

New Assessment for *Lepidochelys olivacea*

Note from the IUCN Red List Unit: This assessment was the subject of a Petition, but following a Ruling by the IUCN Red List Standards and Petitions Working Group (SPWG), the assessment has been accepted for inclusion on the 2008 update of the *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*. The assessment that appears below is the same as that submitted for the Petitions process. However, the content that will appear on the 2008 Red List under this species may differ slightly to the content presented here. This is because some elements of the supporting documentation may be changed in response to issues raised by the SPWG, particularly issues of transparency.

Scientific name (including authority details):

Lepidochelys olivacea (Eschscholtz, 1829)

Synonym/s (if there has been a taxonomic change in the last 5 years or if widely used):

None

English Common Names (if known):

Olive ridley, Pacific ridley

Other Common Names (if known and state language):

French: Ridley du Pacifique, tortue bâtarde, tortue olivâtre

Spanish: tortuga golfina, tortuga lora, tortuga olivacea, tortuga guaraguá, tortuga parlama, tortuga carpintera, tortuga mulato, tortuga manila

Portuguese: tartaruga-oliva, tartaruga-pequena, tartaruga-comum

Order Family Subfamily

Testudines Cheloniidae Chelonini

Geographic Range of species (Figure 1):

The olive ridley sea turtle has a circumtropical distribution, with nesting occurring throughout tropical waters (except the Gulf of Mexico) and migratory circuits in tropical and some subtropical areas (Atlantic Ocean – eastern central, northeast, northwest, southeast, southwest, western central; Indian Ocean – eastern, western; Pacific Ocean – eastern central, northwest, southwest, western central) (Pritchard, 1969). Nesting occurs in nearly 60 countries worldwide. Migratory movements are less well studied than other marine turtle species but are known to involve coastal waters of over 80 countries (see Table 1). With very few exceptions they are not known to move between ocean basins or to cross from one ocean border to the other. Within a region, olive ridleys may move between the oceanic and neritic zones (Plotkin et al., 1995; Shanker et al., 2003a) or just occupy neritic waters (Pritchard, 1976; Reichart, 1993).

Habitat and Ecology Information:

Habitats. Like most other sea turtles, olive ridleys display a complex life cycle which requires a range of geographically separated localities and multiple habitats (Márquez, 1990). Females lay their nests on coastal sandy beaches from which neonates emerge and enter the marine environment to continue their development. They remain in a pelagic phase, drifting passively with major currents that disperse far from their natal sites, with juveniles sharing some of the adults' habitats (Kopitsky et al., 2000) until sexual maturity is reached (Musick

and Limpus, 1997). Reproductively active males and females migrate toward coastal zones and concentrate near nesting beaches. However, some males appear to remain in oceanic waters and mate with females en route to their nesting beaches (Plotkin et al. 1996; Kopitsky et al., 2000). Their post-breeding migrations are complex, with pathways varying annually (Plotkin, 1994) and with no apparent migratory corridors, swimming hundreds or thousands of kilometers over large ocean expanses (Morreale et al., 2007), commonly within the 20°C isotherms (Márquez, 1990). In the East Pacific, they are present from 30°N to 15°S and often seen within 1,200 nautical miles from shore although they have been sighted as far as 140°W (IATTC, 2004). Western Atlantic olive ridleys appear to remain in neritic waters after breeding (Pritchard, 1976; Reichart, 1993).




Figure 1. Geographic range of habitats utilized by the olive ridley, *Lepidochelys olivacea*, based on data in Table 6.

Demographic features / Reproduction. The species displays three modes of reproduction: arribada, dispersed nesting, and mixed strategy (Bernardo and Plotkin, 2007). The first mode represents a synchronous, mass nesting behavior that may include hundreds to thousands of females over a period of days and occurs in fewer than a dozen places worldwide. The more common form of nesting is dispersed or “solitary” with no apparent synchronicity between individual events. At some localities, a mixture of these two forms of nesting can also occur. In general, individual olive ridleys may nest one, two or three times per season, with approximately 100-110 eggs per clutch (Pritchard and Plotkin, 1995). For this assessment we have used an average number of 2.5 nests/female/season and 105 eggs/nest. In contrast to other sea turtle species, the reproductive cycle is nearly annual (over 60% of turtles nest every year; Márquez, 1990). Solitary nesters oviposit on 14 day cycles whereas arribada nesters approximately every 28 days (Pritchard, 1969; Kalb and Owens, 1994; Kalb, 1999). Kalb (1999) found that within a nesting season solitary nesters use multiple beaches for oviposition but arribada nesters display nest site fidelity. There are extreme variations in hatching rates between nesting beaches, however, in general they are much higher in solitary nesting beaches where around 80% is common and sometimes even higher (Gaos et al., 2006). It is widely recognized that survivorship is extremely low on high density arribada nesting beaches because of density-dependent mortality (Cornelius et al., 1991) leading to hatching rates as low as 1 to 8% (Cornelius et al., 1991). Moreover, turtles return approximately every month during a discrete nesting season (3 - 6 months) and nests that remained intact during the previous month are

again at risk when new waves of turtles crawl ashore. On solitary nesting beaches, where density-dependent mortality is not a factor, hatching rates are significantly higher (Castro, 1986; Gaos et al., 2006). Post-hatching survivorship is unknown and there is no information available on recruitment rates. Presumably, like other sea turtles, olive ridleys experience high mortality in their early life stages. Juveniles are believed to occur in similar habitats as the adults (i.e. pelagic waters) where they forage on gelatinous prey such as jellyfish, salps and tunicates (Kopitsky et al., 2004).

Generation Length

For the purposes of Red List assessments, generation length is defined as the “average age of parents” (IUCN, 2001). Since this information is not available from direct observation of sea turtle species we derived a comparable value from estimates of age at which 50% of the breeders are expected to have survived, using information for age at sexual maturity and adult survival rates. An important caveat is that, while it is known that different populations of the same species can attain sexual maturity at different ages (Heppell et al. 2003) and therefore different values would need to be taken into account for different regions, the information is only available for a single region and we have had to assume the estimated values are generally applicable on a global scale. The only published study on growth and age for olive ridleys (Zug et al. 2006) indicates a mean age at sexual maturity for North-central Pacific ridley sea turtles of around 13 years (range of 10-18 years). We calculated the time it would take for a cohort of breeders to reach 50% of its original size from $S^n = 50\%$, where n is years since age at first reproduction, and S is annual survival. Solving for n , $n = \ln(0.5)/\ln(S)$. As extensive estimates of annual survival rates for female nesters are only available from the better studied sister taxon, *Lepidochelys kempii*, (TEWEG, 2000) we used these, which have a range of 85-92% per year. Thus, $n_{50\%} = 4 - 9$ yrs and our derived average age of female olive ridley parents is 17-22 years. We additionally assumed that this value would be the same for male parents. For simplicity, we have used a value of 20 yrs for the species’ generation length in this assessment.

Major Threats.

Like other long-lived species, olive ridleys are prone to population declines because of slow intrinsic growth rate in combination with anthropogenic impacts. These can accumulate over a protracted development through various life stages, multiple habitats (nesting beaches, migratory routes and pelagic foraging zones) and vast geographic expanses.

Targeted exploitation.

Egg harvest. Olive ridleys and their eggs have been harvested, mostly unsustainably, worldwide. However, the current impact is difficult to evaluate because of other simultaneous factors such as incidental take in commercial fisheries. Nonetheless, there is documentation of recent egg use causing declines (Cornelius et al. 2007). From México to Colombia, olive ridley eggs have been and still are used for personal and commercial use (Lagueux, 1989; Arauz, 2000; Campbell, 2007; Cornelius et al., 2007). Laws regulating turtle egg use vary among countries, and even where laws prohibit egg use, illegal use of olive ridley eggs is believed to be widespread because enforcement is either non-existent or insufficient. On unprotected solitary nesting beaches (most are unprotected), egg extraction often approaches 100%. Human use of turtle eggs for consumption and domestic animal consumption historically was widespread in the Indian Ocean and continues today largely wherever ridleys nest (Cornelius et al., 2007). Egg use has been reported in India, Bangladesh, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Andaman Islands, Pakistan and Malaysia and is believed to have caused the decline of olive ridleys

in these countries (Cornelius et al, 2007). Even at monitored beaches a proportion of the eggs are still lost to poaching.

Directed take of adults. In the East Pacific, although olive ridley turtle fisheries are now closed, illegal take of adult turtles still occurs widely with an unknown level of impact. There is evidence that thousands of olive ridleys are still taken each year along the Pacific coast of México (Frazier et al., 2007). In the West Atlantic, the direct take of adults has diminished over time to negligible levels (Cornelius et al., 2007). In the Indian Ocean, the use of adult olive ridleys and their eggs for personal use has been and continues to be widespread (Frazier, 1982; Frazier et al, 2007), and market-driven harvesting of eggs and females from nesting beaches are considered the greatest threat (Cornelius et al., 2007). Personal, subsistence use of adult olive ridley turtles is widespread worldwide (Cornelius et al., 2007; Frazier et al., 2007). Olive ridleys and/or their eggs are used along the entire coast of West Africa (including Macaronesia) and sold in local and regional markets (Fretey, 2001).

Bycatch in fisheries.

The incidental capture of olive ridleys occurs worldwide in trawl fisheries, longline fisheries, purse seines, gill net and other net fisheries and hook and line fisheries (Frazier et al, 2007). The impact of the incidental capture of olive ridleys in fisheries has been well documented for some regions but not for others. In some locations where by-catch statistics are unavailable from fisheries, cause and effect has been used to implicate a fishery in the decline of olive ridleys. The incidental capture of olive ridleys in the shrimp trawl fishery in the western Atlantic, is believed to be the main cause of the significant population decline observed there since the 1970s and currently the number of olive ridleys by caught in trawl fisheries off the coasts of Surinam and French Guiana is believed to be approximately a couple of thousand turtles annually (Godfrey and Chevalier, 2004; Frazier et al., 2007). Gillnets and other fishing methods in this region also capture olive ridleys incidentally but to a lesser extent than shrimp trawl fishery (Frazier et al., 2007). Bycatch in trawl fisheries off Sergipe State in Brazil is considered the most pressing threat to that population (Thomé et al., 2003). In the eastern Atlantic, the incidental capture of olive ridleys by commercial fisheries is thought to be a significant threat but very little systematic data is available (Frazier et al., 2007). Incidental mortality of olive ridleys is worst along the coast of Orissa, India with arribada olive ridleys gathering to nest where fishing effort is high. Every year since the early 80s, thousands or tens of thousands of olive ridleys have stranded dead on the Orissa beaches, presumably as a result of incidental capture in shrimp trawls (Pandav, 2000). A gill net fishery also operates in the region and contributes to the ridley mortality along this coastline. Incidental capture in fisheries is also believed to be a serious threat in the eastern Pacific (Frazier et al, 2007) where olive ridleys aggregate in large numbers off shore from nesting beaches (Kalb et al., 1995; Kalb, 1999), but the information available is incomplete (Pritchard and Plotkin, 1995; NMFS/USFWS, 1998). Incidental capture of olive ridleys in this region has been documented in shrimp trawl fisheries, longline fisheries, purse seine fishery and gill net fisheries (Frazier et al., 2007). Incidental capture of sea turtles in shrimp trawls is a serious threat along the coast of Central America, with an estimated annual capture for all species of marine turtle exceeding 60,000 turtles, most of which are olive ridleys (Arauz, 1996). Recent growth in the longline fisheries of this region are also a serious and growing threat to olive ridleys and have the potential to capture hundreds of thousands of ridleys annually (Frazier et al, 2007). Bycatch of olive ridleys is high in Indonesian tuna long-lines and shrimp trawls although mortality appears to be low (WWF Indonesia, unpublished data).

Habitat impacts.

Degradation, transformation and destruction of natural conditions at nesting beaches from coastal developments continue to threaten the long-term survival of many olive ridley rookeries. Transformation of nesting habitat comes from the construction of new aquaculture ponds, fishing harbors and tourist facilities, as well as growth of existing coastal villages which are increasing in many parts of the world within the range of the olive ridley, particularly along the east coast of India (Pandav and Choudhury, 1999) and in some zones in coastal México to Central America (Cornelius et al., 2007). These impacts contribute stress directly through the loss of nesting habitat or indirectly through changes in the thermal profiles of the beach, increased light pollution (Witherington 1992) and sewage effluents.

