



Kent Academic Repository

Jari?, Ivan, Courchamp, Franck, Gessner, Jörn and Roberts, David L. (2016)
Potentially threatened: a Data Deficient flag for conservation management.
Biodiversity and Conservation, 25 (10). pp. 1995-2000. ISSN 0960-3115.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/56164/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-016-1164-0>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

1 **Potentially Threatened – a Data Deficient flag for conservation management**

2

3 Ivan Jarić^{1,2*}, Franck Courchamp³, Jörn Gessner¹ and David L. Roberts⁴

4

5 ¹ Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries, Müggelseedamm 310,
6 12587 Berlin, Germany

7

8 ² Institute for Multidisciplinary Research, University of Belgrade, Kneza Viseslava 1,
9 11000 Belgrade, Serbia

10

11 ³ Ecologie, Systématique and Evolution, Univ. Paris-Sud, CNRS, AgroParisTech,
12 Université Paris-Saclay, 91400, Orsay, France

13

14 ⁴ Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology, School of Anthropology and
15 Conservation, Marlowe Building, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent, CT2 7NR,
16 United Kingdom

17

18 * Author to whom correspondence should be addressed: Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater
19 Ecology and Inland Fisheries, Müggelseedamm 310, 12587 Berlin, Germany; E-mail:
20 jaric@igb-berlin.de; phone: +49 (0)30 64181 766, fax.: +49 (0)30 64181 626

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Data Deficient species (DD) comprise a significant portion of the total number of
24 species listed within the IUCN Red List. Although they are not classified within one of
25 the threat categories, they may still face high extinction risks. However, due to limited
26 data available to infer their extinction risk reliably, it is unlikely that the assessment of
27 the true status of Data Deficient species would be possible before many species decline
28 to extinction. An appropriate measure to resolve these problems would be to introduce
29 a flag of Potentially Threatened species within the Data Deficient category (i.e.,
30 DD(PT)). Such a flag would represent a temporary Red List status for listed Data
31 Deficient species that are, based on the available direct evidence and/or indirect indices,
32 likely to be assigned to one of the threat categories, but where current data remains
33 insufficient for a complete classification. The use of such a flag could increase the
34 focus of the scientific community and conservation decision-makers on such species,
35 thus avoiding the risk that necessary conservation measures are implemented too late.
36 As such, establishment of the DD(PT) category as a kind of alarm for priority species
37 could be beneficial.

38

39 **Keywords:** Data Deficient; endangered species; extinction risk; IUCN Red List;
40 threatened species.

41

42 The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species is considered as one of the most
43 relevant information sources and decision-making support tools for conservation
44 management (Rodrigues et al. 2006; IUCN 2015). However, for many species, limited
45 or insufficient data are available on their geographic distribution, abundance,
46 population trends and threats to infer their extinction risk reliably. This leaves those
47 conducting assessments in a dilemma: based on available data and acknowledging the
48 associated uncertainties, can a classification other than Data Deficient (DD; IUCN
49 2001) be made? How assessors incorporate and handle the uncertainties associated with
50 poorly known species can result in the difference between a species being listed as Data
51 Deficient or as threatened.

52 Data Deficient species represent as much as 16% of the total number of species
53 listed within the IUCN Red List (i.e., approximately 13,000 out of the 80,000 species
54 assessed so far are classified as Data Deficient; IUCN 2015). Although they are not
55 classified within the threat categories, Data Deficient species may still face high
56 extinction risks, and may actually be more frequently threatened than successfully
57 evaluated species (Howard and Bickford 2014; Bland et al. 2015; Jetz and Freckelton
58 2015; Roberts et al. 2016). This problem was also illustrated by recent population
59 declines reported in some Data Deficient species (Morais et al. 2013). Many of these
60 species may in fact be perilously close to extinction (Schipper et al. 2008).

61 At the same time, such species may be neglected by research and
62 conservation programs, with funding rarely being directed to address specifically the
63 problem of Data Deficient species (Morais et al. 2013; Bland et al. 2015). Lack of
64 conservation focus is mainly driven by their uncertain conservation status (Bland et al.
65 2015), as well as by the tendency of conservation managers to prioritize well-studied

66 species (Sitas et al. 2009). The Data Deficient category is essentially different from the
67 other categories, since its listing does not imply that a taxon is not threatened, but
68 represents an expression of necessity for additional efforts by researchers.

