Check for updates

Zoo Biology

WILEY

ZOOBIOLOGY

COMMENTARY OPEN ACCESS

A Coordinated U.S. Biobank Alliance for the Zoological and Conservation Community

Rachel A. Johnston[1,2] | Lisa Moses[2,3] | Danica Wolfe[1,2] | Megan E. Brown[4] | Asako Y. Chaille[5] | Jennifer D'Agostino[6] | Marietta D. Danforth[7] | Jimmy Erkens[1,2,8] | Alex J. Garretson[9] | Diane P. Genereux[2] | John A. Griffioen[10] | Shelly Grow[4] | Katherine D. Heineman[5,11] | Adrienne Horrigan[12] | Christina Hvilsom[13] | Debbie Johnson[14] | Elinor K. Karlsson[2,15] | Jennifer R. Kropf[16] | Kim Labuschagne[17] | Carla B. Madelaire[5] | Anna Mekarska[18] | Sarah U. Morton[2,19,20] | Piper Mullins[21] | Francis J. Oliaro[22] | Tahlia Perry[1,2] | Budhan S. Pukazhenthi[23] | Andrea S. Putnam[24] | Tanya M. Salvey[22] | Rachel Thompson[25] | Andrew C. Richardson[5] | Mark Kameron Roth[5] | Cynthia C. Steiner[5] | Andrew W. Torrance[26,27] | Gregory J. Watkins-Colwell[28] | Michelle White[2] | Eric J. Baitchman[1,2]

[1]Zoo New England, Boston, Massachusetts, USA | [2]Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA | [3]Center for Bioethics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA | [4]Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Silver Spring, Maryland, USA | [5]San Diego Zoo Wildlife Alliance, San Diego, California, USA | [6]Oklahoma City Zoo and Botanical Garden, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, USA | [7]Great Ape Heart Project, Detroit Zoological Society, Royal Oak, Michigan, USA | [8]Department of Anthropology, Boston University, Boston, Massachusett, USA | [9]AZA Population Management Center, Lincoln Park Zoo, Chicago, Illinois, USA | [10]Fort Worth Zoo, Fort Worth, Texas, USA | [11]IUCN SSC Center for Species Survival-Biodiversity Banking, Gland, Switzerland | [12]Lincoln Park Zoo, Chicago, Illinois, USA | [13]Center for Research and Conservation, Royal Zoological Society of Antwerp, Antwerpen, Belgium | [14]Brookfield Zoo Chicago, Brookfield, Illinois, USA | [15]UMass Chan Medical School, Worcester, Massachusetts, USA | [16]Sedgwick County Zoo, Wichita, Kansas, USA | [17]South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria, South Africa | [18]European Association of Zoos and Aquaria, Amsterdam, The Netherlands | [19]Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA | [20]Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA | [21]Smithsonian's National Zoo and Conservation Biology Institute, Washington, District of Columbia, USA | [22]John G. Shedd Aquarium, Chicago, Illinois, USA | [23]Center for Species Survival, Smithsonian's National Zoo and Conservation Biology Institute, Front Royal, Virginia, USA | [24]Dallas Zoo, Dallas, Texas, USA | [25]Species360, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA | [26]University of Kansas School of Law, Lawrence, Kansas, USA | [27]MIT Sloan School of Management, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA | [28]Yale Peabody Museum, New Haven, Connecticut, USA

Correspondence: Rachel A. Johnston (rjohnston@zoonewengland.org) | Eric J. Baitchman (ebaitchman@zoonewengland.org)

Received: 28 October 2025 | **Revised:** 5 June 2026 | **Accepted:** 24 September 2026

Funding: Institute of Museum and Library Services, Grant/Award Number: MG-255443-OMS-24

Keywords: biospecimens | data sharing | interoperability | research | zoo

ABSTRACT

With dramatic advancements in biological data generation, genetic rescue and reproductive technologies, and inter-institutional coordination of care across entire animal populations, zoos, aquariums, and their collaborators are uniquely positioned to lead population-wide research benefiting animal wellbeing and species survival. However, procedural and inter-institutional barriers make it exceedingly difficult to access existing zoological biospecimens and data at scale. To address this, the Zoonomics Working Group, representing diverse roles across three zoological associations (AZA, EAZA, WAZA), proposes a biodiversity biobank alliance that develops and delivers shared resources to support the collection, storage, and sharing of biological samples and associated data across the zoological and conservation community. By biobank alliance, we mean a community-guided effort that develops shared resources, standards, ethos, and practices for collecting, storing, and sharing biological samples and associated data voluntarily through transparent processes, consistent with professional accreditation standards and international best practices. While initially focused on addressing the needs and regulatory landscape of U.S. institutions, the alliance is designed to create frameworks that are adaptable and adoptable for international expansion. Such a framework would help the

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

© 2026 The Author(s). *Zoo Biology* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC.

zoological community navigate the ethical, legal, and practical challenges of managing biospecimen collections, making access more efficient, reliable, and robust. Achieving this vision requires collective agreement on ethical principles such as reciprocity, transparency, and data stewardship, ensuring that research is both feasible and proactively supported. Such coordination will drive advances in fundamental biology and accelerate progress in animal health, welfare, management, and biodiversity conservation.

