




# Exploring IoT Monitoring Systems for Strengthening Wildlife Governance: Legal and Ethical Perceptions

Pallav Ranjan  and \*Bhupinder Singh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sharda Law School, Sharda University, Greater Noida U.P., India

<sup>2</sup> Sharda Law School, Sharda University, Greater Noida U.P., India  
talwandibss@gmail.com

**Abstract.** Internet of Things (IoT) technology can transform the manner in which wildlife populations are managed and preserved in various ecosystems. The sensor, drone and the interconnected gadgets facilitate real-time gathering of information about the movement of animals, the condition of their habitat, and human intrusion to enhance the governance systems to make informed decisions to limit poaching, minimise habitat destruction, and conserving biodiversity. The management of wildlife frequently crosses national boundaries, and treaties of international trade like the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora need to be followed. Instead such treaties should now mandate that they also address the flows of digital data created by Internet of Things devices to stop their abuse i.e. by banning the unauthorized transfer of sensitive location data that may harmfully assist poachers in case of hacking. The national legal frameworks also make a crucial contribution. In a simplified form, the IoT monitoring systems are represented by a communication of diverse networks of devices, including GPS collars, camera traps, acoustic sensors, and satellite-linked trackers which collect enormous volumes of environmental and behavioural data to be transmitted to centralized environments that are analysed.

**Keywords:** Internet of Things, Wildlife, International Treaties, Animal Welfare, Legal and Ethical Framework.

## 1 Introduction

The technological underpinnings of Internet-of-Things (IoT) wildlife monitoring systems form the basis of changing the scenario in terms of wildlife governance as

they enable a smooth process of acquiring, processing, and sharing the information in remote and harsh conditions where traditional approaches often cannot give up-to-date information on ecological processes [1]. This will enable the wildlife authorities to intervene whenever an illegal activity is done in real time; e.g. by using geofencing alerts to inform rangers about the location of poachers or when there is unusual wildlife distress through geofencing this will enhance the control through shifting the reactive strategy to proactive enforcement that have been successful in other places like the savannas of Africa where the rhino species are faced with threats of extinction. Yet, the convergence of such systems creates some deep legal-related perceptions, specifically around the data-sovereignty and foreign-compliance. In India, the protection of wildlife is provided through the Wildlife Protection Act of 1972 along with new data protection regulations like the Digital Personal Data Protection Act of 2023 which has the potential to apply to IoT-powered monitoring of human activities in and around wildlife parks. This begs the question of such rights to surveillance and the suitability of conservation interests and individual privacy particularly in regions where the natives dwell and may be unwittingly watched over by these systems hence raising the debate on whether such systems are legal forms of surveillance or a violation of the constitutional right to privacy practiced by supreme courts in different jurisdictions.

Morally, the application of IoT in wildlife observation raises two questions in regards to animal welfare, since the imposition of a gadget like a collar or a tag onto a wild animal may cause physical discomfort, fluctuate its natural behaviour, or potentially incur injuries unless the human-animal interaction is conceptualised in a humane way [2]. As a result, ethicists have argued that the minimal intervention principles should be applied, where non-invasive technologies like remote sensing are adopted over direct tagging, and organisations like the World Animal Protection argue that there should be ethical principles placed which will ensure that the devices are light weight, biodegradable, and removable without any long term harm. Moreover, equity and access presentations emphasize ethical issues.

IoT systems are often implemented in developing countries where local populations might be under the resources or technologically illiterate to engage in governance, which may further increase power imbalances between the global conservation non-governmental organizations, the government, and local populations that have a more comprehensive understanding of the ecosystem but are left out of data-driven governance choices. This puts in doubt the issue of environmental justice and the question of whether these technologies are in fact democratising governance or entrenching the hierarchies of the colonial era of wildlife governance. In a more general ethical perspective, the commoditization of wildlife information via IoT systems presents the exploiting risks. Commercial activities might leverage the access to aggregated datasets to make a commercial decision that is not in conservation related to their activities-- such as insurance modelling or tourism analytics without acquiring the consent of the affected stakeholders. This has fuelled the need of ethical frameworks incorporating concepts of transparency, accountability, and benefit sharing as to guarantee the trickling of data to local communities.

