Semnopithecus <br> (Trachypithecus) j. johnii | Hunting | Local trade for live animal for pets and meat for food and medicine. |
| Semnopithecus entellus achates | -- | Not in trade |
| Semnopithecus entellus ajax | -- | Not in trade |
| Semnopithecus entellus anchises | -- | Not in trade |
| Semnopithecus entellus entellus | -- | Not in trade |
| Semnopithecus entellus hector | -- | Not in trade |
| Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos | Hunting | Local trade for live animal and meat for food and medicine |
| Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus | -- | Not in trade |
| Semnopithecus priam priam | Hunting | Local trade in meat and in live animal. |
| Semnopithecus priam thersites (in India) | -- | Not in trade |
| Semnopithecus priam thersites (in Sri Lanka) | Hunting for food, trade | Local and commercial trade for meat. Taxon hunted for sustenance/subsistence living for food, threat has recently increased through commercial trade in meat. |
| Trachypithecus geei | Trade (insignificant) | Local trade in live animals as pets and in road shows. |
| Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei | Illegal hunting for food | Local trade in live animal for zoos and meat for food |
| Trachypithecus pileatus brahma | Not known | Not known |


| Taxon | Hunting as a threat | Trade |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Trachypithecus pileatus <br> durga | Hunting for sport, meat and <br> traditional medicine | Local trade for meat, tail for food, skin for knife <br> covers and for fur; live animal as pets |
| Trachypithecus pileatus <br> pileatus | Hunting for sport, food and <br> traditional medicine | Local, domestic and international trade for fur, meat; <br> tail for food and live animals for zoos. |
| Trachypithecus pileatus <br> tenebricus | Hunting for traditional medicine <br> and food | Local trade for fur, meat, tail for food and medicine <br> and live animal for pets and zoos. |
| Trachypithecus vetulus <br> monticola | Hunting subsistence or small <br> scale cash. | Local and domestic trade for meat and skin. Locally <br> pocketed and isolated groups are prone to extinction <br> owed to village-level subsistence exploitation. |
| Trachypithecus vetulus <br> nestor | Illegal trade for food | Local trade at village level for meat but not significant |
| Trachypithecus vetulus <br> philbricki | Hunting for food | Local trade for meat and skin. Hunted mainly for <br> subsistence living and trade at local village level. Skin <br> in some areas are used to make drums. |
| Trachypithecus vetulus <br> vetulus | Hunting and trade | Local trade for meat for food and pelage for making <br> drums at village level for ubsistence. |
| Hylobatidae <br> Bunopithecus hoolock <br> hoolock | Hunting for food, sport, traditional <br> medicine and cultural use | Local, commercial and domestic trade for blood, <br> bones, fur, meat and phalanges for food and medicine. <br> Live animals are in trade for zoos and as pets. |

## Data quality and uncertainty

Since most primates in South Asia are well studied, assessments were based primarily on field observations. For most primates in India and Bangladesh, the assessments were based on census and monitoring, thanks to the primate projects. However, other forms of data quality sometimes were utilized to assess status and these included indirect information, especially from trade and from habitat trends, from museum studies to ascertain taxonomy and distribution ranges, from literature for distribution and from inferences with respect to population trends. The overall assessment strategy involved bits of different degrees of data quality, but most of it reliable.

The groups reached a consensus in most cases, but in instances where the members of a group had a disagreement, information was clarified in the draft reports after the workshop. The strategy at the workshop was to utilize all available information in deriving a status for the taxa, but also to provide additional information later during the review of the draft report. It was also decided at the workshop that based on new information available, or on a thorough reexamination of all the information provided, the assessments would be made conforming to the IUCN Red List Criteria.

## Assessments

Status assessments were made using the best available information in the literature and expertise available at the workshop. Since most of the primate experts of the region were present, the information may be considered the best compiled up to now. A quick comparison of the assessments done previously with those at the workshop indicates the differences due to the differences in information availability. The 2002 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (Hilton-Taylor, 2002) lists the status assessments at both the species and subspecific levels. At this workshop, species level assessments were not considered if there were recognized subspecies. The 2002 IUCN assessment is based on the 1994 Red List Criteria, while the assessments at this workshop were based on the 2001 IUCN Red List Criteria. A total of 26 taxa differ in their assessments as summarized in Table 5.

## Assessments at the population level

Two taxa have been assessed at the population level, viz., Macaca assamensis and Semnopithecus priam thersites. Macaca assamensis is represented by two described subspecies - M. a. assamensis and M. a. pelops. At the workshop a third population distinct from the two subspecies was identified in Nepal and assessed as Macaca assamensis Nepal Population since there is no formal description of taxon. The Nepal population is classified as Endangered due to restricted distribution and few numbers of mature individuals in a few locations.

Semnopithecus priam thersites is known to occur in the southern tip of the Indian mainland and the Eastern and Northern provinces of Sri Lanka. Although the taxon is common, it is disjunct and the chances of the populations mixing naturally are remote. This taxon was therefore assessed separately for the two countries: in the Indian population was categorized as Endangered due to restricted area of occupancy, while the Sri Lanka population was categorized as Endangered due to continuing decline in population.

Categorising taxa at the population level is important from a conservation point of view. Irrespective of whether a taxon is described formally or not, the value of identifying populations that are restricted and
Table 5: A comparison between the assessments of primates in the 2002 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (using 1994 criteria) and the 2002 South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. workshop (using 2001 criteria)

| 2002 IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals (1994 criteria) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Scientific name | IUCN Status | Current assessments of South Asian primates 2003 C.A.M.P. (2001 criteria) <br> Scientific name |  |
| Loridae |  |  | Status |


| 2002 IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals (1994 criteria) |  | Current assessments of South Asian primates 2003 C.A.M.P. (2001 criteria) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scientific name | IUCN Status | Scientific name | Status |
| Semnopithecus entellus | LR/nt | Semnopithecus entellus | NT* |
| - |  | Semnopithecus entellus achates | LC |
| Semnopithecus entellus ajax | LR/nt | Semnopithecus entellus ajax | CR B1ab(iii,v)+2ab(iii,v) |
| Semnopithecus entellus anchises | LR/nt | Semnopithecus entellus anchises | NT |
| Semnopithecus entellus dussumieri | DD | - | - |
| Semnopithecus entellus elissa | DD | - | - |
| Semnopithecus entellus entellus | LR/nt | Semnopithecus entellus entellus | NT |
| Semnopithecus entellus hector | LR/nt | Semnopithecus entellus hector | EN B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos | DD | Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos | EN B2ab(ii,iii) |
| Semnopithecus entellus priam | DD | Semnopithecus priam priam | VU B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus | LR/nt | Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus | NT* |
| Semnopithecus entellus thersites | VUA1cd | Semnopithecus priam thersites Indian pop. | ENB2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| - |  | Semnopithecus priam thersites Sri Lankan pop. | EN A2cd+4cd |
| Trachypithecus geei | EN A1acd; C2a | Trachypithecus geei | ENB1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v); $\mathrm{C} 1+2 \mathrm{a}$ |
| Trachypithecus johnii | VU A1d; B1+2c; C2a | Semnopithecus (Trachypithecus) johnii johnii | VUC2a(i) |
| Trachypithecus phayrei | ENC2a | Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei | ENC1+2a(i)* |
| Trachypithecus pileatus | EN A1cd; C2a | Trachypithecus pileatus | ENC2a(i) |
| Trachypithecus pileatus brahma | EN A1cd; C2a | Trachypithecus pileatus brahma | DD |
| Trachypithecus pileatus durga | EN A1cd; C2a | Trachypithecus pileatus durga | ENC1+2a(i) |
| Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus | EN A1cd; C2a | Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus | ENC1+2a(i); ${ }^{*}$ |
| Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus | EN A1cd; C2a | Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus | ENC2a(i) |
| Trachypithecus vetulus | ENA1cd | Trachypithecus vetulus | EN A2cd +4 cd |
| Trachypithecus vetulus monticola | ENA1cd | Trachypithecus vetulus monticola | EN A2cd+4cd; B1ab(ii,iii,iv,v) |
| Trachypithecus vetulus nestor | EN Alcd | Trachypithecus vetulus nestor | CR A2cd $+3 \mathrm{~cd}+4 \mathrm{~cd}$ |
| Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki | ENA1cd | Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki | EN A2cd+4cd |
| Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus | ENAlcd | Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus | EN A2cd +4 cd |
| Hylobatidae |  |  |  |
| Bunipithecus hoolock hoolock | ENA1cd | Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock | EN A2abcd +3 bcd ; $\mathrm{C} 1+2 \mathrm{a}(\mathrm{i})$ * |

* Assessments are only at the regional level, limited to South Asia. The regional assessments should not be compared with the global assessments of the 2002 IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals list.
unique helps in recognising critical populations, genetic makeup and ecosystems: Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos and S. e. ajax.


## Justification for changes in categories and criteria

Compared to the assessments listed for South Asian primates in the 2002 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, 26 taxa have been assessed at this workshop as having a different status. Twelve taxa having the same category have been assessed with slightly different criteria. This is because of detailed information available at the workshop with the participation of many primatologists from the region.

This primate assessments in this report are different from some of the exclusive assessments published in scientific, peer-reviewed publications that indicate status assessments from one or two field biologists. A recently published paper on Sri lankan lorises is cited here as an example of why there are differences in such assessments compared to what is seen in this report.

Case study: Two sets of biologists have published (or are about to publish) conflicting assessments of the Loris for Sri Lanka.

Set 1: The C.A.M.P. workshop for South Asian primates held in Coimbatore in March 2002 involved 9 participants (biologists) from Sri Lanka who were familiar with the primate fauna of Sri Lanka.

Set 2: At least two persons with experience with Sri Lankan lorises were not C.A.M.P. participants, Anna-Isola Nekaris and Thiruni Ramanaden. A pre-publication manuscript by Nekaris and Jayawardene (now published in 2003) had been made available to the Sri Lanka group at the workshop, courtesy of these two authors. T. Ramanaden contributed no information.

In general, the assessments made by the Sri Lanka C.A.M.P. group were based on a greater number of observers ( 9 people) with longer periods (many years for most) of observation in the natural areas of Sri Lanka than was possible for data in the Nekaris \& Jayawardene (2003) publication. The two sets of observers agreed in their final assessment of Endangered for three of the four subspecies: Loris tardigradus (or lydekkerianus) nordicus of the dry zone, L. t/l grandis of the eastern midlands, and L. $t / l$ tardigradus of the lowland wetzone. The criteria used for these assessments also agreed in general, but differed greatly in detail; the C.A.M.P. process allowed for the integration of more information from many more sites.

The main difference concerns the assessment of the montane zone loris $L$. $t /$ l nyctoceboides, first described by Hill (1942). The Sri Lanka Camp group, assisted by Sanjay Molur, assessed this subspecies also as Endangered, whereas Nekaris \& Jayawardene (2003) has this subspecies as Critically Endangered. The reason for this difference lies in the criteria used for assessment. The C.A.M.P. group recognized wider extent of occurrence ( $900 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ) and area of occupancy ( $600 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ) involving 4 sites, wheras Nekaris \& Jayawardene (2003) indicated an extent of occurrence less than $100 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ from a single site. The latter authors confined the loris to the type locality originally identified by Hill (1942) whereas the C.A.M.P. biologists had evidence for the existence of these lorises in highland areas other than merely the Horton Plains.

Table 6: Summary of some differences between the C.A.M.P. process and the Nekaris and Jayawardene (2003) publication.

| C.A.M.P. (this Report) (2001 criteria) | Nekaris \& Jayawardene (2003) (1994 criteria adopted and justified for 2001 criteria) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Loris tardigradus nordicus | Loris lydekkerianus nordicus |
| Endangered A2cd+4cd | Endangered Alce |
| Based on information from 28 sites | Based on information from 7 sites |
| Loris tardigradus grandis | Loris lydekkerianus grandis |
| Endangered A2cd +4 cd ; B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) $+2 \mathrm{ab}(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{ii}, \mathrm{iii}, \mathrm{iv}, \mathrm{v})$ | Endangered A1c |
| Based on information from 16 sites | Based on information from 7 sites |
| Loris tardigradus tardigradus | Loris tardigradus tardigradus |
| Endangered A2cd +4 cd | Endangered B1/2abcd |
| Based on information from 30 sites | Based on information from 6 sites |
| Loris tardigradus nycticeboides | Loris tardigradus nycticeboides |
| Endangered A2cd+4cd; B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) | Critically Endangered B1, 2abc |
| Based on information from 4 sites | Based on information from 1 site |

## Recommendations

Reasearch
With any taxonomic group, research is ongoing. What was largely thought as a single taxon of the Common Hanuman Langur is now split into 8 subspecies, each of which is either geographically isolated or forms a cline in the total species distribution. Phylogenetic studies recommended by the new taxonomy suggest further studies in the area since populations vary in their genetic composition and could be distinct. An example from this workshop is of Semnopithecus entellus thersites, which is found in India and Sri Lanka forming two distinct populations due to a geographical break. Although recent changes in taxonomy suggest the two populations to be thersites sub species, since the populations have been distinct for a very long period, further research is required into establishing their difference. Taxonomic research would therefore be an important recommendation.

Taxonomic research was one of the major recommendations made at the workshop. Surveys were recommended for newly recognised taxa, especially subspecies of the Semnopithecus entellus group and the Trachypithecus pileatus group. Life history studies were recommended for a few taxa, especially Loris and Nycticebus and some of the lesser-studied taxa.

Population and Habitat Viability Assessment (P.H.V.A.) was recommended for at least half the taxa assessed because of the need for developing an overall conservation action plan. Since more than $70 \%$ of the primates in the region are under threat, conservation action recommendations need to incorporate all variables for the taxa and all stakeholders. A P.H.V.A. allows for broad participation in developing this plan and also allows for the interpretation of variables affecting taxa in determining their probability of extinction. Some of the other important research recommendations included epidemiological studies and limiting factor research (Figure 4)


Research recommendations
Figure 4. Research recommendations for South Asian primates

Management
Recommendations for habitat management and public education were highest, followed by monitoring of populations, monitoring of habitat, wild population management, and limiting factor management. Other
recommendations having to do with species conservation and recovery were recommended for a few taxa (Figure 5).

Addressing habitat loss was considered the first step in tackling conservation of threatened primate taxa in South Asia. Wild habitat management was designated as the first priority, mainly to stem the loss by human interference and further to develop suitable habitats for the primates. In achieving this, it was felt that management cannot be done in isolation, so public awareness and education were strongly recommended for many taxa. In conjunction the two recommendations would work well in conserving the remaining habitat and populations of primates in their range states/countries.

A hurdle to better management is the lack of knowledge of current trends of a taxon. Monitoring was recommended as a priority to understand the current status of all populations and habitats and implement a holistic conservation action plan.

Captive breeding was not considered an important tool in the long-term conservation of primates, not because of its lack of intrinsic importance, but for the following reasons: the lack of understanding of captive breeding as a viable tool, the absence of faith in captive facilities in the region, inadequate resource personnel, no coordinated breeding plans, limited taxonomic understanding and the personal belief of several field biologists that captive breeding is not worth the investment that could be better spent on wild habitat management.

All primates, except 2 macaques (M. fascicularis aurea and M. sinica opisthomelas), 1 common langur (S. entellus hector) and 1 pileated langur (T. pileatus brahma) occur in protected areas in South Asia. Problems with the taxonomy of the Semnopithecus entellus group still poses a challenge to many a field biologists and taxonomists as to their correct distribution and thereby their occurrence in protected areas in India. Nonetheless, at the species level the S. entellus group is represented in many protected areas. Table 7 in the following pages shows the available information on primate taxa in protected areas in South Asia.


Figure 5. Management recommendations for South Asian primates.

Table 7: Primates in protected areas in South Asia.

| Scientific taxon name | Country | Protected Areas |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loridae <br> Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus | India | Andhra Pradesh: Nellapattu WLS, Sri Venkateswara NP Karnataka: Biligiri Rangaswamy Temple WLS |
| Loris lydekkerianus malabaricus | India | Karnataka: Brahmagiri WLS, Someswara WLS <br> Kerala: Aralam WLS, Idukki WLS, Parambikulam WLS, PeechiVazhani WLS, Periyar NP, Shendurney WLS, Thattakkad WLS, Wynaad WLS <br> Tamil Nadu: Indira Gandhi WLS, KalakkadMundanthurai WLS, Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS |
| Loris tardigradus grandis | Sri Lanka | Central Province: Knuckles <br> Uva Province: Thangamalai WLS |
| Loris tardigradus nordicus | Sri Lanka | Central Province: IFS arboretum, Menikdena FR, <br> Sigiriya Sanctuary, Victoria-Randeniyagala-Rantambe Sanctuary <br> Eastern Province: Ampara Sanctuary, Kanthale FR <br> North Central Province: Angamedilla NP, Flood Plains NP, <br> Giritale Sanctuary, Kaudulla NP, Mihintale Sanctuary, Minneriya NP, Polonnaruwa Sanctuary, Somawathie NP, Wasgamuwa NP, Wilpattu NP <br> Uva Province: Thangamalai Sanctuary |
| Loris tardigradus nycticeboides | Sri Lanka | Central Province: Siripagama WLS <br> Sabaragamuwa Province: Peak Wilderness Sanctuary |
| Loris tardigradus tardigradus | Sri Lanka | Central Province: Gampola-Ambuluwela Biodiversity Park, Udawattekele Sanctuary, Victoria-Randenigala-Rantembe Sanctuary, Walker Estate Sabaragamuwa Province: Kurulukele Sanctuary, Peak Wilderness Sanctuary; Sinharaja World Heritage site, Udawalawe Sanctuary Western Province: Attidiya-Belanwila Sanctuary, Ingiriya (Dombegaskande) FR, Muthurajawela Wetland Reserve |
| Nycticebus bengalensis | India | Arunachal Pradesh: Itanagar WLS, Mehao NP, Namdapha NP, Pakhui WLS <br> Assam: Chakrasila WLS, Dibru-Saikhwa WLS, Gibbon WLS, Kaziranga NP, Borajan WLS, Pobitora WLS <br> Meghalaya: Balpakam NP, Nokrek NP <br> Mizoram: Dampa NP, Nengpui WLS <br> Tripura: Sepahijala WLS |
| Cercopithecidae <br> Macaca arctoides | India | Arunachal Pradesh: Mehao WLS, Namdapha WLS?, Pakhui WLS? <br> Assam: Gibbon WLS <br> Meghalaya: Balpakram NP <br> Mizoram: Murlen NP |
| Macaca assamensis assamensis | India | Arunachal Pradesh: Namdapha NP, Pakhui WLS Assam: Bherjan WLS, Borajan WLS, Dibru-Saikhowa NP, Garampani WLS,Gibbon WLS, Kaziranga NP, Manas NP Meghalaya: Nokrek NP, Balpakram NP, Siju WLS |


| Scientific taxon name | Country | Protected Areas |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mizoram: Dampa NP, Nengpui WLS, Phawngpui Blue Mountain WLS |
| Macaca assamensis <br> Nepal population | Nepal | Central Province: Langtang NP <br> Eastern Nepal: Makalu Barun NP |
| Macaca assamensis pelops | India | West Bengal: Buxa NP, Mahananda WLS |
| Macaca fascicularis aurea | None | -- |
| Macaca fascicularis umbrosa | India | Andaman and Nicobar: Greater Nicobar: Campbell Bay NP, Galathea NP |
| Macaca leonina | Bangladesh <br> India | Chittagong: Chunati WLS <br> Sylhet: Lawachara NP, Rema-Kelanga WLS <br> Arunachal Pradesh: Kamlang WLS, Mehao WLS, Namdapha NP Assam: Dibru-Saikhowa WLS, Garampani WLS, Gibbon WLS, Padumoni-Bherjan-Borajan WLS <br> Manipur: Yangoupokpi-Lokchao WLS <br> Meghalaya: Balpakhram NP, Nongkhyllem WLS, Siju WLS <br> Mizoram: Dampa WLS, Lengteng WLS, Murlen NP, <br> Ngengpui WLS, Phawngpui Blue Mountain NP <br> Nagaland: Fakim WLS, Intanki NP <br> Tripura: Gumti WLS, Sepahijala WLS, Trishna WLS |
| Macaca mulatta mulatta | Bangladesh <br> India <br> Nepal <br> Pakistan | Chittagong: Chunathi WLS <br> Sylhet: Rama Kalanga WLS <br> Andhra Pradesh: Coringa WLS, Eturnagaram WLS, Kawal WLS, Kinnerasani WLS, Lanja Madugu Sivaram WLS, Manjira WLS, Pakhal WLS, Pocharam WLS, Pranahita WLS Arunachal Pradesh: Eagle Nest WLS, Itanagar WLS, Mehao WLS, Mouling NP, Namdapha NP, Pakhui WLS, Sessa Orchid Sanctuary, Tale Valley WLS <br> Assam: Bherjan WLS, Chakrasila WLS, Gibbon WLS?, Manas NP, Nameri NP, Pabitora WLS, Podumoni WLS <br> Bihar: Valmiki NP <br> Haryana: Bir Sikargarh WLS <br> Himachal Pradesh: Chail WLS, Great Himalayan NP <br> Jharkhand: Palamau WLS <br> Maharashtra: Chaprala WLS, Bhamragarh WLS <br> Meghalaya: Balphakram NP, Namdapha NP, Nokrek NP, <br> Nongkhyllem NP, Siju WLS <br> Tripura: Sepahijala WLS <br> Central Province: Lang Tang NP <br> Eastern Province: Makalu Barun NP <br> Islamabad: Margallah Hills NP <br> NWFP: Ayubia NP |
| Macaca radiata diluta | India | Kerala: Chimmony WLS, Chinnar WLS, Eravikulam NP, Idukki WLS, Neyyar WLS, Peechi-Vazhani WLS, Peppara WLS, Periyar NP, Periyar WLS, Parambikulam WLS, Shendurney WLS, |


| Scientific taxon name | Country | Protected Areas |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Thattekkad WLS <br> Tamil Nadu: Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS, Indira Gandhi WLS, Kalakkad-Mundanthurai TR; Mudumalai WLS, Mukurthi NP, Point Calimere WLS |
| Macaca radiata radiata | India | Andhra Pradesh: Eturnagaram WLS, Lanja Madugu Sivaram WLS, Nellapattu WLS, Sri Venkateswara NP <br> Goa: Bondla WLS, Mollem NP, Mollem WLS <br> Karnataka: Bandipur NP, Bannerghatta NP, Kudremukh NP, <br> Nagerhole NP <br> Kerala: Aralam WLS, Silent Valley NP, Wyanad WLS <br> Maharashtra: Radhanagari WLS; Sanjay Gandhi NP, Tansa WLS |
| Macaca silenus | India | Karnataka: Brahmagiri WLS, Kudremukh NP, Mookambika WLS, Pushpagiri WLS, Sharavathi Valley WLS, Someshwara WLS, Talakaveri WLS <br> Kerala: Aralam WLS, Chimmony WLS, Neyyar WLS, Peppara WLS, Parambikulam WLS, Periyar NP, Periyar WLS, Shendurney WLS, Silent Valley NP, Wayanad WLS Tamil Nadu: Indira Gandhi NP, Indira Gandhi WLS, Kalakkad WLS, Mundanthurai WLS, Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS |
| Macaca sinica aurifrons | Sri Lanka | Central Province: Gannoruwa, Knuckles, Menikdena, Udawattekele, VRR Sanctuary <br> Sabaragamuwa Province: Kitulgala Sanctuary, Kurulukelle Sanctuary, Peak Wilderness, Samanalawewa, Sinharaja FR, Udawalawe NP? <br> Southern Province: Rammalakande FR Uva Province: Thangamalai Sanctuary Western Province: Attidiya-Belanwila Sanctuary, Dombagaskande FR, Muthurajawela Sanctuary |
| Macaca sinica opisthomelas | Sri Lanka | None in protected areas |
| Macaca sinica sinica | Sri Lanka | Central Province: Dambulla (IFS arboretum), Menikdena Archelogical Reserve, Ritigala Strict Nature Reserve, Sirigiriya Sanctuary, VRR Sanctuary, Wasgamuwa NP <br> Eastern Province: Buddaragala Sanctuary, Kanthale Naval Sanctuary <br> North Central Province: Elehara FR, Flood Plains NP, Moragaswewa NP, Minneriya-Giritale NP, Kaudulla NP, Polonnaruwa Sanctuary, Somawathie NP, Wilpattu NP North Eastern Province: Kanthale Naval Sanctuary Sabaragamuwa Province: Udawalawe NP Southern Province: Remmalakanda FR, Ruhuna NP Uva Province: Madura Oya NP, Rendenigala Sanctuary, Thangamalai Sanctuary |
| Semnopithecus (Trachypithecus) johnii johnii | India | Karnataka: Brahmagiri WLS <br> Kerala: Aaralam WLS, Chimmony WLS, Chinnar WLS, Eravikulam NP, Idukki WLS, Neyyar WLS, Parambikulam WLS, Peechi WLS, Peppara WLS, Periyar NP, Periyar WLS, Shendurney WLS, Silent Valley NP, Thattekadu WLS, Wayanad WLS |


| Scientific taxon name | Country | Protected Areas |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tamil Nadu: Indira Gandhi WLS, Kalakad WLS, Mudumalai WLS, Mundanthurai WLS, Mukurthi NP, Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS |
| Semnopithecus entellus achates | India | Goa: Bondla WLS?, Mollem WLS? <br> Gujarat: Sasan Gir WLS <br> Karnataka: Bandipur NP? Nagarhole NP <br> Madhya Pradesh: Kanha NP? <br> Maharashtra: Andhari WLS?, Bhamragarh WLS?, <br> Chaprala WLS?, Melghat WLS, Radhanagiri WLS?, Pench NP?, <br> Sanjay Gandhi NP, Tadoba NP?, Tansa WLS <br> Rajasthan: Sariska WLS?, Mount Abu WLS, Kumbalgarh WLS <br> Tamil Nadu: Mudumalai NP?, Mudumalai WLS? |
| Semnopithecus entellus ajax | India <br> Nepal | Himachal Pradesh: Great Himalayan NP?, Kalatop-Khajjiar WLS?, Manali WLS? <br> Jammu and Kashmir: Kistwar NP <br> Central Province: Lang Tang NP |
| Semnopithecus entellus anchises | India | Andhra Pradesh: Eturnagaram WLS, Kawal WLS, Kinnerasani WLS, Lanja Madugu Siwaram WLS, Manjira WLS, Pakhal WLS, Pocharam WLS, Pranahita WLS <br> Maharashtra: Bhimashankar WLS? |
| Semnopithecus entellus entellus | India | Bihar: Valmiki NP, Valmiki WLS <br> Chhatisgarh: Achanakmar WLS, Gomarda WLS <br> Jharkhand: Palamau WLS <br> Maharashtra: Andheri WLS?, Bhamragadh WLS?, Chaprala WLS?, Tadoba NP? <br> Orissa: Chandaka-Dampara WLS |
| Semnopithecus entellus hector | India | None in protected areas |
|  | Nepal | None in protected areas |
| Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos | India | Goa: Bondla WLS?, Mollem WLS? <br> Karnataka: Brahmagiri WLS, Kudremukh NP, Pushpagiri WLS, Sharavathi Valley WLS <br> Kerala: Aralam WLS?, Silent Valley NP?, Wayanad WLS? |
| Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus | India | Bihar: Valmiki WLS <br> Himachal Pradesh: Chail WLS, Renuka WLS? <br> Jammu and Kashmir: Changthang WLS, Dachigam NP, Hemis NP, Karakoram WLS |
|  | Nepal | Central Province: Langtang NP, Royal Chitwan NP <br> Eastern Province: Makalu Barun NP <br> Mid-Western Province: Royal Bardia NP |
|  | Pakistan | NWFP: Manshi WLS |
| Semnopithecus priam priam | India | Andhra Pradesh: Sri Venkateswara NP, Nellapattu WLS <br> Karnataka: Bandipur NP, Biligiri Rangaswamy Temple WLS, Nagarhole NP? <br> Kerala: Wayanad WLS?, Silent Valley NP? |


| Scientific taxon name | Country | Protected Areas |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tamil Nadu: Mudumalai NP, Mudumalai WLS |
| Semnopithecus priam thersites India population | India | Kerala: Chinnar WLS, Neyyar WLS, Peppara WLS, <br> Parambikulam WLS, Shendurney WLS <br> Tamil Nadu: Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS, Indira Gandhi NP, Indira Gandhi WLS, Kalakad WLS, Mundanthurai WLS |
| Semnopithecus priam thersites Sri Lanka population | Sri Lanka | Central Province: VRR Sanctuary, Knuckles <br> Eastern Province: Ampara Sanctuary, Buddaragala Sanctuary, Kanthale Naval Sanctuary <br> North Central Province: Wilpattu, Ritigala Strict Nature Reserve, Angamedilla NP, Flood Plains NP, Giritale NP, Moragaswawe NP, Somawathie NP, Wasgamuwa NP <br> Sabaragamuwa Province: Udawalawe NP <br> Uva Province: Bundala NP, Lunugamvehera NP, Madura Oya NP, Ruhuna NP |
| Trachypithecus geei | Bhutan <br> India | Black Mountain NP, Phipsoo WLS, Royal Manas NP, Trumshingla NP <br> Assam: Chakrasila WLS, Manas NP |
| Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei | Bangladesh <br> India | Sylhet: Lawachara NP, Rama-Kalenga WLS <br> Mizoram: Dampa WLS <br> Tripura: Gumti WLS, Sepahijala WLS, Trishna WLS |
| Trachypithecus pileatus brahma | None |  |
| Trachypithecus pileatus durga | Bangladesh <br> India | Chittagong: Chunathi WLS <br> Sylhet: Ram-Kalenga WLS <br> Assam: Gibbon WLS, Kaziranga NP, Pabitora WLS <br> Mizoram: Dampa NP, Murlen NP, Nengpui WLS <br> Tripura: Gumti WLS, Sepahijala WLS, Trishna WLS |
| Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus | India | Arunachal Pradesh: Namdapha NP Meghalaya: Balphakram NP, Nokrek NP, Siju WLS |
| Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus | Bhutan <br> India | Royal Manas NP <br> Arunachal Pradesh: Eagle Nest WLS, Pakhui WLS <br> Assam: Manas NP, Nameri NP |
| Trachypithecus vetulus monticola | Sri Lanka | Central Province: Peak Wilderness Sanctuary, Horton Plains NP, Hakgala Nature Reserve, Victoria, Randenigala, Rantembe Sanctuary |
| Trachypithecus vetulus nestor | Sri Lanka | Sabaragamuwa Province: Kitulgala WLS, Kurulukale Sanctuary Western Province: Attidiya-Belanwila Forest, Ingiriya, Muthurajawala |
| Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki | Sri Lanka | Central Province: Knuckles FR (east) <br> North Central Province: Angamedilla NP, Anuradhapura Sanctuary, Flood Plains NP, Kaudulla NP, Minneriya-Giritale NP, |

\(\left.\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Scientific taxon name } & \text { Country } & \text { Protected Areas } \\
\hline & & \begin{array}{l}\text { Mihintale Sanctuary, Moragaswewa NP, Polonnaruwa Sanctuary, } \\
\text { Ritigala Strict Nature Reserve, Somawathie NP, Wasgamova NP } \\
\text { North Western Province: Wilpattu NP } \\
\text { Uva Province: Madura Oya NP }\end{array} \\
\hline \text { Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus } & \text { Sri Lanka } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Sabaragamuwa Province: Udawalawe NP, Peak Wilderness } \\
\text { (Ratnapura sector), Gilimale-Eratne Conserved Forest, Morahela } \\
\text { Conserved Forest, Sinharaja Conserved Forest (NWHS) Forest } \\
\text { Reserve } \\
\text { Southern Province: Dombaghakanda Forest Reserve, Kekunadara } \\
\text { Conserved Forest, Oliyagankale Conserved Forest, Heycodi } \\
\text { Conserved Forest, Kombala-Kottawale Conserved Forest, } \\
\text { Kauneliya Conserved Forest, Messava Conserved Forest, Nahiti- } \\
\text { Mukalana Conserved Forest, Detwale Conserved Forest }\end{array} \\
\hline \begin{array}{lll}\text { Hylobatidae } \\
\text { Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock }\end{array} & \text { Bangladesh } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Chittagong: Chunati WLS }\end{array} \\
\text { Sylhet: Lawachara WLS }\end{array}
$$\right\} \begin{array}{l}Arunachal Pradesh: Kamlang WLS, Mehao WLS, Namdapha NP <br>
Assam: Bherjan WLS, Borajan WLS, Dibru-Saikhowa NP, <br>
Garampani WLS, Gibbon WLS, Kaziranga NP <br>
Meghalaya: Balpakram NP, Nokrek NP, Nongkhylem WLS, Siju <br>
WLS <br>
Mizoram: Dampa WLS, Khawnglung WLS, Murlen NP, Nengpui <br>

WLS, Phawangpui WLS\end{array}\right\}\)| Nagaland: Intanki NP |
| :--- |
| Tripura: Gumti WLS, Sepahijala WLS, Trishna WLS |

## Primates in southern Indian zoos

Primates are among the most popular zoo animals due to their similarity to humans and their funny, charming behaviour. Of the 164 public zoos, mini zoos and deer parks in India, which have been recognised by the Central Zoo Authority, the 54 Large, Medius and Small Zoos, which are the better facilities, hold from one to eight species of primates. Sometimes these highly social animals are held in appropriate groupings of numbers and sex ratios, but all too often, as solitary inmates of an enclosure, or a single sex group or occasionally even as mixed species. The status of many of them is uncertain because of recent taxonomic changes. The number in the 112 Mini-zoos and Deer Parks has not been updated by C.Z.A, but it is "considerable" In the remaining South Asian countries there are 14 major zoos, all of which hold from 1-9 species of primates.

The C.A.M.P. workshop provided a forum for the Central Zoo Authority and the Indian zoo community, represented by three Indian zoo directors, to address revisions in primate taxonomy and nomenclature. Now, instead of 15 species of primates with Indian distribution there are more species and subspecies defined in different taxonomic systems. India and the other South Asia zoos in Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, and Sri Lanka, will find the revised taxonomic system a major challenge in identifying subspecies within existing collections. The Conservation Breeding Working Group
recommended that zoos with such species and subspecies refrain from breeding until they could be correctly identified and organized to avoid unwanted propagation of hybrids. They also recommended that zoos update their signage and educational materials and focus on planned programmes for noncontroversial species for the time being.

## Comprehensive Education Project

The Working Group for Education and Species Conservation Action made extensive recommendations for education and awareness. According to one of these recommendations, ZOO/CBSG South Asia has undertaken a comprehensive education programme with the primary objective of disseminating information from the workshop to three major target groups. The groups are i. policy-makers, foresters and academics, ii. adult laypersons in both English and vernacular, and iii. youngsters of different age groups. This programme is going on currently and will be enhanced significantly by the publication of this Report, associated report summaries for very wide distribution, and other material.

Currently over 5000 educational packets featuring South Asian primates have been distributed to 30 institutions for Earth Day, World Environment Day, Wildlife Week and occasional events such as teacher training programmes and other educational events. The packets describe the variety, distribution, status, threats, ecology and problems of South Asian primates. These have been distributed in large quantities to primate biologists who wish to educate the public about primates, to zoological gardens for use in their zoo education programmes and to a range of conservation and education non-governmental organizations to use in local public education on primate conservation. With the publication of this Report many other materials will be brought out and distributed to hundreds of policy-makers and thousands of layperson. Funds for the South Asian Primate Education Programme have been contributed by Primate Society of Great Britain, Margot Marsh Foundation, Thrigby Hall Wildlife Park, Appenheul Primate Park, Primate Conservation, Inc. and Flora and Fauna International.

## Summation

Finally, the South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. Workshop provided an excellent opportunity address the conservation needs for an entire group of taxa and their habitat, as well as the resolution of important issues identified by all stakeholders. Research focus and management recommendations from the Primate C.A.M.P. workshop will help conservation organizations, agencies and institutions nationally, regionally and internationally, to formulate and implement appropriate action on behalf of primate conservation. Funding agencies can use this Report as a reference for prioritizing proposals for maximum benefit of funds.

In addition to assessing each species and subspecies of South Asian primates individually, the workshop provided opportunities to test hypotheses generated about primate relations in the new PSG taxonomy, to access the field data that had been gathered under both individual and institutional efforts and, of course, to provide an opportunity for primate biologists, foresters and other specialists within the South Asia region to meet and discuss matters of mutual concern.

As part of the mandate of the workshop, national assessments of all widely distributed primates were made using the the Regional Guidelines of the IUCN Red List Criteria. The assessments are compiled in Table 8.

Table 8: Status of widely distributed primates at the national level.

| Scientific taxon name | SA | Ba | Bh | I | N | P | SL | E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loridae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus | NT |  |  | NT |  |  |  | E |
| Loris lydekkerianus malabaricus | NT |  |  | NT |  |  |  | E |
| Loris tardigradus grandis | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Loris tardigradus nordicus | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Loris tardigradus nycticeboides | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Loris tardigradus tardigradus | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Nycticebus bengalensis | DD | DD |  | DD |  |  |  | No |
| Cercopithecidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Macaca arctoides | CR | LE |  | CR |  |  |  | No |
| Macaca assamensis assamensis | EN | CR |  | EN |  |  |  | No |
| Macaca assamensis ${ }^{1}$ | EN |  |  |  | EN |  |  | E |
| Macaca assamensis pelops | EN |  | EN | EN |  |  |  | E |
| Macaca fascicularis aurea | CR | CR |  |  |  |  |  | No |
| Macaca fascicularis umbrosa | NT |  |  | NT |  |  |  | E |
| Macaca leonina | EN | CR |  | EN |  |  |  | No |
| Macaca mulatta mulatta | LC | $\downarrow$ NT | $\downarrow$ NT | LC | $\downarrow$ NT | NT |  | No |
| Macaca radiata diluta | LC |  |  | LC |  |  |  | E |
| Macaca radiata radiata | LC |  |  | LC |  |  |  | E |
| Macaca silenus | EN |  |  | EN |  |  |  | E |
| Macaca sinica aurifrons | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Macaca sinica opisthomelas | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Macaca sinica sinica | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Semnopithecus (Trachypithecus) j.johnii | VU |  |  | VU |  |  |  | E |
| Semnopithecus entellus achates | LC |  |  | LC |  |  |  | E |
| Semnopithecus entellus ajax | CR |  |  | CR | CR |  |  | E |
| Semnopithecus entellus anchises | NT |  |  | NT |  |  |  | E |
| Semnopithecus entellus entellus | NT | EN |  | NT |  |  |  | E |
| Semnopithecus entellus hector | EN |  |  | EN | $\uparrow C R$ |  |  | E |
| Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos | EN |  |  | EN |  |  |  | E |
| Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus | NT |  | NT | NT | NT | NT |  | No |
| Semnopithecus priam priam | VU |  |  | VU |  |  |  | E |
| Semnopithecus priam thersites ${ }^{2}$ | EN |  |  | EN |  |  |  | E |
| Semnopithecus priam thersites ${ }^{3}$ | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Trachypithecus geei | EN |  | EN | $\uparrow$ CR |  |  |  | E |
| Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei | EN | CR |  | EN |  |  |  | No |
| Trachypithecus pileatus brahma | DD |  |  | DD |  |  |  | E |
| Trachypithecus pileatus durga | EN | CR |  | EN |  |  |  | E |
| Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus | EN |  |  | EN |  |  |  | No |
| Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus | EN |  | EN | $\uparrow C R$ |  |  |  | E |
| Trachypithecus vetulus monticola | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Trachypithecus vetulus nestor | CR |  |  |  |  |  | CR | E |
| Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus | EN |  |  |  |  |  | EN | E |
| Hylobatidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock | EN | CR |  | EN |  |  |  | No |

[^2] South Asia, ${ }^{1}$ Nepal population, ${ }^{2}$ India population, ${ }^{3}$ Sri Lanka population

## SPECIAL ISSUE WORKING GROUPS

Special Issue: Funding Field Studies

Working group members:
M.M. Feeroz, Minesh Ghimire, J. Das, A. Kumar, J. Bose, J. Biswas, Rekha Medhi, Dilip Chetry, Ardith Eudey

The Working Group addressed the issue of funding agencies, recommending that primate biologists should attempt to obtain funds from their own respective organizations, e.g. University, forest department, wildlife department and relevant ministry. The Group discussed the fact that many national agencies were unable to support the overall requirement, and thus funds should be sought from international organizations.

Some international organizations agencies which provide funds for research and conservation in the South Asian region are United States Department of the Interior/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, McArthur Foundation, Ford Foundation, Toyota Fund, Volkswagen Foundation, Wildlife Conservation Society, USA, World Wide Fund for Nature, USA, Flora and Fauna Internationa, UK, IUCN Netherlands, United Nations Development Programme, Conservation International, USA; Primate Conservation, Inc., selected national embassies, as well as regional organizations like USUR ICIMOD, Nepal, and many others. Many zoos in developed countries are also interested in reviewing proposals and funding field studies of threatened species. Some zoos prioritise species that they hold in their collection while other zoos prioritise solely on merit of the proposal. All of these organisation have a specific format and require an application on the appropriate form.

## Priortitising Proposals

The Working Group felt that proposals and requests should be focused on Data Deficient areas so that the study could contribute to over all basic information on South Asian primates. The group emphasized that proposals had a higher probability of being funded if they targeted lesser-known species, threatened species, conservation dependent species, urban population and trans-boundary research areas.

## Special Issue: Urban Monkeys

Working Group members:
All participants
It was noted by the group that the definition of "urban monkeys" should extend to all other altered habitats, such as plantations, home gardens, etc. and not only those in 'urban' areas.

The group listed the problems of urban monkeys as i) the decreasing space between monkeys and human settlements which results in crop raiding and garbage eating; ii) the resulting decline of remaining populations, e.g. those left after poisoning, shooting, etc.; ;ii) the likelihood of these populations increasing due to their accessibility of garbage, feeding by tourists, etc; iv) destruction of crops; v)
approaching or entering houses, government works etc.; vi) zoonotic diseases from human to monkey and vice versa; vii) guides encouraging feeding to promote contact with tourists, etc.

Governments of all non-human primate bearing countries require help to deal with this problem. It is a human problem which can be mitigated by clearing of garbage, which is the most pro-active and effective solution. It was felt that placing signboards around areas where garbage piles up and monkeys gather was not feasible.

Municiple solutions include translocations and sterilisation. Sterilisation has its own difficulties with implants for females being expensive and short term and catching monkeys for any procedure is expensive and energy consuming. Culling monkeys in some countries in South Asia is culturally controversial.

## The group felt that the more productive solutions and their advantages were:

1. Get rid of garbage entirely instead of simply moving it from one area to another as done by many municipalities.
2. This should be done in association with public education as a concerted public relations effort over the long term
3. Such education should emphasize why we must not feed monkeys or provide any artificial food
4. These efforts can be undertaken over the long term and will prove less costly than intrusive methods, such as translocation, sterilisation, etc.
5. There is an added advantage of getting rid of rodents and other pests as well as cleaning the atmosphere by reducing or eliminating garbage
6. Culling is controversial with some NGOs, religious bodies etc. and can create problems for municipal, state and national governments/
7. Education should extend to religious leaders who should pass the information to temples, etc. The concept of "monkey-god" and it non-requirement of public feeding for pujas need to be explained.
8. Schools and universities as well as Municiple councils should be provided with material to use in their institutions and with their members.
9. Cleanup campaigns can utilise civic organizations, such as Lions Club, Rotary Club etc., as well as team of volunteers or paid public relations personell
10. Target where problems initiate, e.g. temples
11. In zoos, where there are often free ranging monkeys in addition to captive ones, or other tourist sites, screening of polythene bags can be done before visitors enter and visitors
can be requested individual not to feed the monkeys.
12. Constant clearing of garbage prone areas

## Special Issue: Conservation Breeding

Working Group Members:<br>Bipul Chakraborty, Kumar Pushkar, P. C. Tyagi and Manoharan, assisted by Mewa Singh, Douglas Brandon-Jones, Rauf Ali, and Manoj Misra.

Keeping in view the classification of primates into various subspecies, it will be appropriate that the Indian zoos prevent breeding of the following species until they can be properly identified:

1. Bonnet macaque
2. Common langur / grey langur
3. Assamese macaque
4. Capped langur
5. Slender loris

The animals may be segregated on the basis of morphological differences. The help of qualified taxonomists, ideally from the IUCN SSC Primate Specialist Group may be taken by the zoos in determining how the animals should be segregated. The help of the Centre for Cellular and Molecular Biology (CCMB) may also be taken for identification of different subspecies when appropriate.

During the next 3 years time the zoos can be made aware of the revised taxonomy and the anomalies in their collection. Priority can be fixed on non-controversial species to be covered under planned breeding programmes. Zoos will also make the visitors aware of the status and importance of different subspecies in their natural habitat and encourage them to support conservation of the in situ population. With respect to other species the details are as follows:

## 1. Slow loris (Nycticebus bengalensis)

At present 8 zoos in India are displaying 12 ( 6 males and 6 females) slow loris. Out of the 8 zoos, four are located in the animals' habitat area. The species has so far bred very well in captivity. Assam State Zoo, Guwahati and Sanjay Gandhi Biological Park, Patna has good experience in breeding the animals. However due to bad management practices the zoo populations have suffered a higher level of mortality.

Keeping in view of the recommentations of the South Asian Primate CAMP and if at all a special conservation breeding programme of the species needs to be initiated for conserving the gene pool, facilities can be created at the zoos located at Guwahati, Itanagar and Patna. Itanagar zoo is already creating an enclosure on the guidelines of Central Zoo Authority for housing of this species. Not recommended for captive breeding.

## 2. Stump-tailed macaque (Macaca arctoides):

At present 10 zoos in India are displaying 41 ( 20 males and 21 females) stump tailed macaque. Out of the ten zoos, three zoos are located near the animal habitat. Only a few zoos have a sizable number, but
the sex ratio is skewed. Some of the zoos like Guwahati Zoo and Patna Zoo have bred the species in past. Though the overall population of the species is satisfactory on the surface, due to their scattered distribution and skewed sex ratio, few zoos can actually breed the animals. Thus, pooling of the animals has to be done in the zoos which are near the animals habitat, so that if at all any animal that is rescued, or confiscated from traders can be brought to these zoos and involved in the breeding programme. An appropriately designed enclosure for the species is under way at Guwahati Zoo. Recommended for captive breeding.

## 3. Pig-tailed macaque (Macaca leonina):

At present 7 zoos in India are displaying 20 (11:9) Pig-tailed macaques. Only 2 zoos are located near the habitat of the animal. These 2 zoos alone make up for 14 animals, e.g., 7 males and 7 females, with the rest of them are distributed singly in 5 zoos. The Assam State Zoo has been successful in breeding the animal. The present population in the zoos is not sufficient to start a breeding programme, keeping in view that for any such programme at least 20 founder animals would be required. The possibility of having an age group which are currently in their prime is also remote. Therefore, help of zoos outside India and the animals rescued from wild areas would be required to initiate a fruitful breeding programme. Not recommended for captive breeding

## 4. Lion-tailed macaque (Macaca silenus):

At least 18 zoos in India are displaying lion-tailed macaque. Out of these 10 zoos are located in proximity to the animas habitat, ie the Western Ghats. 50 (28:22) animals are on display.

Arignar Anna Zoo, Chennai is the studbook keeper of the species. A studbook for all the Lion-tailed macaque's in Indian Zoos has been prepared by the Wildlife Institute of India. It has also been established that a managed conservation breeding programme for the species can be initiated from the present captive population. AAZP, Chennai, Mysore Zoo and Trivandrum Zoo are participating in the breeding programme. The CZA will make all efforts to pool the single animals in other zoos and send breeding age individuals to the breeding center. Others will be kept on display, provided an appropriate enclosure for the animals should exist, so they may serve as Ambassadors for conservation and protection of their kins in wild. Recommended for captive breeding

## 5. Golden langur (Trachypithecus geei):

Five zoos in India are displaying 7 ( 2 males and 5 females) of Golden langur. Two zoos are located in the proximity of the animals' habitat. It is suggested that, as Assam State Zoo, Guwahati has a very good enclosure for Golden langur in an off-display area, the single animals in other 4 zoos should be shifted to Guwahati. Controlled captive breeding can be carried out at Guwahati, but long term captive breeding of the species cannot be recommended at this stage. Not recommended for captive breeding

## 6. Nilgiri langur (Semnopithecusjohnii):

Eight zoos in India are displaying 27 ( 11 males, 14 females and 2 juveniles) Nilgiri langur. Six zoos are located in the proximity of the animals' habitat. Despite the fact that Arignar Anna Zoo, Chennai, the Chamarajendra Zoological Gardens, Mysore and, more recently the V.O.C. Park, Coimbatore has been successful in breeding of the species, a national programme on conservation breeding of the
animals has not been initiated. Single animals (if they are of breeding age) can be pooled in the above zoos, which are located near the animals habitat, for use in a breeding programme. These zoos may receive animals rescued from the wild, which can then be added to the existing groups.

## Recommended for captive breeding

## 7. Long-tailed Macaque (Macaca fasicularis umbrosa)

This species of primate is distributed only at one zoo at Port-blair, Andamans. Presently 16 (9:7) Long tailed macaque are displayed. In the past the zoo had one or two successes in breeding of the species, however the animal survival rate was poor. This may be due to the design of the enclosure constructed by the Andamans and Nicobar Forest department at Chidiya Tapu Biological Park. May be once these animals get translocated to the new enclosure, breeding may take place.

If at all any programme is initiated for conservation breeding of the species, on offsite area in the new zoo has to be acquired from the wild. The present population may be inbred. One or two of these also may not be in their prime. Not recommended for captive breeding

## 8. Hoolock (Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock):

Five zoos in India are displaying 10 ( 4 males and 6 females) Hoolock gibbon. Three zoos are located near the animal habitat and only Assam State Zoo, Guwahati has an appropriate enclosure for the animals. This is the only zoo which had success in breeding of the Hoolock gibbon, but survival rate was very poor. Being monogamous, breeding of the animals is limited to suitable pairing. Much study is
needed on the behaviour of the species, before any serious breeding programme can be taken up. The zoos located near the animals habitat may in the meantime try to form compatible pairs for breeding.

## Not recommended for captive breeding

## Special Issue: Education, Species Action and Conservation Action

Working group members:
Gigi, K. Joseph, H.R. Bhat, Manoj, K. Misra, P. Srivastava, Santhosh Kumar Sahoo, G. Ramaswamy, Suvas Chandra Ghimire, M.S. Pradhan, Jini Dela, Ramakantha V., C.V.C. Pandian, Wesley Sundarraj, Binu Priya A.R.

The Group described its mandate as describing ways to translate the results from the Primate C.A.M.P. to field action. The challenge is to successfully communicate the right message to the right individual or organisation.

The Working Group defined the primaty messages as :

- Primate taxonomy is evolving
- This is a revised taxonomy
- These are the current (2002) threat status of the primates in south Asia
- You can act to make a difference!

And subsidiary messages as :

- Langur taxonomy is unclear
- Scientist/taxonomists need your help


## Suggestions for appropriate long-range and overall action :

1. A focused one-page summary from the working group in a simple language be sent out by the organizers (ZOO, CBSG, SFSC) to all the key decision makers, accompanied with the executive summary of the working group proceedings for information and sensitization purposes.
2. Carefully identified interested and relevant field practitioners should be sent the full report.
3. Zoo Outreach Organisation may take up the year 2004 as "The Year of Primates".
4. Volunteer scientists/NGO in different parts of the region may be encouraged to take up the census of specific species and subspecies in long term with a missionary zeal.
5. Institutions like SACON may become focal centers for taking a lead on resolving the langur taxonomic tangle.
6. Local officials to be enrolled as active collaborators in the endeavor.
7. Media to be fed exciting stories on it. Interested taxonomists from abroad to fund raise for field work.

## Detailed recommendations

1. The group recognized that a macrolevel (television, websites, press etc.,) and microlevel (village level interaction) of education as crucial for the successful conservation of non-human primates in south Asia.
2. Identify important persons (local leaders) from local communities to sensitize their masses.
3. Forest departments can play a major role in disseminating the facts and conservation needs. Local NGOs can be entrusted as communicators and facilitators to do effectively the same.
4. It has been established that the involvement of local communities in decision making process in the management strategies of concerned protected areas and other natural areas is vital. This creates a sense of ownership towards the natural primate habitat and its conservation.
5. Youth from marginal communities can be selected and trained as efficient interpreters or guides of primates in their nearest natural habitats and thereby promote ecotourism from which they get a financial benefit also.
6. A stakeholder workshop can be organized with the help of NGOs and forest department to communicate the prime values of primates and their conservation. These will help to derive sitespecific education and awareness strategies to be followed in concerned areas.
7. The names of the important primates should be used for some important roads, trains and seminar halls. For e.g. ‘Gibbon Express' for a train in northeast India; 'LTM Hall' in SFS complex to start with.
8. Some slides can be shown in local theatres before a film show.
9. ZOO can develop and distribute education packets on primates to various zoos, ngo's and other interested and concerned individuals, institutions, and forest departments to conduct nature camps and education programmes.
10. Conservation of many primates have been built in with the religious cultural system especially in India. Important religious personalities can be motivated to sensitize their audience to the fact that many primates are endemic to this region and the importance of conservation of the concerned primate species.
11. Develop small booklets with interesting stories many pictures, stickers, and brochures in vernacular language for local communities and some relevant materials for policy makers and administrators in English.
12. In education compare human behaviour with primate behaviour to create interest among locals.
13. Information provided should neither be too complex nor too simple. Information should be precise and should be appropriate for the community.

