

Reintro Redeux

IUCN / SSC Reintroduction Specialist Group, South Asia



No. 4, February 2009

Welcome and Editorial

Welcome to the Newsletter of the Reintroduction Specialist Group, South Asia. We are happy to release this issue at the 6th Annual Joint Meeting of RSG and CBSG. We have combined the two newsletters like a Siamese twin for our own vested interest and hope that it is not too confusing or difficult to handle.

We have just returned from Guwahati, Assam where we conducted the second Translocation Training workshop within a few months for the same species, Hoolock Gibbon. Already the first workshop has been referred as a "pioneering" effort by conservationists in Vietnam who heard about it and wanted the report for their own gibbon translocations. We are approaching translocation differently from some others and this will be explained in more detail in the contents inside, but very simply put, we are highlighting and promoting what we could call "classic translocation" rather than the releases of surplus stock (advised against in RSG Guidelines), confiscated or rescued and "rehabilitated" animals, or even wildlife that is causing problems to human beings, such as city monkeys and elephants with no habitat.

A great many exercises are being passed off as "reintroduction" or translocation or release today which are not really healthy or safe for man, animal, ecosystem. Many of these releases flaunt the Guidelines of the IUCN SSC Reintroduction Specialist Group which have been published for a reason...the reason being that they were developed on the backs of many disastrous releases, or on theoretical yet scientific principles. The Guidelines of RSG is not any holy book, but they were written at least with the welfare of animal, man and environment in mind. Therefore the RSG Guidelines deserve reading and considering with careful thought, as opposed to charging ahead and creating your own rules that fit your needs and not the best interests of species and habitats. This meeting will be about that and other topics. Sanjay and Sally

Hoolock Gibbon,
Hoolock Hoolock
Arnab Roy, Artist
Zoo Outreach
Organisation

Contents

Welcome

Case Study in NorthEastern India — salvaging small wild populations of threatened species while strengthening others, *S Walker and S Molur*

The Translocation of the Golden Lion Tamarin, Cecilia Kierulff

DRAFT Recommendations : Wild to Wild Rapid Translocation Training for Conservation Potential of Hoolock Gibbon, Workshop output

DRAFT Report of Plenary Working Group, Requirements for successful conduct of Wild to Wild Rapid Translocations

Priorities for Translocation of Hoolock Gibbons *Statewise*

Members of CBSG and RSG

Instructions for working groups

Reintro Redeux

Number 4, February 2009

Editors: Sanjay Molur & Sally Walker

RSG South Asia Co-chairs: Sanjay Molur & Sally Walker

Reintro Redeux is the Newsletter of the Reintroduction Specialist Group South Asia. *Reintro Redeux* is published by Zoo Outreach Organisation and Wildlife Information & Liaison Development Society as a service to the South Asian conservation community as well as conservation actioners and enthusiasts at large.

For communication:

Reintroduction Specialist Group South Asia
c/o Zoo Outreach Organisation, 9A Lal Bahadur Colony,
PB 1683, Peelamedu, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu 641004, India
Ph: +91 422 2561743, 2561087, 2568906; Fax: +91 422 2563269
Email: herpinvert@gmail.com; sallywalker@aol.com
zooreach@zooreach.org



Reintro Redeux
is available online at
www.zoosprint.org

Case Study in NorthEastern India -- salvaging small wild populations of threatened species while strengthening others

Proposed use of Wild to Wild Rapid Translocation with specific reference to Hoolock Gibbons in minute populations and habitat fragments, Sally Walker and Sanjay Molur*

The Guidelines of the Reintroduction Specialist Group define translocation as the ***"deliberate and mediated movement of wild individuals or populations from one part of their range to another."***

In view of the current habitat fragmentation and population decline, resulting in large numbers of small populations of threatened species left in isolated fragments of forest or highly degraded habitat or even habitat that has become agricultural fields, it comes as a surprise that the technique of genuine translocation, as defined above, is not used more often. As a matter of fact, it is used very rarely as we discovered when trying to find an experienced reintroduction practitioner who had conducted "deliberate and mediated" movements of small populations of primates.

In our search for a trainer to staff a translocation training for biologists and foresters concerned with the Hoolock Gibbon in northeastern India and Bangladesh with the highly threatened Hoolock Gibbon as a target, we researched the topic thoroughly first for gibbon translocations, and failing that, for ape translocation (as gibbons are apes) and finally for any primate wild to wild translocation that had been conducted systematically (meaning deliberately and mediated as opposed to ad hoc, haphazard or reactionary ! ... there were plenty of those). In the gibbon and ape movements we found that all who had claimed to have done translocation had actually done rehabilitation or releases.

There has been a great deal of work done on gibbon movements but nearly all of it has been rehabilitation ... and that too for lifetime captive gibbons which were rescued from human owners who used the animals for begging from foreign tourists on the beaches of South East Asia to a "sanctuary" set up for the purpose. In India the word "sanctuary" is not used like this ... a sanctuary is a natural forest with some legal protection. In this case "sanctuary" was a forested area fenced in and run like an zoo with open enclosures. The animals remained captive. We have since heard that these sanctuaries were not successful and have been closed down. Anyway, after much searching, we happened to run into Russ Mittermeier and Anthony Rhylands at a conference. I asked Anthony for suggestions of someone who could share their experience who had done the real thing and after some thought he suggested a female biologist from Brazil by name of

Cecilia Kierulff who had conducted a genuine translocation of wild Golden Lion Tamarins from a habitat which offered no long term security to a more suitable one with good potential as a safe haven. She did this with 42 animals in several groups and had no fatalities associated with the translocation. The groups have had very little problem and are breeding well and disbursing appropriately. Her translocations were all successful. Her animals are established.

Even before hearing Dr. Kierulff's experiences, we wondered why wildlife conservation practitioners do not do more to find small, isolated populations of threatened animals which have no chance of survival in their current habitat but still have threatened conspecifics living within their natural range in a relatively safe habitat. It seems to us a "no brainer" that such an investigation should be done before either

1. capturing wild animals for captive breeding
2. introducing captive "welfare" specimens of animals which had been confiscated or donated or rescued but spent some time in captivity. OR
3. even systematically captive born animals intended for release for conservation.

