AMENDMENTS TO APPENDICES I AND II OF THE CONVENTION

Other Proposals

A. PROPOSAL

Transfer of *Amazona aestiva* from Appendix II to Appendix I.

B. PROPOSENENT

The United States of America.

C. SUPPORTING STATEMENT

1. Taxonomy

   11. Class: Aves
   12. Order: Psittaciformes
   13. Family: Psittacidae
   14. Species: *Amazona aestiva* (Linné, 1758)
   15. Common Names: English: Blue-fronted amazon, turquoise-fronted parrot
       French: Spanish:
   16. Code Numbers: 1318003C05002001

2. Biological Data

   21. Distribution: The blue-fronted amazon ranges from interior north-eastern Brazil southwards to the eastern half of Bolivia and south through Paraguay to northern Argentina (Ridgely, 1982). Two subspecies are recognized:

      *A. a. aestiva* (Linné)

      **Brazil:** Eastern Brazil from central Piauí, southern Maranhá and southern Pará south through Pernambuco Bahia, Minas Gerais and Goiás to Rio Grande do Sul, western Paraná and southeastern Mato Grosso. Absent from coastal regions (Forshaw and Cooper, 1989; Darrieu, 1983; Sick 1984). Belton (1984) pointed out that there were no specimens from Rio Grande do Sul and no recent records. Intergrades with *A. a. xanthopteryx* in central southern Mato Grosso and western Paraná (Darrieu, 1983).

      **Paraguay:** Said to intergrade with *A. a. xanthopteryx* in eastern Paraguay (Short, 1975).
A. a. xanthopteryx (Berlepsch)

Argentina: Recorded from the north of the country in the provinces of Salta, Jujuy, Formosa, Tucumán, Chaco, Misiones, northeast and central Corrientes, north Santa Fe (Darrieu, 1983), Córdoba (Nores and Yzurieta, 1983), and occasionally northern Buenos Aires (Forshaw and Cooper, 1989).

Bolivia: From the foothills of the Andes to the eastern border. Recorded from Bermejo, Fortín Campero, Samaipata, Lagunillas (Bond and Meyer de Schauensee, 1943) and around Tiguipa (Remsen et al., 1986). Recorded from Tatarenda and Colonia Crevaux, Santa Cruz (Lönnberg, 1903). Recorded from east of Samaipata, Santa Cruz, and from Río Itáu, Tarija (Nores and Yzurieta, 1984).

Brazil: Extreme south of Mato Grosso and possibly western Paraná, where it may intergrade with A. a. aestiva (Darrieu, 1983).

Paraguay: Distributed throughout the country (Ridgely, 1982). In the east and in Misiones it intergrades with A. a. aestiva (Steinbacher, 1962; Short, 1975).

22. Population: Ridgely, 1982 described it as generally fairly common to common over much of its range.

Argentina: Said to be declining in numbers, throughout the country as a result of persecution and habitat destruction (Argentina CITES MA, March 1986). White and Sclater (1882) stated that it was uncommon in Misiones, but abundant in Catamarca and Tucuman. It was said to be very scarce in Córdoba (Nores and Yzurieta, 1983). However, Ridgely (1982) thought that it was still common to locally very common across much of the Chaco, particularly towards the more lushly vegetated westward fringe. In June 1986 at the CITES Technical Committee meeting, the Argentina MA representative pointed out, in apparent contradiction of their earlier written comments, that the species was considered a pest in their country and was listed as a harmful species under their legislation. Bucher and Martella (1988), supported by Gruss and Waller (1988), maintain that, at least in eastern Salta Province, the population of this species has undergone a drastic decline recently. Bucher et al. (1990) stated that the species is now extremely rare in Cordoba, La Rioja and Catamarca, and rare in Santa Fe; that it has disappeared from most of Santiago del Estero; and that it is still relatively common in some areas of Salta and Jujuy, although much less abundant than even 20 years previously.

Bolivia: Observed in flocks of several hundreds in southeastern Santa Cruz (Lönnberg, 1903). Said to be very common throughout the Chaco (Eisentraut, 1935). More recently described as common and widespread over most of its range, and still relatively numerous near many towns and in many partially settled regions; apparently little or no overall decline (Ridgely, 1982).

Brazil: Said to be "generally common" in Brazil and to be "no problem" (Ridgely, 1979). Stone and Roberts (1934) saw it in flocks at Descalvados, Mato Grosso, in 1931. Scott and Brooke (1985) found it to
be quite common in southeastern Brazil in the Poco das Antas Biological Reserve, Rio de Janeiro, and Sick (1984) found that it was frequent in the interior of Brazil. Willis and Oniki (1981), in a survey of Sao Paulo, found it at only one locality in the extreme southwest, where they estimated the density as 11 birds per 100 hours of observation.