Global warming has the potential to impact the habitats and ecosystems of olive ridley populations worldwide (Hays et al., 2003; Weishampal, 2004) but the specific impacts are purely speculative at this time. Most accounts have focused on the impact of global warming on incubation temperatures of eggs, which influence the sex ratio of the embryos (Hays et al., 2003).

Diseases and predation. Extremely little is known about diseases and their effects on olive ridley abundance. The only disease identified in the literature for olive ridleys is fibropapilloma, a herpes-virus found in sea turtles nearly worldwide (Herbst, 1994). The incidence of fibropapilloma is not believed to be high in olive ridleys but has been observed in olive ridleys nesting in Costa Rica (Herbst, 1994) and in México (Vasconcelos et al., 2000). At some individual rookeries, the predation by wild pigs and/or feral dogs can be substantial (e.g. in the Andaman Islands; Andrews et al., 2001). Infestation of developing eggs by fly and beetle larvae can cause significant mortality of embryos. In an extremely worrying case, the beetle larvae (*Omorgus suberosus fabricius*) has become a plague in the world's largest arribada rookery in Escobilla, México where it is provoking steep drops in the hatching efficiency of the clutches laid, from a typical 30% for this colony (Márquez, 1990) to less than 5% in some areas (López-Reyes and Harfush, 2000). When combined with the relatively low hatching rates of high-density arribada beaches and the destruction of eggs laid by previous nesters, this problem could provoke the rookery's decline!

Conservation Measures Taken and Required:

Most of the conservation actions on behalf of the olive ridley at national and international levels have been based on the species' listing under the *endangered* category in the IUCN Red List. As an Appendix I species under CITES (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species) the international trade of skins from the species which fueled the large scale commercial exploitation of the olive ridley in from the 60s into the 80s was effectively halted. Other relevant international instruments that list the olive ridley as endangered and hence obligate its conservation by member states include: the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles (IAC). CMS-promoted Memoranda of Understanding for the conservation and management of marine turtles and their habitats have been signed by the olive ridley's range states in the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia (known as IOSEA) as well as in other regions such as the Atlantic Coast of Africa under the Memorandum of Understanding concerning Conservation Measures for Marine Turtles of the Atlantic Coast of Africa where 21 out of 26 range states participate.

On the basis of the species' classification in the IUCN Red List or in national endangered species lists, local legislatures of range states confer protection to the olive ridley. Although

this sanctions law-enforcement, the implementation remains patchy at the global scale because of paucity in enforcement capabilities. Successful conservation has usually relied on well coordinated national programs in combination with local and non-governmental organizations incorporating public outreach. Statutory use and enforcement of the Turtle Excluder Devices in the shrimp trawlers has also proven critical in some areas with high levels of interaction with this fishery.

Despite the legislative efforts to protect the olive ridley, human impacts continue to be significant. In some areas (such as West Africa and South East Asia), extensive monitoring needs to be implemented to identify regions and stressors requiring priority actions. Bycatch and illegal take particularly from the coastal, artisanal fisheries need to be evaluated through adequate on-board observer programs and properly addressed. The beetle infestation of the Escobilla rookery must be adequately evaluated and acceptable measures of biological control of the insect need to be implemented. The impact from the increasing development of much of the range state's coastline has to be evaluated and suitable mitigation measures implemented.

Red Listing

Red List Assessment: **Vulnerable**

Red List Criteria: A2bd

Assessment procedure.

In accordance with the IUCN guidelines for Red List Assessments, the focus of this evaluation has been the number of mature individuals (IUCN, 2001). For olive ridleys, as with other sea turtle species, as it is not possible to survey mature individuals we used an index of abundance in the form of the number of *annual nesting females*. Although not all females breed every year (see Reproduction) and males are not evaluated, this index is considered to be the most reliable estimator for long-term population trends of marine turtles since the proportion of the total number of females that nest in any given year and the sex ratio is believed to be fairly constant across time within and between subpopulations (Meylan, 1982; Limpus, 1996).

Direct counts of the number of nesting females (NF) are not always available so we also relied on alternative information that can be converted to NF: number of nests per season, nests/km/yr or number of protected nests per season; annual estimates of hatchling or egg production, or census estimates of nesting females from arribada rookeries. When these proxies were used, the counted units were converted to NF based on the following constants: 105 eggs/nest and 2.5 nests/season/female. Some conservation programs reported annual number of protected nests which did not include the quantity of poached or otherwise destroyed or predated nests. For these cases we extrapolated to the total number of nests based on local estimates of conservation efficiency. All conversions to NF were made under the assumptions that (a) the mean number of eggs/nest and the number of nests/female/season do not differ significantly over the timescales we have used; and (b) the effort and the coverage of the biological parameters we used are reasonably constant through the time frame evaluated. In cases where the different surveys involved different levels of coverage, explicit corrections were made and specified in the result tables.

In spite of the olive ridley being the most abundant sea turtle, available quantitative information is extremely scarce and unevenly distributed across regions. We thus relied on a subset of the world's rookeries which, we assume, exhibit population trends that are representative of the population as a whole or, at least, for each of the regions. We selected 28 Index Sites (figure 1, table 1) for which reasonably long time series of quantitative data are available. They include all the largest known populations, as well as an assortment of smaller rookeries from almost all of the regions where the species is found. All sites are assumed to be demographically independent. However, although genetic data indicate a high degree of inter-rookery migration between some rookeries (e.g. Brazil-Suriname- Bowen et al., 1998; between México to Central America in the Eastern Pacific- Briseño-Dueñas, 1998) the results reflect events within an evolutionary timescale (many generations). Within the time span relevant to the assessment (2-3 generations), available evidence suggests significant demographic independence between the pairs of rookeries in question (e.g. mark-recapture in Nancite and Ostional indicate the vast majority are different turtles- reviewed by Bernardo and Plotkin, 2007; absence of exchange by tagged turtles and non-overlapping nesting seasons Brazil vs Suriname/French Guiana- de Silva et al., in press; and the lack of re-colonization of depleted arribadas in Jalisco and Guerrero in México by the very large Escobilla rookery, 500 to 1,000 kms distant in over four decades).

The population abundance estimates were based on raw data or on extrapolations from regressions performed on available data. As the relatively data-rich trends consistently indicated exponential trajectories we relied on these as the method of choice for extrapolations. Some data sets contained a number of trajectories across the time frames employed and in these more than one regression was employed or a combination of regressions and raw data. We have constrained our back extrapolations to time spans close to known historical events that are believed to have defined major abundance changes in order to avoid gross exaggerations with no supporting evidence. This has, however, meant that in some cases the extrapolations have only been performed back two generations (40 years) and could be considered underestimates of decline.

Uncertainties in the assessment process. Calculations based on very different datasets obtained by different workgroups, using multiple survey methods and spanning many decades are fraught with uncertainties. A number of these could be biasing our assessment. (1) Combining abundance information for individual rookeries obtained with a number of different methodologies could provide a source of error. However, we believe that the magnitude of these errors is of minor significance to the final declines estimated. (2) Because of the assessment's requirement for quantitative information, a very small proportion of the total known rookeries were included, and some regions are not well represented. The bias this introduces is further augmented since it is most likely that rookeries having long time series of data are also the most monitored and hence the better protected. In this case the estimates of decline will be underestimated relative to the true trends for the more numerous and less well monitored/protected rookeries. This is likely the case for regions with little (Indian Ocean and Western Pacific Ocean) or no (entire Eastern Atlantic) representation in our assessment that contribute very little to our global decline values yet where reports with qualitative evidence indicate extensive population declines (reviewed by Frazier et al., 2007; Cornelius et al., 2007). Nonetheless, although ideally a global assessment should incorporate full data from all regions to derive robust evaluations, the available information on the geographic distribution of abundances suggests that the largest rookeries are concentrated in regions with good representation and thus their inclusion will not significantly affect the global results. This is reflected at the regional level and in results for non-arribada rookeries where our sample bias

will probably have caused an underestimation of true decline levels. (3) The extent of extrapolations into time past is an aspect that will undoubtedly contribute to the uncertainty of the results, particularly with scarce information. We have avoided extrapolating far beyond the oldest datasets to avoid this type of errors and thus consider that our results are conservative.

Rationale for the Red List Assessment:

In spite of scarcity in historical data, information from diverse sources has made it possible to evaluate a global decline for this widely distributed species over time periods ranging from decades to 2-3 generations. Striking regional differences are observed in the estimations which undoubtedly indicate far lower survival probabilities in some of the regions than what the global results would suggest.

There was also a stark and recurring contrast between the decline estimates for subpopulations grouped according to breeding strategy- arribada or non-arribada (solitary). The global decline rate estimated from non-arribada subpopulations (-63 to -83%) reflects a widespread low conservation status for these types of subpopulations that suggests they haven't recovered to historical (pre 1960) levels even in regions with long-term protection programs (e.g., over four decades in México) in spite generalized increments over the last decade (Márquez et al., 1998). This needs to be highlighted because rookeries with non-arribada behavior are many times more numerous than those that nest as arribadas (e.g. in México about 98% of olive ridley subpopulations are non-arribada). Yet, as their abundances are up to 3-4 orders of magnitude smaller than arribada rookeries, they have an insignificant influence on the global decline estimates. In fact, the global net decline for the olive ridley is driven principally by population trends in just two arribada populations, Escobilla (México) and Ostional (Costa Rica), both in the Eastern Pacific.

The global decline value estimated on the basis of estimated population reductions of the annual number of olive ridley nesting females at subpopulations in the Index Sites used ranged between **31 and 36%** (Table 3). As most of the back extrapolations were limited to two generations it is likely that this value is conservative.

When deciding whether to apply Red List decline criteria *A1* (the causes of reduction are clearly reversible AND understood AND ceased) or *A2* (the causes of reduction may not have ceased OR may not be understood OR may not be reversible) to obtain decline thresholds for the listing process three characteristics of the species' decline need to be analyzed (SPWG, 2006): (1) is the reduction reversible?, (2) are the causes of the reduction identified and understood?, and (3) have the threatening factors ceased? Since the decline estimated is driven by result from arribada rookeries, the questions need to be addressed against what is known for these types of populations. While it would appear that the elimination of large scale commercial exploitation of the olive ridley for leather and local consumption has allowed for the stabilization of a significant portion of rookeries, particularly in the Eastern Pacific and in particular facilitated the growth of arribada rookeries such as Escobilla and Ostional, the population growth of Mismaloya, Tlalcoyunque and Chacahua in the same region and under similar conservation circumstances remain at reduced abundances well below an arribada category. This could indicate that under some circumstances, the reduction of arribada rookeries below a certain level can make it impossible or unlikely for it to recover an arribada behavior. The major cause for the reduction in the species is thought to have been the massive commercial overexploitations, particularly in the Eastern Pacific. Furthermore, we do not yet fully understand nor are able to manage other stressors, some intrinsic or at least due to inter-

actions between the overcrowding of growing populations that equally provoke dramatic declines in arribadas such as that of Nancite in spite of decades of protection (Cornelius et al., 2007). Though commercial exploitation of olive ridleys for international markets has effectively been eliminated, at local levels significant factors continue to impact individual rookeries such as excessive egg exploitation (e.g. Isla Caña, Panama) or bycatch (such as in Orissa, India). These examples indicate that olive ridleys, under current circumstances, do not meet all of the conditions for A1 and hence should be evaluated with criteria A2.

Under A2, the decline estimations obtained for the olive ridley turtle at a global scale correspond to the *vulnerable* IUCN Red List threshold (a decline of >30% but < 50%).

