European Journal of Wildlife Research

Citizen science contribution to national wolf population monitoring: What have we learned? --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	EJWR-D-19-00196R2	
Full Title:	Citizen science contribution to national wolf population monitoring: What have we learned?	
Article Type:	Original Article	
Keywords:	monitoring; acoustic survey; grey wolf; Canis lupus; large carnivore; citizen science	
Corresponding Author:	Nina Ražen Univerza v Ljubljani Biotehniška fakulteta Ljubljana, SLOVENIA	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Univerza v Ljubljani Biotehniška fakulteta	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Nina Ražen	
First Author Secondary Information:		
Order of Authors:	Nina Ražen	
	Žan Kuralt	
	Urša Fležar	
	Matej Bartol	
	Rok Černe	
	Ivan Kos	
	Miha Krofel	
	Roman Luštrik	
	Aleksandra Majić Skrbinešek	
Hubert Potočnik		
Order of Authors Secondary Information:		
Funding Information:	LIFE (LIFE12 NAT/IT/000807)	Mrs Aleksandra Majić Skrbinešek
	LIFE (LIFE08 NAT/SLO/000244)	Mrs Aleksandra Majić Skrbinešek
	Ministry of the environment and spatial planning (SI)	Dr. Ivan Kos
	Slovenian Research Agency (P4-0059)	Dr. Miha Krofel
Abstract:	<p>Evidence-based management of large carnivores is a crucial step towards their effective conservation. However, monitoring of these populations is demanding and generally requires substantial fieldwork effort. Lately, citizen science has become an increasingly important part of wildlife monitoring, but can that endanger studied species? In this paper, we describe our experiences with recruiting and involving volunteers in annual howling surveys of grey wolf (<i>Canis lupus</i>) population in Slovenia and present the framework about the use of citizens for collecting data. Huge effort of participants in seven year long monitoring at a national-scale has yielded a total of 116 wolf vocal responses, including 53 confirmed litters. Annually between 5 and 12 reproductive packs were detected and an increasing trend in wolf population</p>	

	throughout the study period was observed. Volunteer-based howling surveys proved to be a cost-effective method for detection of reproductive packs on a large spatial scale, offering an insight into wolf population trends across a longer time period and we provide some recommendations for organisation and coordination of surveys. We also discuss ethical issues raised from our experience in using citizen science for this purpose.
--	---

Citizen science contribution to national wolf population monitoring: What have we learned?

Ražen, N.^{*1,3}, Kuralt, Ž.^{*1,3}, Fležar, U.^{*2,3}, Bartol, M.², Černe, R.², Kos, I.¹, Krofel, M.^{1,3}, Luštrik, R.³,

Majić Skrbinšek, A.¹, Potočnik, H.¹

EJWR

*e-mail: nina.razen@gmail.com; Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia,
Jamnikarjeva 101, SI-1000 Ljubljana

Figure 1 A 3x3 km survey grid in southern Slovenia (Europe) with cell additions (2015, 2016 and 2017 with green, purple and blue outline, respectively) and omissions (2016 in red outline). Area was divided into sub-areas (each shaded in different colour) that enabled a more efficient coordination of volunteers.

Citizen science contribution to national wolf population monitoring: What have we learned?

Ražen, N.^{*1,3}, Kuralt, Ž.^{*1,3}, Fležar, U.^{*2,3}, Bartol, M.², Černe, R.², Kos, I.¹, Krofel, M.^{1,3}, Luštrik, R.³, Majić Skrbinšek, A.¹, Potočnik, H.¹

EJWR

*e-mail: nina.razen@gmail.com; Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, Jamnikarjeva 101, SI-1000 Ljubljana

Figure 2 A scheme depicting survey procedure at howling site. In case of a wolf response, surveyors determined the bearing and direction of the response, the number of adult wolves howling (one or more) and the response of pups. Data about howling site location, time of call and response details were filled in a paper form. When pups were detected, howling was terminated in the cell of response and in all adjacent cells in order to minimize disturbance to wolves. In case of a response solely by an adult wolf (or wolves), howling was terminated in that cell and continued in the adjacent cells. In two following nights the survey was repeated in the entire area (except the cells where reproductive packs were detected) to ensure the highest possible probability of detecting a wolf response.

Citizen science contribution to national wolf population monitoring: What have we learned?

Ražen, N.^{*1,3}, Kuralt, Ž.^{*1,3}, Fležar, U.^{*2,3}, Bartol, M.², Černe, R.², Kos, I.¹, Krofel, M.^{1,3}, Luštrik, R.³,

Majić Skrbinšek, A.¹, Potočnik, H.¹

EJWR

*e-mail: nina.razen@gmail.com; Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, Jamnikarjeva 101, SI-1000 Ljubljana

Figure 3 Transience of participants between survey years. Colors denote a group of first-time participants in each year and their transience to successive surveys. Notice the churn of participants from one year to the next.

Figure 4 Results from howling surveys in period from 2010-2012 and 2015-2018. Responses of adult wolves (green) and reproductive packs (brown). Numbers indicate the count of recorded responses in each grid cell.

Citizen science contribution to national wolf population monitoring: What have we learned?

Ražen, N.*^{1,3}, Kuralt, Ž.*^{1,3}, Fležar, U.*^{2,3}, Bartol, M.², Černe, R.², Kos, I.¹, Krofel, M.^{1,3}, Luštrik, R.³, Majić Skrbinšek, A.¹, Potočnik, H.¹

EJWR

*e-mail: nina.razen@gmail.com; Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, Jamnikarjeva 101, SI-1000 Ljubljana

Table 1 Summary of howling survey activities from 2010 to 2018. Due to funding constraints howling survey was not performed in 2013 and 2014.

