Now for some good news from Afghanistan ...
(See page 14.)
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Cover photo: Adult Asiatic black bear and cub photographed by a camera-trap in the central-south part of Nuristan province, Afghanistan, November 2007.
Photo courtesy of WCS Eastern Forest Survey Team.
From the President

Frank T. van Manen  
U.S. Geological Survey  
Dept. of Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries  
274 Ellington PSB  
Knoxville, TN 37996, USA  
Email: vanmanen@utk.edu

Worldwide, many of us work in or near national parks, nature reserves, or other protected areas, often because those areas have been crucial for the protection of bear populations. But we often forget the incredible efforts it took to establish those protections. Without the foresight of extraordinary people that helped establish these areas, I wonder what the status of bears and other large carnivores would be in many places.

I started contemplating all this while watching an excellent 6-part documentary by Ken Burns on America’s National Parks that was broadcast in the U.S. a month ago. John Muir was rightfully credited for the protection of bear populations. But we often forget the incredible efforts it took to establish those protections. Without the foresight of extraordinary people that helped establish these areas, I wonder what the status of bears and other large carnivores would be in many places.

Interestingly, the idea of wildlife protection predates the national park idea. Possibly the first wildlife reserve of sorts, Mihintale Wildlife Sanctuary, was established in Sri Lanka some 2,200 years ago by the king Devanampiya Tissa, who commanded people not to kill animals or cut trees. Nowadays there are many versions of wildlife reserves, ranging from the strictly protected areas accessible only for scientific studies in the former Soviet Union (Zapovedniki) to Game Reserves in many African countries. As we all know, the importance of these reserve systems cannot be overstated. It’s gratifying to see that new reserves are still being established in many countries, and bears often serve as the flagship species. One of the best examples I know of is in China, where efforts to protect and link giant panda habitat areas on a regional scale are truly remarkable. Given the tremendous challenges we face in bear conservation, one can only hope that every country has its John Muir or Devanampiya Tissa.

Electronic Newsletter

Over the past few months, Council has discussed the idea of changing our newsletter to an electronic format. This would be a radical change so we had lengthy discussions weighing the pros and cons. There are several important advantages of providing International Bear News in an electronic format. First, although the newsletter is printed on 100% recycled, post-consumer paper, it will save precious resources and IBA funds. Secondly, it would also lighten some of the workload for our busy editorial team as the printing and shipping stages are eliminated. Finally, we would have more flexibility in terms of format compared with the hardcopy format (e.g., color photos, in-depth articles). Importantly, an electronic newsletter takes much less time to distribute so we could provide more timely articles. For example, Sterling Miller contributed an article in this issue regarding a recent decision by a judge in Montana to relist the grizzly bear in the Yellowstone Ecosystem as threatened under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. This is very much a developing issue and a good example of how an electronic newsletter could provide members with more up-to-date information.

However, there are also some disadvantages to an electronic newsletter: the biggest concern is that people may be less likely to actually read an electronic newsletter. Maybe I’m more old-fashioned than I want to admit but I like sitting down with a delicious home-made espresso and taking time to read the newsletter, something I have yet to do with any electronic newsletter. Of course, you always have the option of printing the ‘e-newsletter’ but that defeats the purpose.

Many of these arguments were discussed and Council, together with the IBN editorial team, decided to go to a ‘hybrid’ format by using an electronic format for the winter (February) issue. If deemed successful we may extend this to the summer issue as well but keep the spring and fall issues in a hardcopy format. Thus, our first e-newsletter is scheduled for February 2010. This is more or less the first step in moving to a multi-format approach to deliver news and features to IBA members (other ideas include the use of ‘e-blasts’ for time-sensitive announcements). We established a committee to come up with an effective format and design: Janissa Balcomb (Layout Editor), Andreas Zedrosser (Council), Diana Doan-Crider (Secretary), and myself. Please feel free to provide feedback to this committee so that we can incorporate your ideas in our first e-newsletter. After the February newsletter is published, we will conduct a survey to determine if you like the new format and to solicit your ideas for improvement.

Georgia Conference

Mark your calendars for the Georgia IBA conference in 16–22 May!! It may seem like this is still a long time away, but you should start planning soon. Although this conference had to be postponed to provide more time for fundraising after the political conflicts, those concerns have now been addressed. The registration fees have been lowered as well. I strongly urge you to attend the conference. This is a critical conference for bear conservation in this region that represents a crossroads between the East
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and the West. NOTE: the deadlines for submission of oral and poster presentations have been changed to 31 December 31, 2009. Important details are provided elsewhere in this newsletter as well as the conference website: http://www.nacres.org/bearconference/.

Soliciting Bids for the Eurasian Conference

Speaking of conferences, we are now seeking bids for the next Eurasian conference. Conference bids should be submitted by 1 May 2010 so that Council can discuss and vote on the location of the Eurasian conference in Tbilisi, Georgia. Please contact me if you have any questions regarding conference bids or if you know of key individuals or organizations eager to host a conference.

Conference Scheduling Committee

A number of members have commented in recent years that some North American members may have started feeling somewhat disconnected from IBA. This topic was brought to Council’s attention recently, which was precipitated by the report of the Western Black Bear Workshop in the August issue of International Bear News. This workshop was well attended and was a great success but some thought that workshop may have started feeling somewhat disconnected from IBA. This committee consists of Mike Vaughan (Committee Chair), who recently retired, Piero Genovesi, Alexandros Karamanlidis, Jeff Stetz, Andreas Zedrosser, Marty Obbard, and Sterling Miller. This committee will provide Council with recommendations and guidelines so that we can address this issue. Please feel free to share your thoughts on this topic with any members of this committee.

Marketing Class Project

Based on the membership survey we conducted earlier this year, it was evident that many of you thought we should try to raise our profile as a non-profit, science-based organization and, in the process, improve our ability to raise funds for our Bear Conservation Fund. I’m taking a first small step in this by working with a graduate class at the University of Tennessee’s Retail and Consumer Sciences program. The graduate students will use IBA as a case study for a class project to make recommendations as to how we could improve our fundraising. These recommendations may cover anything from improving our ability to solicit donations through the website to various retailing options. The class project should be finished by the end of this year so look for more online information on this in the February newsletter.

Online Membership Renewal

... almost there!

This has taken quite a bit longer than we envisioned but we are working on the final iterations of the online membership page. You may have already received an e-mail notice regarding this new feature by the time you receive this newsletter. So no more faxing or sending a check, renew your membership online and while you’re at it, donate a gift membership for someone with limited resources!

Experience and Exchange Grants

2010 Experience And Exchange Grant Proposals Due

1 December

Please note that E&E grant proposals have a new, earlier deadline. Proposals for 2010 grants are due on 1 December (coinciding with the new deadline for Research and Conservation grants).

