

## A Wildlife Forensic Genetic Toolbox to Combat the Illegal Trade of the Short Beaked Echidna

#### by Alexandra Summerell

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

### **Doctorate of Philosophy**

under the supervision of Dr. Rebecca Johnson, Dr. Greta Frankham, Dr. Peter Gunn and Dr. Dennis McNevin

University of Technology Sydney Faculty of Science

February, 2021

## Certificate of original authorship

I, Alexandra Summerell declare that this thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctorate of Philosophy in the Faculty of Science at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Signature:

Production Note: Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 8th February 2021

### Acknowledgments

First and foremost I would like to thank my supervisors Rebecca Johnson and Greta Frankham, for the immense amount of help and encouragement over the many years. Rebecca, thank you for your constant support, knowledge, and guidance, even when being overseas, and for giving me amazing advice, both with my PhD and my career, every bit of which I value so much. Greta, an endless thank you the amount of time you put in, for teaching me so much, for your detailed edits and advice, and for your friendship. The opportunities you both have provided me are incredible and I am so grateful to have worked with you. I can't thank you enough for all the support you have given me, and for all the guidance, editing and encouragement.

Thank you to Peter Gunn for supervising the first few years of my PhD, and for your support and editing, and for allowing me to help so much with teaching. To Dennis McNevin, who graciously stepped in as my supervisor late in the game, and has been so helpful with editing and encouragement.

There have been so many people and organisations who have helped with this project. I am highly indebted to all the assistance, expertise, and time I have received from such amazing people. I hope I have not missed anyone, but if I have please know that I am forever grateful.

Firstly thank you to the sample donors for my project, without whom I would not have a thesis. Thanks to Australia Zoo, Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary, Taronga Zoo, Perth Zoo, Los Angeles Zoo, San Diego Zoo and Featherdale Wildlife Sanctuary for donating live animal samples, and to the veterinarians and zookeepers who did the hard work of collecting blood or plucking quills. To the Australian National Wildlife Collection, Museum Victoria, Queensland Museum, Western Australia Museum, and of course the Australian Museum for the donation of tissue samples, and to all the people behind the scenes who did the hard work of getting them to me. To Stewart Nicol, Rachel Harris, and the University of Tasmania, for your generous donation of so many crucial samples, as well as your guidance, time and expertise you have provided. Particularly to Stewart for giving me a tour around Hobart to try and find a wild echidna, despite the lack of success it was an amazing day. Additionally, to Tahlia Perry and Frank Grützner from the University of Adelaide for lending me your primers and for your help surrounding the sex determination, as well as the amazing work you do each day in echidna research.

To the Australian Museum, and all of the amazing people who work there, I am so grateful for the enormous amount of help you have given me. To Kyle Ewart, I cannot thank you enough for the help I received from you (particularly with R), as well for your friendship and support over so many years. To Caitlin Morrison, for your help with R as well, thank you for always being such a beautiful person and friend. To the incredible AMRI team; Andrew King, Scott Ginn, Anja Divljan, Sandy Ingleby, Matt Lott, Mark Eldridge, David Alquezar, Linda Neaves, and Siobhan Dennison. You were all so welcoming, kind, and patient with me, and I have learnt so much from you. Particularly to Scott, Anja, and, Sandy for all your help with sample registration and retrieval, to Andrew for imparting so much wisdom and always being keen to help me troubleshoot whatever problem I had, and to David for helping with edits, as well as so much paperwork and lab logistics.

Thank you to the Centre for Forensic Science at UTS, while I spent most of my time at the museum, I am very grateful to be a part of such an incredible group of people. Thank you to Mark Barash for your help in the lab. To the forensic biology group, thank you for your support, particularly coming to watch my presentations, it is an honour to be amongst such an amazing group. Particularly thanks to Elisha Prasad for your friendship, understanding, and for aiding me so much with teaching. And to Dilan Seckiner, one of the most supportive

people, and has provided me with a huge amount of guidance and friendship, particularly nearing the end when I had so many submission questions.

Thank you to Carolyn Hogg and the Zoo and Aquarium Association for your early input and guidance, as well as the funding provided to kickstart this project. Additionally, thank you to my other funding sources; The Holsworth Wildlife Research Endowment, and the Australian Museum Research Institute Postgraduate Award. Thank you also to ANZFSS and NIFS for providing me funding to go to conferences, which have been the absolute highlights of my PhD time.

