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Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kingdom</th>
<th>Phylum</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animalia</td>
<td>Chordata</td>
<td>Mammalia</td>
<td>Primates</td>
<td>Cebidae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scientific Name: *Sapajus apella* Linnaeus, 1758

Synonym(s):
- *Cebus apella* (Linnaeus, 1758)
- *Sapajus macrocephalus* (Spix, 1823)

Infra-specific Taxa Assessed:
- *Sapajus apella* ssp. *apella*
- *Sapajus apella* ssp. *margaritae*

Common Name(s):
- English: Black-capped Capuchin, Guianan Brown Capuchin, Margarita Island Capuchin, Tufted Capuchin
- German: Apella, Faunaffe, Gehaubter Kapuziner

Taxonomic Source(s):

Taxonomic Notes:
Phylogenomic analyses of *Sapajus* by Lima *et al.* (2017, 2018) provided support for the validity of *Sapajus nigritus*, *S. robustus* and *S. xanthosternos* as distinct species but lumped the putative species *S. cay*, *S. libidinosus*, *S. apella*, *S. macrocephalus*, and *S. flavius* together as a single widespread lineage. A single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) phylogeny recovered *S. flavius* and *S. libidinosus* as sister species. *Sapajus apella*, *S. macrocephalus*, and *S. cay* individuals, however, were recovered in two geographic clades, from northeastern and southwestern Amazon, rather than clustering by currently defined morphospecies. A STRUCTURE analysis of population clustering revealed widespread admixture among *Sapajus* populations within the Amazon and even into the Cerrado and Atlantic Forest (Lima *et al.* 2018). Difficulty in assigning species by morphology may be a result of widespread population admixture facilitated through frequent movement across major rivers and even ecosystems by robust capuchin monkeys (Lima *et al.* 2018). While the form *macrocephalus* Spix, 1823 is now considered a synonym of *Sapajus apella*, for conservation purposes we maintain the forms *cay* Illiger, 1815 (LC), *libidinosus* Spix, 1823 (VU), and *flavius* Schreber, 1774 (CR), each with distinct external morphologies overall (Silva-Júnior 2001). They occur in different phyto- and zoogeographic regions and, correspondingly occupy distinct adaptive zones, and each have their particular conservation issues and threats.

Assessment Information

Red List Category & Criteria: Least Concern ver 3.1

https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2021-1.RLTS.T172351505A192594550.en
Justification:
*Sapajus apella* is listed as Least Concern as the species is widespread and there are currently no major threats resulting in a significant overall population decline that would warrant listing in a threatened category or listing as Near Threatened. Although declines need to be considered over a period of 45 years (three generations), the species is more of a habitat generalist than other species with similar life-histories. However, the species is declining in some parts of its range, especially due to hunting and this combined with a reduced area of distribution.

Previously Published Red List Assessments
2020 – Least Concern (LC)
https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2020-2.RLTS.T172351505A172353050.en

Geographic Range

Range Description:
This is a wide-ranging species in the lower Amazon. The species is found in Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, French Guiana, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, and Venezuela.

Country Occurrence:
Native, Extant (resident): Bolivia, Plurinational States of; Brazil (Acre, Amapá, Amazonas, Maranhão, Pará, Rondônia, Roraima, Tocantins); Colombia (Colombia (mainland)); Ecuador (Ecuador (mainland)); French Guiana; Guyana; Peru; Suriname; Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of
Distribution Map

https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2021-1.RLTS.T172351505A192594550.en
Population

The species is widespread and common, though it is suspected that populations are decreasing.

Population density of the Margarita Island Capuchin has yet to be properly estimated. Results of an ongoing project about ecology and conservation of the Margarita Island Capuchin will allow the determination of densities in the near future. According to Sanz and Marquez (1994), total population is only 250-300 animals. Marquez and Sanz (1991) estimated between 0.02 and 0.23 groups/hours of observation in different forest fragments. Group size was 4.5 ind/group in average. During surveys conducted in 2007, group size varied between 2 and 15 individuals (N. Ceballos-Mago, direct observation).

In Tinigua National Park, Stevenson et al. (1992) recorded a density for *Sapajus apella* of 16 individuals/km² and, later Stevenson (2007) estimated a density of 27 individuals/km² (Stevenson 2007).