* the costs summarize only travel costs and snacks for volunteers; the gifts were funded by the project

	2010	2011	2012	2015	2016	2017	2018
Project	LIFE+ SloWolf project			National monitoring 2015/16	National monitoring 2016/17	National monitoring 2017-2020	
Date of the survey	30. 8. – 7. 9.	17. – 25. 8.	16. – 19. 8.	25. – 27. 8.	23. – 25. 8.	22. – 24. 8.	20. – 22. 8.
Duration of howling survey [no. of nights]	9	6	3				
No. of grid cells	272	400	372	418	417	436	
No. of local coordination areas	9	8		14		15	
No. of volunteers	25	83	86	90	109	156	153
No. of professional hunters	22	26	23	20	21	22	19
No. of surveyors	47	109		110	130	178	172
Detected pups+adults responses	6	7	5	7		12	9
Detected adult-only responses	5		4	10	11	14	
Cost for professional hunters	/			€7,665.00		€7,760.00	
Cost for volunteers	€704.00*	€1,591.00*	€2,224.00*	€4,889.00	€6,200.00		

Citizen science contribution to national wolf population monitoring: What have we learned?

Ražen, N.*^{1,3}, Kuralt, Ž.*^{1,3}, Fležar, U.*^{2,3}, Bartol, M.², Černe, R.², Kos, I.¹, Krofel, M.^{1,3}, Luštrik, R.³, Majić Skrbinšek, A.¹, Potočnik, H.¹

EJWR

*e-mail: nina.razen@gmail.com; Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, Jamnikarjeva 101, SI-1000 Ljubljana

Table 2 Wolf responses during the howling surveys. Responses of adults wolves only indicated presence of a territorial pack while responses from wolf pups with or without adult wolves indicated their successful reproduction.

Year of survey	Detected responses	
	pups+adults	adult-only
2010	6	5
2011	7	5
2012	5	4
2013	/	
2014	/	
2015	7	10
2016	7	11
2017	12	14
2018	9	14

[Click here to access/download](#)

Electronic Supplementary Material

Razen et al _

WolvesCS_SuppMat_Responses_Form.doc

Nina Ražen
Biotechnical Faculty
University of Ljubljana
Večna pot 111
SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

The Editor-in-Chief
dr. Christian Gortázar
Instituto de Investigación en Recursos Cinegéticos
IREC (SCIC-UCLM-JCCM)
Ronda de Toledo s.n.
13071 Ciudad Real, Spain

Ljubljana, April 1, 2020

Ref.: Ms. No. EJWR-D-19-00196

" Citizen science contribution to national wolf population monitoring: What have we learned?".

Ražen, N.^{*1,3}, Kuralt, Ž.^{*1,3}, Fležar, U.^{*2,3}, Bartol, M.², Černe, R.², Kos, I.¹, Krofel, M.^{1,3}, Luštrik, R.³,
Majić Skrbinšek, A.¹, Potočnik, H.¹

European Journal of Wildlife Research

Dear Editor-in-Chief

Thank you very much for providing us with the review of our manuscript. Herewith we are submitting the revised version, with all suggested changes.

Stay healthy,

Yours sincerely,

Nina Ražen and the co-authors

Citizen science contribution to national wolf population monitoring: What have we learned?

Ražen, N.^{*1,3}, Kuralt, Ž.^{*1,3}, Fležar, U.^{*2,3}, Bartol, M.², Černe, R.², Kos, I.¹, Krofel, M.^{1,3}, Luštrik, R.³, Majić Skrbinšek, A.¹, Potočnik, H.¹

* Authors contributed equally to the manuscript

¹ Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, Jamnikarjeva 101, SI-1000 Ljubljana

² Slovenia Forest Service, Slovenia, Večna pot 2, SI-1000 Ljubljana

³ Dinaricum Society, Slovenia, Večna pot 111, SI-1000 Ljubljana

Corresponding author:

Tel.: + 38631381148

e-mail: nina.razen@gmail.com

Abstract

Evidence-based management of large carnivores is a crucial step towards their effective conservation. However, monitoring of these populations is demanding and generally requires substantial fieldwork effort. Lately, citizen science has become an increasingly important part of wildlife monitoring, but can that endanger studied species? In this paper, we describe our experiences with recruiting and involving volunteers in annual howling surveys of grey wolf (*Canis lupus*) population in Slovenia and present the framework about the use of citizens for collecting data. Huge effort of participants in seven year long monitoring at a national-scale has yielded a total of 116 wolf vocal responses, including 53 confirmed litters. Annually between 5 and 12 reproductive packs were detected and an increasing trend in wolf population throughout the study period was observed. Volunteer-based howling surveys proved to be a cost-effective method for detection of reproductive packs on a large spatial scale, offering an insight into wolf population trends across a longer time period and we provide some recommendations for organisation and coordination of surveys. We also discuss ethical issues raised from our experience in using citizen science for this purpose.

KEY WORDS: monitoring, acoustic survey, grey wolf, *Canis lupus*, large carnivore, citizen science

Introduction

Monitoring large carnivores, such as grey wolf (*Canis lupus*), can be an arduous task, mostly due to the species' secretive lifestyle, relatively low population densities and large home ranges. Moreover, their presence in some areas may lead to conflict situations with humans, which makes overseeing the distribution and size of wolf population a necessity. Reliable monitoring is particularly important when a population is subjected to lethal control, in order to prevent non-sustainable culling and reduce negative side-effects. Despite the wide range of available methods to survey grey wolves (e.g. non-invasive genetic monitoring, camera trapping, snow tracking, acoustic surveys), employing efficient methods over large spatial scales is often resource-demanding (Llaneza et al. 2014). Therefore, monitoring of large carnivores often relies on a network of both professional and non-professional participants (Louvrier et al. 2018; Molinari-Jobin et al. 2017).

