Working Group Descriptions 2018 CPSG Annual Meeting

Assessing to Plan (A2P): Using the Red List to its best advantage

CONVENOR: Claudine Gibson

AIM: The aim of this working group session is to explore how we can maximize the systematic and effective completion of the conservation actions section of Red List assessments, so they provide vital information for linking the assessment process directly through to a process of conservation action planning and delivery.

BACKGROUND: The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species™ provides a universally recognized, global approach for assessing the conservation status of the world's animal and plant species. Each species assessment is generated based on an analysis of a wide range of information including population status, trends and threats, which is then intended to be used to help inform and catalyze conservation action.

Within each species assessment, there is a comprehensive section for inputting information on conservation actions currently in place, and for those that are needed. Potentially, this could provide a huge leap for many species, into conservation action planning. However, there are currently some challenges:

- these fields are not mandatory (and so are often only partially completed)
- preliminary analyses of a sample of records from the database show a disconnect between the threats listed as impacting on species, and the kinds of conservation action recommended, suggesting that the data may require additional review before adoption for conservation action planning.
- the Red List data potentially tell us what conservation action is needed, but not where it is needed, or who might take it forward, which again suggests that an extra layer of work is needed to maximize the value of this information for conservation action planning.
- the Red Listing process (mostly) happens separately from conservation planning activities meaning these two intrinsically-linked processes end up being disconnected.

CPSG is renowned for its facilitation of conservation planning and 'transforming passion for wildlife into effective conservation'. This has typically focused on single species or population planning; however CPSG is now up-scaling this work across multiple taxa. Currently, two objectives of CPSG's work are: **i) to improve the complementarity between Red Listing work and conservation planning work and ii) to develop a tool for moving more species, more quickly, from assessing and into planning (in line with the SSC's ASSESS – PLAN – ACT model).**

PROCESS: The working group will begin with an overview of the Red List process, the IUCN Species Information System (SIS) Toolkit and discussion of the current scope and capacity of assembling information on conservation actions 'in place' and' needed', within individual species assessments. The following issues and questions will then be discussed:

- Threat assessment – to conservation action review: what data do we have and what data do we need?
- Up-sizing: how do we scale up from single species to multi-species review of prioritizing conservation actions needed?
- Building momentum: how can we ensure that the assessment of taxon threat and conservation continues onto the next stages of conservation planning and implementation?

OUTCOMES: i) The group will produce a set of recommendations that describe the various stages of the Red List assessment process that CPSG can synergistically integrate into the development of a comprehensive summary report of the conservation actions needed, for a multi-species, taxonomic group; ii) the group will also make recommendations on how this information can best be delivered to support governments, and the wider conservation community to plan for and apply the most appropriate conservation actions that will most effective for improving the status of threatened species.

PREPARATION: Participants for this working group (especially those not involved with the IUCN Red List assessment process) are encouraged to have a look at various species assessments already published on the IUCN Red List website (www.iucnredlist.org), to become familiar with the information provided within the assessment fields. Other documents that will be useful to be aware of are the classification schemes for 'threats' and 'conservation actions needed', both available on the IUCN Red List website here:

http://www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/classification-schemes

---

Planning to Act (P2A) on ASAP! species: how do we best support those charged with getting things done?

CONVENORS: Jamie Copsey, Caroline Lees, Nerissa Chao, and Vicki Guthrie

AIM: To identify current barriers to the implementation of species conservation plans. We will explore how we might develop new and improved avenues of support to key individuals charged with responsibility for driving action ('species champions') or for coordinating formal plan implementation. Emphasis will be placed on ASAP! species.

BACKGROUND: CPSGs remit is clearly focused around the processes and tools that enable the development of collaborative species conservation plans. ASAP!'s focus is on catalyzing conservation action for ASAP! species. Both organizations recognize that the development of effective plans can

contribute to species recovery and we want to better understand the links between planning and implementation so that we can hone our planning processes. Individuals assigned responsibility either for driving or coordinating formal plans, play a pivotal role. These individuals may be referred to as 'Species Champions' or as 'Plan Implementation Coordinators' though at present these roles are not well defined or differentiated. These individuals may be more effective in their roles where they have access to particular kinds of support, including further training and provision of other tools. This working group explores what kinds of support might be of value and what roles CPSG and ASAP! might have in providing that support.

