

SciName	CommonName	Current Listing	AOO (km2)	EOO (km2)	Decline in range/habitat parameter	Decline in Population	Fragmentation	Locations Meet threshold
<i>Arborophila graydoni</i>	Sabah Partridge	LC	2321.92	11,200	Yes	Yes	Fragmented	Uncertain
<i>Columba trocaz</i>	Madeira Laurel-pigeon	LC	13.65	390	Yes	No	No	Potentially
<i>Columba pollenii</i>	Comoro Olive-pigeon	NT C2a(i)	1100.12	15,600	No	Yes	No	Uncertain
<i>Alectroenas sganzini</i>	Comoro Blue-pigeon	LC	1084.9	69,600	No	Yes	No	Uncertain
<i>Ramphiculus meridionalis</i>	Lompobattang Fruit-dove	VU C2a(ii)	468.43	1,100	Potential	Yes	No	Uncertain
<i>Goldmania violiceps</i>	Violet-capped Hummingbird	LC	1291.25	14,600	Potential	Potential	Fragmented	No
<i>Aglaeactis castelnaudii</i>	White-tufted Sunbeam	LC	832.18	94,300	Potential	Yes	Fragmented	No
<i>Coeligena phalerata</i>	White-tailed Starfrontlet	LC	1825.6	4,700	Potential	Yes	Severe	No

SciName	Highest potential Listing	Proposed Listing	Reason for Difference between Highest and Proposed Listing
<i>Arborophila graydoni</i>	VU B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NT B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	Uncertainty over whether severely fragmented and the number of locations mean that the species would not meet the threshold for Vulnerable. However, given the habitat is likely at least fragmented the species would warrant listing as NT.
<i>Columba trocaz</i>	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii)+2ab(i,ii,iii)	NT B1ab(i,ii,iii)+2ab(i,ii,iii); C2a(ii)	Stability of the population is due to conservation measures (hunting ban). If hunting were to restart then the species would be limited to a very small number of locations and may warrant listing a higher listing. Forest loss does remain high on the island, but with this as the major threat now, the number of locations where the species is found is uncertain. Any information to suggest that the species is found at <10 locations would mean that it would qualify as at least Vulnerable.
<i>Columba pollenii</i>	VU B1ab(v)+2ab(v)	NT B1ab(v)+2ab(v); C2a(i)	Area of impact of hunting on each island is uncertain, but if each island were to be considered one location because of this threat then the species would qualify as Vulnerable.
<i>Alectroenas sganzini</i>	VU B1ab(v)+2ab(v)	NT B1ab(v)+2ab(v)	Area of impact of hunting on each island is uncertain, but if each island were to be considered one location because of this threat then the species would qualify as Vulnerable. However, the species survives well in logged forest and so its actual AOO may be larger.
<i>Ramphiculus meridionalis</i>	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	VU C2a(ii)	Given the very high rates of forest loss in the general region, the species could be restricted to only a few locations. However, the range of this species has not been severely affected so far, and given the uncertainty regarding this, there is currently not sufficient information to list this species under criterion B.
<i>Goldmania violiceps</i>	VU B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NT B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NOT severely fragmented, and uncertainty over decline mean that the species likely approaches rather than meets the threshold for Vulnerable.
<i>Aglaeactis castelnaudii</i>	VU B2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NT B2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NOT severely fragmented, but may be considered fragmented. Therefore, approaches the threshold for Vulnerable rather than meets it.
<i>Coeligena phalerata</i>	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)	

SciName	CommonName	Current Listing	AOO (km2)	EOO (km2)	Decline in range/habitat parameter	Decline in Population	Fragmentation	Locations Meet threshold
<i>Ninox sumbaensis</i>	Least Boobook	NT C1+2a(ii)	159.05	6,100	Potential	Yes	No	Yes
<i>Capito fitzpatricki</i>	Sira Barbet	NT D1	280.06	680	Potential	Potential	No	Uncertain
<i>Scytalopus latebricola</i>	Brown-rumped Tapaculo	LC	894.23	3,900	Potential	Potential	Fragmented	No
<i>Cranioleuca hellmayri</i>	Streak-capped Spinetail	LC	1572.27	6,800	Potential	Yes	Fragmented	No
<i>Cranioleuca dissita</i>	Coiba Spinetail	NT D2	415	670	No	Yes	No	Yes
<i>Stresemannia bougainvillei</i>	Bougainville Honeyeater	LC	1796.29	4,300	Potential	Potential	No	No
<i>Myzomela batjanensis</i>	Bacan Myzomela	NT D1	89.9	100	Yes	Yes	No	Uncertain