E&E grants provide travel funds to facilitate on-site working exchanges between project personnel. These exchanges provide opportunities for hands-on training and for forging ongoing partnerships between projects for training, collaboration, advice, and information exchange. Grantees receive up to $1500 USD, primarily for travel expenses, and the host project is expected to provide (or find support for) living expenses for the visiting biologist. Exchanges typically are designed to last several weeks to several months.

For more information and for application instructions, visit the IBA website at www.bearbiology.com or contact Ole Jakob Sørensen, Chair, at Ole.J.Sorensen@hint.no.
Online Membership is Here!

www.bearbiology.com

International Association for Bear Research & Management
IUCN Bear Specialist Group

Join IBA  Give to Bear Conservation  What's New
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Change in Proposal Submission Deadline

Fred Dean, Committee Chair
Research and Conservation Grants
Email: deansfs@alaska.net

As we announced in the last issue of the News, the deadline for submission of proposals for grants has been changed to midnight on 1 December. This is true for both Experience and Exchange Grants and Research and Conservation Grants. If you did not see the explanation in the last issue, please take a look at it. A revised version of the application form for R&C grants has been posted on the Website.

For anyone who may need to apply for a waiver of overhead that is often charged against grants, especially by universities, there is a PDF copy of a letter on IBA letterhead explaining the R&C Grant Committee’s position with respect to overhead. This can be downloaded if needed. We recognize that overhead charges are generally legitimate; however in the case of IBA’s small grants we cannot support them. Applicants should incorporate the costs of items or services that are often covered by overhead in the proposal budget as identifiable expenses to the greatest extent possible.

Please note that I appreciate the friendly thoughts several people have had in extending invitations to join in web-based interactions. I am not trying to be unfriendly by not responding to these invitations, but I am not planning to setup a Facebook or other personal Web page or participate in game sites on the Web. I have enough trouble keeping up with my “to do list” as it is. I also feel that putting personal information into such public forums may increase the chances of identity theft (which I have experienced without that sort of assistance). I will communicate with IBA grantees and potential applicants to the best of my ability, but please use normal e-mail or the telephone.

Bear Conservation Fund

Special thanks to the Bear Conservation Fund’s newest donor, Gabe Huang. We recently received the following letter from Gabe:

"Dear BCF, I’m Gabe and I’m 4 year old. I love bers. My favorit bears are Kodiaks, Alaskin Brown Bear and Polar Bear!! Here is some money to help the bers.”

Enclosed was $5 USD he had saved.

It is at this time of year that we ask IBA members and others to give to the Bear Conservation Fund, to support IBA’s grants programs. If Gabe can come up with a donation, maybe we can each do so, too. Donate online at: www.bearbiology.com.
Opinion

Court Orders
Yellowstone’s
Grizzlies Back on
the Endangered
Species List

Sterling Miller
National Wildlife Federation
Email: millers@nwf.org

On Sept. 21st, District Court Judge Donald Malloy for the State of Montana ordered the grizzly (brown) bears in and surrounding Yellowstone National Park back on to the list of endangered species under the US Endangered Species Act (ESA). Grizzly bears were listed under the ESA in 1975. Subsequently, following a collaborative recovery effort between federal, state, county, and tribal natural resource management agencies, assisted by some conservation organizations, the US Fish and Wildlife Service removed the grizzlies in the Yellowstone area from protection under the ESA and returned them to management by the states of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho on 29 March, 2007 (delisting rule in the Federal Register Vol. 72, No. 60, 50CFR Part 17:14866-14938). The Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Inc. filed suit to overturn the delisting decision in Judge Malloy’s court and he found in favor of their arguments. Some other conservation organizations, including the National Wildlife Federation, supported the delisting decision.

Additional litigation on the same issue is still awaiting a decision by a District Court Judge in Idaho; this judge may agree with Judge Malloy, disagree with him, or defer making a decision since Judge Malloy’s decision included areas outside of Montana. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has not decided whether to appeal Judge Malloy’s decision, to revise its delisting rule in light of Malloy’s concerns, or some other possible responses. Regardless, the approximately 600 grizzly bears in Yellowstone are once again subject to federal management under the ESA rather than state management under the state management plans that formed part of the delisting rule (these and additional information are available at: http://www.igbconline.org/html/y-delisting.html). Other grizzly bear populations south of Canada remain listed and were unaffected by either the 2007 delisting or the recent ruling by Judge Malloy.

Judge Malloy’s decision did not disagree with the Fish and Wildlife Service that all of the recovery criterion in the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan had been achieved. He found, however, that the state and federal plans for management of the delisted population in Yellowstone were inadequate to assure that the species in this area would not decline because of changes in one of the important foods that might occur because of climate change and other factors. In its delisting rule, the FWS had maintained that impacts of the possible loss of one food (whitebark pine nuts) were unknown because grizzly bears were generalist species, because grizzly bear populations continued to grow at 4-7% per year in the Yellowstone ecosystem over the past 15 years even as whitebark has declined during the same time period. Judge Malloy criticized these findings as not based on the “best available science” with respect to whitebark pine, a contention with which the Fish and Wildlife Service and others strongly disagreed. Judge Malloy was also critical of the delisting rule because the proposed management regimes for delisted bears by state and federal agencies was “unenforceable and non-binding” and did not assure that the species might again need to be relisted. The judge disagreed that the monitoring grizzly bear numbers, grizzly bear foods, grizzly bear mortalities, and grizzly bear reproduction followed by adaptive management designed to address problems that might eventuate constituted “adequate regulatory mechanisms”. He said “these monitoring requirements are unenforceable and do not protect the grizzly bear population” because they “...offer only a plan or promises of future action” and do not “compel” agency actions. He faulted both the federal and state government plans for failing to compel specific actions.

In his decision, Judge Malloy deferred to the USFWS’s expertise on the issue of whether there was insufficient genetic diversity in the isolated Yellowstone population to avoid genetic problems. He also deferred to the FWS that the finding that the Yellowstone grizzly population did not represent a “distinct population segment” (a point not challenged by the Plaintiff in his case) or that delisting wasn’t appropriate because bears were not recovered in a significant portion of their former range (which would include New Mexico and California).
A Swath of Bears

Dave Garshelis
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Grand Rapids, MN 55744, USA
Email: dave.garshelis@dnr.state.mn.us

Bruce McLellan
British Columbia Ministry of Forests
Darcy, BC V0N 3K0, Canada
Email: bruce.mcelellan@gov.bc.ca

Co-chairs Bear Specialist Group

Picture in your mind this swath of bear habitat (or consult a map, if your geography isn’t too good): starting in the Pyrenees Mountains between France and Spain, move eastward (and slightly south) across Italy, Greece, and Turkey, and then through Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and into peninsular India. This narrow slice of the Earth contains a diverse array of habitats, harbors 3 species of bears, and exhibits a host of “classic” conservation issues. BSG members are working hard to resolve these issues in all of these countries.