PROCESS: We will begin with scene-setting presentations followed by an open discussion on barriers to plan implementation. As a group will agree on draft definitions for a Species Champion (as distinct from a Plan Implementation Coordinator). We will then separate into two working groups:

Working Group 1: Plan Implementation Coordinators role and support needs. This group will develop a profile for an implementation coordinator, identifying the skills and any innate qualities required to carry out the role effectively and what their specific role would be. The group will dig further into some of the obstacles that specifically these coordinators may face in performing their role, and identify avenues through which support can be provided to these people through the CPSG planning process. The group will also review the DRAFT CPSG implementation tracking tool.

Working Group 2: Species Champions role and support needs: This group will define the ideal 'species champion' identifying what skills they will require and any innate qualities that might be required, as well as what their role might be. The group will then look at the broader set of conservation action obstacles faced by species champions, again identifying avenues for providing support to this group. This group will also review the DRAFT ASAP! conservation ladder.

Groups will come back together to present their findings and agree on next steps.

OUTCOMES: As a consequence of the workshop we will have:

- Identified barriers 1) to conservation action in general, and 2) to driving formal conservation plan implementation, with special focus on ASAP! species;
- Differentiated and defined the roles of 'Species Champion' and 'Plan Implementation Coordinator' (recognizing that in some cases the same individual may fill both roles);
- Developed "ideal" profiles for each;
- Produced a list of recommended areas for support to those operating in these roles, given the obstacles identified;
- Reviewed the draft CPSG tracking tool for plan implementation, and solicited feedback;
- Reviewed the ASAP! species plotting tool, and solicited feedback.

Illegal Wildlife Trade as a theme for planning

CONVENORS: Chris Shepherd and Caroline Lees

AIM: The aim of the working group is to explore the question: When planning action for species impacted by illegal wildlife trade, how can we get more benefits to more species?

BACKGROUND: CPSG traditionally supports groups – government agencies, NGOs, other SSC Specialist Groups – to plan the conservation of single species. It is now scaling up its operations and developing new tools to support more planning, for more species. A strand of this new work involves grouping species that can be expected to respond in a similar way, to similar sets of planned conservation actions. One of the ways in which we can group species is by threat, and one of the most challenging threats to wildlife in Southeast Asia (as well as in other regions) is illegal wildlife trade. The workshop will consider two broad themes:

1) Increasing the efficiency of existing work

There are examples of where action taken for high profile species could have made a difference to many other, similarly affected taxa, but where this opportunity was missed. Taxon-focused groups often work in isolation, leading to duplication of effort, wasted resources and missed opportunities. There must be ways to do this better.

Single-species workshops have been held recently for several species affected by illegal trade in Southeast Asia (e.g. Helmeted Hornbills, Sunda and Formosan Pangolins, Sun Bears). Within these workshops, small working groups on illegal trade issues were formed which gave rise to actions which are broadly similar across plans and which provide opportunities for inter-species consolidation and collaboration on actions. Further, there may be other, less well-known species that could "piggy-back" on action taken for those higher-profile taxa and there may be simple, achievable ways of maximizing those opportunities.

2) A threat-focused workshop process

Asian song-birds provide an example of a multi-species planning initiative for illegal trade affected species, which is now moving forward successfully to implementation. There is scope to develop a CPSG workshop process that targets multiple species simultaneously but which looks solely at the threat of illegal trade (rather than attempting to tackle all relevant threats concurrently). This new workshop process could differ from CPSG's standard format in: the types and sources of information gathered and collated in advance of the workshop; the types of stakeholders invited to participate; the boundaries of the system that we aim to influence through planning; the working group topics; the planning outputs; the framework set up to drive plan implementation.