Wolf howling survey (Pimlott 1960) (hereafter: howling) is one of the few fast, reliable and cost-effective survey methods available for monitoring of territorial grey wolves and reproductive events. It involves stimulation of howling from the resident wolves using a playback recording or vocal imitation by trained humans. Wolf pack members (adults and pups) respond to the imitated howls, particularly during summer and early autumn, when they stay closer to dens and homesites (Joslin 1967) and during the breeding season in winter (Harrington and Mech 1982). The method was successfully employed in wolf pack censuses in Europe (Llaneza et al. 2005; Potočnik et al. 2010; Blanco et al. 2012; Llaneza et al. 2014; Bartol et al. 2016, 2017, 2018; Papin et al. 2019) and North America (Harrington and Mech 1982; Fuller and Sampson 1988) for studying reproduction, territorial maintenance, resource defense, and activity rhythms of the species (Harrington and Mech 1979; Gazzola et al. 2002; Nowak et al. 2006; Passilongo 2013). Locating homesites with the help of howling is also an effective method complementary to non-invasive genetic sampling, as wolf homesites often contain wolf scats, wolf hair, and prey remains (Joslin 1967; Stansbury et al. 2014; Majić Skrbinišek 2014).

To our knowledge, volunteer-based howling survey has not yet been used under a national monitoring scheme framework, but rather to assess specific research questions (e.g. as a complementary method to test the intensity of territorial marking during reproduction (Llaneza et al. 2014)) or to monitor changes in population under certain anthropogenic disturbances (e.g. impact of wind farms on wolves (Da Costa et al. 2018)). Moreover, it is rarely applied as a large-scale monitoring method, being usually limited to a smaller area of interest (Ausband et al. 2011). While the surveys are often performed by researchers and managers or rangers (Gable et al. 2018; Da Costa et al. 2018), howling in Slovenia has been performed using the so called »citizen-science approach«, i.e. with the cooperation of trained volunteers. Citizen science has been recently demonstrated beneficial for monitoring rare large carnivores in areas of difficult access (e.g. Farhadinia et al. 2018), and is traditionally used to supplement or substitute other more expensive or labour-intensive techniques (Dickinson et al. 2012). Consequently, there is a scarcity of how-to information on organisation and coordination of large-scale howling surveys using citizen science in the scientific literature. Ethical questions, including possible exploitation of the method, are also rarely addressed, despite being a legitimate threat in surveys involving a large amount of volunteers.

In this paper we present some guidelines and recommendations for the organisation and coordination of volunteer-based wolf howling surveys. We consider ethical issues and possible threats to the studied wildlife when including volunteers. Further we discuss if howling surveying with volunteers can be a valid and cost-effective method for

confirming wolf pack presence and reproduction and to monitor population dynamics under a continuous, large-scale long term monitoring scheme.

Methods

Study area

The study area spans from the Eastern Alps to the North-Western part of Dinaric Mountains in Slovenia (Figure 1), through the entire known wolf range, covering 3924 km². It is characterized by a mosaic of various landscape structures, including mixed forests dominated by silver fir (*Abies alba*) and common beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) associations, agricultural land, larger cities, smaller settlements and rugged high mountains. The climate is alpine in the Eastern Alps and a mix of influences from the Alps, the Mediterranean sea, and the Pannonian basin in the Dinarics. The study area covers the core area of all three large carnivores present in Slovenia, i.e. grey wolf (*Canis lupus*), Eurasian lynx (*Lynx lynx*) and Brown bear (*Ursus arctos*) (Potočnik et al. 2018). Golden jackals (*Canis aureus*) have expanded its range to Slovenia only recently (in the 1950s) and are still spreading throughout the country (Krofel et al. 2017). The area is also rich in other vertebrate species, including the main prey species for grey wolf, red deer (*Cervus elaphus*), roe deer (*Capreolus capreolus*) and wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) (Potočnik et al. 2019).

We divided the study area into a grid of 3x3 km square cells (Figure 1) to ensure detectability of wolf responses (Harrington and Mech 1982; Gazzola et al. 2002; Llaneza et. al. 2005). Only cells containing at least 65% of forest cover and other natural habitats (e.g. encroachment areas and natural grasslands) were considered for the howling survey. The grid consisted of 400 cells during the LIFE SloWolf (2010 - 2013) project (Potočnik et al. 2014). Grid was later (2015 - 2017) expanded to 436 grid cells (Bartol et al. 2016, 2018). The survey area was organised into sub-areas (see different colours in Figure 1) that overlapped with potential wolf pack territories and facilitated the coordination of volunteers.

Figure 1 A 3x3 km survey grid in southern Slovenia (Europe) with cell additions (2015, 2016 and 2017 with green, purple and blue outline, respectively) and omissions (2016 in red outline), due to the proximity to anthropogenic disturbances (settlements and highway). Area was divided into sub-areas (each shaded in different colour) that enabled a more efficient coordination of volunteers.

Survey protocol

The howling surveys were performed following modified Harrington and Mech (1982) protocol. The surveys were preferably conducted in three consecutive nights (Potočník et al. 2010) in August (see Table 1 for details) in favourable weather conditions, i.e. no precipitation and minimal or no wind (Harrington and Mech 1982; Fuller and Sampson 1988; Gable et al. 2018). The survey procedure at the site is depicted in Figure 2, and the details of the survey activities are given in Table 1.

