



SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT

*"Hunting provides the principal incentive and revenue for conservation.
Hence it is a force for conservation."*

World Conservation Force Bulletin

www.conservationforce.org November 2012

CITES CoP16 Proposals Published: White Rhino, Polar Bear, Elephant, Pyrenean Chamois, Leopard Permits

October 4th was the final deadline for species specific proposals for CITES 16th Conference of the Parties to be held March 3-15, 2013 in Bangkok, Thailand. The game mammals proposed for transfer of Appendix are the white rhino, elephant, polar bear and the Pyrenean Chamois – not the African lion, the Zambia elephant, the Pacific walrus or the narwhal, nor is there any Southern African white rhino proposal. In short, Kenya has proposed establishing a zero quota

DATELINE: Thailand



John J. Jackson III

on hunting trophies and live trade of white rhino from South Africa and Swaziland for six years. Tanzania is again attempting to downlist its elephant to Appendix II for trophy trade and for a one-off conditional sale of part of its ivory stockpile; Kenya, Burkina Faso, Eritrea, Mali and Togo are proposing prohibition of more elephant proposals until at least nine years after CoP14; the United States is proposing the transfer of polar bear to Appendix I with the effect of prohibiting all international commercial trade; Denmark on behalf of the European Union Member States (EU) is proposing the downlisting of the Pyrenean chamois from Appendix I to Appendix II (this is the chamois on the France-Spain border, i.e. Pyrenean Mountains).

US Proposes Uplisting Polar Bear Again

The USFWS submitted both its species proposals and other agenda items, which are available in full on its website at <http://www.fws.gov/international/cites/cop16/index.html>. The CITES Secretariat has published its first provisional list of proposals for amendment of Appendices

I and II (updated October 9, 2012) but not other agenda items such as Resolutions, Decisions and informational documents. The actual proposals of countries other than the United States are not yet available except for the Secretariat's description.

The United States is proposing the transfer of polar bear from Appendix II to Appendix I. Its other eight proposals are not game-related. The US proposal to transfer the polar bear to Appendix I is very controversial.

Of course, it is being made over the objection of Canada and Nunavut. A similar proposal failed at CoP15 after the CITES Secretariat's opening remark that "CITES is not in the business of making ice," and the EU member states voted against the US proposal. It was rejected with 48 Parties in favor, 62 against and 11 abstentions. Passage required two-thirds of those voting.

The bear was listed on the ESA as threatened because of projected changes in sea ice habitat, but that does not prevent American native trade, which would not be the same case if it were listed on Appendix I of CITES. This may have an end-run effect on

international native trade and backlash on the Administration and political party rumored to be satisfying the animal rights fanatics who have lobbied for the proposal.

The recent increase in quota in Western Hudson Bay is a major point of contention. Nunavut increased that quota from eight to 21 bears despite the earlier recommendation that it be decreased by the IUCN Polar Bear Specialist Group according to the USFWS. Nunavut authorities want to base bear management practices on current information and not predictions about what might happen or outdated simulations. What the US proposal conspicuously does not state is that same Specialist Group wrote that it strongly opposed the US proposal to uplist and that the Specialist Group's quota recommendation predated subsequent population surveys, not just population simulations relied upon by critics. Both the animal protectionists' and USFWS' proposals cite studies, changing opinions and positions out of chronological order. Nevertheless, the proposal states that four of the five polar bear range states were consulted and don't think the bear merit inclusion in Appendix I. Canada: "convinced that polar bears do not merit inclusion...." Denmark/Greenland: "did not see any need to transfer...." Norway: "species was adequately protected...and that no further action was indicated." The fifth, the Russian Federation: one official "indicated that they would support a proposal...."

Kenya Proposes Zero Quota for White Rhino

The South Africa and Swaziland white rhino are currently on Appendix II with an annotation that trade be limited to trophy trade and live trade, and for all other purposes it remains on Appendix I. This Kenya proposal to impose a "zero quota" would prohibit that limited trade. It is noteworthy that the proposal tracks





the same suggestion made to the USFWS more than a year ago by the Species Survival Network (SSN). See *Questions and Answers*, pg. 25-26 referenced in 77 FR 21798, April 11, 2012. Apparently SSN was shopping around, as they do, for a country to make the proposal, and Kenya accepted the challenge. Kenya challenged the black rhino quotas at the last CoP, but was soundly defeated when it insisted upon a vote.