These small, isolated populations are, after all, wild which means that they are most likely free of diseases transmitted by either human beings or animals which is one of the banes of captive stock (even if they have been kept in captivity a short time). Also they are behaviourally superior to any captive born animals and even to wild caught or captured animals which have spent some time in captivity. Wild animals for wild habitats makes much more sense as they have had no chance to develop bad habits, that is if they are truly wild. Wild animals which have become almost domesticated by living in trees in an agricultural field and accustomed to human beings through feeding, and certainly wild animals, such as primates, who have taken up residence in cities and towns and which look to human habitations for their food. It is not that there are no problems with genuine (that is) wild to wild translocation also but the problems are much less likely to result in total failure, which is the case with the other options. Also releasing a batch of animals which have been in captivity into a genuine piece of wild habitat may spoil it for other animals who could pick up transmissible diseases. Given that total picture, properly done translocations beat all other options.

*** Sanjay Molur and Sally Walker Co-Chair RSG, South Asia of the IUCN SSC Reintroduction Specialist Group**

That being said, a little more actual background on this case study will help you understand the other information in this newsletter. We have chosen to share with you a Report in process, and that too, a draft report in order to introduce this topic of translocation as a tool which might be considered before resorting to releases of once captive and ill prepared animals into wild areas.

Background

A training to undertake conservation actions recommended at the Hoolock Gibbon PHVA held at Dhaka, Bangladesh in 2005 was conducted on 15-19 September at the Forest Training School, Jalukbari, Assam. The training had been a long time in planning and awaiting just the right resource persons. Finally, dates were fixed and resource persons rounded up and participants invited.

The training centred on one of the problems discussed at the PHVA, that is the phenomenon of small, wild, isolated populations (actually families) of 2-3 individuals in virtual fragments of forest located far from larger groups. With no possibility of gene transfer between different groups and scant potential for restoring the forest fragments (some of which are surrounded by villages or agricultural fields), these animals could be called "living dead". In the PHVA many of these isolates were identified and it was recommended that they be translocated from certain doom as has been happening with increasing regularity, to localities where they had a chance of survival and being linked with a larger group in course of time. A recommendation from the workshop for this conservation action and tentative and unsystematic plans for doing so inspired the plan for special training.

The training was envisioned to be a "wild to wild" translocation with which would be meticulously planned but conducted rapidly to avoid the wild animals being in human care for long. However, having surveyed the primate community for persons who had done wild to wild translocations and turning up empty-handed, we were forced for some time to consider.

A case study of Golden Lion Tamarin translocations as opposed to GLT reintroductions or rehabilitations of captive and semi captive animals indicated that wild to wild without lengthy quarantine or human handling had the greater chance of success.

Therefore the workshop focused only on wild animals that would be doomed without action, managed in such a way that they could contribute to the wild gene pool for years to come.

The position of Hoolock Gibbon is very precarious in India having declined from one lakh individuals to

5000 in just four decades, a decline of 90%. Human being settling in or near forest areas led to fragmentation of once contiguous forests and Hoolocks from 18 locations were extinguished in less than five years.

Currently Bangladesh has only about 200 individuals in 22 locations, 3 with < 20, another 3 < 15, and 14 < 10 individuals. India has about 200 locations holding Hoolocks but 77 of these locations have less than 20 individuals and 47 less than 10 individuals.

The organisers were very lucky to locate the Brazilian biologist who conducted the wild to wild translocations of Golden Lion Tamarins ALL of which successfully settled into their new, safer locations. This was a dramatic success rate compared to earlier captive GLT reintroductions. Dr. Cecilia Kierulff, now Conservation Coordinator at the Sao Paulo Zoo, kept participants and other resource persons spellbound with her saga of introducing the project, getting permission from the International GLT advisory body as well as from her own authority, finding a site, planning, translocating the Golden Lion Tamarins and the very extensive monitoring which was done until there was no option but to conclude success. Many of these sat spellbound through her presentations twice! We got her back so we could expose the state Chief Wildlife Wardens to the methodology and also to record and video her presentations. We were very fortunate the second workshop to have Dr. Fred Launay, Chair of the Reintroduction Specialist Group with us as well as Mike Jordan, Chair RSG Europe and North Asia who has reintroduced and translocated hundreds of mammals. We also had the Hoolock Gibbon field biologists with us, particularly Jayantha Das, Jihosua Biswas, Surajit Barua and Nabitjit Barua. We should mention that Dr. David Chivers was with us first workshop who served as Ph.D. guide at Cambridge for Cecilia and some of the Indian primatologists. Chief Wildlife Warden of Assam, Mr. Malekar spent a lot of time with us and was the one to permit both workshops. Both workshops were generously sponsored by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Chester Zoo and Knowsley Safari.

We have some material from Cecilia's presentations which we will use as part of our reports on these workshops. Time only permits us to clip some of the more exciting parts to share with you here. We are also including the draft recommendations from both workshops and working group reports from our planning sessions with the foresters and field biologists.

The Translocation of the Golden Lion Tamarin

(Snatches from the PPT presentations of Cecilia Kierulff, Biologist, Brazil)

Between 1994/1998 - six groups (42 individuals) were captured and translocated. Groups were released in União Farm (Federal Railway Network) with 3,200 ha (2,400 covered by forest) – the best lowland forest found during the survey. There was no native population in the release site and there was no supplementation (hard release). Groups have been monitored since they were released – triangulation and habituation.

Processing and re-capture

The entire group was captured, transported to the release site, processed and released together next day. The tamarins were monitored with radio-telemetry. The groups were re-captured every six months to change the radio-collar.

Results

The translocated populations exhibited similar survivorship and reproduction rates in comparison to the native population in Poço das Antas, a good, natural population. Emigration, immigration and movements after release were common following translocation. The adults and subadults dispersed but the reproductive couple remained coherent.

