

1 **Advances in plant conservation translocation**

2

3 **Thomas Abeli¹ & Sarah E. Dalrymple²**

4

5 ¹Department of Science, Roma Tre University, Viale Guglielmo Marconi 446, 00146, Roma, Italy

6 ²School of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool L3 3AF, UK

7

8

9 **Abstract**

10 With thousands of performed cases, conservation translocation is now widely used to restore rare and
11 threatened plant populations worldwide. While we begin to understand from previous mistakes and best
12 practices what makes translocations successful, we realize also how complex the process of performing a
13 translocation is, from the very initial planning phases to the final monitoring phase. Conservation biologists
14 and practitioners met in Rome at the Roma Tre University in June 2022 for the 1st International Plant
15 Translocation Conference, a conference fully dedicated to the most recent advances in plant translocations.
16 This special issue, containing eight articles on different aspects of plant translocation, is a tangible output of
17 the efforts by all attendees to sharing knowledge and establishing plant translocation best practices. Besides
18 reviews and species-specific aspects of translocation, the special issue highlights the importance of the
19 community of scientists and practitioners and the multidisciplinary of conservation translocations to
20 achieve successful outcome.

21

22 **Keywords:** Mediterranean Biodiversity Hot-spot, mitigation translocation, plant conservation, plant
23 reintroduction, translocation aftercare

24

25 **Main Text**


26 With thousands of performed cases, conservation translocation is now widely used to restore rare and
27 threatened plant populations worldwide (e.g., Soorae 2021, 2022). The large amount of data accompanying
28 past and present plant translocations is a massive source of information for improving techniques of future
29 translocations and their outcomes. While the need for a large worldwide database of plant translocation has
30 not been met yet (Godefroid and Vanderbought 2011), several databases developed at the country level has
31 made these data available or partially available to the scientific community and practitioners involved in plant
32 translocation (Silcock et al. 2021; Abeli et al. 2022; TRANSLOC, <http://translocations.in2p3.fr/>; CPC
33 Reintroduction Registry <https://saveplants.org/reintroduction-registry/>). Thanks to these databases, we have
34 entered a new era of translocation science, an era where the analysis of large data sources is shedding light
35 on a key question: What are the drivers of plant translocation outcome (i.e., success or failure)? Several
36 recently published reviews have started to highlight some corner-stones of translocation performance in
37 terms of plant survival, flowering and fruiting rates and recruitment (Godefroid et al. 2011; Dalrymple et al.,
38 2012; Albrecht and Maschinski 2012; Liu et al. 2015; Silcock et al. 2018; Fenu et al. 2019). Key drivers of
39 performance so far include; the number of released plant individuals, their age, the demographic trends of
40 their source, their genetic diversity, and how they were propagated (Godefroid et al. 2011; Dalrymple et al.

41 2012; Liu et al. 2015), as well as some intrinsic species characteristics like the plant life form (Liu et al. 2015)
42 and preferred habitat (Silcock et al. 2019).

43 While we begin to understand from previous mistakes and best practices what makes translocations
44 successful, we realize also how complex the process of performing a translocation is, from the very initial
45 planning phases to the final monitoring phase (CPC, 2018; Commander et al. 2019).

46 The process leading to a conservation translocation includes at least three phases that can be summarized
47 as follows: 1) planning phase – including feasibility studies, social and financial considerations, authorization
48 process, understanding of the target species characteristics, source material and release site selection; 2)
49 implementation phase – including material propagation, site preparation, plant release; 3) post-release
50 phase – including monitoring, aftercare, outcome assessment. Considering the different expertise involved
51 in the abovementioned phases, we may assert that conservation translocation is the most comprehensive
52 and multifaceted conservation tool we have today, encompassing not less than four macro-disciplines, i.e.,
53 biological sciences (taxonomic, genetic, ecological, biological considerations), environmental sciences
54 (geographic, geological, topographic and pedological considerations), social sciences (risk and conflict
55 management, authorization process), and economic sciences (financial risks and sustainability; Figure 1).