The following group of articles, from five of the countries intersected by this swath, provides a flavor for the extraordinary diversity of this conservation work. No two projects are the same, but they all deal with one or more of the following issues: small population size, population fragmentation, conflicts with (impacts on) humans, unsustainable human-caused mortality, and basic problems related to uncertainty about population status, future prospects, and the best ways to move forward. The articles relate high-level, wide-ranging efforts by professionals, including population augmentation, DNA hair-snaring, GPS-collaring, and camera-trapping, to a local landowner’s efforts to put in a water hole for thirsty bears. Not all of these efforts were as successful as hoped, but from each a greater understanding was achieved, setting the stage for future improvements.

Think also about the variety of human cultures occupying this swath of land. Despite differences in language, religion, customs, land use, economy, governmental structure, political strife, etc., local people are facing remarkably similar issues with bears, and bears are facing similar issues with people, mainly lack of space and lack of tolerance.

Put on your boots (sneakers, sandals, clogs, whatever), and enjoy the tour.

Brown Bear Conservation in France: four years after the translocation of five bears from Slovenia

Frédéric Decaluwe
Pierre-Yves Quenette
ONCFS, Equipe technique ours
Impasse de la Chapelle 31800
Villeneuve de Rivière, France
Email: frederic.decaluwe@oncfs.gouv.fr
pierre-yves.quenette@oncfs.gouv.fr
Tel: +33 / (0)5.62.00.81.08

Near extinction in 1995 with only 5 or 6 individuals, the brown bear population in the French Pyrenees was augmented in 1996 and 1997 with the release of 2 females and 1 male from Slovenia. In 2005, the population was estimated at 14 to 18 individuals distributed among 3 distinct core areas. Following a period of consultation with local actors and viability analyses, the Ministry in charge of ecology set up a restoration plan for the 2006–2009 period. This included among other concrete actions, the reintroduction of 4 Slovenian females and 1 male equipped with GPS/GSM collars during 2006. The National Office of Game and Wildlife (ONCFS) was in charge of the technical aspects of the translocation and monitoring across the French Pyrenees. Today, as the restoration plan is coming to an end, it is time to assess the results of this operation.

This synthesis reports on the status of the bear population in the French Pyrenees through trends in bear numbers and distribution, within a sociopolitical context.

Trends in Population Size

Each year we estimate the minimum number of individuals, using a combination of data sources: DNA from hair traps, DNA from opportunistically-collected scats, collared bears, distinguishing characteristics of observed or photographed bears, and measurements of tracks (from which we can discern size classes). The DNA and collared bears also provide information on sex composition. The following information relates only to bears on the French side of the Pyrenees, although the bears regularly move across the international border, and both Spain and Andorra were involved in the decisions to augment this population.

Among the 4 adult females released in the central Pyrenees, 2 died between 2006 and 2007. One of them was fatally injured from a fall 4 months after the release, and the other was accidentally run over by 2 cars. Only 1 of the females (Hvala) reproduced during the period evaluated. It gave birth to a litter of 2 female cubs during the winter of 2006–2007, and to a second litter of 2 cubs during the winter of 2008–2009. The other living female (Sarousse) has not yet produced any cubs.

Taking into account released individuals, reproduction, and mortalities, minimum numbers of bears yearly detected has remained quite stable. At the end of 2008, 4 male individuals were estimated to occupy the western core, the central core was composed of at least 9 animals (including at least 4 adult females),
and the eastern core contained at least 3 individuals, at least 2 of which were males. Minimum total numbers of individuals detected across the Pyrenees were on the order of 15 to 16 individuals a year, including 13 on the French side, distributed over a large mountainous area.

**Movements and Distribution**

The individuals released in 2006 displayed an exploratory phase of variable intensity and duration. The male Balou and the female Franska had home ranges of 1,500 km² and 1,800 km² (minimum convex polygons) respectively, whereas the 3 other individuals apparently settled faster, as judged by their more compact home ranges (450–900 km²). Of note, Balou and Sarousse were translocated after they were recaptured due to problems with their radio-collars. Balou has moved long distances toward the east during 3 consecutive years, suggesting that he has not settled yet.

The area covered by the whole population on the French side is estimated to be about 5,000 km² annually, with a distinct separation between cores areas. Although the total area used each year by brown bears in the French Pyrenees is quite stable, the portions actually used change year to year, so the cumulated area of use, from 2004 to 2008 (9,000 km²), is nearly twice the annual area of occupancy. Thus, as bears move into new areas, there are increased chances for interactions between bears and human activities.

**Socio-political Context**

As for many large carnivores, interactions between human activities and the bear population are very important in the acceptance of a conservation program for this species in the Pyrenees. The released bears, in particular, are viewed by many as potentially more prone to cause conflicts with livestock-rearing because they move about more (until settled), they are considered by local people to be more dangerous (because they come from Slovenia), and they can be tracked with telemetry, so a high proportion of their conflicts can be recorded.

The majority of Pyrenean livestock breeders are still strongly opposed to bear presence, a view supported by most local councilors. Sporadic predation events regularly stir up the situation; this was certainly the case when the bear Franska killed about 130 sheep in 3 months during the summer pasture season of 2007. Even more, opposition to bears has been organized with the creation of several departmental associations with media presence.

Wild boar and large ungulate hunters have long been favorable or at least neutral to the issue, and have even participated in moni-
toring activities across the massif. One federation, however, withdrew from the program prior to the 2006 releases. In addition, a complaint was made by some nature protection associations against the French State, for a lack of specific hunting regulations within bear distribution (i.e., regulations to reduce chances of bears being inadvertently shot). This has increased the complexity of the situation. Indeed, in 2008, the male Balou was injured on its leg by a hunting accident on a boar drive hunt.

Working groups are underway to try to improve the situation with hunters. However, stakeholder representatives of livestock breeders are still opposed to any discussion of the issues.

Conclusions and Conservation Implications

Results of the genetic analyses from 2008 enabled us to update the 1996 population genealogy and to monitor indirectly those bears not equipped with radio transmitters. No new genotype has been identified since 2004, except Hvala’s offspring, and the number of individuals detected with certainty remained stable. Moreover, no female has been detected in the western and eastern cores. The western core, which still comprises 1 to 2 individuals of native Pyrenean stock, is therefore near extinction without reinforcement of individuals from elsewhere.

Given the small number of bears that were released, it is not altogether surprising that the augmentation did not immediately and significantly boost the population size. That of the females were killed, 1 has not yet reproduced, and the 1 male moved out of the area occupied by females are certainly setbacks. However, 1 female has added 4 bears to this small population and the other is expected to produce sometime in the near future.

Two issues still require more work. First, we suggest the implementation of more consistent monitoring methods on each side of the border to make more accurate assessments of trends in this cross-border population. Second, we believe that more efforts should be directed toward social acceptance of the species in the Pyrenean valleys, to allow the population to expand numerically and geographically.