PROCESS: The workshop will begin with 2-3 short, scene-setting presentations (20-30 minutes including questions):

1) Introduction to the issues and what we are trying to achieve
2) Learning from mistakes: case-studies of opportunities missed

Following this the group will:

- Develop a trade-focused "threats map" for a flagship species for which illegal wildlife trade is the major threat. The map will work from poacher through trafficking routes to consumer, including both direct and indirect threats
- Add to this, at pertinent points on the map, broad threat mitigation strategies
- Use this to look at the range of areas in which multiple species could be gathered under the umbrella of a plan for a single-species
- Discuss how this could be made operational in the context of a CPSG planning process.

OUTCOMES: A first step towards a CPSG multi-species planning process centered around a primary threat of illegal wildlife trade.

Wildlife Health as a theme for planning/Disease Risk Assessment

CONVENOR: Boripat Siriaroonrat

AIM: The aims of this working group are to:

1. Raise awareness of how the DRA process is typically applied to single-species planning situations.
2. Identify approaches and tools to facilitate conservation planning for multiple species facing the same disease threat.

BACKGROUND: The SSC mandate to CPSG is to significantly increase capacity and capability in conservation planning, in order to meet the large and growing need for evidence-based plans that feature meaningful actions aimed at mitigating threats to species survival. Increasingly, for many species, both infectious and non-infectious diseases are recognized as either primary or secondary drivers of population decline. Examples include a) the catastrophic decline of several species of Asian vulture due to toxicity associated with eating bovine carcasses treated with the anti-inflammatory drug diclofenac, and b) the continuing spread of the fungal disease chytridiomycosis that is driving amphibian declines around the world.

Additionally, wildlife species are primary reservoirs of some pathogens (e.g. rabies, Nipah virus, West Nile Virus) that cause serious disease in people and domestic animals. Such events can lead to extreme responses including indiscriminate culling of wildlife populations. This may, in turn, result in some unintended consequences such as the further spread of the disease, further threats to rare wildlife species and interruption of important biological cycles such as pollination by bats.

The One Health concept represents a shift in the current dominant approach to wildlife health management from human-centric to eco-centric – a new approach that now recognizes and addresses the interrelationships between the health of people, animals and the ecosystem of which they are a part.

The IUCN Species Survival Commission's Conservation Planning, Wildlife Health, Invasive Species and Reintroduction Specialist Groups joined with the World Animal Health Organization (OIE) to develop an approach incorporating Disease Risk Analysis (DRA) processes founded on the principles of One Health. The result was the publication in 2014 of the Manual of Procedures for Wildlife Disease Risk Analysis, and the companion Guidelines for Wildlife Disease Risk Analysis. Both of these documents are available for free download from the CPSG website: http://www.cpsg.org/document-repository.

PROCESS:

1. A presentation on the use of the IUCN-SSC/OIE Disease Risk Analysis to focus on planning for a single species.
2. Facilitated discussions around the following topics:
    - How would this DRA process be used in a multispecies planning context for, say, vultures in Asia or bats in North America? Would the process be really different? If so, how?
    - What would we need to consider in the design and implementation of such a process?
    - Who would need to be invited to participate?

OUTCOMES:

1. Participants are aware of the IUCN-SSC/OIE DRA process and core requirements for its application to wildlife disease risk assessment and management.
2. Identification of the elements of an approach to conservation planning for disease threats impacting multiple species and processes and tools to assist this.
3. An action plan and implementation group committed to progressing the further exploration and development of the identified processes and tools.

PREPARATION: Download the IUCN-SSC/OIE Manual of Procedures for Wildlife Disease Risk Analysis, available here.

Bring examples of wildlife conservation scenarios you are involved with in which disease has been identified as a significant threat to multiple species. If you have examples of conservation planning approaches to these, whether successful, unsuccessful or in development please bring them along to share.

