Uttar Pradesh Journal of Zoology

Volume 45, Issue 21, Page 333-339, 2024; Article no.UPJOZ.4310
ISSN: 0256-971X (P)

The Balance of Protecting Genetic Conservation and Legal Ownership: A Perspective Through Wildlife DNA

Kundu J [a++*]

[a] *School of Law, Brainware University, India.*

Author's contribution

The sole author designed, analysed, interpreted and prepared the manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56557/upjoz/2024/v45i214643

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://prh.mbimph.com/review-history/4310

Review Article

Received: 18/09/2024
Accepted: 20/11/2024
Published: 28/11/2024

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the complex relationship between genetic conservation and legal ownership of wildlife DNA, which is a key issue at the nexus of biodiversity conservation, intellectual property rights, and ethical governance. Wildlife DNA is extremely valuable for conservation biology, allowing attempts to restore genetic variety, improve endangered populations, and better understand ecological dynamics. However, the legal framework protecting wildlife DNA is complex, with overlapping national and international restrictions such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Nagoya Protocol, and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). These frameworks seek to resolve access, ownership, and benefit-sharing issues surrounding genetic resources, but they frequently leave ambiguities that jeopardize both conservation efforts and indigenous rights.

[++] *Assistant Professor;*
**Corresponding author: Email: advjkundu@gmail.com;*

Cite as: *J, Kundu. 2024. "The Balance of Protecting Genetic Conservation and Legal Ownership: A Perspective Through Wildlife DNA". UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY 45 (21):333-39. https://doi.org/10.56557/upjoz/2024/v45i214643.*

Keywords: Wildlife; DNA; genetic; conservation; policy.

1. INTRODUCTION

The balance between genetic conservation and legal ownership of wildlife DNA is at the heart of biodiversity conservation, ethics, and intellectual property rights. Genetic material from wildlife, particularly endangered species, is critical for assessing species genetic health, maintaining biodiversity, and establishing conservation measures to mitigate the effects of habitat loss and climate change (Bhandari & Bhattacharjee, 2017). However, as genetic data becomes more important for scientific and economic purposes, the question of who has the right to this genetic information—indigenous groups, national governments, or private entities—has gotten more complicated (Morgera, 2014).

International treaties like the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Nagoya Protocol seek to control access to genetic resources and promote equitable benefit-sharing systems, with a focus on protecting indigenous rights and preventing biopiracy (Young, 2010). These frameworks are supplemented by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), which regulates the movement and protection of threatened genetic material. Despite these frameworks, legal uncertainties can result in conflicts between conservation demands and ownership rights, generating ethical concerns about intellectual property claims over wildlife DNA (Tvedt & Young, 2007). India, being a mega-diverse country with a wealth of genetic resources and a strong legacy of indigenous wisdom, presents particular challenges in addressing these issues. The Biodiversity Act of 2002 oversees access to genetic resources, whereas the Forest Rights Act of 2006 acknowledges indigenous groups' rights to their customary lands and resources (Gadgil & Guha, 1993). However, these regulations are frequently incompatible with conservation policies, which might jeopardize the sustainable use of genetic resources and hinder indigenous participation in conservation (Chhatre & Saberwal, 2005).

The need for legal certainty has also increased because to scientific developments in genetic engineering and sequencing. Private businesses are increasingly participating in bioprospecting as DNA sequencing becomes more widely available, occasionally evading laws and jeopardizing conservation initiatives (Shiva, 2001).

2. METHODS

Using a qualitative methodology, this study integrated a thorough literature analysis of current legal frameworks, international treaties, and case studies pertaining to indigenous rights and animal conservation. Key trends and difficulties in striking a balance between conservation initiatives and legitimate ownership rights were found using thematic analysis. In order to provide best practices and policy recommendations for upcoming projects, the study also looked at particular instances of effective partnerships between conservation organizations and indigenous populations.