1 | Introduction

A core objective of U.S.-based zoos and aquariums is to advance animal wellbeing, public engagement, and conservation of wildlife (Association of Zoos and Aquariums [AZA] mission; https://www.aza.org). Fulfilling this mission carries an ethical imperative to apply the best information and practices possible, for both the animals and the public who support these institutions. Groundbreaking advancements in information *standardization* and *harmonization* to link *biobanks* at scale have revolutionized our ability to understand and improve human health over the past 20 years (Rush et al. 2024). A parallel transformation is within reach for wildlife, if we adopt consistent processes and standards for high-quality, biobanked specimens and data collected across zoos and aquariums. Zoos and aquariums have a unique opportunity to gather comprehensive life history, genomic, and health information throughout the lifespan of the world's most threatened species, which, if properly communicated and linked with biobanked samples, can complement and inform efforts to save species in nature. Critically, biobanked materials are not only retrospective research assets but also central, prospective tools that can directly enable conservation action through assisted reproductive technologies, including artificial insemination and *in vitro* fertilization, as well as emerging genomic and genetic management approaches. As these technologies mature, coordinated biobanking will become essential infrastructure for both *ex situ* population management and *in situ* species recovery, positioning biobanks as foundational to conservation practice. Through programmatic and structured collection and sharing of biobanked specimens and associated data, these resources could drive breakthroughs in conservation, animal wellbeing, health, and biological research, including both applied and discovery-driven research that may yield unanticipated insights and broader public engagement. Box 1

Currently, most zoo- and aquarium-based biospecimens and linked animal data collected for research are driven through project-specific efforts, often siloed within individual institutions or small networks (Barrett et al. 2025). Even with the limitations of this project-driven approach, the resulting data have enabled advances across an impressive range of disciplines (Hvilsom et al. 2020; Loh et al. 2018; Norman et al. 2019; Welden et al. 2020), including animal welfare (Liptovszky 2024), breeding management strategies (Russello and Jensen 2018), reproductive technologies (Ballou et al.2023; Bolton et al. 2022; Fujihara and Inoue-Murayama 2024), stem cell technologies (Hutchinson et al. 2024), animal and human health research (Baitchman and Deem 2023; Boddy et al. 2020; Murphy et al. 2018; Sulzner et al. 2021), aging research (Tidière 2024), infectious disease research (Fitak et al. 2019), evolutionary biology (Bertorelle et al. 2022), DNA forensics

BOX 1: | Glossary

Biobank: We follow the convention of the human research field in using the term biobank to refer to collections of biological specimens and paired data for research (Annaratone et al. 2021). Critically, a key feature of biobanks is the *coexistence of biological specimens and data* (Annaratone et al. 2021), particularly about the source individual, such as genomic, health, and environmental information. We therefore refer to biospecimens (living or non-living) and associated data together, to reflect their integrated nature within biobanks.

Data standards: Data standards are consensual specifications (e.g., defined vocabularies) for the representation of data from different sources or settings, and are integral for the sharing, portability, and reusability of data (Richesson and Krischer 2007). Existing data standards that are relevant to biospecimen collections in zoos and aquariums include Darwin Core for biodiversity data (Wieczorek et al. 2012), the Global Genome Biodiversity Network (GGBN) Data Standard for physical genomic samples (Droege et al. 2016), and Biospecimen Reporting for Improved Study Quality (BRISQ) for biospecimens used for biomedical research (Moore et al. 2011).

Harmonization: Harmonization refers to the retrospective practice of reconciling and combining conceptually similar datasets to maximize their comparability or compatibility (Cheng et al. 2024). Harmonized data itself may be constructed as a single dataset or remain dispersed across multiple datasets depending on the various ethical, legal, methodological or logistical factors at play (Cheng et al. 2024).

Knowledge-implementation gap: The knowledge-implementation gap refers to the particular gap between scientific research and its applicability to practitioners (Klütsch and Laikre 2022).

Standardization: The practice of unifying data by making all potential dimensions of the data (i.e. structure, syntax, semantics) identical (Cheng et al. 2024).

Zoonomics: An initiative facilitated by the Center for Zoonomics based at Zoo New England, whose mission is to integrate conservation and medical genomics to improve human, animal, and ecosystem health (https://zoonomics.org/).

10982361, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/zoo.70118 by South African Medical Research Council, Wiley Online Library on [01/10/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Summary

Zoos and aquariums are uniquely positioned to advance population-level research and conservation, but barriers limit access to biospecimens and data at scale. A biobank alliance could enable breakthroughs in biology, animal health, and conservation.

(Pérez-Espona et al. 2021), and conservation (Fa et al. 2011; Mooney et al. 2023). Recognizing the breadth of these applications, members of the zoo community have long proposed shifting from project-driven biospecimen collection to programmatic, cross-institutional biospecimen and data management (Wildt 1992). A strategic shift to scale efforts has been proposed as having the potential to profoundly advance every field it touches (Liptovszky 2024).

To more efficiently investigate and improve animal health and wellbeing, researchers and practitioners must be able to access biobanked biospecimens and associated data at scale. Several types of data, if collected in a standardized manner across institutions and linked to biospecimens, are particularly well-positioned to deliver high-impact insights in animal care, science, and conservation:

Genomic data. Collaborative generation of population-wide genomic data, through partnerships between population managers and researchers, can serve dual goals. They can provide managers with the information needed to maintain populations that are genetically diverse, and advance discoveries in fields such as health genomics, comparative genomics, and conservation genomics (Norman et al. 2019; Genereux et al. 2020; Hohenlohe et al. 2021; Paez et al. 2022).

Health data. Uniformly collected health data across institutions is critical to evaluate progress in health systems (Chan et al. 2010) and can accelerate studies and improvements in veterinary care and animal wellbeing (e.g., Murphy et al. 2018). Importantly, pairing health and genomic data can promote management of healthy, sustainable populations. Moreover, because health data span an animal's entire life, they enable research on fundamental biological processes that are typically not possible to study in wild populations, such as early development (e.g. Wilson et al. 2025), reproductive health (Wildt et al. 2010), aging (Tidière 2024), and cancer (Vincze et al. 2022).

