

Sustainable

The newsletter of the IUCN SSC Sustainable Use Specialist Group
April 2008

Editorial: Robin Sharp on what to expect in this issue.

Chair's message: Jon Hutton reviews recent events of importance for sustainable use.

Main items

On course for Barcelona? Valuable news and advice ahead of IUCN's 4th World Conservation Congress from Robin Sharp

Elephant culling: South Africa's new elephant management regulations include the option for lethal removal. Gerhard Damm gages reactions.

Added value: Scott Brainerd and Robert Kenward reinforce the importance of the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity, recently adopted by the COP to the Bern Convention.

Recreational sea angling: how sea angling provides a lifeline' to coastal communities. Reproduced from the European Fishing Tackle Trade Association website.

From trash to treasure: A garbage dump in Eilat, Israel, is being transformed into a bird sanctuary for migratory birds. By Rueven Yosef.

Book reviews

People, Parks and Poverty: Political Ecology and Biodiversity Conservation by Bill Adams and Jon Hutton. Reviewed by Dilys Roe.

Mary Losvik reviews Malcolm Ausden's habitat management and conservation handbook.

David Erickson on a new TRAFFIC report on the European Union's import policies for hunting trophies.

Frank Vorhies comments on a recent Ecological Economics, article on the economics of wildlife farming and endangered species conservation.

Shorter items

Sustainable Tourism Baseline Criteria Initiative (STBCI).

Biosphere Ethics Project (BEP).

Vilm Process: Steering Group linking Poverty & Conservation.

Sustainable Use at the CBD Conference of the Parties, Bonn 19-30 May 2008.

Also at the Bonn CoP – Biodiversity for Poverty Reduction Day.

Editorial

Welcome to the latest number of *Sustainable*, the newsletter of the IUCN/SSC Sustainable Use Specialist Group (SUSG). This issue contains the usual mix of news items, reports, reviews and articles from around the world, though it would have been more global if we had been able to include planned items on Namibian conservancies and prospects for the polar bear. Hopefully we may have them next time. Increasing awareness of the links between conservation and poverty reduction is reflected in three items. Reviews examine wildlife trade economics and EU trophy hunting rules, while the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity briefly reported in our last issue is more fully explained. We are glad to be able to include an objective account of the most newsworthy feature of the new South African Elephant Management Plan from *African Indaba*, an electronic newsletter which is always full of interest. By contrast we have a volunteered article about successful land reclamation work in Eilat, Israel, to maintain a vital staging point for birds migrating between Africa, Europe and Asia. Other items reflect SUSG members' efforts to keep abreast of and influence important policy developments.

This year two major gatherings of conservationists take place in Europe: the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Bonn in May and the IUCN World Conservation Congress in Barcelona in October. Rather large numbers of people are expected and both will be multi-layered events presenting serious challenges to those who want to be in the right place at the right time. We do our best to highlight events of interests to readers of *Sustainable*.

Finally Jon Hutton, our Chair, mentions the little local difficulties with the new look IUCN website and sustainable use. Until Dave Beamont, our web wizard and my invaluable Assistant Editor, is able to acclimatize our material to its new environment here is a tip: put "Sustainable Use Specialist Group" into Google search and you will be there in an instant. Enjoy your reading.

Robin Sharp

Chair's message

Dear SUSG Members

Much has happened since the last 'Sustainable' - most noticeable of which is the total disappearance of our website as a result of the reconstruction of IUCN's web presence, which happened along with its rebranding. I have to say I'm not a fan of the new IUCN Logo, and as for the new IUCN website, least said the better....

Happily, Dave Beamont is still our loyal webmaster and he is in discussion with IUCN to 're-expose' sustainable use and the important links we had within the IUCN website. In the unlikely even he is unsuccessful we will recreate our own presence...

As you know (because I sent the report around, thanks to those who commented) we held a workshop on Sustainable Use at White Oak last July, and Holly Dublin organised the first ever get together of Specialist Group Chairs earlier this year. The former considered the focus of the SUSG, the latter the future focus of the SSC itself. Since then Holly and I have had several discussions on the future of the SUSG - and especially its regional groups - all with the same conclusion: We need to raise funding to secure a Professional Officer to run the SUSG on a daily basis. Unless we can do this, the group will continue with pockets of energy and activity, but with very little opportunity to channel this energy into a common mission.

More on this when we have completed our research on possible funders...

In the meantime, Roz Almond continues to drive forward our work on Sustainable Use Indicators for the CBD 2010 target while Thomasina Oldfield keeps our quantitative work moving along. We hope to see a publication emerging before World Conservation Congress in October.