3. THE BIOLOGICAL BASIS OF GENETIC CONSERVATION

In order to preserve biodiversity and guarantee that species are resilient to disease, environmental changes, and other challenges, genetic conservation is essential. According to Frankham, Ballou, and Briscoe (2010), this field is concerned with maintaining genetic variety within species, which is crucial for ecological balance, population stability, and adaptive capability. Genetic variety plays a crucial role in conservation biology by allowing species to evolve and adapt to changing climates, human interventions, and new threats. The "genetic buffer" that genetic variety provides increases a population's resistance to environmental stresses. Because they possess a wider range of characteristics, populations with greater genetic variation are better equipped to cope with problems like disease outbreaks or changes in the climate (Allendorf et al., 2013). Cheetah populations, for instance, have a startlingly low level of genetic variation, according to genetic research, which leaves them more susceptible to illness and environmental changes (Menotti-Raymond & O'Brien, 1995). On the other hand, because of their genetic repertoire, species with greater genetic variation—such as the African elephant—display exceptional adaptability across a variety of habitats. The study and conservation of genetic variety is now easier because to developments in molecular biology. Scientists can identify subspecies, evaluate genetic variability, and prioritize conservation efforts using methods like whole-genome sequencing and DNA barcoding (Hebert et al., 2003). For instance, conservationists can customize their tactics for particular tiger populations in various

places by using DNA barcoding to distinguish between tiger subspecies (Mondol et al., 2009).

Understanding how inbreeding, genetic drift, and gene flow affect species survival is made possible by population genetics. Inbreeding is particularly common in small, isolated communities, which lowers genetic diversity and increases the risk of inheritable diseases (Hedrick & Fredrickson, 2010). According to research on the Florida panther, for example, inbreeding depression has resulted in health problems and a declining population, which is why conservationists are bringing in individuals from closely related populations to increase genetic diversity (Johnson et al., 2010). Conservation genomics uses genomic technologies to improve "genetic rescue" and population control. In species like the Australian mountain pygmy possum, genetic rescue—a method that adds genetic material from other populations to increase genetic diversity—has shown promise (Weeks et al., 2017). Scientists can also use conservation genomics to detect poached species, track the illegal wildlife trade, and guarantee genetic integrity in breeding initiatives (Schwartz et al., 2007).

4. LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF WILDLIFE DNA IN CONSERVATION

The legal framework governing the use of wildlife DNA in conservation is complicated and includes both national and international conventions that govern the equitable use, ownership, and access of genetic resources. Fundamental guidelines for handling genetic material from nations with abundant biodiversity are provided by important international accords, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its supplemental Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing. In order to prevent biopiracy and unethical exploitation, the Nagoya Protocol, in particular, stipulates that access to genetic resources requires the prior informed agreement of the country of origin and sets parameters for benefit-sharing with local people (Greiber et al., 2012).

The trading of endangered species and, consequently, their genetic material is regulated under the Convention on International trading in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). In order to prevent the use of biological samples from contributing to the extinction of protected species, CITES controls their international transportation (Reeve, 2002). The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), which promotes the sustainable use and fair distribution of genetic materials, concentrates on plant genetic resources but establishes important precedents for wildlife DNA (FAO, 2009).

National laws are also very important. In line with the goals of the CBD, India's Biodiversity Act of 2002 governs access to its genetic resources and includes clauses allowing local and indigenous populations to participate in decision-making. Comparably, the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of the United States, which forbids the illegal sale and exploitation of genetic material from endangered species, focuses on domestic conservation while also having an impact on international practices (Bean & Rowland, 1997).

Significant legal gaps still exist in spite of these frameworks, especially when it comes to genetic material taken from non-sovereign locations like the Antarctic and the high seas. Ethical and legal issues frequently arise because there are no globally accepted standards for genetic material from these areas (Glowka et al., 1994). In order to establish a unified international legal framework that upholds indigenous rights and conserves biodiversity, these gaps must be filled.

