



Consultation Document on Listing Eligibility and Conservation Actions

Litoria dayi (lace-eyed tree frog)

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

- 1) the eligibility of *Litoria dayi* (lace-eyed tree frog) for inclusion on the EPBC Act threatened species list; and
- 2) the necessary conservation actions for the above species.

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

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

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

or by mail to:

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

Responses are required to be submitted by 2 March 2018.

Contents of this information package	Page
General background information about listing threatened species	2
Information about this consultation process	2
Draft information about the species and its eligibility for listing	4
Conservation actions for the species	10
References cited	12
Consultation questions	14

General background information about listing threatened species

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

<http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/index.html>.

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

<http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/pubs/guidelines-species.pdf>.

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

<http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/nominations.html>.

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

<http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/recovery.html>.

Information about this consultation process

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

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

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

Privacy notice

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

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

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

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

Litoria dayi

(lace-eyed tree frog)

Taxonomy

Conventionally accepted as *Litoria dayi* (Gunther, 1897).

Species Information

Description

Litoria dayi (lace-eyed tree frog) was recently transferred to the genus *Litoria* from the genus *Nyctimystes* after Kraus (2013) showed that it did not meet the morphological characteristics for assignment to that genus (Cogger 2014).

This species is a small to medium sized frog growing to 50 mm in snout-to-vent length. The dorsal surface is rich-brown to orange-brown with or without scattered cream or lichen like spots and blotches, sometimes with black centers, covering it, the head or the limbs. The skin is smooth or finely granular above, coarsely granular on the lower flanks and ventral surfaces. The limbs often have faint banding or marbling and a slight fringe along the outer edges. The belly is cream-white or yellowish, with the throat and under surface of the thighs being blackish. The eyes are large and prominent with a dark brown iris. The lower eyelid is patterned with lines, veins and dots which give the frog its name. Fingers are almost completely webbed. Toe discs are usually smaller than finger discs. The tympanum is indistinct or hidden, although the tympanic annulus is usually distinct (Czechura et al. 1987; Cogger 2014).

In chorus, the mating call is a drawn out "eeeeeeeeee" that inflects downwards at the end, repeated three or four times in succession, producing a harsh growl-like sound. Solitary males can produce a short, sharp "ee" every five to six seconds, sometimes over long periods (Czechura et al. 1987; McDonald 1992).

The tadpole has a body form that is adapted for living in fast flowing streams. The head and body are flattened, dark brown above, a sandy colour ventrally. The tail is very muscular, with distinct dark and light patches. The tail fins are arched and rounded terminally, transparent with irregular pigmentation. They feature a suctorial oral-disc, larger than those found in tadpoles of the *L. nannotis* group. The mouth is surrounded by marginal and submarginal papillae, although the submarginal papillae posterior to the mouth are poorly defined, being little more than longitudinal bumps and ridges. There are two anterior and three posterior labial tooth rows (Davies & Richards 1990; Anstis 2013).

Distribution

The lace-eyed tree frog is endemic to the Wet Tropics Bioregion from Paluma to Cooktown, northern Queensland, at altitudes between sea level and 1200 m above sea level (asl) (Williams & Hero 1998; 2001). Before its decline, the extent of occurrence of this species was originally approximately 9000 km² (McDonald 1992).

The lace-eyed tree frog has disappeared from upland sites throughout the Wet Tropics and was last recorded from Mount Spec State Forest in 1990 and the Kirrama Range in 1989 (Richards et al. 1993). Following a survey over the summer of 1991-1992 Richards et al. (1993) noted that the species was still common at most foothill and lowland sites and recorded adults and larvae from upland sites north of the Daintree River. These populations subsequently disappeared in 1992 and 1993 (M. Cunningham pers. comm.). At one monitoring site at O'Keefe Creek, Big Tableland, this species had been known to occasionally reappear near a site at an altitude of 400 m asl, but it did not establish resident populations and was found to be absent from a monitoring site at 680 m asl (McDonald & Alford 1999). However, populations have been

found to be persisting in the lowlands and foothills (McDonald & Alford 1999; Northern Queensland Threatened Frogs Recovery Team 2001; Hodgkinson & Hero 2003; Phillott & Young 2009; Phillott et al. 2010).