Total Population in 2005 (10 years) more than 200 Golden Lion Tamarins in more than 29 groups (monitored) from the original 42 individuals and six groups.

Why we think Success !!

The translocated population in 2005 was more than 200 individuals in 30 groups.

In 1998 the União Farm was transformed in a Federal Biological Reserve of 3,200 ha. to protect the Golden Lion Tamarin population.

The status of the GLT has been downgraded from Critically Endangered (CR) to Endangered (EN) according to the IUCN criteria and categories.

Factors and/or procedures which increase the success of translocations

These methods led to success ... Cecilia followed methods after studying over 34 references and more than 15,000 animals translocated of 227 species.

Primary factor affecting success is habitat quality, including enough food, sites for reproduction, predation, competition, overhunting etc. If habitat is suitable the species should settle, survive and reproduce. Second most important factor is that the ecology and behaviour of species must be understood to provide minimal requirements for establishment of a new population. The number of animals and the type of release will depend on the characteristics of the animals – territorial, live in social groups etc (specific protocols).

3) The release of a species will be followed by unusual movements, which are a consequence of an expected disorientation caused by sudden translocation to a non-familiar new area. Sometimes a soft release helps to improve the habitat quality and the adaptation of the species at the release site.

Results of Evaluation to reintroduce/translocate (Kleiman 1992)

Condition of the Species

- 01. Need to augment the size or genetic diversity of wild population. Yes
- 02. Available stock. Yes
- 03. No jeopardy to wild population. Yes

Environmental Condition

- 04. Causes of decline removed. ?
- 05. Sufficient protected habitat. ?
- 06. Unsaturated habitat. Yes

Biopolitical Condition

- 07. No negative impact for locals. Yes
- 08. Community support exists. Yes
- 09. GOs and NGOs are supportive/involved. Yes
- 10. Conformity with all laws/regulations). Yes

Biological and Other Resources

- 11. Reintroduction technology known/in development. ?
- 12. Knowledge of species biology. Yes
- 13. Sufficient resources exist for program. ?

First steps

1. Convince everyone that the translocation of the isolated groups was important and urgent! When the urgency of a translocation surpasses the risks.
 - License from International Committee for management and Conservation of *Leontopithecus*. and Brazilian Environmental Agency.
2. Find a good team!!
3. Confirm the presence of the groups using playback.
4. Find financial resources
5. Look for Release site
 - Release site within the historic distribution of the species.
 - Reasons for extirpation/extinction addressed.
 - The site was distant from the other native population (risk of diseases).
 - The size was enough to translocate all groups (number of groups based on the size of GLT territory ~60 hectares).
 - The forest was preserved (and protect).
 - No native population at the release site (ecological impact of density).

The rest of her presentation goes into great detail of how to capture, process, transport, release and monitor. The final Report of the training will include her entire presentation.

We hope this tidbit will just suggest some of the care and planning that has to go into a translocation and why translocation of wild to wild is a better option than captive or rehab animals.

DRAFT Recommendations : Wild to Wild Rapid Translocation Training for Conservation Potential of Hoolock Gibbon (Combined from Sept 2008 and Jan 2009 workshops)

Objectives and Principles

Subject – Training in Wild to Wild rapid translocation of otherwise doomed Hoolock Gibbons from non-supportive isolated, habitat fragments to suitable localities in which they can survive over the long term.

Over-riding purpose – to save those individuals and families which will surely die and at the same time substantially improve the probability of long-term survival of Hoolock Gibbons.

Conclusion – Wild to wild translocation, systematically and expertly implemented, is likely to have the most potential for long-term success for these isolated populations.

The workshop was carried out as a direct response to the Population and Habitat Viability Assessment Workshop for Hoolock gibbon conducted in 2005, which identified the need to translocate small, doomed populations of Hoolock Gibbons to form larger and more secure populations in India and Bangladesh.

Recommendations by participants

It is recommended that :

...small, isolated groups of hoolock gibbons at risk of imminent extinction should be identified for urgent action and translocated to form larger, more secure populations.

... healthy, wild gibbons in threatened small habitats, should be rescued by translocation to secure habitats in preference to being removed into captivity; however, individuals that are injured, or, long-term habituated to human beings, or have been isolated on their own for some time may be better taken into captivity as part of the CZA Coordinated Captive Breeding.

... the health and welfare of the individual animals should receive the highest consideration during all the activities undertaken.

...in view of the complexity of conservation translocations, translocation teams consisting of a few external experts and appropriate local individuals should undertake small scale trial translocations in order to train new practitioners with the process in their first exercises.

... capacity building required for translocation should be organized on census methods, equipment, basics (including orientation) of all skills

needed for translocation exercise and appropriate training for different levels of staff.

... all activities must preserve the genetic integrity of the two separate species, *Hoolock hoolock* and *Hoolock leuconedys*, and any other additional taxa identified.

... GIS mapping, including ground-truthing (or confirmation in the field) should be carried out on the habitats of Hoolock Gibbons across their historical range in India (and Bangladesh).

...urgent up-to-date census (or presence/absence survey in inaccessible areas) of population numbers and threats to Hoolock Gibbons in its entire historical range should be carried out on priority basis (within a year if possible).

...a standard protocol and form should be developed for collecting data in a consistent and comparable manner across the entire Hoolock Gibbon range and a centralized data base should be established at WADWT, Assam for all the states. It should include food plants and lodging trees, published articles, survey results and past history.

...detailed habitat assessment should be done for every potential release site, including threats and the past history of the site and species.

...effective protection should be in place for all release sites.

...local people should be involved in protection of Hoolock Gibbon in order to insure their cooperation and support.

... education and awareness activities should prioritize local stakeholders as well as general public and also national and vernacular press and other media in all the Hoolock Gibbon states. This activity should precede and form an integral part of the translocation exercise and commence as early as possible.

...funding should be assured for the whole process of translocation before animals are captured.

...any translocations of Hoolock Gibbons should be carefully planned and implemented using the best practice guidelines developed at the 2008-09 Wild to Wild Hoolock Gibbon Translocation Training workshops, in accordance with the advice of the IUCN SSC Reintroduction Specialist Group.

