

Risks to conservation of species in the wild from promoting ex situ management: Response to
Farhadinia et al. 2020

Leili Khalatbari^{1,2*}, Helen M. K. O'Neill³, Stéphane Ostrowski⁴, Gholam Hosein Yusefi¹,
Arash Ghoddousi⁵, Hamed Abolghasemi⁶, Christine Breitenmoser-Würsten⁷, Urs
Breitenmoser^{7,8}, José Carlos Brito^{1,2}, Sarah M. Durant^{4,9}.

1 - CIBIO/InBIO, Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos da
Universidade do Porto, R. Padre Armando Quintas, 4485-661 Vairão, Portugal.

2 - Departamento de Biologia da Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade do Porto, Rua
Campo Alegre, 4169-007 Porto, Portugal.

3 - Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology, School of Anthropology and Conservation,
University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent, CT2 7NR, UK

4 - Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), 2300 Southern Blvd, The Bronx, NY 10460, USA

5 - Geography Department, Humboldt-University of Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099,
Berlin, Germany.

6 - Freelance conservationist, No.1, Alley 25, Heydarpour st., Motahari blvd., 7718936846
Rafsanjan, Kerman, Iran.

7 - IUCN/SSC Cat Specialist Group, c/o KORA, 3074 Muri, Switzerland.

8 - Center of Fish and Wildlife Health, University of Bern, Laenggassstrasse 122, CH-3012
Bern, Switzerland.

9 - Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, Regent's Park, London NW1 4RY,
UK.

*Address for correspondence: CIBIO/InBIO, email leili.khalatbari@cibio.up.pt CIBIO/InBIO

Article Impact Statement:

Maintaining in situ populations is a conservation priority and captive management should be implemented with caution.

Running Head:

In situ conservation

Introduction

Conservation of endangered species may include establishing ex situ populations to provide insurance against extinction in the wild. Farhadinia et al. (2020) looked at the use of ex situ management for 43 species/taxa (18 species, 23 subspecies, and 2 subpopulations) of mammalian megafauna and found that approximately one-third of these taxa currently have no ex situ populations and 23% have ex situ populations that are not currently viable. They argue that bringing these species, particularly those found in “politically unstable” regions, into captivity “should be considered more rigorously.”

Although we agree that in certain cases, ex situ management can provide an important safety net to prevent species extinctions, it is not a panacea. Negative conservation impacts may arise throughout the establishment of ex situ populations, and species-specific biological factors influence whether ex situ management (and ultimately reintroduction or reinforcement) is appropriate. Although these considerations should be central to decisions about initiating ex situ management, Farhadinia et al. disregarded them. We rectify this gap and elucidate the problems that may arise during the establishment, management, and release of ex situ populations.

Initiating captive populations

Of the 43 taxa/species included in Farhadinia et al., 15 taxa were identified as having no ex situ management and 10 others were identified as having ex situ populations too small to avoid risks of inbreeding depression. Consequently, effective ex situ management of these 25 taxa would require individuals to be captured from wild populations. Farhadinia et al. used an effective population size of >50 individuals to indicate a viable population, without considering the difference between actual population size (N) and effective population size (N_e) in captive populations. The average ratio of $N:N_e$ is 0.26 (max 0.7) (Lees & Wilcken

2009) thus an ex situ population would need an N of 70 – 190 individuals to achieve an N_e of 50 and to be considered viable. Therefore, at least 5 additional taxa do not currently have sustainable captive populations. For half of these 30 taxa, creating a sustainable ex situ population would require capturing 50-100% of their wild population. When wild populations are very small, as is the case for many critically endangered (CR) taxa, they are vulnerable to stochastic events and inbreeding depression. Therefore, removing enough individuals from these populations to avoid inbreeding in ex situ populations poses an additional threat to their survival in the wild, and in the case of some CR taxa, would make them extinct in the wild, as was the case for red wolf (*Canis rufus*) (Hinton et al. 2017).

