**Part III. Rapid Review of Classification Template**

[**Instructions:** All text within report must Align left. Insert a space between paragraphs. Use line numbers throughout.] (style = Arial Font 12). Delete this paragraph upon completion of the report.]

[**date**]

**RAPID REVIEW OF CLASSIFICATION**

[The Rapid Review of Classification (RRoC) process can only be used for those species that will retain status and are in Bin 5 of the Review of Classification prioritization matrix. The RRoC enters the formal COSEWIC review process equivalent to the 6-month interim status report or SAS; however, as with a SAS, the SSC should consult with jurisdictions, ATK Subcommittee, WMBs, recovery team Co-chairs, and/or external experts no later than 7.5 years since the previous assessment to identify Wildlife Species for which RRoC may be appropriate. Input available data into RAMAS-redlist. Use data from the previous COSEWIC status report, recovery documents, recovery teams, jurisdictions, conservation data centres, and species experts. While the minimum amount of information required for RAMAS-redlist is found in the COSEWIC Technical Summary, adding comments to the various fields in RAMAS-redlist, such as those found under the “Ecology” tab, will give reviewers a more complete understanding of the species and the reasons for the various inputs. Use the “Comments” field under the “Assessment” tab as you would the **Preface** to fully updated status reports: “Summarize new knowledge gained since the wildlife species was last assessed. Focus on what is relevant to the application of the assessment criteria, such as change in taxonomy, population size, trends, extent of occurrence, or area of occupancy”. Ensure that the Reference section in RAMAS (under the “Assessment” tab) includes all the references used to input data and that the Information Sources in the Tech. Summary contains references cited in the Technical Summary. When finalized, the RRoC will be appended to the previous status report/SAS. It may be most efficient to complete a new Technical Summary before inputting data into RAMAS.

Data are typically not available to input into RAMAS for extirpated species therefore no RAMAS output is available. Similarly, a full Technical Summary is not required for extirpated species whose RoC is being done using the RRoC; only the Reasons for Designation and Applicability of Criteria need to be included in the RRoC of extirpated species.]

**PREFACE**

**[Instructions:** Summarize new knowledge gained since the wildlife species was last assessed. Focus on what is relevant to the application of the assessment criteria, such as change in taxonomy, population size, trends, extent of occurrence, or area of occupancy.]

**Current status:** [status (month year) criteria [e.g., EN (April 2008) B1ac(iv)+2ac(iv)]

**Updated map:** ** Required  Not required**

**Explanation / updated map provided:**

[provide map or option:

Not required. See previous assessment (COSEWIC \_\_\_\_).

**TECHNICAL SUMMARY**

**Instructions (to be deleted after completion):** Complete the Technical Summary after you have finished the report. Provide one Technical Summary for each proposed designatable unit (refer to [Guidelines for Recognizing Designatable Units](http://cosewic.ca/index.php/en-ca/reports/preparing-status-reports/guidelines-recognizing-designatable-units)) as well as the species in its entirety within Canada. For the meanings of terms in this Technical Summary, refer to the section entitled [Definitions and Abbreviations](http://cosewic.ca/index.php/en-ca/about-us/definitions-abbreviations) found accompanying the [Information for Preparing Status Reports](http://cosewic.ca/index.php/en-ca/reports/preparing-status-reports/guidelines-recognizing-designatable-units) on the COSEWIC/COSEPAC website ( http://cosewic.ca).

Provide requested data and relevant associated information in the fields on the right-hand column. In the fields that include **“observed, inferred or projected”,** etc. leave the text in the left column intact, but add text such as **“yes, inferred”** or **“yes, inferred and projected”** to the right column.

If details of items in the technical summary are provided in status report text, cite relevant status report section(s). If an item in the technical summary is not applicable (e.g., a quantitative analysis was not done) delete the bracketed text.

