

1 **Keywords:** Conservation; Synthetic biology; biodiversity

2

3 **Is it time for synthetic biodiversity conservation?**

4

5 **Authors:**

6

7 \*Antoinette J. Piaggio United States Department of Agriculture, National Wildlife  
8 Research Center, 4101 LaPorte Avenue, Fort Collins, CO 80521, USA

9

10 \*Philip J. Seddon Department of Zoology, University of Otago, PO Box 56, Dunedin  
11 9016, New Zealand

12

13 \*Gernot Segelbacher Wildlife Ecology and Management, University of Freiburg, D-  
14 79106 Freiburg, Germany

15 Luke Alphey, Arthropod Genetics Group, The Pirbright Institute, Ash Road, Woking,  
16 GU24 0NF, UK, AND Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, South Parks  
17 Road, Oxford, OX1 3PS, UK

18 Elizabeth L. Bennett, Wildlife Conservation Society, 2300 Southern Boulevard,  
19 Bronx, NY 10460, USA

20 Robert H. Carlson Biodesic, Seattle, WA 98103

21 Robert M. Friedman, J. Craig Venter Institute, 4120 Capricorn Lane, La Jolla, CA  
22 92037, USA

23 Dona Kanavy, Department of Molecular and Cellular Medicine, Texas A&M  
24 University, 440 Reynolds Medical Building, College Station, TX 77843, USA

25 Ryan Phelan, Revive & Restore, 2 Marina Boulevard Building A, San Francisco, CA  
26 94123, USA

27 Kent H. Redford, Archipelago Consulting, Box 4750, Portland, Maine, USA &  
28 Department of Environmental Studies, University of New England, Biddeford, Maine,  
29 04112, USA.

30 Marina Rosales Benites de Franco, Federico Villarreal National University, Av. Oscar  
31 R. Benavides 450. 4to Piso., Lima. Perú.

32 Lydia Slobodian, Environmental Law Centre, Godesberger Allee 108-112, 53175,  
33 IUCN, Bonn, Germany

34 Keith Wheeler, Chairman and CEO, ZedX Inc. and Chair Emeritus, IUCN-CEC

35 \* joint first authors in alphabetical order

36    **Abstract:**

37

38    Evidence indicates that, despite some critical successes, current conservation  
39    approaches are not slowing the overall rate of biodiversity loss. The field of synthetic  
40    biology, which is capable of altering natural genomes with extremely precise editing,  
41    might offer the potential to resolve some intractable conservation problems (e.g.  
42    invasive species or pathogens). However, it is our opinion that there has been  
43    insufficient engagement by the conservation community with practitioners of  
44    synthetic biology. We contend that rapid, large-scale engagement of these two  
45    communities is urgently needed to avoid unintended and deleterious ecological  
46    consequences. To this point we describe case studies where synthetic biology is  
47    currently being applied to conservation and we highlight the benefits to conservation  
48    biologists from engaging with this emerging technology.

## Synthesizing Biodiversity?

Despite decades of conservation action and two global initiatives under the auspices of the Convention on Biological Diversity, current indications are that we have been unable to slow the rate of **biodiversity** loss [1-3]. Even with increasing terrestrial and marine areas under some form of protection, current protected area networks are considered to be insufficient to stem biodiversity loss [1, 4]. Further, degradation of protected areas, the impacts of invasive species, emerging infectious diseases, and even societal denial of biodiversity loss threaten to turn back the progress that has been made [1, 5]. Consequently there have been calls for bolder conservation thinking [6], such as engagement with new technologies, including those emerging from the field of **synthetic biology** [7, 8].

Synthetic biology is a rapidly expanding field where engineering principles are applied to the construction of biological parts and systems, resulting in new and desired traits they wouldn't have in their original or natural state [9, 10]. Recently, the field of synthetic biology has facilitated technological advances by adding the powerful capability of **genome editing** through deleting a target gene and/or inserting a synthetic one, now typically using **CRISPR/Cas9** endonucleases [11, 12] (a graphical illustration of this technique can be found in figure 3 [12]). This, paired with harnessing the power of **gene drives**, which can be synthesized or naturally occurring [13], and other new synthetic techniques, bring the efficacy of genetic modification to a new level. Further, this capability of genetic modification is cheaper, easier, more precise, and more rapid than ever before, and thus widely accessible. It has become apparent that synthetic biology holds tremendous potential

74 across numerous fields, including conservation biology. With such tools in hand  
75 conservation of biodiversity could become proactive rather than reactive. What if we  
76 could engineer mosquitoes, which are invasive in Hawai'i, with a synthesized gene or  
77 genetic pathway so that they are no longer capable of transmitting the avian blood  
78 parasite that has devastated endemic bird populations [14]? Or perhaps, using the  
79 techniques of synthetic biology, scientists could produce male mosquitoes that  
80 produce only male offspring when they breed with wild-type females, thus driving  
81 populations locally extinct [15]? What if burgeoning human populations could be fed  
82 with reduced or minimized impacts to biodiversity [2]? Through these examples and  
83 others presented here [Table 1] the potential of synthetic biology to aid biodiversity  
84 conservation efforts is apparent. However, lack of understanding of the technology,  
85 the speed of developments, a potential for unforeseen outcomes, and the prospect of  
86 altering natural systems, have held conservation biologists back from engaging with  
87 synthetic biology. In fact, some conservation activists have recently called for a  
88 moratorium on research of gene drives [16].