69 Assessment of the true status of Data Deficient species could be achieved
70 through focused field surveys (Bland et al. 2015). However, given the necessary time,
71 man-power and monetary implications in collecting baseline data on all Data Deficient
72 species, it is unlikely that this would be possible before populations of many species
73 decline, potentially to extinction (Howard and Bickford 2014; Bland et al. 2015). Given
74 the very large number of species classified as Data Deficient, there is also a need to
75 prioritize those that should be studied first and removed from this category, with
76 prioritization primarily on the grounds of potential threat.

77 We suggest that one of the appropriate measures to resolve this problem
78 would be to introduce a flag of Potentially Threatened species within the Data Deficient
79 category (i.e., DD(PT)), as a temporary Red List status that would warn that such
80 species are potentially threatened and that monitoring, research and conservation
81 attention are required. The idea behind such a flag follows the establishment of the flag
82 of potentially extinct species within the Critically Endangered category (CR(PE);
83 Butchart et al. 2006), as both flags represent temporary classifications until more
84 detailed information are made available to confirm suspected species status.

85 We define Potentially Threatened Data Deficient species as those that are,
86 based on available direct evidence and/or indirect indices, likely to be assigned to one
87 of the threat categories (i.e., VU, EN or CR), but where current data remains
88 insufficient for a complete classification. It is important to emphasize that the liberal
89 use of the Data Deficient category should be discouraged, and all species with

90 sufficient information for their inclusion within one of the threat categories should be
91 classified as such (IUCN 2001). Furthermore, we advise against the direct use of
92 DD(PT) flag for newly assessed species, to avoid further inflation of the Data Deficient
93 category; it should be preferably applied only to the current Data Deficient species, i.e.
94 those that have been classified as such within previous assessments.

95 Although Data Deficient species lack information needed for a Red List
96 classification, large amounts of life-history, ecological, and phylogenetic information
97 may be available for many of these species (Bland et al. 2015). While these data alone
98 can be technically insufficient for making a standardized decision on classifying a
99 species into one of the ‘data-sufficient’ categories, they can be nevertheless used for
100 indirect threat assessments. In recent years, a number of indirect assessment methods
101 have been applied to Data Deficient species within different groups, mainly mammals
102 and amphibians, to infer their likely threat level (Table 1). Most frequently used
103 approaches were machine-learning methods, largely based on information related to
104 geographic range, life-history and ecological data, phylogeny, environmental data and
105 threat intensity (Howard and Bickford 2014; Bland et al. 2015). The general
106 characteristic of all the methods was their attempt to model the relationship between
107 different types of information related to ‘data-sufficient’ species and their Red List
108 classification, and to apply it thereafter to Data Deficient species based on the available
109 information. Such methods should be considered as sufficient evidence for classifying
110 assessed species within the DD(PT) category. The proportion of Data Deficient species
111 considered to be potentially threatened varied between studies; for instance, predictions
112 for Data Deficient mammal species ranged from 35% (Jones and Safi 2011) to 69%
113 (Jetz and Freckelton 2015; Table 1). However, in accordance with the precautionary

114 principle, each species identified as potentially threatened with extinction by one or
115 several of the applied methods should be a candidate for the DD(PT) category. From a
116 conservation perspective, it would be more problematic to incorrectly deny the DD(PT)
117 status to a species than to incorrectly attribute it. Conversely, species identified by all
118 the methods as likely to be not-threatened would remain within the general Data
119 Deficient category until sufficient data and analyses can identify their adequate threat
120 category.

121 Beside the methods listed in Table 1, other methods designed for extinction
122 risk assessment of data-poor species could also be applied, based on the type and the
123 amount of available data. For instance, for many Data Deficient species, biological
124 collections or sighting records represent the only available data (Roberts et al. 2016). In
125 such situations, application of methods that infer threat based on the observation
126 records would be appropriate (e.g. Burgman et al. 1995, 2000; McCarthy 1998; Regan
127 et al. 2000; McInerny et al. 2006; Robbirt et al. 2006).