5. CONSERVATION IMPLICATIONS OF WILDLIFE DNA

Since developments in molecular genetics offer new instruments for managing biodiversity, evaluating genetic health, and putting conservation plans into action, the conservation implications of wildlife DNA are significant. A key component of wildlife populations' capacity to adapt to changing climatic conditions and fend off disease is genetic diversity, which can be found through the use of DNA analysis (Frankham, 2015). For example, in isolated populations like the mountain gorilla, where low genetic diversity presents major conservation issues, DNA profiling has assisted scientists in tracking genetic variation (Gray et al., 2013).

Since DNA barcoding can identify the species and geographic origins of animal goods that have been seized, wildlife DNA is also essential for monitoring the illegal wildlife trade. This strategy bolsters enforcement of international agreements such as CITES and promotes anti-poaching efforts (Dawnay et al., 2007). In one prominent instance, authorities were able to target African

poaching hotspots thanks to DNA research that verified the species and origin of recovered ivory (Wasser et al., 2015).

Furthermore, creating successful captive breeding and reintroduction initiatives requires the use of wildlife DNA. By directing the selection of genetically diverse people for breeding, genetic analysis helps prevent inbreeding depression and promotes healthier, more robust populations (Ballou & Lacy, 1995). The California condor program, where genetic control is essential to preserving the species' viability, has effectively implemented this strategy (Ralls & Ballou, 2004).

Nonetheless, there are ethical issues with using wildlife DNA for conservation. Genetic information ownership is a contentious issue, particularly when it comes to the rights of indigenous tribes to the genetic resources found on their territories (Glowka, 1998). Furthermore, ethical problems regarding human intervention in natural populations are brought up by worries about possible genetic change in wildlife DNA.

6. THE NEED TO BALANCE BETWEEN CONSERVATION AND LEGAL OWNERSHIP

Ecosystem preservation and equitable access to resources depend on striking a balance between conservation objectives and legal ownership rights over biodiversity. Conservation efforts have relied more and more on genetic resources for research and species restoration as biodiversity loss picks up speed. However, there are complicated legal and ethical issues because these genetic resources frequently occur in areas with distinctive indigenous knowledge and ownership claims (Young, 2004).

Fair access and benefit-sharing (ABS) methods are emphasized by international frameworks like the Nagoya Protocol and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). These mechanisms guarantee that countries with high biodiversity and indigenous groups are compensated and acknowledged for the genetic resources they provide to international research (Tobin, 2013). However, many nations find it difficult to strike a balance between the economic interests associated with bioprospecting and conservation concerns, making the implementation of ABS legislation difficult (Morgera, 2016). Biopiracy is the word used to describe the behavior of commercial corporations exploiting genetic resources without proper control, hence depriving indigenous populations of equitable advantages.

Furthermore, the way that national laws handle genetic material and wildlife ownership varies greatly. For instance, community involvement in decision-making processes pertaining to access to genetic resources is emphasized by India's Biodiversity Act of 2002 (Bhagwat & Rutte, 2006). By bringing conservation efforts into line with indigenous peoples' rights, this strategy can promote cooperation rather than conflict. However, there are still loopholes in legal protections and enforcement, especially when it comes to situations where foreign firms are trying to get genetic resources.

7. CONCLUSION

A nuanced approach is essential to balancing the goals of wildlife conservation with the rightful ownership of indigenous communities. Indigenous rights to land and genetic resources frequently collide with conservation efforts, which are motivated by the need to protect genetic diversity. This can lead to both chances for cooperation and potential conflicts. Although the legal frameworks, such as the Nagoya Protocol and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), offer fundamental guidelines for fair benefit-sharing, their application varies by location. Furthermore, although they also have difficulties with inclusivity and enforcement, national laws like India's Biodiversity Act of 2002 provide examples of how to balance conservation objectives with the acknowledgement of indigenous rights.

