

# THREATENED SPECIES SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Established under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*

---

The Minister approved this conservation advice and included this species in the Critically Endangered category, effective from 04/07/2019.

## Conservation Advice

### *Cophixalus hosmeri*

(Rattling Nursery Frog)

#### **Taxonomy**

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

#### **Summary of assessment**

##### **Conservation status**

Critically Endangered: Criterion 2 B1 (a),(b)(i,ii,iii,v)

The highest category for which *Cophixalus hosmeri* is eligible to be listed is Critically Endangered.

*Cophixalus hosmeri* has been found to be eligible for listing under the following categories:  
Criterion 2: B1 (a),(b)(i,ii,iii,v): Critically Endangered

*Cophixalus hosmeri* has been found to be eligible for listing under the Critically Endangered category.

Species can be listed as threatened under state and territory legislation. For information on the listing status of this species under relevant state or territory legislation, see <http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/sprat/public/sprat.pl>

#### **Reason for conservation assessment by the Threatened Species Scientific Committee**

This advice follows assessment of new information provided to the Committee to list *Cophixalus hosmeri*.

#### **Public consultation**

Notice of the proposed amendment and a consultation document was made available for public comment for 30 business days between 7 September 2018 and 22 October 2018. Any comments received that were relevant to the survival of the species were considered by the Committee as part of the assessment process.

#### **Species Information**

##### **Description**

The Rattling Nursery Frog is a small species of frog (snout-to-vent length of males to 14 mm, females to 17 mm), belonging to the family Microhylidae. It is the lightest of Australian *Cophixalus* with mean adult mass of 0.27 g (Williams 2007). The most consistent morphological character for distinguishing it from other *Cophixalus* species of similar size is its relatively short hind legs (Zweifel 1985). The Rattling Nursery Frog is grey-brown above with obscure darker flecks and blotches, the most consistent being a chevron-shaped mark between the shoulders and a streak behind the eye. The throat, chest and sometimes abdomen are dark grey with paler

stippling or the abdomen and thighs are sometimes yellowish. The skin is smooth to slightly granular above and smooth below (Cogger 2014). The male call is a rapidly pulsed tap with some variation occurring between individuals within sites but all of the various calls are of considerably higher frequency than other Australian *Cophixalus* species (Hoskin 2004).

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

### Distribution

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

### Relevant Biology/Ecology

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

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

The generation length of the Rattling Nursery Frog is unknown, but is estimated to be 10 years, based on the known ages of breeding males being between 4-14 years for *Cophixalus ornatus* (Ornate Nursery Frog) (Felton et al. 2006).

### Threats

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

Number	Threat factor	Threat status	Evidence base
1.0	Climate change		
1.1	Temperature increase, extreme weather events e.g. cyclones, droughts	Known potential	The Rattling Nursery Frog is found only at high altitude on two mountains in the wet tropics of northern Queensland. Distribution modelling for this species suggests a population reduction of greater than 40% if temperatures increase by 1 °C (Shoo 2005).  Climate change modelling carried out by Williams and Hilbert (2006) suggests that five <i>Cophixalus</i> species (including <i>C. hosmeri</i> ) would lose more than 50 percent of their core habitat with a 1 °C increase in temperature. However an increase by 3 - 5 °C is predicted to be more likely in the next 50 years. All species are restricted to mountain tops and