SCTI Advisory Group Meeting

Highlights of activities – Species Conservation Toolkit Initiative

May 2018 - September 2018

The **Species Conservation Toolkit Initiative** (SCTI) is a partnership to ensure that the new innovations and tools needed for species risk assessment, conservation planning, and managing populations are developed, are globally available, and are used effectively. The initiative leverages expertise in population biology, computer programming, and species conservation planning to: build and support modeling tools that are essential to guiding conservation actions for thousands of threatened species in the wild; facilitate the intensive management of hundreds of species that are being protected within *ex situ* programs; and integrate conservation efforts across the spectrum of management approaches.

New partners!

The Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA) and the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA) have joined SCTI as major sponsors. They value both the SCTI software tools that guide scientific management of the *ex situ* populations and the contribution that a SCTI tools make to conservation and management of species in their natural habitats. We are equally excited that several more partners from Europe, Asia, and USA plan to join SCTI in 2019 (but we can't yet tell you who they are).

Planning for the future

The SCTI team (Jon, Onnie, Bob, Taylor, and Sara) met at the CPSG offices in Minnesota to reaffirm our mission, describe the primary areas of expertise that are needed to meet our goals, identify what roles can be filled by existing SCTI staff and by colleagues at partner organizations (e.g., IUCN CPSG, Species360, and the zoo associations), and determine what additional staffing or partners are needed to fulfill our mission. The primary areas in which SCTI needs to have access to expertise either on staff or via partnerships are the development of the science of species conservation methods, software coding, training and user support, and assisting in the use of the software to improve species conservation planning. It might be tempting to see SCTI as primarily a "coding shop". However, SCTI was formed to

sustain innovation in species conservation tools, and that means that we need also to be developing the science so that we can identify the next tools. To meet this mission, SCTI also needs to make sure that practitioners can use the software and use it appropriately, and that means that we need to provide adequate documentation, training, and support. In order to understand and serve the needs of the conservationists and managers who use our tools, SCTI needs to work collaboratively with them – especially on analyses that push the limits of our current knowledge and technologies. To enable our small team to be effective, we also need support for office management and communications and for organizational leadership and oversight.

Although we can and will rely heavily on collaborative partners to help fill some of the roles above, we recognize that currently the SCTI team is too small (with one conservation scientist programmer, one leader of our training efforts, and some donated time of two senior conservation scientists) to keep advancing and supporting the innovations that are needed by the species conservation communities. Minimally, we need to start developing technical expertise and experience in species conservation planning in a second conservation scientist-programmer, we need a person both to lead communications with our diverse audiences and to assist with creating training materials, and we need to develop more formal relationships and commitments for collaborative work from partner organizations that share our mission.

Building the capacity of SCTI to serve the conservation community

Due to the support of all the SCTI partners, we are now able to address at least one of the needs identified above: We have begun a search for a second full-time postdoctoral level conservation scientist-programmer! We know that we are looking for someone with special talents, but we are optimistic that we can find the right person to fill the position before the end of 2018.

Strategic thinking

The creation of SCTI was a bold initiative that was hatched out of discussions at CPSG (then, CBSG) meetings. We had optimism that the communities in which we work would being willing to form a partnership to support a small and flexible think-tank to sustain and grow innovation that serves the broader species conservation needs. We are now approaching the end of the first three years of the Initiative, and we need to determine how we can best serve the needs for the next three years and beyond. We need to make use of the expertise in our partners and our Advisory Group to help us think creatively about how to meet our broad mission.

Accordingly, we are planning to have a strategic thinking meeting with primary partners and advisors. We will be conveying more information about these plans soon, but we are thinking about a 2 to 3 day meeting, with an external facilitator, probably sometime in early 2019.

Advisory Group

SCTI benefits from an Advisory Group comprised of both representatives of major organizational partners of SCTI (a number of zoos, zoo associations, and conservation NGOs) and experts in the

application of our tools for species conservation. The SCTI Advisory Group provides strategic advice on our mission and scope, broad priorities for tool development and support, scientific advances, technological opportunities, and new innovations that are needed to address increasingly complex conservation challenges. To provide diverse perspective and expertise on the Advisory Group, we have recently worked to recruit additional experts – from more scientific disciplines, more countries, and more kinds of institutions.