Current Population Trend: Declining

Date of Assessment: 10 April, 2007

Assessor(s): Alberto Abreu-Grobois, Pamela Plotkin

Reviewed by: Milani Chaloupka (MTSG Red List Assessment Steering Committee Chair), Rod Mast, Nicholas Pilcher (MTSG co-Chairs)

Appendices & data tables

Table 1. List of olive ridley turtle index sites used for the status assessment

No.	Index nesting site	Justification and references
EASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN		
<i>ARRIBADA ROOKERIES (current or historical)</i>		
3	México- El Playon de Mismaloya, Jalisco	One of the five former arribada rookeries in México that collapsed in the 1970s due to overexploitation (Marquez et al., 1976) with some historical quantitative information.
6	México -Ixtapilla, Michoacán	New olive ridley rookery that now nests in arribadas. Not known prior to the early 1990s
7	México- Piedra de Tlalcoyunque, Guerrero	One of the five former arribada rookeries in México that collapsed in the 1970s due to overexploitation (Marquez et al., 1976) with some historical quantitative information.
8	México – Chacahua, Oaxaca	One of the five former arribada rookeries in México that collapsed in the 1970s due to overexploitation (Marquez et al., 1976) with some historical quantitative information.
9	México- Escobilla, Oaxaca	One of the two arribada rookeries remaining in México. Showing significant increases such that now > 1,000,000 nests laid/yr (Centro Mexicano de la Tortuga, 2005; Alvabera, 2006)
12	Nicaragua – La Flor	One of the two remaining arribada rookeries in Nicaragua, with some quantitative information
13	Costa Rica- Nancite	One of two historical arribada rookeries in CR, showing signs of sharp declines (ref. Valverde et al., 1998)
14	Costa Rica- Ostional	Currently most important arribada rookery in CR, with continuous extraction of eggs (Chávez et al., in press)
15	Panama – Isla Cañas	Most southerly arribada rookery in E Pacific.
<i>NON-ARRIBADA ROOKERIES</i>		
1	México- El Verde, Sinaloa	Northern limit of nesting range for LO in E Pacific. Excellent monitoring records since 1974 (Rios et al. 2005; Briseño-Dueñas and Abreu-Grobois, 1994)
2	México – Platanitos, Nayarit	Selection of non-arribada rookeries in México spanning the entire length of the country to increase the geographical variety of trends from a region with extensive monitoring of olive ridley subpopulations. Included Ixtapilla, a subpopulation which appears to have originated recently.
4	México – Cuyutlán, Colima	
5	México – Maurata+Colola, Michoacan	
10	México – Pto Arista, Chiapas	
11	Guatemala	
CENTRAL & WESTERN PACIFIC OCEAN		
	Australia – Arnhem Land	Most significant collection of rookeries in Central Pacific (Limpus, unpublished doc.)
16	Malaysia - Terengganu	Long term records available.
17	Thailand- Thaimaung	Additional insight from an area with traditional use of eggs (Limpus, 1995)
18	Thailand- Ko Pharathong	
20	Thailand- Maikaw Beach	

21	Indonesia-Alas Purwo NP	Rare example of recently increasing non-arribada rookery.
EASTERN INDIAN OCEAN		
<i>ARRIBADA ROOKERIES</i>		
22	India – Gahirmatha + Rushikulya + Devi River mouth	One of the largest sets of arribada rookeries in the world with long term datasets (Shanker et al., 2003)
<i>NON-ARRIBADA ROOKERIES</i>		
23	Myanmar	Site of ancient commercial egg harvest (Maxwell, 1911)
24	Bangladesh- St Martin’s Island	Additional regional coverage; extensive history of trade in turtle products and egg collection (Cornelius et al., 2007)
25	India – Cuthbert Bay, Andaman & Nicobar Islands	Area of traditional use of turtle meat and eggs, with extensive predation by wild and feral animals (Cornelius et al., 2007). Few sites surveyed in the past.
26	India – Chennai (Madras)	Representative of area in the region with widespread extraction of nests by humans and animals (Shanker, 2003). 15 years of data available (Shanker 2003, Kachhapa)
WESTERN INDIAN OCEAN		
28	Pakistan - Hawkes Bay and Sandspit, Karachi	Only representative from WIO. History of use in Baluchistan, Pakistan of direct fishery for olive ridleys (Cornelius et al., 2007)
EASTERN ATLANTIC OCEAN		
29	None available with long term quantitative information	
WESTERN ATLANTIC OCEAN		
<i>ARRIBADA ROOKERIES</i>		
29	Suriname- Eilanti	Historically an arribada rookery and primary nesting ground for the Western Atlantic LO subpopulation (Reichart, 1993)
<i>NON-ARRIBADA ROOKERIES</i>		
30	French Guiana-	Very little historical data but new monitoring programs by WWF-France (L. Kelle, pers. com.) and local groups are evidencing increasing population size.
31	Brazil - State of Sergipe: Abaís, Pirambu, Ponta dos Mangues and northern portion of Bahia State: Sítio do Conde, Costa do Sauípe, Praia do Forte and Arembepe	Southern limit for species, good monitoring from 1982 onwards demonstrating a significant and growing rookery (da Silva et al., in press)

Table 2. Summary of available estimates of *Past* and *Present* population abundance (raw estimates) at rookeries of *Lepidochelys olivacea* selected as Index Sites for this assessment. Codes for data types: FH, number of females harvested; NF, nesting females; AE, census estimate of nesting females from arribada beaches; NN, number of nests; PN, protected nests (would not include poached, predated and otherwise lost); NK, nests/km; EP, egg production; and, EH, egg harvest. All values are annual means unless otherwise stated.

Index #	Subpopulation	Data type	Past estimate 1		Past estimate 2		Present estimate		References (Past)	References (Present) and comments
			years	mean	years	mean	years	mean		
EASTERN PACIFIC										
<i>Arribada rookeries (current and former)</i>										
3	México (Playon de Mis-maloya, Jalisco)	AE / PN	1969 -1979	35,000 - 100,000 females			2001-2006	2,328 protected nests	Montoya, 1969; Márquez, et al 1976; Casas Andreu, 1978; Villa Guzmán, 1980	Antonio Trejo, in litt; Dirección General de Vida Silvestre. SEMARNAT México; (max. of last 5 years). Due to impossibility of complete protection assume only 60% of total nests protected
6	México (Ixtapilla, Michoacán)	NF / PN	Prior to 1994	0			1999-2005	2,900 - 10,000 nests	No known olive ridley rookery at this site prior to early 1990s	Dirección General de Vida Silvestre. SEMARNAT México (max. 5 years). Due to impossibility of complete protection assume only 35% of total nests reported
7	México (Piedra de Tlalcoyunque, Guerrero)	AE / PN	1974	20,000 – 50,000 females			1997	608 protected nests	Márquez, et al 1976	Dirección General de Vida Silvestre. SEMARNAT México; Márquez, et al 1998; Peñaflores et al., 2001. Due to impossibility of complete protection

			Past estimate 1		Past estimate 2		Present estimate			
										assume only 35% of total nests are protected
8	México (Chacahua, Oaxaca)	AE / PN	1974	20,000 – 50,000 females			2001-2005	2,042 nests	Márquez, et al 1976	JC Padilla (in litt.); Dirección General de Vida Silvestre. SEMARNAT México. 100% of nests are reported (max. of last 5 years)
9	México (Escobilla, Oaxaca)	AE / AE	1973-1975	180,000 - 401,000 females			2001-2005	1,013,034 females	Márquez, et al 1976 (arribadas in Aug-Oct only)	Dirección General de Vida Silvestre. SEMARNAT México; Alvabera, 2006 (max. of last 5 years)
12	Nicaragua (La Flor)	NN					1993-2004	33,530-68,753 nests	none	Hope, 2000 informs of 69,765 combined for La Flor and Chacocente; Honarvar and van der Berghe (in press)
13	Costa Rica (Nancite)	AE / AE	1970s	142,000 - 335,000 females			2005	20,800 females	Valverde et al., 1998	Solís et al. (2007)
14	Costa Rica (Ostional)	AE / AE	1971	10,000 females			2006	336,000 females	Hughes and Richard, 1974; Chaves et al. (in press)	Solís et al. (2007)
15	Panama (Isla Cañas)	AE / AE	1990s	15,000 – 60,000 females			2006	8,768 females	Evans and Vargas, 1998	L. Vargas, Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente (in litt.) 2007
<i>Non-arribada rookeries</i>										

			Past estimate 1		Past estimate 2		Present estimate			
1	México (El Verde, Sinaloa)	NF / PN	1974	10,000-20,000 females			2000-2005	1,160 protected nests	Márquez et al., 1976	D. Ríos, Annual Reports 2000-2005; Dirección General de Vida Silvestre. SEMARNAT México (max. 5 years). Due to impossibility of complete protection only 90% of total nests are reported.
2	México (Platanitos, Nayarit)	NF / PN	1974	5,000-10,000 females			2000-2005	1,301 nests	Márquez et al., 1976	Dirección General de Vida Silvestre. SEMARNAT México. Due to impossibility of complete protection assume only 35% of total nests reported (max. 5 years);
4	México (Cuyutlán, Colima)	NF / PN	1974	5,000-10,000 females			1999-2003	1,257 nests	Márquez et al., 1976	Dirección General de Vida Silvestre. SEMARNAT México (max. 5 years);
5	México (Maruata-Colola, Michoacán)	NF / PN	1974	5,000-10,000 females			1999-2003	4,198 nests (max in 1993)	Márquez et al., 1976	Sum of two beaches; Dirección General de Vida Silvestre. SEMARNAT México (max. 5 years); Due to impossibility of complete protection assume only 35% of total nests reported
10	México (Pto Arista, Chiapas)	NF / NN	1974	1,000-5,000 females			1999-2004	707 nests	Márquez et al., 1976	Dirección General de Vida Silvestre. SEMARNAT México (max. 5 years); Due to impossibility of complete protection assume only 35% of total nests reported

			Past estimate 1		Past estimate 2		Present estimate			
11	Guatemala	NK	1981	1.87 nests/km/d			1997	1.24 nests/km/d	Muccio, 1998 from data in Higginson, 1982	Muccio, 1998. For 16 km Barra de Chapeton to Monterrico
CENTRAL & WESTERN PACIFIC OCEAN										
16	Malaysia (Terengganu)	EH / nests	1977	240,000			1998- 1999	10	Malaysian Fisheries Dept data cited in Lim- pus , 2001	Liew, 2002
17	Thailand (Thaimaung)	NF	1975	300 fe- males			1996- 2000	10 nests	Chantrapornsyl, 1992	Chantrapornsyl, in litt. To A. Abreu
18	Thailand (Pharathong Island)	NF	1975	300 fe- males			1996- 2000	10 nests	Chantrapornsyl, 1992	Aureggi, 2001 cited by Chantrapornsyl, in litt. to A. Abreu
20	Thailand (Maikaw Beach)	NF	1975	150 fe- males			1996- 2000	10 nests	Chantrapornsyl, 1992	Chantrapornsyl, in litt. To A. Abreu
21	Indonesia (Alas Purwo NP)	NN	1984	10 nests			1993- 1998	230 nests	Dermawan, 2002.	Dermawan, 2002.
EASTERN INDIAN OCEAN										
<i>Arribada rookeries</i>										
22	India (Gahirmatha + Rushi- kulya + Devi River mouth)	NF	1975	150,000 females			1990s - present	150- 200,000 females	Bustard, 1976	Shanker et al., 2003
<i>Non-arribada rookeries</i>										
23	Myanmar	EP / NN	1911	1.5 mill eggs			1999	700 nests	Maxwell (1911)	Thorbjarnarson et al. , 2000
24	Bangladesh (St. Martin's)	NF	1980s	35 nesting females/ night			2001	7 nesting females/ night	S. M. A. Rashid, un- published data, cited in Cornelius et al., in	Islam, 2002

			Past estimate 1		Past estimate 2		Present estimate			
									press	
25	India (Andaman & Nicobar Islands)	NF / NN	1978-1989	445 nesting females			2001	185 nests	M. Tiwari report from Bhaskar, 1993	K Shanker, unpubl report
26	India (Chennai / Madras)	NK/NK	1977	~ 10 nests/km			2002	11.2 nests/km	Shanker 2003	Shanker, 2003
WESTERN INDIAN OCEAN										
28	Hawkes Bay, Pakistan	NN	1982-1984	25-120 nests			1996-1997	2 nests	Asrar, 1999	Asrar, 1999
WESTERN ATLANTIC OCEAN										
<i>Arribada rookeries</i>										
29	Suriname (Eilanti beach)	FH / NN	1967	2,875 females			2005	138 nests/yr	Geijskes (1945, cited in Reichart and Fretey 1993)	STINASU; Foundation for Nature Conservation and WWF Guianas
<i>Non-arribada rookeries</i>										
30	French Guiana	NN	1987	452 nests			2005-2006	2,600 nests	Fretey (1989) cited in Godfrey & Chevalier, unpublished report	Benoit de Thoisy Kwata NGO pers. comm..
31	Brasil (Sergipe)	NN	1940s	250 nests			2005-6	2,971 nests	Godfrey & Chevalier, unpublished report	da Silva et al., in press; L. Soares, in litt.