			<p>are already at the limits of their potential elevational ranges. Therefore the impacts of climate change are thought to be the greatest threat to the survival of these microhylid frogs (Williams 2007). The Rattling Nursery Frog was ranked second on the list of the 20 most vulnerable vertebrate species to climate change in the Wet tropics (Williams &amp; Hilbert 2006).</p> <p>Changes in hydrology and other effects of climate change (e.g. reduction in food supply) may also alter the susceptibility of frogs to disease, but these impacts are likely to be variable among species and sites (DoEE 2016).</p>
2.0	Habitat loss and degradation		
2.1	Clearing, trampling, fragmentation, altered hydrology	Known potential	Feral pigs are responsible for habitat damage and potentially cause adult frog mortality (Richards et al. 1993).
3.0	Invasive species		
3.1	Yellow Crazy Ants ( <i>Anoplolepis gracilipes</i> )	Known potential	Yellow crazy ants spray formic acid to subdue prey, which causes burns and irritates the skin and eyes of animals. They can have severe impacts on a range of ecological processes and lead to significant loss of biodiversity. Yellow crazy ants were detected within the World Heritage Area and Little Mulgrave National Park in 2012 and now cover up to 61 ha (WTMA 2016) within these protected areas. In December 2013 yellow crazy ants were also detected in the Kuranda area (WTMA 2016).
4.0	Disease		
4.1	Amphibian chytrid fungus	Known current	Chytridiomycosis is an infectious disease caused by the amphibian chytrid fungus ( <i>Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis</i> ) that affects amphibians worldwide, causing mass die-offs and some species extinctions (DoEE 2016). However, the prevalence of chytrid is extremely low in Australian microhylids (Hauselberger & Alford 2012).

## How judged by the Committee in relation to the EPBC Act Criteria and Regulations

<b>Criterion 1. Population size reduction (reduction in total numbers)</b>			
Population reduction (measured over the longer of 10 years or 3 generations) based on any of A1 to A4			
	<b>Critically Endangered Very severe reduction</b>	<b>Endangered Severe reduction</b>	<b>Vulnerable Substantial reduction</b>
<b>A1</b>	≥ 90%	≥ 70%	≥ 50%
<b>A2, A3, A4</b>	≥ 80%	≥ 50%	≥ 30%
A1	Population reduction observed, estimated, inferred or suspected in the past and the causes of the reduction are clearly reversible AND understood AND ceased.		(a) direct observation [except A3]
A2	Population reduction observed, estimated, inferred or suspected in the past where the causes of the reduction may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible.		(b) an index of abundance appropriate to the taxon
A3	Population reduction, projected or suspected to be met in the future (up to a maximum of 100 years) [(a) cannot be used for A3]		(c) a decline in area of occupancy, extent of occurrence and/or quality of habitat
A4	An observed, estimated, inferred, projected or suspected population reduction where the time period must include both the past and the future (up to a max. of 100 years in future), and where the causes of reduction may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible.		(d) actual or potential levels of exploitation
			(e) the effects of introduced taxa, hybridization, pathogens, pollutants, competitors or parasites

*based on any of the following*

### Evidence:

#### Insufficient data to determine eligibility

Given that the generation length of the Rattling Nursery Frog is estimated to be approximately 10 years, the appropriate time scale for this criterion is likely to be 30 years. There are no data available to evaluate the population trend over any three generation period.

The species may experience natural fluctuations in number due to seasonal and climatic variation and there is insufficient information to conclude whether or not the observed changes in population size are a result of natural fluctuations. The available data does not allow a quantitative estimate of decline, therefore the Committee considers that there is insufficient information to determine the eligibility of the species for listing in any category under this criterion.

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

**Evidence:**

**Eligible under Criterion 2 B1 (a),(b)(i,ii,iii,v) for listing as Critically Endangered**

The calculated extent of occurrence (EOO) is 44 km<sup>2</sup>, and the area of occupancy (AOO) is 28 km<sup>2</sup> (unpublished data DoEE 2017). These figures are based on the mapping of point records from post-1997 (20 year timeframe), compiled from state and Commonwealth agencies along with museums, research institutions and non-government organisations. The EOO was calculated using a minimum convex hull, and the AOO calculated using a 2x2 km grid cell method, based on the IUCN Red List Guidelines 2014. The EOO meets the threshold for listing as Critically Endangered under subcriterion B1 and the AOO meets the threshold for listing as Endangered under subcriterion B2.

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

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

A continuing decline in area of occupancy and area, extent and/or quality of habitat, and therefore number of mature individuals, may be inferred based on climate change (Shoo 2005; Williams et al. 2003; Williams and Hilbert 2006). Species that are both geographically restricted and patchily distributed, such as *C. hosmeri*, are at a high risk of extinction, as local stochastic events may affect the entire population (Williams 2007).

