BILAG 3-5

Dato: november 2017
Til: naturfagligt udvalg på mødet den 29. november 2017
Sagsbehandler: Bo Håkansson boh@dn.dk

Danmarks Naturfredningsforening

IUCNs spørgsmål i relation til vurdering af et potentielt translokationsprojekt (vejledningens kapitel 3)

Guidelines
1. A conservation translocation has intended conservation benefit, but it also carries risks to ecological, social and economic interests - Annex 3.1:

Annex 3.1:
Deciding when translocation is an acceptable option
3.1 Introduction
1. Any proposed species translocation should be justified by identifying a conservation benefit and weighing any benefits against risks, while considering alternative actions that could be taken. Motivations such as experimenting solely for academic interest, releasing surplus captive stock, rehabilitation for welfare purposes, attracting funding or public profile, or moving organisms to facilitate economic development are not regarded here as conservation purposes.

2. Species or populations that have small or declining populations or ranges, and/or high probabilities of extinction, will often be prime candidates. The metrics used by the IUCN Red List status can be used to assess the potential need for conservation intervention.

3. While the ultimate aim of any conservation translocation is to secure a conservation benefit, this benefit may need long-term or permanent management support to persist. Such obligations and their cost implications should be included in any assessment of alternative conservation solutions
(below).

4. Conservation priorities exist at the levels of species, biological communities and ecosystems
for different purposes. Candidate species for conservation translocation might be accorded priority based on biological criteria such as their ecological role, their evolutionary distinctiveness or uniqueness, their role as flagship species, their degree of endangerment, or their potential as ecological replacements. Translocations may be promoted on grounds of cultural heritage and its restoration but this alone is not conservation benefit. The pivotal criteria for justifying any conservation
translocation will be situation- and species-specific.

5. Where species are extinct, consequent changes in the ecosystem can indicate a need to restore the ecological function provided by the lost species; this would constitute justification for exploring an ecological replacement.

2. There should generally be strong evidence that the threat(s) that caused any previous extinction have been correctly identified and removed or sufficiently reduced - Annex 3.2.

3.2 Assessing extinction causes and threats

1. Any proposed conservation translocation should be justified by first considering past causes of severe population decline or extinction. There should be confidence that these past causes would not again be threats to any prospective translocated populations.

2. Threats need to be identified through all seasons and at appropriate geographic scale for the species, taking account of the species' biological attributes and life history.

3. During a species' absence, potential new threats to any restored population may have arisen.

4. All threats, direct and indirect, that might jeopardise attainment of the stated conservation benefit of the translocation should be identified and measures specified by which these threats would be mitigated or avoided.

5. The spatial extent of a threat should be considered. Threats causing local extinctions are often acute but controllable, but threats that operate over all or a large part of the species' range (such as pathogens, introduced predators or competitors, widespread land-use change, atmospheric
pollutants and climate change) are more difficult to manage.

6. The severity of impact or sensitivity to a threat may vary with demography or life stage. Threat assessments need to consider the adaptive capacity of the focal species; this capacity will tend to be higher in populations with high genetic diversity, long-range dispersal and/or effective colonisation ability, short lifespans/high reproductive rates, phenotypic plasticity, and rapid evolutionary rates.

7. Threats can be biological, physical (such as extreme climate events), or social, political or economic, or a combination of these.

8. Threats may be inferred from anecdotal observations of conditions around the time of extinction, with subsequent rigorous testing of the anecdotes.

9. It is useful to consider multiple hypotheses for causes of extinction or decline and to test these based on the available evidence; where significant uncertainty exists, an experimental approach within the translocation programme can provide guidance for implementation.

10. A trial release may answer uncertainties such as the identity of past threats, but should only
be contemplated where all formal requirements have been met, where consequences will be suitably monitored and will be used to refine further release design, and any unacceptable impacts can be mitigated or reversed.

3. Assessment of any translocation proposal should include identification of potential benefits and potential negative impacts, covering ecological, social and economic aspects. This will be simpler for a reinforcement or reintroduction within indigenous range compared to any translocation outside indigenous range.

4. Global evidence shows that introductions of species outside their indigenous range can frequently cause extreme, negative impacts that can be ecological, social or economic, are often difficult to foresee, and can become evident only long after the introduction.

5. Conservation translocations outside indigenous range may, therefore, bring potentially high risks that are often difficult or impossible to predict with accuracy.

6. Hence, although risk analysis around a translocation should be proportional to the presumed risks (Guidelines Section 6), justifying a conservation introduction requires an especially high level of confidence over the organisms' performance after release, including over the long-term, with reassurance on its acceptability from the perspective of the release area's ecology, and the social and economic interests of its human communities.

7. In any decision on whether to translocate or not, the absolute level of risk must be balanced against the scale of expected benefits.

8. Where a high degree of uncertainty remains or it is not possible to assess reliably that a conservation introduction presents low risks, it should not proceed, and alternative conservation solutions should be sought - Annex 3.3:

3.3 Considering alternatives

Many conservation translocations will yield conservation benefit only at high cost and with considerable risks. Therefore, irrespective of any conservation priority assigned to the species, any proposed translocation should be justified through comparison with alternative solutions, which might
include:

1. Increasing habitat availability through restoration, connectivity, corridor establishment, or habitat protection (area-based solutions),

2. Improving the viability of extant populations through management interventions such as pathogen, predator or invasive alien species control, food provision, assisted reproduction, or protective fencing (species-based solutions),

3. A variety of tools including establishment of protected areas, changes in legislation or regulations, public education, community-based conservation, financial incentives or compensation to promote the viability of the wild populations can be valuable either on their own or in combination with area- or speciesbased solutions (social/indirect solutions),

4. Doing nothing: inaction on behalf of a rare and declining species may carry lower risks of extinction compared to those of alternative solutions, and the focal species might adapt naturally where it is or adjust its range without human intervention (no action).

5. A conservation translocation may be used as one solution amongst these other approaches.