Table 3. Summary of estimates of population change for the olive ridley turtle Index Sites as determined from raw data and extrapolations from it for past abundances using procedures indicated in individual entries of the table. Past and Present estimates are provided in Table 2. Subpopulation size units were based on any of the following estimates: mean annual number of nesting females or of nests at site, or observations per unit effort. Unless otherwise stated, conversions from Table 2 data to number of females was determined using a mean value of 2.5 nests / female and 105 eggs / nest for any given nesting season. Extrapolation functions were used only when there was a suspected change in the subpopulation size over a time interval falling outside of the period covered by available raw data. When using regressions to extrapolate past abundances due to absence of information over the time interval required, linear (L) and/or exponential (E) functions (unless otherwise indicated) were employed using as much of the available abundance data as possible.

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
EASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN							
<i>Arribada rookeries (current and former)</i>							
3	México (Playon de Mismaloya, Jalisco)	35,000-100,000 females/yr (1969-1970)	2,328 protected nests (2001-2006)	1945-1965: assume no significant change 1965-1980: significant decline due to intense commercial extractions in Mexican Pacific of 1.5 -2.5 million adults (1960-1980), or 150,000 – 250,00 per year (Peñaflores et al., 2001) 1980-1990: continued extraction at levels 20% lower (derived from Peñaflores et al., 2001 data) (Depleted but <u>stable</u>; <u>no arribadas currently</u>)	341,204 (E. using 1969-1979 data to 1965)	3,024	-99% (2 generations)

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
6	México (Ixtapilla, Michoacán)	256 nests (1994)	2,853 nests	Olive ridley not known at this site prior to 1994, used earliest datum available	293 (taking into account 35% survey coverage)	3,261 –11,429 (taking into account 35% survey coverage)	3,806% ($\frac{1}{2}$ generations)
7	México (Piedra de Tlalcoyunque, Guerrero)	20,000 – 50,000 females (1974)	608 protected nests/yr (1997)	1945-1965: assume no significant change 1965-1980: significant decline due to intense commercial extractions in Mexican Pacific of 1.5 -2.5 million adults (1960-1980), or 150,000 – 250,00 per year (Peñaflores et al., 2001) 1980-1990: continued extraction at levels 20% lower (derived from Peñaflores et al., 2001 data) 1990-2005: stable (Depleted but stable; currently no arribadas)	247,558 (E, using 1974-1993 data to 1965)	1,266 (E, using >1990 data and assuming 35% survey coverage)	-99.5% (2 generations)
8	México (Chacahua, Oaxaca)	20,000 – 50,000 females (1974)	2,042 nests (2001-2005)	1945-1965: assume no significant change 1965-1980: significant decline due to intense commercial extractions in Mexican Pacific of 1.5 -2.5 million adults (1960-1980), or 150,000 – 250,00 per year (Peñaflores et al., 2001) 1980-1990: continued extraction at levels 20% lower (derived from Peñaflores et al., 2001 data) 1990-2005: declining (Depleted and declining; currently no arribadas)	98,563 (E, using 1974-1992 data to 1963)	460 (E, for 2005)	-99.5% (2 generations)

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
9	México (Escobilla, Oaxaca)	180,000 - 401,000 nesting females (Aug-Oct 1973-1975)	1,013,034 nesting females (2001-2005)	1945-1965: assume no significant change 1965-1980: significant decline due to intense commercial extractions in Mexican Pacific of 1.5 -2.5 million adults (1960-1980), or 150,000 – 250,00 per year (Peñaflores et al., 2001) 1980-1990: continued extraction at levels 20% lower (derived from Peñaflores et al., 2001 data) 1990-2005: increasing (Increasing and has incremented number of arribadas per year)	254,208 (E, extrapolation for data 1973- 1978) correcting 73-75 datum of 3 months by dividing by 0.68, the proportion of females in those months relative to whole year; Alva-bera, 2006)	574,937 (correcting for nest frequency)	+126% (2 generations)
12	Nicaragua (La Flor)	33,530 - 68,000 nests (1993-1999)	69,765 nests for La Flor + Chacocente (2000)	1945-1970s: assume no significant change 1970-1980s: probably populations had decreased due to commercial extractions (Cornelius, 1982) but no data available. In absence of data adopt value for 2004) and assume no change in 3 generations 1990s-2005: information is inconclusive and often confused with Chacocente information (Depleted? and stable?)	27,906	27,906 (avg 2003-2004)	0%
13	Costa Rica (Nan-cite)	142,000 - 345,000	20,800 females	1945-1980s: assume no significant change 1980s-1990: decline (Valverde et al., 1998)	138,000 (max value 1971-1981)	8,320 corrected for nest fre-	-94 to -96%

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
		females (1970s)	(2005)	1990s-2005: continued decline (Depleted? and declining)	187,178 (E, regression to 1965)	quency	
14	Costa Rica (Ostional)	10,000 nesting females (1971)	336,000 nesting females (2006)	1945-1980s: assume no significant change. 1980s-2005: increasing? Will need to continue with Gates and Valverde method to determine if increasing or stable (at least stable and has incremented number of arribadas per year; Chávez et al in press)	4,000 correcting for nest frequency (1971 datum)	134,400 (correcting for nest frequency)	+3,260%
15	Panama (Isla Cañas)	15,000-60,000 nesting females (1997)	8,768 nesting females (2006)	1945-1970s: assume no significant change 1970s-1980: No long term information, though heavy egg extraction during this period led Central American coastal residents and government officials to acknowledged by early 1980s a decline in olive ridleys due to widespread egg harvesting augmented by the incidental capture of turtles in shrimp trawls and by the commercial turtle fishery in Ecuador (Cornelius, 1982). 1980s: high levels of turtle exploitation and poaching in island, increases in the fishing effort in nearby port. anecdotic evidence that arribadas at Isla Cañas have decreased in number (J.A. Cordoba, in litt and	6,000-24,000 nesting females (accounting for 2.5 nest frequency)	3,507 nesting females (accounting for 2.5 nest frequency)	-42 to -85% (in ½ generation)

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
				in Cornelius et al., 2007)			
<i>Non-arribada rookeries</i>							
1	México (El Verde, Sinaloa)	10,000-20,000 nesting females (1974)	1,160 nests	1945-1965: assume no significant change 1965-1980: significant decline due to intense commercial extractions in Mexican Pacific of 1.5 -2.5 million adults (1960-1980), or 150,000 – 250,00 per year (Peñaflores et al., 2001) 1980-1990: continued extraction at levels 20% lower (derived from Peñaflores et al., 2001data) 1990-2005: stable (Depleted but <u>stable</u>)	10,000 to 20,000 (consider these values to reflect fairly well pre-1965 abundances)	306-516 (assuming 90% survey coverage and 2.5 nest frequency)	-95 to -97% (2 generations)
2	México (Platanitos, Nayarit)	5,000-10,000 nesting females (1974)	1,301 nests	1945-1965: assume no significant change 1965-1980: significant decline due to intense commercial extractions in Mexican Pacific of 1.5 -2.5 million adults (1960-1980), or 150,000 – 250,00 per year (Peñaflores et al., 2001) 1980-1990: continued extraction at levels 20% lower (derived from Peñaflores et al., 2001data) 1990-2005: increasing (Depleted but <u>increasing</u>)	5,000 to 10,000 (consider these values to reflect fairly well pre-1965 abundances)	439-1,301 (assuming 35% survey coverage and 2.5 nest frequency)	-74 to -87% (2 generations)

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
4	México (Cuyutlán, Colima)	5,000-10,000 nesting females (1974)	4,198 max nests (1999-2003)	1945-1965: assume no significant change 1965-1980: significant decline due to intense commercial extractions in Mexican Pacific of 1.5 -2.5 million adults (1960-1980), or 150,000 – 250,00 per year (Peñaflores et al., 2001) 1980-1990: continued extraction at levels 20% lower (derived from Peñaflores et al., 2001 data) 1990-2005: increasing (Depleted but <u>increasing</u>)	5,000 to 10,000 (consider these values to reflect fairly well pre-1965 abundances)	483-1,437 (assuming 35% survey coverage)	-71 to -86% (2 generations)
5	México (Maruata-Colola, Michoacán)	5,000-10,000 nesting females (1974)	4,198 nests (max in 1993)	1945-1965: assume no significant change 1965-1980: significant decline due to intense commercial extractions in Mexican Pacific of 1.5 -2.5 million adults (1960-1980), or 150,000 – 250,00 per year (Peñaflores et al., 2001) 1980-1990: continued extraction at levels 20% lower (derived from Peñaflores et al., 2001 data) 1990-2005: stable (Depleted but <u>stable</u>)	5,000 to 10,000 (consider these values to reflect fairly well pre-1965 abundances)	591 -2,806 (assuming 35% survey coverage)	-44 to -72% (2 generations)

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
10	México (Pto Arista, Chiapas)	1,000-5,000 females (1974)	707 nests	1945-1965: assume no significant change 1965-1980: significant decline due to intense commercial extractions in Mexican Pacific of 1.5 -2.5 million adults (1960-1980), or 150,000 – 250,00 per year (Peñaflores et al., 2001) 1980-1990: continued extraction at levels 20% lower (derived from Peñaflores et al., 2001 data) 1990-2005: stable (Depleted but stable)	1,000 to 5,000 (consider these values to reflect fairly well pre-1965 abundances)	85 - 808 (taking into account 35% survey coverage)	-19 to -84% (2 generations)
11	Guatemala	1.87 nests/km/d (1981)	1.24 nests/km/d (1997)	1945-1960s: assume no significant change 1960s-1980: heavy egg extraction; Central American coastal residents and government officials acknowledged by early 1980s a decline in olive ridleys due to widespread egg harvesting augmented by the incidental capture of turtles in shrimp trawls and by the commercial turtle fishery in Ecuador (Cornelius, 1982). 1990s-present: legal harvests probably unsustainable as it only protects <2% of all eggs (Muccio, 2000)	3,191 (E, extrapolated to 16km and all season to 1960)	1,004 (E, extrapolated to 16km and all season to 2005)	-69% (2 generations)

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
CENTRAL & WESTERN PACIFIC OCEAN							
16	Malaysia (Terengganu)	240,000 eggs harvested/yr (1977)	<10 nests	Common local practice of egg harvesting in large numbers at least since the 1950s. Practically extinct.	813 (L, extrapolated to 1950)	<4	-99.5%
17	Thailand (Thaumaung)	300 nesting females (1975)	10 nests (1996-2000)	Probably long-term egg harvest (Limpus, 1995). Assume started in the 1950s so back extrapolation only to 1950	238 (L; correcting for nest frequency)	4	-98%
18	Thailand (Pharathong Island)	300 nesting females (1975)	10 nests (1996-2000)	Probably long-term egg harvest (Limpus, 1995). Assume started in the 1950s so back extrapolation only to 1950	238 (L; correcting for nest frequency)	4	-98%
20	Thailand (Maikaw Beach)	150 nesting females (1975)	10 nests (1996-2000)	Probably long-term egg harvest (Limpus, 1995). Assume started in the 1950s so back extrapolation only to 1950	118 (L)	4	-97%
21	Indonesia (Alas Purwo NP)	10 nests (1984)	230 nests max (1993-1998)	Unknown if depleted from earlier times	4	92	+2,200%
EASTERN INDIAN OCEAN							
<i>Arribada rookeries</i>							
22	India (Gahirmatha + Rushikulya + Devi River mouth)	150,000 nesting females	150,000 – 200,000 nesting	Commercial harvest of sea turtle eggs occurred since colonial days at Gahirmatha and continued until 1974 when it became illegal	150,000 – 200,000 (did not need correcting for nest fre-	150,000 – 200,000 (did not need	0%

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
		(1975)	females (1990s-present)	(Kar, 2001). Up to 1,500,000 eggs a year were harvested (e.g. in 1973, FAO, 1974), although the illegal take was probably much more (Kar, 1988, 2001). In 1974, 800,000 eggs were collected (FAO, 1974), after which all licensed harvesting was halted (Kar, 2001). Nevertheless, and in spite of death of about 15,000 breeding adults per year from the mid 1990s to the present (Shanker et al., 2003) no consistent evidence of decline in the set of 3 rookeries (Shanker et al., 2003). Therefore assume stable over last 3 generation period.	quency)	correcting for nest frequency)	
<i>Non-arribada rookeries</i>							
23	Myanmar	1.5 mill eggs harvested (1911)	700 nests (1999)	Continuous egg harvest since early 1900s. Assume steady linear decline from 1911 datum to present	3,429 (L)	280	-92%
24	Bangladesh (St. Martin's)	35 nesting females/night (1980s)	7 nesting females/night (2001)	With no protection, by the 1980s anecdotal accounts underline declines due to severe exploitation of eggs and illegal killing of adult turtles by fishing and other activities (Islam 1998). Assume same rate of linear declines since the 1960s.	62 (L)	7	-89%
25	India (Andaman & Nicobar Islands)	445 nesting females (1978-	185 nests (2001)	Unknown historical abundances or trends. Use available information that nonetheless indicates significant decline in less than three generations.	178 (correcting for nest frequency)	74	-58% in less than 1 generation