Environmental data. Standardized documentation of environmental factors related to animal management such as diet, housing, group composition, and enrichment can be analyzed with health data. Outcomes may uncover the environmental predictors of health and wellbeing (Wild 2005; Tidière 2024). These insights could be foundational for improving animal care, welfare, reproductive success, and veterinary care, and could also contribute to research fields such as the developmental origins of health and disease (DOHaD; Suzuki 2018) and the social determinants of health (Snyder-Mackler et al. 2020), especially through collaborative investment in standards and tools that advance both animal care and science.

1.1 | Biobank Challenges Ahead

In recent years, zoo- and aquarium-based biobanking in Europe has taken transformative steps toward community coordination. The EAZA Biobank (launched in 2016; Hvilsom et al. 2026; https://www.eaza.net/biobank/) was developed as a distributed network of four "hub" facilities, each with secure long-term storage capacity and dedicated staff, servicing the EAZA Community, with centralized coordination and oversight. It offers a model for shared policies, standardized metadata practices, and common cyberinfrastructure tools for managing access to biospecimens collected in zoos and aquariums. While still evolving, this network demonstrates that cross-institutional and even cross-country coordination is possible and can significantly increase the visibility, usability, and impact of collections.

In contrast, no equivalent coordination exists across institutions in the U.S. to programmatically collect and share biobanked samples and associated animal-level data (e.g. genomic, health, and environmental data) for research and conservation at scale. To close this gap, we formed the *Zoonomics* Working Group to identify and address structural barriers preventing coordinated, large-scale studies in zoos and aquariums across the U.S. Such efforts are urgently needed to provide population-level insights and advance animal health, management, wellbeing, science, and conservation. Historically, several challenges have impeded sample and associated data sharing among institutions.

1.1.1 | The Knowledge-Implementation Gap

First, a historical lack of synergy between zoo and outside research communities has impeded collaboration and data sharing (Taylor et al. 2017; Klütsch and Laikre 2022). Cultural and institutional differences are reported by these communities, with few opportunities for interaction and a lack of platforms for shared communication (Klütsch and Laikre 2022; Liptovszky 2024).

Even when connections are made, differences in professional incentive structures and priorities can hinder the development of truly reciprocal partnerships (Klütsch and Laikre 2022). The research field has developed robust systems to track and report the impact of authors and scientific publications, yet comparable mechanisms for tracking and reporting the impact and reuse of non-authors' contributions of biospecimens, metadata, and genomic resources are largely absent outside isolated cases. This creates a structural asymmetry in how scientific value is measured: downstream visibility and credit are tied to publication metrics and are insufficiently connected to the provenance of the underlying biological resources, weakening incentives for sustained participation in biospecimen and data sharing. While not all contributions warrant authorship, current attribution mechanisms for non-author contributions—such as acknowledgments or informal recognition—are not captured in systems that track and translate contributions into measurable impact. As a result, contributions from source institutions and jurisdictions that invest in the long-term stewardship of animals, and enable access to highly unique biospecimens and data, are often rendered invisible, with impact accruing primarily to researchers through citation-based

10982361, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/zoo.70118 by South African Medical Research Council, Wiley Online Library on [01/10/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

metrics. This gap in standardized systems to track and report upstream contributions reinforces perceptions of inequity and undervaluation among contributing entities rather than substantive recognition.

Many zoos and aquariums also express concerns about trust (Liptovzsky 2024), recognition, and control over how biospecimens and associated data are used—particularly regarding commercialization and intellectual property. These concerns parallel long-standing discussions in human biobanks (e.g., Simon 2007; Caulfield et al. 2014) but have been insufficiently addressed for animal collections. While fostering collaboration between zoo and external science communities is important, it is not sufficient—dedicated resources and legal and ethical guidance are critically needed to support controlled data use and address uncertainty that many zoos and aquariums have regarding benefits sharing, commercialization, and intellectual property.

1.1.2 | *Balancing Data Access and Privacy*

As in human healthcare, zoos and aquariums hold private health records. In human health, organizations have invested heavily in frameworks that define shared values and expectations for sharing biospecimens and data, including codes of conduct, legal frameworks, and cyberinfrastructure for responsible data stewardship that maximize data utility while respecting requirements surrounding data confidentiality and privacy (Lane and Schur 2010). Similarly, a central concern for zoos is ensuring that biospecimens and private animal health data are protected from misuse or misinterpretation. Effective frameworks must provide guidance and oversight to balance access and privacy of animal biospecimens and data. For 50 years, Species360 has established governance, data sharing, and data privacy agreements for their members to align and balance data access and privacy. However, community-guided resources to navigate the decision-making process for data sharing are lacking. Developing consensus-based recommendations regarding policies and mechanisms for access and anonymization will be critical to address hesitation and mistrust, enabling zoos and their conservation partners to share biospecimens and data with confidence.

1.1.3 | *Benefit Sharing for All Partners and Participants*

Equitable benefit sharing with all stakeholders, including sovereign states and Indigenous communities for biospecimens of *in situ* populations, zoos and aquariums for biospecimens of animals in human care, and the animal participants themselves, remains a critical area for further understanding and development. Many institutions currently lack the guidance or resources to consistently align with frameworks such as the Nagoya Protocol for biospecimens from *in situ* populations (Adachi et al. 2014; Comizzoli and Holt 2016; Colella et al. 2023). Coordinated resources are needed to improve equity and trust between partners and support institutional compliance with emerging international norms.