## Status of South Asian Primates

4. Taxon Data Sheets
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{ll}\text { Synonyms } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Loris lydekkerianus Cabrera, 1908 } \\
\text { Loris tardigradus lydekkerianus Cabrera, 1908 } \\
\text { Loris gracilis typicus (Lydekker, 1904) }\end{array}
$$ <br>

Family \& Loridae\end{array}\right\}\)| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| :--- | :--- |
| Common names | Tamil: Thevanangu; Telugu: Devanga Pilli; English: Gray Slender Loris, Mysore <br> Slender Loris, Slender Loris |
| Notes on taxonomy | Six subspecies are distinguished by minor variations in pelage colour and size, <br> based on small samples. Jenkins, 1987 mentioned that it seems likely that there <br> are fewer subspecies than the literature suggests, but larger samples are required <br> to provide a definitive classification. |
| Habit | Nocturnal, arboreal, insectivorous, usually solitary |
| Habitat | Dry deciduous forest and scrub jungles |
| Niche branches and hollows. Feeds on small insects, lizards, fruits etc. |  |


| Status |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | NEAR THREATENED |
| Rationale | Although this taxon is under pressure from various threats, primary being habitat <br> loss and hunting, there is not enough observation or confidence in inference about <br> its rate of decline in the past. Since the taxon is restricted to a few locations (based <br> on available information) and some information is available on its distribution and <br> threats, it is considered Near Threatened. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Data Deficient |
| Justification for change | Better / new information available at the workshop. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with <br> full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife legislation | Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India |  |
| Andhra Pradesh: Nellapattu WLS, Sri Venkateswara NP |  |
| Karnataka: Biligiri Rangaswamy Temple WLS |  |


Distribution of Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus in India from literature and recent field studies
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Distribution of Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus in India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | d <br> Future <br> \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WLS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kolar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Singh et al., 2000a |
| Kolar town | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Singh et al., 2000a |
| Malur | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Singh et al., 2000a |
| Mysore? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heggadadevankote, Hunsur, | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Kumara, H.N. and M. Singh (Unpublished data) |
| Piriyapatna?, T. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narasipura? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tumkur district | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Singh et al., 2000a |
| Kunigal, Tumkur | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Kumara, H.N. and M. Singh (Unpub.) |
| Tamil Nadu |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chennai |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chennai | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Singh et al., 2000a; Groves, 2001 |
| Dindugal | $10^{\circ} 04-$ | $77^{\circ} 54-$ | 100 | - | - | - | - | 313 | 200 | Singh et al., 2000a |
| Ayalur | $\sim 10^{\circ} 24$ | $\sim 78^{\circ} 00$ | - | DD, S | Hunting, road kills, habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | - | - | - | Singh et al., 1999 |
| Nattam | $10^{\circ} 13$ | $78^{\circ} 13$ | - | DD, S | Hunting, road kills, habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | - | - | - | Singh et al., 1999 |
| Sirumalai | - | - | - | DD, S | Hunting, road kills, habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | - | - | - | Singh et al., 1999 |
| Karur |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sevapur | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Singh et al., 2000a |
| Madurai |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alagar hills | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Singh et al., 2000a |
| Nilgiris |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Singh et al., 2000a |
| Kotagiri | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Singh et al., 2000a |
| Salem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chettiri range | $11^{\circ} 50$ | $78^{\circ} 29$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 610m. Schulze, 2003 |

DD, S - Dry deciduous and Scrub forests
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## Loris lydekkerianus malabaricus (Wroughton, 1917)

| Synonyms | Loris tardigradus (Ryley, 1913) <br> Loris malabaricus Wroughton, 1917 <br> Loris tardigradus malabaricus Wroughton, 1917 <br> Loris tardigradus gracilis Jenkins, 1987 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Family | Loridae |
| Common names | Kannada: Kadupapa; Malayalam: Kutti Thevangu; Tamil: Thevaangu; English: Gray <br> Slender Loris, Malabar Slender Loris |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies. The Indian wet- and dry-country subspecies overlap each other. |
| Habit | Moist deciduous, teak plantations, semi-evergreen forests |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | NEAR THREATENED |
| Rationale | Although this taxon is under pressure from various threats, primary being habitat loss and hunting, there is not enough observation or confidence in inference about its rate of decline in the past. Decline is predicted due to the above factors. Since the taxon is restricted to 20 locations (based on available information) and some information is available on its distribution and threats, it is considered Near Threat ened. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Data Deficient |
| Justification for change | Better / new information available at the workshop. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife legislation | Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected |  |
| India | Karnataka: Brahmagiri WLS, Someswara WLS <br> Kerala: Aralam WLS, Idukki WLS, Parambikulam WLS, Peechi-Vazhani WLS, Periyar NP, Shendurney WLS, Thattakkad WLS, Wynaad WLS <br> Tamil Nadu: Indira Gandhi WLS, Kalakkad-Mundanthurai WLS, Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS |
| Recommendations Research | Taxonomic research, life history studies, survey, ecological studies |
| Management | Habitat management, monitoring, public education |
| Captive stocks | 3 zoos in India (4.0.1.5) and 1 zoo in Sri Lanka (0.1.0.1). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | Moist evergreen forests of South India have been reduced to a series of isolated patches by extensive deforestation (Eudey, 1987). It is consider as a bad omen among poachers and so they kill the animal when they sight one. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Easa et al., 2000; Groves, 2001; <br> Hilton-Taylor, 2000; Jenkins, 1987; SAZARC, 2001; Schulze, 2003 <br> Biological Information Sheet (2002): H.N. Kumara <br> C.A.M.P. questionnaire on protected areas (2002): G.K. Joseph, T.U. Uthup |
| Compilers | R. Ali, H.R. Bhat, G.K. Joseph, R. Krishnamani, Ajith Kumar, P.O. Nameer, M.S. Pradhan, S. Ram, K.K. Ramachandran, G. Ramaswamy, A.K. Sharma, M. Singh, W.S.F. Sunderraj. |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey, M.S. Pradhan |
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| Synonyms | Loris tardigradus grandis (Hill and Phillips, 1932) <br> Loris lydekkerianus nordicus (Hill, 1933) <br> Loris tardigradus nordicus Hill, 1933 <br> Loris lydekkerianus grandis Brandon-Jones et al., 2000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Loridae |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Common names | Sinhala: Kalu Unahapuluwa, Unahapuluwa; Tamil: Kadu-papa, Thevaangu; English: Grey Slender Loris, Highland Slender Loris |
| Notes on taxonomy | Hill and Phillips (1932) is followed until published clarification of species status is available. Brandon-Jones et al. (2000) do not recognize L. tardigradus nordicus (Hill, 1933) as a separate subspecies, but have included it with the grandis subspecies based on Groves' (2001) absence of evidence to distinguish these two subspecies from museum specimens. Following Hill (1933) and recent field observations from Nekaris (in press), nordicus and grandis are considered as distinct subspecies in this report. Groves (2001) notes that he is quite unable to distinguish the lowland dry zone (nordicus) and hill country (grandis) lorises. |
| Habit | Nocturnal, arboreal, solitary, insectivorous, frugivorous, carnivorous (small lizards, eggs etc.) |
| Habitat | Tropical hill forest |
| Elevation | 600-1200m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Endemic to Sri Lanka |
| Extent of Occurrence | 1600 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | 400 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/subpopulations | 16 / Not known. Fragmented. <br> There is a close relationship between loss of critical habitat and population number. According to government data, during last 42 years (1956-1993), the country has lost $50 \%$ of its forest cover and more than $50 \%$ if the last 10 years (1994-2003) is included. There is a close relation between loss of critical habitat and population number. Therefore the subspecies have been numerically reduced by $50 \%$. Much of the original forested habitat in the low and midland central hill zone areas has been converted into agriculture, home gardens and plantations. The taxon is therefore very sparsely distributed among isolated pockets of protective vegetation. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>50 \%$ in the last 50 years or more and is predicted to decrease by $>10 \%$ in the next 5 years due to agricultural and economic land use. Decrease in quality due to habitat fragmentation, loss of ecologically important forests and human encroachment. Tropical evergreen forests in the central hills are continuing to be converted for human use. As large home gardens and small estates are urbanized, this taxon is deprived of refuges. |
| Threats | Clear-cutting, deliberate fires, trade, habitat loss by use of chemicals in agriculture. Koslanda, Thangamalai and Kotmale locations are heavily clearcut for timber and for other plantations. Increasing visitor pressure to Thangamalai is a significant |


|  | factor. <br> Threats well understood, not reversible, not ceased |
| :---: | :---: |
| Trade | Local (commercial) trade for eyes for folk medicine and meat for food. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | Estimated at 4-7 years |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Declined by $50 \%$ or more in 3 generations and predicted to decline by $>20 \%$ in the next 10 years. |
| Data source | Informal sightings; observed; minimum/maximum |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED A2cd+4cd, B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v)+2ab(I,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Not Evaluated |
| Justification | The Grey/Highland/Northern Dry Slender Loris occurs only in dry zone forests tracts of Sri Lanka most of which is threatened due to human interference (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation over the years has depleted the area available for this dry-zone taxon and restricted it to several small pockets. From 1956-1993 Sri Lanka lost more than $50 \%$ of forest cover to human activities, followed by a similar rate of decline in the remaining forest cover between 1994 and 2003. Correlating loss of habitat to populations, rate of decline in population is inferred at more than $50 \%$ over 3 generations. Also due to continuing trends past and predicted declines could reduce the population by more than $50 \%$ within the next 11 to 22 years due to continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat along with exploitation of the species observed in the wild. The taxon is also threatened due to its restricted distribution of less than $1600 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ extent of occurrence and $400 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ area of occupancy and continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat, number of locations and in the number of mature individuals, the latter two inferred from threats to habitat and population from degradation and hunting, respectively. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Protected under the Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance Act No. 2, 1937 and subsequent amendments including Act No. 49, 1993 but at the species level |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| Sri Lanka | Central Province: Knuckles; Uva Province: Thangamalai WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Population genetics, taxonomy, life history, population survey, behaviour and ecology, epidemiology, trade |
| Management | Habitat management, monitoring, public education, limiting factor management, work in local communities, PHVA |
| Captive Stocks | Zoos. Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | This species requires habitat conservation and natural breeding. Geographical distribution is in lower slopes and hills of northern, eastern and southern aspects of |

central montane massif. No sightings of grandis in lower plains of dry zone or wet zone. Sometimes, rustier pelage of adults and brown and reddish-brown young of grandis (Phillips, 1935) suggest that this form is more allied to lowland wet zone (L.t. tardigradus) than the lowland dry zone (L.t. nordicus) subspecies. Animal little known to its captors, many of them had not seen such a creature previously. Rewards failed to produce further specimens for months. It would appear that the race is uncommon and sparsely distributed throughout its distribution area (Schulze, 2003). The main distribution area of this subspecies is vulnerable to tourism, which may affect them. The area is also highly exposed to agricultural practices and usage of agro-chemicals is increasing dramatically, which would adversely reduce the insect population, an important food source of this animal.

| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; Groves, 2001; Hill and Phillips, 1932; Hilton-Taylor, <br> 2000; IUCN, Sri Lanka, 2000; Jenkins, 1987; Phillips, 1935; Schulze, 2003 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Ecology and distributional data (in alphabetical order): |
| IUCN Sri Lanka, Biodiversity Field Research team (data communicated by R. |  |
|  | Somaweera through workshop participants). <br> Primate Biology Program, Smithsonian Institution and Institute of Fundamental <br> Studies: original data from W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. <br> Liyanage, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe. <br> University of Jaffna: S. Wijeyamohan |
| Compilers | Chief compilers: W. Dittus and A. Watson <br> Working group: J. Dela, W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, A. <br> Watson, N. Weerasinghe, S. Wijeyamohan <br> Biological Information Sheet (2002): R. Somaweera |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, W. Dittus, A. Eudey, A. Watson |
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| Synonyms | Loris tardigradus nordicus Hill, 1933 <br> Loris lydekkerianus grandis Brandon-Jones et al., 2000 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Family | Loridae |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Common names | Sinhalese: Unahapuluwa; Tamil: Thevaangu; English: Dry Zone Slender Loris, <br>  <br> Northern Slender Loris, Slender Loris |
| Notes on taxonomy | Hill (1933) and Hill and Phillips (1932) is followed until published, clarification of <br> species status is available. Brandon-Jones et al. (2000) do not recognise L. <br> tardigradus nordicus (Hill, 1933) as a separate subspecies but include it with the |
| grandis subspecies based on Groves 2001, absence of evidence to distinguish |  |
| these two subspecies in museum specimen. Following Hill, 1933 and recent field |  |
| observations by Nekaris (in press) L. I. nordicus is considered as a distinct subspe |  |
| cies here. |  |


| Threats | Hunting for folk medicine and habitat loss. <br> Currently the loris population is predicted to be stable in the northern province. For the last ten years (1993-2002), due to current civil war, people fear to go into these areas to hunt, mainly because the animal is nocturnal. No illegal logging or clearing of forest except along the main roads other than by the army. The forest is fairly intact but with the cessation of warfare in 2002 these northern forests areas will come under greater threat. <br> Threats well understood, not reversible, not ceased |
| :---: | :---: |
| Trade | Local and commercial trade for eyes and meat for food and as an aphrodisiac. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | Not known (estimated to be 4-7 years) |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Declined by $>50 \%$ in the last 3 generations and predicted to decline by $>20 \%$ in the next 5 years. |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, general field study, informal sighting, indirect information; observed. |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED A2cd+4cd |
| Rationale | The Grey/Highland/Northern Dry Slender Loris occurs only in dry zone forests tracts of Sri Lanka most of which is threatened due to human interference (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation over the years has depleted the area available for this dry-zone taxon and restricted it to several small pockets. From 1956-1993 Sri Lanka lost more than $50 \%$ of forest cover to human activities, followed by a similar rate of decline in the remaining forest cover between 1994 and 2003. Correlating loss of habitat to populations, rate of decline in population is inferred at more than $50 \%$ in the last 33 years ( 3 generations). Also due to continuing trends past and predicted declines could reduce the population by more than $50 \%$ within the next 11 to 22 years due to continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat along with actual and potential levels of exploitation of the species observed in the wild. The taxon is also threatened due to its restricted distribution of $20,300 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ extent of occurrence and $400 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ area of occupancy and continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat, number of locations and in the number of mature individuals, the latter two inferred from threats to habitat and population from degradation and hunting, respectively. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered A1c |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Protected under the Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance Act No. 2, 1937 and subsequent amendments including Act No. 49, 1993 at the species level. |
| CITES | Appendix II |


| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sri Lanka |  |
|  | Central Province: IFS arboretum, Menikdena FR, Sigiriya Sanctuary, Victoria- |
|  | Randeniyagala-Rantambe Sanctuary |
|  | Eastern Province: Ampara Sanctuary, Kanthale FR |
|  | Korth Central Province: Angamedilla NP, Flood Plains NP, Giritale Sanctuary, |
|  | Somawathie NP, Wasgamuwa NP, Wilpattu NP |
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South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. Report, 2003

| Synonyms | Loris lydekkerinus nycticeboides Brandon-Jones et al., 2001 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Loridae |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Common names | Sinhalese: Unahapuluwa; Tamil: Thevaangu; English: Highland Slender Loris, Horton Plains Slender Loris, Montane Slender Loris |
| Notes on taxonomy | Hill (1942) is followed until further taxonomic work is published. Clarification of species status is available. |
| Habit | Nocturnal, arboreal, solitary, carnivore (small prey) |
| Habitat | Tropical montane rainforest/mist forest |
| Elevation | 1650-2000m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Endemic to Sri Lanka |
| Extent of Occurrence | 900 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | 600 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/subpopulations | 5 / Not known. Fragmented. <br> A continuous decline in locations/subpopulations highly likely in concert with habitat loss. Decline in locations/subpopulations by $>80 \%$ in 200 years. According to government data, during last 42 years, the country has lost $50 \%$ of its forest cover and more than $50 \%$ if the last 10 years (1994-2003) is included. In addition, $80 \%$ of hill country forests were lost to coffee and tea plantations in the 19th century. There is a close relation between loss of critical habitat and population number. Therefore, the subspecies which inhabits the high elevation forest (favoured by tea plantations) has been reduced numerically by $80 \%$ over 200 years. This trend is continuing as high elevation natural forest is being converted to agriculture (vegetable plots and dairy pasture) and is cut for firewood. Some montane forests have been surveyed incompletely and therefore the area of occupancy of L.t. nycticeboides may be greater than indicated here. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area of $>80 \%$ in 200 years and is predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 5 years due to agricultural land use. Decrease in quality due to deforestation, habitat degradation. |
| Threats | Land and water pollution, habitat loss due to agriculture, dairy husbandry, and vegetable cultivation |
| Trade | Local and commercial trade for eyes and meat by tea plantation workers. Possible village level trade for folk medicine. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | Estimated at 4-7 years. |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |


| Population trend | Declined by $>80 \%$ in the last 200 years and is predicted to decline by $>20 \%$ in the next 10 years. Declined by $>50 \%$ in 3 generations. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, informal sightings, indirect information, museum records; observed; minimum/maximum |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED A2cd+4cd; B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| Rationale | The Dry Zone/Northern Slender Loris occurs only in dry zone forests tracts of Sri Lanka most of which is threatened due to human interference (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation over the years has depleted the area available for this dryzone taxon and restricted it to several small pockets. From 1956-1993 Sri Lanka lost more than $50 \%$ of forest cover to human activities, followed by a similar rate of decline in the remaining forest cover between 1994 and 2003. Correlating loss of habitat to populations, rate of decline in population is inferred at more than $50 \%$ over 3 generations. Also due to continuing trends past and predicted declines could reduce the population by more than $50 \%$ within the next 11 to 22 years due to continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat along with actual and potential levels of exploitation of the species observed in the wild. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered A1c |
| Justification for change | Better / new information available at the workshop |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Protected under the Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance Act No. 2, 1937 and subsequent amendments including Act No. 49, 1993 at the species level. |
| CITES | Appendix 1 |
| National RDB | Threatened |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| Sri Lanka | Central Province: Siripagama WLS <br> Sabaragamuwa Province: Peak Wilderness Sanctuary |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Genetic research, taxonomy, life history, population survey, epidemiology, trade, population genetics, behaviour and ecology |
| Management | Habitat management, public education, limiting factor management, work in local communities, PHVA |
| Captive stocks | Zoos, subspecies not known. |
| Comments | If the natural habitat is conserved, the species will reproduce on its own and establish itself well. |
|  | The size of possible habitat to which L.t. nycticeboides are endemic (montane rain and mist froest) is about 40,000 ha in several isolated areas. The subspecies has only been found in one of these areas, on Horton Plains. <br> Osman Hill wrote of L.t. nycticeboides: "That the animal is rare in that locality is evidenced by the fact that Mr. Tunein-Noltenius has been on the look out for it for the previous twenty years without success". Only two specimens have ever been found (in 1938), they and their offspring died in captivity. No recent sightings. In 1982, rangers said that slender lorises still occur on Horton Plains where temperatures |

may fall below $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ during a survey in 2001, however, rangers and researchers who have worked in the park for years said they have never seen heard any evidence of lorises here (Schulz, 2003).

| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; IUCN, Sri Lanka, <br> 2000; Jenkins, 1987; Schulze, 2003 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Ecology and distributional data (in alphabetical order): |
| IUCN Sri Lanka. Biodiversity Field Research team (data communicated by R. |  |
| Somaweera through workshop participants) |  |
| Primate Biology Program, Smithsonian Institution and Institute for Fundamental |  |
| Studies: original data from W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, |  |
| A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe |  |
| University of Jaffna: S. Wijeyamohan |  |
| Biological Information Sheet (2002): W. Dittus |  |
| Compilers | Chief compilers: W. Dittus and A. Watson <br> Working group: J. Dela, W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, R. <br> Somaweera, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe, S. Wijeyamohan |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, W. Dittus, A. Eudey, A. Watson |


Distribution of Loris tardigradus nycticeboides in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies


| Synonyms | Lemur tardigradus Linnaeus, 1758 <br> Stenops tardigradus (Linnaeus, 1758) <br> Loris gracilis E. Geoffroy, 1796 <br> Lemur ceylonicus Fischer, 1804 <br> Stenops gracilis (Kuhl, 1820) <br> Loris ceylonicus (Fischer) Lesson, 1827 <br> Arachnocebus lori Lesson, 1840 <br> Bradylemur tardigradus var. c: Lesson, 1840 <br> Nycticebus gracilis (Blainville, 1841) <br> Tardigradus tardigradus (Boddaert, 1841) <br> Loris gracilis zeylanicus Lydekker, 1905 <br> Loris tardigradus Thomas, 1908 <br> Loris tardigradus tardigradus Hill and Phillips, 1932 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Loridae |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Common names | Sinhalese: Unahapuluwa; Tamil: Thevaangu; English: Red Slender Loris, Slender Loris |
| Notes on taxonomy | Hill (1942) is followed until published clarification of species status is available. |
| Habit | Arboreal, nocturnal, solitary, insectivorous, frugivorous, carnivorous (small prey) |
| Habitat | Tropical rain, swampy coastal and evergreen forests, wet zone lowland forest |
| Elevation | Up to 700 m . |
| Distribution Global | Endemic to Sri Lanka |
| Extent of Occurrence | 7600 km² |
| Area of Occupancy | $2200 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ including possible intermediate types. |
| Locations/subpopulations | 41 / Not known. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area of $>50 \%$ in the last 40 years or more and is predicted by $>20 \%$ in the next 10 years. Decrease in quality due to loss of ecologically critical forest and habitat loss due to urbanisation. <br> Tropical evergreen forests in the Central Hills are continuing to be converted for human use. As large home gardens and small estates are urbanized, this taxon is deprived of refuges. |
| Threats | Deforestation due to urbanisation <br> Threats well understood, not reversible, not ceased |
| Trade | Local, domestic, commercial trade for meat |
| Population Generation time | Estimated to be 4-7 years. |
| Total population | Not known |


| Mature individuals | Not known |
| :---: | :---: |
| Population trend | Declined by $>50 \%$ in 3 generations and is predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 5 years. There is a $1: 1$ relationship between loss of critical habitat and population number. According to government data, during last 42 years, the country has lost $50 \%$ of its forest cover thus brought down the population of the species by $50 \%$. |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study, informal sightings, indirect information, museum records, literature; observed; minimum/maximum |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED A2cd+4cd |
| Rationale | The Red Slender Loris occurs only Sri Lanka most of which is threatened due to human interference (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation over the years has depleted the area available for this dry-zone taxon and restricted it to several small pockets. From 1956-1993 Sri Lanka lost more than $50 \%$ of forest cover to human activities, followed by a similar rate of decline in the remaining forest cover between 1994 and 2003. Correlating loss of habitat to populations, rate of decline in population is inferred at more than $50 \%$ over 3 generations. Also due to continuing trends past and predicted declines could reduce the population by more than $50 \%$ within the next 11 to 22 years due to continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat along with actual and potential levels of exploitation of the species observed in the wild. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered A1c |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Protected under the Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance Act No. 2, 1937 and subsequent amendments including Act No. 49, 1993 at the species level. |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| National RDB | Threatened |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| Sri Lanka | Central Province: Gampola-Ambuluwela Biodiversity Park, Udawattekele Sanctuary, Victoria-Randenigala-Rantembe Sanctuary, Walker Estate <br> Sabaragamuwa Province: Kurulukele Sanctuary, Peak Wilderness Sanctuary; <br> Sinharaja World Heritage site, Udawalawe Sanctuary <br> Western Province: Attidiya-Belanwila Sanctuary, Ingiriya (Dombegaskande) FR, Muthurajawela Wetland Reserve |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Genetic research, taxonomy, life history, survey, epidemiology, limiting factor, trade |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education, limiting factor management, work in local communities |
| Captive stocks | Colombo Zoo 1.2.0.3; India in 3 zoos (5.2.1.8); World over 15.13.4.32 in 10 institutions |
| Comments | If its habitat is preserved, the species will recover naturally <br> The wet zone of Sri Lanka, habitat of L. t. tardigradus, covers $23 \%$ of the island (Total size: $66,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ). During a survey in 2001, in four locations visited, 24 actual sightings (excluding carried infants and calls) of L. t. tardigradus were made; densitites ranged from 0.86-11.7 animals per kilometer. Despite finding this species |

in two isolated forest patches, it has disappeared from much of its range as human settlements have expanded.

| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor (Compiler) (2000); IUCN Sri Lanka (2000); ISIS Abstract Report , 2001; Jenkins, 1987; Phillips, 1935; SAZARC, 2001; Schulze, 2003 <br> Ecology and distributional data (in alphabetical order): <br> IUCN Sri Lanka. Biodiversity Field Research team (data communicated by R. <br> Somaweera through workshop participants) <br> Primate Biology Program, Smithsonian Institution and Institute for Fundamental <br> Studies: original data from W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, <br> A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe. University of Jaffna: S. Wijeyamohan <br> Biological Information Sheet (2002): W. Dittus |
| :---: | :---: |
| Compilers | Chief compilers: W. Dittus and A. Watson Working group: J. Dela, W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe, S. Wijeyamohan |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, W. Dittus, A. Eudey, A. Watson |



Distribution of Loris tardigradus tardigradus in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued



| Synonyms | Loris bengalensis Lacépede, 1800 <br> Nycticebus coucang bengalensis Lacépede, 1800 <br> Nycticebus cinereus Milne-Edwards, 1867 <br> Nycticebus tardigradus typicus Lydekker, 1905 <br> Nycticebus tenasserimensis Elliot, 1913 <br> Nycticebus incanus Thomas, 1921 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Loridae |
| Common names | Assamese: Lajuki bandar; Bengali: Lajiwati bandar, Hindi: Sharimindi billi; Nepali: Lajbarti bandar, English: Bengal Loris, Bengal Slow Loris, Northern Slow Loris, Slow Loris |
| Level of assessment | Species |
| Notes on taxonomy | The recognition of Nycticebus bengalensis as a species follows Groves (1998). |
| Habit | Nocturnal, arboreal |
| Habitat | Tropical evergreen rain forest, semi-evergreen forest, moist deciduous forest |
| Niche | Upper and middle canopy dweller. |
| Elevation | Up to $1,300 \mathrm{~m}$. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Bangladesh, India, Myanmar, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam, China |
| South Asia | Bangladesh, India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | >2,001 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | 25 / Not known. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area observed (rate and period of decline not known). Decrease in quality due to encroachment, tree felling and jhooming. |
| Threats | Fisheries, habitat loss due to building roads, dams, power lines, fragmentation, soil loss/erosion, deliberate fires, hunting and trade for food, traditional medicine, and sport, accidental mortality, trapping, human interference, predators Threats well understood, not reversible, not ceased |
| Trade | Local trade for meat, food and medicine and live animal as pets. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | Not known |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Has declined and is predicted to decline (Rate of decline and period not known) |


| Data source | Field study; observed; minimum/maximum |
| :---: | :---: |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | DATA DEFICIENT in South Asia |
| Rationale | All the data presented here are from captured individuals from the mentioned localities so categorized as Data Deficient. Information on this species from within South Asia is scanty to warrant any confident assessments. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Data Deficient |
| National Status | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Bangladesh: } & \text { Data Deficient } \\ \text { India: } & \text { Data Deficient }\end{array}$ |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Bangladesh: Schedule III, Bangladesh Wildlife (Preservation) (Amendment) Act, 1974. <br> India: Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India: | Arunachal Pradesh: Itanagar WLS, Mehao NP, Namdapha NP, Pakhui WLS Assam: Chakrasila WLS, Dibru-Saikhwa WLS, Gibbon WLS, Kaziranga NP, Borajan WLS, Pobitora WLS <br> Meghalaya: Balpakam NP, Nokrek NP <br> Mizoram: Dampa NP, Nengpui WLS <br> Tripura: Sepahijala WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Survey |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education |
| Captive stocks | South Asia: 10 zoos (8.9.0.17) <br> 8 zoos in India (6.6.0.12) and 2 zoos in Bangladesh (2.3.0.5) World over: 37 institutions (62.57.6.125) recognized as $N$. coucang). |
| Comments | Extensive survey is required for assessing the distribution and status. Threat identification is needed for proper management plan. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; ISIS Abstract Report, 2001; Jenkins, 1987; SAZARC, 2002 <br> C.A.M.P. questionnaire on protected areas (2002): M. Barua, S.S. Chandiramani, S. Debbarma, C. Loma, W.G. Momin, G. Santha, A.K. Sen |
| Compilers | J. Biswas, J. Bose, D. Chetry, J. Das, M.M. Feeroz, Awadesh Kumar, R. Medhi, S. Mitra |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey |


Distribution of Nycticebus bengalensis in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. t Past \%/yr | Future <br> \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BANGLADESH <br> Chittagong Chittagong Kaptai | $22^{\circ} 21^{\prime}$ | $92^{\circ} 17$ | 10 | SE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 75 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | Decline 10/75 | - | - | M.M. Feeroz, pers. comm.. |
| Sylhet <br> Moulvi Bazar <br> West Bhanugach <br> FR | $24^{\circ} 21$ | $91^{\circ} 48$ | 20 | SE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | Khan \& Ahsan, 1984 |
| INDIA <br> Arunachal <br> Pradesh <br> Changlang <br> Namdapha NP? | $\sim 27^{\circ} 39$ | $\sim 96^{\circ} 30$ | - | TE | - |  | - | - | - | Found in adjacent areas. S.S. Chandiramani, 2002 |
| Lower Dibang Mehao WLS | $\sim 27^{\circ} 39$ | $\sim 96^{\circ} 15$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Rare in adjacent areas, A.K. <br> Sen, 2002 |
| East Kameng Pakhui WLS | $27^{\circ} 14$ | $92^{\circ} 51$ | - | ST | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 30 | - | Jayantha Das, Rekha Medhi In 6 groups. Found in adjacent areas too. C. Loma, 2002 |
| Papum Pare Itanagar WLS | - | - | - | ST | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | Awadesh Kumar pers. comm. |
| Assam <br> Dhubri Chakrasila WLS | $26^{\circ} 20$ | 90¹8 | - | MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Goalpara Goalpara | $26^{\circ} 10$ | $90^{\circ} 38$ | - | SE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Golaghat Kaziranga NP | $\sim 26^{\circ} 37$ | $\sim 93^{\circ} 18$ | - | TMD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |

South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. Report, 2003
Distribution of Nycticebus bengalensis in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jorhat | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | G. Santha, 2002 |
| Gibbon WLS | - | - | - | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Kamrup |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Basistha RF | $\sim 26^{\circ} 19$ | $\sim 91^{\circ} 15$ | - | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Ranni RF | - | - | - | MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Karbi Anglong |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borlander RF | - | - | - | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Dhansiri RF | - | - | - | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Marigaon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pobitora WLS | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | >20 | - | Found in adjacent areas too. M. Barua, 2002 |
| North Cachar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borail RF | - | - | - | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Innerline RF | - | - | - | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Langting Mupa RF | $25^{\circ} 30$ | $90^{\circ} 07$ | - | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Tinsukhia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borajan WLS | $27^{\circ} 05$ | $95^{\circ} 04$ | - | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP. Not sighted recently Helga, 2003 |
| Dibru Saikhuwa N | $27^{\circ} 40$ | $95^{\circ} 24$ | - | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP |
| Meghalaya <br> East \& West Garo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nokrek NP | - | - | - | TMD | Hunting (P/Pr/F) | - | - | - | - | IUSPP |
| South Garo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Balpakram NP | - | - | - | SE, TMD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | - | - | - | - | IUSPP |
| Mizoram |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chintuipui Nengpui WLS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | IUSPP |



| Synonyms | Macacus arctoides I. Geoffroy, 1831 <br> Papio melanotus Ogilby, 1839 <br> Macacus ursinus Gervais, 1854 <br> Macacus brunneus Anderson, 1871 <br> Macacus rufescens Anderson, 1872 <br> Macacus speciosus Murie, 1873 <br> Macacus (Magus) arctoides melli Matschie, 1912 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Level of assessment | Species |
| Common names | Assamese: Senduri bandar, Bengali: Sinduri banar; Garo: Makre-Khimdonza; Hindi: Sinduri bandar, Mizo: Zowng Hmalsen; Naga: Chantee; Nepali: Linde bandar; Riyang: Mukhraeka; English: Bear Macaque, Red-faced Stump-tailed Macaque, Stump-tailed Macaque |
| Notes on taxonomy | Association of this species in a clade with M. fasicularis according to Morales and Melnick (1998). According to Delson (1980) and Fooden (1990), there is an association with the M. sinica group. In Napier (1981), 3 subspecies are distinguished: M.a. arctoides in India, Northeast Myanmar, Vietnam and Laos; M.a. melanota in Burma, Thailand and Malaya; and M.a. melli in North Vietnam and South China. |
| Habit | Terrestrial, arboreal, diurnal, feeds on predominantly seed and fruits. |
| Habitat | Tropical semi-evergreen forest, tropical wet evergreen forest, tropical moist deciduous forest |
| Niche | Different strata of the forest. |
| Elevation | 50-1300m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Bangladesh?, India, Northern Myanmar, China south into West Malaysia, Thailand |
| South Asia | Bangladesh?, India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | <500 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/subpopulations | 21/ 7, Fragmented |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area of $>20 \%$ in the last 10 years and predicted to decrease by $>30 \%$ in the next 10 years due to habitat destruction. Decrease in quality due to habitat alteration and selective felling. |
| Threats | Selective logging, timber and firewood collection for charcoal, fisheries, building roads, dams, power lines, deliberate fires, fragmentation, soil loss/erosion, hunting and trade for food, sport and traditional medicine, accidental mortality due to trapping. |
| Trade | Local trade for bones, meat for food and live animal as pets |


| Population |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Generation time | 10-12 years |
| Total population | <250 |
| Mature individuals | <130 |
| Population trend | Declining |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study; observed; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | CRITICALLY ENDANGERED in South Asia C2a(i) |
| Rationale | Macaca arctoides is found in around 21 locations and 7 subpopulations in India most of which are threatened due to human interference (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation over the years has depleted the area available for this habitatspecific taxon and restricted it to several small pockets that are non-viable. Hunting along with habitat degradation has reduced the total mature population of this species to around 126 in South Asia, a reason why it is categorized as Critically Endangered in the region. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Vulnerable A1cd |
| Justification for change | New / better information available. |
| National Status | Bangladesh: Locally Extinct |
|  | Occurrence of this species within Bangladesh is doubtful. It was last recorded in |
|  | India: Critically Endangered $\quad$ C2a(i) |
|  | The Indian population of this species is Critically Endangered as the numbers are very few and fragmented from the neighbouring Myanmar populations. Continuing decline in the species population and the lack of opportunity for recolonization are factors that favour retaining the status as Critically Endangered in India. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule II, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | Arunachal Pradesh: Mehao WLS, Namdapha WLS?, Pakhui WLS? |
|  | Assam: Gibbon WLS |
|  | Meghalaya: Balpakram NP |
|  | Mizoram: Murlen NP |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Genetic research, survey, ecological studies |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education |
| Captive stocks | South Asia: India in 10 zoos (20.21.0.41), World over: 15 institutions (25.26.1.52) |
| Comments | In Indian context, to ensure more legal protection, the species should be upgraded from Schedule II to Schedule V in Indian Wildlife Protection Act, 1972, more areas with Stump-tailed Macaque must come under PA network. Detailed survey in |

northeastern India (Nagaland, Mizoram, Manipur, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya) with proper documentation is needed urgently. The report of sighting by Awadesh Kumar of NERIST in Pakhui WLS in Arunachal Pradesh is not accepted by the researchers of Indo-US Primate Project NE Centre and researchers of Department of Zoology, Guwahati University, Assam.
Macaca arctoides is recorded by Khan (1982) and subsequently by IUCN (2000).
Detailed survey is essential in northeastern Bangladesh since there is no sightings since 1990 (M.M. Feeroz, pers. comm.).

## Compilers

Reviewers

Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; Champion and Seth, 1968; Chetry et al., 2001; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001, ISIS Abstract Report, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; Napier, 1981; SAZARC, 2001
Biological Information Sheets (2002): J. Biswas, D. Chetry
C.A.M.P. questionnaire on protected areas (2002): S.S. Chandiramani, C. Loma, G. Santha, A.K. Sen
J. Biswas, J. Bose, D. Chetry, J. Das, M.M. Feeroz, R. Medhi, S.K. Sahoo
D. Brandon-Jones, D. Chetry, J. Das, A. Eudey, S. Mitra, M.S. Pradhan

## Distribution range of Macaca arctoides in Bangladesh? and India


Distribution of Macaca arctoides in India from literature and recent field studies

Distribution of Macaca arctoides in India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | nd <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dikho River | $26^{\circ} 30$ | $94^{\circ} 45$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 455m, Napier, 1981 |
| Merangkong |  |  | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Napier, 1981 |
| Gibbon WLS | - | - | 19.06 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P), hunting (Pr/F) | Decline | Increase | 105 | 48 | Chetry et al., IUSPP; G. Santha, 2002 |
| Meghalaya <br> South Garo hills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Balpakram NP | - | - | 22 | TMD | Habitat destruction (F), hunting (P/Pr) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | Chetry et al., IUSPP |
| Nokrek RF | - | - | 4.75 | TMD | Habitat destruction (F), hunting (P/Pr) | Decline | Decline | 10 | 5 | Chetry et al., IUSPP |
| Mizoram Champai |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Murlen NP | $23^{\circ} 37$ | $93^{\circ} 18$ | 20 | TMD | Habitat destruction (Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr) | Decline | Decline | 4 | 4 | Chetry et al., IUSPP |
| Tripura <br> No exact location | - | - | 46 | - | - |  | - | 35 | 30 | Gupta, 1994 |

TMD - Tropical Moist Deciduous forest, TSE - Tropical Semi-evergreen forest, TWE - Tropical Wet Evergreen forest

| Synonyms | Macacus assamensis McClelland, 1839 <br> Macacus rheso-similis Sclater, 1872 <br> Macaca assamensis coolidgei Osgood, 1932 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Common names | Assamese: Asomia molua; Barman: Jongak; Bhutia: Poi; Garo: Makre-dow; Lepcha: <br> Sahu; Mizo: Zwongpu; Riyang: Taiman ukhra; English: Assam Macaque, Eastern |
| Assamese Macaque |  |


| Population trend | Population is declining at an unknown rate and is predicted to decline by $>30 \%$ in the next 10 years |
| :---: | :---: |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study; observed; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED in South Asia C2a(i) |
| Rationale | Macaca assamensis assamensis is found in around 46 locations and 32 subpopulations in India and Bangladesh, most of which are threatened due to human interference (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation over the years has depleted the area available for this habitat-specific taxon and restricted it to several small pockets that are nonviable. Hunting along with habitat degradation has reduced the total mature population of this species to around 300 in South Asia, a reason why it is categorized as Endangered in the region, although there are some populations that are contiguous with neighbouring Myanmar. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Vulnerable (Global) A1cd |
| National Status | Bangladesh: Critically Endangered C2a(i); D <br> This taxon is higly restricted and fragmented in Bangladesh with very few individuals, making it vulnerable to a high risk of local extinction due to changes in habitat and other threats. Since the taxon is equally threatened in the neighbouring locations in India, its status in Bangladesh is Critically Endangered and retained as such. India: <br> Endangered C2a(i) <br> The threats to this taxon in India are as severe making it Endangered. Since there are some populations bordering Myanmar that are contiguous, habitat and population protection within the country to lower the probability of extinction of this taxon within India. It is therefore retained as Endangered. |
| Uncertainty | Assessment not based on full range of plausible values and it is based on evidence. Assessment derived based on the consensus of the entire working group and all the participants. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Bangladesh: Schedule III, Bangladesh Wildlife (Preservation) (Amendment) Act, 1974. <br> India: Schedule II, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India: | Arunachal Pradesh: Namdapha NP, Pakhui WLS <br> Assam: Bherjan WLS, Borajan WLS, Dibru-Saikhowa NP, Garampani WLS, Gibbon <br> WLS, Kaziranga NP, Manas NP <br> Meghalaya: Nokrek NP, Balpakram NP, Siju WLS <br> Mizoram: Dampa NP, Nengpui WLS, Phawngpui Blue Mountain WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomic research, survey, life history, limiting factor research |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education, limiting factor management, PHVA |
| Captive stocks | 12 zoos in India (52.37.10.99), 1 zoo in Bangladesh (1.0.0.1) and 1 zoo in Nepal (1.1.0.2). World over: 1 institution (2.2.0.4). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | More survey essential for the accurate evaluation of the status of this species. This is based on the actual figures of this species of northeastern India only with proper |

documentation. The forest department personnel in Assam do not differentiate this taxon from the more common Rhesus Macaque. There is also an occasional trade in meat of this taxon as food in Nagaland (P. Sarkar, BIS). This taxon was recorded twice during the last 11 years of field survey of primates only in one area of northeast of Bangladesh (M.M. Feeroz, BIS).

Sources<br>Compilers<br>Reviewers<br>Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; ISIS Abstract Report, 2001; IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Napier, 1981; SAZARC, 2001<br>J. Biswas, J. Bose, D. Chetry, J. Das, M.M. Feeroz, Awadesh Kumar, R. Medhi, Biological Information Sheets (2002): M.M. Feeroz, P. Sarkar C.A.M.P. questionnaire on protected areas: S.S. Chandiramani, C. Loma, W.G. Momin, G. Santha<br>D. Brandon-Jones, D. Chetry, J. Das, A. Eudey, S. Mitra, M.S. Pradhan

## Distribution range of Macaca assamensis assamensis in Bangladesh and India


Distribution of Macaca assamensis assamensis in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies

Distribution of Macaca assamensis assamensis in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

Distribution of Macaca assamensis assamensis in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tr <br> Past <br> \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Telpani RF | - | - | - | TWE | - | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Meghalaya East, West \& South Garo Hills Nokrek NP | - | - | - | - | - | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Found in adjacent areas too. W.G. Momin, 2002 |
| South Garo Hills Balpakram NP | - | - | - | - | - | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Songsek Tasek RF | $25^{\circ} 38$ | $90^{\circ} 35$ | - | - | - | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Siju WLS | $25^{\circ} 32$ | $90^{\circ} 14$ | - | - | - | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Mizoram <br> Chintuipui |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ngengpui WLS | - | - | - | - | - | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Phawngpui Blue Mountain WLS | - | - | - | - | - | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Mamit Dampa NP | - | - | - | - | - | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Nagaland Khonoma Yuapik | $25^{\circ} 39$ | $94^{\circ} 02$ | - | - | - | Decline Decline | Decline Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |

SE - Semi-evergreen forest; TMD - Tropical Moist Deciduous forest; TWE - Tropical Wet Evergreen forest

| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| :---: | :---: |
| Common names | Nepali: Pahare Bandar, Rai: Pupa; Tamang: Thimnyau; English: Assamese Macaque |
| Level of assessment | Population |
| Notes on taxonomy | No synonyms due to taxonomic confusion. This population is different from Assamese monkey in respect to the head-body length, tail length, T/HB and weight. It also differs by general body colouration. It has darker fur with purple snout. This population is considered a new subspecies. Further taxonomic clarification is sought. Assessment has been carried out at the population level to highlight the status of this unique form endemic to Nepal. |
| Habit | Arboreal, terrestrial, diurnal, omnivorous, multi-male - multi-female group. |
| Habitat | Hill sal forest, mixed deciduous forest, temperate broadleaved forest, rocky outcrops along rivers |
| Niche | Middle canopy. |
| Elevation | 380-2336m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Endemic to Nepal |
| Extent of Occurrence | 2,175 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | 920 km² |
| Locations/subpopulations | 25 / 8. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $<10 \%$ in the last 10 years due to habitat alteration, encroach ment outside protected area, jhum and limited use of habitat by locals and is predicted to decrease by $<10 \%$ in the next 10 years. Decrease in quality due to habitat alteration because of selective logging, fodder, timber and firewood collec--tion. |
| Threats | Past threats: Grazing, shifting agriculture, firewood and charcoal production, selective logging, habitat loss, jhuming <br> Present threats: Fodder collection, landslide |
| Trade | Not in trade |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10 years |
| Total population | <550 |
| Mature individuals | <300 |
| Population trend | Declined by $<10 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decline by $<10 \%$ in the nex 10 years |
| Data source | Census/monitoring, field study, literature; observed; 95\% confidence |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED B1a+b(i,ii,iii,v); C2a(i) |
| Rationale | The taxon is threatened due to its restricted distribution of less than $2200 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ extent of occurrence and $914 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ area of occupancy and continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat, number of locations and in the number of mature individuals, the latter two inferred from threats to habitat and population from degradation and hunting, respectively. The taxon is also restricted to less than 300 mature individualsdistributed in 25 locations and 8 subpopulations with no subpopulation having more than 50 mature individuals. Given its restricted extent of occurrence, threats on its population and habitat, and small numbers in fragmented patches, the Nepal population of this macaque is categorized as Endangered. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Not assessed |
| Justification | New information available currently. Change in species / subspecies taxonomy. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1973 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
|  | Central Province: Langtang NP |
|  | Eastern Nepal: Makalu Barun NP |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomy, genetic research, life history, survey |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education |
| Captive stocks | 12 zoos in India (52.37.10.99), 1 zoo in Bangladesh (1.0.0.1) and 1 zoo in Nepal (1.1.0.2). World over: 1 institution (2.2.0.4). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | Nepalese specimen has to be investigated for its status in subspecies level. Habitat is steep slopes and the population is very thin. High mountain east and west populations seem like different subspecies. |
| Sources | Chalise, 1997; Chalise, 1999a; Chalise, 1999b; Chalise, 2000; Chalise, 2000-2001; Chalise and Ghimire, 1998; CZA, 2000-2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; Karki and Ghimere, 2001; SAZARC, 2001 <br> Biological Information Sheet (2002): M.K. Chalise |
| Compilers | M.K. Chalise, M.K. Ghimere, S.C. Ghimere, B.J. Karki, Awadesh Kumar, H. Kumar, M. Misra, S.K. Sahoo, P. Srivastava |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, M.K. Chalise, A. Eudey, M.S. Pradhan |


Distribution of Macaca assamensis [Nepal population] from literature and recent field studies

Distribution of Macaca assamensis [Nepal population] from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3. Pikhuwa - II (Apsuwa) | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tm D, } \\ & \text { HS, RO } \end{aligned}$ | Agriculture ( P ), slash and burn ( F ), overuse of resources (F) | Decline $10 / 10$ | Decline | 20 | 10 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| 4. Bhumling-Tar (Apsuwa) | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tm D, } \\ & \text { HS, RO } \end{aligned}$ | Agriculture ( P ), slash and burn ( F ), overuse of resources (F) | Decline $10 / 10$ | Decline | 16 | 9 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| 5. Dhongla Vir (Tamku) | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TmD, } \\ & \text { HS, RO } \end{aligned}$ | Agriculture ( P ), slash and burn ( F ), overuse of resources ( $F$ ) | Decline $10 / 10$ | Decline | 17 | 9 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| 6. Evang Dovan (Tamku) | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tm D, } \\ & \text { HS, RO } \end{aligned}$ | Agriculture (P), slash and burn (F), overuse of resources (F) | Decline $10 / 10$ | Decline | 24 | 15 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| 7. Kampek Vir (Tamku) | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TmD, } \\ & \text { HS, RO } \end{aligned}$ | Agriculture ( P ), slash and burn ( F ), overuse of resources (F) | Decline 10/10 | Decline | 37 | 27 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| 8. Sankhuwa (Tamku) | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | - | Tm BL | Agriculture (P/F), Jhoom cultivation (P/F) | Decline | Decline | 13 | 7 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| 9. Khonglewa (Tamku) | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tm D, } \\ & \text { HS, RO } \end{aligned}$ | Agriculture $(P)$, slash and burn $(F)$, overuse of resources (F) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 10 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | Decline | 14 | 10 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| 10. Wayang (Tamku) | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tm BL } \\ & \text { HS, RO } \end{aligned}$ | Agriculture (P/F), Jhoom cultivation (P/F) overuse of resources ( $F$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 10 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | Decline | 27 | 10 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| 11. Balabridge (Tamku) | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tm D, } \\ & \text { HS, RO } \end{aligned}$ | Agriculture ( P ), slash and burn ( $F$ ), overuse of resources (F) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 10 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | Decline | 18 | 9 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| 12. Sintup | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | $\mathrm{HS}, \mathrm{RO}$ | Tm D, overuse | Agriculture ( P ), slash and burn ( F ), of resources (F) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 10 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | Decline | 31 | 20 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| 13. Dankhila | $27^{\circ} 28$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | HS, RO | Tm D, overuse | Agriculture ( P ), slash and burn ( F ), of resources (F) | Decline $10 / 10$ | Decline | 26 | 14 | Chalise et al., 2000 |
| Far Western Province |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Api Mountain (South) | $29^{\circ} 25$ | $81^{\circ} 20$ | 2 | TmR | Habitat loss (P/F), Selective logging (P/F), fuel wood collection (P/F), agriculture (P/F) | - | May decline | 6 | 3 | Chalise, 2001; Karki et al., 1998 |
| Sethi <br> Kimni <br> (Acham) | $29^{\circ} 15$ | $80^{\circ} 45$ | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tm BL, } \\ & \text { RO } \end{aligned}$ | Habitat loss (P/F), Selective logging (P/F), fuel wood collection (P/F), agriculture (P/F) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 10 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | May decline | 35 | 16 | EOO: 5 km². Chalise, 2001; Karki et al., 1998 |
| Western <br> Province <br> Lumbini Palpa <br> Ramdi | $27^{\circ} 34$ | $83^{\circ} 50$ | 5 | HS | Agriculture overuse ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) Known | Not decline | May | 30 | 18 | Chalise et al., 2000 |

HS - Hill Sal forest, RO - Rocky Outcrops, St BL - Subtropical Broadleaved forest, Tm D - Temperate Deciduous forest, Tm R - Temperate riverine forest

| Synonyms | Macacus (Phitex) pelops Hodgson, 1840 <br> Macacus macclellandii Gray, 1846 <br> Macacus sikimensis Hodgson, 1867 <br> Macacus problematicus Gray, 1870 <br> Macaca rheso-similis Sclater, 1872 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Bengali: Assame bandar, Pahari bandar; Bhotia: Pio; Lepcha: Sahu; Myanmari: <br> Myauk-sar, English: Western Assamese Macaque |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | Macaque's distribution range. In case, the Nepalese population is found to be a |
| separate subsecies, then this subspecies will be endemic to India. Taxonomic |  |
| confirmation is required. |  |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED B1ab(i,ii,iii)+2ab(i,ii,iii); C2a(i) |
| Rationale | The taxon is threatened due to its restricted distribution of less than $5000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ extent of occurrence and $60 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ area of occupancy and continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat, and in the number of mature individuals, the latter inferred from threats to habitat and population from degradation and hunting. The taxon is also restricted to less than 300 mature individuals distributed in 20 locations and 12 subpopulations with no subpopulation having more than 50 mature individuals. Given its restricted extent of occurrence, threats on its population and habitat, and small numbers in fragmented patches, the M. assamensis pelops population in South Asia is categorized as Endangered. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Vulnerable A1cd |
| Justification for change | Better / new information available at the workshop. |
| National Status | Bhutan: Critically Endangered C2a(i); D $\downarrow$ Endangered <br> The Bhutan population is very highly restricted and very few in numbers as to be categorised as Critically Endnagered using the global criteria. However, since the adjoining populations in India is fairly contiguous with the Bhutan population, there is a possibility of recolonisation. Further, threats to the taxon in Bhutan is not as high as in India, hence the national category of Critically Endangered is downgraded to Endangered in Bhutan. <br> India: <br> Endangered <br> B1ab(i,ii,iii)+2ab(i,ii,iii); C2a(i) <br> The Indian population of this taxon is restricted in its distribution and in numbers, but since the taxon faces serious threats it is Endangered due to restricted distribution and continuing decline and small numbers. Endangered category is retained as the Indian population is more than $75 \%$ of the global population of this taxon. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | India: Schedule II, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | West Bengal: Buxa NP, Mahananda WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomy (inter-breeding between M. assamensis and M. mulatta), genetic research, survey in Sikkim in India, Bangladesh and Bhutan, limiting factor research |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education, PHVA |
| Captive stocks | 12 zoos in India (52.37.10.99), 1 zoo in Bangladesh (1.0.0.1) and 1 zoo in Nepal (1.1.0.2). World over: 1 institution (2.2.0.4). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | Besides 2 protected areas in West Bengal, the hilly tracts and foothills of north Bengal region are the only resort for this subspecies. Nearly 550 indivuals were recorded during the study covering an area of $1,552.50 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. Several aspects of its ecology and behavior were studied, which recorded several mortality factors. Survival of this staxon is threatened diue to loss of habitat and a growing trend in man-animal conflict is a major concern (S. Mitra, BIS). |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; Mitra, 2000; Mitra (in press); Napier, 1981; SAZARC, 2001 |
| Compilers | M.K. Chalise, M.K. Ghimere, S.C. Ghimere, B.J. Karki, Awadesh Kumar, H. Kumar, M.K. Misra, S. Mitra, S. Ram, S.K. Sahoo, M. Singh, P. Srivatsava Biological Information Sheets (2002): S. Mitra, P. Sarkar, M.M. Feeroz |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey, S. Mitra, M.S. Pradhan |

Distribution range of Macaca assamensis pelops in Bhutan and India

Distribution of Macaca assamensis pelops in Bhutan and India from literature and recent field studies

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area $\left(\mathrm{km}^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BHUTAN <br> Central Bhutan | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Groves, 2001 |
| INDIA <br> Tebang River (Mishmi Hills) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 606m. |
| Sikkim Chuntang | $27^{\circ} 38$ | $88^{\circ} 35$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1621m. Napier, 1981 |
| Dalamcote Fort (Daling) | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Groves, 2001 |
| Rongli | $27^{\circ} 17$ | $88^{\circ} 45$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 818m. Napier, 1981 |
| West Bengal Darjeeling |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Groves, 2001 |
| Andherijar | $26^{\circ} 53$ | $88^{\circ} 17$ | 2 | BLE | Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade ( $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 14 | 7 | Sangita Mitra |
| Batasia (Tonglu) | $26^{\circ} 36$ | $88^{\circ} 11$ | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | 1212m. Napier, 1981 |
| Berrick | $\sim 26^{\circ} 53$ | $\sim 88^{\circ} 17$ | 1.9 | BLE | Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 21 | 12 | Sangita Mitra |
| Bijombari | $\sim 27^{\circ} 02$ | $\sim 88^{\circ} 16$ | 3 | BLE | Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 22 | 10 | Sangita Mitra |
| Chitrey | - | - | - <br>  | BLE | Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) | Stable | Stable | 14 | 7 | Sangita Mitra |
| Ghoom (adjacent area) | $\sim 27^{\circ} 01$ | $\sim 88^{\circ} 16$ | 3.5 | BLE | Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade ( $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 21 | 12 | Sangita Mitra |
| Gopaldhara (Rungbong Valley) | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 1576m. Napier, 1981 |
| Hanumanjara | - | - | 1.4 | BLE | Anthropogenic activities ( P ), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), | Stable | Stable | 25 | 16 | Sangita Mitra |

Distribution of Macaca assamensis pelops in Bhutan and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Distribution in South Asia \& Lat. \& Long. \& Area ( \(\mathrm{km}^{2}\) ) \& Habitat \& Threats Past, Present, Future \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Pop. tre \\
Past \\
\%/yr
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
d \\
Future \\
\%/yr
\end{tabular} \& Pop. No. \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Mat. \\
Ind.
\end{tabular} \& Notes / Sources \\
\hline Kalijhora \& - \& - \& 2.3 \& BLE \& \begin{tabular}{l}
pet trade ( \(\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}\) ) \\
Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade ( \(\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}\) )
\end{tabular} \& Stable \& Stable \& 18 \& 11 \& Sangita Mitra \\
\hline Lepchajagat \& - \& - \& 3.6 \& BLE \& Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade ( \(\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}\) ) \& Decline \& Decline \& 15 \& 9 \& Sangita Mitra \\
\hline Mahanadi \& - \& - \& 3 \& BLE \& Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) \& Decline \& Decline \& 23 \& 11 \& Sangita Mitra \\
\hline Melli \& \(27^{\circ} 06\) \& \(88^{\circ} 17\) \& 1.8 \& BLE \& Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) \& Stable \& Stable \& 23 \& 12 \& Sangita Mitra \\
\hline Merik (adjacent area) \& - \& - \& 4.5 \& BLE \& Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) \& Decline \& Decline \& 14 \& 8 \& Sangita Mitra \\
\hline Mong Pong \& - \& - \& 3.8 \& BLE \& Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) \& Decline \& Decline \& 19 \& 9 \& Sangita Mitra \\
\hline Pagaljhora \& - \& -

88824 \& 3.6 \& BLE \& Anthropogenic activities ( P ), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade ( $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) \& Stable \& Stable \& 51 \& 24 \& Sangita Mitra <br>
\hline Pashok \& $27^{\circ} 05$ \& $88^{\circ} 24$ \& - \& - \& \& \& \&  \& - \& 1060m. Napier, 1981 <br>
\hline Rabijhora \& - \& - \& 1.9 \& BLE \& Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) \& Stable \& Stable \& 12 \& 8 \& Sangita Mitra <br>
\hline Rambi (adjacent area) \& - \& - \& 2.6 \& BLE \& Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) \& Stable \& Stable \& 29 \& 17 \& Sangita Mitra <br>
\hline Sepoydhura \& - \& - \& 1.9 \& BLE \& Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), \& Stable \& Stable \& 17 \& 10 \& Sangita Mitra <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Distribution of Macaca assamensis pelops in Bhutan and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sevok | - | - | 3.5 | BLE | pet trade (Pr/F) <br> Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) | Stable | Stable | 48 | 23 | Sangita Mitra |
| Sukiapokhri | $27^{\circ} 01$ | $88^{\circ} 06$ | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | 1515m. Napier, 1981 |
| Swetijhora | - |  | 3.5 | BLE | Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade ( $\mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Stable | Stable | 29 | 16 | Sangita Mitra |
| Tarjomjhara | - | - | 3 | BLE | Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) | Stable | Stable | 18 | 10 | Sangita Mitra |
| Teesta Bazar | $\begin{aligned} & 26^{\circ} 31- \\ & 27^{\circ} 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87^{\circ} 59- \\ & 88^{\circ} 53 \end{aligned}$ | 3 | BLE | Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) | Stable | Stable | 32 | 10 | Sangita Mitra |
| Tindharia | $-$ | $-$ | 2.9 | BLE | Anthropogenic activities ( P ), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 12 | 7 | Sangita Mitra |
| Zero Point | - | - | 1.8 | BLE | Anthropogenic activities (P), habitat loss (P/Pr/F), landslides (P/Pr/F), accidental loss (P/Pr/F), Predation (Pr/F), pet trade (Pr/F) | Stable | Stable | 8 | 6 | Sangita Mitra |

BLE - Broad-leaved Evergreen forest

## Macaca fascicularis aurea I. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1830

| Synonyms | Macacus aureus E. Geoffroy, 1831 Pithecus vitiis Elliot, 1910 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Bengali: Parailla Bandor; English: Burmese Crab-eating Macaque, Burmese Longtailed Macaque, Crab-eating Macaque, Long-tailed Macaque |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | Commonly cited as E. Geoffroy, 1831, M.f. aurea was first published in abstract by I. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1830. |
| Habit | Terrestrial, arboreal |
| Habitat | Evergreen forests, coastal mangroves |
| Niche | Ground and lower canopy. |
| Elevation | Up to 50 m . |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Bangladesh, Myanmar |
| South Asia | Bangladesh |
| Extent of Occurrence | <5,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | $5 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ |
| Location/subpopulations | 2 / 2. Fragmented and one population holds $>95 \%$ of the total population. Declined by $95 \%$ in the last 10 years. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>80 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decrease by $>40 \%$ in the next 10 years due to logging and commercial shrimp culture. Decrease in quality due to deforestation for conversion of land for shrimp culture. |
| Threats | Aquaculture, agriculture, mangrove removal, human settlement, deforestation. Teknaf Peninsula population is completely decimated due to development activities (ship-building). |
| Trade | Not in trade |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years (M.M. Feeroz, BIS, and inferred from M. sinica) |
| Total population | <100 |
| Mature individuals | <50 |
| Population trend | Mature individuals have declined by $>90 \%$ in the last 10 years. The taxon is predicted to become locally extinct in Bangladesh in the next 10 years. |
| Data source | Census/monitoring, field study; observed; 95\% confidence |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | CRITICALLY ENDANGERED in South Asia A2c+3c+4c; B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v); D |
| Rationale | The South Asian population of this subspecies is Critically Endangered because of population reduction ( $>80 \%$ in 3 generations), restricted distribution because it is found in only two locations in the Teknaf mangroves, which are under threat, and because of few numbers (<50 mature individuals) that are declining continuously. The Bangladesh population is fragmented from the Myanmar population, making it vulnerable to local extinction. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Lower Risk - near threatened (Globally) |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule III, Bangladesh Wildlife (Protection) Act A 1974 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
|  | None |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Life history studies, survey, limiting factor research, ecology and behaviour |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, public education, captive breeding, PHVA. A coordinated Species Management Program is recommended for South Asia. |
| Captive breeding | For reintroduction |
| Captive stocks | None |
| Comments | Initiate ex situ program within 3 years. Techniques for captive breeding are known for this taxon or similar taxa. Sites in Bangladesh are the north-western-most geographical distribution of this subspecies. Among the two sites where this species were found, one is already completely destroyed and only one known population is present at the moment. However, there are some chances of this species to be found in nearby areas. A systematic survey is essential in all its distribution areas in Bangladesh. An action plan should be prepared for the conservation and management of this species. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; Napier, 1981 Biological Information Sheet (2002): M.M. Feeroz |
| Compilers | J. Biswas, J. Bose, D. Chetry, J. Das, M.M. Feeroz, Awadesh Kumar, R. Medhi, S. Mitra |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey, M.S. Pradhan |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area $\left(\mathrm{km}^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BANGLADESH <br> Chittagong <br> Cox's Bazar <br> Fashia Khali <br> Teknaf | $20^{\circ} 52$ | $92^{\circ} 18$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} 3 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SE, CM } \\ & \text { SE, CM } \end{aligned}$ | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline Decline | Decline Decline | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & <50 \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $7$ | Feeroz et al., 1995 Khan, 1987 |

CM - Coastal Mangrove forest; SE - Semi-evergreen forest

| Synonym | Macacus umbrosa Miller, 1902 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | English: Crab-eating Macaque, Long-tailed Macaque, Nicobar Long-tailed Macaque |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Habit | Semi-terrestrial, arboreal, diurnal, omnivorous |
| Habitat | Mangroves, coastal forests predominantly dominated by Pandanus species |
| Niche | Tends to be arboreal in inland forests and terrestrial in coastal forests. |
| Elevation | Up to 600 m . |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Endemic to India (Nicobar Islands) |
| Extent of Occurrence | $1,378 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | 1,241 $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ |
| Locations/subpopulations | Fragmented. Three distinct populations are on three islands. |
| Habitat status | Stable in area. Increase in quality of habitat (Coconut plantations). |
| Threats | Past threats: Human settlement, habitat loss <br> Present and future threats: Construction of roads on Katchal island and Great Nicobar island, hunting. |
| Trade | Not known |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years (inferred from M. sinica). |
| Total population | About 4800 |
| Mature individuals | <3000 |
| Population trend | Stable |
| Data source | Field study; observed; minimum/maximum |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | NEAR THREATENED |
| Rationale | Although restricted to 3 islands in the Nicobars ( $\mathrm{EOO}=1378 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$; AOO $=1241 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ), the habitat is improving which probably makes the population stable. The subspecies is categorized as Near Threatened as a precautionary measure due to perceivable threats from human habitation and influence in the long-term future. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Data Deficient |
| Justification for change | Better / new information available at the workshop. |


| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | Greater Nicobar: Campbell Bay NP, Galathea NP |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Life history, survey |
| Management | Public education, monitoring, PHVA |
| Captive stocks | 1 zoo in India (9.7.0.16) |
| Comments | Another likely threat to the taxon is Tsunami or cyclones for small island populations but the probability is very low. Developmental activities on Katchal Island is likely to cause urbanisation of the groups in the vicinity. The taxon is hunted mainly for subsistence living by Shompen tribals and also to protect coconut plantations. The category is derived based on threats and trade. Based on the data available the working group is forced to conclude that this is of Least Concern. It must be stressed that this conclusion derives from data gathered on one very small survey and no extensive effort has been made recently to do more elaborate surveys. The working group is also concerned that if this is resolved the listing if the species under the Wildlife Protection Act may be diluted. Therefore the status of NT is suggested since any inaccuracy may result in the species being reclassified. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; SAZARC, 2001 <br> Biological Information Sheet (2002): G. Umapathy |
| Compilers | R. Ali, H. Andrews, H.R. Bhat, S. Ganapathiappan, G.K. Joseph., R. Krishnamani, H. Kumar, P.O. Nameer, M.S. Pradhan, S. Ram., K.K. Ramachandran, G. Ramaswamy, A.K. Sharma |
| Reviewers | R. Ali, D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey |

## Distribution range of Macaca fascicularis umbrosa
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| Synonyms | Inuus leoninus Blyth, 1863 <br> Macacus andamanensis Bartlett, 1869 <br> Macacus coininus Kloss, 1903 <br> Macaca adusta Miller, 1906 <br> Macaca insulana Miller, 1906 <br> Macaca nemestrina indocinensis Kloss, 1919 <br> Macaca nemestrina blythii Pocock, 1931 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Assamese: Gahari nejia bandar, Bengali: Baraholeji banar, Bengali (in Bangladesh): Chhotoleji banar, Garo: Peko; Mizo: Zawangmuat; Naga: Kangh; Nepali: Sungur puchero bandar; Riyang: Stongbora; English: Burmese Pig-tailed Macaque, Long-haired Pig-tailed Macaque, Northern Pig-tailed Macaque |
| Level of assessment | Species |
| Notes on taxonomy | Fooden (1975) found evidence of apparently very restricted hybridization between this species and $M$. nemestrina. The British Museum recognizes this species as the subspecies M. nemestrina leonina. |
| Habit | Predominantly arboreal, diurnal, frugivorous |
| Habitat | Tropical semi-evergreen forest, tropical wet evergreen forest, tropical moist deciduous forest, coastal forest, swamp forest, montane forest |
| Niche | Middle canopy. |
| Elevation | 50-1700m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Bangladesh, India, Myanmar, Thailand, Yunnan, China, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam |
| South Asia | Bangladesh, India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | $>2,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ [Bangladesh $=65 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$; India $=>2,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ] |
| Locations/subpopulations | 145 / Not known. Fragmented. Declined by 35\% in the last 8 years. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>40 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decline by $>20 \%$ in the next 10 years due to habitat destruction. Decrease in quality due to loss of fruiting trees, sleeping sites, monoculture and plantation, selective felling and increase in canopy gap. |
| Threats | Selective logging, firewood and charcoal production, fisheries, timber extraction, building roads, dams, power lines, forest fragmentation, soil loss/erosion, deliberate fires, hunting and trade for sport, food and medicine cultural use, accidental mortality, deliberate fires, predators, habitat loss, jhuming, encroachment |
| Trade | Local trade for bones, meat for food and medicine, and live animal as pets and for zoos. |

## Population

| Generation time | 10-12 years |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total population | <5,000 [Bangladesh $=<350$; India $=<5,000$ ] |
| Mature individuals | <2,500 [Bangladesh $=<110$; India $=<2,400$ ] |
| Population trend | Has been declining (Rate of decline not known) and is predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 5 years. |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study, indirect information, literature; observed; subjective |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED in South Asia C2a(i) |
| Rationale | This species in South Asia is restricted to many fragmented locations and a few numbers. Threats affecting the species in the region make it Endangered due to the negative effects on area, quality of habitat, number of locations and number of mature individuals. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Vulnerable (Globally) A1cd |
| National Status | Bangladesh: Critically Endangered C2a(i) |
|  | Very few individuals in the country isolated from neighbouring Indian locations. The habitat is degrading rapidly thereby causing a continuing decline in mature individuals in the country. The status is therefore more critical in Bangladesh compared to the global status. Hence the status in Bangladesh is retained as Critically Endangered. |
|  | India: Endangered C2a(i) |
|  | The Indian population though widely distributed is under severe threats of habitat loss and fragementation and continuing decline in the population over years. The taxon is retained as Endangered for the country due to very less probability of species recovery from neighbouring countries of Bangladesh and Myanmar. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Bangladesh: Schedule III, Bangladesh Wildlife (Preservation) (Amendment) Act, 1974. <br> India: Schedule II, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |

## Presence in Protected Areas

## India

Bangladesh

Chittagong: Chunati WLS
Sylhet: Lawachara NP, Rema-Kelanga WLS
Arunachal Pradesh: Kamlang WLS, Mehao WLS, Namdapha NP
Assam: Dibru-Saikhowa WLS, Garampani WLS, Gibbon WLS, Padumoni-BherjanBorajan WLS
Manipur. Yangoupokpi-Lokchao WLS
Meghalaya: Balpakhram NP, Nongkhyllem WLS, Siju WLS
Mizoram: Dampa WLS, Lengteng WLS, Murlen NP, Ngengpui WLS, Phawngpui Blue Mountain NP
Nagaland: Fakim WLS, Intanki NP
Tripura: Gumti WLS, Sepahijala WLS, Trishna WLS

| Recommendations <br> Research | Taxonomy, life history, survey studies, limiting factor research |
| :--- | :--- |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education, <br> limiting factor management, participatory management planning |
| Captive stocks | South Asia: 10 zoos (14.13.0.27). <br> India in 7 zoos (11.9.0.20); 2 zoos in Bangladesh (3.3.0.6); 1 zoo in Sri Lanka <br> (0.1.0.1); Coordinated Species Management Program is recommended for South |
| Asia. |  |$\quad$| In the Indian context, Pig-tailed Macaque should be upgraded from Schedule II to I |
| :--- |
| (WPA, 1972) to ensure more legal protection. Detailed survey with proper documen- |
| tation is urgently needed in northeastern India (Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, |
| Mizoram, Manipur, Tripura). |

## Distribution range of Macaca leonina in Bangladesh and India
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tr Past \%/yr | nd Future \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tiru Hill RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Kamrup |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amcheng RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Continuous existence not known. Choudhury, 2003 |
| Amcheng RF (south) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Continuous existence not known. Choudhury, 2003 |
| Apricola RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Apricola (east) | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| RF (proposed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogaikhas RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Gorbhanga RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Khanapara RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Continuous existence not known. Choudhury, 2003 |
| Rani RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Karbi Anglong |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amreng RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Balasore RF (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Daldeli RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Dhansiri RF | - | - | 7.04 | TMD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Choudhury, 2003 |
| Disama RF | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Garampani WLS | - | - | 6.05 | - | - |  | - | - | - | Contiguous with Nambor (north block RF) and Nambor Sanctu -ary. Choudhury, 2003 |
| Jinikinding area | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Jungthung RF | - | - | 3.26 | TMD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 11 | 4 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Choudhury, 2003 |
| Kaki RF | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Kaliyoni RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Karbi Anglong | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Langlakso RF (proposed) | - | - | 53.47 | TMD | Hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Longnit RF | - | - | 11.76 | TMD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 20 | 10 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Mikir Hills RF | $\sim 26^{\circ} 25$ | $\sim 93^{\circ} 20$ | 29.98 | TMD | Hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Choudhury, 2003 |
| Patradisa RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Singason area | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Umjakani RF (proposed) | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |

Distribution of Macaca leonina in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | nd <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Karimganj |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Badshahitilla RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Dohalia RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Continued occurrence doubtful. Choudhury, 2003 |
| Longai RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Patharia Hill RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Shingla RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Tilbhum RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Continued occurrence doubtful. Choudhury, 2003 |
| Marigaon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kolakhat RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Sonaikuchi RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Nagaon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bagser RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Borpani RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Doboka RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Lumding RF | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| North Cachar Hills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borail PRF | - | - | 1.76 | TMD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Borail RF | - | - | 1.04 | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 5 | 4 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Choudhury, 2003 |
| Borail RF | - | - | 1.59 | TWE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 4 | 4 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Khurimming RF | - | - | 10.84 | TWE | Hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Choudhury, 2003 |
| Langtingmupa RF | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Tinsukhia |  |  | 7.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bherjan WLS | $\sim 27^{\circ} 30$ | $\sim 95^{\circ} 22$ | - | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | $14$ |  | IUSPP Annual Report, 1994-97 |
| Borajan WLS | $27^{\circ} 05$ | $95^{\circ} 04$ | - | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), selective felling (P) | Decline | Decline | 29 | $16$ | IUSPP Annual Report, 1994-97 |
| Burhi-Dihing RF (north \& south blocks) | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Dangori RF | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Dibru-Saikhowa $\mathrm{N}$ | - | - | 340 | - | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
| Digboi RF (West block) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Choudhury, 2003 |
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Distribution of Macaca leonina in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

E - Evergreen forest, SE - Semi-evergreen forest, TMD - Tropical Moist Deciduous forest, TWE - Tropical Evergreen forest, TSE - Tropical Semi-evergreen forest

## Macaca mulatta mulatta (Zimmermann, 1780)

| Synonyms | Cercopithecus mulatta Zimmermann, 1780 <br> Simia (Cercopithecus) fulvus Kerr, 1792 <br> Simia resus Audebert, 1798 <br> Simia erytraea Shaw, 1800 <br> Macaca (Pithex) nipalensis Hodgson, 1840 <br> Macaca (Pithex) oinops Hodgson, 1840 <br> Macaca mulatta vestita Milne-Edwards, 1892 <br> Macaca mulatta villosa (True, 1894) <br> Macaca siamica Kloss, 1917 <br> Macaca mulatta mcmahoni Pocock, 1932 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Bengali: Banar; Hindi: Bandar, Lal bandar, Lal mukh ka bandar, Lal mukhwala bandar; Hindko: Baojha; Marathi: Makad; Nepali: Rato Bandar, Hajaria Bandar; Oriya: Mankad; Pashto: Shado, Beszoo; Rai: Pupa; Telugu: Kothi; Urdu: Bandur, English: Indian Rhesus Macaque, Rhesus Monkey |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Habit | Arboreal and terrestrial, diurnal, social, female biased ratio, multi male-multi female group, omnivorous |
| Habitat | Temperate coniferous, moist and dry deciduous forests, mangroves, scrub, rain forest, cropland, human habitation, roadside, temples, openland, agriculatural lands, mixed forests, bamboo forests |
| Niche | Open canopy forest, ground dwelling, forest fringe, human settlements. |
| Elevation | Up to $4,000 \mathrm{~m}$. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Afghanistan?, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Myanmar, Thailand, Laos, Vietnam |
| South Asia | Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | $>2,001 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ [Bangladesh $=<60 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$; India $=>2,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2} ;$ Nepal $=<150 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ] |
| Locations/subpopulations | Many / Many. Fragmented. Decline of locations and subpopulation has not been worked out. |
| Habitat status | Stable in area. Predicted to decline by $<10 \%$ in the next 10 years. Quality of habitat stable. |
| Threats | Past threats: Hunting, trade, accidental mortality, road kills, trapping, ecological imbalance (changes in native species dynamics), habitat loss, forest fire Present and future threats: Poisoning in Himachal Pradesh, human-animal conflict, wildfire, human settlement in Nepal terai |
| Trade | Local trade for meat for food and whole animal for pets and road shows. Hunted for sustenance living in northeastern and central India and mid western Nepal. In northeastern India, monkey brain is a delicacy. Tribals eat these macaques in |

Bhamragarh (Maharashtra, India) and the population is almost wiped out.

| Population |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Generation time | 12 years |
| Total population | >1,00,000 |
| Mature individuals | >10,000 |
| Population trend | Not known. Predicted to decline in future (Rate of decline not known) |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study, informal sightings, literature; observed, estimated; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | LEAST CONCERN |
| Rationale | Category based on population number and geographic distribution. Widely distributed in South Asia and more than 10,000 mature individuals estimated, which makes this taxon Least Concern. Even though a few threats are identified, they are not suspected to cause sharp changes to the population. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Lower Risk - near threatened |
| Justification for change | Better / new information available at workshop |
| National Status | Bangladesh: Endangered B2ab(iii) $\downarrow$ Near Threatened |
|  | Restricted in distribution in Bangladesh and some locations are subject to change in quality as also persecution by humans due to human-animal conflicts. Since the taxon can adapt well, the national status of Endangered is lowered to Near Threatened. |
|  | Bhutan: Endangered B2ab(iii) $\downarrow$ Near Threatened |
|  | Restricted in distribution in Bhutan and some locations are subject to change in quality as also persecution by humans due to human-animal conflicts. Since the taxon can adapt well, the national status of Endangered is lowered to Near Threatened. |
|  | India: Least Concern |
|  | The Indian population of this taxon is widely distributed. As the taxon is well adapted to changing environments, the status is Least Concern |
|  | Nepal: Endangered B2ab(iii) $\quad \downarrow$ Near Threatened |
|  | Restricted in distribution in Nepal and some locations are subject to change in quality as also persecution by humans due to human-animal conflicts. Since the taxon can adapt well, the national status of Endangered is lowered to Near Threatened. |
|  | Pakistan: Near Threatened |
|  | Widely distributed in Pakistan and the trends are similar to the Indian situation. However, |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Bangladesh: Schedule III, Bangladesh Wildlife (Preservation) (Amendment) Act, 1974 |
|  | India: Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
|  | Nepal: National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1973 under common species list, but considered as protected (All primates) |
| CITES | Appendix II |

## Presence in Protected Areas

| Bangladesh | Chittagong: Chunathi WLS |
| :--- | :--- |
| India | Sylhet: Rama Kalanga WLS |
|  | Andhra Pradesh: Coringa WLS, Eturnagaram WLS, Kawal WLS, Kinnerasani WLS, |
|  | Lanja Madugu Sivaram WLS, Manjira WLS, Pakhal WLS, Pocharam WLS, Pranahita |
|  | WLS |
|  | Arunachal Pradesh: Eagle Nest WLS, Itanagar WLS, Mehao WLS, Mouling NP, |
|  | Namdapha NP, Pakhui WLS, Sessa Orchid Sanctuary, Tale Valley WLS |
|  | Assam: Bherjan WLS, Chakrasila WLS, Gibbon WLS?, Manas NP, Nameri NP, |
|  | Pabitora WLS, Podumoni WLS |
|  | Bihar: Valmiki NP |
|  | Haryana: Bir Sikargarh WLS |
|  | Himachal Pradesh: Chail WLS, Great Himalayan NP |
|  | Jharkand: Palamau WLS |
|  | Maharashtra: Chaprala WLS, Bhamragarh WLS |
|  | Meghalaya: Balphakram NP, Namdapha NP, Nokrek NP, Nongkhyllem NP, Siju WLS |
|  | Tripura: Sepahijala WLS |
| Central Province: Lang Tang NP |  |
| Nepal | Eastern Province: Makalu Barun NP |
| Pakistan | Islamabad: Margallah Hills NP |
|  | NWFP: Ayubia NP |

## Recommendations

Research
Management

## Captive stocks

## Comments

Taxonomy, survey, limiting factor research
Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, translocation, sustainable utilization, public education, genome resource banking, limiting factor management, work in local communities, management of commensal population to reduce man-animal conflict. In Himachal Pradesh, the government is developing an Act to translocate the monkeys from urban areas to forested areas.

South Asia: 55 zoos (232.269.82.611)
5 zoos in Bangladesh (>21.>38.>8.>95), 42 zoos in India (184.192.70.446), 7 zoos in Pakistan (27.37.4.68) and 1 zoo in Sri Lanka (0.2.0.2).
World over: 2 institutions which hold 2 females in total.
Population moving towards city in the Himalayan range. Most of the monkeys were trapped from the forests to export to USA, as urban monkeys were not preferred for research. Identification and distribution of subspecies needs further research to resolve taxonomic confusion. A survey to delineate boundaries of subspecies is required. Studies of population dynamics in forested and urban areas needed. This group has focused primarily on forest dwellers since those animals are of significance to conservation. On the other hand, the group recognises the fact that a significant decline in the number of forest dwellers is due to their migration to nearby human habitation where they seem to enjoy the more attractive yet extremely unstable habitat. In addition this phenomena is resulting in increasing man-animal conflict and is a serious problem which requires attention at the earliest. The group also understands that the management strategies for the animals in forest and the commensal animals would have to be different. Initiate ex situ Program within 3 years in Nepal. From some areas (Nepal, Himachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, parts of Maharashtra, Dehra Dun) good data is available (reference cited). Other areas assessment is subjective based on known forested areas. Changing human tolerance levels towards macaques is a threat. Population in Bangladesh is under threat due to continuous conflict with humans. Main rpoblem is due to increasing commensalism and population growth in urban and agricultural growth. This is stimulated by a loss of forest habitat and tendency of humans to feed monkeys oin villages, temples and urban areas.

| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; Chalise and Ghimire, 1998; CZA 2000-2001; Ghimire, |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 2000; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; ISIS Abstract Report 2001; Mohnot and |
|  | Sahoo, 2002; Preetha and Singh, 1978; Preetha and Singh, 1981; Mammals of |
|  | Pakistan C.A.M.P., 2003 (unpub.); Roberts, 1997; SAZARC 2002 |
|  | Biological Information Sheets (2002): P.S. Bhatnagar, M.K. Chalise, M.M. Feeroz, E. |
|  | Imam, S.K. Sahoo, T.K. Shreshta, C.H. Southwick, C. Srinivasulu |
|  | C.A.M.P. questionnaire on protected areas (2002): M. Barua, S.S. Chandiramani, S. |
|  | Debbarma, C. Loma, S. Mahadev, M.A. Parsa, P. Ram, Sada Ram, S.P. Samant, G. |
|  | Santha, A.K. Sen, B. Srinivas, P. Srivastava, W.G. Momin |
| Compilers | M. K. Chalise, M.K. Ghimere, S.C. Ghimere, B.J. Karki, Awadesh Kumar, H. Kumar, |
| Meviewers | M.K. Misra, S. Ram, S.K. Sahoo, M. Singh, P. Srivatsava. |
|  | D. Brandon-Jones, M.K. Chalise, A. Eudey, S. Mitra, S.K. Sahoo, M.S. Pradhan |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { Area } \\ \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{array}$ | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BANGLADESH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chittagong |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chittagong |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chandpur Bazar |  |  | 5 | HuS | Human animal conflict (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 88 | 51 | Feeroz et al., 1995 |
| Chunathi WLS | $21^{\circ} 58$ | $92^{\circ} 04$ | 3 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 70 | 39 | Feeroz et al., 1995 |
| Hazarikhil |  |  | 8 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 97 | 48 | Feeroz et al., 1995 |
| Kaptai | $22^{\circ} 21$ | $92^{\circ} 17$ | 10 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 91 | 61 | Feeroz et al., 1995 |
| Cox's Bazar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fashia Khali | - | - | 3 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 39 | 17 | Feeroz, 1999 |
| Himchani |  | - | 7 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 79 | 39 | Feeroz, 1999 |
| Padua | $22^{\circ} 03$ | $92^{\circ} 07$ | 2 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 77 | 31 | Feeroz et al., 1995 |
| Satghar | $\sim 22^{\circ} 00$ | $\sim 92^{\circ} 00$ | 2 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 47 | 21 | Feeroz, 1999 |
| Sitakunda | $22^{\circ} 37$ | $91^{\circ} 39$ | 1 | H, SE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 41 | 22 | Feeroz et al., 1995 |
| Teknaf | $20^{\circ} 52$ | $92^{\circ} 18$ | 5 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 87 | 41 | Feeroz, 1999 |
| Ukhia | $21^{\circ} 15$ | $92^{\circ} 07$ | 5 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 65 | 31 | Feeroz, 1999 |
| Dhaka |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dhaka |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangasal | $\sim 23^{\circ} 43$ | $\sim 90^{\circ} 45$ | 1 | HuS | Human animal conflict (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 10 | 6 | Ahsan, 1984, Feeroz et al. 1995 |
| S.A. factory | $\sim 23^{\circ} 43$ | $\sim 90^{\circ} 25$ | 2 | HuS | Human animal conflict (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 49 | 2 ? | Ahsan, 1984, Feeroz et al. 1995 |
| Shakani Bazaar | - | - | 2 | HuS | Human animal conflict (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 15-20 | 8-9 | Ahsan, 1984, Feeroz et al. 1995 |
| Gagifera Boroni | - | - | 5 | HuS | Human animal conflict (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 117 | 69 | Feeroz et al. 1995 |
| Khulna <br> (Sundarbans) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hiron point | - | - | 15 | M | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 167 | 97 | Feeroz et al. 1995, Sharmin pers. comm., R. Khan, 2000 |
| Kotka | - | - | 20 | M | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 297 | 139 | Feeroz et al. 1995, Sharmin pers. comm., R. Khan, 2000 |
| Mandarbari | $23^{\circ} 01$ | $90^{\circ} 01$ | 10 | M | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 97 | 37 | M.M. Feeroz pers. comm. |
| Madanifena |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chanmugonia | - | - | 7 | HuS | Human animal conflict (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 212 | 130 | Feeroz et al. 1995, Sharmin pers. comm., R. Khan, 2000 |
| Manikgong Dhamrai | - | - | 5 | HuS | Human animal conflict (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 52 | 33 | M.M. Feeroz pers. comm. |
| Narayanagong <br> Narayanagong | $23^{\circ} 37$ | $90^{\circ} 30$ | 6 | HuS | Human animal conflict (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 73 | 47 | M.M. Feeroz pers. comm |
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Distribution of Macaca mulatta mulatta in Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal and Pakistan from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tr Past \%/yr | d <br> Future <br> \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eagle Nest WLS | $27^{\circ} 09$ | $92^{\circ} 21$ | - | E | Hunting (Pr) | Decline | Decline | - | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| Itanagar WLS | - | - | - | SD | Hunting (Pr) | Decline | Decline | - | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| Mouling NP | $28^{\circ} 32$ | $94^{\circ} 46$ | - | E | Hunting (Pr) | Decline | Decline | - | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| Namdapha NP | $\sim 27^{\circ} 39$ | $\sim 96^{\circ} 30$ | - | E | Hunting (Pr) | Decline | Decline | 560 | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki S.S. Chandiramani, 2002 |
| Pakhui WLS | $27^{\circ} 14$ | $92^{\circ} 51$ | $-$ | TE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 500 | - | IUSPP, Annual reports. In 25 groups. Found in adjacent areas too. C. Loma, 2002 |
| 1. Bhola Nallah | $\sim 27^{\circ} 14$ | $\sim 92^{\circ} 51$ | 5 | SE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 65 | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| 2. Bomdila way | $27^{\circ} 15$ | $92^{\circ} 24$ | 0 | E | Hunting (Pr) | Decline | Decline | - | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| 3. Dichu Nallah |  | - | 4 | TE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 19 | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| 4. Mithun Nallah | - | - | 2 | E | Hunting (P/Pr/F), <br> Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 15 | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| 5. Phool Nallah | - | - | 1.5 | E | Hunting (P/Pr/F), <br> Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 21 | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| 6. Sukha Nallah | - | - | 3.4 | R | Hunting (P/Pr/F), <br> Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 20 | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| Papumpara RF | - | - | - | SD | Hunting (Pr) | Decline | Decline | - | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| Sessa Orchid Sanctuary | $27^{\circ} 11$ | $92^{\circ} 32$ | - | SE | Hunting (Pr) | Decline | Decline | - | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| Tale WLS | - |  | - | E | Hunting (Pr) | Decline | Decline | - | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| Upper Dehing East block RF | $27^{\circ} 25$ | $95^{\circ} 42$ | 4 | SD | Hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), <br> Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 22 | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| Assam Bongaigaon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bamungaon RF | $26^{\circ} 55$ | $94^{\circ} 10$ | 1.5 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | - | - | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Kakarjan | - | - | 2.4 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Manas NP | $26^{\circ} 43$ | $90^{\circ} 59$ | 48.9 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Cachar Hills Innerline RF | - | - | 13.52 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Dhubri |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chakrasila WLS | $26^{\circ} 20$ | $90^{\circ} 18$ | 4.5 13.9 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Mohagaya | - | - | 13.9 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Dibrugarh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bherjan WLS | $\sim 27^{\circ} 30$ | $\sim 95^{\circ} 00$ | 0.1 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Dehingmukh | - | - | 6.6 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Jokai | - | - | 2.6 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area $\left(\mathrm{km}^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Joypur RF | $27^{\circ} 14$ | $95^{\circ} 34$ | 10.869 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Namdang RF | $27^{\circ} 20$ | $94^{\circ} 55$ | 2.6 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Podumani WLS | - | - | 0.1 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Teljam | - | - | 1.6 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Golaghat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hogaghar RF | - | - | 0.373 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Nambor West | blockR | - | 3 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Panbhari RF | - | - | 1.2 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Jorhat <br> (Gibbon WLS?) | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | $\sim 200$ | - | 5 groups. Found in adjacent areas too. G. Santha, 2002 |
| Kamrup |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kulsi Plantation RF | $\sim 25^{\circ} 50$ | $\sim 91^{\circ} 20$ | 1.855 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Badsahilia RF | - | - | 8.8 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Chandhubi USF | - | - | 12 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Gorbhanga RF | - | - | 1.146 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Kuwasingh RF | - | - | 9.98 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Norgal RF | - | - | 1.256 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Pantan RF | - | - | 11.285 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Ranni RF | - | - | 4.369 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Karbi Anglong |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amreng RF | $25^{\circ} 43$ | $92^{\circ} 60$ | 5.69 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Amsolong PRF | $26^{\circ} 00$ | $93^{\circ} 30$ | 1 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Balasore PRF | $06^{\circ} 30$ | $80^{\circ} 0$ | 1 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Bokajan PRF | $26^{\circ} 00$ | $93^{\circ} 43$ | 0.98 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Borjuri PRF | - | - | 21 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Borlander DC RF | - | - | 0 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Daldali RF | - | - | 12.33 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Dhansiri RF | - | - | 7.03 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Disama RF | - | - | 69.1 | TSE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Dolamoro PRF | - | - | 0.55 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Englonggiri DC RF | - | - | 1.125 | TSE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Hafjan PRF | - | - | - | TSE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Haithapahar DCRF | - | - | 5 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Jungthung RF | - | - | 3 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Kaki RF | - | - | 14 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Kalaphar PRF | - | - | 0.97 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Kalioni RF | - | - | 5 | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area $\left(\mathrm{km}^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past <br> \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kaziranga RF | $\sim 26^{\circ} 37$ | $\sim 93^{\circ} 18$ | 3.38 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Kaziranga RF | $\sim 26^{\circ} 37$ | $\sim 93^{\circ} 18$ | 20 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Khonbanon RF | - | - | 1 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Langlakso PRF | - | - | 53.46 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Longnit DCRF | - | - | 12 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Mahamaya DCRF | - | - | - | TVE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Miyungdisa DCRF | - | - | - | TSE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Nambor North block RF | - | - | 3 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Patradisa DCRF | - | - | 7 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Tikok PRF | - | - | 2.589 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Ujkir RF | - | - | 23 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Umjakani PRF | - | - | 1 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Western Mikir Hills PRF | - | - | 3.96 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Karimganj |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Longai RF <br> Dohali RF | - | - | 2.12 9 | TSE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline Decline | Decline Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| North Cachar | $25^{\circ} 30$ | $93^{\circ} 00$ | 37.9 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Hills RF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Patharia RF Singla RF | $24^{\circ} 11$ $\sim 27^{\circ} 02$ | $24^{\circ} 31$ $\sim 88^{\circ} 19$ | 1.07 1.92 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Tilbhum RF | - | - | 2.08 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Kokrejhar |  |  | 84.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kachugaon | - | - | - | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Ripu RF | $26^{\circ} 45$ | $90^{\circ} 09$ | - | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Barail PRF | $25^{\circ} 08$ | $93^{\circ} 09$ | 1.76 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Barail RF | $25^{\circ} 08$ | $93^{\circ} 09$ | 1.59 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Khurimming RF | - | - | 10.84 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Langting Mupa RF | $25^{\circ} 30$ | $90^{\circ} 07$ | 49.33 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Panimur PRF | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Upper Jiri RF | - | - | 8.9 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99 |
| Marigaon Pobitora WLS | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | >100 | - | In 5 groups. Found in adjacent areas too. M. Barua, 2002 |
| Sonitpur Nameri NP | $27^{\circ} 01$ | $92^{\circ} 43$ | 25 | Dg | Habitat destruction (Pr) | Decline | - | 80 | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |
| Tinsukhia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kumsong RF | $27^{\circ} 44$ | $95^{\circ} 44$ | 2.252 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), Pets (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | A. Kumar and G.S. Solanki |

Distribution of Macaca mulatta mulatta in Bangladesh，Bhutan，India，Nepal and Pakistan from literature and recent field studies ．．．continued

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 | ＇，＇＇ | 1 ＇ | ， | ， | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| $\stackrel{\dot{\circ}}{\circ} \dot{0}$ | ＇＇ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M } \\ & 0 \\ & 6 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | 웅 ${ }^{\circ}$ | ㅇ， | is | \％ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 1 <br>  <br>  |  | 1 ， | ＇ | ＇ |  |
|  |  | ， |  |  | ， |  |  |
|  |  | ＇ | レー レレ | レ レ | น | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 氏゙ } \\ & \text { ふ } \\ & \text { ジ } \\ & \vDash \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | ！ | ＇＇＇ | 1 1 | ， | ， |  |
| O <br> 0 |  | ， |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\circ} \stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N}}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| － |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \stackrel{0}{\mathrm{o}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{+} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{N}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{c} \\ & \stackrel{ల}{ల} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

South Asian Primate C．A．M．P．Report， 2003
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| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & z \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{+}{\dot{N}} \dot{\Sigma}$ |  | 8 | , | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | , . | ก | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | ก | - |
| $\dot{\circ} \dot{\circ} \dot{\circ}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\mp} \\ & \stackrel{7}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\hat{6}$ | ¢ | 8 |  |
|  | ' ' ' ' |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{0}{0}$ 皆 | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { O }}}$ |  |
|  | , ' , ' |  | coll |  |  | , | , |  |  |
|  | ' ' ' ' | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { ल }} \\ & \text { ल } \\ & \dot{\Sigma} \end{aligned}$ | , |  |  | $\xi$ |  |  |  |
|  | ' ' ' ' | ̇ | $\stackrel{\sim}{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ N | , ' | - | $m$ | - | N |
| \|oَ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\beta}{i} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \hline+ \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{\sum_{\infty}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{5} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \text { § } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |
| + | $\stackrel{4}{4}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { N}}{\substack{\circ \\ \text { ¢ }}}$ | 웃 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\substack{N}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\text { N}}{N} \\ \stackrel{N}{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kanti | $35^{\circ} 35$ | $71^{\circ} 41$ | - | Dry forest | - | - | - | - | - | T.J. Roberts, 1997 |
| Utzun | $35^{\circ} 30$ | $71^{\circ} 40$ | - | Dry forest | - | - | - | - | - | T.J. Roberts, 1997 |
| Shishi Koh | - | - | - | Dry forest | - | - | - | - | - | T.J. Roberts, 1997 |
| Hazara |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower Kaghan | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | T.J. Roberts, 1997 |
| Paras | $34^{\circ} 39$ | $73^{\circ} 31$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | T.J. Roberts, 1997 |
| Shogran | $34^{\circ} 37$ | $73^{\circ} 28$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | T.J. Roberts, 1997 |
| Kohistan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | T.J. Roberts, 1997 |
| Dewan Nallah | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 5 | - | M. Ayaz, 2003 |
| Kuz Paro (Pallas) | - | - | 50 | St-Oak | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Northern Dir |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Landrai valley | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | T.J. Roberts, 1997 |
| Kundla Shahi (Kumraf) | - | - | - | MT | - |  | - | 30-40 | - | M. Ayaz, 2003 |
| Gwaldri valley | $35^{\circ} 30$ | $71^{\circ} 40$ | - | - | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Dokdhusra | $35^{\circ} 32$ | $72^{\circ} 13$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | T.J. Roberts, 1997 |
| Azad Kashmir <br> Muzaffarbad NP in <br> Muzaffarbad | - | - | 20 | MT | Habitat loss, trapping live animals (P/Pr/F) |  | - | $\sim 550$ | - | I. Ahmad, 2002 |
| Neelum Valley Murree hills | $\sim 33^{\circ} 54$ | $\sim 73^{\circ} 22$ | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | T.J. Roberts, 1997 |
| Margalla hills NP | $\sim 33^{\circ} 48$ | $\sim 73^{\circ} 10$ | 120 | S | Habitat degradation (P/Pr/F) |  | - | $\sim 150$ | - | T.J. Roberts, 1997; M. Anwar |
| Pir Sohara Road | - | - | - | S | - | - | - | 5 | - | Rizwan, 2002 |

[^3]| Synonyms | None |
| :--- | :--- |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Malayalam: Vella Kurangu; Tamil: Kulla Kurangu; English: Bonnet Macaque, Pale- <br> bellied Bonnet Macaque |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | The subspecies for M. radiata are those recognized by Fooden (1981). This subspe- <br> cies may have to be elevated to full species status because its life history pattern is <br> different from M. r. radiata. |
| Ubiquitous, diurnal, omnivorous, terrestrial |  |
| Habit | All forest types from scrub to evergreen, forest, plantations, agricultural lands, urban <br> areas |
| Habitat | Terrestrial in low canopy vegetation, arboreal in high canopy vegetation |
| Niche to 2000m. |  |
| Elevation | Endemic to India |
| Distribution <br> Global | Increasing <br> Extent of Occurrence |
| Indirect information, field study, informal sightings; projected; 95\% confidence |  |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | LEAST CONCERN |
| Rationale | Widely distributed in South Asia with around 5000 mature individuals. This subspecies is categorized as Least Concern because there is an increasing trend in the population and the threats are not serious. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Lower Risk - least concern |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule II, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | Kerala: Neyyar WLS, Peechi-Vazhani WLS, Peppara WLS, Periyar NP, Periyar WLS, Shendurney WLS <br> Tamil Nadu: Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS, Kalakkad WLS, Mundanthurai WLS, Point Calimere WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomy, survey (for subspeciation) |
| Management | None |
| Captive Stocks | 36 zoos in India (254.204.168.626). Subspecies not known |
| Comments | Male known to migrate between fragmented locations |
| Sources | Ali, 1981; Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Easa and Jayaraman, 1998; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; Kerala Forest Department, 2001; KFRI, 1993; Napier, 1981; Ramachandran and Joseph, 2001a; SAZARC, 2002; Singh et al., 1997a; Singh et al., 1997b <br> Biological Information Sheets (2002): Ajith Kumar, Sunita Ram C.A.M.P. questionnaire on protected areas (2002): A.D. Baruah, G.K. Joseph, T.U. Uthup |
| Compilers | R. Ali, H.R. Bhat, S. Ganapathiappan, G.K Joseph, R. Krishnamani, Ajith Kumar, P.O. Nameer, M.S. Pradhan, S. Ram, K.K. Ramachandran, G. Ramaswamy, A.K. Sharma, M. Singh, S.F.W. Sunderraj |
| Reviewers | R. Ali, D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey, G.K. Joseph, M.S. Pradhan |


Distribution of Macaca radiata diluta in India from literature and recent field studies

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. trend <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future $\% / \mathrm{yr}$ | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDIA Kerala Punalur | 09 00 | $76^{\circ} 55$ |  | MD-E | Habitat degradation (Pr), over-exploitation (Pr), fragmentation (Pr) Habitat degradation (Pr), over-exploitation (Pr), fragmentation (Pr) | Increase Increase <br> 10 yrs 10 yrs <br> Increase Increase <br> 10 yrs 10 yrs |  | $\begin{aligned} & 150-175 \\ & (151) \\ & 250-300 \\ & (130) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 75-90 \\ (75) \\ 125-150 \\ (270) \end{array}$ | KFRI, 1993 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ranni | 08¹5 |  | - | MD-E |  |  |  | KFRI, 1993 |  |  |
| Buthapandi (Travancore) |  | $77^{\circ} 27$ | - |  |  |  |  | North of Aramboly: Buthapandi; holotype of M.r. diluta. Napier, 1981 |  |  |
| Idukki | 0932 | $77^{\circ} 12$ | 400 | MD-E | Habitat degradation (Pr), tourism (Pr) | Increase 10 yrs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Increase } \\ & 10 \mathrm{yrs} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 100-150 \\ (128) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 50-75 \\ (70) \end{array}$ |  |
| Periyar NP\&WLS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Population increase in tourism zone. G. K. Joseph, 2002 |
| Kollam | - | - | - | MD-E | Habitat degradation (Pr), over-exploitation (Pr), fragmentation (Pr) | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Increase } & \text { In } \\ 10 \text { yrs } & 10 \end{array}$ | Increase <br> 10 yrs | $\begin{aligned} & 700-800 \\ & (360) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 350-400 \\ (725) \end{array}$ | KFRI, 1993 |
| Thenmalai |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pathanamthitta | 0930 | $76^{\circ} 52$ | - | MD-E | Habitat degradation (Pr), over-exploitation (Pr), fragmentation (Pr) | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Increase } \\ 10 \text { yrs } \end{array}$ | Increase 10 yrs | $\begin{aligned} & 100-150 \\ & (125) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 50-75 \\ (65) \end{array}$ | KFRI, 1993 |
| Konni RF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Thiruvananthapuram |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neyyar WLS and | - | - | - | MD-E | - | Increase Increase 10 yrs 10 yrs |  | $\begin{aligned} & 240-275 \\ & (243) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 120-140 \\ (125) \end{array}$ | KFRI, 1993 |
| Shendurney WLS |  | $76^{\circ} 57$ | - |  |  | - - |  |  |  | KFRI, 1993; T.U. Uthup, 2002 KFRI, 1993 |
| Thiruvananthapuram RF | $08^{\circ} 41$ |  |  |  | - | Increase I 10 yrs | Increase 10 yrs | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline- \\ 240-275 \\ (259) \end{array}\right.$ | 175-200 <br> (180) |  |
| Pondicherry Pondicherry | $11^{\circ} 59$ | $79^{\circ} 50$ | - | - | - |  | - |  | - | Intermediate form. Groves, 2001 |
| Tamil Nadu Shernelly (Nelliampathy Plateau) | $10^{\circ} 30$ | $76^{\circ} 45$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 455m. Napier, 1981 |
| Dindugal <br> Kodaikanal, | $10^{\circ} 14$ | $77^{\circ} 29$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1667m. Napier, 1981 |
| 23 miles away |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palni Hills | $\sim 10^{\circ} 18$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 31$ | 600 | MD, P | Habitat alterations (Pr) | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 1500- \\ & 3000 \end{aligned}$ | - | Present pop. trends: Increasing. Rauf Ali, pers. comm. |
| Palni Hills | $10^{\circ} 15$ | $77^{\circ} 30$ |  |  | - | - | - | (2500) | - | 910m. Napier, 1981 |

Distribution of Macaca radiata diluta in India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. trend <br> Past Future <br> \%/yr \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (northern slopes Palni foothills (southwest) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Groves, 2001 |
| Madurai Alagar Koil | $09^{\circ} 49$ | $77^{\circ} 49$ | 5 | S | - | - - | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 75-125 \\ (100) \end{array}$ | - | G. Ramaswamy, pers. comm. |
| Nagapattinam Point Calimere WLS | $10^{\circ} 17$ | $79^{\circ} 52$ | 6 | S | Habitat degradation (Pr), over-exploitation (Pr), fragmentation (Pr) | Increase Increase <br> $10 \mathrm{yrs} \quad 10 \mathrm{yrs}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45-55 \\ & (49) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22-28 \\ & (25) \end{aligned}$ | Ramaswamy, 1994 <br> Found in adjacent areas too. <br> A.D. Bharuah, 2002 |
| Tirunelveli Coutrallam RF | - | - | 40 | S-MD | Habitat degradation (Pr), over-exploitation (Pr), fragmentation (Pr) | Increase Increase <br> $10 \mathrm{yrs} \quad 10 \mathrm{yrs}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150-250 \\ & (200) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75-125 \\ & (100) \end{aligned}$ | Rauf Ali pers. comm. |
| Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS | - | - | 125 | s | Habitat degradation (Pr), over-exploitation (Pr), fragmentation (Pr) | Increase Increase $10 \mathrm{yrs} \quad 10 \mathrm{yrs}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 500-700 \\ (600) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 250-350 \\ & (300) \end{aligned}$ | U. Kumar, 1990 |
| Kalakad-Mundan thurai TR | $\sim 08^{\circ} 30$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 34$ | 800 | S, WE | Habitat degradation (Pr), over-exploitation (Pr), fragmentation (Pr) | Increase Increase | $\begin{aligned} & 1500- \\ & 2500 \\ & (2000) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 750- \\ & 1250 \\ & (1000) \end{aligned}$ | Ali, 1981 |
| Kambam | $09^{\circ} 44$ | $77^{\circ} 18$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Groves, 2001 |

MD-E - Moist Deciduous to Evergreen forest, S - Scrub jungle, S-MD - Scrub to Moist Deciduous forest, WE - Wet Evergreen forest

| Synonyms | Cercocebus radiatus E. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1812 Simia sinica Griffith, 1821 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Marathi: Makad; English: Bonnet Macaque, Dark-bellied Bonnet Macaque |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | The subspecies for M. radiata are those recognized by Fooden (1981). This subspecies Macaca radiata radiata shows migration between groups where as M. r. diluta shows female migration. M. r. diluta is much paler than M. r. radiata. Taxonomists may consider elevating these two subspecies to two species. |
| Habit | Diurnal, omnivorous, terrestrial |
| Habitat | Ubiquitous. All forest types including scrub to evergreen forests, agricultural lands and urban areas |
| Niche | Terrestrial in low canopy vegetation and arboreal in high canopy vegetation |
| Elevation | Up to 2600 m . |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Endemic to India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | >2,001 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/subpopulations | 72 / Many. Contiguous. |
| Habitat status | Not known. Decrease in quality due to urbanization and loss of fruiting trees |
| Threats | Past threats: Agriculture, hunting, trade, road kills <br> Present and future threats: Infrastructure, road kills, research, pathogens/parasites, storms/flooding |
| Trade | Domestic and commercial trade for research and road shows |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years |
| Total population | >1,50,000 |
| Mature individuals | >10,000 |
| Population trend | Total population and mature individuals are increasing (Rate and period not known). |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study, indirect information, literature; projected, observed; 95\% confidence |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | LEAST CONCERN |
| Rationale | Widely distributed in southern India with more than 10,000 mature individuals estimated, which makes this taxon Least Concern. Even though a few threats are identified, they are not suspected to cause sharp changes to the population |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Lower Risk - least concern |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule II, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | Andhra Pradesh: Eturnagaram WLS, Lanja Madugu Sivaram WLS, Nellapattu WLS, Sri Venkateswara NP <br> Goa: Bondla WLS, Mollem NP, Mollem WLS <br> Karnataka: Bandipur NP, Bannerghatta NP, Kudremukh NP, Nagerhole NP <br> Kerala: Aralam WLS, Chimmony WLS, Idukki WLS, Silent Valley NP, Thattekkad WLS, Wynaad WLS <br> Maharashtra: Radhanagari WLS; Sanjay Gandhi NP, Tansa WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomy, life history, survey |
| Management | Sustainable utilization |
| Captive Stocks | 36 zoos in India (254.204.168.626). Subspecies not known |
| Comments | Taxonomic status needs revision. Females are known to migrate |
| Sources | Ali, 1981; Bhat, 1970; Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA 2000-2001; D' Souza and Singh, 1992; Easa and Jayaraman, 1998; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor (Compiler), 2000; KFRI, 1993; Krishnamani, 1994; Napier, 1981; Ramachandran and Joseph 2001a; SAZARC 2002; Singh et al., 1997a; Singh et al., 1997b; Singh and Pirta, 1980 Biological Information Sheet (2002): A.K. Chakraborty, Ajith Kumar, Sunitha Ram, C. Srinivasulu |
| Compilers | R. Ali, H. Andrews, H.R., Bhat, S. Ganapathiappan, G. K Joseph, R. Krishnamani, H. Kumar, P.O. Nameer, M.S., Pradhan, S. Ram, K.K. Ramachandran, G. Ramaswamy, A.K. Sharma, W. S. F. Sunderraj. |
| Reviewers | R. Ali, D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey, M.S. Pradhan |

## Distribution range of Macaca radiata radiata
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|  | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{5}{5}$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 | C. Srinivasulu, BIS | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{5}{5}$ $\frac{0}{5}$ 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ， | ＇ | ， | ＇＇ | ＇＇ | ， | 1 | 1 | ＇ | ＇＇＇＇ | ＇ |
| $\frac{\dot{0}}{\dot{O}} \dot{0}$ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 옷 } \\ & \text { o } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ | 융사N | ， | ， | N | ¢앙 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\sim}-\underset{\wedge}{N} \wedge$ | ， |
|  | ＇ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}1 & 1 \\ & \\ \\ 1 & 1 \\ \end{array}$ |  |
|  | 1 | 1 | ， | 1 ＇ | ＇＇＇ | ， | 1 | ， | ＇＇ | ＇ 1 | ， |
|  | 1 | 1 | น | هi | แレ ய | ＇ | ， |  |  |  | ＇ |
|  | 1 | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ 1 | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | 1 | ＇＇ | ＇＇＇ | 1 |
| O | 1 | ， | ， | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{j}} \end{aligned}$ | 苗 ํNNNN | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \circ \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{~} \end{aligned}$ | ， | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{N} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{i}{\circ} \stackrel{i}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  | ， |
| － | 1 | ， | 1 |  |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ $\sim$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \stackrel{0}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | 领 in in مْ | ＇ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Distribution of Macaca radiata radiata in India from literature and recent field studies... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | d <br> Future <br> \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chikmagalur \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dakshina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kannada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kudremukh NP | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Dharwar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Devikop | $15^{\circ} 08$ | $74^{\circ} 56$ | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 600m. Fooden et al., 1981 |
| Dharwar | $15^{\circ} 28$ | $75^{\circ} 02$ | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | 700m. Fooden et al., 1981 |
| Dharwar | $15^{\circ} 25$ | $74^{\circ} 55$ | - | Road side | - | - | - | $9$ <br> troops | - | $4.4-17.5 \mathrm{~km}$ southwest Fooden et al., 1981 |
| Dharwar | $15^{\circ} 20$ | $74^{\circ} 50$ | - | F | - | - | - | $3$ | - | $18.4-29.5 \mathrm{~km}$ southwest |
| Gadag | $15^{\circ} 25$ | $75^{\circ} 37$ | - | Town | - | - | - | troop | - | Fooden et al., 1981 |
| Kanara |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gersoppa | $14^{\circ} 14$ | $74^{\circ} 38$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 697m. Napier, 1981 |
| Samasgi | $\sim 14{ }^{\circ} 40$ | $\sim 71^{\circ} 50$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 606m. Napier, 1981 |
| Karwar | $14^{\circ} 48$ | $74^{\circ} 08$ | - | F | - | - | - | - | - | Fooden et al., 1981 |
| Samsgi | $14^{\circ} 40$ | $75^{\circ} 00$ | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | 600m. Fooden et al., 1981 |
| Mysore |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chamundi | $12^{\circ} 16$ | $76^{\circ} 40$ | 15 | S | - | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 400-450 \\ & (420) \end{aligned}$ | - | D' Souza \& Singh, 1992 |
| Haleri Estate (northern Coorg) | $\sim 12^{\circ} 31$ | $\sim 75^{\circ} 40$ | - | - | - | - | - | ( | - | A few miles north of Mercara; 326m. Napier, 1981 |
| Kudremukh NP | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Vijayanagar (Bellary, Hampi) | $15^{\circ} 19$ | $76^{\circ} 28$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 455m. Napier, 1981 |
| Wotekolli (southern Coorg) | $12^{\circ} 0$ | $76^{\circ} 0$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 606m. Napier, 1981 |
| Kerala |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ernakulam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Malayathur | $10^{\circ} 11$ | $76^{\circ} 31$ | - | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{SE}, \\ & \text { MD } \end{aligned}$ | - | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 85-150 \\ & (100) \end{aligned}$ | - | Present pop. trend: Increasing. KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| Idukki |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinnar WLS | - | - | 50 | DD, S | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F), Fire (P/Pr/F) | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 50-100 \\ & (57) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30-60 \\ & (37) \end{aligned}$ | Present pop. trend: Increasing. Shifting its habitat from forest to urban areas. KFRI, 1993, 1997 |
| Ervikulam NP | $10^{\circ} 15$ | $77^{\circ} 06$ | 20 | Sh | - | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 40-75 \\ & (48) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24-45 \\ & (29) \end{aligned}$ | Present pop. trends: Increasing. KFRI, 1993, 1997 |
| Idukki WLS | $09^{\circ} 54$ | $77^{\circ} 00$ | 50 | MD, SE | Habitat loss (P/Pr), habitat degradation (Pr), fragmentation (Pr/F), poaching (P), | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 150-200 \\ & (155) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90-120 \\ & (93) \end{aligned}$ | Present pop. trends: Increasing. Shifting its habitat from forest to |
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Distribution of Macaca radiata radiata in India from literature and recent field studies．．．continued

| 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 $z$ $z$ |  |  |  |  |  | ㅇㅇㅇ <br>  <br> 튿 |  <br> － <br> ○ む む <br>  <br> © 앙 <br>  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ＇ | ， | ＇＇ | 1 ＇ | 1 | 1 ＇ | ＇＇ | ， | 1 | ， | ＇ |
| $\frac{\dot{0}}{\circ}$ |  | m | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{1} \\ & \sim \\ & \text { oे } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ ก | 은 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{N} \text { 으슷ㅇ } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | N | 1 | 앙 | 1 |
|  |  |  <br>  <br>  |  | ' |  |  |  | 1 <br>  <br>  | ＇ <br>  <br>  <br>  | ＇ | ＇ <br>  |
|  | ＇ | 1 | ＇＇ |  |  | 1 ＇ | 1. | 1 | ， | ＇ | 1 |
|  |  |  | $\stackrel{\Delta}{\stackrel{0}{0}}$ | $\bigcirc 8$ |  |  |  | ＇ | ， |  | ， |
|  | $\stackrel{\circ}{N}$ | ， |  |  |  |  | ＇ | 1 | 1 | ， | 1 |
| － | $\begin{array}{lll} 8 & 8 & 8 \\ \circ & \circ & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ 6 \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \mathrm{~N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { ㄷ } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{N}{\sim} \text { © } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { o子 } \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | No | ， |
| － | $\begin{array}{ll} \bullet \\ \stackrel{\circ}{\rightleftharpoons} & \circ \\ \rightleftharpoons \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\square} \stackrel{\infty}{\square} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \stackrel{0}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\stackrel{\sim}{N}}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ}$ | ， |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Distribution of Macaca radiata radiata in India from literature and recent field studies... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ghambhir Gadh | $20^{\circ} 03$ | $73^{\circ} 03$ | - | F | - | - |  | 20 | - | 400m. Fooden et al., 1981 |
| Kohaj Killa | $19^{\circ} 41$ | $72^{\circ} 58$ | - | F | - | - |  | >2 |  | 370m. Fooden et al., 1981 |
| Yeur | $19^{\circ} 14$ | $72^{\circ} 57$ | - | F | - | - | - | 1 | - | Fooden et al., 1981 |
| Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve (excl. Kerala) | - | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & M D, D D, \\ & S, T P \end{aligned}$ | - | - | - |  | - | R. Ali and M.S. Pradhan, pers. comm |
| Tamil Nadu Coimbatore |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anamalai Hills (Indira Gandhi WLS) | $10^{\circ} 34$ | $76^{\circ} 55$ | 958 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{MD}, \mathrm{D}, \\ & \mathrm{~S}, \mathrm{SU} \end{aligned}$ | Biomedical research (Pr), vehicular movements (Pr), human habitations (Pr) | - | - | $\begin{array}{\|l} 2000- \\ 3000 \\ (2500) \end{array}$ | - | Present pop. trends: Increasing. Singh et al., 1997a |
| Rookery Estate (Keezh Kothagiri) | $11^{\circ} 25$ | $76^{\circ} 52$ | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | 1552m. Napier, 1981 |
| Ootacamund |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mudumalai WLS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Mukurthi NP | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  |
| Salem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kurumbapatti | $11^{\circ} 47$ | $78^{\circ} 09$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Napier, 1981 |
| Shevaroy Hills | $11^{\circ} 50$ | $78^{\circ} 30$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 1364m. Napier, 1981 |
| Vellore <br> Javadi Hills | - | - | - | MD | - | - | - | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 150-250 \\ (200) \end{array}$ | - | Rauf Ali pers. comm. |

D - Deciduous forest, DD - Dry Deciduous forest, E - Evergreen forest, MD - Moist Deciduous forest, MD-DD - Moist Deciduous to Dry Deciduous forest, P - Plantation areas, S

- Scrub jungle, SE - Semi-evergreen forest, Sh - Shola forest, SU - Semi-urban areas, TP - Teak Plantation

| Synonyms | Simia silenus Linnaeus, 1758 <br> Cercopithecus vetulus Erxleben, 1777 <br> Simia (Cercopithecus) silenus albibarbatus Kerr, 1792 <br> Simia ferox Shaw, 1792 <br> Simia veter Audebert, 1798 <br> Simia silanus F. Cuvier, 1822 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Kannada: Singaleeka; Malayalam / Tamil: Singavaal kurangu; English: Lion-tailed Macaque, Wanderoo |
| Level of assessment | Species |
| Habit | Arboreal, diurnal, frugivorous, insectivorous, usually in small groups |
| Habitat | Wet evergreen forest |
| Niche | Upper canopy |
| Elevation | 100-1,800m. |
| Distribution Global | Endemic to India |
| Extent of Occurrence | $34,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | <2,500 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/subpopulations | 47 / 49. Fragmented |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>20 \%$ in the last 10 years and predicted to decline by $>20 \%$ in the next 10 years due to encroachment, conversion of coffee plantations to tea, habitat degradation. Decrease in quality due to loss of fruiting trees, altered habitat, loss of canopy contiguity. Changes in private forests and outside protected areas. |
| Threats | Roads, dams, powerlines, deforestation, fragmentation, crop plantations, agriculture, mining, hunting for food, trapping, habitat loss, changes in native species dynamics, pathogens/parasites, delayed sexual maturity and long inter-birth interval, inbreeding. Landslide is a future threat. In private forests and plantations, change in land use is a problem for the species. |
| Trade | Local trade for whole animal for pets. The taxon is hunted for sustenance for food near Amarambalam. There are reports of LTM used in medicine also. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | Not known |
| Total population | 3,550 |
| Mature individuals | <2,500 |
| Population trend | Declining in forest fragments and outside protected areas. Stable in protected areas. |
| Data source | Field study; observed; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED C2a(i) |
| Rationale | Widely distributed species with more than 8 locations and 49 subpopulations. This species is however threatened with fragmentation and the estimated mature |


|  | individual population is less than 2500 , with no single subpopulation having more than 250 mature individuals. This species is therefore categorized as Endangered based on restricted mature individuals. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered B1+2c, C2a |
| Justification for change | Better information available from Karnataka at the workshop. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
|  | Karnataka: Brahmagiri WLS, Kudremukh NP, Mookambika WLS, Pushpagiri WLS, Sharavathi Valley WLS, Someshwara WLS, Talakaveri WLS <br> Kerala: Aralam WLS, Chimmony WLS, Neyyar WLS, Peppara WLS, Parambikulam WLS, Periyar NP, Periyar WLS, Shendurney WLS, Silent Valley NP <br> Tamil Nadu: Indira Gandhi WLS, Kalakkad WLS, Mundanthurai WLS, Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS |
| Recommendations Research | Genetic research, life history, epidemiology, limiting factor research |
| Management | Limiting factor management, wild population management, monitoring, public education, captive breeding |
| Captive management | Research and preservation of live genome |
| Captive stocks | South Asia: 19 zoos (13.22.0.52) <br> 18 zoos in India (28.22.0.50), 1 zoo in Nepal (2.0.0.2) <br> There is an up-to-date studbook managed by Wildlife Institute of India (Dehra Dun) for Central Zoo Authority for this species. <br> World over: 61 institutions (168.159.9.336). |
| Comments | Male migration within fragmented population is common. Three kinds of populations present: protected areas, reserve forests other than protected areas and in private forests and plantations. The problem in areas outside protected areas is poor management to no management for LTM. There is need for having a national or regionally endorsed protection plan for LTM. As it is a flagship species it may help in the protection of other rain forest species. Ongoing ex situ program must be intensified or increased. Some techniques of propagation are known for taxon or similar taxon. A PHVA for LTM was conducted in 1993. |
| Sources | Bhat, 1993; Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; ISIS Abstract Report 2001; Joseph, 1998; Joseph and Ramachandran, 1998; Joseph and Ramachandran, 2001; Krishnamani, 2002; Kumar, 1995; Kumar et al., 1998; Kumar et al., 2001; Kumar et al., (in press); Napier, 1981; Ramachandran, 1990; Ramachandran and Joseph, 1998; Ramachandran and Joseph, 2000; Ramachandran and Joseph, 2001; Ramaswamy and Haridoss (Unpublished); SAZARC, 2002; Singh et al., 1997a; Singh et al., 1997b; Singh et al., 1998; Singh et al., 2000; Singh et al. 2001b; Singh et al., (communicated); Walker et al., 1994 Biological Information Sheets (2002): H.R. Bhat, Ajith Kumar, H.N. Kumara, G. Umapathy <br> C.A.M.P. questionnaire on protected areas (2002): G.K. Joseph, T.U. Uthup |
| Compilers | R. Ali, H.R. Bhat, G. K. Joseph, R. Krishnamani, A. Kumar, P.O. Nameer, M.S. Pradhan, K.K. Ramachandran, G. Ramaswamy, A.K. Sharma, M. Singh |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A.K. Sharma, G.K. Joseph, M.S. Pradhan |

## Distribution range of Macaca silenus
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre <br> Past <br> \%/yr | nd Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kerala |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ernakulam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cochin | $09^{\circ} 58$ | $76{ }^{\circ} 14$ | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | Napier, 1981 |
| Cotengady Estate | $10^{\circ} 47$ | $76^{\circ} 43$ | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | 1061m. Napier, 1981 |
| Malayattoor | $10^{\circ} 11$ | $76^{\circ} 31$ | 25 | WE | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) |  | - | 30 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 15(25- \\ 50) \end{array}$ | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| Idukki <br> Periyar TR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $09^{\circ} 32$ | $77^{\circ} 12$ | 300 | WE | Deforestation (P), hunting (P/Pr), Selective logging (P), plantation (P), pilgrimage (F) | Decline 20 yrs | May increase | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 160-180 \\ (178) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89(75- \\ & 85) \end{aligned}$ | In 19 groups. KFRI, 1993, 1997; KFD, 2000. Found in adjacent areas also. G.K. Joseph, 2002 |
| Kannur <br> Aralam WLS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $12^{\circ} 00$ | $75^{\circ} 75$ | 20 | WE | Poaching (P, Pr/F) | Decline 30 yrs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 30 \mathrm{yrs} \end{aligned}$ | 15 | 8 | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| Kottiyur | - | - | 15 | WE | Poaching (P, Pr/F) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 30 \text { yrs } \end{aligned}$ | Decline <br> 30 yrs | 20 | 8 | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| Malapuram |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nilambur North | $11^{\circ} 4$ | $76^{\circ} 75$ | 10 | WE | Poaching (P, Pr/F) | Decline 30 yrs | Decline <br> 30 yrs | 15 | 8 | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| New <br> Amarambalam | $11^{\circ} 00$ | $76^{\circ} 5$ | 150 | WE | Poaching (P, Pr/F) | Decline 20 yrs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stable } \\ & 30 \text { yrs } \end{aligned}$ | 135 | 70 | Joseph \& Ramachandran, 1998, 2000. |
| Palghat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nelliampathy | $10^{\circ} 30$ | $76^{\circ} 47$ | 25 | WE | Plantations (P/Pr/F) | Decline 20 yrs | Decline 30 yrs | 165 | 85 | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census Primate census, 2000 |
| Muthukkulam | - | - | 10 | WE | Poaching (P/Pr/F) | Decline 20 yrs | Decline <br> 20 yrs | 60 | 30 | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| Parambikulam | $10^{\circ} 23$ | $76^{\circ} 44$ | 50 | WE | Poaching (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 345 | 160 | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| WLS (including Kuriakutti area) |  |  |  |  |  | $20 \mathrm{yrs}$ | 30 yrs |  |  | Primate census, 2000 Group size: 15 (5-50). 485 m . |
| Kuriakutil area) Silent Valley NP | $\sim 10^{\circ} 46$ | $\sim 76^{\circ} 42$ | 80 | WE | - | Stable 30 yrs | Stable $30 \mathrm{yrs}$ | 275 | 140 | Group size: 15 (5-50). 485m. <br> Napier, 1981 <br> Joseph \& Ramachandran, 1998, <br> 2001 |
| Pathanamthitta Ranni (Cardamom Hill Reserve) | - | - | 50 | WE | Deforestation (P), hunting (P/Pr/F), Selective logging ( P ), plantation ( P ) | Decline 20 yrs | - | 60-70 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 30(25- \\ 35) \end{array}$ | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| Kollam <br> Kulathupuzha | 07²8 | $80^{\circ} 02$ | - | WE | Deforestation (P), hunting (P/F), <br> Selective logging ( P ), plantation ( P ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 20 \mathrm{yrs} \end{aligned}$ | Stable | 75 | 35 | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |

Distribution of Macaca silenus in India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Area } \\ \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre <br> Past <br> \%/yr | nd Future \%/yr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pop. } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thiruvananthapuram |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neyyar WLS | - | - | - | WE | Deforestation (P), hunting (P/Pr/F), Selective logging ( P ), plantation ( P ) |  | - | - | - | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| Peppara WLS | $08^{\circ} 34$ | $77^{\circ} 13$ | - | WE | Deforestation (P), hunting (P/Pr/F), Selective logging ( P ), plantation ( P ) | Decline <br> 20 yrs | Stable | 30 | 15 | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| Shendurney WLS | $08^{\circ} 49$ | $77^{\circ} 08$ | - | WE | Deforestation (P), hunting (P/F), Selective logging ( P ), plantation ( P ) | Decline 20 yrs | Stable | 135 | 65 | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census In 9 groups. Found in adjacent areas too. T.U. Uthup, 2002 |
| Thrissur |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chalakkudy | $10^{\circ} 18$ | $76^{\circ} 20$ | 50 | WE | Poaching (P/Pr/F) | Decline 20 yrs | Decline | 15 | $\begin{aligned} & 10-25 \\ & (8) \end{aligned}$ | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| Chimmony WLS | - | - | 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census |
| Vazhachal \& Pooyankutty | - | - | 50 | WE | Poaching (P/Pr/F) | Decline 20 yrs | Decline | 135 | - | KFRI, 1993, 1997 census Group size: 15 (5-50) |
| Tamil Nadu Coimbatore |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boluvampatty range | $\sim 10^{\circ} 34$ | $\sim 76^{\circ} 55$ | 450 | WE | Fragmentation (P), Conversion to coffee and tea (P), Poaching (F) | Decline | Stable | 465 | - | Napier, 1981; A. Kumar |
| 1. Anakunthi | - | - | 4 | WE | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) |  | - | 37 | 24 | Mewa Singh \& A.K. Sharma |
| 2. Andiparai | - | - | 3 | WE |  |  |  | 28 | 15 | Mewa Singh \& A.K. Sharma |
| 3. Hindusthan | - | - | 3 | WE | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) |  |  |  | 4 | Mewa Singh \& A.K. Sharma |
| 4. lyerpaddy and Akkamalai | - | - | 30 | WE |  |  | - | 105 | 48 | Mewa Singh \& A.K. Sharma |
| 5. Korangumudy | - | - | 2 | WE | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) |  |  | 22 | 11 | Mewa Singh \& A.K. Sharma |
| 6. Pannimedu | - | - | 8 | WE | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) |  |  | 6 | 1 | Mewa Singh \& A.K. Sharma |
| 7. Puthuthottam | - | - | 1 | WE | Plantations (P/Pr/F) |  |  | 70 | 34 | Mewa Singh \& A.K. Sharma |
| 8. Tata | - | - | 2 | WE | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) |  |  | 15 | 9 | Mewa Singh \& A.K. Sharma |
| 9. Varagaliyar | - | - | 45 | WE | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) |  |  | 180 | 89 | Mewa Singh \& A.K. Sharma |
| 10. Water falls | - | - | 4 | WE |  |  | - | 30 | 17 | Mewa Singh \& A.K. Sharma |
| Kamaraj Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS | $09^{\circ} 31$ | $77^{\circ} 37$ | - | WE | Deforestation (P), hunting (P/Pr/F), selective logging ( P ), plantation ( P ) | Decline 20 yrs | - | $\begin{array}{\|l} 55-75 \\ (62) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 25-35 \\ (31) \end{array}$ | KFRI 1993, 1997 census |
| Tirunelveli KalakadMundanthurai TR | $\sim 08^{\circ} 30$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 34$ | - | WE | Deforestation (P), hunting (P/F), selective logging ( P ), plantation ( P ) | Decline 20 yrs | Stable | $\begin{aligned} & 450-475 \\ & (460) \end{aligned}$ | 230 | W. Sunderraj, pers. comm. Average group size: 12 (5-50) |

[^4]| Synonyms | Macaca sinicus aurifrons Pocock, 1931 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Sinhalese: Rilawa; Tamil: Sen Kurangu, Siru Kurangu; English: Dusky Toque Macaque, Red Monkey, Toque Macaque, Wetzone Toque Macaque |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | The subspecies for M. sinica are those recognized by Fooden (1979). Interme diate morphs between M. s. aurifrons and M. s. opisthomelas found at transition localities were included with M.s. aurifrons. |
| Habit | Terrestrial, arboreal, diurnal, frugivore, insectivore |
| Habitat | Lowland and midland tropical rain forest, wet zone lowland forests. |
| Elevation | Up to 1,200m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Endemic to Sri Lanka |
| Extent of Occurrence | $13500 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ <br> Intermediate stages between M. s. aurifrons and M. s. opisthomelas found at transition areas are included to $M$. s. aurifrons as these forms are very restricted to places such as Ginigathehena, Watawela and Hakgala. |
| Area of Occupancy | $\sim 5,500 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ |
| Locations/subpopulations | 105 / Not known. Fragmented. Locations declined by $50 \%$ in the last 40 years. Extreme fluctuations in locations/subpopulations possible, but not monitored. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>50 \%$ in the last 50 years or more and is predicted to decline by $<10 \%$ in the next 10 years due to habitat loss and human-animal conflict. Decrease in quality due to loss of ecologically critical forest, habitat loss due to urbanization and observed changes in land use. Wet zone intermediate hill forests have now been largely converted into croplands, plantations, estates and home gardens. |
| Threats | Deforestation and habitat loss (large plantations and estates, that might have harbored some pock eted populations, are being reduced into smaller holdings unsuitable to support macaque groups or populations), shooting, snaring and poisoning as this animal is considered a pest. <br> According to government data, during 42 years (1956-1993), the country has lost $50 \%$ of its forest cover, and more than $50 \%$ if the last 10 years (1994-2003) are included. There is a $1: 1$ relationship between loss of critical habitat and population number. Therefore, the species is reduced numerically minimally by $50 \%$. Much of the original forested habitat in the southwest rainforest areas has been converted to agriculture, home gardens and plantations. These habitats are inimical to macaque survival because macaques are not tolerated and are considered as pests. |
| Trade | Not in trade |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 11.8 years, based on dry zone subspecies |


| Total population | Not known |
| :---: | :---: |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Declined by $>50 \%$ in 3 generations and is predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 10 years. |
| Data source | Census/monitoring, field study, informal sighting, indirect information; observed; minimal values |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED A2cd+4cd |
| Rationale | Widely distributed macaque in Sri Lanka, but due to decrease in habitat over the last 40 years of more than $50 \%$, the population has been inferred to decrease by more than $50 \%$ also. Some observed declines have been recorded for this species, but in general the declines have been inferred based on habitat loss over years. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Vulnerable A1c |
| Justification | Better / new information has helped reassess this taxon from Vulnerable to Endangered. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Only endemic species not listed as a protected species by law. |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| Sri Lanka | Central Province: Gannoruwa, Knuckles, Menikdena, Udawattekele, VRR Sanctuary Sabaragamuwa Province: Kitulgala Sanctuary, Kurulukelle Sanctuary, Peak Wilderness, Samanalawewa, Sinharaja FR, Udawalawe NP (probably M. sinica sinica) Southern Province: Rammalakande FR Uva Province: Thangamalai Sanctuary Western Province: Attidiya-Belanwila Sanctuary, Dombagaskande FR, Muthurajawela Sanctuary |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomy, life history, population survey, limiting factor research, epidemiology, trade, population genetics, behaviour and ecology |
| Management | Habitat management, monitoring, public education, limiting factor management, work in local communities |
| Captive stocks | Dehiwela zoo. Subspecies mixed and of unknown origin. |
| Comments | The new label given by Brandon-Jones et al. (2001) "Pale-fronted Toque Macaque" is not acceptable as a common name or distinguishing feature for this subspecies as all toque macaques have "pale fronts", indeed, even Macaca radiata does as well. It is best to conserve the macaques' natural habitat and allow natural reproduc tion to takeits course. Captive breeding, although probably easy, is not recom mended owed to the poor prospects for successful reintroduction into the wild. Resources are better spent protecting these animals and their natural habitat. Greater visibility of macaques near increasing numbers of tourists centers (hotels, concession stands, roadside fruit and vegetable stalls) is not an indicator of overall macaque population increase. Instead it reflects the dietary plasticity of the species |

and in many cases indicates a "last stand clinging to life" where natural forest habitat has been declined. Such macaque populations are also vulnerable to direct killing as pests.

| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; IUCN Sri Lanka, |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2000; Napier, 1981; Pocock, 1931 |  |
|  | Ecological and Distributional Data (in alphabetical order): |
|  | IUCN Sri Lanka, Biodiversity Field Research team (data communicated by R. |
|  | Somaweera through workshop participants). |
|  | Primate Biology Program, Smithsonian Institution and Institute of Fundamental |
|  | Studies: original data from W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, |
|  | A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe. |
| University of Jaffna: W. Wijeyamohan |  |
|  | Biological Information Sheet (2002): W. Dittus, R. Somaweera, S. Wijeyamohan |
| Compilers | Chief compilers: W. Dittus and A. Watson <br>  <br> Working group: J. Dela, W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, R. <br> Somaweera, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe, S. Wijeyamohan |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, W. Dittus, A. Eudey, A. Watson |


Distribution of Macaca sinica aurifrons in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies
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Distribution of Macaca sinica aurifrons in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in <br> South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> $\left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | Pop. trend <br> Past <br> $\% / \mathrm{yr}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Future <br> $\% / \mathrm{yr}$ | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Matugama <br> Anasigalla | $066^{\circ} 29$ | $80^{\circ} 03$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Swamp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Synonyms | Macaca (Zati) sinica opisthomelas Hill, 1942 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Sinhala: Riwala; Tamil: Sen Kurangu, Siru Kurangu; English: Hill Zone Toque Macaque, Montane Toque Monkey, Mountain Toque Monkey |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | Brandon-Jones et al. (2001) do not list this subspecies and dismiss its existence as an intermediary type between M.s. aurifrons and M. s. sinica. It is critical to the conservation of this important subspecies that it is recognized. Personal observations confirm the existence of this montane subspecies as a morphologically distinct apical type (not an intermediary between the other two subspecies). |
| Habit | Terrestrial, arboreal, diurnal, frugivore, insectivore |
| Habitat | Montane tropical rain forest |
| Elevation | >1,800m. |
| Distribution Global | Endemic to Sri Lanka |
| Extent of Occurrence | 400 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | 90 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | 8 / 2. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>80 \%$ in the last 200 years and predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 5 years due to habitat loss. Decrease in quality due to habitat fragmentation, loss of biologically important forest, increased risk of human-animal conflict, habitat loss due to agriculture. |
| Threats | Habitat loss due to agriculture (Coffee and tea plantation) in the past, fuel wood collection, vegetable plantations, encroachment, animal husbandry According to government data, during 42 years (1956-1993), the country has lost $50 \%$ of its forest cover, but more than $50 \%$ has been lost if the last 10 years (19942003) is included. In addition, $80 \%$ of hill country forests were lost to tea plantations in the 19th century. There is a 1:1 relationship between loss of critical habitat and population number. Therefore, the subspecies which inhabits the high elevation forests (favoured for tea plantations) has been reduced numerically by $>80 \%$ over 200 years. This trend is continuing as high elevation natural forest is being con verted to agriculture (vegetable plots and dairy pasture). |
| Trade | Probably not in trade for meat |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 11.4 years |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Declined by $>80 \%$ in the past 200 years and predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 10 years. Declined by $50 \%$ in 3 generations. |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study, informal sightings, indirect information; estimated; minimum/maximum |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED A2cd+4cd; B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| Rationale | Highly restricted macaque ( $\mathrm{EOO}=400 \mathrm{~km}^{2} ; \mathrm{AOO}=90 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ) with only 2 subpopulations identified until now. This primate is also affected by habitat loss over the years with the result that the population is inferred to have declined by more than $50 \%$ in the last 3 generations ( $33-35$ years). Population numbers unknown but the taxon is under threat from various pressures, which has resulted in decline in area, extent, quality of habitat, number of locations or subpopulations and in the number of mature individuals. The taxon is Endangered based on both population reduction and restricted distribution. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Not assessed |
| Justification for change | Assessed at this taxonomic level for the first time. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | This is the only endemic species that is not protected by law. The absence of legal protection is particularly alarming for this highly endangered subspecies. |
| CITES | Not listed |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
|  | None |
| Recommendations |  |
| Management | Habitat management, monitoring, public education, limiting factor management, work in local communities. A coordinated Species Management Program is recom mended for Sri Lanka. |
| Comments | Not found, or no longer found, in its original type specimen collection site at the Horton Plains NP. Conserve the natural habitat and allow natural reproduction to take its course. Captive breeding although probably easy, is not recommended owed to the poor prospects for successful reintroduction into the wild. Resources are better spent protecting these animals and their natural habitat. <br> The IUCN criteria for "Critically Endangered" status is far too tight for a large terres trial mammal such as toque macaques. To qualify, such a taxon would need to be virtually extinct and beyond hope of salvation. Therefore, it is not a useful set of criteria for effective conservation action for this taxon. Given its very restricted and fragmented population, the M.s. opisthomelas subspecies should qualify for what it, in fact, is: "Critically Endangered". This status would distinguish it from other "Endangered" Sri Lankan primates and might be used as a tool to obtain legal protection as well as conservation management action. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2001; Hill, 1942 <br> Ecological and Distributional Data (in alphabetical order): <br> IUCN Sri Lanka, Biodiversity Field Research team (data communicated by R. <br> Somaweera through workshop participants). <br> Primate Biology Program, Smithsonian Institution and Institute of Fundamental Studies: original data from W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, <br> A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe. <br> University of Jaffna: S. Wijeyamohan <br> Biological Information Sheets (2002): W. Dittus, R. Somaweera |
| Compilers | Chief compilers: W. Dittus and A. Watson <br> Working group: J. Dela, W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe, S. Wijeyamohan |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, W. Dittus, A. Eudey, A. Watson |


Distribution of Macaca sinica opisthomelas in Sri lanka from literature and recent field studies
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| Synonyms | Simia sinica Linnaeus, 1771 <br> Cercopithecus pileatus Ogilby, 1838 <br> Cynamolgus (Zati) audeberti Reichenbach, 1862 <br> Macaca sinica inaurea Pocock, 1931 <br> Macaca sinica longicaudata Deraniyagala, 1965 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Sinhalese: Riwala; Tamil: Sen Kurangu, Siru Kurangu; English: Toque Macaque, Dry <br> Zone Toque Macaque |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | The subspecies for M. sinica are those recognized by Fooden (1979). Contact zone <br> with M.s. aurifrons has many individuals with the M.s. sinica pattern |
| Diurnal, terrestrial, arboreal, frugivore, insectivore (requires access to free water) |  |


| Mature individuals | Not known |
| :--- | :--- |
| Population trend | Declined by >50\% in 3 generations and is predicted to decline by >20\% in the next 5 <br> years |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study, informal sightings, indirect information; estimated; <br> 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED |
| Rationale | Widely distributed macaque in Sri Lanka, but due to decrease in habitat over the last |
| 40 years of more than 50\%, the population has been inferred to decrease by more |  |
| than 50\% also. Some observed declines have been recorded for this species, but in |  |
| general the declines have been inferred based on habitat loss over years. |  |

Such macaque populations are also very vulnerable to killing as pests. Captive breeding, although probably easy, is not recommended owed to the poor prospects for successful reintroduction into the wild. Resources are far better spent protecting these animals and their natural habitat. Although this species is found in several NPs, their occurrence is confined to specific moist locations that are far less extensive in area than the total area of the NPs.

| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; ISIS Abstract Report, |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2001; Napier, 1981, |  |
|  | Ecological and Distributional Data (in alphabetical order): |
|  | Primate Biology Program, Smithsonian Institution and Institute of Fundamental |
|  | Studies: original data from W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, |
| A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe. |  |
| University of Jaffna: S. Wijeyamohan |  |
| Biological Information Sheets (2002): W. Dittus, R. Somaweera |  |
| Compilers | Chief compilers: W. Dittus and A. Watson <br>  <br> Working group: J. Dela, W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, R. <br> Somaweera, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe, S. Wijeyamohan |


Distribution of Macaca sinica sinica in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Area } \\ \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. <br> Past <br> \%/yr | nd <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SRI LANKA Nitre Cave | $07^{\circ} 25$ | $80^{\circ} 32$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 455m., Napier, 1981 |
| Central Province Kandy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hasalaka | $07^{\circ} 20$ | $80^{\circ} 57$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Meda Maha Nuwura | $06^{\circ} 52$ | $81^{\circ} 82$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| VRR Sactuary | $\sim 07^{\circ} 15$ | $\sim 80^{\circ} 47$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Matale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aluvihare | $07^{\circ} 30$ | $80^{\circ} 37$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Possibly intermediate with M.s. sinica. Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Dambulla (IFS Arboretum) | $07^{\circ} 51$ | $80^{\circ} 40$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Hettipola | $07^{\circ} 35$ | $80^{\circ} 04$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Possibly intermediate with M.s. sinica. Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Inamaluwa | $07^{\circ} 55$ | $80^{\circ} 40$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Kandalama | $07^{\circ} 52$ | $80^{\circ} 43$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Menikdena |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Nakelle |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Nalanda | $07^{\circ} 40$ | $80^{\circ} 37$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Palapatwala | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Rantembe |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Rattota | $07^{\circ} 31$ | $80^{\circ} 41$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Possibly intermediate with M.s. sinica. Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Sigiriya | $07^{\circ} 57$ | $80^{\circ} 46$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Eastern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Province Ampara |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buddaragala | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Sanctuary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inginiyagala | $07^{\circ} 16$ | $81^{\circ} 30$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Maha Oya | $07^{\circ} 32$ | $81^{\circ} 21$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Napier, 1981 |
| Padiyatalawa | $07^{\circ} 24$ | $81^{\circ} 13$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
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Distribution of Macaca sinica sinica in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. trend Past Future \%/yr \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monaragala |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Butthala | $06^{\circ} 45$ | $81^{\circ} 13$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Dawegiriya | $\sim 7$ | $\sim 80$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Katharagama | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Kuda Oya | $06^{\circ} 31$ | $81^{\circ} 07$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Monaragala | $06^{\circ} 52$ | $81^{\circ} 20$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Muruthukanda | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Okkampitya | $06^{\circ} 45$ | $81^{\circ} 16$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Sella | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Katharagama |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Telulla | $06^{\circ} 35$ | $81^{\circ} 08$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Napier, 1981 |
| Thanamalwila | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Ulgala | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Wadinahela SFR | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Wellawaya | $06^{\circ} 44$ | $81^{\circ} 06$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Napier, 1981 |

[^5]| Synonyms | Simia leonine Shaw, 1800 (in part) <br> Cercopithecus johnii Fischer, 1829 <br> Presbytis johnii (Fischer, 1829) <br> S[emnopithecus] cucullatus I. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1830 <br> Semnopithecus cucullatus I. Geoffroy, 1834 <br> Semnopithecus ruficeps Martin, 1838 <br> Semnopithecus jubatus Wagner, 1839 <br> S[emnopithecus] cephalopterus Blyth, 1844 <br> Pithecus [(Pithecus)] vetulus johni Hill, 1934 <br> Kasi johni Hill, 1936 <br> Presbytis (Trachypithecus) johnii Oates, 1979 <br> T[rachypithecus] johnii Phillips, 1981 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Malayalam: Karinkorungu; Tamil: Karumanthi, Karupu Kurangu; English: Black Leaf Monkey, Indian Hooded Leaf Monkey, John's Langur, Nilgiri Langur, Nilgiri Black Langur, Nilgiri Leaf Monkey |
| Level of assessment | Species |
| Notes on taxonomy | Geographical variation has been noted by Brandon-Jones (1995). |
| Habit | Arboreal, folivorous, diurnal, usually uni-male group. |
| Habitat | Tropical wet evergreen, semi-evergreen, riparian forests, teak plantations |
| Elevation | 300-2,000m. |
| Distribution Global | Endemic to India |
| Extent of Occurrence | <20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | >3,820 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | 41 / Many. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>20 \%$ in the last 20 years and is predicted to decrease by $<20 \%$ in the next 20 years due to habitat loss outside protected areas. Decrease in quality due to forest degradation and land use. |
| Threats | Past threats: Crop plantations, mining, dams, fragmentation, traditional medicine Present and future threats: Human settlement, hunting, road kills, deliberate fires, habitat loss, storms/flooding, landslide |
| Trade | Local trade for live animal for pets and meat for food and medicine. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | Not known |
| Total population | 16,645 |
| Mature individuals | 8,300 |
| Population trend | Declining by $>10 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decline by $<10 \%$ in the next 20 years. |
| Data source | Informal sightings, indirect information; observed; 95\% confidence |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | VULNERABLE C2a(i) |
| Rationale | Widely distributed langur in the Western Ghats but threatened due to habitat loss, fragmentation, human interference and hunting. Number of mature individuals is estimated to be around 8,300 in a restricted range of less than $20,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. Since no subpopulation contains more than 1000 mature individuals, the taxon is Vulnerable due to small numbers. The decreasing area and quality contribute to Vulnerable category for restricted range. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Vulnerable A1d, B1+2c, C2a |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | Karnataka: Brahmagiri WLS <br> Kerala: Aaralam WLS, Chimmony WLS, Chinnar WLS, Eravikulam NP, Idukki WLS, Neyyar WLS, Parambikulam WLS, Peechi WLS, Peppara WLS, Periyar NP, Periyar WLS, Shendurney WLS, Silent Valley NP, Thattekadu WLS, Wayanad WLS Tamil Nadu: Indira Gandhi WLS, Kalakad WLS, Mudumalai WLS, Mundanthurai WLS, Mukurthi NP, Grizzled Giant SquirreI WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Management | Habitat management, monitoring, public education, poaching control measures, PHVA. Converting forest areas to private lands should be prevented. |
| Captive stocks | India in 8 zoos (11.2.14.27) |
| Comments | Mundanthurai populations declined by $50 \%$ in 30 years. Decline may not be as much on the whole. Protected areas are relatively safe. Hunting pressure is very high in fringes. Areas like the proposed Megamalai Sanctuary, Gudrikkal range of Ranni division and New Amarambalam RF in Nilambur south division are fairly contiguous and a good population is still existing there but poaching and other biotic pressures may result in the decline of the population of more than $50 \%$ in the coming 30 years. These areas should be added into the PA network. Conversion of habitat outside PAs such as revenue lands, estates are serious threats to this species. Upper Palni's and New Amarambalam has to be declared as National Parks for the conservation of Nilgiri Langur among other animals. The EOO given is for Northern population and its extent of occurrence is decreasing. Gigi Joseph says that at the present condition the animal is not hunted for medicine in Kerala but the group has some difference of opinion on this point. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones, 1995; Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor (Compiler), 2000; Hohmann and Sunderraj, 1990; Joseph, 2001; KFRI, 1993; KFRI, 1997; Ramachandran and Joseph, 2001b; SAZARC, 2002; Srivastava et al., 1996; Sunderraj and Johnsingh, 2001 <br> Biological Information Sheets (2002): A. Kumar, H.N. Kumara, S. Ram, G. Umapathy |
| Compilers | R. Ali, H.R. Bhat, S. Ganapathiappan, G.K. Joseph, R. Krishnamani, A. Kumar, P.O. Nameer, M.S. Pradhan, S. Ram, K.K Ramachandran, G. Ramaswamy, A.K. Sharma, M. Singh, S.F.W. Sunderraj |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey, G.K. Joseph, M.S. Pradhan, A.K. Sharma |
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Distribution of Semnopithecus (Trachypithecus) johnii johnii in India from literature and recent field studies... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tamil Nadu High Wavy Mountains and higher parts of Varushnaad | 09.32 | 77.25 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Nelliampathy estate | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Megamalai | - | - | 75 | MD, DD | Poaching (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | Mewa Singh |
| Coimbatore Indira Gandhi WLS, Valparai | - | - | 600 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MD, E, } \\ & \text { Sh } \end{aligned}$ | Poaching (P/Pr) habitat destruction (F) | Decline 30 yrs . | Decline 30 yrs. | $\begin{array}{\|l} 3750 \\ (3500- \\ 4000) \end{array}$ | 1800 | Ajith Kumar, pers. comm. Napier, 1985 |
| Dindugal Palni Hills | $\sim 10^{\circ} 18$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 31$ | 200 | DD, Sh and MD, E, SE | Poaching (P/Pr), Habitat loss (F) | Decline 30 yrs . | Decline 30 yrs. | 100 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 50(25- \\ 75) \end{array}$ |  |
| Kamarajar Grizzled Giant | $09^{\circ} 31$ | $77^{\circ} 37$ | 100 | MD | Poaching (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 300 (275 | 150 (100 | W. Sunderraj pers. comm. |
| Squirrel WLS |  |  |  |  | Poacking (P) | 30 yrs. | 30 yrs. | -335) | -200) |  |
| Mudaliar Ootu, near Srivilliputhur | $\sim 09^{\circ} 35$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 35$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Nilgiris <br> Avalanche | 11015 | $76^{\circ} 30$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 11015 |  |  |  | Poaching (P/Pr/F) | $30 \text { yrs. }$ | $30 \text { yrs. }$ | $-225)$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} 100 \\ 110 \end{array}\right.$ | Mewa Singh |
| Conoor |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | Type locality. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Mudumalai, Ooty Gudalur road Mukurthi NP | $11^{\circ} 32$ | 76³8 | 10 | MD, DD | Poaching (P/Pr) Habitat destruction (F) | Stable 30 yrs . | Stable 30 yrs . | $\begin{aligned} & 160(150 \\ & -175) \\ & - \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80(70- \\ & 90) \end{aligned}$ | Mewa Singh |
| Tirunelveli Agasthyamalai (KMTR) | $08^{\circ} 37$ | $77^{\circ} 16$ | 400 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SE}, \mathrm{MD}, \\ & \mathrm{Rp} \end{aligned}$ | Poaching (Pr) | Decline | Decline | 7500 (70008000) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 3000 \\ (2500- \\ 3000) \end{array}$ | Ali. pers. comm. |

[^6]
## Semnopithecus entellus achates (Pocock, 1928)

| Synonyms | [?] Cercopithecus albo-cinereus Desmarest, 1822 [Pithecus entellus] elissa Pocock, 1928 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Common names | English: Western Hanuman Langur |
| Habit | Arboreal, terrestrial, folivore, diurnal |
| Habitat | Tropical dry and moist deciduous, semi-arid, open scrub, woodland, human habitation |
| Elevation | Up to 1,200m. |
| Distribution |  |
| South Asia | Endemic to India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | >2,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | >50 / Many. Fragmented |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $<10 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decrease by $<10 \%$ in the last 10 years due to man-animal conflict and habitat. Decrease in quality due to agriculture and altered habitat. |
| Threats | Agriculture, habitat loss, man-animal conflict |
| Trade | Not in trade |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Not known |
| Data source | Museum study, indirect information; inferred; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | LEAST CONCERN |
| Rationale | This taxon has the widest distribution of all the subspecies of Semnopithecus entellus group, occurring in more than 50 recorded locations. Although there are concerns of its conflict with humans and some doubts on the peripheral populations as being hybrids with other subspecies, this taxon is less threatened from external factors and therefore considered Least Concern. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Not assessed. |


| Justification | This taxon assessed for the first time due to better information available at the <br> workshop and due to the new information on subspecies distribution from museum <br> studies by Douglas Brandon-Jones. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Uncertainty | The participants at the primate C.A.M.P. workshop were not aware of the subspecies <br> classification, which was worked out from museum specimens by Douglas Bran- <br> don-Jones after the workshop. Recognition of the subspecies and its status was <br> agreed upon by all the workshop participants. The localities provided by the partici- <br> pants were classified by Brandon-Jones into various subspecies as per his mu- <br> seum studies. This was accepted by all the participants at the workshop. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Not listed |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| Goa: Bondla WLS?, Mollem WLS? |  |
| Gujarat: Sasan Gir WLS |  |
| Karnataka: Bandipur NP? Nagarhole NP |  |
| Madhya Pradesh: Kanha NP? |  |
| Maharashtra: Andhari WLS?, Bhamragarh WLS?, Chaprala WLS?, Melghat WLS, |  |
| Radhanagiri WLS?, Pench NP?, Sanjay Gandhi NP, Tadoba NP?, Tansa WLS |  |
| Rajasthan: Sariska WLS?, Mount Abu WLS, Kumbalgarh WLS |  |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area $\left(\mathrm{km}^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tr Past \%/yr | d <br> Future <br> \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Karnataka Devikop | $15^{\circ} 06$ | $74^{\circ} 56$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Paratypes at Devikop, 600m. BNHS 5716 from devikop seems intermediate between S.e. achates and S.e. anchises Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Samasgi | $14^{\circ} 40$ | $75^{\circ} 05$ | - | $\square$ | - | - | - | - | - | Paratypes at Samasgi, Kanara border, 600m. This is definitely on the boundary between S.e. achates and S.e. dussumieri with intermediates and specimens referable to both subspecies. Brandon-Jones, 2003. |
| Malakondapenta? |  | - | - | Mango Orchard | - | - | - | - | - | S.e. achatus or S.e. anchises. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Srimangala | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Bellary Vijayanagar | $15^{\circ} 19$ | $76^{\circ} 28$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Paratypes, 450 m . intermediate with S.e. anchises. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Chamarajnagar Bandipur NP? | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Dharwar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alnavar | $15^{\circ} 25$ | $74^{\circ} 43$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Paratype was collected at Alnavar. BNHS. 5180 from Alnavar seems intermediate between S.e.achates and S.e. anchises. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Havasbhavi | $14^{\circ} 35$ | $75^{\circ} 22$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Holotype and paratype were collected at 600m. BrandonJones, 2003 |
| Mysore \& Kodagu |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nagarhole NP? | $12^{\circ} 01$ | $76^{\circ} 05$ | - | MD | Habitat loss (Pr), hunting (Pr), encroachment (Pr) | Decline | - | - | - | The population estimate is for the entire area of occupancy which includes Mudumalai, |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Nagarhole and Bandipur. Present pop. status: Stable Mewa Singh, Ajith Kumar. The holotype and paratypes of [P. e.] elissa were collected here. Intermediate with S.p. priam Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Utthara Kannada Anshi | $14^{\circ} 59$ | $74^{\circ} 22$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Gund |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Mandurli | $15^{\circ} 15$ | $74^{\circ} 37$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Potoli | $15^{\circ} 11$ | $74^{\circ} 33$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 550 m , Southeast of Supa, 6 miles south of Kalinadi River. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Shimoga Shimoga? | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | M. Singh, ZSI, Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Madhya <br> Pradesh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bori | $22^{\circ} 27$ | $78^{\circ} 16$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 500m. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Lahi, Soni Malwa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Mukhi Balaghat | $\sim 22^{\circ}$ | $80^{\circ} 30$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Singpur | $23^{\circ} 13$ | $81^{\circ} 25$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Balaghat Ouda | $21^{\circ} 48$ | $80^{\circ} 11$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Bhopal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bhopal? | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Sanchi | $23^{\circ} 29$ | $77^{\circ} 44$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 370m. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Hoshangabad Panchmari | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 500 in 25 troops. BrandonJones, 2003 |
| Kanha and Balaghat Kanha NP? | $\sim 22^{\circ} 20$ | $\sim 80^{\circ} 40$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ZSI. Probably S.e. achates, but possibly S.e. entellus Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Mandsaur Nimach? | $24^{\circ} 25$ | $74^{\circ} 50$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ZSI. Brandon-Jones, pers. |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | , | , | , | 1 | , | , | 1 | ' ' | , | ' ' |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \dot{0}$ | , | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | ' | 1 | , | $\stackrel{10}{\sim}$ | ¢ | 우 은 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 1 |  |  | 1 <br>  | ' |  | 1 <br>  | ' ' | 1 <br>  <br>  |  |
|  | , | , | , | , | 1 | 1 | 1 | ' ' | ' | ' 1 |
|  | ' | , | 1 | , | 1 | , | , | ' ' | ' | ' ' |
|  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ' | , | ' ' | 1 |  |
| - | $\stackrel{ \pm}{\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}}$ | $\stackrel{10}{\stackrel{1}{+}}$ |  | ' |  | O + | ¢ on | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{\circ}{\wedge}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { ले } \\ & \stackrel{+}{N} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\text { N }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{1}{N}}$ | , | ' | ' | $$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ |  | or $\stackrel{+}{+}$ $\sim$ | $\begin{aligned} & \sim_{0}^{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Semnopithecus entellus ajax (Pocock, 1928)

| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| :---: | :---: |
| Common names | Hindi: Goli, Hanuman langur; Oriya: Hanu Mankara; English: Himalayan Grey Langur, Western Himalayan Langur |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Habit | Folivore, diurnal, social, arboreal |
| Habitat | Subtropical, moist temperate, alpine, coniferous, broadleaved forests, human habitation |
| Niche | Top canopy, human settlements, cropland. |
| Elevation | 2200-4000m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | India, Nepal |
| Extent of Occurrence | <100 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | $<10 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | <5/>4. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Stable in area but predicted to decline in future by $<10 \%$ in the next 10 years due to forest clearance for agriculture and encroachment. Decrease in quality due to altered habitat. |
| Threats | Past threats: Overgrazing, building roads through forests, lopping, deforestation, agriculture, fire <br> Present and future threats: Agriculture and development |
| Trade | Not in trade |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years |
| Total population | <500 [India $=<450$; Nepal $=<50]$ |
| Mature individuals | <250 [India $=$ <220; Nepal $=$ <30] |
| Population trend | Decline in the past not known but is predicted to decline by $<10 \%$ in the next 10 years |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study; observed; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | CRITICALLY ENDANGERED B1ab(iii,v)+2ab(iii,v) |
| Rationale | This taxon is confirmed from a highly restricted locality in India and in one locality in Nepal. Due to the threats to the taxon in India, it is Critically Endangered. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Lower Risk - near threatened |


| Justification | Better taxonomic information available at the workshop. |
| :---: | :---: |
| National Status | India: Critically Endangered B1ab(iii,v)+2ab(iii, v); D |
|  | Highly restricted and threatened due to human interference and development activities. |
|  | Nepal: Critically Endangered B1ab(iii,v)+2ab(iii,v); D |
|  | Very few numbers and restricted to a single location. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | India: Schedule II, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 Nepal: National Park and Wildlife Conservation Act 1973. |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | Jammu and Kashmir: Kistwar NP |
| Nepal | Central Province: Lang Tang NP |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomic research, life history, survey studies, limiting factor research |
| Management | Wild population management, monitoring, public education, limiting factor management |
| Captive stocks | 24 zoos in India (59.35.6.100), 1 zoo in Nepal (3.1.0.4). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | Since S.e. ajax appears to be a debatable subspecies in terms of its zoogeographical distribution, a systematic survey is required to map the range of this subspecies along its present known range as well as along the adjoining sectors in the northwestern Himalayan region both in India and Pakistan. At the workshop, it was decided that the distribution range of the taxon would be restricted to the confirmed S.e. ajax localities in Chamba Valley, and to the one locality in Melamchigaon, Nepal All the other localities are listed as intermediates between S.e. ajax and S.e. schistaceous, but are not considered in the assessment of S.e. ajax. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones, 2003; Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; SAZARC, 2002 <br> Biological Information Sheet (2002): S.K. Sahoo <br> CAMP questionnaire on protected areas (2002): M.A. Parsa |
| Compilers | D. Brandon-Jones, M. Chalise, M.K. Misra, M.K. Ghimere, S.C. Ghimere, B.J. Karki, Ajith Kumar, S.K. Sahoo, M. Singh, P. Srivatsava |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey, M.S. Pradhan, S.K. Sahoo |


Distribution of Semnopithecus entellus ajax in India and Nepal from literature and recent field studies

Distribution of Semnopithecus entellus ajax in India and Nepal from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> (km ${ }^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ghitrari | $32^{\circ} 27$ | $76^{\circ} 22$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2003. <br> 1830m. Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus. Brandon-Jones, |
| Kakira | $32^{\circ} 09$ | $76^{\circ} 02$ | 5 | P, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 40-70 \\ & (49) \end{aligned}$ | 17 | Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus. Brandon-Jones, 2003. |
| Kalatop-Khajjiar WLS | $32^{\circ} 09$ | $76^{\circ} 02$ | 6 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 17 | 6 | Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus. Brandon-Jones, 2003. |
| Karl | $32^{\circ} 9$ | $76^{\circ} 2$ | 14 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 44 | 19 | Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus. Brandon-Jones, 2003. |
| Ranikot | $32^{\circ} 09$ | $76^{\circ} 02$ | 6 | Forest | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 2 | 2 | Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus. Brandon-Jones, 2003. |
| Sahi | $32^{\circ} 09$ | $76^{\circ} 02$ | 5 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) |  |  | - | - | Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus. Brandon-Jones, 2003. |
| Satrundi | $32^{\circ} 09$ | $76^{\circ} 02$ | 18 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 14 | 7 | Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus. Brandon-Jones, 2003. |
| Shimot | $32^{\circ} 9$ | $76^{\circ} 02$ | 3 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 46 | 19 | Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus. Brandon-Jones, 2003. |
| Kangra Valley <br> Baijnath | $32^{\circ} 01$ | $76^{\circ} 08$ | 8 | SU | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - |  | - | - | Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus. Brandon-Jones, 2003. |
| Chichian | $\sim 32^{\circ} 06$ | $\sim 76^{\circ} 16$ | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2750m. Napier, 1985. Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus. Brandon-Jones, 2003. |
| Kangra | $32^{\circ} 06$ | $76^{\circ} 16$ | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 730m. Brandon-Jones, 2003 Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus |
| Kangra Fort | $\sim 32^{\circ} 05$ | $\sim 76^{\circ} 16$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 750m. Brandon-Jones, 2003 Intermediate with S.e. schistaceus |
| Samayala | $\sim 32^{\circ} 10$ | $\sim 76^{\circ} 25$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2900m. Brandon-Jones, 2003 Intermediate with S.e. |
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## Semnopithecus entellus anchises Blyth, 1844

| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| :---: | :---: |
| Common Names | English: Deccan Hanuman Langur |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Habit | Arboreal, diurnal, folivore |
| Habitat | Forest fringe, human settlement, tropical dry deciduous forest |
| Niche | Mid to top canopy |
| Elevation | Up to 800 m . |
| Distribution |  |
| South Asia | Endemic to India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | >2,001 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | 63 / Not known. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $<10 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decrease by $<10 \%$ in the last 10 years due to man-animal conflict and habitat. Decrease in quality due to agriculture and altered habitat. |
| Threats | Agriculture, habitat loss, man-animal conflict, wildfire |
| Trade | Not in trade. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Total population and mature individuals stable. |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study; observed; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | NEAR THREATENED |
| Rationale | Not much is known about this subspecies since it is recorded from only a few locations. It is likely that the range of the taxon, although very wide is actually restricted to fewer locations that are exposed to changing habitat patterns and use, making this a more vulnerable taxon. It is therefore categorised as Near threatened compared to S.e. achates. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Lower risk - near threatened |
| Uncertainty | The participants at the primate C.A.M.P. workshop were not aware of the subspecies classification, which was worked out from museum specimens by Douglas Bran- |

don-Jones after the workshop. Recognition of the subspecies and its status was agreed upon by all the workshop participants. The localities provided by the participants were classified by Brandon-Jones into various subspecies as per his museum studies. This was accepted by all the participants at the workshop.

| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule II, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | Andhra Pradesh: Eturnagaram WLS, Kawal WLS, Kinnerasani WLS, Lanja Madugu Siwaram WLS, Manjira WLS, Pakhal WLS, Pocharam WLS, Pranahita WLS Maharashtra: Bhimashankar WLS? |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Man-animal conflict research |
| Management | Wild population management, public education, monitoring |
| Captive stocks | 24 zoos in India (59.35.6.100). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | Male migration is known between groups but not between severely fragmented locations. This subspecies is widely distributed in peninsular India cutting into the distribution of S. entellus achates from Disa in Gujarat through Nimar in Madhya Pradesh, Mahabaleswar and Wai in Maharashtra and Vijaynagar in Karnataka. Its distribution in Andhra Pradesh is in the northern areas of the state, north of river Krishna and south of river Godavari all the way to the east coast. The taxon also shows an intermediate form in Diguvametta on the southern bank of river Krishna where Semnopithecus priam priam's distribution range ends. The areas of overlap have intermediates, which are in this report listed under both taxa. The presence of such intermediates in protected areas have been indicated with a "?" above. Further notes on the taxon are included in the distribution table. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones, 2003; Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; SAZARC, 2002 <br> Biological Information Sheet (2002): C. Srinivasulu <br> CAMP questionnaire on protected areas (2002): B. Srinivas, S. Mahadev |
| Compilers | D. Brandon-Jones, M. Chalise, M.K. Ghimere, S.C. Ghimere, B.K. Jhamak, A. Kumar, <br> H. Kumar, M.K. Misra, M.S. Pradhan, S.K. Sahoo, A.K. Sharma, M. Singh, P. Srivatsava |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey |
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Distribution of Semnopithecus entellus anchises in India from literature and recent field studies ．．．continued

|  |  |  | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{5}{5}$ $\frac{5}{0}$ 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ 0 3 $\vdots$ 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{5}{5}$ $\frac{0}{0}$ 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{5}{5}$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  |  |  | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{5}{5}$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{\infty}{0}$ $\frac{5}{5}$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ＇＇＇ | 1 ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ， | ＇ | 1 | ， | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ， | ， |
| $\frac{\dot{O}}{\circ} \dot{0}$ | ＇＇＇ | ，＇ | 1 | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ， | ， | ， | ， | ， | ＇ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & \frac{0}{i} \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ＇ | 1 <br>  | ＇ |  | $\begin{array}{r}1 \\ \\ \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
|  | ＇＇＇ | 1 ＇ | ， | ， | ， | ， | ， | ， | ， | 1 | 1 | 1 | ， | ， |
|  | น レ レ | レ レ | น | น | レ | น | น | น | น | ， | น | น | น | レ |
|  | ＇＇＇ | 1 ＇ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ＇ | ， | 1 | 1 | ＇ | ， | ，＇ |
| － | ＇1＇ | ＇＇ | ， | ， | ， | ， | ， | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ， | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ |
| ＋ | ＇＇， | 1 ＇ | 1 | 1 | ， | ， | ， | ， | ， | ， | ， | ， | 1 | ， |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Semnopithecus entellus entellus (Dufresne, 1797)

| Synonyms | Presbytis entellus Dufresne, 1797 Simia entellus Dufresne, 1797 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | English: Bengal Hanuman Langur, Northern Plains Gray Langur |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | The syntypes of Simia entellus Dufresne, 1797 are in the Paris (MNP) collection and are still in good condition to place them with confidence in this taxon. |
| Habit | Arboreal, terrestrial, folivore, diurnal |
| Habitat | Tropical dry and moist deciduous, scrub, woodland |
| Niche | Top canopy |
| Elevation | Up to 400 m . |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Bangladesh, India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | >2,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | >35 / Not known. Fragmented |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $<10 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decrease by $<10 \%$ in the last 10 years due to man-animal conflict and habitat. Decrease in quality due to agriculture and altered habitat. |
| Threats | Agriculture, habitat loss, man-animal conflict in Bangladesh |
| Trade | Not in trade |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years |
| Total population | Not known [Bangladesh $=$ <500] |
| Mature individuals | Not known [Bangladesh = <250] |
| Population trend | Total population and mature individuals declining by $<10 \%$ in the last 30 years and is predicted to decline by $<10 \%$ in the next 20 years. |
| Data Source | Census, field study; observed; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | NEAR THREATENED |
| Rationale | This taxon is widely distributed occurring in $>35$ recorded locations. Althought there are concerns of its conflict with humans and some doubts on the peripheral populations as being hybrids with other subspecies, this taxon is less threatened from external factors and therefore considered Near Threatened. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Lower Risk - near threatened |


| National Status | Bangladesh: Endangered C2a(ii) <br> Since the Bangladesh population is highly restricted (only a single location) and subject to habitat destruction and man-animal conflicts, the threats could therefore makes the national population subject to extinction. Hence the Endangered category is retained. <br> India: <br> Near Threatened <br> Widely distributed in India but subjected to various threats in its entire range, this taxon is categorised as Near threatened within the country also. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Uncertainty | The participants at the primate C.A.M.P. workshop were not aware of the subspecies classification, which was worked out from museum specimens by Douglas Brandon-Jones after the workshop. Recognition of the subspecies and its status was agreed upon by all the workshop participants. The localities provided by the participants were classified by Brandon-Jones into various subspecies as per his museum studies. This was accepted by all the participants at the workshop. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Bangladesh: Schedule III, Bangladesh Wildlife (Preservation) (Amendment) Act, 1974. <br> India: Schedule II, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | Bihar: Valmiki NP, Valmiki WLS <br> Chhatisgarh: Achanakmar WLS, Gomarda WLS <br> Jharkhand: Palamau WLS <br> Maharashtra: Andheri WLS?, Bhamragadh WLS?, Chaprala WLS?, Tadoba NP? <br> Orissa: Chandaka-Dampara WLS |
| Recommendations Research | Taxonomic research, survey |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, translocation, public education, limiting factor management |
| Captive stocks | South Asia: 26 zoos; 24 zoos in India (59.35.6.100), 2 zoos in Bangladesh (3.4.0.7). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | According to Brandon-Jones, the occurrence of this taxon in Bangladesh is due to its introduction by the Hindu pilgrims on the left bank of river Jalangi. From the Delhi Gazette of 2 March 1867, the "many thousands" of langurs in Krishnagar were all descendants from a single pair released "many years ago" by devotees. The first record of this taxon in Bangladesh at Keshobpur, by Gittins and Akonda (1982) could be the expansion of the introduced population into Bangladesh. <br> Local and domestic trade for meat and whole animal. Hunting for sustenence by local tribals in Bhamraghad WLS, Maharashtra (P. Srivastava, 2002) and in Bangladesh (Feeroz, 2002). |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones, 2003; Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; ISIS Abstract Report, 2001; SAZARC, 2002 <br> Biological Information Sheets (2002): M.M. Feeroz, C. Srinivasulu CAMP questionnaire on protected areas (2002): S.D. Badgaiyan, N.H. Kakotdkar, M.M. Raheem, P. Ram, S.P. Samant, P. Srivastava |
| Compilers | D. Brandon-Jones, M.K. Chalise, S.C. Ghimere, M.K. Ghimere, B.K.Jhamak, A. Kumar, M.K. Misra, S. Mitra, P. Srivastava |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey, S. Mitra |


Distribution of Semnopithecus entellus entellus in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies
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| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbf{N}} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbf{0}} \\ \bar{T} \end{array}$ | 3 | 山 | 4 | แ |  | , | , | , | , |
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Distribution of Semnopithecus entellus entellus in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

Distribution of Semnopithecus entellus entellus in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area $\left(k m^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tr Past \%/yr | nd Future \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pudamari | $19^{\circ} 27$ | $84^{\circ} 29$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Ganjam <br> Udayagiri and Khandagiri | $\sim 20^{\circ} 06$ | $\sim 84^{\circ} 32$ | 3-4 | BLE | - | Stable | Stable | 60-70 | - | Sangita Mitra, Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Khurda \& Cuttack |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ChandakaDampara WLS | $20^{\circ} 23$ | $85^{\circ} 44$ | 10 | DD | - |  | - | 60-70 | - | Sangita Mitra, Brandon-Jones, |
| Cuttack | $20^{\circ} 30$ | $85^{\circ} 50$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| West Bengal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guptipara | $23^{\circ} 13$ | $88^{\circ} 25$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Krishnagar tributary | $23^{\circ} 24$ | $88^{\circ} 30$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | On the left bank of Jalangi, a of the Ganges. Brandon-Jones, |
| Midnapore | $22^{\circ} 26$ | $87^{\circ} 20$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 60m. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Mothoumoni | $23^{\circ} 35$ | $86^{\circ} 57$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Birbhum |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laavpore (in Ramparhat) | - | - | 3 |  | Anthropogenic activities (Pr/F) | Stable | Stable | 15-20 | 12-18 | Sangita Mitra. Brandon-Jones, pers. comm. |
| Tarapith (in Ramparhat) | - | - | 1.5 |  | Anthropogenic activities (Pr/F) | Stable | Increase | 10-15 | 8-10 | Sangita Mitra. Brandon-Jones, pers. comm. |
| Hugli <br> Chandannagar | $22^{\circ} 51$ | $88^{\circ} 21$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Kolkata |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kolkata | $23^{\circ} 10$ | $88^{\circ} 25$ | $-$ | - | - |  | - | - | - | Along the banks of a nullah about 80 km upstream from Kolkata and near the botanical gardens. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Hoogly and the Ganges | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | On the western or right bank Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Murshidabad Jangipur | $24^{\circ} 28$ | $88^{\circ} 04$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Singbhum <br> Santhara range | $22^{\circ} 23$ | $85^{\circ} 32$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, 2003 |

BLE - Broadleaved Evergreen forest, CL - Cropland, DD - Dry Deciduous forest, F - Forest, TDD - Tropical Dry Deciduous forest, U - University campus, U/SU - Urban or Semiurban areas, V - Villages, VG - Vegetable Gardens, W - Woodland
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\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{ll}\text { Synonyms } & \begin{array}{l}\text { S[emnopithecus] petrophilus Gray, } 1843 \\
\text { Semnopithecus petrophilus Hodgson, 1846 } \\
\text { Presbytis thermophilus Jerdon, 1867 (nomen nudum) } \\
\text { Pithecus entellus hector Pocock, 1928 } \\
\text { Pithecus entellus schistaceus Pocock, 1928 }\end{array}
$$ <br>

Cercopithecidae\end{array}\right\}\)| Nepali: Kalomukhe Bandar, Lampuchhre Badar, Phetawal Langur; Tharu: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Common names | Kaldhaure, Guna; English: Gray Langur, Hanuman Langur, Lesser Hill Langur |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| Rationale | This taxon has a disjunct distribution within the lower elevations of Himalaya, restricted in its area of occupancy and threatened by human activities. The number of individuals is also restricted and declining due to which the taxon is Endangered. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Lower Risk - near threatened |
| Justification | Better / new information available. Incorrect information used previously. Initial assessment at species level. |
| National Status | India: Endangered B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v); C2a(i); D <br> Indian population is restricted in area and numbers, although the proportion of population is more than in Nepal. Hence the category is retained as Endangered. <br> Nepal: <br> Endangered <br> B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v); C2a(i) $\uparrow$ Critically Endangered <br> Fewer individuals in Nepal, with very small population extending into India on the western border makes this taxon more vulnerable in Nepal compared to the global population. Hence assessment within Nepal is upgraded to Critically Endangered. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | National Park and Wildlife Conservation Act 1973 as a common animal. |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
|  | None |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomic research, life history, survey studies, limiting factor research |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education |
| Captive stocks | 24 zoos in India (59.35.6.100), 1 zoo in Nepal (3.1.0.4). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | The population of Ramnagar and llam was considered previously as a subspecies of Semnopithecus entellus entellus. Due to taxonomic revision, it falls under S.e. hector. It requires ecobehavioural study and species management plan for Nepal. The government/concerned agency in Nepal should give special attention to this Critically Endangered subspecies. Among 300 individuals, 18 animals died within a year due to accidental deaths. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones, 2003; Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; Chalise, 1994-1995; Chalise, 1995; Chalise, 1999a; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; Napier, 1985; SAZARC, 2002 <br> Biological Information Sheet (2002): M.K. Chalise, S.K. Sahoo |
| Compilers | D. Brandon-Jones, M.K. Chalise, M.K. Ghimere, S.C. Ghimere, B. J. Karki, Awadesh Kumar, H. Kumar, M.K. Misra, S.K. Sahoo, S.K. Sharma, M. Singh, P. Srivatsava |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, M. K. Chalise, A. Eudey |


Distribution of Semnopithecus entellus hector in India and Nepal from literature and recent field studies

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDIA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uttaranchal Takula | $\sim 29^{\circ} 44$ | $\sim 79^{\circ} 43$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 1630m. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Almora Champawat | $29^{\circ} 20$ | $80^{\circ} 06$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Paratype. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Kumaon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dhela, Ramnagar | $\begin{aligned} & 26^{\circ} 51- \\ & 29^{\circ} 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 79^{\circ} 00- \\ 87^{\circ} 10 \end{array}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Type locality of hector. 606m. Napier, 1985. 450 m . Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Kumaon | $\sim 30^{\circ} 03$ | $\sim 79^{\circ} 17$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Includes the holotype and paratype of all localities. Groves, 2001; Brandon-Jones, pers. comm. |
| Ratighat | $29^{\circ} 30$ | $79^{\circ} 29$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1128m. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Sitabani | $28^{\circ} 31$ | $80^{\circ} 41$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 340m, 600m. Groves, 2001; Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Uttar Pradesh Kansrao? | $30^{\circ} 05$ | $78^{\circ} 08$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Pr. id. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Kasauli stream? | $30^{\circ} 55$ | $76^{\circ} 57$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 700m. Pr. id. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Lohaghat | $29^{\circ} 25$ | $80^{\circ} 06$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Seasonally absent, 1700m. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Nishangara | $28^{\circ} 15$ | $81^{\circ} 13$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 600m. Brandon-Jones, unpub. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Sarju or Suheli | $\sim 28^{\circ} 31$ | $\sim 80^{\circ} 41$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Garhwal Mandal | $\sim 30^{\circ} 25$ | $\sim 79^{\circ} 15$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1630m. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Hardwar Hardwar? | $29^{\circ} 58$ | $78^{\circ} 10$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Pr. id. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| West Bengal Terai at Sivok | $26^{\circ} 52$ | $88^{\circ} 27$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Pankhabari | $26^{\circ} 50$ | $88^{\circ} 16$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 500 m . Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Darjeeling Naxalbari? | - | - | 3-4 | BLE | Anthropogenic (Pr/f) | - | Decline | - | - | Probably. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |

Distribution of Semnopithecus entellus hector in India and Nepal from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NEPAL <br> Central Nepal Bhikhna Thori | $27^{\circ} 21$ | $84^{\circ} 37$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| West Nepal Chispani (Garhi) | $27^{\circ} 34$ | $85^{\circ} 05$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 290m. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Chatra | $26^{\circ} 51$ | $87^{\circ} 10$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 150m. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Gandaki <br> Hazaria | $\sim 26^{\circ} 51$ | $\sim 85^{\circ} 20$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Groves, 2001 |
| Patherghatta | $\sim 27^{\circ} 10$ | $\sim 85^{\circ} 30$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 180m. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Thaprek (Tanahu) | - | - | - | Hill Sal | Selective logging, firewood collection, fodder collection | - | Stable | - | 45 |  |
| Kathmandu Kathmandu | $27^{\circ} 43$ | $85^{\circ} 18$ | - | - | \| - |  | - | - | - | Terai. South of Kathmandu Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Mahakali <br> Churiya (adjacent area) (Jhilmilatal) |  |  | 59 | Hill Sal | Landslide, selective logging, agriculture, fuelwood and fodder collection | - | Stable | - | 15 | M.K. Chalise and M. K. Ghimire |
| Mechi: Ilam Barhgothe village (Chulachuli) | $26^{\circ} 42$ | $87^{\circ} 46$ | 5 | HS, St BL | ```Timber extraction (P/Pr/F), Agriculture (P), stone mining (Pr/F), firewood collection (Pr/F)``` | - | - | 10 | 5 | EOO: 28 km². Chalise, 1994-95 Chalise, 1995; Chalise, 1999a |
| Jare forest (Sakphara) | $26^{\circ} 46$ | $87^{\circ} 41$ | 5 | Sal | Firewood (Pr/F), fodder collection (F) |  | - | 15 | 8 | EOO: 28 km². Chalise, 1994-95 Chalise, 1995; Chalise, 1999a |
| Jare forests (adjacent area) | $26^{\circ} 46$ | $87^{\circ} 41$ | 5 | Sal | Fodder collection (F) | - | - | 15 | 7 | EOO: 28 km². Chalise, 1994-95 Chalise, 1995; Chalise, 1999a |
| Sanokholsi Chuli (Danabari) | $26^{\circ} 44$ | $87^{\circ} 54$ | 5 | Sal | Fodder collection (F) |  | - | 15 | 9 | EOO: 28 km². Chalise, 1994-95 Chalise, 1995; Chalise, 1999a |

HS - Hill Sal forest, Sal - Sal forest, St BI - Sub-tropical Broad-leaved forest; Pr. id. - Provisional identification

## Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos Blyth, 1841

| Synonyms | Semnopithecus johnii Martin, 1840 <br> Presbytis entellus hypoleucos (Blyth, 1841) <br> Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos Blyth, 1841 <br> Presbytis entellus dussumieri (I. Geoffroy, 1842) <br> Semnopithecus entellus dussumieri I. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1842 <br> Semnopithecus entellus dussumieri I. Geoffroy, 1843 <br> Presbytis anchises Blyth, 1844 <br> Pr[esbytis] johnii Blyth, 1859 <br> [Presbytis] leucopus Wroughton, 1912 (nomen nudum) <br> Pithecus entellus achates Pocock, 1928 <br> Pithecus entellus aeneas Pocock, 1928 <br> Pithecus entellus elissa Pocock, 1928 <br> Pithecus entellus iulus Pocock, 1928 <br> Pithecus entellus priamellus Pocock, 1928 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | English: Black-footed Gray Langur, Dark-armed Malabar Langur, Dark-legged Malabar Langur, Dark-shanked Malabar Langur, Dussumier's Langur, Dussumier's Malabar Langur, Southern Plains Gray Langur |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes of taxonomy | The type of hypoleucos is in the Zoological Survey of India collection, Kolkata. This species is recognized as the subspecies Presbytis entellus hypoleucos by Napier (1985). Recent investigations by Brandon-Jones reveals the S.e. hypoleucos population as part of S.e. dussumieri, but because of priority, S.e. hypoleucos is considered as the senior synonym of S.e. dussumieri. This taxon is a natural hybrid of S.e. achates and Trachypithecus johnii johnii. |
| Habit | Arboreal, semi-terrestrial, primarily folivorous, diurnal |
| Habitat | Tropical rain forest, dry deciduous forest, sacred groves, moist deciduous forest, gardens, riparian forest |
| Niche | Folivorous. 100-1,200m. |
| Distribution Global | Endemic to India |
| Extent of Occurrence | <20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | < 500 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | 6/<10. Fragmented |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>10 \%$ in the next 10 years and is predicted to decrease by $<10 \%$ in the next 20 years due to habitat degradation. Decrease in quality due to human intervension, fire. |
| Threats | Past threat: Timber plantations <br> Present and future threats: Agriculture, human settlement, fragmentation, habitat loss, mining, deforestation, hunting, deliberate fires. |
| Trade | Local trade for live animal and meat for food and medicine. |
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| Population |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Generation time | 12 years |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Current decline not known and is predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 10 years. |
| Data source | Museum studies, census or monitoring, field study, informal sightings; observed; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED B2ab(ii,iii) |
| Rationale | The subspecies has a restricted range and area with a fragmented distribution. With the forests of the Western Ghats being threatened and degraded, the status of this taxon is threatened and is categorised as Endangered. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Data Deficient |
| Justification | Better / new taxonomic and distribution information available. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule II, Part II, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix 1 |
| Presence in Protected |  |
| India | Goa: Bondla WLS?, Mollem WLS? <br> Karnataka: Brahmagiri WLS, Kudremukh NP, Pushpagiri WLS, Sharavathi Valley WLS <br> Kerala: Aralam WLS?, Silent Valley NP?, Wayanad WLS? |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomic research (on zoo animals also), life history, survey |
| Management | Habitat management, monitoring, PHVA |
| Captive stocks | 24 zoos in India (59.35.6.100). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | This subspecies extends south from Goa to the Wayanad Plateaux in Kerala along the west coast and the Western Ghats. In Goa it forms intermediates with S.e. achates, in Wayanad Plateaux, including Silent Valley, it is intermediate with S.p. priam. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; Napier, 1985; KFRI, 1993; KFD, 1997; SAZARC, 2002 |
| Compilers | R. Ali, H.R. Bhat, D. Brandon-Jones, S. Ganapathiappan, G.K. Joseph, R. Krishnamani, Ajith Kumar, P.O. Nameer, M.S. Pradhan, S. Ram, K.K Ramachandran, G. Ramaswamy, A.K. Sharma, M. Singh, S.F.W. Sunderraj |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey, G.K. Joseph |


Distribution of Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos in India from literature and recent field studies

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 ＇ | ， | ， | 1 | ， | 1 | ， | ， | 1 | ， | 1 | ， |
| $\stackrel{\dot{1}}{\circ}$ | ＇＇ | ， | ， | ， | ＇ | ， | ＇ | ， | 1 | $\stackrel{\circ}{寸}$ | 1 | ¢ |
|  |  |  | ＇ |  | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | 1 <br>  |  |  | ＇ |
|  | ，1 | ， | ， | ， | 1 | ， | ， |  | 1 | 1 | ， |  |
|  | ，1 | ш | ， |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ᄃ } \\ & \text { 山̈ } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 1 | ш | 1 | ш | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{山}{山} \\ & \text { 山 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\infty$ 은 | 1 | ， | ， | 1 | 1 | ， | ， | 1 | 1 | ＇ | 1 |
|  | ＇ 1 | ， | O in in |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text { n }}{\stackrel{1}{N}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{0}{\uparrow}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{j} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{0}{N} \end{aligned}$ | ， | $\stackrel{10}{\sim}$ |
| 过 | 1 ＇ |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\stackrel{\circ}{+}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{N}{i}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{\dot{J}}}{\underset{\sim}{*}}$ | ， | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \stackrel{N}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\vec{v}} \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ס্ত } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{E} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\overline{\bar{\circ}}} \\ & \text { \#} \\ & 0 . \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kannur? | $11^{\circ} 59$ | $75^{\circ} 32$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Provisionally restricted type locality. Lectotype and paralectotype were collected. Napier, 1985; Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Thalassery | $11^{\circ} 45$ | $75^{\circ} 32$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Field report from Jerdon (1867) Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Mallapuram New Ambarambalam? | - | - | - | MD-E | Human Intervention (P/Pr/F) | - | - | - | - | Most probably S.e. hypoleucos, but possibly S.p. priam. Brandon-Jones, pers. comm. |
| Nilambur North? | - | - | - | MD-E | Human Intervention (P/Pr/F) | - | - | - | - | $60 \%$ of the total numbers are adults. KFRI, 1993, 1997. <br> Most probably S.e. hypoleucos, but possibly S.p. priam. Brandon-Jones, pers. comm. |
| Nilambur South? | - | - | - | MD | Poaching (P), Habitat loss (Pr) | - | - | - | - | $60 \%$ of the total population are adults. KFRI, 1993, 1997. <br> Most probably S.e. hypoleucos, but possibly S.p. priam. Brandon-Jones, pers. comm. |
| Palghat <br> Silent Valley NP? | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | $60 \%$ of the total numbers are adults. KFRI, 1993, 1997. <br> Intermediate with S.p. priam. <br> Brandon-Jones, pers. comm. |
| Wynaad Wynaad WLS? | $11^{\circ} 6$ | $76^{\circ} 00$ | - | MD | Human intervention (Pr) | - | - | 167 | - | 60\% of the total numbers are adults. KFRI, 1993, 1997. Most probably S.e. hypoleucos, but possibly S.p. priam. BrandonJones, pers. comm. |

E - Evergreen forest, E-Sh - Evergreen forest to Shola, MD - Moist Deciduous forest, MD-E - Moist Deciduous to Evergreen forest

## Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus Hodgson, 1841

| Synonyms | Semnopithecus nipalensis Hodgson, 1840 <br> Presbytis lania Elliot, 1909 <br> Pithecus entellus achilles Pocock, 1928 <br> S[emnopithecus] hodie Corbet and Hill, 1992 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Nepali: Kalomukhe Bandar, Lampuchhre Bandar, Phetawal Bandar; Tamang: Preken; Tharu: Kaldhaure; English: Central Himalayan Langur, Hanuman Langur, Nepal Gray Langur |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Habit | Diurnal, terrestrial, arboreal, folivore. Multi-male multi-female, all male group also seen. |
| Habitat | Subtropical to temperate, broadleaved forest, pine forest, riparian, montane forest, riverine forest, rocky outcrops, scrub jungle |
| Niche | Upper canopy, frequently terrestrial. |
| Elevation | 1,000-3,200m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Afghanistan, Bhutan, China, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Tibet |
| South Asia | Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | >2,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | >70 / Many. Fragmented |
| Habitat status | Stable in area. Decrease in quality due to loss of fruiting trees, altered habitat, fuel wood and timber collection. |
| Threats | Timber, firewood and charcoal production, habitat loss |
| Trade | Not in trade |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years |
| Total population | >50,000 |
| Mature individuals | >10,000 |
| Population trend | Not known |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study; observed; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | NEAR THREATENED |
| Rationale | The taxon although widely distributed across the Himalaya, is subject to various threats from human interference, logging, habitat loss, fires, human habitations, expansion, developmental activities, encroachment, war, etc., which makes it susceptible to declines in areas subject to such threats. Hence categorised as |


|  | Near Threatened. <br> 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lower Risk - near threatened |  |$\quad$| Better / new information available. Incorrect information used previously. Initial |
| :--- |
| Justification |
|  |
| assessment at species level. Status according to Nepal population. |
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|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \tilde{\sim} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 'qndun ‘səuor-uopuesg 'mo<tz |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +i | , | , | , | , | 1 | の | $\bullet$ | , | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| $\dot{\circ} \dot{0} \dot{0}$ | , | 1 | , | 1 | , | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{1} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\stackrel{i}{i}}{\dot{\gamma}} \underset{ \pm}{\Psi}$ | , | 1 | , | , |
|  | ' |  |  | 1 <br>  |  | ' |  |  | ' |  |  |
|  | , | , | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{Z}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { © } \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ | , | 1 | 1 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{0} \\ & \frac{\pi}{\pi} \end{aligned}$ | , | 1 | 0 | , | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \mathbf{L}^{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & L^{-} \end{aligned}$ | , | , | , | 1 |
|  | , | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \stackrel{0}{1} \\ & ल \end{aligned}$ | 1 | , | , | N | $\bullet$ | ' | , | ' | ' |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { oi } \\ & \text { Co } \\ & \hline 1 \end{aligned}$ | , | , | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\stackrel{\text { N }}{N}}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ }}{\stackrel{1}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ৷ } \\ & \stackrel{\text { N }}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\stackrel{0}{0}}$ | , | , | $\stackrel{\omega}{\stackrel{\omega}{\sim}}$ | , | , |
| تِ | , | , | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { مे } \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\ominus}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{+}{க} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\dot{N}}{\stackrel{+}{j}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { م } \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | , | , | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ® } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | , |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | nd Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kullu Jagatsukh | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Intermediate with S.e. ajax. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Rahla | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Intermediate with S.e. ajax. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Simla |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | EOO: 6500 km² |
| Baldeyan | $\sim 31^{\circ} 06$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 10$ | 12 | F, CL | Human settlement (Pr) Habitat loss (F) | - | Decline 20 yrs. | 31 | 12 | S.K.Sahoo |
| Bamta | $\sim 31^{\circ} 06$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 10$ | 6 | F | None | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 10-30 \\ & (10) \end{aligned}$ | 5 | EOO: 30 km ${ }^{2}$ (District). S.K. Sahoo |
| Bharari | $\sim 31^{\circ} 06$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 10$ | 5 | SU | Habitat loss (P/F), human settlement (Pr) | - | Increase 20 yrs. | $\begin{aligned} & 40-60 \\ & (42) \end{aligned}$ | 17 | EOO: $9 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). S.K. Sahoo |
| Chharbara | - | - | 40 | F | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | Decline 20 yrs. | 10-20 | 4 | EOO: 8.6 km $^{2}$ (District). S.K. Sahoo |
| Chopal | - | - | 30 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | Decline 20 yrs. | $\begin{aligned} & 50-70 \\ & (61) \end{aligned}$ | 26 | EOO: $110.5 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). <br> S.K. Sahoo |
| Dasholi | - | - | 5 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | Decline 20 yrs . | 34 | 13 | EOO: $20.5 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). S.K. Sahoo |
| Durgapur | - | - | 4.5 | F | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | , | 21 | 8 | EOO: $25 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). S.K. Sahoo |
| Junga | - | - | 6 | F | Habitat loss (P/F) | - | Decline 20 yrs . | 31 | 14 | EOO: $30.5 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). S.K. Sahoo |
| Koti | $31^{\circ} 06$ | $77^{\circ} 07$ | 7 | F | - | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 20-50 \\ & \text { (1?) } \end{aligned}$ | $1 ?$ | EOO: $14.9 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). S.K. Sahoo |
| Kufri | - | - | 7 | SU | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | Decline 20 yrs. | $\begin{aligned} & 50-100 \\ & (56) \end{aligned}$ | 21 | $\begin{aligned} & 35.4 \mathrm{~km}^{2} \text { (District)??. S.K. } \\ & \text { Sahoo } \end{aligned}$ |
| Mackrog | - | - | 7 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | Decline 20 yrs. | $\begin{aligned} & 30-50 \\ & (37) \end{aligned}$ | 16 | EOO: $15 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). S.K. Sahoo |
| Mashobra | $31^{\circ} 07$ | $77^{\circ} 13$ | 8 | SU, F | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | Decline 20 yrs. | $\begin{aligned} & 50-70 \\ & (59) \end{aligned}$ | 19 | EOO: $19.5 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). <br> S.K. Sahoo |
| Narkanda | $31^{\circ} 16$ | $77^{\circ} 27$ | 9 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | Decline 20 yrs. | $\begin{aligned} & 20-70 \\ & (27) \end{aligned}$ | 13 | EOO: 23.5 km² (District) S.K. Sahoo. <br> Brandon-Jones,2003 |
| Oilan forest | - | - | 7 | F | None | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 10-25 \\ & (14) \end{aligned}$ | 5 | EOO: $25.5 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). Present pop. trend: stable. S.K. Sahoo |
| Simla Urban | $31^{\circ} 6$ | $77^{\circ} 13$ | 20 | U/SU | Trapping (p), habitat loss (P/F) |  | Increase 20 yrs. | 400-600 | 164 | S.K. Sahoo |
| Simla rural | $31^{\circ} 6$ | $77^{\circ} 13$ | 13 | Co (CL) | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) |  | Decline 20 yrs . | $\begin{aligned} & 86(80- \\ & 105) \end{aligned}$ | 33 | Brandon-Jones, unpub. S.K. Sahoo Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | Pop. <br> Past \%/yr | nd Future \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rohnot? | $31^{\circ} 02$ | $77^{\circ} 08$ | 10.5 | F | None | - | - | 23 | 9 | schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector EOO: 31 km² (District). S.K. Sahoo. Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
| Sarahan? | $31^{\circ} 31$ | $77^{\circ} 48$ | 3 | F, CL | Habitat loss (F) | - | Decline 20 yrs . | 21 | 8 | EOO: 8.7 km² (District)S.K. Sahoo. Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
| Sataun? | $-$ | - | 2 | F | Habitat loss (F) |  | Decline 20 yrs. | 23 | - | EOO: $5.3 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District)S.K. Sahoo. Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
| Shilai? | $31^{\circ} 02$ | $77^{\circ} 08$ | 5 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/Pr/F) | - | Decline 20 yrs. | - | - | EOO: $44.5 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). S.K.Sahoo. Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
| Thal ka Nala? | - | - | 3 | F | - |  | - | - | - | EOO: $7 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District). <br> Present pop. trend: stable. Have not seen langurs there may be some. S.K. Sahoo Provisionally S.e.schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
| Uchh Ghat? | - | - | 5 | Ru/F | Habitat loss (F) | - | Decline 20 yrs . | 38 | 16 | EOO: $17 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District)S.K. Sahoo. Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
| Solan Arki? | $31^{\circ} 08$ | $76^{\circ} 58$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5000 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/F) |  | - | 36 | 14 | EOO: $26 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District)S.K. <br> Sahoo. Provisionally S. e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e. hector |
| Barog? | $\sim 30^{\circ} 55$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 07$ | 6 | SU | - |  | - | 33 | 14 | EOO: $10.5 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District) S.K.Sahoo. Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
| Chail WLS | $30^{\circ} 56$ | $77^{\circ} 12$ | 10 | Forest | None | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 70-100 \\ & (72) \end{aligned}$ | 32 | EOO: 18 km² (District) S.K. Sahoo. Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & \left(\mathrm{km}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kasauli? | 31054 | 76057 | 10 | SU | Trapping (P), habitat loss (P/F) | Decline 20 yrs . | - | $\begin{aligned} & 58-75 \\ & (58) \end{aligned}$ | 34 | EOO: $14.2 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District)S.K. Sahoo. Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector. D. Brandon-Jones, pers. comm. |
| Kummarhati? | - | - | 5 | SU | Trapping (P), habitat loss (P/F) | Decline 20 yrs . | - | 23 | 9 | EOO: $7.3 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District) S.K. Sahoo. Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
| Parwanoo? | - | - | 4 | F/CL | Habitat loss (P/F) | Decline 20 yrs . | - | 23 | 10 | EOO: 7.5 km $^{2}$ (District)S.K. Sahoo. Provisionally S. e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
| Sabathu? | - | - | 10 | F, CL | Habitat loss (P/F) | Decline 20 yrs . | - | 30 | 11 | EOO: $15.4 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (District)S.K. Sahoo. Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e.hector |
| Solan? | $30^{\circ} 54$ | $77^{\circ} 06$ | 3 | SU | Trapping (P), habitat loss (P/F) | Decline 20 yrs . | - | 41 | 17 | EOO: 8.4 km$^{2}$ (District) S.K. Sahoo |
|  <br> Kashmir <br> Kargil <br> Karakoram WLS | - | - | 5000 | - | - |  | - | - | - |  |
| Kishengara Gugai Nala | - | - |  |  | - |  | - | - | - | ${ }_{2003}^{2440-3660 m . ~ B r a n d o n-J o n e s, ~}$ |
| Changthang WLS Hemis NP | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 4000 \\ & 4100 \end{aligned}$ | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |
| Srinagar Dachigam NP Nishat Garden? |  |  | 141 | - | - |  | - | - | - |  |
| Nishat Garden? | $34^{\circ} 05$ | 74049 | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | 2440 m . on the hills just behind Nishat Garden, about 13 km NE of Srinagar, Kashmir. S.e.schistaceus or intermediate with S.e. ajax |
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| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | nd Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chitwan Ramnagar | $27^{\circ} 44$ | $84^{\circ} 27$ | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{STr} \mathrm{D}, \\ & \mathrm{Sal} \end{aligned}$ | Agriculture (P/Pr/F), timber and fodder collection (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 300 | 156 | EOO: 10 km². Chalise, 1994-95; Chalise, 1995; Chalise, 1999a 1500-3000 m. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Royal Chitwan NP |  | -880 | 932 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Lachung | $27^{\circ} 42$ | $88^{\circ} 45$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Fairly plentiful (although restricted to the heavy forest) in the Lachen Valley from about 1500-3000m. Brandon-Jones, 2003 <br> Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Lingtam | $27^{\circ} 13$ | $88^{\circ} 44$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1900m. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Sedonchen | $27^{\circ} 15$ | $88^{\circ} 46$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2100m. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Uttaranchal near Chakrata? | $30^{\circ} 42$ | $77^{\circ} 51$ | - | - | - | - | - | 50 | - | Probably S.e.schistaceus |
| Molta? | $30^{\circ} 30$ | $79^{\circ} 39$ | - | - |  |  | - |  | - | Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tons valley about 6 km from the confluence of Har-Ki-Dun, Uttaranchal. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Dehra Dun Mussoorie | $30^{\circ} 27$ | $78^{\circ} 05$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Kumaon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3660m. Provisional Identification |
| Kumaon | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3660m. Provisional Identification Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| NEPAL <br> Central Nepal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rimiche? <br> (Syafru) | $28^{\circ} 20$ | $81^{\circ} 20$ | - | TBL, P | Selective logging (P/Pr/F), firewood and fodder collection (P/Pr/F) | - | Stable | 13 | 7 | Chalise, 1997; Chalise \& Ghimire, 1998; Chalise, 2001; M.K. Ghimire, (unpublished). Provisionally S.e. schistaceus, but possibly S.e. ajax |
| Kathmandu Kathmandu | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Approximate type locality of S.e. schistaceus (it is doubtful any specimens were |
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BLE - Broadleaved Evergreen forest, CL - Cropland, Co - Commensal land, D - Deciduous forest, F - Forest, MT - Moist Temperate forest, P - Pine forest, Ru - Rural, Sal -

| Synonyms | Semnopithecus pallipes Blyth, 1844 <br> Pr[esbytis] priamus Blyth, 1847 <br> Presbytis thersites Blyth, 1847 <br> Semnopithecus priamus Blyth, 1847 <br> S[emnopithecus] albipes I. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1851 <br> Semnop[ithecus] albimanus Schlegel, 1876 <br> Semnopithecus leucoprimnus Hornaday, 1885 <br> Pithecus entellus pallipes Pocock, 1928 <br> Pithecus entellus priamellus Pocock, 1928 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | English: Coromandel Grey Langur, Madras Grey Langur, Tufted Grey Langur |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | This taxon was recognized as a subspecies of $S$. entellus by Brandon-Jones et al. (2002). Semnopithecus priam as recognised by Groves (2001) is a more agreeable taxonomic status. This species is represented by two subspecies -- S.p. priam and S.p. thersites. The types of priam and thersites are in the Zoological Survey of India collection, Kolkata. |
| Habit | Arboreal, semiterrestrial, folivorous, diurnal |
| Habitat | Dry decideous forest |
| Niche | Folivorous |
| Elevation | 100-1000m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Endemic to India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | 501-2,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | 40 / Not known. Fragmented |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>10 \%$ in the last 20 years and is predicted to decrease by $>10 \%$ in the next 10 years due to habitat loss. Decrease in quality due to human interference. |
| Threats | Hunting, habitat loss |
| Trade | Local trade in meat and in live animal. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 12 years |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Population stable at present but is predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 10 years. |


| Data Source | Informal sightings, indirect information; inferred; 95\% confidence |
| :---: | :---: |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | VULNERABLE B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v) |
| Rationale | This subspecies is distributed widely, south of river Krishna in Andhra Pradesh to Madurai in Tamil Nadu, but the area of occupancy is very few and far in between. Due to its highly fragmented distribution and threats on its habitats, the taxon is susceptible to declines at various localities and hence categorised as Vulnerable. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Data Deficient |
| Justification | New / better information available at the workshop |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule II, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | Andhra Pradesh: Sri Venkateswara NP, Nellapattu WLS <br> Karnataka: Bandipur NP, Biligiri Rangaswamy Temple WLS, Nagarhole NP? <br> Kerala: Wayanad WLS?, Silent Valley NP? <br> Tamil Nadu: Mudumalai WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomic research (on zoo animals also), life history, survey |
| Management | Habitat management, public education, PHVA |
| Captive stocks | 24 zoos in India (59.35.6.100). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | This subspecies occurs south of river Krishna in Diguvametta (intermediate form with S.e. anchises) and has a range extending down south all the way to Madurai in the dry zone. It mixes with S.e. achates in Nagarahole, with Trachypithecus johnii johnii in Nilgiris, with S.e. hypoleucos in the Wayanad Plateaux and with S. priam thersites in Palni Hills. The Eastern Ghats population in Tamil Nadu is highly threatened due to uncontrolled hunting by settlers in the hills. Many populations have been decimated in the recent past. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones, 2003; Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; <br> Hilton-Taylor, 2000; KFD, 1997; KFRI, 1993; SAZARC, 2002 <br> Biological Information Sheet (2002): C. Srinivasulu <br> C.A.M.P. questionnaire on protected areas (2002): C.S. Rao |
| Compilers | D. Brandon-Jones, R. Ali, H.R. Bhat, S. Ganapathiappan, G.K. Joseph, R. Krishnamani, Ajith Kumar, P.O. Nameer, M.S. Pradhan, S. Ram, K.K Ramachandran, G. Ramaswamy, A.K. Sharma, M. Singh, S.F.W. Sunderraj |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey |

## Distribution of Semnopithecus priam priam


Distribution of Semnopithecus priam priam in India from literature and recent field studies

| n <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> $i$ <br>  <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 2 |  | C．Srinivasulu，BIS | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{5}{3}$ $\vdots$ 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ 0 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ 0 $\frac{5}{5}$ 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{2}{\bar{n}}$ 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{5}{5}$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ 0 5 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ 2 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{5}{5}$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ 2 $\frac{2}{5}$ 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ 2 5 5 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{5}{\bar{n}}$ 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ 2 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 | $\frac{0}{0}$ 0 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 |  | $\frac{0}{0}$ 0 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ，＇＇ | ， | ＇ | 1 | ＇ | ＇ | ， | ＇ | ， | ＇ | ， | 1 | ， | ＇ | ， | ＇ | 1 | ＇ | ， |
| $\begin{aligned} & \dot{0} \\ & \dot{O} \\ & \dot{2} \\ & \mathbf{z} \end{aligned}$ | ＇＇＇ | ＇ | ＇ | 1 | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | 1 | ＇ | 1 | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ |
|  | ＇＇＇ |  | 1 <br>  <br>  | ＇ <br>  <br>  | 1 <br>  | ＇ | ＇ <br>  <br>  <br>  | 1 <br>  <br>  | $\prime$ <br>  | ＇ <br>  <br>  | ＇ | ＇ | 1 <br>  <br>  | ＇ | 1 <br>  <br>  | ＇ <br>  <br>  | 1 <br>  <br>  | ＇ | ＇ <br>  <br>  |
|  | ＇＇＇ | ， | ＇ | 1 | 1 | ， | ， | ， | 1 | ， | 1 | ， | ， | 1 | ， | ， | 1 | 1 | ， |
|  | ＇＇＇ | แ | レ | レ | レ | แ | แ | แ | レ | レ | レ | แ | レ | レ | レ | レ | レ | レ | レ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pi \widehat{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{E} \\ & \frac{1}{4} \underset{y}{n} \end{aligned}$ | ，1 ， | 1 | ＇ | ， | 1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { N్ల } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | ， | ＇ | ， | ＇ | 1 | ， | ， | 1 | 1 | ， | ， | ， |
| － | 冎 |  | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | 1 | ， | ＇ | ， | ＇ | 1 | ， | ， | 1 | ＇ | ， | ＇ | ＇ |
| － | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\text {＋}}$ |  | 1 | 1 | ＇ |  |  | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | 1 | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ | ＇ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\overline{0}} \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \dot{\overline{0}} \\ & \underline{\pi} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $$ |  |  |  | $\dot{\overline{0}}$ $\infty$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\bar{\pi}$ |  | $\infty$ <br> 3 <br> 3 <br> 志 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> $\mathbf{0}$ <br> 2 |

Distribution of Semnopithecues priam priam in India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| near Nellore | $14^{\circ} 26$ | $79^{\circ} 58$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Sriharikota island | - | - | - | F | - | - | - | - | - | C. Srinivasulu, BIS |
| Prakasam Giddalur \& adj. forests | - | - | - | F | - | - | - | - | - | C. Srinivasulu, BIS. Intermediate with S.p. priam. BrandonJones, Unpub. |
| Markapur \& adj. forests | - | - | - | F | - | - | - | - | - | C. Srinivasulu, BIS. Intermediate with S.p. priam. BrandonJones, Unpub. |
| Nallamala hills forests | - | - | - | F | - | - | - | - | - | C. Srinivasulu, BIS. Intermediate with S.p. priam. BrandonJones, Unpub. |
| Karnataka <br> Sivasamudram | $12^{\circ} 16$ | $77^{\circ} 10$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Coimbatore side of the Cauvery river at Sivasamudram (Cauvery Falls). Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Bangalore Bangalore? | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Requires confirmation but probably S. p. priam. BrandonJones, 2003 |
| Chamarajnagar Bandipur WLS | - | - | - | - | Habitat loss, hunting and encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Declining | - | - | - | Present pop. trend: stable. Mewa Singh, Ajith Kumar. Probably S. p. priam. BrandonJones, 2003 |
| Honnametti Estate (BRT WLS) | $11^{\circ} 54$ | $77^{\circ} 14$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Coorg Nagarhole NP? | - | - | 643.39 | - | - |  | - | - | - | Intermediate between S.e. achates and S.p. priam. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Kerala <br> Palghat <br> Silent Valley NP? | - | - | 89.52 | MD-E | Human intervention | - | - | - | - | 60\% of the total numbers are adults. Joseph \& Ramachandran, 1996. Most probably S.p. thersites, but |
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| 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br>  <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 |  |  | Brandon-Jones, unpub. | 'qndun 'səuor-uopue»g |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | , | , | , | ' | ' | , | , | 1 | , |
|  |  | , | ' | , | ' | , | ' | ' | , | , |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | , | , | , | 1 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 | , | 1 | , |
|  |  | , | 1 | , | 1 | 8 | , | , |  |  |
|  |  | 1 | 1 | , | 1 | ○ | ' | ' | ' | , |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { oi } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{7}{2}$ 0 $\stackrel{0}{1}$ 1 | 1 | , | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \stackrel{+}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{+}{\stackrel{1}{N}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\aleph}{N} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\imath} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |
| ـِّ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\stackrel{1}{\circ}}$ |  | , | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 0 \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\sim}{\circ} \\ \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\stackrel{\text { N}}{\sim}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{5} \\ & \stackrel{0}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oে } \\ & \stackrel{+}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\vdots}{\bar{N}} \\ & \sum_{i=}^{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Semnopithecus priam thersites (Blyth, 1847)

| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| :--- | :--- |
| Common names | Malayalam: Manthi; Tamil: Vellamanthi; English: Grey Langur |
| Level of assessment | Population |
| Notes on taxonomy | This taxon was recognized as a subspecies of S. entellus by Brandon-Jones et al. <br> (2002). Semnopithecus priam as recognised by Groves (2001) is a more agreeable <br> taxonomic status. This species is represented by two subspecies -- S.p. priam and <br> S.p. thersites. The types of priam and thersites are in the Zoological Survey of India <br> collection, Kolkata. |
| Arboreal, semi-terrestrial, folivorous, diurnal |  |


| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Vulnerable (Globally) A1cd |
| :---: | :---: |
| Justification | Better / new information was avaialable. The assessment is at the population level, not at the taxon level. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Schedule II, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India | Kerala: Chinnar WLS, Neyyar WLS, Peppara WLS, Parambikulam WLS, Shendurney WLS <br> Tamil Nadu: Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS, Indira Gandhi WLS, Kalakad WLS, Mundanthurai WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomic research (on zoo animals also), survey studies, ecology and behaviour |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, public education, PHVA pending |
| Captive stocks | 24 zoos in India (59.35.6.100). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | This is a southern Western Ghats taxon restricted to the south of Palghat Gap along the foothills up to 1000 m . It mixes with S.p. priam population along the foothills of Palni Hills in Tamil Nadu. In 1981, Kurup said they were in villages (111 in Kanyakumari and 66 in Tirunelveli), but recent observations by Rauf Ali reveal that Tirunelveli and Kanyakumari populations no more occur . |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones, 2003; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; KFRI, 1993; KFRI, 1997; Kurup, 1981; SAZARC, 2002 <br> CAMP questionnaire on protected areas (2002): T.U. Uthup |
| Compilers | D. Brandon-Jones, H.R. Bhat, G.K. Joseph, H. Kumar, R. Krishnamani, P.O. Nameer, M.S. Pradhan, S. Ram, K.K Ramachandran, G. Ramaswamy, A.K. Sharma, M. Singh, S.F.W. Sunderraj |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, A. Eudey |

## Distribution of Semnopithecus priam thersites [India population]



| Distribution of Semnopithecus priam thersites in India from literature and recent field studies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Pop. tre } \\ \text { Past } \\ \% / \mathrm{yr} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Future <br> \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| INDIA <br> Kerala <br> Aramboli Pass ( $8-10 \mathrm{~km}$ to the south) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Cochin Shernelly (Nelliampathy estate) | $10^{\circ} 32$ | $76^{\circ} 40$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | The holotype of Pithecus entellus priamellus was collected at Shernelly, 460m, Nelliampathy Plateau about 40 km south east of Sharnelli |
| Idukki <br> Chinnar WLS | - | - | - | DD, Rp | Habitat loss (Pr), habitat degradation (Pr) | Decline | Stable | 250 | 150 | KFRI, 1993, 1997; P.O. Nameer, April 1999, September 2003 |
| Palghat <br> Parambikulam WLS | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Trivandrum Achenkoil? | - | - | - | MD | Fragmentation, habitat loss (Pr) |  | - | - | - | Mature individuals: 50\% of total population. Present Pop. trend: Increasing, not recorded during the 1993 census, sighted in 1997 census. Distribution south of Palghat is considered to be the subspecies S.e. dussumieri. KFRI Wildlife census 1993, 1997. Probably S.p. thersites. Brandon-Jones, pers. comm. |
| Neyyar WLS <br> Peppara WLS | - | - | - | MD | Fragmentation, habitat loss (Pr) |  | - | - | - | Mature individuals: 50\% <br> KFRI Wildlife census 1993, 1997. Probably S.p. thersites Bran-don-Jones, pers. comm. |
| Quilon <br> Shendurney WLS? | - | - | - | MD | Fragmentation, habitat loss (Pr) | - | - | - | - | Mature individuals: 50\% of total population. Present Pop. trend: Increasing, not recorded during the 1993 census, sighted |

Distribution of Semnopithecus priam thersites in India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | Pop. tren <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | in 1997 census. |
| Tamil Nadu Coimbatore Aliyar-Valparai road (Indira Gandi WLS) | $10^{\circ} 30$ | $77^{\circ} 00$ | - | DD, Rp | - | Declining | Stable | 1919 | 1200 | Ninth hairpin bend, Annamalai Hills, 800 m (about 40 km south east of Sharnelli Estate). Mewa Singh; Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Dindugal Palni Hills? | $\sim 10^{\circ} 18$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 31$ | - | DD, Rp | - |  | - | - | - | Mewa Singh. Intermediate between S.p. priam and S.p. thersites. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Kanyakumari Kanyakumari | 0805 | $77^{\circ} 35$ | - | CL, U | Urbanisation (Pr) | - | - | 111 | 65 | Present pop. trend: Stable. ZSI, 1981. This was suggested by Jerdon (1867) but British Museum specimens from near there are referable to S.p. thersites. Brandon-Jones, 2003 |
| Madurai <br> High Wavy Mountains | 0932 | $77^{\circ} 25$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Among the foothills of the High Wavy Mountains. BrandonJones, 2003 |
| Dohnavur | 08®30 | $77^{\circ} 30$ | - | S | - | - | - | - |  | Plains along the foothills near Dohnavur and among the massive rock faces in the scrub jungle below the evergreen belt. Brandon-Jones, unpub. |
| Tirunelveli Grizzled Giant Squirrel WLS | - | - | - | DD, Rp | Habitat loss (Pr), habitat degradation (Pr) | - | - | - | - | Mewa Singh |
| Kalakad WLS, Mundanthurai WLS | $\sim 08^{\circ} 30$ | $\sim 77^{\circ} 34$ | - | DD, Rp | Habitat degradation (P/Pr) | - | - | 100 | 60 | Rauf Ali, pers. comm. In: D. Brandon-Jones, unpub.. Present pop. trend: Stable. W. Sunderraj, pers. comm. |
| Lower Papanasam Dam | $08^{\circ} 43$ | $77^{\circ} 23$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Tambraparni River, just below the Lower Papanasam Dam, c. 200 m . Brandon-Jones, unpub. |

Distribution of Semnopithecus priam thersites in India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area (km ${ }^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | Pop. <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nambikoil |  |  | - |  | Habitat degradation (P/Pr) |  | - | 50 |  | Present pop. trend: Stable. Mewa Singh, pers. comm. |
| Tirunelveli urban | $08^{\circ} 45$ | $77^{\circ} 43$ | - | $\mathrm{CL}, \mathrm{U}$ | Road accidents (Pr), urbanization (Pr) |  | - | 66 | 35-40 | Present pop. trend: Stable. ZSI, 1981 |

## Semnopithecus priam thersites (Blyth, 1847)

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{ll}\text { Synonyms } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Presbytes priamus (Kelaart, 1812) } \\
\text { Presbytis entellus thersites (Blyth, 1847) } \\
\text { Presbytis thersites (Kelaart, 1852) } \\
\text { Pithecus entellus thersites (Phillips, 1935) } \\
\text { Presbytis thersites (Pocock, 1939) }\end{array}
$$ <br>

Cercopithecidae\end{array}\right]\)| Sinhalese: Alu, Konda Vandura; Tamil: Mandhi Kurangu, Saambal Kurangu; |
| :--- |
| English: Grey langur, Hanuman Langur |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED in Sri Lanka A2cd+4cd |
| Rationale | The Sri Lankan population of this taxon, is isolated from the Indian population and is also under severe pressure due to various threats to the habitat. The rate of decline in the population is correlated to habitat loss, which is $>50 \%$ over 3 generations and is likely to decline in the future over the next 10-20 years. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Vulnerable (Globally) A1cd |
| Justification | Better / new information available. The assessment is at the population level, not at the taxon level. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Protected under the Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance Act No. 2, 1937 and subsequent amendments including Act No. 49, 1993. |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
|  | Central Province: VRR Sanctuary, Knuckles |
|  | Eastern Province: Ampara Sanctuary, Buddaragala Sanctuary, Kanthale Naval Sanctuary |
|  | North Central Province: Wilpattu, Ritigala Strict Nature Reserve, Angamedilla NP, Flood Plains NP, Giritale NP, Moragaswawe NP, Somawathie NP, Wasgamuwa NP Sabaragamuwa Province: Udawalawe NP |
|  | Uva Province: Bundala NP, Lunugamvehera NP, Madura Oya NP, Ruhuna NP |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Survey, genetic research, taxonomic research, life history, limiting factor, epidemiology, trade |
| Management | Habitat management, monitoring, public education, limiting factor management, implement extant laws, work in local communities, PHVA. A coordinated Species Management Program is recommended for Sri Lanka. |
| Captive stocks | Zoos, subspecies not known, but not a viable conservation option. |
| Comments | This species should be conserved in the natural habitat and allow the species to reproduce in the wild. Although there is a law to protect wildlife, implementation of the law is rare unless under extreme circumstances (e.g. commercial hunting from Ruhuna NP). According to government data, during the last 42 years (1956-1993), the country has lost $50 \%$ of its forest cover, but the loss is greater than $50 \%$ if the habitat change is during the last 10 years (1994-2003) is included. There is a close relationship between the loss of critical habitat and population number. Hunting in NPs by the "Northern Tamil Tiger war" has negatively impacted grey langur populations. |
| Sources | Brandon-Jones et al., 2002; Hilton-Taylor, 2001 |
|  | Ecological and Distribution data (as in alphabetical order): |
|  | IUCN Sri Lanka. Biodiversity Field Research Team, Primate Biology Programme, Smithsonian Institution and Institute of Fundamental studies, |
|  | Original data from W. Dittus, Sunil Gunatilake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe |
|  | University of Jaffna: S. Wijeyamohan |
|  | Biological Information Sheets (2002): W. Dittus, R. Somaweera |
| Compilers | Chief compilers: W. Dittus and A. Watson <br> Working group: J. Dela, W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe, S. Wijeyamohan |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, W. Dittus, A. Eudey, A. Watson |
| 284 | South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. Report, 2003 |


Distribution of Semnopithecus priam thersites in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies

Distribution of Semnopithecus priam thersites in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area $\left(k m^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. trend Past Future \%/yr \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chenkaladi | $07^{\circ} 46$ | $81^{\circ} 05$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Walachchanai | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Trincomalee Kantale FR | $08^{\circ} 22$ | $81^{\circ} 00$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Kanniya | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Nilaveli | 0840 | $81^{\circ} 12$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Seruwawilla | $08^{\circ} 22$ | $81^{\circ} 19$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Trincomalee | $08^{\circ} 34$ | $81^{\circ} 13$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| North Central Anuradhapura |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anuradhapura | $08^{\circ} 20$ | $80^{\circ} 22$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Avukana | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Habarana | $08^{\circ} 02$ | $80^{\circ} 45$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Harowapothana | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Kahatagasdigiliya | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Kabitigolawa | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Kikirawa | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Madaragam Aru (Wilpattu) near WL dept. bungal | - | - | - | R | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Maradanmaduwa (Wilpattu) near WL dept. bungal | $08^{\circ} 40$ | $80^{\circ} 52$ | - | R | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Medawachchiya | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Mihintale | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Noitchiyagama | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Pomparippu (Wilpattu) | $08^{\circ} 20$ | $79^{\circ} 52$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Ritigala Strict Nature Reserve | $08^{\circ} 05$ | $80^{\circ} 39$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Thanthirimalai | - | - | - | W | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |

Distribution of Semnopithecus priam thersites in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Area } \\ \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. t <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Wilpattu) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Polonnaruwa Angamedilla NP | 070 50 | $80^{\circ} 55$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Aralaganwilla | $07^{\circ} 46$ | $81^{\circ} 11$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Attanakadawela | 0750 | $80^{\circ} 52$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Bakamuna FR | $07^{\circ} 46$ | $80^{\circ} 49$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Dimbulagalla | $06^{\circ} 58$ | $80^{\circ} 36$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Elahara FR | 0744 | $80^{\circ} 47$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Flood Plains NP | - | - | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Giritale NP | $07^{\circ} 59$ | $80^{\circ} 55$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Mannampitiya | $07^{\circ} 54$ | $81^{\circ} 07$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Medirigiriya | - | - | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Minneriya | $08^{\circ} 01$ | $80^{\circ} 54$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Moragaswawe $N$ | $08^{\circ} 01$ | $80^{\circ} 46$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Polonnaruwa | $07^{\circ} 56$ | $8^{\circ} .02$ | - | MDE | - | Stable | Stable | - | - | Dittus \& A. Watson, 1990 todate |
| Siripura | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Somawathie NP | 08¹6 | $81^{\circ} 10$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Wasgamuwa NP: Dasthota | $07^{\circ} 50$ | $81^{\circ} 01$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Wasgamuwa NP: Yakkurae | $07^{\circ} 49$ | $81^{\circ} 01$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Welikanda | - | - | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| North Western <br> Kurunagala <br> Bingiriya | $\sim 7$ | $\sim 79$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Hettipola | 0735 | $80^{\circ} 04$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Kuliyapitiya | - | - | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Pomparippu | - | - | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Puttalam | $08^{\circ} 01$ | $79^{\circ} 55$ | - | MDE | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |

Distribution of Semnopithecus priam thersites in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. trend Past Future \%/yr \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wellawaya | $06^{\circ} 44$ | $81^{\circ} 06$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Northern Prov. Jaffna Kodikamam | $09^{\circ} 40$ | $80^{\circ} 13$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Kilinochchi A9 Road | $09^{\circ} 24$ | $80^{\circ} 25$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| lyakachchi | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Pallai | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Mullaithivu A9 Road | $09^{\circ} 24$ | $80^{\circ} 25$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Vavuniya Madukanda | $08^{\circ} 43$ | $80^{\circ} 31$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Mamaduwa | $08^{\circ} 49$ | $80^{\circ} 31$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Vavuniya | $08^{\circ} 45$ | $80^{\circ} 30$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Sabaragamuwa Ratnapura |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Embilipitiya | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Moragoda | $06^{\circ} 22$ | $80^{\circ} 04$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Rakwana | $06^{\circ} 28$ | $80^{\circ} 37$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Udawalawe NP | $06^{\circ} 27$ | $80^{\circ} 52$ | - | W | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Uva Province Ampara |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maduru Oya NP | $07^{\circ} 32$ | $81^{\circ} 11$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Badulla |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Damana | $07^{\circ} 12$ | $81^{\circ} 39$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Giranthurukotte | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Karamatiya | - | - | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Koskanda | $06^{\circ} 40$ | $80^{\circ} 01$ | - | - | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Maduru Oya NP (Badulla section) | $07^{\circ} 32$ | $81^{\circ} 11$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Mahiyangana | $07^{\circ} 19$ | $80^{\circ} 59$ | - | MDE | - | - - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |

Distribution of Semnopithecus priam thersites in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued

Distribution of Semnopithecus priam thersites in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued


| Synonyms | Presbytis geei (Khajuria, 1956) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Assamese: Sonali bandar; Bengali: Sonali-bandar; Bodo: Mokre gophur; Hindi: <br> Sunheara bandar; Nepali: Sunaulo bandar, Sugrib; English: Gee's Golden Langur, <br> Golden Leaf Monkey |
| Level of assessment | Species |
| Notes on taxonomy | Recently a new subspecies, T.g. bhutanensis, has been designated in northern <br> Bhutan by Wangchuk (2003). The Indian population is the nominate subspecies. <br> However, due to doubts in the taxonomy, the assessment is at the sepcies level in <br> this exercise. |
| Habit | Predominantly arboreal, diurnal, folivorous |
| Habitat | Tropical evergreen, moist deciduous and sal-dominated forest, deciduous broad- <br> leaf, semi-evergreen, evergreen broad-leaved forests and fields. |
| Upper and middle canopy dweller. |  |

numbers that are continuously declining.

| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered A1acd; C2a |
| :---: | :---: |
| Justification | Better / new information available currently and change in species/subspecies taxonomy. |
| National Status | Bhutan: Endangered B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v); C1+2a <br> Bhutan has a better proportion of the population and the situation is not as serious in the country, hence the category is retained as Endagered. <br> India: $\quad$ Endangered B1ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v); C1+2a $\uparrow$ Critically Endangered <br> The loss to habitat in India is at an alarming rate and there has been a decrease in habitat for this species by more than $50 \%$ in the last 30 years. The southern locations within India are severely fragmented from the northern Manas population, making the isolated fragments vulnerable to extinction. Hence the status in India is upgraded to Critically Endangered. |
| Uncertainty | Assessment for this taxon based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of the working group |
| Wildlife Legislation | India: Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected |  |
| Bhutan | Black Mountain NP, Phipsoo WLS, Royal Manas NP, Trumshingla NP |
| India | Assam: Chakrasila WLS, Manas NP |
| Recommendations <br> Research | Taxonomic research, survey studies, limiting factor research, habitat fragmentation |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education, PHVA |
| Captive stocks | South Asia: India in 5 zoos (2.5.0.7) <br> A coordinated Species Management Program recommended for South Asia. There is an up-to-date studbook managed by Wildlife Institute of India (Dehra Dun) for Central Zoo Authority for this species. |
| Comments | Entire range of Golden langur in both the countries should be evaluated by satellite imagery photographs. Detailed survey on the current status and demographic trends of Golden Langur is essential. Trans-border exchange of information and research and management plan recommended. Due to localised distribution $T$. geei is confined only into a small patch of forest in India and Bhutan. In India they are restricted only to national parks, wildlife sanctuaries and secondary forests of degraded habitat in unclassified forests comprising only around $1000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$, while in Bhutan, the estimated range is $1400 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. Again in India the species pose severe pressure in the form of loss of habitat and needs special measures for conservation. Hotspots like northeastern India (Eastern Himalaya) where the problems are very unique, a unique solution/ action plan is required to solve these problems. So a broad, viable conservation is recommended to preserve their habitat. In Bhutan, the population is secure as the habitat is still large and contiguous and no poaching or capture occur. |
| Sources | Choudhury, 2002; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2001; SAZARC, <br> 2002; Srivatsava et al., 2001; Wangchuk, 1995; Wangchuk, 2003; Wangchuk et al.., 2003 <br> Biological Information Sheet (2002): J. Biswas, T. Wangchuk |
| Compilers | J. Biswas, J. Bose, D. Chetry, J. Das, M. M. Feeroz, Awadesh Kumar, R. Medhi, S. Mitra |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, D. Chetry, J. Das, A. Eudey, S. Mitra, M.S. Pradhan |

## Distribution of Trachypithecus geei in Bhutan and India


Distribution of Trachypithecus geei in Bhutan and India from literature and recent field studies

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> (km ${ }^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BHUTAN <br> Royal Manas, Black Mountain \& Pipsu WLS, Pipsugaon, Trumshingla | - | - | 1400 | SE | - | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 3000- \\ & 5000 \end{aligned}$ | - | T. Wangchuk, pers. comm. Nature Conservation Division, NP Royal Govt. of Bhutan; Choudhury, 2002; Wangchuk, et al. 2003 |
| INDIA <br> Assam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bongaigaon <br> Bamungaon RF | $\sim 26^{\circ} 28$ | $\sim 90^{\circ} 34$ | <3 | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 10 \mathrm{yrs} \end{aligned}$ | 8-10 | 8 | Links with adjacent forest lost since 1970s, Heavily degraded. Choudhury, 2002. J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| Bhairab Pahar PRF | - | - | <10 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr) | - | - | >60 | - | Links with adjacent forest lost since 1970s, Heavily degraded. Choudhury, 2002 |
| Bhumeswar Hill PRF | - | - | <5 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr) | - | - | <10? | - | Heavily degraded. A few survived till 1990s. Current situation not known. |
| Khakarpur PRF | - | - | <5 | - | Habitat destruction (P), Habitat degradation (Pr), encroachment (Pr) | - | - | >10 | - | Choudhury, 2002 |
| Kakoijana RF | - | - | <10 | ${ }_{-}^{-}$ |  |  | - | 60 | ${ }_{-}$ | Links with adjacent forest lost since 1970s, Heavily degraded. Direct sighting by Forest dept. Choudhury, 2002 |
| 1. Hapachara | - | - | 13 | Sec | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (Pr), lesser immature individuals ( $F$ ) | Decline | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Decline } \\ & 10 \text { yrs. } \end{aligned}$ | 25 | 17 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 2. Khagarpur | - | - | 5 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (Pr), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline <br> 10 yrs. | 80 | 65 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| Malegarh Hills (Kharagaon PRF) | - | - | <4 | - | Habitat destruction (Pr) |  |  | 4-5 | - | Completely degraded. Choudhury, 2002 |
| Nakkati RF | - | - | <10 | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline | 19 | 2 | J. Biswas et al., Links with adjacent forest lost since 1970s, Heavily degraded. Choudhury, 2002 |
| Dhubri |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | >300 | - | Fragmented since 1990. Felling in the fringe areas. Choudhury, 2002 |
| Bengalduva | - | - | <4 | - | Habitat destruction (Pr) | - | - | >10 | - | Choudhury, 2002 |

Distribution of Trachypithecus geei in Bhutan and India from literature and recent field studies... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beshkamari RF | - | - | <0.5 | - | Habitat destruction (Pr) | - | - | >10 | - | Links with adjacent forest lost since 1970s. Choudhury, 2002 |
| Chakrasila WLS | $26^{\circ} 20$ | $90^{\circ} 18$ | 40 | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs . | 150 | 113 | Choudhury, 2002. <br> J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| Sarpamari RF | - | - | <1 | - | Habitat destruction (Pr) |  |  | 3-4 | - | Heavily degraded, location on National highway. Choudhury, 2002 |
| Srigram RF | - | - | <4 | - | Habitat destruction (Pr) |  | - | > 10 | - | Partly degraded habitat. Choudhury, 2002 |
| Kokrajhar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bengtol RF | - | - | <5 | $-\quad$ | Habitat destruction (Pr), heavy felling (Pr) |  | Decline | 150-175 | 31 | Fragmentation and heavy felling since 1990s. Completely degraded. Choudhury, 2002 |
| Manas NP | - | - | 40 | - | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline 10 yrs . | Decline 10 yrs . | 150-175 | 31 | J. Biswas et al.., IUSPP |
| A. Chirrang RF |  |  | 350 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lost $30 \%$ of habitat in 1990. Choudhury, 2002 |
| 1. Bismurie | $\sim 26^{\circ} 23$ | $\sim 90^{\circ} 16$ | - | Sec | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs. | 18 | 12 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 2. Darrangapara | $\sim 27^{\circ} 40$ | $\sim 92^{\circ} 55$ | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs. | 32 | 10 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 3. Diglibari | - | - | - | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs. | 116 | 66 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 4. Karigaon | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline <br> 10 yrs. | 5 | 3 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 5. Pantapara | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline <br> 10 yrs. | 10 | 6 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 6. Santipur | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs. | 19 | 11 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 7. Saralpara | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline <br> 10 yrs. | 60 | 36 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 8. Ultapani | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline <br> 10 yrs. | 105 | 65 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| Katrigocha RF | - | - | <5 | - | Habitat destruction (Pr) |  | - | >10 | - | Partly degraded. Choudhury, 2002 |
| B. Manas RF |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  | >100 |  | Fragmented due to felling and encroachment in 1990s. <br> Choudhury, A., 2002 |
| 1. Abhyapuri | $\sim 26^{\circ} 28$ | $\sim 90^{\circ} 34$ | 3.5 | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline 10 yrs . | Decline 10 yrs. | 9 | 5 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 2. Bhairai Hill | $\sim 26^{\circ} 28$ | $\sim 90^{\circ} 34$ | 11.5 | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), | Decline | Decline | 9 | 5 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |

Distribution of Trachypithecus geei in Bhutan and India from literature and recent field studies... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3. Bordangi | - | - | - | SE | lesser immature individuals (F) Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | 10 yrs . Decline 10 yrs . | 11 | 5 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 4. Hatichera | - | - | - | SE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs . | 37 | 21 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 5. Hilly Khola | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs . | 12 | 7 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 6. Khoragaon | - | - | 4 | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline <br> 10 yrs. | 19 | 11 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 7. Kusumdisa | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs . | 16 | 9 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 8. Lalai | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs . | 55 | 31 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| Kochugaon RF | - | - | 15 | - | Large forest villages (Pr), encroachment (Pr), heavy felling (Pr) |  | - | <50 | - | Heavily degraded, hardly $10 \%$ of original habitat remains. <br> Choudhury, 2002 |
| Nadangiri RF | - | - | <6 | - | Habitat fragmentation (Pr) | - | - | >20 | - | Links with other adjacent forests including Nayekgaon PRF lost in 1990s. Partly $\qquad$ |
| Nayekgaon PRF | - | - | <8 | - | Habitat fragmentation (Pr) | - | - | 45 | - | Links with other adjacent forests including Chakrasila lost in 1990s. Partly degraded. Choudhury, 2002 |
| C. Ripu RF | - | - | $350$ |  |  |  |  | $>400$ |  |  |
| 1. Ballamjhora | - | - |  | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs . |  | 37 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 2. Geylengdung | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs | 31 | 17 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 3. Guabari | - | - |  | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs. | ? | 9 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 4. Hollonjhora | - | - | 3 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs . | ? | 3 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 5. Jamduar | - | - | - | Sec | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs . | ? | 31 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 6. Jamduar | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs . | 42 | 23 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 7. Janali | - | - | 60 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs. |  | 44 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| 8. Raimona | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs | 184 | 116 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |

Distribution of Trachypithecus geei in Bhutan and India from literature and recent field studies... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $26^{\circ} 26$ | $93^{\circ} 25$ | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), lesser immature individuals (F) | Decline | Decline 10 yrs. | 7 | 4 | J. Biswas et al., IUSPP |
| Kokrajhar and Dhubri Abhoya rubber plantation, Nayekgaon | - |  | <3 | P | Habitat fragmentation (Pr) |  |  | 64 | - | Choudhury, 2002 |


| Synonyms | Presbytis phayrei Blyth, 1847 <br> Trachypithecus phayrei phayrei (Blyth, 1847) <br> Presbytis barbei Blyth, 1867 <br> Semnopithecus holotephreus Andersons, 1878 Presbytis melamera Elliot, 1909 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Assamese: Chashma Bandar; Bengali: Chashma Bandar; Bengali in Bangladesh: Chashma pora hanuman; Mizo: Dawr; Nepali: Chasme Bandar, English: Phayre's Langur, Phayre's Leaf Monkey |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Habit | Diurnal, predominently arboreal and folivorous |
| Habitat | Mixed moist deciduous forest, primary secondary moist evergreen forest, bamboo dominated areas, often near tea gardens, semi-evergreen forests. |
| Niche | Middle and top canopy. |
| Elevation | Up to 800 m . |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Bangladesh, India, Myanmar |
| South Asia | Bangladesh, India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | >2,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | $23 / 9$. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>50 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decline by $>30 \%$ in the next 10 years due to habitat destruction, habitat shrinkage, agriculture and establishment of tea gardens. Decrease in quality due to altered habitat, primary forest destruction. Establishment of tea gardens and paper mills is the primary cause of change. |
| Threats | Timber plantations, livestock ranching, shifting agriculture, firewood collection and charcoal production, infrastructure, human settlement, deforestation, fragmentation, collecting, illegal hunting for food, habitat loss, pesticides/chemical pollution, industrial pollution, inbreeding |
| Trade | Local trade in live animal for zoos and meat for food |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years (inferred from other langur species) |
| Total population | <1,600 [Bangladesh $=$ <100; India $=$ <1500] |
| Mature individuals | <600 [Bangladesh $=$ < 50; India $=$ <550] |
| Population trend | Declining by $>10 \%$ (Period not given) and is predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ (Period not given) |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study, informal sightings, indirect information, literature; observed; 95\% confidence. |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED C1+2a(i) |
| Rationale | Widely distributed leaf monkey found in 23 locations and 9 subpopulations in the northeastern parts of India and Bangladesh. Loss of habitat and other humaninduced threats have caused the population numbers to be restricted to around 700 mature individuals making this primate Endangered. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered C2a |
| National Status | Bangladesh: Critically Endangered A2c; C1+2a(i); D <br> Less than 50 mature individuals exist in Bangladesh, which is a decline of $>80 \%$ in the last 20 years, making this taxon extremely vulnerable to extinction in the near future. The population is also isolated from the Indian locations. Hence the higher category of Critically Endangered is retained in Bangladesh. India: <br> Endangered C1+2a(i) <br> Widely distributed leaf monkey found in a few locations. Loss of habitat and other human-induced threats have caused the population numbers to be restricted making this primate Endangered in India. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Bangladesh: Schedule III, Bangladesh Wildlife (Preservation) (Amendment) Act, 1974. <br> India: Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected |  |
| Bangladesh | Sylhet: Lawachara NP, Rama-Kalenga WLS |
| India | Mizoram: Dampa WLS <br> Tripura: Gumti WLS, Sepahijala WLS, Trishna WLS |
| Recommendations Research | Taxonomy, life history, survey |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education, PHVA |
| Captive stocks | Bangladesh: Dhaka Zoo (2000) (1.2.0.3) |
| Comments | Extensive surveys with proper documentation required. Project based research to be initiated on a large scale. Ongoing projects on habitat (Ph.D.) and demography in India and distribution survey in northeastern India by Joydeep Bose. Two new localities have already been discovered in April 2002 by Joydeep Bose. The taxonomy still has to be verified. The Bangladesh population has declined by $>90 \%$ in 20 years when Ahsan and Khan (1984) reported 1050 individuals. The habitat of this taxon is primarily affected by excessive jhuming and encroachment. The time between successive jhuming practice has reduced resulting in secondary growth of bamboo thickets (J. Biswas, BIS). |
| Sources | Bhattacharya and Chakraborty, 1990; Blyth, 1847; Choudhury, 1990; Choudhury, 1994, Choudhury, 1996; Choudhury, 1997; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Gupta, 1994; Hilton-Taylor, 2001; Mukherjee et al., 1993; SAZARC, 2002 Biological Information Sheet (2002): J. Biswas, J. Bose, M.M. Feeroz CAMP questionnaire on protected areas (2002): S. Debbarma |
| Compilers | J. Biswas, J. Bose, D. Chetry, J. Das, M. M. Feeroz, Awadesh Kumar, R. Medhi, S. Mitra. |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, J. Bose, D. Chetry, A. Eudey, S. Mitra, M.S. Pradhan |
| 300 | South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. Report, 2003 |


Distribution of Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tr <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BANGLADESH <br> Chittagong Konerhat | - | - | - | SE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 1050 | 410 | Ahsan \& Khan, 1984 |
| Sylhet <br> Moulvi Bazar <br> Rama-Kelanga <br> WLS (Srimangal <br> FR) | - | - | - | SE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) |  | - | - | - | Feeroz, et al., 1993; Kalin pers. comm. |
| West Bhanugach FR (Lawachara WLS) | $24^{\circ} 21$ | $91^{\circ} 48$ | 20 | SE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 10-20 | - | Feeroz, M.M., 1999 |
| INDIA <br> Assam <br> Karimganj |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Patharia RF (Lakhichara, Section 13, Dhalchari Rakhar Samarthal No. 7, Border road bridge, | $\begin{aligned} & 24^{\circ} 111- \\ & 24^{\circ} 31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92^{\circ} 27-1 \\ & 92^{\circ} 53 \end{aligned}$ | 76 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TWE, } \\ & \text { SE, } \end{aligned}$ | Hunting ( $P$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr}$ ), deforestation (F) | Decline | Decline | 50 | 17 | IUSPP Annual reports, II Survey |
| Bornatillamokam) Sarjul village (Tilbhum $R F$, Bisarithilla south) | - | - | 17.95 | TWE, SE, B | Hunting ( $P$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr}$ ), deforestation (F) | Decline | Decline | 12 | - | IUSPP Annual reports, II Survey |
| Innerline RF <br> (Balichuri, <br> Gollacharra, <br> Khulinallah, <br> Pachpirmukam, <br> Damcherra, <br> Kalapahar, <br> Gasuria, Utkal) | $-$ | - | 1079.97 | TWE SE, B | Hunting (P), encroachment (P/Pr), deforestation (F) | Decline | Decline | 61 | 29 | IUSPP Annual reports, II Survey |
| Sundar Ganai | - | - | 151.51 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TWE, } \\ & \text { SE, } \end{aligned}$ | Hunting ( $P$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr}$ ), deforestation (F) | Decline | Decline | 13 | 6 | IUSPP Annual reports, II Survey |
| Mizoram Mamit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teirei rest house, Near Nallar (In Dampa WLS) | $\begin{aligned} & 22^{\circ} 32, \\ & 92^{\circ} 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23^{\circ} 41, \\ & 22^{\circ} 27 \end{aligned}$ | 500 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TWE, } \\ & \text { SE, } \end{aligned}$ | Hunting (P), bamboo plantation (Pr) | - | - | 15 | - | Raman et al., 1995 |

Distribution of Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Area } \\ \left(\mathrm{km}^{2}\right) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tripura |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Groves, 2001 |
| North Tripura |  |  | 5235 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No exact location | - | - | 18.53 | MTr, B | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 41 | 33 | Mukherjee et al., 1993 |
| No exact location |  | - | - | MTr, B | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 124 | 50 | Gupta, 1994 |
| South Tripura |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No exact location |  | - | - | MTr, B | Jhoom cultivation (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 614 | 233 | Gupta, 1994 |
| No exact location | $23^{\circ} 50$ | $91^{\circ 1} 15$ | 5235 | MTr, B | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 75 | 50 | Mukherjee, et al., 1993 |
| Gumti WLS |  | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Trishna WLS | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  |
| West Tripura |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No exact location | - | - | - | MTr, B | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 148 | 97 | Mukherjee, et al., 1993 |
| No exact location |  | - | - | MTr, B | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 161 | 59 | Gupta, 1994, Mukherjee et al., 1993 |
| Sepahijala WLS | 23037- | 91¹7- | - | RP, TTC, Z, MMD, P | Encroachment (P/Pr/F), replacement of primary forest with secondary vegetation (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 100 | - | Joydeep Bose (In prep.) 19 groups. Found in adjacent areas too. S. Debbarma, 2002 |

B - Bamboo forest, MTr - Moist Tropical forest, MMD - Moist mixed deciduous forest, P - Plantation area, RP - Rubber plantation area, SE - Semi-evergreen forest, TTC -
Toy train complex, TWE - Tropical Wet Evergreen forest, Z - Zoo area

## Trachypithecus pileatus brahma (Wroughton, 1916)

| Synonyms | Presbytis brahma Wroughton, 1916 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Assamese: Tupimuria bandar; Garo: Rangol; Hindi: Topi-wala bandar; Khasi: Tongo; Bengali: Topi Bandar, English: Buff-bellied Langur, Capped Langur |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies supposedly known only from the Dafla Hills, north of Brahmaputra. Category C taxon. Taxonomic status to be reviewed. |
| Habit | Arboreal, diurnal |
| Habitat | Subtropical forest, broadleaved forest, evergreen deciduous forest, bamboo forest |
| Niche | Upper and middle canopy dweller. Up to 2000m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Endemic to India |
| Extent of Occurrence | Not known |
| Area of Occupancy | Not known |
| Locations/subpopulations | Not known |
| Habitat status | Not known |
| Threats | Not known |
| Trade | Not known |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | Not known |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Not known |
| Data Source | Museum study, indirect information; inferred; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | DATA DEFICIENT |
| Rationale | Nothing is known about the distribution, threats or populations of this primate. This taxon is known from only a single individual collected in 1911. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered (A1cd, C2a) |
| Justification | This taxon was previously wrongly assessed. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |

Wildlife Legislation
CITES
Schedule I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002
Appendix I

## Presence in Protected Areas

None
Recommendations
Research
Management
Taxonomic research, survey, life history studies, extensive survey
Habitat management, monitoring, public education
Captive stocks
Comments

Sources
Compilers

Reviewers

12 zoos in India (8.5.0.13). Subspecies not known.
Detailed and continuous monitoring and census survey is recommended in its geographic range.

CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; Jenkins, 1987; SAZARC, 2002
J. Biswas, J. Bose, D. Chetry, J. Das, M.M. Feeroz, Awadesh Kumar, R. Medhi, S. Mitra
D. Brandon-Jones, D. Chetry, J. Das, A. Eudey, M.S. Pradhan, G.S. Solanki

Type distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus brahma in India



| Synonyms | Presbytis durga (Wroughton, 1916) Pithecus pileatus saturatus (Hinton, 1923) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Assamese: Topimuria bandar; Bengali: Topi bengali; Garo: Rangol; Hindi: Topi wala Bandar; Khasi: Tongo; English: Capped Langur, Orange-bellied Capped Leaf Monkey |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | The real existence of this subspecies and its relationship to T.p. pileatus needs to be tested carefully. Both the individual variation within a troop and even whether the darkness of the upper side and redness of the underside are not somehow a purely phenotypic result of temperature and humidity (Groves, 2001). |
| Habit | Predominently arboreal, top and middle canopy dweller, diurnal |
| Habitat | Subtropical forest, broadleaved forest, evergreen forest, moist deciduous forest, bamboo forests |
| Niche | Top and middle canopy dweller. |
| Elevation | 10-600m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Bangladesh, India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | <4,200 km² [Bangladesh $=<150 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$; India $=<4,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ] |
| Locations/subpopulations | $<45 /<60$. [Bangladesh $=<12$; India $=<35$ ]. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area of $>40 \%$ in the last 20 years and predicted to decline by $>30 \%$ in the next 20 years due to jhum cultivation and encroachment. Decrease in quality due to loss of lodging trees. |
| Threats | Crop plantations, timber, selective logging, firewood and charcoal production, human settlement, building roads, dams, power lines, deliberate fires, soil loss/ erosion, fragmentation, hunting for sport, meat and traditional medicine, trapping, human interference, predators |
| Trade | Local trade for meat, tail for food, skin for knife covers and for fur; live animal as pets. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years (inferred from other langur species) |
| Total population | <1100 [Bangladesh $=$ <300; India $=$ <800] |
| Mature individuals | <550 [Bangladesh $=<150$; India $=<400$ ] |
| Population trend | Declining by $>30 \%$ in the last 20 years and is predicted to decline by $>20 \%$ in the next 20 years. |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study; observed; 95\% confidence |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED C1+2a(i) |
| Rationale | Widely distributed capped langur in India and Bangladesh recorded in 49 locations and 41 subpopulations identified. Very few mature individuals due to decreasing habitat and other human influence makes this primate Endangered. An estimated 550 mature individuals make up the population with no subpopulation having more than 250 mature individuals. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered A1cd, C2a |
| National Status | Bangladesh: Critically Endangered $\mathbf{B 2 a b}(\mathbf{i}, \mathrm{ii}, \mathrm{iii}, \mathrm{iv}, \mathrm{v}) ; \mathbf{C 2 a}(\mathrm{i})$ <br> The Bangladesh population is fragmented with a few exceptions of bordering locations being contiguous with the Indian populations. Since the threat to this taxon is high in the country, it is prone to declines and local extinctions, hence the national status is retained as Critically Endangered for the country. <br> India: <br> Endangered <br> C1+2a(i) <br> Widely distributed in northeastern india, but highly fragmented locations and relatively small population makes this taxon Endagered within the country. This status is retained as such. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Bangladesh: Schedule III, Bangladesh Wildlife (Preservation) (Amendment) Act, 1974. <br> India: Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| Bangladesh: | Chittagong: Chunathi WLS Sylhet: Ram-Kalenga WLS |
| India: | Assam: Gibbon WLS, Kaziranga NP, Pabitora WLS Mizoram: Dampa NP, Murlen NP, Nengpui WLS Tripura: Gumti WLS, Sepahijala WLS, Trishna WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomy, survey, habitat fragmentation |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education, PHVA. A coordinated Species Management Program is recommended for South Asia. |
| Captive stocks | 12 zoos in India (8.5.0.13). Subspecies not known. |
| Comments | The distributional range proposed by D. Brandon-Jones et al. (2002) is confusing as the subspecies has a large over lapping range with that of $T$. pileatus pileatus with no obvious demarkation. A detailed survey on the distributional range and its limits of occurrence of both the subspecies of capped langur is highly recommended. Coat color of this subspecies found in central Bangladesh varied significantly between the northeastern and the southeastern populations. |
| Sources | CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; Napier, 1985; SAZARC, 2002 Biological Information Sheet (2002): J. Biswas, M.M. Feeroz, R. Medhi CAMP questionnaire on protected areas (2002): M. Barua, S. Debbarma, G. Santha |
| Compilers | J. Biswas, J. Bose, D. Chetry, J. Das, R. Medhi |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, D. Chetry, J. Das, A. Eudey, M.S. Pradhan |
| 308 | South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. Report, 2003 |

Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus durga in Bangladesh and India

Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus durga in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies

Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus durga in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | nd Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Golaghat Golaghat | $26^{\circ} 30$ | $93^{\circ} 59$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | One adult female on 31 Dec 1919 and an adult female on 28 jan 1920 has been collected at an elevation of 0.909 m and 121m. respectively. Napier, 1985 |
| Kaziranga NP | $\sim 26^{\circ} 37$ | $\sim 93^{\circ} 18$ | - | SE, MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F) | Increase | Increase | 166 | 108 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Hailakandi Katakhal RF | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 6 | 4 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Jorhat | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gibbon WLS | - | - | - | SE | Hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 304 | 181 | IUSPP Annual reports; 10 groups. G. Santha, 2002 |
| Kamrup |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amchang RF | $26^{\circ} 19$ | $91^{\circ} 15$ | - | MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | 8 | 5 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Apricola RF | $26^{\circ} 19$ | $91^{\circ} 15$ | - | MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | 5 | 4 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Borjuri RF | - | - | - | MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Dhaniangon RF | - | - | - | MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | 5 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| South Amchang RF | - | - | - | MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | 9 | 6 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Karimganj |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Innerline RF | - | - | 113 | SE, B | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Longai RF | - | - | 151 | SE, D | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Patharia RF | $24 \times 11$ | $24^{\circ} 31$ | 76.47 | SE, D | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 6 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Singla RF | $\sim 27^{\circ} 02$ | $\sim 88^{\circ} 19$ | 270.5 | SE, B | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 14 | 11 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Lakhimpur |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bara Hapjan | $27^{\circ} 32$ | $95^{\circ} 30$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | One adult male has been recorded tobe collected on 3 Nov 1919 from this area at an elevation of 60m. Napier, 1985; Groves, 2001 |
| Marigaon Pabitora WLS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Found adjacent to the protected area. M. Barua, 2002 |

Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus durga in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathbf{k m}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre <br> Past <br> \%/yr | nd Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Naga hills Lakhuni | $26^{\circ} 33$ | $94^{\circ} 27$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | One adult male has been recorded to be collected from this region on 10 Sep. 1919. Napier, 1985 |
| North Cachar Krungning RF | - | - | 108 | SE, B | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 25 | 17 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Lanka | $25^{\circ} 56$ | $92^{\circ} 57$ | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | One adult male has been collected at an elevation of 121 m . on 22 Oct 1920. Napier, 1985 |
| Longingnang RF | - | - | 493 | SE, B | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 18 | 10 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Mizoram <br> Champai Murlen NP | $23^{\circ} 37$ | $93^{\circ} 18$ | - | SE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | - |  | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Chintuipui Nengpui RF Nengpui WLS | - |  | $\overline{-} 110$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SE} \\ & \mathrm{SE} \end{aligned}$ | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline Decline | Decline Decline | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 5 \\ 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} 2 \\ 9 \end{array}$ | IUSPP Annual reports IUSPP Annual reports |
| Mamit Dampa NP | - | - | 500 | SE | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | 9 | 5 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Tripura <br> South Tripura Gumti WLS Trishna WLS | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 389.54 \\ & 190.70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SE} \\ & \mathrm{MD} \end{aligned}$ | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | $4$ | $2$ | IUSPP Annual reports IUSPP Annual reports |
| West Tripura Sepahijala WLS | - | - | 18.53 | MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 16 | $9$ | IUSPP Annual reports 14 groups. Found in adjacent areas too. S. Debbarma, 2002 |



## Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus (Blyth, 1843)

| Synonyms | Presbytis pileatus Blyth, 1843 <br> Semnopithecus pileatus (Blyth, 1843) <br> Semnopithecus argentatus Horsfield, 1851 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Assamese: Tupimuria bandar, Bengali: Mukpori Hanuman; Bengali: Topi-bandar; Garo: Rangel; Hindi: Topiwala bandar; Khasi: Tongo; Mizo: Ngau; English: Blondebellied Capped Leaf Monkey, Capped Langur |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Habit | Predominantly arboreal, diurnal, foliovorus |
| Habitat | Mixed forests |
| Niche | Top and middle canopy dweller. |
| Elevation | 400-3,000m |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | India, Myanmar |
| South Asia | India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | <3,500 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | <50/<75. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>20 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decrease by $>30 \%$ in the next 10 years due to habitat loss. Decrease in quality due to altered habitat. Primary causes of change due to encroachment, jhum cultivation, monoculture of plants. |
| Threats | Shifting agriculture, grazing, plantations, agriculture, timber, selective logging, firewood and charcoal production, human settlement, building roads, dams, power lines, deliberate fires, soil loss/erosion, forest fragmentation, hunting for sport, food and traditional medicine, accidental mortality, trapping, human interference, predators, habitat loss, poor reproduction |
| Trade | Local, domestic and international trade for fur, meat; tail for food and live animals for zoos. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 10-12 years (inferred from other langur species) |
| Total population | <600 |
| Mature individuals | <350 |
| Population trend | Declining and is predicted to decline. |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study; suspected; subjective |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED in South Asia C1+2a(i); D |
| Rationale | Resticted in range in India in 33 locations and 15 subpopulations. Habitat and populations suffer from severe human-induced threats which have resulted in only very few mature individuals estimated currently. Restricted numbers indicate that the taxon is Endangered. Since nothing is known of the neighbouring Myanmar population, the assessment is retained as Endangered for South Asia. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered (Globally) A1cd, C2a |
| Uncertainty | Assessment is based on full range of plausible values and it is based on evidence. Based on the consensus of the entire working group and also based on the consensus of all the participants |
| Wildlife Legislation | India: Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| India: | Arunachal Pradesh: Namdapha NP <br> Meghalaya: Balphakram NP, Nokrek NP, Siju WLS |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Life history, survey, ecological and behavioural study |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, PHVA pending |
| Captive stocks | 12 zoos in India (8.5.0.13). Subspecies not known |
| Comments | A distribution map of the species should be made. Information compiled here is based on data from Assam and Arunachal Pradesh. Exact population number in Arunachal Pradesh is not yet available. For further survey, probable area of distribution will be India (Nagaland, Mizoram, Manipur, Tripura, Meghalaya) and Bangladesh. No subspecies demarcation is available with request to geographic area of the species. Status is based on actual sightings only. Further research is required for accurate evidence of the status. |
| Sources | Blyth, 1843; Choudhury, 1989; CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99; Napier, 1985; SAZARC, 2002 Biological Information Sheet (2002): J. Biswas, R. Medhi CAMP questionnaire on protected areas (2002): S.S. Chandiramani, W.G. Momin |
| Compilers | J. Biswas, J. Bose, D. Chetry, J. Das, M. M. Feeroz, Awadesh Kumar, R. Medhi, S. Mitra |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, D. Chetry, J. Das, A. Eudey, S. Mitra, M.S. Pradhan |
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Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus in India from literature and recent field studies

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | Pop. Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDIA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arunachal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pradesh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Changlang |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Namdapha NP | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | S.S. Chandiramani, 2002 |
| Deban, Gibbon's and Haldibari | - | - | 177 | E | Poaching (P/Pr/F), encroachment (F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | American Society of Primatolo gists, 2002 |
| Assam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Konshnong | $25^{\circ} 30$ | $94^{\circ} 31$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Collected on 1 Aug 1920, Napier, 1985 |
| Dibrugarh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dibrugarh | $27^{\circ} 29$ | $94^{\circ} 54$ | - | TVE | - |  | - | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Jorhat <br> Jorhat RF | $26^{\circ} 45$ | $94^{\circ 13}$ | - | TWE | - |  | - | 59 | 29 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Karbi Anglong |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bokajan PRF | $26^{\circ} 00$ | $93^{\circ} 43$ | 9.81 | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Borjuri PRF | - | - | 214.88 | SE | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 12 | 8 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Borlander DCRF | - | - | - | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Daldali RF | - | - | 123.33 | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Dhansiri RF | - | - | 70.39 | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Disama RF | - | - | 11.25 | SE | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Dolamara PRF | - | - | 5.53 | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 8 | 7 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Englonggiri DCRF | - | - | - | SE | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), | Decline | Decline | 6 | 5 | IUSPP Annual reports |

Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus in India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre <br> Past <br> \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hafjan PRF | - | - | - | Mx | deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) <br> Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), <br> habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), <br> deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Haithapahar | - | - | 54.39 | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Jungthung RF DCRF | - | - | 32.57 | SE | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 5 | 5 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Kalaphar PRF | - | - | 9.77 | SE | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Kalioni RF | - | - | 209.79 | Mx | Hunting and killing ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 4 | 4 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Kaziranga PRF | $\sim 26{ }^{\circ} 37$ | $\sim 93^{\circ} 18$ | 33.88 | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), jhooming ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 4 | 3 | IUSPP, Annual reports |
| Khonbamon RF | - | - | - | SE | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), jhooming ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 8 | 6 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Langlakso PRF | - | - | 534.68 | SE | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), jhooming ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 15 | 12 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Longnit DCRF | - | - | 117.62 | SE | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 10 | 8 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Mahamaya DCRF | - | - | - | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 10 | 7 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Mikir Hills RF | $\sim 26{ }^{\circ} 25$ | $\sim 93^{\circ} 20$ | 299.79 | - | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 6 | 5 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Miyungdisa DCRF | - | - | - | SE | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Nambor North block RF | - | - | 53.09 | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), jhooming ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 10 | 7 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Nambor West | - | - | 166.33 | Mx | Hunting and killing ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |

Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus in India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { Area } \\ \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{array}$ | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | Pop. tr <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Patradisa DCRF | - | - | 32.57 | Mx | deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), | Decline | Decline | 3 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Tikok PRF | - | - | 25.89 | SE | deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) <br> Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), <br> habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), <br> deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Western Mikir Hills RF | - | - | 39.36 | SE | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 6 | 5 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Khasi Hills <br> Laitkynsao | $25^{\circ} 12$ | $91^{\circ} 40$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Napier, 1985 |
| Naga Hills Mokokchung | 26019 | $94^{\circ} 31$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Napier, 1985 |
| North Cachar Hills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borail PRF | - | - | 17.6 | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Borail RF | - | - | 15.90 | SE | Hunting and killing ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), habitat destruction ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Khurimming RF | - | - | 108.41 | E | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), | Decline | Decline | 3 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Langting Mupa RF | $25^{\circ} 30$ | $90^{\circ} 07$ | 493.35 | E | deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), <br> deforestation (P/Pr/F) ihooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Parimur PRF | - | - |  | Mx | Hunting and killing (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), deforestation (P/Pr/F), jhooming (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Sibsagar | $26^{\circ} 58$ | $94^{\circ} 39$ | - | TWE | - | - | - | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Tinsukhia | $27^{\circ} 30$ | $95^{\circ} 22$ | - | TWE | - |  | - | 91 | 68 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Meghalaya Garo Hills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tura | $25^{\circ} 32$ | $90^{\circ} 14$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Adult male collected on 24 Feb 1920 and a juvenile on 8 Mar 1920. Napier, 1985 |

Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus pileatus in India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats <br> Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South Garo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Balpakram NP | - | - | 220 | E,MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | 65 | 41 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Nokrek NP | - | - | 47.4 | E, MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | 25 | 16 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Rewak |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W.G. Momin, 2002 |
| Siju WLS | $25^{\circ} 32$ | $90^{\circ} 14$ | 5.18 | E,MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | 31 | 16 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Songsek Tasek | $25^{\circ} 38$ | $90^{\circ} 35$ | 23.3 | E, MD | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (F) | Decline | Decline | 16 | 10 | IUSPP Annual reports |

E-Evergreen forest, MD - Moist Deciduous forest, Mx - Mixed forest, SE - Semi-evergreen forest, TWE - Tropical Wet Evergreen forest

| Synonyms | Pithecus pileatus tenebricus Hinton, 1923 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Assamese: Tupimuria bandar; Bengali: Topi banar; Bodo: Golija makhre; Hindi: Topi wala bandar, English: Capped Langur, Tenebrous Capped Leaf Monkey |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Habit | Predominantly arboreal, diurnal, folivorous |
| Habitat | Subtropical forest, broad-leaved forest, evergreen forest, deciduous forest |
| Niche | Top and middle canopy dweller. |
| Elevation | 100-2,000m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Bhutan, India |
| Extent of Occurrence | >20,000 km ${ }^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | 501-2,000 km ${ }^{2}$ [Bhutan $=<500 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$; India $\left.=<500 \mathrm{~km}^{2}\right]$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | <50 / <100 [Bhutan $=$ <20; India $=<30]$. Fragmented |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area in the past (rate of deline and period not given) and is predicted to decrease in future (rate of deline and period not given) due to habitat destruction, firewood collection and hunting. Decrease in quality due to loss of fruiting trees. |
| Threats | Crop plantations, grazing, shifting agriculture, timber, roads, soil loss/erosion, deforestation, hunting for traditional medicine and food, poisoning, hooking, human interference, habitat loss. |
| Trade | Local trade for fur, meat, tail for food and medicine and whole animal for pets and zoos. Trade for food is resulting in population decline. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 9-12 years |
| Total population | <900 [Bhutan $=$ <500; India $=$ <400] |
| Mature individuals | <550 [Bhutan $=$ <300; India $=$ <250] |
| Population trend | Declining by $>30 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 10 years. |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, literature; suspected; minimum/maximum |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED C2a(i) |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered A1cd, C2a |
| Rationale | Restricted area of occupancy of less than $2,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ in South Asia along with a population estimate of <600 mature individuals makes this taxon Endangered according to criterion C. The taxon also faces considerable threat from humans and has declined in numbers in the wild, mostly in India. |
| National Status | Bhutan: Endangered C2a(i) <br> The Bhutan population is more contiguous, but since it is restricted in distribution and in numbers, the taxon is categorised as Endangered as it faces some threats. The status is retained as such in Bhutan as the population is relatively healthy compared to the neighbouring Indian population. <br> India: <br> Endangered B2ab(i,ii,iii,iv,v); C1+2a(i) 个 Critically Endangered <br> The indian population of this taxon is fragmented and under tremendous human pressure. The restricted taxon with few numbers is also declining drastically, making the situation more critical in India. Hence the status within the country is upgraded to Critically Endangered. |
| Justification | New / better information avaialable at the workshop |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | India: Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix I |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| Bhutan | Royal Manas NP |
| India | Arunachal Pradesh: Eagle Nest WLS, Pakhui WLS Assam: Manas NP, Nameri NP |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomy, life history, survey studies, limiting factor research |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, monitoring, public education, limiting factor management |
| Captive stocks | 12 zoos in India (8.5.0.13). Subspecies not known |
| Comments | Extensive survey and proper documentation of the subspecies is urgently needed. Distribution of the T. pileatus pileatus and T.p. durga subspecies are not clear due to many overlapping localites and poor taxonomic studies. |
| Sources | CZA, 2000-2001; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2001; Napier, 1985; IUSPP Annual Reports, 1994-99; SAZARC, 2002; Solanki and Kumar, 2000 Biological Information Sheet (2002): J. Biswas CAMP questionnaire on protected areas (2002): C. Loma |
| Compilers | J. Biswas, J. Bose, D. Chetry, J. Das, M.M. Feeroz, Awadesh Kumar, R. Medhi, S. Mitra, G.S. Solanki |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, D. Chetry, J. Das, A. Eudey |

## Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus in Bhutan and India


Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus in Bhutan and India from literature and recent field studies

Distribution of Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus in Bhutan and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Area } \\ \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Goalpara |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Moghahar RF | - | - | 16.5 | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline 5 yrs. | Decline 5 yrs. | 13 | 8 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Ronguli RF | - | - | - | SE, MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline <br> 5 yrs. | Decline 5 yrs. | 19 | 11 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Kamrup |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bogranadi | - | - | - | ${ }_{-}$ | $\cdots$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | - | - | One adult female on 4 Jan 1921 and a juvenile male on 14 Jan 1921 as been collected at an elevation of 909 m and 606 m elevation respectively. Napier, 1985 |
| Gorbhanga RF | - | - | 11.4 | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 8 | 6 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Jorsal RF | - | - | 12.5 | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 9 | 6 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Kulsi Plantation RF | $\sim 25^{\circ} 50$ | $\sim 91^{\circ} 20$ | 0.2 | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 6 | 5 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Kuwasingh RF | - | - | 0.9 | SE/B | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 6 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Matanga River | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | ${ }^{-}$ | One adult male has been collected from this region at an elevation of 364 m . On 31 Dec 1920. Napier, 1985 |
| Pantan RF | - | - |  | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 9 | 5 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Ranni RF | - | - | 43.69 | MD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 11 | 9 | IUSPP Annual reports |
| Sonitpur Nameri NP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Balepong | $\sim 27^{\circ} 01$ |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | G.S. Solanki \& A. Kumar pers. comm. |
| 2. Hathiputi Gate | - | - | 4.5 | SD, Dg | - | Decline | Decline | 25 | 19 | G.S. Solanki \& A. Kumar pers. comm. |

B - Bamboo forest, MD - Moist Deciduous forest, MxD - Mixed Deciduous forest, SD - Semi-deciduous forest, SE - Semi-evergreen forest

| Synonyms | Presbytis senex monticola Kelaart, 1850 <br> Presbytis cephalopterus var. monticola Kelaart, 1850 <br> Presbytis ursinus Blyth, 1851 <br> Pithecus vetulus monticola Phillips, 1936 <br> Kasi senex monticola Pocock, 1939 <br> Kasi vetulus monticola HIII, 1939 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Sinhalese: Kalu Wandura; Tamil: Mundi Kurangu; English: Bear monkey, Purplefaced Langur, Montane Purple-faced Langur, Purple-faced Leaf Monkey |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | A large high mountain subspecies. Despite its common designation of "purplefaced" there is no purple colour in this species. The face is black in all subspecies. |
| Habit | Folivorous, diurnal, arboreal |
| Habitat | Montane (hill country) tropical rain forest |
| Elevation | 1,000-2,200m. |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Endemic to Sri Lanka |
| Extent of Occurrence | $3,200 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. Protected areas only $265 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | $>2,350 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. Possibly higher if unprotected natural forests habitats, that have not yet been surveyed (e.g, Boga Valley) are included. |
| Locations/Subpopulations | 34 / Not known. Fragmented. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>50 \%$ in the last 42 years or more and is predicted to decrease by $>10 \%$ in the next 10 years due to encroachment for plantations and agricultural crops. Decrease in quality due to destruction of critical food plants, refuges, and travel routes. Increased forest fragmentation will prevent genetic exchange among scattered subpopulations. |
| Threats | Deforestation, fragmentation and habitat loss (crop plantation, development, human settlement) and hunting for subsistence or small scale cash. <br> According to government data, during 42 years (1956-1993), the country has lost $50 \%$ of its forest cover, and more than $50 \%$ if the last 10 years (1994-2003) is included. In addition, $80 \%$ of hill country forests were lost to tea plantations in the 19th century. There is a close relationship between loss of critical habitat and population number. |
| Trade | Local and domestic trade for meat and skin. Locally pocketed and isolated groups are prone to extinction owed to village-level subsistence exploitation. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | Not known but estimated at 8-14 years |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | >10,000 |
| Population trend | Total population and mature individuals are declining by $>50 \%$ in 3 generations and is predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 10 years. In the last 200 years, the population has declined by at least $80 \%$. |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study, informal sightings, indirect information, museum records, literature, hearsay/belief; observed; 95\% confidence |


| Status |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED A2cd+4cd; B1ab(ii,iii,iv,v) |
| Rationale | The Montane Purple-faced Leaf Monkey occurs only in restricted forests tracts of Sri Lanka most of which is threatened due to human interference (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation over the years has depleted the area available for this dryzone taxon and restricted it to several small pockets. From 1956 - 1993 Sri Lanka lost more than $50 \%$ of forest cover to human activities, followed by a similar rate of decline in the remaining forest cover between 1994 and 2003. Correlating loss of habitat to populations, arte of decline in population is inferred at more than $50 \%$ over 3 generations. Also due to continuing trends past and predicted declines could reduce the population by more than $50 \%$ within the next 11 to 22 years due to continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat along with actual and potential levels of exploitation of the species observed in the wild. <br> The taxon is also threatened due to its restricted distribution of less than $3200 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ extent of occurrence and continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat, number of locations and in the number of mature individuals, the latter two inferred from threats to habitat and population from degradation and hunting, respectively. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered A1cd |
| Justification | New / better information avaialable at the workshop. |
| Uncertainty | Assessment based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and based on the consensus of the whole working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance Act No. 49 of 1993. Only endemic species, not listed as a protected species by law. |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Protected Areas | Central Province: Peak Wilderness Sanctuary, Horton Plains NP, Hakgala Nature Reserve, Victoria, Randenigala, Rantembe Sanctuary |
| Recommendations Research | Survey, genetics, taxonomy, ecology, behaviour, lifehistory, epidemiology, limiting factor (trade) |
| Management | Habitat management, limiting factor management, monitoring. Implementation of legal status is a priority. |
| Comments | Captive stocks are not a viable alternative to natural conservation. Preserve the taxon's natural habitat and allow normal reproduction to occur in the wild. Captive breeding is difficult owed to dietary constraints, and poor prospects for successful reintroduction and is not recommended. Techniques not known to propagate this taxon. |
| Sources | Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2001, IUCN Sri Lanka, 2000 <br> Ecological and Distributional Data (in alphabetical order): <br> IUCN Sri Lanka, Biodiversity Field Research team (data communicated by R. <br> Somaweera through workshop participants). <br> National Conservation Review (NCR) 1997 data as analyzed by J.D.S. Dela Primate Biology Program, Smithsonian Institution and Institute of Fundamental Studies: original data from W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe. University of Jaffna: W. Wijeyamohan |
| Compilers | Chief editors: J. Dela, W. Dittus, A. Watson <br> Working group: J. Dela, W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, R. Somaweera, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe, S. Wijeyamohan |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, W. Dittus, J. Dela, A. Eudey, A. Watson |


Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus monticola in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies

Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus monticola in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area $\left(k m^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. <br> Past <br> \%/yr | d <br> Future <br> \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pattipola | $06^{\circ} 51$ | $80^{\circ} 50$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Pedro | $06^{\circ} 55$ | $81^{\circ} 07$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | NCR data. Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Piduruthalagala | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Pussellawa - NE | $06^{\circ} 54$ | $81^{\circ} 15$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | NCR data. Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Rozelle | $\sim 06^{\circ} 58$ | $\sim 80^{\circ} 36$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Wattawela |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Nuwara Eliya | $06^{\circ} 58$ | $80^{\circ} 46$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Sabaragamuwa Province Ratnapura |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Upper Belihul Oya |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Uva Province Badulla |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Badulla | $06^{\circ} 58$ | $81^{\circ} 02$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Bandarawela | $06^{\circ} 49$ | $80^{\circ} 58$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Diyatalawa | $06^{\circ} 47$ | $80^{\circ} 58$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |
| Namunukula | $06^{\circ} 55$ | $81^{\circ} 07$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Participants from Sri Lanka |


| Synonyms | Kasi senex nestor Pocock, 1939 <br> Kasi vetulus Hill, 1936 <br> Kasi vetulus nestor Hill, 1939 <br> Pithecus vetulus nestor Phillips, 1935 <br> Pithecus vetulus phillipsi Hinton, 1923 <br> Presbytis senex nestor Bennet, 1935 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Sinhala: Kalu Wandura; Tamil: Karung Kurangu; English: Purple-faced Langur, Purple-faced Leaf Monkey, Western Purple-faced Langur |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | Wet-zone subspecies, from north of Kalu Ganga, Sri Lanka. Despite its common designation of "purple-faced" there is no purple color in this species. The face is black in all subspecies. |
| Habit | Diurnal, arboreal, folivore (natural), Refugee population feed heavily on fruits in urbanized habitats. Original forest population believed to be mainly folivorous like other subspecies of this species. |
| Habitat | Lowland tropical rain forest (natural), refugee populations presently inhabit semiurban and rural home gardens, rubber plantation and areas with adequate canopy cover where these have replaced the original natural forest. |
| Elevation | Up to $1,000 \mathrm{~m}$. |
| Distribution Global | Endemic to Sri Lanka |
| Extent of Occurrence | $4,200 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ |
| Area of Occupancy | 1,900 $\mathrm{km}^{2}$, although only $<4 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ are natural forests |
| Locations/Subpopulations | Many ( 3 if only viable forests are considered). Fragmented. Continuous decline observed. Decline of subpopulations in home gardens and plantations by $50-80 \%$ in 10 years. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>50 \%$ in the last 10 years and is predicted to decline by $>80 \%$ in the next 10 years due to urbanization and development (the range already lacks natural forest). Decrease in quality due to fragmentation, reduction or loss of area, loss of quantity and diversity of food supply, refuges and travel routes between subpopulations. |
| Threats | Crop plantations, development (infrastructure, industry), human settlement, defores tation, fragmentation, illegal trade for food, pylon collision, habitat loss |
| Trade | Local trade at village level for meat but not significant |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 8-14 years |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | >10,000 |
| Population trend | Total population and mature individuals are declining by $>50 \%$ in the last 11 years or $>80 \%$ in 3 generations and is predicted to decline by $>80 \%$ in the next 10 years. |
| Data source | Census or monitoring, field study, informal sightings, indirect information; inferred; minimum values |
| 330 | South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. Report, 2003 |


| Status | CRITICALLY ENDANGERED |
| :--- | :--- |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | The purple-faced langur occurs in the wet zone of Sri Lanka most of which is <br> Rationale <br> threatened due to human interference (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation <br> over the years has depleted the area available for this dry-zone taxon and restricted it |
| to several small pockets. From 1956 - 1993 Sri Lanka lost more than 50\% of forest |  |
| cover to human activities, followed by a similar rate of decline in the remaining forest |  |
| cover between 1994 and 2003. Correlating loss of habitat to populations, rate of |  |
| decline in population is inferred at more than 80\% over 3 generations. Also due to |  |
| continuing trends past and predicted declines could reduce the population by more |  |
| than 50\% within the next 11 to 22 years due to continuing decline in area, extent and |  |
| quality of habitat along with actual and potential levels of exploitation of the species |  |
| observed in the wild. A decline of more than 80\% in the next three generations is |  |
| predicted. |  |


Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus nestor in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies



| Synonyms | Presbytis senex senex Erxleben, 1777 <br> Pithecus philbricki Philips, 1927 <br> Kasi senex senex Pocock, 1939 <br> Kasi vetulus philbricki Hill, 1939 <br> Presbytis senex harti Deraniyagala, 1955 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Sinhalese: Kalu Wandura; Tamil: Mundhi Kurungu; English: Purple-faced Langur, Dry Zone Purple-faced Langur, Northern Purple-faced Langur |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Notes on taxonomy | This is the subspecies formerly called Presbytis senex senex until Napier (1985) revised the nomenclature. Despite its common designation of "purple-faced" there is no purple color in this species. The face is black in all subspecies. |
| Habit | Diurnal, arboreal, folivorous |
| Habitat | Dry evergreen forests (Tropical monsoon and deciduous dry forest). Confined to moister areas of dry zone with tall closed forest canopy near permanent sources of water. |
| Niche | Diurnal, arboreal, folivorous. through dry zone but locally confined to moister tall stature forests |
| Elevation | Up to 800 m . |
| Distribution |  |
| Global | Endemic to Sri Lanka |
| Extent of Occurrence | $19,900 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. Only $2,500 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ of good high forests estimated to be left, but only a fraction of this (the moister areas) are suitable for the taxon. |
| Area of Occupancy | $3,300 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ |
| Locations/Subpopulations | 34 / Not known. Fragmented. Only the tall stature moister areas are suitable, therefore area of occupancy is far less than indicated. Decline in locations/sub populations in concert with habitat decline. Extreme fluctuations unknown, but probable in relation to periodic cylones especially in the north east of Sri Lanka. Cyclones wreak most damage to this subspecies niche of upper forest canopy as has been shown at Polonnaruwa. |
| Habitat status | Decrease in area by $>50 \%$ in the last 40 years or more and is predicted to decline by $>10 \%$ in the next 10 years due to development, agriculture, deforestation (habitat loss). Decrease in quality due to loss of natural food plants, refugia and routes of travel for genetic exchange among isolated population fragments. Plantations and home gardens offer no long term survival prospects. |
| Threats | Shifting agriculture, deforestation, human settlement, development, hunting for food, habitat loss, occasional cyclones in far northeastern areas of range. <br> According to government data, during 42 years (1956-1992), the country has lost $50 \%$ of its forest cover, but more than $50 \%$ if the last 10 years (1994-2003) is included. The Mahaweli Development Scheme after 1978 had further reduced available habitat for this taxon. There is a close relationship between loss of critical |

habitat and population number as this species is arboreal.

| Trade | Local trade for meat and skin. Hunted mainly for subsistence living and trade at local village level. Skin in some areas are used to make drums. This may lead to extinction of subpopulations. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 8-14 years |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Total population and mature individuals declined by $>50 \%$ over 3 generations and is predicted to decrease by $20-30 \%$ in the next 10 years. In the last 200 years, the population has declined by $80 \%$. |
| Data Source | Census or monitoring, field study, informal sightings, indirect information; inferred |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED A2cd+4cd |
| Rationale | This subspecies of the purple-faced monkey is threatened due to human interfer ence (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation over the years has depleted the area available for this dry-zone taxon and restricted it to several small pockets. From 1956 - 1993 Sri Lanka lost more than $50 \%$ of forest cover to human activities, followed by a similar rate of decline in the remaining forest cover between 1994 and 2003. Correlating loss of habitat to populations, arte of decline in population is inferred at more than $50 \%$ over 3 generations. Also due to continuing trends past and predicted declines could reduce the population by more than $50 \%$ within the next 11 to 22 years due to continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat along with actual and potential levels of exploitation of the species observed in the wild. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered A1cd |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Protected under the Flora and Fauna Protection Ordinance Act No. 49 of 1993 |
| CITES | Appendix II, at the species level |
| Presence in Protected areas |  |
|  | Central Province: Knuckles FR (east) |
|  | North Central Province: Angamedilla NP, Anuradhapura Sanctuary, Flood Plains NP, Kaudulla NP, Minneriya-Giritale NP, Mihintale Sanctuary, Moragaswewa NP, Polonnaruwa Sanctuary, Ritigala Strict Nature Reserve, Somawathie NP, Wasgamova NP <br> North Western Province: Wilpattu NP <br> Uva Province: Madura Oya NP |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Taxonomic research, life history, survey, limiting factor research, epidemiology, trade, zoogeography, population genetics, ecology, behaviour |
| Management | Habitat management, monitoring, limiting factor management, PHVA, implementa tion of extant laws a priority |
| Comments | Preserve their natural habitat and allow natural reproduction take its course in the |

wild. Captive breeding is difficult owed to dietary constraints, and poor prospects for successful reintroduction and is not recommended. The fact these highly arboreal langurs are locally restricted to moist tall forests (e.g., riverine) indicates a numerical presence far less than would be suggested by total natural forest cover in the dry zone of Sri Lanka. Hunting of this taxon for subsistence and local (village level) trade is common. Notably, this taxon has not been seen in Ruhuna NP (Blocks 1and2)

| Sources | Dittus, 1985; Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor, 2000; IUCN Sri Lanka, 2000 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Ecological and distributional data (in alphabetical order): |
|  | IUCN Sri Lanka, Biodiversity Field Research team (data communicated by R. |
|  | Somaweera through workshop participants). |
|  | National Conservation Review (NCR) 1997 data as analysed by J.D.S. Dela |
|  | Primate Biology Program, Smithsonian Institution and Institute of Fundamental |
|  | Studies: original data from W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, |
|  | A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe. |
|  | University of Jaffna: S. Wijeyamohan |
| Biological Information Sheet (2002): W. Dittus |  |
| Compilers | Chief editors: J. Dela, W. Dittus, A. Watson |
|  | Working group: J. Dela, W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, R. |
| Somaweera, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe, S. Wijeyamohan |  |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, W. Dittus, J. Dela, A. Eudey, A. Watson |

## Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki


Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies

Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus philbricki in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued


| Synonyms | Cercopithecus vetulus Erxleben, 1777 <br> Presbytis senex vetulus Erxleben, 1777 <br> Cercopithecus kephalopterus Zimmermann, 1780 <br> Cercopithecus cephalopterus Boddaert, 1785 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Simia veter Shaw, 1800 <br> Cercopithecus latibarbatus E. Geoffroy, 1812 <br> Cercopithecus leucoprymnus Otto, 1825 |  |
| Semnopithecus fulvogriseus Desmoulins, 1825 <br> Presbytis cephalopterus Kelaart, 1856 <br> Semnopithecus kelaarti Schlegel, 1876 <br> Kasi senex vetulus Pocock, 1939 <br> Pithecus vetulus vetulus Pocock, 1939 |  |
| Family | Cercopithecidae |
| Common names | Sinhala: Kalu Wandura; Tamil: Mundi Kurangu; English: Purple-faced Leaf Monkey, |
| Purple-faced Langur, Southern Lowland Wetzone Purple-faced langur |  |


|  | lost $50 \%$ of its forest cover, and more than $50 \%$ if the last 10 years (1994-2003) is included. There is a $1: 1$ relationship between loss of critical habitat and population number. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Trade | Local trade for meat for food and pelage for making drums at village level for subsistence. |
| Population |  |
| Generation time | 8-14 years |
| Total population | Not known |
| Mature individuals | Not known |
| Population trend | Total population and mature individuals declining by $50 \%$ or more over 3 genera tions and is predicted to decline by $<10 \%$ in the next 10 years. |
| Data source | Informal sightings, indirect information, inferences, observed; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED A2cd+4cd |
| Rationale | The Southern Lowland Wet Zone Purple-faced Monkey is threatened due to human interference (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation over the years has depleted the area available for this dry-zone taxon and restricted it to several small pockets. From 1956 - 1993 Sri Lanka lost more than $50 \%$ of forest cover to human activities, followed by a similar rate of decline in the remaining forest cover between 1994 and 2003. Correlating loss of habitat to populations, arte of decline in population is inferred at more than $50 \%$ in the last 33 years ( 3 generations). Also due to continuing trends past and predicted declines could reduce the population by more than $50 \%$ within the next 11 to 22 years due to continuing decline in area, extent and quality of habitat along with actual and potential levels of exploitation of the species observed in the wild. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered A1cd |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Protected under the Flora and Fauna Protection Ordinance 1937 as amended by Act 1993 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected areas |  |
| Sri Lanka | Sabaragamuwa Province: Udawalawe NP (near permanent water only), Peak Wilderness (Ratnapura sector), Gilimale-Eratne Conserved Forest, Morahela Conserved Forest, Sinharaja Conserved Forest (NWHS) Forest Reserve Southern Province: Dombaghakanda Forest Reserve, Kekunadara Conserved Forest, Oliyagankale Conserved Forest, Heycodi Conserved Forest, KombalaKottawale Conserved Forest, Kauneliya Conserved Forest, Messava Conserved Forest, Nahiti-Mukalana Conserved Forest, Detwale Conserved Forest |
| Recommendations |  |
| Research | Genetics, taxonomy, life history, survey, ecology and behavioural studies |
| Management | Habitat management, public education, government education, implementation of extant conservation laws |


| Captive stocks | Probably, but subspecies status is uncertain, In any case, captive breeding is not recommended as a conservation strategy. Techiques not known to propagate this taxon. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Comments | This is the southerly wet-zone subspecies. Historically, it was found in the rainforest from south of the Kalu Ganga to about Ranna, ascending to nearly $1,000 \mathrm{~m}$. Its current distribution is more restricted and fragmented. Preserve their natural habitat and allow natural reproduction take its course. Where the subspecies lives near man, it may be considered as pest. Possible local home gardens and plantation extinction of pocketed social groups or subpopulations owed to village level exploitation and killing as pests. <br> Captive breeding is difficult owed to dietary constraints, and poor prospects for successful reintroduction and is not recommended. The forest areas in which the subspecies occurs in is very small, the largest being Sinharaja which is 11187 ha. Other than for Sinharaja CF, all mentioned conserved forests have minimal protec tion. |
| Sources | Groves, 2001; Hilton-Taylor (Compiler), 2001; IUCN Sri Lanka, 2000 <br> Ecological and Distribution data (in alphabetical order): <br> IUCN Sri Lanka, Biodiversity Field Research team (data communicated by R. <br> Somaweera through workshop participants). <br> National Conservation Review (NCR) 1997 data as analysed by J.D.S. Dela Primate Biology Program, Smithsonian Institution and Institute of Fundamental Studies: original data from W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe. <br> University of Jaffna: S. Wijeyamohan |
| Compilers | Chief editors: J. Dela, W. Dittus, A. Watson <br> Working group: J. Dela, W. Dittus, S. Gunatillake, N. Kodithuwakku, K. Liyanage, A. Watson, N. Weerasinghe, S. Wijeyamohan |
| Reviewers | D. Brandon-Jones, W. Dittus, J. Dela, A. Eudey, A. Watson |

## Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus


Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies

Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued

Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued

Distribution of Trachypithecus vetulus vetulus in Sri Lanka from literature and recent field studies ... continued

R - Rain forest, Sw - Swamp forest

| Synonyms | Simia golock (Bechstein, 1795) <br> Hylobates fuscus (Wilson Lewis, 1834) <br> Simia hoolock (Harlan, 1834) <br> Hylobates choromandus (Ogilby, 1837) <br> Hylobates scyritus (Ogilby, 1840) <br> Hylobates hoolock (Blanford, 1881-1891) <br> Hylobates hoolock hoolock (Groves, 1967) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Family | Hylobatidae |
| Level of assessment | Subspecies |
| Common names | Assamese: Holou bandar; Bengali: Ulluk; Bilaspuri: Bonmanush; Bodo: Hulu <br> makhra; Garo: Heru, Huru; Hindi: Uluk; Karbi: Jambli, Kinghoiduk; Khasi: Hulu, <br> Hulaing; Manipuri: Yommu; Mizo: Hahuk; Nepali: Bon Manchhe; Rai: Sokpha; <br> Rankhol: Saha; Riang: Hulao; Rongmi: Paang; Rukni: Hoolau; English: Western |
| Hoolock, Hoolock Gibbon |  |


| Total population | <750 [Bangladesh $=<140$; India $=<610$ ] |
| :---: | :---: |
| Mature individuals | <450 [Bangladesh $=<80$; India $=<370$ ] |
| Population trend | Declined by $>50 \%$ in the last 50 years ( 3 generations) and is predicted to decline by $>50 \%$ in the next 50 years. |
| Data Source | Census or monitoring, field study, informal sightings, indirect information, museum records, literature, hearsay/belief; observed; 95\% confidence |
| Status |  |
| SAP CAMP (Ver. 3.1) | ENDANGERED in South Asia A2abcd+3bcd; C1+2a(i) |
| Rationale | The Hoolock Gibbon is found in around 126 locations and 97 subpopulations in India and Bangladesh, most of which is threatened due to human interference (see under threats). Habitat fragmentation over the years has depleted the area available for this habitat-specific taxon and restricted it to several small pockets that are nonviable. Hunting along with habitat degradation has been observed to reduce the population of Hoolock Gibbon in South Asia by more than $50 \%$ in the last 50 years (3 generations) due to continuing decline in extent of occurrence, area of occupancy and quality of habitat along with exploitation of the taxon in the wild. The rate of decline is also predicted to continue at the same level over the next 50 years ( 3 generations) since more habitat destruction is predicted for human settlements, increasing population, refugee problems, encroachments and hunting. The number of mature individuals is around 440 in South Asia, with no subpopulations having more than 250 mature individuals and a continuing decline of over $20 \%$ over 2 generations. The South Asian population is bigger than the few individuals found in Myanmar, hence the status is retained as Endangered. |
| 2001 Red List (Ver. 2.3) | Endangered (globally) A1cd |
| National Status | Bangladesh: Critically Endangered C1+2a(i) <br> The population within Bangladesh is severely fragmented and there are no migrations between the neighbouring populations. Since the threats to the taxon are high, the restricted and small population is under severe threat. The category of Critically Endangered is therefore retained for the population within the country. India: <br> Endangered <br> A2abcd+3bcd; C1+2a(i) <br> The Indian population of this taxon, which is fragmented from the Bangladesh or Myanmar populations is further fragmented into many non-viable remnants, which due to threats to habitat, are highly threatened. Hence the category of Endangered is retained for this taxon in India. |
| Uncertainty | The assessment is based on full range of plausible values, evidentiary and with full consensus of all participants of the working group. |
| Wildlife Legislation | Bangladesh: Schedule III, Bangladesh Wildlife (Preservation) (Amendment) Act, 1974. <br> India: Schedule I, Part I, Indian Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 amended up to 2002 |
| CITES | Appendix II |
| Presence in Protected Areas |  |
| Bangladesh | Chittagong: Chunati WLS Sylhet: Lawachara WLS |
| India | Arunachal Pradesh: Kamlang WLS, Mehao WLS, Namdapha NP <br> Assam: Bherjan WLS, Borajan WLS, Dibru-Saikhowa NP, Garampani WLS, Gibbon WLS, Kaziranga NP <br> Meghalaya: Balpakram NP, Nokrek NP, Nongkhylem WLS, Siju WLS |
| 350 | South Asian Primate C.A.M.P. Report, 2003 |

Mizoram: Dampa WLS, Khawnglung WLS, Murlen NP, Nengpui WLS, Phawangpui WLS
Nagaland : Intanki NP
Tripura: Gumti WLS, Sepahijala WLS, Trishna WLS

| Recommendations <br> Research | Genetic research, life history, survey studies, ecological studies |
| :--- | :--- |
| Management | Habitat management, wild population management, public education, limiting factor <br> management, participatory management plan, PHVA |
| Captive stocks | 5zoos in India (3.5.0.8) and 3 zoos in Bangladesh (3.3.0.6). A coordinated Species <br>  <br> Management Program is recommended for South Asia. |
| Comments | The Hoolock population in South Asia is extremely fragmented throughout the range. |
|  | An effective management plan for conservation is needed for this species. Some <br> areas with good population should be declared as Gibbon Sanctuary. An extensive <br> survey for gibbons in Arunachal Pradesh is needed especially in high altitudes. |
|  | Population in Bangladesh is declining in all areas except in West Bhanugach Forest |
|  | Reserve, which supports 10 groups of gibbons. The population has increased in |
| this area during the last 10 years and this is the only habitat in the country support- |  |
| ing the largest gibbon population (M.M. Feeroz, BIS) |  |

## Distribution range of Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock in Bangladesh and India


Distribution of Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area $\left(\mathrm{km}^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tr Past \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BANGLADESH Chittagong |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chittagong Chunathi WLS | $21^{\circ} 58$ | $92^{\circ} 04$ | 11 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 12 | 8 | Ahsan, 1994; Feeroz, 1991, 1999a; Feeroz \& Islam, 1992; Feeroz, et al., 1995 |
| Hazarikhil | - | - | 6 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F), hunting (Pr) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | Ahsan, 1994; Feeroz, 1999a |
| Kaptai | $22^{\circ} 21$ | $92^{\circ} 17$ | 5 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (F) | Decline | Decline | 5 | 4 | Feeroz et al., 1995; <br> M. Farid Ahsan pers. comm. |
| Pablakhali | $23^{\circ} 16$ | $92^{\circ} 05$ | 5 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment ( $F$ ) | Decline | Decline | 2-4 | - | Feeroz et al., 1995; <br> M. Farid Ahsan pers. comm. |
| Padua | $22^{\circ} 03$ | $92^{\circ} 07$ | 5 | SE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | Feeroz et al., 1995; M.M. Feeroz pers. comm. |
| Satghar | $\sim 27^{\circ} 00$ | $\sim 92^{\circ} 00$ | 6 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 6 | 4 | Feeroz \& Islam, 1992; Ahsan, 1994 |
| Cox's Bazar Bhomarighona | - | - | 12 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (Pr/F), selective logging (Pr) | Decline | Decline | 7 | 4 | Ahsan, 1994; Feeroz, et al., 1995 |
| Himchari | - | - | 6 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | Feeroz et al., 1995; Feeroz, 1999a; M. Farid Ahsan pers. comm. |
| Nila | - | - | 5 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (F) | Decline | Decline | 4 | 2 | Feeroz et al., 1995 |
| Teknaf | - | - | - | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (Pr/F), fragmentation (Pr) |  | - | 4 | - | Das et al., 2002a |
| Ukhia | $21^{\circ} 15$ | $92^{\circ} 07$ | 6 | E | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 6 | 4 | Feeroz, 1999a |
| Sylhet Hobigang |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shatchari | - | - | 8 | SE, BLME | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (F) |  | Decline | 9 | 6 | Feeroz, 1999a |
| Moulvi Bazar |  |  |  | SE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adampur | $23^{\circ} 18$ | $89^{\circ} 52$ | 10 | SE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (Pr), timber plantation (Pr) |  | Decline | 7 | 5 | Feeroz, 1999a; <br> M. Farid Ahsan pers. comm. |
| Horinchana | - | - | 11 | SE, TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (Pr) |  | Decline | 6 | 4 | Feeroz, 1999a |
| Lawachara WLS | $24^{\circ} 32$ | $91^{\circ} 47$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Largest population in Bangladesh. M.M. Feeroz, BIS |

Distribution of Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pathalia RF | $24^{\circ} 11$ | $24^{\circ} 31$ | 10 | SE, TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (Pr) |  | Decline | 7 | 4 | Feeroz, 1999a, M.M. Feeroz, pers. comm. M. Farid Ahsan, pers. comm. |
| Rajkandi | - | - | 8 | SE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) encroachment (P/Pr), timber plantation (Pr) | - | Decline | 5 | 4 | Feeroz, 1999a |
| West Bhanugach FR | $24^{\circ} 21$ | $91^{\circ} 48$ | 20 | SE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), <br> Encroachment(Pr), <br> gas field exploration (Pr), tourism (F) | - | Decline | 33 | 19 | Ahsan, 1984, 1994; <br> Feeroz, 1991, 1999a; <br> Feeroz et al., 1995; <br> Feeroz \& Islam 1992, 2000 |
| INDIA <br> Arunachal <br> Pradesh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Changlang Namdapha NP | $\sim 27^{\circ} 39$ | $\sim 96^{\circ} 30$ | 20 | E | Hunting (P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (Pr), encroachment (F) | Decline | Decline | 17 | 14 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Choudhury, 1991 Found in adjacent areas. S.S. Chandiramani, 2002 |
| Miao RF | $\sim 27^{\circ} 39$ | $\sim 96^{\circ} 15$ | 1 | SE | Encroachment (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roing | $28^{\circ} 10$ | $95^{\circ} 50$ | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Tilsong, 1979 |
| Mehao WLS | $\sim 27^{\circ} 39$ | $\sim 96^{\circ} 15$ | 1 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (F) | Decline | Decline | 48 | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99, Rare in adjacent areas. A.K. Sen, 2002 |
| Lohit <br> Kamlang WLS | $27^{\circ} 44$ | 96³9 | 1 | E | Hunting (P/Pr/F), <br> habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), <br> encroachment (Pr) | - | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Choudhury, 1991 |
| Assam Sadya <br> Zubza | $\begin{aligned} & 27^{\circ} 50 \\ & 25^{\circ} 41 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 95^{\circ} 03 \\ 94^{\circ} 03 \end{array}$ | - |  |  |  | - |  | - | Jenkins, 1987 Jenkins, 1987 |
| Cachar Barail RF | - |  | - | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | - | - | 22 | - | Das et al., 2002a |

Distribution of Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Innerline RF | - | - | - | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) |  | - | 5 | - | Das et al., 2002a |
| Hatikhali | $25^{\circ} 39$ | $95^{\circ} 30$ | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | 485m. Jenkins, 1987 |
| Dibrugarh Joypur RF | $27^{\circ} 14$ | $95^{\circ} 34$ | 10.869 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 12 | 10 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Goalpara Moghaghar RF | - | - | 0.373 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Golaghat Kaziranga NP | $\sim 26^{\circ} 37$ | $\sim 93^{\circ} 18$ | 5 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 8 | 6 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Nambor West Block RF | - | - | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (Pr), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Panbhari RF | - | - | 1.2 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Hailakandi |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Innerline RF | - | - | 1 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Das et al. 2002a |
| Katakhal RF | - | - | 3 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991, Das et al. 2002a |
| Jorhat Gibbon WLS | - | - | 10 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 20 | 17 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; G. Santha, 2002 |
| Kamrup |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apricola RF | $26^{\circ} 19$ | $91^{\circ} 15$ | - | TMD | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 1987 |
| Badsahilia RF | - |  | 12 | TSE |  |  |  |  | - | Choudhury, 1987 |
| Chandubi USF | - | - | 12 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 30 | 25 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Gorbhanga RF | - | - | 1.146 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Jorsal RF | - | - | 1.256 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Kulsi Plantation RF | $\sim 25^{\circ} 50$ | $\sim 91^{\circ} 20$ | 1.855 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), | Decline | Decline | 5 | 4 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Jenkins, 1987 - Collected on 4 Sep 1920 at 121 m . |
| Kuwasingh RF | - | - | 9.98 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), | Decline | Decline | 10 | 8 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |

Distribution of Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area (km ${ }^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tr <br> Past <br> \%/yr | d Future \%/yr | Pop. <br> No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | encroachment (P/Pr/F) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nellie RF | - | - | - | TMD |  |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 1987 |
| Pantan RF | - | - | 11.285 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Ranni RF | - | - | 4.369 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 12 | 10 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1997 |
| Sama RF | - | - | - | TMD | - |  | - | - | - | Choudhury, 1987 |
| Karbi Anglong |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amreng RF | $25^{\circ} 43$ | $92^{\circ} 60$ | 6 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Amsolong PRF | $26^{\circ} 00$ | $93^{\circ} 30$ | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Balasore PRF | $06^{\circ} 30$ | $80^{\circ} 20$ | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Bokajan PRF | $26^{\circ} 00$ | $93^{\circ} 43$ | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Borjuri PRF | - | - | 21 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Borlander DCRF | - | - | 2 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 5 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Daldali RF | - | - | 12 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Dhansiri RF | - | - | 7 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 10 | 8 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Disama RF | - | - | 2 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Dalamora PRF | - | - | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Englongiri DCRF | - | - | 4 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Garampani WLS | $26^{\circ} 93$ | $93^{\circ} 52$ | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Hafjan PRF | - | - | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Haithapahar DCRF | - | - | 5 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Jungthung RF | - | - | 3 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 6 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Kalapahar PRF | - | - | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Kalioni RF | - | - | 5 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), | Decline | Decline | 3 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |

Distribution of Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | d <br> Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kaziranga PRF | $\sim 26^{\circ} 37$ | $\sim 93^{\circ} 18$ | 3 | TSE | hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), <br> hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Khonbamon RF | - | - | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Langlakso PRF | - | - | 20 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Longnit DCRF | - | - | 12 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 7 | 5 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Mahamaya DCRF | - | - | 5 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Mikir Hills RF | $\sim 26^{\circ} 25$ | $\sim 93^{\circ} 20$ | 23 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 5 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Miyungdisa DCRF | - | - | 5 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Nambor North Block RF | - | - | 5 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 4 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Nambor West Block RF | - | - | 3 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Patradisa DCRF | - | - | 7 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Tikok PRF | - | - | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Umjakani PRF | - | - | 1 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Western Mikir Hills PRF | - | - | 4 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 8 | 5 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Karimganj |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Innerline RF | - | - | 2 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 4 | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Das et al., 2002a |
| Longai RF | - | - | 3 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Das et al., 2002a |
| Patharia RF | $24^{\circ} 11$ | $24^{\circ} 31$ | 2 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Das et al., 2002a |
| Singla RF | $\sim 27^{\circ} 02$ | $\sim 88^{\circ} 19$ | 5 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 5 | 4 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Das et al., 2002a |
| Lakhimpur Bara Hapjan | $27^{\circ} 32$ | $95^{\circ} 30$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 100m. Jenkins, 1987 |
| North Cachar Barail PRF | $22^{\circ} 08$ | $93^{\circ} 09$ | 5 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; |

Distribution of Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area $\left(\mathrm{km}^{2}\right)$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. <br> Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barail RF | $22^{\circ} 08$ | $93^{\circ} 09$ | 4 | TWE | hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | Das et al., 2002a <br> IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Barail RF (Silchar) | $22^{\circ} 08$ | $93^{\circ} 09$ | 3 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 5 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Choudhury, 1991; Das et al., 2002a |
| Innerline PRF | - | - | 14 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 22 | 15 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Choudhury, 1991; Das et al., 2002a |
| Khurimming RF | - | - | 10 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 10 | 7 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Langting Mupa RF | $25^{\circ} 30$ | $90^{\circ} 07$ | 20 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ), encroachment ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Pr} / \mathrm{F}$ ) | Decline | Decline | 15 | 12 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| North Cachar Hills RF | $25^{\circ} 30$ | $93^{\circ} 00$ | 5 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 6 | 4 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Das et al., 2002a |
| Panimur PRF | - | - | 1 | STBLH | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Tinsukhia Bherjan WLS | $\sim 27^{\circ} 30$ | $\sim 95^{\circ} 22$ | 1 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Borajan WLS | $27^{\circ} 05$ | $95^{\circ} 04$ | 5 | TSE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 10 | 9 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Burhi Dehing RF | $27^{\circ} 13$ | $94^{\circ} 42$ | 2.2 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Dibang Valley RF | $\sim 28^{\circ} 00$ | $\sim 95^{\circ} 38$ | 4 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Dibru-Saikhowa N | $27^{\circ} 40$ | $95^{\circ} 24$ | 2 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 4 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Hahkhati RF | $27^{\circ} 44$ | $95^{\circ} 40$ | 0.67 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Kakojan RF | $27^{\circ} 29$ | $95^{\circ} 39$ | 2.345 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Kumsang RF | $27^{\circ} 44$ | $95^{\circ} 44$ | 2.252 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Kundilakalia RF | - | - | 7.284 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Margharita | $27^{\circ} 17$ | $95^{\circ} 41$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Jenkins, 1987, collected on 29 Oct 1919 |
| Mesaki RF | $\sim 27^{\circ} 42$ | $\sim 95^{\circ} 40$ | 1.366 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 4 | 3 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Upper Dehing | $27^{\circ} 25$ | $95^{\circ} 42$ | 1 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |

Distribution of Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & \left(\mathbf{k m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. $t$ <br> Past <br> \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East block RF Upper Dehing West block RF | $27^{\circ} 24$ | $95^{\circ} 33$ | 1 | TWE | encroachment (P/Pr/F) Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Manipur | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Gupta, 1994; V. Ramakantha, 1991 |
| Ukrul Senapathi | $25^{\circ} 07$ | $94^{\circ} 22$ | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | Gupta, 1994; V. Ramakantha, 1991 |
| Meghalaya Garo Hills Khasi Hills, Jaintia Hills | - | - | - | - |  |  | - |  |  | Alfred \& Sati, 1990 <br> IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; <br> Tilson, 1979 |
| East Garo hills Nokrek NP | - | - | 16 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), horticulture (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 25 | 18 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991. Also found adjacent to the protected area. W.G. Momin, 2002 |
| Songsek Tasek RF | $25^{\circ} 38$ | $90^{\circ} 35$ | 20 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), horticulture (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 20 | 15 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 ; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Ri Bhoi Nongkhylem WLS | - | - | 2 | TMD | Encroachment(P/Pr/F), habitat destruction (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| South Garo <br> Baghmara RF | - | - | 1 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Balpakram NP | - | - | 30 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), horticulture (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 16 | 12 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Rewak RF | - | - | 7 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), horticulture (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 2 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Siju WLS | $25^{\circ} 32$ | $90^{\circ} 14$ | 5 | TMD | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), horticulture (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Mizoram <br> Mizo Hills |  |  | - |  |  |  | - |  | - | Tilson, 1979 |
| Champai Murlen NP | $23^{\circ} 37$ | $93^{\circ} 18$ | 5 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 8 | 7 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Chnintuipui |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Distribution of Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock in Bangladesh and India from literature and recent field studies ... continued

| Distribution in South Asia | Lat. | Long. | Area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | Habitat | Threats Past, Present, Future | Pop. tre Past \%/yr | Future \%/yr | Pop. No. | Mat. Ind. | Notes / Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ngengpui RF | - | - | 3 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 1 | 1 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Nengpui WLS | - | - | 10 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Phawangpui WLS | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | Raman et al., 1995 |
| Mamit <br> Dampa WLS | - | - | 2 | TWE | Habitat destruction (P/Pr/F), hunting (P/Pr/F), encroachment (P/Pr/F) | Decline | Decline | 3 | 2 | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99; Choudhury, 1991 |
| Sercchip Khawnglung WLS | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  |
| Nagaland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Khonoma Mokokchung | $\begin{aligned} & 25^{\circ} 39 \\ & 26^{\circ} 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94^{\circ} 02 \\ & 94^{\circ} 31 \end{aligned}$ | - | TWE | - | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 Jenkins, 1987, collected on 6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sep 1919; 15 Sep 1919; 26 Mar 1920 |
| Yuapik | - | - | - | TWE | - | Decline | Decline | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |
| Dimapur ItankiNP | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | State Forest Report, 1988 |
| Tripura |  |  | $\sim 138$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | AOO given is for all three districts (North, South \& West) |
| North Tripura | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 19 | 14 | Gupta, 1994; Mukherjee et al. 1993 |
| Atharamora Hill Range | $23^{\circ} 49$ | $91^{\circ} 45$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Bhattacharya \& Charkrabarty, 1990 |
| South Tripura | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 38 | 19 | Mukherjee et al., 1993; Gupta, 1994 |
| Gumti WLS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | J. Bose, IUSPP |
| Trishna WLS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | J. Bose, IUSPP |
| West Tripura | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 4 | Gupta, 1994; Mukherjee et al., 1993 |
| Sepahijala WLS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | IUSPP Annual reports, 1994-99 |

BLME - Broad-leaf Mixed Evergreen forests, E- Evergreen forest, SE - Semi-evergreen forest, STBLH - Sub-tropical Broadleaved Hill forest, TMD - Tropical Moist Deciduous forests, TSE - Tropical Semi-evergreen forest, TWE - Tropical Wet Evergreen forests
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## Loridae

Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus Cabrera, 1908 and L. l. malabaricus Wroughton, 1917

## Summary

The Slender Loris inhabits southern India and Sri Lanka. The two subspecies found in southern India include Loris lydekkerianus lydekkerianus Cabrera, 1908. and L. l. malabaricus Wroughton, 1917.

