This is a peer reviewed version of the following article: Tulloch, A., Auerbach, N., Avery-Gomm, S., Bayraktarov, E., Butt, N., Dickman, C.R., Ehmke, G., Fisher, D.O., Grantham, H., Holden, M.H., Lavery, T.H., Leseberg, N.P., Nicholls, M., O'Connor, J., Roberson, L., Smyth, A.K., Stone, Z., Tulloch, V., Turak, E., Wardle, G.M., Watson, J.E.M. (2018) A decision tree for assessing the risks and benefits of publishing biodiversity data, *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, Vol. 2, pp. 1209-1217; which has been published in final form at:

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0608-1

A decision tree for assessing the risks and benefits of publishing biodiversity data

Ayesha I.T. Tulloch[1,2,3]*, Nancy Auerbach[4], Stephanie Avery-Gomm[4], Elisa Bayraktarov[4], Nathalie Butt[4], Chris R. Dickman[3], Glenn Ehmke[5], Diana O. Fisher[4], Hedley Grantham[2], Matthew H. Holden[4], Tyrone H. Lavery[6], Nicholas P. Leseberg[1], Miles Nicholls[7], James O'Connor[5], Leslie Roberson[4], Anita K. Smyth[8], Zoe Stone[1], Vivitskaia Tulloch[4], Eren Turak[9,10], Glenda M. Wardle[3], James E.M. Watson[1,2]

1. School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia Queensland 4072, Australia
2. Wildlife Conservation Society, Global Conservation Program, 2300 Southern Boulevard, Bronx NY 10460-1068, USA
3. Desert Ecology Research Group, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Sydney, Sydney NSW 2006, Australia
4. School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, Brisbane Queensland 4072, Australia
5. BirdLife Australia, Melbourne VIC 3053, Australia
6. Biodiversity Institute, University of Kansas, Lawrence Kansas 66045, U.S.A.
7. Atlas of Living Australia, National Collections & Marine Infrastructure, CSIRO, Acton ACT 2601, Australia
8. Terrestrial Ecosystem Research Network (TERN), The University of Adelaide, North Terrace, Adelaide SA 5005, Australia
9. NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, Goulburn St, Sydney NSW 2000, Australia

10. Australian Museum, 6 College St Sydney NSW 2000, Australia

***Author for correspondence:** Ayesha I.T. Tulloch

Desert Ecology Research Group, Heydon-Laurence Building A08, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Sydney, Sydney NSW 2006, Australia. ayesha.tulloch@sydney.edu.au

Keywords: data sharing, risk analysis, decision science, data deficient species, conservation biology, research data publication

Inadequate information on the geographical distribution of biodiversity hampers decision making for conservation. Major efforts are underway to fill knowledge gaps, but there are increasing concerns that publishing the locations of species is dangerous, particularly for species at risk of exploitation. While we recognize that well-informed control of location data for highly sensitive taxa is necessary to avoid risks, such as poaching or habitat disturbance by recreational visitors, we argue that ignoring the benefits of sharing biodiversity data could unnecessarily obstruct conservation efforts for species and locations with low risks of exploitation. We provide a decision-tree protocol for scientists that systematically considers both the risks of exploitation and potential benefits of increased conservation activities. Our protocol helps scientists assess the impacts of publishing biodiversity data and aims to enhance conservation opportunities, promote community engagement and reduce duplication of survey efforts.

Achieving effective conservation relies on accurate knowledge of where species occur to assist with their management [1-3]. This is particularly true for rare and endangered species that are at risk of extinction. Despite this, one in six IUCN-listed species are considered data deficient, and conservation practitioners routinely face a paucity of primary data on the temporal and spatial distribution of biodiversity [4,5,6]. Resolving this issue is urgent: without adequate spatially explicit biodiversity data, good management and policy decisions that enable the protection of species and ecosystems may be unachievable[7-9].

Primary biodiversity data is evidence that associates a species or taxon with a geographic location within a specified time interval. This may include one or more types of evidence: a sighting, a DNA sample, a verified photographic image or traces such as scats, tracks, nests or burrows that that can be attributed to a given taxon with confidence. Primary data may also provide biologically useful information such as age, sex, breeding status, and population abundance. Today there are not just unprecedented online science data services for researchers, conservationists and the public (e.g. wildlife atlases and scientific data repositories such as http://aekos.org.au [10]), but an increased willingness to share primary biodiversity data (e.g. via citizen science programs such as eBird [11]). Further, scientific journals and funding agencies increasingly request transparently archiving research data [12-14].

Sharing species occurrence information publicly or privately presents a challenge for scientists because it requires balancing potentially difficult and uncertain trade-offs. For example, shortly after their discovery was published, poaching for the pet trade contributed to the local extinction of Chinese Cave Geckos *Goniurosaurus luii* in Vietnam [15], prompting calls to not publish primary biodiversity data [16]. In contrast, primary occurrence data shared by researchers in publicly-available databases and within the scientific literature were critical to recent re-assessments of extinction risk for endemic birds in Bolivia and Australia [17,18]; which allowed for accurate assessments of extinction status of up to two-thirds of the examined species that otherwise would have been uncertain. To ensure effective conservation informed by the best available knowledge of species distributions and abundances, we must understand the benefits of sharing data and the costs of not sharing data, rather than only the risks as has been the recent focus. Here, we propose a risk management decision protocol that balances potential negative outcomes for species against the conservation benefits of publishing primary occurrence data. By following our decision tree, scientists collecting biodiversity data will be able to ensure that they do not overlook potential conservation opportunities for study species, and that conservation mistakes do not occur through inappropriate release or restriction of data.

How are biodiversity data shared?

Data publication is often carefully managed by data authors and custodians to maintain confidentiality and meet jurisdictional laws and national regulations (Supplementary Table 1). Ways of managing the release of data classified as “sensitive” range from publishing precise locations but changing species identifiers to a classification of “restricted” or to a higher taxonomic resolution such as genus or family (if spatial locations are important to share for conservation purposes), to keeping species names accurate but changing locations to mask true spatial coordinates (e.g. by buffering or masking the location), or restricting species location information completely by withholding it from public access (see Supplementary Table 1).

The most comprehensive guide on assessing sensitivities around species and required generalisation rules for publishing species locations is provided by the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) [19]. GBIF's protocol is to first identify which species are at risk from harm by human activity, and to second assess the impact of this activity on the taxon. These criteria are used to determine whether a species is flagged as sensitive and are then followed by further rules determining the degree of sensitivity. A subsequent rule determines whether release of information will increase the likelihood of harmful impacts on the species. The assessment for whether data should be released considers what level of generalisation or "denaturing" might be required. These range from no restriction for species classed as *low sensitivity*, to increasing restrictions through data generalisation for *low to medium sensitivity* (0.001˚), *medium to high sensitivity* (0.01˚), and *highly sensitive taxa* (0.1˚). All location data are withheld if a species is identified as of high biological significance and under high threat [19]. However, no consideration of the benefits of publishing data is made.