With respect to the forthcoming Congress, which is of course being held in Barcelona, it would be helpful to find out which SUSG members intend to be there, for the open forum and/or the Member's week. If you are going to be there could you let Lauren Evans know so that she can compile a list -

lauren.evans@unep-wcmc.org

Best wishes

Jon

On course for Barcelona? IUCN's 4th World Conservation Congress

By Robin Sharp

Please refer to the last *Sustainable* for a guide to the nuts and bolts of the Congress. Since then a number of colleagues have heard that their proposals for workshops and related events in the World Conservation Forum have been approved either in full or subject to working with other partners (who may or may not share the same point of view). This good news is somewhat tempered by an examination of accepted events on the Congress website (via <http://www.iucn.org>). The list runs to 34 pages and contains over 700 items, of which 320 are workshops (Aliances, Global or combined). A planning chart indicates that 20 workshops will be taking place simultaneously during most waking hours from 6-9 October inclusive. Promises that further guidance about Aliances workshops etc would be issued in January have so far not been fulfilled. 'April' is now the projected date, as it is for registration and hotel booking at what seem to be quite high prices. A little bird tells us that a version of the 'Terminal 5' computer meltdown bug is around in Gland. Subject to this, the following Forum events of special interest can be found on the list:

SASUSG: Voice of the Voiceless

Sand County Foundation: Using Resilience Thinking to Solve Wicked Problems in Conservation

CIC: Sustainable Hunting Tourism

ESUSG: Environmental Health & Wealth: Innovations in conservation through use

EBCD: 7 proposals on marine topics including aquaculture, high seas fisheries, climate change and fisheries, shark finning etc : most are listed as to be combined with others.

IIED: Livelihood Impacts of Protected Areas

CARE International: Protected Areas, Equity & Livelihoods

FFI: Market valuation of biodiversity & ecosystem services.

The most intriguing title comes, surprisingly, from the World Bank: "The grubby dog-eared books that feed conservation movements". Will they be giving them away?

The website section on the 'Sailing to Barcelona' says that 150 boats will participate and lists some of the commitments they will be bearing. However the costs of getting your boat to Barcelona remain an issue. Whatever happens in the harbour it is clear that marine questions will be among the hot topics in the conference hall. There looks to be a strong emphasis on livelihoods and people issues, while climate change is featuring strongly: a case of jumping onto the ice-flow?

As to the Business Session please remember that resolutions have to be submitted from member organisations (not Commissions who are voiceless in the Business Session) by 6 June. Although nomination periods for the elections to

Council and Commission chairs have closed there is no official news as to who has been nominated.

Robin Sharp is Editor of Sustainable: robisharp@googlemail.com

South Africa Prepares to Resume Elephant Culling

By Gerhard Damm

In a comprehensive update to South Africa's elephant policy, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) announced new elephant management regulations on 25 February 2008. The regulations, which will come into effect on May 1st include strict conditions. Lethal removal may be undertaken only in terms of a culling plan prepared with the assistance of a recognized elephant management specialist and approved by the relevant issuing authority that sets out the conditions under which culling would take place. The culling plan must provide the issuing authority with the following information relating to the operation:

- evidence that the actual or projected elephant numbers at a specific location are incompatible with the agreed land use objectives spelt out in the management plan and that a reduction in population numbers is therefore necessary;
- evidence that all other population management options have been rejected by an ecologist after appropriate consideration and evaluation;
- proposed number of elephants to be culled;
- proposed method of animal selection;
- proposed time frames;
- proposed culling methods; and
- intended use of products.

The new regulation also says that elephants' survival often depends on their operation as a family unit, and an elephant may not be culled if it is part of a family unless the matriarch and juvenile bulls are culled as well.

Minister van Schalkwyk told reporters, "our simple reality is that elephant population density has risen so much in some southern African countries that there is concern about impacts on the landscape, the viability of other species and the livelihoods and safety of people living within elephant ranges." Van Schalkwyk said he had discussed the new regulations with neighbouring countries, all with booming elephant populations as a result of their conservation efforts, facing the same dilemma. Botswana has by far the largest population, with an estimated 165,000 elephants, Zimbabwe 80,000 and Mozambique some 20,000.

South Africa's elephant population has ballooned to more than 20,000 from 8,000 in 1995. A total of 14,562 elephants were culled in South Africa between 1967

and 1994. The Minister explained that South Africa's elephant management policy is part of an adaptive management process and that his department would continue to invest in research and scientific analysis. Bob Scholes, lead author of the major scientific report (see <http://www.elephantassessment.co.za>) which underpins the elephant management regulations, acknowledged that culling would change the way elephants behave, with possible social behavioral consequences as a result of culling, but highlighted that contraception also is fraught with problems. Moving elephants, another alternative, usually is prohibitively expensive and suitable land for translocated elephants is scarce.