1.1.4 | *Fragmented Access Policies*

One key obstacle is the absence of consensus-based, predefined criteria that are mutually recognized across institutions for sharing samples and associated animal-level data. Even when samples are physically centralized in large biorepositories, *ownership* of the samples and associated metadata are still typically dispersed across many institutions, and each institution maintains its own review process and access requirements. Thus, to access biospecimens or data of an entire population, users must navigate separate approval processes from each institution that owns biospecimens—sometimes resulting in dozens of institutional reviews—making the work prohibitively time- and labor-intensive. This inefficiency burdens both external partners and internal practitioners, including coordinators whose mandate is to manage genetically diverse populations (e.g., for Species Survival Plans [SSPs]), thus significantly delaying new knowledge that could benefit species conservation. Shared, consensus-based criteria and procedural standards for biospecimen and data sharing, adopted voluntarily across institutions' access committees, can foster trust and mutual recognition, paving the way to greater coordination, collaboration, and delegation between access committees (Global Alliance for Genomics and Health GA4GH 2021). Institutions that adopt this approach (within the constraints of differing national policies if extending beyond the U.S.) can streamline the administrative effort involved in contributing to research. Successful examples of this concept include the EAZA Biobank and Species360 Conservation Science Alliance (https://species360.org/species360-conservation-science-alliance/). Importantly, such frameworks are not intended to restrict research scope; shared criteria are used only to streamline requests that can proceed without repeated institutional review, while all other requests remain eligible for institution-specific evaluation.

1.1.5 | *Lack of Discoverability of Biobanks, Biobank Contacts, and Biospecimens*

Effective utilization of biobanks requires that external users be able to explore information about the existence of biospecimens and associated data. Specifically, users need a central portal to search for biological materials to assess their scope, quality, and usefulness. Although public data portals (e.g., Global Genome Biodiversity Network [GGBN; Droege et al. 2014]) are being used to share sample metadata by zoos and aquariums in Europe, in the U.S., this type of information is inaccessible outside individual institutions. Without the ability to see what biospecimens exist, particularly for studies at the population scale, practitioners and researchers are hesitant to blindly pursue a lengthy and highly redundant approval process. Surfacing such data in a secure platform, trusted and endorsed by the zoological community, will advance science and conservation, opening up new possibilities of study.

1.1.6 | *Limited Adoption of Data Standards*

These discoverability issues stem from deeper data limitations. While most institutions maintain internal biospecimen inventories, few have adopted global data standards (e.g. Darwin Core [Wieczorek et al. 2012]) or use data management platforms that enable interoperability or cross-institutional discovery. Data are often stored in inconsistent or incomplete formats, lacking the structure needed to make it usable. Without shared data standards, it becomes difficult or impossible to integrate

10982361, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/zoo.70118 by South African Medical Research Council, Wiley Online Library on [01/10/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

records across institutions. Even when organizations are eager to collaborate, the work of reconciling disparate systems, data structures, and permission processes can be prohibitively complex.

Addressing these challenges will require long-term investment for financial, operational, and social sustainability (Watson et al. 2014). Achieving such viability will require developing a clear plan that aligns funding, community needs, and goals for user uptake to ensure collections are actively used and deliver sustained impact (Henderson et al. 2017). Institutional collaborations with external partners, built on transparency and trust, may also help address community challenges. For example, formal partnerships with natural history museums, which share similar missions in biodiversity research and education, have the capacity to preserve and manage requests for non-living specimens and biospecimens in perpetuity, potentially providing services that zoos could delegate while maintaining controlled access (Poo et al. 2022).

1.2 | Call for a Biobank Alliance Across Zoos and Aquariums

To overcome these challenges, we propose establishing a biobank alliance of zoos and aquariums to develop community-guided resources that support consistent and streamlined practices for collecting, storing, and sharing high-quality biological samples and associated data. While initially focused on addressing the needs and regulatory landscape of U.S. institutions, the proposed alliance is intended to develop frameworks that are adaptable and adoptable across global contexts. By moving from isolated, project-specific sampling and data collection toward more coordinated, programmatic collection and data integration, the zoo and aquarium community could enable discoveries impossible within the current fragmented model (Table 1). Importantly, this approach is intended to complement—not duplicate—existing efforts such as the EAZA Biobank, supporting management and research of populations and species maintained in the U.S. The alliance would build on and coordinate with regional networks and like-minded initiatives (e.g. AZA Biobanking Scientific Advisory Group; IUCN SSC Animal Biobanking for Conservation Specialist Group; IUCN SSC Center for Species Survival Biodiversity Banking; IUCN SSC Conservation Genetics Specialist Group; ZooMu Network [Poo et al. 2022]) to integrate existing expertise and build shared resources within a coordinated, implementation-focused framework for zoos and aquariums worldwide. We propose establishing a biobank alliance in order to achieve the following aims:

1.2.1 | *Build Trust and Ensure Equity*

- Adopt, for animals, the principle to "protect personal data while sharing vital knowledge that could benefit all" (Global Alliance for Genomics and Health GA4GH 2025). This concept should guide the alliance's approach to ethics, transparency, access, and community engagement.
- Delineate benefit sharing, intellectual property, and equitable, transparent engagement with all partners.
- Promote automated mechanisms that track biospecimen and data reuse and provide credit to contributing entities that is proportional to involvement and measurable.

1.2.2 | *Support Consistent and Efficient Access Policies*

- Establish a shared framework of guiding principles for data collection, access, and use.
- Define clear, pre-approved conditions for sample and data use to speed legitimate access.

1.2.3 | *Make Data Discoverable*

- Promote data systems that uphold FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable [Wilkinson et al. 2016]) and CARE (Collective Benefit, Authority to Control, Responsibility, and Ethics [Carroll et al. 2020]) principles.
- Enhance interoperability across collections by developing a common data framework that describes how data are collected, stored, managed, and used, and by whom and for what purposes (Chan et al. 2010).