There are methods of publishing information on where species occur that do not directly release raw species locality data. Many NGO expeditions assess, and publish data, on the biological value of areas to highlight the need for conservation action, e.g., Conservation International's Rapid Assessment Program shares expedition data online to promote awareness of regions with high biodiversity value and high threat [20]. Alternatively, species habitat suitability maps can now be published at high resolutions (down to 10m grid-cell size). Such maps, showing locations that have a high probability of containing the species, often include 1) locations where the species occurs and this is known, 2) locations where the species occurs but this is not known, and 3) locations where the species does not occur but can colonise or be translocated if habitat quality is maintained. It is not possible to distinguish between the latter two categories *a priori* so they are typically represented as a combined mapped area (https://mol.org/species/map/). As habitat suitability maps are derived from actual species records they are only meaningful and useful if they are produced using precise rather than denatured locations. Hence it is essential that the experts generating these maps have access to full details of the sightings.

Benefits of publishing biodiversity data

Here we define data publishing as the release of primary biodiversity data (defined earlier), or products based on these that link a taxon to a location at a given time, to public databases for use by others. In addition to direct conservation benefits, publishing biodiversity data has multiple benefits for researchers and society including research verification, public engagement, stimulation of new/collaborative research, and informing non-researchers about key ecological or conservation issues [21-25] (Table 1).

For species affected primarily by threats such as climate change and habitat loss, if greater availability of biodiversity data enabled more efficient and cost-effective management decisions, the benefits of revealing population locations may outweigh the overall risk of increasing human exploitation of locations[26]. For instance, habitat loss due to forestry and farming is the most frequent threat to global terrestrial biodiversity [27]. Rare species with poorly known distributions are especially likely to have declined from habitat loss, but new populations are often found in unexpected parts of their former ranges [28,29]. Any known location data are crucial to protect the remaining habitats of such species through activities such as building accurate species habitat suitability models [30], which can be incorporated into conservation planning and management. Accurate species distribution models built on fine-resolution location data could result in more effective conservation measures because they can lead to investment in conservation at locations where species occur but have not been sighted and locations where species do not occur but can be colonised or translocated. Sharing data is particularly helpful for data deficient species that often slip through the net of regulatory mechanisms due to poor information on where they are and what threatens them [31]. Ignoring these species in conservation plans risks failing to preserve important locations as well as diversity in ecological traits and evolutionary features of biodiversity [32].

Withholding data and records can lead to perverse outcomes for species requiring management to ensure their persistence. For example, where new locations for threatened species remain undiscovered or are destroyed unknowingly in land development, or there is a false impression of range restriction or small population size. If the objective of government conservation agencies, NGO ecologists, scientists and land managers is to minimise the risk of species extinction (Table 1), then sharing data could help indirectly, by improving information on a species' population size or distribution and enabling a more accurate assessment of threat status, or directly, through enabling increased conservation action in known locations. Additionally, agencies that need occurrence data to manage or assess populations may waste limited resources funding redundant data collection.

Risks of publishing biodiversity data

Despite recent data sharing initiatives and regulations (Supplementary Table 1), there is evidence that different types of data collectors have varying perceptions of how sharing data could undermine their own objectives (Table 1). Moreover, there is no doubt that poaching of species highly-valued for traditional medicine and recreational hunting has caused species' population declines and even extinctions (e.g., the Javan rhino *Rhinoceros sondaicus* [33-35]; Table 2). In addition to documented population declines, human access to habitats has caused individual mortality, changes in wildlife behaviour, reduced reproductive rates and habitat disturbance or loss that affect species' ability to persist in their environment [36,37]. Individual mortality has a greater impact on rare than common species and can cause feedbacks that eventually lead to population declines. Much of the evidence for data publication leading to species declines is anecdotal, with few instances of a direct link between a decline in a population after data on its location being published (Table 2).

Many perceived risks of publishing biodiversity data stem from cultural, social or economic objectives rather than conservation objectives (Table 1). For example, many fishers do not share fishing location data because of concerns their data may be used against them to prosecute for violations or lead to fishing restrictions. Many resource managers view their knowledge as private intellectual property and feel that sharing it with others may put them at an economic and social disadvantage [26]. To achieve a goal of maximising research output [38], a research scientist might be concerned about the extra time and cost required to share reproducible data, which could instead be used to publish more papers or write more grants.

A balanced decision tree for sharing biodiversity data

From risks to opportunities to conserve species

A sole focus on the risk to a species fails to consider situations in which the benefits of sharing data outweigh the benefits of not allowing access to biodiversity data. The context of any decision about data publication should not miss opportunities to conserve species, and needs to consider public and private costs such as from redundant surveying effort or the loss of a species. As such, we propose that scientists follow a decision tree that considers the benefits of sharing biodiversity data (Figure 1), which include highlighting species and places of conservation concern (Table 1). In our decision tree, we assess these kinds of benefits against possible risks of sharing data, such as increased pressure on populations (Table 2). Importantly, our protocol considers all relevant threats to the species, and whether conservation mechanisms are either already in place or could be put in place to mitigate or avoid these. A balanced and transparent evaluation of how, not whether, to share biodiversity data requires owners to clarify the risks and likely impacts to a species from data publication, and at the same time help place this information in a decision-making framework that considers actions to reduce risks of harm to species.

Risk management for species at threat of exploitation

Following a risk assessment approach [39] to sharing biodiversity data, we agree with other discussions on data sharing [16] that it is first necessary to identify the risk of published locality data enabling (or increasing) access to a species based on how valuable and accessible it is to collectors, poachers, recreational visitors, or other people with interest in the species (Supplementary Figure 1). This will enable those considering publishing spatial biodiversity data to assess the likely harm to the species or population if visitors disturb or exploit it at published localities.



Figure 1. Decision tree for publishing biodiversity data from monitoring and surveying. Green, yellow, orange and red boxes indicate data publishing decisions in order of data restrictiveness. Blue-shaded boxes indicate considerations of conservation benefits and actions to mitigate impacts resulting from data sharing. Grey boxes indicate examples from the text and Tables 2 and 3. "IDs" is abbreviation for "identities" (i.e. species' scientific and/or common names). Question marks suggest how to inform particular steps in the tree: **?**[1] follow tree according to associated species; **?**[1] Consult CITES; **?**[2] Consult IUCN Red List, Recovery plans, National/State threat assessments; **?**[3] Consult global accessibility maps, local people, government threatened species officers in jurisdiction; **?**[4] Consult conservation evidence and scientific literature; **?**[5] Consult IUCN Red List, conservation evidence and scientific literature, government threatened species officers in jurisdiction.