Rob Little, WWF South Africa, said the government approach was "responsible". Susan Lieberman, WWF global species director, commented "It's not something anybody welcomes at all, but we also have to look at the broader conservation management issues." Eugene Lapointe, President of IWMC World Conservation Trust, said: "South Africa has been forced to take this step precisely because its conservation policies, based on the principle of sustainable use, have proven so successful in boosting elephant populations."

The March issue of the Endangered Wildlife Trust's Magazine "Vision" contained an objective article by Dr. John Ledger. Interestingly, Ledger quotes noted elephant scientist Peter Mundy from Zimbabwe as saying: "almost all range states have their elephants culled, the southern African countries do it themselves, while most of the other countries have effected population reduction "by delegation" to poachers." Former Kenya Wildlife Service Director Dr. Richard Leakey has given qualified backing for South Africa's plan to cull elephants. He said that culling is "a necessary part of population management", but added that there is also a responsibility to curb human activities that impinge on elephant habitat. Predictably, radical animal rights activists rejected the new regulations.

For the text of the Minister's Announcement go to <http://www.environment.gov.za/>

Gerhard Damm is Editor of African Indaba (www.africanindaba.co.za) and Vice President of the CIC Tropical Game Commission: gerhard@muskwa.co.za

European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity

By Scott Brainerd and Robert Kenward

The groundbreaking European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity was adopted by the Standing Committee of the Parties to the Bern Convention in November 2007, as briefly reported in the last issue of Sustainable. The Bern Convention is a binding international agreement to conserve wildlife in Europe made in 1979 and now joined by 46 member countries of the Council of Europe. This is an organisation whose main aim is to promote unity among European nations based on democracy and human rights.

In November 2005 production of the Charter was remitted to a Working Group with experts from Bern Convention Parties, as well as representatives from non-governmental organisations with an interest in hunting and conservation of biodiversity, (including IUCN/SSC's ESUSG, FACE and CIC). The remit was to address hunting as a consumptive and recreational form of utilisation and management of birds and terrestrial mammals in Europe. The Charter thus represents a collective effort of governments, hunters and environmental organisations. Scott Brainerd was tasked to draft the document with input from all Parties and Observers and was assisted by an informal group (all members of ESUSG) from the ngo's already mentioned. After much hard work and explanations to those with doubts and concerns and some moments when it seemed that major weakening changes might be made the Charter finally came home to port.

The Charter has three main goals: 1) to present a set of principles and guidelines to ensure the sustainability of wild resource use in Europe, especially through hunting; 2) to provide guidelines for sustainable hunting tourism in Europe; and 3) to recommend best practices for European hunters.

In this context, the Charter provides guidelines for sustainable hunting practices and hunter involvement in monitoring, research and biodiversity restoration. It promotes cooperation between stakeholders in biodiversity management (landowners, conservationists, government agencies, and hunter's organisations). It addresses the sustainability of hunting tourism and economic incentives for local communities to conserve wildlife. It recommends a code of conduct for tour operators and European hunters who engage their services. Furthermore, the Charter encourages hunter education and safe and sound hunting practices. It emphasises the need for hunters to be knowledgeable about wildlife (including non-game) species and their requirements, as well as basic conservation principles.

So what is the "added value" of the Charter? First of all, it cements hunting as a legitimate and important tool in the management of biological diversity under the auspices of the Bern Convention. A substantial introductory section explains the importance of understanding the three pillars of sustainability and sets out relevant EU and international policy regarding hunting, biodiversity and eco-tourism. It also applies central principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity as exemplified by the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity and the Malawi Principles for the Ecosystem Approach. As well as the 12 key principles, which incorporate the 14 from Addis Ababa and 12 from Malawi, a novel feature is that there are 47 guidelines aimed at biodiversity regulators and managers, as well as 59 guidelines for hunters and hunting tour operators, which will hopefully be seen as an equitable distribution. Our hope is that the Charter will be actively used by the Parties to promote the role of sustainable hunting in the management of European biodiversity, and that this model will have application beyond its borders. The SUSG and IUCN more widely, along with other NGO's have a central role to play in facilitating this process at all levels.

http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/conventions/Bern/Recommendations/tpvs07erev_2007.pdf will give access to an electronic version, while hard copies are being produced by FACE and CIC.