The Committee considers that the species’ extent of occurrence is very restricted, the area of occupancy is restricted and the geographic distribution is precarious for the survival of the species because it occurs at only one location and a decline in area of occupancy and area, extent and/or quality of habitat and number of mature individuals has been inferred. Therefore, the species has met the relevant elements of Criterion 2 to make it eligible for listing as Critically Endangered.

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

its geographic distribution is precarious for its survival based on at least 1 of the following 3 conditions:				
(a)	(i) Number of mature individuals in each subpopulation	≤ 50	≤ 250	≤ 1,000
	(ii) % of mature individuals in one subpopulation =	90 – 100%	95 – 100%	100%
(b)	Extreme fluctuations in the number of mature individuals			

**Evidence:**

**Not Eligible**

Surveys of calling males estimated density of the Rattling Nursery Frog at approximately 42 per hectare (Shoo & Williams 2004; Williams 2007). Over an AOO of 28 km<sup>2</sup> this equates to over 100 000 male frogs in the population.

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

Following assessment of the data the Committee has determined that the number of mature individuals is not limited. Therefore, the species has not been demonstrated to have met the required element of this criterion.

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

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

**Evidence:**

**Not Eligible**

Surveys of calling males estimated density of the Rattling Nursery Frog at approximately 42 per hectare (Shoo & Williams 2004; Williams 2007). Over an AOO of 28 km<sup>2</sup> this equates to over 100 000 male frogs in the population. Even without taking females into account this is well in excess of the threshold of 1000 individuals to be eligible under this criterion.

The Committee has determined that the number of mature individuals is not low. Therefore, the species has not been demonstrated to have met the required element of this criterion.

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

## Evidence:

### Insufficient data to determine eligibility

Population viability analysis has not been undertaken. Therefore, there are insufficient data to demonstrate if the species is eligible for listing under Criterion 5.

## Conservation Actions

### Recovery Plan

A recovery plan is not recommended because the Rattling Nursery Frog is located in a small area in a single jurisdiction and the Conservation Advice sufficiently outlines the priority research and conservation actions needed to support the recovery of this species.

### Conservation and Management priorities

#### Habitat loss and disturbance

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

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

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

#### Disease

- Minimise the spread of the amphibian chytrid fungus by implementing suitable hygiene protocols (Murray 2011) to protect priority populations as described in the *Threat abatement plan for infection of amphibians with chytrid fungus resulting in chytridiomycosis* (Department of the Environment and Energy 2016).
- Provide disease identification and prevention protocols (methods of handling, diagnostic keys, etc.) to researchers and land managers for use in the field.

#### Stakeholder Engagement

- Collaborate with land managers bordering (outside of) the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area to protect and manage rainforest areas where the species occurs, or which contain potential habitat for the species, from threats due to disease and invasive species.
- Interested nature conservation, land management and land holder groups could be engaged in conservation management activities, such as survey and monitoring, but should be made aware of the need to follow correct field practices and hygiene protocols to mitigate the risks of trampling and disease transmission. If necessary, use workshops to aid stakeholders in developing the skills and knowledge required to manage threats to this species while undertaking these activities.
- Inform the public about the status and recovery efforts for the species, e.g. by providing information to visitors to the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area and publicising the species through the media.

### **Survey and Monitoring priorities**

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

### **Information and research priorities**

- Improve knowledge of the reproductive biology, age structure and growth rates of the Rattling Nursery Frog.
- Improve knowledge of the thermal tolerance limits of the Rattling Nursery Frog and assess its possible response to future climate scenarios.
- Improve understanding of how climate change will likely impact on the Rattling Nursery Frog due to altered temperatures, rainfall, environmental stressors and disease virulence.
- Improve understanding of husbandry methods for the species.
- Investigate the development of a strategic assisted colonisation (or translocation) strategy in response to the threat of climate change. The strategy should include consideration of the benefits and risks of undertaking a coordinated series of translocations of *Cophixalus* species to mountain tops further south as increased temperatures impact on their survival and reproductive success.
- Improve understanding of the impacts of feral pigs and yellow crazy ants on the Rattling Nursery Frog.