Our protocol accounts for various kinds of risk to species from data publication that have been identified in existing ethical data-publication guidelines (Supplementary Table 1). The main risks are increased exploitation for trade or resource use (*ex situ* threats), or disturbance/destruction of habitat due to human access to localities (*in situ* impacts). High *ex situ* value species are those exploited by the wildlife trade or for resources such as food or timber (see CITES Appendix 1 or 2 species; https://cites.org/eng). Well-known examples include the African white and black rhinoceros, all elephant species and many fish. Our decision tree also accounts for the fact that risks to some species might be mitigated by conservation measures, such as restricting access to important sites through regulations or physical barriers (e.g. fencing off reserves); actions that might enable public sharing of data. For species where it is not feasible to restrict access, data publication protocols that mask certain characteristics of the data might be used to protect the species identification or location by the public (Supplementary Table 1), although this might restrict the ability of conservation planners and managers to use the data. We suggest in our decision tree that building a high-resolution habitat model with the data would be a sensible way to publish the data whilst ensuring the exact locations of individuals were masked (Figure 1). The full data could be stored securely and granted after request and assessment of motivations, with data protected by a data sharing agreement. For example, a government conservation agency could collate all threatened species occurrence data from researchers licensed to conduct studies on a species, and build a high-resolution map to provide information to the public about the habitat requirements and distribution of species to engage people whilst not providing site-specific occurrence data that would be available under license for researchers. For some species, the risk is so high that both measures (masking locations and restricting access) should be enacted whilst ensuring that monitoring is undertaken to track changes in the species and their threats – this equates to the strictest protocol in our decision tree (Figure 1). One example is fisheries spawning locations, which are almost impossible to restrict access when in international waters, but have high value and a history of over-harvesting (Example 2 in Table 3).

For many high-risk species, releasing public data on species occurrence might increase the risk of species decline if locations were previously unknown. If no conservation measures are in place to avoid these declines, our tree suggests that data be desensitised to mask the identities of species but not locations (Figure 1). This would mean the public can still learn that a precise location has conservation value but would not have specific information on which threatened species occur there, reducing the incentive to visit the location. In some cases, however, sharing location data is unlikely to increase the risk of decline, as population information is already in the public domain, or there is poor access to populations. For these populations, we recommend publishing data without restrictions (Figure 1), as additional information could benefit species by improving the ability to track changes in a population or discover new populations in other locations based on improved knowledge about habitat preferences.

Some species have higher value *in situ* than *ex situ*, with lower or non-existent market value. Species with high *in situ* value often have high ecotourism value (e.g. whale sharks, rare birds), and may be directly impacted by human disturbance and pathogen exposure associated with human movement into and out of their habitat (e.g. disruption of bird behaviour through electronic bird song playback). Without appropriate conservation measures such as infrastructure or sensitive guidelines for researchers, threatened or rare species with high *in situ* value are vulnerable to perturbation by human visitors, and we recommend restricting data in a way that prevents disturbance, for instance through publishing a habitat map instead of raw locations (Figure 1).

Many species may not be directly impacted by exploitation for trade or tourism but are still at risk of indirect *in situ* impacts if shared data increase visitation to their localities. For example, the surrounding environment could be negatively affected by vegetation disturbance, soil compaction, or introduction of invasive species, or the species might be impacted through associations with other species. These types of disturbances appear minor compared to direct exploitation but can result in a decline in the condition of the surrounding habitat which may harm health and alter behaviour. For example, a fungal species may not be vulnerable to threats of increased disturbance or wildlife trade, but the tree species with which it shares a symbiotic relationship could suffer high exploitation rates resulting from harvesting for its timber. In this case, the vulnerability of the tree population in addition to the fungus should be considered when assessing how to publish data on the occurrence of the fungus (Figure 1).

Maximising data availability to help conservation

Data sharing among researchers, government agencies, NGOs, and citizen science groups will improve our knowledge of population trends and ecology and our ability to protect species from anthropogenic impacts.

Many species such as threatened orchids are vulnerable to *in situ* human recreational activities through habitat degradation, irrespective of whether collection activities are restricted [40,41]. If conservation measures are not in place, increased visitation resulting from the release of new locations for highly-valued recreational species could cause local population declines, and we recommend restricting data to mask either species' identities or localities (Figure 1 and Example 4 of Malaysian *Rafflesia* in Table 3), depending on whether data have value for mitigating threats. In many cases, however, conservation measures have been implemented to avoid or mitigate declines (e.g. the creation of an exclusion zone to eliminate the chance of visitors disturbing the site, see Example 1 of the Australian Night Parrot *Pezoporus occidentalis* in Table 3). In these cases we recommend making occurrence data public to improve conservation, ecological learning and community engagement (Figure 1).

When a species' or population's primary threats are neither *in situ* nor *ex situ* direct exploitation or disturbance (see Example 3 of the Vangunu Giant Rat *Uromys vika* in Table 3), we recommend making data public, due to either little known risk of increased visitation to the site, or little chance that visitation would affect population viability (Figure 1). Even when a species has *in situ* value, the risks of increased visitation might be outweighed by the benefits of publishing data. One example is the Critically Endangered West Indian Ocean Coelacanth *Latimeria chalumnae*, an ancient fish thought to have been extinct for 60 million years. In 2000, divers observed coelacanths off South Africa's coast, then tagged several individuals [42]. These rare, slow-growing fish are potentially valuable to collectors, but their deep cave habitats are difficult to access and fisheries bycatch poses a much greater threat to survival than poaching [43]. The location data have been made publicly available, triggering widespread interest among scientists, managers, and the public. This publicity helped create new marine protected areas, fisheries management measures, and a multinational research programme that has generated over US$6 million in direct government funding, benefitting many additional species in southern Africa (pers comm., A Paterson, South African Institute for Aquatic Biodiversity).

In some cases, it may be impossible to decide whether a species has value in the wildlife trade or is vulnerable to visitation disturbance. Until protocols can be updated with new data, we recommend a precautionary approach that restricts data publication, such as that taken in the case of the newly rediscovered, endangered Night Parrot in Australia (Table 3).