The survey started one hour after sunset and lasted until one hour before sunrise, at the latest. Within each grid cell, one howling site was chosen by the surveyors. The criteria for choosing a howling site were accessibility (surveyors were limited to vicinity of forest roads), topography (howling from a higher elevation, choosing spots with good audibility) and distance from potential disturbances (main roads, pastures, settlements and other anthropogenic structures were avoided). In this way, the highest possible audibility of the surveyor and detectability of a response was ensured.

Figure 2 A scheme depicting survey procedure at howling site. In case of wolf response after howling imitation, survey was terminated in particular cell (adult response) or in particular and adjacent cells (pups response).

In case of a wolf response, surveyors determined the bearing of the response, the number of adult wolves howling (one or more) and the response of pups (see a sample survey form in supplemental material). Data about howling site location, time of call and response details were filled in a paper form. When pups were detected, howling was terminated in the cell of response and in all adjacent cells in order to minimize disturbance to wolves. In case of a response solely by an adult wolf (or wolves), howling was terminated in that cell and continued in the adjacent cells. In three following nights the survey was repeated in the entire area (except the cells where reproductive packs were detected) to ensure the highest possible probability of detecting a wolf response. If reproductive pack (pups or pups with adults) responded, the grid cell was examined by researchers for non-invasive genetic samples in the following days and the presence of pups thereafter confirmed with genetic analysis (Bartol et al. 2016, 2017, 2018).

Survey coordination

Prior to survey, volunteers attended a training session, where experts presented the most important theoretical and practical aspects of the survey, e.g.: basic wolf biology, monitoring results from previous year(s), navigation skills, howling imitation, howling survey protocol and practical examples of possible wolf and other animal responses. Participants were required to demonstrate howling to be eligible to participate or, due to stage fright, instructed to practice until re-evaluated in the field prior to the survey. Volunteers that did not pass the assessment were still allowed to join the field teams as drivers or navigators, but not for simulating vocalizations. The survey was coordinated at a local scale, where each sub-area was coordinated by a pair of local coordinators. The local coordinators were constantly available for volunteers in case of technical or logistical issues (e.g. vehicle breakdowns), while the main coordinator had a general overview of the activities and was in position to effectively direct and adjust the implementation of the survey.

Volunteers within each area communicated constantly with their local coordinators in the field, who reported data about responses to the main coordinator. Any changes (such as excluding cells in case of pups' response, transmission of volunteers and other) were immediately reported to neighbouring local coordinators and to volunteers. Novice and experienced volunteers formed combined teams covering 4-5 cells per team per night. Every team was given an overview of terrain and detailed topographic maps for navigation. Local coordinators assisted volunteers' selection of the most suitable howling sites within the grid cells. In case of wolf pups' response, teams were reassigned to other cells the following day(s). Volunteers needed to be equipped with navigational tools and printed maps, as some locations in the survey area were not well covered with mobile networks that enabled access to online maps. Volunteers were encouraged to draw the location and direction of wolf response on the map so the information could be used in the assessment.

Volunteers were acknowledged for their work with practical gifts or an organized event, and later provided with the final survey reports. The drivers' travel expenses were refunded according to the reported mileage, and snacks were provided for all participants.

Results

Survey coordination activities and volunteer participation

The main howling coordination and organization activities are reported in Table 1. Due to shortage of surveyors in years 2010 (48) and 2011 (109), the surveys were carried out in parts and lasted for 9 and 6 days, respectively. In 2013 LIFE SloWolf project ended and funding for howling surveys shifted to national in 2015. Increase in total annual amount of funds, allowed the organizers to increase both the number of grid cells surveyed and the number of participating volunteers. Important improvements were made in coordination of volunteers in terms of signup (e.g. adoption of online system instead of an email application), communication (e.g. use of social platforms) and training (e.g. training events at more locations around Slovenia) (see Table 1). Volunteers were coordinated by a local NGO.

Table 1 Summary of howling survey activities from 2010 to 2018. Due to funding constraints howling survey was not performed in 2013 and 2014.

	2010	2011	2012	2015	2016	2017	2018
Project	LIFE+ SloWolf project			National monitoring 2015/16	National monitoring 2016/17	National monitoring 2017-2020	
Date of the survey	30. 8. – 7. 9.	17. – 25. 8.	16. – 19. 8.	25. – 27. 8.	23. – 25. 8.	22. – 24. 8.	20. – 22. 8.
Duration of howling survey [no. of nights]	9	6	3				
No. of grid cells	272	400	372	418	417	436	
No. of local coordination areas	9	8		14		15	
No. of volunteers	25	83	86	90	109	156	153
No. of professional hunters	22	26	23	20	21	22	19
No. of surveyors	47	109		110	130	178	172
Detected pups+adults responses	6	7	5	7		12	9
Detected adult-only responses	5		4	10	11	14	
Cost for professional hunters	/			€7,665.00		€7,760.00	
Cost for volunteers	€704.00*	€1,591.00*	€2,224.00*	€4,889.00	€6,200.00		

* the costs summarize only travel costs and snacks for volunteers; the gifts were funded by the SloWolf project

In total, 483 different participants joined the howling surveys. The number of participants increased substantially over the years but the transience generally decreased with time (Table 1, Figure 3). Cumulative transience (participants from all previous years) increased and since 2012 about half of the participants had already participated in at least one of the previous surveys.

Figure 3 Transience of participants between survey years. Colors denote a group of first-time participants in each year and their transience to successive surveys. Notice the decline of participants from their first year to the next.