Survey results from 1991 found the lace-eyed tree frog was occurring in the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area (where there is no logging or clearing of its habitat), in Cedar Bay National Park, Crater Lakes National Park, Daintree National Park, Lumholtz National Park, Millstream National Park, Paluma Range National Park and Wooroonooran National Park, Crystal Cascades National Park, Wallaman Falls (Seaview), and Palmerston National Park, and Daintree Timber Reserve (165 Monkhouse) as well as Lamb Range, Mt Lewis, Mt Spec and Windsor Tableland State Forests (SF 768 Alcock) (Tyler 1997; M.Cunningham 2001, pers. comm). In the field, stable populations of several species susceptible to the amphibian chytrid fungus (including the lace-eyed tree frog) persist at lower altitudes where temperatures are higher compared to highland sites (McDonald & Alford 1999).

Relevant Biology/Ecology

This species is a rainforest specialist. In montane areas the species prefers fast-flowing rocky streams although they also frequent slower watercourses where ample vegetation exists along the margins (Czechura et al. 1987). At low elevations, the species favours rock soaks, narrow ephemeral streams and rock outcrops in larger watercourses, and it may also be found on rocks, boulders and vegetation in or adjacent to streams (Czechura et al. 1987).

Adults feed indiscriminately on both aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates (Hodgkinson & Hero 2003). Their principal diet includes Coleoptera, Aranea, Odonate larvae, Blattodea and Diptera (Hodgkinson & Hero 2003).

The lace-eyed tree frog is a spring/summer breeder (Davies & Richards 1990) with peak breeding activity from October to April. Females may lay over a 100 large (2.3-2.6 mm diameter) unpigmented eggs with discrete egg capsules in a cohesive clump on or under rocks in water or just above the water-line (Czechura et al. 1987; Davies & Richards 1990).

Tadpoles from eggs laid in early summer complete development in 3-4 months, whereas tadpoles from eggs laid in late summer may over-winter and metamorphose the following summer. During the early stages of development tadpoles from a single clutch aggregate together under a single rock. This behaviour persists until the gut is fully formed, after which they disperse and commence grazing on algal-covered rocks. When disturbed they release their grip on the rocks and are swept downstream, where they shelter under rocks or in crevices. This sheltering behaviour allows the tadpoles to remain in riffles even after flooding (Davies & Richards 1990).

Adult lace-eyed tree frogs display a moderate association with streams and are found with some reliability within the stream banks over an extended season (McDonald & Alford 1999). Frogs move towards rainforest streams where they are known to breed only during the warmer wet season/early dry season. Adult males are most abundant at the stream during this time, presumably because they are holding breeding territories. Juveniles and females are rarely encountered. Changes in the stream temperature seem to influence nocturnal activity and trigger the movement of the species in relation to the stream. The location of this species during non-breeding periods remains unknown (Hodgkinson & Hero 2002).

Threats

The lace-eyed tree frog is threatened mainly by disease and invasive ant species. The following table lists the threats impacting the species in approximate order of severity of risk, based on available evidence.

Threat factor	Consequence rating	Extent over which threat may operate	Evidence base
Disease - Chytrid fungus	Severe	Majority of former range	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 (Department of the Environment and Energy 2016). Numerous studies (Laurance et al. 1996, Woodhams et al. 1996, Berger et al. 1998, 1999) have shown that this species is impacted by chytridiomycosis (Laurance et al. 1996; Berger et al. 1998; Woodhams & Alford 2005).
Invasive species	Moderate	Majority of range	Yellow crazy ants (<i>Anoplolepis gracilipes</i>) 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 Wet Tropics World Heritage Area at Edmonton and Little Mulgrave National Park in 2012 and now cover up to 61 ha (Wet Tropics Management Authority 2016) within these protected areas. In December 2013 yellow crazy ants were also detected in the Kuranda area (Wet Tropics Management Authority 2016).
Habitat loss and degradation (e.g. clearing, trampling, fragmentation, altered hydrology, salinity)	Moderate	Minor	Feral pigs (<i>Sus scrofa</i>) are responsible for riparian habitat damage and potentially cause adult frog mortality. However there is very little research into their impacts on native frog populations (Richards et al. 1993). There are a substantial number impoundment structures (dams, weirs etc.) on many of the rivers and streams of the Wet Tropics (Northern Queensland Threatened Frogs Recovery Team 2001). Given the stream dwelling nature of this species it is reasonable to expect that this