Flexibility to adapt to different contexts and changing information

A major challenge of data publication is the evolving nature of restricted data. Lists of "sensitive" species are useful for some data publication protocols (see Supplementary Table 1), but these lists need regular updating to account for changes in conservation status, knowledge and threats and be adopted on a national or global scale. The IUCN Red List is partially revised each year, but local and regional information on threats to species is often poorly mapped and *ad hoc* [44]. Genuine status changes may be rapid and can apply to previously unrestricted species of Least Concern. For example, five of the six most prominent and economically valuable formerly common ash tree species in North America entered the IUCN Red List in 2017 as Critically Endangered, due to huge mortality from an invasive insect, driven by warming climate [45]. Current data restrictions could also be lifted if new conservation actions are implemented, such as the habitat protections for Night Parrots (see above). Decisions to share data should therefore be updated iteratively and quickly.

Because the problem of data sharing is complex, our proposed decision tree is not a one-fits-all solution, and we hope that additional inputs by scientists and other stakeholders will enhance its structure and application to diverse decision contexts. Designation of species-specific data sharing rules will need to be adapted to existing pressures found at national or sub-national scales. Users of the decision protocol should also ensure that criteria used to assess existing conservation and policy mechanisms to protect species can detect situations where policy mechanisms or legislation exist but are not implemented. We developed our decision tree based on the objective of maximizing persistence of a species, but the protocol could be adapted to account for additional objectives, such as maximising public engagement in conservation, or conserving whole ecosystems.

Ensuring data re-use and application to conservation decisions

An essential step to promote data sharing and enhance data re-use is to ensure that users know which data exist and are available. Metadata represent the set of instructions or documentation that describe the content, context, quality, structure, and reusability of a data set. In addition to publishing biodiversity data, making public the background metadata is critical, and could be accompanied by a sample of the database to enable potential users to assess if those data are fit for purpose [46]. We present our protocol anticipating that repositories holding biodiversity data will have cybersecurity data administrators managing the security of holdings. Data policies should state repository security so that data submitters can decide whether the repository is trustworthy. As species locality data are found in multiple repositories, we recommend that the appropriate mode of sharing biodiversity data be a species or population attribute rather than an attribute of a given set of data points specified by data authors. This places greater responsibility on researchers to determine how to share data and the decision tree we have proposed should help this.

Although acquiring the information needed to walk through our decision tree could sometimes be time consuming and difficult for individual researchers to obtain, all the information needed for applying our decision tree will be available to those evaluating species for the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) or for IUCN Red Listing. Hence it would make sense for the application of our decision tree to be integrated into these evaluation processes as well as national and subnational assessments of species' threat status and updated regularly.

Combating illegal species exploitation

Human exploitation of species for trade, resources, or nature-based recreation continues even in locations with few or no scientific studies. Increased use of social media means that the opportunity to manage sensitive information is declining even if we want to restrict it [47]. The wide range and varied impacts of threats to species mean that researchers and practitioners have an imperative to understand not only where species occur, but also the spread and intensity of both local and off-site threats to species. Despite government agreements such as CITES, illegal resource take (e.g. unreported fishing) and wildlife trade continues, with black market prices ranging from US$2 for a sea turtle in Mexico [48], to US$31,000 for an Australian black-cockatoo [49], or US$400,000 for a gorilla [50]. It is important to articulate whether these kinds of threats, driven by *ex situ* markets, are likely to increase when new localities or ecological information on a population are published. In this way, data can be responsibly and appropriately restricted if threats to a species would increase after publishing new localities, or shared without restriction if new data would not affect species' persistence (see Figure 1).

Sharing of species information is without doubt critical in building biodiversity knowledge and managing the global extinction crisis. To date, almost all data publication decisions made by governments, societies or individuals focused on the costs of sharing; benefits are never explicitly quantified, making it impossible to extrapolate data restriction decisions to other species, locations or contexts. Our decision protocol for publishing spatial biodiversity data aims at overcoming this inefficiency and enables scientists to better decide how (and when) to publish data responsibly in repositories. The challenge is to share data in a way that avoids perverse outcomes for biodiversity when it is used. In many cases, sharing data will have greater conservation (and educational) benefits than restricting it from use by those wishing to use it to increase community engagement or to promote conservation actions. Above all else, being explicit about what those benefits might be, and weighing them against the likely risks of making data public, will ensure that species are not put in greater danger from new data being released into the public domain.

References

1 Costello, M. J., May, R. M. & Stork, N. E. Can We Name Earth's Species Before They Go Extinct? *Science* **339**, 413-416, doi:10.1126/science.1230318 (2013).

2 Boitani, L. *et al.* What spatial data do we need to develop global mammal conservation strategies? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **366**, 2623 (2011).

3 Rondinini, C., Wilson, K. A., Boitani, L., Grantham, H. & Possingham, H. P. Tradeoffs of different types of species occurrence data for use in systematic conservation planning. *Ecol Lett* **9**, 1136-1145, doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00970.x (2006).

4 Whittaker, R. J. *et al.* Conservation Biogeography: assessment and prospect. *Divers Distrib* **11**, 3-23, doi:10.1111/j.1366-9516.2005.00143.x (2005).

5 Winter, M. *et al.* Patterns and biases in climate change research on amphibians and reptiles: a systematic review. *Roy Soc Open Sci* **3**, doi:10.1098/rsos.160158 (2016).

6 Feeley, K. J. & Silman, M. R. Keep collecting: accurate species distribution modelling requires more collections than previously thought. *Divers Distrib* **17**, 1132-1140, doi:10.1111/j.1472-4642.2011.00813.x (2011).

7 Joppa, L. N. *et al.* Filling in biodiversity threat gaps. *Science* **352**, 416-418, doi:10.1126/science.aaf3565 (2016).

8 Zeller, D., Froese, R. & Pauly, D. On losing and recovering fisheries and marine science data. *Marine Policy* **29**, 69-73, doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2004.02.003 (2005).

9 Walsh, J. C., Dicks, L. V. & Sutherland, W. J. The effect of scientific evidence on conservation practitioners' management decisions. *Conserv Biol* **29**, 88-98, doi:10.1111/cobi.12370 (2015).

10 Turner, D. J., Smyth, A. K., Walker, C. M. & Lowe, A. J. in *Terrestrial Ecosystem Research Infrastructures* 341-368 (CRC Press, 2017).

11 Sullivan, B. L. *et al.* eBird: A citizen-based bird observation network in the biological sciences. *Biol Conserv* **142**, 2282-2292, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2009.05.006 (2009).

12 Rausher, M. D., McPeek, M. A., Moore, A. J., Rieseberg, L. & Whitlock, M. C. Data Archiving. *Evolution* **64**, 603-604, doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00940.x (2010).