DRAFT Report of Plenary Working Group discussion, 29 January 2009: Requirements for successful conduct of Wild to Wild Rapid Translocations for Future Conservation Potential for Hoolock Gibbon

Contents

1. GIS
2. Survey
3. Capacity Building Programme
4. Equipment and suppliers
5. Genetic studies
6. Trial Translocations with Coordinated Teams
7. Central Database-WADWT; Live interactive website

Discussion

1. GIS

For GIS it was felt that coordinating with several other departments in India was the correct approach. These include ASTEC-ARSAC, North East Space Application Centre, Gagan (To standardize the error in GPS) and possibly others.

Funding was also discussed specifically for GIS and the following donor agencies were recommended. Dr. Fred Launay gave a short presentation on a new funding agency for species and participants suggested others, e.g.

The Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund <http://www.mbzspeciesconservation.org/>
Margot March Biodiversity Fund, MMBF
MAVA Foundation

www.mava-foundation.org/en/qui_en.html

Mac Arthur Foundation

www.macfound.org

Whitley Trust

www.whitley-award.org

Ford Foundation

www.fordfound.org/grants

2. Survey

In addition to the habitat survey information provided by GIS mapping, it is necessary to conduct survey(s) of the Hoolock Gibbon populations in all localities, including health status. A format for health status should be designed by a suitable individual or organization and quickly circulated for comments and adopted by all Hoolock Gibbon states. Major components of the population surveys include:

a. A **common survey protocol** should be developed and circulated for suggestions and then adopted by all Hoolock Gibbon states for sake of consistency and accuracy. Participants felt that WADWT which will manage a central Database should be the caretaker and monitor of the information gathered.

b. Minimum requirement - Presence / absence — a minimum requirement in order to evaluate the needs of Hoolock Gibbon states for translocations

of doomed populations is a presence absence survey which might be done by foresters or even locals in every single locality heretofore reported to hold Hoolock Gibbons. The presence/absence survey is useful in insuring that all populations are included. A target of completing presence absence within a very short time following the receipt of this report is suggested by Editor, e.g. 3-6 months, the earlier the better in view of the urgency of salvaging some individuals which otherwise would not survive long under current conditions.

c. Priority setting and plan requirement — A more elaborate survey is required to make management decisions and make time bound plans based on rational priorities. Such a survey should include number, sex, health condition (if possible), environmental conditions at sites, including threats, etc.

d. Comprehensive survey format should include

- i. Habitat Evaluation- Threats
- ii. Ground truthing for GIS

e. Surveys of isolated populations are most urgent as these populations are more at risk of extirpation by a great variety of factors.

f. Surveys for long term comparison – for purpose of research it would be useful to conduct a detailed Census including Demographic data of 2 of the same selected sites in each state every 2 years so that a historical profile can be accurately maintained.

g. Survey for Identification of potential release sites – this is to include a history of the locality, the other animals in the area including their health status, threats, as well as evaluation of habitats for appropriateness of Hoolock Gibbon. Although obvious, it should be noted that all sites should be within the natural or historical range of Hoolock gibbon.

h. After the detailed surveys are complete, Hoolock Gibbon stakeholders may consider inviting CBSG South Asia for organizing another Population and Habitat Viability Assessment Workshop (PHVA) to make get an up-to-date overview of the probability of extinction of the species. The PHVA also examines other issues which have arisen since a previous PHVA and generally brings together and bonds the various stakeholders by creating consensus by information exchange and scientific use of current and detailed data about the species and habitat.

3. Capacity Building Programme for translocation of Hoolock Gibbon

A capacity building programme designed specifically for the purpose of planning, undertaking and monitoring translocation of Hoolock Gibbon was felt to be required by workshop participants. Listed below are the topics for training and ideas mentioned.

a. Orientation on wild to wild rapid translocation – All persons to be involved with Hoolock Gibbon translocation to be trained with primary information or the basics of translocation. As the meaning and method of the word “translocation” as applied to wildlife has become vague with incorrect or mis-named practice, it is required to conduct orientation training for persons who may be involved but did not attend the training in September 2008 or the workshop in January 2009. The meaning of “translocation” as used in this document is essentially the definition from the Guidelines of the IUCN SSC Reintroduction Specialist Group, to wit :

Definition of Terms : “Translocation”: deliberate and mediated movement of wild individuals or populations from one part of their range to the other. (from IUCN Guidelines for Reintroductions, IUCN SSC Reintroduction specialist Group, 1998) <http://www.iucnsscrg.org/download/English.pdf>

(See Appendices for more information and clarification on the definition of terms and policy as per IUCN RSG Guidelines)

The workshop organizers, hosts and sponsor have, in view of the wide range of misconceptions and misnomers of a range of movements of wild animals adopted the descriptor of “wild to wild rapid translocation” to insure that what we intend is not mistaken for any other type of movement of wildlife. Methods involving captive or so called “conservation” bred wild animals, rescued individuals, rehabilitated animals, pet , orphaned, or otherwise “held” individuals will have their place and no criticism is intended to any organization of good intention with its primary purpose the conservation interests of species over self.

- b. Census methodology
One forest officer from each state will be invited for training on census methods of gibbons.
- c. Capacity building principles
Different training for different levels of personnel.
Training should involve high profile personality including media to generate more awareness.

- d. Equipment required for translocation exercise
Training in the availability and use of all required equipment for research, planning, implementation and monitoring of Hoolock Gibbons in context of translocation.

4. List of equipment

Participants and resource persons of the workshop and others with experience in translocation may suggest equipment which should be included in a list for the training purpose, keeping in mind the accessibility, feasibility, appropriateness and cost of equipment. Information on suppliers in the country will be very useful.