The Advisory Group had its first meeting in Berlin in October 2017, and will meet next at the CPSG annual conference in Bangkok in October 2018. The group will have a 3-hour working meeting during the CPSG conference. We are also organizing a mini-symposium for a CPSG plenary session in which several SCTI partners and colleagues will describe exciting and innovative methods that they are applying to species conservation planning.

Ensuring success for the next generation

A primary reason for the creation of SCTI was that we cannot rely on the same people forever to deliver the tools we need to succeed in species conservation and population management. We need to recruit the next generation of conservation scientists to serve our communities. SCTI is well on the way to doing just that, and perhaps just in time! We are fortunate that Jon Ballou – even a few years after his retirement from the Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute – continues to devote substantial hours each week to work with the SCTI team on envisioning and building valuable tools. Bob Lacy has recently announced that he will be retiring from his position at the Chicago Zoological Society (CZS) in early 2019. However, Bob too will continue working with SCTI (following in Jon's footsteps, as always!). Moreover, CZS is committed to continuing its leadership in population biology and species conservation methods, and has begun a search for a Conservation Scientist with expertise in population biology and an eagerness to work with SCTI.

A manual for Outbreak

For several years, the OUTBREAK software has provided the means to model the spread (and control) of infectious disease in wildlife populations. The model can be linked with Population Viability Analysis models (such as VORTEX) to enable consideration of disease in species risk assessments and population management. However, although the program was intuitive enough that a number of scientists and students picked it up and have used it effectively (especially in Australia and Brazil), wider use of the software has been hindered by the lack of a complete manual.

Thanks to the efforts of Carlo Pacioni of Australia, Sara Sullivan of SCTI, Caroline Lees and Phil Miller of CPSG, Bob Lacy of CZS, and others (and some funding from the US National Science Foundation), we have now released the first complete manual for OUTBREAK! The manual is available on-line, is included in the latest installation of the program, and has been integrated into the software as context-sensitive Help.

Software enhancements

We continually make refinements in all of our software tools. These include improvements to the user interfaces, adjustments to algorithms for handling unusual species and data, and changes to keep current with evolving operating systems and network implementations.

Among the recent enhancements to PMx is a completely revised Selection tab in PMx, allowing much easier identification of which animals are to be included in genetic and demographic calculations. The Demography section has been steadily enhanced, with new metrics for reporting the status of the populations and completeness the data.

To Outbreak, we added the ability to describe any input rates (such as disease transmission rates and recovery times) as functions of individual and population properties, rather than only as constant values. In Vortex, improvements were made in the ways that management of captive populations can be modeled, and to the graphical analyses of sensitivity tests of uncertain parameters.

Building capacity to use the tools

At the request of the Canadian government (and with funding from them), we taught a workshop, hosted by the Seattle Zoo, on advanced uses of VORTEX. The Canadian government and several NGOs are eager to have their scientists become experts in VORTEX, so that the agencies can assess the cumulative impacts of anthropogenic threats to species and test proposed management actions.

Earlier this year, SCTI began to develop online training materials for Outbreak and PMx. Among the first products of this effort are a series of introductory videos on the OUTBREAK software, first trialed at a Disease Risk Assessment workshop in Brazil and now available at http://www.vortex10.org/Outbreak.aspx. To determine priority training needs for PMx, we distributed a Training Needs Assessment on our website and various international listservs in March 2018. Over 130 PMx users from 23 countries responded, giving us a better understanding of where additional training is most needed and in what format our users are interested in receiving that training. Currently, three online formats are being tested, and PMx users are welcome to view these materials and leave feedback using the following links:

- Short, interactive module: Creating a PMx Project with ZIMS export files
- Comprehensive overview course: The Genetics Module
- Narrated video: Who is in the Managed N?