*Scott Brainerd is Wildlife Biologist at the Norwegian Association of Hunters and Anglers and Norwegian Institute for Nature Research: Scott.Brainerd@nina.no
Prof. Robert Kenward is Regional Chair for Europe of the SUSG of IUCN/SSC: reke@ceh.ac.uk.*

Parliament recognizes value of recreational sea angling

Campaigning continues to grow in Scotland to preserve and sustain recreational fishing, which is seen as vital to the country's economy. In February 2008 the Scottish Parliament debated a Members Motion regarding sea angling which had been lodged by John Scott, Member of the Scottish Parliament (MSP) and received cross party support. At an event in the Parliament building before the debate, the Scottish Sea Angling Conservation Network (SSACN) gave a presentation, which demonstrated how sea angling provides a 'Lifeline' to the economies of many coastal communities. This included the story of a doughty common skate that has been tagged and thus known to have been caught and returned safely to the sea eight times. Worth just £25 on the fishmonger's slab and now nick-named 'Yo Yo', the fish is estimated to have earned over £6,000 for the local economy from recreational angling.

'Yo Yo' demonstrated that since many sea anglers and angling charter boats operate a catch-and-release policy for depleted fish species, the fish targeted by sea anglers are worth much more alive than dead. The SSACN also called for the establishment of 'Angling Centres' around the Scottish coast. These centres would be focused on education, conservation and communication. SSACN technical director Ian Burrett, said: "The government seems to have taken on board the point that angling tourism is extremely important to Scotland, and that promoting it will help meet their target of increasing tourism by 50 per cent by 2015."

In the parliamentary debate MSPs John Scott and John Farquhar Munro renewed calls for the Scottish government to do everything in its power to preserve fish stocks and support recreational angling. Scott said angling was a subject that has been overlooked by politicians and outlined how important a role recreational sea angling played in Scotland's economy. It was supporting not only boat hire companies and tackle shops, but also a plethora of other businesses such as hotels, cafes and pubs in often fragile coastal communities, bearing in mind that an estimated 225,000 residents participate in sea angling each year. In addition research by Highlands and Islands Enterprise estimated that almost 80,000 UK residents visited the Highlands in 2003 to take part in sea angling, supporting over 400 full time equivalent jobs. And in terms of spend, Scottish Natural Heritage, the official conservation agency, have suggested that boat

anglers spend an average of £1,375, the equivalent figure for shore anglers being a not inconsiderable £861. Scott concluded: "The truth is that recreational sea angling is an activity we all should welcome, not simply because of its economic importance, but also because it represents the ultimate in sustainable, environmentally sound fishing. It causes no damage to the sea bed and the numbers of fish taken bear no threat to the viability of stocks." Later European Fishing Tackle Trade Association (EFTTA) President Gregg Holloway congratulated the SSACN and MSPs for staging the debate.

N.B. This is a shorter version of a news report which first appeared in EFTTA News online and has been reproduced with permission.

Recycling a garbage dump for migratory birds in Eilat

By Reuven Yosef

Israel is the only land bridge for birds migrating south from Europe and Asia to Africa in autumn and north to their breeding grounds in spring. Eilat, in southern Israel, is critical for many migrant species because it is reached after a flight of almost 2000 km of continuous desert regions of the Sahel, Sahara and Sinai, often taking 20-40 hours without "re-fuelling". To the north-east there are still 650 km more of the Syrian Desert and due east the vast Arabian desert. Hence many birds land in the green areas that surround Eilat to rest and feed before or after crossing the deserts. This is the reason for establishing the International Birding & Research Center in Eilat (IBRCE) in 1993.

An estimated half to one billion birds of over 230 species pass through the Eilat staging point area twice a year on these migrations, in many cases the majority of the world's population for a given species (e.g., Steppe Eagle, Levant Sparrowhawk). Comparing raptor species that use the three major crossings from Europe and Asia to Africa, 26 are recorded at Gibraltar, 25 at Messina and 39 at Eilat, which sees some 3 to 5 million flying through annually.

Eilat was established in 1948 around a tiny Turkish Police Station (Um-Rasrash) on the western side of the Gulf of Aqaba. In 1955 the population was 500 which rose steadily to 13,000 in 1972, when tourism was discovered and building of hotels brought economic growth to the city. Today the population is 53,000 and there are almost 8000 hotel rooms. Of the once extensive salt marsh of 12 sq. km, **nothing remains today**. This marsh was located at the terminal point of the surrounding valleys when they flood in winter. The soil dictated a unique plant community dominated by *Suaeda monoica*. For the migrants, the advantage is that it fruits and flowers during spring and autumn. Historically this allowed the migratory birds to exploit the habitat which evolved into a vital staging area for many species. The establishment of human settlements and agriculture in the Arava valley offer the only alternative habitats for the birds. However, these oases are heavily sprayed with a wide range of biocides (including DDT), are monocultural, and use modern techniques.