Despite a great deal of posturing from some interests in the white rhino ranching industry in South Africa, there is no proposal to liberalize trade such as de-horning and commercial sale of ranched rhino horn. The largest private rhino owner, John Hume, stopped safari hunting of his rhino on the basis that the horn was potentially worth much more as a commercial product. Well, the proposal that would permit such trade, much less its CoP passage, has not materialized. Nevertheless, Kenya has introduced its counter-proposal to eliminate even trophy trade. The short of it is that trophy hunting has already been voluntarily curtailed due to a pipe dream for higher profits from commercial sale.

Leopard Permit Clarification

Botswana, South Africa and the US have submitted a joint document to revise the leopard quota resolution in

a good faith effort to clarify when and where the quota for the year of take and the separate quota for the year of export is appropriate. This is aimed at the law enforcement seizure crisis that began in 2011 and continued into the first few months of 2012 in some ports of entry in the US, where hunters' trophies were seized and treated as contraband by USFWS port inspectors. There are too many variables to determine this early whether the amendment will evolve into a true fix. For one thing, it would only revise the leopard quota resolution, Res. 10.14 (Rev. CoP14), not the resolution governing permits and certificates (Rev. 12.3, Section VII, Rev. CoP15). It also only contends with leopards, not other listed species with quotas that were seized during the crisis, like elephant and crocodile. Unless the fix includes other species, it is likely to occur again.

No Lion Proposals

Despite lots of signals, no proposal materialized to uplist the African lion. This gives the hunting community more time to shore up lion management and practices. It will be three years until the next CoP. In the interval, the anti's proposal in the United States to list the lion on the ESA will no doubt be resolved, for better or worse.

Believe me, it is no accident that there is no proposal to uplist the lion. Extra-special thanks goes to Shikar Safari Club's Foundation for its unexcelled contributions to Tanzania lion management, Philippe Chardonnet and IGF, and the many other champions of lion conservation across Africa. One and all, please stay the course. The hunter's role must be documented and perceived to be positive and must in fact be positive. ■

Remarks of Deborah Lyons, Deputy Head of Mission, at the Inuit Delegation - Polar Bear Reception at Embassy of Canada, Washington, D.C., September 20, 2012

Canada is an Arctic country and is blessed with a richness of resources, the envy of many around the world. Amongst this richness is, of course, our polar bear population. We are home to approximately 16,000 of the estimated 20,000-25,000 polar bears in the global Polar Regions. This means

that roughly 2/3 of the world's polar bears call Canada home. Therefore, we have a conservation responsibility that we take seriously.

Canada has a robust management system in place for conserving and managing our 13 subpopulations of polar bears spread across our wide



SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT

World Conservation Force Bulletin

EDITOR/WRITER
John J. Jackson, III

PUBLISHER
Barbara Crown

Copyright ©2012 by Dagga Boy Enterprises LLC. ISSN 1052-4746. This bulletin on hunting-related conservation matters is published periodically free of charge for subscribers to The Hunting Report, 12182 SW 128 Street, Miami, FL 33186. All material contained herein is provided by famed wildlife and hunting attorney John J. Jackson, III with whom The Hunting Report has formed a strategic alliance. The purpose of the alliance is to educate the hunting community as well as pro-advocacy of hunting rights opportunities. More broadly, the alliance will also seek to open up new hunting opportunities worldwide and ward off attacks on currently available opportunities. For more information on Conservation Force and/or the services available through Jackson's alliance with The Hunting Report, write:

Conservation Force
3240 South I-10 Service Road West, Suite 200
Metairie, LA 70001
Tel. 504-837-1233 Fax 504-837-1145
www.ConservationForce.org

For reprints of this bulletin or permission to reproduce it and to inquire about other publishing-related matters, write:

The Hunting Report
12182 SW 128 Street
Miami, FL 33186
Tel. 1-800-272-5656 Fax 305-253-5532

Remember to favor Conservation Force's Corporate Sponsors:



www.faunaandflora.com/



www.hornady.com/

All are the leaders in their fields.