Legally, the overlap with intellectual property rights introduces a second dimension since innovations in IoT hardware and software to monitor wildlife can be patented, and this may harm unfinanced conservation activities in the Global South.

Open source-compatibles are promoted as a solution to collaborative governance, but this has to overcome antitrust regulations and trade secrets protections, which differ between countries, such as the U.S. Patent Act and the stricter data sharing requirements of the EU. Other areas of perception of liability can be found in the legal context, especially where the failures of the IoT cause a change in conservation, like the unwanted poaching attributed to device breakdowns. This poses the question of responsibility as to whether it is the manufactures, the deployers or the regulators and what the international law can do to standardise accountability in transboundary wildlife channels [3].

Morally, the consideration of privacy is not only human, but also of so-called animal privacy in which incessant monitoring could actually interfere with natural ecological processes, like migration patterns due to the realization of being tracked. Even though this form of anthropomorphism is a controversial concept among bioethicists who maintain that some instances of such intrusions are acceptable in the greater good of species survival as long as they are reasonable and temporary, this still presents a challenge on accepted moral paradigms. In enhancing governance, IoT would also provide an opportunity to conduct evidence-based policy-making, such as SMART (Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool) projects, which combine use of IoT data and GIS mapping to optimise patrol area and allocation of resources.

However, this dependence on technology brings about susceptibilities to cyberattacks which legally require high levels of cybersecurity where many countries that place emphasis on wildlife are parties to the self-protective cybercrime frameworks like the budapest Convention on Cybercrime. The impact of perceived bias in AI-based IoT analytics also complicates the ethical environment by making algorithms cautioning against incomplete datasets triage activities in specific regions/communities disproportionately, which will result in unequal application of enforcement resulting in a societal history of unfairness being reproduced. This requires ethical audit and inclusion of various stakeholders during system design. In a future perspective, it is possible to consider legal responses to the IoT in the wildlife sector, including the harmonisation of international guidelines on IoT, perhaps by updating the convention on bio-diversity at the UN, which includes provisions on ethical data applications and data mining to address the digital divide gap.

Ethically, it is important to encourage interdisciplinary discussions among technologists, ethicists, lawyers, and conservationists to achieve perceptual change caused by IoT that does not necessarily manifest as panacea but as something that requires diligent management to avoid unintended impacts like over-dependence on technology at the cost of community-based initiatives. Practically, case studies at the Tsavo National Park in Kenya have shown the reduction of 40% of cases of elephant poaching by using IoT and real-time alerts, but also how legal issues have been involved in prosecuting cases involving digital evidence, which is required to meet admissibility in a court of law. Although the ethical benefit of empowering the local rangers with IoT tools to enhance job satisfaction has been realized, the question of employment displacement due to automation has been cited.

## **2. Technological Foundations of IoT Monitoring Systems**

Internet of Things is a network of physical objects that can exchange data with each other on their own without human interference by embedding in them sensors, programs and connectivity capabilities [4]. In the context of wildlife monitoring, this

conceptual framework is transformed into the use of rugged and low-power gadgets that can work under extreme conditions like deep forests, dry arid deserts or aquatic environments, thus permitting real-time monitoring of the behaviours of wildlife, changes in the environment, and man-made problems.

These systems have a layered architecture that has perception, network and application layers. The sensor layer is that of perception which consists of sensors detecting things like location through GPS, temperature, humidity and bioacoustic signals. The analytics processes in the application layer work with the gathered data through cloud-based analytics, which are often combined with artificial intelligence, to forecast their poaching danger or trends in habitat deterioration. Some of the main technologies that facilitate this technological paradigm are improvements in miniaturisation, as devices can be carried without being heavy or intrusive when deployed on wildlife, and energy-harvesting technology like solar panels or kinetic converting the devices, which increases battery life in regions with limited access [5].