Thank you to the amazing group of people at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Sydney; particularly Ed Liew and Matt Laurence, for employing me, for your valuable knowledge, as well as for letting me use your space to write. The biggest thank you to Jason Bragg, your help was incredible, thank you for teaching me so much about R, I am forever indebted.

To my FASS/ERU family; thank you for your endless support and encouragement while I tried to do too much at once, and for not getting sick of asking me how much longer I had left. Thank you to the managers for allowing me study leave and flexible hours when I needed it. In particular, thank you to Tim Smith and Bec Douglas for the amazing training and constant reassurance and support you give me, and a huge thank you to Nicole Wyner for your friendship, proof-reading, and constant cheerleading, I am eternally grateful to you all.

To my amazing friends who I have seen much less of than I would have liked over this time, I love you all so much and am so thankful for your support. To my Commotion friends, and Kass and Bec for your constant cheerleading and support. To my online friends, Emily, Esther, Steph, Bean, Laura, Kim, Courts, Nadia, Maddy, Alex, Evan, Jill, you have been my rock and have provided me with so much support, guidance, and joy (and free accommodation!). Thank you to the large number of you who proof-read for me; I am so, so appreciative. Particularly big thank you to Kim who did a huge amount of proof-reading for me, you are an incredible person and friend. And to Nadia, for making my echidna gifs, which have been the absolute highlight of my presentations at many conferences.

Last but not least, to my family. My brother Patrick, thank you for always being there for me, despite being just as overwhelmed with university as I was, your support, guidance, (and proof-reading), means everything to me. To Taylah, I am so glad to have you as part of our family, you are always so positive and supportive. To Mum and Dad, you have provided unwavering support, in so many ways, and never falter your belief in me. Mum thank you for being the biggest provider of encouragement, advice, and positivity, and keeping me sane (and healthy!) over the years. Dad, you are a huge inspiration, and I would not have made it without your PhD knowledge and guidance, your proof-reading, and your level-headedness. Thank you all.

### **Thesis by Compilation Declaration**

The following publication will be included in the thesis titled 'A Wildlife Forensic Genetic Toolbox to Combat the Illegal Trade of the Short Beaked Echidna' in the form of a thesis by compilation. Ph.D. candidate Alexandra Summerell researched, wrote, and edited the publication, while Dr Rebecca Johnson, Dr Greta Frankham, and Dr Peter Gunn contributed their guidance, edits and feedback to the article. The publication was accepted and published in Forensic Science International and will be included as Chapter 2 of this thesis.

# DNA based method for determining source country of the short beaked echidna (*Tachyglossus aculeatus*) in the illegal wildlife trade (Accepted)

A E Summerell<sup>1,2</sup>, G J Frankham<sup>1</sup>, P Gunn<sup>2</sup>, R N Johnson<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Australian Centre for Wildlife Genomics, Australian Museum Research Institute, 1 William Street, Sydney, Australia.

<sup>2</sup>Centre for Forensic Science, University of Technology Sydney, 15 Broadway, Ultimo, Australia.

The research and sample collection in this thesis was conducted under the University of Technology Animal Ethics (201500040) and Taronga Zoo Animal Ethics (3b/06/16). All samples from live animals in zoos were collected by trained veterinarians. Samples from University of Tasmania were collected by Stewart Nicol and Rachel Harris and were collected under several UTAS animal ethics spanning multiple years: 97006, A0005711, A0005452, A0007124, A0008659, A0010426, A12320, as well as the following Parks and Wildlife Permits: FA99096, FA011254,

FA02120, FA03080, FA04041, FA05057, FA06367, FA07020, FA08053, FA09048, FA10045, FA1103, FA12069.

The research in this thesis was supported by funding from:

- The Zoo and Aquarium Association Australasia
- The Holsworth Wildlife Research Endowment
- The Australian Museum Research Institute Postgraduate Award

Below are the signatures of co-authors of Chapter 2:

Production Note: Signature removed prior to publication.

Alexandra Summerell

Production Note: Signature removed prior to publication.

Rebecca Johnson

Production Note: Signature removed prior to publication.

Greta Frankham

Peter Gunn

Production Note: Signature removed

prior to publication.