89  
90 Some conservation biologists have recognized the potential of synthetic biology for  
91 biodiversity conservation and called for dialogue between the conservation and  
92 synthetic biology communities [8, 17-18]. Initially, members of the two communities  
93 sat down formally in April 2013 [17] at a workshop in Cambridge, UK, with the  
94 explicit goal of exploring areas of mutual interest and identifying concerns.  
95 Subsequently, some of the same participants along with new members from both  
96 communities took part in a workshop in Sausalito, California in April 2015. This  
97 workshop had three goals; i) educate conservationists about the application of these  
98 new tools and their potential benefits and risks; ii) inform synthetic biologists about

99 urgent conservation problems that have thus far been intractable to conservation  
100 efforts; iii) identify a subset of the cases presented at the meeting that offer the best  
101 opportunity for tool development and application ([http://longnow.org/revive/meeting-](http://longnow.org/revive/meeting-report/)  
102 [report/](http://longnow.org/revive/meeting-report/)). This was the first attempt at identifying real-world problems that traditional  
103 conservation approaches have been unable to solve, but that might realistically be  
104 addressed by synthetic biology.

105  
106 Most recently, in December 2015, a meeting was held between conservation and  
107 synthetic biologists at the Rockefeller Foundation Bellagio Center in Bellagio, Italy.  
108 This meeting was led by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)  
109 and sought to: i) understand the relevance of synthetic biology to IUCN's mission and  
110 vision; ii) identify ways in which synthetic biology might have a positive impact on  
111 conservation issues, but also the potential negative impacts, and ways to mitigate  
112 these; iii) discuss the future of synthetic biology, its role in international biodiversity  
113 conservation, and ways to influence the trajectory of the application of synthetic  
114 biology to conservation. As participants in the Bellagio meeting we identified a  
115 critically urgent need for immediate and broad engagement of the conservation  
116 community with synthetic biology practitioners. Here, we look at two case studies of  
117 currently intractable conservation problems where synthetic biology solutions are  
118 being sought [Box 1 and Box 2]. Further, we consider other biodiversity problems in  
119 detail [Table 1], identify likely risks, uncertainties, points of concern within the  
120 conservation community, and potential mitigation of these concerns. Our goal is to  
121 stress the critical need for conservation biologists to apply their expertise in  
122 investigating the use of synthetic biology as a possible tool to be added to the  
123 biodiversity conservation toolbox [19]. Further, we emphasize that synthetic biology

will be applied to global environmental issues with or without conservation biologists' expertise. The robust science needed to ensure safe and successful application will be more assured with the participation of conservation biologists. We conclude by suggesting some guiding principles for the integration of synthetic biology and conservation biology. Considering the moral, ethical, and aesthetic issues associated with intentional direct human modification of a wild species, we call for the development of a robust decision-making, risk-assessment framework, and research to be conducted on the application of synthetic biology to conservation issues.

### **Conservation crisis**

Biological diversity is the currency of conservation, but by all indications we are losing the battle to slow biodiversity loss. An evaluation of the outcomes of a 2002 major global commitment to slow the rate of biodiversity loss showed that by the 2010 deadline key indicators of biodiversity had declined, while pressures on natural systems had increased [1]. In 2010, due to the continued loss of biodiversity, another attempt was made to secure global agreement on a set of ambitious biodiversity-related "Aichi Targets" to be achieved by 2020 (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity COP-10 Decision X/2). However, interim analyses indicate that, despite some local successes, and improved responses and policies, rates of biodiversity loss have not slowed and thus the 2020 targets are unlikely to be achieved [3]. While protecting geographic areas is a major focus of biodiversity conservation [5] other conservation tools take a single species management approach or regulate drivers of biodiversity loss such as pollution, invasive species, land use

change, and climate change. The estimated cost of protecting, monitoring, and managing terrestrial conservation sites for a single animal taxon, such as birds, is in excess of US\$65 billion annually [20]. Most countries cannot sustain such economic costs. Although the overall rate of biodiversity loss has not been slowed, without current efforts many more species would be threatened and/or extinct [21].

## **Conservation and synthetic biology**

Most conservationists acknowledge that more tools are needed to slow the loss of biodiversity. In fact, there have been attempts to adopt more risky, and therefore controversial conservation interventions, such as assisted colonization to mitigate climate-change-induced habitat alterations [22], or ecosystem restoration using ecological replacements [23]. But these have been resisted by some within the conservation community due to justifiable concerns around unanticipated deleterious impacts on recipient ecosystems and/or further alterations to natural systems [24, 25]. Given that conservation biologists have been characterized as scientists “wishing to pool their knowledge and techniques to solve problems” [26], and to seek novel interdisciplinary connections and practices, why have they, as a community, generally “paid little attention to synthetic biology”, and been “timid” to engage in this body of knowledge and techniques [7]? Instead, as the conservation community has become aware of synthetic biology there has been resistance and fear from some, although not all, sectors [7, 27].