128 However, the recognition of DD(PT) flag for species already in the Data
129 Deficient category would contribute to the better research and conservation
130 prioritization of those species for which a sound classification other than Data Deficient
131 cannot be made. The use of such a flag would reduce the risk of these species being
132 neglected by the scientific community and conservation decision-makers, to the point
133 when postponed conservation measures are implemented too late. Establishment of the
134 DD(PT) flag could be highly beneficial as a temporary measure, designed to highlight
135 the status of such species. Given that they are also likely to be threatened with
136 extinction, species classified as DD(PT) should be recognised as a major research
137 priority. Research efforts are expected to be more effective and yield more critical

138 knowledge if they are directed to the least known species (de Lima et al. 2011). Given
139 that they are also likely to be threatened with extinction, species classified as DD(PT)
140 should be recognised as a major research priority.

141 Classification of DD(PT) species could also serve as a platform to instigate
142 and enhance communication within the scientific community on the true status of such
143 species. One of the primary roles of the IUCN Red List is to contribute to conservation
144 efforts, as a communication tool for decision-makers, funding sources, scientific
145 community and the general public. Establishment of the DD(PT) category as a kind of
146 alarm for potential priority species would fit this purpose and likely prove to be a
147 highly beneficial tool, with the scientific community and managers involved in
148 monitoring programs as its major end-users.

149

150

151

152 **Acknowledgements**

153 The authors acknowledge the sponsorship provided by the Alexander von
154 Humboldt Foundation and the Federal German Ministry for Education and Research, as
155 well as the support by the Invacost research program, and by the Project No. 173045,
156 funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the
157 Republic of Serbia.

158

159 **References:**

160

161 Bland LM, Collen B, Orme DL, Bielby J (2015) Predicting the conservation status of
162 data-deficient species. *Conserv Biol* 29(1):250-259.

163

164 Burgman MA, Grimson RC, Ferson S (1995) Inferring threat from scientific
165 collections. *Conserv Biol* 9:923-928.

166

167 Burgman MA, Maslin BR, Andrewartha D, Keatley MR, Boek C, McCarthy MA
168 (2000) Inferring threat from scientific collections: power tests and an application to
169 Western Australian Acacia species. In: Ferson S, Burgman MA (eds) *Quantitative
170 Methods for Conservation Biology*, New York, Springer-Verlag, pp 7–26

171

172 Butchart SHM, Stattersfield AJ, Brooks TM (2006) Going or gone: defining 'Possibly
173 Extinct' species to give a truer picture of recent extinctions. *Bull BOC* 126a:7-24.

174

175 Davidson AD, Hamilton MJ, Boyer AG, Brown JH, Ceballos G (2009) Multiple
176 ecological pathways to extinction in mammals. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*
177 106(26):10702-10705.

178

179 de Lima RF, Bird JP, Barlow J (2011) Research effort allocation and the conservation
180 of restricted-range island bird species. *Biol Conserv* 144:627-632.

181

182 Howard SD, Bickford DP (2014) Amphibians over the edge: silent extinction risk of
183 Data Deficient species. *Divers Distrib* 20(7):837-846.

184

185 IUCN (2001) IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. Version 3.1.
186 <http://www.iucnredlist.org>. Accessed 10 May 2016
187
188 IUCN (2015) The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2015-4.
189 <http://www.iucnredlist.org> Accessed 10 May 2016
190
191 Jetz W, Freckleton RP (2015) Towards a general framework for predicting threat status
192 of data-deficient species from phylogenetic, spatial and environmental information.
193 *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 370(1662):20140016.
194
195 Jones KE, Safi K (2011) Ecology and evolution of mammalian biodiversity. *Philos*
196 *Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 366(1577):2451-2461.
197
198 Luiz OJ, Woods RM, Madin EMP, Madin JS (2016) Predicting IUCN extinction risk
199 categories for the world's Data Deficient groupers (Teleostei: Epinephelidae). *Conserv*
200 *Lett* doi: 10.1111/conl.12230 (in press)
201
202 McCarthy MA (1998) Identifying declining and threatened species with museum data.
203 *Biol Conserv* 83:9-17.
204
205 McNerny GJ, Roberts DL, Davy AJ, Cribb PJ (2006) Significance of sighting rate in
206 inferring extinction and threat. *Conserv Biol* 20:562-567.
207