## **Table of Contents**

Certificat	te of original authorship	ii
Acknowl	edgments	<i>iii</i>
Thesis by	<sup>9</sup> Compilation Declaration	v
List of Fi	gures	x
-	ıbles	
•		
Cha	pter One: General Introduction	1
1.1	The illegal wildlife trade	2
1.2	Conventions, laws, and legislation	4
1.2.1	CITES	
1.2.2		
1.2.3	1	
1.2.4	Known strategies of the illegal wildlife trade – laundering of wild-caught anima ve bred.	
-	Tools utilised in the prevention of illegal wildlife trade	
<b>1.3</b>	Validation in forensic science	
<b>1.4</b>	The use of DNA in wildlife forensic science DNA markers	
1.4.1		
1.4.3		
1.4.4		
1.5	The echidna (Tachyglossus sp. and Zaglossus spp.)	22
1.6	Study species - the short beaked echidna - Tachyglossus aculeatus	
1.6.1	Reproduction in the short beaked echidna	
1.6.2	Subspecies of the short beaked echidna	26
1.7	Echidnas in the illegal wildlife trade	29
1.8	Study aims	
1.9	References	33
Cha	pter Two: DNA based method for determining source country of the	short
	chidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus) in the illegal wildlife trade	
2.1	Abstract	
2.2	Introduction	52
2.3	Methods	56
2.3.1	Quills - sampling, storage and gDNA extraction methods	
2.3.2		
2.3.3	Amplification conditions	
2.3.4		
2.3.5	Validation	60
2.4	Results	
2.4.1	Quill extractions	
2.4.2		
2.4.3	Validation	
2.5	Discussion	66

achygl	pter Three: Investigating subspecies of the short beaked echidna ossus aculeatus) using single nucleotide polymorphisms for use in orensic context	
3.1	Abstract	
3.2	Introduction	
3.3	Methods	
3.3.1	Sample collection	
3.3.2	-	
3.3.3	SNP sequencing	
3.3.4		
3.3.5		
3.4	Results	
3.4.1	SNP dataset	
3.4.2	PCoA	
3.4.3	DAPC	
3.4.4		
3.4.5		
3.5	Discussion	
3.5.1	SNP analysis	
3.5.2	•	
3.5.3	•	
3.6	Conclusion	
	References pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for the second s	the
Cha ort bea Idlife t	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for ked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	the lega
Cha ort bea	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for ked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill	the lega
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a ked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade Abstract Introduction	the legal
Cha ort bea ildlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a sked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade Abstract	the lega
Cha ort bea ildlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a sked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade Abstract	the lega
Cha ort bea idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3	<pre>pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a ked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade</pre>	the lega
Cha ort bea idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4	<pre>pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a ked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade</pre>	the lega
Cha ort bea idlife t 4.1 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a sked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade         Abstract	the lega
Cha ort bea idlife t 4.1 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a sked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade         Abstract	the lega
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a liked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade         Abstract	the lega
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a sked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	the lega
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a sked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	the lega
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a sked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	the lega
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for a sked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade         Abstract	the lega
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3 4.3.4	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for the echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	the lega
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for the echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	the legal
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3 4.3.4 4.3.5 4.4	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for the echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	the legal
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3 4.3.4 4.3.5 4.4 4.4.1	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for the echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	the lega
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3 4.3.4 4.3.5 4.4	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for the echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	the legal
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3 4.3.4 4.3.5 4.4 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.1 4.4.2	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for indexed echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3 4.3.4 4.3.5 4.4 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.5 4.5.1	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for indexed echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	the legal
Cha ort bea Idlife t 4.1 4.2 4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6 4.2.7 4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2 4.3.3 4.3.4 4.3.5 4.4 4.4.1 4.4.2 4.4.1 4.4.2	pter 4: Development of forensically informative DNA markers for iked echidna: their use in pedigree testing and application in the ill rade	

4.5.5	Further work	157
4.6	Conclusion	
4.7	References	
echidna	upter Five: Investigation of a sex determination test for (Tachyglossus aculeatus) using real-time PCR – the ch g in wildlife forensic science	allenges of
5.1	Abstract	
5.2	Introduction	
5.3	Methods	
5.3.1		
5.3.2 5.3.3		
5.4	Results	
5.4.1		
5.4.2	1	
5.5	Discussion	
5.5.1 5.5.2		
5.6	Conclusion	
5.7	References	
Cha	pter Six: General Discussion	
6.1	Thesis overview	
6.2	Non-invasive sampling	
6.3	Determination of geographic origin	
6.4	Marker development and individualisation	
6.5	Validation in wildlife forensic science	
6.6	Future directions and recommendations	232
6.7	Conclusion	236
6.8	References	238
AP	PENDICES	251