We see several points of contention that have emerged from those that call for synthetic biology to be in abeyance: i) technology has been responsible for many of

the plights of the natural world and it is unlikely that technology can also address these plights; ii) once we start making human-made changes to genomes, natural selection may take over and begin to modify the modifications we have made; iii) representing a value-based position, the idea of synthetic biology applied to conservation is often accused of being equivalent to “playing God.” This represents a philosophical rather than scientific view about the importance of leaving nature alone; iv) synthetic biology technologies might be patented and we would then be left with difficult decisions about how to separate profit-driven motives from public-good initiatives. Questions then arise such as: who will “own” endangered species modified by patented technologies? v) Synthetic-biology-driven approaches might spread modified genes to wild relatives, and might also create land use changes that will further stress endangered ecosystems; vi) the development of new and modified crops grown to provide feedstock for synthetic biology-altered microorganisms (especially those developed for fuel production) might have an impact on both ecosystems and the rural poor. We acknowledge all of these concerns and we do not dismiss them, but we suggest they are not facts, but rather hypotheses to be tested with rigorous science. We argue that the answer to these questions lies in the scientific engagement of experts from conservation biology and other fields, robust research, and ecological risk assessments [28].

The concerns listed above are not new; there have been over 40 years of genetic modification of organisms and synthetic biology is part of this continuum. What is unique to synthetic biology is the ease of the application. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine recently observed that research of gene drives has already greatly exceeded the pace of research on population genetics and

ecosystem dynamics [28]. These subjects are clearly within the purview of conservation biology and must continue to be advocated for especially for proposed releases of organisms with modified genomes. It is improbable that calls for moratoria will slow the advances or applications of synthetic biology. In fact, it can be a disservice to the goal of protecting biodiversity if conservationists do not participate in applying the best science and thinkers to these issues. Several international organizations are striving to debate how to create frameworks and regulations for synthetic biology [28-30]. However, we have not even begun to debate the role of synthetic biology in biodiversity conservation, although at the IUCN World Conservation Congress in September 2016, Resolution 095 was passed by consensus, with calls for the IUCN to develop an approach for engaging with the synthetic biology community [31]. We hope by presenting our opinion that this necessary conversation will begin and that robust scientific engagement will follow.

Synthetic biology hybridizes engineering and biology and has two main areas: (i) genome redesign for new and desired traits, and (ii) faster and more reliable fabrication techniques for parts and systems that do not exist in the natural world. The discovery of techniques such as gene drives and CRISPR has led to an explosion of synthetic biology research in the past few years. Recently, not only have synthetic biology research projects increased exponentially, but so too has the interest in the economic potential of bio-products from the application of synthetic biology methods [32]. The economic motivation to develop and deploy these technologies is strongly driving a rapid pace of development. Events such as emerging infectious diseases, and the effects of climate change, will constitute even stronger incentives. While researchers have been able to work with genetically modified organisms for about

four decades now, the cheap, easy, and precise tools now available through synthetic biology make it possible to alter the genetic code of organisms or even create novel ones rapidly and inexpensively. Synthetic biology is characterized by extremely fast technological developments and a mindset that the future need not look like the past, including future biological systems. This perspective stands in stark contrast to that of conservation biology currently, which, despite the value of sustainable use being acknowledged, is essentially preservation minded [7]. We argue that 21<sup>st</sup> century conservation philosophy should embrace concepts of synthetic biology and both seek and guide appropriate synthetic solutions to aid biodiversity.

## **Synthesis of Conservation and Synthetic Sciences**

We suggest it is necessary to adapt the culture of conservation biologists to a rapidly changing reality. The current paradigm is not accomplishing radical positive change nor adequately slowing anthropogenic destruction of habitat and biodiversity. To make progress, we need to continue to push for more of the same solutions that we know can succeed (e.g., a greater proportion of the planet being set aside for protection per [6]). But we must also embrace new technologies and methodologies. There is a consequent immediate need for the conservation community to more fully engage with synthetic biology: (i) to understand potential and identify risks through applying their expertise to robust risk assessments; (ii) to advise synthetic biologists of environmental concerns and issues; (iii) to head off possibly ecologically damaging initiatives; and (iv) to identify the most appropriate conservation problems for the development and implementation of acceptable synthetic biology solutions. In fact, some intractable conservation issues already have synthetic biology approaches being

applied to them (Box 1 and Box 2). These examples represent flagships for many conservation issues (i.e. invasive species and emerging diseases), and also demonstrate that the application of synthetic biology to conservation issues is occurring presently. Further, the application to wild systems has been outlined and a roadmap developed [12].

*[Table 1]*

*[Box 1] Case study 1: eradication of pest species*

*[Box 2] Case study 2: management of wildlife disease*

## **Guiding principles for the way forward**

We offer the following guiding principles for those involved in biodiversity conservation to recognize their responsibility in participating in synthetic biology and as recommendations for scientifically rigorous application of this technology to conservation problems:

### **Responsible Stewardship**

The Presidential Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues outlined five guiding principles for their evaluation of synthetic biology, one of which was “responsible stewardship” [33]. We reiterate this concept here as we believe it is one that the conservation community should adopt wholeheartedly. Responsible stewardship as

defined by [34] is our responsibility as humans and stewards of the natural world to not take extreme stances on new technologies. We should neither embrace them completely nor set out to block them for fear of unintended consequences. “Responsible stewardship rejects positions that forsake potential benefits in deference to absolute caution and positions that ignore reasonably foreseeable risks to allow unfettered scientific exploration” [34]. We do not think this is incompatible with the precautionary principle of conservation. The way forward is to acknowledge the potential benefit of new technologies, make measured decisions to integrate new technologies into conservation solutions, and implement ongoing oversight. Further, conservation and synthetic biologists must be open and willing to educate themselves about their respective fields in order to identify ways to bridge the gap and achieve integration. Such an effort would be a powerful, interdisciplinary way to achieve responsible stewardship.