Wolf responses

From 2010 to 2018 we recorded 53 wolf reproductive pack responses and an additional 63 adult-only wolf responses (see Table 2). The responses were recorded in 96 different grid cells, confirming the presence of reproductive territorial packs all across the survey area (Figure 4). The number of responses gradually increased over the survey period for adult-only and for reproductive packs.

Table 2 Wolf responses during the howling surveys. Responses of adults wolves only indicated presence of a territorial pack while responses from wolf pups with or without adult wolves indicated their successful reproduction.

Year of survey	Detected responses	
	pups+adults	adult-only
2010	6	5
2011	7	5
2012	5	4
2013	/	
2014	/	
2015	7	10
2016	7	11
2017	12	14
2018	9	14

Figure 4 Joint results from howling surveys in period from 2010-2012 and 2015-2018. Responses of adult wolves (green) and reproductive packs (brown). Numbers indicate the count of recorded responses in each grid cell.

Discussion

Studying large carnivores requires significant time, effort and funds. With this study, we show that involving volunteers can be an affordable and effective way of obtaining basic information about wolf populations on an annual level. Using citizen science for howling surveys however, requires balancing the number of participants needed with the size of the survey area and the available funding. These activities have substantially progressed in Slovenia over the past 9 years, with important improvements in survey coordination in terms of cost optimization, communication technology and critical assessment of the survey results.

Due to a high turnover of participating volunteers between years, attracting enough new participants that would provide sufficient manpower to cover the entire study area was the main challenge for the coordinating NGO each year of the survey. Staying updated with new means of communication and promotion of activities was necessary to attract an appropriate number of participating volunteers.

Importantly however, by organizing local volunteer training events in different areas with regular wolf presence (SW and SE Slovenia), we were successful in involving a significant proportion of locals, including hunters, in wolf monitoring. Majič-Skrbinšek (2014) has shown that active involvement of stakeholders and the general public in wolf monitoring activities improved the level of knowledge and attitudes towards wolves (at least in Slovenia). Indeed, has the inclusion of interested members of the public in field research activities proved beneficial, volunteers not only gained field experience through participation, but also became more aware of the general ecological issues and more susceptible to scientific research (Bonney et al. 2009; Jordan et al. 2012). Besides verbal communication, they shared their improved knowledge and experiences with others through local media, social media, presentations in their environment (e.g in schools). As the number of participants gradually increased between the years, but transience dropped, we believe that reaching new people each year continued to contribute to a positive attitude towards wolves in Slovenia. The regular volunteer inflow is also necessary to

cover steadily larger areas, following the expansion of wolf population in the country. A combination of main and local coordinators proved to be crucial for effective communication during the survey. The logistical optimization, i.e. grouping volunteers by residence area and allocation of groups of volunteers to their closest local sub-areas, minimized the travel costs. Since 2017, prepaid stamped envelopes were enclosed to the howling forms for immediate posting of results to the coordinating NGO which simplified the retrieval of the forms.

1.7% response rate is comparable with other studies, where wolf response rates ranged from 0.1% to 56.8% (Crête and Messier 1987; Fuller and Sampson 1988; Harrington and Mech 1979; Gazzola et al. 2002; Passilongo 2012; Leblond et al. 2017). Comparing responses, pups responded in 39.1-58.3% (on average in 47.7%) of all responses.

The imitations of wolf howling induced vocalization of non-target species, the most frequent being tawny owl (*Strix aluco*), ural owl (*Strix uralensis*), domestic dog and in recent years also golden jackal (*Canis aureus*). Results obtained by howling survey were evaluated by a group of experts (researchers and managers) after the survey. In the last two years, the after-survey communication was especially important due to golden jackal vocalizations being mistakenly recognized as wolves by volunteers. To mitigate that, volunteers were provided with example recordings of typical wolf and jackal responses. Volunteers were also encouraged to record the elicited howling responses which proved beneficial in critical review of detected responses. Assessment of the detected responses was another crucial step for filtering out potential golden jackal responses. Based on all the available data collected in the field by volunteers, data on golden jackal distribution (Potočník et al. 2018) and all known information about residential wolf packs (Bartol et al. 2017, 2018) experts were able to critically assess and discard erroneous records.

This study shows that howling enabled the assessment of real-time information about the presence of residential wolf packs and their reproduction in Slovenia. Interestingly, wolf pups were heard each year in different cells, except for five cells, where their response was heard twice. Responses from adults were also mostly heard in different cells (except for eight cells). This gives additional information about the use of different rendez-vous sites and thus denning sites of a wolf pack as well as on the dynamic use of the entire territory throughout different years.

Although the acoustic method cannot provide the same resolution of the data as genetic method, it gives an immediate result and is a good orientation for field work and targeted inspection of the area (systematic walks and drives on close roads and paths) to collect genetic biological samples (scat, hair urine samples, and prey remains) (Skrbinšek et al. 2014). Even though wolf howling was elicited from August-September when the pack activity is focused around rendezvous site and the rate of response is higher compared to other seasons (Harrington and Mech 1979, 1982; Gazzola et al. 2002; Nowak et al. 2006; Passilongo et al. 2010), there is no guarantee for a response (Harrington and Mech, 1982). Moreover, there may be pack-specific differences in the likelihood of response (Gable et al. 2018) as well as limitations of human auditory abilities of hearing wolf responses in combination with topographical features (Harrington and Mech 1982; Fuller and Sampson 1988; Nowak et al. 2006). Variation in responses could happen due to stochastic chance of responding, population growth and pack movement. Even during the same year, wolves often move pups between different den and rendezvous sites. It's also important to be aware that some transboundary wolf packs may stay undetected if they had their rendezvous sites in a neighboring country while it is possible to detect a transboundary pack by genetic monitoring later in

the season. This might be one of the main reasons for yearly variation of acoustically detected territorial packs (Table 2). A possible solution would be an expansion of the howling grid across the border with Croatia or even a collaborative approach to wolf monitoring between countries.