References and Further Reading
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Egnatia Highway: connecting people, fragmenting bear habitat and populations

Charilaos Pilidis
N.G.O “CALLISTO”
123, Mitropoleos St.
Thessaloniki, Greece 54621
& Mammal Research Unit
School of Biological Sciences
University of Bristol
Email: pilides@hotmail.com

Alexis Giannakopoulos, and Yorgos Mertzanis
N.G.O “CALLISTO”
123, Mitropoleos St.
Thessaloniki, Greece 54621

Greece holds the southernmost populations of brown bears in Europe with a distribution split into two
distinct nuclei, covering a total range of 16,500 km². Over the past two decades, intensive conservation actions directed at this species at a range scale have been implemented by NGOs. As an indication of success, bears have recently been observed outside their known distribution. While this is encouraging and may well indicate a possible re-colonisation of their historical range, bears have been facing a new threat due to the rapid development of the transportation infrastructure that can be observed throughout the country. An example of such development is Via Egnatia, a 680-km long, fenced highway, which is part of the trans-European highway network (TENT). The highway, now fully operational, connecting the eastern and western parts of the country, leaving a permanent effect on the landscape, and threatening to further fragment bear distribution into several sub-populations. This development has lead to a direct increase in bear mortality. Over the past two years 9 bears have been killed in road traffic accidents. We aim to investigate the unseen effects of this development in terms of fragmentation and viability of bear sub-populations, and provide an update on the current conservation status of bears in Greece. Our specific objectives are to:

- Collect hair and scat samples representatively across the brown bear distribution in Greece, and use genetic methods to investigate population structure and diversity.
- Assess the barrier effect of the fenced Egnatia Highway on the movements and gene flow of bears.
- Identify the major recolonisation routes that need to be preserved, and establish guidelines to ensure habitat connectivity.

The project is being conducted in collaboration with the Mammal Research Unit of the University of Bristol, and with the valuable support from Euronatur. We hope to contribute significantly to knowledge...
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on the genetics of Europe’s largest carnivore. The project falls under a larger framework of activities targeting bear conservation and the minimisation of ecological impacts of large-scale infrastructure on wildlife. The intention is to utilise the results of the project toward the update and further development of the existing National Bear Action Plan.

Brown Bear Research Gets a Boost in Turkey with GPS Collars

Özgün Emre Can
John Beecham
Eray Çağlayan
Emin Nasuhoğlu
Turkish Nature Association & Carnivore Initiative for Turkey
Taner Hatipoğlu
Hasan Emir
Fehmi Arıkan
Turkish Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Email contact: emre.can@dogadernegi.org

The Turkish Nature Association (Doga Dernegi-DD) and the Turkish Ministry of Environment and Forestry signed a protocol in 2008 to become official partners in all aspects of brown bear research and management in Turkey. The Brown Bear Research and Conservation Project, directed by DD, is funded by the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) with support from the Turkish Ministry of Environment and Forestry. The project is focused on five levels of human–brown bear conflicts in Turkey using a holistic approach:

1. Conducting research to understand the reasons and mechanisms of the conflict,
2. Implementing and testing pilot damage prevention techniques, such as electric fences to protect orchards and crops, and elevated platforms to protect apiaries in major human–bear conflict areas,
3. Increasing public awareness of human–bear conflicts by working with Turkish media,
4. Training teachers and children by implementing a bear education program specifically designed for Turkey,
5. Working for brown bear habitat restoration, gathering data on the conflict at the national scale, and identifying the gaps in the current wildlife legislation related to bear management in Turkey.

Within the framework of the Brown Bear Research and Conservation Project, we successfully trapped a total of 5 bears in Artvin (August 2008) and Kastamonu (June 2009).
The team captured 2 brown bears (4 year-old 110-kg male, and 8 year-old 140-kg male) in Artvin province and three bears (3 year-old 65-kg male, 7 year-old 80-kg female, and a 12 year-old 170-kg male) in Kastamonu province using Aldrich foot snares. Trap sites were baited with animal by-products purchased from local outlets. Captured bears were immobilized with intramuscular injections of Zoletil and Medetomidine using a Dan-inject capture rifle. Once immobilized, the bear's physiological condition was monitored, while body measurements recorded and the bears were fitted with GPS-GSM collars manufactured by either Vectronics Aerospace (Germany) or Lotek (Canada). Leather spacers were placed on all collars as a backup to the electronically programmed collar release mechanism. The GSM systems of the GPS collars are not currently working due to a technical issue with the network in Turkey, but data are being stored in the collars.

The project partners will continue working on human–bear conflicts at the national level in 2010 and will implement a capacity building and training program for universities and local wildlife authorities.
The Asiatic Black Bear Still Survives in Nuristan, Afghanistan

Stephane Ostrowski
Peter Zahler
Alex Dehgan
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Peter Smallwood

Wildlife Conservation Society
Email contact: sostrowski@wcs.org

Although data on population sizes and trends are lacking for the Asiatic black bear (*Ursus thibetanus*) across great swathes of Asia, the documentation of widespread illegal killing – both retaliatory and especially for trade in parts for traditional medicines – combined with loss of habitat, support the conclusion that this species is likely declining in most parts of its range (IUCN 2008). Worldwide the species is listed as vulnerable.

Little recent information exists about Asiatic black bears in western Asia (Gutleb and Ziaie 1999, Ahmadzadeh et al. 2008) and virtually nothing concerning its status in Afghanistan. Habibi (2003) declared the species threatened in the country based on observations made in the late 1970s and claimed that indiscriminate hunting had probably depleted the population in large parts of its range. Once occurring across most of eastern Afghanistan, nowadays it is said to subsist only in isolated pockets of forests in remote parts of the eastern provinces. Based on these indications, on the occasional occurrence of cubs for sale in eastern Afghanistan and on the presence of four young adult specimens at the Kabul zoo, allegedly procured as cubs from the central part of Nuristan province, in December 2006, the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) launched a series of wildlife surveys to detect the presence of Asiatic black bears in south-central Nuristan on the border with Kunar province (see map). The study was conducted in the framework of the WCS Biodiversity Conservation Program, a wider conservation initiative in Afghanistan implemented by WCS and funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Between December 2007 and December 2008, evidence of the Asiatic black bear was found in Nuristan at altitudes ranging from 1,700 to 2,600 m, consisting of 19 direct sightings and numerous scats and tracks. Using camera traps, the species was photographed on 44 occasions during November and December 2007 in deciduous, coniferous and evergreen oak forests.

Black bears appeared widespread in the study site, and although we still lack actual data on their abundance, survey teams composed of local people considered them numerous. Paradoxically, this status may result from habitat degradation in adjacent districts. In Nuristan the species certainly suffers habitat loss in the east of the province, which has experienced a dramatic decline of its forested range in recent years due to illegal logging.
it is therefore possible that central Nuristan, still relatively preserved from illegal logging, has received in recent years the input of immigrant animals from neighboring areas where forests have vanished. Alternatively, overall habitat degradation may be forcing the few remaining bears into more frequent contact with local people, resulting in the perception of abundance.

