

**Progress Report, Action #12**  
**2018-2020 Bilateral and Multilateral Actions,**  
**Circumpolar Action Plan:**  
**Conservation Strategy for the Polar Bear**



<b>Title</b>	Polar Bear Range States' Trade Working Group Recommendations
<b>Point(s) of contact or Lead Country</b>	Trade Working Group/Canada Caroline Ladanowski, Andrea Gordon
<b>Partner countries</b>	All Range States
<b>Timeline Description as per 2018-2020 implementation table</b>	Carried over from 2015-2017; task expected to be completed in 2018-2020 2-yr cycle
<b>Baseline status as per 10 year table (CAP Annex III)</b>	TWG recommendations approved at 2015 meeting. Work on consistent implementation has not started yet.
<b>Planned Outputs</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use the agreed Terms and Units used by the Range States in their Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) Annual Reports circulated to the CITES Parties for their use in their CITES annual reports.- <b>COMPLETED</b></li> <li>2. Use of the agreed Method to Estimate the Number of Polar Bears in International Trade for Range States when analyzing the CITES trade data. - <b>COMPLETED</b></li> <li>3. Use of the agreed Administrative Procedures to Verify CITES Export Permits for CITES Management Authorities. <b>COMPLETED</b></li> <li>4. Develop a Polar Bear Range States Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN) for information sharing between the Range States. – <b>ongoing</b></li> </ol>

	<p>5. Implementation of agreed tagging procedures for harvested bears and bears taken in defense of life and property – <b>partially completed</b></p> <p>6. Canada will post an online report of Canadian CITES Export Permits Issued for Bears Harvested in Canada annually. - <b>ongoing</b></p>
<b>Modifications made to date</b>	None
<b>Progress Report Date</b>	September 30, 2019

### Progress Report on Activity

Number	Planned Output Description	Output Progress	Output Status
1	Use the agreed Terms and Units used by the Range States in their CITES Annual Reports circulated to the CITES Parties for their use in their CITES annual reports.	<p><b>Canada</b> Canada uses the agreed Terms and Units for polar bear in their CITES annual reports, and as described in CITES Notification 2016/032, including the Annex (<a href="https://cites.org/sites/default/files/notif/E-Notif-2016-032.pdf">https://cites.org/sites/default/files/notif/E-Notif-2016-032.pdf</a>). While it is not possible to have a single set of terms for all polar bear imports, exports, and re-exports due to differing requirements of national legislation, the Range States recommend that CITES Parties use terms and units in their CITES annual reports for the polar bear parts in trade as they are used by each Range State.</p> <p><b>Norway</b> Generally Norway adheres to the last version of the Guidelines for the preparation and submission of CITES annual reports (re-issued January 2017). This version will be used as basis for Norway’s reporting on the year 2016.</p>	<p>All five polar bear Range States are current with their CITES Annual Reports submission.</p> <p><b>Completed in 2017.</b></p>

Number	Planned Output Description	Output Progress	Output Status
		<p>“See for reference – the Report from the Range States Trade Working Group Project: Completed Tasks (part Ai) with full list of appropriate terms”. On terms for scientific samples Norway uses the CITES term specimen (SPE) and always indicate in the description section what kind of sample it is (blood, milk, teeth, hair). Trade in claws is very rare, while claws attached to the rug or skin is only described as 'complete rug'. Norway notes the term bone (BON) for uncarved bones and carving (CAR) for carved bones. Trade in such specimens is rare to and from Norway.</p> <p><b><u>United States</u></b> The United States, to the best extent possible, uses the agreed terms and units for polar bear in its Annual Reports.</p> <p><b><u>Greenland</u></b> Generally Greenland adheres to the recommended terms as described by CITES concerning trade in polar bears (<i>Ursus maritimus</i>) in its annual reports. However, there is currently a voluntarily export ban on polar bears, resulting in export being limited to instances such as households and scientific specimens</p>	
2	Use of the agreed Method to Estimate the Number of Polar Bears in International Trade for Range States when analyzing the CITES trade data.	<p><b><u>Canada</u></b> Canada’s CITES Scientific Authority uses the agreed method to estimate the number of polar bears in international trade, to evaluate conservation impact. The method for analyzing the CITES trade data is described in CITES Notification 2016/032 (<a href="https://cites.org/sites/default/files/notif/E-Notif-2016-032.pdf">https://cites.org/sites/default/files/notif/E-Notif-2016-032.pdf</a>).</p> <p><b><u>Norway</u></b> Norway concurs that the origin of parts of polar bears as in international trade is not necessarily harvested the same year as of export. For analysis of trade volume focus should be on harvest of whole bears and not on samples or parts of a bear. In its reporting Norway has focus on avoiding double reporting (e.g., skin and skull being two specimens). Such permits will,</p>	<p>Agreed upon methodology exists and all CITES Parties were informed.</p> <p><b>Completed in 2017.</b></p>