208 Morais AR, Siqueira MN, Lemes P, Maciel NM, De Marco P, Brito D (2013)
209 Unraveling the conservation status of Data Deficient species. *Biol Conserv* 166:98-102.
210
211 Quintero E, Thessen AE, Arias-Caballero P, Ayala-Orozco B (2014) A statistical
212 assessment of population trends for data deficient Mexican amphibians. *PeerJ* 2:e703.

213 Regan HM, Colyvan M, Burgman MA (2000) A proposal for fuzzy International Union
214 for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) categories and criteria. *Biol Conserv* 92:101-
215 108.

216
217 Robbirt KM, Roberts DL, Hawkins JA (2006) Comparing IUCN and probabilistic
218 assessments of threat: do IUCN red list criteria conflate rarity and threat? *Biodivers*
219 *Conserv* 15:1903-1912.

220
221 Roberts DL, Taylor L, Joppa LN (2016) Threatened or Data Deficient: assessing the
222 conservation status of poorly known species. *Divers Distrib* 22(5):558-565.
223

224 Rodrigues ASL, Pilgrim JD, Lamoreux JF, Hoffmann M, Brooks TM (2006) The value
225 of the IUCN Red List for conservation. *Trends Ecol Evolut* 21(2):71-76.
226

227 Schipper J, et al. (2008) The status of the world's land and marine mammals: diversity,
228 threat, and knowledge. *Science* 322(5899):225-230.
229

230 Sitas N, Baillie JEM, Isaac NJB (2009) What are we saving? Developing a standardized
231 approach for conservation action. *Anim Conserv* 12:231-237.

Table 1. Examples of studies that involved indirect estimation of extinction threat for Data Deficient species.

Reference	Assessed DD species	Method	Used data	Results
Davidson et al. 2009	Mammals	Decision-tree modelling, classification tree and random forest modelling	11 explanatory variables; geographic range, density, group size, mass-specific production, home range, body mass, habitat mode and activity period identified as relevant predictors	28 out of 341 assessed species (8%) determined to be at high extinction risk
Jones and Safi 2011	Mammals	Combination of spatial eigenvector estimation and phylogenetic eigenvectors	Phylogenetic, distribution and environmental data	35% of 481 assessed species determined to be threatened with extinction
Morais et al. 2013	Brazilian anuran species	Quantile regression to model a relationship between the time since species discovery and range-size	Time since species description and current species distribution	37 of 231 assessed species (16%) determined to be threatened with extinction, overall rate likely 57%
Howard and Bickford 2014	Amphibians	Machine-learning method, random forest models	Extinction risk data and distribution ranges	63% of 1249 assessed species determined to be probably threatened with extinction
Quintero et al. 2014	Mexican amphibians	Machine-learning method, random forest models	14-15 explanatory variables, including data on species' life history and population trends, environmental data and negative impacts	18 out of 24 assessed species (75%) determined to be declining
Bland et al. 2015	Terrestrial mammals	Seven machine learning methods: classification tree, random forest, boosted tree, k nearest neighbours,	29-36 explanatory variables, including data on species' life history and ecology, environmental data and	313 of 493 assessed species (63%) determined to be threatened with extinction

		support vector machine, neural network, and decision stumps	measures of threat intensity	
Jetz and Freckelton 2015	Mammals	Spatial-phylogenetic statistical framework, generalized linear models, generalized least-squares approach	Body mass, distribution and encroachment (anthropogenic habitat transformation) data	331 of 483 assessed species (69%) determined to be threatened with extinction
Luiz et al. 2016	Groupers (Teleostei: Epinephelidae)	Ordinal analytical approach, cumulative link mixed-effects modelling	Body-size, maximum depth of occurrence, breadth of habitat use, geographic range size, aggregative spawning behaviour, and biogeographical region	6 of 50 assessed species (12%) determined to be endangered or vulnerable

233

234

235