## **Look to the Past**

With the advent of classical biological control (CBC) and ecological restoration many of the same concerns about altering natural processes and ecosystems were discussed as are being raised today in the context of synthetic biology applications in the wild. Others have suggested that detailed risk assessments as are regularly used in CBC to evaluate risks and benefits are of use in conservation applications of synthetic biology [28, 35]. We advocate this view and further urge conservation biologists and synthetic biologists to apply the decision frameworks and risk assessments developed for the application of CBC and ecological restoration [36, 37] to intractable conservation issues, to make informed and thoughtful decisions about ecological, political, and

biological issues surrounding each project before deciding the validity of applying synthetic biology to such issues. Having a framework, including risk assessments and adaptive management [19] for decision-making will serve to highlight conservation issues that are inappropriate candidates for application of synthetic biology and will provide legitimacy for projects that pass the rigors of the framework.

## **Early and Often**

There has been insufficient engagement between the conservation biology and synthetic biology communities. We are concerned that the accelerated application of synthetic biology to wild systems is outpacing our level of understanding and input. Robust scientific studies need to happen early and often. Further, this research needs to be transparent and to “engage the public early and often”; this message was a common denominator of each of the workshops mentioned earlier. It is likely that the public, including other scientists, are the greatest source of knowledge about potential pitfalls of applying synthetic biology to specific conservation issues and public opinion is likely the biggest hurdle for any project, such as the case studies (Box 1 and Box 2). Without a guiding principle of “early and often” it is likely that synthetic biology will be applied to conservation issues without broad engagement of conservation experts and without the appropriate stakeholder involvement.

## **Concluding Remarks**

Humanity has responsibility to reduce the rate of loss of biodiversity. For this we need to use integrated strategies. It is time for the conservation community to consider the

324 application of synthetic biology and other new genomic tools. Engagement is urgently  
325 needed and it should be based on a series of guiding principles and with a robust  
326 decision framework to understand the pros and cons built on existing and new science  
327 to maximize biodiversity benefits and minimize biodiversity harm. The conservation  
328 community should reach out to the synthetic biology community and with them  
329 jointly engage in broad conversations with communities, scientists, and regulators  
330 across the globe. The future of nature may depend on our efforts at this critical nexus  
331 of biodiversity conservation and technology.

332 **Acknowledgments**

333

334 We would like to thank the Rockefeller Foundation for making the workshop at  
335 Bellagio Center possible, and all participants for stimulating discussions. Our  
336 sincerest thanks to Ben Novak for his tireless help on one of the figures. The  
337 conclusions in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent  
338 the views of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

## Key References

1. Butchart, S.H.M. *et al.* (2010) Global biodiversity: indicators of recent declines. *Science* 328, 1164-1168
2. Rands, M.R.W. *et al.* (2010) Biodiversity Conservation: Challenges Beyond 2010. *Science* 329, 1298
3. Tittensor, D.P. *et al.* (2014) A mid-term analysis of progress toward international biodiversity targets. *Science* 346, 241-244
4. Butchart, S.H.M. *et al.* (2015) Shortfalls and solutions for meeting national and global conservation area targets. *Cons. Lett.* 8, 329-337
5. Sutherland, W.J. *et al.* (2011) Horizon scan of global conservation issues for 2011. *Trends in Ecol. Evol.* 26, 10-15
6. Noss, R.F. *et al.* (2012) Bolder thinking for conservation. *Cons. Biol.* 26, 1-4.
7. Redford, K. *et al.* (2013) Synthetic biology and conservation of nature: Wicked problems and wicked solutions. *PLoS Biology* 11: e1001530
8. Johnson, J.A, *et al.* (2016) Is there a future for genome-editing technologies in conservation? *Anim. Cons.* 19, 97-101
9. Carlson, R.H. (2010) *Biology is technology: The promise, peril, and new business of engineering life*. Harvard University Press.
10. Church, G.M. and Regis, E. (2014). *Regenesis: how synthetic biology will reinvent nature and ourselves*. Basic Books, New York
11. Mali, P. *et al.* (2013) RNA: guided Human Genome Engineering via Cas9. *Science* 339, 823-826
12. Esvelt, K.M. *et al.* (2014) Concerning RNA-Guided Gene Drives for the Alteration of Wild Populations. Ed. Diethard Tautz. *eLife* 3: e03401

364 13. Champer J., A. Buchman , and O.S. Akbari (2016) Cheating evolution:  
365 engineering gene drives to manipulate the fate of wild populations. *Nature*  
366 *Reviews Genetics*. 17, 146-59. 14. Gantz, V.M. *et al.* (2015) Highly efficient  
367 Cas9-mediated gene drive for population modification of the malaria vector  
368 mosquito *Anopheles stephensi*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 112, 6736-6743

