All forms/templates are available to download on the EAZA Member Area.

Appendix 3: Template for proposing a new EEP

TAGs can use this Template for proposing a new EEP to the EEP Committee. As per default these applications follow from the RCP publication process and the Species Assessment Sheet should be sent along with this template. In exceptional cases new EEPs may also be proposed in between RCP editions. A separate Species Assessment Sheet should be completed if an EEP is being applied for in between RCP editions. Note that not all sections below may be relevant to each programme. Also note that 'species' represents any taxonomic unit the TAG has chosen as the unit of management in an EEP.

EEP Proposal for

Common Species Name: Zebra shark
Scientific Species Name: *Stegostoma fasciatum* [Fishbase] ***/ Stegostoma tigrinum*** [IUCN]

Prepared by

Name(s): Elasmobranch TAG
Year: 2023

1. Contact information

Contact details of proposed EEP Coordinator

Name: Silvia Lavorano
Institution: Acquario di Genova
Email: slavorano@costaedutainment.it

2. Taxonomy information

Taxonomy of the species *(indicate which taxa are included in this programme and why, and give an indication of the degree of confidence in the taxonomic identification of the individuals in the EEP population)*

Monotypic species

3. Identified roles

Identified role(s) description *(copy from the Species Assessment Sheet in RCP)*
Direct conservation roles:

- Insurance: This role contemplates the possibility to maintain a long-term *ex situ* population to preserve options for the future. However, in order to fulfill this role, it is important to do genetic research focusing on how related are the founders of EAZA's population, as well as researching why is occurring parthenogenesis in aquaria. Additionally, more breeding expertise is needed.
- Population restoration: This additional role which was not contemplated during the RCP, aims to re-establish the species to Raja Ampat (Indonesia). This role requires behaviourally competent and genetically viable individuals for release into the wild following the IUCN Translocation Guidelines. The population restoration process has already begun through the initiative StAR by ReShark and an MoU with them is being developed.

Indirect conservation roles:
- Conservation Education: This role will be used to convey messages on the general threats to sharks (especially finning) and to coral reefs. This role can contribute to increasing public awareness of the status of sharks and to highlight the need to conserve them in the wild and to protect their natural habitat.
- Fundraising: This role focuses on helping to raise funds to support conservation for the Zebra shark's AZA project. There is, however, the potential risk to loss opportunity for funding other more threaten/urgent species.

Non-conservation roles:
- Exhibit: Attractive shark species which is suitable for tropical coral exhibits.

Programme decision statement:

EEP

In order to fulfil the selected roles, it will be necessary to maintain a demographically and genetically stable population. Furthermore, this species will aim to contribute to engage the public with a conservation education story focused on finning and coral reefs (as habitat). In conclusion, the TAG recommended to manage *Stegostoma tigrinum* as an EEP given the active management level required.

4. Programme participants and governance

EAZA institutional scope *(As a default, participation in EEPs is obligatory for EAZA Members. If you wish for an exemption, identify which institution(s) holding this species is/are not part of the EEP and explain the underlying reasons.)*

Non-EAZA holding institutional scope *Select one or more of the options below.*

- ☐ *EAZA population/community is the dominating driver of the EEP and any non-EAZA Members will occasionally join and are not integral to the structure of the EEP.*
- √ *In addition to EAZA, there are other structural/equal drivers of the EEP (e.g., World Pheasant Association, …). Please describe.*
- ☐ *A larger initiative exists and the EAZA population is a small part of this (e.g., GSMP, …). Please describe.*

Additional information: There is a core group of 65 individuals within 18 EAZA member facilities. In addition, there are another 79 sharks in 36 non EAZA facilities, most of them being involved in EUAC. Depending on the importance for the programme the TAG/EEP will be working on the formalization of these facilities with the Aquarium matters (March 2022) document in mind.

Essential non-EAZA partners not holding animals *(List the organisations, define their role, and how they will work with the EEP).*

Members of the EEP core group (Species Committee + non-voting members)

- *By default, EEPs have a Species Committee (a democratically elected representation of the holders) as part of their EEP core group (information on the Species Committee and its associated default decision making process can be found in the Population Management Manual). If that will not be the case for this EEP, explain why and define the composition, structure and decision-making process for the EEP core group.*

  Default, species Committee is to be elected.

All forms/templates are available to download on the EAZA Member Area.