Knowledge integration with other complementary technologies can also enhance its efficacy; such integration can be used in the case of minimal-ground-based sensor deployment with those drones having thermal sensors creating aerial surveillance complementing ground-based sensors, forming a multimodal monitoring ecosystem. At the ethical level, the technology casts doubts on the environmental imprint of the production and disposal of the devices and the use of environmentally friendly products like biodegradable casings. Recent developments have seen the introduction of 5G support in ultra-low latency in urban-wildlife interfaces and blockchain as supportive of tamper-proof records, thus international partnerships are transparent. The integrative role of the technological bases, in general, can be finally identified as contributing to issues of empty spaces between raw information and actionable governance policies, supplementing a shift towards global biodiversity objectives identified in banners like the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations [6].

### 2.1 Key Components of IoT Devices for Wildlife Tracking

The main elements of the IoT devices used in wildlife monitoring are carefully designed to endure harsh conditions and provide precise and uninterrupted data that guides the governance process. Such systems consist of hardware components such as sensors, microcontrollers, communication components and the power supply are built into small durable units that can be mounted on animals or can be embedded in the habitat without affecting natural behaviours.

The key principle behind such devices is the use of sensors as sensory organs as GPS modules offer accurate geolocation tracking with accuracy to the meters, critical in mapping the movements of migrants, as well as in detecting border crossings in transboundaries of the zones under protection; accelerators and gyroscopes are used to measure patterns of movement, making a distinction between typical foraging and indicative distress vocalisation in response to environmental changes, which is credited with climate changes; bio (acoustic) sensors to track vocalisation that allow recognising species and estimating the population density through machine learning algorithms analysing the command units are microcontrollers, including ARM Cortex processor-based, which process raw data on-the-fly to remove noise and generate alerts, away from data transmission channels and use less energy [7].

The communication modules are essential in remote locations; they can be either 4G/5G (high bandwidth) or Iridium (global) or an energy-efficient low-power wide-area network (LPWAN) like Sigfox or NB-IoT, which do not need frequent recharging or significant power sources. Components to manage power, e.g., lithium-ion batteries supplemented by solar cells or piezoelectric harvesters, ensure durability; e.g. collars placed in the Kruger National Park in South Africa can last one to two years, which limits the need to interact with the animals and raises few ethical questions about the opportunities to handle the animals anew. Enclosure is designed to be robust, is frequently water and dust resistant, maize by being disguised, and is normally made of materials that are biocompatible so as to avoid skin irritation by collared animals.

Some weaknesses are that it can be easily tampered with or damaged by the environment; tamper-evident designs and redundancy sensors replace these issues. Potential innovations can include neuromorphic chips to enable on-device artificial intelligence to improve real-time threat detection, or biodegradable electronics to solve the e-waste ethics issue. Together these elements combine to form powerful tracking mechanisms that not only enhance data faithfulness but also correspond with the law of data privacy (e.g. GDPR equivalents of wildlife data) and with ethical requirements of dignified treatment.

### **3. Legal Frameworks Governing IoT in Wildlife Management**

The legal frameworks around IoT in the wildlife management context include a complex mix of international, national, and regional rules and regulations that are created to balance technological innovation with conservation needs, data security, and ethical issues and make sure that the implementation of the IoT has matured to enhance governance without violating rights or sovereignty. At the global stage, such treaties like the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) of 1992 are bound as foundational principles of sustainable use of the biodiversity and promote the use of IoT implicitly by stating that the monitoring process and information exchange should be controlled. CITES convention prescribes data-driven action against the illicit trade where IoT-linked evidence of species migration could play a significant role in the prosecution, although it needs to be balanced with digital standards to deal with the problem of data authenticity and chain-of-custody. On a national level, laws differ significantly: the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 in the United States allows the agencies of the federal government to utilize tracking data to manage the environment, and at the same time demands that the Privacy Act be met to ensure that incidental human data is not violated.

