

Distribution and preliminary conservation assessments of commonly used forest species in the Nepalese Himalayas

B. Adhikari^{1*}, C. A. Pendry¹, I. E. Måren², K. R. Bhattarai^{3,4} and R. P. Chaudhary⁵

Balancing the trade-offs between biodiversity conservation and ecosystem service delivery is a colossal challenge in the areas of the globe with high productivity and high demand, such as in south Asia. In order to meet this challenge, we need enhanced knowledge of the species constituting these semi-natural systems. This paper reports the country-level preliminary conservation assessments for 153 woody plant species from the Middle Hills in central Nepal based on the IUCN criteria. Distribution maps and threat categories are provided for all species. Ten species are categorized as Near Threatened, two as Endangered and one as Vulnerable. Conservation assessments could not be completed for 24 species because of insufficient distribution data.

Key words: Conservation assessments, forest species, Himalayas, species distribution

In the global north, it is widely recognised that the conservation of semi-natural landscapes and their associated species are of paramount importance for the conservation of biodiversity, but these landscapes do not receive the same recognition in the global south. In south Asia, traditional semi-natural landscapes are still the backdrop for rural livelihoods, and cover large land areas. However, many of the region's traditional land uses are changing due to agricultural intensification or abandonment caused by socio-economic change (Sharma, 2016) in these tightly-linked social-ecological systems. Enhanced knowledge of the dynamics between land use and biodiversity will be critical for future successful biodiversity conservation and ecosystem service delivery. The shift towards a system's view where humans are seen as part of the system (Berkes, 2004; Folke, 2006; Sharma, 2016) will benefit both biodiversity conservation and ecosystem service delivery in Nepal and other countries in the region. A recent study on species diversity, forest structure, ecosystem services and forest management practices both in the community forests (CFs) and government managed forests (GMFs) at Panchase, situated towards the west of Pokhara (Måren *et al.*, 2013) found that the CFs had greater species diversity and less degradation than the GMFs, which in practice acts as a resource

which is open for unrestricted exploitation by all. The community forest user groups (CFUGs) at Panchase manage their forests so as to improve their condition by removing undesirable species in favour of the growth of the species with high value for fuel, fodder, fibre and medicine. However, it is not clear whether greater species diversity has any relationship with the numbers of rare species growing in the forest. Nepal's flora is believed to comprise around 7,000 species of flowering plants (Press *et al.*, 2000; Watson *et al.*, 2011; Miede *et al.*, 2015), but only few of its species have been evaluated for their conservation status. The distribution data which are used to generate conservation assessments is derived primarily from herbarium specimens (Rich and Lewis, 1999; Antonovics *et al.*, 2003), but these collections are very unevenly spread across Nepal (Watson *et al.*, 2011), so the distribution patterns of most species are inadequately known.

In this study, we examined six locations in central Nepal, the three of which are within the Protected Areas (National Parks or Conservation Areas) and the rest three are outside the Protected Areas, in order to further examine the effects of different legal frameworks on maintenance of forest biodiversity. This paper reports the preliminary conservation assessments for all the species

¹ Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, 20a Inverleith Row, Edinburgh, EH3 5LR, Scotland UK. *E-mail: B.Adhikari@rbge.ac.uk

² Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, the University Museum, University of Bergen, Allegt. 41, 5006 Bergen, Norway

³ Sheridan Davis Campus, 7899 McLaughlin Rd, Brampton, ON L6Y 5H9, Canada

⁴ Himalayan Resource & Development Center, GPO Box 7426, Kathmandu, Nepal

⁵ Research Centre for Applied Science and Technology (RECAST), Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

found in this study.

Materials and methods

Study sites

Three forested areas in central Nepal are studied, each with a study site within the protected area (National Park or Conservation Area) and an equivalent study site outside the protected area. These areas were Annapurna (Ghorepani inside the Annapurna Conservation Area and Panchase outside the protected area), the Kathmandu Valley (Shivapuri-Nagarjun National Park inside and Chandragiri outside the protected area) and Langtang (Langtang National Park inside and Bhalche outside the protected area) (Fig. 1). The study was conducted in the pre-monsoon season from February to June, 2010. Both the CFs and the GMFs (excluding plantations) were sampled using stratified random sampling. Sample plots of 10 m x 10 m size were laid out across the study sites with similar the biophysical factors and elevation (Mären *et al.* 2013 for further details). In each study site, equal numbers of plots (180) were sampled, totalling 540 plots in the three regions (six sites). Results from pH and loss on ignition (LOI) analyses indicated only small differences in the soil conditions of the sites and the regions.