			may affect the species, especially at lower altitudes where the remnant populations currently persist. However, the potential impact of existing or proposed water extraction on these species has not been examined (Northern Queensland Threatened Frogs Recovery Team 2001).
Population fragmentation	Potential	Whole of range	There are no data with which to assess this threat.
Climate change (temperature increase, extreme weather events e.g. cyclones, droughts)	Potential	Whole of range	There are no data with which to assess this threat.

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

Criterion 1. Population size reduction (reduction in total numbers)				
Population reduction (measured over the longer of 10 years or 3 generations) based on any of A1 to A4				
	Critically Endangered Very severe reduction	Endangered Severe reduction	Vulnerable Substantial reduction	
A1	≥ 90%	≥ 70%	≥ 50%	
A2, A3, A4	≥ 80%	≥ 50%	≥ 30%	
A1	<div><div></div><div>based on any of the following</div></div>		(a) direct observation [except A3]	
A2			(b) an index of abundance appropriate to the taxon	
A3			(c) a decline in area of occupancy, extent of occurrence and/or quality of habitat	
A4			(d) actual or potential levels of exploitation	
		(e) the effects of introduced taxa, hybridization, pathogens, pollutants, competitors or parasites		

Evidence:

While there was a substantial decline in the population of lace-eyed tree frogs, this occurred predominantly in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Generation length is not known with certainty, but is estimated to be 3.5 years based on two similar-sized *Litoria* species found in similar habitats (red-eyed tree frog *L. chloris* (red-eyed tree frog) and *L. lesueuri* (Lesueur's tree frog)) (Morrison et al. 2004). Consequently, that decline falls outside the relevant time period for this criterion.

The lace-eyed tree frog population appears now to have been relatively stable at low altitude sites for over a decade (e.g. McDonald & Alford 1999; Northern Queensland Threatened Frogs Recovery Team 2001; Hodgkinson & Hero 2003; Phillott & Young 2009; Phillott et al. 2010; Hoskin & Puschendorf 2014). While chytrid fungus continues to pose a threat to the species at higher altitudes, it does not appear to do so at lower altitudes.

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

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

Evidence:

The lace-eyed tree frog is distributed in the Wet Tropics area of northern Queensland from north of the Daintree River to Paluma Range National Park. The calculated extent of occurrence is 18 740 km², and the area of occupancy is 176 km² (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, herbaria, 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 species is found at more than 10 locations, and populations appear to be relatively stable, especially at lower altitudes (Northern Queensland Threatened Frogs Recovery Team 2001).

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

Criterion 3. Population size and decline			
	Critically Endangered Very low	Endangered Low	Vulnerable Limited
Estimated number of mature individuals	< 250	< 2,500	< 10,000
AND either (C1) or (C2) is true			

C1	An observed, estimated or projected continuing decline of at least (up to a max. of 100 years in future)	Very high rate 25% in 3 years or 1 generation (whichever is longer)	High rate 20% in 5 years or 2 generation (whichever is longer)	Substantial rate 10% in 10 years or 3 generations (whichever is longer)
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:

Given the broad distribution and stable populations of the species at a multitude of lowland stream locations (Northern Queensland Threatened Frogs Recovery Team 2001), it is likely that the population is >10 000 individuals

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

Criterion 4. Number of mature individuals			
	Critically Endangered Extremely low	Endangered Very Low	Vulnerable Low
Number of mature individuals	< 50	< 250	< 1,000

Evidence:

Given the broad distribution and high abundance of the species at a multitude of lowland stream locations, it is likely that the population is >10 000 individuals

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

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

Evidence:

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

Consideration for delisting

The lace-eyed tree frog was listed as Endangered under the EPBC Act at the commencement of the Act in 2000. There was a dramatic range contraction with an observed reduction in population size in the late 1980s and early 1990s due to the spread of the chytrid fungus. However, the lace-eyed tree frog population appears now to have been relatively stable at low altitude sites for over a decade (e.g. (McDonald & Alford 1999; Northern Queensland Threatened Frogs Recovery Team 2001; Hodgkinson & Hero 2003; Phillott & Young 2009; Phillott et al. 2010; Hoskin & Puschendorf 2014). While chytrid fungus continues to pose a threat to the species at higher altitudes, it does not appear to do so at lower altitudes.