13 Whitlock, M. C., McPeek, M. A., Rausher, M. D., Rieseberg, L. & Moore, A. J. Data Archiving. *Am Nat* **175**, E45-146, doi:10.1086/650340 (2010).

14 Fuller, R. A., Lee, J. R. & Watson, J. E. M. Achieving open access to conservation science. *Conserv Biol* **28**, 1550-1557 (2014).

15 Ngo, H. *et al.* First population assessment of two cryptic Tiger Geckos (Goniurosaurus) from northern Vietnam: Implications for conservation. *Amphibian & Reptile Conservation* **10**, 34-45 (2016).

16 Lindenmayer, D. & Scheele, B. Do not publish. *Science* **356**, 800-801, doi:10.1126/science.aan1362 (2017).

17 Runge, C. A., Tulloch, A., Hammill, E., Possingham, H. P. & Fuller, R. A. Geographic range size and extinction risk assessment in nomadic species. *Conserv Biol* **29**, 865-876 (2015).

18 Herzog, S. K., Maillard Z., O., Embert, D., Caballero, P. & Quiroga, D. Range size estimates of Bolivian endemic bird species revisited: the importance of environmental data and national expert knowledge. *Journal of Ornithology* **153**, 1189-1202, doi:10.1007/s10336-012-0850-2 (2012).

19 Chapman, A. D. & Grafton, O. Guide to best practices for generalising sensitive species occurrence data. (Report for the Global Biodiversity Information Facility, Copenhagen, 2008).

20 Alonso, L. E., Deichmann, J. L., McKenna, S. A., Naskrecki, P. & Richards, S. J. (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2011).

21 Reichman, O. J., Jones, M. B. & Schildhauer, M. P. Challenges and Opportunities of Open Data in Ecology. *Science* **331**, 703-705, doi:10.1126/science.1197962 (2011).

22 Wallis, J. C., Rolando, E. & Borgman, C. L. If We Share Data, Will Anyone Use Them? Data Sharing and Reuse in the Long Tail of Science and Technology. *Plos One* **8**, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0067332 (2013).

23 Borgman, C. L. The Conundrum of Sharing Research Data. *J Am Soc Inf Sci Tec* **63**, 1059-1078, doi:10.1002/asi.22634 (2012).

24 McKiernan, E. C. *et al.* The open research value proposition: How sharing data can help researchers succeed. *Figshare*, doi.org/10.6084/m6089.figshare.1619902.v1619902, Retreived 1619901 Nov 1612017, doi:doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1619902.v2 (2015).

25 Borgman, C. L. *et al.* Knowledge infrastructures in science: data, diversity, and digital libraries. *Int J Digit Librarie* **16**, 207-227, doi:10.1007/s00799-015-0157-z (2015).

26 Johnson, T. R. & van Densen, W. L. T. Benefits and organization of cooperative research for fisheries management. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **64**, 834-840, doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsm014 (2007).

27 Maxwell, S. L., Fuller, R. A., Brooks, T. M. & Watson, J. E. Biodiversity: The ravages of guns, nets and bulldozers. *Nature* **536**, 143-145 (2016).

28 Fisher, D. O. Trajectories from extinction: where are missing mammals rediscovered? *Global Ecol Biogeogr* **20**, 415-425, doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00624.x (2011).

29 Fisher, D. O. & Blomberg, S. P. Correlates of rediscovery and the detectability of extinction in mammals. *P Roy Soc B-Biol Sci* **278**, 1090-1097, doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.1579 (2011).

30 Kissling, W. D. *et al.* Building essential biodiversity variables (EBVs) of species distribution and abundance at a global scale. *Biological Reviews* **93**, 600-625, doi:10.1111/brv.12359 (2018).

31 Proença, V. *et al.* Global biodiversity monitoring: From data sources to Essential Biodiversity Variables. *Biol Conserv* **213**, 256-263, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2016.07.014 (2017).

32 Trindade-Filho, J., de Carvalho, R. A., Brito, D. & Loyola, R. D. How does the inclusion of Data Deficient species change conservation priorities for amphibians in the Atlantic Forest? *Biodivers Conserv* **21**, 2709-2718, doi:10.1007/s10531-012-0326-y (2012).

33 Setiawan, R. *et al.* Preventing Global Extinction of the Javan Rhino: Tsunami Risk and Future Conservation Direction. *Conserv Lett* **11**, n/a-n/a, doi:10.1111/conl.12366 (2018).

34 Leader-Williams, N., Baldus, R. D. & Smith, R. J. in *Recreational hunting, conservation and rural livelihoods: Science and practice* (eds B. Dickson, J. Hutton, & W.A. Adams) 296-316 (John Wiley & Sons, 2009).

35 Loveridge, A. J., Hemson, G., Davidson, Z. & Macdonald, D. W. in *Wild felid biology and management* (eds D.W. Macdonald & A.J. Loveridge) 283-304 (Oxford University Press, 2010).

36 Steven, R., Pickering, C. & Guy Castley, J. A review of the impacts of nature based recreation on birds. *J Environ Manage* **92**, 2287-2294, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2011.05.005 (2011).

37 Gonzalez, J. A. Effects of Harvesting of Waterbirds and Their Eggs by Native People in the Northeastern Peruvian Amazon. *Waterbirds: The International Journal of Waterbird Biology* **22**, 217-224, doi:10.2307/1522210 (1999).

38 Arlettaz, R. *et al.* From Publications to Public Actions: When Conservation Biologists Bridge the Gap between Research and Implementation. *Bioscience* **60**, 835-842, doi:10.1525/bio.2010.60.10.10 (2010).

39 Burgman, M. A. *Risks and decisions for conservation and environmental management*. (Cambridge University Press, 2005).

40 Kelly, C. L., Pickering, C. M. & Buckley, R. C. Impacts of tourism on threatened plant taxa and communities in Australia. *Ecological Management & Restoration* **4**, 37-44, doi:10.1046/j.1442-8903.2003.00136.x (2003).

41 Ballantyne, M. & Pickering, C. Ecotourism as a threatening process for wild orchids. *Journal of Ecotourism* **11**, 34-47, doi:10.1080/14724049.2011.628398 (2012).

42 Hissmann, K. *et al.* The South African coelacanths - an account of what is known after three submersible expeditions : coelacanth research. *South African Journal of Science* **102**, 491-500 (2006).

43 Erdmann, M. Lessons learned from the conservation campaign for the Indonesian coelacanth, Latimeria menadoensis : coelacanth research. *South African Journal of Science* **102**, 501-504 (2006).