There are no recent records from Rio Grande do Sul (Belton, 1984) P. Roth (in litt., 17 December 1985) said that populations were declining in large parts of its range.

Paraguay: Wetmore (1926) found it to be common west of Puerto Pinasco in 1920. In 1930, it was reported to be common at Fort Wheeler in the Chaco and abundant at Descalvados (Naumburg, 1930). Common in the Chaco of the west; fairly common to locally common eastwards from the Paraguay River; no declines evident (Ridgely, 1982).

23. Habitat: The blue-fronted amazon is found from lowland areas to intermontane valleys in the Andes up to 1600 m (Ridgely, 1982). Olrog (1984) reported it to be characteristic of savannahs in Argentina. Scott and Brooke (1985) also found it in established secondary forest and in riverine and swampy forest. Sick (1984) described it as occurring in both humid and dry terrain. In Brazil, it favours gallery forests, deciduous woodland, and semi-open or forest edge areas (Ridgely, 1979).

It is usually seen in pairs or small groups, but in the non-breeding season may assemble in large, noisy, and conspicuous roosts (Ridgely, 1982). It feeds entirely in trees (Short, 1975) on fruits, berries, seeds, nuts, blossoms, and leaf buds. It attacks crops, and Budher et al., 1990 found that only citrus were damaged and that most damage occurred in Salta and Jujuy. Nesting usually takes place in holes in trees and has been recorded in September in Paraguay, with clutches of 2-3 eggs (Naumburg, 1930). In eastern Bolivia, nesting on cliffs has also been reported (Ridgely, 1982).

3. Trade Data

31. National Utilization:

Argentina: Said to be suffering from direct human persecution and permanent habitat destruction (Argentina CITES MA, 1986). Most nestlings (95%) are collected from breeding cavities either by enlarging the access hole or by cutting down the entire tree. Both methods leave the cavities unusable for breeding in the following season.

Bolivia: No information.

Brazil: It is the most popular parrot in Brazil as a cage bird (P. Roth in litt., 17 December 1985), since it is considered a "good talker" (Ridgely, 1979). Ridgely (1979) considered that this form of exploitation did not appear to have seriously affected its numbers, although subsequently he recommended future vigilance (Ridgely, 1982). However, Roth reported population declines in 1985.
Paraguay: Many thousands of birds were reported as having been exported annually from Paraguay (Ridgely, 1979), but it is likely that this has now largely ceased.

32. Legal International Trade: CITES reports indicate that the minimum trade in this species increased steadily from 10,644 in 1981 to 58,464 in 1988. However, in 1989 there was a sharp decline to 21,753 birds. CITES records indicate that a minimum total of 280,000 blue-fronted amazons were legally imported into CITES Party nations from 1983 to 1989. The major recorded importers over this period were the USA (46%) and the Federal Republic of Germany (21%). About 9% of the birds recorded in trade apparently originated in Argentina.

Argentina has set an annual export quota of 23,000 birds in both 1990 and 1991. Exports of blue-fronted amazons from all other range countries are now prohibited. The justification for a large export quota from Argentina is based on the bird’s status as an alleged agricultural pest. Enrique Bucher, Centre de Zoologia Aplicada, University of Cordoba, states that damage problems are restricted to certain areas (mostly citrus-growing areas), so it is unlikely that the entire population of amazons can be considered to be causing agricultural damage because large portions of its distributional range are unsuitable for agriculture.

4. Protection Status

All of the range states are Parties to CITES. Most of the following information was extracted from Fuller et al. (1987).

Argentina: Considered a harmful species and therefore excluded from a general ban on trade in wildlife under Resolution No. 62 of 14 March 1986 (CITES Notification to the Parties No. 412, 28 November 1986). In 1990 and 1991, an annual export quota of 23,000 birds was established (CITES Notification No. 626, 8 April 1991).

Bolivia: Listed as a regulated species under Decreto Supremo No. 11251 in 1973, although export of some birds has been authorized. All exports of live wildlife were prohibited in 1964.

Brazil: All exports of wildlife have been prohibited since 1967.

Paraguay: All exports of wildlife have been prohibited since 1975.

5. Information on Similar Species

None.

6. Comments from Countries of Origin

None.

7. Additional Remarks:

Since the 1970s, this species has been bred in captivity on many occasions throughout the world (Low, 1986). In the United States, a survey (1990) reported a total of 692 birds being held by private aviculturists, involving 229
breeding pairs which reared 98 young (Allen and Johnson, 1991). In the United Kingdom, a survey (1990) reported 65 young were reared in captivity (Coombes, 1991).
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