SciName	Highest potential Listing	Proposed Listing	Reason for Difference between Highest and Proposed Listing
<i>Ninox sumbaensis</i>	EN B2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	EN B2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	
<i>Capito fitzpatricki</i>	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NT B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v); D1	Uncertainty over number of locations means it currently would not meet the threshold for listing under a Threatened category. Further comments regarding this may mean it warrants a higher Red List status.
<i>Scytalopus latebricola</i>	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NT B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	Forest loss has been very slow over 3 generations. However, the preferred habitat of this species is dense undergrowth rather than forest and so the clearance of this habitat within the Santa Marta Mountains will not have been counted. Uncertainty does remain over whether declines are taking place, and the species's habitat may be better described as fragmented rather than severely fragmented, and so it likely approaches but does not meet the threshold for Vulnerable.
<i>Cranioleuca hellmayri</i>	VU B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NT B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	Habitat at least considered fragmented, any comments to suggest that it is severely fragmented would warrant its listing as Vulnerable.
<i>Cranioleuca dissita</i>	EN B1ab(v)+2ab(v)	EN B1ab(v)+2ab(v)	
<i>Stresemannia bougainvillei</i>	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)	LC	NOT severely fragmented and >10 locations so would not qualify as Threatened. Uncertainty over whether the species is declining means that it is proposed that it remain as LC rather than be listed as NT.
<i>Myzomela batjanensis</i>	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	VU C2a(ii)	The assessment depends on the number of locations where this species is considered to be found. This value is likely to be small (but >1), though we request further information regarding this to see whether it meets the thresholds for listing as Vulnerable or Endangered under criterion B. Using population densities for conspecifics and assuming only a fraction of its suitable habitat is occupied would give a population size of just larger than 2,500 mature individuals (rising to >10,000 if all of the suitable habitat is occupied), and so the species at least now meets the threshold for Vulnerable under criterion C2a(ii).

SciName	CommonName	Current Listing	AOO (km2)	EOO (km2)	Decline in range/habitat parameter	Decline in Population	Fragmentation	Locations Meet threshold
<i>Sphecotheres viridis</i>	Timor Figbird	LC	1623.34	43,500	Potential	Yes	Fragmented	No
<i>Pachycephala tenebrosa</i>	Morningbird	LC	244.48	2,300	Yes	Yes	No	No
<i>Vireo bairdi</i>	Cozumel Vireo	LC	361.19	550	Potential	Potential	No	Yes
<i>Rhipidura kordensis</i>	Biak Fantail	LC	2127.9	6,100	Potential	Potential	No	No
<i>Clytorhynchus hamlini</i>	Rennell Shrikebill	LC	358.01	980	Potential	Potential	No	No
<i>Sittiparus owstoni</i>	Izu Tit	NT C2a(i)	32.6	1,100	Yes	Yes	Fragmented	Yes
<i>Apalis lynesii</i>	Namuli Apalis	NT B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)	401.02	1,700	Potential	Potential	No	Potentially
<i>Hypsipetes borbonicus</i>	Reunion Bulbul	LC	1049.57	2,700	Potential	No	No	Uncertain