44 Tulloch, V. J. D. *et al.* Why do we map threats? Linking threat mapping with actions to make better conservation decisions. *Front Ecol Environ* **13**, 91-99, doi:10.1890/140022 (2015).

45 IUCN. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2017-3. <http://www.iucnredlist.org>. (Downloaded on 05 January 2018, 2017).

46 Michener, W. K. Ecological data sharing. *Ecological Informatics* **29**, 33-44, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2015.06.010 (2015).

47 Smith, M., Szongott, C., Henne, B. & Von Voigt, G. in *Digital Ecosystems Technologies (DEST), 2012 6th IEEE International Conference on.* 1-6 (IEEE).

48 Mancini, A. & Koch, V. Sea turtle consumption and black market trade in Baja California Sur, Mexico. *Endangered Species Research* **7**, 1-10 (2009).

49 Barry, C. Australia's wildlife blackmarket trade. *Australian Geographic* **August 16**, doi:http://www.australiangeographic.com.au/topics/wildlife/2011/08/australias-wildlife-blackmarket-trade/ (2011).

50 Stiles, D., Redmond, I., Cress, D., Nellemann, C. & Formo, R. K. Stolen Apes: The Illicit Trade in Chimpanzees, Gorillas, Bonobos and Orangutans. A Rapid Response Assessment. (United Nations Environment Programme, GRID-Arendal. www.grida.no, 2013).

51 Auliya, M. *et al.* Trade in live reptiles, its impact on wild populations, and the role of the European market. *Biol Conserv* **204, Part A**, 103-119, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.05.017 (2016).

52 Collins-Kreiner, N., Malkinson, D., Labinger, Z. & Shtainvarz, R. Are birders good for birds? Bird conservation through tourism management in the Hula Valley, Israel. *Tourism Management* **38**, 31-42, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.01.009 (2013).

53 Lowe, A. J. *et al.* Publish openly but responsibly. *Science* **357**, 141-141, doi:10.1126/science.aao0054 (2017).

54 Michener, W. K., Brunt, J. W., Helly, J. J., Kirchner, T. B. & Stafford, S. G. Nongeospatial metadata for the ecological sciences. *Ecol Appl* **7**, 330-342, doi:Doi 10.2307/2269427 (1997).

55 Piwowar, H. A., Day, R. S. & Fridsma, D. B. Sharing Detailed Research Data Is Associated with Increased Citation Rate. *Plos One* **2**, e308, doi:ARTN e308 10.1371/journal.pone.0000308 (2007).

56 Campbell, E. G. & Bendavid, E. Data-sharing and data-withholding in genetics and the life sciences: results of a national survey of technology transfer officers. *J Health Care Law Policy* **6**, 241-255 (2003).

57 Tenopir, C. *et al.* Data sharing by scientists: practices and perceptions. *Plos One* **6**, e21101, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0021101 (2011).

58 Keniger, L., Gaston, K., Irvine, K. & Fuller, R. What are the Benefits of Interacting with Nature? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **10**, 913 (2013).

59 Rosen, G. E. & Smith, K. F. Summarizing the Evidence on the International Trade in Illegal Wildlife. *EcoHealth* **7**, 24-32, doi:10.1007/s10393-010-0317-y (2010).

60 Boakye, M. K., Pietersen, D. W., Kotzé, A., Dalton, D.-L. & Jansen, R. Knowledge and Uses of African Pangolins as a Source of Traditional Medicine in Ghana. *Plos One* **10**, e0117199, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0117199 (2015).

61 Gong, S.-P., Chow, A. T., Fong, J. J. & Shi, H.-T. The chelonian trade in the largest pet market in China: scale, scope and impact on turtle conservation. *Oryx* **43**, 213-216, doi:10.1017/S0030605308000902 (2009).

62 Stuart, B. L., Rhodin, A. G. J., Grismer, L. L. & Hansel, T. Scientific Description Can Imperil Species. *Science* **312**, 1137-1137, doi:10.1126/science.312.5777.1137b (2006).

63 Purcell, S. W. *et al.* Sea cucumber fisheries: global analysis of stocks, management measures and drivers of overfishing. *Fish and Fisheries* **14**, 34-59, doi:10.1111/j.1467-2979.2011.00443.x (2013).

64 Packer, C. *et al.* Effects of Trophy Hunting on Lion and Leopard Populations in Tanzania. *Conserv Biol* **25**, 142-153, doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01576.x (2011).

65 Williams, V. L., Cunningham, A. B., Kemp, A. C. & Bruyns, R. K. Risks to Birds Traded for African Traditional Medicine: A Quantitative Assessment. *Plos One* **9**, e105397, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0105397 (2014).

66 Meeuwig, J. J., Harcourt, R. G. & Whoriskey, F. G. When Science Places Threatened Species at Risk. *Conserv Lett* **8**, 151-152, doi:10.1111/conl.12185 (2015).

67 Crawford, A. & Bernstein, J. MEAs, Conservation and Conflicts. A case study of Virunga National Park, DRC. (International Institute for Sustainable Development, Geneva, Switzerland, 2008).

68 Jenkins, M. Who murdered the Virunga gorillas. *National Geographic* **214**, 34-65 (2008).

69 Sattler, P. & Williams, R. The Conservation Status of Queensland's Bioregional Ecosystems. (QLD Environment Protection Agency, Brisbane, Australia, 1999).

70 Kearney, M. R., Porter, W. P. & Murphy, S. A. An estimate of the water budget for the endangered night parrot of Australia under recent and future climates. *Climate Change Responses* **3**, 14, doi:10.1186/s40665-016-0027-y (2016).

71 Murphy, S. A., Silcock, J., Murphy, R., Reid, J. & Austin, J. J. Movements and habitat use of the night parrot Pezoporus occidentalis in south-western Queensland. *Austral Ecology* **42**, 858-868, doi:10.1111/aec.12508 (2017).

72 Sadovy de Mitcheson, Y. *et al.* Fishing groupers towards extinction: a global assessment of threats and extinction risks in a billion dollar fishery. *Fish and Fisheries* **14**, 119-136, doi:10.1111/j.1467-2979.2011.00455.x (2013).

73 Jumin, R. *et al.* From Marxan to management: ocean zoning with stakeholders for Tun Mustapha Park in Sabah, Malaysia. *Oryx*, 1-12, doi:10.1017/S0030605316001514 (2017).

74 Adams, V. M., Tulloch, V. J. & Possingham., H. P. Land-sea conservation assessment for Papua New Guinea: A report on the work undertaken to fulfil the terms of the project Review and Integration of the Terrestrial and Marine Program of Works on Protected Areas. (University of Queensland, Australia, and Conservation and Environment Protection Authority, Papua New Guinea, 2016).