When using a percentage clearly indicate whether the percentage refers to an increase or a reduction by using a plus or minus sign. Delete these four paragraphs of instructions upon completion of the Technical Summary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [Genus species] | |
| [English common name]  [Nom commun français] |  |
| Range of occurrence in Canada (province/territory/ocean): | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  | |
|  | **Demographic Information** | | | | | |  |
| 1. | Generation time (usually average age of parents in the population; indicate if another method of estimating generation time indicated in the IUCN guidelines(2011) is being used) | | | | | | ­\_\_ yrs |
| 2. | Is there an [observed, inferred, or projected] continuing decline in number of mature individuals? | | | | | |  |
| 3. | Estimated percent of continuing decline in total number of mature individuals within [5 years or 2 generations, whichever is longer up to a maximum of 100 years] | | | | | |  |
| 4. | [Observed, estimated, inferred, or suspected] percent [reduction or increase] in total number of mature individuals over the last [10 years, or 3 generations, whichever is longer up to a maximum of 100 years]. | | | | | |  |
| 5. | [Projected or suspected] percent [reduction or increase] in total number of mature individuals over the next [10 years, or 3 generations, whichever is longer up to a maximum of 100 years]. | | | | | |  |
|  | [Observed, estimated, inferred, or suspected] percent [reduction or increase] in total number of mature individuals over any period [10 years, or 3 generations, whichever is longer up to a maximum of 100 years], including both the past and the future. | | | | | |  |
| 7. | Are the causes of the decline a. clearly reversible and b. understood and c. ceased? | | | | | | a.  b.  c. |
| 8. | Are there extreme fluctuations in number of mature individuals? | | | | | |  |
|  |  | | | | | |  |
|  | **Extent and Occupancy Informatio**n | | | | | | |
| 9. | Estimated extent of occurrence (EOO) | | | | | | km² |
| 10. | Index of area of occupancy (IAO)  (Always report 2x2 grid value). | | | | | | km² |
| 11. | Is the population “severely fragmented” i.e., is >50% of its total area of occupancy in habitat patches that are (a) smaller than would be required to support a viable population, and (b) separated from other habitat patches by a distance larger than the species can be expected to disperse? | | | | | | a.  b. |
| 12. | Number of “locations”[[1]](#footnote-1)\* (use plausible range to reflect uncertainty if appropriate) | | | | | |  |
| 13. | Is there an [observed, inferred, or projected] decline in extent of occurrence? | | | | | |  |
| 14. | Is there an [observed, inferred, or projected] decline in index of area of occupancy? | | | | | |  |
| 15. | Is there an [observed, inferred, or projected] decline in number of subpopulations? | | | | | |  |
| 16. | Is there an [observed, inferred, or projected] decline in number of “locations”\*? | | | | | |  |
| 17. | Is there an [observed, inferred, or projected] decline in [area, extent and/or quality] of habitat? | | | | | |  |
| 18. | Are there extreme fluctuations in number of subpopulations? | | | | | |  |
| 19. | Are there extreme fluctuations in number of “locations”[[2]](#footnote-2)\*? | | | | | |  |
|  | Are there extreme fluctuations in extent of occurrence? | | | | | |  |
| 21. | Are there extreme fluctuations in index of area of occupancy? | | | | | |  |
|  | **Number of Mature Individuals (in each subpopulation)** | | | | | | |
| 22. | Subpopulations (give plausible ranges) | | | | | | N Mature Individuals |
|  |  | | | | | |  |
|  |  | | | | | |  |
|  | Total | | | | | |  |
|  | **Quantitative Analysis** | | | | | | |
| 23. | Is the probability of extinction in the wild at least [20% within 20 years or 5 generations whichever is longer up to a maximum of 100 years, or 10% within 100 years]? | | | | | |  |
|  |  | | | | | |  |
|  | **Threats (direct, from highest impact to least, as per IUCN Threats Calculator)** | | | | | | |
| 24. | |  | | --- | | Was a threats calculator completed for this species?    What additional limiting factors are relevant? |   **Rescue Effect (immigration from outside Canada)** | | | | | | |
| 25. | Status of outside population(s) most likely to provide immigrants to Canada. | | | | | |  |
| 26. | Is immigration known or possible? | | | | | |  |
| 27. | Would immigrants be adapted to survive in Canada? | | | | | |  |
| 28. | Is there sufficient habitat for immigrants in Canada? | | | | | |  |
| 29. | Are conditions deteriorating in Canada?[[3]](#footnote-3)+ | | | | | |  |
| 30. | Are conditions for the source (i.e., outside) population deteriorating?[[4]](#footnote-4)+ | | | | | |  |
| 31. | Is the Canadian population considered to be a sink?[[5]](#footnote-5)+ | | | | | |  |
| 32. | Is rescue from outside populations likely? | | | | | |  |
|  | **Data Sensitive Species** | | |
| 33. | Is this a data sensitive species? | | | | | |  |
|  | **Current Status** | | | | | | |
| 34. | COSEWIC: | | | | | | |
| 35. | Year Assessed: | | | | | | |
| 36. | COSEWIC Status History:  NOTE e.g.,: The species was considered a single unit and designated Special Concern in April 1983. Split into two populations in May 2002. The Atlantic population was designated Endangered in May 2002. Status re-examined and confirmed in May 2012. | | | | | | |
| 37. | Criteria: | | | | | | |
| 38. | Reasons for Designation: | | | | | | |
|  | **Recommended Status and Reasons for Designation:** | | | | | | |
| 39. | Recommended Status:  NOTE this is changed to current ‘status’ after a Wildlife Species Assessment Meeting when the report is finalized | | | | | 40. Alpha-numeric codes: | |
| 41. | Reasons for designation: | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | | |
|  | **Applicability of Criteria** | | | | | | |
| 42. | Criterion A (Decline in Total Number of Mature Individuals): | | | | | | |
| 43. | Criterion B (Small Distribution Range and Decline or Fluctuation): | | | | | | |
| 44. | Criterion C (Small and Declining Number of Mature Individuals): | | | | | | |
| 45. | Criterion D (Very Small or Restricted Population): | | | | | | |
| 46. | Criterion E (Quantitative Analysis): | | | | | | |

[Section and page break]

**Acknowledgements:**

**Authorities contacted:**

**Information sources:**

**Writer of RRoC:**

[The following sections will be included in the draft RRoC reports and be reviewed during the review and voting processes (Flowcharts I and II) but will be removed when the RRoC is finalized.]

**RAMAS results graphic output** (paste screen clipping, e.g., From Side Note):

RAMAS® Red List: Threatened species classification under uncertainty, is a computer program that provides a range of probable IUCN species status based on IUCN criteria. These categories and criteria have been adopted for use by COSEWIC in assigning status. Note that IUCN Critical and Endangered categories correspond to COSEWIC Endangered; IUCN Vulnerable is COSEWIC Threatened; and IUCN Least Concern is COSEWIC Special Concern.

[Paste screen clipping here]

**RAMAS text output:**

[paste text output here]

1. \* See Definitions and Abbreviations on [COSEWIC website](http://cosewic.ca/index.php/en-ca/about-us/definitions-abbreviations) and [IUCN](http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/red-list-documents) (Feb 2014) for more information on this term [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. + See [Table 3](http://cosewic.ca/index.php/en-ca/assessment-process/wildlife-species-assessment-process-categories-guidelines/modifications-rescue-effect) ( Guidelines for modifying status assessment based on rescue effect) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)