In the mid-hills, Oak-Laurel forests are situated at higher elevations while the mixed *Schima-Castanopsis* forests are found at lower elevations. These forests differ considerably in their floristic composition and ecology (Dobremez, 1976). *Quercus semecarpifolia* Sm. is the dominant tree species in the Oak-Laurel forests with the species of laurel such as *Lindera pulcherrima* (Nees) Hook. f., *Neolitsea pallens* (D. Don) Momiy. & H. Hara ex H. Hara, *Machilus duthiei* King ex Hook. f. and *M. odoratissima* Nees. The *Schima-Castanopsis* forests are dominated by *Schima wallichii* (DC.) Korth., *Castanopsis indica* (Roxb.) Miq. and *C. tribuloides* (Sm.) A.DC.

Other species which are also commonly found in the mid-hill forests include several species of *Rhododendron*, *Acer* spp., *Prunus* spp., *Quercus glauca* Thunb., *Quercus lamellosa* Sm., *Quercus lanata* Sm., *Lyonia ovalifolia* (Wall.) Drude, *Eurya acuminata* DC., *Ilex dipyrena* Wall., *Symplocos ramosissima* Wall. ex G. Don and *Daphniphyllum himalense* (Benth.) Mull. Arg.

Pinus wallichiana A. B. Jacks. is found at the higher elevations while *P. roxburghii* Sarg. is noticed at the lower altitudes.

The less commonly occurring species include *Magnolia doltsopa* (Buch.-Ham. ex DC.) Figlar, *Taxus wallichiana* Zucc., *Edgeworthia gardneri* (Wall.) Meisn. etc. These forests are home to a number of important species of wildlife such as Himalayan black bear (*Ursus thibetanus*), tiger (*Panthera tigris*), Indian muntjak (*Muntiacus muntjak*), common leopard (*Panthera pardus*), jackal (*Canis aureus*) and several species of bats (Aryal and Dhungel, 2009; Miehe *et al.*, 2015).




Fig. 1: Map showing the localities of the six study sites within the three regions in central Nepal, the Himalayas

Calculation of conservation assessments

The herbaria at the Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh Herbarium (E), the Natural History Museum London (BM) and the National Herbarium and Plant Laboratories, Kathmandu (KATH) were consulted for specimens of the 153 woody species recorded during the study. All the specimens were photographed and data-based in the 'Padme database', which is used to manage all information for the Flora of Nepal project. Altogether, 4,374 herbarium specimens (1,927 specimens recorded from the E, 1,239 specimens from the BM and 1,208 from the KATH) together with the occurrence-records in the present study and unvouchered field records of the occurrences of the unambiguously identified common species in the 'Padme database' were used for the assessments. In addition to this, the distributions of species in the neighbour countries were also taken into consideration while assigning the categories. The assessments were based mostly on criteria B and A of the IUCN Categories and the criteria using extent of occurrence (EOO)

and area of occupancy (AOO) plus evidence (or inferring) of decline in the habitat (IUCN, 2016). Species which are very close to qualifying or likely to qualify for a threatened category (critically endangered, endangered or vulnerable) in the near future were categorized as Near Threatened (NT). Evidence of population size and/or reduction was, generally, not available. The EOO was calculated using GeoCAT (Bachman *et al.* 2011; <http://geocat.kew.org/>) while the AOO using a facility in the 'Padme database

Results and discussion

One hundred and fifty-three woody plant species were recorded from the six study sites, comprising 80 species of trees, 48 shrubs and 25 woody climbers (Annex I). The highest species richness of trees and climbers were recorded at the Annapurna sites (trees 53; climbers 21), followed by the Kathmandu Valley (trees 44; climbers 18) and the Langtang sites (trees 26; climbers 11). There was a greater diversity of shrubs in the Kathmandu sites (30) and the Annapurna sites (30) followed by the Langtang sites (16). The most commonly recorded family was Rosaceae (26 species) followed by Lauraceae (9 species), Fagaceae and Ericaceae (both 7 species).