The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the European Union implements strict management of personal information gathered via IoT in the wildlife territory and defines location data collected by human-proximate sensors as sensitive and requiring a consent system and data reduction to prevent the fines. Aspects of surveillance refer to legislation like the India Information Technology Act, which controls the interception of electronic data, and mandates the wildlife IoT devices to have warrants when monitoring in secured areas to save misuse against the local wildlife groups [8].

#### **3.1 International Treaties and Conventions on Wildlife Protection**

The next pillar in incorporating the IoT monitoring systems into the international governance is through international treaties and conventions on the protection of

wildlife which can serve as both binding and non-binding tools in guiding ethical and legal application of technologies and minimize biodiversity loss. IoT is important to Article 7 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which has 196 parties that have ratified since 1992, which outlines the emphasis on ecosystem monitoring to develop digital innovation towards the achievement of the 30 per cent goal on protected-area coverage by 2030.

The UNESCO World Heritage Convention safeguard's natural locations and incorporates IoT to detect any threat like forest cutting, moreover needing impact studies in order to make certain that the devices do not undermine heritage or ecological worth.

### **3.2 National Laws on Data Privacy and Surveillance**

National regulations regarding data privacy and data surveillance collide with the IoT in wildlife management, subjecting it to ensure personal information is not inadvertently gathered through the monitoring system and permitting the conservation and preservation of wildlife, potentially shaping it into accountability and rights perspective. In the US, the Privacy Act of 1974 controls the use of personal data by federal agencies, and requires IoT systems deployed in national parks to anonymize human-relevant personal data collected by camera traps or drones, and additionally the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA) of 1974 applies to IoT data transmission and requires a warrant to conduct surveillance in national parks to prevent fourth amendment abuses.

The Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDPA) of 2023 of India requires the consent and restriction of the purpose of data processing, which applies to information collected by the IoT related to poachers or surrounding communities, and breaches are addressed the Wildlife Protection Act, at the same time, Surveillance Ordinance permits surveillance in proportional amounts to prevent potential unreasonable intrusions. There are no universal laws on surveillance, and Cybersecurity Law in China focuses on state manipulation, which permits the use of IoT in panda surveillance and encourages the proliferation of mass surveillance, but ethical issues of the latter are confronted by Surveillance Devices Act in Australia, which enforces authorizations around audiovisual use of IoT in secure premises. Perceptions of law create security versus privacy contradictions, with the European court of human rights decision in the proportionality of cases concerning environmental surveillance aligning with ethics, wherein, under law, the legal audit of information ensures a reduction in biases within the feed supplied by AI-processed IoT, which can overrepresent marginalized populations.

### **3.3 Regulatory Challenges in Cross-Border IoT Deployments**

The issues of jurisdiction differences, technological limitations, and geopolitical arguments underpin the regulatory obstacles of cross-border wildlife management IoT deployments, making it difficult to enhance governance through continuous monitoring of wildlife movements across international borders where migration patterns are free [9]. Data sovereignty is the main challenge as illustrated by the Data Localization Law in Russia, which requires all data generated by the IoT to be stored within the country, a situation that is inconsistent with shared systems along trans-frontiers like the Kavango-Zambezi region of five African countries; this

therefore requires bilateral agreements that will enable the flows of data without violating different privacy regimes.

Legal understandings of liability also compound problems: broken shared IoT networks (e.g., as a result of poaching that has not been detected because of signal loss) become issues of attribution under international law, and there is no single framework, such as a potential Wildlife IoT Convention, to distribute liability, resulting in the creation of ad hoc problems that can only be solved by memoranda of understanding. The problem with intellectual property occurs when proprietary IoT might be carried across borders; under other patent protection rules; borders become more permeable under the TRIPS Agreement and this may lead to suffocation of collaborative implementations in case licensing is cumbersome to developing nations. Transnational vulnerability makes cybersecurity challenges worse; a transnational breach in the IoT infrastructure of one country may disseminate common wildlife data, necessitating the application of the Budapest Convention on Cybercrime, but not all countries with wildlife richness are signatories which allow the security of transnational monitoring projects to be undermined.