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
		1989)					
26	India (Chennai / Madras)	~ 10 nests/km	11.2 nests/km	Substantial fluctuations in abundance, from 3.7 – 14.3 nests/km between 1988 - 2002			0
WESTERN INDIAN OCEAN							
28	Pakistan - Hawkes Bay and Sandspit, Karachi	25-120 nests (1982-1984)	2 nests	Unknown historical abundances or trends. Use available information that nonetheless indicates significant decline in less than three generations.	10-48 in 1980s	< 1	-60 to -98% (1 generation)
WESTERN ATLANTIC OCEAN							
<i>Arribada rookeries</i>							
29	Suriname (Eilanti beach)	2,875 females (1967)	411 nests/yr (200s)	As per review by Godfrey & Chevalier (unpublished) take of nesting females goes back at least to the 1930s. Convert to 1945 data using assumption that min 15 and max 50% of	1,758 (L)	164	-91 to -99%

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
				all females were being harvested per year (1,500) and continuous linear decline (Godfrey and Chevalier, unpublished). Geijskes (1945, cited in Reichart and Fretey 1993) Also calculated using a back extrapolation from exponential regression of decline rate to derive 1945 and 1965 values (5,354 and 1,125, respectively) so consider the above values acceptable. Note: as Eilanti beach does not exist anymore, the present monitored areas are not the same but we have assumed they represent remnants of the same population	5,647 (L)		
<i>Non-arribada rookeries</i>							
30	French Guiana	1,000 nests (1940s)	2,600 nests (avg 2005 & 2006)	No historical information, made best approximations based on oldest surveys available and most plausible past abundances (Godfrey and Chevalier, unpublished)	400 (L)	1,040 (correcting for nest frequency)	+160%
31	Brasil (Sergipe)	250 nests (1940s)	2,971 nests (2005-6)	No historical information, made best approximations based on oldest surveys available and most plausible past abundances (Godfrey and Chevalier, unpublished)	100 (L)	582 (correcting for nest frequency)	+1,396%
<i>global totals only for non-arribada sites (max / min)</i>					60,309	10,281	-67% to -83%
					31,271	5,319	
<i>global totals only for arribada sites (max / min)</i>					1,266,558	841,309	-30%

Index #	Subpopulation (Index Site)	Raw Data (from Table 2) Past	Raw Data (from Table 2) Present	Notes on Population Trajectories & (Comments on Current Status)	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	% Change over time period
					1,195,490	833,137	to -34%
<i>GLOBAL TOTALS (max / min)</i>					1,326,867	851,590	-31%
					1,226,762	841,309	to -36%

Table 5. Population changes for the olive ridley Index Sites grouped by region. Changes are determined as explained in previous sections to obtain compilations of regional subtotals.

Region	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size (2005)	% Change
EASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN			
<i>Arribada rookeries (Playon de Mismaloya, Jalisco, México; Ixtapilla, Michoacán, México; Piedra de Tlalcoyunque, Guerrero, México; Chacahua, Oaxaca, México; Escobilla, Oaxaca, México; La Flor, Nicaragua; Nancite, Costa Rica; Ostional, Costa Rica; Isla Cañas, Panama)</i>	1,184,911	765,249	-32% to -35%
	1,117,732	757,081	
<i>Non-arribada rookeries (El Verde, Sinaloa, México; Platanitos, Nayarit, México; Cuyutlán, Colima, México; Maruata-Colola, Michoacán, México; Pto Arista, Chiapas, México; Barra de Chapeton - Monterrico, Guatemala)</i>	58,191	7,871	-95% to -73%
	29,191	2,908	

Region	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size (2005)	% Change
<i>totals</i>	1,243,102	773,120	-39% to -33%
	1,146,923	759,989	
CENTRAL & WESTERN PACIFIC OCEAN (<i>only non-arribada rookeries- Terengganu, Malaysia; Thaimaung, Thailand; Pharaohong Island, Thailand; Maikaw Beach, Thailand; Alas Purwo NP, Indonesia</i>)	1,412	108	-92%
EASTERN INDIAN OCEAN			
<i>Arribada rookeries</i> (Gahirmatha + Rushikulya + Devi River mouth, India)	76,000	76,000	0%
<i>Non-arribada rookeries</i> (Myanmar; St. Martin's, Bangladesh; Andaman & Nicobar Islands, India)	178	74	-58%
<i>totals</i>	76,178	76,074	0%
WESTERN INDIAN OCEAN (<i>only non-arribada rookeries- Hawkes Bay, Pakistan</i>)	48	4	-98% to -60%
	10	1	
WESTERN ATLANTIC			
<i>Arribada rookeries</i> (Eilanti beach, Suriname)	5,647	55	-99% to -97%
	1,758	55	
<i>Non-arribada rookeries</i> (Cayenne and Kourou, French Guiana; Sergipe, Brasil)	480	2,228	364%

Region	Past Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size	Present Annual Nesting Female Subpopulation Size (2005)	% Change
<i>totals</i>	6,127	2,284	-63% to 2%
	2,238	2,284	

Table 6. Country Distribution

	Country	presence	nesting	foraging	Reference
	Western Atlantic				
1	Cuba	P	F		Moncada et al., 2000
2	Puerto Rico	P	F		Caldwell and Erdman, 1969; Caldwell et al. 1969
3	Jamaica	P			Brongesma, 1972 in Fretey, 1999
4	Dominican Republic	P	N?		Bacon, 1981 in Fretey, 1999
5	Barbuda	P?			Fuller et al., 1992 in Fretey, 1999
6	Guadeloupe	P			Fretey and Lescure, 1999
7	Martinique	P			Bacon, 1981 Fretey and Lescure, 1999
8	Curaçao	P			Sybesma and Hoetjes, 1992 in Fretey, 1999
9	Panama	P?		F	Bacon, 1981 in Fretey, 1999
10	Trinidad and Tobago	P	N1	F	Carr 1957; Gyan, 1987 in Fretey, 1999
11	Venezuela	P	N1	F	Nowak, 1974 in Fretey, 1999
12	Guyana	P	N		Pritchard and Trebbau, 1984, Fretey, 1999; Godfrey and Chevalier, 2004
13	Suriname	P	N		Reichart and Fretey. 1993 Schulz, 1975 Caldwell et al. 1969, Pritchard & Trebbau 1984; Godfrey and Chevalier, 2004
14	French Guiana	P	N		Fretey, 1989 in Fretey, 1999; Godfrey and Chevalier, 2004
15	Brazil	P	N		Marcovaldi and Marcovaldi, 1987; da Silva et al., 2003
16	Uruguay	P			Frazier, 1984 in Fretey, 1999
	Eastern Atlantic				
17	Morocco	P?	N?	XF	Fretey, 2001
18	Mauritania	P?	XN	XF	Fretey, 2001
19	Cape Verde	P	XN	XF	Fretey, 2001
20	Senegal	P	XN	XF	Fretey, 2001
21	Gambia	P	XN	XF	Barnett et al., 2004
22	Guinea Bissau	P	N	XF	Barbosa et al., 1998
23	Guinea	P	N?	XF	Fretey, 2001
24	Sierra Leone	P	N	XF	Siaffa et al., 2003
25	Liberia	P	N	XF	Fretey, 2001
26	Cote D' Ivoire	P	N	XF	Gomez et al., 2003
27	Ghana	P	N	XF	Beyer 2002
28	Togo	P	XN	XF	Hoinsoude et al., 2003
29	Benin	P	N	XF	Doussou Bodjrenou et al., 2004
30	Sao Tome & Principe	P	N	XF	Fretey, 2001
31	Boiko, São Tome, Corisco, Mbanye, Hoco Islands				Fretey et al., 2004
32	Nigeria	P	N	XF	Fretey, 2001
33	Cameroon	P	N	XF	Fretey et al., 2004
34	Equatorial Guinea	P	N	XF	Fretey et al., 2004
35	Gabon	P	N	XF	Fretey et al., 2004
36	Congo	P	N	XF	Fretey et al., 2004
37	Angola	P	N	F	Fretey et al., 2004
38	Namibia	P	XN	XF	Fretey, 2001

39	South Africa	P	XN	XF	Fretey, 2001
	Red Sea				
40	Eritrea		N		Ross & Barwani, 1982; Frazier, 1975, 1980; Pilcher et al., 2006
	Western Indian Ocean				
41	India, West coast	P	N	?	Kar & Bhaskar, 1982; Shanker & Choudhury, 2006; Sunderraj et al, 2006
42	Pakistan	P	N	?	Kabraji & Firdous, 1984; Asrar, 1999; Qureshi, 2006
43	Iran	P	XN	?	Kami, 1997
44	Kenya	P	N	?	Zanre, pers. comm.; Church, 2004
45	Madagascar	P	XN	F	Frazier, 1975, 1980, 1982; Pritchard, 1979
46	Maldives	P	XN	?	Frazier, 1975, 1980, 1982; Pritchard, 1979
47	Mozambique	P	N	?	Frazier, 1975, 1980, 1982; Pritchard, 1979
48	Oman	P	N	?	Ross & Barwani, 1982; Frazier, 1975, 1980, 1982; Salm, R.V., Jensen, R.A.C. & Papastavrou, V.A. (1993); Baldwin. R.M. and A. A. Al- Kiyumi.(1999)
49	Somalia	P	?	?	Frazier, 1975, 1980, 1982
50	South Africa	P	N	?	Hughes, 1972
51	Sudan	P?	XN	X	Ross & Barwani, 1982; Frazier, 1975, 1980, 1982
52	Tanzania	P	N	?	Frazier, 1975, 1980, 1982; Frazier, 1976
53	Yemen	P?	XN	?	Walczak, 1979
	Eastern Indian Ocean				
54	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	P	N		Andrews et al., 2006
55	Thailand	P	N	?	Aureggi et al., 2004
56	Bangladesh	P	N	?	Rashid and Zahirul. 1998; Islam, 2002a,b; Sarker, 2004; Rashid, 2006
57	India, East coast	P	N	F	Bhaskar, 1981; Kar & Bhaskar, 1982; Shanker & Choudhury, 2006; Tripathy et al., 2003; Bhupathy and Saravanan, 2006; Shanker, 2003
58	Myanmar	P	N	?	Thorbjornarsson et al, 2000; Shanker and Pilcher, 2003
59	Sri Lanka	P	N	F	Dattatri & Samarajiva 1983; Hewavisenthi, 1990; Amarasooriya and Jayathilaka, 2002; Kapurusinghe, 2006; De Silva, 2006
	Western Pacific				
60	Australia	P	N	?	Harris, A. 1994; Whiting, S. D. 1997; Limpus, C. J. Miller, J. D. and Fleay, A. 1981; Limpus, 1975
61	Brunei	P	N	?	Pilcher, 2001; Shanker and Pilcher, 2003
62	Cambodia	?	?	F	Kosal, Mao
63	Federated States of Micronesia	P		?	Falanruw, M. V. C. Mccoy, M. and Namlug. 1975
64	Indonesia	P	N	F	Suwelo, 1999; Putrawidjaja, 2000; Halim et al., 2001
65	Japan	P		?	Kamezaki, 1999
66	Malaysia	P	N	?	Tisen and Bali, 2002
67	Papua New Guinea	P	N	F	Spring, C. S. , 1979; Spring, C. S. and J. Gwyther, 1999; Phillip, 2002

68	Philippines	P	N	?	Gomez, E. D. 1980.
69	Taiwan	?			
70	Thailand	P	N	?	Chantrapornsyl, S. 1992; Charuchinda, M. and S. Chantrapornsyl. 1999
71	USA (Hawai'i)	P		?	Balazs and Hau, 1986
72	Vietnam	N		?	Shanker and Pilcher, 2003; Hamann et al., 2006
	Eastern Pacific				
73	EUA	P			Houck and Joseph, 1958; Hubbs, 1977
74	México	P	N	F	Márquez et al., 1976
75	Guatemala	P	N	F	Higginson, J. & Orantes R. 1987; Higginson, 1989; Márquez, 1990; Muccio, 1998; Juarez and Muccio, 1997
76	El Salvador	P	N	F	Cornelius, 1982; Hasbún & Vásquez. 1999
77	Honduras	P	N	F	Cornelius, 1982; Minarik, C.J. 1985; Lagueux, 1989; Lagueux, 1991
78	Nicaragua	P	N	F	Cornelius, 1982; Martinez, P. Gutierrez, C. and Arauz, R. 1998; Pritchard, 1979
79	Costa Rica	P	N	F	Hughes and Richard, 1974; Pritchard, 1979
80	Panama	P	N	F	Cornelius, 1982; Córdoba L. 2000; Pritchard, 1979
81	Colombia	P	N	F	Amorocho, et al., 1989; Martínez, 2000; Pritchard, 1979; Martinez and Paez, 2000
82	Ecuador	P	N	F	Hurtado, M. 1981; Green and Ortiz-Crespo, 1982; Fritts, T. H. 1981.; Alava et al. In press?
83	Peru	P	N	F	Brown and Brown, 1982
84	Chile	P			Brito, J. 1994.