Preliminary conservation assessment

Two species, *Taxus wallichiana* Zucc. and *Hoya edeni* King ex Hook. f. were categorised as 'Endangered' (EN), one species, *Hypericum cordifolium* Choisy as 'Vulnerable' (VU), ten species as 'Near Threatened' (NT) and 116 species as 'Least Concern' (LC). There were insufficient data to calculate conservation assessments for 24 species, and so those species were categorised as 'Data Deficient' (DD) (Table 1). The complete list of the species (trees, shrubs and climbers) found in the study sites along with their preliminary conservation assessments is presented in Annex I.

Tree species: Among the 80 species of trees, seven were categorised as 'Near Threatened' (NT)

based on the IUCN criteria; the species being *Abies spectabilis* (D. Don) Mirb., *Acer caudatum* Wall., *Aesculus indica* (Colebr. ex Cambess.) Hook., *Camellia kissi* Wall., *Eriobotrya elliptica* Lindl., *Euonymus pendulus* Wall. and *Litsea doshia* (D. Don) Kosterm. *T. wallichiana* is the only tree species listed as 'EN' (A2 a, c, d). The population of this species is decreasing at an alarming rate because of commercial demand (Liu *et al.*, 2011; Poudel *et al.*, 2012; Gajurel *et al.*, 2013), and it has been listed in the CITES Appendix 2 since 1995. Fifty eight species were fairly well distributed, and were categorized as 'LC' while 14 species were placed under 'DD'.

Shrubs: One species, *H. cordifolium* Choisy was recorded as 'VU' (B1 a, b). Three species, *D. bholua* Buch.-Ham. ex D. Don, *D. papyracea* Wall. ex Steud. and *Edgeworthia gardneri* (Wall.) Meisn. were recorded as 'NT' while thirty-seven species fell into 'LC' category, and seven were categorized as 'DD'.

Climbers: One species, *Hoya edeni* King ex Hook. f. was assessed as 'EN', (B1 a, b) while 21 were recorded as 'LC', and three were categorized as 'DD'.

Conclusion

This study clearly reflects the limitations of the data which are currently available. Almost 15% of the species were classified as 'Data Deficient' as their distributions were too poorly known to confidently assign them to any category. Several of these species have very limited distributions, and are known only from a few specimens, and so it is quite possible that a significant number of them are actually under threat of depletion or extinction. Looking at the maps of some of the common species, such as *P. roxburghii* and *P. Wallichiana* (Annex II), it is evident that these species are certainly under-recorded and the data set is insufficient to make accurate conservation assessments for these species. Clearly, more distribution records are needed before we can

Table 1: Preliminary conservation assessments based on the IUCN criteria for 153 woody plant species recorded at the Ghorepani, Panchase, Shivapuri, Chandragiri, Langtang and Bhalche sites in central Nepal

| Data Deficient (DD) | Least Concern (LC) | Near Threatened (NT) | Vulnerable (VU) | Endangered (EN) | Critically Endangered (CE) |
|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| 24 | 116 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 0 |

be certain of the conservation status of these commonly occurring and widely utilized Nepalese woody plants.

Many natural resource systems, here exemplified by forests, fall under collective management or are subject to use by multiple individuals, often for a variety of purposes (Poteete and Ostrom, 2004). Sustaining these resources in the face of economic and demographic pressures depends upon an array of interdependent components including legislation and local engagement. In order to facilitate evidence-based natural resource management, we need to enhance our knowledge regarding the species richness, composition and dynamics of these systems. Pandey (2007) found comparatively higher species richness in the community forests than in the national parks and government forests he investigated, and in the sacred groves of the Western Ghats of India. Bhagwat *et al.* (2005) found informal protection traditions to contribute to successful biodiversity conservation. We see similar trends in some of our material; however, we cannot see this as an overriding trend for the data set as a whole. In other words, these dynamics within social-ecological systems are context-dependent which call for enhanced knowledge in order to manage both ecosystem service delivery to the local people, and contribute to biodiversity conservation.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Mr. Bishnu Chapagain, Mr. Ashok Chaudhary, Mr. Kuber Bhatta, Mr. Rupesh Gurung, Ms. Lila Sharma, Ms. Asha Suwal, Mr. Rajesh Shrestha and Ms. Keith McInturff for their assistance in our fieldwork. We are thankful to all the villagers who helped us in our fieldwork. We acknowledge Machhapuchhre Development Organisation (MDO) and Ms. Bashuda Gurung for providing insightful information on the Panchase area. We are grateful to the Norwegian Research Council (190153/V10) and Grolle Olsens Legat for their financial support to accomplish this study.