#### **4. Ethical Perceptions and Dilemmas in IoT Deployment**

Use of Internet of Things (IoT) technologies to protect wildlife such as sensor networks, camera trap systems, GPS collars, and real-time monitoring systems raise serious ethical impressions and problems. Such technologies are expected to boost data gathering to ensure protection of biodiversity, monitoring endangered species, and the alleviation of poaching as one of the thereof threats. However, they pose ambiguous issues in relation to surveillance, welfare of animals, data protection, and social justice. Upon ethical theories, there is the encouragement that conservation gains are balanced with the harm that can be done to the animals, humans and the environment. The discourse is further complicated by unintended consequences like data misuse that results in exploitation, an intrusion of privacy into wildlife and other nearby communities and unequal distribution of technological benefits [10]. With the increase in IoT into the remote and sensitive, the stakeholders need to balance between creativity and accountability, little intrusion, informed consent where relevant, and equitable results. The question around continuous observation is whether it commoditises nature or upholds related ethics of nonhuman beings. Strong requirements, communal involvement, and clear information administration are needed to reduce dangers and foster trust in such deployments.

##### **4.1 Privacy Concerns for Human Communities near Wildlife Zones**

Implementation of IoT in wildlife areas, such as camera traps, auditory devices, drones, and motion-driven networks, has often used the information about localized human populations residing near or within the boundaries of the conservation spaces. The main aim of such systems is to capture images of wildlife, but these are used to capture activity or sound and the movement of people who share common trails, resources or lands, posing a great threat to privacy. In many cases, people are scared that surveillance will be passed on to their personal areas like the house that was seen on the high sensors or that surveillance may be misused to check traditional activities, land conflicts or even criminalisation of subsistence farming [11]. Cases have been reported where communities are opposed to camera traps because of feelings on sharing images, the possibilities of misuse by the authorities, or mere suspicions like children abduction associated with hidden cameras. These images destroy trust, which

sparks resistance, equipment vandalism or theft and eventually sabotage conservation efforts that require backing of locals. The ethical consensus on community-owning lands is not to engage in intrusive surveillance without express consent and substantive engagement.

#### **4.2 Animal Welfare and Ethical Use of Tracking Devices**

The ethical implementation of IoT-enabled tracking technologies, such as GPS collars, tags, implants and biologgers, depends on the protection of the well-being of animals and the provision of conservation advantages. Even though these devices provide priceless information on movements, behaviour and habitat use, the process of placing equipment and long-term implications of the tools has serious welfare implications. Catching, holding or tranquilizing of animals during the fitting of devices is a source of stress, possible harm and behavior change [12]. The extra energy required by the added weight or hardware causes skin abrasions, loss of hair, entanglement and disturbed social behavior, especially in small and weak or seasonally shifting species. Research, proving that high welfare effect undermines the validity and ethical value of the data, highlights the importance of strict criteria. The new questions, like the idea of privacy in the wild or the ethical considerations of constant surveillance, represent potential vulnerability in that the abuse of data might be used to poach or even exploit. Relational-ethics views call us to the acknowledgment of the animals as relational beings that need respect, other than utilitarian ends. Ethical deployment puts the interests of the animals before the volume of data and a set of principles that favour caution, openness and constant observability ought to be adopted with an aim of avoiding the harm and to further the conservation goals.