1 Possibly now extinct or no recent evidence of continued nesting
x="no"

References.

- Alvabera, E. 2006. Revisión de la anidación de tortugas marinas en los campamentos del Centro Mexicano De La Tortuga durante el periodo 2001-2005. Paper presented at colloquium "Presencia del Centro Mexicano de la Tortuga en la Universidad Autónoma Benito Juárez de Oaxaca". Oaxaca de Juárez, Oax., 22-23 May, 2006. 28 pp.
- Amoroch, D. 1992-1996. Biología reproductiva de la tortuga golfina (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) en Playa Larga, El Valle-Chocó. Pacífico Colombiano. Informes técnicos COLCIENCIAS-Fundación Natura.
- Amoroch, D., Sánchez, F.A. and Quiroga, D.D. 2001 El encanto de las tortugas marinas en el parque Nacional Natural Gorgona. In: L.M. Barrios and Y.M. López-Victoria (eds) *Gorgona marina Contribución al conocimiento de una isla única*, pp. 141-148. INVEMAR, Serie Publicaciones Especiales No. 7, Santa Marta.
- Amoroch, D., Rubio, H. and Díaz, W. 1992 Observaciones sobre el estado actual de las tortugas marinas en el Pacífico colombiano En Contribución al conocimiento de las tortugas marinas de Colombia. Serie de Publicaciones Especiales del INDERENA. Libro 4: 155-179.
- Andrews, H.V., Krishna, S. and Biswas, P. 2005. Marine turtles around the Andaman and Nicobar Islands-their current status and distribution. In: K. Shanker and B.C. Choudhury (eds) *Marine Turtles of the Indian Subcontinent*. Universities Press, Hyderabad, India.
- Andrews, H.V., Tripathy, A., Aghue, S., Glen, S., John, S. and Naveen, K. 2006. The status of sea turtle populations in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. In: K. Shanker and H.V. Andrews (eds) *Towards an integrated and collaborative sea turtle conservation programme in India: a UNEP/CMS-IOSEA Project Report*. Centre for Herpetology/Madras Crocodile Bank Trust, Post Bag 4, Mamallapuram, Tamil Nadu.
- Andrews, H.V., Chandi, M., Vaughan, A., Aungthong, J., Aghue, S., Johnny, S., John, S. and Naveen, S. 2006. Marine turtle status and distribution in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands after the 2004 M 9 quake and tsunami. *Indian Ocean Turtle Newsletter* 4: 3-11.
- Arauz, R.M. 1996. A description of the Central American shrimp fisheries with estimates of incidental capture and mortality of sea turtles. In: J.A. Keinath and D.E. Barnard, J.A. Musick and B.A. Bell (compilers) *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation*. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NMFS-SEFSC-387.
- Asrar, F.F. 1999. Decline of Marine Turtle Nesting Populations in Pakistan. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 83: 13-14.
- Bacon, P. 1981. The status of sea turtle stocks management in the Western Central Atlantic. WECAF Stud. No. 7, 38 pp.
- Balazs, G.H. 1983. Status review document for Pacific sea turtles. NOAA/NMFS/SWFSC Administration Report H-83-17. 6 pp.
- Balazs, G.H. and Hau, S. 1986. Geographic distribution *Lepidochelys olivacea* in Hawaii. *Herpetological Review* 17(2): 51.
- Baldwin, R.M. and Al-Kiyumi, A.A. 1999. The ecology and conservation status of sea turtles of Oman. In: M. Fisher, S.A. Ghazanfar and A. Spalton (eds) *The Natural History of Oman, A Festschrift for Michael Gallagher*, pp. 89-98. Backhuys Publishers, Leiden.
- Bernardo, J. and Plotkin, P.T. 2007. An evolutionary perspective on the *Arribada* phenomenon and reproductive behavioral polymorphism of olive ridley sea turtles, (*Lepidochelys olivacea*). In: P.T. Plotkin (ed.) *Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Bhaskar, S. 1981. Preliminary report on the status and distribution of sea turtles in Indian waters. *Indian Forester* 107(11): 707-711.
- Bhaskar, S. 1984. The distribution of sea turtles in India. In: E.G. Silas (ed.) *Proceedings of the Workshop on Sea-Turtle Conservation*, pp. 21- 35. Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute Special Publication 18, Cochin, India. 120 pp.
- Bhupathy, S. and Saravanan, S. 2006. Marine turtles of Tamil Nadu. In: K. Shanker and B.C. Choudhury (eds) *Marine Turtles of the Indian subcontinent*, pp. 58-67. Universities Press, Hyderabad, India.
- Briseño-Dueñas, R. and Abreu-Grobois, F.A. 1994. Las Tortugas Marinas y sus Playas de Anidación. Informe Final. UNAM-CONABIO, 202 pp.
- Briseño-Dueñas, R. 1998. Variación genética de la región control del ADN mitocondrial de poblaciones de la tortuga golfina (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) en el Pacífico oriental e implicaciones para su conservación. Masters thesis, Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, México.
- Brito, J. 1994. Hallazgo de *Lepidochelys olivacea* en la costa central de Chile. Resúmenes XIV Jornadas de Ciencias del Mar / I Jornada Chilena de la Salmonicultura, 23-25 de Mayo de 1994, Puerto Montt, Chile. 138 pp.
- Brongersma, L.S. 1982. Marine turtles of the Eastern Atlantic Ocean. In: K.A. Bjorndal (ed.) *Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles*, pp.407-416. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

- Brongersma, L.D. 1972. European Atlantic Turtles. *Zoologische Verhandeling, Leiden* 121: 1-318.
- Bustard, H.R. 1976. World's largest sea turtle rookery? *Tigerpaper* 3(3): 25.
- Caldwell, D.K. and Erdman, D.S. 1969. Pacific ridley sea turtle, (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) in Puerto Rico. *Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Science* 68(2): 112.
- Caldwell, D.K., Rathjen, W.F. and Hsu, B.C.C. 1969. Surinam ridleys at sea. *International Turtle & Tortoise Society Journal* 3(1): 4-5.
- Campbell, L. 2007. Understanding human use of Olive Ridleys: implications for conservation. In: P.T. Plotkin (ed.) *Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Carr, A. 1967. *So Excellent a Fish*. Natural History Press, Garden City, NY.
- Carr, A. 1957. Notes on the zoogeography of the Atlantic sea turtles of the genus *Lepidochelys*. *Revista de Biología Tropical* 5(1): 45-61.
- Casas-Andreu, G. 1971. National and Regional Reports: México. Marine Turtles. Proceedings of the 2nd Working Meeting of Marine Turtle Specialists, Organized by the SSC, IUCN, 8-10 March 1971, pp.41-46. IUCN, Morges, Switzerland.
- Casas-Andreu, G. 1978. Análisis de la anidación de las tortugas marinas del género *Lepidochelys* en México. *Anales del Instituto de Ciencias del Mar y Limnología*. 5(1): 141-158.
- Castro, J.C. 1986. Contribución de las tortugas loras solitarias (*Lepidochelys olivacea* Eschscholtz) en el mantenimiento de las poblaciones de esta especie. Licenciatura de Tesis. Universidad de Costa Rica.
- Chacón, D. 2001. Diagnóstico Regional Y Planeamiento Estratégico Para La Conservación De Las Tortugas Marinas En El Istmo Centroamericano. 134 pp.
- Chantrapornsyl, S. 1992. Biology and conservation olive ridley turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*, Eschscholtz) in the Andaman Sea, southern Thailand. *Phuket Marine Biological Center Research Bulletin* 57: 51-66.
- Charuchinda, M. and Chantrapornsyl, S. 1999. Status of sea turtle conservation and research in Thailand. Report of the SEAFDEC-Asean Regional Workshop on Sea Turtle Conservation and Management. MFRDMD-SEAFDEC, Kuala Terengganu, Malaysia 26-28 July, 1999, pp. 60-174.
- Chaves, G., Morera, R., Aviles, J.R., Castro, J.C. and Alvarado, M. In press. Trends of the nesting activity of the "arribadas" of the olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*, Eschscholtz 1829), in the Ostional National Wildlife Refuge (1971-2003). *Chelonian Conservation and Biology*.
- Clifton, K., Cornejo, D.O. and Felger, R.S. 1982. Sea turtles of the Pacific Coast of México. In: K.A. Bjorndal (ed.) *Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles*, pp. 199–209. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Córdoba, L. 2000. Informes de trabajo. Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente. Mimeografiado.
- Cornelius, S.E., Alvarado-Ulloa, M., Castro, J.C., Mata del Valle, M. and Robinson, D.C. 1991. Management of olive ridley sea turtles (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) nesting at Playas Nancite and Ostional, Costa Rica. In: J.G. Robinson and K.H. Redford (eds) *Neotropical Wildlife Use and Conservation*, pp. 111-135. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Cornelius, S.E., Arauz, R., Fretey, J., Godfrey, M.H., Márquez-M., R. and Shanker, K. 2007. Effect of land-based harvest of *Lepidochelys*. In: P.T. Plotkin (ed.) *Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- da Silva, A.C.C.D., de Castilhos, J.C., Lopez, G. and Barata, P.C.R. In press. Nesting biology and conservation of the olive ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) in Brazil, 1991/1992 to 2002/2003. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association*.
- Das, I. 1989. Sea turtles and coastal habitats in south-eastern Bangladesh. Project report to the Sea Turtle Rescue Fund. Center for Marine Conservation, Washington, D.C.
- Dash, M.C. and Kar, C.S. 1990. *The turtle paradise – Gahirmatha*. Interprint, New Delhi. 295 pp.
- Dattatri, S. and Samarajeeva, D. 1983. The status and conservation of sea turtles in Sri Lanka. A project of the Sea Turtle Rescue Fund. Center for Environmental Education, Washington, D.C.
- Dermawan, A. 2002. Marine turtle management and conservation in Indonesia. In: I. Kinan (ed.) *Proceedings of the Western Pacific Sea Turtle Cooperative Research and Management Workshop*, pp. 67-75. Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Domingo, A., Sales, G., Giffoni, B., Miller, P., Laporta, M., Maurutto, G. 2006. Captura incidental de tortugas marinas con palangre pelágico en el Atlántico Sur por las flotas de Brasil y Uruguay. Col. Vol. Sci. Pap. IC-CAT, 59(3): 992-1002 (2006).
- Epperly, S.P., Braun, J., Chester, A.J., Cross, F.A., Merriner, J.V., Tester, P.A., Churchill, J.H. 1996. Beach strandings as an indicator of at-sea mortality of sea turtles. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 59: 289-297.