After almost a decade of howling in the entire wolf range in Slovenia, howling results indicate an increasing trend of Slovenian wolf population. The method is not recommended for estimating wolf population size in a specific country and specific year, but rather to be used over a longer time period to follow population trends or as a complementary method to facilitate collection of non-invasive genetic samples, as already demonstrated in other studies (e.g. Harrington and Mech 1982; Llaenza et al. 2005; Stansbury et al. 2014).

Howling can be an especially useful approach in areas with expanding wolf populations and in areas with an unknown wolf distribution (Papin et al. 2019). Moreover, real-time data obtained with howling could be used in short-term management decisions and actions considering further monitoring by other methods, prevention of damages and raising awareness. An additional benefit of the method is its potential to create a positive attitude towards the returning species, if conducted with the help of local volunteers.

Despite the outlined benefits, there are some drawbacks of involving volunteers in wolf surveys which have to be considered. Citizen science is defined as the involvement of volunteers in science, so it has the dual benefits of making a contribution to 'science while also engaging with the general population (Pocock 2014). However, there are many different types of citizen science (Roy et al. 2012) including projects strongly shaped by the volunteer participants, so-called 'collaborative' and 'co-created projects' (Bonney et al. 2009). This sometimes brings volunteers into natural environments that they otherwise would not visit, bringing additional disturbance into the area. Organizing once-a-year events lowers such pressure, but possible disturbances of wildlife must be considered when organizing such surveys. In our experience, giving the volunteers explicit instructions and detailed protocols can help lower negative impact. As the howling method is easy to perform, volunteers must be clearly informed not to use it in any other occasion except during surveys, although this is almost impossible to control. We need to trust involved participants, as we bring them to areas with possible dens and rendezvous sites, that are most intimate and vulnerable wolf refuges year round, not to exploit given opportunities. Although chances of getting a response from wolf pups in our study area were low (0.79 % response rate), there is always a possibility of the divulgation of the den and rendezvous sites locations. So far the attitude towards wolves in Slovenia is positive (Skrbinšek et al. 2014) and we are not aware of negative examples, although situations in other countries could be the opposite.

Not only engaging people with science and their environment, cost effective data collection, but also straightforward data collection due to technological advances (Pocco et al. 2014) are some positive reasons for citizen science projects. But we need to bear in mind the ethical issues. Organization should be regularly adjusted to the current situation, areas and species background, specifics of the people, their knowledge, trustworthiness and attitude. Researchers should decide whether involving citizen science is suitable for proposed project, or could it bring more harm to the wildlife, than positive consequences. As with any other scientific tool, citizen science activities will not always be the most appropriate approach for specific research or monitoring tasks, but can be a useful support when properly conducted.

Below, we provide the main recommendations for organization and coordination of a vocal survey using citizen science:

- I. Consider ethical issues about suitability of citizen science for the proposed project.
- II. Collecting suitable and available data on species presence, survey area and its accessibility.
- III. Constructing coordination plan and estimating required funds prior to organisation of survey.
- IV. Outlining a detailed financial plan covering all resources, with collection and implementation of information and its transformation into organization of survey.
- V. Ensuring volunteers are well trained and clearly coordinated. Training and lectures performed by researchers should be efficient, practical and detailed, providing volunteers with protocols, knowledge, confidence and skills.
- VI. Shared coordination and planning. A good plan with specified tasks, a priori arrangements, shared transportation suggestions and good knowledge of local areas (choosing the best howling points in advance, considering terrain, possible sound travel, distance from roads, settlements, natural hides) can save significant time and money.
- VII. Good collaboration within the coordination team and volunteers can make the organization much easier. Volunteers should be competent and confident in what they do, able to cooperate, enjoy the fieldwork and feel appreciated. Taking part in a survey should not be money consuming for volunteers. Small gestures of attention and expressed gratitude are appreciated.
- VIII. Analysis of collected data and feedback information should be immediate and shared with volunteers, participating bodies and to some extent, media.
- IX. Using online platforms for constant and immediate communication between the organizers and the volunteers is very time efficient but requires good responsiveness.
- X. Using howling results to complement other data for monitoring (e.g. genetic) is highly recommended and a combination of different methods for monitoring can yield optimal results.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank volunteers of Dinaricum Society and hunters from special purpose hunting grounds and everyone else that contributed to the monitoring of wolves in Slovenia, we are indebted for their contribution to the field. We would like to thank anonymous reviewers for their comments and improvements of the manuscript. This study was funded by LIFE08 NAT/SLO/000244 SloWolf, LIFE WolfAlps: LIFE12 NAT/IT/000807 and Ministry of the environment and spatial planning. M.K. was supported by the Slovenian Research Agency (grant no. P4-0059)

Conflict of interests

The authors declare they have no financial or other conflict of interest.