Arctic. We have a National Conservation Strategy that has received support from provinces, territories and Wildlife Management Boards. And we work with them and Aboriginal groups/organizations and the other Range States (Norway, Greenland, Russia, United States) towards collaborative, coordinated management and conservation decisions.

In addition to being an important resource in and of itself, we also recognize that the polar bear is a critical element in the culture of our Northern communities. Polar bear hunting, the consumption of the meat, and the use of its products, such as hides, is important both from an economic and social consideration for many of our Northern communities. But of course people are rightly concerned about the sustainability of this majestic icon of the North. And we understand and embrace that concern. But as often happens, some of this concern is being fueled by misinformation.

As many of you know, certain members of Congress have reached out to Secretary Salazar to ask that international trade be banned. These are based on, what I would argue, are some misconceptions about polar bear populations and the polar bear hunt. Let me just clarify a few points for you:

1.) In those overtures to Secretary Salazar the tripling of the hunt quota for Western Hudson Bay bears was portrayed as an example of overharvesting, but no numbers were given. So let me give you the numbers tonight. The quota went from eight

bears a year to 24. Twenty-one were actually taken that year – many of which were defensive kills. You will recall that ZI mentioned our total population is around 16,000.

2.) Another misconception is that the Government of Canada is not doing enough to support the polar bear population. Well, that's not quite true, in fact, we invest nearly \$2 million a year in monitoring and research in order to manage the bears in a system based on science and influenced by Inuit traditional knowledge. The Canadian polar bear management system is a benchmark for other polar bear countries, and we would be happy to put it head to head against any other country's wildlife management program.

3.) Again there are those who think that by cutting international trade there will be a big impact on the polar bear population. Again, let me put this in perspective. Or, as your former President Clinton would say: let's do the arithmetic. Let me remind you of the 16,000 population. Of that our total annual hunt quota is 600 bears a year, and that quota is seldom met. Only two percent of the total Canadian population of polar bears enter into international trade. T W O percent.

International trade is not a threat to polar bears. Hunting by the Inuit and Inuvialuit is not a threat to polar bears. There are many factors that influence the health and size of the polar bear population. The international trade is not a significant influence. Uplisting bears will not improve or even impact conservation efforts. To focus on this is wrong-headed and diminishes the ability of our Northern peoples to put food on their table and bring much needed revenues to their families. How fair is this? It's not like those of us in the south who have many options for supporting our livelihood.

So let me leave you with this message: Canada takes seriously our stewardship. We want to work with the US in a common approach – one that embraces the rigor of science, the wisdom of our Inuit traditional knowledge, and our shared commitment. Everyone in this room wants to ensure the sustainability of this majestic icon of the North. ■



3 Amigos: USFWS Makes 90-Day Finding to Review Downlisting Those Species in USA

On September 19, 2012 the USFWS made and published a positive 90-day finding for two petitions to de-list the scimitar-horned oryx, dama gazelle and addax by removing the captive-bred and captive populations in the US. The finding said the petitions presented “substantial information indicating that de-listing the US captive animals or US captive-bred members of these species may be warranted.” The service also initiated

a status review of the US population for the 12-month requirement. It did not set a deadline for comments or information, nor did it designate a USFWS point person to whom to direct comments and information. Information can be sent by postal mail to UFS&WS, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 420, Arlington, VA 22203. See *Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 90-Day Finding on Petitions to Delist US Captive Populations of the*

Scimitar-Horned Oryx, Dama Gazelle, and Addax, 77 FR 58084, September 19, 2012.

This is a welcome development. It arises from two separate petitions to downlist the US population and three separate but consolidated lawsuits by the Exotic Wildlife Association (EWA), SCI and Terry Owen. When the listing was initially proposed, the hunting community (including Conservation Force and its allied

partner organizations) urged that the captive bred population in the US be excluded, to no avail. Instead, the three were listed along with a Special Rule exempting ranches from permitting. Now that the Special Rule exempting ranches from the need to permit has been struck down in litigation, the EWA Downlisting Petition asks the USFWS to revisit the listing because "[t]he Final Rule listing these three antelope as endangered leaves no doubt that the exemption...was integral to USFWS' decision to list the three antelope (citing page 52320). In fact, it is likely that without the exemption USFWS would not have listed the three species at all."