In the survey site, the Asiatic black bear currently suffers retaliatory killings for its predation on livestock and raiding crops (Drs Ali and Rita, pers. obs.). Besides the current lack of security and armed conflict in the region, which renders short-term conservation measures difficult to implement on the ground, major long-term challenges for the successful conservation of the Asiatic black bear in central Nuristan include continued habitat loss and fragmentation, insufficient natural resource management regimes at the local level, little to no management at the central level, and the increasing pressure of illegal armed loggers.
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Ecological Studies on the Asiatic Black Bear (*Ursus thibetanus*) at Dachigam National Park, Kashmir - an Update
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The Kashmir Valley in the Jammu and Kashmir State of India has become a hot spot for bear–human conflicts — as a result, both the bears and humans have become victims. The persistence of the situation can be a major problem for the locals and in turn for the conservation of black bears in this region. Keeping this in view, the Wildlife Institute of India (WII), Dehradun, initiated a research project during 2007 to understand the ecology, behaviour and conflict issues related to Asiatic black bears (see *IBN* May 2008 16:-3). The following is an update of the progress of field research activities carried out under this project.

Our main study site was in the Lower Dachigam area (ca. 90 km²) of Dachigam National Park, Kashmir. We assessed bear–human conflicts using questionnaire surveys (*n* = 314) in the surrounding areas from June 2007 to July 2009. We divided our intensive study area into 23 grids of 2 x 2 km to assess the distribution, relative abundance and habitat use by black bears. In each grid we placed one hair and camera trap station, and marked random transects (*n* = 10) or marked existing natural trails (*n* = 3), where we checked for bear sign. These transects and trails covered all the major habitats of black bears in the study area. In the last two years, we recorded 89 black bear sightings, 234 scats, 101 feeding signs and 144 other signs along these transects and trails. Based on these sightings and signs, we found that the black bear distribution in Lower Dachigam was clumped in riverine and lower temperate habitats during summer, but was uniform during spring and autumn. Encounter rates varied by season: highest in summer (1.14 sign or sightings/km), followed by autumn (1.01), spring (0.52) and winter (0.18), apparently related to movements of bears in and out of the study area.

We collected 78 hair samples, which will be used to estimate population size. We obtained 399 bear photo captures, with capture rates for different camera traps ranging from 1.9 to 8.6 photos/100 trap-days. Capture rate was highest in summer, followed by autumn, spring and winter. Time stamps on camera trap photos indicated that the black bears were crepuscular in all seasons except spring, when they were mostly nocturnal.

We observed a significant difference in the use of habitats by black bears in different seasons: most signs were in riverine and oak plantation habitats in all seasons, and the fewest signs were in temperate grasslands. We opportunistically observed bears feeding (*n* = 67) and also collected and analysed scats (*n* = 234). Results indicated that the diet was dominated by herbs and grasses (54%) during spring, and mostly fruits during summer (72%) and autumn (75%).
Major black bear–human conflicts included crop and livestock depre-
dations, and human attacks. Crop
depredation (apple, cherry, walnut
and maize) resulted in significant
economic losses for some farmers.
The duration of crop damage in the
Central Wildlife Division was longer
than the South Wildlife Division be-
because of changes in cropping patterns
in the recent past. Villagers in the
Central Division have started growing
cherry in place of apple because of its
high economic value.

Local villagers used different crop
protection measures against black
bear crop damage. About 80% used
the traditional method of drumming
empty metal containers. About 21%
had used an animal-proof cement
wall, which was found to be effective
but was unaffordable to many.

Most bear attacks occurred during
summer at dawn or dusk, when people
were either going to or returning from
crop fields and orchards. About 56% of
people who had encountered a bear ($n$
= 68) reported that they tried to stay
calm and move away. About 10% acted
in a risky manner by chasing the bear
and not giving it an adequate escape
route. Notably, 54% of the encounters
resulted in human injury, either when
a bear charged a human or when a
human chased a bear.

Many instances occurred when the
Department of Wildlife Protection
“rescued” bears from conflict areas
(captured and released back into the
park). In one such case, we fitted a
GPS-collar on a bear rescued from
Danihama village. It remained near
where it was released in the park for
20 days, but then moved outside and
get involved in conflicts again. After
54 days, the bear was rescued from
the same village from where it was
first rescued. The current practice
of rescuing bears from conflict areas
and releasing them into bear habitats
may not be an effective option for
managing bear–human conflicts in
the region.

We suggested and initiated other
measures to mitigate black bear–hu-
man conflicts in the area. These
include: development of a spatio-tem-
poral database of conflicts, awareness
program for local villagers, support
and strengthening of local traditional
protection measures (e.g., drumming
of empty metal containers, barbed
wire fencing, guard dogs, scarecrows),
improvement of cattle sheds (e.g.,
replacement of wooden doors with
iron doors), and marking of rescued
animals by color-coded collars or
ear tags to monitor their movement
patterns. We plan to continue our re-
search on black bears during the next
two years and have plans to employ
ARGOS collars to aid in understand-
ing habitat utilization, activity, and
movement patterns.
Sloth Bear – Human Conflict Mitigation Effort: wetland creation
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Human encroachment and fragmentation of wild lands outside of the national park system in India continue to take their toll on wildlife populations. Generally larger mammals, such as the sloth bear, are more susceptible to these forces that may isolate small populations, which are then more likely to disappear due to human activities (i.e. poaching), lack of resources, or stochastic events. Though sloth bears do have the benefit of generally smaller home ranges than similar sized bears (Joshi et al. 1995, Ratnayeke 2007), and it has been postulated that myrmecophagous mammals are better able to survive in fragmented habitat (Abensperg-Traun 1991), fragmentation and loss of habitat are still perhaps the greatest threat to sloth bear existence. Fragmented forests bring bears into more contact, and thereby conflict, with humans. These conflicts can diminish human tolerance for the animals in these isolated pockets of habitat.

Joshi, et al (1995) gave two potential reasons for the high survival rate of sloth bears in Royal Chitwan National Park: 1) the limited size of sloth bear home range size, which helps them to better avoid encounters with humans, and 2) the fact that the National Park provides all of the bears’ resource needs, which tends to keep the bears inside the protected area. However, in fragmented forest areas sloth bears are often forced into human-occupied areas in order to attain needed resources, and their home ranges may be significantly larger.

The Benekal Reserve Forest in the Koppal district of the State of Karnataka, near Hampi (see figure), is still home to sloth bears, as well as other large predators including leopards and wolves. However, the area is quite fragmented and is surrounded by farming and other various legal and non-legal commercial interests, such as mining and wood gathering. These human activities sometimes lead to human–wildlife conflicts. Additionally, bears are often drawn outside the reserve forest for resources — mainly water (a tributary of the Tungabhadra River as well as irrigation canals surround much of the area) and food (privately owned farmlands border the area). Conflicts often take place at dusk when the primarily nocturnal bears are awake, and the farmers have not yet gone home for the evening, or in the early morning.