Literature cited

- Akcijski načrt za trajnostno upravljanje populacije volka (*Canis lupus*) v Sloveniji za obdobje 2013-2017 (2015) Wolf action plan for Slovenia. Government RS 12. 3. 2015. Ljubljana (In Slovenian).
http://www.mop.gov.si/fileadmin/mop.gov.si/pageuploads/podrocja/velike_zveri/akcijski_nacrt_upravljanja_volk_2013_2017_revidirano.pdf. Accessed 26 July 2019
- Ausband DE, Skrivseth J, Mitchell SS (2011) An automated device for provoking and capturing wildlife calls. Wildl Soc Bull 35(4):498–503. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wsb.80>
- Bartol M, Černe R, Hrovat M, Jelenčič M, Jonozovič M, Konec M, Kos I, Krofel M, Kuralt Ž, Luštrik R, Potočnik H, Skrbinšek T, Žele D (2016) Spremljanje varstvenega stanja volkov v Sloveniji v sezoni 2015/2016. Final Report, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Ljubljana, 56p (in Slovenian with English summary)
http://www.natura2000.si/fileadmin/user_upload/Volk_Koncno_porocilo_Spremljanje_varstvenega_stanja_volkov-1del.pdf. Accessed 26 July 2019
http://www.natura2000.si/fileadmin/user_upload/Volk_Koncno_porocilo_Spremljanje_varstvenega_stanja_2del.pdf. Accessed 26 July 2019
- Bartol M, Černe R, Hrovat M, Jelenčič M, Jonozovič M, Kos I, Krofel M, Kuralt Ž, Luštrik R, Potočnik H, Skrbinšek T, Vengušt G, Žele D (2017) Spremljanje varstvenega stanja volkov v Sloveniji v sezoni 2016/2017. Final Report, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Ljubljana, 42p (In Slovenian with English summary)
http://www.natura2000.si/uploads/tx_library/MonitoringVolk_201617_koncno_porocilo1.pdf,
http://www.natura2000.si/uploads/tx_library/MonitoringVolk_201617_koncno_porocilo2.pdf. Accessed 26 July 2019
- Bartol M, Černe R, Hrovat M, Jelenčič M, Jonozovič M, Kos I, Krofel M, Kuralt Ž, Luštrik R, Potočnik H, Skrbinšek T, Vengušt G, Žele D (2018) Spremljanje varstvenega stanja volkov v Sloveniji v letih 2017/2020. Partly Report, Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning, Ljubljana, 46p. (In Slovenian with English summary)
http://www.natura2000.si/uploads/tx_library/Spremljanje_varstvenega_stanja_volkov_v_Sloveniji_v_letih_2017-20_2._delno_final.pdf. Accessed 26 July 2019
- Blanco JC, Yolanda C (2012) Surveying wolves without snow: a critical review of the methods used in Spain. Hystrix. Ital J Mammal 23:35–48.
- Bonney R, Cooper CB, Dickinson J, Kelling S, Phillips T, Rosenberg KV, Shirk J (2009) Citizen Science: A Developing Tool for Expanding Science Knowledge and Scientific Literacy. 59, 977–984

Da Costa (2018) The Indirect Impacts of Wind Farms on Terrestrial Mammals: Insights from the Disturbance and Exclusion Effects on Wolves (*Canis lupus*). In: Mascarenhas M et al. (eds.), Biodiversity and Wind Farms in Portugal. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60351-3>

Dickinson JL, Shirk J, Bonter D, Bonney R, Crain RL, Martin J, Phillips T (2012) The current state of citizen science as a tool for ecological research and public engagement. *Front Ecol Environ* 10: 291-297.

Farhadinia MS, Moll R, Montgomery R, Macdonald D (2018) Citizen science data facilitate monitoring of rare large carnivores in remote montane landscapes. *Ecol Indic* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.06.064>

Fuller TK, Sampson BA (1988) Evaluation of a simulated howling survey for wolves. *J Wildl Manag.* 52:60–3.

Gable TD, Windels SK, Bump JK (2018) Finding wolf homesites: improving the efficacy of howl surveys to study wolves. *Peer J.* <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.5629>

Gazzola A, Avanzinelli E, Mauri L, Scandura M, Apollonio M (2002) Temporal changes of howling in south European wolf packs. *Ital J Zool* 69:2, 157-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11250000209356454>

Harrington FH, Mech LD (1979) Wolf howling and its role in territory maintenance. *Behaviour* 68, 207–249.

Harrington FH, Mech LD (1982) An analysis of howling response parameters useful for wolf pack censusing. *J Wildl Manag.* 1982;46:686–93.

Jordan RC, Ballard HL, Phillips TB (2012) Key issues and new approaches for evaluating citizen-science learning outcomes. *Front Ecol Environ* 10, 307–309.

Joslin PWB (1967) Movements and Home Sites of Timber Wolves in Algonquin Park. *Am Zool* 7:279-288. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3881432> .

Krofel M, Giannatos G, Ćirović D, Stoyanov S, Newsome TM (2017) Golden jackal expansion in Europe: a case of mesopredator release triggered by continent-wide wolf persecution? *Hystrix* 28(1). <https://doi.org/10.4404/hystrix-28.1-11819>

Llaneza L, Ordiz A, Palacios V, Uzal-Fernandez A (2005) Monitoring wolf populations using howling points combined with sign survey transects. *Wildl Biol Pract* 2:108-117.

Llaneza L, Garcia EJ, Lopez-Bao JV (2014) Intensity of Territorial Marking Predicts Wolf Reproduction: Implications for Wolf Monitoring. *PLoS ONE.* <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0093015>

Louvrier J, Duchamp C, Lauret V, Marboutin E, Cubaynes S, Choquet R, Miquel C (2018) Mapping and explaining wolf recolonization in France using dynamic occupancy models and opportunistic data. *Ecography* 41:647–660. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.02874>

Majič-Skrbinšek S (2014) Final Report LIFE08 NAT/SLO 000244 SloWolf. Conservation and surveillance of conservation status of wolf (*Canis lupus*) population in Slovenia. University of Ljubljana www.volkovi.si/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/slowolf_final_report.pdf. Accessed 26 July 2019

Molinari-Jobin A, Kéry M, Marboutin E, Marucco F, Zimmermann F, Molinari P, Frick H (2017) Mapping range dynamics from opportunistic data: Spatiotemporal modelling of the lynx distribution in the Alps over 21 years. *Anim Conserv* 1-13.