Number	Planned Output Description	Output Progress	Output Status
		<p>therefore, be adjusted to calculate the actual number individuals traded, while still mentioning what products are traded (in the description section).</p> <p><b><u>United States</u></b>  CITES Parties informed of agreed methodology to estimate the number of polar bears in international trade. CITES Notification 2016/032. No recent trade analyses have been done by the United States.</p> <p><b><u>Greenland</u></b>  At the present time, Greenland does not have the capacity to register exports of CITES listed II animals, therefore Greenland has not performed any trade analyses on number of polar bears in trade to and from Greenland.</p>	
3	Use of the agreed Administrative Procedures to Verify CITES Export Permits for CITES Management Authorities.	<p><b><u>Canada</u></b>  Canada uses and supports other countries' use of the agreed Administrative Procedures for verification of CITES export permits, by following the agreed administrative procedures, including ensuring that Canada's contact information on the CITES website is up to date, and ensuring Management Authorities respond to requests for information within the prescribed time limits, as described in CITES Notification 2016/032 (<a href="https://cites.org/sites/default/files/notif/E-Notif-2016-032.pdf">https://cites.org/sites/default/files/notif/E-Notif-2016-032.pdf</a>).</p> <p><b><u>Norway</u></b>  CITES Management Authority of Norway regularly updates contact information on 'National CITES Authorities' as found on the CITES web pages. This includes police/criminal investigation contact details related to environmental issues.</p> <p>Regarding verification of Polar Bear export permits, the Norwegian CITES MA usually will be able to respond within a week.</p> <p><b><u>Greenland:</u></b></p>	<p>Agreed upon administrative procedures for verification were developed and CITES Parties were informed in CITES Notification 2016/032.</p> <p><b>Completed in 2017.</b></p>

Number	Planned Output Description	Output Progress	Output Status
		<p>The CITES Management Authority of Greenland generally adheres to the agreed administrative procedures as described by CITES concerning trade in polar bears (<i>Ursus maritimus</i>). Greenland will work towards updating the contact and species information on the Greenlandic CITES website: <a href="https://naalakkersuisut.gl/da/Naalakkersuisut/Departementer/Natur-Miljoe/Natur-og-Klimaafdelingen/CITES">https://naalakkersuisut.gl/da/Naalakkersuisut/Departementer/Natur-Miljoe/Natur-og-Klimaafdelingen/CITES</a>.</p>	
4	<p>Develop a Polar Bear Range States WEN for information sharing between the Range States.</p>	<p><b><u>Canada</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In February 2018, the Polar Bear Range States endorsed the idea of creating a « Northern Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN) » following a discussion after a presentation from Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) at the Range States Meeting of the Parties in Fairbanks, Alaska, USA.</li> <li>• Since February 2018, Canada has taken action to create a Working Group to advance towards a comprehensive WEN for information sharing. To date, Working Group members from Canada, the United States, Greenland and Norway have been identified. Through the work of this group, Canada has shared information about the recently-developed “3-pronged approach” for improved tracking bears in trade.</li> <li>• In July 2018, Canada provided to the United States a presentation at the Annual Meeting of the U.S.-Russia Polar Bear Commission (Egvekinot, Chukotka, Russia, July 24, 2018). The presentation gave an overview of what a “Northern Wildlife Enforcement Network” would be including the type of information that members could share, the identification of challenges, opportunities and next steps.</li> <li>• On October 4 2018, Canada organized a “Northern Countries Enforcement Meeting” which took place during the CITES Standing Committee 70 in Sochi, Russia. The following were present: Russia foreign Ministry, Enforcement authorities of Canada (ECCC), Russia (NCB Moscow), United States (US Fish and Wildlife Service) as well</li> </ul>	<p>Progress made, but implementation <b>on-going</b>.</p>