To distribute our training materials, we are developing a dedicated training section of our website. Here, toolkit users will be able to access materials through personal accounts, track their activity through user profiles, and interact with other users in dynamic forums. Additionally, the SCTI team will be able to gain insight into learning behaviors and pinpoint areas for improvement by tracking metrics related to completion rates, learner performance, and learner satisfaction. As these e-learning materials take time to design, build, and evaluate, we will also provide quick pdf-based technical guides and make updates to the user manuals as needed. Most recently, we partnered with Species360 to produce an online guide for testing ZIMS PMx exports. This pdf is available for download using the “Walk Me” tool on the Species360 website. We will continue to collaborate with partners providing their own online or in

person training related to our tools and provide daily technical assistance to queries sent to help@vortex10.org.

Working with partners

The SCTI team met with the science team of Species360 to share new developments and discuss possible areas of collaboration. We are working closely with Species360 to ensure full compatibility and exchange of data between ZIMS and PMx. In the process, this has led to a number of enhancements to both PMx and ZIMS for Studbooks, and we are now working with Species360 to export additional data fields from ZIMS to PMx.

We continue to help regional zoo associations with the new exports of data from ZIMS to PMx. Documentation of data standards and guides were created to help user groups confirm the accuracy of data exports.

We are continuing to work with a group of botanical gardens to test the use of PMx and population management methods developed by zoos for guiding collaborative breeding programs for plants. We hosted a workshop for colleagues from 6 botanic gardens on the use of PMx for plant population management. This project has led us to improve how PMx handles hermaphroditic (monoecious) species – an enhancement that will likely be useful for management of some fish and many invertebrate animal species as well.

SCTI provides expert advice (and sometimes debugging, as needed) to CPSG as it applies the latest features in Vortex to some of the most complex species risk assessments. When time permits, technical assistance is provided also to graduate students, researchers, wildlife agencies, zoos and aquariums, and others.

Go to scti.tools!

A new SCTI website is about to be unveiled. (It is still in development as of 1 October.) The site provides much more information about SCTI, downloads of software and documentation, and more. It will soon provide access to on-line training modules and videos, and forums for supporting communities of users.

Some of our plans for the next few months

SCTI is flexible and responsive. We are constantly refining software and increasing support, and adding new features and even new programs, as suggestions, new ideas, and new science are identified by our team, our partners, or the broader conservation community. Among the developments underway, and which we expect to release within the next few months, are:

SCTI is participating in the annual conferences of EAZA, AZA, and CPSG to meet with partners and users of the SCTI tools.

A training workshop on the OUTBREAK software will be conducted in conjunction with the EAZVW/AAZV/IZW joint conference, held in Prague.

We will be completely revising the PMx manual, especially to describe the many newer features.

The SCTI Team

Jonathan Ballou

Onnie Byers

Taylor Callicrate

Robert Lacy

Sara Sullivan

SCTI Partners (as of August 2018)

Association of Zoos and Aquariums

Auckland Zoo

Chicago Zoological Society

Copenhagen Zoo

European Association of Zoos and Aquaria

Living Desert Zoo & Gardens

National Zoo/Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute

Oceans Initiative

Raincoast Conservation Foundation

Saint Louis Zoo

San Diego Zoo Global

San Francisco Zoo & Gardens

Seattle Aquarium

SOS Rhino

Species360

IUCN SSC Conservation Planning Specialist Group

Zoological Society of London

Contract support for specific projects:

Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans

The Nature Conservancy

US Institute of Museum & Library Services

US National Science Foundation

Investigating patterns of international wildlife trade in ASAP species

CONVENORS: Johanna Stärk, Chris Shepherd, Rita da Silva, Ioanna Alexiadou, and Dalia A. Conde

AIM: Investigate and discuss patterns of international trade in ASAP species to unveil fraudulent claims of captive-breeding.