### **Recommendations**

- (i) The Committee recommends that the list referred to in section 178 of the EPBC Act be amended by **including** in the list in the Critically Endangered category: *Cophixalus hosmeri*
- (ii) The Committee recommends that there not be a recovery plan for this species.

Threatened Species Scientific Committee

26/02/2019

## **References cited in the advice**

- Anstis M (2017). *Tadpoles and Frogs of Australia* 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. New Holland Publishers Pty Ltd, Australia.
- Cogger H G (2014). *Reptiles and Amphibians of Australia*. 7th edn. CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, Victoria.
- Felton A R, Alford R A and Schwarzkopf L (2006). Multiple mate choice criteria and the importance of age for male mating success in the microhylid frog, *Cophixalus ornatus*. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology* 59:786-795.
- Hauselberger K F and Alford R A.(2012). Prevalence of *Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis* infection is extremely low in direct-developing Australian microhylids. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms* 100,191-200.
- Hoskin C J (2004). Australian microhylid frogs (*Cophixalus* and *Austrochaperina*): phylogeny, taxonomy, calls, distributions and breeding biology. *Australian Journal of Zoology* 52,237-269.
- IUCN (2001). IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 3.1. IUCN Species Survival Commission. IUCN, Gland Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- IUCN (2012). IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 3.1. Second edition. Gland Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- IUCN (2017). IUCN Standards and Petitions Subcommittee 2017. Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 13. In Standards and Petitions Subcommittee.
- Richards S J, McDonald K R & Alford R A (1993). Declines in populations of Australia's endemic tropical rainforest frogs. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 1,66-77.
- Shoo L (2005). Predicting and detecting the impacts of climate change on montaine fauna in Australian tropical rainforests. PhD thesis. Griffith University.
- Shoo L, Storlie C, Williams Y M & Williams S E (2010). Potential for mountaintop boulder fields to buffer species against extreme heat stress under climate change. *International Journal of Biometeorology* 54,475-478.
- Shoo L & Williams Y (2004). Altitudinal distribution and abundance of microhylid frogs (*Cophixalus* and *Austrochaperina*) of north-eastern Australia: baseline data for detecting biological responses to future climate change. *Australian Journal of Zoology* 52,667-676.
- Williams S E, Bolitho E E & Fox S (2003). Climate change in Australian tropical rainforests: an impending environmental catastrophe. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 270,1887-1892.
- Williams S E & Hilbert D W (2006). Climate change as a threat to the biodiversity of tropical rainforest in Australia. In: Laurance WF, CA Peres (eds) *Emerging Threats to Tropical Forests*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago. pp 33-53.
- Williams Y (2007). Ecological differences between rare and common species of microhylid frogs of the Wet tropics biogeographic region. Thesis. James Cook University.
- Zweifel R G (1985). Australian frogs of the family Microhylidae. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* 182:267-388.

## **Other sources cited in the advice**

- Atlas of Living Australia  
(2016) <http://spatial.ala.org.au/?q=lsid%3Aurn%3Aalsid%3Abiodiversity.org.au%3Aafd.taxon%3A0dae967f-74bd-40f3-8946-84e61b2b0562#>
- Department of the Environment and Energy (2016). Threat abatement plan for infection of amphibians with chytrid fungus resulting in chytridiomycosis, Commonwealth of Australia 2016. Available from: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/tap/infection-amphibians-chytrid-fungus-resulting-chytridiomycosis-2016>
- Department of the Environment and Energy (2017). Area of Occupancy and Extent of Occurrence for *Cophixalus hosmeri*. Unpublished report, Australian Government Department of the Environment, Canberra.

Wet Tropics Management Authority (WTMA) (2016). Stamp Out Yellow Crazy Ants. Viewed 2 December 2016. Available on the internet at: <http://www.wettropics.gov.au/stamp-out-yellow-crazy-ants.html>.