References

Antonovics, J., Hood, M. E., Thrall, P. H., Abrams, J. Y. and Duthie, G. M. 2003. Herbarium studies on the distribution of anther-smut fungus (*Microbotryum violaceum*) and *Silene*

species (Caryophyllaceae) in the eastern United States. *American Journal of Botany* **90**: 1522–1531. doi:10.3732/ajb.90.10.1522 accessed on 14 June, 2016.

Aryal, A. and Dhungel, S. K. 2009. Species diversity and distribution of bats in Panchase region of Nepal. *Tigerpaper* **36 (2)**: 14–18.

Bachman, S., Moat, J., Hill, A. W., de la Torre, J. and Scott, B. 2011. Supporting Red List threat assessments with GeoCAT: geospatial conservation assessment tool. *ZooKeys* **150**: 117–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3897/zookeys.150.2109> accessed on 14 June, 2016.

Berkes, F. 2004. Rethinking community-based conservation. *Conservation Biology* **18 (3)**: 621–630.

Bhagwat, S. A., Kushalappa, C. G., Williams, P. H. and Brown, N. D. 2005. The role of informal protected areas in maintaining biodiversity in the Western Ghats of India. *Ecology and Society* **10**: 8.

Dobremez, J. F. 1976. **Le Nepal: Ecologie et Biogéographie**. Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, France.

Folke, C. 2006. Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analyses. *Global Environmental Change* **16**: 253–267.

Gajurel, J. P., Cornejo, C., Werth, S., Shrestha, K. K. and Scheidegger, C. 2013. Development and characterization of microsatellite loci in the endangered species *Taxus wallichiana* (Taxaceae). *Applications in Plant Sciences* **1 (3)**: 1200281. <http://doi.org/10.3732/apps.1200281> accessed on 18 July, 2016.

IUCN. 2016. Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria, Version 12. Prepared by the Standards and Petitions Subcommittee, The International Union for Conservation of Nature. <http://www.iucnredlist.org/documents/RedListGuidelines.pdf> accessed on 14 December, 2016.

Liu J., Gao, L. M., Li, D. Z., Zhang, D. Q. and Moller, M. 2011. Cross-species amplification and development of new microsatellite loci

- for *Taxus wallichiana* (Taxaceae). *American Journal of Botany* **98**: e70–e73.
- Måren, I., Bhattarai, K. R. and Chaudhary, R. P. 2013. Forest Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity in Contrasting Himalayan Forest Management Systems Environmental Conservation. Published online doi:10.1017/S0376892913000258 accessed on 15 October, 2016.
- Miehe, G., Pendry, C. A. and Chaudhary, R. 2015. **Nepal: An Introduction to the Natural History, Ecology, and Human Environment of the Himalayas**. Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.
- Pandey, S. S. 2007. Tree Species Diversity in Existing Community-based Forest Management Systems in Central Mid-hills of Nepal. Swedish Biodiversity Centre, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Poteete, A. R. and Ostrom, E. 2004. Heterogeneity, Group Size and Collective Action: The Role of Institutions in Forest Management. *Development and Change* **35**: 435–461. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7660.2004.00360.x accessed on 9 January, 2017.
- Poudel, R. C., Möller, M., Gao, L. M., Ahrends, A., Baral, S. R., Liu, J., Thomas, P. and Li, D. Z. 2012. Using Morphological, Molecular and Climatic Data to Delimitate Yews along the Hindu Kush-Himalaya and Adjacent Regions. *PLoS ONE* **7** (10): e46873. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0046873 accessed on 16 December, 2016.
- Press, J. R., Shrestha, K. K. and Sutton, D. A. 2000. **Annotated Checklist of the Flowering Plants of Nepal**. The Natural History Museum, London, UK.
- Rich, T. C. G. and Lewis, J. 1999. Use of herbarium material for mapping the distribution of *Erophila* (*Brassicaceae*) taxa sensu Filfilan and Elkington in Britain and Ireland. *Watsonia* **22**: 377–385.
- Sharma, L. N. 2016. The Disturbance-Diversity Relationship: Integrating Biodiversity Conservation and Resource Management in Anthropogenic Landscapes. PhD Thesis, Department of Biology, University of Bergen, Norway.
- Watson, M. F., Akiyama, S., Ikedo, H., Pendry, C., Rajbhandari, K. R. and Shrestha, K. K. 2011. **Flora of Nepal** (vol. 3). The Royal Botanical Garden Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