Freese (1975, 1977) estimated the population density in the Manu National Park to be 36 individuals/km², and similar densities (40 individuals/km²) were found by Terborgh (1983, Terborgh and Janson 1985, Janson 1985a,b).

Further population densities estimates have been published as follows: Gallery forest in El Tuparro National Park, Colombia - 15-17 individuals/km² (Defler and Pintor 1985); Pacaya-Samiria, Peru - 8-10 individuals/km³ (Soini 1986); Estación Biológica de Caparú, Colombia - 8 individuals/km³ (Defler 2004); Río Puré, Colombia - 5.8 individuals/km² (Defler 2004); Samiria basin, Peru - 24 individuals/km² (Freese 1975, 1977). In Brazil, group size varies from 7 to 21 individuals (Peres 1988a, Izawa 1980). The following are density estimates in different sites: 14.6 ind/km² and 24.11 ind/km³ in Carauari, AM; 0.71 ind/km² in Coari, AM; 6.84 ind/km² in Tefé, AM; 6.73 ind./km² in Sena Madureira, AC (Peres 1988a); 8.62 ind/km² in FLOES do Antimary, AC and 8.95 ind/km² in Fazenda Bela Esperança, AC (Calouro 2005); 1.38 ind/km² and 8.18 ind/km² in Lago Mamori, AM and 6.61 ind/km² (Vulinec et al. 2006); 0.19 groups/10 km survey TI Campinas/Katukina (Calouro 2007), 0.27 groups/10 km survey Reserva Florestal Humaitá (Botelho et al. 2012).

Current Population Trend: Decreasing

Habitat and Ecology (see Appendix for additional information)

This species inhabits nearly all types of Amazonian lowland and submontane forest.

Capuchins are frugivores-insectivores, including a wide variety of fruits, seeds and arthropods, frogs, nestlings and even small mammals in their diet, supplemented by stems, flowers and leaves. They are extractive, manipulative foragers (see Struhsaker and Leland 1977, Izawa 1979).

Mean group size is 18 individuals, with numbers of females exceeding the numbers of males (adult sex ratio of 0.85). Males disperse. Both sexes make up linear hierarchies, the top-ranking male being dominant to the top-ranking female. Subordinate males are often peripheral (Fragaszy et al. 2004).

Size: Adult male 1.35-4.8 kg (mean 3.05 kg); adult female: 1.76-3.4 kg (mean 2.4 kg) (Jack 2007).
**Systems:** Terrestrial

**Use and Trade**

The species is hunted for food and for pets (among the most common primate kept as pets). The release of pet monkeys back into the wild is another threat for these primates (Martinez et al., 2000). Such releases must be considered in terms of the level of risk of disease transmission and hybridization. In Peru, Aquino and Encarnación (1994) reported that hunting has led to its extirpation in areas around human settlements. The species is affected by illegal trade. In local markets in Amazonian Ecuador, a capuchin monkey could be sold in US$20-50 (J. Olalla pers. comm.).

**Threats (see Appendix for additional information)**

The species is hunted for food and for pets (among the most common primate kept as pets). The release of pet *S. a. margaritae* back into the wild is another threat for these primates (Martinez et al. 2000). Such releases must be considered in terms of the level of risk of disease transmission and hybridization. In Peru, Aquino and Encarnación (1994) reported that hunting has led to its extirpation in areas around human settlements. The species is threatened by habitat loss and fragmentation caused by urban/human population expansion.

**Conservation Actions (see Appendix for additional information)**

This species is listed on CITES Appendix II. This species occurs in numerous protected areas, many of which are very large.

**Bolivia**

- Noel Kempff Mercado National Park (1,500,000 ha) (Wallace et al. 1998)
- Madidi National Park and Natural Area of Integrated Management (1,900,000 ha) (Wallace et al. 2010)
- Pilon Lajas Biosphere Reserve and Indigenous Territory (400,000 ha) (Wallace et al. 2010)
- Amboro National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management (440,000 ha) (Wallace et al. 2010)
- Carrao National Park (625,000 ha) (Wallace et al. 2010)
- Isiboro Sécure National Park and Indigenous Territory (1,372,000 ha) (Wallace et al. 2010)
- Beni Biosphere Reserve (135,000 ha) (Wallace et al. 2010)
- Manuripi-Heath Wildlife Reserve (1,000,000 ha) (within range)