Within one canyon area (see figure), there were 6 documented bear attacks in 2006 and 2007. All of these attacks took place in the evening or during the night. The victims included farmers, a cattle shepherd, and a foreign tourist who was rock climbing and had been warned about bear activity in the area. The rock climber was attacked by a mother bear and her two cubs. The wounds to all the victims were considered minor, except one local man who received 24 stitches to the head. The canyon area in which these attacks took place originates in the Benekal Reserve Forest, but then crosses through undeveloped protected private land, and finally through farmland before butting up against the canal. The habitat in this area is rocky, scrub forest and during the summer things can get quite dry, thereby making water sources a focal point for bears. The journey to water takes bears straight into human-occupied territory.

A private landowner and wildlife enthusiast aware of these human–bear conflicts wondered if providing a water source further inland away from the farms would help to reduce conflicts with sloth bears. This landowner owns land that borders the reserve forest on one side and private farmlands on the other side. Near

Benekal Reserve Forest, Mallapur and farmlands. “Bear Path” is the canyon bottom used as a travel corridor by local bears.
his modest field station was a small natural spring which he thought could potentially be turned into a small wetland. The fragmented habitat of this area, although offering many potential day resting sites in the form of rock crevices and an adequate amount of natural food, does not offer much water, especially in the dry season. The bears had to cross into agricultural areas to get to water.

The landowner pitched the idea of creating a wetland to some visiting wetland specialists. The hope was that a water source away from human activity might give the bears an alternative to crossing through active farmlands. Before the 2008 summer arrived, a new wetland area had been built (see photo). Shortly after building the wetland, bears were observed drinking at this newly developed waterhole. Notably, no bear attacks have occurred in this valley since 2007.

There are many other variables that could also account for the lack of attacks during this time, and we recognize that bears will still be drawn to the surrounding farmlands for food, such as groundnut, corn, paddy (*Oryza sativum*), and bajra (*Pennisetum glaucum*), and even for water, especially if the wetland dries up for part of the year. But certainly the option of having a watering hole farther away from human activity may help to reduce human–bear conflict in this canyon in the future. The private landowner is also planting fruit trees on his land to increase the amount of food available to bears. Although this may be only a small bandage on a very large problem, it does show that there are potentially creative solutions to bear–human conflicts that can make a difference for the safety of people and bears alike.
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Greece-Egnatia Highway: fence failure makes it a deadly barrier for brown bears
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Spring and Summer 2009 have been a rather dark period for bears trying to cross the 37 km stretch of Egnatia highway cutting trough the Pindos bear population (in northwest Greece). After a 7-year monitoring and impact assessment, this most controversial and brand new part of the Egnatia highway, was recently inaugurated by the Prime Minister and opened to traffic in late May 2009. The inauguration occurred despite the fencing being far from meeting the appropriate bear proof standards. With a fence height of 1.60m, a depth of hardly 30-40 cm into the ground and a conventional mesh it was only a question of time for the first bear traffic fatality to occur.

Indeed on 21 June and only 3 weeks after the highway inauguration, a 187 kg adult male bear attempted a highway crossing at 10:30 a.m. resulting in a serious collision with a car passing at full speed. Despite the efforts of Callisto’s team of veterinarians, the bear died two hours after it was hit. The huge media boom that resulted urged the Minister of Environment, Land Planning and Public Works to call all involved parties for an extraordinary meeting in order to take urgent measures. Fence replacement had ultimately become a priority!

Three months later a new fence was under construction but this did not prevent a second more serious bear traffic accident to occur on 3 September 2009, in the old fenced part of the highway, involving a car and two heavy trucks. Miraculously, there were no human victims but the bear was not so lucky. Callisto, in cooperation with Arcturos, has intensified pressure on the company supervising highway construction (EGNATIA ODOS A.E) to speed up installation of the new fence and to fully comply with standard procedures; including a bend at the top of the fence and two lines of electric wire. With seven bear traffic accidents, of which six were fatal, over the last year and a half, highways appear to be a seriously growing threat to the bear population in the country!
Sun Bear Education Center in East Kalimantan
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In February 2009, a new sun bear education exhibit was opened in East Kalimantan, Indonesian Borneo. This sun bear education exhibit is part of an environmental education center near Balikpapan municipality, which has adopted the sun bear as its mascot several years ago. The education center also houses 5 confiscated sun bears in a natural enclosure. Since its opening in February 2006 close to 100,000 Indonesians have visited the education center to see the sun bears in their semi-natural habitat. The new sun bear education exhibit has proven highly popular with local schools which visit the center weekly.

The sun bear education exhibit starts off with an introduction to all bear species in the world, after which interactive information is featured about the sun bears' physical characteristics, ecology, conservation and research, and human-bear interactions. The sun bear education exhibit is a first of its kind in the region, and aims to educate local Indonesians in order to generate wider local support for sun bear and habitat conservation. The website of the exhibit is www.beruangmadu.org/index.php?page=education-exhibits.

continued on page 22
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**Sun bear ‘translocation’ in East Kalimantan**

In April this year, a young sun bear cub was handed over to the sun bear education center in East Kalimantan. As there was no long-term place for this cub in the education center, it was decided to arrange for a monitored release of this young bear in a remote protection forest in the Wehea region in East Kalimantan. In May, several local Dayak staff were trained in methodology for carrying out sun bear sign transects, and a small sleeping cage was built for the sun bear in the forest. Further training was given on walking the small cub in the forest and on taking behavioral observations, as well as collection of food samples. If all goes well, the sun bear will be fitted with a radio-collar when it is large enough to continue monitoring in order to increase information on whether, and how, such individual sun bear releases can be successful.
Coexisting with Carnivores in the Madison Valley: finding some common ground
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On 18 August 2009, we hosted a workshop at the Sun West Ranch in the Madison Valley to discuss in an open and informal way where we are in terms of coexisting with carnivores: the conflicts with bears and wolves, the tools available to address those conflicts. More broadly we were interested in addressing the way we communicate among ourselves and how can we improve the level of cooperation and coordination so that not only conflicts can be avoided, but so we can foster a greater sense of respect and trust.

The workshop was attended by several Sun West Ranch homeowners, Madison Valley residents and staff of the Sun Ranch Institute and Northern Rockies Conservation Cooperative.

We discussed and exchanged views on several themes, including but not limited to: what have we done in terms of promoting coexistence between carnivores and people, the significance of the Madison Valley for connectivity, and the current population status of bears and wolves in the valley. We also probed to what extent the conflicts are simply on-the-ground conflicts or the result of more complex cultural and ideological worldviews on bears and wolves.