369 15. Hammond, A. *et al.* (2016) A CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive system targeting female  
370 reproduction in the malaria mosquito vector *Anopheles gambiae*. *Nat.*  
371 *Biotechnol.* 34, 78-83

372 16. A call for conservation with a conscience: no place for gene drives in science  
373 (2016); [http://www.synbiowatch.org/wp-](http://www.synbiowatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ETC_letter_vs_genedrives_v5.pdf)  
374 [content/uploads/2016/08/ETC\\_letter\\_vs\\_genedrives\\_v5.pdf](http://www.synbiowatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ETC_letter_vs_genedrives_v5.pdf)

375 17. Redford, K.H. *et al.* (2014) Synthetic biology and the conservation of  
376 biodiversity. *Oryx* 48, 330-336

377 18. Taylor, H.R. and N.J. Gemmell (2016) Emerging technologies to conserve  
378 biodiversity: further opportunities via genomics. Response to Pimm *et al.*  
379 *Trends in Ecol. Evol.* 31, 171-172

380 19. Salafskay, N.*et al.* (2002) Improving the practice of conservation: a conceptual  
381 framework and research agenda for conservation science. *Cons. Biol.* 16,  
382 1469-1479

383 20. McCarthy, D.P. *et al.* (2012) Financial costs of meeting global biodiversity  
384 conservation targets: Current spending and unmet needs. *Science* 338, 946-949

385 21. Hoffman M. *et al.* (2015) The difference conservation makes to extinction risk of  
386 the worlds ungulates. *Cons. Biol.* 29, 1301-1313

387 22. Hoegh-Guldberg, O. *et al.* (2008) Assisted colonization and rapid climate change.  
388 *Science* 321, 345-346

389 23. Seddon, P.J. *et al.* (2014) Reversing defaunation: Restoring species in a changing  
390 world. *Science* 345, 406-412

391 24. Ricciardi, A. and Simberloff, D. (2009). Assisted colonization is not a viable  
392 conservation strategy. *Trends in Ecol. Evol.* 24, 248-253

393 25. Ricciardi, A. and Simberloff, D. (2014) Fauna in decline: first do no harm.  
394 *Science* 345, 884

395 26. Soulé, M.E., Wilcox, B.A., eds. (1980) *Conservation biology: An evolutionary-*  
396 *ecological perspective*. Sunderland, Mass., Sinauer.

397 27. SynBioWatch, Civil Society Perspectives on Synthetic Biology (2016). *Reckless*  
398 *driving: Gene drives and the end of nature*.  
399 <http://www.synbiowatch.org/2016/08/reckless-driving/>

400 28. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2016) *Gene Drives*  
401 *on the Horizon; Advancing Science, Navigating Uncertainty, and Aligning*  
402 *Research with Public Values*. The National Academies Press

403 29. World Health Organization (2014) *The guidance framework for testing genetically*  
404 *modified mosquitoes*. World health organization, programme for research and  
405 training in tropical diseases

406 30. U.S. Government (2016) *Modernizing the Regulatory System for Biotechnology*  
407 *Products: An Update to the Coordinated Framework for the Regulation of*  
408 *Biotechnology*. [https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/biotech_coordinated_framework.pdf)  
409 [biotech\\_coordinated\\_framework.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/biotech_coordinated_framework.pdf)

410 31. IUCN (2016) *Motion 095 – Development of IUCN policy on biodiversity*  
411 *conservation and synthetic biology*. Adopted at WCC 2016 in Hawai'i, United  
412 States, 1-10 September 2016. <https://portals.iucn.org/congress/motion/>

- 413 32. Carlson, R.H. (2016) Estimating the biotech sector's contribution to the US  
414 economy. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 34, 247-255
- 415 33. Presidential Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues (2010) *New*  
416 *Directions: the Ethics of Synthetic biology and Emerging Technologies.*  
417 (<http://bioethics.gov/cms/synthetic-biology-report>)
- 418 34. Gutmann, A. (2011) The ethics of synthetic biology: Guiding principles for  
419 emerging technologies. *Hastings Cent. Rep.* 41, 17-22
- 420 35. Webber, B.L. et al. (2015) Is CRISPR-based gene drive a biocontrol silver bullet  
421 or global conservation threat? *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 112, 10565-10567
- 422 36. Charudattan, R. (2005) Ecological, practical, and political inputs into selection of  
423 weed targets: What makes a good biological control target? *Biol. Control* 35,  
424 183-196
- 425 37. Pastorok, R.A. et al. (1997) An ecological decision framework for environmental  
426 restoration projects. *Ecol. Eng.* 9, 89-107
- 427 38. Capizzi, D. (2014) Rating the rat: global patterns and research priorities in  
428 impacts and management of rodent pests. *Mamm. Rev.* 44, 148-162
- 429 39. Blackburn, T.M. (2004) Avian Extinction and Mammalian Introductions on  
430 Oceanic Islands. *Science* 305, 1955-1958
- 431 40. Simberloff D et al. (2013) Impacts of biological invasions: what's what and the  
432 way forward. *Trends in Ecol. Evol.* 28, 58-66
- 433 41. Jones H.P. et al. (2016) Invasive mammal eradication on islands results in  
434 substantial conservation gains. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 112, 4033-4038
- 435 42. Towns D.R. and & K. G. Broome (2003) From small Maria to massive Campbell:  
436 Forty years of rat eradications from New Zealand islands, New Zealand *J.*  
437 *Zool.* 30, 377-398

438 43. Dowling DK, Tompkins DM, Gemmell NJ (2015) The Trojan Female Technique  
439 for pest control: a candidate mitochondrial mutation confers low male fertility  
440 across diverse nuclear backgrounds in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evol. Appl.* 8,  
441 871-880.