Number	Planned Output Description	Output Progress	Output Status
		<p>as the following CITES Management Authorities: Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Participating countries discussed about priorities, experiences, intelligence, operation thunderstorm results as well as current challenges each countries are facing. Canada underlined to participants that while it was an informal meeting, it hoped that it would lead to a more structured opportunity to share information in the future as there is no other existing forum for discussions on compliance / enforcement issues for northern latitude countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In October 9-13, 2018, during the INTERPOL Wildlife Crime Working Group meetings in Singapore, further conversations occurred highlighting the many similar issues and challenges experienced by the Arctic countries. Through discussions it became clear that many of the “Northern” issues in common go beyond “Arctic” species: glass eels, reptile smuggling, wild American ginseng, illegal harvesting of timber, fishery products, marine mammal ivory, bird egg poaching, etc. The many common repercussions identified included the increase in tourism and incursion of cruise ships into the Arctic, disturbing sensitive habitats and wildlife, as well as the increasing issues with import and introduction of invasive species into the domestic flora.</li> <li>• Further to discussions with members of the network, it was suggested that a collaborative approach with “Northern WEN” members would create Artic Documents outlining best practices could be shared to inspire each country. This could be accomplished through the development and agreement of terms of reference, outlining and identify areas of work.</li> <li>• Progress has been made, but implementation of recommendation is still on-going to create a more structured opportunity to share information in the future. There is a need to continue discussions,</li> </ul>	

Number	Planned Output Description	Output Progress	Output Status
		<p>among law enforcement authorities to share experiences, intelligence and collaborate on transnational investigations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration and sharing of information would encourage and enhance the transmission of law enforcement information between parties, providing opportunities to improve traceability of Northern species in trade and increase sharing of best practices and lead to increased prosecution of offenders.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Norway</u></b> Norway reported that the national wildlife authorities (NEA) act as their national WEN contact.</p> <p><b><u>United States</u></b> The U.S. presented this WEN initiative to Russia at the 2018 U.S.-Russia Bilateral Polar Bear Commission meeting in July 2018.</p> <p>On behalf of USFWS law enforcement, the U.S. invited the Russians to participate in the Wildlife Crime Working Group Meeting in London, October 8-12, 2018, and expressed that the organizers extended their welcome and invitation to have a representative from Russia attend the meeting, and participate in sessions about forming an Arctic WEN. The U.S. also expressed the organizers request for a Russian LE point of contact to whom they could extend a formal invitation to. Further, the U.S. provided Russia with their U.S. LE point of contact: bryan_landry@fws.gov Senior Special Agent, US Fish &amp; Wildlife Service, Office of Law Enforcement, International Operations Unit.</p> <p><b><u>Greenland</u></b> The Ministry of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture (APNN) has been actively participating in telephone meetings as well as e-mail correspondence in the</p>	

Number	Planned Output Description	Output Progress	Output Status
		WEN Working Group. APNN has notified and invited the Ministry of Nature and Environment, which is the CITES management authority in Greenland, to participate in the WEN working group.	
5	Implementation of agreed tagging procedures for harvested bears and bears taken in defense of life and property.	<p><b><u>Canada</u></b>  Canada and other Range States have shared information on their tagging procedures with each other, and this action item is complete. The tagging system in Canada allows for reliable tracing of the exported specimens back to individual harvested bears, and ensures that export of every bear is based on legal and non-detrimental harvest. A detailed description of the tagging procedures used by Canada was provided to other range states in the TWG Final Report.</p> <p><b><u>Norway</u></b>  The Norwegian CITES permitting authority generally wants to see a correlation between specimens and permits, e.g., via tagging or other marking and through better description of specimens on the permits. Tagging will be mainly for products such as whole skins. Norway supports the notion of tag remaining on the specimens from harvest and to the final destination if possible.</p> <p>A new national CITES regulation is now proposed (autumn 2017) and awaits final Government endorsement. This new regulation makes it mandatory for skins of polar bears to be tagged upon import or to be tagged soon after. The tagging requirement is also applicable to polar bear skins inside the country. Locking tags are deemed to be the cheapest method and can be more easily checked. Copies of CITES permits stating tag number (including permits issued by other Parties) or a new NEA issued certificate will also be mandatory. Records of tagged specimens will be kept by NEA.</p> <p><b><u>United States</u></b>  A detailed description of the United States tagging procedures was provided in the TWG Final Report. United States domestic law only allows coastal</p>	<p>Action appears to be completed by Canada and the United States. For Norway, new regulations are pending.</p> <p><b>Partially completed.</b></p>