The lace-eyed tree frog has extensive occupied habitat located within protected areas in Queensland (Wet Tropics World Heritage Area). Delisting the species is not expected to result in the loss of any recovery actions that could result in it becoming eligible for re-listing in the future.

Note: if the species is found to be ineligible for listing as a threatened species under the EPBC Act, the following section of this consultation document will not be relevant

Conservation Actions

Recovery Plan

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

Conservation and Management priorities

Disease

- Minimise the spread of the 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.

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

- Manage priority sites to reduce the impacts of habitat destruction by feral pigs by using fencing and controlling pig numbers.
- Minimise the spread of yellow crazy ants and manage their impacts by implementing an eradication program based on baiting at critical stages of the ants life cycle, as outline on the Wet Tropics Management Authority website (Wet Tropics Management Authority 2016).

Stakeholder Engagement

- Encourage ongoing and effective coordination of state-wide action to support conservation of the lace-eyed tree frog, including eradication programs for invasive species.
- Provide input to Wet Tropics Management Authority environmental codes of practice with land management agencies (fire, water infrastructure, transport and public utility, mining and quarrying, defence and grazing) to ensure conservation and management actions are compatible with the requirements of the species.
- Provide advice on Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines water management issues and programs including:
 - domestic extraction of water,
 - water extraction policy/usage through the Water Allocation Management Program,
 - impact of ground water pumping,
 - impact of water extraction on water flow, and
 - in-stream riparian impacts including small perennial streams and seasonal streams.
- Provide advice and information on the use of herbicides / biocides against pests and diseases in areas with threatened frogs.
- 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.

Survey and Monitoring priorities

- Conduct targeted surveys throughout the range of the lace-eyed tree frog to better define its distribution and abundance, including sites above 400m asl.
- Establish and maintain a monitoring programme based on these data to:
 - determine trends in population size and distribution, mortality and timing of life history stages; and
 - monitor the progress of recovery, including the effectiveness of management actions and the need to adapt them if necessary.

Information and research priorities

- Investigate options for linking, enhancing or establishing additional populations.
- Improve understanding of the extent and impact of infection by chytrid fungus on the lace-eyed tree frog to better inform how to apply existing or new management actions relevant to the recovery. This includes knowledge on:
 - the different strains of the fungus;
 - levels of virulence;
 - mechanisms for resistance to the disease;
 - treatment options; and

- the potential of other species (e.g. freshwater crayfish) to act as reservoirs or vectors for transmission of the fungus (Department of the Environment and Energy 2016).
- Determine the extent of the threat and the likely impacts from yellow crazy ants.
- Improve understanding of how climate change will likely impact the lace-eyed tree frog due to altered temperatures, rainfall, environmental stressors and disease virulence.
- Improve understanding of husbandry methods for the species.
- Improve understanding of the impacts of environmental toxins.