### List of Figures

Figure 1.1 The short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus) uses its long tongue to reach termites and ants; its main source of food. Their quills are used for protection and are a modified form of hair; they can be plucked or shed naturally (Source: Ben Beaden © Australia Zoo, used with permission.). 24 Figure 1.2 Distribution of the short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus). The distribution and overlap of *T.a. aculeatus* and *T.a. acanthion* is ambiguous, hence the crossover presented in this map is an estimation by the author and warrants further investigation. Green = T.a. aculeatus; Dark blue = T.a.Figure 2.1 Example of quill used. Black line depicts where the quill was cut (~1cm from the root end Figure 2.2 Maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree representing D-loop sequences from both Australian and Papua New Guinea short beaked echidnas. Bootstrap values (percentage) are listed above the nodes and no values less than 50 were shown. PNG samples shown in red. Respective museum or zoo Figure 2.3 Bayesian Inference representing D-loop sequences from both Australian and Papua New Guinea short beaked echidnas. Posterior probabilities (decimals) are listed above the nodes and no values less than 50% are shown. PNG samples shown in red. Respective museum or zoo numbers are Figure 2.4 Map of samples used in phylogeographic analysis. PNG/Torres Strait (Moa Island) samples in red, and Australian in black. Location of sample SD-2 (San Diego Zoo with Indonesian parents) Figure 3.1 Map of short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus) collection locations for samples used in Chapter 3. Enlarged section shows localities for Tasmania. Each blue dot represents a single Figure 3.2a PCoA of Dataset A from 172 samples, representing four subspecies of the short beaked echidna. Each dot represents a single sample. Subspecies are separated by colour (Red = T.a.) Figure 0.2b PCoA of Dataset B from 69 samples, representing three subspecies of the short beaked echidna. Subspecies are separated by colour (Green = T.a. aculeatus; Blue = T.a. lawesii; Red = T.a.Figure 0.2c PCoA of Dataset C from 58 samples, representing two subspecies of the short beaked Figure 3.3 Discriminant analysis of principle coordinates (DAPC) for subspecies of the short beaked echidna based on over 2000 Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms (SNPs). a) Dataset A; all sampled individuals, 50 PCs retained; b) Dataset B, all mainland populations, 10 PCs retained; c) Dataset C, all Figure 3.4 Bayesian population assignment (STRUCTURE) plots for short beaked echidna subspecies based on over 2000 Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms (SNPs). Each vertical column represents a