## Distribution and habitat

L.l. lydekkerianus inhabits dry deciduous and scrub jungles of Eastern Ghats and southeastern India. L.l. malabaricus inhabits moist deciduous, teak plantations, semi-evergreen forests of the Western Ghats. There are no population figures available from most of its habitat. The subspecies malabaricus occurs in KMTR and Anamalai hills where it is found in the relatively dry ranges of the Western Ghats up to an altitude of 1000 m . Fairly dense populations of the lydekkerianus subspecies inhabits the dry scrub jungles of Dindigul district in Tamil Nadu. Three distinct populations with moderately high densities occur in the Kaundinya, Tirumala and Seshachalam hills of Andhra Pradesh.

## Threats

The recent field studies have brought out the following threats to Loris.
a) Accidental deaths: Whenever on ground, the Loris is clumsy and slow. While crossing roads it is often run over or lethally hit by passing vehicles. Many deaths have been recorded due to electrocution by open electric wires.
b) Loss of canopy contiguity: Since the Loris cannot jump from one tree to another, it requires a hundred percent canopy continuity to move through the vegetation. Since most of its habitat is also used by humans for cattle grazing and fuel wood, the resulting canopy continuity loss often forces animals to descend to where they become vulnerable to accidents and small predators.
c) Loss of habitat: It has been observed in many places that the scrub jungles are clear-felled for plantation of fast-growing species. This results in decimation of the entire local population of Loris.
d) Poaching: Poaching occurs in several places for the preparation of Loris eye soup. They are also sold openly in Madurai bird market.
e) Forest fires: Forest fires in dry areas may totally exterminate local Loris populations.

## Status

Although it is data deficient from most of its ranges of occurrence, the field data gathered over the past few years suggests that both the subspecies are Near Threatened.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas: Several potential areas mentioned for both the subspecies earlier should be considered as ''Conservation priority areas". No habitat disturbance should be permitted in these areas.

Topics: The forest areas in the Dindigul district, which harbour very high densities of loris, should be legally declared as a reserve for Slender Loris.

## Priority areas for management

Geographical areas: Since there never has been any special emphasis on Loris conservation, the identified areas should be considered as priority areas.

Forest department responsibilities: Since most of the habitat where Loris occurs is relatively dry, most of these forests continue to be worked, sometimes even clear-felled. The department should take care that large canopy gaps are not created and natural scrub must be retained as far as possible. This type of practice is more important for the
lydekkerianus subspecies in the Eastern Ghats since the habitat of the malabaricus subspecies are already in many protected areas in the Western Ghats. In the habitats of both of the subspecies, forest fires should be prevented since loris cannot escape from such fires.

Private owners: High densities of Slender Loris are also found in private areas adjoining reserve forests. Loris often use fences, Acacia, Azadirachta and Tamarindus trees for insect foraging. The farmers often inadvertently remove such niches. Since there is no man-animal conflict as far as loris is concerned, the farmers can be made aware of the habits of Slender Loris. Good populations therefore can be maintained in private lands as buffer populations around reserve forests.

## Priority areas for research

1. The foremost priority for research is to determine the real geographical distribution and the northern limits of the occurrence of both sub species.
2. In the areas of its occurrence, intensive surveys must be taken up immediately to determine density and abundance.
3. Ecological and behavioral studies should be initiated in a few representative habitats of both sub species to understand the resource base, food habits, life history, reproductive biology etc.
4. The researchers of the University of Mysore have already obtained some baseline data. Several questions such as dispersal of subadults have been raised which need to be addressed. Since lorises are nocturnal and usually solitary, permission for radio-collaring of animals whenever necessary must be given to produce quality research.

## In situ/ex situ conservation approaches

Forest department: Whereas no specific conservation approach other than fire prevention is required in the protected areas, the forest department must ensure canopy contiguity in scrub jungles, and understorey canopy continuity in mixed deciduous forests. Cutting of climbers has to be stopped.

State government: The State Governments in the area of occurrence of loris should legalize the identified reserve forests as loris reserves. Ecodevelopment schemes should be initiated in areas adjoining loris reserves. This is achievable without large budgets.

Central government: The Ministry of Environment and Forests should fund loris conservation and research projects as a thrust area for the next 15 years.

## Education and awareness

Since Loris does not have any man animal conflict for resources with humans, education programs should be undertaken to make people aware of loris conservation. Education must also be imparted to dispel the unfounded belief that eating Loris eyes is good for eyesight as that is the major reason for poaching.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

The research group at the University of Mysore has already conducted extensive surveys in several loris localities. Research has also been conducted to obtain baseline data on ecology and behavior. This group should be identified as the nodal agency for further research and for coordinating research activities by other researchers.

## Community involvement

The community around the forests where loris occurs should be involved in ecodevelopment programs.

## Loris tardigradus grandis

## Summary

This subspecies is distributed in the lower hills of eastern dry zone. Population trends are little known. Habitat conservation are recommended.

## Distribution and habitat

Midland hills of eastern dry zone. Natural forest, moist and dry monsoon evergreen forest.

## Threats and Status

Habitat loss and hunting, burning of forest by people. Endangered

## Priority areas

Knuckles Natural Reserve.

## Government responsibility

Implement laws for the conservation of the taxon and its habitat.

## Research areas

1. Survey
2. Population monitoring

## In situ / ex situ conservation approaches

1. Consumption of animals in forest areas should be stopped.
2. Strict enforcement for laws for encroachers.
3. Government has to make efforts to stop killing of animals

## Loris tardigradus nordicus

## Summary

This subspecies is distributed in the eastern dry zone. Population trends are little known. Habitat conservation is recommended.

## Distribution and Habitat

Eastern dry zone. Tropical dry evergreen forest and moist forest

## Threats and Status

Habitat loss and hunting. Endangered.

## Priority areas

1. Polonnaruwa environs
2. Research needed

## Government responsibility

Implement conservation laws

## Private owners

Need education

## Research priority

1. need broad population surveys
2. Population biology and genetics

## In situ / ex situ conservation approaches

1. Consumption of animals in forest areas should be stopped.
2. Strict enforcement for laws for encroachers.
3. Government has to take efforts to stop killing of animals

## Education and awareness

Needed

## NGOs

Be selective

## Community

Part of broad education

## Loris tardigradus nycticeboides

## Summary

This montane subspecies with its limited habitats is the most threatened of the Loris subspecies, mostly due to habitat loss. In the past 200 years, habitat loss was more than $80 \%$, with $50 \%$ occurring in the last 40 years.

## Distribution

Central hill zone above 1800m.

## Habitat

Tropical montane rainforest/moist forest

## Threats

Habitat loss due to agriculture is the main threat currently, and is predicted for the future.

## Status

Endangered

## Priority areas

Geographical areas: Any remaining natural forest patches are suitable for this subspecies. Natural forests surrounding Horton Plains NP, near Pattipula,.Ambewela, Diagama, possibly upper reaches of Adam's Peak. Pattipola and Ambewela have natural forest that are currently not protected. Upper reaches of Diagama estate has unprotected natural forest.

Topics: Remaining natural crown lands require immediate protection.
Government responsibility:

1. Legal implementation
2. Vegetable plantations to be banned from converting natural forest, rather to use already degraded land.

Private owners: Need to be educated of the CR status of this endemic form. Should be encouraged to preserve suitable privately owned farms and patches.

## Priority - Research

1. Population survey
2. Life History
3. Population Genetics
4. Population Genetics
5. Long-term socio-demographic and ecological research

## Conservation approaches

Agriculture department: discourage forest destruction
Encourage rejuvenation of degraded non-forest lands = plentiful
Village administrators with the help of environmental officers can actively involve in conservation efforts.

## Education and awareness

Education and awareness needed

## Role of research and NGOs

Research necessary. NGO assistance must be selectively involved.

## Community involvement

Required at all levels

## Loris tardigradus tardigradus

## Summary

This species of Loris is found in lowland rain forests and not much is known about its population biology. It is widely distributed. Habitat management for conservation is recommended.

## Distribution

Lowland wet zone (South West) in tropical rain, swampy coastal and evergreen forests, wet zone lowland forests

## Threats

Habitat loss (due to urbanization) and hunting.

## Status

Endangered.

## Priority areas for conservation and management

As much of the remaining forest of this region is small and fragmented it is necessary to conserve areas of contiguous forest that would be capable of sustaining viable populations in the long term. For practical reasons these areas should coincide with areas considered as important for conservation of indigenous biodiversity and should encompass the forests contiguous with Sinharaja, the World Heritage Site and National Heritage Wilderness Area.

## Management considerations

Management plans have been developed for several wet zone forests within the range of this subspecies, and several are due to be implemented. Special consideration for primate conservation could be integrated into forest management especially as this species is a valuable indicator species. Particular attention should be given to requirements for conservation of this subspecies' zonation and forest management practices in managed forests.

## Priority areas for research

1. No long-term studies have been carried out on this subspecies as yet, and none at all on rainforest populations of the species as a whole. Hence studies are required to ascertain the feeding and ranging habits of this species and its social organisation in under lowland wet zone forests of the region.
2. Natural forests of this area are severely fragmented and surrounded by high density of human populations so that habitat change is a continuous occurrence for many populations. This offers an excellent opportunity to study the impacts of habitat change on populations in terms of feeding and ranging behaviour and survival of populations. Further, comparative studies of this nature with forest populations should provide a good indication of adaptability of the sub-species to habitat change and how.
3. Surveys are needed to determine the distribution and population density of these animals in the present and proposed Protected Area network in this region.

## Cercopithecidae

## Macaca assamensis Nepal population

## Summary

The assamese population of Nepal is unique with reference to their features and colouration. They were assessed as Endangered based on limited range. It is included in the National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1973, Nepal. Thus it is kept as a separate population and proposed a new subspecies within M. assamensis in the classification. The total population of these monkeys is 540 individuals that are restricted to 8 sub populations and 25 locations (group) in Nepal. There has been a nominal decline of less than $10 \%$ in 10 years.

## Distribution

It is distributed from Sankhuwashabha district in the east to Dadeldhura in the far west of Nepal between 380-2336m altitudinal range with very limited distribution. Out of total 24 groups, 20 groups have been recorded only from two Protected Areas (13 groups are reported from Buffer zones of Makalu-Barun National Park and 7 groups from Langtang National Park) with remaining 4 scattered in 4 different locations in Nepal. The western-most distribution Dadeldhura and Achem district has only one record in each. They are even found in lower altitude ( 380 m ) if the same mountain slope reaches higher altitude (temperate and higher). Altogether they are distributed in the east and west of mid-hills of Nepal.

## Habitat

This monkey species mostly moves around the fringe of the forest and frequently comes along the riverine and open forest. It is found resting at night in rocky outcrops. They frequently move around cultivation areas far from villages, open areas between forest patches. Beside leafy matter they also eat tuber and insects and raid crops and vegetables. They range from sub tropical to temperate region in broadleaved mixed forest, hill sal forest, riverine forest, grassy slopes, shrubby vegetation, rocky outcrops and sometimes pass alpine forest (2200+). The forest species they inhabit includes Schima-castanopsis Elaeocarpus dominated forests with scattered Macaranga species and some leguminous climbers.

## Threats

A majority of the population ( 426 out of 540 ) are in Protected Areas. In the buffer zones of the Makalu-Barun NP had the main threat of the past as shifting agriculture has reduced after declaration of the area as National Parks. In both PAs controlled use of timber, fuel wood, fodder and grazing are allowed for local people. These practices result in deterioration of habitat quality.

The other 4 scattered groups are in forest areas that face the threats of fuelwood, timber, and fodder collection, severe grazing and chasing by humans. This has led to a high rate of decrease in the habitat as well as decrease in habitat quality for this species.

## Status

The species is Endangered based on limited geographic range $<2500 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ in extent and $<1000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ in area of occupancy with fragmented habitat that is declining in extent and quality. The species is also included in the National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1973 of Nepal.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographic areas: Population found in areas other than boundary of Protected Area needs to be identified and provide protection eg., Ramdi, Dadeldhura, Bhumlingtar and Kimni population.

## Priority areas for management

Geographic areas: For groups other than those in Protected Areas.
Meta population management: The population in Ramdi, Bhumlingtar, Kimni and Dadeldhura are to be conserved with special consideration.

Responsibilities of Forest Department: Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation should manage and protect habitat of this species and regulate overuse of forest in such areas.

Private owners: The users of community forest, private forest or grazers should be made aware of the status of species and involve them for management.

## Research

1. Survey: there is the possibility of finding this species in many other areas which require extensive survey.
2. Genetics and taxonomy: This population seems different from Assamese monkey in respect to their head and body length, tail length and tail/head body length ratio. It differs in body colour, with darker fur and purple snout. This needs study in genetics and taxonomy to confirm it in subspecies level.
3. Life history parameters: as the ecological and life history parameters have not yet been done, it has to be started to understand the species
4. Crop-raiding study: This species is known to raid crops and vegetables around the forest fringe. It requires detailed study of their habitat to reduce conflict with local people.

## Government's role

Government should give priority in research to reduce primate-human conflict by initiating and allowing researchers to work in Protected Areas and outside areas.

## NGOs / INGOs

They need to support and facilitate research through grants and collaborative programmes.

## Community involvement

Many populations within and outside Protected Areas are close to human habitation. They need to find out alternate cropping patterns that will reduce damage of crops and reduce park and people conflict. They may also help to identify the fruit plants of this species in the surrounding forest that enabled concerned authority to plant suitable plant species during afforestation programme.

## Funding

As national support for funding is meager, international support has to be sought. In collaboration with Natural History Society of Nepal, DNPWC will be able to conduct research and implement action plan.

## Macaca assamensis pelops

## Summary

Macaca assamensis pelops (Hodgson, 1840) is presently available in India, possibly Bangladesh and Bhutan, and endemic to this region.

## Distribution

It is restricted as a subspecies in distribution and presently occurs in different localities of West Bengal in India, and possibly Bangladesh and Bhutan. Most of the groups in the state of West Bengal are found in the hill forest of northern districts like Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri.

## Habitat and habit

It occupies the middle and upper canopy of broadleaved evergreen forest between elevations of $180-2270 \mathrm{~m}$. It is arboreal, diurnal and omnivorous in habit.

## Threats

Anthropogenic activities of different nature, habitat loss, accidental loss and natural calamities.

## Status

It is Vulnerable at subspecies level. It is in Appendix II of CITES and in the IWLPA Schedule II.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographic: Northern Bengal, mainly the hill forests between $150-3000 \mathrm{~m}$ should be preserved as the natural habitat of this population.

Topics: Utmost care should be taken to save the habitat and present population existing there. Study on ecology, behaviour, population dynamics, interspecific interactions and especially man-animal interaction is urgently needed. Taxonomic research is also recommended, as there are chances of inbreeding with Rhesus macaque.

## Priority areas for management

Geographical areas: Wild populations outside the Protected Areas as well as in PAs should be considered for management. Public awareness should be increased and involvement of local inhabitants is necessary for further conservation.

Metropolitan areas: Even free-ranging metropolitan specimens are to be salvaged as these monkeys have an extremely restricted distribution.

Responsibilities of Government / Forest Departments: To ensure protection of the wild population and commensal groups, forest department personnel should enhance their activities an increase awareness in people living in and around the protected areas, near human settlements and around temples for better management.

Private owners: There has been an instance where local people captured individuals outside the PAs and kept them as pets or translocated them elsewhere. This should be stopped immediately.

## Priority areas of research

1. Intensive surveys all over the range of its distribution in West Bengal and Sikkim has to be carried out in addition to earlier census and monitoring.
2. Field studies must be undertaken on the population dynamics of this species including a majority of the groups in West Bengal and Sikkim.
3. There is almost no information on the reproductive biology except the study undertaken by Sangita Mitra during 1996-1997, where 2 groups were studied intensively and data recorded. This is also an area to be investigated in order to assess the reproductive potential of the subspecies.

## In situ and ex situ conservation approaches

Forest Department: Forest department officials and other staff should start taking effective and long-term measures to check the decline in population size. They should prepare a scientific management plan to mitigate present impact of anthropogenic activities on the population.

State Government's role: At present the state government and forest department are not aware of all the non-human primates present in the states of West Bengal and Sikkim. This subspecies has so far been ignored because of its apparent similarity with rhesus macaque, and people must be informed of this fact. Till date there have been several census surveys by Central Government ZSI, but further research on this subspecies is necessary to deal with the population in the present context.

Central Governments role: Review of the present status in IWL(P)A to resolve man - animal conflict.

## Education and awareness

Awareness programmes has to be undertaken among local inhabitants who are habituated to abusing monkeys in several ways (stone throwing, poisoning etc.,)

## Role of research institutes/ NGOs

Several central and state institutions may take up extensive monitoring programmes inside all the Protected Areas in the range of its distribution and outside also where most of the commensal groups are being poisoned.

## Community involvement

It is extremely important to involve all the locals staying adjacent to the different groups of Assamese macaque, because majority of the macaque population is occupying areas near human settlements in hills as well as in other areas.

## Macaca arctoides I. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1830

## Summary

The Stump-tailed Macaque, sole representative of arctoides group, is found south of the Brahmaputra river system in Northeast India. It has a population of $<250$ individuals (directly sighted) from Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Meghalaya, Mizoram and Tripura since 1994. It is found in different habitats near to forest villages as well as in the remote places in widely fragmented areas. The primary threats are habitat destruction and hunting. According to surveys of the Indo-US Primate project, NE centre, the species has been categorised as Critically Endangered. There are no management action plan for the species until now.

## Distribution

The Stump-tailed Macaque is found south of Brahmaputra River system in Northeast India. The survey confirmed the distribution in Assam, Meghalaya, Mizoram and Tripura. It was recorded previously from Bangladesh but no sighting has been recorded since 1990.

## Habitat

The species is found in tropical semi-evergreen forest, tropical wet evergreen forest and tropical moist deciduous forest of Northeast India.

## Threats

Stump-tailed Macaques are hunted for food, medicine and for pets, however, the primary threat is the habitat destruction.

## Status

According to IUCN criteria this species is Critically Endangered based on C2a (i)

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas:

1. The Gibbon Wildlife Sanctuary, Assam, the only protected area with 7 non-human primate species, should be upgraded to a National Park for the conservation of a large subpopulation of Stump-tailed macaque in particular and other primates in general.
2. The North Cachar Hill Reserve Forest and Barail complex, Assam should also be upgraded to wildlife sanctuary for the better conservation of the species. More and more fragmented areas should be brought under protected area network.

Topics: Care should be taken to protect all remaining habitats. Measure should be taken to minimise other anthropogenic pressures in good population areas.

Geographical area: Considering the population status it is necessary to consider all the areas where the species are available as priority areas.

Metapopulation management: There is no requirement for metapopulation management
Forest department responsibilties: The forest department should stop the monoculture plantation. Forest Department should take strict measures to stop grazing pressure from fringe villages. There has to be considerable vigilance to prevent hunting and any encroachment on forest lands.

## Priority areas for research

1. Intensive survey is to be done with proper documentation in Northeast India and in Bangladesh from where no sighting has been recorded after 1990.
2. A long-term demographic study needs to be done for selected population.
3. A field study on the ecology and behaviour of the species in different habitats has to be carried out.
4. Community based conservation should be initiated.

## In situ/ ex situ conservation approach

Forest Department: Food trees must be planted based on the natural habitat in the Stump-tailed Macaque habitats.
State Government: The state govt. should bring more and more habitat of Stump-tailed Macaque under protected area network

Central Government: Central Government should initiate processing for upgradation of good habitat as the species is Critically Endangered and also should be declared as a thrust area for conservation and research.

## Education and Awareness

Aneducation programmes for grassroots level people should be done in collaboration with NGOs.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

Animal ecology and wildlife biology lab, Department of Zoology Guwahati University, Assam, Primate research Centre (northeast) and "Aaranyak" (NGO) are providing necessary support in carrying out long-term studies of the species. They should therefore be involved in implementing the action plan for this species.

## Community involvement

Community participation with socio-economic development programme in the fringe areas of the species habitat should be built up.

## Macaca fascicularis umbrosa

## Summary

The Crab-eating Macaque is found on three islands of the Nicobar group of islands. It has a population of about 4800 , which is assumed to be stable at the moment. It is found in all the habitat types present on these islands, including all the different forests, coral reefs and coconut plantations. The only perceived threat is that it is hunted to prevent crop raiding. Since only one brief survey has been done, its status is listed as 'Near Threatened'.

There are no major management issues. Plans to start fruit orchards in the islands need to be abandoned. An ecodevelopment programme to reduce pressure on the forest is recommended. A more detailed survey, research on ecology and behaviour, and long term demographic monitoring are suggested.

## Distribution

The Nicobar or Crab-eating Macaque, Macaca fascicularis umbrosa, is found on three islands of the Nicobar group of islands: Great Nicobar ( $1045 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ), Little Nicobar ( $159 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ) and Katchal ( $174 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ). These are separated by large sea distances and therefore have to be treated as separate populations. There are an estimated 4800 individuals, of which about half are mature.

## Habitat

This species is found in littoral forest on the coast, especially forest where the predominant species are Pandanus, a major food item. They are also found in evergreen and giant evergreen forest where they are less abundant. They crop raid in coconut plantations and are also found near settlements. On cloudy days, and in the early morning and late evening, they go out onto the coral reefs to forage on marine life.

## Threats

Animals are hunted when they come for crop raiding. The indigenous Shompen tribals also hunt them for food. Construction of roads on Katchal island and Great Nicobar island. The majority of the islands are protected areas, so there is no scope for further settlement.

## Status

According to IUCN criteria this species is not threatened. However, since this determination is made based on one survey, using the assumption that densities near the roads and the coast are recommended same as inland (which may not be true), a status of 'Near Threatened' has been given.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas: The Great Nicobar Biosphere Reserve needs to be expanded to include the whole island of Great Nicobar. All sites except the existing settlement areas on the South-East Coast should become part of the core zone. These would include tribal villages, which would not be disturbed.

Topics: Care has to be taken to ensure that all further immigration into these islands is stopped. Wildlife personnel should be posted on Katchal to monitor human activity there.

## Priority areas for management

Geographical areas: All three islands should be considered priority areas.
Metapopulation management: There is no requirement for metapopulation management.
Forest department responsibilities: The Forest Department has a plan to introduce fruit orchards to reduce the pressure on the coconut plantations. This will result in part of the forest being converted to plantations, which is undesirable. It will also result in an increase in the macaque population and which will not aid in reduction of pressure on the coconuts. Therefore this should not be done. A mix of grease and resin, unpleasant to touch, is used in the Nilgiri Hills to control crop raiding on areca nuts, and this should be experimented with and then made available.

There has to be considerable vigilance to prevent any encroachment on forest land, especially on Katchal.
Private owners: Land owners, especially those with coconut plantations, should be made aware of the uniqueness of the species. They need to be encouraged to innovate methods of preventing crop raiding. Encroachments, especially on Katchal, need to be cleared.

## Priority areas for research

1. Intensive suveys need to be carried out to validate the brief survey that has already been done
2. A field study of the basic biology of the species, covering feeding ecology and ranging patterns, as well as social behaviour, needs to be done urgently.
3. A long term demographic study needs to be initiated.

## In situ/ ex situ conservation approaches

Forest department: The plan to have fruit orchards needs to be abandoned. Boats need to be obtained to patrol the coasts efficiently to prevent poaching.

State government: The role of Andaman \& Nicobar Administration is to make funds available for more effective patrolling, and to initiate ecodevelopment schemes to win public trust, as well as reduce the dependency on the forest for fuelwood.

Central government: The role for the Central Government is to ensure that smuggling of wildlife items is controlled effectively from the islands.

## Education and awareness

Education programmes for schoolchildren have already been conducted by NGO's in collaboration with the Forest Dept. These need to be intensified.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

ANET (Andaman and Nicobar Islands Environmental Team) and SACON have had a long involvement in these islands. ANET is developing the logistical support necessary to conduct surveys and initiate long term monitoring programmes. It should therefore undertake the responsibility of monitoring and implementing the species action plan for this species.

## Community involvement

This will be required for any ecodevelopment programme, and should be built into the programme.

## Macaca leonina Blyth, 1863

The Pig-tailed macaque is found in the south of Brahmaputra river system. It has a population of 484 individuals directly sighted, Assam, Meghalaya, Mizoram and Tripura since 1994 and Bangla Desh. It is found in different habitats near to forest villages and as well as in remote places in widely fragmented areas. The primary threats are habitat destruction and hunting. According to the survey of the Indo-US Primate project, NE centre, India and Department of Zoology, Jahangirnagar University, Dhaka, Bangladesh, the species has been assessed as Endangered. There is no management action plan for the species up to now.

## Distribution

The Pig-tailed Macaque is found south of the Brahmaputra River system in Northeast India and Bangladesh. The survey confirmed the distribution in Assam, Meghalaya, Mizoram and Tripura and Bangladesh.

## Habitat

The species is found in tropical semi-evergreen, tropical wet evergreen, tropical wet evergreen, tropical moist deciduous forest of Northeast India and Bangladesh.

## Threat

Pig-tailed Macaques are hunted for food, medicine and for pets, however, the primary threat is the habitat destruction.

## Status

According to IUCN criteria this species is Endangered.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas:

1. The Gibbon Wildlife Sanctuary, Assam, the only protected area with 7 non-human primate species should be upgraded to a National Park for the conservation of a large subpopulation of theis speces in particular and other primates in general. The North Cachar Hill Reserve Forest and Barail complex, Assam should also be upgraded to wildlife sanctuary for the better conservation of the species. More and more fragmented areas should be brought under protected area network.
2. In Bangladesh, the West Bhanugach Forest Reserve in the north-east and Bhomari ghona in South-east should be get priortised for conservation, since these areas support more than $75 \%$ Big-tailed Macaque of the country.

Topics: Care should be taken to protect all remaining habitats. Measure should be taken to minimise other anthropogenic pressures in good population area.

Geographical area: Considering the population status it is necessary to consider all the areas where the species are available as priority areas.

Metapopulation management: There is no requirement for metapopulation management

Forest department responsibilities: The forest department should stop the monoculture plantation. Forest Department should take strict measures to stop grazing pressure from fringe villages. There has to be considerable vigilance top prevent hunting and any encroachment on forest lands.

## Priority areas for research

1. Intensive survey is to be done with proper documentation in northeast India and in Bangladesh is urgently required.
2. A long-term demographic study needs to be done in selected populations.
3. Field studies on the ecology and behaviour in different habitats has to be carried out.
4. Community based conservation should be initiated.

## In situ/ ex situ conservation approach

Forest department: Food trees must be planted based on the natural habitat in Pig-tailed Macaque habitats.
State Government: The state government should bring more and more habitat of Pig-tailed Macaque under protected area network

Central Government: Central Government should initiate protection and upgradation of good habitat as the species is Critically Endangered. The speces also should be declared as thrust area for conservation and research.

## Education and Awareness

Education programmes for grassroots level people should be done in collaboration with NGOs.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

Animal ecology and wildlife biology lab, department of Zoology Gauhati University, Assam, Primate research Centre (northeast) and "Aaranyak" (NGO) are providing necessary support in carrying out long-term studies of the species. Wildlife Research Group of the Department of Zoology, Jahangirnagar University, can play a vital role in the preparation of action plan for this species. They have undertaken long-term systematic behavioural ecological studies in collaboration with the University of Cambridge, UK. They should therefore be involved in implementing the action plan for this species.

## Community involvement

Community participation with Socio-economic development programme in the fringe areas of the species habitat should be built up.

## Macaca radiata diluta

## Summary

The Bonnet Macaque is found widely distributed south of the line from Pondicherry crossing Cumbam Pass and Alleppey in Kerala to Kanyakumari district. The main management issue is the increasing Macaca radiata diluta in the agricultural/semi-urban areas while in forest areas the numbers are more or less stable. There is need for more detailed survey on the ecology and behaviour and long-term demographic monitoring in forest areas as well as cultivated semi-urban areas.

## Distribution

This subspecies of bonnet macaque is distributed south of a line from Pondicherry crossing Cumbam Pass and Alleppey in Kerala to Kanyakumari district in the extreme south of India.

## Habitat

Macaca radiata diluta is found in all forest types from scrub jungles to evergreen forests, plantations, agricultural lands and semi/urban areas.

## Threats

Habitat degradation in forested areas is a threat along with hunting of crop raiding animals. However, the species is not troubled in protected areas.

## Status

According to IUCN criteria the species is of Least Concern.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas: All available forested tracts in its geographical distribution including the protected areas identified need to be identified as their priority areas for conservation.

## Priority areas for research

1. Detailed surveys of the species in its entire range of occupancy need to be done.
2. Ecology and behaviour of the species in forested areas need to be done separately.

## In situ / ex situ conservation approaches

State government: Population control methods can be thought of in urban areas.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

1. University of Mysore, Mysore, Karnataka; SACON, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu and Kerala Forest Research Institute, Peechi, Kerala may be made coordinating agencies for future research activities on bonnet macaques.
2. Conducting surveys and initiate long-term monitoring of bonnet macaques.

## Community involvement

Community involvement should be ensured for developing the management strategies for the species.

## Macaca radiata radiata

## Summary

This subspecies of bonnet macaque is found widely distributed in the Peninsular India from the south of Godavari to high ranges in Cumbum pass. It is considered to be a common species in both forest and adjacent forest areas. It has attained a minor pest status in the agricultural and semi urban environments.

The main management issue is the increasing Macaca radiata radiata in the agricultural/semi urban areas while in forest areas the numbers are more or less stable. There is a need for more detailed surveys on the ecology, behaviour and long-term demographic monitoring in forest areas, as well as cultivated semi urban areas is suggested.

## Distribution

Macaca radiata radiata is distributed in Peninsular India, South of Godavari River extending up to high ranges in the South. It is distributed in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka, Kerala and Maharasthra. Northern limit of the distribution runs from Vijayawada region of Krishna district in the east to westward through northern portion of the districts of Prakasham, Mahbubnagar and southern Hyderabad. In south it extends up to the high ranges and south of Pulney hills throughout the east coast in Tamil Nadu north of a line extending from Pondicherry to Cumbam pass.

## Habitat

Macaca radiata radiata is found in all forest types from scrub jungles to evergreen forests, plantations, agricultural lands and semi/urban areas.

## Threats

Threats are habitat degradation and hunting of crop raiding animals.

## Status

According to IUCN criteria the species is of Least Concern.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas: All available forested tracts in its geographical distribution including the protected areas identified need to be identified as priority areas for conservation.

## Priority areas for management

Forest department responsibilities: Habitat restoration activities should be initiated in the fringe areas.
Awareness should be undertaken in areas where this species is in direct conflict with human beings, especially in areas with tourism activities pressure.

## Priority areas for research

Detailed survey of the species in its entire range of occupancy needs to be done. Ecology and behaviour of the species in forested areas need to be done separately.

## In situ/ ex situ conservation approaches

State government: Population control methods can be considered in urban areas.
Habitat restoration strategies in its natural habitat.

## Education and awareness

1. Awareness activities should be undertaken for the fringe area people and school children about the behaviour of the species.
2. Special awareness packages should be developed for use in tourism spots and urban areas.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

1. University of Mysore, Mysore, Karnataka; SACON, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu and Kerala Forest Research Institute, Peechi, Kerala may be made coordinating agencies for future research activities on bonnet macaques.
2. Conducting surveys and initiating long-term monitoring of Macaca radiata radiata.

## Community involvement

Community involvement should be ensured for developing the management strategies for the species.

## Macaca silenus

## Summary

The Lion-tailed Macaque is an endangered arboreal primate found in the evergreen forests of the Western Ghats between Agastyamalai and the Sharavathy river. Most animals are found in the Anaimalais, which are severely fragmented. The most important conservation priority is to establish corridors linking up forest fragments. Since the Lion-tailed Macaque is a 'flagship' species for the evergreen forests of the Western Ghats, the setting up of a "Project LTM" is recommended.

## Distibution

The range of the Lion-tailed Macaque (Macaca silenus) is in the evergreen forests of the Western Ghats from Mookambika WLS in Karnataka down to Kalakkad-Mundanthurai WLS in Tamil Nadu.

## Habitat

This species is found in wet and dry evergreen forests of the southern Western Ghats.

## Threats

Threats to this species include habitat alteration for agriculture, plantations, mining, roads, and dams, habitat fragmentation, trapping as pets and hunting.

## Status

According to the IUCN criteria this species is Endangered. The total population is estimated as 3550 individuals, spread over 41 subpopulations at 49 locations.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas: The largest population is in the Anaimalai hills (900-1100), but this is very heavily fragmented. The largest contiguous population is in the Agastyamalai region (400-480). These two locations have to become the focus of major conservation efforts. Significant populations also exist in the Kudremukh region (550-650) and in the Nilgiris (400-475). Agastyamalai and the Nilgiri populations exist in protected areas. The Anamalais populations occur partly in private forests that are subject to conversion to other land uses, as are the populations in the Kudremukh region.

Topics: The creation of corridors is the top conservation priority

## Priority areas for management

Geographical areas: The most important conservation priority for this species is attempting to link up the fragmented habitats in the Anaimalais. Areas where the species is found in the Kudremukh region should be consolidated and brought into the protected areas network wherever possible. Makuta RF between Brahmagiri WLS and Talakaveri WLS should also be brought into the PA network. The protected area network for the Agastyamalai region consists of Kalakad-Mundanthurai Tiger Reserve in Tamil Nadu, and Neyyar WS, Peppara WS and Shendurney WS in Kerala. These areas are contiguous and should be brought under unified management. There may be legal hurdles to doing this, but informal arrangements may be possible to institute very soon, and avenues for doing this must be explored; a minimum requirement is joint patrolling along the state boundary. Similar arrangements need to be made for the protected areas network in the Anaimalais, which also lie on both side of the state boundary.

Metapopulation management: The creation of corridors between habitats is a priority. Swapping of adult males between forest fragments in the Anaimalais may be considered as an experiment, where the creation of corridors is not feasible.

Forest department responsibilities: Ecodevelopment programmes in the Kalakad-Mundanthurai Tiger Reserve in Tamil Nadu have resulted in a sea change in the attitudes of the villagers living adjacent to the park towards the Forest Department. This has resulted in a major reduction in poaching and fuelwood collection from within the sanctuary. This model needs to be documented and replicated in other areas having populations of Lion-tailed Macaques.

In the short term, PA managers on both sides of the state boundary between Tamil Nadu and Kerala should liaise frequently with their counterparts on the other side. A forum might be created for this purpose. In the long-term, integrated management is necessary.

Private areas: There are many privately held estates which contain populations of LTM. These are being converted to other uses. The Forest Dept. should have a say in the management of these estates to ensure that no further degradation occurs. Estate owners should be encouraged to plant fruit bearing trees as shad trees for their crops, usually tea or coffee. Where necessary these should be acquired to integrate into the PA network and funds should be made available for this purpose.

## Priority areas for research

1. Genetic research is required to establish the levels of variation within and between the different subpopulations. This can be done in a non-intrusive fashion by collecting faecal material.
2. Studies are required to determine the factors that limit the distribution of Lion-tailed Macaques, given that it is unable to adapt to a variety of habitats like the other macaques.
3. Demographic studies are required to determine life history parameters in different regions, and these need to be initiated urgently.
4. The understanding of reproductive physiology of the species in small forest fragments is important to the longterm maintenance of these populations, and research towards this end needs to be taken up.
5. Research is required to delineate corridors between different Lion-tailed macaque habitats.
6. Research is required on which species of trees can be planted to create corridors between fragments of Liontailed macaque habitats. These would necessarily be rainforest species whose silviculture is poorly understood.

## In situ/ ex situ conservation approaches

Forest department: Since most locations having LTM are very remote and poachers are armed, giving sophisticated firearms to forest protection staff, as well as training in their use, is recommended. The Forest Department must initiate ecodevelopment activities around LTM areas.

State government: The state governments of Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Kerala should to obtain funding for the above activities.

Central government: The Central Government should establish a secretariat called 'Project LTM' to coordinate ecodevelopment activity, collaboration between the state forest departments and the establishment of corridors. One of the main justifications for this is that the LTM can be considered a flagship species for the management of rainforest.

## Education and awareness

Education programmes are required to be carried out around LTM habitats to create awareness about the uniqueness of the species.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

The maximum amount of fieldwork that has been done on the LTM has been from Mysore University and SACON, Coimbatore. These two institutes should jointly initiate and monitor the implementation of this action plan.

## Community involvement

Community involvement will be necessary in the ecodevelopment plan, and local NGOs having a good record should be identified for this purpose.

## Macaca sinica aurifrons

## Summary

This subspecies of the Macaca sinica is found only in the west zone Sri Lanka. Its current threat is habitat loss due to accelerated development and deforestation. This is the most populated (human-settled) area of the country. Major management issues are conservation of the remaining forest areas.

## Distribution

This wet zone species occupies an area wholly in the southwestern side of the island. Macaca sinica aurifrons population distribution is not equal within this region though more or less of wet zone tropical forest or more or less uniformly distributed forest exist.

## Threats

The species is killed due to crop raiding. Increase in urbanization within its range is resulting in a higher risk due to human animal conflict. e.g. shooting, maiming, poisoning, electrocution, road kills etc.

## Status

Current assessment places it as Endangered.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical area: A large percentage of Macaca sinica aurifrons populations are found outside current PA. These areas should be considered for individual protection or inclusion within the neighboring existing PA.

Topics: Encroachment into both PAs as well as more importantly in the case of this subspecies encroachment and/ or conversion of outside forest areas into channa lands/development schemes etc. (having dense Macaca sinica aurifrons populations) should be prevented.

## Priority areas for management

Geographical area: Forest areas are with high density of Macaca sinica aurifrons: Many sanctuaries with forest reserves do not have the same protection levels as NPs. These contain many populations of Macaca sinica aurifrons should be protected.

Meta population management: There is no requirement.

Forest department responsibilities: The Rangers of this region should be given greater power and training in order to implement the existing Protection law. Enforcement of these laws should be strictly adhered to, currently this is not the case.

Private owners: Farmers and private planters who have Macaca sinica aurifrons within their lands and/or bordering should be educated about the importance of this species existence. Innovative methods of crop raiding prevention should be looked into and implemented as well.

## Priority areas for research

Intensive surveys needs to be carried out in all islands.

## In situ / ex situ conservation approaches

1. Consumption of animals in forest areas should be stopped and garbage should be eliminated.
2. Strict enforcement of laws for encroachers.
3. Government has to take efforts to introduce other methods of preventing crop-raiding other than killing of animals.

## Macaca sinica opisthomelas

## Summary

This subspecies, described by Hill 1942, has mistakenly been ignored by earlier IUCN Red Book assessments. We have observed this distinct morphological type at several locations in a very restricted area of less than $90 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ in montane rainforests above 1800 m . Its population and critical habitat has reduced by more than $80 \%$ in the last 200 years due to conversion of natural forest in to coffee and tea plantations. There has been additional habitat loss albeit at a lower rate in the last 30 years. The subspecies is Critically Endangered.

Contrary to Brandon-Jones et al. (2002), this is NOT an intermediate type between the other two subspecies, instead, it is at the extreme of a gradient in subspecies (population) morphs and represents a critical contribution to the biodiversity. It is no longer present in its type locality in Horton Plains.
"Management" requires immediate legal protection, extension of Horton Plains, and protection of other remaining natural forests critical for this subspecies. Research for survey, population genetics, ecology and life history are recommended.

## Distribution

Confined to less than $90 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$, montane rain forest in 2 main, but fragmented, subpopulations.

## Habitat

Tropical montane rain forest

## Threats

Habitat loss due to agriculture and fuel wood collection, encroachment. Killing as pests

## Status

Not previously recognized by IUCN owed to oversight of published data. Currently assessed as Critically Endangered.

## Priority area for Conservation

Geographical areas: Any remaining natural forest patche suitable for this subspecies. Natural forests surrounding Horton Plains NP, near Pattipula, Ambewela, Diagama, possibly upper reaches of Adam's peak (requires survey to
ascertain suitability for M.s.opisthomelas). Pattipola and Ambewela have natural forest that are currently not protected. Upper reaches of Digama estate has unprotected natural forest.

Topics: Remaining natural crown lands require immediate protection.
Government responsibility:

1. Legal implementation
2. Converting natural forest in to Plantation should be tamed, rather use already degraded land.

Private owners: Need to be educated about the CR status of this endemic form. Should be encouraged to preserve suitable privately owned farms and patches.

## Priority - Research

1. Population survey
2. Life history
3. Population genetics
4. Long-term socio-demographic and ecological research

## Conservation approaches

Agriculture department: discourage forest destruction
Encourage rejuvenation of degraded non-forest lands = plentiful
Village administrators with the help of environmental officers, based at divisional secretariats can actively involve in conservation efforts.

## Education and awareness

Education and awareness needed

## Role of research and NGOs

Research necessary. NGO assistance must be selectively involved.

## Community involvement

Required at all levels

## Macaca sinica sinica

## Summary

This subspecies of the Macaca sinica is found only in the dry zone of Sri Lanka. Populations of this species is declining due to habitat loss. According to the 2000 IUCN Red List, this species was categorized as Vulnerable. Our current assessment places it in the Endangered category.

Current management issues are changing land use patterns resulting in human-animal conflict. This needs to be addressed.

## Distribution

Macaca sinica sinica is found in the Northeast and southeast dry zone of the island occurring in an area of 32600 $\mathrm{km}^{2}$. Occupied habitat type is uniform throughout. But number of animals is not uniformly distributed.

## Threats

The species are hunted due to crop raiding. Increase in urbanization within its range is resulting in a higher risk due to human animal conflict e.g. shooting, maiming, poisoning, electrocution, road kills etc.

## Status

IUCN 2000 Red List categorized as Vulnerable. Current assessment places it as Endangered.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas: A large percentage of Macaca sinica sinica populations are found outside current PAs. These areas should be considered for individual protection or inclusion within the neighboring existing PA.

Topics: Encroachment into both PA s as well as more importantly in the case of this subspecies encroachment and/ or conversion of outside forest areas into channa lands/development schemes etc. (having dense Macaca sinica sinica populations) should be prevented.

## Priority areas for management

Geographical area: Forest areas are with high density of Macaca sinica sinica: Many Sanctuaries with forest reserves do not have same protection levels as NPs. These should be protected as they contain many populations of Macaca sinica sinica .

Meta population management: There is no requirement.
Forest department responsibilities: The Rangers of this region should be given greater power and training in order to implement the existing Protection law. Enforcement of these laws should be strictly adhered to, currently this is not occurring.

Private owners: Farmers and private planters who have Macaca sinica sinica within their lands and/or bordering should be educated about the importance of this species existence. Innovative methods of crop raiding prevention should be looked into and implemented as well.

## Priority areas for research

Intensive surveys needs to be carried out in all islands.

## In situ / ex situ conservation approaches

1. Consumption of animals in forest areas should be stopped and garbage eliminated.
2. Strict enforcement for laws for encroachers.
3. Government has to make efforts to introduce other methods of crop-raiding prevention rather than killing animals

## Semnopithecus entellus hector

## Summary

Survey of other areas in Terai and foothills is urgently required for this Endangered langur. Corridor to the two areas of Sakphara needs to be surveyed. Research on corridor population, growth factor, genetic factor and taxonomy is required. Survey of all other possible habitats in the Terai and foothills of Nepal has to be done immediately.

## Distribution

It is found in Chulachuli, Sarphara, Danabari in East Nepal and Ramnagar Chitwan in Central Nepal. These two populations are far away from each other and cannot be linked by a corridor.

## Habitat

Both are in subtropical areas between 300 m to 500 m with denuded topography of mixed sal forest including hill sal elements.

## Threats

Fuel wood and fodder collection are the main threats in the area. Currently stone quarries and road development are also a problem to the monkey habitat.

## Status

In relation to very small population (355), which is declining, a very small area of occupancy ( $10 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ) and habitat loss due to conversion for non-forestry use, this species has been considered to be Endangered.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographic areas: Because of small population, all five locations need protection. The two populations around Jare of Sakphara are nearby and their physical barrier needs to be explored to link them with a corridor. Primate conservation action plan needs to be prepared.

## Priority areas for management

Meta population management: Corridor linking two sites of Sakhpara populations is on priority. Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation (DNPWC) should be responsible to conduct and coordinate the census and monitor all groups with collaboration with Natural History Society of Nepal (NAHSON) and other NGOs.

## Priority areas for research

1. Research should be done on establishing a corridor between two sites of Sakhpara including on plant species that should be planted in the corridor.
2. Research is required to determine the limiting factors that hinder the population growth of the species.
3. Monitoring and census of all the groups should be started immediately.
4. Extensive survey should be carried out to determine the other population in other areas.
5. With reference to recent taxonomic revision (2002), DNA analysis should be carried out with the population.

## Community development

1. Community development programme should be initiated to reduce the natural resource demand of local people.
2. The feasibility of starting ecotourism (local guides, crafts) with the condition that all revenue would be bestowed to local villagers.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

Natural History Society of Nepal, International Primatology Society and other INGOs should be responsible for monitoring and implementation of this action plan with Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation, Nepal.

## Education awareness

A curriculum has to be developed to educate and create awareness among locals as well as concerned agencies to safeguard this Endangered species.

## Funding agencies

National and international agencies will be contacted for funds to implement the above plan.

## Semnopithecus entellus hypoleucos

## Summary

The assessment of this taxon was done at the subspecific level, taking into consideration the recent taxonomic revisions. Conservation actions required are prevention of habitat loss and degradation (especially outside protected areas), research to confirm taxonomic status, and surveys to delineate distribution, identification of
distinct populations, estimation of population abundance, and identification of area-specific conservation measures.

## Distribution

The Working Group considered this subspecies to include the population occurring in the western side of the Western Ghats, north of Palakkad Gap up to River Sharavati. This population consists of subpopulations in Silent Valley National Park, Wayanad WLS, Aralam WLS, few small populations which probably occur in sacred groves in northern Kerala, and a large and contiguous population in the tropical rainforest in the districts of Kodagu, Dakshin Kannada and Udupi. Thus, the major area of its distribution is in Karnataka.

## Habitat

The major habitat of this species is the rainforest in its distribution limits, and sacred groves.

## Threats

Loss of habitat (e.g. sacred groves) outside protected areas and poaching are some of the major threats.

## Status

This is classified as Endangered due to restricted distribution.

## Conservation measures

## Research

1. Confirmation of the subspecies status through field verification and genetic studies.
2. Identification of critical habitats and distributional limits
3. Estimation of population abundance and structure
4. Identification of area specific conservation actions

## Semnopithecus entellus schistaceus

## Summary

Even with the broad range it has been recorded from $>50$ locations with $>50,000$ individuals and these areas have been used by local people for timber, fodder, fuel wood and grazing. The current status is Near Threatened due to limited geographic range, fewer individual these along with above mentioned threats and requires special attention to reduced these pressures through research, awareness, people participation and protection measures.

## Distribution

Found in Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan at an elevation range between 1000-3200m.

## Habitat

Ranges from lower belt of temperate forest to upper temperate forest and sub alpine areas especially in Langtang National Park. It is found in subtropical to temperate, broadleaved forest, pine forest, riparian, montane forest, riverine forest, rocky outcrops, scrub jungle. Present information provides area of $>20,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ of approximate area of occupancy.

## Threats

Timber, fuel wood and fodder collection and grazing in the protected areas and habitat loss by timber, firewood and charcoal production in outside areas.

## Status

Near Threatened based on limited geographic range, fragmented population and decrease in habitat quality.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographic distribution: Due the dependency of langurs mostly in forested areas for fruits, leaves and resting,
current habitat degradation is partly responsible for decline in the population. Regulation of anthropogenic pressure in both Protected area and outside habitats are crucial. It is recommended to prepare a species conservation plan.

## Priority areas for management

Though they are located far apart in different areas including Protected Areas, they have not yet received appropriate attention. Within the present knowledge on subspecies by Brandon-Jones et al., 2002 (draft) this subspecies became endangered. This requires special attention for the improvement of habitat.

Responsibilities of Government: To initiate and facilitate awareness for conservation and protection of this species.
Private owners: As there is conflict with the local people for fodder use, conserving and planting fodder species in forest fringes needs to be done through people's participation.

## Research

Survey: all ranges from east to west between 1000-3000m.
Taxonomic and genetic study: Recent classification has brought 2 species and 9 subspecies of common langurs in South Asia which warrants proper confirmation up to subspecies level.

Monitoring: Periodic census and monitor is essential.
Ecology and behavior: Study on this subspecies has not yet been done hence it is essential to initiate a long-term study on ecology and behavior to understand its life history patterns.

## Government's role

To allow, initiate and support research.

## NGOs / INGOs role

Initiate and support research through technical and financial support.

## Education and awareness

The status of the species needs to be informed to local and all other concerned people.

## Community involvement

Essential to understand consequences to reduce conflict.

## Semnopithecus priam thersites - India population

## Summary

The assessment of this taxon was done at the population level, taking into consideration recent taxonomic revisions. Conservation actions required are prevention of habitat loss and degradation (especially outside protected areas), research to confirm taxonomic status, and surveys to delineate distribution, identification of distinct populations, estimation of population abundance, and to identification of area-specific conservation measures.

## Distribution

In India, this subspecies is probably confined to the southern most part of the Western Ghats with two distinct populations in Kalakad-Mundanthurai Tiger Reserve and one in adjoining private lands. Recent observations reveal that Kanyakumari and Tirunelveli populations no longer exist. It also occurs also in Sri Lanka

## Habitat

Its typical natural habitat is the dry deciduous forest, garden and cultivation areas in the eastern rain shadow foothills of the Western Ghats in Kalakkad-Mundanthurai Tiger Reserve.

## Threats

Potential threats are habitat loss, powerlines, roads, human settlement and accidental mortality.

## Status

This is classified as Endangered due to restricted and fragmented distribution.

## Conservation measures

Two out of three distinct populations occur in KMTR. Prevention of fuel wood removal and grazing, and public awareness campaigns.

## Research

1. Confirmation of the subspecies status through field verification and genetic studies.
2. Identification of critical habitats and distributional limits
3. Estimation of population abundance and structure
4. Identification of area specific conservation actions

## Semnopithecus priam thersites - Sri Lanka population

Semnopithecus entellus thersites is the only Grey Langur species found within the country and spread throughout the dry zone area. They are susceptible to habitat loss and current populations are in decline hence categorised as Endangered. This species is also hunted for food. Current land use patterns resulting in rapid conversion of natural forest into agricultural lands needs to be addressed.

## Distribution

This species of langur is primarily found in the Northern, Central and Southern dry zone areas of the country covering an area of $43,600 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. Population distribution within this area is not contiguous.

## Threats

Increase in urbanization within the range resulting in high risk due to animal-human conflict e.g. hunting for food, poisoning, electrocution, road kills etc.

## Status

Current assessment recognizes its Endangered position

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical area: A large percentage of Semnopithecus entellus thersites populations are found outside current PA. These areas should be considered for individual protection or inclusion within the neighboring existing PA.

Topics: Encroachment into both PAs as well as more importantly in the case of this subspecies encroachment and/ or conversion of outside forest areas into channa lands/development schemes etc. (having dense Semnopithecus entellus thersites populations) should be prevented.

## Priority areas for management

Geographical area: Forest areas are with high density of Semnopithecus entellus thersites: Many sanctuaries with forest reserves do not have same protection levels as NPs. These containing many populations of Semnopithecus entellus thersites should be protected.

Meta population management: There is no requirement.
Wildlife Department Responsibilities:

1. Strict enforcement of anti poaching laws and patrolling of protected and buffer zone areas.
2. Outside areas should also be monitored for hunting and encroachment.

Private owners: Farmers and private planters who have Semnopithecus entellus thersites within their lands and/or bordering should be educated about the importance of this species existence. Innovative methods of crop raiding prevention should be looked into and implemented as well.

## Priority areas for research

Intensive surveys needs to be carried out in all islands.