The practicality of establishing effective ex situ populations in politically unstable regions is another key concern. Ex situ management is substantially more expensive than in situ management (Balmford et al. 1995), and many countries have insufficient resources to effectively manage and maintain captive populations, especially during armed conflicts during which local resources and foreign aid are likely to be diverted elsewhere. Moving endangered species to other countries can be appropriate and effective when undertaken in collaboration with range governments and wildlife authorities. However, amidst political turmoil or periods of unrest, these agencies are likely to be stretched in their capacity to adequately engage with these initiatives; removing biodiversity under such circumstances may raise legitimate allegations of exploitation and neocolonialism (Hayward et al. 2018).

Maintaining a captive population

Ex situ management is extremely complex; species often have complicated husbandry requirements for survival, health, and reproduction. These requirements are usually identified over many years of experience in captive management, often through trial and error. For example, although all female cheetahs (*Acinonyx jubatus*) breed in the wild (Laurenson et al.

1992), a substantial proportion do not successfully breed in captivity, even when kept in optimal conditions (Wachter et al. 2011). Thus, ex situ management is unlikely to serve as comprehensive insurance for 2 CR subspecies of cheetah (*A. j. hecki* and *A. j. venaticus*), particularly because moving individuals into captivity reduces their effective population size and further threatens their viability in the wild.

Difficulties in providing appropriate conditions to foster natural behavior and reproduction in captivity hinders the maintenance of genetic diversity. Moving large mammals between institutions for breeding has welfare implications and is very expensive, and there is no guarantee of successful reproduction. Assisted reproduction is becoming more widely used, but it is an invasive, expensive procedure that is, for many endangered species, untested and experimental (Weise et al. 2014).

Reintroduction or reinforcement

The ultimate objective of ex situ conservation should be reintroduction or reinforcement of wild populations; however, preparing animals for release is a complicated process, particularly for species, such as large carnivores, that rely on complex and learned behaviors to survive in the wild. Young predators learn many of their skills from their mothers. Although some hunting-related behaviors may be innate, predator and human-avoidance behaviors are usually learned (e.g., in cheetahs; Durant 2000), yet they have a direct impact on the likelihood of an animal surviving after release (Tetzlaff et al. 2019). Training animals to hunt and forage effectively in a captive setting is difficult, time-consuming, and expensive, and there is no guarantee of success. In addition, reintroductions ultimately depend on the timely cooperation of ex situ institutions making their, often valuable, captive populations available for release into the wild, which is not always guaranteed.

Finding suitable areas for release is also challenging, particularly when concurrent in situ conservation efforts are absent or limited, because the original threats to the species may persist. Reinforcing extant populations with captive individuals will put additional pressure on available resources and may result in intraspecific competition (Hayward et al. 2007), exacerbate human-wildlife conflict, and erode potential goodwill (Qin et al. 2015). Equally, if the species has been extirpated at reintroduction sites, then local human populations may have lost coping mechanisms for living alongside the species, which may lead to human-wildlife conflict (Linnell & Cretois 2018).

Additional considerations

Several inconsistencies in the approach used by Farhadinia et al. are cause for concern. Most importantly, their “43 critically endangered species” included some subspecies, but not others (e.g., all subspecies of *Gorilla beringei* and *Gorilla gorilla* were included but not all subspecies of *Pongo pygmaeus*). Two subpopulations that are not recognized as subspecies (West African subpopulations of the African wild dog [*Lycaon pictus*] and the African lion [*Panthera leo*]) were also included. These inconsistencies have a substantial impact on their results, depending on which definition of species and subspecies is used (Table 1 & Appendix S1).

The existence of armed conflict in a species range was suggested as a reason for implementing ex situ management. However, as they acknowledge, periods of conflict do not inevitably lead to conservation harm (Collar et al. 2017). Using conflicts to justify diverting funding from in situ conservation towards ex situ management is inappropriate. Likewise, Farhadinia et al. claim that border zones can compromise conservation, but there is no justification given for this generalization. For 15 taxa, having transboundary ranges was the sole indicator of political instability (Table 1), but no evidence was provided showing they

are at greater risk because of this. Ex situ populations are also susceptible to political instability; captive animals are sometimes mistreated or killed (Kinder, 2013).