BACKGROUND: Unsustainable and illegal wildlife trade is one of the major challenges of South East Asia (SEA) and its rapid growth is threatening many CITES-listed species. An analysis of the CITES Trade database showed that over 35 million CITES listed animals have been exported from SEA between 1998 to 2007, with 4.5 million derived from captive-breeding facilities [1]. While trade in captive bred individuals can relieve pressure on wild populations, the high number of transactions of specimens claimed to be captive-bred raise concerns about the potential illegal laundering of wild caught animals declared as produced in captivity [2]. Successful breeding of threatened species on a commercial scale requires extensive knowledge in captive husbandry, good record keeping, and high standards of veterinary care. Moreover, establishing captive breeding populations capable of producing second-generation offspring takes considerable time and effort.

This is especially the case for species with slow life histories, i.e. species that mature late and produce few offspring, as for example the case in many turtles and tortoises; hence making captive-breeding unprofitable [3]. For example, the Critically Endangered Palawan Forest Turtle (Siebenrockiella leytensis) listed on CITES Appendix II, has been commercialized as captive bred, however this is unlikely, since up until 2015 it had never successfully reproduced in captivity [4]. The Palawan Forest Turtle is only one of currently 176 species in South East Asia that have been prioritized by the IUCN SSC's Asian Species Action Partnership (ASAP) focusing on critically endangered land or freshwater vertebrates occurring regularly in the region. Of these, 39 species are species listed on CITES Appendix I and 29 species are listed on Appendix II [5]. A major challenge for many countries to meet the requirements for trade in CITES-listed species to control the illegal laundering include corruption, weak law enforcement, insufficient capacity of the authorities and lack of knowledge on species captive breeding potential. In this workshop, we will work with data from the CITES Trade database to discuss and identify ASAP

species at highest risk of unsustainable trade and identify species that may be illegally laundered as captive-bred to support authorities in their fight against illegal trade.

PROCESS:

1. General presentation of trade analytics of ASAP species and the CITES Trade database
2. Division into smaller working groups divided by taxa to discuss trade patterns, identify possible fraudulent claims of captive breeding and to prioritize ASAP species at highest risk of unsustainable or fraudulent trade
3. Presentation of main findings and discussion of follow up actions

RECOMMENDED READING:

Relevant definitions of CITES source codes: Captive breeding and ranching of CITES-listed animals: EU approaches to handling imports of C, F, and R specimens
http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetailDoc&id=33543&no=40

An example of how to identify illegal laundering based on the species reproductive potential:
Nijman, V. and Shepherd, C.R. (2015). Adding up the numbers: an investigation into commercial breeding of Tokay Geckos in Indonesia. TRAFFIC.
https://www.traffic.org/site/assets/files/6060/adding-up-the-numbers.pdf

REFERENCES:

[1] Nijman, V. (2010). An overview of international wildlife trade from Southeast Asia. Biodiversity and conservation, 19(4), 1101-1114.

[2] Nijman, V., and Shepherd, C. (2009). Wildlife trade from ASEAN to the EU: Issues with the trade in captive-bred reptiles from Indonesia. TRAFFIC Europe Report for the European Commission, Brussels, Belgium. Available at: https://www.traffic.org/site/assets/files/9837/issues-with-the-trade-in-captive-bred-reptiles-from-indonesia.pdf

[3] Iverson, J. (1992). Correlates of Reproductive Output in Turtles (Order Testudines). Herpetological Monographs, 6, 25-42. doi:10.2307/1466960

[4] https://www.traffic.org/news/captive-breeding-claims-turned-turtle/

[5] CITES Appendices I, II, III https://cites.org/eng/app/appendices.php

Ex situ management of ASAP species

CONVENORS: Sonja Luz, Danny de Man, Kathy Traylor-Holzer, and Roopali Raghavan

AIM: The aim of this working group is to discuss the Ex-Situ needs for ASAP species and the potential requirement for a more pro-active strategy for Ex-Situ management approaches.