SciName	Highest potential Listing	Proposed Listing	Reason for Difference between Highest and Proposed Listing
<i>Sphecotheres viridis</i>	VU B2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NT B2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	At least fragmented. Any comments to suggests it could be severely fragmented may warrant listing as Vulnerable.
<i>Pachycephala tenebrosa</i>	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	LC	NOT severely fragmented and >10 locations so would not qualify as Threatened. However, forest loss for such a small area is particularly high and so we request comments as to whether it may warrant listing as NT.
<i>Vireo bairdi</i>	EN B1ab(ii,iii,v)+2ab(ii,iii,v)	NT B1ab(ii,iii,v)+2ab(ii,iii,v); D2	Uncertainty over declines would suggest it does not get listed as Threatened. Also, while limited to one small island that can be affected by hurricanes, the species does appear to be able to persist after them. They remain a threat, but unlikely to drive the species to CR/EX in a short period of time. Therefore, NT D2 may be appropriate too.
<i>Rhipidura kordensis</i>	NT B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	LC	NOT severely fragmented, and uncertainty over decline mean that the species may not even approach the threshold for Vulnerable.
<i>Clytorhynchus hamlini</i>	EN B1ab(ii,iii,v)+2ab(ii,iii,v)	LC	NOT severely fragmented and >10 locations so would not qualify as Threatened. Uncertainty over whether the species is declining means that it is proposed that it remain as LC rather than be listed as NT.
<i>Sittiparus owstoni</i>	EN B1ab(ii,iii,v)+2ab(ii,iii,v)	EN B1ab(ii,iii,v)+2ab(ii,iii,v)	
<i>Apalis lynesii</i>	EN B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NT B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	Uncertainty over declines and number of locations would suggest it should not be listed as Threatened.
<i>Hypsipetes borbonicus</i>	NT B1ab(iii,v)+2ab(iii,v)	NT B1ab(iii,v)+2ab(iii,v)	Habitat loss is occurring, however this is relatively slow and the population is currently considered to be increasing. This is due to conservation actions (a ban of hunting of this species) and so it may be appropriate to list the species as Near Threatened, as a lifting of the ban could quickly mean the species qualifies for a threatened category.

SciName	CommonName	Current Listing	AOO (km2)	EOO (km2)	Decline in range/habitat parameter	Decline in Population	Fragmentation	Locations Meet threshold
<i>Zosterops semperi</i>	Citrine White-eye	LC	544.03	2,900,000	Potential	Unknown	Potentially Severe	No
<i>Fulvetta danisi</i>	Indochinese Fulvetta	LC	796.69	199,000	Potential	Yes	Fragmented	No
<i>Henicorhina anachoreta</i>	Hermit Wood-wren	LC	2566.3	5,200	Potential	Yes	Fragmented	No
<i>Geokichla dumasi</i>	Buru Thrush	NT B1ab(v)	1542.5	9,100	No	Yes	No	Uncertain
<i>Foudia consobrina</i>	Grand Comoro Fody	NT C2a(ii)	555.5	1,300	No	Potential	No	Uncertain
<i>Pyrhulagra taylori</i>	Grand Cayman Bullfinch	NT C2a(ii)	71.1	380	No	Yes	No	Uncertain

SciName	Highest potential Listing	Proposed Listing	Reason for Difference between Highest and Proposed Listing
<i>Zosterops semperi</i>	VU B2ab(ii,iii,v)	LC	Uncertainty over declines would suggest it does not get listed as Threatened. Different subspecies are likely to be severely fragmented with very large distances between them. However, subpopulations within each subspecies are unlikely to be fragmented. Given the large uncertainty the species may be considered to not be approaching the threshold for Vulnerable and would remain as LC.
<i>Fulvetta danisi</i>	VU B2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	LC	Does appear to approach the threshold for Vulnerable, however, the species does also occur in a range of other habitats (see Collar and Robson 2017) so the AOO figure is likely to be an underestimate.
<i>Henicorhina anachoreta</i>	VU B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NT B1ab(i,ii,iii,v)+2ab(i,ii,iii,v)	NOT severely fragmented, but may be considered fragmented. Therefore, approaches the threshold for Vulnerable rather than meets it.
<i>Geokichla dumasi</i>	VU B1ab(v)+2ab(v)	NT B1ab(v)+2ab(v)	Uncertainty over the number of locations would suggest that the species would not qualify as Vulnerable. However, if hunting may be considered such a threat that the island is considered to be only 1 location, then it would warrant uplisting to VU.
<i>Foudia consobrina</i>	EN B1ab(v)	NT B1ab(v)+2ab(v): C2a(ii)	The threat from nest predators means that the species may be confined to 1 location. However, uncertainty over this and the decline means that the species may be best retained as Near Threatened; though we request any further comments or information regarding this.
<i>Pyrrhulagra taylori</i>	EN B1ab(v)+2ab(v)	NT B1ab(v)+2ab(v): C2a(ii)	The threat from nest predators means that the species may be confined to 1 location. However, uncertainty over this and the fact the species inhabits other habitats (and hence its AOO will be larger than stated) means that the species may be best retained as Near Threatened; though we request any further comments or information regarding this.