We then engaged in an exercise of appraising to what extent we, as a community, have been successful in addressing carnivore/human coexistence concerns and how can we do a better job. We discussed what “measures of success” could be and whether there is a place for economic incentives for carnivore/human coexistence. There is, for example, a new “eco-tourism” initiative called Madison Valley Expeditions that on the basis of a relationship with local working ranches, visitors are allowed to have access to private lands for hiking, wildlife watching and other activities. A variety of views were expressed as to the value of “eco-tourism”. Participants then discussed the value of local knowledge and the importance of harnessing the experience, wisdom and enthusiasm of those who are directly affected by the conflicts to foster a greater sense of ownership over problems.
Update to American Black Bear Range Map
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This winter, the Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission plans to launch a survey to update the range of American black bear across North America. The last update was in the late 1990s (Pelton and van Manen 1994, Pelton et al. 1999). We’re attempting to use a web-accessible GIS to collect the data and we will contact at least one person for each per state/province in the next few months.

Specific details are still being worked out, but we will likely be using 50 km² hexagons with two levels (breeding/primary range and non-breeding/secondary range) and point locations for unusual or transient locations outside this area. Previous mapping efforts suggested future updates be digital and repeatable. We felt that using hexagons to denote occupied range rather than the traditional hand-drawn polygon would be a much easier way to submit and process the data and facilitate comparison with future updates. Hand-drawn maps require digitizing into a GIS, and creating polygon lines on screen with the web-accessed GIS application requires 100s of mouse clicks to enter vertices at each bend in the line. Also, we felt range boundaries were seldom as definitive an edge as a line denotes. Furthermore, at the continental scale much of this detail would be lost.

We are asking for point locations where bears have been documented outside their managed populations because although it has not been part of past range maps, the news this year has been full of stories of black bears showing up outside of their traditional habitats and in odd places such as Miami, Cape Cod. Nebraska had their first black bear occurrence since 1907 (Hoffman et al. 2009). These locations may be harbingers of future range expansion, and we felt it was important to capture this data now for future updates.
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Participants agreed that honest dialogue and sharing information on conflicts and movements of local bears and wolves is critical to increasing a sense of commitment and the willingness to prevent conflicts. That said, there was also an awareness among all of us that there is no single tool that works for all and sometimes lethal control, albeit regretfully, must be deployed.

As the workshop was wrapping up, nearby, a black bear was trying to break into a homeowner’s garage; a reminder perhaps to put words into action?
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A black bear that became a “problem bear” for allegedly “harrassing” hikers on Bear Creek in the Madison Valley
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The Bear Forest

The first dancing bears arrived in the Dutch bear sanctuary “The Bear Forest” in the summer of 1993. This sanctuary for mistreated and abused dancing- and circus bears has been a safe haven for brown bears ever since. Two hectares of forested area, on the edge of Ouwehand Zoo in Rhenen, tucked away in a natural forest in the center of The Netherlands. The sanctuary is well planted with pine and deciduous trees, shrubs, has many tree-trunks, a large water basin for the bears to swim in and dens for the bears to shelter or sleep in. Since 1993, 22 bears have lived and still live in this semi-naturalistic enclosure.

During the past few years Alertis – the Fund for bear and nature conservation - the non-governmental organization behind “The Bear Forest”, has put together all the experience and information acquired over the past one and a half decade on captive bears into a single document on large naturalistic bear enclosures. “The Bear Forest” has been used as a blue print since the sanctuary has demonstrated to be very well designed and managed for more than 15 years. The document has been transformed into a website called “Large Bear Enclosures” (LBE).

The website (www.largebearenclosures.com)

The website is divided into three parts: enclosure design, bear management and veterinary management; it offers practical approaches to managing captive brown bears in their most natural setting. The website gives an insight in the step-by-step approach as to how an LBE can be built and managed.

Practical information presented in “Enclosure Design” focuses on fence construction and materials, in- and outdoor enclosures and vegetation. The second part of the website, “Bear Management,” describes in detail the management of LBEs and its inhabitants. These enclosures differ from more traditional zoo enclosures in size, management and sometimes purpose. The third part on “Veterinary Management” describes all aspects of present-day veterinary care of captive bears. The information is often accompanied by graphics and photographs. A veterinarian should be able to diagnose health problems by means of simple and practical strategies.

Brown bears appear to be very strong and healthy animals. Properly managed, they are rarely subject to severe infectious or non-infectious diseases. Next to the problems caused by the mistreatment of the animal (like in the case of dancing bears), trauma is often seen due to management failures or fighting with other
Captive Bears

Large Bear Enclosures

Throughout the world, bears are held in captivity, used for conservation and entertainment purposes. Some of these bears are held in zoos and circuses, while others are kept in private collections. The conditions in which these bears are kept can vary greatly, from severely overcrowded and unsanitary enclosures to relatively spacious and well-maintained enclosures.

The Bear Forest in the Netherlands is a large semi-natural habitat that has been developed to provide a more natural environment for bears. The forest contains various types of trees and shrubs, as well as a variety of other elements that are typical of a natural bear habitat.

In addition to the forest, the Bear Forest also includes a series of enclosures that are designed to meet the specific needs of different bear species. These enclosures vary in size and design, with some being large and open, while others are smaller and more enclosed.

The Bear Forest is open to visitors, who are encouraged to learn more about bears and the challenges they face in the wild. The forest offers a unique opportunity to see bears in a more natural setting, and to gain a deeper understanding of their behavior and needs.

The Bear Forest is a model for the care and management of bears in captivity, and serves as a valuable resource for those who are committed to the conservation of these magnificent animals.
Captive Bears

Student Highlight: Lori Homstol

Lori is working on a widespread and increasing problem: human-bear conflicts. In British Columbia, Canada, bear managers kill approximately 800 black bears and 35 grizzly bears annually because of conflicts with humans. Because managers were under increasing pressure to use non-lethal methods, particularly around resort communities, the BC Conservation Officer Service supported a scientific study of how black bears respond to aversive conditioning (AC). Using theories of how animals learn and guidelines for effective punishment, Lori is studying the effectiveness of non-lethal bear management tools in Whistler, BC. The study began in 2005 and Lori started her masters program with the University of Alberta in 2007.

Using theories of how animals learn, she is conducting two experiments to test the effectiveness of non-lethal bear management tools. The first is to pair a whistle sound cue with pain stimuli (3-5 days of rubber bullets fired from a shotgun and marbles fired from a slingshot). If successful, this would allow the public to safely deter bears from conflict situations with a whistle before Conservation officers arrived, helping to reduce food-conditioning. She has GPS radiocollared bears alternately assigned to one of three treatment groups: pain with whistle, pain alone, and a control. Lori then compares pre-treatment measures of wariness to post-treatment wariness. Also, she’ll compare bears’ use of security cover and human developments before and after treatments and across treatment groups.