56



57

58 **Figure 1.** Overall complexity of a plant translocation with at least four macro-disciplines involved in three
59 phases. Disciplines are represented as a cloud near each of the translocation phase where they provide the
60 main contribution; however, every discipline may contribute to plant translocation outcome in more than
61 one phase.

62

63 Despite recent advances, there are still several aspects of plant translocation that need to be clarified, as in
64 most cases the drivers of outcome identified in the abovementioned reviews were species-specific and/or
65 site-specific, which prevents identification of a single recipe (or even a few) recipes for all target taxa. For

66 instance, how intrinsic plant traits and preferred habitat affect translocation outcome is still poorly
67 investigated, as is the trade-off between cost of aftercare and its contribution to translocation performance.
68 For this reason, conservation biologists and practitioners met in Rome at the Department of Science of the
69 Roma Tre University from 20 to 23 June, 2022 for the 1st International Plant Translocation Conference
70 (IPTC2022; <https://host.uniroma3.it/eventi/IPTC2022/>), a conference fully dedicated to the most recent
71 advances in plant translocations. This special issue, containing eight articles on different aspects of plant
72 translocation, is a tangible output of the efforts by all attendees to sharing knowledge and establishing best
73 practices. One the most important achievements of the IPTC that is reflected in this special issue is the
74 recognition that mitigation translocations are in fact translocation with a different perspective, but with
75 important commonalities in terms of methods.

76 The special issue opens with Doyle et al. (2023), the first and most comprehensive review and perspective
77 article on mitigation translocation aimed at reframing mitigation translocations as conservation driven. Doyle
78 et al. (2023) sets a new state-of-the-art for mitigation translocation and bridges the science-based standards
79 of conservation translocations to achieve global standards for mitigation translocations.

80 In the new era of large dataset analysis, Fenu et al. (2023) reviews translocations in the Mediterranean area,
81 with the aim to mark the current situation of plant translocations in this Biodiversity Hotspot and identify
82 future directions. The great discrepancy between translocations performed (836 cases related to 572 plant
83 species) and published (133 published papers related to 56 plant species) further reflects the need for
84 database implementation and analysis.

85 According to Fenu et al. (2023), France is among the most active countries for the number of conservation
86 and mitigation translocations performed. Diallo et al. (2023) analyses the threats affecting 193 plant species
87 subjects to mitigation and conservation translocation in France, with clear differences in terms of threats
88 between the two types of action. While mitigation translocation is usually applied to populations
89 threatened by infrastructure development, conservation translocations are often applied to other types of
90 human-induced disturbances and natural system modifications.

91 How long post-translocation monitoring should last is one of the most debated topics in plant translocation,
92 with globally agreed standards not yet achieved. Julien et al. (2023) provides an overview of monitoring
93 duration in 575 conservation and mitigation translocations in France. In most translocations monitoring
94 lasted less than four years, with shorter monitoring in mitigation translocations than in conservation
95 translocations, further evidence of higher standards needed for mitigation translocation. Monitoring is
96 important also to identify and mitigate the consequence of unexpected issues on translocated populations,
97 through aftercare techniques.

98 One of the most important aspects in translocation includes genetics and genomics considerations for
99 ensuring that translocated populations are adaptively representative, diverse, and composed of unrelated
100 individuals. Using two Australian species as case studies (*Prostanthera densa* and *Fontainea oraria*),
101 Rossetto et al. (2023) developed a workflow to better support the use of genetic and genomic studies in
102 plant translocation.

103 Monks et al. (2023), reviewed the role of fencing and watering for the outcome of 76 translocations of 50
104 species in the Mediterranean province of Western Australia and found that fencing and watering
105 significantly improved translocation outcomes in terms of survival and growth, and reproduction,
106 respectively.