## In situ / ex situ conservation approaches

1. Consumption of animals in forest areas should be stopped and garbage eliminated.
2. Strict enforcement for laws for encroachers.
3. Government has to take efforts to introduce other methods to prevent crop-raiding other than killing of animals

## Trachypithecus geei (Ali and Santapau, 1956)

## Summary

Golden Langur is restricted to a very small area of northwestern Assam in India and South Central Bhutan. It has a population of about 4500 , which is apparently stable in Bhutan but continuously declining in India. In India, various anthropogenic factors has resulted to habitat shrinkage, breaking the continuity of the forest and at the same time have restricted a substantial number of the population in to fragmented forest pockets. Based on current population trends and restricted distribution the species is listed as Endangered. To ensure legal protection more and more habitat area should be brought under protected area network.

## Distribution

Golden langur is found only in India and Bhutan. In India their distribution is restricted between the River Manas in the east, Sankosh in the west and Brahmaputra in the south. In Bhutan they are restricted in to the Chamkhar/ Mangde/Manas river complex up to 3000 m ranges.

## Habitat

Tropical evergreen, moist deciduous and sal-dominated forest, deciduous broadleaf, semi-evergreen, evergreen broad-leaved forests and fields.

## Threats

Habitat loss (encroachment, illegal felling), habitat fragmentation and habitat degradation are major threats to the species in India.

## Status

CITES- Appendix-I
IUCN Red Data list- Endangered
WPA (1972), India- Schedule-I.

## Priority areas for conservation

In India, all the habitat area should be considered as priority areas. Attention should be paid to isolated population in small fragmented forest pocket.

## Topics

Ripu, Chirrang Reserve Forest that is the only large contiguous patch of habitat for Golden Langur outside the protected area network should be upgraded to Wildlife Sanctuary. Chakrasila WLS should be upgraded to National Park.

## Priority areas for management

Geographic areas: Trans-border joint action plan to protect the habitat of the species is very essential. So such practices should be encouraged. All the fragments should be protected. Measures should be taken to minimize other anthropogenic pressures in good population area.

Metapopulation management: There is no requirement for metapopulation management.
Forest department responsibilities: The forest department should stop the illegal felling of trees. There has to be considerable vigilance to prevent hunting and any encroachment of forestlands.

## Priority areas for research

1. Intensive survey has to be done on population trends with proper documentation in Northeastern India.
2. A long-term demographic study needs to be done in selected population.
3. The field study on the ecology and behavior and in different habitats has to be carried out.
4. Community based conservation should be initiated.

## In situ/ex situ conservation approach

Forest Department: Massive plantation program should be encouraged to reforest some of the substantially good population of Golden Langur and build few corridors to link forest fragments. Food trees must be planted based on the natural habitat for Golden Langur.

Central Government: Potential population should be protected by projecting species like other programs viz. "Project tiger".

## Education and Awareness

Education programmes for grassroot level people has to be done in collaboration with NGOs.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

Animal ecology and wildlife biology lab; Department of Zoology, Guwahati University, Assam; Primate research Centre (northeast) and "Aaranyak" (NGO) are providing necessary support in carrying out long-term studies of the species. They should therefore be involved in implementing the action plan for this species.

## Community involvement

Community participation with socio-economic development programme in fringe areas of the species' habitat should be built up.

## Semnopithecus (Trachypithecus) johnii johnii

## Summary

The Black Leaf Monkey endemic to the Western Ghats of Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Southern part of Karnataka is found in the elevation range of $300-2000 \mathrm{~m}$. It has a population of about $16,000+$ individuals in five locations in many sub-populations. Due to habitat loss and hunting for traditional medicine and for meat, the population is perceived to be declining at about $10 \%$ in the past decade.

## Distribution

This species is found along the Western Ghats between $8.5^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ to $12.3^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ range extending from Agastyamalai region
in the south to the Brahmagiris in the North. Five major locations where they are found are Agasthyamalai, Palani Hills, Anamalais, Nilgiris and Brahmagiris.

## Habitat

This species is found in the tropical wet evergreen, semi-evergreen, riparian forests and teak plantations of the Western Ghats.

## Threats

1. Major threats identified are habitat loss, hunting for medicine and meat. Other threats are habitat conversion, habitat fragmentation, flash flooding, land slide.
2. Areas such as the Mundanthurai plateau have lost most of their populations due to flash floods in 1992 and the resulting loss of riparian forest.

## Status

This species is considered Vulnerable based on habitat loss, habitat degradation, and decrease in extent of occurrence in the northern part of its range.

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas: The main population is Kalakad-Mundanthurai Tiger Reserve, and special attention should be paid to this area.

Topics: Demographic studies need to be initiated in at least two sites, one in evergreen and other in deciduous sites, as they are not understood.

## Priority areas for management

Forest department responsibilities: The Forest Department should keep strict vigilance in the areas and should take stringent action against poachers. Remote areas should be frequently visited by forest officials to prevent poaching of animals and illegal timber cutting; and joint patrolling along the state boundary between Tamil Nadu and Kerala should be initiated by the respective Forest Departments.

## Priority areas for research

1. Intensive surveys are to be carried out in the distribution areas and also outside protected areas.
2. Field studies on ecology, life history, and behavior are to be undertaken.
3. Long term monitoring of identified groups has to be initiated with proper documentation.
4. Genetic resource for suspected hybridization may also be undertaken.

## In situ conservation approaches

## Policy makers

1. Conversion of Nilgiri Langur habitat in any form especially conversion of coffee plantation into tea plantation is to be stopped.
2. Replacement of native trees in coffee plantation with fast growing exotic tree species has to be discouraged.

## Education and awareness

Forest Department and Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) can take initiatives to create awareness among the fringe area people about the rarity, endemism, and importance of this near-threatened species and the necessity of conservation.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

1. Identified research priorities can be undertaken by the research institutions to generate sufficient data in the regions for proper management of this species.
2. Research organizations can train local people on the basics of census techniques and involve them in conservation activities.
3. SACON/ Mysore University and KFRI should take the responsibility for monitoring the implementation of this Action Plan.

## Community involvement

Eco-development activities have been initiated in two Protected areas (Kalakad-Mundanthurai Tiger Reserve and Periyar Tiger Reserve). These can be used as models for similar initiatives in other PA's where biotic pressures are high. Local communities can be involved in management activities like habitat restoration, anti-poaching activities and in population monitoring. They should also be involved in eco-tourism initiatives to show people Nilgiri Langurs.

## Trachypithecus obscurus phayrei (Blyth, 1847)

## Summary

The Phayre's leaf monkey (T. obscurus phayrei) according to Dr. D. Brandon Jones, 2002 is the subspecies, till recently believed to be Trachypithecus phayrei phayrei. It occurs in Northeastern India, Bangladesh and Eastern Myanmar. Recent field studies report the population in Northeastern India and Bangladesh to be $<1600$. The populations are distributed in primary and secondary forest habitats including bamboo-dominated fragmented forest patches and near tea gardens. Main threats are habitat destruction, degradation and shrinkage. Localized hunting is also reported. Based on the available data (which is limited), the subspecies is Endangered. It is protected under Indian Wildlife Protection Act, 1972 (Amend., 1991), under Schedule -I and under Schedule-III of Bangladesh Wildlife Preservation (Amendment) Act 1974. More detailed surveys are needed to complete the distribution of this subspecies as complete distribution is still not known.

## Distribution

The Leaf Monkey is reported from the states of Assam, Mizoram and Tripura of India and only three sites of Bangladesh.

## Habitat

The species is found in primary and secondary moist evergreen and moist mixed deciduous forests. They are found to inhabit bamboo patches and plantations such as Rubber (Hevea brasiliensis). They are forest dwellers and are not known to raid crops.

## Threats

1. Habitat loss/shrinkage due to human settlements, agricultural land expansion, establishment and expansion of tea gardens.
2. Hunting for food.

## Status

1. I.U.C.N-SSC Red Data Book: Data Deficient (India)
2. CITES-II: Lower risk (India)
3. Indian Wildlife Protection Act, 1972 (Amend. 1991): Schedule-I (India)
4. IUCN-SSC RDB 2000: Critically Endangered (Bangladesh)
5. $3^{\text {rd }}$ Schedule BW (P) (A) Act 1974. (India)

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas: The whole distribution belt in southern Assam is fragmented and habitat continuity may be restored through plantations including bamboo, connecting fragmented "island" patches. As far as Tripura is concerned, large areas having known populations are severely infested with insurgency. This problem needs to be
tackled at the Govt. level. The population in Bangladesh are only distributed in the Northeast and Southeast of Bangladesh .

## Topics:

1. Habitat loss prevention
2. Community participation in conservation

## Priority areas for management

Geographical areas: Throughout the distribution range - Indo Bangladesh joint venture is required.

## Priority areas for research

1. Intensive surveys involving demographic studies are required. Special points to be covered are
a) Documentation (photographs, video records etc.)
b) Collection of skins and other body parts whenever available.
c) Habitat analysis studies including habitat fragmentation estimates.
d) Pinpoint locations (using GPS)
2. Continued study on ecology behaviour and life history. Comparative studies in different kinds of habitat to be stressed upon.

## Role of NGOs

1. Support Forest Department Conservation activities in the way of providing emergency relief funds and boosting morale of field staff with various incentives like insurance cover, special anti-poaching kits etc.
2. Involve religious and other powerful bodies in wildlife conservation
3. Initiate mass awareness campaign in schools.
4. Act as pressure group on the government.

## Trachypithecus pileatus tenebricus (Hinton, 1923)

## Summary

Tenebrous (capped) Leaf Monkey is found in North-eastern Assam and some parts of Arunachal Pradesh in India and north Central Bhutan. It has a population of $<1000$ (observed). In India various anthropogenic factors has resulted in habitat shrinkage, breaking the continuity of the forest and at the same time have restricted a substantial number of population in to fragmented forest and protected areas. Based on the current population trends and fragmentation of their habitat, the species is listed as Endangered.

To ensure legal protection more and more habitat area should be brought under Protected Area network.

## Distribution

Capped (tenebrous) Leaf Monkey is found in India (Assam, Arunachal Pradesh) and Bhutan.

## Habitat

Sub-tropical evergreen, broad-leaved forest, semi evergreen, moist deciduous forest. They are also found in bamboo thicket of secondary forest.

## Threats

Habitat loss (encroachment, shifting cultivation), habitat fragmentation and habitat degradation, hunting, less immature individuals in the population are the major threats to the species in India.

```
Status
CITES- Appendix-I
```

IUCN Red Data list- Vulnerable
WPA (1972), India- Schedule-I.

## Priority areas for conservation

In India, all the habitat area should be considered as priority areas.
Geographical areas: Large continuous habitats throughout the distribution range of Capped Leaf Monkey (orange bellied) are extremely important for long-term conservation through out the distribution range. Few important localities in India are Langlakso-Mikir Hills-Kalioni Complex and Barail North Cachar Complex. There are similar complex in Bangladesh and Mayanmar also.

## Priority areas for management

Geographic areas: All large continuous forest habitats with Capped leaf monkey (orange bellied) should be considered for proper management plan, i.e., to bring those areas under PA network.

Metapopulation management: not required at this point of time.
Forest Department responsibilities: Strict implementation of Wildlife Protection Acts, CITES etc. are essential. For implementation of laws, all divisions (e.g. logging, territorial, social, working plan, wildlife) of Forest Department should work together with the help of local administration.

## Priority areas for research

1. Intensive surveys needed to be carried out in the potential Capped leaf monkey (orange bellied) habitats which never been surveyed and to validate the brief survey reports that has already been done in the earlier. In Indian part detail survey is required in Arunachal Pradesh.
2. Detailed study should be done on the ecology and behavior of fragmented populations.
3. A long-term synthetic demographic study should be initiated.

## In situ/ ex situ conservation approach

Forest Department: Massive plantation program should be encouraged to reforest some of the substantially good population of the monkey and building few corridors to tie up fragments. Food trees must be planted based on the natural habitat in the Capped leaf monkey habitats.

Central Government: The potential population should be protected by projecting the species as flagship species like other program viz. "Project tiger".

## Education and Awareness

Education programmes for grassroots level people has to be done in collaboration with NGOs.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

Animal ecology and wildlife biology lab, department of Zoology Gauhati University, Assam, Primate Research Centre (northeast) and "Aaranyak" (NGO) are providing necessary support in carrying out long-term studies of the species. They should therefore be involved in implementing the action plan for this species.

## Community involvement

Community participation with socio-economic development programme in the fringe areas of the species habitat should be built up.

## Trachypithecus pileatus durga (Wroughton, 1916)

## Summary

Capped leaf monkey is found in Central and Southern Assam, Mizoram, Tripura in India and Bangladesh. It has a population of $<1100$. In India and Bangladesh various anthropogenic factors has resulted in habitat shrinkage,
breaking the continuity of the forest and at the same time have restricted a substantial number of population in to fragmented forest pockets. Based on current population trends and fragmentation of their habitat the species is listed as Vulnerable. To ensure legal protection more and more habitat area should be brought under protected area network.

## Distribution

Capped (Orange-bellied) Leaf Monkey is found in India and Bangladesh and adjacent parts of Myanmar. In India they are found in Central and Southern Assam, Mizoram, Yamuna River in Bangladesh limits Tripura while their distribution.

## Habitat

Sub-tropical evergreen, semi evergreen, moist deciduous forest. They are also found in Bamboo thicket of secondary forest.

## Threats

Habitat loss (encroachment, shifting cultivation), habitat fragmentation and habitat degradation, less immature individuals in the population are the major threats to the species in India.

## Status

CITES- Appendix-I
IUCN Red Data list- Endangered
WPA (1972), India- Schedule-I.

## Priority areas for conservation

In India, all the habitat area should be considered as priority areas.
Geographical areas: Large continuous habitats throughout the distribution range of Capped Leaf Monkey (orange bellied) are extremely important for long-term conservation through out the distribution range. Few important localities in India are Langlakso-Mikir Hills- Kalioni Complex and Barail North Cachar Complex. There are similar complexes in Bangladesh and Myanmar also.

## Priority areas for management

Geographic areas: All large continuous forest habitats with Capped Leaf Monkey (Orange -bellied) should be considered for proper management plan, i.e., to bring those areas under PA network.

Metapopulation management: not required at this point of time.
Forest Department responsibilities: Strict implementation of Wildlife Protection Acts, CITES etc. are essential. For implementation of laws, all divisions (e.g. logging, territorial, social, working plan, wildlife) of Forest Department should work together with the help of local administration.

## Priority areas for research

Intensive surveys have to be carried out in potential Capped Leaf Monkey (orange bellied) habitats which have never been surveyed and to validate brief survey reports that has already been done. In Indian part detailed survey is required in Arunachal Pradesh. Detailed study should be done on the ecology and behavior of fragmented populations. A long-term synthetic demographic study should be initiated.

## In situ/ ex situ conservation approach

Forest Department: Massive plantation programmes should be encouraged to reforest some of the substantially good population of the monkeys and build few corridors to link fragments. Food trees must be planted based on the natural habitat of Capped Leaf Monkey.

Central Government: Potential population should be protected by projecting the species as flagship species like other programmes viz. "Project tiger".

## Education and awareness

The education programmes for grassroots level people has to be done in collaboration with NGOs.

## Role of research institutes and NGOs

Animal ecology and wildlife biology lab, Department of Zoology Guwahati University, Assam, Primate Research Centre (northeast) and "Aaranyak"(NGO) are providing necessary support in carrying out long-term studies of the species. They should therefore be involved in implementing the action plan for this species.

## Community involvement

Community participation with socio-economic development programme in fringe areas of the species' habitat should be built up.

## Trachypithecus vetulus

## Summary

The Purple-faced Langur Semnopithecus vetulus is endemic to Sri Lanka. Currently four subspecies are recognized, $S$. vetulus vetulus distributed in the wet southern lowlands of the country, S. vetulus nestor in the densely populated wet western lowlands, $S$. vetulus montocola in the wet montane areas, and S. vetulus philbricki in the lowland dry zone. Past studies on forest populations of this species indicate that they live in small groups and are predominantly folivorous, but studies on some populations in modified habitats show that dietary adaptations are more possible for this species than previously believed.

It is almost wholly arboreal and hence dependant on habitats with adequate canopy cover. A comprehensive aerial photographic survey of the country's forest cover indicated that forest cover had dropped to 44 percent of the island's land area from a 70 percent at the turn of the century, much of which is attributed to channa (shifting cultivation). The most recent complete forest survey in 1992 based on satellite remote sensing and field checking indicate that closed - canopy natural forest; which is the prime habitat of the purple-faced langur had dropped to 24 percent of the land area of the country. Significantly, forest loss which was 42,000 ha per year from 1956 to 1983 had increased to 54,000 ha per year from 1983, mainly due to forest loss in the dry zone due to irrigated agriculture and associated human settlement under the Mahaweli Scheme. At present, closed canopy natural forests are concentrated largely in the dry zone, while the lowland rainforests, which contain the highest level of biological diversity and two of the subspecies of $S$. vetulus occupy less than 10 percent of the forest area. Although around 14 percent of the land area lies within state reserves, of serious concern is the fact that very little of these forests, as well as forests of the montane zone, are protected, increasing the vulnerability of these forests for further destruction. While recent initiatives for management and conservation of Sri Lanka's natural forests are seeking to stem the tide of rapid species loss, their management plans have so far not considered the requirements for primate conservation. Consequently although several long-term studies on this species in various parts of its range have indicated that conservation action is required, no long-term plans have been prepared as yet for the conservation of this species which is considered threatened in the 1999 List of Threatened Fauna and Flora of Sri Lanka and is listed as Endangered in IUCN's 2000 global list of threatened species.

## Education and Awareness

Most forests in the wet zone in which three of the sub species of Purple-faced Langur occurs are surrounded by heavy population densities. The cooperation of local people for conservation is a vital need. Human tolerance of monkeys in the past was due to religions factors in a predominantly Buddhist society, but these attitudes are changing with rapid changes in socio-economic values. Education is important to increase tolerance among urban populations, but where monkey - human conflict is acute, this may not be sufficient to obtain the cooperation of local people for conservation action. Hence identification of methods to mitigate crop and roof damage from these monkeys as well as spread awareness of these methods, while examining novel ways to gain the cooperation of local people in primate conservation needs to be identified.

## Trachypithecus vetulus monticola

## Distribution

The range of this sub-species stretches across the country from the north-western coastal areas, across the north central province to the east coast, ranging from inland to meet the range of the highland subspecies in the central province. This is the only subspecies that is sympatric with $S$. entellus thersites.

## Threats

The range of this subspecies has been considerably decreased during the past few decades due to deforestation in the dry zone due to agriculture, deforestation and to some extent hunting for subsistence and killing as a crop pest. In more recent years, development of the dry zone and the establishment of resultant infrastructure and roads is
also adding to the decline of its natural habitat and its quality. Consequently its range is diminishing which will cause a population decline.

## Status

Endangered

## Priority areas for conservation and management

Although large areas of forests remain in the range of this subspecies, there are few contiguous areas of Protected Area that can be considered as adequate habitats for viable populations. Further, two of the largest Protected Areas - the Wilpattu National Park and the Somawathie National Park that can provide refuge to this sub-species are out of bounds due to the civil strife in the country, and no knowledge of the status of populations in them are currently available. Priority areas for conservation should thus include wildlife and forest reserves that are left in its range including smaller forest patches such as the Polonnaruwa Sanctuary where there has been long-term studies on primates.

## Priority areas for research

- Due to almost three decades of civil strife a large segment of natural forests in this range might have severely degraded while status of populations may have declined drastically due to hunting. Thus, surveys are needed to determine distribution and population density of this subspecies in areas where long term conservation of this sub-species is viable.
- This is the only sub-species of $S$. vetulus that subsist with all other primate species in the country. Hence comparative studies on feeding and ranging behaviour as well as response to habitat change in areas subject to severe disturbance need to be carried out.


## Management considerations

It has also to be borne in mind that once civil life returns to the areas that are now under civil strife, vast changes in forest cover can be expected due to clearing for establishment of infrastructure for transport and social welfare services as well as for resettlement of displaced human populations. Hence identification of priority areas for conservation of populations and their management to ensure that the species requirements are met with, is of importance.

## Distribution

The range of this sub-species stretches into the wet highlands ranging to heights of $1000-1200 \mathrm{~m}$.

## Threats

The natural habitat of this subspecies is montane biodiversity rich rain forests. Major threats in the past comprise forest loss due to large-scale deforestation during colonial times for large-scale plantation, agriculture and human settlement and selective logging in wet zone forests in the early 1070s. However, many of these forests are species rich and continue to offer habitats for primates. Currently there is a moratorium on logging in all natural forests of
the country but encroachment by local people for expanding small holdings of crops continue to be a considerable threat to these forests.

## Status

This subspecies is listed as Endangered in the 2000 IUCN List of Threatened Species.

## Priority areas for conservation and management

Since much of the remaining forests of this region are small and fragmented it is necessary to conserve areas of contiguous forests that would be capable of sustaining viable populations of this subspecies in the long term. For practical reasons these areas should coincide with areas considered as important for the conservation of indigenous biodiversity, and should include contiguous forests of the montane region, including Horton Plains National Park.

## Priority areas for research

1. Natural forests of this area are severely fragmented and surrounded by high density of human populations so that habitat change is a continuous occurrence. Therefore there has to be a study of the impacts of habitat change on populations in terms of feeding and ranging behaviour and survival of populations as well as comparative studies of this nature with forest populations.
2. Surveys are needed to determine the distribution and population density of these animals in the present and proposed Protected Area network in this region.

## Semnopithecus vetulus nestor

## Summary

The Purple-faced Langur Semnopithecus vetulus is endemic to Sri Lanka. Currently four subspecies are recognized, $S$. vetulus vetulus distributed in the wet southern lowlands of the country, S. vetulus nestor in the densely populated wet western lowlands, S. vetulus montocola in the wet montane areas, and S. vetulus philbricki in the lowland dry zone. Past studies on forest populations of this species indicate that they live in small groups and are predominantly folivorous, but studies on some populations in modified habitats show that dietary adaptations are more possible for this species than previously believed.

It is almost wholly arboreal and hence dependant on habitats with adequate canopy cover. A comprehensive aerial photographic survey of the country's forest cover indicated that forest cover had dropped to 44 percent of the island's land area from a 70 percent at the turn of the century, much of which is attributed to channa (shifting cultivation). The most recent complete forest survey in 1992 based on satellite remote sensing and field checking indicate that closed - canopy natural forest; which is the prime habitat of the purple-faced langur had dropped to 24 percent of the land area of the country. Significantly, forest loss which was 42,000 ha per year from 1956 to 1983 had increased to 54,000 ha per year from 1983, mainly due to forest loss in the dry zone due to irrigated agriculture and associated human settlement under the Mahaweli Scheme. At present, closed canopy natural forests are concentrated largely in the dry zone, while the lowland rainforests, which contain the highest level of biological diversity and two of the subspecies of $S$. vetulus occupy less than 10 percent of the forest area. Although around 14 percent of the land area lies within state reserves, of serious concern is the fact that very little of these forests, as well as forests of the montane zone, are protected, increasing the vulnerability of these forests for further destruction. While recent initiatives for management and conservation of Sri Lanka's natural forests are seeking to stem the tide of rapid species loss, their management plans have so far not considered the requirements for primate conservation. Consequently although several long-term studies on this species in various parts of its range have indicated that conservation action is required, no long-term plans have been prepared as yet for the conservation of this species which is considered threatened in the 1999 List of Threatened Fauna and Flora of Sri Lanka and is listed as Endangered in IUCN's 2000 global list of threatened species.

## Education and Awareness

Most forests in the wet zone in which three of the sub species of Purple-faced Langur occurs are surrounded by
heavy population densities. The cooperation of local people for conservation is a vital need. Human tolerance of monkeys in the past was due to religions factors in a predominantly Buddhist society, but these attitudes are changing with rapid changes in socio-economic values. Education is important to increase tolerance among urban populations, but where monkey - human conflict is acute, this may not be sufficient to obtain the cooperation of local people for conservation action. Hence identification of methods to mitigate crop and roof damage from these monkeys as well as spread awareness of these methods, while examining novel ways to gain the cooperation of local people in primate conservation needs to be identified.

## Distribution

The range of this sub-species stretches from the coastal areas of the wet lowlands into the wet highlands ranging up to the elevation of about 1000 m where it meets the range of the highland subspecies. Intermediate forms are believed to exist in this part of its range as well as where it meets the range of the southern subspecies.

## Threats

There are probably less than $1000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ of natural forest within the range of this subspecies, so that most of the populations live in human modified areas such as home gardens and plantations. However, these habitats have also changed rapidly during the past decade, and are increasingly fragmented due to high population densities, pressure on land and changing socio-economic conditions. Consequently, monkeys living in these areas are severely constrained due to loss of food trees, ranging pathways and increased hostility by local people with whom they coexist.

## Status

Endangered

## Priority areas for conservation and management

As much of the remaining forest of this region are extremely small while offering the only refugia for natural forest populations, management of these areas for conservation of this sub-species is of vital importance. Further, as populations living in modified areas show considerable changes in diet, feeding predominantly on fruit, conservation of these populations also assume importance. Hence acceptable measures to meet the twin objectives of primate conservation and the aspirations of local people need to be collectively identified, developed and adopted.

## Priority areas for research

1. Surveys are necessary to identify forests suitable for long-term survival of populations of this sub-species
2. As studies indicate that populations living in modified environments can exist on a high fruit diet that is rich in human edible species, comparative studies on feeding and ranging habits of forest populations are important to gauge the adaptability of this sub-species.
3. As conservation of population outside forested areas depend entirely on human attitudes, pilot testing of projects that meet the twin aspirations of eco-tourism and primate conservation need to be initiated.

## Semnopithecus vetulus philbricki

## Summary

The Purple-faced Langur Semnopithecus vetulus is endemic to Sri Lanka. Currently four subspecies are recognized, $S$. vetulus vetulus distributed in the wet southern lowlands of the country, S. vetulus nestor in the densely populated wet western lowlands, S. vetulus montocola in the wet montane areas, and S. vetulus philbricki in the lowland dry zone. Past studies on forest populations of this species indicate that they live in small groups and are predominantly folivorous, but studies on some populations in modified habitats show that dietary adaptations are more possible for this species than previously believed.

It is almost wholly arboreal and hence dependant on habitats with adequate canopy cover. A comprehensive aerial photographic survey of the country's forest cover indicated that forest cover had dropped to 44 percent of the island's land area from a 70 percent at the turn of the century, much of which is attributed to channa (shifting cultivation). The most recent complete forest survey in 1992 based on satellite remote sensing and field checking indicate that closed - canopy natural forest; which is the prime habitat of the purple-faced langur had dropped to 24 percent of the land area of the country. Significantly, forest loss which was 42,000 ha per year from 1956 to 1983 had increased to 54,000 ha per year from 1983, mainly due to forest loss in the dry zone due to irrigated agriculture and associated human settlement under the Mahaweli Scheme. At present, closed canopy natural forests are concentrated largely in the dry zone, while the lowland rainforests, which contain the highest level of biological diversity and two of the subspecies of $S$. vetulus occupy less than 10 percent of the forest area. Although around 14 percent of the land area lies within state reserves, of serious concern is the fact that very little of these forests, as well as forests of the montane zone, are protected, increasing the vulnerability of these forests for further destruction. While recent initiatives for management and conservation of Sri Lanka's natural forests are seeking to stem the tide of rapid species loss, their management plans have so far not considered the requirements for primate conservation. Consequently although several long-term studies on this species in various parts of its range have indicated that conservation action is required, no long-term plans have been prepared as yet for the conservation of this species which is considered threatened in the 1999 List of Threatened Fauna and Flora of Sri Lanka and is listed as Endangered in IUCN's 2000 global list of threatened species.

## Education and Awareness

Most forests in the wet zone in which three of the sub species of Purple-faced Langur occurs are surrounded by heavy population densities. The cooperation of local people for conservation is a vital need. Human tolerance of monkeys in the past was due to religions factors in a predominantly Buddhist society, but these attitudes are changing with rapid changes in socio-economic values. Education is important to increase tolerance among urban populations, but where monkey - human conflict is acute, this may not be sufficient to obtain the cooperation of local people for conservation action. Hence identification of methods to mitigate crop and roof damage from these monkeys as well as spread awareness of these methods, while examining novel ways to gain the cooperation of local people in primate conservation needs to be identified.

## Distribution

The range of this sub-species stretches across the country from the north western coastal areas, across the North Central Province to the east coast, ranging inland to meet the range of the highland subspecies in the Central Province. This is the only subspecies that is sympatric with $S$. entellus thersites.

## Threats

The range of this subspecies has been considerably decreased during the past few decades due to deforestation in the dry zone due to irrigated agriculture, and to some extent hunting for subsistence and killing as a crop pest. In more recent years development of the dry zone and the establishment of resultant infrastructure and roads are also adding to the decline of its natural habitat and its quality. Consequently its range is diminishing which will cause a further decline in its population.

## Status

Endangered

## Priority areas for conservation and management

Although large areas of forests remain in the range of this subspecies, there are few contiguous areas of Protected Area that can be considered as adequate habitats for viable populations. Further, two of the largest protected areas - the Wilpattu National Park and the Somawathiya National Park that can provide refuge to this sub-species are out of bounds due to the civil strife in the country, and no knowledge of the status of populations in them are currently available. Priority areas for conservation should thus include the wildlife and forest reserves that are left in its range including smaller forest patches such as the Polonnaruwa Sanctuary where there has been long-term studies on primates.

## Priority areas for research

Due to almost three decades of civil strife a large segment of natural forests in this range might have severely degraded while status of populations may have declined drastically due to hunting. Thus, surveys are needed to determine distribution and population density of this subspecies in areas where long term conservation of this subspecies is viable.

This is the only sub-species of $S$. vetulus that subsist with all other primate species in the country. Hence comparative studies on feeding and ranging behaviour as well as response to habitat change in areas subject to severe disturbance need to be carried out.

## Management considerations

It has also to be borne in mind that once civil life returns to the areas that are now under civil strife, vast changes in forest cover can be expected due to clearing for establishment of infrastructure for transport and social welfare services as well as for resettlement of displaced human populations. Hence identification of priority areas for conservation of populations and their management to ensure that the species requirements are met with, is of importance.

## Semnopithecus vetulus vetulus

## Summary

The Purple-faced Langur Semnopithecus vetulus is endemic to Sri Lanka. Currently four subspecies are recognized, $S$. vetulus vetulus distributed in the wet southern lowlands of the country, S. vetulus nestor in the densely populated wet western lowlands, S. vetulus montocola in the wet montane areas, and S. vetulus philbricki in the lowland dry zone. Past studies on forest populations of this species indicate that they live in small groups and are predominantly folivorous, but studies on some populations in modified habitats show that dietary adaptations are more possible for this species than previously believed.

It is almost wholly arboreal and hence dependant on habitats with adequate canopy cover. A comprehensive aerial photographic survey of the country's forest cover indicated that forest cover had dropped to 44 percent of the island's land area from a 70 percent at the turn of the century, much of which is attributed to channa (shifting cultivation). The most recent complete forest survey in 1992 based on satellite remote sensing and field checking indicate that closed - canopy natural forest; which is the prime habitat of the purple-faced langur had dropped to 24 percent of the land area of the country. Significantly, forest loss which was 42,000 ha per year from 1956 to 1983 had increased to 54,000 ha per year from 1983, mainly due to forest loss in the dry zone due to irrigated agriculture and associated human settlement under the Mahaweli Scheme. At present, closed canopy natural forests are concentrated largely in the dry zone, while the lowland rainforests, which contain the highest level of biological diversity and two of the subspecies of $S$. vetulus occupy less than 10 percent of the forest area. Although around 14 percent of the land area lies within state reserves, of serious concern is the fact that very little of these forests, as well as forests of the montane zone, are protected, increasing the vulnerability of these forests for further destruction. While recent initiatives for management and conservation of Sri Lanka's natural forests are seeking to stem the tide of rapid species loss, their management plans have so far not considered the requirements for primate conservation. Consequently although several long-term studies on this species in various parts of its range have indicated that conservation action is required, no long-term plans have been prepared as yet for the conservation of this species which is considered threatened in the 1999 List of Threatened Fauna and Flora of Sri Lanka and is listed as Endangered in IUCN's 2000 global list of threatened species.

## Education and Awareness

Most forests in the wet zone in which three of the sub species of Purple-faced Langur occurs are surrounded by heavy population densities. The cooperation of local people for conservation is a vital need. Human tolerance of monkeys in the past was due to religions factors in a predominantly Buddhist society, but these attitudes are changing with rapid changes in socio-economic values. Education is important to increase tolerance among urban
populations, but where monkey - human conflict is acute, this may not be sufficient to obtain the cooperation of local people for conservation action. Hence identification of methods to mitigate crop and roof damage from these monkeys as well as spread awareness of these methods, while examining novel ways to gain the cooperation of local people in primate conservation needs to be identified.

## Distribution

The range of this sub-species stretches into the wet lowlands in the southern area of Sri Lanka, ranging from the coastal areas to the foothills of the central hills where it meets the range of the highland subspecies.

## Threats

The natural habitat of this subspecies is the biodiversity rich lowland rain forests, although for several hundred years some populations have also adapted to living in plantations and home gardens. Major threats in the past comprise extensive forest loss due to encroachment for agriculture and human settlement and selective logging in wet zone forests in the early 1970s. However, several of these forest patches continue to be species rich, including this subspecies, and are earmarked for conservation of biodiversity and for inclusion in the Protected Area network. Currently there is a moratorium on logging in all natural forests of the country but encroachment by local people for expanding crop small holdings continue to be a considerable threat to these forest. Further, all forests of this region are surrounded by heavily populated villages and plantations, and conservation of populations in many of the smaller forest patches, as well as outside them, will depend on the participation of local people on forest and species conservation.

## Status

Endangered

## Priority areas for conservation and management

As much of the remaining forest of this region are small and fragmented it is necessary to conserve areas of contiguous forest that would be capable of sustaining viable populations in the long term. For practical reasons these areas should coincide with areas considered as important for conservation of indigenous biodiversity and should encompass the forests contiguous with Sinharaja, the World Heritage Site and National Heritage Wilderness Area.

## Management considerations

Management plans have been developed for several wet zone forests within the range of this subspecies, and several are due to be implemented. Special consideration for primate conservation could be integrated into forest management especially as this species is a valuable indicator species. Particular attention should be given to requirements for conservation of this subspecies zonation and forest management practices in managed forests.

## Priority areas for research

1. No long-term studies have been carried out on this subspecies as yet, and none on rainforest populations of this subspecies as a whole. Hence studies are required to ascertain the feeding and ranging habits of this species and its social organisation in lowland wet zone forests of the region.
2. Natural forests of this area are severely fragmented and surrounded by high density of human populations so that habitat change is a continuous occurrence for many populations. This offers excellent opportunity to study the impacts of habitat change on populations in terms of feeding and ranging behaviour and survival of populations. Further, comparative studies of this nature with forest populations should provide a good indication of adaptability of the sub-species to habitat change.
3. Surveys are needed to determine the distribution and population density of these animals in the present and proposed Protected Area network in this region.

## Hylobatidae <br> Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock

## Summary

Hoolock Gibbon is the only species of Apes in India, Bangladesh and Myanmar and is restricted to few good forested habitats in this region. This species is most vulnerable among all the species found in this region to habitat alteration as it is strictly canopy dweller, monogamous, has long parental care, and small group size. So, a proper Action Plan for this species and intensive long-term research is essential to understand the function of calls and formation patterns.

## Distribution

Bunopithecus hoolock hoolock is found in northeastern and southeastern regions of Bangladesh, northeastern States (Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Tripura) of India and western Myanmar.

## Habitat

This species is found in a wide variety of forest habitats from tropical semi-evergreen forest, tropical moist deciduous forest and subtropical broad-leaved hill forest, mixed-evergreen forest. They are mostly found in areas with high density of fruiting trees.

## Threats

Habitat destruction, habitat alteration, fragmentation, hunting and trade are recognized as major threats for the survival of this species. Moreover, threats have been multiplied in this species due to their monogamous nature, small group size, long parental care, less reproductive turnouts and strictly arboreal nature.

## Status

This species is evaluated globally as Endangered according to the IUCN criteria. However as Critically Endangered in Bangladesh (RDBs, IUCN Bangladesh, 2000).

## Priority areas for conservation

Geographical areas: Large continuous habitats throughout the distribution range of Hoolock Gibbon are extremely important for long-term conservation through out the distribution range. Few important localities in India are Langlakso-Mikir Hills- Kalioni Complex and Barail North Cachar Complex. There are similar complex in Bangladesh and Mayanmar also.

## Priority areas for management

Geographic areas: All large continuous forest habitats with Hoolock Gibbon should be considered for proper management plan, i.e., to bring those areas under PA network.

Metapopulation management: Not required at this point of time.
Forest Department responsibilities: Strict implementation of Wildlife Protection Acts, CITES etc. are essential. For implementation of laws all divisions (e.g. logging, territorial, social, wWorking plan, wildlife) of Forest Department should work together with the help of local administration.

## Priority areas for research

1. Intensive surveys have to be carried out in potential Gibbon habitats which have never been surveyed and to validate brief survey reports that have already been done earlier. In India, a detailed survey is required in Arunachal Pradesh.
2. Detailed study should be done on the ecology and behavior of fragmented populations.
3. A long-term synthetic demographic study should be initiated.
4. Hoolock Action Management Plan should be developed.

## In situ / ex situ conservation approach

Forest department: Food trees must be planted based on the natural habitat in Hoolock Gibbon habitats.

State Government: Hoolock Gibbon should be focused as "Flagship Species" for the conservation of the forest habitats.

Central Government: Create National Parks for Hoolock Gibbons, which will support all the species as they are canopy species.

Education and Awareness: On the importance of this species in forest regeneration in School and college level.
Role of research institutes and NGO's: Coordinated research Institutes, Universities, Forest Department and NGO's play an important role to support the species. All of them can contribute to prepare and implement of the Action Plan.

Community involvement: Local people living in the Gibbon habitats should be involved to develope a participatory management plan. They should also be involved in eco-tourism activities.


Slender Loris
(Loris tardigradus)

## Status of South Asian Primates

7. Appendices


Hoolock or White-browed Gibbon (Female)

## Appendix 1: List of Primates in South Asian Zoos other than India

| No. | Species Name | M | F | U | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | Gibbon, Hoolock (Bunopithecus hoolock) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bangladesh (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chittagong Zoo | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Comilla Zoo | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Dhaka Zoo | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| II |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chittagong Zoo, Bangladesh | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
|  | Dhaka Zoo, Bangladesh | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
|  | Nepal (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Central Zoo, Nepal | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
|  | Pakistan (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lahore Zoo, Pakistan | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
|  | Sri Lanka (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Colombo Zoo, Sri Lanka | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 |
|  |  | 10 | 11 | 0 | 21 |
| III | Langur, Capped (Trachypithecus pileatus) Bangladesh (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chittagong Zoo | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Dhaka Zoo | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
|  | Rajshahi Zoo | ? | ? | ? | 1 |
|  | Rangpur Zoo | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
|  |  | >3 | >6 | 0 | >10 |
| IV | Macaque, Assamese (Macaca assamensis) Bangladesh (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chittagong Zoo | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Nepal (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Central Zoo | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| V | Macaque, Lion-Tailed (Macaca silenus) Nepal (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Central Zoo | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| V | Macaque, Pig-tailed (Macaca nemestrina) Bangladesh (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chittagong Zoo | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Dhaka Zoo | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |


| No. | Species Name | M | F | U | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sri Lanka (2002)Colombo Zoo |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 |
| VII | Macaque, Rhesus (Macaca mulatta) Bangladesh (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chittagong Zoo | 4 | 5 | 0 | 9 |
|  | Comilla Zoo | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
|  | Dhaka Zoo | 12 | 30 | 0 | 42 |
|  | Rajshahi Zoo | ? | ? | ? | 28 |
|  | Rangpur Zoo | 5 | 3 | 0 | 8 |
|  | Pakistan (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bahawalpur Zoo | 4 | 5 | 0 | 9 |
|  | Dewan Zoo (2001) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Jungle Kingdom (2001) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|  | Karachi Zoo | 8 | 17 | 0 | 25 |
|  | Lahore Zoo | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
|  | Landhi Korangi Zoo | 7 | 6 | 0 | 13 |
|  | Marghzar Zoo (2000) | 4 | 5 | 2 | 11 |
|  | Sri Lanka (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Colombo Zoo | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  | >48 | >77 | >12 | 165 |
| XIII | Loris, Slow (Nycticebus bengalensis) Bangladesh (2002) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chittagong Zoo | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
|  | Dhaka Zoo | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
|  |  | 4 | 6 | 0 | 10 |
|  | TOTAL | 75 | 108 | 12 | 224 |

# Appendix 2: List of Primates in Indian Zoos <br> Central Zoo Authority (CZA) database, 2001-2002 

| S.No | Species Name | M | F | U | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | Gibbon, Hoolock (Bunopithecus hoolock) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | National Zoological Park, Delhi | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | Lucknow Prani Udyan, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 3 | Assam State Zoo cum Botanical Garden, Guwahati, Assam | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | Aizawl Zoo, Mizoram | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 5 | Sepahijala Zoological Park, Tripura | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 |
| II | Langur, Common (Semnopithecus entellus) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | National Zoological Park, Delhi | 9 | 2 | 0 | 11 |
| 2 | Rohtak Zoo, Haryana | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| 3 | Mahendra Choudhury Zoological Park, Chhatbir | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 4 | Gandhi Zoological Park, Gwalior | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | Kamla Nehru Prani Sanghrahalay Zoo, Indore | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 6 | Kanpur Zoological Park, Uttar Pradesh | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 7 | Kamla Nehru Zoological Garden, Ahmedabad | 3 | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| 8 | Sakkarbaug Zoo, Junagarh, Gujarat | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 9 | Sayaji Baug Zoo, Vadodara, Gujarat | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| 10 | Veermata Jijabai Bhosale Udyan \& Zoo Mumbai | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 11 | Indira Gandhi Zoological Park, Visakhapatnam, A.P. | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| 12 | Sri Chamarajendra Zoological Garden, Mysore | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 13 | Thiruvananthapuram Zoo, Kerala | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| 14 | Arignar Anna Zoological Park, Vandalur | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| 15 | Children's Corner, Guindy | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 16 | Sanjay Gandhi Biological Park, Patna, Bihar | 13 | 4 | 0 | 17 |
| 17 | Maitri Baagh Zoo - Bhilai, Chatishgarh | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 18 | Alipore Zoological Garden, Kolkata | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 19 | Padmaja Naidu Himalayan Zoological Park, Darjeeling | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| 20 | Nandankanan Biological Park, Bhubaneshwar | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 21 | Bhagwan Birsa Biological Park, Ranchi | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 22 | Jawaharlal Nehru Biological Park, Bokaro | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| 23 | Tata Steel Zoological Park, Jamshedpur | 4 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| 24 | Assam State Zoo Cum Botanical Garden, Guwahati, Assam | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | 59 | 35 | 6 | 100 |
| III | Langur, Capped (Trachypithecus pileatus) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Mahendra Choudhury Zoological Park, Chhatbir | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | Kanpur Zoological Park, Uttar Pradesh | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | Kamla Nehru Zoological Garden, Ahmedabad | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | Sayaji Baug Zoo, Vadodara, Gujarat | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | Nehru Zoological Park, Hyderabad | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 6 | Bannerghatta, Karnataka |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Arignar Anna Zoological Park, Vandalur | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8 | Sanjay Gandhi Biological Park, Patna, Bihar | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 9 | Jawaharlal Nehru Biological Park, Bokaro | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 10 | Assam State Zoo cum Botanical Garden, Guwahati, Assam | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |


| S.No | Species Name | M | F | U | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | Manipur Zoological Garden, Imphal, Manipur | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 12 | Sepahijala Zoological Park, Sepahijala, Tripura | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | 8 | 5 | 0 | 13 |
| IV | Macaque, Assamese (Macaca assamensis) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | National Zoological Park, Delhi | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 2 | Mahendra Choudhury Zoological Park, Chhatbir | 14 | 18 | 7 | 39 |
| 3 | Jaipur Zoo, Rajasthan | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 4 | National Park, Bannerghatta Zoological Garden, Karnataka | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | Sanjay Gandhi Biological Park, Patna, Bihar | 5 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| 6 | Alipore Zoological Garden, Kolkata | 4 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| 7 | Nandankanan Biological Park, Bhubaneshwar | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8 | Itanagar Zoological Park, Arunachal Pradesh | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 9 | Assam State Zoo cum Botanical Garden, Guwahati, Assam | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 10 | Manipur Zoological Garden, Imphal | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| 11 | Aizawl Zoo, Aizawl, Mizoram | 14 | 6 | 0 | 20 |
| 12 | Sepahijala Zoological Park, Sepahijala, Tripura | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 |
|  |  | 52 | 37 | 10 | 99 |
| V | Macaque, Lion-Tailed (Macaca silenus) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | National Zoological Park, Delhi | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 2 | Mahendra Choudhury Zoological Park, Chhatbir | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 3 | Kanpur Zoological Park, Uttar Pradesh | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | Peshwe Park Zoological Garden (Sambhaji Park) Pune, MH | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | Jaipur Zoo, Rajasthan | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 6 | Nehru Zoological Park, Hyderabad | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 | Bellary Children's Park-cum-Zoo, Karnataka | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 8 | National Park, Bannerghatta Zoological Garden, Karnataka | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 9 | Sri Chamarajendra Zoological Garden, Mysore | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| 10 | Thiruvananthapuram Zoo, Kerala | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 |
| 11 | State Museum \& Zoo, Thrissur | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 12 | Arignar Anna Zoological Park, Vandalur | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 |
| 13 | Children's Corner, Guindy | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 14 | Sanjay Gandhi Biological Park, Patna, Bihar | 2 | , | 0 | 3 |
| 15 | Maitri Baagh Zoo - Bhilai, Chatisgrah | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 16 | Alipore Zoological Garden, Kolkata | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17 | Nandankanan Biological Park, Bhubaneshwar | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 18 | Assam State Zoo cum Botanical Garden, Guwahati, Assam | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | 28 | 22 | 0 | 50 |
| VI | Macaque, Pig-tailed (Macaca leonina) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Mahendra Choudhury Zoological Park, Chhatbir | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 2 | Lucknow Prani Udyan, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | V.O.C. Park Mini Zoo, Coimbatore | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | Sanjay Gandhi Biological Park, Patna, Bihar | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | Alipore Zoological Garden, Kolkata | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 6 | Assam State Zoo cum Botanical Garden, Guwahati, Assam | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| 7 | Sepahijala Zoological Park, Sepahijala, Tripura | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 |
|  |  | 11 | 9 | 0 | 20 |


| S.No | Species Name | M | F | U | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VII | Macaque, Rhesus (Macaca mulatta) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | National Zoological Park, Delhi | 17 | 16 | 29 | 62 |
| 2 | Mahendra Choudhury Zoological Park, Chhatbir | 1 | 1 | 19 | 21 |
| 3 | Gandhi Zoological Park, Gwalior, MP | 10 | 10 | 2 | 22 |
| 4 | Kamla Nehru Prani Sanghrahalay Zoo, Indore | 7 | 10 | 0 | 17 |
| 5 | Kanpur Zoological Park, Uttar Pradesh | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| 6 | Lucknow Prani Udyan, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 | PT. Govind Ballabh Park High Altitude Zoo, Nainital | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| 8 | Kamla Nehru Zoological Garden, Ahmedabad | 9 | 10 | 10 | 29 |
| 9 | Nature Park, Surat, Gujarat | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 10 | Sakkarbaug Zoo - Junagarh, Gujarat | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 11 | Sayaji Baug Zoo - Vadodara, Gujarat | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 |
| 12 | Auragabad Municipal Zoo, Maharashtra | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| 13 | Peshwe Park Zoological Garden (Sambhaji Park) Pune, MH | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| 14 | Veermata Jijabai Bhosale Udyan \& Zoo Mumbai | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| 15 | Bikaner Zoo - Rajasthan | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 |
| 16 | Jaipur Zoo - Rajasthan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 17 | Jodhpur Zoo - Rajasthan | 6 | 5 | 0 | 11 |
| 18 | Udiapur Zoo - Rajasthan | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 19 | Indira Gandhi Zoological Park, Visakhapatnam | 7 | 3 | 0 | 10 |
| 20 | Nehru Zoological Park, Hyderabad | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 21 | Sri Venkateswara Zoological Park, Tirupati | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| 22 | Bellary Children's Park-cum-Zoo, Karnataka | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 23 | National Park, Bannerghatta Zoological Garden, Karnataka | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 |
| 24 | Sri Chamarajendra Zoological Garden, Mysore | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 25 | Tiger \& Lion Safari, Thyyarekoppa Shimoga, Karnataka | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 26 | Thiruvananthapuram Zoo, Kerala | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 27 | State Museum \& Zoo, Thrissur | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 28 | Arignar Anna Zoological Park, Vandalur | 13 | 10 | 2 | 25 |
| 29 | Children's Corner, Guindy | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| 30 | V.O.C. Park Mini Zoo, Coimbatore | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 31 | Sanjay Gandhi Biological Park, Patna, Bihar | 15 | 18 | 0 | 33 |
| 32 | Maitri Baagh Zoo - Bhilai, Chatisgrah | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 33 | Alipore Zoological Garden, Kolkata | 6 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| 34 | Calcutta Snake Park Zoological Garden, Badu, West Bengal | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 35 | Nandankanan Biological Park, Bhubaneshwar | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 36 | Bhagwan Birsa Biological Park, Ranchi | 6 | 5 | 8 | 19 |
| 37 | Jawaharlal Nehru Biological Park, Bokaro | 9 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| 38 | Tata Steel Zoological Park, Jamshedpur | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| 39 | Manipur Zoological Garden, Imphal | 11 | 13 | 0 | 24 |
| 40 | Aizawl Zoo - Aizawl, Mizoram | 13 | 7 | 0 | 20 |
| 41 | Lady Hydari Park, Animal Land Shillong | 4 | 5 | 0 | 9 |
| 42 | Sepahijala Zoological Park, Tripura | 4 | 6 | 0 | 10 |
|  |  | 184 | 192 | 70 | 446 |
| VIII | Macaque Bonnet (Macaca radiata) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | National Zoological Park, Delhi | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| 2 | Rohtak Zoo, Haryana | 7 | 6 | 0 | 15 |
| 3 | Mahendra Choudhury Zoological Park, Chhatbir | 5 | 3 | 2 | 10 |
| 4 | Gandhi Zoological Park, Gwalior, MP | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |


| S.No | Species Name | M | F | U | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | Kamla Nehru Prani Sanghrahalay Zoo, Indore | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 6 | Van Vihar National Park, Bhopal, MP | 0 | 0 | 125 | 125 |
| 7 | Kanpur Zoological Park, Uttar Pradesh | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| 8 | Lucknow Prani Udyan, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh | 6 | 8 | 0 | 14 |
| 9 | PT. Govind Ballabh Park High Altitude Zoo, Nainital | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 10 | Kamla Nehru Zoological Garden, Ahmedabad | 5 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| 11 | Nature Park, Surat, Gujarat | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 12 | Sakkarbaug Zoo - Junagarh, Gujarat | 8 | 3 | 0 | 11 |
| 13 | Sayaji Baug Zoo - Vadodara, Gujarat | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 14 | Auragabad Municipal Zoo, Maharashtra | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 |
| 15 | Peshwe Park Zoological Garden (Sambhaji Park) Pune, MH | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| 16 | Veermata Jijabai Bhosale Udyan \& Zoo Mumbai | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 17 | Bikaner Zoo - Rajasthan | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 18 | Jaipur Zoo - Rajasthan | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| 19 | Indira Gandhi Zoological Park, Visakhapatnam | 6 | 6 | 1 | 13 |
| 20 | Nehru Zoological Park, Hyderabad | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 21 | Sri Venkateswara Zoological Park, Tirupati | 7 | 3 | 0 | 10 |
| 22 | Sri Chamarajendra Zoological Garden, Mysore | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 23 | Thiruvananthapuram Zoo, Kerala | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 |
| 24 | State Museum \& Zoo, Thrissur | 23 | 16 | 3 | 42 |
| 25 | Arignar Anna Zoological Park, Vandalur | 15 | 6 | 1 | 22 |
| 26 | Children's Corner, Guindy | 110 | 106 | 0 | 216 |
| 27 | V.O.C. Park Mini Zoo, Coimbatore | 3 | 6 | 0 | 9 |
| 28 | Sanjay Gandhi Biological Park, Patna, Bihar | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 29 | Maitri Baagh Zoo - Bhilai, Chatisgrah | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 30 | Alipore Zoological Garden, Kolkata | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 |
| 31 | Nandankanan Biological Park, Bhubaneshwar | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 32 | Jawaharlal Nehru Biological Park, Bokaro | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 |
| 33 | Tata Steel Zoological Park, Jamshedpur | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 34 | Itanagar Zoological Park, Arunachal Pradesh | 8 | 5 | 5 | 18 |
| 35 | Assam State Zoo Cum Botanical Garden, Guwahati, Assam | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 36 | Manipur Zoological Garden, Imphal | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
|  |  | 254 | 204 | 168 | 626 |
| XI | Macaque, Stump-tailed (Macaque arctoides) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Lucknow Prani Udyan, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| 2 | Aurangabad Municipal Zoo, Maharashtra | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | Indira Gandhi Zoological Park, Visakhapatnam | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 4 | Sri Venkateswara Zoological Park, Tirupati | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| 5 | Sri Chamarajendra Zoological Garden, Mysore | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 6 | Sanjay Gandhi Biological Park, Patna, Bihar | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 |
| 7 | Jawaharlal Nehru Biological Park, Bokaro | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 8 | Assam State Zoo Cum Botanical Garden, Guwahati, Assam | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| 9 | Manipur Zoological Garden, Imphal | 5 | 6 | 0 | 11 |
| 10 | Lady Hydari Park, Animal Land Shillong | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  | 20 | 21 | 0 | 41 |
| X | Langur, Nilgiri (Semnopithecus johii johnii) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Kanpur Zoological Park, Uttar Pradesh | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |


| S.No | Species Name | M | F | U | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Indira Gandhi Zoological Park, Visakhapatnam | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 3 | Sri Chamarajendra Zoological Garden, Mysore | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 4 | Thiruvananthapuram Zoo, Kerala | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | Arignar Anna Zoological Park, Vandalur | 3 | 7 | 2 | 12 |
| 6 | Children's Corner, Guindy | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 7 | V.O.C. Park Mini Zoo, Coimbatore | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 8 | Nandankanan Biological Park, Bhubaneshwar | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | 11 | 14 | 2 | 27 |
| XI | Langur, Golden (Trachypithecus geei) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Kanpur Zoological Park, Uttar Pradesh | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | National Park, Bannerghatta Zoological Garden, Karnataka | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | Jawaharlal Nehru Biological Park, Bokaro | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | Assam State Zoo Cum Botanical Garden, Guwahati, Assam | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 5 | Sepahijala Zoological Park, Tripura | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | 2 | 5 | 0 | 7 |
| XII | Loris, Slow (Nycticebus bengalensis) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Lucknow Prani Udyan, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | Kamla Nehru Zoological Garden, Ahmedabad | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | Jaipur Zoo - Rajasthan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | Sanjay Gandhi Biological Park, Patna, Bihar | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 5 | Itanagar Zoological Park, Arunachal Pradesh | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 6 | Assam State Zoo Cum Botanical Garden, Guwahati, Assam | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 7 | Manipur Zoological Garden, Imphal | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 8 | Lady Hydari Park, Animal Land Shillong | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | 6 | 6 | 0 | 12 |
| XIV | Loris, Slender (Loris lydekkerianus) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Sri Chamarajendra Zoological Garden, Mysore | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | Arignar Anna Zoological Park, Vandalur | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | Children's Corner, Guindy | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
|  | Macaque, Crab-eating (Macaca fascicularis) |  |  |  |  |
| 1. | Haddo Mini Zoo, Port Blair (9.7.0.16) | 9 | 7 | 0 | 16 |
|  | TOTAL | 651 | 562 | 257 | 1470 |
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## Index -- Scientific Names

| Bunopithecus |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | hoolock |  |
|  | hoolock | 349 |
| Loris |  |  |
| lydekkerianus |  |  |
|  | lydekkerianus | 65 |
|  | malabaricus | 70 |
| tardigradus |  |  |
|  | grandis | 76 |
|  | nordicus | 81 |
|  | nycticeboides | 87 |
|  | tardigradus | 92 |
| Macaca |  |  |
|  | arctoides | 105 |
|  | assamensis Nepal population | 116 |
|  | assamensis |  |
|  | assamensis | 110 |
|  | pelops | 121 |
| fascicularis |  |  |
|  | aurea | 127 |
|  | umbrosa | 131 |
| leoninamulatta |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | mulatta | 146 |
| radiata |  |  |
|  | diluta | 167 |
|  | radiata | 172 |
| silenussinica |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | aurifrons | 189 |
|  | opisthomelas | 198 |
|  | sinica | 202 |


| Nycticebus |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bengalensi |  | 99 |
| Semnopithecus (Trachypithecus) johnii |  |  |
|  | johnii | 211 |
| Semnopithecus entellus |  |  |
|  | achates | 217 |
|  | ajax | 226 |
|  | anchises | 233 |
|  | entellus | 241 |
|  | hector | 247 |
|  | hypoleucos | 252 |
|  | schistaceus | 257 |
| priam |  |  |
|  | priam | 270 |
|  | thersites India population | 277 |
|  | thersites Sri Lanka population | 283 |
| Trachypithecus |  |  |
| geei |  | 292 |
|  | obscurus |  |
|  | phayrei | 299 |
| pileatus |  |  |
|  | brahma | 304 |
|  | durga | 307 |
|  | pileatus | 313 |
|  | tenebricus | 320 |
| vetulus |  |  |
|  | monticola | 325 |
|  | nestor | 330 |
|  | philbricki | 335 |
|  | vetulus | 341 |

## Index -- Common Names




[^0]:    Rhesus Macaque
    (Macaca mulatta)

[^1]:    * Regional Assessment for South Asia (R); the remaining species have been assessed globally
    ${ }^{1}$ Indian population; ${ }^{2}$ Sri Lanka population

[^2]:    SA - South Asia; Ba - Bangladesh; Bh - Bhutan; I - India; M - Maldives; N - Nepal; Pk - Pakistan; SL - Sri Lanka; E - Endemic to

[^3]:    AF - Agricultural fields, C - Coniferous forest, D - Deciduous forest, DD - Dry Deciduous forest, Dg - Degraded forest, E - Evergreen forest, F - Forest, G - Garden, HuS
    Human Settlement, M - Mangrove, M Sal - Montane Sal forest, MD - Moist Deciduous forest, R - Riverine forest, S - Scrub jungle, SA - Sub-Alpine forest, SD - SemiHuman Settlement, M - Mangrove, M Sal - Montane Sal forest, MD - Moist Deciduous forest, R - Riverine forest, S - Scrub jungle, SA - Sub-Alpine forest, SD - SemiTemperate Hill Sal forest, TMD - Tropical Moist Deciduous forest, TSE - Tropical Semi-evergreen forest, TWE - Tropical Wet Evergreen forest, UA - Urban Areas

[^4]:    WE - Wet Evergreen forest

[^5]:    Mo - Monastry

[^6]:    DD - Dry Deciduous forest, D to Sh - Deciduous forest to Shola, E - Evergreen forest, Sh - Shola, SE - Semi-evergreen forest, MD - Moist Deciduous forest, Rp - Riparian