single individual, the partitioning of different colours in each column is directly proportional to the
membership coefficient to that cluster. a) Dataset A, all sampled individuals K =2; b) Dataset B,
mainland populations only, $K = 4$ ; c) Dataset C, eastern Australia and PNG samples only, $K = 3$ 98
Figure 3.5 The relationship between geographic and genetic distances for the <i>T.a. aculeatus</i> samples
using the Isolation By Distance Mantel test in GENALEX99
Figure 4.1 Comparison plot of short beaked echidna samples in Dataset C (Currumbin Wildlife
Sanctuary and Australia Zoo) kinship values obtained from IBD Maximum Likelihood Estimator
(SNPRelate), compared to the expected values from the known pedigree. First-order: $k = 0.25$ , Second-
order: $k = 0.125$ , Third-order: $k = 0.06$
Figure 4.2 Reconstructed pedigree for subset of Dataset C, representing relationships in Currumbin
Wildlife Sanctuary captive short beaked echidna population. Square = Male, Circle = Female,
Diamond = Unknown sex 142
Figure 4.3 Reconstructed pedigree for subset of Dataset C, representing relationships in the Australia
Zoo captive short beaked echidna population. Square = Male, Circle = Female 143
Figure 4.4 Comparison plot of short beaked echidna samples in Dataset D (Perth Zoo) kinship values
obtained from IBD Maximum Likelihood Estimator (SNPRelate), compared to the expected values
from the known pedigree. First-order: $k = 0.25$ , Second-order: $k = 0.125$
Figure 4.5 Reconstructed pedigree for Dataset D representing relationships within the Perth Zoo
captive short beaked echidna population. Square = Male, Circle = Female, Diamond = Unknown sex.
1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
<b>Figure 4.6</b> Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)
145         Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples (n=88) from Dataset E (Tasmania)         using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator (SNPRelate).         146
145         Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples (n=88) from Dataset E (Tasmania)         using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator (SNPRelate).         146         Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania
145         Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples (n=88) from Dataset E (Tasmania)         using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator (SNPRelate).         146         Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania         (TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( $SNPRelate$ ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = ~0.25); Half-siblings (k
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( $SNPRelate$ ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = $\sim$ 0.25); Half-siblings (k = 0.10-0.18); Distant relatedness (k < 0.1); and Unrelated (k = 0).
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( $SNPRelate$ ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = $\sim$ 0.25); Half-siblings (k = 0.10-0.18); Distant relatedness (k < 0.1); and Unrelated (k = 0).
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( $SNPRelate$ ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = ~0.25); Half-siblings (k = 0.10-0.18); Distant relatedness (k < 0.1); and Unrelated (k = 0).
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( $SNPRelate$ ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = ~0.25); Half-siblings (k = 0.10-0.18); Distant relatedness (k < 0.1); and Unrelated (k = 0).
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( $SNPRelate$ ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = ~0.25); Half-siblings (k = 0.10-0.18); Distant relatedness (k < 0.1); and Unrelated (k = 0).
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( $SNPRelate$ ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = ~0.25); Half-siblings (k = 0.10-0.18); Distant relatedness (k < 0.1); and Unrelated (k = 0).
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( $SNPRelate$ ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = ~0.25); Half-siblings (k = 0.10-0.18); Distant relatedness (k < 0.1); and Unrelated (k = 0).
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples $(n=88)$ from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator $(SNPRelate)$ .146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = ~0.25); Half-siblings (k = 0.10-0.18); Distant relatedness (k < 0.1); and Unrelated (k = 0).
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( $SNPRelate$ ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = ~0.25); Half-siblings (k = 0.10-0.18); Distant relatedness (k < 0.1); and Unrelated (k = 0).
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples ( $n=88$ ) from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( $SNPRelate$ ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = ~0.25); Half-siblings (k = 0.10-0.18); Distant relatedness (k < 0.1); and Unrelated (k = 0).
145Figure 4.6 Kinship values from short beaked echidna samples $(n=88)$ from Dataset E (Tasmania)using IBD Maximum Likelihood estimator ( <i>SNPRelate</i> ).146Figure 4.7 Comparison of the percentage of short beaked echidna relationships in wild Tasmania(TAS) population (grey) to the captive echidna population of Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary (CWS)(blue). Relationships were categorised into Parent-Offspring/Full-siblings (k = $\sim 0.25$ ); Half-siblings (k = $0.10-0.18$ ); Distant relatedness (k < $0.1$ ); and Unrelated (k = 0).147Figure 4.8 Reconstructed pedigree for short beaked echidna sample M.50841 based on IBD kinshipvalues. M.48072 showed a kinship value representing a first-order relative, whereas M.48073 andM.48075 showed kinship values representing unrelated individual echidnas.148Figure 4.9 Probability of identity (PI) for short beaked echidna samples combining 167 SNPscalculated in GENALEX. The PI decreases rapidly with increasing number of SNPs and reaches zerowithin the first 15 informative SNPs. A combination of approximately 20 SNPs is sufficient to separatefigure A1 Amplicons from conventional PCR amplification of 28 short beaked echidna ( <i>Tachyglossus aculeatus</i> ) samples used in accuracy validation study in Chapter 5. Figures a) and b) are <i>AMH</i> amplicons,Figures c) and d) are <i>CRSPY</i> amplicons. Samples in red = known female samples; samples in blue =