- Evans, K.E. and Vargas, A.R. 1998. Sea turtle egg commercialization in Isla de Cañas, Panama. In: R. Byles and Y. Fernandez (compilers) *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation*, p. 45. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NMFS-SEFSC-412.
- Falanruw, M.V.C., McCoy, M. and Namlug. 1975. Occurrence of Ridley sea turtles in the Western Caroline Islands. *Micronesica* 11(1): 151-152.
- Frazier, J. 1984. Las tortugas marinas en el Océano Atlántico Sur Occidental. *Asoc. Herp. Arg. Sér. Difulg.* 22-21.
- Frazier, J. 1985. Marine Turtles. *Sanctuary, Asia* V(1): 43-48
- Frazier, J.G. 1991. La presencia de la tortuga marina *Lepidochelys olivacea* (Escholtz) en la Republica Oriental del Uruguay. *Rev. Fac. Hum. y Cienc. (Cienc. Biológicas)* 3 época. 2(6) [1986]: 1-4.
- Frazier, J., Arauz, R., Chevalier, J., Formia, A., Fretey, J., Godfrey, M.H., Márquez-M., R., Pandav, B. and Shanker, K. 2007. Human-turtle interactions at sea. In: P.T. Plotkin (ed.). *Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Frazier, J.G. 1975. Marine turtles of the Western Indian Ocean. *Oryx* 13(2): 164-175.
- Frazier, J.G. 1980. Exploitation of marine turtles in the Indian Ocean. *Human Ecology* 8: 329-370.
- Frazier, J.G. 1982. Status of the sea turtles in the Central Western Indian Ocean. *Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles in the Indian Ocean*. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Fretey, J. 1989. Reproduction de la tortue olivâtre (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) en Guyane française pendant la saison 1987. *Nature Guyanaise* 1: 8-13.
- Fretey, J. 1999. Repartition des tortues du genre *Lepidochelys* Fitzinger, 1843. I. L'Atlantique ouest. *Biogeographica* 75(3): 97-117.
- Fretey, J. 2001. *Biogeography and Conservation of Marine Turtles of the Atlantic Coast of Africa / Biogéographie et conservation des tortues marines de la côte atlantique de l'Afrique*. CMS Technical Series Publication, no. 6 UNEP/CMS Secretariat, Bonn, Germany.
- Fretey, J. and Lescure, J. 1999. Sur la présence de *Lepidochelys olivacea* (Eschscholtz, 1829) (Chelonia, Cheloniidae) dans les Antilles françaises. *Bulletin de la Société Herpétologique de France* 90: 41-49.
- Fritts, T.H. 1981. Marine turtles of the Galapagos Islands and adjacent areas of the eastern Pacific on the basis of observations made by J.R. Slevin 1905-1906. *Journal of Herpetology* 15(3): 293-301.
- Fuller, J.E., Eckert, K.L. and Richardson, J.I. 1992. WIDECASST Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for Antigua and Barbuda (K.L. Eckert, Editor). CEP Technical Report No. 16. UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme, Kingston, Jamaica. 88 pp.
- Gaos, A.R., Yañez, I.L. and Arauz, R.M. 2006. Sea turtle conservation and research on the Pacific coast of Costa Rica. Technical Report. Programa Restauración de Tortugas Marinas.
- Godfrey, M. and Chevalier, J. 2004. The status of olive ridley sea turtles in the west Atlantic. Unpublished report to the Marine Turtle Specialist Group of the SSC/IUCN. 22 pp.
- Gomez, E.D. 1980. A review of the literature on marine turtles in the Philippines. *Philippines Journal of Biology* 9(1): 95-99
- Groombridge, B. 1989. Aerial survey of the Baluchistan coast (Pakistan). *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 46: 6-9.
- Gyan, N. 1987. National Report prepared for the second Western Atlantic Turtle Symposium, Mayagüez, Puerto Rico, October 1987.
- Halim, M.H., Silalahi, S. and Sugarjito, J. 2001. Conservation and utilization trend of marine turtles in Indonesia. *Tigerpaper* 28(4): 10-16.
- Hamann, M., Chu The Cuong, Nguyen Duy Hong, Pham Thuoc and Bui Thi Thuhien. 2006. Distribution and abundance of marine turtles in the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 15: 3703-3720.
- Harris, A. 1994. Species review the olive ridley. In: R. James (compiler) *Proceedings of the Australian Marine Turtle Conservation Workshop* held at Sea World Nara Resort, Gold Coast, 14-17 November 1990, pp. 63-67. Queensland Dept. of Environment and Heritage, and Australian Nature Conservation Agency.
- Hasbún, C.R. and Vásquez, M. 1999. Sea turtles of El Salvador. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 85: 7-9.
- Hays, G.C., Broderick, A.C., Glen, F. and Godley, B.J. 2003. Climate change and sea turtles: a 150-year reconstruction of incubation temperatures at a major marine turtle rookery. *Global Change Biology* 9(4): 642-646.
- Heppell, S.S., Snover M.L. and Crowder L.B. 2003. Sea turtle population ecology. In: P. Lutz, J.A. Musick and J. Wyneken (eds) *The Biology of Sea Turtles*, pp. 275-306. CRC Marine Science Series. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Herbst, L.H. 1994. Fibropapillomatosis of marine turtles. *Annual Review of Fish Diseases* 4: 389-425.
- Higginson, J. and Orantes R. 1987. Manejo de Tortugas Marinas. Universidad de San Carlos. Guatemala. 79 pp.

- Higginson, J. 1989. Sea turtles in Guatemala: threats and conservation efforts. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 45:1-5.
- Honarvar, S. and van den Berghe, E. In press. Monitoring olive ridley turtles (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) on the Pacific coast of Nicaragua. In: 25th Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation, 2005.
- Hope, R. 2000. Egg harvesting of the olive ridley marine turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) along the Pacific Coast of Nicaragua and Costa Rica an arribada sustainability analysis. Dissertation Thesis, MA in the Faculty of Economic and Social Studies. University of Manchester, England.
- Houck, W.J. and Joseph, J.G. 1958. A northern record for the Pacific ridley, *Lepidochelys olivacea*. *Copeia* 1958: 219-220.
- Hubbs, C.L. 1977. First record of mating ridley turtles in California, with notes on commensals, characters, and systematics. *California Fish and Game* 63(4): 263-267.
- Hughes, D.A. and Richard, J.D. 1974. The nesting of the Pacific Ridley Turtle *Lepidochelys olivacea* on Playa Nancite Costa-Rica. *Marine Biology* 24(2): 97-107.
- Hurtado, M. 1981. Marine turtles recaptured in Ecuadorian waters. *Bol. Inform. Inst. Nac. Pesca Guayaquil, Ecuador* 2(5): 18-23.
- IATTC. 2004. IATTC working group on bycatch. 4th Meeting Kobe (Japan) 14-16 January 2004. Review of the status of sea turtle stocks in the Eastern Pacific. Document BYC-4-04. 9 pp.
- Islam, M.Z. 2002. Marine turtle nesting at St. Martin's Island, Bangladesh. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 96: 19-21.
- Islam, M.Z., Islam, S.Z. and Rashid, S.M.A. 1999. Sea turtle conservation program in St. Martin's Island by CARI-NAM a brief review. *Tigerpaper* 26(1): 17-22.
- IUCN 2001. *IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 3.1*. IUCN Species Survival Commission. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, U.K. ii + 30pp.
- Jiménez, L and Zorrilla, X. 1998. 1998 Programa de Conservación y Monitoreo de las tortugas marinas en el Parque Nacional Natural Sanquianga. In: D. Amorocho, P. Saldana and C. Pinzón (eds) *Memorias del II Curso Taller Internacional en Biología y Conservación de Tortugas Marinas en Colombia*, 48-53 pp. WIDE-CAST-BP Conservation project, Cali.
- Kalb, H.J. 1999. Behavior and physiology of solitary and arribada nesting olive ridley sea turtles (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) during the internesting period. Ph.D. dissertation. Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- Kalb, H.J. and Owens, D.W. 1994. Differences between solitary and arribada nesting olive ridley females during the internesting period. In: K.A. Bjorndal, A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson and P.J. Eliazar (compilers) *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation*, p. 68. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NMFS-SEFSC-351.
- Kalb, H., Valverde, R.A. and Owens, D. 1995. What is the reproductive patch of the olive ridley sea turtle? In: J.I. Richardson and T.H. Richardson (compilers) *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation*, pp. 57-60. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NMFS-SEFSC-361.
- Kamezaki, N. 1999. Natural History Notes: a stuffed olive ridley, *Lepidochelys olivacea*, found in Ujung Pandang, Sulawesi Island. *Umigame Newsletter of Japan* 40: 17.
- Kami, H.G. 1997. First record of the Olive Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys olivacea*, in Iranian coastal waters (Testudines, Cheloniidae). *Zoology in the Middle East* 15: 67-70
- Kar, C.S. and Bhaskar, S. 1982. The status of sea turtles in the eastern Indian Ocean. In: K.A. Bjorndal (ed.) *The Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles*, pp. 365-372. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Kopitsky, K.L., Pitman, R.L. and Dutton, P.H. 2004. Aspects of olive ridley feeding ecology in the eastern tropical Pacific. In: M.S. Coyne and R.D. Clark (compilers) *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation*, pp. 217. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NMFS-SEFSC-528.
- Kopitsky, K., Pitman, R.L. and Plotkin, P.T. 2000. Investigations on at-sea mating and reproductive status of olive ridleys, *Lepidochelys olivacea*, captured in the eastern tropical Pacific. In: H.J. Kalb and T. Wibbels (compilers) *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation*, pp. 160-162. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NMFS-SEFSC-443.
- Kosal, Mao. 2004. Biodiversity of Cambodia's wetlands. In: M. Torell, A.M. Salamanca and B.D. Ratner (eds) *Wetlands Management in Cambodia: Socioeconomic, Ecological, and Policy Perspectives*, pp. 14-16. World-Fish Center Technical Report 64.
<http://www.worldfishcenter.org/Pubs/CambodiaProceedings/pdf/CambodiaProceedings-02.pdf>
- Lagueux, C.J. 1989. Olive Ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) Nesting in the Gulf of Fonseca and the Commercialization of its Eggs in Honduras. M.S. Thesis, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida. 1989. 138 pp.
- Liew, Hock-Chark. 2002. Status of marine turtle conservation and research in Malaysia. In: I. Kinan (ed.) *Proceedings of the Western Pacific Sea Turtle Cooperative Research and Management Workshop*, pp. 51-56. Feb-

- ruary 5-8, 2002, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA. Honolulu, HI Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.
- Limpus, C.J. 1996. Myths, reality, and limitations of green turtle census data. In: J.A. Keinath, D.A. Barnard, J.A. Musick, and B.A. Bell. (compilers) *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation*, pp. 170-173. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-387.
- Limpus, C.J. 2001. Report to 3rd IOSEA meeting. Manila, Phillipines.
- Limpus, C.J. 1995. Global overview of the status of marine turtles: a 1995 viewpoint. In: K.A. Bjorndal (ed.) *Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles*, Revised Edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Limpus, C.J., Miller, J.D. and Fleay, A. 1981. The Olive Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys olivacea*, recorded from South Queensland. *Herpetofauna* 12(2): 2-3.
- Limpus, C.J. unpublished. A Biological Review of Australian Marine Turtles IV. Olive Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys olivacea* (Eschscholtz). 23 pp.
- López, E. and Harfush, M. 2000. Determination of the percentage of olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) *in situ* nests that are affected by beetles at Escobilla, beach, México. In: A. Mosier, A. Foley and B. Brost (compilers) *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation*, p. 83. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-477, 369 pp.
- Marcovaldi, M.A. and Marcovaldi, G.G. 1987. Projeto Tartaruga marinha. Areas de desova, época de reprodução, técnicas de preservação. B. FBCN, Rio de Janeiro, 95-103.
- Marquez, R., Villanueva, A. and Peñaflores, C. 1976. Sinopsis de datos biológicos sobre la tortuga golfina, *Lepidochelys olivacea* (Eschscholtz, 1829). Inst. Nac. Pesca, México, INP/52 Sinopsis sobre la Pesca. 1976, 61 pp.
- Márquez, R. 1976. Reservas naturales para la conservación de las tortugas marinas en México. Serie Información INP/S1 83, 1-22.
- Márquez, R. 1976b. Estado actual de la pesquería de tortugas marinas en México, 1974. Serie Información INP/S1, i46 28 pp.
- Márquez, R. 1990. FAO Species catalogue. Vol. 11: Sea turtles of the world. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of sea turtle species known to date. FAO Fisheries Synopsis. No 125, Vol. 11. Rome. 81 pp.
- Márquez, R., Vasconcelos, J. and Peñaflores, C. 1990. XXV Años de Investigación, conservación y protección de la tortuga marina. Secretaría de Pesca, Instituto Nacional de la Pesca. 49 pp.
- Márquez, R., Jiménez, M.C., Carrasco, M.A. and Villanueva, N.A. 1998. Comentarios acerca de las tendencias poblacionales de las tortugas marinas del género *Lepidochelys* después de la veda total de 1990. *Oceánides* 13(1): 41-62.
- Martínez, L.M. 2000. Ecología de anidación de la tortuga golfina (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) en la Playa de La Cuevita, Costa Pacifica Chococana, Colombia, en 1998. *Actualidades Biológicas Medellín* 22(73): 131-143.
- Martinez, P., Gutierrez, C. and Arauz, R. 1998. Nesting biology of the olive ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) in La Flor Wildlife Refuge, Rivas, Nicaragua. In: S.P. Epperly, J. Braun (compilers) *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Sea Turtle Symposium*, p. 228. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-415. 294 pp.
- Meylan, A.B. 1982. Estimation of population size in sea turtles. In: K.A. Bjorndal (ed.) *Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles*, Revised Edition, pp. 135-138. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Minarik, C.J. 1985. Olive Ridleys of Honduras. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 33: 3-4.
- Moncada, F., Rodríguez, A.M. Márquez, R. and Carrillo, E. 2000. Report of the Olive Ridley Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) in Cuban Waters. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 90: 13-15.
- Montoya, A.E. 1969. Programas de investigación y conservación de las tortugas marinas en México. In: Proceedings of the Working Meeting of Marine Turtle Specialists organized by IUCN at Morges, Switzerland on 10-13 March. 1969. Pp. 34-53.
- Morreale, S.J., Plotkin, P.T., Shaver, D.J. and Kalb, H.J. 2007. An adult migration and habitat utilization. In: P.T. Plotkin, (ed.) *Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Muccio, C. 1998. Informe Nacional Sobre El Estado De La Conservacion De Tortugas Marinas En Guatemala. Asociación Rescate y Conservación de Vida Silvestre (ARCAS). Unpublished report, 25 pp + annexes.
- Mukherjee, S.K. 2001. The GOI UNDP sea turtle project. In: K. Shanker and B.C. Choudhury, (eds) *Proceedings of the National Workshop for the Development of a National Sea Turtle Conservation Action Plan, Bhuvaneshwar*. Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, India.
- Musick, J.A. and Limpus, C.J. 1997. Habitat utilization and migration in juvenile sea turtles. In: P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick (eds) *The Biology of Sea Turtles*, pp. 137-164. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