The USFWS did not act on the petitions within 90 days, so suits were filed to enforce both petitions. The 90-day finding comes after more than two years. That means the prescribed time to make a 12-month finding has also already passed.

On June 12, 2012, the District Court approved settlement of the claims that the USFWS had missed the 90-day deadline, 1:12-cv-003040-BAH, Docket No. 95. The court-approved settlement provided that the 90-day determination would be submitted to the Federal Register by August 31. The settlement also provided that the already past due 12-month finding be submitted for publication to the Federal Register Office by May 31, 2013. That is the date the USFWS will either deny the petition or issue a proposed rule itself to downlist the species. If the 12-month determination in May/June is positive, a final downlisting determination should be published in June 2014 (one year after the 12-month determination) and effective 30 to 90 days after that if the three species are downlisted. A new Administration could expedite the late 12- and 24-month determinations.

Whether or not the three are downlisted, Conservation Force will

continue to assist ranchers with the necessary permitting, reporting, renewing and with establishing and monitoring related conservation projects for the three species in the wild in their countries of origin. It is critical that the US populations be secure if they are to be downlisted or delisted as a distinct, recovered population segment or range as the downlisting petitions claim. The status and management of the three antelope are under a microscope from now until it is over in June 2014. One thing is certain: the burden on the USFWS created by the captive breeding regulations and the take permitting is many times greater than the USFWS anticipated. It is important that ranchers acquire their permits to operate within the law and remain good stewards of these three antelope. If you need the permit applications and/or assistance, contact me at jjw-no@att.net or 504-837-1233. ■

PH Stu Taylor Recovery Fund Established

As we often do with conservation partners in the field, Conservation Force is serving as the public charity funding conduit for the medical care and recovery of professional hunter Stuart (Stu) Taylor of Kambako Safaris, Mozambique. Kambako is a longstanding partner in our shared Niassa Reserve projects, and Stu is in terrible need of help.

Stu was hunting buffalo in Kambako Safaris' Block B of the Niassa Reserve, Mozambique. During a Cape buffalo charge, a client tripped and accidentally shot Stu. The .458 solid entered low through Stu's left shoulder and exited high in the chest/collar bone region.

Stu went through four surgeries in four weeks. He has now been sent home for five weeks and is bed-restricted, as he needs to build up his strength. More worrying is the fact the surgeons will

not do any more operations because his heart is under stress, as it was severely bruised from the hydrostatic shock from the gunshot. Once the go-ahead is given when Stu is strong enough, reconstruction surgery will commence. The surgeon has made it very clear that there is a minimum of another four operations required (if all goes well). He has also made it very clear that this recovery is going to take the best part of a year and won't give any guarantees to how much movement Stu will get back in his shoulder. When this was written, it was close to seven weeks since the accident, and Stu did not have any movement in the shoulder. Those of you who know Stu, know he is a fighter and he is determined to get back into hunting as soon as possible. His medical bills are already well over the million Rand mark (\$130,000-plus), and he still has bigger

expenses coming in the next year. He and his trackers have lost the majority of this year's earnings, and it looks like next year's as well.

Tax deductible, dedicated donations can be made for Stu's medical care by postal mailing your donation payable to Conservation Force at PO Box 278, Metairie, LA 70004-0278 USA or by credit card on Conservation Force's website at <http://www.conservationforce.org/donate.html>. In either case, indicate that the sum is for Stu's Fund. ■



Conservation Force Sponsor

Grand Slam Club/Ovis generously pays all of the costs associated with the publishing of this bulletin. Founded in 1956, Grand Slam Club/Ovis is an organization of hunter/conservationists dedicated to improving wild sheep and goat populations worldwide by contributing to



GRAND SLAM CLUB/OVIS

game and wildlife agencies or other non-profit wildlife conservation organizations. GSCO has agreed to sponsor Conservation Force Bulletin in order to help international hunters keep abreast of hunting-related wildlife news. For more information, please visit www.wildsheep.org.