References cited in the advice

- Anstis M (2013). Tadpoles and Frogs of Australia. New Holland, Sydney.
- Berger L, Speare R, Dasak P, Green DE, Cunningham AA, Goggin CL, Slocombe R, Ragan MA, Hyatt AD, McDonald KR, Hines HB, Lips KR, Marantelli G & Parkes H (1998). Chytridiomycosis causes amphibian mortality associated with population declines in the rainforests of Australia and Central America. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science USA* 95,9031-9036.
- Cogger HG (2014). Reptiles and Amphibians of Australia. 7th edn. CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, Victoria.
- Czechura GV, Ingram GJ & Liem DS (1987). The genus *Nyctimystes* (Anura: Hylidae) in Australia. *Records of the Australian Museum* 39,333-338.
- Davies M & Richards SJ (1990). Developmental biology of the Australian hylid frog *Nyctimystes dayi* (Gunther). *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Australia* 114,207-211.
- Hodgkinson, S.C. & J.-M. Hero (2002). Seasonal behaviour of *Litoria nannotis*, *Litoria rheocola* and *Nyctimystes dayi* in Tully Gorge, north Queensland, Australia. In: R. Nattress, ed. *Frogs in the Community - Proceedings of the Brisbane Conference 13-14 Feb 1999*. Qld Museum.
- Hodgkinson S & Hero J-M (2003). Seasonal, sexual and ontogenetic variations in the diet of 'declining' frogs *Litoria nannotis*, *Litoria rheocola* and *Nyctimystes dayi*. *Wildlife Research* 30,345-354.
- Hoskin CJ & Puschendorf R (2014). The importance of peripheral areas for biodiversity conservation: with particular focus on endangered rainforest frogs of the Wet Tropics and Eungella. National Environmental Research Program Cairns.
- Kraus F (2013). Morphological data show that *Hyla dayi* Gunther, 1897 (Amphibia: Anura: Hylidae) should never have been assigned to *Nyctimystes*. *Memoirs of the Queensland Museum* 56,581-587.
- Laurance WF, McDonald KR & Speare R (1996). Epidemic disease and the catastrophic decline of Australian rain forest frogs. *Conservation Biology* 10,406-413.
- McDonald K & Alford R (1999). A review of declining frogs in northern Queensland. In: Campbell R (ed) *Declines and Disappearances of Australian Frogs*. Environment Australia. Canberra. pp 14-22.
- McDonald KR (1992). Distribution patterns and conservation status of north Queensland rainforest frogs. . Brisbane: . Queensland Department of Environment and Heritage Brisbane.
- Morrison C, Hero JM & Browning J (2004). Altitudinal variation in the age at maturity, longevity, and reproductive lifespan of anurans in subtropical Queensland. *Herpetologica* 60,34-44.
- Northern Queensland Threatened Frogs Recovery Team (2001). Recovery plan for the stream-dwelling rainforest frogs of the Wet Tropics biogeographic region of north-east Queensland 2000–2004. Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service Canberra.
- Phillott AD, McDonald KR & Skerratt LF (2010). Return rates of male hylid frogs *Litoria genimaculata*, *L. nannotis*, *L. rheocola* and *Nyctimystes dayi* after toe-tipping *Endangered Species Research* 11,183-188.

- Phillott AD & Young S (2009). Occurrence of cloacal prolapse in wild hylids in the Wet Tropics, Australia. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms* 86,77-80.
- Richards SJ, McDonald KR & Alford RA (1993). Declines in populations of Australia's endemic tropical rainforest frogs. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 1,66-77.
- Tyler M (1997). The Action Plan for Australian Frogs. Environment Australia, Canberra.
- Williams SE & Hero JM (1998). Rainforest frogs of the Australian Wet Tropics: guild classification and the ecological similarity of declining species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 265,597-602.
- Williams SE & Hero JM (2001). Multiple determinants of Australian tropical frog biodiversity. *Biological Conservation* 98,1-10.
- Woodhams DC & Alford RA (2005). Ecology of Chytridiomycosis in rainforest stream frog assemblages of tropical Queensland. *Conservation Biology* 19,1449-1459.

Other sources cited in the advice

- 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 *Litoria dayi*. Unpublished report, Australian Government Department of the Environment, Canberra.
- Northern Queensland Threatened Frogs Recovery Team (2001). Recovery plan for the streamdwelling rainforest frogs of the Wet Tropics biogeographic region of north-east Queensland 2000–2004. Report to Environment Australia, Canberra. Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service, Brisbane.
- Wet Tropics Management Authority (2016) (website). Stamp Out Yellow Crazy Ants. Viewed 2 December 2016. Available from: <http://www.wettropics.gov.au/stamp-out-yellow-crazy-ants.html>

Consultation questions

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

15. Can you advise as to whether this species is of cultural significance to Indigenous Australians?