The disappearance of the habitat raised serious conservation challenges as to how the birds could accomplish their migrations, or breed successfully, in the future without this important resource at their disposal. In order to rectify the situation, in 1993 the IBRCE acquired the local garbage dump that was used from early 1950's till the 1970's. This offered a unique chance to recycle a 'human abused' landscape and make it environmentally friendly for migrant birds. At the outset we used heavy machinery to dig large craters and to bury the garbage *in situ*. We convinced local contractors to pour the clean earth excavated for building new hotels and covered the pits with 3 m of clean earth which resulted in a clear landscape. We then planted the area with indigenous plants. Irrigation is with partially treated sewage water, and owing to its extremely high organic content, has resulted in an extremely fast growth rate and fruiting of the plants. This provides the migrating birds with food in an area less than 5% of the original salt marsh. If we are able to keep to the intended schedule, all seedlings and trees will be in the ground within the next 24 months.

When this aim is achieved, and the "Bird Sanctuary" is fully operational, we will be able to substantially replace the habitats lost in the past two decades and to help the migratory bird populations of Europe and Asia accomplish their annual migrations. It is critical that the global community, which has already recognized the importance of not only conserving breeding and wintering grounds but also staging areas. A number of awards have recognized this but much remains to be accomplished if the enterprise is to achieve its objective.

Prof. Reuven Yosef is Director of the IBRCE and corresponding member of the European SUSG: ryosef@eilatcity.co.il

Book Reviews

People, Parks and Poverty: Political Ecology and Biodiversity Conservation by Bill Adams and Jon Hutton, recently published in Conservation and Society (Vol 5, No 2)

Reviewed by Dilys Roe

This article explores the "political ecology" of conservation – ie the political and social processes – from local to global levels - that underlie particular environmental outcomes or conditions. The paper focuses on protected areas (PAs) and starts by highlighting recent cases of evictions from protected area and the outcry this has generated from human rights organizations and other social activists and advocates. This debate is, in a way, just the tip of the iceberg in a much broader, long-running discussion about the relationship between biodiversity conservation and human well-being. The authors note that to date this discussion has not been based, to any great extent, on an explicit understanding of the political and economic dimensions of conservation policy and suggest that one important reason for this is "the disciplinary gulf that exists between predominantly natural science-trained conservation planners and predominantly social science-trained critics of conservation."

The authors suggest that field of political ecology offers a way forward in bridging this gulf given that it “explicitly addresses the relations between the social and the natural, arguing that social and environmental conditions are deeply and inextricably linked.” To illustrate this the paper reviews six different dimensions of the political ecology of conservation:

- 1) the significance of how nature is understood for the way conservation has been thought about and practiced – in particular ideas about the separateness of humans and nature in concepts such as ‘wilderness’;
- 2) the nature, extent and significance of the social impacts of protected areas – particularly that of physical displacement;
- 3) the scale and distribution of economic costs and benefits from conservation;
- 4) the issue and politics of indigenous rights – particularly over identity and territory – and the potential clash with PA designation;
- 5) the links between poverty and conservation – and in particular the broad potential and specific role of conservation in meeting global and local poverty reduction objectives;
- 6) the renewal of calls for “science-based” biodiversity conservation that focuses on a core agenda of conservation biology and a return to strictly protected, people-free parks.

The authors then go on to further elaborate the emerging – and often competing - trends that can be discerned in this integrated analysis. In particular, the power of conservation science as the basis for conservation planning is highlighted. But this is countered at the policy level with scope and scale of criticism of conservation and the increasing recognition of the need for trade-offs between conservation and other societal goals. The paper concludes with some hope that conservation biologists are beginning to transcend disciplinary boundaries and are increasingly recognizing the need to explore how conservation can be achieved in a human landscape.

Many different authors have grappled with the various strands of this long debate – either individually or in a variety of combinations. Adams and Hutton provide a great service in condensing and clarifying this. Pulling this disparate debate under the umbrella of political ecology provides a greater sense of structure – or at the very least, some comfort in an all-embracing terminology and common point of reference – and this article should prove a valuable resource to those embarking on – or already embroiled in – a conservation career, from whichever disciplinary perspective. The authors identified a disciplinary gulf as a major constraint to modern conservation – this paper serves as a great first step towards bridging that divide.