#### **4.3 Equity and Access Issues in Technology Adoption**

The use of IoT in wildlife conservation widens equity and access disparities particularly in developing nations where hotspots of biodiversity are common. High prices of sensors and networks along with data processing and maintenance create obstacles which exclude deployment to well-funded organisations or wealthy countries and smaller projects in the Global South face financial limitations, unreliable infrastructure and lack of technical know-how. Surveys show that those living in developing economies face more challenges in finding financial support and funding, and women in conservation face increased challenges in finding resources or training. Such digital divide opens the prospects of techno-colonialism, where external entities limit immediate solutions without input of locals, which perhaps excludes the locals (indigenous knowledge) and benefits go to the wealthy at the expense of the poor (and vice versa). Disproportionate access hinders inclusive conservation whereby the local communities surrounding the areas of wildlife might not be allowed to influence or share in the benefits of the technologies deployed to monitor their areas [13]. These issues require comprehensive changes that would democratise technology so that various voices influence the use of the IoT, and the conservation efforts resulting will be truly sustainable and fair.

### **5. Stakeholder Perspectives: Conservationists, Governments and Indigenous Groups**

The enthusiasm expressed by stakeholders in the application of Internet-of-Things (IoT) technologies in the field of wildlife conservation is surrounded by a scale of

enthusiasm mitigated by observable skepticism, representing diverse priorities and lived experiences [14]. The use of IoT-based conservation devices, in the form of camera traps, acoustic sensors, GPS collars and artificial-intelligence-based networks, is also a common recommendation of non-governmental organisations and biological scientists because of its ability to produce real-time and high-resolution data on species movement, poaching and habitat modification. These tools help to monitor remote sites at scale, evidence-based intervention, and anti-poaching efforts using applications like EarthRanger. However, many conservationists understand the correlative dangers of a technological dependency, such as the marginalisation of conventional approaches, the generation of biasness in data consumption, and the reinforcement of militarisation in conservation areas. State actors see the IoT as a strategic resource to implement policies in secure zones, meet international commitments through the frameworks like the Convention on Biological Diversity, and incorporate objective knowledge to national policy frameworks to conserve biodiversity and mitigate climate change. Topics of their interests include centralised control systems, international exchange of data, and economical scalability but they face financial Resource barriers, lack of infrastructures in developing nations and the dilemma between enforcement and utilisation of community rights. However, overriding fears are the possibility of appropriating Indigenous data without free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC), destruction of sovereignty, absence of involvement in any kind of decision making, and contradiction to cultural values of wildlife as people, and not merely data [15]. Co-production is necessary to fully utilize collaboration and, in this context, Indigenous leadership drives deployment, distributes benefits evenly, and restrains IoT to core values of holistic stewardship to provide output that increases instead of replaces local wisdom.

## **6. Conclusion, Policy Reforms for Ethical IoT Implementation: Future Scope to Sustainable Wildlife Governance**

Although IoT technologies have the transformative potential of wildlife conservation, making it possible to provide accurate monitoring, timely detection of threats, and make decisions based on data, their introduction is still required to be regulated by strict ethical standards to prevent unintended damage. Such problems like invasions of privacy by the neighboring communities, supporting welfare of observed wildlife, access inequalities, and conflicts between stakeholder groups highlight the urgency of the moderated, rights-based procedures. To deploy ethical IoT, the technology-centred frameworks of ethics require a transition to relational frameworks with minimal harm and respect of both the non-human and human communities, integrating many knowledge systems. Institutionalisation of these principles requires policy reforms, they should be given mandates to adhere to privacy-by-design, animal welfare impact assessment as e.g. device weights, non-invasive alternatives) and equitable funding mechanisms to narrow digital gaps, especially those in biodiversity hotspots of the Global South. The future directions include the development of sustainable wildlife governance by means of hybrid solutions that combine IoT with TEK to achieve co-produced monitoring, open-source tools to achieve affordability, and capacity-building approaches to enable local actors. The benefit-sharing schemes can be encouraged through cross-sectoral policies that can coordinate conservation goals with human rights, climate adaptation, and the Sustainable Development Goals to support the sources of revenue,

eco-tourism or carbon credit. The ethically-guided IoT implementation can initiate a just change to relational, resistant ecosystems where the technology serves as a supportive tool, but not a replacement, to stewardship by conservation practitioners, agencies, Indigenous peoples, and local communities and ensure that biodiversity and cultural, as well as social integrity flourish under the increasing environmental change.