1.2.4 | *Promote Utilization of Shared Resources and Standards*

- Provide communication platforms to connect the zoo and research communities.

TABLE 1 | Summarizes key contrasts between current fragmented practices and the proposed alliance functions.

Domain	Current practice	Proposed alliance function
Sample and data collection	Project-based, institution-specific efforts	Coordinated, programmatic sampling across institutions and SSPs (scope and structure to be defined by the alliance working group)
Attribution and benefits sharing	Uncertainty on benefits, risks, and recognition of sharing biospecimens and data	Community guidance on data use, commercialization, intellectual property, and recognizing and tracking contributions
Discoverability and access	Limited visibility; separate institutional approvals required	Institutions visible in global collection directories (e.g. GRSciColl); shared criteria and procedures to streamline access
Standards and metadata	Inconsistent data entry across institutions	Voluntary adoption of global standards, enabling interoperability and reuse

10982361, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/zoo.70118 by South African Medical Research Council, Wiley Online Library on [01/10/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

- Foster capacity building across the zoo and aquarium workforce in high-quality sample collection, data standards, and optimal data management, consistent with successful global standards to maximize compatibility and impact (e.g. International Society for Biological and Environmental Repositories [ISBER]; Global Alliance for Genomics and Health [GA4GH], a not-for-profit alliance that sets standards and frames policies to expand genomic data use within a human rights framework).

1.3 | Strategies to Get Started

Establishing a biobank alliance will depend not only on developing resources but also on deliberate community building and institutional coordination. Early efforts should therefore focus on organizing leadership, defining participation structures, and creating mechanisms for transparent communication and trust. We recommend beginning with these foundational steps, all of which should be developed through community-guided, consensus-based processes:

- Engage partners to explore potential alliance structures, roles, and responsibilities.
- Develop a plan that establishes structure and leadership, outlines the initial steps and required resources, and positions the alliance for formal mandate within the AZA framework.
- Create a codified framework of shared values and expectations for sample and data sharing, with voluntarily endorsed ethical principles, such as the framework provided by GA4GH (Knoppers 2014), to build a foundation of trust and support consistent cross-institutional practices.
- Develop guidelines and protocols for documenting ownership or stewardship of biospecimens, data, and intellectual property.
- Collaboratively establish the purpose, scope, applications, and conditions under which biospecimens and data are voluntarily shared and used.
- Identify and adapt appropriate formal metadata standards (e.g., Darwin Core [Wieczorek et al. 2012]) and best-practice guidelines (e.g. Hvilsom et al. 2025; Corrales and Astrin 2023) tailored to zoo and aquarium contexts.
- Conduct a collaborative pilot sampling campaign for a single species or SSP across multiple zoos to pilot the aforementioned frameworks, helping refine approaches to ethics, metadata, and sample management. An endangered, well-coordinated species (e.g. a great ape) could serve as a guiding case study to inform scalable, trust-based systems (Box 2).
- Develop a coordinated communication and training strategy, building on existing training efforts, to expand the reach of knowledge exchange and capacity building. Models such as GA4GH's open-source resource library and Harvard Catalyst's cross-institutional training platforms could inform scalable approaches.
- Use early adopter outputs, including publications, outreach and reporting products, and other visibility pathways, to demonstrate how participation aligns with institutional missions to advance conservation impact, scientific contribution, and institutional leadership.

BOX 2: | Pilot collaborative sampling campaign framework (illustrative example)

Objectives: Evaluate feasibility of coordinated biospecimen collection of a focal species across institutions (e.g., an ESA-listed species with an active SSP and ongoing coordinated research and conservation efforts, such as one of the great apes), including standardized metadata capture and integration of genomic, health, and environmental data.

Governance: Establish shared sampling protocols, coordinated institutional approvals, and delegated review mechanisms across participating institutions under agreed stewardship principles.

Metrics of success: Assess interoperability of datasets, completeness and quality of metadata, number of participating institutions, efficiency of access/approval workflows, and downstream research or management outputs.

1.4 | Initial Steps Toward Alliance Development

This proposal advances long-standing calls for coordinated wildlife biobanking by moving beyond conceptual recommendations toward structured, community-driven implementation, with initial steps already underway. The initial Zoonomics Working Group (authors of this article) brought together individual experts across zoos, aquariums, and partner organizations to define shared challenges and needs. Building from this foundation, a Phase 2 Working Group has been established, composed of institutional representatives and liaisons participating in a structured planning process (following the structured conservation planning process of the IUCN SSC Conservation Planning Specialist Group [CPSG 2020]) intended to reflect institutional priorities and perspectives (see Supporting Information Table S1 for participating institutions). This group represents the initial participation pathway and, in collaboration with a broader advisory network for community input, is currently developing a prioritized action plan for the alliance. Defining an operational model for the alliance, including whether to adopt a distributed hub-and-service structure similar to the EAZA Biobank, will be a critical step of the Working Group's process. Alliance viability is expected to be informed by engagement in this community-driven process and the institutional grounding of the resulting plan. These early efforts demonstrate institutional momentum and mark a transition from individual advocacy to coordinated institutional action.

1.5 | The Importance of Ethics

Zoos and aquariums are mission-driven organizations motivated by both a beneficent duty to the animals in their care and to advancing biodiversity conservation. These two goals

10982361, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/zoo.70118 by South African Medical Research Council, Wiley Online Library on [01/10/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

underlie the aims and core values of research supported by zoos and aquariums. A direct way to fulfill these mandates is the appropriate use of biospecimens and animal data. Organizations arguably have an obligation to the animal donors of these biospecimens to maximize the benefits that can be gained from their use. When done with integrity, fairness, and efficiency, sharing of biospecimens and data amplifies research benefits well beyond what individual institutions could achieve, making optimization of data value both an ethical imperative (Fischer and Zigmond 2010) and a recognized AZA standard (Association of Zoos and Aquariums 2025, Standard 5.3).