Annex I: List of the species recorded in the Annapurna (A) Region (Panchase and Ghorepani), the Kathmandu (K) Valley Region (Chandragiri and Shivapuri) and the Langtang (L) Region (Bhalche and Langtang], and their preliminary conservation assessment

| S.N. | Scientific name | Family | Recorded from | | | P. Con. Asses. |
|--------------|--|------------------|---------------|---|---|----------------------|
| | | | A | K | L | |
| TREES | | | | | | |
| 1 | <i>Abies spectabilis</i> (D.Don) Mirb | Pinaceae | ✓ | | | Near Threatened (NT) |
| 2 | <i>Acer caesium</i> Wall. ex Brandis | Sapindaceae | ✓ | | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 3 | <i>Acer campbellii</i> Hook. f. & Thomson ex Hiern | Sapindaceae | | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 4 | <i>Acer caudatum</i> Wall. | Sapindaceae | ✓ | | | Near Threatened (NT) |
| 5 | <i>Acer sterculiaceum</i> Wall. | Sapindaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 6 | <i>Actinodaphne angustifolia</i> Nees | Lauraceae | ✓ | | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 7 | <i>Actinodaphne sikkimensis</i> Meisn. | Lauraceae | ✓ | | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 8 | <i>Aesculus indica</i> (Colebr. ex Cambess.) Hook | Sapindaceae | ✓ | | | Near Threatened (NT) |
| 9 | <i>Alnus nepalensis</i> D.Don | Betulaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 10 | <i>Benthamia capitata</i> (Wall.) H. Hara | Cornaceae | | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 11 | <i>Betula alnoides</i> Buch.-Ham. ex D.Don | Betulaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 12 | <i>Camellia kissi</i> Wall. | Theaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Near Threatened (NT) |
| 13 | <i>Carpinus viminea</i> Lindl. | Betulaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 14 | <i>Castanopsis tribuloides</i> (Sm.) A.DC. | Fagaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 15 | <i>Cotoneaster frigidus</i> Wall. ex Lindl. | Rosaceae | | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 16 | <i>Daphniphyllum himalense</i> (Benth.) Mull. Arg. | Daphniphyllaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 17 | <i>Deutzia staminea</i> R. Br. ex Wall. | Hydrangeaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 18 | <i>Dodecadenia grandiflora</i> Nees | Lauraceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 19 | <i>Elaeagnus parvifolia</i> Wall. ex Royle | Elaeagnaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 20 | <i>Eriobotrya dubia</i> (Lindl.) Decne. | Rosaceae | | ✓ | ✓ | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 21 | <i>Eriobotrya elliptica</i> Lindl. | Rosaceae | | | ✓ | Near Threatened (NT) |
| 22 | <i>Euonymus pendulus</i> Wall. | Celastraceae | | ✓ | ✓ | Near Threatened (NT) |
| 23 | <i>Eurya acuminata</i> DC. | Pentaphylacaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 24 | <i>Euryacer asifolia</i> (D.Don) Kobuski | Pentaphylacaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 25 | <i>Ficus neriifolia</i> Sm. | Moraceae | | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 26 | <i>Ficus pumila</i> L. | Moraceae | ✓ | | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 27 | <i>Fraxinus floribunda</i> Wall. | Oleaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 28 | <i>Garuga pinnata</i> Roxb. | Burseraceae | | ✓ | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 29 | <i>Hydrangea heteromalla</i> D.Don | Hydrangeaceae | | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 30 | <i>Ilex dipyrena</i> Wall. | Aquifoliaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 31 | <i>Juglans regia</i> L. | Juglandaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 32 | <i>Leucosceptrum canum</i> Sm. | Lamiaceae | | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 33 | <i>Ligustrum confusum</i> Decne. | Oleaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 34 | <i>Lindera pulcherrima</i> (Nees) Hook. f. | Lauraceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 35 | <i>Litsea doshia</i> (D.Don) Kosterm. | Lauraceae | | ✓ | ✓ | Near Threatened (NT) |
| 36 | <i>Lyonia ovalifolia</i> (Wall.) Drude | Ericaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 37 | <i>Lyonia villosa</i> (Hook. f.) Hand.-Mazz. | Ericaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 38 | <i>Macaranga pustulata</i> King ex Hook. f. | Euphorbiaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 39 | <i>Machilus clarkeana</i> King ex Hook. f. | Lauraceae | ✓ | | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 40 | <i>Machilus duthiei</i> King ex Hook. f. | Lauraceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 41 | <i>Machilus odoratissima</i> Nees | Lauraceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 42 | <i>Magnolia doltsopa</i> (Buch.-Ham. ex DC.) Figlar | Magnoliaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 43 | <i>Maytenus rufa</i> (Wall.) H. Hara | Celastraceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 44 | <i>Myrica esculenta</i> Buch.-Ham. ex D.Don | Myricaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 45 | <i>Myrsine semiserrata</i> Wall. | Primulaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 46 | <i>Neolitsea pallens</i> (D.Don) Momiy. & H. Hara ex H. Hara | Lauraceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 47 | <i>Osmanthus fragrans</i> Lour. | Oleaceae | ✓ | | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 48 | <i>Photinia integrifolia</i> Lindl. | Rosaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |


| | | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------|---|---|---|---------------------|
| 49 | <i>Pieris formosa</i> (Wall.) D. Don | Ericaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 50 | <i>Pinus roxburghii</i> Sarg. | Pinaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 51 | <i>Pinus wallichiana</i> A.B. Jacks. | Pinaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 52 | <i>Prunus cerasoides</i> D. Don | Rosaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 53 | <i>Prunus cornuta</i> (Wall. ex Royle) Steud. | Rosaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 54 | <i>Prunus napaulensis</i> (Ser.) Steud. | Rosaceae | ✓ | | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 55 | <i>Prunus rufa</i> Hook. f. | Rosaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 56 | <i>Prunus undulata</i> Buch.-Ham. ex D. Don | Rosaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 57 | <i>Pyrularia edulis</i> (Wall. ex Roxb.) DC. | Santalaceae | ✓ | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 58 | <i>Pyrus pashia</i> Buch.-Ham. ex D. Don | Rosaceae | ✓ | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 59 | <i>Quercus glauca</i> Thunb. | Fagaceae | | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 60 | <i>Quercus lamellosa</i> Sm. | Fagaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 61 | <i>Quercus lanata</i> Sm. | Fagaceae | | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 62 | <i>Quercus semecarpifolia</i> Sm. | Fagaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 63 | <i>Rhamnus purpureus</i> Edgew. | Rhamnaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 64 | <i>Rhododendron arboretum</i> Sm. | Ericaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 65 | <i>Rhododendron barbatum</i> Wall. ex G. Don | Ericaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 66 | <i>Rhododendron campanulatum</i> D. Don | Ericaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 67 | <i>Rhus javanica</i> Miller | Anacardiaceae | | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 68 | <i>Rhus succedanea</i> L. | Anacardiaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 69 | <i>Salix obscura</i> Andersson | Salicaceae | ✓ | | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 70 | <i>Saurauia napaulensis</i> DC. | Actinidiaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 71 | <i>Schima wallichii</i> (DC.) Korth. | Theaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 72 | <i>Skimmia arborescens</i> T. Anderson ex Gamble | Rutaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 73 | <i>Sorbus vestita</i> (Wall. ex G. Don) Lodd. | Rosaceae | ✓ | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 74 | <i>Symplocos ramosissima</i> Wall. ex G. Don | Symplocaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 75 | <i>Symplocos theifolia</i> D. Don | Symplocaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 76 | <i>Taxu wallichiana</i> Zucc. | Taxaceae | ✓ | | | Endangered (EN) |
| 77 | <i>Tsuga dumosa</i> (D. Don) Eichler | Pinaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 78 | <i>Viburnum erubescens</i> Wall. ex DC. | Adoxaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 79 | <i>Viburnum grandiflorum</i> Wall. ex DC. | Adoxaceae | | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 80 | <i>Zizyphus incurva</i> Roxb. | Rhamnaceae | | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |

SHRUBS/BUSHES


| | | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------|---|---|---|----------------------|
| 1 | <i>Eleutherococcus cissifolius</i> (Griff. ex Seem.) Harms | Araliaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 2 | <i>Arundinaria maling</i> Gamble | Poaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 3 | <i>Berberis aristata</i> DC. | Berberidaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 4 | <i>Berberis asiatica</i> Roxb. ex DC. | Berberidaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 5 | <i>Berberis insignis</i> Hook. f. & Thomson | Berberidaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 6 | <i>Berberis napaulensis</i> (DC.) Laferr. | Berberidaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 7 | <i>Berberis wallichiana</i> DC. | Berberidaceae | ✓ | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 8 | <i>Boeninghausenia albiflora</i> (Hook.) Rchb. ex Meisn. | Rutaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 9 | <i>Colebrookea oppositifolia</i> Sm. | Lamiaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 10 | <i>Colquhounia coccinea</i> Wall. | Lamiaceae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 11 | <i>Cotoneaster acuminatus</i> Lindl. | Rosaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 12 | <i>Cotoneaster microphyllus</i> Wall. ex Lindl. | Rosaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 13 | <i>Daphne bholua</i> Buch.-Ham. ex D. Don | Thymelaeaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Near threatened (NT) |
| 14 | <i>Daphne papyracea</i> Wall. ex Steud. | Thymelaeaceae | ✓ | ✓ | | Near threatened (NT) |
| 15 | <i>Desmodium elegans</i> DC. | Leguminosae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 16 | <i>Desmodium multiflorum</i> DC. | Leguminosae | | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 17 | <i>Drepanostachyum falcatum</i> (Nees) Keng f. | Poaceae | ✓ | | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 18 | <i>Edgeworthia gardneri</i> (Wall.) Meisn. | Thymelaeaceae | | | ✓ | Near threatened (NT) |
| 19 | <i>Gaultheria fragrantissima</i> Wall. | Ericaceae | | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 20 | <i>Hypericum cordifolium</i> Choisy | Hypericaceae | | ✓ | | Vulnerable (VU) |
| 21 | <i>Hypericum hookerianum</i> Wight & Arn. | Hypericaceae | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 22 | <i>Indigofera heterantha</i> Wall. ex Brandis | Leguminosae | | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------------------|---|-----|---------------------|
| 23 | <i>Inula cappa</i> (Buch.-Ham. ex D.Don) DC. | Compositae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 24 | <i>Lonicera ligustrina</i> Wall. | Caprifoliaceae | ✓ | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 25 | <i>Maesa chisia</i> Buch.-Ham. ex D.Don | Primulaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 26 | <i>Mussa endatrentleri</i> Stapf | Rubiaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 27 | <i>Neillia rubiflora</i> D.Don | Rosaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 28 | <i>Phyllanthus clarkei</i> Hook. f. | Euphorbiaceae | | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 29 | <i>Piptanthus nepalensis</i> (Hook.) D.Don | Leguminosae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 30 | <i>Prinsepia utilis</i> Royle | Rosaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 31 | <i>Randia tetrasperma</i> (Roxb.) Benth. & Hook. f. ex Brandis | Rubiaceae | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 32 | <i>Ribesacum inatum</i> Wall. ex G. Don | Grossulariaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 33 | <i>Rosa brunonii</i> Lindl. | Rosaceae | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 34 | <i>Rosa macrophylla</i> Lindl. | Rosaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 35 | <i>Rosa sericea</i> Lindl. | Rosaceae | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 36 | <i>Rubus calycinus</i> Wall. ex D.Don | Rosaceae | | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 37 | <i>Rubus ellipticus</i> Sm. | Rosaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 38 | <i>Rubus pentagonus</i> Wall. ex Focke | Rosaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 39 | <i>Rubus sumatranus</i> Miq. | Rosaceae | | ✓ | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 40 | <i>Sarcococca saligna</i> (D.Don) Mull. Arg. | Buxaceae | ✓ | ✓ | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 41 | <i>Sarcococca wallichii</i> Stapf | Buxaceae | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 42 | <i>Spiraea canescens</i> D.Don | Rosaceae | | ✓ | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 43 | <i>Swidao blonga</i> (Wall.) Sojak | Cornaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 44 | <i>Viburnum cylindricum</i> Buch.