Nowak S, Jędrzejewski W, Schmidt K, Theuerkauf J, Mysłajek RW, Jędrzejewska B (2006) Howling activity of free-ranging wolves (*Canis lupus*) in the Białowieża Primeval Forest and the Western Beskidy Mountains (Poland). *J Ethol* 25:231–7.

Papin M, Aznara M, Germaine E, Guérolde F, Pichenot J (2019) Using acoustic indices to estimate wolf pack size. *Ecol Indic* 103: 202–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.03.010>

Passilongo D, Bucciatti A, Dessi-Fulgheri F, Gazzola A, Zaccaroni M, Apollonio M (2010) The acoustic structure of wolf howls in some eastern tuscany (central italy) free ranging packs. *Bioacoustics* 19: 159-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09524622.2010.9753622>

Passilongo D (2013) Acoustic behaviour of two large terrestrial mammals in relation to resource maintenance and mating systems: wolf (*Canis lupus*) and red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) as model species . Dissertation. University of Sassari.

Passilongo D, Mattioli L, Bassi E, Szabó L, Apollonio M (2015) Visualizing sound: counting wolves by using a spectral view of the chorus howling. *Front Zool* 12-22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12983-015-0114-02015>

Potočnik H, Krofel M, Skrbinšek T, Ražen N, Jelenčič M, Žagar A, Kos I (2010) Monitoring volkov z izzivanjem tuljenja. SloWolf Report (LIFE08 NAT/SLO/000244 SloWolf) (In Slovenian) <http://www.volkovi.si/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/2010-potocnik-et-al.-howling-porociloslowolf.pdf>. Accessed 26 July 2019

Potočnik H, Krofel M, Skrbinšek T, Ražen N, Jelenčič M, Kljun F, Žele D, Vengušt G, Kos I (2014) Projektno poročilo za Akcijo C1 (LIFE08 NAT/SLO/000244 SloWolf): Spremljanje stanja populacije volka v Sloveniji (3). 1., 2. in 3. sezona – 2010/11, 2011/12 in 2012/13. Projekt LIFE+ SloWolf. http://www.volkovi.si/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/porocilo_c1_koncno.pdf. Accessed 26 July 2019

Potočnik H, Boljte B, Flajšman K, Jelenčič M, Kavčič I, Kljun F, Konec M, Kuralt Ž, Levanič T, Majić Skrbinšek A, Pokorny B, Skrbinšek T, Stronen AV, Kos I (2018a). Prostorska razporeditev, številčnost, ocena populacijskih trendov in potencialno širjenje areala vrste zlati šakal (*Canis aureus* L.) v Sloveniji (V1-1626). Ciljni raziskovalni program "Zagotovimo.si hrano za jutri": Final Report. Ljubljana in Velenje. Biotechnical Faculty, Department for Biology; Slovenian Forest Institute; College of Environmental protection, 139 pp.

Potočnik H, Kos I, Flajšman K, Pokorny B (2018b). Competition, coexistence or exclusion? Distribution of expanding Golden jackal in relation to distribution and density of two other Canid species, Grey wolf and Red fox, in Slovenia. V: Modern aspects of sustainable management of game populations: book of abstracts. Belgrade, Faculty of Agriculture, p. 16

Potočnik H, Ražen N, Krofel M, Kuralt Ž, Flajšman K, Pokorny B, Kos I (2018c) Potential versus actual "habitat interference" between expanding golden jackals and wolves in Slovenia. Proceedings of the 2nd International Jackal Symposium, Marathon Bay, Attiki Province, Greece Hell. Zool. Arch., No. 9 Nov 2018. https://issuu.com/europeanwildernesssociety/docs/2ijs_book_editor_copy_final. Accessed 26 July 2019

Potočnik H, Pokorny B, Flajšman K, Kos I (2019) Evrazijski šakal. (Zlatorogova knjižnica, 42), [Golden jackal; In Slovenian]. Ljubljana: Lovska zveza Slovenije, 2019. 250 pp.

Pimlott DH (1960) The use of tape-recorded wolf howls to locate timber wolves. Toronto: Twenty-second Midwest Wildlife Congress, 15 pp.

Pocock MJO, Chapman DS, Sheppard LJ & Roy HE (2014). Choosing and Using Citizen Science: a guide to when and how to use citizen science to monitor biodiversity and the environment. Centre for Ecology & Hydrology. ISBN: 978-1-906698-50-8

Rapačić Ž (1989) Staništa vuka u Bosni i Hercegovini i rezultati reprodukcije. Lovački list April-Maj 1989.

Roy HE, Pocock, MJO, Preston CD, Roy DB, Savage J, Tweddle JC, Robinson LD (2012) Understanding Citizen Science & Environmental Monitoring. Final Report on Behalf of UK-EOF. Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Wallingford, Oxfordshire.

Stansbury CR, Ausband DE, Zager P (2014) A long-term population monitoring approach for a wide-ranging carnivore: Noninvasive genetic sampling of gray wolf rendezvous sites in Idaho, USA. J Wildl Manag 78:1040–1049. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jwmg.736>