Dilys Roe is Senior Researcher, Biodiversity, at the International Institute for Environment & Development: dilys.roe@iied.org

N.B. Dilys also draws our attention to the monthly BioSoc Bulletin where similar articles are regularly reviewed. It can be found via the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group website at <http://www.povertyandconservation.info>

Habitat Management for Conservation. A Handbook of Techniques. By Malcolm Ausden, 2007. Oxford University Press. 424 pages. Paperback £29.95.

Reviewed by Mary Losvik

This comprehensive handbook is about managing land, including agricultural land, first of all to enrich it for wildlife. The whole range of techniques available for actively managing habitats for conservation is discussed, including species management, which makes it special as far as I know. Techniques for establishing vegetation for habitat restoration are however excluded. The region in question is mainly temperate Western Europe. It is a book in the series 'Techniques in Ecology and Conservation', edited by W. J. Sutherland.

The first part of the book concerns issues and techniques common to all habitats, including a philosophical approach, a subject which is missed in so many handbooks. The second part describes detailed methods of management used in specific habitats, with useful summaries in the beginning of each chapter. There is a wealth of up-to-date information, written in a rather concentrated way, and with excellent examples. And, first and foremost for a handbook, it is easy to find the topics you are looking for. All figures are well explained and to the point, the good and illustrative photos are all in black and white and rather small. One might have wished for a few larger photos and some in colour to break uniformity. The extensive use of the concepts 'create/recreate' both in books on restoration and here seem to be too strong and reminds me as a biologist of the big battle between creationists and evolutionists. Examples of contexts are 'species assemblages created through past' and 'create cultural habitats' where 'develop, establish and restore' could rather be used in my opinion.

The handbook is aimed at a wide readership and is indispensable for everyone working with management for conservation and the techniques involved.

Dr. Mary H. Losvik is at the Bergen Museum, University of Bergen, Norway, and is a member of the European SUSG: Mary.Losvik@bm.uib.no

A review of the European Union's import policies for hunting trophies. Amelie Knapp. A TRAFFIC Europe Report for the European Commission, Brussels, Belgium, pp. 81, 2007.

Reviewed by David Erickson

There are few subjects that are as complex as international trade regulations, and CITES is no exception; add in some European Union directives and

regulations on top and you may just need to call in some geologists to help you make sense of all the different strata. However, that's just what Amelie Knapp and her colleagues at TRAFFIC were able to do in this report, bringing clarity and new insights to an extremely complex and layered subject.

To accomplish her task, the author confidently digs into the subject, reducing mountains of data into a succinct but thorough analysis. The report contains a comprehensive account of trophy hunting as a conservation tool, background on the surrounding legal framework, presentation of several case studies and a discussion of methods and subsequent analysis as well as a list of critical recommendations.

The discussion of the rationale behind hunting as a tool for conservation provides an excellent overview of the current thinking and the acknowledged positive and negative impacts of trophy hunting. For anyone who is not familiar with the issues surrounding recreational hunting, the author provides an excellent primer. Following this is a good description of how the CITES and EU rules interrelate and the regulations which drive the process.

The analysis of the CITES trade data is fascinating. Data on which species are being imported into the EU are not limited to *Appendix/Annex* listed species, but include all imported mammals, birds and reptiles. A comprehensive list of all species concerned is included as an annex. The author makes excellent use of the data, and provides some very valuable insights. Particularly interesting was the list of the top three Annex A listed imports into the EU, by species and total number. Topping the list, surprisingly, was the European Turtle-dove (*Streptopelia turtur*), followed by Leopard (*Panthera pardus*) and the Brown or Grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*). Data analysis of this kind has tremendous value for sustainable use and hunting-conservation organizations; regular trend analysis, inclusive of export/import locations, combined with other information could allow pre-emptive engagement with range states and hunters, by sustainable use practitioners and hunting-conservation organizations, to ensure species populations are not being negatively impacted by hunting.

The report also sheds light on the workings of the EU Scientific Review Group (SRG), which has the power to suspend or allow importation of protected species within the entire EU. Representatives of the qualified CITES Management Authorities from the EU States make up the members of the SRG, and this group meets periodically to review relevant documentation, rulings and site-based reports. This highlights another area of opportunity for sustainable use practitioners, specifically to work with operators and management authorities at the site level to improve conservation effort so that it is transparent, documentable and meets the various criteria that are laid out in the *SRG Guidelines for Scientific Authorities*.

It is certainly the case that most of us keep full and active schedules, so one more report which lands on the pile of other unread reports is not ideal. However, do make time to at least read the Executive Summary and page

through some of the tables and case studies – you will certainly not be disappointed.