- *List the EEP core group members (names and institutions) (if already known): Species Committee members, Advisors, others.*

Collaboration with EAZA Working Groups and Committees *(Explain any current and/or future proposed links to existing EAZA groups and committees, such as the Animal Training Working Group, Biobanking Working Group, EAZA Reproductive Management Group (RMG), EAZA Population Management Advisory Group (EPMAG), EAZA Education Committee, EAZA Nutrition Working Group, EAZA Research Committee, Reintroduction and Translocations Group, Transport Working Group, EAZA Veterinary Committee, EAZA Conservation Committee, Animal Welfare Working Group, Palm oil Working Group).*

In the future this EEP could collaborate with the Working Groups and Committees highlighted in yellow

5. Programme characteristics

The detailed programme characteristics, goals, objectives and management strategies to fulfil the roles and goals of the EEP will be developed at a later stage as part of a Long-Term Management Plan (LTMP). The questions below are intended to help paint a rough view of what is currently intended/expected for the general EEP programme characteristics.

- *If there is a recent/active Long-term Management Plan for this species, list the demographic, genetic and other goals determined (if they still apply post RCP workshop).*

There is a draft LTMP in progress.

- *What is the anticipated duration of the programme?*

To be defined.

- *What is the anticipated likelihood and time scale of the use of the EEP population for restoration in the wild (reintroduction, reinforcement, etc.)?*

All forms/templates are available to download on the EAZA Member Area.

The EEP is working on a MoU between Eaza and Reshark to join the StAR Project (Stegostoma tigrinum Augmentation and Recovery Project), a Reshark project.

- *Are some or all the individuals within this EEP intended to be held in specialist ex situ centres in the species' native range? Specify.*

Main role is the establishment of a genetically and demographically sustainable population to fulfil the insurance role. Depending on the discussion with Reshark there might be the potential to provide eggs/juvenile sharks for release projects. These new young CB individuals will be held for a while in specialist ex situ centers within StAR project.

- *Is it expected to be necessary that the whole population, or a certain proportion thereof, will need to be held off exhibit in order to fulfil the roles of the programme? If yes, please explain. (this question does not refer to the temporary housing of individuals off exhibit for space reasons).*

It could be for some individuals in certain institutions related to StAR project.

- *Does a part or the whole of the EEP population need to be held in bio-secure facilities? And/or are there known diseases that have an above average effect on fulfilling the roles of the EEP?*

No

- *What is the expected estimated number of individuals and institutions required to fulfil the selected roles? (this question will be answered in detail during the LTMP session for the taxon, but if some indication of scale is clear already, this should be stated here)*

Depending on the LTMP.

- *Is this EEP intended to include rearing of wild eggs/young (i.e. head-starting)?*

Currently no.

- *Is this EEP intended to include ex situ breeding?*

All forms/templates are available to download on the EAZA Member Area.

Yes

- *Is there likely sufficient expertise for this, or a model, taxon to achieve the roles of the programme and provide conditions for good welfare? Please indicate if Best Practice Guidelines already exist and if yes, include publication date.*

Yes, there are Husbandry Guidelines published in 2010. These need to be transferred to the BPGs template, and made publically available.

- *Will (non-)breeding and transfer recommendations be issued? If yes, with what frequency? (naturally problems will need to be solved throughout the year, but with what frequency will recommendations be issued for the whole population at once)*

Yes. To be determined later

- *Do you anticipate that the EEP population will be (largely) closed or will there be regular planned additions of individuals? In case of the latter, will this be for genetic and/or demographic reasons and what will be the source (other ex situ sources and/or from the wild)?*

To be determined with the final LTMP

- *Do you expect genetic and demographic management in this EEP to be individual and/or group-based?*

Individually based

- *Do you expect genetic management in this EEP to be based on pedigree analysis, group history analysis, and/or molecular genetics?*

Yes

- *Do you anticipate, or proactively plan for, biobanking and/or assisted reproduction to be key components of this programme?*

Yes

- *Do you anticipate certain national or international legislation to form a particular hindrance (more than average) to achieving the roles of your EEP (e.g., CITES, BALAI, governmental ownership, etc.). If so, explain how.*

Currently no

- *Are there any other issues/plans related to in situ conservation support that you feel should be mentioned and are not evident from the role description of the EEP?*

No

- *Is there a research component/aspect to the EEP that is expected to have important consequences for the design of the EEP programme (e.g. housing and husbandry of a significant proportion of the population, etc.)? If yes, explain.*

Yes. Genetic studies, Artificial insemination, contraception,

- *Do you anticipate there to be any sizeable political, social, or public conflicts of interest related to the EEP programme and how do you plan to deal with them?*

Currently no

- *Any important additional programme characteristics that you would like to mention?*

6. References (if any)

Janse, M., Baylina, N., Wille, M., Aparici Plaza, D., van der Meer, R., Hausen, N. (eds.) 2021. EAZA Elasmobranch Taxon Advisory Group Regional Collection Plan – First Edition. EAZA Executive Office: Amsterdam.