5. Genetic study – Arunachal Pradesh

Since the PHVA workshop held in 2005 in Bangladesh, research and field studies have revealed that 1. The two types of Hoolock Gibbon, formerly thought to be two subspecies are in fact species (*Hoolock hoolock* and *Hoolock leuconedys* also known as Western Hoolock Gibbon and Eastern Hoolock Gibbon) and 2. Although until now it was thought that India had only Western Hoolock Gibbon, according to a study by Das, *et al* some populations of Eastern Hoolock Gibbon, *Hoolock leuconedys*, reside in the state of Arunachal Pradesh in India. *In view of this, care should be taken there should be no mixing of species under any circumstances.*

6. Trial Translocations – All resource persons were united in the suggestion that trial translocations should be considered as early as possible so that the natural obstacle of trying something new could be overcome, while gaining practical knowledge and practice of the myriad elements of preparation, implementation and follow-up can be evaluated and modified if necessary. Adequate care including preparation, equipments, logistics, team members, etc. should be taken with these trials, so that disasters which might prevent future exercises can be avoided. It was the view of resource persons that external experts be called to complement the local team.

- a. Three demonstration or trial sites were discussed and identified as likely prospects, one each in Tripura, Assam and Arunachal Pradesh. Arunachal Pradesh may be first as they have already done some work, identifying a needy population and a suitable site for release.
- b. There should be Identification of stakeholders. All the parties with a vested interest should be identified.
- c. *Public Information*
 - i. *Involvement of Media*
Media can be a tremendous aid to the success of conservation projects as well as a threat. Dr.

Fred Launay shared some of his experience with press, emphasizing the need to inform and educate the press on the subtleties of the operation well in advance of the exercise with suitable meetings and materials. The press can publish feature and news article as well as meetings so they may attune people to the proposed exercise and clarify misconceptions. In order to do this, the press has to be sensitized with background material and press releases that are simple, short and accurate as they are under many constraints such as time, space and having to serve the public at large over a wide range of educational levels.

ii. Education and awareness

Likewise Education and awareness activities of stakeholders of all levels must be instituted well before the actual translocation takes place. Stakeholders living in the area where the exercise is to take place may not want the animals to be removed (in the case of donor site) or they may not want the animals anywhere near them (in case of recipient site). They may also try to gather close around creating unwanted difficulties in conducting this delicate operation. They need to be educated about the overall importance of the project and the need for a certain amount of space, silence and privacy for the translocation team to work through the operation, from beginning to end. In no case should public approach the site or vehicle to see the animals or get their attention by make sounds or snapping their fingers, beating on the cage, etc.

iii. Political support

The support of all levels of government is absolutely necessary to any sensitive project. Government (and also media, public, etc.) should be carefully briefed with transparent information. When moving or doing almost any unnatural activity with animals, there is some risk of accident which may lead to the injury or death of the animal. This is certainly a risk when conducting a large number of movements or a new activity. So that government or pressure groups do not stand in the way of future translocations in reaction to a single unfortunate event, it is good to explain the risks and the options available. In the case of Hoolock Gibbon situated in small, isolated and otherwise unsuitable habitats it is a matter of time until the entire family or group is lost in any case. Translocation is a method of saving these animals as well as strengthening the populations of Hoolock Gibbons near the release site.

iv. Other ways to spread the word

Meeting the people whom we know, giving background, status of species, work plan, etc. and targeting open-minded individuals and involve them in the next stages, will invite their

cooperation in advertising and being a friend to the project.

d. Action Items for Trial Translocations

Tentative examples of information to be gathered and considered;

- where you want to capture and release
- type of areas, land tenure system, logistics, etc.
- number of animals
- equipments, no. of people, telemetry requirements (GPS, or conventional tracking); time to gather
- distance from the release sites- logistics
- assessment of total project (materials required, condition of the site, obstacles, threats, contingency actions) before drafting the proposal,
- transportation (back up vehicles if required)
- Government permissions – Central Govt., state government
- Team – for these first exercises it is advisable to work with an experienced external team
 - o External trainers and advisors - Primatologist, Handling expert, Veterinarian familiar with reintroduction and primates, Reintroduction/Translocation expert all capable of on site training and communicating with local experts and other staff.
 - o Local experts and staff - handlers, experienced wildlife veterinarian, veterinary technician, biologist, forester, driver, photographer/recorder.
 - o Always mindful that the more people at the site, the more confusion.
- Coordinator – Senior forester who is knowledgeable of the area and the species
- Documentation

7. Central Database – WADWT ; Live interactive website

A Central Data base will be established by the Wildlife Areas Development and Wildlife Trust, WADWT which will maintain items such as lists of food plants and lodging trees, published articles on Hoolock Gibbons, translocations protocols and other relevant information, bibliography, list of experts and their area of expertise and contact details; survey results of sites, size, date, population, areas, profile of area situation, and past history of Hoolock Gibbons in the site.

Priorities for Translocation of Hoolock Gibbons *Statewise*

This plenary working group took place after lunch of the second day of the January 2009

Translocation Training workshop for Hoolock Gibbon. Representatives from all seven range states of Hoolock Gibbon were present at the workshop.

Three states were represented by the Chief Wildlife Wardens (Assam, Manipur, Tripura), two states by Dy. Chief Wildlife Wardens (Meghalaya, Arunachal Pradesh), and two states by senior forest officers posted in range of Hoolock Gibbon (Mizoram and Nagaland)

Each state detailed its priority actions for the conservation of Hoolock Gibbons specifically relating to Translocation. These priorities given below are not ranked in priority order.