-Ham. ex D.Don | Sambucaceae | | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 45 | <i>Viburnum mullaha</i> Buch.-Ham. ex D.Don | Sambucaceae | | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 46 | <i>Wikstroemia canescens</i> Meisn. | Thymelaeaceae | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 47 | <i>Zanthoxylum armatum</i> DC. | Rutaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 48 | <i>Zanthoxylum oxyphyllum</i> Edgew. | Rutaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| WOODY CLIMBERS | | | | | |
| 1 | <i>Ampelocissus rugosa</i> (Wall.) Planch. | Vitaceae | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 2 | <i>Aristolochia griffithii</i> Hook. f. & Thoms. Ex Duch. | Aristolochiaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 3 | <i>Ceropegia longifolia</i> Wall. | Apocyanaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 4 | <i>Cissampelos pareira</i> L. | Menispermaceae | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 5 | <i>Clematis connata</i> DC. | Ranunculaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 6 | <i>Clematis montana</i> Buch.-Ham. ex DC. | Ranunculaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 7 | <i>Cochlianthus gracilis</i> Benth. | Leguminosae | ✓ | | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 8 | <i>Euonymus echinatus</i> Wall. | Celastraceae | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 9 | <i>Hedera nepalensis</i> K. Koch | Araliaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 10 | <i>Hedyotis scandens</i> Roxb. | Rubiaceae | | ✓ | Data Deficient (DD) |
| 11 | <i>Holboellia latifolia</i> Wall. | Lardizabalaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 12 | <i>Hoya edenii</i> King ex Hook. f. | Apocyanaceae | ✓ | ✓ | Endangered (EN) |
| 13 | <i>Jasminum humile</i> L. | Oleaceae | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 14 | <i>Jasminum officinale</i> L. | Oleaceae | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 15 | <i>Piper mullesua</i> Buch.-Ham. ex D.Don | Piperaceae | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 16 | <i>Rubia manjith</i> Roxb. ex Fleming | Rubiaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 17 | <i>Rubus acuminatus</i> Sm. | Rosaceae | | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 18 | <i>Rubus paniculatus</i> Sm. | Rosaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 19 | <i>Sabia campanulata</i> Wall. ex Roxb. | Sabiaceae | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 20 | <i>Schisandra grandiflora</i> (Wall.) Hook. f. & Thomson | Schisandraceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 21 | <i>Smilax aspera</i> L. | Smilacaceae | ✓ | ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 22 | <i>Smilax elegans</i> Wall. ex Kunth | Smilacaceae | | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 23 | <i>Smilax ferox</i> Wall. ex Kunth | Smilacaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |
| 24 | <i>Smilax menispermoides</i> A. DC. | Smilacaceae | ✓ | | Least Concern (LC) |
| 25 | <i>Tetrastigma serrulatum</i> (Roxb.) Planch. | Vitaceae | ✓ | ✓ ✓ | Least Concern (LC) |


Annex II: Distribution maps of the species recorded from the three Mid-hills regions of Nepal, based on the herbarium specimens deposited at the RBGE, BM and KATH




Trees




Trees




Trees




Shrubs




Shrubs




Shrubs




Shrubs



Climbers



Climbers



Jasminum humile

Jasminum officinale



Piper mullesua

Rubia manjith



Rubus acuminatus

Rubus paniculatus



Sabia campanulata

Schisandra grandiflora



Smilax aspera


Smilax elegans



Smilax ferox

Smilax menispermoides

Climbers



Tetrastigma serrulatum