Number	Planned Output Description	Output Progress	Output Status
		<p>dwelling Alaska Natives to harvest polar bears for subsistence or handicraft purposes. Once harvested Alaska Natives must report and register the hide and skull of the bear with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) or its representative within 30 days, at which time a uniquely numbered tamper-resistant tag is placed on both the hide and skull and that tag must remain with the hide through the tanning process. At time of tagging the Service collects a pre-molar from the harvested animal but no hair is currently collected. Additionally, the Service does not allow the commercial sale or export of raw or tanned hides or mounts of polar bears. Any polar bear taken in defense of human life or illegally harvested must either be transferred to the Service or in the case of an illegal harvest is seized by the Service. Such specimens are tagged by the Service and remain the property of the Service. United States domestic law does not allow a polar bear to be taken (killed) in defense of property.</p> <p><b><u>Greenland</u></b>  Greenland has at the present time no tagging procedure for harvested bears, or bears taken in defense of life and property, as there is currently a voluntarily polar bear export ban in place. When all the sub-populations of polar bears in Greenland have been estimated, the Ministry of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture and the Ministry of Nature and Environment will start a collaborative project to investigate the possibilities of applying a tagging system for all harvested polar bears, in the case of a possible future lift of the voluntarily export ban. Greenland is though exploring the used methods in other polar bear countries where methods are in place.</p>	
6	Canada will post an online report of Canadian CITES Export Permits Issued for Bears Harvested in Canada annually.	<p><b><u>Canada</u></b>  Canada annually publishes a summary of wildlife trade as part of the WAPPRIITA (Canada’s Wildlife Trade Act) annual report. The most recent WAPPRIITA annual report, published in February 2020, can be found here: <a href="https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/convention-international-trade-endangered-species/publications/wild-animal-plant-protection-2018-report">https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/convention-international-trade-endangered-species/publications/wild-animal-plant-protection-2018-report</a>. The</p>	Action still in progress by Canada and under consideration.  <b>In progress.</b>

Number	Planned Output Description	Output Progress	Output Status
		<p>WAPPRIITA annual reports contain a summary of information on polar bear exports. Canada continues to work to make data available in an accurate timely and transparent way that respects legal and privacy concerns, in order to facilitate cooperation and ensure transparency and use of polar bear trade data in an efficient way.</p> <p>Canada also provides an annual trade data report to the CITES Secretariat. The latest published (2015) CITES polar bear trade data can be found here: <a href="http://trade.cites.org/">http://trade.cites.org/</a>. The recommended methods for analyzing these data are outlined in Recommendation #2 of the Circumpolar Action Plan (CAP) Implementation Plan and can also be found in CITES Notification 2016/032 (<a href="https://cites.org/sites/default/files/notif/E-Notif-2016-032.pdf">https://cites.org/sites/default/files/notif/E-Notif-2016-032.pdf</a>).</p> <p><b><u>Norway</u></b></p> <p>Norway reported to monitor trade the focus should be on whole skins and exempt scientific samples or smaller items. There is no regular harvest of polar bear in Norway and a database containing requested information has therefore not been established. The off-take of polar bear in Norway averages one a year and are animals causing danger. These specimens are usually traded on the domestic market.</p>	

### Next Steps

Please describe all future activities that will contribute toward the planned outputs, or ongoing activities related to the action, if any. If the action is complete, simply write “Action complete”.

### Considerations Going Forward -

Considering your experience implementing this CAP Action to date, would you recommend that it be retained as a priority action moving forward (i.e. will it provide a positive conservation benefit for polar bears, and will multilateral collaboration on the action benefit the RS). If not, please provide a short explanation of why. If yes, than please also provide any suggested modifications going

forward to make the action more meaningful in terms of goals/objectives/desired outputs. Please ensure that any modifications result in a clear expected outcome(s) (e.g. a report) and a method for sharing that report (conference, Range State website etc).