**Brazil**

- Tumucumaque National Park (3,882,376 ha)
- Cabo Orange National Park (630,017 ha)
- Gurupi Biological Reserve (272,379 ha)
- Lago Piratuba Biological Reserve (394,223 ha)
- Rio Trombetas Biological Reserve (409,578 ha)
- Uatumã Biological Reserve (942,786 ha)
- Jari Ecological Station (207,370 ha)
- Terra do Meio Ecological Station (3,373,111 ha)
- Niquia Ecological Station (282,803 ha)
- PARNA Serra do Divisor (837,551,19 ha) (Calouro 1999)
- Fazenda Experimental Catuaba (820 ha) (Regh 2006)
- FLOES Antimary (57.629 ha) (Calouro 2005)
• ESEC Rio Acre (79.093,73 ha) (Calouro 2006)
• Ti Campinas/ Katukina (187.400 ha) (Calouro 2007)
• PE Chandless (693970,40 ha) (Calouro 2008)
• Parque Ambiental Chico Mendes (57 ha) (Carmo et al. 2009)
• Reserva Florestal Humaitá (2000 ha) (Botelho et al. 2012).
• REBIO Abufarí (233.864,64 ha)
• ESEC Jutaí-Solimões (289.511,76 ha)
• ESEC Juami-Japurá (831.524,72 ha)
• RDS Mamirauá (1.124.000 ha)
• PARNA Pico da Neblina (2.252.616,84 ha) (Rylands and Bernardes 1989)
• Ti Igarapé Capanã (Peres 1988a)
• RDS Uacari (632.949,00ha)
• RDS do Cujubim (2.450.380,00ha)
• Resex do Rio Gregório (308.859,00ha)
• Resex do Alto Tarauacá (Botelho 2013)
• ESEC Cuniã (186.743,26 ha) (Rylands and Bernardes 1989).

Colombia
• Amacayacu Natural National Park (293,000 ha) (within range but possibly scarce or even absent, Defler 2004)
• Cahuinarí Natural National Park (575,500h) (INDERENA, 1989) (within range, Defler 2004)
• Serrañia de Chiribiquete Natural National Park (1,280,000 ha) (within range, Defler 2004)
• Cordillera de los Picachos Natural National Park (286,600 ha) (within range, Defler 2004)
• Cueva de los Guacharos Natural National Park (9,000 ha) (INDERENA 1989)
• El Cocuy National Natural Park (306,000 ha) (INDERENA 1989)
• El Tuparro Natural National Park (548,000 ha) (INDERENA 1989) (within range, Defler 2004)
• La Paya Natural National Park (442,000 ha) (Palanco-Ochoa et al. 1999; within range Defler 2004)
• Serranía de la Macarena Natural National Park (630,000 ha) (Struhsaker and Leland 1977; within range, Defler 2004)
• Nukak Natural National Reserve (855,000 ha) (within range, Defler 2004)
• Puinawai Natural National Reserve (1,092,500 ha) (within range, Defler 2004)
• Tinigua National Park (201,875 ha)
• Pure National Park (1,000,000 ha)

Ecuador
• Yasuní National Park (Tirira 2007)

French Guiana
• Parc amazonien de Guyane (3,300,000 ha)
• Nouragues Natural Reserve (100,000a)
• La Trinité Natural Reserve
• Kaw Reserved Area (76,800 ha)

Guyana
• Kaietur National Park (11,655 ha)
• Iwokrama Forest Reserve (364,000 ha)

Peru
• Manu National Park (1,532,806 ha) (Aquino and Encarnación 1994)
• Tingo Maria National Park (18,000 ha) (Aquino and Encarnación 1994)
• Pacaya Samiria National Reserve (2,080,000 ha) (Aquino and Encarnación 1994)
• Tamshiyacu-Tahuayo Communal Reserve (Aquino and Encarnación 1994)