1. Arunachal Pradesh

- Survey of release sites
- Training & acquiring equipment for radio tracking, health screening
- Radio-collaring – probably just 1 collar per family
- The first trial translocation to be carried out
- Genetic studies
- Some funding for translocation is already available
- Research advisory group chaired by Chief Wildlife Warden
- Writing of a project plan/action plan that clearly details the component actions and resources available/needed

2. Assam

(Central coordinating committee exists)

- Writing of a project plan/action plan that clearly details the component actions and resources available/needed
- Survey and habitat evaluation
- Survey of isolated populations to locate populations possibly requiring translocation.
- One trial translocation to be carried out.
- Funding required for translocation work

3. Mizoram

- Training in translocation techniques, awareness training for communities, district councils & NGOs
- Identification of sites requiring translocation and release sites
- Mapping of isolated population
- Radio-collaring – probably just 1 collar per family
- Genetic studies for variability
- Funding for translocation needs to be sourced
- Research advisory group chaired by Chief Wildlife Warden

- Writing of a project plan/action plan that clearly details the component actions and resources available/needed
- Survey and mapping

4. Nagaland

- Hoolock Gibbons in 4 districts and isolated. Work difficult due to insurgency activities. Extensive hunting takes place. Village councils are very powerful and can restrict hunting.
- Survey of areas involving village councils and mapping.
- Identification of suitable and safe habitats involving a combination of GIS and local information.
- Funding required for the survey work.

5. Tripura

(Already prepared a draft for a Primate Conservation Foundation to be established with a combination of government and raised funding)

- Writing of a project plan/action plan that clearly details the component actions and resources available/needed
- Survey of isolated population
- GIS mapping of remaining habitats
- Detailed population study in 2 habitats to monitor trends
- One trial translocation to be carried out.
- Capacity building
- Survey/translocation equipment and list of suppliers.
- Presence/absence survey of all areas
- Funding

6. Manipur

Hoolock Gibbons are known to occur in 2 districts

- Survey and mapping of all areas
- Writing of a project plan/action plan that clearly details the component actions and resources available/needed
- GIS mapping of remaining habitats

7. Meghalaya

Individuals being held as pets to be dealt with separately

- Survey of all areas to establish the current status and whether translocation is required.
- Writing of a project plan/action plan that clearly details the component actions and resources available/needed

CBSG & RSG South Asia Members - Country by Country

CBSG S Asia members AFGHANISTAN

Kushal Habibi
<vze6rtav@verizon.net>

CBSG S Asia members BANGLADESH

Md. Abdur Razzaque Miah
<na@su-dls.org>,
Md. Anwarul Islam
<anwar1955@gmail.com>,
Md. Liaquat Ali
<liaquat_69@yahoo.com>,
Md. Mostafa Feeroz
<feeroz@juniv.edu>,
Md. Salim Iqbal
<salim87@bangla.net>,
Md. Waliur Rahman Akand
<shakif78@gmail.com>,
Nitish Chandra Debnath
<principalcgv@yahoo.com>,
cvasu@yahoo.com>,
Shimona Annoor Quazi
<shimona.quazi@gmail.com>,
Shital Kumar Nath
<smati71@yahoo.com>,
Sohrab Uddin Sarker
<mdsohrabu@yahoo.com>,
gulshan_al@yahoo.com>,

Bangladesh (no email)

Mr. A.K.M. Lutfur Rahman
Siddique, Dhaka
Mr. Abu Sayed Md. Kamal,
Dhaka
Dr. Ahmed Ziaur Rahman,
Dhaka
Dr. Arabinda Kumar Saha,
Rangpur
Dr. Md. Abdul Huq,
Mymensingh
Mr. Md. Mazibur Rahman,
Dhaka
Mr. Md. S.K. Mahabub
Rahaman, Dhaka
Dr. Md. Serazul Islam,
Dhaka
Dr. Md. Shahidullah,
Mirpur
Mr. Mohammad
Mohsinuzzaman
Chowdhury, Dhaka
Mr. Mohammed Abdul
Mannan, Chittagong
Ms. Momtaj Begum, Dhaka
Dr. N.C. Roy, Rangpur
Ratan Kumar Mondal,
Dhaka
Ms. Sharmin Sultana,
Dhaka
Mr. Tapas R. Chakraborty,
Dhaka
Ms. Umme Rukhsana,
Dhaka

CBSG S Asia members BHUTAN

Karma Jordhen
<roplng@druknet.bt>,

CBSG S Asia members INDIA

A. Manimozhi
<aazp@vsnl.com>,
manimozhi_64@yahoo.co.in>,
Adit Pal
<aditpal@gmail.com>,
Ajith Kumar
<ajith@ncbs.res.in>,
Anil K. Chhangani
<chhanganiak@yahoo.com>,
Asad R. Rahmani
<rahmani.asad@gmail.com>,
bnhs@bom3.vsnl.net.in>,
bnhs@bom4.vsnl.net.in>,
Ashok Kumar
<wildhaathi@yahoo.com>,
Atul Kumar Gupta
<akphayre@yahoo.com>,
mt028@ifs.nic.in>,
akphavri@gmail.com>,
B.A. Daniel
<badaniel@zooreach.org>,
Bhaskar Choudhury
<rescuevet@rediffmail.com>,
Bibhab Kumar Talukdar
<bibhab@aaranyak.org>,
bibhab1@sancharnet.in>,
Binod C. Choudhury
<bcc@wii.gov.in>,
Bipul Chakrabarty
<bipulchakrabarty@yahoo.co.in>,
Brij Kishor Gupta
<brijkishor68@yahoo.com>,
Brij Raj Sharma
<sharmabrijraj@hotmail.com>,
Chelmala Srinivasulu
<hyd2masawa@gmail.com>,
csrinivasulu@osmania.ac.in>,
Dilip Chetry
<dilip@aaranyak.org>,
primateconservation@rediffmail.com>,
Dipankar Lahkar
<dipankar.lahkar@gmail.com>,
bird.dipankar@gmail.com>,
G. Rangaswamy
<nbrpark@eth.net>,
G. Umopathy
<guma@ccmb.res.in>,
G.S. Solanki
<gssolanki02@yahoo.co.in>,
Ganapathy Marimuthu
<gmari@sancharnet.in>,
mailbox_gm@rediffmail.com>,
Ganesh Kumar Dubey
<dubeyganesh@hotmail.com>,
Gladwin Joseph
<gladwin@atree.org>,
Gopinathan Maheswaran
<gmaheswaran@yahoo.com>,