BACKGROUND: Integrated and professionally managed Ex-Situ programs of threatened species can substantially support conservation efforts, and many notable examples exist in which Ex-Situ facilities like Zoos have helped to save species from extinction. With that there is no longer the need to discuss what roles Zoos and Aquaria can play in conservation, but rather when should such programs be considered (especially for species on the brink of extinction) and who is in the best position to do so. While comprehensive guidelines have been developed (e.g. IUCN guidelines on the use of Ex-Situ management for species conservation) to help evaluate Ex-Situ involvement, it seems we are still struggling greatly to reach agreement among relevant stakeholders and with that are often far too late in implementing such programs.

For the 175 Critically Endangered ASAP species an Ex-Situ Working Group was established, which is currently trying to better understand needs, opportunities and constraints for Ex-Situ management of ASAP species specifically.

PROCESS: The CPSG working group will be introduced to the ASAP Ex-Situ working group and receive a preliminary overview of the status of current Ex-Situ management of ASAP species. For that purpose, and to our best knowledge, ASAP species have been sorted into 3 categories:

1. None currently kept in captivity
2. Currently kept in captivity, but not clear to how well they are integrated in conservation programs/action plans
3. Currently kept in captivity, with Ex-Situ programs seemingly well integrated into conservation programs/action plans.

Furthermore, the participants will receive a brief introduction to the existing evaluation tools (e.g. IUCN Ex-Situ Guidelines and ICAP process).

Following that, we hope that specific issues and questions will be discussed:

- Are the existing tools to evaluate Ex-Situ needs of species properly used and understood, and is there a need for more specific guidelines or even protocols?
- Who should/can make the recommendation/decision on when to start Ex-Situ programs and what info is (i) necessary or (ii) highly desirable before this decision is made?
- How do we ensure that captive management programs are ethical, legal and sustainable, as well as properly integrated in In-Situ conservation of the species?

- When and where should such programs be initiated, what is the role of western zoos and how do we build appropriate capacity managing Ex-situ programs for ASAP species in range countries?

OUTCOMES: We hope that the discussions of this working group will help us improve existing programs as well as aid in prioritizing needs for Ex-Situ management programs of ASAP species. We furthermore hope to get more insights from both In-Situ and Ex-Situ stakeholders on how to optimize processes leading to a successful One Plan Approach conservation outcome.

PREPARATION: Please review the following documents:

IUCN SSC Ex Situ Guidelines

Building Global Capacity for Species Conservation Planning

Supporting the implementation of CPSG's Strategic Plan

CONVENORS: Jo Gipps and Brad Andrews

AIM: To consider ways in which the CPSG community can support the implementation of CPSG's Strategic Plan 2018-2020, particularly through securing additional funding.

BACKGROUND: The core of CPSG's Strategic Plan (the five Strategic Goals) was drafted by CPSG staff, following a meeting and workshop in Minneapolis in April 2017, and was discussed at the CPSG Annual Meeting 2017 in Berlin. Other sections of the Plan (Mission, Approach and Challenge; Introduction and Context; Governance; Finance; Fundraising) have been added subsequently. Two Fundraising Case for Support documents have also been drafted.

PROCESS: We shall quickly review the Strategic Plan, without attempting further editing. We will then review the Fundraising Case for Support documents (both the 1 page and the 12 page booklet versions, (see links below) to assess their viability, discuss appropriate audiences, and determine what, if any, additional tools may be required to assist the fundraising effort. We shall consider any major ideas, suggestions, concerns, or additions that emerge from our discussions. Some questions we will review are:

- How can CPSG best target its existing funder base while at the same time develop a new funder base to support delivery of the strategic plan?
- What potential partnerships exist for CPSG to strengthen its 'case for support'?
- Are there institutions out there that would commit significant and consistent staff time to help CPSG scale up its planning and capacity building for planning work?

OUTCOMES: Improvements in structure, reach and utility of all the work needed to deliver the Strategic Plan successfully.

PREPARATION: Please review the following documents:

Conservation Pivot Points: Building Global Capacity for Species Conservation Planning

Building Global Capacity for Species Conservation Planning