All biobanks and their associated data use have inherently ethical features, including considerations of data sharing and governance, consent and representation, genetic privacy, ownership and access rights, and genetic diversity management (Cadigan et al. 2025). Biobank alliances have additional ethical dimensions beyond those of individual biobanks in all of these areas. For example, data protection protocols must be standardized across multiple institutions. However, the increased ethical complexity can also ensure more systematically responsible stewardship of biological materials overall.

The list of values crucial to shaping a successful alliance of zoo biobanks includes those required for any responsible conduct of conservation research (Sandler et al. 2021). The FAIR and CARE Principles (Wilkinson et al. 2016; Carroll et al. 2020; Jennings et al. 2023) should be considered as guiding frameworks in the development of shared values and practices, as they may prove integral to ensuring the alliance's integrity. Additionally, the Zoonomics working group has identified three specific principles of ethical research as paramount to the integrity and success of the alliance: 1) responsible stewardship, 2) transparency, and 3) reciprocity. While data stewardship and transparency may be familiar as typical scientific research principles, reciprocity is less commonly included as an explicit responsibility. In this context, reciprocity means that the benefits of the alliance and subsequent data generation flow bidirectionally—to both the researchers and organizations, and to the benefit of the animals in their care and in broader conservation efforts. As such, reciprocity as an expressed value of scientific research has particular resonance to the zoo and aquarium community.

2 | Conclusion

By prioritizing interoperable and programmatic data collection, efficient access, and consistency with global standards and other regional biobank consortia, a wildlife biobank alliance will open entirely new lines of research, and will accelerate progress in animal health, welfare, management, and conservation.

Author Contributions

The ideas and concepts presented in the article were developed by all authors through Working Group discussions. Rachel A. Johnston and Lisa Moses drafted the initial article. All authors contributed to reviewing and editing the article.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank members of AZA, the Molecular Data for Population Management Scientific Advisory Group, and the ZooMu Network for helpful discussions on the ideas presented here. This work was made possible through funding from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (Grant Number MG-255443-OMS-24).

Conflicts of Interest

One coauthor (Rachel Thompson) is an employee of Species360, which is referenced in this Perspective. No financial, commercial, or organizational interests from Species360 influenced the preparation, content, or conclusions of this work.

Data Availability Statement

No new data were generated or analyzed for this perspective.

References

Adachi, K., H. Meyer, D. V. Eugui, and X. Seuba. 2014. "The Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol: Intellectual Property Implications. A Handbook on the Interface Between Global Access and Benefit Sharing Rules and Intellectual Property." *United Nations Conference on Trade and Development*.

Annaratone, L., G. De Palma, G. Bonizzi, et al. 2021. "Basic Principles of Biobanking: From Biological Samples to Precision Medicine for Patients." *Virchows Archiv* 479, no. 2: 233–246.

Association of Zoos and Aquariums. 2025. *Accreditation Standards and Related Policies*. Silver Spring, MD.

Baitchman, E., and S. L. Deem. 2023. "Zoos as One Health Education Centers for Students in the Human Health Professions." *In Fowler's Zoo and Wild Animal Medicine Current Therapy* 10: 79–84.

Ballou, J. D., R. C. Lacy, K. Traylor-Holzer, K. Bauman, J. A. Ivy, and C. Asa. 2023 "Strategies for Establishing and Using Genome Resource Banks to Protect Genetic Diversity in Conservation Breeding Programs." *Zoo Biology* 42, no. 2: 175–184.

Barrett, L. P., F. E. Clark, M. S. Freeman, E. Williams, and V. L. O'Connor. 2025. "Manyzoos: A New Collaborative Approach to Multi-Institution Research in Zoos." *Zoo Biology* 44: 393–402.

Bertorelle, G., F. Raffini, M. Bosse, et al. 2022. "Genetic Load: Genomic Estimates and Applications in Non-Model Animals." *Nature Reviews Genetics* 23, no. 8: 492–503.

Boddy, A. M., T. M. Harrison, and L. M. Abegglen. 2020. "Comparative Oncology: New Insights Into an Ancient Disease." *Iscience* 23, no. 8: 101373.

Bolton, R. L., A. Mooney, M. T. Pettit, et al. 2022. "Resurrecting Biodiversity: Advanced Assisted Reproductive Technologies and Biobanking." *Reproduction and Fertility* 3, no. 3: R121–R146.

Cadigan, R. J., R. Ponsaran, C. Rich, J. Timmons, K. B. Brothers, and A. J. Goldenberg. 2025. "Supporting Stewardship: Funding, Utilization, and Sustainability as Ethical Concerns in Networked Biobanking." *AJOB Empirical Bioethics* 16, no. 1: 42–51.

Carroll, S. R., M. Hudson, J. Holbrook, S. Materechera, and J. Anderson. 2020. *Working With the CARE Principles: Operationalizing Indigenous Data Governance* (9). Ada Lovelace Institute.

Caulfield, T., S. Burningham, Y. Joly, et al. 2014. "A Review of the Key Issues Associated With the Commercialization of Biobanks." *Journal of Law and the Biosciences* 1, no. 1: 94–110.

Chan, M., M. Kazatchkine, J. Lob-Levyt, et al. 2010. "Meeting the Demand for Results and Accountability: A Call for Action on Health Data From Eight Global Health Agencies." *PLoS Medicine* 7, no. 1: e1000223.