Goutam Narayan
<gn@ecosystems-india.org>,
goutam.narayan@gmail.com>,
ecosystems@sify.com>,
phog@sancharnet.in>,
Jacob V. Cheeran
<jacob@cheerans.com>,
Joydeep Bose
<jbose100@gmail.com>,
K. Ilango
<kilangozsi@rediffmail.com>,
K.N. Banerji
<ap110@ifs.nic.in>,
Kartick Satyanarayan
<kartick@wildlifefos.org>,
karticksatyanarayan@hotmail.com>,
Kaushik Deuti
<kaushikdeuti@rediffmail.com>,
Kazveen Dinyar Umrigar
<punezoo@vsnl.net>,
Khursheed Ahmad
<khursheed202@yahoo.com>,
khursheed@gmail.com>,
Kishore Kotecha
<info@asiaticlion.org>,
Lala Aswini Kumar Singh
<laksinghindia@gmail.com>,
M. Sivadasan
<dmsivadasan@rediffmail.com>,
M.P. Nayar
<errc@vsnl.net>,
Manju Siliwal
<manju@zooreach.org>,
manjusiliwal@rediffmail.com>,
Manoj Kumar Misra
<manojmisra@peaceinst.org>,
Mewa Singh
<msingh@psychology.uni-mysore.ac.in>,
mewasingh@sancharnet.in>,
mewasingh@bsnl.in>,
Mir Mohamad Mansoor
<mirmnsur@gmail.com>,
mimmnsur@yahoo.com>,
mimansoor2002@yahoo.co.uk>,
Mohammad Firoz Ahmed
<firoz@aaranyak.org>,
Murali Pai
<ecovetpai@gmail.com>,
muralipai@rediffmail.com>,
N. Baskar
<aazp@vsnl.com>,
N.C. Bahuguna
<ccf@moefrocko.org>,
wb040@ifs.nic.in>,
N.P.S. Chauhan
<npsc@wii.gov.in>,
N.V. Kataria
<gj116@ifs.nic.in>,
N.V.K. Ahsraf
<ahsraf@wildlifetrustofindia.org>,
ashraf@wti.org.in>,
Nandini Rangaswamy
<md@chandragroup.com>,
Narayanan Krishna kumar
<krishforbio@hotmail.com>,

Nirmal Jeet Singh
<mahal_njs@yahoo.com>,
P.O. Nameer
<nameer.ommer@gmail.com>,
P.R. Sinha
<dwii@wii.gov.in>,
R.J. Ranjit Daniels
<ranjit.daniels@gmail.com>,
R.J. Rao
<soszool@rediffmail.com>,
Raju Vyas
<razoovyas@hotmail.com>,
Rakesh Soud
<assam_rhino@rediffmail.com>,
Rama Prosad Mukherjee
<pkbanerjee6@rediffmail.com>,
Raman Sukumar
<rsuku@ces.iisc.ernet.in>,
Ravi Chellam
<rchellam61@yahoo.co.uk>,
S. Paulraj
<dfosivaganga@rediffmail.com>,
dfosvg@tn.nic.in>,
S.K. Patnaik
<saroj_p9@yahoo.com>,
Sally R. Walker
<sallyrwalker@aol.com>,
zooreach@zooreach.org>,
Sanjay R.V. Molur
<herpinvert@gmail.com>,
sanjaymolur@gmail.com>,
sanjay@zooreach.org>,
Sanjay Singha Thakur
<biome1@vsnl.net>,
sanjaythakur12@rediffmail.com>,
Sanjeev Kumari Paul
<pandrukhinauradheera@yahoo.com>,
sanjupaulraj@yahoo.co.in>,
Sant Prakash
<sa_ntprakash@yahoo.co.in>,
santprakashdr@gmail.com>,
Satya Priya Sinha
<sinhasp@yahoo.com>,
sinhaSP@hotmail.com>,
Shrawan Kumar Sinha
<sk_sinha00@yahoo.com>,
shrawanksinha@gmail.com>,
zoovetanal@yahoo.com>,
Sripathi Kandula
<sribat@rediffmail.com>,
sripathikandula@yahoo.com>,
sribat@hotmail.com>,
sribat@gmail.com>,
Sujit Chakraborty
<sumittriazsi@yahoo.co.in>,
Sumit Dookia
<sdookia_gazelle@rediffmail.com>,
sumitdookia@gmail.com>,
Sushil K. Dutta
<sk_dutta@yahoo.com>,
sushilkumar_dutta@rediffmail.com>,
Syed Ainul Hussain
<hussain@wii.gov.in>,
Thulasingham Kalachelvan
<tkchelvan@rediffmail.com>,
Tuhin Chakraborty
<sowhap@rediffmail.com>,

V. Kalaiarasan
<vkarasan@gmail.com>,
Vinod Khanna
<drvkhanna51@gmail.com>,
Yuvraj Ramachandra
Mr. Adhir Kumar Das,
Kolkatta, West Bengal
Dr. Apurba Chakraborty,
Guwahati, Assam
Mr. C.S. Yalakki, Palakkad,
Kerala
Mr. Devendra Kumar Ved,
Bangalore, Karnataka
Dr. G.S. Rawat, Dehradun,
Uttaranchal
Dr. Janak H. Desai,
Vadodara, Gujarat
Dr. Lakshmi Narayan
Acharjyo, Bhubaneswar
Mr. Mrigen Barua,
Guwahati, Assam
Dr. Rajendra Kumar Sahu,
Ahmedabad, Gujarat
Mr. S.C. Sharma, New
Delhi
Mr. Salim Javad, Aligarh,
Uttar Pradesh
Mr. Sandip S. Diwan,
Baroda, Gujarat
Mr. Susanta
Bhattacharyya, Kolkatta,
West Bengal
Mr. T. Ramakrishna,
Hyderabad, Andhra
Pradesh
Mr. Tarun Kumar Roy,
Siliguri, West Bengal
Dr. V. Ramakanth,
Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu
Mr. Vinod Rishi, Dehradun,
Uttaranchal
Dr. Yadunath Prasad
Sinha, patna, Bihar