## List of Tables

Table 2.1 Methodology for each extraction trial    57
Table 4.1 Source of short beaked echidna samples used in each dataset used to analyse IBD
<b>Table 5.1</b> Average $T_m$ of peaks for short beaked echidna samples amplified with AMH and CRSPY
genes, comparing QIAGEN and Applied Biosystems SYBR Green
Table 5.2 Average melting temperature $(T_m)$ ( $\pm$ SD) and standard error for six short beaked echidna
samples used in <i>repeatability</i> validation study, using both AMH and CRSPY genes. Melting
temperatures were averaged from six replicates across two plates
Table 5.3 Limit of detection serial gDNA dilution results for two genes amplified for short beaked
echidna samples of known sex194
Table 5.4 Species specificity results averaged over two RT-PCR runs.         195
Table A1 List of echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus and Zaglossus bruijnii) samples used for analyses in
Chapter 2
Table A2 List of species used in <i>specificity</i> validation testing in Chapter 2. All samples donated by the
Australian Museum
<b>Table A3</b> List of short beaked echidna ( <i>Tachyglossus aculeatus</i> ) samples ( $n=192$ ) used for analyses
Chapter 3
Table A4 List of extraction methods and DNA concentrations for short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus
aculeatus) samples used in Chapter 3
Table A5 Filtering applied on SNP dataset used in Chapter 3 using the dartR R package
Table A6 Short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus) samples used for analyses in Chapter 4,
including corresponding method of extraction and DNA concentration
Table A7 Filtering applied on SNP dataset used in Chapter 4 using the dartR R package
Table A8 List of kinship values (k) for replicates used in Chapter 4. Observed value represents value
obtained when replicate sample was compared to original sample of the same name 287
Table A9 Subset from Dataset C: Kinship values for short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus)
samples from Australia Zoo ( $n=4$ ), calculated using Identity by Descent Maximum Likelihood
estimator in the SNPRelate R package
Table A10 Subset of Dataset C: Kinship values for short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus)
samples from Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary ( $n=24$ ); calculated using Identity by Descent Maximum
Likelihood estimator in SNPRelate R package
Table A11 Dataset D: Kinship values for short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus) samples
from Perth Zoo ( $n=8$ ), calculated using Identity by Descent; Maximum Likelihood estimator in
SNPRelate R package
Table A12 Dataset E: Kinship values for the short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus)
population from Lovely Banks, Tasmania ( $n=88$ ), calculated using Identity by Descent; Maximum
Likelihood estimator in SNPRelate R package
<b>Table A13</b> List of SNPs ( $n=167$ ) with minor allele frequency >0.4, using for probability of identity
calculations in Chapter 4

Table A14 List of short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus) samples used for analyses in
Chapter 5
Table A15 List of species used in <i>specificity</i> validation testing in Chapter 5. All samples donated by
the Australian Museum
Table A16 Melting temperature $(T_m^{o}C)$ and fluorescence for short beaked echidna ( <i>Tachyglossus</i>
aculeatus) samples used in accuracy validation study in Chapter 5
Table A17 Melting temperature ( $T_m^{o}C$ ), Average $T_m$ , SD and standard error for all short beaked
echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus) samples used in repeatability study in Chapter 5 310

### Abstract

The international illegal wildlife trade is widespread and affects thousands of species. The illegal trade in 'captive bred' animals is one component of this trade, driven by the perceived value of unique species or those that are difficult to breed in captivity. 'Demand' for these species is met via poaching wild individuals to supplement 'captive breeding'. One of Australia's most iconic species; the short beaked echidna (Tachyglossus aculeatus) is one such species impacted by this trade. Echidnas are found throughout Australia, as well as New Guinea, and are notoriously difficult to breed in captivity, with less than 20 bred in Australian zoos in the last five years. However, in 2016 Indonesian breeding facilities listed a breeding quota of 50 echidnas raising suspicion around the origin of these animals. Exposing and combating illegal trade requires the development of robust forensic tools to aid enforcement. This thesis uses conservation genetics approaches to create a forensic genetic toolbox that can be implemented with short beaked echidnas of suspicious origin. Chapter 2 outlines a validated mitochondrial DNA test that was able to determine source region (i.e. New Guinea or Australia) of short beaked echidnas, including with DNA extracted from non-invasive samples. Mitochondrial DNA provided limited resolution to determine the source finer than region, thus *Chapter 3* presents a single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) marker set developed to investigate short beaked echidna subspecies, which to date had only been described based on morphology and geographic distribution. Genetic structure within the SNP data were congruent with current subspecies, but significantly wider sampling of echidnas, in particular, island populations and at subspecies overlap zones is needed to reach definitive conclusions. In *Chapter 4* I demonstrated these SNP markers also had the

power to elucidate relatedness between individuals, and using captive bred individuals, could be used to reconstruct pedigree, which I then applied to assess relationships within a wild population. *Chapter 4* includes a suite of SNPs that once validated could be used for forensic investigations of short beaked echidnas. Lastly, *Chapter 5*, outlines the attempted validation of a real-time PCR sex determination method using previously published methods. This test however failed multiple validation criteria so would require further optimisation before it could be used in a wildlife forensic context. This thesis presents the first set of genetic tools for the short beaked echidna in a forensic context, providing novel information on source region, subspecies and relatedness that can be implemented to combat the illegal trade of this iconic species.