## Factors predicting the outcome of targeted conservation interventions

Cas	se study number:	
Scie	entific name:	
Cor	mmon name(s):	
RE	SPONSE VARIABLES	
Οve	erview of recovery programme and	d species status:
•••••		
Por	oulation trend – has the population	n increased/decreased/stabilised from its lowest point at the
-	ginning of the recovery programm	·
1.	Extinct	
2.	Population decline continuing	
3.	Population decline halted	
4.	Population recovery	
5.	Unknown	
OR		
1.	Declining/Extinct	
2.	Stable/Increasing	
3.	Unknown	
<u>Cor</u>	nservation reliance	
1.	Captive managed	
2.	Intensively managed	
3.	Lightly managed	
4.	Conservation dependent	
5	Self-custaining	П

## **PREDICTOR VARIABLES**

Biology/ecology

1.	Order:
2.	Body Mass:
3.	Litter size:
4.	Interbirth Interval:
5.	Habitat type:
	Forest
	Other info:
<u>Geo</u>	-political environment
6.	WWF biogeographic realm:
	Nearctic       □       Palearctic       □       Afrotropic       □       Indomalaya       □         Australasia       □       Neotropic       □       Oceania       □       Antarctic       □

7.	Human development index:	
8.	Human footprint:	
9.	Corruption index:	
Thre	<u>eats</u>	
10.	What are the primary threats to the species?:	
	Residential & commercial development Agriculture & aquaculture Energy production & mining Transportation and service corridors Biological resource use Human intrusions & disturbance Natural system modifications Invasive & other problematic species, genes & diseases Pollution Geological events Climate change & severe weather Other options  Other info:	
11.	Do the ultimate threats originate from within or outside t	the species' range?
	Closed system (within) □	
	Open system (outside) □	

12.	2. Have the primary threats been substantially reduced or reversed?					ed?	
	All $\square$	Mos	t 🗆	Some		None □	
13.	Have any of the	prima	ary threats e	scalated	during th	e course of	the recovery programme?
	Substantial esca	lation		Modera	ate escalat	tion 🗆	No escalation $\square$
14.	Have novel three course of the rec		-		ature of th	e primary t	hreat changed during the
	Yes □	No					
15.	Is the lack of go	od qu	ality suitable	e habitat	:/range a l	known limit	ation to recovery?
	Yes □	No					
16.	Is small populati	ion siz	ze/inbreeding	g a knov	vn or prob	able limitat	ion to recovery?
	Yes □	No		Unknov	wn 🗆		
17.	Level of legal pro	otecti	on the speci	es has w	vithin rang	e states?	
	Full protection		П				
	Partial protection	า					
	No protection	•					
	no protection						

18. Level of legal protection of the species' habitat across range states?

	Full protection		
	Partial protection		
	No protection		
19.	Level of law enforce	ment for protection of species a	nd/or its habitat:
	Effective enforceme	nt across its range	
	Effective enforceme	nt in PAs only	
	Partial enforcement	across range	
	Partial enforcement	in PAs only	
	Ineffective/weak en	forcement across its range	
20.	Population size at be	eginning of intervention:	
21.	Magnitude/rate of d	ecline at beginning of intervention	on:

22. Level of confidence in available field data on status of the population prior to recovery programme?

	High confidence	
	Reasonable confidence	
	Low confidence	
	No confidence/status unknown	
23.	Number of scientific publications a	vailable for the species:
	a) BEFORE start of recovery pro	ogramme?
	b) AFTER start of recovery prog	gramme?
24.	Is there an action/management pla	an for the species?
	Yes □ No □	
25.	What was the time between forma commencement of key manageme	Il recognition of the need for a recovery programme and nt activities?
26.	What are the conservation actions	that form a core component of the recovery programme?
	Invasive action to target species	
	Ex-situ captive breeding In situ population recovery	
	Translocation	
	Disease management	
	Non-invasive action to target speci	
	Habitat protection/management/re Invasive species management	ecovery
	Law enforcement/anti-poaching	# III I
	Community engagement/education Compensation payments	n/livelinoods
	Ecological research	
27.	Were there any analogous recover	y programmes based on a similar species or using similar
-· •	techniques to this recovery program	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	Yes □ No □	

<u>Stal</u>	keholders and management					
28.	Number of national level organisations	with key role in project				
	National/federal government agency					
	Regional/state administration agency					
	NGO					
	Zoo					
	Academic institution					
	Private company					
	Other					
29.	Number of international level organisations with key role in project					
	National/federal government agency					
	NGO					
	Zoo					
	Academic institution					
	Private company					
	Other					
30.	Maximum number of people employed on recovery project at any time during the project's history?					
31.	What is the overall management structure of the recovery programme?					
	Formal recovery team led by e.g. government					
	Formal collaborative recovery team/working group with no leadership					
	Informal collaboration between stakeholders □  Little/no collaboration between stakeholders □					

vel of agreement on key actions between primary stakeholders? eneral agreement   Partial agreement   Weak agreement	
eneral agreement □ Partial agreement □ Weak agreement	
	ıt 🗆
evel of political support for recovery programme across its range states?	s?
active endorsement	
assive endorsement $\Box$	
None	
Conflict	
evel of community support for/engagement with the recovery programm	me?
eneral support  cutral attitude  termittent conflict  crsistent conflict	

37.	Continuity of major funding:					
	1 year or less $\ \square$	1-3 years □	3+ years □			
38.	Are key recovery plan actions ever delayed through lack of funds?					
	Rarely/Never □	Occasionally $\square$	Regularly $\square$	Always □		

39. Are there any issues that you feel significantly contributed to the species' recovery/decline that have not been captured in the questions so far?