107 Literature reviews and database analysis are very important to inform practical activities in the field, for
108 instance, the selection of suitable sites for translocation. Prado et al. (2023) built their study on current
109 knowledge on limnological and ecophysiological requirements of quillworts to assess suitable sites for the
110 translocation of the threatened endemic quillwort *Isoetes cangae*, in Brazil.

111 Finally, Reiter et al. (2023) showcases the complex relationships between plant reproduction, weather and
112 pollinator activity using the endangered orchid *Caladenia xanthochila* as a case study. The study highlights
113 that pollinators play a key role in translocation outcome and suggests hand pollination as an aftercare
114 technique to improve translocation outcome.

115

116 **The importance of the plant translocation community**

117 Although the contributions in this special issue, and previous literature, can attest to the long-established
118 utilization of plant translocation, we feel that this editorial is an opportunity to commend and promote the
119 excellent work happening in the plant conservation translocation community. The amount of activity,
120 longevity of projects, and quality of work has reached a new level of scientific rigor and professionalism that
121 positively reflects on an engaged and committed community of practitioners and researchers. Indeed, the
122 boundaries between practice and research are blurred and are a product of the willingness of practitioners
123 to adopt best practice, to learn from each translocation attempt, and of researchers to address applied
124 questions of direct relevance to practice. This willingness to work collaboratively is evident in data sharing
125 and calls for strengthened databases, a feature of an emerging movement in conservation to rigorously
126 incorporate evidence in conservation actions (Downey et al. 2022). The importance of experimental trials in
127 conservation interventions has been noted recently (Sutherland et al. 2022) but is long-established in plant
128 conservation translocations. Finally, as was evident at the International Plant Conservation Translocation
129 Conference, as well as in this Special Issue, the plant translocation community continually demonstrates its
130 appetite to learn from past failures to improve – an aspect of conservation practice which is crucial to future
131 success (Dickson et al. 2021). Our ability to share experiences and identify the root causes of failures will be
132 improved by greater sharing between national databases (Fenu et al. 2023) and is something we should
133 strive to do globally in order to most effectively protect plant diversity for future generations.

134

135 **Conflict of interest statement**

136 Authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

137

138 **References**

139 Abeli T, D'Agostino M, Orsenigo S, et al (2021) IDPlanT: the Italian database of plant translocation. *Plant*
140 *Biosyst*, 155:1-4.

141 Albrecht MA, Maschinski J (2012) Influence of founder population size, propagule stages, and life history on
142 the survival of reintroduced plant populations. *Plant reintroduction in a changing climate: promises and*
143 *perils* (pp. 171-188), Island Press, Washington, DC.

144 Commander LE, Coates D, Broadhurst L, Offord CA, Makinson RO, Matthes M (2018) *Guidelines for the*
145 *translocation of threatened plants in Australia*. Third Edition. Australian Network for Plant Conservation,
146 Canberra.

147 CPC (2018) *CPC Best Plant Conservation Practices to Support Species Survival in the Wild*. The Center for
148 Plant Conservation.

149 Dalrymple SE, Banks E, Stewart GB, Pullin AS (2012) A meta-analysis of threatened plant reintroductions
150 from across the globe. In *Plant reintroduction in a changing climate* (pp. 31-50). Island Press,
151 Washington, DC.