75 Government of Papua New Guinea. National Marine Conservation Assessment for Papua New Guinea. (Conservation and Environment Protection Authority, Papua New Guinea, 2015).

76 Hamilton, R., de Mitcheson, Y. S. & Aguilar-Perera, A. The Role of Local Ecological Knowledge in the Conservation and Management of Reef Fish Spawning Aggregations. *Fish Fish Ser* **35**, 331-369, doi:10.1007/978-94-007-1980-4_10 (2012).

77 Lavery, T. H. & Judge, H. A new species of giant rat (Muridae, Uromys) from Vangunu, Solomon Islands. *Journal of Mammalogy*, gyx116-gyx116, doi:10.1093/jmammal/gyx116 (2017).

78 Barcelona, J. F., Pelser, P. B., Balete, D. S. & Co, L. L. Taxonomy, ecology, and conservation status of Philippine Rafflesia (Rafflesiaceae). *Blumea - Biodiversity, Evolution and Biogeography of Plants* **54**, 77-93, doi:10.3767/000651909X474122 (2009).

79 Olson, R. J. & McCord, R. A. in *Ecological Data: Design, Management, and Processing* (ed J.W. Brunt W.K. Michener) 117-141 (Blackwell Science Ltd., 2000).

Acknowledgements

AITT was supported by an Australian Research Council Discovery Early Career Researcher Award DE170100599. EB, GE, NPL and LR were supported by the Australian Government National Environmental Science Programme's Threatened Species Recovery Hub. NPL was partially funded by Bush Heritage Australia. Richard Alcorn (eBird), Tanya Laity (Australian Government Department of the Environment and Energy), Steve Murphy and Alex Kutt (Bush Heritage Australia) provided feedback on early drafts. Jessica Miller and Richard Fuller contributed to early discussions.

Author contributions: AITT led the development of the risk assessment and decision tree with contributions from all authors to the final decision protocol. All authors provided ideas and critical feedback and co-wrote the manuscript.

Competing interests: The authors have no competing financial or non-financial interests.

Data availability: Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Table 1. Likely objectives of various data owners (potential data providers) for sharing biodiversity data and perceptions of how publishing species data might advance or undermine that objective.

Objective for sharing data	Examples of data authors	Perception of how publishing data advances objective	Perception of how publishing data undermines objective
Minimise risk of species extinction	Government agencies, NGO ecologists, scientists, land managers	Avoid impacts and increase protection in known locations; Increase species ecological knowledge; Inform status assessments (e.g. IUCN Red List).	Increase human access to species' locations, leading to poaching[51], disease spread, habitat degradation (trampling, alien species spread) or disturbance [36,52].
Maximise ability to get funding for biodiversity management	NGO ecologists, scientists, land managers	Secure future funding by demonstrating importance and effectiveness of project (e.g. important species detected).	Reduce future funding by disproving importance or effectiveness of project (e.g. important species not detected), or exposing inappropriately collected data; Hinder projects and profitability by inspiring extra regulation.
Inform and improve future monitoring	Government agencies at local, state or national levels	Evaluate progress towards conservation objectives (e.g. identify trends); Develop spatial units for data aggregation and future sampling.	Violate privacy of stakeholders granting access to study area (e.g. landholders, indigenous groups), limiting future access.
Maximise data reliability for improving knowledge	IUCN, government agencies, scientists	Decrease false negative error rate; Illuminate gaps in knowledge of species; Reduce data deficiency for species[53].	Increase false positive error rate if datasets vary in rigour or accuracy, wasting effort on incorrect records.
Minimise data loss/ entropy and survey redundancy	Museums, developers, consultants, government agencies	Reduce risk of losing access to data and legacy effects of loss of local champion[54]; Maximise efficiency of limited resources to collect structured data.	Increase visitation to private study or recreational locations, reducing novelty or utility of data; Reduce knowledge power and competitive edge (e.g. to win survey tenders through local expertise).
Maximise academic output or impact	Scientific researcher in academic institution	Increase collaborations, citations and use of research[55]; Verify published results.	Others use data without acknowledging/ citing source[56,57]; Opportunity cost (e.g. time) of compiling/sharing data; Embarrassment if others find errors in analysis (e.g. publish rebuttals).
Maximise public interest in biodiversity	Citizen science programs, citizen scientists, government agencies	Engage the public in nature; Human health benefits of wildlife access [58].	Increase human access to species' locations, leading to inadvertent habitat degradation or disturbance and reduced site value[36,52].

Table 2. Threats to species related to sharing of biodiversity data. Making localities of some species available to the public can increase one or more of three major threats to species: poaching (driven by illegal wildlife trade), hunting/collecting for food, medicine and trophies, and habitat disturbance and degradation. Effects on populations of sensitive species range from disturbance of regular behaviours and reduced reproductive rates to reduced population survival and possible local or global extinctions, but there is little direct evidence linking data publication to these impacts. Literature review conducted by searching Web of Science (20/8/2017) for keywords "species" AND "data publication" or "data sharing" or "publication of data" AND "threat" or "poach*" or "wildlife trade" or "recreational hunting" or "trophy hunting".

Threat	**Examples of the scale of the threat**	**Direct evidence of data publication leading to population impacts**
Collection for international wildlife markets	Mortality and associated population declines due to illegal trafficking of ivory (~5370 dead elephants) between 1996-2008[59].	Published data (digital archives, scientific journals, social media) led to poachers collecting 1000s of South African succulents to sell to European plant enthusiasts [a].
Collection for local traditional medicine	Population declines of African pangolins due to harvesting scales/bones for spiritual healing[60].	No published literature found directly linking data publication to impacts.
Collection for pet trade	Pet market trade in CITES-listed turtle species in China[61]; illegal import of >20 million live reptiles to EU between 2004-2014[51].	Local extinctions of newly discovered restricted-range reptiles of value in pet markets following formal publications of locality information[62].
Resource use such as harvesting animals or eggs for food	Declines in marine stocks (e.g. sea cucumbers, tuna) due to over-fishing [63]; reduced nesting and colony abandonment of Andes flamingos and Peruvian heronries due to egg harvest[37].	No published literature found directly linking data publication to impacts. Anecdotal records of resource declines (e.g. in Coral Triangle spawning locations).
Recreational hunting	Areas with highest trophy hunting levels have highest population declines of Tanzanian lions and leopards[64].	Reduced population survival and group cohesion of lions in Africa due to corrupt tourist hunting practices tracking known individuals/prides[34,35].
Cultural beliefs about negative impacts of species	Illegal killing and disturbance of native flying foxes in Australia perceived as a nuisance due to noise, smell and droppings at roost sites[d].	Research data tracking endangered white sharks used by Western Australian government agency to kill sharks in attempt to reduce shark-human interactions[66].
Recreational disturbance for wildlife watching	Habitat degradation and disturbance of animal behaviours by bird watchers in popular bird-watching locations[36].	Data shared on breeding location of painted snipe pair resulted in nest being abandoned due to disturbance by wildlife enthusiasts[b].
Killing/ habitat destruction to	Killing of mountain gorillas in DRC allegedly by rebels, soldiers, corrupt officials to discredit	'Panic clearing' by Australian landholders of vegetation needing protective mechanisms

prevent conservation	conservationists and facilitate access to World Heritage region for illegal charcoal trade[67,68]	after government report[69] mapped occurrence of rare/threatened communities[c].