David Erickson is the Projects Officer for CIC, the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation: d.erickson@cic-wildlife.org

The economics of wildlife farming and endangered species conservation

Richard Damania, World Bank, Washington DC, USA and Erwin H. Bulte, Department of Economics, Tilburg University, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, Netherlands, and Development Economics Group, Wageningen University, Netherlands. *Ecological Economics*, Volume 62, Issues 3-4, 15 May 2007, Pages 461-472

A comment by Dr Francis Vorhies

In their journal article, “The economics of wildlife farming and endangered species conservation,” Damania and Bulte address a critically important but surprisingly understudied factor in endangered species conservation – the *supply* of endangered species. Conservationists and conservation policy makers, such as the Parties to CITES (the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora) focus generally on the *demand* for an endangered species and options for limiting or regulating this demand.

It is well known that the nature and extent of the demand for an endangered species impacts on its likely sustainability, as well as on the likely effectiveness of policy responses to this demand. For example, though both rhino horn and elephant ivory may be highly demanded, because the nature of these demands differs, the response to protective policy measures such as trade bans are also likely to differ.

Banning trade in rhino horn is likely to be relatively less effective than banning the trade in ivory as the former is viewed by most consumers as a medicinal product, while the latter is regarded as ornamental. Likewise, raising awareness of the species’ status among rhino horn consumers (in order to reduce demand) is more challenging than doing the same for ivory consumers. Appreciating the responsiveness of differing consumer groups to a reduction in supply – what economists would call the *elasticity of demand* – has played a critical role in wildlife trade policy formulation.

Understanding how consumers and more importantly producers will respond to increased supplies of endangered species, however, is less well understood and is the focus of this paper. The authors explain:

“Rather than trying to keep poachers out of protected areas at enormous costs - driving up prices on black markets, possibly increasing the incentive

to hunt - alternative 'supply side' policies have been proposed. Stated simply, the recommendation is to flood the market for wildlife commodities with captive-bred varieties and other alternatives. This will depress prices and make poaching unprofitable, thus allowing wild populations of endangered species to recover." (Page 462)

The authors contend that supply side approaches have not been well studied and perhaps because of this, conservation policy makers have been unwilling to consider them.

The article then proceeds to develop a number of economic models in order to understand the implications of promoting supply side policies for endangered species conservation. Though appropriate for *Ecological Economics*, this analysis assumes that the reader has a good deal of understanding of economic theory, thus making the analysis terribly hard to follow for non-economists.

That said, the authors are clear about the conclusions they derive and they conclude:

"This paper has highlighted the potential dangers of introducing supply side policies (such as captive breeding) without carefully scrutinizing the microeconomic structure of the market, together with the dynamic effects on resource stocks. The analysis reveals that captive breeding may be detrimental if it induces aggressive competition, and whether this occurs will depend critically upon the form of competition that eventuates in the market." (Page 470)

In short, according to the models developed in the paper, supply side policies may backfire by facilitating an increased trade in the endangered species and thus also encouraging an increased supply (i.e. poaching) of wild species. In light of this observation, Damania and Bulte appear to be hesitant about promoting supply side conservation policies. However, it may well be that the traditional emphasis on reducing demand rather than increasing supply needs to be reconsidered. The article is a welcome contribution to the much needed study of the potential for supply side conservation policies.

Frank Vorheis is a member of IUCN SSC ESUSG and Earthmind, Geneva, Switzerland: fvorhies@earthmind.net

In Brief.....shorter items

Sustainable Tourism Baseline Criteria Initiative (STBCI)

Last November, thanks to the sharp eyes of a colleague in an IUCN member organisation, we became aware of this major process to establish criteria for a global certification scheme for sustainable tourism. The IUCN Secretariat was

asking for members' comments on the draft criteria and offering to pass them to Rainforest Alliance, an international NGO based in the States which had launched the Initiative and secured the partnership of UNEP, the UN Foundation and IUCN among others. SUSG members who looked at the draft criteria were alarmed to discover that they appeared to outlaw the consumptive use of wildlife, whether sustainable or not, and thus hunting tourism and other activities which could promote conservation through use. We pointed out to IUCN colleagues that this aspect of the criteria appeared to conflict with IUCN policy. It was agreed that Robert Kenward, Chair of ESUSG, should take the lead in co-ordinating SUSG comments and these were submitted to Rainforest in January after the consultation period was extended to give us more time to formulate text. While we have reason to believe that our submission is being taken seriously we have no assurance that it will be accepted. IUCN Secretariat assure us that there will be a further round of public consultation but on the STBCI website <http://www.sustainabletourismcriteria.org>, it is not clear that a revised draft has yet to be published. We therefore need to remain vigilant. The proponents have approval for an Aliances Workshop at the Barcelona WCC, which will provide a chance for more dialogue. **RS**