The second experiment is using a nausea-inducing emetic (thiabendazole) to induce a conditioned taste aversion to human food attractants that are difficult to secure from bears (e.g., apples in orchards and grain spilled on railway tracks). In one treatment, Lori offered grain and honey to captive bears during pre-
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Truman Update
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Conference Organizer
19th International Conference on Bear Research and Management is organized by NACRES-Centre for Biodiversity Conservation and Research (www.nacres.org), a not-for-profit organization that was founded in 1989 in Georgia. Its mission is to safeguard the biodiversity of Georgia and the South Caucasus, through conservation activities at national and local levels, based on sound science, sustainability principles, and local participation. NACRES carries out research and conservation activities both at the ecosystem and species levels. In parallel to other mammal species in the South Caucasus, the brown bear is one of the top priority animals for our organization.

Conference Goal and Language
One of the main goals of the Tbilisi conference is to promote dialogue
between bear specialists of the West and the East. We will try our best to bring more scientists and conservationists from previously under-represented countries (e.g., Russia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, other former USSR countries, etc) to meet their counterparts from the world to share their experiences, discuss and possibly plan future cooperation in the fields of bear research and management.

The official language of the Conference is English. But as we expect to have delegates from former USSR countries, the conference will provide simultaneous translation into English for all Russian-language oral presentations. The organizers will also try their best to have interpreters around during the sessions and coffee-breaks to facilitate contacts between English and Russian speaking delegates.

**Georgia – some brief data**

Georgia is an Eurasian country, located in the South Caucasian, at the juncture of Eastern Europe and Western Asia. Georgia borders four countries: Turkey to the southwest, Russia to the north, Armenia to the south, and Azerbaijan to the east. In addition, there is a western coastline on the Black Sea. Georgia’s population is over 4.3 million, nearly 84% of which are ethnic Georgians. It is predominantly a Christian country and approximately 90% of its population identify themselves as followers of the Georgian Christian Orthodox Church.

**Environment**

Georgia's natural environment is one of the most unique and varied in the world. Remarkable for its landscape diversity, from mountains to desert, from snow to palm trees, Georgia ranks among the world’s “must to see countries”. Within 67,000 square kilometers (about the size of Ireland) you can find 5,000-meter peaks (approx. 16,400 ft); glaciers, alpine meadows; sub-tropical coastline, desert, semi-desert; fertile alluvial valleys, wetlands and of course huge swathes of virgin forest. Indeed nearly 40% of Georgia is still forested, a large proportion of which is still “virgin”. Due to its large areas of uninhabited forest, low levels of tourism and remote high alpine zones Georgia has preserved more species of animal than any country in Europe. This includes a number of endemic species - of which perhaps most notable is the Caucasian tur, a relative of the European ibex it comes in two versions, eastern and western. The western Capra caucasica is unique for its splendid laterally curved horns. Besides these species, Georgia has many animals now long departed from Western Europe. Apart from brown bears, Georgia has populations of lynx, wild boar, bezoar goats, chamois, red deer, Caucasian wolves, striped hyena, jackal, wild cat, a number of endemic butterflies, lizards, snakes, and tortoises. Recently the critically endangered Caucasian leopard has been caught on NACRES’ remote cameras in the Vashlovani National Park - although it has yet to be seen by naked eye.

**Tbilisi, the capital**

Tbilisi (population: 1.2 million), is a picturesque city: not simply a hill city of winding cobblestone streets but because it is a city of the mountains. Nestled in a river valley where the Northern and South Caucasus Mountain ranges almost meet, it has spectacular views from innumerable locations and a short drive from downtown you are in the alpine meadows above. Over the centuries Tbilisi has become synonymous with gracious living and warm welcomes. “Tbili” actually means “warm,” and although this refers to the water in the natural sulphur baths in one of the districts of the city - it could speak for the people as a whole. In addition, it is a very safe place to visit.

Tbilisi International Airport has many direct flights from major cities in Europe (Istanbul, Paris, London, Vienna, Frankfurt, Munich, Amsterdam, etc). A passport valid for at least 6 months is required for visitors of all nationalities. However, there is no visa requirement for citizens of European Union countries, USA, Canada, Israel, and Japan. Former USSR nationals (except of Russia and Turkmenistan) do not require a visa.

**Suggested Field Trips**

Field trips will include the Borjomi National Parks, historical cultural tour city tour in old historic capital (Mtskheta, near the present capital Tbilisi), famous wine cellars in Kakheti region (eastern Georgia), and the Kazbegi region in the Great Caucasus mountains.

Detailed information on Georgia, Tbilisi, and our meeting (including information on the conference venue, travel arrangements, registration, planned workshops, presentation formats and protocols, lodging, travel grants, etc) can be found at the Conference website:

www.nacres.org/bearconference.
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About the International Association for Bear Research and Management (IBA)

The International Association for Bear Research and Management (IBA) is a non-profit tax-exempt organization open to professional biologists, wildlife managers, and others dedicated to the conservation of all bear species. The organization has over 550 members from over 50 countries. It supports the scientific management of bears through research and distribution of information. The IBA sponsors international conferences on all aspects of bear biology, ecology, and management. The proceedings are published as peer-reviewed scientific papers in the journal *Ursus*.

**IBA Mission Statement**

**Goal:** The goal of the International Association for Bear Research and Management (IBA) is to promote the conservation and restoration of the world’s bears through science-based research, management, and education.

**Objectives:** In support of this goal, IBA’s objectives are to:
1. Promote and foster well-designed research of the highest professional standards.
2. Develop and promote sound stewardship of the world’s bears through scientifically based population and habitat management.
3. Publish and distribute, through its conferences and publications, peer-reviewed scientific and technical information of high quality addressing broad issues of ecology, conservation, and management.
4. Encourage communication and collaboration across scientific disciplines and among bear researchers and managers through conferences, workshops, and newsletters.
5. Increase public awareness and understanding of bear ecology, conservation, and management by encouraging the translation of technical information into popular literature and other media, as well as through other educational forums.
6. Encourage the professional growth and development of our members.
7. Provide professional counsel and advice on issues of natural resource policy related to bear management and conservation.
8. Maintain the highest standards of professional ethics and scientific integrity.
9. Encourage full international participation in the IBA through the siting of conferences, active recruitment of international members and officers, and through financial support for international research, travel to meetings, memberships, and journal subscriptions.
10. Through its integrated relationship with the Bear Specialist Group of the World Conservation Union (IUCN)/Species Survival Commission, identify priorities in bear research and management and recruit project proposals to the IBA Grants Program that address these priorities.
11. Build an endowment and a future funding base to provide ongoing support for IBA core functions and for the IBA Grants Program.
12. Support innovative solutions to bear conservation dilemmas that involve local communities as well as national or regional governments and, to the extent possible, address their needs without compromising bear conservation, recognizing that conservation is most successful where human communities are stable and can see the benefits of conservation efforts.
13. Form partnerships with other institutions to achieve conservation goals, where partnerships could provide additional funding, knowledge of geographical areas, or expertise in scientific or non-scientific sectors.

Deadline for the February 2010 issue is 5 January 2010
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