442 44. Johnson, T.H. and Stattersfield A.J. (1990) A global review of island endemic  
443 birds. *Ibis* 132, 167-180.

444 45. Paxton, E.H. *et al.* (2016) Collapsing avian community on a Hawaiian Island. *Sci.*  
445 *Adv.* 2: e1600029

446 46. van Riper III C. *et al.* (1986) The Epizootiology and Ecological Significance of  
447 Malaria in Hawaiian Land Birds. *Ecol. Monogr.* 56, 327-344

448 47. LaPointe, D.A. *et al.* (2012) Ecology and conservation biology of avian malaria.  
449 *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1249, 211-226

450 48. LaPointe, D.A. *et al.* (2009) Managing disease. In Conservation Biology of  
451 Hawaiian Forest Birds. T.K.Pratt, C.T.Atkinson,P.C. Banko, J. Jacobi, &  
452 B.L.Woodworth, Eds.: 405–424. Yale University Press. New Haven.

453 49. Alphey, L. (2014) Genetic control of mosquitoes. *Ann. Rev. Ent.* 59, 205-224

454 50. Champer, J. *et al.* (2016) Cheating evolution: engineering gene drives to  
455 manipulate the fate of wild populations. *Nat. Rev. Gen.* 17,146-159

456 51. Sutherland, W.J. *et al.* (2014). A horizon scan of global conservation issues for  
457 2014. *Trends in Ecol. Evol.* 29, 15-22

458 52. Campbell, K.J. *et al.* (2015) The next generation off rodent eradications:  
459 innovative technologies and tools to improve species specificity and increase  
460 their feasibility on islands. *Biol. Cons.* 185, 47-58

461 53. Sutherland, W.J. *et al.* (2016) A horizon scan of global conservation issues for  
462 2016. *Trends in Ecol. Evol.* 31, 44-53

- 463 54. Sutherland, W.J, *et al.* (2010) A horizon of global conservation issues for 2010.  
464 *Trends in Ecol. Evol.* 25, 1-6
- 465 55. Ainsworth, T.D. *et al.* (2016). Climate change disables coral bleaching protection  
466 on the Great Barrier Reef. *Science* 352, 338-342
- 467 56. Jin, Y.K. *et al.* (2016) Genetic markers for antioxidant capacity in reef-building  
468 corals. *Sci. Adv.* 2, e1500842

469 Table 1:  
470  
471 Major conservation problems with possible solutions applying synthetic biology  
472 approaches.

## **Box 1 Eradication of invasive rodents**

In total only 147 of the more than 2,000 species of rodents worldwide are considered pests, and of these, only three species (black rat *Rattus rattus*, Norway rat *Rattus norvegicus*, and house mouse *Mus musculus*) have by far the greatest negative impacts on the system in which they invade, particularly on endemic fauna on island systems [38]. Rodent invasions of islands have resulted in the extinction of hundreds of species of native birds [39], particularly seabirds, and thereby disrupting the flow of nutrients from the ocean to the land [40].

Invasive mammal eradication on islands is a major conservation tool, and rodents are the most common targets for eradication [41]. The principal approach to rodent eradication on islands involves the use of poisons, particularly the aerial broadcast of non-selective anticoagulants [42]. Although there are alternative techniques that do not require toxins [(e.g., 43], toxicants are still considered the most effective. There are concerns about development of anticoagulant resistance in target species, and about the effects of poisons on non-target species, but it has been suggested that the search for alternative techniques has not yet been fruitful [38].

Experimental work currently underway is exploring the feasibility of a synthetic biology solution to the problem of invasive rodents through the creation of mice with a gene from the Y chromosome inserted onto chromosome 17 (autosome) that results in the production of only male offspring (Figure 1). The release of these modified mice (**SRY mice**) into a natural population therefore has the potential to eventually breed that population out of existence as males predominate, reproduction ceases, and

498 the remaining animals die of old age. The numbers of modified inoculants that would  
499 need to be released, and the time frames to extinction, remain uncertain. The risks of  
500 such an approach include the accidental translocation or natural dispersal of **GM**  
501 rodents to other, non-target rodent populations; possible hybridization between GM  
502 individuals and endemic rodent species; public opposition to the environmental  
503 release of a GM animal, and unanticipated ecosystem effects following successful  
504 rodent eradication. Mitigation of risks could entail a focus on isolated oceanic islands  
505 that have no human inhabitants nor endemic rodents, but to which access can be  
506 strictly regulated. Many such islands exist in the Oceania region, on which invasive  
507 rodents have heavily impacted the endemic fauna. Early field trial success on oceanic  
508 islands might facilitate public acceptance of synthetic biology solutions to  
509 conservation challenges, and would additionally enable the refinement of lab and field  
510 protocols, and the specificity of risk-cost assessments. Strategies for mitigation might  
511 include the use of reversible gene drives, or traditional application of rodenticides.