- National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. Recovery plans for U.S. Pacific populations of the olive ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*). NMFS Silver Spring, MD.
- Nowak, R.M. 1974. Status of the green turtle, loggerhead and olive ridley turtle. Report to the U.S. Office of Endangered Species, 56 pp.
- Pandav, B. and Choudhury, B.C. 1999. An update on mortality of Olive ridley sea turtle in Orissa, India. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 83: 10-12.
- Pandav, B. 2000. Conservation and Management of Olive Ridley Sea Turtles on the Orissa Coast. PhD Thesis Utkal University, Bhubaneswar, India.
- Pandav, B., Choudhury, B.C. and Shanker, K. 1998. The olive ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) in Orissa. An urgent call for an intensive and integrated conservation programme. *Current Science* 75: 1323-1328.
- Peñaflores-Salazar, C., Vasconcelos-Pérez, J., Albavera-Padilla, E. and Jiménez Quiroz, M.C. 2001. Especies sujetas a protección especial. Tortuga golfina. In: M.A. Cisneros, L.F. Beléndez, E. Zárate, M.T. Gaspar, L.C. López, C. Saucedo and J. Tovar (eds) *Sustentabilidad y Pesca Responsable en México. Evaluación y Manejo: 1999-2000*, pp. 1001-1021. Publicado en CD. Instituto Nacional de la Pesca/SEMARNAT. México.
- Pilcher, N., Mahmud, S., Howe, S., Teclerariam, Y., Weldeyohannes, S., Mengsu, T. and Giotom, M. 2006. An update on Eritrea's marine turtle programme and first record of olive ridley turtle nesting in the Red Sea. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 111: 16.
- Plotkin, P.T. 2003. Adult migrations and habitat use. In: P. Lutz, J.A. Musick and J. Wyneken (eds) *The Biology of Sea Turtles: II*, pp. 225-241. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Pritchard, P.C.H. and Plotkin, P.T. 1995. Olive Ridley Sea Turtle. In: Status Reviews for Sea Turtles Listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, pp. 146-162. National Marine Fisheries Service, St. Petersburg, FL.
- Pritchard, P.C.H. 1969. Studies of the Systematics and Reproductive Cycles of the Genus *Lepidochelys*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Florida, FL.
- Pritchard, P. 2007. *Arribadas* I have known. In: P.T. Plotkin (ed.) *Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Putrawidjaja, M. 2000. Marine turtles in Irian Jaya, Indonesia. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 90: 8-10.
- Rajagopalan, M., Vivekanandan, E., Balan, K. and Narayana Kurup, K. 2001. Threats to sea turtles in India through incidental catch. In: K. Shanker and B.C. Choudhury (eds) *Proceedings of the National Workshop for the Development of a National Sea Turtle Conservation Action Plan, Bhubaneswar*, pp. 12-14. Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, India.
- Ramboux, A.C. 1981. Informe de trabajo Las Lisas, 5-13 de agosto de 1981, Memorandum a L.F. Martinez, Director Tecnico, DITEPESCA, 7pp.
- Ramboux, A.C. 1982. Programa de Proteccion de las Tortugas Marinas en la Costa Sur-Oriental de Pacifico. Resultados de la temporada de 1981. Gua/81/004. Acuicultura Experimental, Documento de Campo No. 1, DITEPESCA/ Organizacion de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentacion (FAO), Guatemala.
- Rashid, S.M.A. and I. Zahirul. 1998. Establishing marine turtle hatchery in Saint Martins Island, Bangladesh. Proceedings of the 4th Asia-Pacific Environmental NGOs Conference, 26-27 November, 1998, Singapore. Centre for Advanced Research in Natural Resources & Management (CARINAM).
- Reichart, H.A. 1993. Synopsis of biological data on the olive ridley sea turtle *Lepidochelys olivacea* (Eschscholtz 1829) in the western Atlantic. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-336, 76pp.
- Reichart, H.A. and Fretey, J. 1993. WIDECASST Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for Suriname (K.L. Eckert, Editor). CEP Technical Report No. 24. UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme, Kingston, Jamaica. xiv + 65 pp.
- Rosales-Loessener, F. 1987. Reporte Nacional Guatemala, Simposio de Tortugas del Atlantico Occidental II (WATS II), Mayaguez, Puerto Rico.
- Rosales-Loessener, F. 1997. Informe Tecnico, Resultados del Proyecto de Proteccion de Tortugas Marinas en las Playas de Anidacion de Las Lisas, El Ahumado y El Chapeton, Chiquimulilla, Santa Rosa, AGEXPRONT, Guatemala. 19 pp.
- Ross, J.P. and Barwani, M.A. 1982. Review of sea turtles in the Arabian Area. In: K.A. Bjorndal (ed.) *The Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles*, pp. 373-384. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- Salm, R.V., Jensen, R.A.C. and Papastavrou, V.A. 1993. *Marine Fauna of Oman: Cetaceans, Turtles, Seabirds and Shallow Water Corals*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland. 66 pp.
- Settle, S. 1995. Status of nesting populations of sea turtles in Thailand and their conservation. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 68: 8-13.

- Shanker, K. and Mohanty, B. 1999. Operation Kachhapa in search of a solution for the olive ridley of Orissa (Guest Editorial). *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 86: 1-3.
- Shanker, K. and Choudhury, B.C. 2006. *Marine Turtles of the Indian Subcontinent*. Universities Press, Hyderabad, India.
- Shanker, K. 1995. Conservation of sea turtles on the Madras coast. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 64: 3-6.
- Shanker, K., Choudhury, B.C., Aggarwal, R.K. and Singh, L. 2000. Conservation genetics of the olive ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) on the east coast of India. A report. Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun. 40 pp.
- Shanker, K., Pandav, B. and Choudhury, B.C. 2003. An assessment of the olive ridley turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) nesting population in Orissa, India. *Biological Conservation* 115: 149-160.
- Silas, E.G., Rajagopalan, M., Dan, S.S. and Bastion Fernando, A. 1985. On the large and mini *arribadas* of the olive ridley *Lepidochelys olivacea* at Gahirmatha, Orissa during the 1985 session. *Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute information service* 64: 1-16.
- Solís, D.S., Orrego, C.M., Blanco-Segura, R.V., Harfush-Meléndez, M.R., Albavera-Padilla, E.O. and Valverde, R.A. 2007. Estimating arribada size: going global. Presented at the 27th Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Conservation and Biology Myrtle Beach, S Carolina. 22-28 February, 2007.
- Spring, C.S. 1979. Status of marine turtle populations in Papua New Guinea. In: K.A. Bjorndal (ed.) *Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles*, pp.281-289. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Spring, C.S. and Gwyther, J. 1999. Stomach contents of an Olive Ridley Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) from the Gulf of Papua, Papua New Guinea. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology* 3(3): 516-517.
- Standards and Petitions Working Group. 2006. Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 6.1. Prepared by the Standards and Petitions Working Group for the IUCN SSC Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee in July 2006. Downloadable from <http://app.iucn.org/webfiles/doc/SSC/RedList/RedListGuidelines.pdf>.
- Sunderraj, S.F.W., Joshua, J. and Kumar, V.V. 2006. Sea turtles and their nesting habitats in Gujarat. In: K. Shanker and B.C. Choudhury (eds) *Marine Turtles of the Indian subcontinent*, pp. 156-169. Universities Press, Hyderabad, India.
- Suwelo, I.S. 1999. Olive ridley turtle records from south Banyuwangi, East Java. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 85: 9.
- Sybesma, J. and Hoetjes, P.C. 1992. First record of the olive ridley and of nesting by the loggerhead turtle in Curaçao. *Caribbean Journal of Science* 28(1-2): 103-104.
- Turtle Expert Working Group. 2000. Assessment Update for the Kemp's Ridley and Loggerhead Sea Turtle Populations in the Western North Atlantic. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-444, 115 pp.
- Thomé, J.C.A., Marcovaldi, M.A., dei Marcovaldi, G.G., Bellini, C., Gallo, B.M.G., Lima, E.H.S.M., da Silva, A.C.C.D., Sales, G. and Barata, P.C.R. 2003. An overview of Projeto TAMAR-IBAMA's activities in relation to the incidental capture of sea turtles in the Brazilian fisheries. In: J.A. Seminoff (compiler) *Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation*. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC, 503, 119-120.
- Thorbjarnarson, J.B., Platt, S.G. and Khaing, S.T. 2000. Sea turtles in Myanmar past and present. *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 88: 10-11.
- Tripathy, B., Shanker, K. and Choudhury, B.C. 2003. Important nesting habitats of olive ridley turtles (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) along the Andhra Pradesh coast of eastern India. *Oryx* 37(4): 454-463.
- T Tripathy, B., Shanker, K. and Choudhury, B.C. 2006. Sea turtles and their nesting habitats along the Andhra Pradesh coast. In: K. Shanker and B.C. Choudhury (eds) *Marine Turtles of the Indian subcontinent*, pp. 68-87. Universities Press, Hyderabad, India.
- Turtle Expert Working Group. 2000. Assessment update for the Kemp's ridley and loggerhead sea turtle populations in the western North Atlantic. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-444, 115 pp.
- Vasconcelos, J., Albavera, E., Lopez, E.M., Hernandez, P. and Peñaflores, C. 2000. First assessment on tumors incidence in nesting females of olive ridley sea turtle *Lepidochelys olivacea*, at La Escobilla Beach, Oaxaca, México. In: F.A. Abreu-Grobois, R. Briseño-Dueñas, R. Márquez and L. Sarti (compilers) *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Sea Turtle Symposium*, pp. 276-278. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NMFS-SEFSC-436.
- Velez, A.M. and Serna, R.D. 1998. Programa de conservación de tortugas marinas en la playa de La Cuevita. In: D. Amorocho and C.E López (eds) *Memorias del Primer Curso Taller Internacional en Biología y Conservación de Tortugas Marinas en Colombia*. Fundación FES-WIDECAS-FARB, Cali.
- Villa Guzmán, J. 1980. Pesquería de Tortugas Marinas en el Estado de Jalisco. Tesis Prof., Fac. de Ciencias, UNAM. México, 43 pp.

- Weishampel, J.F., Bagley, D.A. and Ehrhart, L.M. 2004. Earlier nesting by loggerhead sea turtles following sea surface warming. *Global Change Biology* 10(8): 1424-1427.
- Whiting, S.D. 1997. Observations of a nesting olive ridley turtle in the Northern Territory. *Herpetofauna* 27(2): 39-42.
- Witherington, B.E. 1992. Behavioral responses of nesting sea turtles to artificial lighting. *Herpetologica* 48: 31-39.
- Zug, G.R., Chaloupka, M. and Balazs, G.H. 2006. Age and growth in olive ridley sea turtles (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) from the North-central Pacific: a skeletochronological analysis. *Marine Ecology* 27: 263-270.