**CBSG S Asia members
NEPAL**

Mukesh Kumar Chalise
<nebors@ccsl.com.np>,
Rachana Shah
<rachanasayshi@yahoo.com>,
Ravi Sharma Aryal
<raviaryal@yahoo.com>,
Mr. Ang Phuri Sherpa,
Kathmandu

**CBSG S Asia members
PAKISTAN**

Aamir Ismail Rizvi
<drairizvi@hotmail.com>,
Muhammad Mansoor Qazi
<muddassir74@yahoo.com>,
Naeem Ashraf Raja
<naeemashrafraja@yahoo.com>,
Richard Garstang
<rgarstang@wwf.org.pk>,
Uzma Khan
<ukhan@wwf.org.pk>,
Mr. Abdul Qadeer Mehal,
Lahore

**CBSG S Asia members
SRI LANKA**

Anslem De Silva
<kalds@sltnet.lk>,
Jayantha Jayewardene
<jayantha@jayewardene.com>,
Jayanthi Alahakoon
<pinnawela@yahoo.com>,
zoosl@sl.lk>,
Rohan Pethiyagoda
<rohanpet@gmail.com>,
Ruchira K. Somaweera
<ruchira.somaweera@gmail.com>,
TSD Surasinghe
<tdilan@gmail.com>,
surasinghe@sjp.ac.lk,
surasinghe@yahoo.com>,
Mr. Saman Senanayake,
Kurunegala

**REINTRODUCTION
SPECIALIST GROUP**

**RSG South Asia
members
INDIA**

Aniruddha Belsare
<anyadoc@gmail.com>,
Asad R. Rahamani
<rahmani.asad@gmail.com>,
bnhs@bom3.vsnl.net.in,
bnhs@bom4.vsnl.net.in>,
B. C. Choudhury
<bcc@wii.gov.in>,
B. R. Sharma
<sharmabrijraj@hotmail.com>,
E. K. Jayson
<mathew@kfri.org>,
Goutam Narayan <
gn@ecosystems-india.org>,
goutam.narayan@gmail.com>,
ecosystems@sify.com>,
pygmyhog@gmail.com>,
phog@sancharnet.in>,
Janaki Lenin
<janaki@gmail.com>,
K.G. Mohanan Pillai
<kgm_pillai@yahoo.com>,
Kartick Satyanarayan
<kartick@wildlifecos.com>,
karticksatyanarayan@hotmail.com>,
Manoj Kumar Misra
<manojmisra@peaceinst.org>,
Mewa Singh
<msingh@psychology.uni-
mysore.ac.in>,
mewasingh@sancharnet.in>,
N. Krishnakumar, IFS
<krishforbio@hotmail.com>,
P. O. Nameer
<nameer.ommer@gmail.com>,
R. J. Rao
<soszool@rediffmail.com>,
Ravi Chellam
<rchellam61@yahoo.co.uk>,

Satya P. Sinha
<sinhasp@yahoo.com>,
sinhaSP@hotmail.com>,
Shomita Mukherjee
<shomitam@yahoo.com>,
Vivek Menon
<vivek@wti.org>,
Mr. B. K. Majumdar,
Nagpur, Maharashtra
Mr. C. S. Yalakki,
Palakkad, Kerala
Dr. Harry Andrews,
Mammalapuram, Tamil
Nadu
Sri. Prakash Thosre, Pune,
Maharashtra
Mr. Raha, 24 Parganas
Dist., West Bengal
Dr. Rajesh Gopal, New
Delhi
Dr. Romulus Whitaker,
Chengalpattu, Tamil Nadu
Mr. S. S. Bist, Kolkatta,
West Bengal
Mr. Salman Rajesh,
Imphal, Manipur
Mr. Sudhakar Kar,
Bhubaneswar, Orissa
Shri. Sujoy Chaudhuri,
Pune, Maharashtra
Dr. Vidya Athreya, Pune,
Maharashtra

NOTE !

**IF YOUR NAME IS HERE AND OUR EMAIL IS EITHER WRONG
OR MISSING, PLEASE MAKE SURE WE HAVE IT.**

**IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO JOIN CBSG OR RSG SOUTH ASIA,
PLEASE PICK UP A FORM, FILL IT OUT AND HAND IT IN.**

CBSG Process : Working in working groups

Task I: Assign Working Group Roles

Assign these roles at the start of each working group session

Facilitator

- Assures that each person wanting to speak is heard
- Keeps the group task front and center
- Keeps track of discussion using flip charts

Recorder

- Keeps track of group discussion using a computer
- Will provide the basis of the report from this workshop

Timekeeper

- Keeps the group aware of the time remaining

Presenter

- Delivers the working group report in plenary

Task II: Participant Introductions and Agenda Construction

- Please take 5 minutes to introduce yourselves to each other.
- Each participant states what they would like the group to accomplish
- If necessary revise the working group agenda to accommodate as many participant's goals as possible
- The facilitator will then propose a process for accomplishing these goals (you may or may not choose to follow the steps outlined below).

Task III: Issue Generation and Prioritization

- Brainstorm issues related to your group's topic.
- Consolidate similar issues and theme them into topic areas.
- Prioritize the issues

Task IV: Issue Elaboration and Objective Identification

- Summarize each of your group's high priority issues into a problem/issue statement. Be sure to ask yourselves *why* it is a problem or issue of concern and then include the answers in your problem statement.
- Based on the problem/issue statement, identify specific goals that you feel must be met in order to address this problem/issue (what needs to be accomplished?).

Task V: Action Identification and Prioritization

- For each of your group's top priority goals, brainstorm a range of possible actions to achieve the stated objective.
- Actions must be SMART!! (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-oriented and Time-fixed)
- Prioritize the proposed actions.

Working Agreement

- All ideas are valid
- Everything is recorded on flip charts
- Everyone participates; no one dominates
- Listen to each other
- Treat each other with respect
- Differences and problems are acknowledged - not "worked"
- Observe time frames
- Complete draft report by end of meeting

Working group reports

- Group convenors responsible for giving hard copy and disk copy (Word) of final report to a CBSG staff member before the close of the meeting.