Biosphere Ethics Project (BEP)

Readers may recall that one of the resolutions adopted at the Bangkok WCC in 2004 called for the Commission on Environmental Law (CEL) to take the lead in preparing a draft Code of Ethics for Biodiversity Conservation. Accordingly SSC, along with other Commissions, were invited to send a representative to a workshop at Windblown Hill, Chicago, in August 2005 organised by the CEL Ethics Specialist Group and supported by the Center for Humans and Nature. The Chair of SSC asked SUSG to provide the SSC nominee and at that time it seemed likely that a small but representative planning group might provide a first draft of a code which would then be subject to wide consultation in and beyond IUCN (see report in *Sustainable January 2006*). After a further workshop in Gland in September 2006, where SUSG again represented SSC, the project took a somewhat different turn and adopted a method of operation which envisaged identifying the scope and content of a draft code via a series of regional workshops which would be linked to actual conservation initiatives on the ground. The first of these was held at the original venue of Windblown Hill in September 2007 but due to timing constraints SUSG could not field a participant. This March another workshop took place in Cape Town organised in conjunction with SANParks: Rob Little represented SSC/SUSG and the SSC Chair attended the final session. Following a third workshop in Brazil at the end of May, there will be a global analysis workshop in Chicago in late June at which Rosie Cooney will carry the flag for SSC/SUSG. Our current understanding is that no draft code will be presented to the WCC business session for adoption but there will be an Aliances Workshop. Another space to watch! **RS**

Vilm Process: Steering Group linking Poverty & Conservation

As reported in the December 2007 issue of this Newsletter, SUSG represented SSC at the second of two workshops arranged by the German Nature Conservation Agency and held on the Island of Vilm, Germany, to discuss the possibility of developing some principles and guidelines relating to the impact of conservation activities on the local poor. Since then those interested have formed a Steering Group for further consultation, without so far committing the groups from which they have come. The Group put on a small side event at the Rome meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body (SBSTTA) and offered some text to the Working Group on Protected Areas which was also meeting in Rome. Currently the Group are aiming to submit a short proposal embodying over-arching principles to the CBD Conference of the Parties meeting in Bonn 19-30 May if a sympathetic Party is willing to table it. They also hope to share in a side event planned by the IUCN WCPA Equity and Livelihoods Task Force. For the Barcelona WCC they envisage drafting a resolution calling for support for the development of principles and guidelines via a broad consultative process. **RS**

Sustainable Use at the CBD Conference of the Parties, Bonn 19-30 May 2008

The European SUSG will be joining CIC (The International Council for Game & Wildlife) in co-sponsoring a side event on **22 May at 1315 hours** at the CBD CoP. Entitled *Benefits for People & Wildlife: Sustainable Use in Practice*, the event will present four current initiatives in which the Addis Ababa and Malawi Principles are being implemented at international, national and local levels, and will ask how such processes can be accelerated and spread more widely. Presentations will showcase the following initiatives: The European Charter on Hunting & Biodiversity, (see elsewhere in this issue), the 2007 research case study, Use Nationally of Wild Resources across Europe (UNWIRE), showing that millions European citizens are spending billions of euros on hunting, angling, bird-watching and gathering fungi and plant materials and linking governance factors to conservation benefit, a long term Swiss study which demonstrates that mushroom picking and disturbance of the forest floor at various levels of intensity have a very limited impact, thus pointing the way to more widespread enjoyment of a resource which affords both nourishment, pleasure and economic benefit; and updates from the Torghar Project in Pakistan whose design is based on the principles of sustainable use, local tribe involvement and conservation biology where populations of Sulaiman Markhor (*Capra falconeri jerdoni*) have increased after more than 20 years from a critical level to a stable populations thanks to sustainable hunting tourism and community conservation efforts. Please join us if you are planning to be at the CoP. **RS**

Also at the Bonn CoP – Biodiversity for Poverty Reduction Day

The Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (PCLG) will host a “Biodiversity for Poverty Reduction Day” on Saturday May 24th 2008 – the middle weekend of CoP9 of the Convention on Biological Diversity - in Bonn, Germany. The day will have three key elements: 1) Policy initiatives linking biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction 2) Research findings: what have we learnt about biodiversity-poverty linkages? 3) Linking poverty and conservation in practice. The Group

would like to encourage wide participation in this event – from PCLG members and others. Although the deadline for sending proposals to highlight ongoing work has passed (a mix of paper and poster presentations will be included) please contact pclg@iied.org if you are interested in attending. (adapted from PCLG website)