It is crucial to have a balanced strategy that preserves ecological integrity while honoring indigenous authority. Governments and organizations can support a more sustainable and equitable model of conservation by bolstering legal protections for genetic resources, encouraging community involvement, and fortifying policy frameworks for equitable access. In addition to being morally right, this strategy makes ecosystems and civilizations more resilient, which eventually helps achieve the aim of conserving biodiversity worldwide. Therefore, strong, enforceable legal frameworks are essential to promoting a future in which ownership and conservation coexist peacefully.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

Balancing genetic conservation with legal ownership in the context of wildlife DNA requires a series of well-considered actions. First, establishing clear ownership rights and guidelines for wildlife DNA is crucial. This would involve creating regulations that specify who holds ownership over genetic materials derived from wildlife, thus preventing conflicts over use and proprietary claims. International protocols can be put in place to guide these rights, clearly defining control over DNA samples and derived genetic data.

Second, creating a genetic database focused solely on conservation would be beneficial. This centralized, accessible database would allow data to be shared among researchers with the goal of supporting biodiversity monitoring while preventing unauthorized commercial use. Such a system would be instrumental in helping conservationists track endangered species without interference from commercial interests.

Another important step is implementing fair benefit-sharing agreements to ensure that the benefits derived from wildlife DNA are equitably shared. This is particularly important for indigenous communities or the countries from which the genetic materials originate. Frameworks like the Nagoya Protocol can serve as guides for ensuring that compensation and collaboration between researchers, local communities, and governments are fairly addressed.

Strengthening legal protections against genetic biopiracy is also essential. Introducing stringent laws to prevent the unauthorized extraction, use, or patenting of wildlife genetic materials would help curb unethical practices. Penalties for companies or individuals attempting to commercialize wildlife DNA without proper permissions should be firmly enforced.

Encouraging collaborative research over commercial ownership is another way to address the balance. By promoting open-access research efforts focused on conservation, there is less pressure for competing ownership claims. This approach can be supported by government and non-profit funding, which helps ensure that valuable genetic data remains in the public domain rather than being monopolized by corporations.

Finally, promoting transparent regulatory oversight and public awareness would greatly support this balance. Oversight mechanisms should be put in place to regulate and monitor the use of wildlife DNA in both research and industry, with a focus on transparency and accountability. Public education on the importance of genetic conservation and the ethical considerations surrounding wildlife DNA would also help foster responsible use and widespread support for legal protections.

These measures together offer a balanced approach to conserving biodiversity while addressing the complex issue of legal ownership in genetic research, promoting both ethical stewardship and conservation-focused innovation.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

Allendorf, F. W., Luikart, G., & Aitken, S. N. (2013). Conservation and the genetics of populations. Wiley-Blackwell.

Ballou, J. D., & Lacy, R. C. (1995). Identifying genetically important individuals for management of genetic variation in pedigreed populations. In Population Management for Survival and Recovery (pp. 76-111). Columbia University Press.

Bean, M. J., & Rowland, M. J. (1997). The evolution of national wildlife law. Praeger.

Bhagwat, S. A., & Rutte, C. (2006). Sacred groves: potential for biodiversity management. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 4(10), 519-524.

Bhandari, M., & Bhattacharjee, P. (2017). Biodiversity governance in India: Understanding the legal provisions and their effectiveness. Environmental Policy Review, 19(2), 130-145.

Chhatre, A., & Saberwal, V. (2005). Political economies of forest management in India. Conservation and Society, 3(1), 137-144.

Dawnay, N., Ogden, R., McEwing, R., Carvalho, G. R., & Thorpe, R. S. (2007). Validation of the barcoding gene COI for use in forensic genetic species identification. Forensic Science International, 173(1), 1-6.

FAO. (2009). International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. Food and Agriculture Organization.