- 152 Diallo M, Mayeur A, Vaissière AC, Colas B (2023) The relevance of plant translocation as a conservation tool
153 in France. *Plant Ecology* xx:xx. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-023-01295-4>
- 154 Dickson I, Butchart SH, Catalano A, et al (2023) Introducing a common taxonomy to support learning from
155 failure in conservation. *Conserv Biol*, 37:e13967.
- 156 Downey H, Bretagnolle V, Brick C, et al (2022) Principles for the production of evidence-based guidance for
157 conservation actions. *Conserv Sci Pract*, 4(5):e12663.
- 158 Doyle CA, Abeli T, Albrecht MA, Bellis J, Colas B, Dalrymple SE, Ensslin A, Espejo J, Erftemeijer PL, Julien M,
159 Lewandowski W (2023) Achieving conservation outcomes in plant mitigation translocations: the need
160 for global standards. *Plant Ecology*. xx:xx. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-023-01310-8>
- 161 Fenu G, Bacchetta G, Charalambos SC, et al (2019) An early evaluation of translocation actions for
162 endangered plant species on Mediterranean islands. *Plant Diversity* 41:94-104.
- 163 Fenu G, Calderisi G, Boršić I, Bou Dagher Kharrat M, García Fernández A, Kahale R, Panitsa M, Cogoni D
164 (2023) Translocations of threatened plants in the Mediterranean Basin: current status and future
165 directions. *Plant Ecology* xx:xx. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-023-01303-7>
- 166 Godefroid S, Piazza C, Rossi G, Buord S, Stevens AD, Agurauja R, Cowell C, Vanderborght T (2011) How
167 successful are plant species reintroductions? *Biol Conserv* 144:672-682.
- 168 Godefroid S, Vanderborght T (2011) Plant reintroductions: the need for a global database. *Biodivers Conserv*
169 20:3683–3688.
- 170 Julien M, Schatz B, Robert A, Colas B (2023) Monitoring time of conservation-driven and mitigation-driven
171 plant translocations in Europe. *Plant Ecology* xx:xx. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-023-01311-7>
- 172 Liu H, Liu Z, Jin X, Gao J, Chen Y, Liu Q, Zhang DY (2020) Assessing conservation efforts against threats to
173 wild orchids in China. *Biol Conserv* 243:108484.
- 174 Monks L, Yen J, Dillon R, Standish R, Coates D, Byrne M, Veski P (2023) Herbivore exclusion and water
175 availability improve success across 76 translocations of 50 threatened plant species in a biodiversity
176 hotspot with a Mediterranean climate. *Plant Ecology* xx:xx. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-023-01313-5>
177
- 178 Prado LA, da R. Gripp A, Cogo AJ, Santos MP, da Rocha JG, Genovez JG, Calderon EN, Martins RL, Cavalcante
179 AB, de A. Esteves F, Zandonadi DB (2023) Environmental characterization of an Amazonian lake for
180 *Isoëtes cangae* translocation. *Plant Ecology* xx:xx. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-023-01300-w>
- 181 Reiter N, Wicks M, Pollard G, Brown G, Menz M, Björn B (2023) Improving conservation and translocation
182 success of an endangered orchid, *Caladenia xanthochila* (Orchidaceae), through understanding
183 pollination. *Plant Ecology* xx:xx. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-023-01334-0>
- 184 Rossetto M, Bragg J, Brown D, van der Merwe M, Wilson TC, Yap JY (2023) Applying simple genomic
185 workflows to optimise practical plant translocation outcomes. *Plant Ecology* xx:xx. Doi:
186 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-023-01322-4>
- 187 Silcock JL, Simmons CL, Monks L, Dillon R, Coates D (2021) Australian Plant Translocation Database.
188 Australian Network for Plant Conservation, The University of Queensland. Data Collection.
- 189 Silcock JL, Simmons CL, Monks L, Dillon R, Reiter N, Jusaitis M, Veski PA, Byrne M, Coates DJ (2019)
190 Threatened plant translocation in Australia: a review. *Biol Conserv* 236:211–22.

- 191 Soorae PS (2022) Global Reintroduction Perspectives: 2022 Case studies from around the globe. IUCN/SSC
192 Reintroduction Specialist Group, Gland, Switzerland and Environment Agency, Abu Dhabi, UAE.
- 193 Soorae PS (2021) Global Reintroduction Perspectives: 2021 Case studies from around the globe IUCN/SSC
194 Reintroduction Specialist Group, Gland, Switzerland and Environment Agency, Abu Dhabi, UAE.
- 195 Sutherland WJ, Robinson JM, Aldridge DC, et al (2022) Creating testable questions in practical conservation:
196 a process and 100 questions. *Conserv Evi* 19:1-7.