10982361, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/zoo.70118 by South African Medical Research Council, Wiley Online Library on [01/10/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Cheng, C., L. Messerschmidt, I. Bravo, et al. 2024. "A General Primer for Data Harmonization." *Scientific Data* 11, no. 1: 152.

Colella, J. P., L. Silvestri, G. Súzan, M. Weksler, J. A. Cook, and E. P. Lessa. 2023. "Engaging With the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-Sharing: Recommendations for Noncommercial Biodiversity Researchers." *Journal of Mammalogy* 104, no. 3: 430–443.

Comizzoli, P., and W. V. Holt. 2016. "Implications of the Nagoya Protocol for Genome Resource Banks Composed of Biomaterials From Rare and Endangered Species." *Reproduction, Fertility, and Development* 28, no. 8: 1145–1160.

Corrales, C., and J. J. Astrin. 2023. "Biodiversity Biobanking – A Handbook on Protocols and Practices." *Advanced Books* : e101876. https://doi.org/10.3897/ab.

Droege, G., K. Barker, J. J. Astrin, et al. 2014. "The Global Genome Biodiversity Network (GGBN) Data Portal." *Nucleic Acids Research* 42, no. D1: D607–D612.

Droege, G., K. Barker, O. Seberg, et al. 2016. "The Global Genome Biodiversity Network (GGBN) Data Standard Specification." *Database* 2016: baw125.

Fa, J. E., S. M. Funk, and D. O'Connell. 2011. *Zoo Conservation Biology*. Cambridge University Press.

Fischer, B. A., and M. J. Zigmond. 2010. "The Essential Nature of Sharing in Science." *Science and engineering ethics* 16, no. 4: 783–799.

Fitak, R. R., J. D. Antonides, E. J. Baitchman, et al. 2019. "The Expectations and Challenges of Wildlife Disease Research in the Era of Genomics: Forecasting With a Horizon Scan-Like Exercise." *Journal of Heredity* 110, no. 3: 261–274.

Fujihara, M., and M. Inoue-Murayama. 2024. "The Wildlife Biobanking of Germ Cells for In Situ and Ex Situ Conservation in Japan." *Theriogenology Wild* 4: 100086.

Genereux, D. P., A. Serres, J. Armstrong, et al. 2020. "A Comparative Genomics Multitool for Scientific Discovery and Conservation." *Nature* 587: 240–245. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2876-6.

Global Alliance for Genomics and Health (GA4GH) 2021Data Access Committee Guiding Principles and Procedural Standards Policy, Version 1.

Global Alliance for Genomics and Health (GA4GH). 2025. https://www.ga4gh.org/about-us/.

Henderson, M. K., K. Goldring, and D. Simeon-Dubach. 2017. "Achieving and Maintaining Sustainability in Biobanking Through Business Planning, Marketing, and Access." *Biopreservation and Biobanking* 15, no. 1: 1–2.

Hohenlohe, P. A., W. C. Funk, and O. P. Rajora. 2021. "Population Genomics for Wildlife Conservation and Management." *Molecular Ecology* 30, no. 1: 62–82.

Hutchinson, A. M., R. Appeltant, T. Burdon, et al. 2024. "Advancing Stem Cell Technologies for Conservation of Wildlife Biodiversity." *Development* 151, no. 20: dev203116.

Hvilsom, C., A. Brown, M. Bruford, et al. 2025. *Biobanking Guidelines for Conservation Purposes. Gland*. IUCN. https://doi.org/10.2305/ECLR4913.

Hvilsom, C., H. L. Welden, M. Stelvig, et al. 2020. "The Contributions of EAZA Zoos and Aquariums to Peer-Reviewed Scientific Research." *Journal of Zoo and Aquarium Research* 8, no. 2: 133–138.

Hvilsom, C., P. Helsen, A. Ball, et al. 2026. "Integrating Biobanking Into Conservation Practice: The Development and Impact of the EAZA Biobank." *Zoo Biology*. https://doi.org/10.1002/zoo.70103.

Jennings, L., T. Anderson, A. Martinez, et al. 2023. "Applying the 'CARE' Principles for Indigenous Data Governance'to Ecology and Biodiversity Research." *Nature Ecology and Evolution* 7, no. 10: 1547–1551.

Klütsch, C. F., and L. Laikre. 2022. "Closing the Conservation Genetics Gap: Integrating Genetic Knowledge in Conservation Management to Ensure Evolutionary Potential." In *Closing the Knowledge-Implementation Gap in Conservation Science: Interdisciplinary Evidence Transfer Across Sectors and Spatiotemporal Scales*, 51–82. Springer International Publishing.

Knoppers, B. M. 2014. "Framework for Responsible Sharing of Genomic and Health-Related Data." *The HUGO Journal* 8, no. 1: 3.

Lane, J., and C. Schur. 2010. "Balancing Access to Health Data and Privacy: A Review of the Issues and Approaches for the Future." *Health Services Research* 45, no. 5p2: 1456–1467.

Liptovszky, M. 2024. "Advancing Zoo Animal Welfare Through Data Science: Scaling Up Continuous Improvement Efforts." *Frontiers in Veterinary Science* 11: 1313182.

Loh, T. L., E. R. Larson, S. R. David, et al. 2018. "Quantifying the Contribution of Zoos and Aquariums to Peer-Reviewed Scientific Research." *Facets* 3, no. 1: 287–299.

Mooney, A., O. A. Ryder, M. L. Houck, J. Staerk, D. A. Conde, and Y. M. Buckley. 2023. "Maximizing the Potential for Living Cell Banks to Contribute to Global Conservation Priorities." *Zoo Biology* 42, no. 6: 697–708.

Moore, H. M., A. B. Kelly, S. D. Jewell, et al. 2011. "Biospecimen Reporting for Improved Study Quality (BRISQ)." *Journal of Proteome Research* 10, no. 8: 3429–3438.