Frankham, R. (2015). Genetic rescue of small inbred populations: Meta-analysis reveals large and consistent benefits of gene flow. Molecular Ecology, 24(11), 2610-2618.

Frankham, R., Ballou, J. D., & Briscoe, D. A. (2010). Introduction to conservation genetics. Cambridge University Press.

Gadgil, M., & Guha, R. (1993). This fissured land: An ecological history of India. University of California Press.

Glowka, L. (1998). A guide to designing legal frameworks to determine access to genetic resources. IUCN Environmental Policy and Law Paper, 34, 1-51.

Glowka, L., Burhenne-Guilmin, F., Synge, H., McNeely, J. A., & Gündling, L. (1994). A guide to the Convention on Biological Diversity. IUCN.

Gray, M., Roy, J., Vigilant, L., Fawcett, K., Basabose, A., Cranfield, M., & Robbins, M. M. (2013). Genetic census reveals increased but uneven growth of a critically endangered mountain gorilla population. Biological Conservation, 158, 230-238.

Greiber, T., Moreno, S. P., Åhrén, M., Nieto Carrasco, J., Chege Kamau, E., Cabrera Medaglia, J., ... & Tvedt, M. W. (2012). An explanatory guide to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing. IUCN.

Hebert, P. D., Ratnasingham, S., & deWaard, J. R. (2003). Barcoding animal life: cytochrome c oxidase subunit 1 divergences among closely related species. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 270(Suppl_1), S96-S99.

Hedrick, P. W., & Fredrickson, R. J. (2010). Genetic rescue guidelines with examples from Mexican wolves and Florida panthers. Conservation Genetics, 11(3), 615-626.

Johnson, W. E., Onorato, D. P., Roelke, M. E., Land, E. D., Cunningham, M., Belden, R. C., ... & O'Brien, S. J. (2010). Genetic restoration of the Florida panther. Science, 329(5999), 1641-1645.

Menotti-Raymond, M., & O'Brien, S. J. (1995). Evolutionary conservation of ten microsatellite loci in four species of Felidae. Journal of Heredity, 86(4), 319-322.

Mondol, S., Karanth, K. U., & Ramakrishnan, U. (2009). Why the Indian subcontinent holds the key to global tiger recovery. PLoS Genet, 5(8), e1000585.

Morgera, E. (2014). The Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing: Implications for biodiversity conservation. International Environmental Law Review, 16(3), 279-296.

Morgera, E. (2016). Fair and equitable benefit-sharing at the crossroads of the human right to science and international biodiversity law. Laws, 5(4), 42.

Ralls, K., & Ballou, J. D. (2004). Genetic status and management of California condors. The Condor, 106(2), 215-228.

Reeve, R. (2002). Policing international trade in endangered species: The CITES treaty and compliance. Routledge.

Schwartz, M. K., Luikart, G., & Waples, R. S. (2007). Genetic monitoring as a promising tool for conservation and management. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 22(1), 25-33.

Shiva, V. (2001). Protecting our biological and intellectual heritage in the age of biopiracy. Kali for Women.

Tobin, B. (2013). Setting the record straight on ABS and the Nagoya Protocol. Biodiversity and Conservation, 22(4), 1191-1207.

Tvedt, M. W., & Young, T. (2007). Beyond access: Exploring implementation of the fair and equitable sharing commitment in the CBD. Biodiversity and Conservation, 16(8), 2077-2095.

Weeks, A. R., Heinze, D., Perrin, L., Stoklosa, J., Hoffmann, A. A., & van Rooyen, A. (2017). Genetic rescue increases fitness and aids rapid recovery of an endangered marsupial population. Nature Communications, 8(1), 1-6.

Young, T. (2004). Legal frameworks for the equitable sharing of biodiversity. Environmental Law Review, 6(2), 81-92.

Young, T. (2010). Access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Environmental Law Review, 12(4), 256-272.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://prh.mbimph.com/review-history/4310