Suriname
• Brinckheuvel Nature Reserve (6,000 ha) (probable: Mittermeier and van Roosmalen 1982)
• Central Suriname Nature Reserve (1,600,000 ha) (Mittermeier and van Roosmalen 1982)
• Coppename Monding Nature Reserve (12,000 ha) (probable: Mittermeier and van Roosmalen 1982)
• Galibi Nature Reserve (100 ha) (Mittermeier and van Roosmalen 1982)
• Sipaliwini Nature Reserve (100,000 ha) (Mittermeier and van Roosmalen 1982)
• Wia-wia Nature Reserve (36,000 ha) (Mittermeier and van Roosmalen 1982)
• Brownsberg Nature Park (8,400 ha) (Mittermeier and van Roosmalen 1982; Norconk et al. 2003)
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### Appendix

#### Habitats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
<th>Major Importance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Forest -&gt; 1.5. Forest - Subtropical/Tropical Dry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Forest -&gt; 1.6. Forest - Subtropical/Tropical Moist Lowland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Forest -&gt; 1.7. Forest - Subtropical/Tropical Mangrove Vegetation Above High Tide Level</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Forest -&gt; 1.8. Forest - Subtropical/Tropical Swamp</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Forest -&gt; 1.9. Forest - Subtropical/Tropical Moist Montane</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Savanna -&gt; 2.2. Savanna - Moist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Use and Trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End Use</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pets/display animals, horticulture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food - human</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Impact Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Residential &amp; commercial development -&gt; 1.1. Housing &amp; urban areas</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low impact: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                                 | Stresses: 1. Ecosystem stresses -> 1.1. Ecosystem conversion  
|                                                                 |                     1. Ecosystem stresses -> 1.2. Ecosystem degradation |
|                                                                 | Stresses: 1. Ecosystem stresses -> 1.1. Ecosystem conversion  
|                                                                 |                     1. Ecosystem stresses -> 1.2. Ecosystem degradation |
| 2. Agriculture & aquaculture -> 2.3. Livestock farming & ranching -> 2.3.2. Small-holder grazing, ranching or farming | Ongoing | -     | -        | Low impact: 3 |
|                                                                 | Stresses: 1. Ecosystem stresses -> 1.1. Ecosystem conversion  
|                                                                 |                     1. Ecosystem stresses -> 1.2. Ecosystem degradation |
2. Agriculture & aquaculture -&gt; 2.3. Livestock farming & ranching -&gt; 2.3.3. Agro-industry grazing, ranching or farming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Low impact: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stresses:</td>
<td>1. Ecosystem stresses -&gt; 1.1. Ecosystem conversion 1. Ecosystem stresses -&gt; 1.2. Ecosystem degradation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Transportation & service corridors -&gt; 4.1. Roads & railroads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Low impact: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stresses:</td>
<td>1. Ecosystem stresses -&gt; 1.1. Ecosystem conversion 1. Ecosystem stresses -&gt; 1.2. Ecosystem degradation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Biological resource use -&gt; 5.1. Hunting & trapping terrestrial animals -&gt; 5.1.1. Intentional use (species is the target)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Low impact: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stresses:</td>
<td>1. Ecosystem stresses -&gt; 1.1. Ecosystem conversion 1. Ecosystem stresses -&gt; 1.2. Ecosystem degradation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Biological resource use -&gt; 5.3. Logging & wood harvesting -&gt; 5.3.5. Motivation Unknown/Unrecorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Low impact: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stresses:</td>
<td>1. Ecosystem stresses -&gt; 1.2. Ecosystem degradation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Natural system modifications -&gt; 7.2. Dams & water management/use -&gt; 7.2.11. Dams (size unknown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Low impact: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stresses:</td>
<td>1. Ecosystem stresses -&gt; 1.1. Ecosystem conversion 1. Ecosystem stresses -&gt; 1.2. Ecosystem degradation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conservation Actions in Place**
(http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Action in Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-place land/water protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation sites identified: Yes, over entire range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs in at least one protected area: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-place education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in international legislation: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to any international management / trade controls: Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conservation Actions Needed**
(http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Land/water management -&gt; 2.1. Site/area management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Needed**
(http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes)
### Research Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Research</th>
<th>1.1. Taxonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research</td>
<td>1.3. Life history &amp; ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Research</td>
<td>1.5. Threats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Data Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Population severely fragmented: No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habits and Ecology</td>
<td>Generation Length (years): 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amendment

Amendment reason: The list of Assessor names has been corrected in this assessment.
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