## References

- [1] Kumari, S., & Prabha, C. (2026). Ethical and Privacy Considerations in AI-Driven Wildlife Monitoring. In *Computational Bioacoustic Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 237-247). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [2] Korol, E., & Korol, S. (2025). Ai-augmented commons governance: Ethical rulemaking and enforcement for sustainable resource management in rural areas. *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 7(5), 09-25.
- [3] Ali, G., Mijwil, M. M., Adamopoulos, I., & Ayad, J. (2025). Leveraging the internet of things, remote sensing, and artificial intelligence for sustainable forest management. *Babylonian Journal of Internet of Things*, 2025, 1-65.
- [4] Fadzly, N., & Yeo, Z. H. (2025). Future Directions and Emerging Technologies in AI for Animal Ecology. *Artificial Intelligence and Animal Ecology*, 244-265.
- [5] Hapicha, E. M. H. (2025). Integrating Predictive Analytics and Community Engagement in Kenya: A Framework for Technology-Driven Wildlife Conservation in Private Conservancies. *National Security: A Journal of the National Defence University-Kenya*, 3(1), 50-67.
- [6] Mumba, C., Phiri, D., Kabbudula, E., Gondwe, L., Mebelo, N., Simweene, G., ... & Makungu, C. (2025). Exploring community knowledge, perceptions, and the impacts of anthrax among farming communities living in game management areas in Zambia: A qualitative study using a hybrid approach. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 19(5), e0012852.
- [7] Vidal, B., Verger, L., & Nagy, G. J. (2025). Exploring the One Health–One Welfare nexus and zoonoses. *Science in One Health*, 100128.
- [8] Shawon, R. A. R., Rahman, M. M., Dandi, S. O., Agbayiza, B., Iqbal, M. M., Sakyi, M. E., & Moribe, J. (2025). Knowledge, perception, and practices of wildlife conservation and biodiversity management in Bangladesh. *Animals*, 15(3), 296.

- [9] Osei, M. K. (2025). Exploring System Context Contributing to Emerging REDD+ Collaborative Governance Regime in Ghana: Stakeholders Perceptions at the National Level. *Environmental Management*, 75(3), 505-523.
- [10] Fernandes, F. O. L., Crima, S., & Ferrinho, P. (2025). Is it feasible to develop a one health surveillance system in a fragile state? The case of Guinea-Bissau. *One Health*, 101269.
- [11] Jenkins, J., & Lawundeh, W. (2025). Wildlife lost in translation: Understanding low compliance with outdated wildlife hunting legislation in Sierra Leone. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 7(8), e70090.
- [12] Pareti, M., Guo, J., Yin, J., Liu, Q., Abudurofu, N., Bulibuli, A., & Canavari, M. (2025). Exploring Chinese consumers' perception and potential acceptance of cell-cultured meat and plant-based meat: A focus group study and content analysis. *Foods*, 14(9), 1446.
- [13] Ntoko, V. N., & Schmidt, M. (2026). Towards Strengthening the Right to a Healthy Environment: Local Knowledge and Perceptions of Climate Change Impacts on Wildlife and Indigenous Livelihoods on Mount Cameroon. In *Handbook on Human Rights to a Healthy Environment: International, Regional, and Comparative Pathways for Policy Intervention in Cameroon* (pp. 417-440). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [14] Neethirajan, S. (2025). Agency in livestock farming—A perspective on human–animal–computer interactions. *Human-Centric Intelligent Systems*, 5(3), 291-307.
- [15] Neethirajan, S. (2025). Safeguarding digital livestock farming—a comprehensive cybersecurity roadmap for dairy and poultry industries. *Frontiers in Big Data*, 8, 1556157.

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