Murphy, H. W., M. D. Danforth, and V. L. Clyde. 2018. "The Great Ape Heart Project." *International Zoo Yearbook* 52, no. 1: 103–112.

Norman, A. J., A. S. Putnam, and J. A. Ivy. 2019. "Use of Molecular Data in Zoo and Aquarium Collection Management: Benefits, Challenges, and Best Practices." *Zoo Biology* 38, no. 1: 106–118.

Paez, S., R. H. S. Kraus, B. Shapiro, et al. 2022. "Reference Genomes for Conservation." *Science* 377, no. 6604: 364–366.

Pérez-Espona, S. 2021. "CryoArks Consortium. Conservation-Focused Biobanks: A Valuable Resource for Wildlife DNA Forensics." *Forensic Science International: Animals and Environments* 1: 100017.

Poo, S., S. M. Whitfield, A. Shepack, et al. 2022. "Bridging the Research Gap Between Live Collections in Zoos and Preserved Collections in Natural History Museums." *BioScience* 72, no. 5: 449–460.

Richesson, R. L., and J. Krischer. 2007. "Data Standards in Clinical Research: Gaps, Overlaps, Challenges and Future Directions." *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 14, no. 6: 687–696.

Rush, A., J. A. Byrne, and P. H. Watson. 2024;. "Applying Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable Principles to Biospecimens and Biobanks." *Biopreservation and Biobanking* 22, no. 6: 550–556.

Russello, M. A., and E. L. Jensen. 2018. "Ex Situ Wildlife Conservation in the Age of Population Genomics." In *Population Genomics: Wildlife*, 473–492. Springer International Publishing.

R. Taylor, H., N. Dussex, and Y. van Heezik. 2017. "Bridging the Conservation Genetics Gap by Identifying Barriers to Implementation for Conservation Practitioners." *Global Ecology and Conservation* 10: 231–242.

Sandler, R. L., L. Moses, and S. M. Wisely. 2021. "An Ethical Analysis of Cloning for Genetic Rescue: Case Study of the Black-Footed Ferret." *Biological Conservation* 257: 109118.

Simon, B. M. 2007. "How to Get a Fair Share: IP Policies for Publicly Supported Biobanks." *Ethics* 440: 441–450.

Snyder-Mackler, N., J. R. Burger, L. Gaydosh, et al. 2020. "Social Determinants of Health and Survival in Humans and Other Animals." *Science* 368, no. 6493: eaax9553.

Sulzner, K., C. Fiorello, F. Ridgley, D. Garelle, and S. L. Deem. 2021. "Conservation Medicine and One Health in Zoos: Scope, Obstacles, and Unrecognized Potential." *Zoo Biology* 40, no. 1: 44–51.

10982361, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/zoo.70118 by South African Medical Research Council, Wiley Online Library on [01/10/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Suzuki, K. 2018. "The Developing World of DOHaD." *Journal of Developmental Origins of Health and Disease* 9, no. 3: 266–269.

Tidière, M., J. Stärk, M. J. Adkesson, D. A. C. Ovando, and F. Colchero. 2024. "The Untapped Potential of Zoo and Aquarium Data for the Comparative Biology of Ageing." In *The Biodemography of Ageing and Longevity*, 95–116. Cambridge University Press.

Vincze, O., F. Colchero, J. F. Lemaître, et al. 2022. "Cancer Risk Across Mammals." *Nature* 601, no. 7892: 263–267.

Watson, P. H., S. Y. Nussbeck, C. Carter, et al. 2014. "A Framework for Biobank Sustainability." *Biopreservation and Biobanking* 12, no. 1: 60–68.

Welden, H. L., M. Stelvig, C. K. Nielsen, et al. 2020. "The Contributions of EAZA Zoos and Aquariums to Peer-Reviewed Scientific Research." *Journal of Zoo and Aquarium Research* 8, no. 2: 133–138.

Wieczorek, J., D. Bloom, R. Guralnick, et al. 2012. "Darwin Core: An Evolving Community-Developed Biodiversity Data Standard." *PLoS One* 7, no. 1: e29715.

Wildt, D. E. 1992. "Genetic Resource Banks for Conserving Wildlife Species: Justification, Examples and Becoming Organized on a Global Basis." *Animal Reproduction Science* 28: 247–257.

Wild, C. P. 2005. "Complementing the Genome With an "Exposome": the Outstanding Challenge of Environmental Exposure Measurement in Molecular Epidemiology." *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers and Prevention: A Publication of the American Association for Cancer Research, Cosponsored by the American Society of Preventive Oncology* 14, no. 8: 1847–1850.

Wildt, D. E., P. Comizzoli, B. Pukazhenthi, and N. Songsasen. 2010. "Lessons From Biodiversity—The Value of Nontraditional Species to Advance Reproductive Science, Conservation, and Human Health." *Molecular Reproduction and Development* 77, no. 5: 397–409.

Wilkinson, M. D., M. Dumontier, I. J. Aalbersberg, et al. 2016. "The FAIR Guiding Principles for Scientific Data Management and Stewardship." *Scientific Data* 3, no. 1: 160018.

Wilson, I., T. Perry, R. Eisenhofer, P. Rismiller, M. Shaw, and F. Grutzner. 2025. "Microbiota Changes in Lactation in the Short-Beaked Echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus)." *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* 101, no. 5: fiaf036.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section.

Table S1: Institutions participating in the Phase 2 Working Group. Inclusion reflects participation in the Phase 2 Working Group planning process only and does not imply additional commitments or endorsement beyond that role.

10982361, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/zoo.70118 by South African Medical Research Council, Wiley Online Library on [01/10/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License