Conclusion

Farhadinia et al. suggest using “ex situ management as an insurance against extinction,” but insurance does not always pay out. For example, the northern white rhinoceros (*Ceratotherium simum cottoni*) is effectively extinct in the wild despite years of intensive ex situ management that cost substantial amounts of money (Gibbens 2018).

Although we agree that ex situ management can be an important aspect of species conservation, which has been effective for certain species, its use should be considered on a species-by-species basis and incorporate biological, ecological, and socioeconomic information rather than broad-stroke generalizations based on threat levels and inferences about range-country governance. The difficulties associated with ex situ management and reintroduction and reinforcement discussed here are not exhaustive; multiple species-specific issues affect different taxa. Such difficulties may explain why very few of these species have been the subject of successful releases.

Ex situ management is resource intensive and often depletes limited in situ resources and efforts, with no guarantee of success, particularly for species with complex behaviors or threats. Where sufficient species-specific data are available, robust decision trees, based on input from a range of stakeholders and experts, can be useful tools for determining whether ex situ management may be appropriate (e.g., Canessa et al. 2016). The 5-step process proposed by International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Species Survival Commission (SSC) (IUCN SSC 2014) provides best practice guidelines on when ex situ management is likely to successfully augment conservation efforts, but mammalian

megafauna (especially large carnivores) often do not meet these conditions due to their intrinsic characteristics.

Generalized endorsement of ex situ management as an insurance against the extinction of megafauna, in the absence of more pragmatic recommendations, risks being an expensive and dangerous distraction from addressing the real threats to many species in the wild. We, therefore, argue that in situ conservation should remain the primary focus of species conservation and that ex situ management as a tool to recover a species should only be initiated as a last resort after using IUCN SSC best practice guidelines.

Acknowledgments

L.K., G.H.Y. and J.C.B. were supported by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (PD/BD/132429/2017, PD/BD/52605/2014, CEECINST/00014/2018/CP1512/CT0001). A.G. appreciates the financial support by the German Research Foundation (DFG; PArCS project #409732304). We thank J. Ewen for providing constructive comments.

Supporting Information

Additional information is available online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the online article. Authors are solely responsible for the content and functionality of these materials. Queries (other than absence of the material) should be directed to the corresponding author.

Literature Cited

Balmford A, Leader-Williams N, Green MJB. 1995. Parks or arks: where to conserve threatened mammals? *Biodiversity and Conservation* **4**: 595-607

- Canessa S, Converse SJ, West M, Clemann N, Gillespie G, McFadden M, Silla AJ, Parris KM, McCarthy MA. 2016. Planning for ex situ conservation in the face of uncertainty. *Conservation Biology* **30**:599–609.
- Collar NJ et al. 2017. Averting the extinction of bustards in Asia. *Forktail* **33**:1–26.
- Durant SM. 2000. Predator avoidance, breeding experience and reproductive success in endangered cheetahs, *Acinonyx jubatus*. *Animal Behaviour* **60**:121–130.
- Farhadinia MS, Johnson PJ, Zimmermann A, McGowan PJK, Meijaard E, Stanley-Price M, Macdonald DW. 2020. Ex situ management as insurance against extinction of mammalian megafauna in an uncertain world. *Conservation Biology* DOI:cobi.13496.
- Gibbens S. 2018. After last male's death, is the northern white rhino doomed? National Geographic, Washington, D.C. Available from <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/news/2018/03/northern-white-rhino-male-sudan-death-extinction-spd/> (accessed July 2020)
- Hayward MW, Ripple WJ, Kerley GIH, Landman M, Plotz RD, Garnett ST. 2018. Neocolonial conservation: is moving Rhinos to Australia conservation or intellectual property loss. *Conservation Letters* **11**: 1-7
- Hayward MW et al. 2007. Practical considerations for the reintroduction of large, terrestrial, mammalian predators based on reintroductions to South Africa's Eastern Cape Province. *The Open Conservation Biology Journal* **1**:1–11.
- Hinton JW, Brzeski KE, Rabon DR, Chamberlain MJ. 2017. Effects of anthropogenic mortality on Critically Endangered red wolf *Canis rufus* breeding pairs: implications for red wolf recovery. *Oryx* **51**:174–181.
- IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) SSC (Species Survival Commission). 2014. Guidelines on the use of ex situ management for species conservation. Version 2.0. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland

- Kinder JM. 2013. Zoo animals and modern war: Captive casualties, patriotic citizens, and good soldiers. Pages 45–75 in Hediger R, editor. *Animals and War: Studies of Europe and North America*. Brill, Leiden.
- Laurenson MK, Caro T, Borner M. 1992. Female cheetah reproduction. *National Geographic Research and Exploration* **8**:64–75.
- Lees CM, Wilcken J. 2009. Sustaining the ark: the challenges faced by zoos in maintaining viable populations. *International Zoo Yearbook* **43**:6–18.
- Linnell JD, Cretois B. 2018. Research for AGRI committee-The revival of wolves and other large predators and its impact on farmers and their livelihood in rural regions of Europe. European Parliament, Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies, Brussels.
- Qin Y, Nyhus PJ, Larson CL, Carroll CJW, Muntifering J, Dahmer TD, Jun L, Tilson RL. 2015. An assessment of South China tiger reintroduction potential in Hupingshan and Houhe National Nature Reserves, China. *Biological Conservation* **182**:72–86.
- Tetzlaff SJ, Sperry JH, DeGregorio BA. 2019. Effects of antipredator training, environmental enrichment, and soft release on wildlife translocations: a review and meta-analysis. *Biological Conservation* **236**:324–331.
- Wachter B, Thalwitzer S, Hofer H, Lonzer J, Hildebrandt TB, Hermes R. 2011. Reproductive history and absence of predators are important determinants of reproductive fitness: the cheetah controversy revisited. *Conservation Letters* **4**:47–54.
- Weise FJ, Stratford KJ, van Vuuren RJ. 2014. Financial costs of large carnivore translocations – accounting for conservation. *PLoS ONE* **9**(8): e105042.

Tables

Table 1. Differences in the variables evaluated by Farhadinia et al. (2020) against three alternative approaches of defining the subspecies and species taxonomic status of the taxa under evaluation and alternative definitions^a.

Variable	Farhadinia et al. 2020 (includes some recognized ssp ^b , but not all, and subpopulations of unrecognized ssp)	Alternative 1 (recognized ssp used where possible; if no IUCN ^c Red List entry for ssp, then parent species red-list category is used)	Alternative 2 (recognized ssp used where possible; if no IUCN Red List entry for the ssp, then it is inferred from information on the parent species in the red list)	Alternative 3 (excludes all ssp; only the IUCN Red List entry for parent species is used)
Number of taxa	43	38	42	21
Number of range countries	54	49	55	32
Number of taxa with total in situ population <250	24	20	22	8

Number of taxa with total in situ population >1000	8	9	9	7
Taxa with decreasing population (%)	86.05	86.84	80.95	90.48
Taxa with ranges that cross national boundaries (%)	48.84	42.11	38.1	38.1
Taxa with armed conflict in range (%)	30.23	28.95	28.57	28.57
Number of taxa with no ex situ population – international	23	19	21	9
Number of taxa with no ex situ population – national	15	12	13	6

Taxa with no ex situ and ranges crossing international boundaries & conflict zones (%)	73.33	66.67	75	57.14
Taxa with no ex situ and ranges crossing conflict zones (%)	26.67	25	33.33	14.29

^a Detailed data for the alternatives are in Appendix S1

^bSubspecies,

^cInternational Union for Conservation of Nature.