## **Box 2 Controlling avian malaria in Hawai'i**

More than 90% of bird extinctions during historic times have occurred on islands, and the Hawaiian Islands have lost a greater proportion (34%) of their endemic bird species than any other system [44]. It is estimated that 71 of the 113 endemics became extinct, and over three quarters of those left are endangered. Further, range contraction of endemic birds of Kaua'i has appeared to accelerate since 2000, and multiple extinctions are predicted in the next decade [45]. While significant losses occurred as a result of the impacts of invasive species, and due to exploitation and habitat destruction following the arrival of humans, it is believed that after the 1920s the principal cause of extinction and decline has been avian malaria, caused by protozoan parasites in the genus *Plasmodium*, and transmitted by the mosquito vector *Culex quinquefasciatus* that was introduced to the islands in 1826 [46]. Global warming is predicted to increase the impact of avian malaria in Hawai'i as mosquitoes expand their range into high-altitude refugia [47]. Traditional approaches to the control of mosquito-borne disease have focussed on reducing the abundance of vectors through removal of larval habitat, chemical control of adults and larvae, or biological control using predators or microbial pathogens [48]. Such approaches are difficult to apply over large areas of rugged terrain, and/or would have unacceptable impacts on native invertebrates, therefore there have been calls for innovative techniques to control avian malaria transmission [47].

A synthetic biology solution to avian malaria vector control takes the form of a variation on the traditional Sterile Insect Technique (**SIT**), whereby the DNA of invasive male mosquitoes is damaged, e.g. through irradiation, and the mass release

of **sterile males** overwhelms the invasive wild population. A more precise synthetic biology solution uses genetic modification to disrupt normal cell function. The **RIDL** technique, the release of insects carrying a dominant lethal genetic system, entails the release of genetically modified male mosquitoes whose offspring would inherit a self-limiting gene and die before becoming functional adults (Figure 2). Field trials of mosquito vector control using the RIDL technique have been conducted since 2009, and have successfully suppressed target populations of *Aedes aegypti* in the Cayman Islands, Brazil, and Panama [49]. To date, trials have used a self-limiting approach, requiring repeated mass release of genetically modified males. But a self-sustaining control would be possible using a gene-drive system, eliminating the need for ongoing releases, but potentially being harder to monitor and adjust in a natural population [49, 50]. Some conservation biologists believe this might be an effective management tool for the endemic birds of Kauaʻi [45]

Risks from using a gene drive approach to the control of avian malaria in the Hawaiian Islands include the loss of efficacy due to evolved resistance to the lethal gene [49]; the escape of transgenic mosquitoes to other natural systems; disruption of any process whereby endemic species acquire natural immunity to Plasmodium infection; and societal resistance to the environmental release of a **GMO**. The challenge, and opportunity, is for the conservation community to work with synthetic biologists to design the appropriate approach: disrupt the vector's ability to transmit the parasite or drive the vector to local extinction?

Figure legends:

Figure 1: SRY Gene Drive in mice

To skew sex ratios in naturally breeding populations, the male determining gene (*Sry*), normally found on Chromosome (Chr) Y, can be inserted into a naturally occurring gene drive element on Chr 17 called the t-complex. The t-complex is passed down to greater than 90% of the offspring through the paternal side. A) The X and Y chromosomes are shown, with the *Sry* gene on Chr Y, as well as on any autosome (autosome 1 is shown as an example) and in the t-complex. B) In normal breeding scenarios, the *Sry* gene is located only on Chr Y and therefore only mice inheriting Chr Y are male, therefore approximately 50% of the offspring are XY (male) and 50% are XX (female). C) In a breeding scenario where the *Sry* gene has been added to an autosome, approximately 75% of the offspring will be male and 25% will be female. The \* denotes the scenario where the mouse is chromosomally female but phenotypically male. D) In breeding scenarios where the male carries the *Sry* gene within the Chr 17 t-complex, over 90% of offspring will inherit the t-complex containing autosome. It is predicted that fewer than 10% of the offspring will be XX (female), with the remaining being phenotypically male, including either XY (male) or XX (sterile male).

Figure 2: Engineering sterile mosquitos

(a) A population homozygous for a repressible female-specific lethal can be mass-reared by providing the repressor (chemical “antidote”) during rearing. (b) Cohorts intended for field release are reared in the absence of the repressor, so females die. This rearing could be in the factory, as shown, or in the field if eggs were released, perhaps into artificial larval habitats. (c) The males are released to court and mate wild vector females. (d) Offspring of such mating are heterozygous for the dominant female-lethal gene so females die. (e) Heterozygous males can mate additional wild females, inducing some further female mortality. The female-lethal effect means that the construct has a high fitness cost and will disappear rapidly from the population unless replaced by periodic release of additional homozygous males (a-c).