a. http://e360.yale.edu/features/unnatural-surveillance-how-online-data-is-putting-species-at-risk
b. http://www.shanghaibirding.com/2017/08/24/painted-snipe-ethics
c. https://theconversation.com/australia-is-a-global-top-ten-deforester-and-queensland-is-leading-the-way-87259
d. https://www.animalecologylab.org/not-in-my-backyard.html

Table 3. Examples of how decision tree can be used to support decisions to share data (see Supplementary Table 2 for details).

Species and location	**Risks of data sharing**	**Conservation mechanisms and benefits of data publication**	**Decision tree action and reasons**
1. Night Parrot *Pezoporus occidentalis,* arid zone of Australia	No population of live birds known until 2013. Exact location withheld from the public. To limit risks of poaching or disturbance from birdwatchers very few conservation professionals, government representatives and researchers had access to location data and calls.	In 2016, Queensland State Government made discovery location an exclusion zone with imprisonment if accessed unlawfully. Bird's call and data on habitat preferences released when conservation mechanisms were in place. At least three new populations discovered since by people using recorded call[70,71].	Species was at risk of exploitation due to *in situ* activities (disturbance due to human activities) in 2013. **Decision: MASK SPECIES LOCATIONS, NOT IDENTITIES** In 2018 protection mechanisms are in place to mitigate declines. **Decision: PUBLIC DATA**
2. Fish spawning aggregations, Pacific Ocean	Species that spawn seasonally in large groups are easy for fishers to locate and exploit. Over-exploitation of reef fish spawning aggregations led to collapse of several species following discovery of new aggregation locations, with 20 species of grouper at risk of extinction if current overfishing trends continue.	Controlled release of spawning data to researchers by the NGO SCRFA (Science and Conservation of Fish Aggregations) through data sharing confidentiality agreements enabled decision-makers to target spatial conservation planning to protect species such as threatened grouper (Serranidae), snapper (Lutjanidae) and emperor fish (Lethrinidae)[72-76].	Species is at risk of *ex situ* exploitation for food and fish trade. Conservation/policy mechanisms to mitigate declines not in place at all sites. Location data useful to inform management. Data can be requested by researchers and used under protocols that restrict publishing of maps identifying spawning locations. **Decision: RESTRICT DATA: MASK SPECIES IDENTITIES AND LOCATIONS**

3. Vangunu Giant Rat *Uromys vika*, Solomon Islands	Recently discovered mammal known from a single specimen on Vangunu Island[77]. Location is remote and difficult to access, requiring permission from landowners and tribal chiefs. Forest inhabited by *U. vika* is threatened by logging and not secured under any formal conservation land.	Local community attempting to protect habitat as the Zaira Community Resource Management Area (ZCRMA), which also supports a vulnerable bat *Pteralopex taki* and nesting leatherback turtles *Dermochelys coriacea*. It is hoped that increased recognition will attract further support for ZCRMA and thus protect *U. vika*.	Species has no *ex situ* economic value and not threatened by disturbance from increased visitation due to remoteness of location. Publication of holotype location data will increase recognition of forests' conservation value and may help conservation efforts to set up protected areas. **Decision: PUBLIC DATA**
4. Parasitic corpse flower *Rafflesia*, Malaysia	Populations consist of few individuals, are relatively accessible and threatened by logging, agriculture and disturbance by unsustainable ecotourism. Releasing species occurrence data without conservation measures would increase risk of decline of *Rafflesia* and host plants through increased visitation[78].	Visitors to *Rafflesia* blooming events provide nature ecotourism revenue. Populations occur mostly outside protected areas and there are no proposed protection mechanisms or policies to mitigate declines. Data might be used by conservation planners to propose new protected areas.	Individuals have *in situ* value for tourism, but could be threatened by increased visitation. Publication of location data is needed to identify sites with conservation value, but human traffic must be managed. **Decision: RESTRICT DATA: MASK SPECIES IDENTITIES NOT LOCATIONS**.

Box 1. Glossary for decision tree

Access: whether individual/population can be physically reached by humans, restrictive access can be due either due to natural processes/factors (e.g., geological = species located on a sea cliff), or human intervention (e.g., protection = species in a strictly controlled site.

Associated species: non-target species that may be dependent on the target species, for example, due to physical/structural relationships (e.g., liana on a tropical tree), or nutritional interactions (e.g., obligate nectarivore or pollen-producer, or obligate seed disperser such as flying fox).

Conservation/policy mechanisms: actions that aim to improve species/population persistence by mitigating threats causing population declines.

Data repository or archive: a permanent collection of data sets with accompanying metadata usually stored in an online cloud service so that a variety of users can readily access, understand, download and use data [79].

***Ex situ* economic value**: individuals or populations have monetary worth outside of natural/native site, e.g., exploitation through harvesting of individuals for food, medicine or wildlife trade.

Impact on other species: for example, ground-level species may be (inadvertently) trampled/damaged by people walking to access the target species, or arboreal species by people climbing trees to view another target species.

Impact on population: direct (removal), physical (damage to individuals), or environmental (habitat degradation/reduction) impact, such that population viability is compromised.

***In situ* value**: individuals/populations have monetary or cultural worth in natural/native site, e.g., for ecotourism.

***In situ* disturbance:** impacts on individuals/populations in natural/native site due to human activity, e.g., invasive species, tourism, habitat degradation.

Public data: information on species locations, abundance, ecology published with no restrictions so that it is openly available to the public (i.e. primary data with no denaturing or masking).

Restrict data: information on species locations, abundance, ecology only published after being masked, generalised or converted to habitat suitability model. Some masked species and location data are likely to be stored offline but models may be publicly available.