## **Glossary:**

Biodiversity – biological diversity, sum of variation in ecosystems, species and genes

CRISPR/Cas9 – (clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats) - biochemical method to efficiently cut and edit DNA – using a specific Protein (Cas9)

De-extinction – the development of functional proxies of species which have previously gone extinct

Gene drive – technique for spreading selected, usually recombinant, DNA sequences (genes) through wild populations with the aim of getting rid of unwanted characteristics of an organism or adding desired characteristics. This is a naturally occurring process of “selfish-genes” that is now being harnessed to spread genome edits through a population rapidly

Genome editing – making targeted changes to an organism’s genome - mostly by using specific endonucleases such as CRISPR/Cas9

GM – genetically modified (see also GMO), aka genetically engineered (GE)

GMO – genetic modified organism, also living modified organism (LMO), is an organism whose characteristics have been changed by genetically engineering (contrasting classical selection experiments or naturally by mating and/or recombination)

iGEM – international genetically engineered machine – organization dedicated to education and the advancement of synthetic biology and the development of an open community and collaboration ([igem.org](http://igem.org))

RIDL – Release of insects carrying a dominant lethal gene or genetic system

SIT – sterile insect technique, where sterile individuals of a species generated in the lab (e.g. through radiation) are generated

Synthetic biology – Application of science, technology and engineering to facilitate and accelerate the design, manufacture and/or modification of genetic materials in living organisms (from [http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific\\_committees/consultations/public\\_consultations/sc\\_enihr\\_consultation\\_21\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/consultations/public_consultations/sc_enihr_consultation_21_en.htm))

SRY mice – SRY is a gene determining sex that regulating testis differentiation, in these mice this gene is placed on the autosome and offspring are only male.


Sterile male – sterile males are released to nature so when mating with wild females there is no offspring. Males are sterilized either through radiation (previously) or by genetic manipulation

Conservation Issues	Biodiversity Issues	Synthetic Biology Solutions	References
Invasive Species	Mice and rats on islands	See Box 2	[8] [17] [51] [52]
	Brown tree snake ( <i>Boiga irregularis</i> ) in Guam	Use Y chromosome alterations and gene drives to stop reproduction in this species	[17]
Pathogens	Avian blood parasites in Hawaiian birds	See Box 3	[5] [49] [51]
	Fungal pathogens: White-nose Syndrome in North American bats and Chytrid fungus in amphibians, and snakes	Engineer genetic resistance to fungal diseases	[17] [18] [51]
	Plague in black-footed ferrets	Use CRISPR/CAS 9 to cut out part of genome that is susceptible to disease and replace with genetic code for disease resistance	[18]
Habitat Conversion	Palm Oil	Use other plants or systems to produce manmade palm oil and take pressure off current production methods and thus reduce tropical forest conversion	[2]
	Productivity of soils reduced from pesticides and herbicides or mining practices such as gold or strip	Synthetically restore microbiome of soils for habitat restoration, engineer plants that require less pesticides/herbicides for production	[5]
	Extraction of and use of fossil fuels	Provide alternative solutions and thus alleviate pressures on such resources and the damage they cause such as habitat loss and pollution. Create and modify a micro-organisms to consume hydrocarbons to clean up oil spills	[17] [51]
Loss of Biodiversity	Agriculture and its limitations to feed and house (forests) a growing human population	New food sources or ways to produce food without pesticides and large tracts of arable land	[2] [8]
	Loss of faunal and floral biodiversity	Create ecological proxies, restore ecological functions	[2]
	Revive and restore extinct species	“De-extinction” (e.g. woolly mammoth) use an existing species (elephant) and alter its genome to incorporate genetic code from the extinct species and create a proxy species that hopefully fills the same ecological role as the extinct species	[17] [51]
Overexploitation	Rhino horn, ivory and deep sea sharks for squalene	Produce molecule that is a substitute and can be manmade	[51] [53]
	Pet trade and feral domestic animals	Produce sterile pets	[51]
	Fish species	Improve aquaculture for higher protein production	(A)
Pollution	Replacing things made from petroleum and synthetic rubber	Engineered plants to make the same products	[51]
	Pesticide use	Increase resistance to pests	(B)
	CO2 emissions or other greenhouse gases	Biofuels from synthetic Algae	[5] [17]
	Pharmaceuticals in the environment	Create or modify a micro-organisms to consume or degrade pharmaceuticals	[17]


	Micro-plastics in ocean and soils	Create or modify a micro-organisms to consume or degrade micro-plastic	[2] [54]
	Water pollution	Create and modify algal or bacterial species that consume or degrade pollutants	[2]
	Coral Reef Bleaching	Alter coral reef genome for resistance borrowing pathways from coral species that seem to withstand increased temperature and/or acidity	[2] [17] [55] [56]

(A) <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/AnimalVeterinary/DevelopmentApprovalProcess/GeneticEngineering/GeneticallyEngineeredAnimals/UCM466218.pdf> (B) <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/23395/genetically-engineered-crops-experiences-and-prospects>


## A. Examples of SRY gene knock-ins




## B. Normal Sex Ratio (~50% SRY inheritance)



## C. Autosomal SRY-knockin (~75% SRY inheritance)




## D. T-complex SRY-Gene Drive (≥90% SRY inheritance)



Wildtype autosome 17 only inherited maternally.  
Paternal wildtype autosome 17 inheritance prevented by SRY + t-complex.

# REARING FACILITY



# FIELD

